

2

Human and animal space in historic ‘pet’ cemeteries in London, New York and Paris

Hilda Kean

This chapter will analyse the nature of three important historic animal cemeteries. These are the Hyde Park pet cemetery in London, Hartsdale pet cemetery outside New York, and the Cimetière des Chiens in Asnières-sur-Seine in Paris. Dating back to the late 19th century, these are the oldest animal cemeteries in their respective countries. Those in New York state and Paris still function as ‘open’ cemeteries. Animal cemeteries emphasise the importance of particular individual animals to individual humans. Although there are occasional references such as a plaque ‘In memory of the millions of animals whose lives are taken for research and testing’ (in Hartsdale) or to ‘the strays and ill-treated creatures’ (in the PDSA animal cemetery in Ilford, London), these are primarily sites of expression of emotion of humans towards personally known animals with whom at least one human shared their personal living space.

During the 19th century the status of domestic animals grew; and, in turn, so did the commemoration of animals after death. Despite their relatively short lives, ‘pets were seen as being worthy of celebration with the visual language of permanence’. Thus Matthew Craske has described the work of artist Landseer, famous for animal paintings, who

H Kean (2013). Human and animal space in historic ‘pet’ cemeteries in London, New York and Paris. In J Johnston & F Probyn-Rapsey (Eds). *Animal death*. Sydney: Sydney University Press.

‘in much the manner as a taxidermist, [was] commissioned to paint, as if in life, the corpse of a dog brought to his studio by a grieving owner’ (Craske 2000, 42). As Diana Donald has astutely analysed, in Landseer’s paintings each animal has a ‘distinctive psychology’ (Donald 2007, 144). His portraits of dogs were not ‘banal portraiture’ but ‘emotive moral dramas, in which the mentality of animals, and its relationship to that of humans, were the real subject’ (Donald 2007, 127). His popularity helped influence the way that domestic animals were seen as sentient beings (Kean 2000, 80–2). This depiction of animals was one influence on the initiation of public animal cemeteries but so too was the growing public – as well as private – memorialisation in civic and national sculpture at least in Europe and the United States of America (Kean 2011a; Michalski 1998, 7–8). In addition, such public animal cemeteries were also situated, as Philip Howell has discussed, ‘within the same moral and spiritual framework as the reformed practice of interment, and the parallel growth of sanitary suburban cemeteries’ (Howell 2002, 11). Here was an attempt to alleviate the status of animals not merely in the present but in some future afterlife. The *Strand Magazine* gave status to dogs by suggesting ‘So intelligent and so amiable a dog assuredly deserves a Christian burial’ (‘A cemetery for dogs’, *Strand Magazine* 1893, 625–33 as quoted in Howell 2002, 10). Certainly the sentiments famously expressed by Jane Carlyle on the death of her dog Nero were not hers alone: ‘I grieve for him as if he had been my little human child’ (Howell 2002, 13).

The three cemeteries have changed in different ways over the past century. The London Hyde Park Dog Cemetery as it was originally called (it also admitted the corpses of three small monkeys, and two cats) was established in 1880 in the part of the park that lies adjacent to Kensington Gardens (Gordon-Stables 1912, 257–59; Simpson 1902, 260). Although accounts vary as to the origins of the cemetery, either initiated by the Duke of Connaught (Gordon-Stables 1912) or through a favour of the gatekeeper to friends who lived nearby (Pet Cemetery 1997), it is evident that the cemetery was not run for profit but as a philanthropic gesture towards grieving animal owners. The acreage was small, being situated within the garden of Mr Winbridge the gatekeeper at the Victoria Lodge (Pet Cemetery 1997). Within a few years there was no further space and by 1902, when it contained some three hundred graves, it was permanently closed (Pet Cemetery 1997; Simpson

2 Human and animal space in historic 'pet' cemeteries



Figure 2.1 Hyde Park Pet Cemetery, London (1997).

1902, 257). Subsequently many animal cemeteries have been established in the London area (and elsewhere), including those run by animal charities such as the renovated PDSA cemetery in Ilford which both hosts memorials for individual animals deemed to have been heroes during the Second World War and the remains of thousands killed by their human 'companions' at the start of the war (Kean 2013; Parker 2008). Since the early years of the 20th century, the Hyde Park cemetery has no longer fulfilled its original function. It has nevertheless been preserved as a heritage site although opportunities to visit have been restricted. (It became a heritage site and could be seen on 'Open House' weekends one day a year but this opportunity to view is no longer available.)

By way of contrast the geographical location of the Hartsdale cemetery, the oldest animal cemetery in the United States, founded in 1896, north of New York in Westchester County, is far from the centre of the sprawling city. The original owner Dr Johnson was a veterinary surgeon. Apparently he was inspired by seeing similar cemeteries in

Animal death



Figure 2.2 Overview of Hartsdale Pet Cemetery, New York (2007).

London, Paris and Edinburgh.¹ He offered his apple orchard as a burial site for a friend's dog and then developed the ground as a business.² Initially five acres, the cemetery continues to function and grow. By 1920 some 3000 animals had been buried including dogs and cats, one lion, two monkeys, three ducks, one horse and a number of chickens ('Where good dogs go' 1920, 68). Today there are remains of nearly 80,000 nonhuman animals although in recent years it has also taken in cremated humans too, reaching by 2007 some 700 such ashes. The cremated remains, for example, of Sandra Rindner from New York City who founded 'Miss Rumpel's Orphanage for Small Dogs' and who died in 2006 have been buried there along with the remains of four canine companions and one feline called Buzby.³

1 The small Edinburgh dog cemetery within the castle grounds was started during the 19th century as a burial place for regimental mascots and for the dogs of officers and is still tended as a memorial ground. 'Where good dogs go', 1920, 68.

2 Hartsdale Pet Cemetery and Crematory. Retrieved 13 March 2013 from www.hartsdalepetcrematory.com/aboutus.

3 'Founder of canine orphanage interred at Hartsdale', 2007, 2. Retrieved 3 June 2013 from site.mawebcenters.com/hartsdalepetcemetery/Newsletters/2007.pdf.

2 Human and animal space in historic 'pet' cemeteries



Figure 2.3 Cat on grave at Cimetière des Chiens, Asniere-sur-Seine, Paris (2011).

The Parisian cemetery that presumably inspired Dr Johnson was the Cimetière des Chiens in Asnières-sur-Seine, just outside the city of Paris on the left bank side of the Seine beyond the Clichy bridge. When it was founded in 1899 by Georges Harmois and Marguerite Durand the cemetery was on land occupied by rag and bone men ('chiffonniers'). Soon this site of discarded remains was transformed into an altogether more prestigious place commemorating animal death with the employment of the Parisian architect Eugene Petit as designer of the grand entrance to the cemetery (Cimetière des Chiens 2011). Outside the city this too was a place set apart from the everyday where humans

Animal death

could mourn animals. In recent decades the cemetery has expanded onto adjacent land. It also is a place for living animals. Feral cats are regularly fed within the cemetery by people listed by name within the cemetery who are regulated by the ADCC (Association de Défense du Cimetière de Chiens et Autres Animaux).

Rather than dispose of former family companions as waste, the establishment of specific burial grounds for animals also became ‘infused with . . . spiritual(ist) associations’ (Howell 2002, 12). Initially – and later – public cemeteries for animals reflected the form of the commemoration found in contemporary human cemeteries. Thus, in London, funerals were conducted that included attendance by former canine friends (Gordon-Stables 1912, 257–58). Headstones were laid out in little rows and carried epitaphs; for example, as quoted on the headstone of ‘Betty’:

And when at length my own life’s work is o’er,
I hope to find her waiting as of yore,
Eager, expectant, glad to meet me at the door.
(Gordon-Stables 1912, 258)

All three cemeteries include similar sentiments of hope of a future meeting. ‘A bientôt au paradis’, is but one Parisian example. As an early epitaph from Hartsdale records:

My Adored Zowi I do not cringe from death as much
Since you are gone, my truest friend.
Thy dear dumb soul will wait for mine
However long before the end
(‘Where the good dogs go’ 1920, 68).

There are frequent visual representations of the gate to paradise. More recent burials reflect other religious sentiments, most notably those of Judaism, with small stones placed on the gravestone, as evident on the memorial to the rabbit Bunga in Asnières, or the Star of David on the memorial to Bethel ‘good girl’ in Hartsdale. As Norine Dresser has noted, if no specific animal rituals are available then pet owners tend to incorporate animals into rituals originally intended just for humans (Dresser 2000, 102). Thus markers will not be put on gravestones

2 Human and animal space in historic 'pet' cemeteries



Figure 2.4 Gate to Heaven memorial, Cimetière des Chiens, Asniere-sur-Seine (2011).

of animals within a Jewish household until a year has passed (Dresser 2000, 100). However, the still functioning cemeteries at Hartsdale and Asnières have, in different ways, attempted to go beyond the creation of a site of personal mourning to a site that remembers the role of individual animals with the nation's and city's story.

National heritages

Dating to the early years of the cemetery, Barry, a 19th-century St Bernard dog, and national hero, was represented by a grand sculpture at the entrance to Asnières (Terhune 1937, 284). On the dog's back is a child he has rescued during the course of his work at the Hospice of Great St Bernard in the Alps. According to the story, he saved 40 people. He was killed by the 41st who, in an exhausted state, thinking him a wolf, stabbed Barry. Nevertheless the dog made his way back to the hospice to raise the alarm, directing a rescue party to the injured man before dying himself. Although the story has recently been debunked, the presence of a represented Barry is nevertheless an attempt to construct the cemetery as more than a site of personal mourning (Bondeson 2011, 190–95). This development of the cemetery as a broader heritage site is reinforced by the stone of 2006 to Moustache, remembering his death nearly two centuries before. Moustache, a black poodle dog prominent in Napoleon's campaigns in Austria and Spain, died from a cannonball in 1812. His plaque was erected by those who identified themselves as 'Amis du patrimoine Napoléonien' rather than as animal lovers as such.⁴

The first memorial in Hartsdale to go beyond a personal relationship with an individual animal was the 1923 statue of a nameless German shepherd dog, designed by Walter Buttendorf and sculpted by Robert Catterson, in 1923. This nameless dog wearing a red cross is sculpted alongside a soldier's battered helmet and canteen. It is dedicated to 'man's most faithful friend', the dogs who played their part 'in bringing peace and comfort to the men who were wounded on the battlefield.' This would be the first of several such memorials in Hartsdale. Recent plaques have included those to dogs who served during the Oklahoma bombing in 1995 and to Sirius. This rescue dog – who worked with David Lim, a police officer – was the only such dog to die in the aftermath of the attack on the World Trade Center in 2001. Lim had been trapped in the collapsed building and was one of the last survivors to be

4 By way of contrast, the statue of the Alaskan malamute dog, Balto, who brought lifesaving diphtheria serum to the stranded people of Nome in Alaska, was not erected in New York's Central Park by people with connections to Alaska but rather by dog lovers living near the park (Kean 2009).

2 Human and animal space in historic 'pet' cemeteries



Figure 2.5 Barry at the gates of Cimetière des Chiens (2011).

rescued. Ironically Lim had left the dog behind in the basement while he rushed up as far as the 44th floor as he had not wanted to endanger Sirius. Lim was forbidden from going back to the basement to search for Sirius. The dog was found months later and brought up in a basket covered with the American flag, in a similar ritual to that enacted for human victims. Subsequently there was a memorial service attended by 400 people and 100 dogs.⁵

The location of such animal memorialisation is significant. Some countries, most notably Australia, have created national icons of certain animals in war, often in important memorial sites. In particular the

1936 Wallace Anderson 'Simpson and his donkey' outside the Melbourne Shrine of Remembrance and the 1988 version by Peter Corlett outside the Australian War Memorial in Canberra have ensured that this earlier iconography of the emerging ANZAC nation remains a central part of national commemoration that the founders of the Australian War Memorial in Canberra had established (Scates 2009, 159; Kean 2012b, 251–56). This Australian trend of commemorating animals' role in war in national sites of memory has been most recently perpetuated through the 2009 'Animals in War' memorial of Steve Mark Holland in the same location. Drawing on a bronze horse's head that was previously part of a memorial to the Desert Mounted Corps in Port Said in Egypt, destroyed during the Suez crisis, it pays attention particularly through an accompanying plaque to the various roles of animals who 'served alongside Australians' (Kean 2011b, 63).

However, such examples are in national sites of war memory where people go to remember and think primarily about the human war dead. Such landscapes are very different locations to those of memorials in animal cemeteries. The memorials to Moustache or Sirius, for example, will only be seen by those already sufficiently interested in nonhuman animals to be visiting an animal cemetery. Such memorials, while erected with respectful intentions, are unlikely to alert people generally to the importance of animals' role within a nation's heritage.

Blurring animal and human space

This raises the question of the extent to which such cemeteries are 'animal' places. In discussing 'nature's spaces', for example, Steve Hinchliffe has suggested that they are not 'straightforwardly independent of the societies with which they co-exist. A better spatial imagery than an island of natural facts untouched by people will be needed' (Hinchliffe et al. 2005, 33). In thinking more expansively about a continuum between animals included and excluded within 'everyday space', Philo has argued that companion animals are readily accepted into such places

5 '15 seconds of hell: K-9 officer lives through North Tower collapse'. CNN.com. Retrieved 13 March 2013 from edition.cnn.com/SPECIALS/2002/america.remembers/stories/heroes/lim.html.

2 Human and animal space in historic 'pet' cemeteries

(Philo 1995, 677). Animal cemeteries are, I suggest, places of overlapping, if not competing, geographies in which human and animal are blurred in various ways. In discussing animal memorialisation in Australia, Rose Searby, for example, has talked of the way in which memorial landscape is 'co-constructed by humans and animals, something that can enable a repositioning of animals in relation to humans and result in the creation of a new framework of reference for memorialising animals' (Searby 2008, 120). Certainly in some sense one can define these animal cemeteries as animal places, since they contain the corpses or cremated remains of animals. But these corporeal remains are never seen. All that is visible are human words and iconography and sometimes a photo of the animal when alive or an engraved representation in stone.

To an interested visitor – rather than a former companion – the physicality of the animal is, in some ways, less important than the way in which the animal is described, usually by an individual or couple of humans. Human emotions towards a dead animal are dominant but, as many of the inscriptions suggest, such sentiment is reflective of a relationship crossing species boundaries. As James Serpell has observed, 'human-pet relationships are unique because they are based primarily on the transfer or exchange of social rather than economic or utilitarian provisions' (Serpell 2005, 131). There are narratives that describe an individual's behaviour or characteristics, or even, in a few instances, the prizes won by pedigree cats or dogs such as 'Ici Reposent les Premiers Komondors de France de Bergers Hongrois Celebres Champions Nationaux Internationaux et Mondiale'.

Across time the dominant sentiments are of the value the human has derived from the relationship. Typical examples range from the epitaph to Barrie in London: 'In life the firmest friend, The first to welcome, Foremost to defend' or 'Minouche, my best pal' in Hartsdale in 1937, or Béb  'Toi, notre chien, plus humain qu'un humain . . .' in Asni res this century. In many instances – again across time – the animal death provides the human with an opportunity to talk about their own condition that has been ameliorated by the now dead animal. Thus the early gravestone to Douchka 'compagne fidele dans mes jours de tristesse et de solitude 1894–1907' and 'A notre petit Marquis si fidele mort le 24 Juillet 1923 a l'age de 9 ans notre seul ami'. This continues in the recent past, for example, in the epitaph to a small black dog: 'Sophie

mon bébé nous avons eu 17 ans d'amour toi et tes petites soeurs vous avez remplacé l'enfant que je n'ai pas eu. Je t'aime a jamais. Ta petite Mère'. Such outpourings are not exclusively French. Thus in Hartsdale Trixie is described in 1987 as 'very best friend' and in Hyde Park Puck Lee was described, 'In a false world thy heart was brave and true'.⁶

In discussing animal–human relationships and their representations generally, it is important to look at the broader cultural and chronological contexts. The relationship is not constant (Brantz 2010, 10–11; Kean 2012a, 58–60). Nevertheless, strikingly, but perhaps not surprisingly, there is the overwhelmingly constant feature of a positive and emotional engagement. While fashions in memorial stones or the language of loss may shift, an underpinning sentiment does cross time. It is the human expressing emotion, often addressed to the dead but deemed receptive animal. Morris, Knight and Lesley have noted, 'That pet owners believe more in animal emotion is likely due to the extent to which they have engaged socially with their own animals' (2012, 221). This understanding continues after the animal's death.

Changing contexts: emotion and language

Clearly such epitaphs illustrate human emotion towards the dead animal; but they do more than that. The cemetery itself has certain conventions: not least that those visiting will be sympathetic to the idea of remembering animal companions. It is a space that provides a safe location for humans to convey positive emotion towards this particular animal–human relationship. Such emotion may more generally be subject to ridicule or derision. Although interactive websites or obituary pages of newspapers may provide opportunities for the expression of loss, they are so 'public' and detached from physical space that it is impossible to easily 'monitor' visitors. This has been analysed by Jane Desmond in relation to pet obituaries covered in some American newspapers where their proximity to human obituaries has been seen as

6 Gordon-Stables 1912, 259. Another example drawn from the Berkshire Park animal cemetery to the west of Sydney is 'Our beloved son Ewark Suen now that you're away from us we will never feel the same. An essential part of our life is missing and nothing else can take your place, mummy and pappu'.

2 Human and animal space in historic 'pet' cemeteries

demeaning towards people (Desmond 2011). Companion animals – other than pedigrees who have genealogical breed charts that record the names of their parents and grandparents etc. – routinely have only one given name. The assumption is that they are looked after within a particular family and that if a surname is needed at all it will be that of the humans. Thus although the names of pet animals are always stated, the names of the humans are not. Indeed it is quite unusual to have a full name. Exceptions include 'Mrs Jennie M Owen's Black Pomeranian Rags' in Hartsdale from 1921 or the grand black marble stone of Alfred Anthony D'Elia in which (as at 2007) 21 cats were remembered by name. Thus human sentiments can be expressed anonymously in a quasi-public place. A particularly striking example is on the stone in Hyde Park to 'Fritz Omnia Veritas' with underneath 'Balu son of Fritz poisoned by a cruel Swiss'. The sentiments expressed can be quite revealing about the condition of the human. As in the examples suggested above, it can include declaring oneself to be friendless apart from animal companionship. The 'animal space' in fact permits the most personal of human statements of their *own* condition and past emotional state.

In a cemetery in Western culture, whether human or animal, language is key. As I have discussed elsewhere concerning human grave-stones in the 19th century, texts from the Psalms were often employed for those suffering from a long illness. For example, 'I waited patiently for the Lord and he inclined unto me and heard my cry' (Kean 2004, 65). Thus the dead person would be seen to speak. In this example I considered the way in which a woman who was illiterate in life became transformed in death as articulate and literate, thus maintaining a material presence in the village where she had lived and died for some centuries after her death. As Ranciere has discussed, 'The availability of writing – of the "mute" letter – endows any life, or the life of anybody, with the capacity of taking on meaning, of entering into the universe of meaning' (as quoted in Kean 2004, 66).

Recently, in an insightful work, Tom Tyler has critically explored anthropomorphism as a form of anthropocentrism, and different philosophical debates on the nature of language as a symbol of a divide between animals and humans (Tyler 2012, 63ff). Traditionally the possession (or not) of language – defined as an exclusively human attribute – was what was deemed to distinguish humans from animals. This was

Animal death



Figure 2.6 Balu memorial stone, Hyde Park Pet Cemetery (1997).

challenged most famously by Bentham who attempted to define not language as a dividing line but to employ other senses, notably pain, as a shared experience (Kean 2000, 21–2). In animal cemeteries there is no attempt to make the dead animal speak: rather s/he is a focus for the words of a grieving human. This follows on from the nature of the relationship between a known individual human and a known individual animal. Those forming strong bonds with companion animals under-

2 Human and animal space in historic 'pet' cemeteries

stand that there is a form of communication in various ways between humans and animals within a household – even if for scientists this is a relatively new phenomenon (Bradshaw 2011, 210–23).

In the 19th century, Bentham was seeking, amongst other things, to move away from what apparently distinguished humans and animals to what drew them together. Yet at that time, 'speaking animals' were routinely employed by animal welfare campaigners to convince people of the need for humane attitudes. Keri Cronin has carefully explored visual images used by 19th-century campaigners against animal cruelty. In order to invoke sympathy in humans yet to be convinced of the value of animal welfare, animals were depicted as speaking. Such images included the popular image of a Newfoundland dog (famous for rescuing people from drowning), taken from a Landseer painting, used in anti-vivisection propaganda with the slogan 'Save me! I would save you' (Cronin 2011, 214). As Cronin analyses, an imagined voice and agency underscored the fact that nonhuman animals were sentient beings (220). Similarly Teresa Mangum has argued that, in contemporary poetry exploring emotion towards animal loss, 'the human speaker finds himself or herself fighting to articulate the unique dignity and importance of an animal in part to explain to *themselves* and to others how a human could feel such deep grief at the loss of a "mere animal" ' (Mangum 2007, 162; my emphasis).

Writing of the more recent period, Davis et al. have argued that in the 21st century losing a pet is seen as qualitatively similar to losing a beloved human (Davis et al. 2003, 58). The difference is the way in which that loss might be expressed and where. Emotion has been expressed in pet cemeteries from the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries onwards: no attempt to explain grief is needed because of the location. The place, the physical landscape of the cemetery, is itself a celebration of a particular personal cross-species relationship. Justification is not needed; nor are measures to convince the unsympathetic of the existence of the sentience of animals. Animals do not need to 'speak' from beyond the grave to convince particular humans that they have consciousness – in this context it is a given. Although an animal 'voice' is absent, many traces of the animal's activities and sense of agency are present. Former actions of animals within a domestic space are recorded as well as the human response. Thus in Asnieres Arry is remembered by a glass bowl containing tennis balls and Iris described



Figure 2.7 Tennis balls for Arry, *Cimetière des Chiens* (2011).

as ‘Aux pieds ailes’. (In the Berkshire Park pet cemetery to the west of Sydney, in language reminiscent of Thomas Hardy’s poem about his own epitaph, Cleo Cotton is remembered for her observations within the landscape: ‘sunshine, plants, soil, grass and insects. She used to notice such things.’)⁷

Adrian Franklin has argued that in recognising the needs of others and possibilities of mutuality the ‘animal–human relation is not one characterised simply by strong sentiments, but also unconsciously challenging and dissolving the human–animal boundary itself’ (Franklin 1999, 86). While such dissolving may be found in the emotional engagement expressed in animal cemeteries in some way, there are also sharp divisions: the human is still living and thus able to express emotion or hopes for the future, while the dead animal, obviously, is not. However, the sight of feral cats wandering through Asnières and being

7 ‘He was a man who used to notice such things.’ ‘Afterwards’ in Hardy 1970, 521.

2 Human and animal space in historic 'pet' cemeteries

fed amongst the graves also reinforces the cemetery as a place of safety for animals.

Despite the growth in number of animal cemeteries, domestic animals remembered publicly in these ways are still in a minority. There are new forms such as internet remembrance; for example, the websites *Gone Too Soon* (www.gonetoosoon.org/) or *Rainbow Bridge* (www.rainbowbridge.com/) that are often explicitly religious or spiritual in tone. Physical 'unofficial' sites such as the memorial wall in the Federal Park in Annandale in Sydney are secular in character. Brief details of the dog's name and dates are written on one of the brick arches near where dogs and humans play. Thus this acts as a signifier of death but within a place not removed from the everyday, in an animal-human place of leisure.

Recently those working with abused or abandoned animals have started to explore the ways in which domestic animals may mourn other animals. Julie Ann Smith of the House Rabbit Society, a rescue society founded in 1988, suggests that rabbits eventually come to understand that their partners are dead by grooming or lying by them (Smith 2005, 190). However, she does not know, she says, whether the rabbit acting in this way will know that this will happen to her/him in the future, albeit concluding that 'animals may understand their own experiences in their own ways' (Smith 2005, 200).

Perhaps one of the most interesting developments in commemorating animal death is the burial ground that exists at the Hillside Animal Sanctuary, in England, just outside Norwich. The sanctuary takes in and look after thousands of abandoned 'farm' animals and horses and donkeys and also undertakes investigations into animal cruelty, particularly in farming. As they state on their website, 'Although at Hillside we have given sanctuary to over 600 horses, ponies and donkeys, most of our residents have been rescued from the farming industry'.⁸ (It routinely exposes atrocious conditions even in farms given RSPCA approval.) Animals are not killed but live out their days safely. They are then buried in a small graveyard in the centre of the sanctuary adjacent to the fields where cows graze. The graves are simple, but large, and adorned with modest wooden crosses.

8 Hillside Animal Sanctuary. Retrieved on 13 March 2013, www.hillside.org.uk.

Animal death



Figure 2.8 Dog memorial wall, Federal Park, Annandale, Sydney (2010).

In a discussion at the end of the collection *Killing animals*, Diana Donald noted that ‘perhaps the absolute basic distinction is between those kinds of killing that are wilfully invisible, removed from the consciousness of the perpetrators and excluded from the sight of anyone else, and those that are in some way commemorated or represented?’ (Animal Studies Group 2006, 198). What is striking about the Hillside example is that the type of animal usually killed in a slaughterhouse and whose corpse is eaten is taking on the status of a companion animal or human being very visibly in a cemetery form. Such an ‘afterlife’ of dead animals within a cemetery is a very different place to that discussed in a recent collection of ‘afterlives’ of animals, particularly in natural history museums. In this context, Geoffrey Swinney argues, ‘animals were appropriated and reconstructed in humans’ image’. They were ‘anthropomorphized and fashioned to embody human emotions and values . . . Death allows such roles to be consolidated, and the postmortem reconstruction of an animal is both material and epistemological’ (Swinney 2011, 221).

In a cemetery animals are not taxidermised; nor are they being represented for some sort of human edification or enlightenment. Although the physical space is public, it is simultaneously personal: the appropriate response to the dead animal is an emotional one rather

2 Human and animal space in historic 'pet' cemeteries



Figure 2.9 Grave at Hillside Animal Sanctuary, Frettenham, Norwich.

than intellectual. It is also a place of visible animal death – and the animal has not been killed for food or sport or scientific experimentation. We tend to see animal cemeteries in some ways as a given since they partly mirror human cemeteries, which is perhaps why so little scholarly attention has been paid to them. However, if we consider them in relation to the way in which most nonhuman animals on the planet meet their end and are used after death, perhaps we might see them as places not only worth visiting but thinking about more carefully.

Acknowledgments

Thanks to: Edward C Martin Jr and staff at Hartsdale pet cemetery; Paul Ashton, Pauline O'Loughlin and Katrina Fox for introducing me to the Berkshire pet cemetery and the memorial wall in Federal Park, Glebe.

Animal death

Works cited

- Animal Studies Group (Ed.) (2006). *Killing animals*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Anon (2007). Founder of canine orphanage interred at Hartsdale (2007). *Friends of the Peaceable Kingdom in Hartsdale* 11: 2. [Online]. Available: www.petcem.com/Newsletters/2007.pdf [Accessed on 13 March 2013].
- Bondeson J (2011). *Amazing dogs: a cabinet of canine curiosities*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Bradshaw J (2011). *In defence of dogs*. London: Allen Lane.
- Brantz D (2010). *Beastly natures: animals, humans and the study of history*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.
- Craske M (2000). Representations of domestic animals in Britain 1730–1840. In J Wood and S Feeke (Eds). *Hounds in leash: the dog in eighteenth and nineteenth century sculpture* (pp40–53). Leeds: Henry Moore Institute.
- Cronin JK (2011). ‘Can’t you talk?’ Voice and visual culture in early animal welfare campaigns. *Early Popular Visual Culture*, 9(3): 203–23.
- Cimetière des Chiens, Asnières sur Seine (2011). *Map and guide*, Asnières-sur-Seine: Cimetière des Chiens.
- Davis H, Irwin P, Richardson M & O’Brien-Malone A (2003). When a pet dies: religious issues, euthanasia and strategies for coping with bereavement. *Anthrozoos*, 16(1): 57–74.
- Desmond J (2011). Deaths and the written record of history: the politics of pet obituaries. In L Kalof & GM Montgomery (Eds). *Making animal meaning* (pp99–111). East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
- Donald D (2007). *Picturing animals in Britain 1750–1850*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Dresser N (2000). The horse bar mitzvah: a celebratory exploration of the human–animal bond. In A Podberscek, E Paul & J Serpell (Eds). *Companion animals and us* (pp90–107). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Franklin A (1999). *Animals and modern cultures: a sociology of human–animal relations in modernity*. London: Sage.
- Gordon-Stables L (1912). The dogs’ cemetery in Hyde Park. *The Animals’ Guardian*, November: 257–59.
- Hardy T (1970 [1930]). *The collected poems of Thomas Hardy*. London: Macmillan.
- Hinchliffe S, Kearnes M, Degen M & Whatmore S (2005). Urban Wild Things: a cosmopolitical experiment. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 23: 643–58.
- Howell P (2002). A place for the animal dead: pets, pet cemeteries & animal ethics in late Victorian Britain. *Ethics, Place & Environment*, 5(1): 5–22.

2 Human and animal space in historic 'pet' cemeteries

- Kean H (2000). *Animal rights: political and social change in Britain since 1800*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Kean H (2004). *London stories: personal lives, public histories*. London: Rivers Oram Press.
- Kean H (2009). Balto, the Alaskan dog and his statue in New York's Central Park: animal representation and national heritage. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 15(5): 413–30.
- Kean H (2011a). Traces and representations: animal pasts in London's present. *The London Journal* 36(1): 54–71.
- Kean H (2011b). Commemorating animals: glorifying humans? Remembering and forgetting animals in war memorials. In M Andrews, C Bagoti Jewitt & N Hunt (Eds). *Lest we forget: remembrance and commemoration* (pp60–70). Stroud: History Press.
- Kean H (2012a). Challenges for historians writing animal–human history. What is really enough? *Anthrozoos*, 25th Anniversary Supplement: S57–S72.
- Kean H (2012b). Animals and war memorials: different approaches to commemorating the human–animal relationship. In R Hediger (Ed.). *Animals and war* (pp237–62). Boston: Brill.
- Kean H (forthcoming 2013). The people's war on the British home front: the challenge of the human–animal relationship. In E Dardenne & S Mesplède (Eds). *Representing animals in Britain*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Mangum T (2007). Narrative dominion or the animals write back? Animal genres in literature and the arts. In K Kete (Ed.). *A cultural history of animals in the age of empire* (pp153–74). Oxford: Berg.
- Michalski S (1998). *Public monuments: art in political bondage 1870–1997*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Morris P, Knight S & Lesley S (2012). Belief in animal mind: does familiarity with animals influence beliefs about animal emotions? *Society and Animals* 20(3): 211–24.
- Parker G (2008). The Dickin medal and the PDSA animal cemetery. *After the Battle* 140: 46–55.
- Pet Cemetery (1997). *Pet Cemetery, Hyde Park*. Open House leaflet. London: The Royal Parks.
- Philo C (1995). Animals, geography, and the city: notes on inclusions and exclusions. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 13: 655–81.
- Scates B (2009). *A place to remember: a history of the shrine of remembrance*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Searby R (2008). Red Dog, horses and Bogong moths: the memorialisation of animals in Australia. *Public History Review* 15: 117–34.

Animal death

- Serpell JA (2005). People in disguise: anthropomorphism and the human–pet relationship. In L Daston and G Mitman (Eds). *Thinking with animals: new perspectives on anthropomorphism* (pp121–36). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Smith JA (2005). ‘Viewing’ the body: towards a discourse of rabbit death. *Worldviews: Environment, Culture, Religion* 9(2): 184–202.
- Simpson F (1990 [1902]). Cat and dog London. In *Edwardian London*, vol. 1 (pp254–60). London: Village Press. First published in G Sims (Ed.). *Living London*, Cassell & Co.
- Swinney GN (2011). An afterword on afterlife. In SJMM Alberti (Ed.). *The afterlives of animals* (pp219–34). Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.
- Terhune AP (1937). *A book of famous dogs*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Doran & Co.
- Tyler T (2012). *Ciferae: a bestiary in five fingers*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Where good dogs go (1920). *New York Times*, 4 July: 68.