

CHAPTER 9

The Hedgehog from Jordan Or, How to Locate the Movement of Wild Animals in a Partially Mediterranean Context¹

Sarah Green

University of Helsinki

Abstract

This chapter considers Mediterranean crosslocations in terms of non-human animals. It begins with a hedgehog crossing the border between Jordan and Israel, and describes some of the ways it has been spatially located. One involves formal scientific classification systems: Latin naming conventions, concepts of habitat and ideas about indigeneity. The hedgehog's designated habitat overlaps with another locating system in the region, the state border territorial structure, which is not at all relevant to hedgehogs. A third layer is to consider how the hedgehog might fit into the idea of Mediterranean, to which the short answer is: awkwardly. The chapter then moves away from hedgehogs to briefly describe how people in different parts of the geographical Mediterranean have accounted for the dramatic rise in populations of wild boar in their area in recent years. Wild boar are among a number of animals that have suddenly appeared, or rapidly increased in number, in many

How to cite this book chapter:

Green, Sarah. 2022. 'The Hedgehog from Jordan: Or, How to Locate the Movement of Wild Animals in a Partially Mediterranean Context'. In *Locating the Mediterranean: Connections and Separations across Space and Time*, edited by Carl Rommel and Joseph John Viscomi, 199–221. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33134/HUP-18-9>.

areas in the geographical Mediterranean region. Looking at how people have accounted for this provides one way to briefly explore how the logic of locating regimes might be deployed to explain changes in the spatial presence of non-human animals.

Animal Locations

Non-human animals within the geographical Mediterranean region are located in a variety of ways, only one of which involves explicitly referring to them as Mediterranean animals. They could be referred to as invasive species (in which case they do not belong in the Mediterranean) or desert animals (which only partially overlaps with the Mediterranean). These are different ways of locating where animals belong that coexist, and spatially overlap with, the way that other kinds of things are located. For example, the habitat of an animal can stretch across several state borders, creating a ‘crosslocation’ of animal habitat and political borders. This chapter briefly unpacks the means by which animals are located within Euro-American scientific standards – i.e. the Linnaean classification system first developed in the 18th century in Northern Europe – and then looks at how that system coexists with other locating regimes, most particularly state border regimes, and the use of the idea of Mediterranean as a locating mechanism. I begin with an entirely insignificant event – a hedgehog crossing the Jordan–Israel border on a sunny day in 2019 – in order to explore the different logics used to spatially locate places (e.g. states) and things (e.g. hedgehogs), logics that often overlap and crosscut one another. This is followed by an exploration of what kind of locating practice is involved in the idea of Mediterranean and considers how the hedgehog might fit into that kind of locating regime. Finally, I briefly describe how people in different parts of the geographical Mediterranean have accounted for the dramatic rise in populations of wild boar in their area in recent years, in order to explore how they draw on diverse locating logics in order to make sense of the new way in which the wild boar have made their presence felt. I suggest that the key element many people draw upon in this process is to locate the newly arrived animals into one or more power structures that create certain kinds of connections, separations, and hierarchies in their region: in crosslocations terms, the wild boar are located through drawing upon one or more locating regimes and fitting their new use of location into it. I will begin with the hedgehog.

Taxonomies

On a warm day in June 2019, a hedgehog crossed the border from Jordan into Israel, made its way to a spare flowerpot that was lying outside a house in a kibbutz about 30 kilometres north of Eilat, and then promptly snuggled into it (see [Image 9.1](#)). Nobody was concerned. Nor have hedgehogs attracted a great deal of attention in anthropology; when they are mentioned, it is usually a metaphorical reference to a comparison between foxes and hedgehogs first made by Archilochos and then made famous by Isaiah Berlin: ‘a fox knows many things, but a hedgehog one important thing’ (Berlin 1954; Carrithers 2005, 582; Jung 1987, 322). Viveiros de Castro mentioned the fact that hedgehogs were used as footballs in *Alice in Wonderland* (Viveiros de Castro 2015, 14–15); Mike Michael mentioned them in some research on roadkill (Michael 2004).



Image 9.1: Hedgehog from Jordan, June 2019.

Photo: Joan Neiberg.

Although these references only mention hedgehogs in generic terms, it is almost certain that the animal they had in mind is the European hedgehog, named *Erinaceus europaeus* within the Linnaean taxonomic system. There are currently 17 types (species) of hedgehog listed within that classification system, subdivided into five genera (*Atelerix*, *Erinaceus*, *Hemiechinus*, *Mesechinus*, and *Paraechinus*). Yet almost all references to hedgehogs in Euro-American literature, including Beatrix Potter's Mrs Tiggly-winkle, actually mean *Erinaceus europaeus* (or *Ee* for short), rather than any of the other 16 species.² This is not surprising, as *Ee* was the original model for the generic idea of hedgehog-ness, as it were: Linnaeus himself named *Ee* in 1758, in the tenth edition of *Systema Naturae* – the same edition that introduced the binomial (genus and species) nomenclature system for animals (Linné 1758). Thereafter, all animals found around the world that were deemed to be sufficiently similar to *Ee*, according to the criteria set out by the Linnaean taxonomic system, were classified as belonging to the same group: the family Erinaceidae, which also includes moonrats (they look like hedgehogs, but have no spines), and the subfamily Erinaceinae (named by Gotthelf Fischer von Waldheim in 1814), which contains only hedgehogs. These 17 variations of the 'same' creature are not to be confused with porcupines, which belong to the order of rodents, taxonomically speaking; nor should they be confused with the lesser hedgehog tenrec (*Echinops telfairi*) or greater hedgehog tenrec (*Setifer setosus*), which are endemic to Madagascar and are not hedgehogs at all, according to the taxonomic system, even though they are called hedgehogs in English, since they look quite a lot like *Ee*. The taxonomic system is all about establishing similarities and differences that make a difference within the logic of Linnaean taxonomy. That logic also draws strongly on certain understandings of location in its classification practices, particularly through concepts of indigeneity, habitat, and niche – in what one critical animal geographer has referred to as 'a gigantic act of enclosure'.³

The hedgehog that crossed the border from Jordan to Israel and nestled into a flowerpot in a kibbutz on that day in June 2019 was not an *Ee* hedgehog but an example of one given the taxonomic name *Paraechinus aethiopicus* (or *Pa* for short). In contemporary terms, the name is a little misleading, as *Pa*'s listed habitat covers most of North Africa and all of the Arab world but is not listed as existing in today's Ethiopia (Amori et al. 2012). The locational reference for *Pa*'s name,

‘aethiopicus’, is a reference to Aethiopia, which was a rather vaguely located place that occasionally appeared in classical history. The historian Herodotus discussed Aethiopia several times and, to him, the area was located directly south of Egypt, which would place it in contemporary Sudan (Godley 1975 [1920], 299). Earlier classical references placed Aethiopia to the east of the Nile and up to the Red Sea. My point is that the German naturalist who classified and named *Pa* in 1832, a man called Christian Gottfried Ehrenberg, who made a scientific expedition to North Africa and the East Mediterranean in the early 1820s, took the locational name from his reading of classical history, and not from whatever names such animals might have been given by people living in the regions that he visited.⁴ The main point was to create a non-local, universal, standardised nomenclature that could be used anywhere, with the implication that this system would describe an objective and timeless reality. Yet the use of classical history to name a location also reveals that all standards have histories and come from somewhere in particular – in this case, from late-19th-century Northern Europe (Lampland and Star 2009, 14).

In any case, whether or not these hedgehogs live in today’s Ethiopia, they certainly live in Jordan,⁵ and on that day in June one of these little creatures walked across the Jordanian border to an Israeli kibbutz, which is, by all accounts, quite a common occurrence.⁶

The point of that lengthy and technical description of a non-event was to demonstrate the historically and epistemologically contingent process of describing locations – in this case, of a hedgehog that was on the move. I described two ways to locate *Pa*’s place in the world: the Linnaean taxonomic system, which embeds within it the concepts of habitat, niche, and indigeneity; and the fact that *Pa* crossed a state border, drawing on modern state territorial border logic. These two locating systems coexist in parallel rather than in conflict: it does not matter that *Pa*’s habitat crosscuts a range of political borders: the borders are not built for hedgehogs. Of course, there are other occasions when the crossing of animal habitats and political borders do cause problems – for example, in the Pyrenees, where policies involving national parks and the protection of wildlife come into direct conflict with the interests of livestock farmers living in the same areas (Vaccaro and Beltran 2009). The same can be said of trouble involving wild boar, as I describe further below. The key issue here is that coexisting classification systems that locate things differently (state borders, animal habi-

tats) do not necessarily cause conflicts, even when they overlap in the same geographical spaces. The particular political border *Pa* crossed on that day had been through a number of transitions during the 20th century: British, French, Palestinian, Egyptian, Jordanian, and Israeli interests jostled for space around there at various different moments and with varying degrees of violence (Robins 2004). Yet *Pa*'s designated habitat remained the same throughout, and neither she nor any other hedgehogs were prevented from crossing whatever new political borders were being created there at any given moment.

Nevertheless, all that political jostling was significant for *Pa*'s naming and the classification of her location, including that location being given a name that came from classical history, which was something of an obsession in European scientific circles at the time. North European involvement in, and agreements concerning, this region made it not only possible for people such as Ehrenberg to travel to the region in the 1820s so he could collect specimens of *Pa*; in addition, the whole idea of going off on expeditions to discover and classify things according to this logic also provided the motivation and resources for Ehrenberg to do so. Along with many other European explorers, Ehrenberg collected all kinds of samples, both of plants and animals, and then returned to Europe to analyse, sort, and order them, and then give them Linnaean taxonomic names. The naming marked a scientific discovery.

In other words, my description of *Pa*'s name, movements, and location have their roots in historically and geographically specific understandings of location, both for the animal's habitat and for the territory (Elden 2013). And it is important to note that the Linnaean taxonomic system has been regularly challenged, despite having been globally adopted. Rousseau went out of his way to challenge it, and, perhaps most famously, Goethe questioned the whole underlying premise of Linnaean taxonomy: rather than rely on a static system of fixed similarities and differences, as Linnaeus did, Goethe began from the premise that all living entities are constantly in a process of transformation and change, so that a static classification system was actually wrong-headed (Larson 1967). Thus the historical and epistemological contingency of these descriptions means it could have been otherwise: there have been other ways to classify and organise political and legal territoriality, and there have been other ways to understand hedgehogs and their habitats.⁷ Still, *Paraechinus aethiopicus* (*Pa*) is in practice the contemporary formal taxonomic name of that hedgehog and the same

Latin name is used throughout the world in all languages, irrespective of whatever she is called locally, and irrespective of how people in the area might classify her, how they might understand her association with the local area, or how they might understand her character (her hedgehog-ness, as it were).⁸ And the border between Jordan and Israel that *Pa* crossed is a political border that belongs to an historically specific way to classify territory and establish political and legal powers over particular patches of the earth, and one that is currently the internationally agreed standard for doing so. It could have been otherwise, but it ended up this way.

Mediterranean Partial Locations

So, how does the Mediterranean fit into this story? As [Chapter 1](#) in this volume outlines, the classification of the Mediterranean has undergone a variety of transformations, giving the word shifting meaning and significance. As Rommel and Viscomi note, a key part of this has been movement from Braudel's understanding of Mediterranean as a process to drawing more on Horden and Purcell's approach of regarding Mediterranean as being characterised by its connections as well as being a process. These shifts have specific histories associated with perspectives that could loosely be described as Euro-American modern and, more recently, postmodern, perspectives. Anthropologists have of course engaged in those debates as much as classicists, historians and political scientists.⁹ Critiques often suggest that there is something partial about earlier understandings of Mediterranean – that such accounts are both incomplete and describe things from a particular vantage point or perspective.¹⁰ All-encompassing accounts are often replaced by ones that are multiple, generating a sense of ongoing change and transformation, or ones that reject the idea that there is some-*thing* to discuss at all: the Mediterranean as an intellectual invention, or as no longer having relevance, whether or not it is a process of shifting connections.

The approach within this volume comes closer to one that suggests ongoing change and transformation, but with an additional twist: that the changes stop and start, and that they are not random; that disconnections, separations, and fragmentations are often as relevant as connections in understanding how the process of ongoing change works. That focus on disconnection as well as connection places emphasis

on the hierarchical and power-inflected way that differences between people and places are effected, which is anything but random.

There are three implications here that are worth making explicit. The first is that it is probably not helpful to search for a final answer to the Mediterranean, as the question appears to be scale- and context-dependent, both across time and space. The second is that different understandings of Mediterranean have held purchase within different disciplines, which means that diverse meanings coexist within scholarship as well as across the geographical Mediterranean region. For example, ecosystems researchers have linked together parts of the world that have ‘Mediterranean-type’ environmental conditions, which includes parts of Chile, California, and Australia (Esler, Jacobsen, and Pratt 2018). In that account, Mediterranean could be geographically located anywhere in the world: so long as certain ecological conditions are present, it is a Mediterranean location. The historically contingent issue there is to note that such ecosystems are called Mediterranean-type rather than, for example, California-type ecosystems: just as the first hedgehog to be taxonomically classified was a European one, the Mediterranean ecosystem provides the model for the rest of the world. The third implication is that, despite all that diversity and complexity, there are non-random and deliberate ways in which ‘the’ Mediterranean has been made to appear, and that these can have both trivial and serious material effects for people.

Collectively, all of this makes it tempting to understand Mediterranean in the same way that Janet Carsten understands kinship: by considering how the concept is meaningful for particular people and at particular moments, fully abandoning the 19th-century view from nowhere (Carsten 1995, 236). That approach, which is highly familiar in anthropology (looking for ethnographic meaning, which is by definition relative and context-dependent), is certainly worthwhile, and has resulted in excellent contributions to understanding the Mediterranean within the discipline (e.g. Herzfeld 2005; Ben-Yehoyada 2017). At the same time, even ethnographic meaning focuses on questions of what things are – or, at least, a sense of their value. While keeping the idea of focusing on the relative (and often hierarchical) value involved, I am instead, and drawing on the crosslocations approach, shifting my attention to location rather than identity: looking at how Mediterranean is deployed as a way to relatively locate things, which coexists with other ways to locate things. This approach emphasises relative

locations (where something is located relative to its connections to and disconnections from other locations) rather than identities (what something is, as such), and it focuses on the coexistence of a range of different ways to locate things rather than only one. And that allows a focus on the dynamics of connections and separations, both within and across different logics. This does not replace research on identities; instead, by shifting attention to location, something can be added to the debate, something that concerns the dynamics of connections and separations between different ways of ascribing things a place in the world.¹¹

The example I have been using is the coexistence of a logic informing the creation of political state borders (in this case, Israel and Jordan), and a North European 18th-century taxonomic system that names and spatially locates living entities, including hedgehogs (in this case, *Paraechinus aethiopicus*). So, the next question to be addressed is: how does Mediterranean as a way of locating things come into the story of animals moving across a landscape that is criss-crossed with several different locating regimes?

In the case of *Pa*, the short answer is: indirectly. *Pa*'s Mediterranean location is a rather small and not very explicit part of her story; although she is found in many areas that are described as being part of the geographical Mediterranean, including a portion of southern Israel, a thin strip along the coasts of Egypt and Libya, and then in wider strips along northern Algeria, Tunisia, and Morocco, the bulk of her designated habitat covers almost the entirety of the Arabian Peninsula, all of Jordan, some of Syria and Iraq, and the Western Sahara, plus a small population further south in Sudan, none of which are included in the geographical Mediterranean. And, in practice, *Pa* is not classified as a Mediterranean animal; her most common non-Latin name is 'desert hedgehog'. The desert is an environment that also straddles the border between Mediterranean and that which is not Mediterranean; desert points towards the 'tug-of-war' Herzfeld has referred to between imagining Mediterranean as the birthplace of Western civilisation while simultaneously being Middle Eastern (Herzfeld 2014). *Pa* is somewhere in between there, and, perhaps significantly, her habitat does not include anywhere in the north Mediterranean, the part of the region most often referred to as Southern Europe.

Here, it is worth briefly noting the well-known hierarchies involved in evoking the word Mediterranean, ones that assert and ascribe a

sliding scale of relative values to different parts of the Mediterranean, and which clearly distinguish between the locations that surround the Mediterranean Sea: North Africa, Southern Europe, and the eastern shores, which are variously called Mediterranean, eastern Mediterranean, Near East and Middle East. The explicit assertion of being Mediterranean – what Herzfeld refers to as ‘Mediterraneanism’ (Herzfeld 2005, 2014) – is often an intentional political project, one that aims to generate certain distinct associations with some places (e.g. Europe) and separations from others (e.g. the Middle East and North Africa).

This dynamic has been noted in many places, but perhaps most particularly in Israel (Ohana 2011). Monterescu and Handel, in a recent study of the use of the concept of ‘terroir’ for Israeli viticulture, argue that, ‘[s]eeking to “undo Palestine,” [Israeli terroir] steps over the Arab Middle East by conjuring up the Mediterranean as a gateway to the global market and to cultural normalcy’ (Monterescu and Handel 2020, 255). Herzfeld, in a commentary on architectural styles deployed in Israel, suggests that evoking Mediterranean helped to resolve ‘a conflict between romantic Orientalism on the one hand and the Eurocentric fear of cultural absorption into something “Middle Eastern” on the other. In that tension, appealing to a Mediterranean identity ... offered a relatively cosmopolitan compromise’ (Herzfeld 2014, 125).

Clearly, there are stakes involved in locating a place as Mediterranean, which requires some deliberate performative effort in Israel to balance the desert against the vineyards. As noted by Hirsch in her study of the development of a hummus ‘cult’ in Israel, this does not necessarily mean entirely rejecting the Arab world (Hirsch 2011) but it does require generating a clear separation, a difference that makes a difference (Bateson 1972, 453). *Pa*, located as a desert animal, exists only on one side of that difference; yet, as a hedgehog, she is classified as belonging to a family of animals that also belong entirely to the other side: the other species of hedgehogs, who are in the family Erinaceidae and the subfamily Erinaceinae, and, particularly, Mrs Tiggy-winkle, *Erinaceus europaeus*, the European hedgehog that Linnaeus himself named. In that sense, *Pa* can be located as being at the heart of Mediterranean: by being labelled a desert hedgehog, she is distinguished from the European hedgehog but she belongs to the same family (literally). It depends on the locating regime and how you read it.

Locating Wild Boar

Speaking of deserts, issues relating to the environment regularly come up in discussions of Mediterranean things, and are often even given a determining status. It is as if the topography, climate, and soils explain everything (a particularly good example is McNeill 1992). Braudel devoted over 270 pages to discussing the Mediterranean's environment, climate, topography and the like, and Horden and Purcell embedded the idea of 'micro-ecologies' into their entire framework for understanding Mediterranean: a place that combined 'easy seaborne communications with a quite unusually fragmented topography of microregions' (Horden and Purcell 2000, 5). In both of these studies, the physical characteristics of the Mediterranean are key aspects of the dynamics of the place. Interestingly, these descriptions rarely describe wild animals. Both Braudel (1995) and Horden and Purcell (2000) passed over wildlife with almost no comment, except occasional mentions of hunting.

Among the animals hunted in the 16th century were wild boar, which can live in a wide variety of environments and are known to be exceptionally adaptable. That makes them potentially troublesome animals, as they are highly capable of interfering with human activity: a crossing of paths that disturbs. And indeed, in recent years, wild boar in all parts of the geographical Mediterranean and also in many other parts of the world, including North America (both the US and Canada), have been causing trouble.¹² There has been a very significant increase in their numbers in recent years, along with their appearance in towns and cities, and they regularly dig up land searching for roots, often destroying lawn and other plants, and they are capable of eating, or at least destroying, entire fields of crops in one night. The animals in question, which again Linnaeus himself named in 1758 as *Sus scrofa*, is taxonomically the same as the domesticated pig, which is named as a subspecies: *Sus scrofa domesticus* (named by Johann Christian Polycarp Erxleben in 1777).

This capacity for animals to be adaptable, especially their capacity to move out of what is classified as their indigenous habitats and into some other place, can lead to a particularly negative classification: 'invasive species'. That concept combines the classificatory logic of habitat with the political border logic of territories, generating an idea of territorial transgression that has long been associated with

colonial, nationalist, and racist approaches towards questions of location.¹³ Whether or not the wild boar appearing in ever greater numbers across the geographical Mediterranean region count as ‘invasive’ depends on who you ask: some argue that the animals are the same species that always existed in the area anyway; others suggest they are a new species that came in from somewhere else; some extend the idea of ‘invasive’ to mean transgressive, by moving into somewhere they have no right to be (cities, cultivated fields, etc.). The media regularly carry stories about wild boar ‘trashing’ places, even in cities, around the entire region.¹⁴

In any case, while I was carrying out some preliminary ethnographic research in 2019 and early 2020 on the transportation of livestock across the Mediterranean region, as well as looking into efforts to track wild animals and manage the spread of zoonotic disease, just about every veterinarian, zoological researcher, agriculture ministry official, farmer, animal trader, and hunter that I met spontaneously mentioned a huge increase in the numbers of wild boar in their region in recent years. This has also been noticed by the officials in the European Union, which has funded a substantial project called ENETWILD, which in 2019 was specifically focusing on the wild boar issue.¹⁵

Here, it is worth noting that there is an increasing trend among animal geographers to remove the nature–culture border between cities and countryside and insist that cities are also, normally and as a matter of course, wild animal habitats. Indeed, Jennifer Wolch, in noting that cities have always contained a wide variety of non-human animals, has called for an *Anima Urbis* movement, which regards urban environments to be as much non-human animal environments as they are human ones (Wolch 2002). This is an idea that encompasses most of the critiques of zoos, gardens, nature–culture distinctions, and classificatory constraints that usually accompany this approach of blurring the lines between human and non-human. In particular, critiques question the way such places (zoos, gardens, etc.) generate clear spatial separations between wild, natural, and cultural, arguing that 18th-century thinking on such matters in fact imposed those separations, rather than reflecting them. In effect, the argument is that Linnaean classificatory logic generated these different locations (by creating distinctions using a particular logic), rather than recording them.

A similar argument is made by Irus Braverman in her study of three zoos separated by three different kinds of border regime in Israel–Pal-

estine (Braverman 2013). In an account that is quite similar to the earlier studies I mentioned on Mediterraneanism, Braverman demonstrates a deep level of intertwining of political, religious, and classificatory logic that plays out in the connections and separations between these zoos. The work of researchers such as Wolch and Braverman argues that 18th- and 19th-century scholars were strongly influenced by the idea of the human–animal distinction, a distinction that some argue has been crucial to Euro-American ideas of both civility and sovereignty.¹⁶ In that sense, the classification of animals and attempts to contain them in zoos, which after the 1750s became repositories for keeping all the specimens being collected from around the world, as well as showcasing the colonial and modern mastery of the natural world (Urbanik 2012, 78), was never entirely successful. Apart from the fact that animals would quite often get out of their zoos, there were also always animals that were out anyway. These borders were never intended for the animals, as such.¹⁷

So perhaps the wild boar were always there. In any case, looked at from the perspective of location, many comments I received from people in my travels around the geographical Mediterranean were not quite in line with the idea of the need to maintain a distinction between places that animals belong and human places. Instead, people most often discussed how the wild boar arrived: stories about how something or someone, somewhere, had either accidentally or deliberately arranged things so that the boar would move into certain spaces.

Penny Johnson provides a similar report from the West Bank (Johnson 2019). Johnson devotes an entire chapter of her book to ‘A conspiracy of wild boars’ (Chapter 6). She received repeated reports from Palestinian farmers whose crops were being regularly destroyed by the animals that the Israeli settlers were dumping the boar onto Palestinian lands. Johnson herself argued that, whether or not that occurred, Israelis’ habit of building walls and boundaries, and dumping raw sewage into the rivers and onto the landscape, probably contributed considerably to attracting the animals and changing where they travelled. Johnson points out that Palestinians’ knowledge of powerful human forces causing bad effects in the area could easily be turned into a convincing theory that the boar had also been deliberately placed so as to cause maximum damage to Palestinians.

During my own brief visit to Israel–Palestine in March 2019, the wild boar issue was raised as well. One of the Israeli government’s

representatives of the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE), a veterinarian, suggested that a considerable number of wild boar were coming across to Israel from Jordan; he also suggested that these animals were the source of the spread of various diseases to domestic livestock (sheep and goats, mostly) on the Israeli side. This was one of several occasions during my travels that the crossing of state borders was brought into the discussion. The Israeli veterinarian believed that the surveillance and management of infectious animal diseases were not nearly as good on the Jordanian side of the border, which had bad consequences for Israel, as the animals wandered across the border and spread their diseases there. The stark difference between that and the accounts given by Palestinians speaking to Johnson give a fairly good impression of what kinds of locational threats each was concerned about.

A different account was provided by an Israeli activist working on behalf of the Bedouin. She had spent decades campaigning to try to reverse the illegal building of Israeli settlements on Bedouin grazing lands in the West Bank. She also campaigned to try to prevent the ‘boxing in’ of the Bedouin, which stopped them from travelling the routes that they once did with their camels, goats, and sheep. She believed, as did those who spoke to Penny Johnson, that the wild boar had been deliberately released by settlers into the Bedouin grazing lands in order to drive the Bedouin away. The several Bedouin whom I met during that short trip, both in the West Bank and in the Negev Desert, did not spontaneously mention any trouble with wild boar. Instead, they focused squarely on the difficulties they confronted in their efforts to move across the landscape with their animals (goats, sheep, and camels), which nowadays involves the crossing of multiple highly securitised borders, and the fact that, when their animals wandered out of their designated areas, they were frequently confiscated or even shot by the authorities (a point that Johnson also mentions). This is an obvious example of how two different locating logics contradict one another: the one involving animal herding and the routes developed by Bedouin to move their animals across the landscape with the seasons; and the second involving state borders and other kinds of political territorial barriers that crosscut them in a way that prevented or deterred movement of any animals.

Beyond the Israel–Palestine region, in Lebanon in July 2019, a researcher who specialised in studying small mammals (fruit bats and

mice, mostly) suggested that the wild boar had been introduced to Lebanon for recreational hunting, and that it had got out of hand because of the lack of goats and sheep on the hills. He added that the dramatic drop in the number of wolves in Lebanon in recent years had also meant that the wild boar could breed unhindered. He further believed there were several 'non-indigenous' species of wild boar in the area as a result of them being introduced by humans. And, as an afterthought, he suggested that the number of wolves and jackals were now increasing again in Lebanon, perhaps because of the rise in numbers of wild boar.

A different suggestion was made by a veterinarian who ran a veterinary surgery and supplies shop in Beirut, and who was a specialist in artificial insemination for cattle. While he himself agreed with the small mammal researcher's explanation for the rise in wild boar numbers, he also recounted a conspiracy theory he had heard from some of his customers. This was a variation on the theme reported by Palestinian farmers: the theory was that Israelis were gathering up wild boar on their side of the border, sedating them with alpha-chloralose, and then dumping the sleeping boar on the Lebanese side of the border. The veterinarian grinned, and added that, of course, he did not believe that story, despite providing highly specific information on the drug used to allegedly sedate the animals.

In all these reports, a sense of the tensions created by overlapping locations that are crosscut by power-inflected hierarchies is palpable: people locate the wild boar within a dense interspersing of different ways of managing, controlling, and subdividing the landscape, and unsurprisingly conclude that those with the greatest power are the ones who are probably controlling the new appearance of any animals in the area.

Although the story was somewhat different, a similar dynamic appeared in a remote part of Calabria in July of 2019, where wild boar were not only pottering around local towns and villages, particularly at night and when piglets had recently been born, but they were also causing 'havoc' in the rural areas, according to a local vet who also bred domestic pigs. The vet said they dug up fields, damaged trees and walls, and generally created a mess. He commented that he had to give up growing maize because the boar ate it all. A local landowner in the same small town, along with a number of others, suggested that the wild boar had been deliberately introduced to the area by wealthy

investors in order to cause so much destruction that the value of the land would drop, so the investors could buy it all up at a bargain price and make a huge profit out of developing the land. One of them commented that these new wild boar were not the same species as the local wild boar, suggesting that they were bigger and bred much faster than their 'local' boar. This assertion might have been related to the widespread belief that part of the town had been deliberately permitted to fall into disrepair so that it could be cleared and developed for profit. Someone else in the town suggested that the wild boar had been introduced in order to develop hunting tourism in the area (as was also suggested in Lebanon), but the plan had gone wrong and the boar were now running amok.

A similar story about hunting development was recounted in Epirus in north-western Greece, which I visited in March 2020 (just before the Covid-19 lockdown in most of Europe). A national parks officer there reported that wild boar had been introduced to encourage recreational hunting, but little hunting had occurred, and so the boar population had got out of hand. I was aware that, indeed, there had been such a plan to develop wild boar hunting in Epirus, as I happened to have been researching in the area in the early 2000s when a wild boar sanctuary was being built there with EU funding (Green 2005, 240–42). However, the story at that time was that the wild boar were indigenous to the area, rather than being introduced, and the sanctuary was to encourage an increase in their numbers.

A sheep and goat pastoralist from the Pogoni area of Epirus, a Sarakatsani man who had been practising pastoralism in the area for decades, had a somewhat different story. He suggested that the wild boar had increased because of the decline of sheep and goat pastoralism in the area, which had given the wild boar much more space in which to breed and thrive. He also suggested that the wild boar were not the same animals as they had been years ago – not because new species had been introduced but because the local wild boar had crossbred with domestic pigs. It was only in recent decades that pig farming had become big business in the region and, inevitably, some of these farm animals had escaped from the farm and bred with wild boar. This, he said, had resulted in a considerable improvement in the reproductive capacity of the wild boar: the domestic pigs had been specially bred to produce as many piglets as possible, and to be able to have more than

one litter per year. As a result, the wild boar's reproductive capacities were also much improved.

Combining all these explanations together – along with many similar ones I heard during my visits to various parts of the geographical Mediterranean – it is possible to generate a clear sense of what people cared about, and how they understood the location dynamics of these wild boar. While many people suggested the boar might be 'invasive' or at least not local, that idea was not connected to the agency of the animals themselves but to the actions of some powerful group of people. Either by accident or design, some humans had unleashed these highly annoying and destructive creatures into the landscape. People attempted to fit the boar into the variety of locating processes that they felt were responsible for how things ended up where they did around their area. Nobody believed that the wild boar had appeared randomly or entirely by their own agency; all accounts assumed that there was some kind of change in the engagement between people and the landscape that led to the wild boar either to move in, or to increase in numbers. Some suggested that powerful people, or wealthy people, or familiar enemies from across the border, were behind it; others suggested that a series of transformations – such as the growth of pig farming in Epirus – had the unintended effect of increasing the birth rate of the wild boar. People did not focus on nature–culture divisions or urban–rural divisions; rather, the discussions focused mostly on the experience that these animals were creating a mess that local residents found difficult, costly, and annoying. And, in attempting to account for their presence, people drew on the dynamics of different locating regimes – the operations of various types of economic power; or the logic of ecology, in which an imbalance caused in one part of the ecosystem (e.g. the removal of sheep and goat pastoralism from the mountains) will result in a compensation in another part (the increase in wild boar); or the operations of political border regimes (wild boar coming from Jordan, or being spread by Israeli settlers, or being dumped in Lebanon by Israelis). In that sense, these accounts could all be described as people's experiences and understanding of the workings of coexisting locating regimes: a means to try to understand where the boar came from by locating them within those power dynamics.

Conclusion

Wild boar, like desert hedgehogs, are to be found in the geographical Mediterranean region, though they have not been marked out as being stereotypically Mediterranean animals: they have not been drawn into Mediterraneanist efforts to create particular hierarchies, relative values between locations, or particular connections and separations between them. Instead, they have been located by people according to a variety of coexisting logics of where things are in the world, and how they got there. *Pa* passes mostly unnoticed, and only appears to be firmly located through her names – as *Paraechinus aethiopicus*, which locates her within a taxonomic system invented by North Europeans; as a desert hedgehog, which places her on one side of a particular internal division within Mediterraneanist discourse; and as a hedgehog, which means, in taxonomic family terms, she belongs on all sides of the Mediterranean and beyond. Nobody suspects that *Pa* has crossed the Jordan–Israel border because of some kind of deliberate or accidental action; her location coexists in parallel with other locating regimes in the area. In contrast, the wild boar, whose numbers have been dramatically increasing over the last few years to the consternation of just about everybody, has been identified as being considerably more transgressive. And, rather than place the blame on the boar for this trouble, people have looked to human intervention, and identified a variety of dynamics that have either reflected or created hierarchies, connections, and separations across the landscape that the wild boar have either exploited or been pushed into deliberately. Their location is not accidental in the way that *Pa*'s appears to be; instead, the wild boar are caught up in conflicting locating regimes, and their transgression of other people's places, as well as the mess that they cause, are placed firmly in the hands of those who control locating dynamics in the area. Through exploring how these two creatures have been drawn into these dynamics, and the way that people make sense of their locations in the world, I have tried to provide a brief glimpse of crosslocations at work.

Notes

- 1 The research for this chapter has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement no 694482, Crosslocations, <https://www2.helsinki.fi/en/researchgroups/crosslocations>, last accessed 4.4.2022). I am grateful to the anonymous reviewers of this volume for their helpful comments, which have improved this chapters considerably – most particularly Reviewer 1, who identified a slippage in language in the previous version of this chapter regarding the concept of relations and separations.
- 2 *E. europaeus* is the more common way of abbreviating taxonomic names, but that is still overly long in my view.
- 3 Michael J. Watts in Philo and Wilbert (2000, 292).
- 4 Souguir-Omrani et al. (2018); Beck (2018, 100).
- 5 Archaeological research confirms that hedgehogs have been around the area of Jordan for a very long time (Byrd 1989).
- 6 I am very grateful to Ruth Mandel, who sent me a photograph of *Pa*, taken by her sister. Permission received to reproduce it here.
- 7 Bolton and Degnen (2010); Fairchild (2003); Foucault (1974); Gilfoyle, Brown, and Beinart (2009); Goldman (1991); Haraway (1988); Law and Mol (2003); Poovey (1998).
- 8 Bolton and Degnen's edited volume *Animals and Science* provides a range of excellent examples of the way that scientific classification of animals both contradict other ways that people understand them and have often been used for political and economic ends (Bolton and Degnen 2010).
- 9 Bechev and Nicolaidis (2010); Ben-Yehoyada (2017); Braudel (1995); Herzfeld (1984); Mitchell (2002); Petri (2016); Pina-Cabral (1989); Bromberger (2006).
- 10 Examples of such critiques include Herzfeld (1980, 1984); Pina-Cabral (1989); Giaccaria and Minca (2011); Bechev and Nicolaidis (2010); Mitchell (2002).
- 11 I am avoiding the term 'relations' so as not to cause confusion between 'connection' and 'relation' in this context. While often used interchangeably in English, in this chapter the difference is important. My focus is on classification systems and how their logics generate separate and distinct locations – ones that often overlap and coexist. I am not concerning myself with the subtler question of whether these classification systems imply autonomous entities in which relations are created between them; or, alternatively, whether such classification systems imply that entities come into being through their relations (see Strathern 2020 for a richly described analysis of this distinction). That is a different question from the one I am addressing here. I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer who pointed out the slippage in my language in a previous version of this chapter.
- 12 See, for example, Weeks and Packard (2009); Gren et al. (2020); Sordi (2020); Toger et al. (2018). See also regular media reports on the wild boar issue – for example, <https://undark.org/2020/09/14/feral-pig-swine-bomb-ontario-montana> (accessed 30 December 2021) and <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/animals/article/huge-feral-hogs-swine-spreading-through-north-canada?fbclid=IwAR05Cx FtKkN7UwRAjpaHzfVycJaBKhuNx67FsWM-BXkJuBsqt-5P9oGUJ8ZI> (accessed 30 December 2021).

- 13 See, for example Comaroff (2017); Comaroff and Comaroff (2001); Franklin (2006); Vaccaro and Beltran (2009); Wolch (2002).
- 14 <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/jul/30/boar-wars-how-wild-hogs-are-trashing-european-cities> (accessed 1 June 2020).
- 15 <https://enetwild.com/the-project> (accessed 1 June 2020).
- 16 Vaughan-Williams (2015, 87–93); Derrida (2009).
- 17 In recent years, there has been an increased use of GIS technologies to track where animals actually go when left to their own devices (Cheshire and Uberti 2017). That is leading to considerable revision of concepts of habitat: the findings not only suggest that many earlier assumptions were inaccurate; they also suggest a high level of variation across space and time, and a tendency for animals to take a number of issues into account in deciding how, when, and where to move – not all of which are related to food, shelter, or safety.

References

- Amori, Giovanni, Sabrina Masciola, Jenni Saarto, Spartaco Gippoliti, Carlo Rondinini, Federica Chiozza, and Luca Luiselli. 2012. 'Spatial Turnover and Knowledge Gap of African Small Mammals: Using Country Checklists as a Conservation Tool'. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 21 (7): 1755–93. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-012-0275-5>
- Bateson, Gregory. 1972. *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. Chicago, IL, and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Bechev, Dimitar, and Kalypso Nicolaidis, eds. 2010. *Mediterranean Frontiers: Borders, Conflict and Memory in a Transnational World*. London: Tauris Academic Studies.
- Beck, Lothar A., ed. 2018. *Zoological Collections of Germany: the Animal Kingdom in Its Amazing Plenty at Museums and Universities*. Cham: Springer International.
- Ben-Yehoyada, Naor. 2017. *The Mediterranean Incarnate: Region Formation Between Sicily and Tunisia since World War II*. Chicago, IL, and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Berlin, Isaiah. 1954. *The Hedgehog and the Fox: An Essay on Tolstoy's View of History*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Bolton, Maggie, and Cathrine Degnen, eds. 2010. *Animals and Science: From Colonial Encounters to the Biotech Industry*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.
- Braudel, Fernand. 1995. *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*. vols I and II. Translated by Siân Reynolds. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Braverman, Irus. 2013. 'Animal Frontiers: A Tale of Three Zoos in Israel/Palestine'. *Cultural Critique* 85: 122–62. <https://doi.org/10.5749/culturalcritique.85.2013.0122>
- Bromberger, Christian. 2006. 'Towards an Anthropology of the Mediterranean'. *History and Anthropology* 17 (2): 91–107.
- Byrd, Brian F. 1989. 'The Natufian: Settlement Variability and Economic Adaptations in the Levant at the End of the Pleistocene'. *Journal of World Prehistory* 3 (2): 159–97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02757200600624339>

- Carrithers, Michael. 2005. 'Why Anthropologists Should Study Rhetoric.' *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 11 (3): 577–83.
- Carsten, Janet. 1995. 'The Substance of Kinship and the Heat of the Hearth: Feeding, Personhood, and Relatedness among Malays in Pulau Langkawi.' *American Ethnologist* 22 (2): 223–41.
- Cheshire, James, and Oliver Uberti. 2017. *Where the Animals Go: Tracking Wildlife with Technology in 50 Maps and Graphics*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Comaroff, Jean. 2017. 'Invasive Aliens: The Late-Modern Politics of Species Being.' *Social Research* 84 (1): 29–52. <https://doi.org/10.1353/sor.2017.0004>
- Comaroff, Jean, and John L. Comaroff. 2001. 'Naturing the Nation: Aliens, Apocalypse and the Postcolonial State.' *Journal of Southern African Studies* 27 (3): 627–51.
- Derrida, Jacques. 2009. *The Beast and the Sovereign*. vol. I. Translated by Geoffrey Bennington. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Elden, Stuart. 2013. *The Birth of Territory*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Esler, Karen J., Anna L. Jacobsen, and R. Brandon Pratt. 2018. *The Biology of Mediterranean-Type Ecosystems*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Fairchild, Amy L. 2003. *Science at the Borders: Immigrant Medical Inspection and the Shaping of the Modern Industrial Labor Force*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 1974 [1966]. *The Order of Things. An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. Translated from the French. London: Tavistock.
- Franklin, Adrian. 2006. *Animal Nation: The True Story of Animals and Australia*. Sydney: UNSW Press.
- Giaccaria, Paolo, Claudio Minca. 2011. 'The Mediterranean Alternative.' *Progress in Human Geography* 35 (3): 345–65. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132510376850>
- Gilfoyle, Daniel, Karen Brown, and William Beinart. 2009. 'Experts and Expertise in Colonial Africa Reconsidered: Science and the Interpenetration of Knowledge.' *African Affairs* 108 (432): 413–33. <https://doi.org/10.1093/afraf/adp037>
- Godley, Alfred Denis, ed. 1975 [1920]. *Herodotus: Histories*. Books I–II. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Goldman, Lawrence. 1991. 'Statistics and the Science of Society in Early Victorian Britain: An Intellectual Context for the General Register Office.' *Social History of Medicine* 4 (3): 415–34. <https://doi.org/10.1093/shm/4.3.415>
- Green, Sarah. 2005. *Notes from the Balkans: Locating Marginality and Ambiguity on the Greek-Albanian Border*. Princeton, NJ and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Gren, Ing-Marie, Henrik Andersson, Justice Tei Mensah, and Thérèse Pettersson. 2020. 'Cost of Wild Boar to Farmers in Sweden.' *European Review of Agricultural Economics* 47 (1): 226–46. <https://doi.org/10.1093/erae/jbz016>
- Haraway, Donna. 1988. 'Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective.' *Feminist Studies* 14 (3): 575–99. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3178066>
- Herzfeld, Michael. 1980. 'Honour and Shame: Problems in the Comparative Analysis of Moral Systems.' *Man (n.s.)* 15 (2): 339–51. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2801675>
- Herzfeld, Michael. 1984. 'The Horns of the Mediterraneanist Dilemma.' *American Ethnologist* 11 (3), 439–54.

- Herzfeld, Michael. 2005. 'Practical Mediterraneanism: Excuses for Everything, from Epistemology to Eating'. In *Rethinking the Mediterranean*, edited by William V. Harris, 45–63. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Herzfeld, Michael. 2014. 'Po-Mo Med'. In *A Companion to Mediterranean History*, edited by Peregrine Horden and Sharon Kinoshita. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 122–35.
- Hirsch, Dafna. 2011. "Hummus Is Best When It Is Fresh and Made by Arabs": The Gourmetization of Hummus in Israel and the Return of the Repressed Arab'. *American Ethnologist* 38 (4): 617–30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1425.2011.01326.x>
- Horden, Peregrine, and Nicholas Purcell. 2000. *The Corrupting Sea: A Study of Mediterranean History*. Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Johnson, Penny. 2019. *Companions in Conflict: Animals in Occupied Palestine*. New York, NY: Melville House Publishing.
- Jung, Hwa Yol. 1987. 'Being, Praxis, and Truth: Toward a Dialogue between Phenomenology and Marxism'. *Dialectical Anthropology* 12 (3): 307–28.
- Lampland, Martha, and Susan Leigh Star, eds. 2009. *Standards and Their Stories: How Quantifying, Classifying, and Formalizing Practices Shape Everyday Life*. Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press.
- Larson, James L. 1967. 'Goethe and Linnaeus'. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 28 (4): 590–96. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2708532>
- Law, John, and Annemarie Mol. 2003. *Situating Technoscience: An Inquiry into Spatialities*. Lancaster: Centre for Science Studies, Lancaster University.
- Linné, Carl von. 1758. *Caroli Linnæi ... Systema naturæ per regna tria naturæ, secundum classes, ordines, genera, species, cum characteribus, differentiis, synonymis, locis* Holmiæ: impensis L. Salvii.
- McNeill, John Robert. 1992. *The Mountains of the Mediterranean World: An Environmental History*. Cambridge and New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Michael, Mike. 2004. 'Roadkill: Between Humans, Nonhuman Animals, and Technologies'. *Society & Animals* 12 (4): 277–98.
- Mitchell, Jon P. 2002. 'Modernity and the Mediterranean'. *Journal of Mediterranean Studies (Special Issue)* 12 (1): 1–22.
- Monterescu, Daniel, and Ariel Handel. 2020. 'Terroir and Territory on the Colonial Frontier: Making New-Old World Wine in the Holy Land'. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 62 (2): 222–61. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417520000043>
- Ohana, David. 2011. *Israel and Its Mediterranean identity*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Petri, Rolf. 2016. 'The Mediterranean Metaphor in Early Geopolitical Writings'. *History* 101 (348): 671–91. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-229X.12326>
- Philo, Chris, and Chris Wilbert, eds. 2000. *Animal Spaces, Beastly Places: New Geographies of Human-Animal Relations*. London and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pina-Cabral, João de. 1989. 'The Mediterranean as a Category of Regional Comparison: A Critical View'. *Current Anthropology* 30 (3): 399–406.
- Poovey, Mary. 1998. *A History of the Modern Fact: Problems of Knowledge in the Sciences of Wealth and Society*. Chicago, IL, and London: University of Chicago Press.

- Robins, Philip. 2004. *A History of Jordan*. Cambridge and New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Sordi, Caetano. 2020. 'Bicho Bandido: Wild Boars, Biological Invasions and Landscape Transformations on the Brazilian-Uruguayan Border (Pampas Region)'. *Social Anthropology* 28 (3): 614–28. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8676.12785>
- Souguir-Omrani, Hejer, Jomaa Chemkhi, Akila Fathallah-Mili, Yusr Saadi-BenAoun, Insaf BelHadjAli, Ikram Guizani, and Souheila Guerbouj. 2018. 'Paraechinus aethiopicus (Ehrenberg 1832) and Atelerix algirus (Lereboullet 1842) Hedgehogs: Possible Reservoirs of Endemic Leishmaniases in Tunisia'. *Infection Genetics and Evolution* 63: 219–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meegid.2018.05.029>
- Strathern, Marilyn. 2020. *Relations: An Anthropological Account*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Toger, Marina, Itzhak Benenson, Yuqi Wang, Daniel Czamanski, and Dan Malkinson. 2018. 'Pigs in Space: An Agent-Based Model of Wild Boar (*Sus scrofa*) Movement into Cities'. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 173: 70–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2018.01.006>
- Urbanik, Julie. 2012. *Placing Animals: An Introduction to the Geography of Human-Animal Relations*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Vaccaro, Ismael, and Oriol Beltran. 2009. 'Livestock Versus "Wild Beasts": Contradictions in the Natural Patrimonialization of the Pyrenees'. *Geographical Review* 99 (4): 499–516. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1931-0846.2009.tb00444.x>
- Vaughan-Williams, Nick. 2015. *Europe's Border Crisis: Biopolitical Security and beyond*. New York, NY: Oxford University.
- Viveiros de Castro, Eduardo. 2015. 'Who Is Afraid of the Ontological Wolf? Some Comments on an Ongoing Anthropological Debate'. *The Cambridge Journal of Anthropology* 33 (1): 2–17.
- Weeks, Priscilla, and Jane Packard. 2009. 'Feral Hogs: Invasive Species or Nature's Bounty?' *Human Organization* 68 (3): 280–92. <https://doi.org/10.17730/humo.68.3.663wn82g164321u1>
- Wolch, Jennifer. 2002. 'Anima urbis'. *Progress in Human Geography* 26 (6): 721–42. <https://doi.org/10.1191/0309132502ph400oa>