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Abstract: Like his mother Queen Victoria, Edward VII kept a thriving kennel at Sandringham and developed close bonds with several of his dogs. His most well-known canine companion was Caesar of Notts, a wirehaired fox terrier who entered the royal kennels in 1903. Caesar went everywhere with Edward and their travels were often recounted in the popular press. Caesar's most famous role, however, came after Edward's death, when Caesar was included in the king's funeral procession on 20 May 1910. The image of the scruffy dog following the gun carriage carrying his dead master struck a poignant chord with the public and interest in Caesar exploded. Pictures and stories featuring the dog appeared in the contemporary press, and in other texts and material objects including books, paintings, and picture postcards. Using these primary sources as well as recent animal studies scholarship, this paper establishes the significance of the king's bond with Caesar, explains how Caesar became a symbol of the nation in mourning, and discusses the dog's part in shaping the public memory of Edward VII by highlighting the king's domestic attachments, and his empathy for the common people of Britain.
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As the coffin carrying the body of King Edward VII made its way through London on the morning of 20 May 1910, observers were moved to see a small wirehaired fox terrier trotting obediently behind the gun carriage with his kilted handler.¹

The dog was Caesar, the king’s favorite canine and constant companion for the past eight years. Caesar became an emblem of the nation in mourning. His picture appeared in the popular press and he was featured in a wealth of other texts and material objects including books, poems, photographs, sculptures, toys, calendars, paintings, and prints. Other monarchs were dog enthusiasts, but no other royal canine has before (or since) captured the public’s interest as Caesar. While numerous newspaper stories, websites, and blogs have featured his image, recounted his life story, and highlighted his bond with Edward VII, there has been little scholarly investigation to map out the importance of this attachment.² I argue that Caesar’s bond with Edward had significance beyond that of heart-warming human interest story. Caesar’s very public presence in popular culture in the weeks and years following the king’s death aided in fashioning Edward’s public memory, particularly in regards

---

¹ I would like to thank: Alan Fausel, Adjunct Curator, and Jaimie Fritz, Archivist, at the American Kennel Club Museum of the Dog for their assistance with research and obtaining images from the AKC collection; Eleanor Garthwaite and Jane Oakley from Sworders Fine Art Auctioneers for their assistance obtaining images. Research for this paper was funded in part by a Research and Development grant from Longwood University, Spring 2022.

to strengthening Edward’s weak domestic attachments, and exemplifying Edward’s legacy as friend of the common man and “affectionate father of his people.”³

Examining Caesar’s relationship with the king, the dog’s prominence in the funeral procession, and his visibility in popular culture after Edward’s death will offer new insights in several disciplines. Current scholarship on pets and pet-keeping has focused, in part, on the complex emotional and affective dynamics between human and pet within the home, and how these dynamics can alter the private physical spaces of the home.⁴ Pets, therefore, are often defined and discussed in relation to the family and the domestic sphere. This research will highlight the ways that a domestic dog can have impact in the public sphere as well, and will contribute to the current discourse on the affective role of domestic pets.⁵ Moreover, understanding how Caesar’s visibility in text and image helped shape Edward’s public memory provides an additional perspective on royal funerals and public response, and the ways a royal legacy may be fashioned outside of the more customary sources such as eulogies, official rituals, and memorials.⁶ The deaths of Princess Charlotte Augusta of Wales (1796-1817) and

---


⁵ Phillip Howell examines the discourse surrounding the public “street” dog or stray which often invoked fear of disease and disorder, and the private “domestic” dog in At Home and Astray, the Domestic Dog in Victorian Britain (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2015).

Diana, Princess of Wales (1961-1997) both provide examples of royal deaths that also generated widespread public grief, mourning, and merchandising. Caesar will add a new dimension to these discussions. Lastly, Caesar’s prominent place in the funeral procession illuminates how pets (and other animals) may function as participants within death and mourning rituals. While several scholars have addressed pets as funeral participants, their role has not been explored in depth.

The Royals and their dogs
Dogs have been a conspicuous part of the royal households for centuries, and their relationships with their royal owners have been documented in paintings, photographs, and other material objects. Medieval and early modern monarchs (and members of the nobility) kept dogs for hunting such as the alaunt, greyhound, and mastiff, and smaller lapdogs roamed
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8 There are several Victorian examples of dogs participating in funeral rituals which include: Lion, dog of boxer Tom Sayers (d. 1865) and Keeper, dog of writer Emily Brontë (d. 1848). While Lion is mentioned in the scholarship examining Sayers funeral and tomb in Highgate Cemetery, London, Lion’s presence is only briefly examined. See for example: Alexander Darius Ornella, “Remembering Heroes, Remembering Nations: Sport as Bodily Practice of Remembrance,” in *Highgate Cemetery: Image Practices in Past and Present*, eds. Marie-Therese Mäder, Albert Saviello, and Baldassari Scolari (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 2020), 149–172, doi.org/10.5771/9783845294520; Mike Huggins, “Reading the Funeral Rite: Cultural Analysis of the Funeral Ceremonials and Burial of Selected Leading Sportsmen in Victorian England, 1864–1888,” *Journal of Sport History* 38, no. 3 (Fall 2011): 407–424; Maureen B. Adams also briefly discusses Emily Brontë’s dog Keeper and his role in her funeral in “Emily Brontë and Dogs: Transformation Within the Human-Dog Bond,” *Society and Animals* 8, no. 2 (2000): 1–15.

the domestic environment as companions. Paul van Somer depicted Anne of Denmark (1574-1619) in riding costume with her greyhounds in 1617. Artists such as Antony Van Dyke often included dogs in portraits of Charles I (1600-1649) and his family. The Georgians too were fond of their dogs, evinced in several extant letters of Frederick Prince of Wales (1701-1751), his wife Augusta (1737-1813), and Frederick’s niece Princess Augusta Sophia (1768-1840), that reference the building of dog kennels at Cliveden and Kew, and the purchasing of new beds and combs. Painter Barthélemy du Pan featured Frederick’s children in a lively outdoor frolic with several of the royal dogs in 1746.

It is in the reign of Queen Victoria (1819-1901) and Prince Albert (1819-1861) that we see a greater visibility and documentation regarding the dogs in the royal household which corresponds to the rise of companionate pet-keeping that surged in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It would not be an exaggeration to say that Victoria, Albert, and their nine children greatly loved their dogs. The royal kennels in the Home Park at Windsor, built 1840-1841, regularly housed anywhere between seventy to 100 dogs. This number did not include the royal family’s personal pets, who often dwelled with them in the royal household, such as the well-known King Charles spaniel Dash of Queen Victoria’s youth and early marriage; Deckle, the first of many dachshunds to be sent from Albert’s family in Coburg, Germany; several long-haired collies named Sharp and Noble who were often photographed with Victoria in mourning after Albert’s death; Albert’s favorite greyhound Eos; and the
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Pomeranian Turi who comforted the queen on her deathbed, among numerous others.\textsuperscript{16} Portraits of royal dogs in groups, alone, and with members of the royal family, were commissioned from such eminent painters as Sir Edwin Landseer, Charles Burton Barber, and Maud Earl as well as from photographer William Bambridge.\textsuperscript{17} Edward and Alexandra continued the tradition and commissioned likenesses of many of their favorite animals, and even had a hand in making images themselves. Queen Alexandra and her daughter Princess Victoria, for example, were keen photographers and filled photograph albums with images of friends and family including their cherished canines.\textsuperscript{18}

\section*{Jack the Irish terrier, and Caesar of Notts}

Following his parents Queen Victoria and Prince Albert before him, Edward VII (as well as his wife Queen Alexandra) was a great dog enthusiast and kept a thriving kennel at Sandringham built in 1879. Like many members of his family, although a variety of different types of dog were represented in the kennels, the king had a fondness for certain breeds, particularly French bulldogs and terriers, and Edward formed close bonds with several notable canines before Caesar. Early in his reign Edward’s favorite companion was an Irish terrier named Jack, a stray who ambled up the steps at Marlborough House one day in 1901 and charmed the king with his confident and bold personality.\textsuperscript{19} Jack’s arrival was considered providential by the royal household as Edward was still desolate over the recent loss of Peter, his French bulldog.\textsuperscript{20} A notice was placed in the newspaper, Jack’s owner was found, and the man was happy to make the dog a gift to the king. Jack’s constant presence by the king’s side garnered the attention of the press. According to Curtis Brown, correspondent for the \textit{Washington Post}, Edward was particularly charmed by “the impudence [of Jack] in contrast with the stolid docility of the

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{20} Jane Ridley refers to Peter as the king’s “Bad tempered bulldog” who was always ready to “snap at any visitor.” Ridley, \textit{Heir Apparent}, 441.
\end{thebibliography}

\textit{Royal Studies Journal (RSJ)}, Volume 10, no. 2 (2023), 387
lamented Peter.” Jack did as he pleased, wandered about the palace at will, and could disappear for hours or even days. Jack’s place in Edward’s affections was firmly set when the king became ill with an abdominal abscess shortly before his coronation in 1902. In Brown’s account of their relationship, Jack would not leave Edward’s side, eating his meals by the foot of the royal bed and accompanying the king as he convalesced aboard the royal yacht. The king took Jack with him everywhere and, as with other favored royal canines, he was photographed and immortalized in paint. Celebrated animal painter Maud Earl requested permission to include Jack in a collection of twenty-four photogravures entitled “Terriers and Toys” to accompany an exhibition of her paintings in 1903 at the Graves Gallery in London. According to the Times, so great was Edward’s attachment to Jack that Earl was granted a studio at the palace so that Jack would not have to leave for his sittings. Jack was available to sit for Earl most of the day, except for breakfast and lunch when he was required to be at the king’s table.

Sadly, Jack did not live long. In 1903, on a trip to Ireland with the king and queen, Jack died suddenly while they were staying at the Viceregal Lodge in Dublin. The terrier was buried on the grounds with a large grave side monument with the epitaph: “Here lies Jack, King Edward’s favorite Irish terrier who only lived twelve hours after reaching his native land. He died at Viceregal Lodge on 21 July 1903.” After the dog’s death, like a parent with a departed child, Edward kept a lock of Jack’s hair in a locket on his writing desk.

Caesar, a wirehaired fox terrier, entered the royal kennel in 1903 as a gift to the king, shortly after Jack’s death. Edward developed an equally close relationship with Caesar as he had with Jack. Caesar slept on a chair beside the royal bed, often ate at the royal table, and accompanied the king on numerous private holidays and official royal visits, including to Vienna, Paris, St. Petersburg, Marienbad, Pompeii, Athens, Biarritz, Berlin, and Naples. Many of Caesar’s travels were chronicled by Edward’s motor engineer Charles William Stamper, who
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23 Gordon, Noble Hounds, 110.
24 Gordon, Noble Hounds, 110.
25 Gordon, Noble Hounds, 110.
26 W.E. Grey, “Caesar, the Dog that belonged to a King,” Daily Mail, 26 Dec 1910, 4.
worked for the king from 1905 until the king’s death in 1910. According to Stamper, Caesar “invariably accompanied his master, whenever, wherever he motored.” Not only did Caesar travel with the king, he met other important world leaders. The Daily Mail claimed that Caesar was “the most popular dog in the world. [Having been] petted by Emperors, Kings, Princes, Presidents, and numerous other exalted personages.”

Despite his royal connections and the illustrious company he often kept, he was not a particularly well-behaved dog. Stamper recounts several tales of Caesar’s misdeeds: chasing peacocks around the garden outside the Café Glatzen in Marienbad; dispatching two pet rabbits belonging to Daphne Mitford, the daughter of Lord Redesdale; scouring ditches for rats, and coming back covered in muck; and various incidents of Caesar escaping from his handlers. His preferred method of entering the motor car was to jump into Stamper’s seat once he left it to open the door, and then leap through the dividing window to the back seat. Despite his rather mischievous ways, according to Stamper, “the dog and [the king] were devoted to one another.” When Caesar was mischievous, Edward would shake his walking stick at him: “‘You naughty dog,’ he would say very slowly. ‘You naughty, naughty dog.’ And Caesar would wag his tail and ‘smile’ cheerfully up into his master’s eyes, until His Majesty smiled back in spite of himself.” To ensure that everyone knew to whom Caesar belonged—particularly helpful given his propensity for escape and evasion—Edward had a collar fashioned with a brass tag that read “I belong to the King.”
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27 C. W. Stamper, What I know: Reminiscences of five years personal attendance upon his late majesty King Edward VII, 2nd ed. (London: Mills and Boon, 1913). Caesar’s exploits were also chronicled by the popular press. The Daily Mirror, for example, recounted “How Caesar lost himself in Copenhagen,” on one of his early travels with the king. The Daily Mirror, 14 April 1904, 3.

28 Stamper, What I know, 11.

29 “Caesar’s Adventure,” Daily Mail, 3 April 1911, 7.

30 Stamper, What I know, 72.

31 Stamper, What I know, 72. The king was quite upset that Caesar had killed the rabbits and offered to replace the deceased pets. According to Stamper, this was one of the few times that Caesar was punished for his behavior.

32 Stamper, What I know, 12.

33 Stamper, What I know, 78, 80, 255.

34 Stamper, What I know, 12.

35 Stamper, What I know, 73.

36 Caesar was not the only royal dog to have this special tag. George V’s dog Bob, a Cairn terrier, had a collar with a similar inscription. Gordon, Noble Hounds, 89.
Like other favored pets in the royal household, Caesar’s likeness was captured by various artists. Faberge made a chalcedony version of Caesar with ruby eyes and a collar with the appropriate identification just as on Caesar’s real collar.\footnote{“Faberge Caesar,” Royal Collection Trust, accessed 30 June 2022, \url{https://www.rct.uk/collection/40339/caesar}. Caesar accompanied King Edward and Queen Alexandra to the Royal Dairy at Sandringham on 8 December 1907 to view the wax model of his figurine as well as those of other pets and farm animals being modelled by the Faberge studios.} Artist Maud Earl was commissioned to create a portrait of Caesar and granted studio room at Buckingham palace, between the private apartments of Alexandra and Edward, so that the king and queen could visit the artist as she worked (Figure 1). It was at Earl’s suggestion that the painting was called Caesar: I belong to the King.\footnote{Freeman Lloyd, “Maud Earl, Painter of Kingly Dogs,” American Kennel Gazette 48, no. 12 (1 December 1931), 13-17, 15. Earl also painted Edward’s bulldog Peter, and Queen Alexandra’s favorite borzoi, Alix.} In Earl’s portrait Caesar faces left with his head turned toward the viewer. In front of him on the ground is a white glove as if he had just run away with the item and is turning to see if anyone is giving chase. Earl captures not only his infamous mischievous personality, but also his rather rough disheveled coat that no amount of bathing or brushing seemed to be able to tame.\footnote{Caesar “had a boy to look after him and was generally bathed and brushed twice a week.” “Caesar,” Daily Telegraph, 23 May 1910, 5.}
The death and funeral of the king

King Edward VII died on 6 May 1910 at Buckingham Palace from heart failure brought on by bronchitis. In addition to the tributes to Edward, the assessments of his reign, the discussions of the funeral arrangements, and the many sympathies for the grief-stricken Queen Alexandra, the press also carried updates on Caesar. Numerous stories detailed his “inconsolable” grief, his “pathetic restlessness,” his wandering the palace looking “in vain” for the familiar face of the king. The king’s funeral took place on 20 May 1910, and Edward’s subjects, most dressed in black, packed the London streets to watch the funeral procession slowly wind its way from Whitehall to Paddington station for the king’s final journey to

40 Wolffe, Great Deaths, 244. The body remained in the king’s palace bedroom for eight days so that close family and friends could visit and say their farewells. The body was eventually placed in the coffin and moved to Westminster Hall to lie in state from 17 to 19 May 1910.

Windsor for burial. Walking behind the gun carriage that carried the king’s remains were two of Edward’s most cherished companions: his horse Kildare and dog Caesar (Figure 2). It was Queen Alexandra who requested that Kildare and Caesar accompany their master on this final journey.\(^{42}\) Behind these beloved animals followed a gathering of sovereigns and princes of Europe including nine reigning monarchs: Edward’s son and successor George V, Kaiser Wilhelm II, and the Kings of Norway, Denmark, Greece, Spain, Bulgaria, Portugal and Belgium.\(^{43}\)

![Figure 2. Rotary Photographic Company, The Funeral of the Late King Edward VII, The Late King’s Charger and Favourite Dog, 1910, bromide postcard print, 13.97 x 8.57 cm. Collection of the author.](image)

The image of Edward’s devoted canine walking in the funeral procession captured the public’s imagination. Numerous press narratives and illustrations of the funeral noted Caesar’s presence and remarked on the effect this scruffy dog had on the solemn proceedings. The *Daily Mail* claimed, “No sight in the endless array of martial splendor was more moving
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\(^{42}\) “King Edward’s Dog, Special Care of the Queen Mother,” *Daily Mail*, 23 May 1910, 7.

than that of this dumb creature, the faithful companion of King Edward’s last days;” and the
*Daily Telegraph* declared that “No more human touch was ever given to any event great or small
than the presence of the dog walking with his late Majesty’s charger.” The cover of *The Graphic* carried an illustration of Caesar standing on his back paws to receive a caress from
Queen Alexandra as she entered her carriage at Westminster Hall before the funeral
procession. The *Illustrated London News* (ILN) devoted the front page of the Saturday 28 May
1910 edition to an illustration of Caesar straining at the leash to reach the king as the train
bearing the royal coffin left Paddington, with an additional large photograph of Caesar and
Kildare in the funeral procession. The previous week the paper revealed that a new painting
of the mourning dog, entitled *Silent Sorrow*, by renowned animal artist Maud Earl, had been
commissioned by the ILN to memorialize Edward’s death. Readers of the ILN were assured
that the photogravure of the image would soon be available for purchase.

Public interest in Caesar skyrocketed and consumer goods that featured him
multiplied. Various printers issued photographic postcards of Caesar alone, Caesar at the
funeral, and Caesar with Edward (Figures 2, 3, 4). Artist Herbert Dicksee created an engraving
of Caesar entitled “Where’s Master?” exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1911 (Figure 5).
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46 “Dumb Mourner at His Majesty’s Funeral, Queen Alexandra caressing King Edward’s Terrier,” *The Graphic*, 24
May 1910, cover. Other newspapers also remarked on this tender moment. See for example: “King Edward’s
Dog,” *Daily Mail*, 23 May 1910, 7; “The Queen Pets the King’s Terrier,” *Daily Mail*, 21 May 1910, 22; “Millions
Watch King’s Funeral,” *New York Times*, 21 May 1910, 1; Sir Richard Holmes, ed., *Edward VII: His Life and Times*,
47 “Left Behind...” and “In Silent Grief, Mourning Their Dead Master,” *Illustrated London News*, 28 May 1910, 1 and
18 respectively.
49 Spratt’s Dog Biscuits also issued several postcards with Caesar alone and in the Funeral procession. See for
example: “Spratt’s Dog Biscuits Antique Postcard King Edward’s Favourite dog, ’Caesar,’” *Ebid*, accessed June 21,
Additional incarnations of Caesar included cigarette cards,\(^{50}\) a board game,\(^{51}\) Carlton crested china Caesars were available,\(^{52}\) and Steiff toys issued a black and white mohair stuffed and jointed Caesar in 1911.\(^{53}\) *The Daily Mirror* also noted that an unnamed English firm of toymakers had issued a plush, jointed version of Caesar that was “seen in the streets cuddled in the arms of children in their perambulators.” This same English company also issued a life size Caesar for the “bigger girl and boy.”\(^{54}\)
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52 Carlton Crested China Caesar-‘I am the King’s Dog,’” Ebay, accessed 29 June 2022, https://www.ebay.co.uk/itm/265723587817?hash=item3dde5c2ce9:glf8AAOswKejisyGNf.


54 “Toy Caesars” *The Daily Mirror*, 21 June 1910, 4. The name of the English toy company is not known.

Figure 5. Herbert Dicksee, *Where’s Master?*, 1911, etching, published by Frost and Reed, pl. 40 x 58 cm. Image courtesy of Sworders Fine Art Auctioneers, London.
For the 1910 Christmas season, Caesar calendars were selling out, and West End shops featured a Caesar “bassinette rug” to keep the kingdom’s children “warm during winter outings in their perambulators.” There were so many variations of Caesar that W. E. Grey wrote in the *Daily Mail* that “Enthroned in thousands of British nurseries here and in the Dominions is a new idol—Dog Caesar. His image is made of wool and plush, plaster of Paris or mere paper.” Perhaps the most well-known work related to Caesar is the one he “wrote” himself. In 1910, shortly after Edward’s death, Hodder and Stoughton in London published *Where’s Master? by Caesar the King’s dog*, written by Sir John Ernest Hodder Williams. The book, narrated by Caesar, detailed Edward’s illness and death and the dog’s role in the funeral procession. The book was an instant success and ran to at least sixteen editions. Perhaps capitalizing on the book’s popularity, the Reverend J. Mountain published a pamphlet “for the Boys and Girls of the Empire” with a similar title in 1911 “Caesar or I’m the dog that belongs to the king!,” which featured several short poems, similar in theme to *Where’s Master?* but with a decidedly more religious emphasis.

It would be easy to dismiss the intense interest in Caesar, particularly during the funeral and in the weeks and months that followed, as simply the manifestation of an overly sentimental nation of dog lovers. However, Caesar was more significant than that. In both the way he was imaged and in the way he was discussed, Caesar became a locus for shaping the public memory of the king.
Edward, dogs, and domesticity

Caesar’s celebrity is, in part, a reflection of the rise of domestic pet-keeping and the increased cultural dialogues about pets, animal welfare, and treatment that began in the eighteenth century and burgeoned in the nineteenth century. In many Victorian households—from urban and rural working class to the upper reaches of the aristocracy (as evinced by the royal family)—animals of various kinds were brought into the domestic sphere to live alongside the home’s human occupants in ways not seen in previous centuries. The very act of bringing a dog (or any other pet) into the home was not a casual one but carried symbolic weight. For the Victorians, and the Edwardians after them, home was not just a structure, but a haven of love, comfort, and safety that shielded its inhabitants from the harshness and competitiveness of the public sphere. In 1864 art critic and writer John Ruskin called the Victorian home “the place of peace, the shelter, not only from all injury but from terror doubt and division ... it is a sacred place, a vestal temple, a temple of the hearth.” Reformers Samuel Smiles felt the domestic sphere had greater influence on character formation than even the schoolroom and


62 For discussion of what constitutes a “pet” rather than any other kind of animal see for example: Amato, Beastly Possessions, 23; and Erica Fudge, Pets, (London: Routledge, 2008), 12–38.


claimed the home was “the crystal of society—the very nucleus of national character.”

Ruskin and Smiles were far from alone in their views on the importance of the domestic sphere and the sanctity of the home. Victorian advice manuals on household management, domestic magazines and journals, paintings and illustrations, extolled the virtues of the domestic sphere and emphasized its significance as the bedrock of a stable, well-ordered British society. Home was not just made up of its human inhabitants, however. According to Ivan Kreilkamp pets became a necessary component to creating the affective Victorian home. Kreilkamp argues,

[A] home that permits the luxury of love for an animal in fact proves and ratifies its domesticity. In some sense, conceptual categories of the sentimental home or domestic space cannot exist without the presence of the pet, that being that, as an object of extravagant, excessive, potentially ‘sentimental’ love, demonstrates the power and potency of affect within the home.

Connecting a pet with the domestic space and its associative sentiments had repercussions for the construction of Edward VII’s public memory. As John Wolffe explains, religious leaders “faced an unspoken dilemma” in how best to eulogize the king. His mother Queen Victoria had presented herself throughout her reign as a model of domestic virtue, and wifely devotion. While Edward was not totally bereft of visible domestic ties—he had of course married Alexandra of Denmark in 1863, and they had six children, five of whom had survived into adulthood—his domestic life did not seem as exemplary as his mother’s. The king was a man of great appetites who enjoyed house parties, gambling, and horse racing, and who carried on liaisons with a series of mistresses, including actress Lillie Langtry and socialite Alice Keppel

---


among several others. These activities, well-known to the public, were not the stuff of great eulogies. According to Wolffe, many Christian leaders elected to focus on other more generally recognized and accepted traits of the deceased king such as “peacemaker” and friend to the people in their praise of him and in the consideration of his legacy.

Nevertheless, Edward’s lack of private domestic virtues did not go unexamined after his death. In an article for the New York American, entitled “New King a Lover of Home,” British playwright and novelist Keble Howard wondered what the new king, George V, can do for England, “what is the outlook?” he asked. Howard predicted that the outlook was decidedly “domestic.” While King Edward was a “man of the world, a clubman, [and] a ‘jolly good sort...qualities which stood him in good stead,’” George V, on the other hand is “more reserved,” and closer to his wife and children. Howard claims that “Our new king will bring back to the court [my ital.] the atmosphere of the Victorian era. Domestic Virtues will no longer be unfashionable ... we may expect to find the home life of the English once again the fount of the nation’s prosperity.” Howard applauded the return to Victorian domestic values, signaling that, at least for some Edwardians, the Victorian domestic ideal continued to be an important ideology vital to the health of the nation and one that might have been deficient during the reign of Edward VII.

How does Caesar’s prominent position in the funeral procession and his visibility in popular culture after the king’s death relate to Edward’s domestic inadequacies? As discussed earlier, Kreilkamp argues that pet-keeping could validate a household’s domestic credentials, confirming the affective influence of the domestic sphere. The very presence of Caesar, as well as the other personal pets of the royal family, helped secure a sense of domesticity for a household felt to be lacking. A household, even a royal one often buffeted by scandal, which had enough love and affection to encompass animals within its sphere could not be completely barren of all domestic virtues. That Caesar was a dog specifically, and not another kind of pet, also carried particular cultural capital. According to Sara Amato: “Dogs were the most

---


69 Wolffe, Great Deaths, 246–247.

70 Keble Howard, “New King a Lover of Home,” New York American, reproduced in The Washington Post, 10 May 1910, 2. This quote as well as the following.
celebrated pets and provided the standard against which all others were measured.”\footnote{Amato, Beastly possessions, 25.} Victorian books, poems, theatrical performances, paintings, and photographs all celebrated the many virtues of the dog.\footnote{Amato, Beastly Possessions, 74–75.} Phillip Howell contends that as dogs were increasingly integrated within the ideal Victorian home, they became “metonymically associated with the institutions of family and the household.”\footnote{Howell, At Home and Astray, 127.} Home and dog became inextricably linked. While Queen Alexandra, George V, and other members of the immediate royal family were part of the procession that followed the coffin on its way to Paddington station, it was Caesar who would become symbolic of Edwards’ domestic life. Wolff recognizes this in his analysis of Edward VII’s funeral affirming that Caesar’s inclusion offered: “A poignant hint of the late King’s private life.”\footnote{Wolff, Great Deaths, 255.}

Caesar’s link to the domestic sphere is highlighted in several of the images that relate to Caesar’s mourning of Edward. As mentioned previously, sometime soon after Edward’s death the Illustrated London News commissioned Maud Earl, who was a favorite artist of the royal family, for a painting to commemorate the king’s death (Figure 5).\footnote{Maud Earl briefly discussed the commission in an interview for the American Kennel Gazette. Freeman Lloyd, “Maud Earl Painter of Kingly Dogs,” American Kennel Gazette 48, no. 12 (1 December 1931): 13–17. The image was offered for sale again in April 1914 at Caesar’s death.} The result was Silent Sorrow which depicts Caesar in the foreground facing to the right, leaning his head on the “seat of a large easy chair, that of his dead master.”\footnote{Lloyd, “Maud Earl,” 15.} While Caesar and the bottom portion of the armchair are rendered with distinct detail, the top of the chair fades away creating a clear focus on Caesar. Earl’s composition is a variation of the “empty chair” trope where a single empty chair alone or within a domestic environment connotes the empty space left by the death of a loved one. Perhaps the most well-known version is Sir Luke Fildes’s Empty Chair, which depicts Charles Dickens’s desk chair in his study at Gad’s Hill after the author’s death in June 1870, but there are numerous other images which feature this theme in the Victorian and Edwardian periods.\footnote{There are two versions of The Empty Chair, Gad’s Hill. One is a watercolour that Fildes did on site at the request of the family. Fildes’s original watercolour is located at the Rare Book Department of the Free Library of}
be found in any middle or even working-class household. This domestic context is even more elaborate in Herbert Dicksee’s etching entitled *Where’s Master?* exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1911 (Figure 5). In Dicksee’s image Caesar lies forlornly on a rug in front of a hearth in the center of the composition. Behind him is once again a padded arm chair, with a side table and the brass fender of a fireplace. In both Earl’s and Dicksee’s images, Caesar mourns not at an empty throne in a palace room, but at the comfortable chair of the father of the house in front of the family hearth (particularly highlighted in Dicksee’s work). In both images the humble domestic setting does not diminish the king’s rank but elevates Caesar and Edward’s bond, and underscores that Edward’s household, because of Caesar, was a true home of love and affection.

---

Philadelphia, PA. The other version is an engraving by F. G. Kitton, based on Fildes’s painting, published in *The Graphic*, Christmas number, 6 December 1870, unknown page.

Meagan Doolittle has discussed the way material objects such as the family clock and the Father’s chair can evoke memories of the “warmth of the hearth” in autobiographical accounts of working-class homes. Megan Doolittle, “Time, Space, and Memories: The Father’s Chair and Grandfather Clocks in Victorian Working-class Domestic Lives,” *Home Cultures* 8, no.2 (November 2011): 245–264. See also the poem: G. Weatherly, “An Old Arm Chair,” *Quiver* 13 (January 1878): 374.
Caesar, Edward, and the common man

While Dicksee and Earl provide the public with a brief glimpse inside the domestic life of the king, Caesar himself opens the doors to the palace and allows the king’s subject inside to “witness” the last days of the monarch in the book *Where’s Master? by Caesar the King’s Dog* written by John Ernest Hodder Williams. The text features Caesar as narrator while he searches for his master throughout the palace. As he searches, Caesar remembers his life with the king and their travels together, the king’s illness and death, and the royal funeral procession. While it is clear that Caesar’s master is a monarch, Williams creates a warm affection and intimacy between Caesar and Edward that reflects the simplicity of a dog’s love for his master, regardless of his rank. Edward talks with Caesar calling him “old man” and “little scamp.”

79 When the king feels poorly on the train, Caesar cuddles with the king to keep

---

79 Williams, *Where’s Master?*, 17, 22.
him warm, and when Caesar is barred from the king’s bedroom as Edward is being examined by the royal physicians, the king exclaims “Let Caesar come in at once!” Historian Margery Masterson has commented that Where’s Master? “admitted commoners into the King’s bedchamber at the moment of his death, increasing the pathos of his passing, but, perhaps, lessening the awe of the occasion.”

If the narrative of Where’s Master? creates a common, less regal death scene for the king, then it is in keeping with images discussed above and how Edward’s reign was often characterized after his death. One of the most prominent themes in many of the reflections about Edward was that the king was a much beloved monarch, an “Affectionate father of his people,” whose death was felt personally by his subjects. In a letter to Lord Minto, John Morley, Secretary of state for India under Lord Minto, wrote “The feeling of grief and sense of personal loss throughout the country … is extraordinary … It is in one way deeper and keener than when the Queen died nine years ago, and to use the same word over again, more personal.”

According to Wolffe,

[Edward’s] gregariousness, tact, courtesy and evident zest for life appealed to many. He was perceived as the model English gentleman, who had a genuine interest and concern for the under privileged. Hence the ‘poor toiling masses’ could hail him as ‘good old Teddy’ or ‘dear old Dad.’

These sentiments were highlighted in the popular press after Edward’s death. For example, The Times claimed that the king was “universally popular with his own subjects and countrymen whatever state and social condition … [the people] loved him for his kindly
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80 Williams, Where’s Master?, 36.
82 Wolffe, Great Deaths, 246.
83 National Library of Scotland, MS, 12740, 36, Morley to Minto, 12 May 1910, as qtd. in Wolffe, Great Deaths, 244.
84 Wolffe, Great Deaths 244-245, see footnote 123, (244).
courtesy to all. They felt whatever their rank, that in not a few essential matters he was of themselves.”

In part this great affection between king and subjects was due to Edward’s rather ordinary preferences and pursuits. According to Reynolds’s Newspaper, “[Edward] was a very average typical Briton in his tastes and habits and the man in the street saw in him a glorified portrait of himself.” It was Edward’s very commonness that seemed to endear him to the public. The king loved his country estate at Sandringham, enjoyed good cigars, shooting game, and playing cards, loved his horses and dogs, and was not above carousing with the lads. After the king’s death, the New York Times printed a letter from an “Old-Time Reporter” about the then Prince of Wales on a visit to New York City. On the suggestion of the newspaper reporters covering his visit, Edward slipped his handlers and left his hotel with the reporters to spend a few hours drinking mint juleps at various “café’s” around Union Square. Eventually the prince recognized that he needed to return to his duties, and went back to the hotel much to the relief of his entourage who had been in a state of panic.

In addition to his connection to the domestic sphere, Caesar also became emblematic of the king’s concern and empathy for the common man of Britain. Caesar could function in this role in part because pets were seen as reflections of their owners. In her study of animals in Victorian consumer society, Amato discusses how: “Pets ... were representative of their owners, living symbols of social status, wealth or poverty.” Guidebooks advised men to be careful of the type or breed of dog they adopted as a pet. Being followed about by a mongrel dog could reflect poorly on a man’s status. Caesar, the offspring of champion Cackler of Notts, came from the prestigious kennels of Kathleen Pelham-Clinton (1872-1955), the Duchess of Newcastle, who was a prominent dog breeder and show judge of wirehaired fox terriers and borzois. Cackler is considered one of the key progenitors of the wirehair fox terrier which
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85 “The Death of the King,” The Times, 7 May 1910, 11.
86 “The Passing of the King,” Reynolds’s Newspaper, 8 May 1910, 1.
88 Amato, Beastly Possessions, 76.
89 Amato, Beastly Possessions, 77; For further discussions on the development of dog breeds, breeding, and dog competitions and shows see: Michael Warboys, Julie-Marie Strange, and Neil Pemberton, The Invention of the Modern Dog, Breed and Blood in Victorian England (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 2018); and Ritvo, The Animal Estate, particularly 82–121.
was recognized as a distinct breed by the 1870s.\footnote{91} Being from the litter of a champion bred at a respected kennel Caesar would appear, according to contemporary pet guidebooks, an appropriate companion for the King of England.

However, Caesar’s lineage could be easily dismissed in order to characterize him as common dog, and thus further emphasize Edward’s sympathy for the common people of Britain. Rather than reflecting Edward’s high rank, Caesar acted as a symbol of his humanity. In his pamphlet for children, “Caesar, or I am the dog that belongs to the king,” the Rev J. Mountain characterizes Caesar as a humble little dog without pedigree. He begins the first line of each stanza of the poem “Caesar and his Master,” by highlighting the dog’s lowly status. In the poem Caesar claims: “I am only a plain little dog … I am only a poor little dog … I am only a rough little dog.” The other dogs around Caesar claim that because he is a fox-terrier he has no pedigree, although this clearly was not the case.\footnote{92} But despite his “failings” Caesar is a merry dog, because the king loves him. And the fact that the monarch deigns to find lovable this ordinary dog without pedigree makes Caesar the envy of the other dogs.\footnote{93}

Caesar’s lack of pedigree and Edward’s love for his common little dog also appears in a children’s book, \textit{Norah on the Durbar}, published in 1912.\footnote{94} The text is similar to \textit{Where’s Master?} as it is also narrated by a dog, this time by Norah, an Irish terrier. The book chronicles how Norah came to be kidnapped from her life at the Irish court in Dublin and taken to India. While Norah is in Ireland, there is a rumor that George V will be visiting, and she is hoping that the king’s dog Happy will accompany him. Norah is keen to hear how Caesar has been fairing after his master’s death. Norah reminisces about her friend Caesar and in doing so reminds the reader about Caesar’s lowly birth: “Caesar was a good fellow and though, he had not much of

\footnote{91}“History of the Wire Fox Terrier,” \textit{The Wire Fox Terrier Association of Great Britain}, accessed 21 June 2022, \url{https://www.wirefoxterrierassociation.co.uk/}.
\footnote{92}“There are puppies around me which say, ‘Fox terriers no pedigree bring.’” Mountain, “Caesar,” 2.
\footnote{93}Caesar certainly did not act like or look like the many champions that lived in the Sandringham kennels. An article in the \textit{Lady’s Realm} magazine in 1901 described Queen Alexandra’s champion borzoi Alix as “a tall graceful dog with a white coat and a small head. He is friendly to strangers and has a high-bred and gracious manner.” Caesar, with his unruly rough coat, cheeky “grin,” and naughty behavior and who was friendly to few people other than the king, certainly did not exhibit the gracious manner of a pedigreed canine. Sarah A. Tooley, “Queen Alexandra’s pets,” \textit{The Lady’s Realm} 11 (1901-1902): 302.
\footnote{94}D. Bennet, \textit{Norah on the Durbar} (Bombay, 1912). The identity of the author of this book is debated. The British Library cites D. Bennet as the author, while Clifford Hubbard claims it was penned by John Ernest Stodder Williams. Hubbard, \textit{A Book at Random}, 27.
a pedigree compared with Happy and myself, he had far nobler traits than either of us.” As in the Rev. Mountain’s text, Norah highlights that Edward’s love for Caesar was a manifestation of his sympathy for those below him in rank. Norah remembers that “Caesar’s dear Master was kind and sympathetic to all, but his heart went out more to those who had no pedigree and were of humble birth.”

These sentiments were also underscored in many of the newspaper accounts of Edward’s funeral. The image of this “simple” and rough little dog trotting after his master during the funeral procession not only further reinforced the intense bond between king and canine, but also the humanity of the king. According to a reporter from the New York Times, perhaps no feature in the whole procession, “with its magnificence of costume and allurement of personality, left such a vivid impression on all who saw it as this simple human note.” And indeed one “Britisher” in a letter to the editor of The Sun, clearly saw Caesar as evidence of Edward’s “common touch:”

The charger at the funeral of a military officer of rank is usual ... but a dog at the funeral of a king! What did it mean? I am disposed to think that it emphasized the fact that, as Mr. Chesterton says, King Edward was the ‘average man enthroned.’ Those 30,000 British soldiers who stood with arms reversed as the body of the king passed will remember that he was one of them, for he loved his dog. [my ital.]

Sir Richard Holmes is the most emphatic in discussing the impact Caesar had in shaping the public memory of the king. In Edward VII: His Life and Times, Holmes claims that Edward’s achievements as king “seemed to efface the purely human image of him.” The public thought of Edward as from his coronation, “wise, pale grey-haired, and venerable king absorbed in difficult and far-reaching schemes for the advancement of his Empire.” Nevertheless, Caesar would eclipse that regal vision of the king and replace it with the humane man of the people:
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95 Bennet, Norah, 4. For more information on Happy, George V, Queen Mary and their other dogs see Gordon, Noble Hounds, 83–89; 111–112.
97 A Britisher, “The King’s dog Caesar,” The Sun (New York), 1 June 1910, 8.
...the sight of a little terrier sadly following his coffin changed all that! It brought back the homely figure; the human man in his weakness and his strength; the man who always had a little dog by his side to play with; the man who thought of the sufferers in the hospital; the man who liked men of the working class, and came to their dinners and collected money for them to improve their education ... Thus it was that when they saw Caesar the people caught their breath. ‘Ah, poor thing!’ said the men, while many of the women held their faces in their hands”

Dogs and mourning
One of the reasons why Caesar’s image as canine chief mourner resonated so strongly with the public was that by the early twentieth century the dog had become a familiar figure of steadfast mourning in the visual and material culture of death. Dogs appeared on the memorial brasses and tomb effigies of royalty and nobility of Western Europe throughout the middle ages and into the early modern period. The practice was revived in the nineteenth century under the influence of the Gothic revival when imitating medieval tombs became popular. Queen Victoria insisted on a Gothic design for Prince Albert’s cenotaph and tomb chest in the Albert Memorial Chapel at Windsor, installed in 1873. Designed by George Gilbert Scott, the cenotaph features a figure of Eos, Albert’s favorite greyhound, at the feet of the recumbent effigy of Albert who is dressed in the armor of a medieval knight.

Eos is just one of many faithful mourning hounds that appear in Victorian culture. As John Morley attests “Dogs were given a firm place in the Victorian language of grief.” Identified as they were with the affection of the domestic sphere, and with their famed devotion and loyalty to their owners, dogs made ideal mourners, and there are many stories and poems that featured grieving faithful canines in the nineteenth century. William
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99 Holmes, Edward VII, vol. II, 636. The New York Times reported a similar response from a mourner along the funeral route as she saw Caesar walk by: “It’s his dog, his little dog that he was so fond of!” cried a woman with a sob.” “Millions Watch,” 1.


102 While Scott designed the tomb chest, the sculptural work was carried out by Baron Henri de Triqueti. See Darby and Smith, The Cult of the Prince Consort, 34–40.

Wordsworth wrote “Fidelity” in 1805 to commemorate Foxie, a small terrier who stayed by the body of her owner Charles Gough for three months after Gough fell to his death while hiking in the Lake District in 1805. Sir Walter Scott followed with his own poem about the incident, “Helvellyn,” published in 1806. Perhaps the most famous of the mourning dogs was Greyfriars Bobby who slept by the side of his master’s grave in Greyfriars kirkyard in Edinburgh for fifteen years until the dog’s death in 1872. Bobby’s love and loyalty were celebrated in a statue erected in Edinburgh in 1873 and in various poems, stories, and films.¹⁰⁴

Grieving dogs were also prevalent in visual culture and images of dogs at the coffin, grave, body, or chair of their deceased owners were particularly popular themes for artists and photographers throughout the nineteenth and into the twentieth centuries. Edwin Landseer, a favorite painter of Queen Victoria and her family who did numerous paintings of the royal pets, also created images featuring the mourning dog, including Attachment (1830) that depicts the aforementioned tragedy of Foxie and Charles Gough; The Poor dog (also called The Shepherd’s grave, 1829); the Loyal Hound, (1831), and one of Landseer’s most famous works The Old Shepherd’s Chief Mourner, exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1837.¹⁰⁵ This painting in particular plucked at the heartstrings of viewers and critics alike. To make it more widely available to the general public, the painting was engraved in three separate editions in 1838, 1869, and 1884, and it continued to be a popular image throughout the nineteenth century.¹⁰⁶ The painting was featured in the Sunday at Home magazine in 1864.¹⁰⁷ Poet Agnes R. Howell used it as the basis of her poem “The Shepherd's Mourner,” published in 1875,¹⁰⁸ as did Bramwell Brontë for his Sonnet I, “On Landseer’s Painting the Shepherd’s Cheif [sic] Mourner:

A dog watching at Twilight over its Master’s grave,” 1842; and influential art critic John Ruskin singled out Landseer’s painting for special praise in his book *Modern Painters*. Nineteenth-century animal right’s advocates also used the painting in their campaigns to condemn animal cruelty.

Caesar can certainly be considered the cultural littermate of Bobby, Foxie, and the many other steadfast canine companions that appeared in text and image. For some observers, Caesar’s mourning was especially pure and heartfelt as Caesar loved the king without regard or even understanding of Edward’s rank. A writer from the *New York Daily Tribune* noted that: “In all Edward’s proud domain, among all the millions that faithfully served him and sincerely loved him, there was none so sublimely indifferent to his rank and station none so unconscious of the significance of his favors, none so disinterested [as Caesar].” Moreover, the *Tribune* writer observed, Caesar alone would be the most constant mourner for his whole world was Edward. While the human world would move on, a new king would take up his duties, grief would subside, and Edward’s reign and death fade into history, Caesar, displaying the constancy and devotion of his kind, would continue to sit beside an empty chair and “patiently beg an answer to the mystery of the desertion of his friend.”

**Conclusion**

Despite Alexandra’s alleged dislike of Caesar—she supposedly once called him a “horrid little dog”—she did take pity on the terrier and brought him into her household after the king’s death where he became quite attached to her as well. By all accounts, after Edward’s death, Caesar lived out the rest of his life a much loved and spoiled dog. While he no longer lived the

---


113 “The King’s Dog,” 6.

busy life of the canine companion of the reigning monarch, Caesar, nevertheless, continued to be in the public eye for his remaining years. He could be seen accompanying Queen Alexandra on trips and was up to his old shenanigans when he escaped from Marlborough house in April 1911.\(^{115}\) Happily, he was recognized, captured, and quickly returned to Queen Alexandra.\(^{116}\) Photographs, prints, and poems that featured Caesar continued to be sold, with proceeds often donated to various charities.\(^{117}\) *The Daily Mirror* reported that Caesar was “expected to perform the opening ceremony of a luxurious club which is being provided in Parklane for the aristocracy of the canine world.”\(^{118}\) According to the *Pall Mall Gazette*, Caesar’s last public appearance “was on the day of the State opening of Parliament ... [February 1914] when spectators observed him on the balcony of Marlborough House with Queen Alexandra.”\(^{119}\)

Caesar died on 18 April 1914 while under anesthetic. He had been ill for some time and surgery was considered the last hope. There were obituaries and acknowledgements in various newspapers including the *Times* which honored the dog with a rather lengthy tribute.\(^{120}\) He was buried with other canines of the royal household at Marlborough house. The inscription on his gravestone written by Alexandra reads: “Our beloved Caesar who was the king’s faithful and constant companion until death and my greatest comforter in my loneliness and sorrow for four years after” (Figure 7). Like his father Prince Albert before him whose beloved Eos nestles at his feet on his cenotaph in the Albert Memorial Chapel, sculptor Bertram Mackennal placed Caesar at Edward’s feet in the funeral monument he created for Edward and Alexandra in St George’s Chapel, Windsor unveiled in 1927 (Figure 8).\(^{121}\) While Edward’s tomb effigy does not have the overt references to medieval knighthood and chivalry as Albert’s, Caesar’s
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118 “This Mornings News items,” *The Daily Mirror*, 4 September 1912, 13. The “club” referred to here may have been something similar to “The Dog’s Toilet Club” on Bond Street that offered grooming and other services to affluent pet owners. The club was highlighted in an article in the *Strand Magazine* in 1896. See William Fitzgerald, “Dandy Dogs,” *Strand Magazine*, vol. XI, (January-June 1896): 538–550.
119 “Talk of the Town,” *Pall Mall Gazette*, 20 April 1914, 7.
120 “Death of Caesar,” *The Times*, 20 April 1914, 10. See also “Caesar Dead,” *Daily News and Leader*, 20 April 1914; “Death of Caesar,” *The Daily Mirror*, 20 April 1914, 10.
presence, nonetheless, evokes a similar solemn narrative of the faithful hound's last duty: to lie ever watchful at the feet of his master, who has concluded his sacred duties and has earned his eternal rest.

![Image of Caesar's grave](https://www.flickr.com/people/37718677333@N01)

Figure 7. Lorelei from San Francisco, USA (https://www.flickr.com/people/37718677333@N01). *The king's dog from the royal pet cemetery at the Marlborough house*. 2008. Creative commons license.
Caesar of Notts’s relationship with Edward VII, and his role within the royal funeral procession was more than a momentary curiosity and touching royal anecdote. Caesar’s very public visibility, not only within Edward’s death and mourning rituals, but also in the numerous objects, images, and texts related to Caesar produced afterward helped to secure the king’s public memory outside of more traditional commemorative methods. Since dogs were strongly associated with the love and affection of the domestic sphere, Caesar strengthened Edward’s ties to home and hearth that were called into question by his philandering lifestyle, and his love for his “common” scruffy little terrier assisted in bolstering the view of Edward as friend to the working class and “father to the people.” These traits were more acceptable themes in constructing Edward’s legacy than other less laudable aspects of his character. Caesar was able to maneuver between the boundaries of public and private, royal and commoner because, as Erica Fudge argues, dogs (and other pets) are boundary breakers, “they ... have individual names like humans, they live with us as members of our families, and so on. They are thus figuratively breaking down the distinction between inside
and outside because they are like us and not like us simultaneously.” Examining Caesar’s role in Edward VII’s funeral and in the construction of the king’s legacy demonstrates the power of the dog (and other pets) to transcend the boundaries of the home, suggesting new avenues of inquiry regarding not only the role of pets in the public and private spheres, but their significance within public rituals and ceremonies.
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