

We need to talk about the dog! Human-canine relations in Sud L pez, Bolivia: explorations of a hybrid community.

Introduction

Human-animal relations have long been present in ethnographic writing on the Andes, particularly in relation to camelid pastoralism (Flores Ochoa 1977, Tomoeda 1985, Dransart 2002). Nevertheless scholarship on the region has not been prominent in the so-called ‘animal turn’ in anthropology (Mullin 2002, Knight 2005), multispecies ethnography or anthropology-beyond-humanity (Ingold 2013, Kohn 2013, Kirksey and Helmreich 2010). Relations between Andeans and domestic animals other than camelids, guinea pigs (Archetti 1997) and Muscovy ducks (Stahl 2003) have also been neglected. This article attempts to address these gaps through focusing on relations between Andean humans and their dogs. I look to my experience with a dog in a llama-herding community in Sud L pez province in southern Bolivia, together with more general historical material, to elucidate how Andean herders and their dogs ‘become together’ through their shared lives and activities. The Andes region, with its tradition of animal domestication and rich colonial history is an ideal location in which to develop our understandings of human-animal hybrid communities (Lestel et. al. 2006).

Beyond the regional ethnographic focus, my work on dogs draws on two recent approaches in anthropology: the ontological turn (Kohn 2015) and multispecies ethnography. There is a tension between the two as Blaser notes: some scholars critique the ontological turn for relying too much on what human informants say, while “multispecies ethnography and new materialism tend to rely heavily on the natural sciences as spokespersons for the nonhumans admitted into politics” (Blaser 2016, 547). Nevertheless, I find both approaches useful in

looking at Andean herders' dogs as they bring to light the ambivalence with which the animals are regarded. The dogs are part of herders' lives – they mediate the experience humans have of their environment and provide companionship – yet they are also outsiders – alien to the ontological configuration in which Andean humans and other beings are part. The two approaches highlights what de la Cadena indicates when she draws on Strathern's concept of partial connections to describe the phenomenon of indigeneity in the Andes existing in tension with the idea of *mestizaje*. It is, she writes is "...a complex formation, a historico-political articulation of more than one, but less than two, socionatural worlds" (de la Cadena 2010, 347). The category, 'dog' in Sud LÍpez could be considered in a similar light.

My Canine Fieldwork Companion

I begin with some personal reflections. On returning to Sud LÍpez, following a two-year absence, I was invited to the house of one of my friends, Don Mauricio who had worked with me previously on recordings about herding. I welcomed the meeting as a chance to renew our friendship. However, he and his teenage son, Ramiro, had something else on their minds – the dog I had called Cindy.¹

My association with the largest dog in town – a tall, black short-haired bitch – had not been intentional. One of Ramiro's cousins had brought her to LÍpez, but had left her behind when he subsequently travelled to find work. Initially, don Mauricio had taken her in but, after she worried a young llama, he ceased to provide food for her.

The incident with the llama happened at Carnival when food is plentiful and lipeño humans visit the houses of festival sponsors carrying plastic bags to take home leftovers from huge feasts. I had shared most of my excess food with my landlady's grandchildren, but offered some meat to the sad-looking dog who followed me to my patio. From that moment she

barely left my side and, at least in my presence, people referred to her as my dog. She would not stay behind when I walked to neighbouring communities and once there slept outside my lodgings. She wandered freely, like other dogs in the village, but always arrived on my patio for breakfast, and when I travelled I had to ask someone to make soup for her. I found myself suddenly not just an anthropologist in an Andean village, but a ‘human-with-dog’, joined to an animal through sharing space and walks, and having to consider her needs and her impact on people. When I had to return home, I could not take her with me – she was not trained for air travel or life in a regulated environment and I did not want to offend local people by removing an animal I had not purchased formally. Don Mauricio agreed to take her back, and I felt guilty as I climbed into a truck while she slept in a sunny spot against a wall.

I met with don Mauricio and Ramiro in the kitchen of their adobe-brick house where a pot of soup boiled on the stove and llama ribs roasted. They explained events since my departure. Two of don Mauricio’s older sons had taken Cindy to a neighbouring village, where she had given birth to pups. Having puppies, they said, had made the usually timid animal aggressive, which had caused problems. Things had come to a head during a festival when amidst all the drinking and dancing, Cindy had grabbed hold of a woman’s *pollera* (skirt) and pulled it off. My friends found this amusing, but for the villagers it had been the excuse for which they had been waiting. At a community meeting it was decided that she had to go, and my friends had decided to kill her – relieved to dispose of an animal who was making them unpopular. Don Mauricio had kept one of her puppies, a male, but it had been run over by a truck.

Although sad about my dog’s fate, I was not surprised. Killing bitches once they have reared a litter is accepted practice in Sud Lípez. I remembered from my earlier fieldwork how the

family at the nearby mine killed their bitch, Luna, and kept her male puppy. Nevertheless, the seriousness with which don Mauricio communicated Cindy's fate to me, and that a community meeting had been called to persuade his family to dispose of her, showed that lipeños attach significance to the animals. Since examining human-dog relations was an unplanned direction in my research, I have not done systematically what Lestel et. al. (2006) advocate for studying hybrid communities. This is to combine etho-ethnology, or an ethnological study with animals as privileged agents, with ethno-ethology, or local understandings of animals and their behaviour. However, I approach Lestel's goal by combining my ethnographic observations (approximating to ethno-ethology) with insights from biologists who advocate an ethnographic approach to animal behaviour (approximating to etho-ethnology), while placing Andean human-canine relations more generally in a historical context.

Why look at dogs?

The intertwined lives of dogs and humans are of interest to anthropologists since dogs are a special case among domestic animals. As companion animals, they live with humans in their dwellings – or at least outside in their patios – rather than on the mountainside or in fields.² They eat similar food to humans and in Andean villages are sometimes dressed in human clothes when a discarded child's jumper is fitted on the dog for protection against the cold. Lestel gives human/dog relationships as a “perfect illustration of how two different species can live together, cooperate and influence each other” (Lestel et. al. 2006, 163). Animal behaviourists suggest various reasons to account for their closeness. Hare and Tomasello (2005, 439) consider dogs unusually skilled at reading human social and communicative behaviour, while Miklósi et. al. (2003, 763) draw attention to their tendency to look at human

faces, suggesting that positive feedback from looking back at humans has created possibilities for complex forms of dog-human communication.

Bradshaw draws attention to dogs' generally affable temperaments, while pointing out their ability to socialise with other dogs and humans simultaneously (Bradshaw 2012, 52 and 69). This raises questions about how other living beings are understood from a canine perspective. Bradshaw (2012, 128) writes of 'kin recognition' in canine sociality with human owners and while kinship is a term that has been problematized in anthropology, Carsten's (2000) less restrictive notion of 'relatedness' might be appropriate. Dogs seem flexible in the arrangements they accommodate, and recognise something like relatedness with other individuals, who usually include humans, other dogs and possibly other domestic animals.

Animal behaviour studies converge with multispecies ethnography in emphasising the entanglement of humans in the lives of dogs (Bradshaw 2012) suggestive of humans and dogs 'becoming together', to use Haraway's (2008) terminology, through shared activities.

Haraway recognises there is hierarchy in the arrangement, and uses Pratt's term *contact zone* (Pratt 1992) to emphasise how humans and dogs are constituted in and by their relations to each other within asymmetrical relations of power (Haraway 2008, 216). Under normal circumstances, dogs are, to paraphrase Despret (2004), 'dogs-with-humans' and most would find it difficult to survive outside the relationship. 'Dogs-with-humans' need not mean affiliation to human individuals, since many survive by scavenging on the edge of human environments.

Recent writing in anthropology asserts there is no such thing as 'human society' (Ingold 2013, 20, Lestel 2006): all communities of animate beings are hybrid in terms of species composition. Haraway similarly writes against 'human exceptionalism' as she terms 'the premise that humanity alone is not a spatial and temporal web of inter-species dependencies'

(Haraway 2008, 11). She sees particular merit in focusing on companion species as indicators of an ongoing and intimate ‘becoming with’ (Haraway 2008, 16-17): a mutual growing together and enmeshment of organisms attuned to each other.

The term *multispecies ethnography* implies the existence of species, context independent specifications of what living things are, and a concept that both biologists (Donaghue 1985) and anthropologists (Ingold 2013) have critiqued. Ingold prefers to emphasise what living things do writing that, “...every animate being is fundamentally a ‘going-on in the world’” (Ingold 2013, 20). Furthermore, the capacities that beings develop, he argues, following Lestel (1998), is the outcome of a process of development in hybrid communities that cross-cut the boundaries of conventional taxonomic groupings. How beings ‘become together’ involves interactions with physical environments, so that humans-with-dogs in the Andes might not be the same as humans-with-dogs elsewhere and “dogs” should possibly be understood as the potential for a range of human-canine possibilities.

De la Cadena (2014) critiques multispecies ethnography from a different perspective. In her ethnography from highland Peru, she writes that Andean *runa* consider themselves to inhabit a world also peopled by nonhumans in the form of sentient mountains and other ‘earth beings’. Earth beings’ together with *runa* form an *ayllu*, the Andean unit of social organisation and the relation through which both categories of being, as de la Cadena (2014, 255) puts it, ‘make the place that they also are’. Drawing on Viveiros de Castro (1998) she argues that, Amerindians’ self-designations do not denote species, but define the position of the subject. When *runa* take this position, she suggests their subject position is ontologically *not only* human – but human-in-*ayllu* with earth beings (de la Cadena 2014, 256).³ She proposes that a challenge to multispecies ethnography is facing up to partial connections with

entities that become *not only* species. While de la Cadena does not write about animals, facing up to such partial connections may be helpful in considering lipeño dogs.

Dogs and Humans in a Llama-Herding Community

In contemporary Sud LÍpez, there is not much social differentiation between families – all describe themselves as *originarios* and nearly all own llamas. However, there are disparities of wealth, and some families have stronger ties to urban Bolivia than others. Most households have at least one dog – often kept in the countryside with the family’s herds, at an *estancia*, although sometimes accompanying a family with children to the village while school is in session. Dogs are named, but the names follow no particular pattern unlike those given to llamas at birth (Dransart 2002). Lipeños do not describe their dogs as pets (*mascotas*), although one quite urbanized family allowed their small dog, Princesa, to sleep on children’s beds. I have not encountered urban pets being brought to visit LÍpez, although this may happen with improved transport links to Tupiza and the presence of urban outsiders such as health post personnel may influence how relations between humans and companion animals unfold. Lipeño dogs do not wear collars, although some wear green ribbons around their necks to show they have been vaccinated against rabies. They are seldom tethered, and are never put on leads - Cindy became terrified when I tried to lead her with a rope.

Dogs in Sud LÍpez are all mongrels, but people seem to keep two broad types: medium sized animals, possibly with German shepherd or collie ancestry, and smaller, short-legged types. Both in the village and at the *estancia* larger animals are kept outside buildings in which humans eat and sleep, but are allowed into the patio or space around them, where their owners sometimes construct a shelter or kennel. They constantly attempt to enter human living spaces but are sent out. Dogs trying to enter kitchens are describes as ‘abusivos’. ‘*Está abusando*’ (‘he’s taking advantage’), ‘*¡Fuera, perro!*’ (‘Get out, dog!’), I would hear

regularly as Roger, my first host's dog, tried to get into the kitchen. I likewise kept Cindy outside because I had no shelves to keep food out of reach of a canine nose.

Dogs thus live in human spaces and humans modify their spaces to accommodate dogs although, notably, most try to maintain some distance from them. The dogs do not seem entirely to accept the separation. I suggest, following Viveiros de Castro (1998) and Despret (2004), that dogs do not differentiate their subject position so clearly from humans as do *lipeño* humans from their dogs. *Lipeño* dogs want to get in, to be included, and perhaps to lose themselves through involvement in human activities.

Dogs are not fed human leftovers, but people – normally women – cook soup for them (*lawá del perro*). Doña Eustaquia, my landlady's daughter, told me that she used to cook for her dog, giving me to understand that she had held it in some affection. Nell (2014, 137) observed *campesinos* in Northern Potosí likewise cooking soup for dogs, from inferior quality maize, adding scraps like potato peelings to the mix. Although the food given to dogs is inferior to human food, humans invest time in caring for their dogs who, unlike other domestic animals, are expected to eat cooked food. Dogs are incorporated more than other animals into the human household and, as Ellen has observed, by continuously raising and feeding them, people make them into fellow social beings (Ellen 1999, 63). Humans never eat dogs in *Lípez* and would, I suspect, find the idea repulsive.⁴

At the *estancia*, large dogs are valued – Cindy attracted admiring comments on account of her size. They are considered useful because they bark to frighten away foxes that prey on young llamas and alert owners to the approach of unknown humans. They identify the *estancia* as a territory to defend against intruders by barking. The dogs do not accompany herd animals to pasture, unless walking with a human, and they do not treat herd animals as family, as do guard-shepherding breeds in Europe (Bradshaw 2011: 126-7). Unlike some

anthropologists in Andean communities, I did not find lipeño dogs particularly fierce, they bark, but do not usually bite, and lipeños do not expect their animals to be aggressive towards people. Any that display this characteristic are described as *malo* (bad). They are encouraged to hunt wild animals such as partridges and viscachas. A dog that can bring down a vicuña – a wild camelid protected by law – is admired, although I never actually saw a dog kill one.

Regarding vicuñas, firstly, a dog has to be able to distinguish between the wild vicuña and a domestic llama, for attacking an animal that belongs to its owner (or a neighbour) is completely unacceptable. Dogs are not given much training or guidance by humans, and since puppies are usually brought from elsewhere, they do not have the opportunity to learn appropriate behaviour from older dogs. They thus need to make judgements about the relations with which they engage with other animals and humans from outwith their households. Cindy's poor judgement concerning llamas was what had brought her to me initially. Secondly, lipeños, regardless of the law, would be reluctant to kill vicuñas, unless in dire need, as the animals are considered property of the powerful mountains.⁵ Having a dog, an autonomous agent, kill the animals might a way of avoiding unpleasant repercussions.

Although kept by herders, and considered indispensable by some, dogs are not used for driving llamas. A lipeño friend recalled meeting a shepherd on holiday from Cumbria, who had explained how he worked with sheepdogs. My friend had been very impressed and asked me where he could buy such a dog, thinking it could save his mother a lot of effort. He fell silent when I explained the work and patience that training a sheepdog involves. He recognised that he lacked the necessary skill, but the idea of schooling dogs also seemed alien to him. Lipeños use voice to summon or chastise a dog, and will strike a dog who misbehaves, but they do not train them to perform specific actions. The absence of schooling

mirrors Andean patterns of relations with domestic herd animals (Dransart 2002 and 2010). Dransart notes that Andeans expect their animals to develop characteristics such as autonomy and leadership (Dransart 2010) but do not attempt to impose particular behaviours upon them. Where herding is concerned, it may also be that llamas are less obliging than sheep or not habituated to the actions of a herding dog. My experience with Cindy, on encountering a group of llamas on a mountainside, was that the llamas did not run, but turned to face her, lowering their heads in a manner suggestive of both curiosity and menace.⁶ As Ingold might put it, driving animals is not part of a doggy ‘going-on-in-the-world’ in the Andes.

Dogs are present in ethnographic literature on the Andean region, for they are associated with the dead, and in particular with the human soul’s journey to the next world. In Sud L pez, there is a consensus that one’s dog should not make noise at night in the village – I received complaints when Cindy was too vocal. When dogs bark at night, people say, “Someone is going to die,” or, of the dogs, “They must have seen an *alma*.” The soul of someone who is going to die is thought to be already wandering away from the body. Dogs left outside at night encounter these souls, as do humans. In some accounts, dogs act as guides for the dead or help human souls cross a river, while in others the soul has to pass through a place populated by dogs (Harris 1982, Bolton 2002, Zuidema and Quispe 1968). At the *ocho d as* rituals following the death of an elderly woman, I recall overhearing two men discussing whether a large black dog should be killed to accompany her soul. While some authors have charted the distribution of the relation, or speculated on its geographical origin (Benson 1991, Berezkin 2014), I suggest it connects to both the ontological status of dogs and to an entanglement of dogs with living humans in the course of journeys.

Herders I interviewed about llama-caravan journeys, which are becoming rare due to the ubiquity of motorised transport, agreed that it was essential to take a dog. The dog, they told

me, was important as a guard when leaving the llama troop to trade goods and negotiate exchanges. I suspect the dogs also provided companionship for, even with a human assistant, journeys of up to a month were lonely experiences. What dogs do when they accompany people into the countryside, is move through the landscape with humans. In this respect my relationship with Cindy fell into a pattern of human-canine relations typical of the region – she walked with me and ‘became with’ me through the shared activity of walking. A herder on a journey of exchange would have his or her perception of the environment mediated as much by the tail-wagging, barking, growling and whining of an accompanying dog as by the actions and needs of the pack llamas. At the end of the day’s travel, the dog must have sat down to share food by the campfire and would remain sufficiently alert through the night to give warning of predatory animals or unrecognised people. The presence of a dog was an integral part of the experience of travel.

Andean human-canine relations in historical perspective

Before my relationship with Cindy I had given dogs in the Andes little consideration. Nouns for ‘dog’ exist in the Andean languages, Quechua and Aymara (*alqo* and *anu* respectively), while animals imported by Europeans have Spanish-derived names. Nonetheless, I had assumed today’s Andean dogs to be descended from colonial imports. DNA analysis of ancient and modern canine remains suggests that I was right for entirely mistaken reasons.

Recent studies of canine domestication suggest that all domestic dogs are descended from grey wolves (*Canis lupus*) (Leonard et. al. 2002, 1613).⁷ South America has various native species of the Canidae family (foxes, maned wolves and bush dogs), but no extant species of the genus *Canis*. While there have been suggestions of separate domestication events in New and Old Worlds, DNA evidence seems to imply that the humans who colonised America between 12 000 and 14 000 years ago brought with them lineages of domestic dogs (Leonard

et. al. 2002, Rosenfeld 2012). Hence, dogs probably reached the South American continent already fully integrated into the lives of humans and were indeed imports, albeit at a much earlier date than I had imagined.

While the mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) analysis of some breeds of dog specific to the Americas – such as the Peruvian hairless dog – indicates partial non-European ancestry (Asch et.al. 2013), almost all non-pedigree dogs in South America have predominantly European origins (Asch et.al. 2013, Castroviejo-Fisher et.al. 2011, Leonard et.al. 2002). Leonard et.al. (2002) suggest that native American dogs were largely replaced by those brought by European colonists and even that Europeans may have systematically discouraged the breeding of native American dogs (Leonard et.al. 2000, 1613). I find this last suggestion unlikely at a time before the appearance of modern breeds, when Europeans would only have recognised general classes of dogs (Larsen et.al. 2012).

There are both archaeological and ethnohistorical traces of dogs in the Andes. Schwartz (1997) records that although canine remains are not abundant, there are remains of dogs at sites in highland Bolivia and Peru. Mitchell (2017) notes that the remains of domestic and wild canids are readily confused, and sees no convincing evidence of domestic dogs in South America prior to 3000 cal. BC. Despite Schwartz's claim that their initial appearance coincides chronologically with early evidence of camelid domestication (Schwartz 1997, 18), he furthermore sees no evidence of dogs having been kept for herding llamas (Mitchell 2017: 317). There is evidence that dogs were eaten by some pre-Hispanic groups (Vega, Garcilaso de la 1961, 161, Salomon and Urioste 1992, 70), although this appears to have been a very unusual practice. There are also instances of dogs having been buried with human owners, including an Inca period grave at Machu Picchu in which the skeletons of a woman and a dog were found (Schwartz 1997, 121).

Dogs appear in several illustrations in the letter to the King of Spain attributed to Andean nobleman, Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala in the early seventeenth century. The illustrations offer insights into the role of dogs in both Inca and colonial periods, although it must be remembered that Guaman Poma was writing seventy years after the conquest. A self-portrait, depicts the author walking to Lima to deliver his letter in the company of his son, a horse and two dogs, labelled ‘amigo’ and ‘Lautaro’ (Guaman Poma 1993 vol. 2, 889). That they are named, and one is called ‘friend’, implies he valued them for companionship while travelling. Indeed, on a journey fraught with difficulties, including being robbed and abandoned by his son, a particularly low point is reached when the two dogs desert him after walking for days through torrential rain and snow (Guaman Poma 1993 vol. 2, 898).

[Insert Fig. 1 **Caption:** “Guaman Poma’s illustration of a young girl, her dog and her llamas in the Inca era”]

Several dogs appear in the section, *Nueva Corónica*, illustrating life under Inca administration. In drawings depicting the life stages through which men and women pass, a dog with pointed ears sleeps while a baby girl learns to crawl (Guaman Poma 1993 vol. 1., 231). An elderly man walks carrying a bundle accompanied by a small dog (Guaman Poma 1993 vol. 1, 146) and a young girl walks, spinning yarn, to tend her llamas with a similar dog (Guaman Poma 1993 vol. 1,167). Elsewhere, a small dog jumps up at an important woman from Collasuyu (Guaman Poma 1993 vol. 1, 135). Returning to Schwartz’s comments about the dogs of Native Americans and Spaniards, these illustrations appear to indicate that dogs kept by pre-Hispanic Andeans were small and valued for companionship by a range of people including in contexts of walking.

Dogs were a feature of the Spanish conquest. Indeed, reports of dogs described as ‘huge’ or ‘mastiff-like’, used to attack *indians* (Las Casas [1552] 1989, 82) contributed to the ‘Black

Legend' of Spain's treatment of Native Americans. According to the authors of *Dogs of the Conquest*, Spaniards held their dogs in high regard. (Varner and Varner 1983, cited in Schwarz 1997, ix). However, Schwarz notes that Native Americans found Spaniards' dogs frightening and startling: she suggests that they were qualitatively different from those with which they were familiar noting that 'dog' can mean many different things to different people (Schwarz 1997, x). Ingold (2013, 20) might say that a dog can be many different kinds of 'goings-on-in-the-world' and the dogs imported in colonial times may well have changed Amerindian peoples' expectations of what a dog should do.

New expectations – that dogs should be aggressive or useful for hunting – may have encouraged rural people to seek out animals descended from European imports. In the *Buen Gobierno* section of Guaman Poma's letter, depicting life in the colonial Viceroyalty, some illustrations appear to capture changing roles for dogs under the colonial regime.⁸ While pre-conquest dogs are depicted as companions to infants, women and the elderly, post-conquest dogs are depicted as set to work by men. A messenger (*chasqui*) is accompanied by a *perro de ayuda* ('helper-dog') (Guaman Poma 1993 vol. 2, 662) and an *indian* in Spanish clothing with two dogs is described as a hunter (Guaman Poma 1993 vol. 2, 694). The commentary accompanying this illustration notably includes an exhortation that the indigenous population, "... raise good hunting dogs for catching partridges, for hunting deer, vicuñas, guanacos and mountain sheep [sic] – hunting dogs and greyhound shepherds – and that the *cholos*, dogs of the Incas, they kill them and finish with them." (Guaman Poma 1993 vol. 2. 697).⁹ The author goes on to recommend that the *indios* should have dogs both large and small, the smaller dogs making better guards in towns as they bark to deter thieves (Guaman Poma 1993 vol. 2. 697).

[Insert Fig. 2: **Caption:** “Guaman Poma’s illustration of a colonial *chasqui* (messenger) and his dog.”]

While the origin of the word *cholo*, used to describe the Inca dogs, is uncertain,¹⁰ the same term is used today to denote a racial or economic category of persons between indigenous Andeans and mestizos – urban *indians* – and is used as an insult. An early record of its use, contemporary with Guaman Poma, appears in the *Crónicas Reales de los Incas* of Garcilaso de la Vega. Garcilaso explains it as an insulting racial category for humans with *indian* and African ancestry, but also attributes its origin to a term for a disreputable mongrel dog in the Windward Isles (Vega, Garcilaso de la 1609, Part 1, 505). I have no evidence for Garcilaso’s etymology, but his usage suggests the term was applied both to dogs and humans in Guaman Poma’s time. Guaman Poma urges the viceregal population to eliminate their indigenous mongrel dogs and replace them with working dogs of European origin, which they should value, but which are also outsiders to Andean communities.

Leonard et.al. (2002) demonstrate that the genetic material of indigenous dogs has all but disappeared from contemporary South American mongrels. This could have resulted from the rural population selectively eliminating native types in favour of European imports – in line with new expectations that dogs should work, rather than simply provide companionship. Strong claims about post-conquest dogs cannot be made on the basis of just one historical source, but it seems likely that European colonization penetrated aspects of Andean human-canine sociality and expectations of what a doggy ‘going-on-in-the-world’ should be and subsequently this may have resulted in changes to the genetic substance of Andean canines themselves.

Dogs as Outsiders

Lipeño people identify as *originarios* (originary people), a designation that, in a partial connection Platt (2001: 635-6) explains, conflates a colonial fiscal category and an Andean understanding of relation to place and ancestors. In the last twenty years, with the rise of indigenous consciousness, lipeños, like other groups in highland Bolivia, have recuperated the political offices of *ayllu* organisation, which had fallen into disuse following the National Revolution of 1952 (Choque and Mamani 2001). While the posts of authority of the *ayllu* were discontinued in the post-Revolution years, the political changes did not affect how lipeños understood themselves. Being lipeño involves existing in a special relationship with the lipeño landscape (particularly the mountain, Cerro Bonete) and with one's llamas (Bolton 2001). It is these relationships, fundamental to lipeño being, that lead me to postulate that lipeños are *not only* human in a similar manner to the *runa* whom de la Cadena (2015) describes.

Herd animals are intertwined with the kinship relations of lipeño humans through inheritance. Almost everyone in Sud Lípez owns llamas, and can explain how one's herd should grow from animals received as a child from one's parents. Llamas are also conceptualised as lent to humans by powerful 'earth beings', their treatment being watched over by ancestors. The herd is held to be an endogamous breeding group – similar and parallel to a human *ayllu* – that should increase from within through the fertility of its animals (Bolton 2006). The emphasis on the herd as a whole accounts for herders' reluctance to sell live animals – since sale entails a separation of that which should remain whole.

Lipeños also consider llamas to have a place of origin (*paqarina*) in the landscape. Dransart argues, from her fieldwork in Isluga, Chile, that each new generation of llamas is understood to have to be brought into domestication (Dransart 2010), a process that recalls Platt's account of how new generations of humans in Ayllu Macha require conversion from an

originary gentile state to Christianity (Platt 2001: 636). Where both llamas and humans are concerned, new generations are born or conceived into particular relationships with remote ancestors and land.

Llamas, effectively live in a society of llamas, similar to human society although they are conceptually separate from humans (Dransart 2010, 90-92). The separation from humans, recalling discussions of perspectivism in Amazonia (Viveiros de Castro 1998), is perhaps necessary for humans to ultimately hold the power of life and death over them. Revisiting de la Cadena's assertion that Andean runa are *not only* humans, lipeños understanding of llamas as living in kinship groups linked to both 'earth beings' and humans suggests we could consider them *not only* llamas integral to the *ayllu*.

The contrast with dogs is stark. Lipeños display no concern for maintaining a breeding population of dogs and most, dogs, have been brought from elsewhere. It was not uncommon on the six-hour truck ride from Tupiza to sit beside a child cradling a newly purchased puppy in its arms. Nielsen recalls a llama caravan journey from a Lípez community when a puppy was acquired for a small quantity of salt (Nielsen 1997-8, 146). As already mentioned, lipeños kill bitches once they have raised a litter, and are not bothered if the pups do not survive. Killing bitches is rationalised in terms of nuisance to neighbours when the animal on heat attracts a retinue of noisy admirers. Effectively, dogs are not encouraged or expected to live in consanguineous groups, and have no particular relation to the landscape. Martínez (1989, 26) notes that dogs do not come under the category of animals considered *uywa* to Aymara speakers – animals, such as llamas, cared-for by humans in a relation analogous to that people have with the *uywiri* or 'earth beings'. Neither are they considered *sallqa*, the wild animals belonging to the earth beings.

A conversation doña Eustaquia revealed more about the status of dogs. She told me how one should always pay for a dog with money or, if selling a puppy, demand payment. Payment confers proper ownership of the animal and will encourage the new owner to treat it well. There is an assumption that a dog will come from outside the household, but that this status implies a possibility for mistreatment. Doña Eustaquia added that she would rather have killed her dog than pass it to someone else, because new owners would be sure to treat it badly. I do not recall seeing dogs kicked, beaten or starved in LÍpez, as Andean ethnographers have recounted elsewhere, possibly because of the effort involved in acquiring them, but the possibility for mistreatment is present in people's imaginations. Recalling the journeys made by human souls after death, some authors specify that receiving help from dogs is conditional on having treated them well during life (Zuidema and Quispe 1968, 31)), and specify punishments for those who maltreat them (Gose 1994, 123, Valderrama and Escalante 1980, 258-60).

Anthropologists of other ethnographic regions explain why people treat dogs badly, drawing attention to canine habits that might be considered problematic (Laugrand and Oosten 2015, Losey, Wishart and Loovers (eds.) 2018), and Ellen 1999, 65). However, the possibilities lipeños perceive for their maltreatment in new households, as outsiders kept at a distance, recalls discussions of kinship, particularly affinity, in the Andes. Throughout the region, affines have ambivalent relations with the kin groups into which they are incorporated. Affinity is both necessary for regeneration but is simultaneously threatening to the kin-based family unit and affinal relations hold a potential for violence (Harvey 1994, 76). Urton views the in-law status as that of a useful stranger included in an inferior or servile position, but notes that outsiders are also necessary for the definition and continuance of the *ayllu*. (Urton 1991, 795).

In Pacariqtambo, Urton (1991, 802) notes that the differentiated social categories of *originario* and *forastero* (stranger) from colonial times are still visible in the present. This is not the case in Sud LÍpez. *Revisitas* (censuses) from nineteenth-century LÍpez show the presence of outsiders (*agregados*) who came to work the mines. In 1841, for example, the sole member of the Porco family is described as an *agregado* (ANB RV493 1841). However, by 1877 (AND RV 504 1877) his descendants are not differentiated from other *ayllu* members and everyone includes the present-day Porcos as *originarios*. Human outsiders can be assimilated in one or two generations. Dogs, however, never establish lineages and, unable to assimilate through ties to previous generations, they remain perpetual outsiders. However, it is through relations with external entities that the *ayllu* is shaped. The outsider status of dogs may relate to their important role in guiding souls of the newly dead through unknown territory and connect to how lipeños sought and appreciated my participation in rituals surrounding death, as both outsider and worker.

If a dog's position in a household is akin to that of wife's brother or son-in-law, from the perspective of a man, he is an included stranger, who could, like a human in-law, be a useful worker –perhaps a partner on a journey to the valley. The relation implies the dog should be male – a gendering supported lexically as Allen (2011, 56) notes when she records the Quechua noun (*suyt'u*) being used for the face of a dog, an elongated potato and a penis. Immature or effectively ungendered bitches pass unnoticed, but mature, reproductive females appear problematic. The extensive literature on gender in the Andes stresses complementarity and how some tasks are considered suitable for men and others for women (e.g. Allen 1988, 78-79). While women did accompany llama caravans to the valleys, journeys of exchange were considered principally male activities and a suitable working partner for a man would also be male, like his partner in reciprocal work (*ayni*) who might also be an in-law (Allen 1988, 86). The status of the dog as an affine, however, means that women are necessarily

involved in relations with dogs and, as noted above, usually cook for them. Some smaller dogs in LÍpez also seemed inseparable from their female owners.

Conclusions

Catherine Allen's comment that Andean dogs are "... insiders to the household whose business is to keep their distance, to whine and growl on the other side of the door," (Allen 2011, 54) captures an ambivalence in human-canine relations in Sud LÍpez. Don Mauricio needed to talk to me sensitively about my dog's fate, but his family had no particular qualms about killing her. This paper has attempted to examine the position of dogs in a llama-herding community through ethnographic observations in what Lestel et. al, (2006) terms a hybrid community, combined with a historical contextualisation of human-canine relations in the wider Andean region. I suggest that dogs in Sud LÍpez are perpetual strangers, with a ontological status distinct from that of the herd animals raised by lipeños, but further work is needed to explore how this status also help shape relations with herd animals..

A general historical purview suggests that human relations with dogs may have changed with the coming of Europeans. This suggestion finds some support in Downs (1960: 45-6) identification of a dichotomy between "European" and "Asian" attitudes towards dog domestication.¹¹ While Europeans bred and trained dogs for hunting, herding and hauling since ancient times, in Asia dogs scavenged on the fringes of human settlements. Pre-conquest Andean dogs may well have been hangers-on rather than workers. Nevertheless, this is an area requiring further investigation. Further research is also needed to extend the work on dogs in the Andes beyond this paper's ethnographic focus on Sud LÍpez.

Finally, I approached dogs in the Andes through recent trends in human-animal studies. Examining both hybrid communities and lipeño ontologies has been useful in thinking

through relations between herders and their dogs. Unsurprisingly, ‘dog’, like *mestizaje* and *originario* is an aggregate brought about through colonial encounters. Nonetheless, thinking about dogs has also involved revisiting some well-trodden paths of Andean ethnography – reciprocal labour, gender complementarity and affinity – and suggests that scrutinising human-animal relations in the Andes might have a wider contribution to make to studies of the region.

¹ I gave her the name Cindy, as I did not know her name initially.

² This applies also to cats, although few households kept cats in Sud LÍpez since rodents are not a problem. Lipeño cats tend to live short, unhealthy lives, struggling to survive on corn soup.

³ Canessa (2017, 16) asks whether “*in-ayllu*” is a phrase that Andean people use. My understanding is that de la Cadena attempts to express something understood and experienced by her research participants, but not necessarily articulated by them.

⁴ See Bolton (2010) on the meat of different animals in Sud LÍpez.

⁵ In a local myth, a man who kills a vicuña without real need wakes up to find he has sprouted horns on his head

⁶ Savalois et. al. (2013, 81) write that shepherds in the course of training sheep-dogs take care to use sheep habituated to being driven by a dog.

⁷ Freedman et. al. (2014) suggest that dogs and grey wolves have an extinct canine as a common ancestor.

⁸ Mendoza España and Valadez Azúa (2003) identify types of pre-Hispanic dog from Guaman Poma’s manuscript, but do not acknowledge that part of the manuscript depicts life in the Viceroyalty.

⁹ “... crían muy buenos perros cazadores, perdigueros y cazadores de venados y vicuñas, uanacos, carneros del monte, y perros cazadores y galgos pastores y cholos, perros de los Ingas, lo maten y lo acaben...” (Guaman Poma 1993 vol. 2, 697). The Royal Library of Denmark’s transcription

<http://www.kb.dk/permalink/2006/poma/865/en/text/> differs from Szeminski’s, showing that transcribers have struggled with the text. Having reviewed the online manuscript, I agree with Szeminski.

¹⁰ My thanks to the anonymous reviewer who suggested it could derive from the Nahuatl *Xoloitzcuintli* or *Xolo* for short, a hairless breed found in Mexico.

¹¹ My thanks to Tim Ingold for drawing my attention to Downs’ work.

References cited

- Allen, Catherine J. 2011. *Foxboy: Intimacy and Aesthetics in Andean Stories*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Archetti, Eduardo. 1997. *Guinea Pigs: Food, Symbol and Conflict of Knowledge in Ecuador*. Oxford: Berg.
- Asch, Barbara et.al. 2013. "Pre-Columbian origins of Native American dog breeds, with only limited replacement by European Dogs, confirmed by mtDNA analysis." *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 280: 20131142.
- Benson, Elizabeth. 1991. "The Chthonic Canine." *Latin American Indian Literature Journal* 7(1): 95-120.
- Berezkin, Yuri. 2005. "'The Black Dog at the River of Tears': Some Amerindian Representations of the Passage to the Land of the Dead and their Eurasian Roots." *Forum for Anthropology and Culture* 2: 130-168.
- Blaser, Mario. 2016. "Is Another Cosmopolitics Possible?" *Cultural Anthropology* 31(4): 545-570.
- Bolton, Maggie 2002 "Doing *Waki* in San Pablo de LÍpez: Reciprocity between the living and the dead." *Anthropos* 97(2): 379-396.
- Bolton, Maggie. 2006. "Genetic Defects or Generative Prototypes: Competing Models for Animal Improvement in Southern Bolivia." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 12(3): 531-549.

- Bolton, Maggie. 2010. "Healthy Meat and Natural Animals: Nature, Culture and Decolonizing Knowledge in Bolivia." In *Animals and Science: From Colonial Encounters to the Biotech Industry*, edited by Maggie Bolton and Cathrine Degnen, 169-195. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Bradshaw, John. 2012. *In Defence of Dogs: Why Dogs Need Our Understanding*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Canessa, Andrew. 2017. "Methods really do matter: A response to Marisol de la Cadena." *Hau: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 7(2): 15-17.
- Carsten, Janet. 2000. *Cultures of Relatedness: New Approaches to the Study of Kinship*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Castroviejo-Fisher, S. et. al. 2011. "Vanishing Native American dog lineages." *BMC Evol. Biol.* 11, 73 (doi: 10.1186/1471-2148-11-73).
- de la Cadena, Marisol. 2010. "Indigenous Cosmopolitics in the Andes: Conceptual Reflections beyond 'politics'." *Cultural Anthropology* 25(2): 334-370.
- de la Cadena, Marisol. 2014 "Runa: Human but *not only*." *Hau: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 4(2): 253-259.
- de la Cadena, Marisol. 2015. *Earth Beings: Ecologies of Practice across Andean Worlds*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Despret, Vinciane. 2004. "The Body We Care For: Figures of Anthro-zoo-genesis." *Body and Society* 10 (2-3): 111-134.

- Donaghue, M.J. 1985. "A Critique of the Biological Species Concept and Recommendations for a Phylogenetic Alternative." *The Bryologist* 88 (3): 172-181.
- Downs, J.F. (1960) "Domestication: an examination of the changing social relationships between man and animals'. *Kroeber Anthropology Society Papers* 22: 18-67.
- Dransart, Penelope. 2002. *Earth, Water, Fleece and Fabric*. London: Routledge.
- Dransart, Penelope. 2010. *Animals and their Possessions: Properties of Herd Animals in the Andes and Europe*." In *Animals and Science: From Colonial Encounters to the Biotech Industry*, edited by Maggie Bolton and Cathrine Degnen, 84-104. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Ellen, Roy. 1999. "Categories of Animality and Canine Abuse." *Anthropos* 94: 57-68.
- Flores Ochoa, Jorge. 1977. *Pastores de Puna: Uwywamichiq Punarunakuna*. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
- Freedman, Adam H. et. al. 2014. "Genome Sequencing Highlights the Dynamic Early History of Dogs." *PLoS Genetics* 10(1): e1004016.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1004016>
- Gose, Peter. 1994. *Deathly Waters and Hungry Mountains: Agrarian Ritual and Class Formation in an Andean Town*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Guaman Poma de Ayala, Felipe. 1993. *Nueva corónica y buen gobierno*. Forward by Franklin Pease, vocabulary and translations by Jan Szemínski. Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Haraway, Donna. 2008. *When Species Meet*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Hare, Brian and Michael Tomasello. 2005. "Human-like Social Skills in Dogs." *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 9(9): 439-444.
- Harris, Olivia. 1982. "The Dead and the Devils among the Bolivian Laymi." In *Death and the Regeneration of Life*, edited by M. Bloch and J. Parry, 45-73. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harris, Olivia. 1994. "Condor and Bull: The ambiguities of masculinity in Northern Potosí." In *Sex and Violence: Issues in Representation and Experience*, edited by P. Gow and P. Harvey, 70-96. London: Routledge.
- Harvey, Penelope. 1994. "Domestic Violence in the Peruvian Andes." In *Sex and Violence: Issues in Representation and Experience*, edited by P. Gow and P. Harvey, 66-89. London: Routledge.
- Ingold, Tim. 2013. "Anthropology Beyond Humanity." Edward Westermarck Memorial Lecture, May 2013. *Suomen Antropologi: Journal of the Finnish Anthropological Society* 38(3): 5-23.
- Kirksey, E. and S. Helmreich. 2010. "The Emergence of Multispecies Ethnography." *Cultural Anthropology* 25 (4): 545-576.
- Knight, John. 2005. *Animals in Person: Cultural Perspectives on Human-Animal Intimacy*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Kohn, Eduardo. 2013. *How Forests Think: Toward and Anthropology Beyond the Human*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Kohn, Eduardo. 2015. "Anthropology of Ontologies." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 44:311-327.
- Larson, G., Karlsson, E.K., Perri, A. et al. 2012. "Rethinking dog domestication by integrating genetics, archaeology, and biogeography." *PNAS* 109 (N 23): 8878-8883.
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1203005109>
- Las Casas, Bartolomé de. 1989. *Brevísima relación de la destrucción de las Indias*. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Laugrand, F. And Oosten. 2015. *Hunters, Predators and Prey: Inuit Perceptions of Animals*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Leonard, Jennifer A. et. al. 2002. "Ancient DNA Evidence for Old World Origin of New World Dogs." *Science* 298: 1613-1616.
- Lestel, Dominique. 1998. "How Chimpanzees have Domesticated Humans: Towards an anthropology of human-animal communication." *Anthropology Today* 14(3): 12-15.
- Lestel, Dominique, Florence Brunois and Florence Gaunet. 2006. "Ethno-ethnology and Ethno-ethology." *Social Science Information* 45 (2): 155-177.
- Losey, R., R. Wishart and J.P. Laurens Loovers. 2018. *Dogs in the North: Stories of Cooperation and Co-Domestication*, London, Routledge.
- Mendoza España, Velia and Raúl Valadez Azúa. 2003. "Los perros de Guaman Poma de Ayala: Visión actual del estudio del perro precolombino sudamericano." *AMMVEPE* 14(2), 43-52.

- Miklósi, A. et. al. 2003. "A simple reason for a big difference: wolves do not look back at humans, but dogs do." *Current Biology* 13(9): 763-6.
- Mitchell, P. 2017. "Disease: a hitherto unexplored constraint on the spread of dogs (*Canis lupus familiaris*)" in *Pre-Columbian South America. Journal of World Prehistory* DOI 10.1007/s10963-017-9111-x
- Mullin, Molly. 2002. "Animals and Anthropology." *Society and Animals* 10(4): 387-393.
- Nell, Cornelia. 2014. *The Foodpaths of Chawpirana People: An Ethnography of Living In-Betweenness in the Bolivian Andes*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Department of Social Anthropology, University of St Andrews.
- Nielsen, Axel. 1997-8. "Tráfico de caravanas en el sur de Bolivia: Observaciones etnográficas e implicancias arqueológicas." *Relaciones de la Sociedad Argentina de Antropología* Vol. XXII-XXIII: 139-178.
- Peirce, Charles. 1992. *The Essential Pierce: Selected Philosophical Writings* (2 volumes). Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Rosenfeld, Silvana. A. 2012. "Animal Wealth and Local Power in the Huari Empire." *Ñawpa Pacha* 32(1): 131-164.
- Salomon, Frank and George Urioste, eds. 1992. *The Huarochirí Manuscript: A Testament of Ancient and Colonial Andean Religion*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Savalois, Nathalie, Nicolas Lescureux and Florence Brunois. 2014. "Teaching the Dog and Learning from the Dog: Interactivity in Herding Dog Training and Use." *Anthrozoos* 26 (1): 77-91.

- Schwartz, Marion. 1997. *A History of Dogs in the Early Americas*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Stahl, P. 2003. "Pre_Columbian Andean animal domesticates at the edge of empire." *World Archaeology* 34: 470-483.
- Tomoeda, H. 1985. "The Llama is my Chakra: Metaphor of Andean Pastoralism.", In *Andean Ecology and Civilization: An interdisciplinary perspective on Andean ecological complementarity*, edited by Shozo Masuda, Izumi Shimada and Craig Morris. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.
- Urton, Gary 1991 "The Stranger in Andean Communities", in R. Thiercelin (ed.) *Cultures et sociétés Andes et Méso-Amérique: Mélanges en hommage a Pierre Duviols* vol. 2, Aix- en- Provence, Université de Provence.
- Valderrama, Ricardo and Carmen Escalante. 1980. "Apu Qorpuna: Visión del Mundo de los Muertos en la Comunidad de Awkimarka." *Debates en Antropología* 5: 233-64.
- Varner, J.G. and J. J. Varner. 1983. *Dogs of the Conquest*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Vega, Garcilaso de la. 1961. *The Incas: The Royal Commentaries of the Inca Garcilaso de la Vega 1539-1616*, translated by María Jolas. London: Cassell.
- Viveiros de Castro, Eduardo. 1998. "Cosmological Deixis and Amerindian Perspectivism." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 4(3): 469-488.

Zuidema, R.T and U. Quispe. 1968. "A Visit to God: The Account and Interpretation of a Religious Experience in the Peruvian Community of Choque-Huarcaya."

Anthropologica Vol. X: 22-39.