

Suzana Marjanić

CETERA ANIMANTIA
Od etnozoologije do zooetike

Nakladnici: PERGAMENA d.o.o., Zagreb, Rozganska 18
Tel./fax: +385-(0)1-3640-942
pergamena@pergamena.hr; www.pergamena.hr
ZNANSTVENI CENTAR IZVRSNOSTI
ZA INTEGRATIVNU BIOETIKU
Zagreb, Ivana Lučića 1a

Biblioteka: BIOETIKA

Urednik
biblioteke: Ante Čović

Knjiga 43: Suzana Marjanić, *Cetera animantia. Od etnozoologije do zooetike*

Recenzenti: Hrvoje Jurić
Leo Rafolt

Redaktura
i korektura: Josip Guć

Naslovnica: Bernardić studio

Slika na
naslovnici: Ivan Mesek i Zefrey Throwell, *Woodland Concertina*,
kratki film, 2016.

Knjiga je nastala u okviru projekta Hrvatske zaklade za znanost *Kulturna animalistika: interdisciplinarna polazišta i tradicijske prakse – ANIMAL* (IP-2019-04-5621).

CIP zapis je dostupan u računalnome katalogu Nacionalne i sveučilišne knjižnice u Zagrebu pod brojem 001107011.

ISBN 978-953-6576-73-9

Suzana Marjanić

CETERA ANIMANTIA
Od etnozoologije do zooetike

PERGAMENA

ZNANSTVENI CENTAR IZVRSNOSTI ZA
INTEGRATIVNU BIOETIKU

Zagreb, 2022.

Sadržaj

<i>Zoo-uvod</i>	7
-----------------------	---

I. ZOO-TEORIJA:

animalistika (<i>animal studies</i>), ljudsko-životinjski studiji (<i>human-animal studies</i>), antrozoologija (<i>anthrozology</i>), antropologija životinja (<i>anthropology of animals</i>), kulturna zoologija, odnosno kulturna animalistika i kritička animalistika (<i>critical animal studies</i>)	13
Antropologija životinja – paradoks i/ili nužnost	15
»Na čemu si ti?« Primjer viševrsne etnografije/antropologije životinja.	35
Pokret za prava životinja – lokalna vizura ili animalisti, svih pogleda na svijet, ujedinite se!	57
Ekofeminizam o »etici« medijski zataškane priče: utjecaj mesne i mliječne industrije na globalno zatopljenje	83

II. ZOO-DUŠA:

lat. <i>anima</i> – <i>animal/is</i>	109
Zoopsihonavigacija kao poveznica vješticarstva i šamanizma.	111
Folklorne koncepcije duše kao životinje (zoopsihonavigacije): folklorno kršćanstvo kao kontrapunkt kristijaniziranoj dogmi, i danas ...	137
Postmortalna duša i zoomorfni kôd (lat. <i>anima</i> – <i>animal/is</i>) – komparacija hrvatske i bugarske etnotradicije i stanje danas.	153

III. MITSKI ZOO

165

Zmaj i junak ili kako <i>ubiti</i> zmaja na primjeru međimurskih predaja o grabancijašu i pozoju.	167
Od anatolijske Boginje Ptice Grabljivice preko starogrčkih sirena do morskih djevoja u hrvatskim usmenim predajama	189
Životinjsko u vilinskom: vile kao zoomorfni mitski kiborzi.	209

Fragment historijske antropologije snova – noćne i/ili mitske more prema etno/eko-zapisima Tomislava Macana. . . .	235
IV. TRANSDISCIPLINE I JEDINSTVO ZNANJA:	
goli čovjekoliki majmun	253
Transrodnost (i <i>transvrsizam</i>) i kao <i>utopijska</i> projekcija	255
Zoocentrički o bestijalnim pornjavama i erotskim zoofilijama	267
<i>Zoosfera Tita Andronika:</i>	
ljudska, previše ljudska bestijalnost	291
Krležin politički i psihotičan bestijarij: primjer dramske menažerije	317
Reklamni bestijarij – od Marinkovićeve Zoopolisa do »prave slovačke piletine«	333
Reklamna reprezentacija životinja – neotenija vs. sanitarna zona Gregora i Janka	349
Plakat u ulozi mačke, mačka u roli plakata: plakat-mačka i/ili mačka-plakat	361
<i>Krv životinja</i> ili reprezentacija zla u dokumentarnim filmovima o pravima, odnosno oslobođenju životinja ili kako kultura kolje prirodu: »problem zla« u Coetzeejevu romanu o Elizabeth Costello.	376
Životinje kao izazov humanizmu ili četiri komentatora traže Coetzeejev lik	381
<i>Summary</i>	391
<i>Kazalo imena</i>	397
<i>Bilješka o autorici</i>	417

Summary

“The maximum happiness of one
depends on the maximum happiness of all.”

Quote by Brazilian poet and anarchist activist José Oiticica,
122th fragment of Julian Beck’s diary *The Life of the Theatre*

The book *Cetera animantia: From Ethnozoology to Zoo-Ethics* brings together studies written at the interpretative intersection of ethnozoology, animal anthropology and zoo-ethics (critical animal studies) – with ethnozoology defined as a sister discipline to ethnobotany and ethnoecology, and a subdiscipline of ethnobiology – starting with 1996, the year when I first met Nikola Visković, at the time a professor at the Faculty of Law of the University of Split, and also the first Croatian culturologist to publish a book on zoo-ethics – *Animal and Man: A Contribution to Cultural Zoology* (1996). Furthermore, in addition to the extraordinary role he played, I would also like to highlight the research project *Cultural Animal Studies* which I started together with my colleague Antonija Zaradija Kiš at the Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Research in Zagreb back in 2008. All of the texts have been influenced by a zooethical niche which I had, on the other hand, been exposed thanks to the numerous animal/non-human rights activists (among which I am primarily referring to our first animal rights group, *Animal Friends*, founded in 2001), as well as from the inspiring bioethical research conducted by my colleague Hrvoje Jurić and the ecofeminist class held by Karmen Ratković at the Centre for Women’s Studies in Zagreb.¹ In fact, the very title of the book, *Cetera animantia: From Ethnozoology to Zoo-Ethics*, is based on an observation made by Hrvoje Jurić, referring to how the Bible and other religious and philosophical texts of the Judeo-Christian tradition view the issue of animals/non-humans precisely through the problem of the “animal soul”; it also takes inspiration from the diagnosis outlined by Nikola Visković, according to whom our ethicists and philosophers (up until the introduction of the principles of zoo-ethics into our bioethical niche, when Hrvoje Jurić defined Singer’s bioethics based on the question of whether his categories of thinking can even be situated within any tradition) generally consider it “beneath them to talk about nature and animals as ethical values, i.e. subjects”,

¹ When it was first created back in 1995 as part of an experimental programme, the class *Ecofeminism and Deep Ecology* was jointly conducted by Karmen Ratković and Vesna Teršelič.

seeing that our ethics is still “stuck” in the Kantian-Hegelian paradigm, according to which animals possess neither consciousness nor spirit and should, therefore, not be included in considerations of ethics. In this sense, the titular “from... to” does not point to a developmental valorisation of research but rather to the fact that classical perspectives in the field of animal studies ought to include a zoo-ethical mode as well, which is here specifically understood to be that of critical animal studies. According to Steven Best, one of the founders of critical animal studies, which is also a topic I write about in the first part of the book, academic considerations of animals as promoted by animal studies are purely abstract and theoretical, and lacking in a perspective which would also include animal rights.

The first four chapters deal with certain zoo-theoretical postulates, with the first chapter intended to serve as a kind of introduction to the three subsequent chapters, in the sense that certain paragraphs supplement each other. Furthermore, whereas Anglophone scholarship uses four different terms – *animal studies*, *human-animal studies*, *anthrozoology* and *anthropology of animals* – in the Croatian scientific and cultural circle one can instead find the syntagm “cultural zoology”, or “cultural animal studies”, and it is worthwhile to point out that the introduction of this term can also be attributed to previously mentioned Nikola Visković. However, I would also like to emphasise that a kind of species/animal turn in anthropology was already suggested by Claude Lévi-Strauss in 1962, when he published *Totemism (Le totemisme aujourd'hui)*; this trend was then further radicalised in 1989 by anthropologist Barbara Noske, who took it “beyond the boundaries of anthropology”. Finally, the International Society for Anthrozoology (ISAZ) was founded in 1991 – only two years after the publication of Barbara Noske’s book *Humans and Other Animals: Beyond the Boundaries of Anthropology*, in which she put forth her proposal for the creation of an anthropology of animals.

The next three chapters deal with *zoo-psychonavigation* and the question of the animal soul. The turn towards a negative qualitative definition according to which animals supposedly do not possess a soul took place in the 14th century. As the Aristotelian principle, which endowed animals with a soul (this being a soul with two modes no less), found itself increasingly challenged around the 14th century, animals slowly began to fade from theological debates. One may refer to the ironic comment made by psychologist Bruce M. Hood, who said that the Latin term for the animal kingdom (*animalia*) is, thus, no longer appropriate, seeing that it is derived from the Latin word for soul (*anima*).² Without a doubt, the animalisation of the soul (zoo-psychonavigation), which remained preserved within the matrix of folk Christianity, was something the Church found issue with. The ethnologist

² As indicated by Brigitte Resl in the encyclopaedic work *A Cultural History of Animals* (Vol. 2, Oxford: Berg, 2007), in the seventh book of Pliny’s *Natural History* “humans are discussed in part by means of a comparison between them and animals, or rather, ‘the other animals’: *cetera animantia*. Pliny’s principal taxinomial category, therefore, is *animantia*, and this encompasses both humans and nonhuman animals. He then progresses in the next book of the *Natural History* to the ‘rest of the animals’: *reliquia animalia*. *Animalia* and *animantia* are synonymous for Pliny.”

Kazimierz Moszyński pointed to the linguistic similarity (in Slavic languages) between the Latin words *anima* and *animal*, *animalis* and stated that his view was that animals should be described as the “bearers of life”. Unlike the speciesist stance of Christian – here primarily referring to Catholicism – dogma which upholds the non-existence of the animal soul, Anglicanism has its own theodicy and views on the animal soul, as is the one, for example, put forth by Anglican priest Andrew Linzey. Here I use the term *zoo-psychonavigation* (psychonavigation in an animal form) to refer to the secondary creation of the soul at the moment of the temporary death of supernatural persons and mythical beings, which can also be dubbed catalepsy or cataleptic trance (the separation of the soul from the body). Additionally, the term *zoo-psychonavigation* is invoked to examine three different phenomena – zoo-metempsychosis, zoo-metamorphosis and riding (flying) an animalistic “vehicle” or “vessel”.

The section which deals with the *mythical zoo* by looking at a number of selected examples (the dragon; the siren as a mythical aquatic cyborg; the triad mare – fairy – witch, i.e. the zoo-psychonavigation of the witch and the *mare/mora*, and the fairy’s teriomorphism) interprets the mythical space based on the definition given by Lévi-Strauss, who described it as the crossing of the boundary between the human and the animalistic, or, as Donna J. Haraway put it, as crossing into the world of mythical cyborgs. As for the fairy’s teriomorphic legs, South-Slavic myth shows that the replacement of human legs with those of animals points to the dual nature of fairy phenomena, whereby the ideosphere of the interpretation depends on the religious/cultural background from which the search for meaning originated. Christian interpretations, for example, will see them as demonic attributes, while culturologists will see traces of totemism or a shamanist matrix. The chapter on sirens (mermaids) and *mares/more* was also written as an homage to the ecological, naturalist and activist writings of Tomislav Macan (Dubac, 1905 – Dubrovnik, 1971), the founder of modern ecological thought in Croatia, who noted as early as 1963 that the eastern coast of the Adriatic Sea was turning into a lifeless wasteland because of the use of dynamite in fishing.

The final section, *Transdisciplines and the Unity of Knowledge: The Naked Ape*, is a tribute to Wilson’s concept of the unity of knowledge and Morris’s zoo-metaphor of the human animal, and begins with a chapter on transgenderism (and transspeciesism) as a utopian projection. By describing the ecological androgynous paradigm and transspeciesism (whereby the aforementioned term implies a negation of speciesism and, consequently, an extension of concern to include all forms of life) as utopian projections, I consider the radical “NO!” directed at a present which still, whether we like it or not, does not allow an equal legal and political status for all forms of life, and where such equality can only become possible once certain people and all animals and plants will no longer be seen as property. This section is followed by the article “A Zoocentric Take on Bestiality Porn and Erotic Zoophilia” in which I, based on a conditional distinction between erotic zoophilia and bestiality (“bestiality porn”, bestial sadism) – whereby the latter is seen as a zoo-

sexual strategy close to the term *brutality* – point to certain examples of bestiality and zoo-pornographic practice, which can also be described as *antropornography*, a term used by Carol J. Adams to refer to the sexualised, pornographic depiction of non-human animals. I see both articles as documentary fragments reflective of the time at which they were written, i.e. the time when I was concerned with such topics, which is why I have decided to include both the old data from the original year of research and some more recent examples. The same section also includes the article “Poster as Cat, Cat as Poster: Poster-Cat and/or Cat-Poster” about the kitty-cat posters designed for the PUF theatre festival by Predrag Spasojević, which was written for a monograph published on the occasion of the Pula-based designer’s sudden and untimely passing.

The final section is also a tribute to literary animal studies, a literary quatrain – namely, to William Shakespeare and his revenge tragedy *Titus Andronicus*, which demonstrates how the kitchen generally tends to be a bloody place, while the political kitchen is also often cannibalistic. Furthermore, I have also included an homage to the political and psychotic bestiary of Miroslav Krleža in which I used a dramatic-stylistic pentagram to trace over time, from *Salome*, *Legend*, *Masquerade* (1914) to *The Way to Paradise* (1970), Krleža’s dominant zoo-metaphors (for each period I singled out a dramatic work and a dominant zoo-metaphor) within the context of his negative anthropology, among which I would like to highlight the fundamental point of *Aretheus* (1959) according to which man is a political animal, while politics itself is the struggle against the animal within man. In the chapter on literary animal studies I also interpreted the marketing bestiary of Marinković’s *Cyclops* (1965), which also supplements the chapter on marketing speciesism. I looked at the final, wartime episode of Marinković’s debut novel through a “positive qualitative” lens while also maintaining a critical distance from certain previous interpretations which saw Melkior’s act of crawling in the zoo, among the screaming, frightened animals begging him to help them, as the “degradation of human existence into an animalistic one”. Melkior’s escape into the Zoopolis is the proof of existence of a topos which is far more human(itarian) than the militarist topos of the human, the only animal which wages war. I decided to end the section, and the book itself, with a look at Coetzee’s novel *The Lives of Animals* (1999); I also discussed another of his novels that dealt with the topic of animal rights, *Elizabeth Costello* (2003), in the chapter on documentaries about animal rights, where I examined in parallel the documentary short *Blood of the Beasts* (1949) by Georges Franju, the film *Earthlings* (2005) by Shaun Monson, and Coetzee’s ruminations on the obscenity of evil. The destabilisation of rational thought is equally demonstrated by Franju and Monson: Franju invites us as viewers to think about why violence is normative, while Monson (only) encourages us to look at the suffering of animals.

In conclusion, I would like to point out that I have already written about Krleža’s zoo-metaphors and the status of animals as subjects and symbols in performance art in some of my previously published books (in 2005, 2014, and 2017). Each article also comes with a bibliographic note on previously published works.

Anti-speciesist disclaimer: In the chapter on old-speciesist advocacy of Joan Dunayer's book *Speciesism*, which was translated into Croatian by the cultural anthropologist, ethnologist and historian Zoran Čiča, she also criticised Francione's *Introduction to Animal Rights*, in which the aforementioned animal rights theorist objects to racist and sexist vocabulary and invests considerable effort into avoiding sexist terms; the book, however, Dunayer notes, is still full of speciesist vocabulary. "The whole time, he uses the speciesist phrase 'humans and animals', which excludes humans from animals. His vocabulary retains the traditional speciesist hierarchy: 'animals, including mammals, birds, *even* fish, possess a significant level of intelligence'. Books on animal rights distort their own message when their vocabulary is still embedded in speciesism." Unfortunately, while I was also not able to avoid the well-established dichotomy of linguistic speciesism, this is not reason enough for me to consider the book a speciesist work, as the previously mentioned animal rights theorist and feminist demands in her consistent drive towards radicalisation (which demands the reality check). As stated by Marjorie Garber in the afterword to Coetzee's novel *The Lives of Animals* (1999), when reflecting on parallelism and the analogy of "Holocaust/animal holocaust" as a challenge to humanity, the H/holocaust is for many an event beyond analogy and this also raises the question of whether zoo-metaphors (e.g., the oft-used term "scapegoat") and zoo-comparison are unfair: "Viewed through literary categories, this is a challenge to humanism".

Translated by **Armin Protulipac**

Kazalo imena

- Acampora, Ralph R. 329
Adams, Amanda 196, 203
Adams, Carol J. 9, 45–46, 49, 51, 66, 68–70, 80, 83, 85–92, 103–105, 196, 269, 271, 273, 277, 279, 285, 299, 311, 353, 355, 358, 394
Adorno, Theodor W. 202, 285, 382
Agamben, Giorgio 27, 29, 292, 311, 379
Agapkina, Tatjana A. 156, 161
Aigremont [Schultze-Galléra, Siegmar] 213, 228
Ajdačić, Dejan 29
Akhtar, Shabbir 49, 51
Álamo de la Rosa, Victor 269, 285
Alba [zec] 46
Albuquerque, Ulysses Paulino 39
Alighieri, Dante 318
Allen, Woody 274
Alves, Rômulo Romeu Nóbrega 21, 39, 51
Amy Tomy [mačka] 400
Andersson Cederholm, Erika 54, 80
Andrews, Naomi J. 255–256, 264
Andriolo, Karin 375–376, 378–379
Anđelković, Maja 29
Antolović, Jasna 198–199, 203, 206
Antonijević, Dragoslav 130–131
Arbman, Ernst 140
Ardalić, Vladimir 121, 128, 131, 212, 224, 228, 239–242, 248
Arendt, Hannah 373
Aristofan 215, 228, 258–259
Aristotel 27, 35, 84, 138, 147–148, 312, 392
Arko-Pijevac, Milvana 204
Arluke, Arnold 18, 29
Armageddon, Andy 374, 379
Armstrong, Edward Allworthy 141, 147–148
Armstrong, Philip 36, 49, 54
Ásbóth, Oskar 174, 183
Asp, Carolyn 293, 300–301, 306, 308, 312
Attali, Jacques 311–312
Aubrey, John 297
Augé, Marc 335, 344–345
Babcock, Jay 106
Bachofen, Johann Jakob 259
Bacon, Francis 202, 371, 375–376
Badovinac, Zdenka 347
Badurina, Anđelko 150, 186
Bäckman, Louise 130
Bagarić, Petar 51
Bailey, Cathryn 69
Bajuk, Lidija [Bajuk Pecotić, Lidija] 11, 19, 39, 156, 161
Bakašun, Ana 150, 161, 379
Baker, Steve 45, 46, 51, 320, 351, 358
Bakota, Boris 103
Bakstein I. 282, 285
Balluch, Martin 25, 32
Baltrušaitis, Jurgis 179, 184
Bandić, Dušan 172, 184
Banićević, Morea 105
Banović, Stjepan 172, 184, 212, 228
Barada, Valerija 261, 264
Barber, Malcolm 147–148
Barbin, Alexina [Barbin, Abel; Barbin, Herculine Adélaïde] 260
Bard, Alexander 20, 29
Barrionuevo, Alexei 210, 228
Barthes, Roland 183–184, 203, 258
Bartlett, Djurdja 232
Bartol, Damir [Indoš] 356
Bartulin, Andrija 212, 225, 228