

INTRODUCTION

Writing Animal Histories

ZEB TORTORICI AND MARTHA FEW

On 12 January 1563, Juan Canuc was walking with his wife to a nearby ranch for livestock grazing when they heard a number of chickens clucking on the hillside near a large cross. According to Canuc's testimony, which was translated from Yucatecan Maya to Spanish by a court-appointed interpreter, the couple found a young boy who "had his underwear loose and was sitting on the ground with a turkey [*gallina de la tierra*, a "chicken of this land"—it being native to Mesoamerica] in between his legs."¹ The boy, a fourteen-year-old Maya named Pedro Na, from a small town near Mérida in Mexico's largely indigenous Yucatán Peninsula, had been caught in flagrante delicto, committing the "unnatural" crime of bestiality. Canuc handed Na over to Spanish authorities, who threw him in prison and then tried him, apparently eager to make an example out of the boy. As was customary in bestiality cases, colonial authorities "deposited" the bird as evidence, but it died within a few days as a result of being injured by Na. Under questioning, the boy admitted, "It was true that yesterday afternoon in the said road, he came across some turkeys and chickens, and he took the said turkey and went to the hillside with it and, with the carnal agitation [*alteración carnal*] he felt . . . he had carnal access with the turkey."²

Some weeks later, Pedro Na was sentenced to be taken from prison on horseback, with his hands and feet bound, accompanied by a town crier proclaiming his crime as he was brought to the central plaza, there to be publicly castrated and then permanently expelled from the province of Yucatán. Adding a macabre touch to the role of animals in spectacles and

processions of public shame, on 14 February 1563 authorities pronounced, “[Because] the turkey with which the said Pedro Na committed the crime is dead and has been preserved, we order that as the sentence is carried out, the dead turkey shall be hung from Pedro Na’s neck as he is paraded through the streets of this city. After the said sentence is executed, the turkey shall be burned in live flames and turned into ashes.”³ The turkey was surely a rotten corpse by this point; after all, it had died at least one month before the sentence was carried out. As a number of historians have shown, bestiality cases like this one supply a surprising amount of information about human societies, sexual desires, legal traditions, the urban/rural dichotomy, and human-animal interactions in history.⁴ But these cases also provide us with information about particular animals that is otherwise lost in the historical record, where one nonhuman animal tends to blur into another. Pedro Na’s case allows us to look, however fleetingly, at the fate of an individual animal as well as the culturally and theologically determined meanings and symbolism with which it was imbued at one particular moment in history.

What can the turkey with which Pedro Na violently fornicated tell us about the experiences and representations of animals in history? The turkey, had it not died from the injuries inflicted by the sexual act, surely would have been killed by authorities, who, following injunctions set forth in the Book of Leviticus, would have burned, hung, or beaten to death those animals implicated in bestiality cases.⁵ How do cases like this elucidate colonial encounters among and between human and nonhuman animals? How can we take the intertwined histories of two animals, one of them human, gleaned from archival documents such that we may critically interrogate human uses of and interactions with other animals? The case, which reveals the semiotic space in which one dead animal (put on public display) attained a political, moralistic, religious, and cultural significance in early colonial Mexico, certainly has the potential to broaden our understanding of animal symbolism and human dominion over animals as it was understood in the context of the violent interface between different cultures and the enormous changes wrought by colonization. Ultimately, the case of Pedro Na provides an entrance into the world in which certain forms of theological and juridical regulation of relationships and boundaries between humans and animals prevailed; but it also sets the stage to examine larger changes in animal husbandry and the use of European domesticated animals in rural agrarian economies in this mundane moment. We notice, for instance, the presence of Castilian chickens among flocks of native Mesoamerican turkeys and the types of interspecies gazing that character-

ized the everyday enactment of human-animal interactions and agricultural industry in a colonial landscape.

In this vein, we want to pose the question of what Latin American histories look like if we choose as the standpoint of our observation a focus not only on the human-animal interaction but also on the experiences and histories of the nonhuman actor in the unfolding of history. Despite the methodological challenges inherent in writing histories of animals, by using documents created by and for humans, does this “centering” of animals—human and nonhuman alike—allow us to write more comprehensive and less anthropocentric cultural histories? Does the centering of animals—the transforming of nonhuman animals into *central* actors in the historical narrative—provide us with significantly different versions of the past than those historical works that solely present animals as visible and important factors in history? This is, as can be seen in the individual essays in this volume, a tension that permeates the entire collection. Some of the contributors are primarily invested in denaturalizing the human/animal binary, whereas others are more intent on demonstrating how the exploitative practices of humans in the past have wreaked havoc on particular species and on the natural environment. A few of the contributors work carefully through the methodological implications of “centering animals” within historical narratives, while others are skeptical of that very practice of centering animals, or they seek to include nonhuman animals as yet another social actor (alongside social classes, women, the state, the church, etc.) into the histories they write. After all, while animals play significant roles in all of the essays included in *Centering Animals*, they remain, at times, nearer to the margins of analysis—the perhaps necessary casualty of using the category of the “human” in order to examine the “animal.” The project of centering animals is, in this sense, a necessarily tenuous one, especially given that the mere analytical and figurative presence of animals—their visibility—by no means automatically centers them.⁶

We believe, however, with Erica Fudge, that “the history of animals is a necessary part of our reconceptualization of ourselves as human.”⁷ We need therefore to critically interrogate the category of the “human” in our exploration of the multiple ways in which such species-categorical boundaries were challenged, broken down, rendered ambiguous, and sometimes reified in history. In other words, these essays explore what Marcy Norton has recently termed the “modes of interaction” between species.⁸ This task is peculiarly urgent with regard to Latin American history, given the importance of the Columbian exchange in reconfiguring the natural history of the

continent, and the fact that early modern Spain was, as Georgina Dopico Black notes, “particularly interested in what lies at the edges of the human: the beast and the sovereign, but also the monster, the machine, the hermaphrodite, the native, the slave, and the divine.”⁹ Lauren Derby, in a recent essay, shows how animals for the most part “remain invisible” in much of the literature on landscape change in Latin America, in spite of the popularity of environmental history.¹⁰ Derby also asserts that “bringing the animals into the analysis might move us closer to local understandings of the natural world and syncretism on the ground between European, indigenous and creole views and practices, enabling new ways of thinking about environmental change.”¹¹ It is no exaggeration to say that these changes, from the vectors created for microbes to the transformation of vast areas of land into pasturage, have played a determining role in Latin American history.

Macrohistory, however, depends on countless individual human-animal interactions. A perusal of historical and judicial archives in colonial Mexico and Guatemala, for example, brings to light a number of files in the colonial period involving all sorts of animals (as well as animal parts and commodities): bestiality, animal abuse, bullfights and cockfights, crop destruction by insects and roving domesticated animals, cochineal dye production, feral animals, *abigeato* (the stealing of livestock), shape-shifting, witchcraft, and, among other things, the persistent use of rigged scales to falsely weigh meat with the intent of charging the consumer higher prices. Yet, as colonial historians of Mexico and Guatemala who have based our work on the meticulous exploration of the historical archives concerning our target time-frame—the seventeenth, eighteenth, and early nineteenth centuries—we knew we were missing much of the picture of human-animal histories and interactions in Latin American history. The desire to see close readings of human-animal relationships from a variety of Latin American historical contexts—to theorize the types of looking and interaction that take place among and between different species—is largely what initially inspired us, first, to organize a conference panel on human-animal interactions in colonial Latin America, and subsequently to edit this volume.¹² In doing so, we are responding to an impulse that traverses some of our other work, in which the examination of animals has come to play an increasingly important role.

This edited volume therefore addresses the histories of animals as they relate politically, economically, culturally, and scientifically to colonial and postcolonial Latin America. The essays compiled here contribute to the growing body of historical writing on the multiple interactions between

humans and other mammals, birds, insects, and fish that have been mediated in Latin America by colonial and capitalist economies, criminal-justice systems, medicinal practices, religious institutions, and colonial and post-colonial states. We are interested in writing histories of animals and of human-animal relationships as a way to complicate and go beyond recent work on the critical examinations of difference through the analytic lenses of race, ethnicity, gender, and sexuality. *Centering Animals* is ultimately an attempt to counteract the relative invisibility of animals in Latin American historiography, premised on the fact that animals were visible and prevalent historically in colonial and postcolonial Latin American societies, and that the interactions between humans and animals have significantly shaped the narratives of Latin American histories and cultures.

The themes of the volume are in dialogue with recent work on historical and contemporary debates over animal rights, changing moral attitudes toward human dominion over nature and the animal world, the relations of animality to humanity and divinity, and competing local forms of ecological knowledge. This work challenges the modern construction of dualisms such as the human-animal and wild-domestic. We seek to denaturalize and historicize Western conceptualizations of animals and nature. Current work on the cultural histories of animals, while particularly strong for Europe and North America, has for the most part not focused on Latin America. That human-animal studies in history is still a relatively nascent field helps explain why the cultural histories of animals in the historiography of Latin America have yet to appear on a larger scale. For the literature that does exist, we are in accordance with Julie Livingston and Jasbir K. Puar that “the most compelling work in the field challenges the instrumentalization of animals that is driven solely by efforts to deepen the singularity of humanness or to enhance the capacities of human exceptionalism.”¹³ Given, however, the environmental exchanges and consequences of European conquest and colonialism in Latin America, competing Mesoamerican, Andean, and other indigenous conceptions of animals in the natural world, and the construction of racial, ethnic, gender, and sexual hierarchies that mirrored and interacted with the reconceptualization of human-nonhuman animal hierarchies, animal histories in colonial and postcolonial Latin America are rich in critical moments that are especially relevant to the animal-rights and environmental turn of the present.

Regarding the colonial Americas as a whole, significant contributions addressing animals have been made by a number of scholars. Robert Cunningham Graham’s *Horses of the Conquest* and John Grier Varner and Jean-

nette Johnson Varner's *Dogs of the Conquest* are two important examples.¹⁴ Alfred W. Crosby's *The Columbian Exchange: Biological and Cultural Consequences of 1492* (1973) created a framework for understanding the discovery and conquest of the New World in terms of the ecological changes that humans brought about.¹⁵ Among the works by scholars following in Crosby's path, Elinor G. K. Melville's *A Plague of Sheep: Environmental Consequences of the Conquest of Mexico* was a notable, and much cited, study that surveyed a whole area of biological, environmental, and cultural changes that had, up until then, not been sufficiently conceptualized by historians.¹⁶ From the beginning, the Spanish were intent on transposing the ecology of Europe into the American sphere. Christopher Columbus transported cattle, horses, pigs, sheep, and goats to the Caribbean on his second voyage in 1493. A number of animals—used as sources of food and, in the case of horses and dogs, as weapons in warfare—accompanied Hernán Cortés, Francisco Pizarro, and other Spanish conquistadors on their expeditions.¹⁷ As Crosby asserts—in a statement subsequently echoed by a number of environmental historians—Europeans would not have made nearly as great a change as they did in the Americas had they not arrived with their animals. Virginia DeJohn Anderson's research on the New England and Chesapeake colonies, published nearly a decade after the equally important collection *New England's Creatures: 1400–1900*, edited by Peter Benes, also examines the biological and environmental changes wrought by the European introduction of livestock, dogs, and horses there.¹⁸ Keith Thomas's pioneering work on the cultural understanding of nature in early modern England cites an example in colonial Virginia whereby colonists sought to convert indigenous lifestyles (and correspondingly mitigate the threats of the wild) by offering native peoples one cow for every eight wolves that they could kill.¹⁹ Jon T. Coleman's important book *Vicious: Wolves and Men in America* is unsurpassed in its use of diverse historical documentation to trace the near extermination (and eventual protection) of the wolf in North America.²⁰ Of course, these intentional changes in the environment designed by the colonizers were destined not to remain for long in their hands, as they and the animals they brought with them in ships became unconscious vectors for organisms they could not even see.²¹ This body of historical work sets the backdrop for our edited collection, showing how European domesticated animals were commonly used, sometimes inadvertently, as tools in the “civilizing” missions wreaked upon the natives and as agents to “tame” the land and, simultaneously, how colonists were invested economically and

morally in exterminating certain species that they deemed particularly noxious to the colonial enterprise.

There is, of course, recent and important work dealing specifically with animals in Latin America, including Abel A. Alves's *The Animals of Spain: An Introduction to Imperial Perceptions and Human Interaction with Other Animals, 1492–1826* and Miguel de Asúa and Roger French's *A New World of Animals: Early Modern Europeans on the Creatures of Iberian America*, which examines travel accounts, ethnographic depictions of indigenous cultures, reports of flora and fauna, and natural histories to show how Europeans encountered and conceptualized previously unknown creatures in the Americas.²² *Zoología fantástica do Brasil (séculos XVI e XVII)* similarly looks at the way the European representations of the creatures encountered in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Brazil were figured in a discourse of monsters and fantasies.²³ A majority of the studies on animals in Latin America, however, look not at animals as real factors in history, but at their representation in terms of mythology, animal symbolism, and anthropology, or at their straightforward natural history in zooarchaeology, paleontology, evolution, ecology, and environmental studies. Two important multidisciplinary edited collections published respectively in Mexico and Colombia—*Relaciones hombre-fauna: Una zona interdisciplinaria de estudio* and *Rostros culturales de la fauna: Las relaciones entre los humanos y los animales en el contexto colombiano*—serve as good examples of this strain of human-animal studies in Latin America.²⁴ Another strand of the work on animals in colonial Latin America evokes considerable sophistication in the analyses of hybrid human-animal deities, shape-shifting and diabolical animals, animal metaphors, and animal symbolism as represented in archival documentation and codices.²⁵ The animals themselves, however, have rarely been accorded a standpoint that would make them the primary focus of such works (unlike in recent anthropological works that call attention to “trans-species ethnography”).²⁶ Thus, while much has been written on animals as symbols, representations, and phantasmagorical creatures, we situate the essays in this volume within a historiography of colonial and postcolonial Latin America that aims to make the interactions between human and non-human animals the primary focus of the analysis, so as to ensure that the “real animal” in question does not disappear from historical discourse.

The vast number of works dealing with indigenous peoples in the Americas attests to the astrological and cosmological significance animals had in many communities. From the centrality of Quetzalcoatl, the Mesoamerican

plumed-serpent deity, and a number of other deities with animal qualities and characteristics in the Nahua pantheon to the Quechua recognition of llamas, birds, and a serpent in the constellations, we see how animals were imbued with all sorts of cosmological significance in indigenous societies.²⁷ The existence and quotidian use of domesticated dogs, turkeys, and stingless bees in Mesoamerica, domesticated llamas and guinea pigs in the Andes, and the frequent use of animals as tribute in Incan and Nahua political communities all attest to their agricultural and economic importance prior to the arrival of Europeans in the New World.²⁸ Indigenous cultures from the northern parts of what are now Alaska and Canada to Tierra del Fuego in the far south had their own specialized bodies of knowledge about animals, as some of the chapters here highlight. For the Nahua-speaking regions of Mesoamerica, for example, book 11 of *The Florentine Codex*, “Earthly Things,” is a compendium of information—though overseen and at least partially mediated by the Spanish friar Bernardino de Sahagún in his desire to create a European taxonomy of Mesoamerican animals—on indigenous knowledge of four-footed animals, fish and other aquatic creatures, birds, serpents, insects, medicinal plants, trees, rocks, water, and similar topics.²⁹

Thus, as evidenced by a number of works on European and indigenous interactions with new animals on both sides of the Atlantic, all human groups had conceptual, cosmological, and linguistic difficulties in making sense of the strange and exotic animals with which they came into contact. Europeans often framed animals native to the Americas as monstrous and fantastic. In January of 1493 Columbus, most likely gazing on manatees, recorded that he had seen three “mermaids” near the coast of Hispaniola. They were, however, “not so beautiful as they are depicted, for only after a fashion had human form in their faces.”³⁰ Likewise, the opossum was referred to by Vincent Yáñez Pinzón, a commander on a ship traveling with Columbus on his first voyage, and later described by John Ogilby in his 1671 *America*, as a composite creature with “the foremost part resembling a Fox, the hinder a Monkey, the feet were like a Mans, with Ears like an Owl; under whose Belly hung a great Bag, in which they carry’d the Young, which they drop not, nor forsake till they can feed themselves.”³¹ The linguistic conceptualization and formulation of new creatures posed similar problems. A number of European vernacular names for South American mammals are in fact derived from such indigenous languages as Quechua (llama and puma), Araucanian, Carib (peccary), and Tupi-Guaraní (jaguar, capybara, and tapir). Indigenous peoples, at least in the early phases of contact, as shown by James Lockhart, often used extant indigenous words and terminology to

designate recently arrived and previously unknown European animals. The Nahuas, for example, used the autochthonous word for cotton, *ichcatl*, to signify European sheep. The word *maçatl*, the Nahuatl word for deer, was used to refer to European horses. And cows and bulls were called *qua-quauhe*, “one with horns.”³² These linguistic events, as well as other historical testimonies, have proven invaluable in helping us work toward a historiography of human-animal interactions in early Latin America.

Another one of our primary aims is to situate these essays within the burgeoning field of human-animal studies. Kenneth Shapiro has aptly described this interdisciplinary field as “primarily devoted to examining, understanding, and critically evaluating the myriad of complex and multi-dimensional relationships between humans and other animals.”³³ While Shapiro rightly places the formal inception of human-animal studies alongside the inaugural issue of *Anthrozoos*, in 1987, the social sciences have been interested in the relationships between humans and animals going all the way back to the natural histories and popular zoologies that were written before and during the Enlightenment. The massive effect of the information that flooded into Europe as a result of European exploration, colonialism, and exploitation of distant places overturned the entire inherited understanding of people, plants, and animals. In contrast to the humanistic and often overtly anthropocentric nature of previous research and writing on animals, much of the human-animal studies scholarship penned in the last two decades locates itself not only within a posthumanist paradigm, but also, to use Erica Fudge’s terminology, within the “anti-humanist” tradition, where the *human* can be theorized as “a category of difference, not substance.”³⁴ It is equally important to note that much of the recent historical, sociological, anthropological, and philosophical work currently defined as human-animal studies could not have been done without the socially activist influences of Peter Singer’s *Animal Liberation*, originally published in 1975, and Tom Regan’s *The Case for Animal Rights* (1983).³⁵ Much of the research at the present time being done in the field of human-animal studies is linked politically with the modern animal-rights movement and the controversies surrounding factory farming, new biotechnologies, and endangered species. As Nigel Rothfels recently put it, this is a “scholarship that is also embedded in ethics and activism.”³⁶ In an attempt to more meaningfully “center animals” through scholarship, we have decided to donate the proceeds of *Centering Animals in Latin American History* to animal-welfare organizations in Latin America. We thus envision our work as equally invested in both ethics and activism. The relatively recent advent of human-

animal studies has also influenced and, to a large extent, determined the geographic imbalance of the chapters included in this collection. While it was far from our original plan to have three chapters that focus on Mexico and none that look at Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Uruguay, Venezuela, and a number of other Latin American countries, our goal from the beginning was never encyclopedic, but rather provisional. We envision the essays collected here—with geographic concentrations on Mexico, Guatemala, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Puerto Rico, Peru, Chile, Argentina, and Brazil—as multiple starting points that theorize animals as historical actors and that will, we hope, provoke future interdisciplinary research and writing on animals in Latin American history.³⁷ In a recent essay, “Does ‘the Animal’ Exist,” the historian Susan J. Pearson and the anthropologist Mary Weismantel urge scholars to employ interdisciplinary approaches in order to “recover animals’ physical presence in social life; to embed that social life within political economy; and, finally, to plot the spatial dimensions of human-animal relations.”³⁸ The various essays of this edited collection, while largely employing methodologies most familiar to the discipline of history, contextualize animals and their physical and symbolic presence within “social life” (in a variety of Latin American historical moments), yet this volume is merely a beginning. Since animals have figured more prominently in the works of Latin American anthropology than in those of history, it is our hope not only that historians will increasingly “center” animals in Latin American environmental, political, economic, social, and cultural histories, but that—as Pearson and Weismantel suggest—scholars utilize the theoretical and methodological tools available to them from a variety of academic disciplines in order to write such histories. To do so requires historians to “move beyond the archive and draw upon techniques derived from ethnography, oral history, [and] literary studies.”³⁹

Naturally, any attempt at “centering animals” in history requires rethinking and reconceptualizing the domains in which the animal plays a role in human societies. As highlighted in some of the essays included here, the contributors are aware of the conceptual pitfalls inherent in writing animal histories, some of which have been cogently theorized by Erica Fudge in “A Left-Handed Blow: Writing the History of Animals.” Neel Ahuja, John Soluri, and Neil L. Whitehead, in their respective contributions, call into question the political and methodological investments grounded in “centering animals” in history. In recognition of Nigel Rothfels’s argument that “there is an inescapable difference between what an animal *is* and what people *think* an animal is,” the contributors to this volume examine the

histories of real animals and human conceptions of other animals, as framed within the field of multiple and different Latin American social practices.⁴⁰ Thus, while not covering all of Latin America, we have selected essays that provide the reader with a range of geographic and cultural contexts in Latin America, spanning the course of Latin America's colonial and postcolonial history, up until the late twentieth century.

We have organized the essays here thematically to highlight some of the major themes regarding the histories of human-animal relationships that this edited volume addresses, dividing the book into three sections: "Animals, Culture, and Colonialism"; "Animals and Medicine, Science and Public Health"; and "The Meanings and Politics of Postcolonial Animals," with provocatively posthumanist concluding comments offered by Neil L. Whitehead. The authors in part I (León García Garagarza, Martha Few, and Zeb Tortorici) each explore the symbolic and enacted roles of animals in key processes of colonization such as indigenous rebellion, religion, public spectacles of entertainment, and economic production. The essays in part II (by Adam Warren, Heather McCrea, and Neel Ahuja) examine the role of animals and animal parts in medical cultures, public-health policies, and scientific experimentation in the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries. It is in this section that the unstable human-animal-microbe triad becomes most evident. In part III the authors (Reinaldo Funes Monzote, John Soluri, Regina Horta Duarte, and Lauren Derby) focus on the politics of animals in postcolonial Latin America through hunting, the commodification of animals and animal parts, movements for the protection of animals and the environment, and political symbolism.⁴¹ This final section's focus on "postcolonial animals" is more theoretical than temporal. This section, therefore, addresses the fact that the desiderata of "the fate of the nonhuman animal" has been too long neglected in the interdisciplinary field of postcolonial studies.⁴² As Philip Armstrong notes, "In identifying the costs borne by non-European 'others' in the pursuit of Western cultures' sense of privileged entitlement, post-colonialists have concentrated upon 'other' humans, cultures, and territories but seldom upon animals."⁴³ Together, these contributions explore the ways in which human agents within different social contexts have perceived, used, and treated animals. The discussion aims at both finding broad connections among different culture areas and elucidating local constructions of the meanings of animals. Tracing the epistemological limits and ethical considerations that have variously shaped human-animal interactions is an important starting point of any attempt to write animals into Latin American history.

The specific types of relationships between humans and other animals and the histories discussed in these essays deserve some attention. That the economic relationships that humans have with animals cannot be understated raises a number of salient questions. How do animals become part of the different socioeconomic communities created by and ultimately for humans? What are some of the myriad ways that animals are commodified as food, clothing, medicinal remedies, agricultural tools, and forms of transportation? All of the essays here speak to the processes of commodification in one way or another. León García Garagarza deals specifically with the ways that Juan Teton, an indigenous spiritual leader in mid-sixteenth-century Mexico, preached against the imposition of Catholicism and the consumption of European domesticated animals. Framing such consumption within eschatological beliefs and identifying the Spaniards with the legendary *tzitzimimeh* deities at the end of time, Teton warned Nahua commoners, for example, that “those who eat the flesh of [European] cows will be transformed into that.” In his analysis, García Garagarza reconstructs the world of colonial conflict, spiritual conquest, and ontological fluidity through the vast changes brought about when European animals and animal symbolism were imposed on peoples who were unfamiliar with European animals.⁴⁴ Teton’s brief moment came as Nahua speakers were still translating the advent of these animals and the introduction of a pastoral economy in early Mexico into the terms of earlier cultural constructs. From the European perspective, Rebecca Earle rightly asserts that in the Spanish Americas “diet was in fact central to the colonial endeavor,” and here García Garagarza shows us that native diet was similarly central to indigenous religious beliefs and particular modes of anticolonial discourse.⁴⁵

Adam Warren, in his essay, turns to another moment in the colonial interface between Europeans and American peoples by focusing on material taken from the animal-based medicinal remedies central to human healing and Andean medicine. As an example of how the latter operated, he uncovers the medical practices among one indigenous group, the Kallawayas, concerning the influence of animal remedies on human bodily humors. Then he shows how similar beliefs were deployed in eighteenth-century home-remedy guides, known as *recetarios*, and natural histories of the Andes, much in the same way that Miruna Achim has shown regarding the use of lizards in colonial Mexican medicine.⁴⁶ Using the example of remedies made from animal parts, including llama fat and condor skin, Warren demonstrates a sort of medicinal *mestizaje* through which Martín Delgar, one *recetario* author, translated indigenous healing practices involving animals

for an urban and ethnically mixed colonial audience. Both García Garza and Warren deal with the convergence and conflicts of indigenous and Spanish knowledge of animals at specific historical moments, accessing the experiences and symbolic worlds of humans and other animals in Mesoamerica (as the old order collapsed) and the Andes (as the new colonial order emerged).

In a very different context, that of twentieth-century Puerto Rico, Neel Ahuja's essay also looks at the use of animals in the promotion of human health, specifically in reference to primate experimentation at U.S.-funded research institutions that were established in Puerto Rico in the mid-twentieth century under the aegis of finding vaccines and cures for polio and other diseases. Devoting part of his essay to a critique of the ways monkeys were envisioned as "'raw materials' for the production of scientific knowledges and pharmaceutical commodities," Ahuja devotes another part of the essay to the fascinating adaptation (and feralization) of escaped rhesus and African patas monkeys intended solely for research. Ahuja merges the methodologies of transnational history with a critical look at human-animal studies to offer a fascinating glimpse of the colonial and postcolonial politics at play in the global primate trade, perceptions of public health, and the unequal production and exchange of medical knowledge.

While Ahuja and most of the other contributors in this volume perhaps rightly avoid invoking any notion of "animal agency," it is a problematic yet worthwhile concept to bring up, especially within the context of the posthumanist turn in the humanities and social sciences. Cary Wolfe writes that posthumanism "names a historical moment in which the decentering of the human by its imbrications in technical, medical, informatic, and economic networks is increasingly impossible to ignore, a historical development that points toward the necessity of new theoretical paradigms (but also thrusts them on us), a new mode of thought that comes after the cultural repressions and fantasies, the philosophical protocols and evasions, of humanism as a historically specific phenomenon."⁴⁷ Posthumanist notions of subjectivity then seek to problematize earlier humanist paradigms of agency, which were plagued by the romantic assumption "of the essential and a priori distinction between humans and all other kinds of entities that exists."⁴⁸ In spite of such shifts, Chris Wilbert is justified in his recent assertion that agency has, "at a general analytical level in the social sciences, been seen anthropocentrically as a purely human property."⁴⁹

If we return to the topic of bestiality that was discussed at the outset of this introduction, we easily find proof of animals that struggled against and

sometimes resisted the sexual violence inflicted on them by humans. The large corpus of bestiality cases from colonial Mexico and Guatemala shows us that the nonhuman victims of bestiality tended to be the large European domesticated animals—donkeys, mares, mules, cows, goats, and sheep—that were ubiquitous in postconquest rural spaces and farming communities. Archival documentation demonstrates that one of the primary signs through which judicial authorities inferred that bestiality had either been intended or consummated was whether or not the suspect had bound the hind legs of the animal with rope or cloth. When faced with the invasive sexual acts of humans, many animals attempted to flee or kick their would-be-assailants. In an 1818 bestiality case from the Mexican town of Teocaltiche, for example, Tomás Amador, who had tied up a mule and covered its eyes, confessed that although his intention was to fornicate with the animal, “he got to unbuttoning his underwear, but he did not sin [with the animal] because the mule resisted [*se resistió*], kicking him in the shin.”⁵⁰ This is one rare instance in which an animal, if the story is true, succeeded in “resisting” human sexual advances.

The question of whether or not to frame such acts as demonstrative of animal “agency,” however, may be misguided, especially if we seriously consider the posthumanist goal of decentering of the human. Might the imposition of the category of agency on nonhuman animals be one of Cary Wolfe’s “cultural repressions and fantasies” of humanism—one that fails to demonstrate how many animals, when faced with imminent danger, reacted instinctually and in ways that sometimes thwarted the plans of their human or nonhuman aggressors? Could the same be said for bulls in a bullring, rhesus monkeys escaping from animal institutions, birds that fled their human hunters, and seals that protected their young in the face of the human hunt for pelts? To simply declare that such animals have “agency” might be to approach the issues of animal sentience and instinct in an anthropocentric way, especially given that the notion of agency arises in a secular Western culture and is itself saturated with Western humanist beliefs. While agency, in this sense, can be a category bereft of meaning, Dorothee Brantz notes that historically “even though people may have wanted to treat animals as mere resources, this desire to instrumentalize the nonhuman has been repeatedly challenged, and not least by the animals themselves when they refused to ‘play along.’”⁵¹ While we will never be able to know what the animals were thinking, we can look at nonhuman animal reactions to invasive human cultural practices as evidence of their sentience, their cognition, and their instincts to circumvent what they perceived to be particularly

threatening, dangerous, or painful situations.⁵² On the other hand, it should be noted that historians regularly attribute agency (in a more metaphoric and collective sense) to a variety of nonhuman social entities including nation-states, market forces, the church, governments, classes, and genders. In this sense, the attribution of “agency” to nonhuman actors and entities is largely a means of making sense of the past through narrative mechanisms. There are, in essence, many types of “agency” to be found in these essays—some of them subtly anthropomorphizing, others less so.⁵³

The human consumption of animals and animal parts is another theme that runs through these essays. Animal consumption and animal labor are particularly central to the essays by Reinaldo Funes Monzote and Regina Horta Duarte, both of which have been significantly revised, updated, and translated into English for inclusion in this volume.⁵⁴ John Soluri’s contribution, focusing on competing local and international rights over sealing in Tierra del Fuego from the mid-nineteenth century to the early twentieth, also analyzes the human consumption of animals and animal products—seals and pelts—which were valued for both their use value (they were an important source of food for local populations) and their exchange value (the pelts were sold internationally at a profit by large-scale sealing expeditions). Here, however, histories of consumption and commodification are mediated by protectionist and environmentalist efforts to curtail the abuses of draft animals and trends toward the extinction of endangered avian and maritime species. In the Cuban context Funes Monzote examines the roles of animals—namely, oxen, horses, and mules—in the production of sugar throughout the nineteenth century. Emphasizing the brutal treatment that many working animals received, he links the growing cultural discomfort with the mistreatment of animals to the founding of the Sociedad Cubana Protectora de Animales y Plantas (Cuban Society for the Protection of Animals and Plants) in Havana in 1882. Inspired by the creation of Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in England in 1824 and similar organizations worldwide, the Cuban movement for the protection of animals successfully limited the “barbaric and cruel” mistreatment of beasts of burden, bullfighting, and cockfighting in Cuba—invoking terms that implicated both prejudices of class and race.⁵⁵ On numerous levels, the story that Funes Monzote tells testifies to the “pervasive violence enacted on animal bodies in public spaces that was ubiquitous . . . throughout much of the world in the nineteenth century.”⁵⁶

Both Duarte and Soluri look at competing hunting rights and the ways in which particular species of birds and seals, respectively, were intensively

hunted when, due to shifts in fashion, the demand for particular animal products—plumes and pelts—would rise in American and European markets. Duarte surveys diverse sources including late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century hunting manuals, fashion magazines, ornithological texts, and contemporary scientific research on birds to examine how the international demand for exotic plumes negatively affected Brazil's avifauna and was of collateral importance in the destruction of the natural environment in the early part of the twentieth century.⁵⁷ Invasive hunting and environmental practices were partly curtailed by the rise in international legislation aimed at the protection of birds and their habitats, but the disjuncture between legal measures and the social realities in Brazil persists. Duarte also highlights another factor affecting both the production and consumption of animal products, namely, the racial and racist components of Brazil's modernizing projects, and in so doing raises the question of difference as determined by race and social class in conjunction with species alterity.

Soluri also uses ethnic and national identities as factors in the clashes over indigenous and international rights to hunt fur seals off the Patagonian coast. Using scientific texts, travel accounts, ships' logs, and archival documents, Soluri shows that these sources seldom describe seals as living organisms or as dynamic components of an ecosystem but rather as mere commodities whose histories become methodologically difficult (and perhaps even undesirable) to "center." The author offers an extended analysis of the conflicts of interest between local hunters (largely comprised of populations made up of the ancestors of the Chonos, Kawéskar, and Yámana) and international sealing expeditions, between national and international interests and conservationist policies, and between global markets and local ecologies. And then there are the interests of the seals themselves. Demonstrating the pervasive and deleterious ecological effects of large-scale hunting on populations of South American fur seals, Soluri's histories exemplify the following points made by the Animal Studies Group: "The killing of animals is a structural feature of all human-animal relations. It reflects human power over animals at its most extreme and yet also at its most commonplace. From a historical point of view, there is nothing new about this killing; what has changed is the scope of the technology involved and the intensity of its global impact on animal species."⁵⁸

It is this troubling specter of animal death—and the ever-present fears of human death in societies that were populated by feral animals, epidemic contagion, insect infestations, disease transmissions, and environmental

degradation—that looms largest in all of the chapters. Given that killing is a key element of most human-animal relationships, this perhaps comes as no surprise.⁵⁹ Two of the chapters in this volume focus specifically on the killing of “pests” and the effects of stray animals and potentially noxious insects like locusts and mosquitoes on (post)colonial economies and public health. Martha Few’s contribution examines human perceptions of the periodic swarming of the *chapulín* (locust) in colonial Guatemala in relation to the tactics taken by colonial officials and the population at large to combat infestations and crop destruction. Using accounts written by political officials, Indian elites, farmers, priests, and European travelers, Few examines how potentially catastrophic swarms of locusts “forced periodic diversions of Indian tribute labor and other colonial wealth away from agricultural production,” thus suspending the colonial order. Theorizing locusts as ambiguous “social agents” that have been imbued with economic, political, medical, and religious significance, Few examines the meanings behind insect exorcisms and state-sponsored killing campaigns.

While insects—a comparatively overlooked category in historical human-animal studies—are historical actors in their own right, their reception and treatment by humans are highly contingent on economic context and scientific knowledge of disease transmission.⁶⁰ Moving us into the realm of debates over postcolonial public health in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Mexico, Heather McCrea analyzes the transformation of stray dogs, vagrant swine, mosquitoes, louses, ticks, and other creatures from the conceptual category of “pests” to that of “vectors of disease,” in the latter role becoming impediments to social progress. This movement toward an analysis of insects, pests, viruses, and vectors is significant here and, in the words of Livingston and Puar, “complicate[s] any easy narrative about ‘the animal turn’—the rise in interest in animal studies—that privileges certain sites, disciplines, and species.”⁶¹ Cholera epidemics and the spread of filth and disease through urban cemeteries and slaughterhouses provide only part of the backdrop to an era in which the civil effort was initiated to segregate humans, animals, and insects in the name of public health. McCrea also traces the racial implications and social applications of these categories in relation to the fact that the governing class and the Mexican press customarily referred to the country’s indigenous Maya as “barbarous savages” that impeded national progress. The racial implications of such narratives are clear: “It was easy to subsume animals, insects, and the indigenous Maya into negative categories all associated with filth, pestilence, and backwardness.” The elimination of Mexico’s indigenous population that was often desired and unambiguously voiced by the

country's elite—a narrative that repeats itself in the histories of all Latin American countries—fed into human beliefs and prejudices about animality and the perceived origins of social disorder.

The chapters outlined here have thus far broached the multiple meanings of animal uses and deaths, in the names of consumption, commodification, science, public health, fashion, and entertainment, as enacted in specific Latin American historical contexts. The chapters contributed by Zeb Tortorici and Lauren Derby also look at everyday social realities and unique cultural practices involving animals, but do so specifically from the vantage point of public spectacles centered on animals (respectively, dogs and goats) and their symbolic representations. Tortorici's contribution broaches the relationship between dogs and human (affective) pleasure by examining the unorthodox occurrences of canine weddings, baptisms, and funerals in eighteenth-century Mexico.⁶² Focusing his analysis first on the 1770 Inquisition trial of one priest who jokingly wed two canines “in the name of the Father and the Mother of all dogs” at a local party in Mexico City, Tortorici examines the nature of animal spectacles and the disjunctures coding the popular and official beliefs surrounding privileged species, sacrosanct rituals, the meaning of mockery and desecration, and human-animal relationships. Juxtaposing carnivalesque spectacles and sardonic literary texts involving dogs with the Mexican Inquisition's concerns about heretical doctrinal infractions, Tortorici asserts that the social world that was built up around the domestic dog in Bourbon Mexico was indicative of a change in the sensibilities regarding animals and affective ties with pets. Such historical and literary representations of dogs provide us ultimately with a window into pet-keeping as a cultural practice “through which we can glean the colonizing logic and the cultural binaries that governed the ideas surrounding pets and affections bestowed on them: domestic/savage, pet/stray, purebred/mixed, leisurely/utilitarian, and private/public.” Tortorici's chapter advances the project of “centering animals” in history by shifting from the discourses on and about animals to the actual histories of those animals, in order to better understand their mutable relationships with the humans around them.

Derby takes a different and innovative approach by looking at the way animals can figure as political symbols in modernity (though real animals remain present throughout the essay as well). Her study specifically looks at why Rafael Trujillo, the dictator who ruled the Dominican Republic from 1930 until 1961, was nicknamed the “goat” by his enemies, and why popular festivities performed during “the feast of the goat” exploited that nick-

name.⁶³ After his death, Trujillo was remembered and mocked through carnivalesque acts and widespread associations of the dictator with “the goat” in popular culture. To elucidate the cultural significance of goats in the Dominican Republic, Derby addresses lore about the sexual behavior of goats, popular animal metaphors and puns, and tales of shape-shifting and animal sacrifice. The choice of the goat as a symbol for the dead Trujillo can be explained only by going into the layered meanings of the goat in colonial and postcolonial Dominican history. In burning an image of a goat with Trujillo’s face and consuming goat meat en masse on the first anniversary of Trujillo’s death, Dominicans effected the ritual reestablishment of their dignity from an epoch of national humiliation—for, according to Derby, “for once they were the ones eating the goat, rather than the reverse.” This chapter shows how humans imbued goats with meaning in one particular historical and cultural context.

Erica Fudge has noted that animals appear in historical archives and libraries “as absent presences: there, but not speaking.”⁶⁴ This “absent-presence of animals” pervades the records on which we base our histories, laying bare the variety of anthropocentric attitudes embodied in these sources. The authors of these essays, however, find traces of animal histories—often mere bits and pieces, as of that unnamed turkey whose corpse was strung around the neck of Pedro Na while he underwent castration at the hands of colonial Spanish authorities in 1563—that provoke us into reading further into the hunted, killed, commodified, commercialized, dissected, cooked, consumed, and endangered animals that appear (and disappear) in the Latin American historical record. References to animals are scattered throughout indigenous cosmologies and codices, European accounts of exploration and colonization, natural histories, criminal cases and Inquisition trials, religious treatises, medical manuals and scientific experiments, ethnographies, public-health measures, artistic representations, and political campaigns for animal welfare. In these texts, real animals figure alongside the metaphorical animals that were used to symbolically represent the limits of humanity and thus sometimes occluded the real, sentient animal. Animals appear to be both everywhere and nowhere at the same time. The essays in this volume speak to the myriad and protean historical relationships between humans and other animals in Latin American history, a relationship as important as that between humans with each other. This focus essentially foregrounds the critical analysis of the uses to which so many nonhuman animals have been put to in the past. It is our hope that the essays in this collection meaningfully “center animals” historically, politi-

cally, and ethically. Perhaps not unlike the sixteenth-century human bystanders observing the castration of Pedro Na for the crime of bestiality and the burning of the turkey's corpse, we are witnesses to both tangible and textual fragments of animals whose multiple meanings and experiences we can only begin to understand.

Notes

1. Archivo General de las Indias (AGI), Justicia, leg. 248 (microfilm reel #191), f. 2: "Al dho Pedro Na yndio que tenya los caçaguelles quitados y sentado en el suelo y entre las piernas una gallina de la tierra y este testigo le hechó la mano e vido como a la dha gallina le salia e corria sangre del sieso y del dho Pedro Na tenya los caçaguelles desatados e descubierto el myembro engendratibo." For a closer analytical look at this case in the context of other bestiality cases, see Zeb Tortorici, "Contra Natura: Sin, Crime, and Unnatural Sexuality in Colonial Mexico 1530–1821" (PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 2010). For evidence that the Spanish term *gallina de la tierra* was used to refer specifically to turkeys found for the first time in the Americas, see Rafael Heliodoro Valle, "El Español de la América Española," *Hispania* 36.1 (1953): 52–57; and Lawrence B. Kiddle, "Los nombres del pavo en el dialecto nuevomejicano," *Hispania* 24.2 (1941): 213–16.
2. AGI, Justicia, leg. 248 (microfilm reel #191), f. 3: "Que es verdad que ayer tarde en el dho camyno topo a estas gallinas con unos pollos e tomo de ellas la gallina que les mostraba e se entro con ella en el monte e se debaxo los caçaguelles e con la alteracion carnal que tubo tomo el myembro engendratibo en la mano e se lo metio por el sieso a la dha gallina e tubo aceso carnal con ella e della le hizo correr sangre por el sieso a la dha gallina e que en esto llegaron un yndio e una yndio."
3. AGI, Justicia, leg. 248 (microfilm reel #191), f. MVCXIX: "La gallina con que delinquyo y cometio el dho pedro na el dho delito esta muerta e se ha tenydo guardada mandaba e mando que para executar la dha sentencia se la cuelgen del pescueço al dho pedro na e sea traydo con ella por las calles acostumbradas desta zbdad e despues de executada la dha sentencia el susodho mando se quemase la dha gallina en llamas bibas e fuese hecha polbos."
4. For the historiography of bestiality in the early modern period, see Jonas Liliequist, "Peasants against Nature: Crossing the Boundaries between Man and Animal in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Sweden," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 1.3 (1991): 393–423; P. G. Maxwell-Stuart, "'Wild, Filthie, Execrabill, Detestabill, and Unnatural Sin': Bestiality in Early Modern Scotland," in *Sodomy in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Tom Betteridge (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 82–93; William E. Monter, "Sodomy and Heresy in Early Modern Switzerland," in *The Gay Past: A Collection of Historical Documents*, ed. Salvatore J. Licata and Robert P. Petersen (New York: Routledge, 1986), 41–55; John M. Murrin, "'Things Fearful to Name': Bestiality in Early America," in *The Animal/Human Boundary: Historical Perspectives*, ed. Angela N. H. Creager and William

Chester Jordan (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2002), 115–56; Helmut Puff, “Nature on Trial: Acts ‘Against Nature’ in the Law Courts of Early Modern Germany and Switzerland,” in *The Moral Authority of Nature*, ed. Lorraine Daston and Fernando Vidal (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 232–53; and Laura Stokes, *Demons of Urban Reform: Early European Witch Trials and Criminal Justice, 1430–1530* (Houndmills, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011). On the modern period, see Jens Rydström, *Sinners and Citizens: Bestiality and Homosexuality in Sweden, 1880–1950* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003). For work that broaches both early modern and contemporary issues, see Piers Beirne, *Confronting Animal Abuse: Law, Criminology, and Human-Animal Relationships* (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2009), especially chapter 3, “Toward a Sociology of Animal Sexual Assault.” For the only historical treatments of bestiality in colonial Mexico, see Lee Penyak, “Criminal Sexuality in Central Mexico, 1750–1850” (PhD diss., University of Connecticut, 1993); Mílada Bazant, “Bestialismo, el delito nefando, 1800–1856,” in *Documentos de Investigación* (Mexico City: El Colegio Mexiquense, 2000), 1–22; Zeb Tortorici, “Against Nature: Sodomy and Homosexuality in Colonial Latin America,” *History Compass* 10.2 (2012): 161–78; and Tortorici, “Contra Natura.”

5. One of the rules of the law in Leviticus is this: “If a man lie with a beast, he shall surely be put to death; and ye shall slay the beast. And if a woman approach unto any beast, and lie down thereto, thou shalt kill the woman and the beast; they shall surely be put to death; their blood shall be upon them” (Leviticus 20:13).
6. We are particularly grateful to Frederico Santos Soares de Freitas for pushing us to think more about the many ambiguities inherent in the project of centering animals (or other social actors) in the analytic sphere.
7. Erica Fudge, “A Left-Handed Blow: Writing the History of Animals,” in *Representing Animals*, ed. Nigel Rothfels (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002), 5.
8. Marcy Norton, “Going to the Birds: Birds as Things and Beings in Early Modernity,” in *Early Modern Things: Objects and Their Histories, 1500–1800*, ed. Paula Findlen (London: Routledge, 2013), 53–83.
9. Georgina Dopico Black, “The Ban and the Bull: Cultural Studies, Animal Studies, and Spain,” *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies* 11.3–4 (2010): 237.
10. This, however, is changing for the better. See, for example, the recent scholarship by Marcy Norton: “Animals in Spain and Spanish America,” in *Lexikon of the Hispanic Baroque: Technologies of a Transatlantic Culture*, ed. Ken Mills and Evonne Levy (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, forthcoming 2013); “Adoption and Predation: Human-Animal Relationships in the Caribbean and South America,” invited seminar at the McNeil Center for Early American Studies, University of Pennsylvania, 13 January 2012; and “Beyond Anthropocentrism and Anti-anthropocentrism: Elite Hunting as a Mode of Interaction,” invited paper for European Colloquium, History Department, Cornell University, 3 October 2011.
11. Lauren Derby, “Bringing the Animals Back In: Writing Quadrupeds into Caribbean History,” *History Compass* 9.8 (2011): 602–21.

12. We originally organized a panel titled “Animals, Colonialism, and the Atlantic World” for the 2006 annual meeting of the American Society for Ethnohistory, which took place in Williamsburg, Virginia.
13. Julie Livingston and Jasbir K. Puar, “Interspecies,” *Social Text* 29.1-106 (2011): 3.
14. See Robert Cunninghame Graham, *Horses of the Conquest: A Study of the Steeds of the Spanish Conquest* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1949); and John Grier Varner and Jeannette Johnson Varner, *Dogs of the Conquest* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1983).
15. For a good general discussion, see Alfred W. Crosby, *The Columbian Exchange: Biological and Cultural Consequences of 1492* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1972), especially chapter 3, “Old World Plants and Animals in the New World”; and Alfred W. Crosby, *Ecological Imperialism: The Biological Expansion of Europe, 900–1900* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986). For European perceptions of animals native to the Americas, see Antonello Gerbi, *Nature in the New World: From Christopher Columbus to Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo*, trans. Jeremy Moyle (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1975); and Kathleen Ann Myers, *Fernández de Oviedo’s Chronicle of America: A New History for a New World*, trans. Nina M. Scott (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2007). On how Mesoamerican ideas about hummingbirds were received in Europe, see Iris Montero Sobrevilla, “Transatlantic Hum: Natural History and the Torpid Hummingbird, c. 1500–1800” (PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 2012).
16. See Elinor G. K. Melville, *A Plague of Sheep: Environmental Consequences of the Conquest of Mexico* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), for a discussion of the pastoralization of the Mexican landscape that proceeded hand-in-hand with evangelization. See also Andrew Sluyter, “The Ecological Origins and Consequences of Cattle Ranching in Sixteenth-Century New Spain,” *Geographical Review* 86.2 (1996): 161–77; Renée González-Montagut, “Factors That Contributed to the Expansion of Cattle Ranching in Veracruz, Mexico,” *Mexican Studies / Estudios Mexicanos* 15.1 (1999): 101–30; and David E. Vassberg, “Concerning Pigs, the Pizarros, and the Agro-pastoral Background of the Conquerors of Peru,” *Latin American Research Review* 13.3 (1978): 47–61.
17. Aside from Varner and Varner, *Dogs of the Conquest*, see also Sara E. Johnson, “‘You Should Give Them Blacks to Eat’: Waging Inter-American Wars of Torture and Terror,” *American Quarterly* 61.1 (2009): 65–92, for a discussion of the use of dogs as tools of torture in colonial Haiti and other historical contexts.
18. Virginia DeJohn Anderson, *Creatures of Empire: How Domestic Animals Transformed Early America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004). The edited collection by Peter Benes, *New England’s Creatures: 1400–1900* (Boston: Boston University Press, 1995), was published well before the current trend in historical scholarship toward human-animal interactions.
19. Keith Thomas, *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England 1500–1800* (New York: Penguin, 1983), 30.

20. Jon T. Coleman, *Vicious: Wolves and Men in America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004).
21. For example, the *Aedes aegypti* mosquito, implicated in the spread of yellow fever, first appeared in America in the larvae carried in the water casks of slave traders from Africa. In turn, the yellow fever microorganism was carried in the mosquito. See Ralph T. Bryan, "Alien Species and Emerging Infectious Diseases: Past Lessons and Future Implications," in *Invasive Species and Biodiversity Management*, ed. Odd Terje Sandlund, Peter Johan Schei, and Slaug Viken (Dordrecht: Springer, 1999), 163–76. We thank Roger Gathman for this observation and reference.
22. Abel A. Alves, *The Animals of Spain: An Introduction to Imperial Perceptions and Human Interaction with Other Animals, 1492–1826* (Leiden: Brill, 2011); and Miguel de Asúa and Roger French, *A New World of Animals: Early Modern Europeans on the Creatures of Iberian America* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2005).
23. Afonso de Escragnolle Taunay and Odilon Nogueira de Matos, *Zoologia fantástica do Brasil (séculos XVI e XVII)* (São Paulo: Edusp, Museu Paulista Universidade de São Paulo, 1999).
24. Eduardo Corona M. and Joaquín Arroyo Cabrales, eds., *Relaciones hombre-fauna: Una zona interdisciplinaria de estudio* (Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, 2002); and Astrid Ulloa and Luis Guillermo Baptiste-Ballera, eds., *Rostros culturales de la fauna: Las relaciones entre los humanos y los animales en el contexto colombiano* (Bogotá: Instituto Colombiano de Antropología e Historia, 2002). See also Alberto G. Flórez Malagón, ed., *El poder de la carne: Historias de ganaderías en la primera mitad del siglo XX en Colombia* (Bogotá: Editorial Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, 2008), for a recent collection of essays on cattle raising in Colombia.
25. The works that fall into this camp are numerous. For a few examples, see Louise M. Burkhart, *The Slippery Earth: Nahuatl-Christian Moral Dialogue in Sixteenth-Century Mexico* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1989); Alfredo López Austin, *Cuerpo humano e ideología: Las concepciones de los antiguos nahuas* (Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1980); Elizabeth P. Benson, *Birds and Beasts of Ancient Latin America* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1997); Serge Gruzinski, *Man-Gods of the Mexican Highlands: Indian Power and Colonial Society, 1520–1800* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1989); Lisa Sousa, "The Devil and Deviance in Native Criminal Narratives from Early Mexico," *The Americas* 59.2 (2002): 161–79; and Laura de Mello e Souza, *The Devil and the Land of the Holy Cross: Witchcraft, Slavery, and Popular Religion in Colonial Brazil* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004). For recent anthropological work on shape-shifting in the contemporary Amazonia, see Carlos Fausto, "A Blend of Blood and Tobacco: Shamans and Jaguars among the Parakanã of Eastern Amazonia," and Márnio Teixeira-Pinto, "Being Alone amid Others: Sorcery and Morality among the Arara, Carib, Brazil," both in *In Darkness and Secrecy: The Anthropology of Assault Sorcery and Witchcraft in Amazonia*, ed. Neil Whitehead and Robin Wright (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004).

26. Works that do focus centrally on animals are often anthropological. See, for example, Edmundo Morales, *The Guinea Pig: Healing, Food, and Ritual in the Andes* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1995); Eduardo P. Archetti, *Guinea-Pigs: Food, Symbol and Conflict of Knowledge in Ecuador* (New York: Berg, 1997); Marion Schwartz, *A History of Dogs in the Early Americas* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997); Lynn Hirschkind, "Sal/Manteca/Panela: Ethnoveterinary Practice in Highland Ecuador," *American Anthropologist* 102.2 (2000): 290–302; and Eduardo Kohn, "How Dogs Dream: Amazonian Natures and the Politics of Transspecies Engagement," *American Ethnologist* 34.1 (2007): 3–24.
27. On cosmological animals in the Quechua world, see Gary Urton, "Animals and Astronomy in the Quechua Universe," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 125.2 (1981): 110–27.
28. On the eating of domesticated guinea pigs in the pre-Hispanic Andes and of domesticated turkeys and dogs in Mesoamerica, see Sophie D. Coe, *America's First Cuisines* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1994).
29. Bernardino de Sahagún, *Florentine Codex: General History of the Things of New Spain*, trans. Arthur J. O. Anderson and Charles E. Dibble (Santa Fe: School of American Research; Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1950–82).
30. Cited in Asúa and French, *A World of New Animals*, 4.
31. Cited in Susan Scott Parrish, "The Female Opossum and the Nature of the New World," *William and Mary Quarterly* 54.3 (1997): 475–514. Parrish offers a fascinating glimpse at the debates surrounding the sexuality and social meanings constructed around this particularly peculiar creature found in the Americas.
32. James Lockhart, *The Nahuas after the Conquest: A Social and Cultural History of the Indians of Central Mexico, Sixteenth through Eighteenth Centuries* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992), 280. Lockhart writes that descriptive terms also abound: "tentzone, 'bearded one,' for goat; and *quanaca*, 'head flesh,' in reference to the rooster's comb and hence to the whole animal, then including the chicken as well" (Lockhart, *The Nahuas after the Conquest*, 279).
33. Kenneth Shapiro, *Human-Animal Studies: Growing the Field, Applying the Field* (Ann Arbor: Animals and Society Institute, 2008), 5.
34. Fudge, "A Left-Handed Blow," 15.
35. See Peter Singer, *Animal Liberation* (New York: Random House, 1975); and Tom Regan, *The Case for Animal Rights* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004).
36. Nigel Rothfels, "Foreword," in *Other Animals: Beyond the Human in Russian Culture and History*, ed. Jane Costlow and Amy Nelson (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2010), 1–16.
37. For some of the invaluable edited collections on animals in history, which we have used as partial models for this collection, see Angela N. H. Creager and William Chester Jordan, eds., *The Animal/Human Boundary: Historical Perspectives* (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2002); Gregory M. Pflugfelder and Brett L. Walker, eds., *JAPANimals: History and Culture in Japan's Animal Life* (Ann Arbor:

- Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan, 2005); and Jane Costlow and Amy Nelson, eds., *Other Animals: Beyond the Human in Russian Culture and History* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2010).
38. Susan J. Pearson and Mary Weismantel, "Does 'the Animal' Exist? Toward a Theory of Social Life with Animals," in *Beastly Natures: Animals, Humans, and the Study of History*, ed. Dorothee Brantz (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2010), 22.
 39. Derby, "Bringing the Animals Back In," 603.
 40. Nigel Rothfels, *Savages and Beasts: The Birth of the Modern Zoo* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), 5.
 41. For more on the commodification of animals and animal products in Spain and Latin America, see, for example, Carla Rahn Phillips and William D. Phillips Jr., *Spain's Golden Fleece: Wool Production and the Wool Trade from the Middle Ages to the Nineteenth Century* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997); Jeffrey M. Pilcher, *The Sausage Rebellion: Public Health, Private Enterprise, and Meat in Mexico City, 1890–1917* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2006); and Sandra Aguilar, "Nutrition and Modernity: Milk Consumption in 1940s and 1950s Mexico," *Radical History Review* 110 (2011): 36–58.
 42. Philip Armstrong, "The Postcolonial Animal," *Society and Animals* 10.4 (2002): 413.
 43. Armstrong, "The Postcolonial Animal," 413.
 44. For a comparative look at ontological fluidity and porous human-animal boundaries among the Tupi and other indigenous peoples of the South American lowlands (through the concept of multinaturalism), see Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, *A inconstância da alma selvagem e outros ensaios de antropologia* (São Paulo: Cosac and Naify, 2002); and Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, "Cosmological Deixis and Amerindian Perspectivism," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 4.3 (September 1998): 469–88. On diet in early colonial Spanish America, see Rebecca Earle, "'If You Eat Their Food . . .': Diets and Bodies in Early Colonial Spanish America," *American Historical Review* 115.3 (2010): 688–713.
 45. Earle, "'If You Eat Their Food . . .,'" 688.
 46. Miruna Achim, *Lagartijas medicinales: Remedios americanos y debates científicos en la Ilustración* (Mexico City: Conaculta / UAM Cuajimalpa, 2008).
 47. Cary Wolfe, *What Is Posthumanism?* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010), xv.
 48. Malcolm Ashmore, Robin Wooffitt, and Stella Harding, "Humans and Others, Agents and Things," *American Behavioral Scientist* 37 (1994): 734.
 49. Chris Wilbert, "What Is Doing the Killing? Animal Attacks, Man-Eaters, and Shifting Boundaries and Flows of Human-Animal Relations," in *Killing Animals*, Animal Studies Group (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2006): 32.
 50. Biblioteca Pública del Estado de Jalisco, Fondos Especiales, caja 145, exp. 6, prog. 2188, f. 5: "Hasta llegó a desabrocharse un boton de la pretina de los calsones, pero que no pecó pues la mula se resistió que hasta una patada le dio en una espinilla."

51. Brantz, *Beastly Natures*, 3.
52. It is also worthwhile noting that some of the insects and animals discussed in these chapters—namely, the locusts discussed by Few, the mosquitoes looked at by McCrea, and the seals examined by Soluri—often exhibited no visible signs of alarm or anxiety, at least none that were readable by humans, either prior to or during their killings. Both Few and Soluri register a certain degree of human surprise, as evidenced in their historical documents, at how easy it sometimes was to kill those respective creatures. Soluri, on the other hand, also mentions that, depending on the intention of the writer, the seals were sometimes described as violently resisting their human predators.
53. We thank Frederico Santos Soares de Freitas for his incisive comments on “agency” and social entities.
54. Reinaldo Funes Monzote’s essay included here is a revised version of his “Facetas de la interacción con los animales en Cuba durante el siglo XIX: Los bueyes en la plantación esclavista y la Sociedad Protectora de Animales y Plantas,” *Signos Históricos* 16 (2006): 80–110. Regina Horta Duarte’s essay was originally published as “Pássaros e cientistas no Brasil: Em busca de proteção, 1894–1938,” *Latin American Research Review* 41.1 (1996): 3–26.
55. For other important works on bullfighting in the Iberian world, see Adrian Shubert, *Death and Money in the Afternoon: A History of the Spanish Bullfight* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001); and Elisabeth Hardouin-Fugier, *A History of Bullfighting* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010). On animals and human festivities in Spain, see also William Christian Jr., “Sobrenaturales, humanos, animales: Exploración de los límites en las fiestas españolas a través de las fotografías de Cristina García Rodero,” in *La Fiesta en el mundo hispánico* (Toledo: Universidad de Castilla–La Mancha, 2004), 13–32.
56. Amy Nelson, “The Body of the Beast: Animal Protection and Anticruelty Legislation in Imperial Russia,” in *Other Animals: Beyond the Human in Russian Culture and History*, ed. Jane Costlow and Amy Nelson (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2010), 95–112.
57. For a look at birds, ornithological knowledge, and avian husbandry in the Americas and early modern Europe, see Rebecca Brienen, “From Brazil to Europe: The Zoological Drawings of Albert Eckhout and Georg Marcgraf,” in *Early Modern Zoology: The Construction of Animals in Science, Literature and the Visual Arts*, ed. Karl A. E. Enenkel and Paul J. Smith (Leiden, Brill: 2007), 273–317; and Norton, “Going to the Birds.”
58. Animal Studies Group, *Killing Animals* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2006), 4.
59. This high level of animal killing is especially evident in “postdomestic” societies, where, according to Richard W. Bulliet, “people live far away, both physically and psychologically, from the animals that produce the food, fiber, and hides they depend on, and they never witness the births, sexual congress, and slaughter of those animals. Yet they maintain very close relationships with companion animals

—pets—often relating to them as if they were human.” The second characteristic of postdomesticity is the high level of consumption of animal products alongside “feelings of guilt, shame, and disgust when they think (as seldom as possible) about the industrial processes by which domestic animals are rendered into products and about how those products come to market.” See Richard W. Bulliet, *Hunters, Herders, and Hamburgers: The Past and Future of Human-Animal Relationships* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 3.

60. For research on insect dyes and commodification in colonial Mexico, see Raymond Lee, “Cochineal Production and Trade in New Spain to 1600,” *The Americas* 4.4 (1948): 458–63; and Carlos Marichal, “Mexican Cochineal and the European Demand for American Dyes, 1550–1850,” in *From Silver to Cocaine: Latin American Commodity Chains and the Building of the World Economy, 1500–2000*, ed. Steven Topik, Carlos Marichal, and Zephyr Frank (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), 76–92. Marichal writes, “Cochineal (*grana cochinilla*) became, after silver, the most important Mexican export for over three hundred years, or down to approximately 1850” (Marichal, “Mexican Cochineal and the European Demand for American Dyes,” 76).
61. Livingston and Puar, “Interspecies,” 5.
62. Another take on these cases is offered by Frank T. Proctor III, “Amores Perritos: Puppies, Parties, and Popular Catholicism in Bourbon Mexico City,” paper presented at the Tepaske Seminar on Colonial Latin America, Emory University, 26 May 2011.
63. For a fascinating account of animal symbolism and consumption in the Dominican Republic, see Lauren Derby, “Gringo Chickens with Worms: Food and Nationalism in the Dominican Republic,” in *Close Encounters of Empire: Writing the Cultural History of U.S.–Latin American Relations*, ed. Gilbert M. Joseph, Catherine C. LeGrand, and Ricardo D. Salvatore (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998), 451–91.
64. Erica Fudge, *Perceiving Animals: Humans and Beasts in Early Modern English Culture* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2002), 2.