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Introduction: Armored Beasts and the Elephant in the Room

Abstract
Animal spectacles are important for a holistic understanding of early modern Spanish culture. Influenced by Albrecht Dürer’s *Rhinoceros*, early modern Spain celebrated itself as a planetary world power through the spectacles of an exotic elephant, rhinoceros, armadillo, and lion. Also, partially due its role as a foil to the positing of animals as exotic, Spain created a spectacle of a homegrown bull. This chapter asserts the importance of deploying the methodology of a biogeography for one of each of these species, all of whom played a role as an animal protagonist in a spectacle. The writing of biogeographies takes the extinction of species in the Anthropocene into account and, in contrast to the negative impact of each animal’s role as an object in a spectacle, places an emphasis on an earth ethics that fosters healthy animal-human communities.

Keywords: animal spectacles, early modern Spain, biogeography, Anthropocene, exotic animal, earth ethics, Albrecht Dürer (1471–1528)

On May 18, 1969, Apollo 10 shot a picture that captured the entire Earth from outer space. The astronaut reduced the Earth to the frame of a lens with a finger click of the camera. The image—a blue orb mottled with white clouds and some brown swatches delineating part of Mexico and the Gulf of California—turned the Earth into humanity’s absolute other. The absolute othering of the Earth in a photograph, however, also made the Earth absolutely human. The wholly other, as psychoanalysis teaches, now inhabited as the most familiar.¹ The Earth took on a decidedly human form.

¹ For a description of psychoanalysts such as Freud, who connected the uncanny with the familiar, see Hillis Miller 2001.
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Earth anthropomorphosis, the transformation of the Earth into a human being, is not a backwards premodern or animist vision, but places the Earth at the forefront of new paradigms in different academic fields. Shaping broad-ranged thinking in the field of science, the simultaneous distancing of the Earth as object and its subsequent closeness as subject stimulated the Gaia hypothesis. Following chemist James Lovelock (1919–) and then microbiologist Lynn Margulis (1938–2011), philosophers of science coined the Gaia hypothesis to propose an earth ethics in which all organisms and their inorganic surroundings on Earth are closely integrated and form a single and self-regulating complex system. Gaia, as science’s object, is also the scientist’s subject; that is, Gaia is a human body—a complicated life system—capable of suffering from disease and even capable of emotion.  

Aside from the field of science, the work of sustainability scholar Arturo Escobar (2011) shows how the anthropomorphosis of the Earth impacts the field of economics. Escobar does not use the name Gaia, the Greek earth goddess, but Pachamama, the world mother from Incan thought, to characterize a form of earth ethics that has impacted his academic field. Closely linked to the Gaia notion in which the Earth is a single and self-regulated system, Pachamama, in the field of economics, takes on the meaning of a complicated life system, signaling the biocentric turn away from anthropocentrism’s tenet that a human life is the only life worth living. Escobar points to the notion of *buen vivir*, a Quechua and Aymara concept that upholds a philosophy of life that subordinates economic objects to ecological criteria, human and animal dignity, and social justice.  

How will people share the Earth with different animal species over the next hundred years? The following book offers a version of an earth ethics for the field of the humanities by studying five animal individuals used as spectacles in early modern Spain. It studies a rhinoceros, elephant, armadillo, bull, and lion in order to reflect upon the consequent ways that humans in the early modern period set precedents for a future that undermined the sustainability of the living planet. It is an example of how the humanities can, like the sciences or economics, produce scholarly work that seeks an earth ethics, which, in this case, looks to the damage to animal lives in the Anthropocene, the geological moment in which humanity’s impact on past and present tragically collide with respect to animal extinction.

---

2 For an overview of Gaia and the environment, see Crist and Rinker 2010. For the extension of Gaia theory beyond science into cultural studies such as Latour’s systems theory, see Clarke 2017. For avoiding the simplifying reductionism of the term, see Clarke 2014. For the relationship between Gaia and Pachamama to Spanish culture, see Beusterien 2016.
Animal biographies have been the focus of many recent publications. With the goal of underscoring the importance of animal conservation in the Anthropocene, rather than animal “biographies,” the following study offers five “biogeographies.” The study of biogeography has typically been carried out by scientists. David Quammen writes in *The Song of the Dodo: Island Biogeography in an Age of Extinctions*: “Biogeography is the study of the facts and the patterns of species distribution” (1996, 17). E. O. Wilson (1929–) and mathematician Robert MacArthur (1930–72) pioneered the notion of biogeography, and their study of islands became the basis of the field of conservation. Following their lead, studies in biogeography generally focus on what influences the distribution of species across the planet.

Different scientists continue to debate exactly when and what have been the most significant human factors that have impacted the planet and patterns of species distribution. This book does not focus on scientific questions relevant to the Anthropocene, such as what the most important reason for the rise of carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere is or what focus animal conservation should take. In the spirit of a growing body of studies that value science while carrying out humanities-based scholarship, the following study presents the biogeography of five animal individuals. Its goal is to provide an example of how the humanities can study the broader question of the distribution of a specific species across time and to underscore the age of extinction in the Anthropocene.

In early modern Spain, the practice of giving animals as gifts on a global scale among potentates affected the lives of rhinoceroses, elephants, and lions. The rise of the humanist curio cabinet affected the lives of armadillos.

---

3 One can find innumerable popular books dedicated to the life stories of individual lions, rhinos, monitor lizards, apes, and dogs. The genre of the animal biography has also found hold in many academic publications. For instance, Susan Nance examines Jumbo in the context of global consumerism in *Animal Modernity: Jumbo the Elephant and the Human Dilemma* (2015), and André Kreeber and Mieke Roscher study the exceptional lives of unusual animals in *Animal Biographies: Re-framing Animal Lives* (2018).

4 Impacted by conservation efforts, some scientists study animals in light of the Anthropocene. For instance, the collaboration between Tigga Kingston, a bat biologist, and Christian Voight, a senior research scientist at the Leibniz Institute for Zoo and Wildlife Research, produced *Bats in the Anthropocene: Conservation of Bats in a Changing World* (2016).

5 One noteworthy incorporation of the notion of the biogeography for animals in the early modern period can be found in the work of Natalie Lawrence (2014 and 2015), who studies the commodification and exoticization of pangolins and birds of paradise.

6 The Reaktion Animal Series is an example of a combined effort to study animals in the context of science and the humanities. The Reaktion Animal Series has over ninety monographs dedicated to animals, from the albatross to the zebra, looking to collaborations between biology and the cultural life of species.
The rise of the primacy of the bull in staged animal combat affected the lives of bulls. In turn, each animal influenced the culture of future spectacles and how humans impacted the distribution of each of these species. The rhinoceros and the elephant are important for zoo history, the armadillo for the history of natural history museums, and the bull and lion for staged animal combats, especially the Spanish bullfight. The book, then, evokes the Anthropocene in the sense that it examines the extraction of five animal individuals from their habitats to show how institutions used them for a theatrical, spectatorial purpose and how they, in turn, affected modern institutions of animal spectacle.

Spain was formative in the emergence of the modern animal spectacle. In the early modern period, the Spanish Habsburg monarchy claimed dominion over the planet’s animals and the planet itself. Spain divided Earth’s geopolitics into what it called the “four parts of the world,” as Serge Gruzinski (2010) writes in his study of the history of globalization and Spain. From 1580 to 1640, the Spanish Catholic monarchy was a significant player in the global arena of material and ideological dissemination at all levels because it brought “together territories, exchange routes, and areas of influence dispersed among several continents: Europe, Africa, America, and Asia” (Gruzinski 2015, 192).

The Spanish divided the world into four parts—a division of the Earth that is crucial for understanding the significance of the animals studied in this book. Hawa’i the elephant and Abada the rhinoceros were from Asia, Fuleco the armadillo from America, Jarama the bull from Europe, and Maghreb the lion from Africa. The chart below provides the year and place of birth and death, as well as the place and date of each animal spectacle.

Each chapter begins by offering a brief introduction to the species of each animal by explaining each one’s birth and the animal’s journey to Spain. Jarama the bull was transported a relatively short distance—36 miles—from the town of Aranjuez to Madrid. Ottoman authorities gifted Maghreb the lion to Spain in an act of diplomacy. Maghreb was captured in the Atlas Mountains, brought to Oran, and then transported by boat and over land to Madrid. Fuleco the armadillo was born and died in Brazil and his carapace was sent by ship across the Atlantic Ocean from Cartagena de Indias (in present-day Colombia) to Seville. Hawa’i the elephant and Abada the rhinoceros experienced the most harrowing journeys of the five. Like Maghreb, they were sent alive to Iberia as diplomatic gifts. The Mughal Emperor Akbar (1542–1605; r. 1556–1605) sent both animals to Iberia. They both travelled on ships from Goa, India, around the Cape of Good Hope, and were unloaded in Lisbon. Abada was transported in a cage and Hawa’i walked across land...
to Madrid. Abada later died in Madrid. Hawa’i, in turn, left Spain for France and died in England. The following maps show each animal’s sex and the route each took in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, respectively.

One tenet of the following study is the critical need to examine spectacle in light of animals’ acquired value as exotic. The biogeography of each animal illuminates how spectacles were part of a historical structure that mobilized animal bodies for the maintenance of a global Spanish Empire. In the early modern Spanish context, the bodies of the rhinoceros, elephant, armadillo, and lion were considered “exotic.” Each one’s body acquired the value of being exotic because they crossed oceans and imperial frontiers. The body of each acquired worth in the Spanish geo-cultural imaginary because of a global system determined by a network of trade, travel, and translation. As Jacques Lezra has written in *Transnational Mobilities in Early Modern Theater*, critical practice “requires the focus on the interrupted circuit of trade, travel, and translation on display” (2014, 216). Certain animals became exotic when their bodies were deployed for learning and enjoyment in Spain’s spectacle culture. Their symbolic and material value entered an

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Birth: Place, Date</th>
<th>Death: Place, Date</th>
<th>Display: Place, Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawa’i</td>
<td>Elephant</td>
<td>Asian elephant (<em>Elephas maximus</em>)</td>
<td>India, c.1580</td>
<td>London, 1593</td>
<td>Antón Martín Hospital (Madrid), 1583-1591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abada</td>
<td>Rhinoceros</td>
<td>Indian rhinoceros or Greater one-horned rhinoceros (<em>Rhinoceros unicornis</em>)</td>
<td>India, 1573</td>
<td>Madrid, 1591</td>
<td>1. General Hospital (Madrid), 1583-1591 2. Taxidermy specimen, Casa de Campo (Madrid), 1592-1598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuleco</td>
<td>Armadillo</td>
<td>Six-banded armadillo (<em>Euphractus sexcinctus</em>)</td>
<td>Brazil, c.1559</td>
<td>Brazil, c.1569</td>
<td>Carapace specimen in collection of Gonzalo Argote de Molina (Seville), 1570-1586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarama</td>
<td>Bull</td>
<td>Spanish Fighting Bull (<em>Bos taurus ibéricus</em>)</td>
<td>Spain, c.1626</td>
<td>Madrid, 1631</td>
<td>Make-shift theater, Campo de Moro (Madrid), 1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maghreb</td>
<td>Lion</td>
<td>Barbary Lion (<em>Panthera leo leo</em>)</td>
<td>Maghreb, c.1621</td>
<td>Madrid, 1631</td>
<td>Make-shift theater, Campo de Moro (Madrid), 1631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. The Lives of Five Animals in Spectacles in Early Modern Spain.
Escher-like circuit in which their physical transoceanic displacement had to be translated from the foreign to the home, producing a cultural surplus of value in both directions and in both contexts (Lezra 2014, 200).

The newly shaped notion of the exotic animal in the early modern period influenced the formation of ways to visualize “home,” that is, the indigenous, domestic, or homegrown animal, propagating forms of human sight based on the emerging collective notions of Europe or Spain in contradistinction to ...
the early modern division of the world into Africa, Asia, and the Americas. Scholars who study the history of animals in spectacle note the emergence of the notion of the exotic in the sixteenth century. Eric Baratay and Elisabeth Hardoin-Fugier point out in Zoo: A History of Zoological Gardens in the West that Rabelais used the term “exotic” in 1552 to describe new commodities arriving to Europe. Rabelais invents a fictional island, Medamothi, and describes the merchants from Asia and Africa who brought their wares to the markets at the port of Medamothi, including “various paintings, various tapestries, various animals, fish, bird and other exotic and well-travelled merchandise” (qtd. Baratay and Hardoin-Fugier 2002, 29).

Early modern Spain was crucial for the emergence of the notion of the exotic animal in the emerging global system of the early modern period. Many studies, including those on animals in medieval Spain, ignore the specific context governing the appearance of the notion of exotic in early modern Europe and simply assume that humans universally construct “exotic” animals. “Exotic” is the first word of Vernon N. Kisling’s history of humankind, a collection of wild animals from ancient animal collections to the modern zoo-garden. His study begins: “exotic animals have long been the ultimate collectibles” (2000, 1). Yi-Fu Tuan’s Dominance and Affection: The Making of Pets also uses a generic definition of the exotic to show how potentates throughout history dominated strange animals in a show of pride and prestige. For instance, when the founder of the Qin dynasty (221–207 BCE) created a capital city, it established a hunting preserve and park with captured animals from newly incorporated lands that included a rhinoceros from Huang and birds from Tiaozhi (Tuan 1984, 76).

Kisling and Tuan’s use of the word “exotic” ignores the historical specificity of its emergence in early modernity. With respect to animal extraction and exploitation for aesthetic purposes, the exotic was contingent on spectacles, that is, human visual representations of animals, demonstrating that humans are not hard-wired across time and cultures to visually perceive animals in the same way. The term “exotic” as it exclusively applied to animals appeared at the beginning of the seventeenth century with the publication of Exoticorum libri decem (Ten Books of Exotica, 1605) by the Dutch botanist Charles de L’Écluse (Carolus Clusius, 1526–1609). L’Écluse constructed the

7 The experience of the Indies triggered a turn toward the discovery of indigenous European nature. For instance, see Cooper 2007.
8 For usages of the term “exotic” to describe animals in the Spanish Middle Ages, see Adroer i Tasis 1989 and Keller 1972.
9 For the connection between L’Écluse and Spanish humanists in Seville, see Gómez López 2005. For L’Écluse and botany, see Egmond 2009 and 2010.
definition of the exotic based upon how sixteenth-century Portuguese and Spanish authorities united the planet’s geography into the “East” (Africa and Asia) and “West” Indies (America).

This book looks to the development of the notion of the exotic animal in the sixteenth-century Spanish context because it provides a foundation for European identity and globalism, particularly the case of the Dutch as informed by L’Écluse. The exotic animal appeared in the context of the Spanish Habsburg monarchy with Philip II (1527–98). Philip II, following a Renaissance model of outward-looking self-sufficiency, ideologically unified the East and West Indies into Europe’s exotic space. In terms of spectacle, one of most significant material signs of Philip II’s construction of the space of home (as Europe) versus the outside (as the Indies) can be found in how he employed armor. For Philip II, the most visually impressive European monarch dressed himself in the most visually impressive suit of armor.

The source for Philip II’s exaltation of armor was Emperor Maximilian I (1459–1519). The Habsburg Maximilian I was the first significant king to use armor as a regal symbol. To do so, he exploited full-body armor as the iconic image of the king. He established the first royal armory in court at Innsbruck in 1504, dressed in armor for his official royal portrait commissioned to Bernhard Strigels (ca. 1460–1528), and wrote a pseudo-autobiographical chivalric romance titled The White King in which he established the primacy of armor as visual icon (Schroth 2004, 113; Stoichita 2016).

The artist Hans Burgkmair (1473–1531) created the standard designs for Maximilian’s armor. Burgkmair’s competitor, Albrecht Dürer (1471–1528), also designed armor for Emperor Maximilian, including Three Studies of a Helmet (ca. 1514; Paris, Louvre); the Study of a Suit of Armor for Maximilian I (ca. 1517; Vienna, Albertina); and sketches of a Visor for a Jousting Helmet (ca. 1515; Albertina, Vienna) (Pimentel 2017; Clarke 1986; Smith and Findlen 2002, 20n.2). Dürer continued designing armor after Maximilian’s reign. He depicted Philip II’s father, Charles V, in armor. He won a project from the Nuremberg city council for a portrait of Charles

10 For the meaning of “exotic” before the eighteenth-century Enlightenment, including how it emerged in the Dutch context of globalism and in the sense of a European identity, see Schmidt 2015.

11 Spain’s outward-looking self-sufficiency contrasted with the perception of the exotic in terms of the Confucian model of inward-looking self-sufficiency and the European Enlightenment’s nineteenth-century outward-looking self-sufficiency. For an overview of the meaning of the exotic animal (a giraffe in the Medici court in the sixteenth century) with regards to the notion of outward-looking sufficiency, see Ringmar 2006.
V in which he designed an image cast on a medallion that showed the King wearing the characteristic Golden Fleece pendant and encased in armor (Chipps Smith 1983, 235).

Burgkmair’s designs not only included armor for the human body, but also for the horse. The armored man on an armored horse in pageantry culture constituted an image of a composite living beast, a conjoined man on a horse, the epoch’s most marvelous visual show of royalty. Just as dressing up in armor signaled the Empire’s most revered human figure, so armor in the sixteenth century also signaled the most visually impressive exotic animal. Dürer single-handedly created the image of that armored animal when he drew an image of a rhinoceros (fig. 1).

Dürer’s Rhinoceros achieved cultural currency across Europe by evoking the cult of armor. In The Rhinoceros and the Megatherium: An Essay in Natural History, Juan Pimentel, who also sees curiosity cabinets and private collections as precursors of imperial museums, begins his study with Dürer’s Rhinoceros. Pimentel calls Rhinoceros an “armored pachyderm” (2017, 3) and states that it was “imagined without being seen” and “transformed by the imagination into a picture that was reproduced and distributed around the world” (2017, 3).
When Dürer made the broadsheet *Rhinoceros*, he created a hide on the animal that bears resemblance to his armor designs for Emperor Maximilian I from the same period. David Quammen writes that the Dürer rhino is a fantasticaly embellished version of a rhino; it is an armor-clad war machine. Quammen explains that the rhino is “complete with a gorget at the throat, a breastplate around the midsection, pauldrons for the shoulders, faulds skirting the thighs, and nicely aligned rivets along the plate edges” (2000, 205). Quammen concludes that Dürer emphasized the armor quality of the animal when he “angled back the angle of the horn, making it more dangerous as a weapon for hooking and ripping [...] For good measure he added a second horn, smaller, pointing forward from the back of the neck. The lower legs he wrapped in chain mail” (2000, 205). Pimentel explains the visual impact: “the chain-metal armor evokes both a dragon and a reptile and, at the same time, the knight or samurai who has to combat it. This is where Dürer situates and transmits all the force of the animal and where he simultaneously displays his great debt to his experience designing armor” (2017, 97).

Dürer encased armor on the body of *Rhinoceros* to signal its role as an outsider, the Empire’s exotic animal other. With *Rhinoceros*, Dürer established an important sixteenth-century truth with respect to the exotic animal: The iconic animal from the Indies was naturally clad in armor. Just as armor transformed the king and his horse into a visual symbol of the Empire, so armor on the animal transformed it into a visual symbol of the Empire’s exotic space. In contrast to the monarch whose armor represented dominion, control, and protection over the imperial home environment, the armor on the animal marked it as the exotic creature from the Indies that the Empire needed to conquer and place into captivity.

Dürer had achieved a reputation as the century’s most accurate and naturalistic painter of animals. The most important sixteenth-century animal authorities, such as Conrad Gesner (1516–65), testified that Dürer’s enhanced *Rhinoceros* was true-to-life and scientifically accurate (Leitch 2017). Horses were fitted with armor, which, because of its cost and value to the elite, can be considered the most valued of all sixteenth-century artifices. When Dürer put armor on *Rhinoceros*, he evoked the valued artifice of armor. He also established a dichotomy between the armor produced as artifice in Europe versus armor as a natural product from the Indies. For Dürer, armor augmented *Rhinoceros* as a visual spectacle of wonder because it was not manufactured—like horse armor—but the natural hide of the animal.

Dürer successfully mass marketed *Rhinoceros*, with its human eye staring back. Printers circulated *Rhinoceros* relentlessly, figuratively providing a
familiar image of armor on the skin of Europe’s most important and iconic exotic animal. Ironically, through the materiality of armor, the exotic animal, the wholly other, also inhabited the most familiar space. Armor was shaped and crafted in Nuremberg, the global center for armor production, the city in which Dürer created *Rhinoceros*. “Exotic,” from the Greek, is literally that which comes from the outside or that which is foreign, and Dürer designed the century’s emblematic exotic animal icon with armor, the product forged in his hometown of Nuremberg.

Dürer’s *Rhinoceros* sets one of the most important precedents for the foundation of the notion of exotic in modern animal spectacles. After taking the crown of the Spanish Empire, Philip II followed the precedent of the cult of armor from Dürer and Maximillian I. Philip II dressed himself in armor for his official portrait in self-promotion as planetary monarch. He built an armory in Madrid, his new capital city. Philip II acquired Maximilian’s, as well as his father Charles V’s, armor collection, and placed them in the Spanish Royal Armory in Madrid. Philip also commissioned new armor and bards. Early modern historians also celebrated Philip II as an armored monarch. The proposed frontispiece of the first official history of Philip II, *Historia general del mundo* (*The General History of the World*, 1599) by Antonio Herrera y Tordesillas (1549–1625), shows Philip encased in armor. Herrera y Tordesillas depicts Philip II as a new Hercules wearing armor, which symbolizes the monarch as a warrior who combines ideal classical and Christian virtues (Parker 2014).

Philip II rode horses in pageants—each encased in armor—and Philip’s artificially augmented body transformed him into an awe-inspiring image of the planet’s most powerful monarch. By Philip’s reign, Dürer’s *Rhinoceros* had increased in popularity, contributing to the emblematic visual power of armor. Because armor not only covered the monarch, but also the armored beast that the monarch figuratively had to combat and conquer, Dürer’s broadsheet *Rhinoceros*—only an artistic creation—helped disseminate amazement about the natural world, particularly about animals from foreign places. The spectacle as quest to see an armored animal, a keen desire in Philip’s Spain, was influenced by Dürer’s armor-animal fiction that had become accepted fact. People craved to see a living rhinoceros and other animals supposedly naturally fitted with armor.

Armadillo carapaces were the most popular animal specimens in collection cabinets. Nicolás Monardes (1493–1588), in fact, coined the name “armadillo” based on the fact that the armadillo specimen owned by Gonzalo Argote de Molina (1548–96) was supposedly a small version of a European armored horse that had been endowed with armor by nature. Philip II also
made a spectacle of Abada, a living Indian rhino, and people perceived Abada through the lens of Dürer's *Rhinoceros*. The goldsmith Juan de Arfe y Villafañe (1535–1603) went to Madrid to observe Abada and designed a magnificent gilded ewer that celebrated Philip II as imperial monarch (a detail of which is the cover image for this book). Arfe wrote, following Dürer, that Abada had skin that was like armor.

***

I have organized each chapter of *Transoceanic Animals as Spectacle in Early Modern Spain* in a similar way. Each begins with a summary of the life and death of each animal. Chapter 1 examines Hawa‘i and Abada; Chapter 2 Fuleco; and Chapter 3 Jarama and Maghreb. Each chapter then focuses on the human institutions of theatrical animal display that radically altered the lives of each animal: Hawa‘i and Abada as objects of spectacle in a proto-zoo in Madrid; Fuleco as a specimen exhibit in a proto-museum; and Jarama and Maghreb as performers in a staged animal combat. Finally, each chapter provides a brief conclusion that shows how the study of early modern Spanish culture can offer productive and creative aesthetic solutions for future human-animal cohabitation.

I have coined a proper name for each of the five animals. Jane Goodall (1934–) famously named her chimps to the chagrin of the science profession, which insisted that the animals be given a number. Her naming, however, opened up a controversy in the field and stimulated new approaches to animal conservation. Although some animal individuals like certain elephants and bulls were given proper names in history, the following book anachronistically and intentionally provides names for five animals that had never received them before now. With the goal of writing a study grounded in the humanities in the spirit of animal conservation, I christened these animals with a name, like Goodall, to recognize their individuality and subjectivity; to stir academic controversy; and to encourage scholars, teachers, and students to create new animal biogeographies.

Chapter 1 describes Philip II’s placement of Abada the rhinoceros and Hawa‘i the elephant in a hospital in Madrid. A fee was charged to see each. Placed in hospitals in his newly created capital city, Philip II intimately tied the animals to theater. Hospitals got much of their revenue from plays and, in cities where stand-alone theaters were not built, innyards in hospitals were used for commercial public spectacles. Philip II’s proto-zoo featured Abada and Hawa‘i and, like modern zoos, he used two captured exotic animals to enhance the image of the metropole capital and to enhance Spain’s imperial prowess.
Chapter 1 especially focuses on the emerging public sphere in early modern Spain. The viewing experience of the animals combined cognitive and affective responses based on the public's sense of collectivity and individuality. The primary thread that united the public's response, such as the one shown on the ewer designed by Juan de Arfe, was Philip II's use of the spectacle of the captive animal as a show of power. Hawa'i and Abada arrived to Europe as gifts from the Emperor Akbar, and Philip II flexed geopolitical muscle by not gifting away each animal after they came into his possession. The chapter concludes by pointing out that a history of the zoo, a microcosm of the Anthropocene, inspires compassion for animal sentience, especially for an animal's sense of territory.

Chapter 2 tells the story of Fuleco the armadillo. Ursula Heise writes in *Imagining Extinction: The Cultural Meanings of Endangered Species* (2016) that comedy as a genre opens new cognitive and emotional attachments between people and animals. Keeping Heise's idea about comedy in mind, the chapter proceeds in an entertaining way with the hopes that nonfiction scholarship, like fiction, can adopt a comic tone for encouraging new modes of survival.

The story of Fuleco sheds light on three important human figures: Gonzalo Argote de Molina, Nicolás Monardes, and King Philip II, each of whom imagined Fuleco's body as showing off his particular version of a theater of the world. Gonzalo Argote de Molina used Fuleco to enhance his reputation because he established his home as a proto-museum and included Fuleco the armadillo, alongside paintings, books, armor, live purebred horses, trophy animal heads from hunting, and animal specimens from the East and West Indies. Nicolás Monardes used Fuleco to enhance his business interests when he published Fuleco's image in *Primera y segunda y tercera partes de la Historia medicinal, de las cosas que se traen de nuestras Indias Occidentales* (*Medicinal History of the Things Brought from Our West Indies*, 1574). Finally, King Philip II, who, like Monardes, visited Argote's collection, most likely felt that Fuleco's presence in Argote's museum symbolically enhanced the value of the live horses and armor that he had collected in the Royal Armory in Madrid.

Chapter 3 examines how Philip II's grandson, Philip IV (1605–65), used a lion from Africa in a fight against a bull for the purposes of public entertainment as described in the collection of poems in *Anfiteatro de Felipe el Grande* (*The Amphitheater of Philip the Great*, 1632) by José Pellicer de Ossau y Tovar (1602–79). Chapter 3 describes how the poets in *The Amphitheater of Philip the Great* used the spectacle of a staged animal combat to forge emerging collective identities of Europe and nation, as well as in terms of race. The chapter uses a performance studies framework to show the degree to which
the staged animal combat formed part of the collective culture of spectacle. Furthermore, the chapter ultimately, by way of contrast, argues on the behalf of models of animal and human collaboration rather than human observation and animal destruction in spectacle. The chapter concludes by describing a performance model of human-animal collaboration through a reading of a graphic novel based on *El retablo de las maravillas* (*The Marvelous Puppet Show*), a play by Miguel de Cervantes.

Dürer made the *Rhinoceros* exotic and, paradoxically, familiar by encasing it with armor from his hometown, just as *The Amphitheater of Philip the Great* also made the fighting bull simultaneously exotic and familiar. Pellicer and the poets that comprised Spain’s literary establishment depicted the fighting bull as exotic in the sense that it was the only wild animal left in the world to dominate. They describe the bull as a “lion from Spain,” evoking the king of beasts from Africa, but also writing that most ferocious bull was indigenous to Spain. According to *The Amphitheater of Philip the Great*, the most othered animal, the uncontrollable all-powerful bull, inhabited the most familiar space, bred on the grasses on the banks of the Jarama River in central Spain bordering the capital Madrid.

Ultimately, the spectacle of animals in early modern Spain as told through the method of the biogeography I employ here helps scholars and students in the humanities to look beyond the superficial interpretation of images and texts in order to better understand landscapes of exclusion. The conclusion of *Transoceanic Animals as Spectacle in Early Modern Spain* considers how teachers can use biogeography for that purpose. Students can invent their own names for animals in a class project that introduces them to the culture of animal spectacles in early modern Spain. For instance, they can name an anonymous quetzal bird from America. By way of example, I provide the case study of a shield with quetzal feathers which Philip II placed in the collection in the Royal Armory.

In *1668: The Year of the Animal in France*, Peter Sahlins explains how animals reveal the central dimensions of early French modernity in the seventeenth century. Sahlins studies living animals and their symbolic afterlives, noting that they are “agents in the making of early modern France, even as their agency extended to their dead bodies and painted representations” (2017, 20). The following book looks to five agents that expose much about the central dimensions of early modern Spanish culture. Hawa’i the elephant was literally a living animal on display in a room in Madrid, and my title for this introduction—the idiom “the elephant in the room”—refers to the erasure of something big and the omnipresent awareness of that erasure, namely, animals in spectacle culture in early modern Spain.
Animal spectacles are vital to a holistic appreciation of Spanish culture. *Transoceanic Animals as Spectacle in Early Modern Spain* examines animal spectacles that had repercussions for the emergence of the modern institutions like the zoo, natural history museum, and the bullfight. After providing a history of a destructive moment in the life of human-animal communities, particularly a description of a moment in early modern European history in which animals were extracted from natural habitats for human spectacle, the final goal of this book is to look toward an earth ethics. The goal of an earth ethics, influenced by species extinction in the Anthropocene, is to emphasize a history of destruction so as to inspire animal spectacles of mutual compassion.

Just as fields in the sciences need methods from the humanities for understanding the ethical dimensions of their research, so the humanities field needs methods from the sciences for full appreciation of its objects of study. Recognizing and valuing animal sentience, for instance, underscores mutual compassion by moving past human-centric definitions of spectacle. One important example of science enriching the humanities is the notion that animals come into sentience via territory. Art is born not solely through human expression, but emerges out of an animal expressing a sense of home through territory. Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari have written that animals’ marking of territory is “art in its pure state” (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 183). Art begins with the animal or “at least with the animal that carves out a territory and constructs a house” since this marking of territory “implies the emergence of pure sensory qualities, of sensibilia that cease to be merely functional and become expressive features” (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 183).

The story of the lives and afterlives of five sentient animals in early modern Spain pushes toward new ways to imagine an earth ethics. With respect to the study of animals in early modern England, Erica Fudge writes that taking animals seriously highlights the fact that the marginalization of animals in modern humanities research itself serves an important philosophical and moral function. It obliterates a way of thinking that raises questions about the nature of the animal and the human; that offers us another inheritance, another way of conceptualizing both ourselves and the world around us. (2006, 4)

Of course, not all animals mark territory, and Luce Irigaray has suggested a more expansive sensitivity to animal territory by describing how animal territory is a grace gifted by animals that can lead toward altruism and
communion with the living. For Irigaray, animals do not belong to the human nor in the human space, but in a space appropriate to their lives (Štuva 2013). In the context of human-bound animal extinctions and resurrections, Transoceanic Animals as Spectacle in Early Modern Spain hopes for a future where humans and animals—and the Earth—establish interspecies relationships that demand lives of mutual caring. 12
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