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Dogs have served as human’s best friends for centuries. This paper examines the parameters and level of attachment within dog-human relationships from c. 1350-1750 with particular emphasis on the European upper class. The bulk of this paper’s evidence is supported by late medieval and early modern European art and literature; however, all forms of evidence reveal that as human’s best friends, dogs have significantly contributed to human’s physical and psychological well-beings throughout the world. These contributions resulted strong, emotional attachment. This attachment between dogs and their owners is especially evident in early modern Japan, China, Europe, and the Americas because of the numerous works of art dating from this time period.

Throughout the world, pets have provided unconditional love and companionship for centuries. As early as 1389, dog lovers believed that “the moost defaute of houndes is that thei lyven not longe inowe.”

The earliest recorded use of the noun pet in the Oxford English Dictionary was in 1508; this distinguished house pets as symbols of higher status and “honorary people, endowed with names, personalities, privileges and...possessions of their own.”

The majority of these pets were dogs. As humans’ best friends for centuries, dogs have significantly contributed to their owners’ physical and psychological well-beings. These contributions resulted in a strong emotional attachment.

1 I am so thankful to Dr. Ivana Elbl for her inspiration, positive energy, encouragement, help, and wisdom in the formation of this paper. Without her, this paper, among many other things, would not have been possible and I will be forever grateful. Many thanks, Ivana.


4 Bohrer 152.
This attachment between owners and their dogs is particularly evident in early modern Japan, China, Europe, and the Americas because numerous works of art depict this aspect of the dog-human relationship. Art provides visual impressions of dog-owner attachment largely because of many artists’ portrayals of dogs’ positions and gazes. Their presence in particular settings alone represents a close relationship between the owners and pets, such as at mealtimes, at the fireside, and during mass. Dogs were included in the specific routines of prominent historical figures, especially in regards to daily care and treatment. Examples will be included along with artistic evidence to aid this paper’s thorough discussion of the emotional attachment between owners and dogs. However, the available evidence has limitations. Firstly, the vast majority of primary and secondary sources are of European provenance. Furthermore, they place strong emphasis on the nobility and other upper class members. Therefore, this paper’s argument is chiefly supported by Western authors and primary sources that focus on the European upper class. This paper’s main focus will be on the European upper class and early modern art - the most important form of primary evidence. Another form of empirical evidence is literature because of its tales of dogs’ affection, loyalty, companionship, and unconditional love. The evidence is expected to support the contention that owners and dogs had a very strong emotional bond in the late medieval and early modern periods because of the support of psychological theory.

A psychological understanding of attachment is the basis of this paper’s theoretical framework. Attachment is defined as “a strong affectional bond.” All affectional bonds (including attachments) endure over time, involve a specific person, and are emotionally significant. Thus, an affectionate dog-

---

5 Norwich, Baille-Graham, and Baille-Graham 216.
6 Robert A. Baron, Bruce Earhard, and Marcia Ozier, *Psychology – Third Canadian Edition* (Toronto: Pearson Education Canada Inc., 2002) 332. This source’s definition of attachment was chosen because it was formerly used as Trent University’s introductory psychology course textbook for several years. Although this definition addressed the bond between infants and mothers, it is equally applicable to dogs and their owners. This paper will discuss the dog-owner attachment further in this theoretical portion.
owner relationship constitutes an attachment particularly because dogs demonstrate attachment behaviours toward their owners that closely resemble those of small children toward their mothers. Like small children, dogs need to be introduced to the owners and socialize with them during a sensitive period, preferably puppyhood.\(^8\) Once attachment is established, attachment behaviours are evident. Attachment behaviour is defined as those behaviours “aimed at promoting and restoring proximity and contact, such as following, approaching, vocalizing, clinging and crying,” all of which small children and dogs demonstrate alike.\(^9\) This fulfils the criterion of experiencing security and comfort from the relationship with the ability to temporarily withdraw from the secure base confidently in order to engage in other activities. This is known as the Secure Base Effect – the primary factor that distinguishes an attachment from any other type of affectional bond.\(^10\)

Mary Ainsworth’s Strange Situation Test allows identification of a Secure Base Effect. Although this test was originally created to identify and examine young child-mother attachment, it is clearly applicable to dogs and their owners. The three ways of identifying a Secure Base Effect in dogs are: (1) play and exploration becomes depressed when a stranger is present and when alone, but returns after reunion with the attachment figure; (2) although exploration and play rates are high at the beginning of the test (dog solely with the owner), they often stop and immediately return to the attachment figure when the stranger appears; and (3) some are confident to engage in play with the stranger with the owner present. However, when the attachment figure leaves, most dogs refuse to continue playing because the security that the owner’s presence provides is absent.\(^11\) Because this test is applicable to dogs, Custance et al. used this procedure to investigate the dog-human relationship in their 2003 observational study of whether or not the dog-human
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\(^9\) Custance et al. 225-228.

\(^10\) Custance et al. 227, 228, and 229. Although this definition of attachment behaviour was created in 1970, it is still applicable in modern ideas and concepts of attachments.

\(^11\) Custance et al. 229.
relationship is an attachment bond with the application of Mary Ainsworth’s Strange Situation Test. This procedure involves observing the participant in an unfamiliar room, introduced to an unfamiliar adult (stranger), and subjected to three brief periods of separation from the owner, the attachment figure. Since the aim of this study was to “investigate the nature of the dog-human relationship by observing owner-dog pairs under controlled conditions using a modified version of the Strange Situation procedure developed by Mary Ainsworth,” an additional period of isolation was added for further analysis during which the dog was left in the designated room with articles of clothing belonging to the owner as well as the stranger.¹²

The dogs’ behaviours in this study clearly resembled those of small children who were securely attached¹³ to their mothers. Exploration and play significantly declined from when the dog was alone with the owner to when the stranger was also present. When alone with the stranger, exploration remained this way or ceased altogether. If play and exploration did not cease when in the company of just the stranger, it ceased when the dog was left alone. Like small children in previous studies, some dogs did not immediately notice their owners’ absence but when they did, the majority showed distress and protested by engaging in behaviours that indicated that they were searching for the absent owners. Such behaviours included orientation to the last place in which the owner was seen, scratching and jumping on the door, pulling on the door handle (with its forelegs or mouth), remaining oriented to the door, approaching the owner’s empty chair or looking at it from a distance.¹⁴ Whining and barking usually increased when the owner was absent and reached their highest levels when completely isolated. Although some dogs did not vocalize, their search and owner association behaviours increased.

¹² Custance et al. 225, 227, and 246. All dogs in this study were kept by their owners exclusively for companionship, lived within the human home and were accustomed to being taken outdoors with their owner and encountering strangers. For additional information regarding the dogs used in this study, see page 230 of this source.

¹³ According to Baron, Earhard, and Ozier 334, a secure attachment is “a pattern of attachment in which infants actively seek contact with their mother and take comfort with their mother and take comfort from her presence when they are reunited with her during the Strange Situation Test.”

¹⁴ Custance, et al. 236, 247, and 248.
Some dogs accepted petting from the stranger (when the owner was absent) but continued to maintain orientation with the door. Thus, despite the stranger’s efforts, he or she was unable to provide sufficient comfort during the owner’s absence. More importantly, these behaviours fulfil all three Secure Base Effect requirements and as a result, this study successfully demonstrated that dogs are attached to their owners like small children to their mothers.

This attachment was also demonstrated by Fallani, Prato-Previde, and Valsecchi in their 2006 study “Do disrupted early attachments affect the relationship between guide dogs and blind owners?” However, this study took a step further by investigating the attachment of guide dogs to their owners because of their previous owner separation(s). This different form of attachment was compared to those with a single owner with the same format and procedure as Custance et al. – Mary Ainsworth’s Strange Situation Test. Fallani, Prato-Previde, and Valsecchi found that guide dogs form new affectional bonds “whose quality and integrity is not compromised by the experience of separation per se.” Furthermore, this study revealed no evidence that the loss of the first attachment figure causes any behavioural problems, resulting in an equally strong attachment to the new (blind) owner.

These studies have shown that regardless of the owner, dogs are very much attached to their owners like small children to their mothers. Thus, it can be said that dogs are members of the family, especially considering that people make sacrifices for their dogs as they would for human family members. Susan Phillips Cohen defined family as “a cornerstone of human society and a resource for its members” and because many people similarly define family to suit their personal and emotional needs. Considering dogs’ attachment to their owners, it is not surprising that most pet owners consider their dogs as members of their families, but most also describe them much like their
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15 Custance, et al. 249. These behaviours are consistent with the attachment behaviours described by Ainsworth in her studies of infants.
16 Fallani, Prato-Previde, and Valsecchi 241 and 243.
17 Fallani, Prato-Previde, and Valsecchi 256.
18 Fallani, Prato-Previde, and Valsecchi 256.
own children. In 2000, the vast majority of people with strong relationships with their dogs reported that they refer to themselves as their dogs’ parents; nearly three quarters reported that they greet their dogs before their spouses; and more than half would choose their dogs (rather than another human) for company if stranded on a desert island. Furthermore, 39% of dogs slept on a family member’s bed and 63% of the participating owners gave their dog a Christmas gift.\textsuperscript{20} Considering these recent statistics, the aim of Cohen’s study was to explore what exactly a person means when he/she says that their pet “is a member of the family.”\textsuperscript{21} The participants in Cohen’s study revealed that pets are firmly inside their family circle by identifying their dogs as family according to the various ways that they function within their household. They also indicated that their dogs provide frequent opportunities for intimacy and nurturing like human family members and most importantly, they asserted that dogs will not hurt or abandon like humans occasionally do.\textsuperscript{22}

With this sense of security, it is no surprise that dogs are “by far the most popular species of companion animals.”\textsuperscript{23} Like human family members, dogs not only have physical and psychological benefits, but they provide emotional support as well. For example, dogs have been shown to help older women feel less lonely and patients with Alzheimer’s disease or psychiatric disorders tend to become less agitated in the company of a dog. Thus, it is not surprising that despite orders from physicians, 80% of people with pet allergies refused to give up their dogs and 70% acquired new dogs after the passing of their first.\textsuperscript{24} Perhaps this is partially because dog ownership has been associated with a greater survival rate after a heart attack, lower blood pressure, cholesterol, and triglyceride values, and increased longevity despite severe heart arrhythmia and/or a prior heart attack. Furthermore, statistics reveal that elderly dog owners have fewer doctor visits.\textsuperscript{25}

\textsuperscript{20} Cohen 622.
\textsuperscript{21} Cohen 632. Although Cohen touched on other pets, this paper will only focus on the dogs.
\textsuperscript{22} Cohen 632, 633, 634, and 635.
\textsuperscript{23} Custance et al. 226.
\textsuperscript{24} Cohen 623.
\textsuperscript{25} Cohen 623.
Recent historiography reveals remarkably similar qualities in the relationship between dogs and their owners in the late medieval and early modern eras, especially in the exchange of affection. This is best portrayed in art evidence.\textsuperscript{26} Edgar Peters Bowron’s \textit{Best in Show: the Dog in Art from the Renaissance to Today}\textsuperscript{27} includes the largest selection of art relevant to this paper. According to Bowron, artists included dogs in their works because of their companionship and because they were recognized as life role models for humankind; dogs were not only humans’ best friends, but the artists’ best friends as well.\textsuperscript{28} As the most domesticated and favoured animals in early modern times, they were a ready and willing source of inspiration. Hence, Bowron concludes that dogs’ representation alone (in art) proves that dogs were loved: “the more it was loved, the wider the variety of roles it commanded in art.”\textsuperscript{29} Bowron’s positive attitudes toward the role of dogs in art increased the value of this source; not only did Bowron’s work contain the most samples of artistic evidence, but \textit{Best in Show} was also the most helpful and significant source in regards to art analysis in reference to the role of dogs. Although Kenneth Clark, author of \textit{Animals and Men – Their relationship as reflected in Western art from prehistory to the present day}\textsuperscript{30} and Erwin Panofsky, author of \textit{Problems in Titian – Mostly Iconographic}\textsuperscript{31} also include art examinations, they did not pertain to the dogs but rather the people and scenery.

Literary evidence also reveals strikingly similar qualities in the relationship between dogs and their owners. However, the limitation of literary evidence is that it is all of European provenance. Despite this limitation, the literary evidence (like the art evidence) reveals that dogs were valued, loved,

\textsuperscript{26} Artistic evidence will be included throughout this paper. The works were retrieved from the Internet; all online sources were used solely for the art. Works that were not available online have been included in the Appendix.


\textsuperscript{28} Bowron 1.

\textsuperscript{29} Bowron 1.

\textsuperscript{30} Kenneth Clark, \textit{Animals and Men – Their relationship as reflected in Western art from prehistory to the present day} (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1977).

and were involved in the daily life and routines of their owners. As beloved family members, poems and other works were composed in their honour. Such works were found in Lucy Menzies’ 1922 book *The first friend: an anthology of the friendship of Man and dog, compiled from the literature of all ages 1400 B.C.-1921 A.D.* and in a more recent collection edited by Maynard Leonard called *The Dog in British Poetry*. Kristen M. Figg provides an excellent literary interpretation and discussion of Jean Froissart’s late fourteenth century poem *The Debate between the Horse and the Greyhound*. This is a reflection of the dog-owner relationship and the signs and symbols of love and affection that other authors and primary sources have clearly described and portrayed.

The various roles and signs of affection that are evident in both the literary and visual primary sources are fully supported by secondary sources regardless of what part of the world that the authors discussed. Secondary sources discuss the care, treatment and emotional attachments of owners and dogs in China, Japan, and throughout Europe and the Americas. This includes both the Indigenous groups that had dogs (as pets) prior to European contact and those who domesticated dogs that were brought over by the Europeans.

Marion Schwartz does not discuss European contact in depth, but she provides the most detailed descriptions and discussions of the relationship between owners and dogs amongst Native cultures. Schwartz provides a detailed overview of many Native cultures throughout the Americas. Her work includes more analysis from the late eighteenth-century onward;

---


however, her research clearly reflects the attitudes and treatment toward dogs in Europe and Asia. The research of Barbara A. Purdy\textsuperscript{36} and James Homer Williams\textsuperscript{37} also reflect early modern European attitudes and treatment toward dogs. However, Purdy and Williams offer more detailed insights to a specific Native culture. Although Purdy and Williams review the Native cultures like Schwartz, their research has proven to be equally valuable in comparing the similarities of dog-owner relationships throughout Europe, the Americas, China, and Japan.

Similarly, monographs that review global appreciation for dogs are valuable for comparing the similarities of dog-owner relationships. The three valuable works of this type are the monographs by Stanley Coren,\textsuperscript{38} Gena K. Gorrell,\textsuperscript{39} and Susan McHugh.\textsuperscript{40} Their books are reputable and very beneficial to this paper despite the fact that the authors are not professional historians. For instance, Stanley Coren is a professional psychologist and a professor at the University of British Columbia and thus, his book \textit{Pawprints of History} does not contain historical analysis. However, his research findings are reputable because he successfully revealed that in the early modern world, dogs’ relationships with humans were much like that in the modern day. Coren examined the dog-human relationship throughout Europe, Japan, the Americas, and the influences of European contact. His global research findings agree with those of professional historians’. Like Coren’s book, Gena K. Gorrell’s book \textit{Working Like a Dog} was also a valuable source because Gorrell revealed parallels in regards to dogs’ relationships with humans. Unlike Coren, Gorrell included some historical analysis. She also included excellent descriptions of the early


\textsuperscript{37} James Homer Williams, “Great Doggs and Mischievous Cattle: Domesticated Animals and Indian-European Relations in New Netherland and New York.” \textit{New York History} 76.3 (July 1995): 244-264.


\textsuperscript{40} Susan McHugh, \textit{Dog} (London: Reaktion Books Ltd., 2004).
modern Chinese dogs, their owners, care and treatment of their dogs, and artistic evidence. Animal specialist Susan McHugh also included appropriate artwork in her book *Dog*. McHugh’s artistic support and research were helpful in supporting this paper’s argument despite that her examination of the relationship between dogs and their owners is broad; it includes dogs and their owners around the world during the past 15,000 years.

This paper will build upon this historiography and expand it with an examination of the artistic concept and technique of *realism*. According to fine arts professor Wayne Frantis, *realism* refers to artistic techniques that reflect real or actual viewpoints, such as candid scenes rather than posed scenes.\(^{41}\) Most works of art that portray owners with their dogs have realistic components, such as the dog gazing at its owner rather than simply posing for the artist. Such details are excellent examples of dog-owner relationship symbolism. *Realism* is evident in early modern literature and in secondary sources because relationships are components of human and animal life. Therefore, *realism* will be applied to all aspects of the human-dog relationship throughout early modern Japan, China, Europe, and the Americas. This application will aid the discussion of the emotional relationship that early modern people and dogs shared with a particular focus on the European upper class. Evidence will be discussed in reference to the significant aspects of daily life that strongly resemble modern daily routines and leisure activities. These are religion, daily life routines (such as meals and sleep), protection, hunting, collars, and the care and treatment of dogs in Japan, China, Europe, and the Americas.

Religion reveals the emotional attachment between dogs and owners because it played a role in promoting and enhancing the dog-owner relationship. An excellent example of this may be seen in seventeenth century Buddhist Japan. The only son of *Shogun* (military General - 将軍) *Tokugawa Tsunayoshi* (徳川 綱吉)\(^{42}\) had died, leaving him without an heir. Tsunayoshi
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\(^{42}\) According to Coren 158, Tsunayoshi was the fifth of the fifteen Tokugawa Shoguns. They ruled Japan from 1600-1868. Coincidentally, this dog-loving Shogun was born on February 23\(^{\text{rd}}\) in the Year of the Dog, 1646. His efforts in animal protection, particularly his *Laws of Protection* earned him the nickname *Inu* (Dog - 犬) *Shogun*. He ruled from 1680-1709.
consulted Ryuko, a Buddhist priest for advice. He told Tsunayoshi that “when a person does not have an heir, it is always due to the fact that they have done much killing in their previous lives. Therefore, the best thing to do for a person who desires an heir is to show great love for all living things.”\(^43\)

With support from his mother, Tsunayoshi passed the *Laws of Compassion for All Living Things*. Although the name implies that these laws were designed for the welfare of all animals, they were originally created for the protection of dogs. The largest number of its regulations addressed dogs because of the Japanese people’s respect for them. Tsunayoshi’s love for his (and other) dogs was perhaps most clearly demonstrated when he personally demanded that all dogs be treated according to the “fundamental principles of humanity.” More than 10% of Tsunayoshi’s miscellaneous orders were laws regarding animal welfare; punishment for harming a dog was banishment or death.\(^44\)

Other Asians’ relationships with dogs were also enhanced as a result of Buddhist influence. In China (as well as other Buddhist and Asian countries), small breeds were developed to resemble the hybrid lion dog because of its symbol as the introduction of Buddhism. In China, the introduction of Buddhism was represented by the symbol of the “spirit-lion” or “lion-dog.”\(^45\) Such dogs, including the *shi zi* (Chinese), *shishi* or *kara shishi* (Japanese), *kang seng* (Tibetan), *su tu* (Vietnamese), and *sing tow* (Thai) refer to the “spirit-lion” or “lion-dog.” The dog was the animal that converted to Buddha’s “doctrine of peace.”\(^46\) Dogs, particularly these smaller breeds, became the “provenance of emperors” and were quickly transported to other parts of the world where small breeds had not previously been seen, particularly to the European upper classes.\(^47\) These smaller breeds quickly became popular, sought after, and loved by European upper classes. This is particularly evident in works of art. For example, although the dog is not being held or touched by either of

\(^{43}\) Coren 159.
\(^{44}\) Coren 158, 159, and 160.
\(^{45}\) McHugh 80-81 and 89.
\(^{46}\) McHugh 81.
\(^{47}\) McHugh 81 and 82. To modern pet owners, these dogs are known as “under-the-table” dogs. The Pekinese, Shih Tzu, and pug fall under this category.
the owners in Jan van Eyck’s “Giovanni Arnolfini and his Wife,” a significant relationship between the owners and the dog is evident; the dog is standing proudly between the married couple and its facial expression appears to be calm, proud and content. However, in Eyck’s “Portrait of Lady with a Lap-Dog,” the lady’s hand and arm positions and the dog’s obvious comfort in her arms are clear indications of their love and attachment.

Like Buddhism, Christianity influenced believers’ relationships with their dogs. In fact, the Christian church was one of the first institutions to reflect on the phenomenon of a dog’s love and to make it known. This can be seen in ecclesiastical art, particularly because art was used to reinforce religious values. Dogs were symbols of fidelity in art and in the lives of saints, particularly St. Eustace and St. Hubert, the patron saints of huntsmen. Naturally, they are commonly depicted with dogs by their side, thus reinforcing the value of dogs and demonstrating the value and love of pet dogs in the church. In that time period, all family members attended church; therefore, dogs were brought to church because they were members of the family. This was done despite the objection of church authorities. For example, William of Wykeham, Bishop of Winchester, wrote in 1387 that nuns were not permitted to bring animals to church, including dogs: dogs were to be removed altogether, and nuns were to “abide with the precincts of [their] nunnery.” According to English nunnery expert Eileen Power, an expert in English nunneries, dogs were the nuns’ favourite pets. Nuns continued to bring them to church despite the dogs’ barking, occasional tearing of church books, and orders from ecclesiastical superiors to remove them from the church altogether. However,
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50 Lucy Menzies, “Dogs in Medieval Art and the Lives of Saints,” *The first friend: an anthology of the friendship of Man and dog, compiled from the literature of all ages 1400 B.C.-1921 A.D.* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1922) 76. This paper will discuss the role of hunting as an influence in the dog-owner relationship.
51 Menzies 77.
53 Reeves 125.
nuns were not the only people who felt that their four-legged companions needed spiritual guidance. Shepherds commonly brought their dog(s) to church on St. Hubert’s Day (November 3rd) to have their dogs blessed and to receive a wafer for each dog, which acted as a charm against hydrophobia.54

Secular figures contributed to parishioners’ enthusiasm for including their canine family members in the ecclesiastical world. A great secular influence was Gaston Phébus, Count III of Foix.55 His 1387 hunting manual, *Livre de chasse*, influenced hunting for centuries throughout Europe once it was translated and revised into several languages. His views were quickly assimilated, particularly those of the connection between hunting and ecclesiastical morale. The most important was his perception of hunting as “a way of avoiding mortal sin and saving his soul” because hunting permits one to escape the seven deadly sins.56 According to Phébus, a true hunter is incapable of being idle and having bad thoughts and consequently cannot do evil.57 Dogs were required hunting companions, “for a hound is noblest and most reasonable beast that God has created. He loves his master loyally and unconditionally.”58 Edward of York, who translated Phébus’ book into English (from French) and named it *Master of Game*, agreed with Phébus’ views on dogs and stated that they were among God’s “finer works of creation.”59 Because of this connection with the Christian church, dogs have significantly assisted their owners not only in the world of hunting but in cases of identity crises. For instance, Maximilian II’s dog restored his claim to the throne because of its collar’s Catholic emblem, which assured authorities that he was not a Protestant.60

The relationship with a pet dog was exceptional, especially among

54 Menzies 77.
55 Author of the 1387 hunting manual *Livre de Chasse*. Its author and the contents of this manuscript will be discussed in regards to hunting, education of huntsmen, and care of dogs in this paper. The version that has been consulted for this paper is Gaston III de Foix Phébus, et al., *The Hunting Book of Gaston Phébus* (London: Harvey Miller P, 1998).
56 Figg 100.
57 Phébus, et al. 19 and Figg 100.
58 Phébus et al. 31.
59 Reeves 107.
60 Gorrell 19.
the nobility. Such a relationship was highly sought. Dogs were bred in royal palaces not only as pets but also as members of the court. With their court status came a title (in addition to its name), guards and other aristocratic services, just like a human court member. Owners commonly assigned servants or noble attendants to carefully monitor them. In Japan, for example, breeding was usually assigned to the samurai (侍 – military nobility), whose dog-loving feudal lords (daimyo – 大名) often housed several hundred dogs in their Edo mansions. Especially fine dogs were offered as gifts and usually became members of the court and/or household. Such gifts were highly valued. Dogs were valued for their beauty but more so for the relationship that would develop between the dog and the owner.

Nobles had particular regard for their relationships with their dogs because their pet dogs were frequently the only living things that were fully trusted not only as companions, but as guardians. European kings often found comfort in their relationships with their dogs because when surrounded by schemers, spies and others whom could not be trusted, dogs were the only reliable things for “honest[y] and unselfish affection and devotion[].” Naturally, royals also had dogs for companionship even if protection was not essential. For instance, William I had several dogs. Some were specifically designated for hunting. His hunting dogs were equal in companionship to his smaller indoor dogs – he frequently had one of his pet dogs with him for company wherever he went. This is depicted in the statue of William I in The Hague. The dog’s loyal position and affectionate gaze to William are very noticeable and noteworthy. King James I of England, who was also King James VI of Scotland, was also a dog-lover. His relationships with his dogs were so significant that he prioritized his scholarly ambitions in conjunction
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61 McHugh 90. Unfortunately, McHugh does not provide examples of the royal titles that were given to royal dogs.
62 Coren 159.
64 Gorrell 20.
65 Coren 9.
with or second to his pet dogs. For example, in 1615 while visiting Cambridge University, he attended a public debate between John Preston and Matthew Wren on whether or not dogs could make syllogisms.66

Female royalty also kept dogs because of the relationship that would develop. A woman was commonly married off to whom she was betrothed to a man she has not met. Soon after, she was pregnant and endured the loss of most babies; the babies who survived were usually cared for by servants.67 Thus, a noblewoman usually had little companionship with the exception of her pet dog(s). Dogs also served as comfort for physical pain, particularly for Premenstrual Syndrome (PMS). According to Gorrell, the warmth of a dog was very soothing, for surely a soft, loving pet was more comforting than rubber hot-water bottles used by future generations.”68 McHugh supports this by describing small dogs as comforters or toys; similarly in 1576, Johannes Caius described small dogs as primarily “luxurious plaything[s] for women.”69 According to Abraham Fleming (in 1576), the smaller the dogs, “the more pleasure they provoke...for mincing mistresses to bear in their bosoms, to keep company withal in their chambers, to succour with sleep in bed...to play in their laps and lick their lips[.]”70 Poets commonly wrote about the various practical uses of lap dogs by the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, especially for noblewomen.71 Examples include “The Turnspit Taught” and “Shock and his Mistress” by John Gay.72 Historian Ramm noted that lap dogs were “all the rage” by this era. Mary, Queen of Scots, for example, dressed her lap dogs in velvet in the winter.73 The relationship between women and their small dogs was very prominent, but it was not uncommon for a man to enjoy the company of small dogs as well, such as William I as previously discussed.

66 Boehrer 152.
67 Gorrell 19-20.
68 Gorrell 20.
69 McHugh 83.
70 Bowron 15.
71 McHugh 83.
72 These poems may be found in Leonard (ed.) 14-15 and 166-167.
Small dogs were connected with everything exotic, especially in courts. Examples include the popular Cavalier King Charles’ spaniel and Frederick II, Duke of Mantua’s small dog. Regardless of the dog’s breed or the owner’s sex, the emotional attachment appears to be the same in regards to love and affection for each other.

Owners’ love and feelings for their dogs are revealed in how they are treated. Late medieval and early modern dog owners undoubtedly loved and valued their dogs. Noble dogs of Europe and Asia alike were very closely guarded. Japan had Tsunayoshi’s *Laws of Compassion* and China had harsh punishments for selling dogs without permission. European and Asian noble dogs alike were pampered like human members of the nobility. They enjoyed the privileges and luxuries of regular baths, perfumes, robes made of velvet or embroidered satin, earrings, diamond lockets, and were proudly carried and displayed on silk cushions. European noble dog owners further enhanced such elegance with collars. The dogs of Henry VIII had collars that were embroidered with hanging pearls and pendants; King Louis XI’s dog *Cherami* (dear friend) wore a red velvet collar that was “covered in pearls and rubies;” each of Mary Stuart’s dogs had a blue velvet collar with its name embroidered; and the collars of the Ferrarese court were made by the court’s
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74 McHugh 89.
75 Gorrell 18.
76 Gorrell 19. Chinese emperors have appointed his favourite dogs to noble rank as early as the sixth century. More specifically, Marco Polo reported that the emperor had a staff of 20,000 – half of which were assigned to care for his dogs. For visual impressions of various elaborate dog collars and accessories, see the black and white image of Archduke Albrecht, son of Maximilian II in Gorrell 19, Reeves 127 for a stained-glass image of the dog at the feet of Margaret Loos (c. fifteenth century) that is currently in the St. William window at York Minister, Bowron 15 for a copy of Tiberio di Tito’s “A Dwarf with Medici Dogs in Boboli Gardens,” c. 1620-1625, Phébus et al. 46 and 47, and Albrecht Dürer’s “Resting Dog,” c. 1520 in Bartum 208 or in Salley 89. Although the collars and accessories are clear reflections of the emotional bonds between the dogs and owners, the following images provide strong implications of the genuine love for dogs but not in regards to their collars and/or accessories among children: Diego Velaquez’s “Maids of Honour,” c. 1656 in Clark 185 or Held 185, and Hermanus van Anderwerelt’s “Family Portrait Group,” c. 1664 in Sutton 4, Paolo Veronese’s “Supper at Erasmus,” c. 1570-1575 in Clark 164.
77 Gorrell 19.
78 Coren 203.
goldsmith. Dog collars like these were also provided for dogs given to other monarchs as gifts for their dogs. According to seventeenth-century writer Philip Camerarius, each of the four hundred dogs (that accompanied the four hundred soldiers) that Henry VIII provided to Holy Roman Emperor Charles V had elaborate, iron collars. The king of Granada received six alaunts and six running dogs from King Ferdinand of Portugal, “all with richly decorated collars, silver gilt muzzles and leashes woven of golden thread.”

This kind of love and attention that the nobility gave their dogs were much like that given to children. Gorrell reminds her readers that early modern Europe was an era when many children died young. Hence, a common practice was to keep heirs to titles and large estates isolated from other children to maintain good health. Thus, a dog was a much-needed companion that provided unconditional love and affection (like most parents). Dogs were most likely better playmates for children than their parents; princes learned to ride when they were still toddlers because their pet dogs allowed them to straddle them in place of a horse or pony.

Like children, dogs, the only domesticated animals that the First Nations had prior to European contact, were named. Like Asian and European dog owners, they took pride and joy in naming their dogs. Some often used the same names that were given to people whereas others had names specifically reserved for dogs. However, if a family lost several children, parents would give the next child a dog’s name because it was believed to keep the new child alive and healthy. Children were permitted to cry when a dog died because they were special companions not only for their daily chores, but for leisurely

79 Bowron 6. Bowron also noted that the 1468 inventory of Sigismondo’s possessions reveal that he also owned several elaborate collars that were silver.
81 Cummins 5.
82 Gorrell 19.
83 Gorrell 20.
84 Williams 246. An example of this is the North-eastern woodland Natives. For a photograph of a Native comb depicting a dog happily seeking attention from its owner, see Williams 250.
85 Schwartz 31 and 32.
activities as well.\textsuperscript{86} Dogs remained part of pre-Contact Native (and European) childhood.

In Europe, daily chores and leisure activities were only some of the situations where dogs were regularly present – situations where “we would never dream of admitting them.”\textsuperscript{87} For instance, dogs accompanied their owners to church (as previously discussed) but they “were allowed the greatest liberty” in the owners’ private living quarters.\textsuperscript{88} Dogs would normally sleep with their masters from puppyhood to old age whether it was by the fireplace, entrance or even in the master’s bed. Two examples include Normandy’s seneschal Jacques de Brézé and fifteenth-century Prince John of Portugal: Brézé’s dog \textit{Souillart} always slept in his chamber near the fire\textsuperscript{89} and John reportedly loved his two alaunts so much that he slept between them at night.\textsuperscript{90} Hence, it is no surprise that dogs were always present at meals as demonstrated in the Limbroug Brothers’ “Tres Riches Heures du Duc de Berry: January” (1412-1416).\textsuperscript{91}

The aspect of companionship for which dogs were most appreciated (on both sides of the world) was protection. Protection is a sure quality of the dog-owner relationship – the mere sound of a dog’s bark frightens intruders. It is also the strongest form of unconditional companionship and loyalty. Dogs were guardians not only by protecting their masters from harm, but specifically for the blind as well.\textsuperscript{92} Although all breeds and sizes of dogs were a guaranteed source of protection, larger dogs were on demand as guards,

\textsuperscript{86} Schwartz 32. For an image of First Nations and a pet dog, see Williams 250. Historians have included numerous works of art pertaining to the First Nations and dogs, but they did not pertain to this paper’s time period. The majority was completed from the nineteenth century onwards. To see many of these works of art, consult Marion Schwartz, \textit{A History of Dogs in the Early Americas – with selected drawings by Susan Hochgraf} (New Haven & London: Yale U Press, 1997).
\textsuperscript{87} Johnston 114.
\textsuperscript{88} Norwich, Baille-Graham, and Baille-Graham 216.
\textsuperscript{89} Figg 101-102.
\textsuperscript{90} Cummins 25 and Figg 102.
\textsuperscript{91} This image may also be found in Clark 174.
such as alaunts, mastiffs, or other large breeds. The dogs’ positions, gazes towards their owners, and owners’ hand positions on the dogs suggest that dogs were extensions of the family. However, they were important extensions of the family because of their abilities to protect as a result of their superior vision, hearing and olfactory senses. As previously discussed, dogs served as guards for royalty. However, dogs were recognized for their protective abilities for other tasks, such as herding. Dogs’ protective functions increased human survival as they were used to supplement human senses and therefore provided reliable protection to other animals as well. For instance, Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala noted in 1615 that the Incas often used dogs as shepherds to defend the flocks.

This type of practice was also common in Europe. However, because of Europe’s significantly higher population and diversity, their four-legged companions were used for a wider variety of purposes, such as protecting their property from thieves. For the best protection, Europeans ensured that their dogs rested during the day in order to guard at their full potential at night. Dogs were the most trusted guardians because of their courage. According to Phébus, a dog’s courage “is such that a dog will defend his master’s house and property at the risk of his life.” Another factor was their loyalty, for dogs are “true to his lord and his master, and of good love and true.” Such courage and loyalty were also praised in poetry, particularly in the first stanza of John Molle’s 1625 poem “The Faithfulest Beast:"

Of any beast, none is more faithful found
Nor yields more pastime in house, plaine,
or woods,
Nor keepes his master’s person, nor his goods,
With greater care, than doth the dog or hound.

---

93 Johnston 115.
94 Schwartz 33 and 55.
95 Phébus et al. 31.
96 Norwich, Baille-Graham, and Baille-Graham 79.
A specific example of this faithfulness may be seen in the French legend of *The Dog of Montargis*, in which the Count of Montargis’ nephew and a knight of King Charles V named Aubrey de Montdidier was murdered in 1371. Because Dragon located Montdidier’s body just outside of Montargis and Dragon’s animosity toward Richard Macaire (one of Charles’ bodyguards), Charles ordered a trial-by-combat. After the dog won the fight on the Ile Notre-Dame in Paris, Macaire confessed and was hanged. In this particular case, the dog was an instrument of justice. This is clearly indicated in the fourth stanza of Molle’s poem:

```
Thy friends he loves; and in thy presences lives
By day; by night he watcheth faithfully
That thou in peace may’st sleep; he never
gives
Good entertainment to thine enemy.
```

Dogs could not only be trusted as property protection, but protection of their owners and belongings when travelling as well. Europeans travelled frequently with their dogs and Europe is much more sympathetic and accommodating toward travellers with canines than the United States of America. For late medieval and early modern nobles, the role of dogs as travel companions helped define their status. According to Figg, this is because the dog’s purpose as a symbol of its owner’s rank often relieved him/her “of any practical duties whatsoever, especially in the context of travel.” Although dogs also relieved their owners of practical duties in the New World, dogs were not symbols of status like in Europe. However, dogs were very practical travel companions because prior to European contact, Natives did not have horses.

---

98 Ramm 61.
100 Johnston 115.
101 Figg 85-86 and 99.
Thus, dogs carried or hauled loads of food, wood, and other necessities.\textsuperscript{102}

Dogs were especially practical travel companions for hunting. They were used to hunt practically everything – bear, moose, beaver, elk, deer, caribou, wild boars, and much more. Dogs with superior hunting abilities were held with high favour, especially those that were owned by European gentlemen.\textsuperscript{103} Dogs’ hunting skills would be put on display for special audiences. For example, William Shakespeare wrote that his “love shall hear the music of my hounds” in his poem “The Music of the Hounds.”\textsuperscript{104} Hunting was a part of daily life for the nobility. They enjoyed the entertainment of the actual hunt and of course, grandly displaying their achievements.\textsuperscript{105} King James I, who hunted as a child, set up a hunting establishment and enjoyed hunting until his death in 1624.\textsuperscript{106} Hunting with dogs was “a universal aristocratic sport” – a pastime of kings, knights, princes, Queen Elizabeth I, barons, and Asian emperors.\textsuperscript{107} In fact, hunting was the theme for a pack of Burgundian playing cards.\textsuperscript{108} According to Theodore of Antioch, hunting was “the only amusement appropriate to kings in hunting.”\textsuperscript{109} As a result, hunting became a symbol of prestige and status. This is implied Cornelius Vroom’s portrait of Elizabeth I, “Elizabeth as Diana.”\textsuperscript{110} Furthermore, hunting was a form of avoiding sin while simultaneously training for war. Both of these aspects

\textsuperscript{102} Gorrell 23 and Schwartz 31.
\textsuperscript{103} Boehrer 170.
\textsuperscript{105} Keith Gardener, In Pursuit (Suffolk: British Sporting Art Trust, 2003) 45-46.
\textsuperscript{106} Coren 37.
\textsuperscript{107} Coren 159, Gorrell 18, and Sekules 175.
\textsuperscript{108} Sekules 178. Such playing cards allowed players to virtually enter the world of hunting. Until the four classic suits were invented in the mid-fifteenth century, most playing cards were organized in suits that reflected the activities of specific social classes. For an image of a hunting playing card, see Sekules 178.
\textsuperscript{109} Cummins 5. He made this particular statement at the conclusion of his translation of Moamin’s treatise for the Emperor Frederick II.
were part of a “princely education”\textsuperscript{111} that included dogs because they were essential components of hunting as aids, guardians, and companions. Thus, when King Louis XIII received his hunting education prior to being crowned at the tender age of nine in 1610, it included setting his dogs on small prey in his palace ballroom.\textsuperscript{112}

Another essential feature of huntsmen was their love for books on hunting which were often translated and re-translated for the élite. The most famous of such manuals is the “classic how-to-do-it hunting book” written by Gaston Phébus\textsuperscript{`} in 1387, called \textit{Livre de Chasse}.\textsuperscript{113} This manual places great emphasis on the care of dogs, which only reiterates their value, appreciation and hence, the dog-owner relationship. Designated servants, known as \textit{berners} were responsible for the dogs’ care. The \textit{berners} were huntsmen or more specifically, \textit{kennelmen} who had “the charge of the hounds.”\textsuperscript{114} Huntsmen were also to be apothecaries and surgeons in case of emergencies because surgical needs were a recurring item of expense in royal French hunting accounts.\textsuperscript{115} Because of these responsibilities, huntsmen required education. According to Phébus, the “education of a huntsman-to-be should begin when he is seven.”\textsuperscript{116}

\textsuperscript{111} Cummins 5.
\textsuperscript{112} Gorrell 20.
\textsuperscript{113} This work is cited as Phébus, Gaston III de Foix, et al. \textit{The Hunting Book of Gaston Phébus}. London: Harvey Miller P, 1998 in the Bibliography. According to Gardner 47-48 and Phébus et al. 3 and 5, the original hunting manual was initially translated from French to English in England between 1406 and 1413 by Edward of Norwich, the second Duke of York. Figg 85 also indicates that the Duke’s translation (\textit{Master of Game}) is the oldest English hunting book.
\textsuperscript{114} Norwich, Baille-Graham, and Baille-Graham 205-206 and Reeves 106. According to Norwich 205-206, the word \textit{berner} seems to have been derived from the French \textit{brenier} or \textit{bernier}, one who paid his dues to his feudal lord in bran of bread which was made for the lord’s hounds. \textit{Brenage}, \textit{brennage} or \textit{bernage} was the tenure on which land was held by the payment of bran, and the use of all grains for the feeding of hounds. Berner in its first sense meant finder of brain, then feeder of hounds. This word seems to have remained in use in England long after it had disappeared from the language of French venery. Gaston refrained from using the word \textit{berner} and replaced it with \textit{valet de chiens}.
\textsuperscript{115} Cummins 29. For sample of royal French hunting accounts, see “Appendix I – Royal French Hunting Accounts” in Cummins 250-259. For visual impressions of veterinarian practices from \textit{Livre de Chasse}, see Phébus et al. 41.
\textsuperscript{116} Phébus et al. 36. Phébus dedicated an entire segment of his manual to the education of huntsmen: “Chapter 22, fol. 51v: How one should teach those one wishes to make into good hunters.”
He argued that this age was not too young because it takes a lifetime to perfect a craft, and “what a man learns in his youth he will hold best in his old age.” Thus, a good master “who loves hounds and has a thorough knowledge of them, and who will punish the boy if he does not obey” was mandatory for all apprentices. Such a master would pass on good morale and demonstrate a good emotional relationship with the dogs. The first thing a master was to teach all apprentices was the names of all the hounds which was typically done in the environment of the dogs’ kennels.

North American Indigenous peoples used kennels as well. As they eventually became emotionally attached to dogs, they could not kill dogs and in turn, followed Europe’s example and built kennels for the best care. Extravagant European examples include the kennels of James I of England and the Duke of Berry, both of whom owned numerous breeds and set very high management standards. High management standards meant following Phébus’ guidelines for kennel contents and management. For instance, a kennel should be located in a large, green yard with maximum sun exposure. The kennel doors were to be left open in order for the dogs to wander in and out as they pleased. A kennel should contain a fireplace for warmth during cold weather or when they get wet from rain or rivers. Each dog was to be provided with fresh water twice a day. At least one gutter was to be built for draining water and urine. Anything that was not cleaned by the gutter, including any other type of debris, was to be cleaned every morning when the thick straw (on the floor) was replaced. In agreement, William Somerville wrote,

O’er all let cleanliness preside, no scraps

---

117 Phébus et al. 36-37.
118 Phébus et al. 37. He dedicates an entire section of Livre de Chasse to kennels: “Of the kennel for the hounds.” However, for specific instructions in how to build a kennel, see Norwich, Baille-Graham, and Baille-Graham 125-126.
119 Williams 261. Unfortunately, Williams does not specify which First Nations cultures had built kennels, but the First Nations in general because of their attachment to dogs and refusal to kill them.
120 Coren 37 and Johnson 115 and 117.
Bestrew the pavement, and no half-picked bones.\textsuperscript{121}

Straw was also used to rub down the hounds after receiving their daily comb. Additionally, someone was to be in the kennel day and night to prevent fights.\textsuperscript{122} Such standards meant that caring for dogs required special skills. Hence, kennel employees were usually servants who specialized in outdoor duties\textsuperscript{123} or the apprentice, who at this stage was known as the “dog-boy” or an “embryo huntsman.” When he failed to complete his duties, he was beaten.\textsuperscript{124}

Therefore, as a general rule, kennel employees devotedly and happily completed their duties. Dogs were treated as companions and members of the family, especially considering that they were included in their owner’s portraits rather than human family members.\textsuperscript{125} Dogs and children received equal care as children in Europe and among the New World Natives alike;\textsuperscript{126} Chinese and European royalty alike had staff to care for their dogs.\textsuperscript{127} Hence, it is not surprising that Phébus spoke to his dogs like he would have spoken to other people and told them nothing but the truth. According to Phébus, dogs understand “better than any man of [his] household” did not speak to them often. However, he made clear that when spoke to his dogs, he spoke “in the most beautiful and gracious language that he c [ould].”\textsuperscript{128}

Phébus’ teachings in communication and general treatment of dogs


\textsuperscript{122} Phébus et al. 37 and 38 and Johnston 117.

\textsuperscript{123} Kate Mertes, The English Noble Household 1250-1600 – God Governance and Political Rule (London: Basil Blackwell, Inc., 1988) 49. An example of a specialized employee is William of Wykeham was the keeper of the king’s dogs in the mid-1350s. This may be found in William Woods, England in the Age of Chaucer (London: Hart-Davis, Mac-Gibbon Ltd., 1976) 122.

\textsuperscript{124} Phébus et al. 37 and Johnston 117. As previously discussed, such apprentices began their training as young as age seven.

\textsuperscript{125} Figg 95. Examples of this include William Hogarth’s “Portrait of Mary Edwards,” c. 1742 in Held 375; Titain’s “Elenora Gonzaga,” c. 1538 in Bowron 8, and William Hogarth’s self portrait, “The Painter and His Pug,” c. 1745 in Clark 236.

\textsuperscript{126} Schwartz 42.

\textsuperscript{127} Gorrell 18.

\textsuperscript{128} Johnston 117 and 118.
are related to dogs’ health. Substantial and humane efforts were made in maintaining their physical health and curing sicknes.

In the kennel, pallets were to be placed precisely one foot above the floor because earth’s moisture would be unable to threaten the dogs’ health. Dogs were to be walked daily and permitted to run where they may eat grass. Grass and wholesome herbs were highly beneficial in healing various forms of sickness. For more serious medical conditions, dogs were cautiously given medical attention. Rabies were uncommon but when a dog had rabies, it was not held against it; by the late fourteenth-century, Phébus and other upper-class dog owners were well aware of the cures for rabies. Cures were also available for constipation, maggots, tumours and fleas. Many cures for dog ailments consisted of food concoctions. For instance, Phébus strongly recommended that for a cold, the dog’s nostrils should be held over a steaming pot of water, camomile, mint, sage, rue or other herbs. Dog owners were to be meticulous when diagnosing a cold because it may be mistakenly identified as a sore throat. For a sore throat, Phébus suggested that meat (in tiny pieces) be cooked either in broth or goat or cow’s milk. If these cures were unknown, dog owners would alter their sick dogs’ diets by enriching them with bean broth, buttered eggs, chopped meat or goat’s milk. Royal hounds received additional special treatment. When ill, they usually received offal or blood. When they were very ill or disheartened, offal or blood was sometimes served in potage form. According to Figg, sick royal dogs were also served table scraps and blood pudding. Sometimes owners would only permit their ill dog to consume butter.

However, it was not uncommon for dogs to receive fancy food like this

---

129 For Phébus’ advice on the various illnesses and their cures, see the chapter “Of the sicknesses of hounds and of their cure,” which begins in Phébus, et al. on page 32.
130 Figg 102, Schwartz 41, Phébus et al. 37-38, and Johnson 113 and 117.
131 See Phébus’ “Chapter 16, fol. 40v: Of the sicknesses of hounds and of their cure,” which begins on page 32 in Phébus, et al. Unfortunately, no information has been found to confirm whether or not these cures were effective or if they were false hopes/beliefs. This primary source asserts that these cures were indeed cures, and not false beliefs.
132 Figg 102.
133 Figg 96.
134 Cummins 27 and Johnson 117.
135 Cummins 26.
136 Figg 96.
even when they were in perfect health. In Jean Froissart’s fourteenth century poem *The Debate Between the Horse and the Greyhound*, Grisél (the horse) would rather be a dog because she would be fed “rich soup” for breakfast, as well as bread and butter on a regular basis – “if there is only one good morsel around [the dog] will have it in [its] muzzle.”

Froissart was not exaggerating the greyhound’s menu – *souppes de levrier*, the greyhound soup that is mentioned in the original French version of this poem, is defined as a mixture of coarse brown bread soaked in the “last and worst fat of the beefpot” in Cotgrave’s Dictionary of 1611. In the Canterbury Tales, Geoffrey Chaucer also addresses the food privileges of dogs:

> Of smale houndes hadde she, that she fedde  
> Wit roasted flesh, and milk, and waste brede.  
> But sore wept she if on of hem were dede.\(^{139}\)

Similarly, all of Mary, Queen of Scots’ dogs were fed a ration of two loaves of bread daily.\(^{140}\) Such a bread diet was acceptable to Phébus; according to the master of dog owners, dogs were to be fed bread when not hunting so that they will only associate meat with the *curée*\(^{141}\) and thus, hunt most efficiently.\(^{142}\)

These hunting skills were applicable in war. Spain used dogs in their

\(^{137}\) Figg 95-96 and Palmer, Figg, and Froissart 489.  
\(^{138}\) Figg 96.  
\(^{140}\) Coren 203.  
\(^{141}\) The *curée* was the “ceremony of giving the hounds their reward on the skin of the animal they have chased.” Norwich, Baille-Graham and Baille-Graham 7. For more details of the *curée*, see Cummins 44 and Phébus’ chapter “How the hounds should be given their reward” in *Livre de chasse*, which begins on page 48 in the consulted version for this paper: Gaston III de Foix Phébus, et al, *The Hunting Book of Gaston Phébus* (London: Harvey Miller P, 1998). For an artist’s portrayal of a *curée*, see Sekules 176. This image was originally published in Phébus’ *Livre de Chasse*. In the reproduction that was consulted for this paper, this image may be found on page 70.  
\(^{142}\) Cummins 26. Large bills for bread were not uncommon in French royal accounts. For an example of a French royal account, see Cummins’ Appendices, particularly the first.
conquest of the Canary Islands from Portugal and against the Moors of Granada. In fact, several dog masters at Granada accompanied Columbus on his second voyage. \textsuperscript{143} Dogs were extremely effective in the New World, even when not in combat because they were feared by Indigenous people. Philip Camerarius wrote that dogs were so courageous in war that Natives were “more afraid of his teeth, than of any other Spanish weapons [.]” \textsuperscript{144} In fact, Native people believed that the value of one dog was that of ten men and if Becerillo, an exceptional war dog, was included, they would rather fight one hundred Spaniards without Becerillo than ten Spaniards with him. \textsuperscript{145} War dogs like Becerillo were not only feared because of their courage and teeth, but because they were difficult to defeat in battle because of their armour. Dogs’ armour was made of metal plates, chains, and collars that included spikes or knife blades. \textsuperscript{146} The uses of dogs reinforce the emotional attachment between owners and dogs – dogs readily obey and defend their owners like in other relevant situations, such as property protection or warfare. However, the dogs of the New World cannot be held accountable for their brutality against the Natives. As Coren points out, the person who committed the crime is the person who wielded the weapon. This person is prosecuted, not the weapon. Hence, the Spaniards were responsible for the abuse – not the dogs. \textsuperscript{147} Because the dogs’ owners were responsible, they were rewarded for their dogs’ success. They were awarded one and a half times the pay of a crossbowman in addition to whatever was obtained in food, gold, slaves, and

\textsuperscript{143} Coren 72-73. Because the Natives (that Columbus conquered) did not have dogs, armour and only had light weapons, dogs were valuable weapons of war and personal defence. According to Coren and Varner, Columbus took twenty dogs on this voyage.


\textsuperscript{145} Varner 5 and 27. For a popular tale of Becerillo, see Coren 77-79 or Varner 24-26. However, Varner is much more thorough than Coren.

\textsuperscript{146} Varner 34.

\textsuperscript{147} Coren 77.
other valuables. Because of dogs’ successes in war, allied monarchs would provide war dogs. For instance, King Henry VIII of England sent four hundred mastiffs to Holy Roman Emperor Charles V for his siege of Valencia against Francis I of France in 1518.

If an owner perished in war, dogs continued to play the role of humans’ best friends by accompanying and remaining in the journey to the afterlife. For example, many Native cultures believed that dogs were guides for difficult afterlife journeys and were sought for comfort in times of sickness and anticipated death. Another example is the execution of Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots by order of her cousin, Queen Elizabeth I. While awaiting her execution for allegedly being an accomplice in assassination plots against Elizabeth I, she was permitted to have her dogs for consolation. However, the dog that she hid under her clothing to the scaffold was only discovered when the executioner was untying her garters. The dog refused to leave the bloody body. When it was forced away from her, it rushed back to the severed head and bloody shoulders. Although Mr. Bull, the executioner, was ordered to burn everything that was splashed with her blood, the dog was given to the French as a memorial of her. Another example is the great Duke of Berry, who witnessed a dog that refused to leave his master’s grave; he gave money to a neighbour to keep it fed for the remainder of its life.

Upper class dog owners who endured the death of their beloved dogs buried them like other humans. This included erecting tombstones in their memory that usually contained carved images or sculptures. Ludovico II Gonzaga, the Marquis of Mantua, erected a tombstone with a Latin epitaph in memory of his dog Rubino. Likewise, noblewomen commonly erected effigies of their lap dogs, decorated with collars and additional accessories. These features were also common on owners’ tombs and coffins. Dogs were often carved or sculpted at their masters’ feet to symbolize their undying love,

148 Varner 27.
149 Varner 34.
150 Schwartz 4.
151 Coren 204-5.
152 Johnston 113.
153 Bowron 7.
This undying love, loyalty and protection have been portrayed and seen in other forms of primary and secondary evidence. Dogs truly were, and still are humans’ best friends. These characteristics were particularly evident in the aspects of religion, daily life routines, protection, hunting, collars, and the care and treatment of dogs in early modern Japan, China, Europe, and the Americas. Numerous works of art demonstrate this not only by the inclusion of dogs but by their facial expressions, body positions, and loving gazes toward their owners. The owners’ facial expressions, body positions and hand or arm positions on the dog are also symbols of a loving relationship. Literature also reveals that dogs have served as man’s unconditional best friend for centuries through tales of bravery, loyalty, love, and devotion.

Professional historians did not complete all of the consulted secondary sources for this paper, but non-historians’ works are still reputable and supported by the primary and secondary sources and thus, this paper’s position on the aspects of the dog-owner relationship in the late medieval and early modern worlds. Like the primary and remaining secondary sources, they clearly indicate that dogs have proven to be selfless creatures filled with unconditional love, whose actions have been psychologically demonstrated to have positive physical and mental effects. Clearly, the natural reaction for humans was (and still is) to become equally attached to dogs, for who can refuse unconditional love, affection, and devotion? Psychological studies have shown that the dog-owner relationship is very much like that of small children with their mothers. Modern dog owners would certainly agree with the unknown seventeenth-century Miwok who stated that a dog is “as worthy as life itself,” and caring mothers would undoubtedly say the same about their children. Considering that late medieval and early modern and modern pet owners have actually said similar things about their pet dogs, they may

---

154 Bowron 1 and Johnston 113. For example, see Johnston 116 for a photograph of Cardinal Langham’s late fourteenth century tomb in Westminster Abbey. The mourning dog is lying at the Cardinal’s feet. Likewise, a mourning dog is lying at the feet of Lord Hungerford’s tomb that was created in the second half of the fifteenth century. It may be found in Alabaster, Salisbury Cathedral. See Clark 173 for an image of this.

155 Schwartz 37.
also have said such things about their children; psychological studies have also revealed that the attachment that a dog has to its owner is very much like that of a small child to its mother; hence the striking similarities between these two relationships. Children are exceptionally important to loving parents as dogs are to their kind and affectionate owners. In modern day, the relationship between one of the two parties with an outsider is minimal (if non-existent) if the outsider cannot accept both parties. This also applied in the seventeenth-century poet John Molle, who wrote “Love me and love my dog, and so adieu!”

Like children and parents, dogs and their emotionally attached owners do not abandon each other because their love and attachment are unconditional, for

In summer’s heat he follows by they pace;
In winter’s cold he never leaveth thee;
In mountains wild he by thee close doth trace;
In all they feares and dangers true is he.

Humans and dogs of the late medieval and early modern worlds and had relationships much like that of modern day. These are completely different time periods, but psychological studies have indicated that affectionate, modern dog owners would certainly agree with loving late medieval and early modern dog owners that “the moost defaute of houndes is that thei lyven not longe inowe.”

---

157 John Molle, “A Faithful Friend,” The first friend: an anthology of the friendship of Man and dog, compiled from the literature of all ages 1400 B.C.-1921 A.D., ed. Lucy Menzies, (London: Allen & Unwin, 1922) 75 and John Molle, “The Faithfullest Beast,” The Dog in British Poetry, ed. R. Maynard Leonard, (San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 2005) 209. Although the titles are different, they refer to the same poem. Furthermore, the author’s name was not included in Lucy Menzies’ anthology. It was added upon discovery of the author in R. Maynard Leonard’s anthology.
158 Johnston 118 and Norwich, Baille-Graham, and Baille-Graham 84.
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