„Zoophilologica. Polish Journal of Animal Studies"
Nr 1 (15)/2025, pp. 1–24
ISSN 2451-3849
DOI: https://doi.org/10.31261/ZOOPHILOLOGICA.2025.15.16

Moumita Bala
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9177-6618
Indian Institute of Technology Patna, India

Smriti Singh
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1829-5906
Indian Institute of Technology Patna, India

Literary Representation of Animal Captivity Reading *Hannah's Dream* through Foucauldian Lens

Художественная картина неволи животных
Чтение романа *Ради Ханны* сквозь
призму Фуко

Абстракт

Зоопарки – это пространства взаимодействия человека и животных. Считается, что они предоставляют людям ограниченный доступ к дикой природе и дают представление о великолепии животного мира. Однако возникают вопросы относительно того, насколько животные действительно видимы в такой среде. Это побуждает задуматься над ключевой проблемой: может ли содержащееся в городских условиях животное, изолированное от своей естественной среды обитания, по-настоящему дать представление о природном состоянии своего вида и при этом сохранить свою субъектность? Рэнди Маламуд, Боб Маллан и Гарри Марвин подвергают критическому осмыслению способы репрезентации животных в неволе, а также исследуют культуру зоопарков в городских пространствах. Пассивное наблюдение за животными

Literary Representation of Animal Captivity
Reading *Hannah's Dream*
through Foucauldian Lens

Abstract

Zoos are spaces for human–animal engagement; they are believed to provide people with limited exposure to the wilderness, a glimpse of the innate splendour of the animal kingdom. However, questions arise regarding the degree to which animals are actually visible in these environments. This prompts us to reflect on a crucial query: can a confined urban animal, separated from its natural environment, truly provide an understanding of a species' natural state while preserving their subjectivity? Randy Malamud, Bob Mullan, and Garry Marvin provide critical evaluations of how captive animals are portrayed in zoos and also examine the presence of zoo culture in urban societies. Observing animals passively in a zoo reduces them to mere exhibits for entertainment purposes, rather than allowing us to truly appreciate them for what they are. This paper uses Foucault's concept of biopower

в зоопарках сводит их к простым экспонатам, служащим развлекательным целям, не позволяя относиться к ним как к живым существам. В статье используется концепция биовласти Мишеля Фуко для интерпретации романа *Ради Ханны* (англ. *Hannah's Dream*) Дайан Хаммонд как повествования о зоопарке, в котором героиня Ханна выступает в качестве объекта биовласти, формирующей ее самоощущение в двойной роли: как животного-компаньона и как зоопаркового животного. Основное внимание уделяется тому, как антропоцентрический дискурс доминирования и контроля над животными влияет на идентичность Ханны.

Ключевые слова: Фуко, животное-компаньон, зоопарковое животное, биовласть, дисциплина

to interpret Diane Hammond's novel *Hannah's Dream* as a zoo narrative, wherein Hannah is positioned as a recipient of biopower that shapes her sense of self in dual roles: that of a companion animal and a zoo animal. The central inquiry revolves around exploring how Hannah's identity is constructed by the anthropocentric discourse of dominance and control over animals.

Keywords: Foucault, companion animal, zoo animal, biopower, discipline

Introduction

Literature offers a unique lens for exploring and understanding the complex interactions between humans and animals. It showcases the profound connections between humans and animals, depicting them as companions or partners rather than mere subjects or objects. Narrative imagination allows us to see the world from the perspective of non-human entities.[1] Donna Haraway's concept of "companion species" emphasizes this interconnectedness, highlighting co-evolution and mutual influence.[2] Texts often situate animals within their ecological contexts, stressing the interconnectedness of all living beings and the impact of human actions on the natural world. Literary analysis reveals how power dynamics extends beyond human interactions to include human–animal relationships, shedding light on issues of domination, control, and resistance. Contemporary literary animal studies challenge traditional views by granting agency to animals, recognizing them as actors within narratives. This perspective fosters ethical considerations regarding the treatment and representation of animals. By questioning traditional dichotomies such as human/animal, culture/nature, and subject/object, literature disrupts

[1] Marion W. Copeland, "Literary Animal Studies in 2012: Where We Are, Where We Are Going," *Anthrozoös*, vol. 25, no. 1 (2012): 91–105, http://dx.doi.org/10.2752/175303712X13353430377093.

[2] Donna Haraway, *The Companion Species Manifesto: Dogs, People, and Significant Otherness*. Vol. 1. (Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press, 2003).

rigid classifications and promotes a more fluid understanding of existence. Drawing on theories of Foucault, Derrida, and Haraway,[3] the study of literary animals prompts a re-evaluation of traditional literary methods, incorporating interdisciplinary approaches from animal studies, ecology, and philosophy. Literature deepens our understanding of the human–animal relationship by offering a rich exploration of animals as symbols, companions, actors, and subjects within human culture. It challenges traditional boundaries, encourages ethical reflection, and enhances our appreciation of the interconnectedness of all life.[4] Literary animal studies advocate for the inclusion of diverse texts and less-studied animals, broadening the literary canon to encompass a wider range of human–animal interactions.

One literary genre that is particularly significant for examining the power dynamics within human-animal relationships is the zoo narrative. This genre encompasses a range of stories, cultural artifacts, and representations that portray zoos and the animals they house. These narratives are explored in literature, art, and popular culture, often revealing deeper cultural, ethical, and philosophical issues surrounding the captivity of animals. Zoos symbolize a miniature version of the broader animal kingdom and provide a window into nature. Stories centered around zoos explore the art of imitating these environments, having the power to question the very foundation of their establishments. Both zoos and narratives about zoos exercise human authority over animals.[5] Zoos are depicted in the anthropocentric discourse as places where people and nature interact, and the discourse also emphasizes their importance for conservation, tourism, education, and research.[6] But in most of the zoo narratives, zoos are often perceived as establishments characterized by cruelty and the confinement of animals, and the reason behind the portrayal of this situation can be interpreted as critique of zoos, condemning the culture that exists within them.[7]

[3] Michel Foucault, *"Society Must Be Defended": Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975–1976*, trans. David Macey (New York: Picador, 2003); Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Vintage Books, 1977); Haraway, *The Companion Species Manifesto: Dogs, People, and Significant Otherness*; Donna Haraway, "When Species Meet," in *The Routledge International Handbook of More-than-Human Studies*, (Routledge, 2008), 42–78; Jacques Derrida and David Wills, "The Animal That Therefore I Am (More to Follow)," *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 28, no. 2 (2002): 369–418.

[4] Roland Borgards, "Introduction: Cultural and Literary Animal Studies," *Journal of Literary Theory*, vol. 9, no. 2 (2015): 155–160.

[5] Randy Malamud, *Reading Zoos: Representations of Animals and Captivity* (London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1998), 14–15.

[6] J. M. Bartos and J. D. Kelly, "Towards Best Practice in the Zoo Industry: Developing Key Performance Indicators as Bench-Marks for Progress," *International Zoo Yearbook*, vol. 36, no. 1 (1998): 143–157; Neil Carr and Scott Cohen, "The Public Face of Zoos: Images of Entertainment, Education and Conservation," *Anthrozoös*, vol. 24, no. 2 (2011): 175–189, https://doi.org/10.2752/175303711X12998632257620.

[7] Malamud, *Reading Zoos: Representations of Animals and Captivity*, 15.

This research focuses on a tale set in a zoo environment, making it a narrative centered around the zoo, often referred to as a zoo narrative. In *Hannah's Dream*, the author Diane Hammond focuses on the unique identity of an individual elephant named Hannah in the zoo. Hannah was rescued from Burma after she followed her mother onto a rubber plantation and faced a tragic incident. Hannah's mother was fatally shot when they trespassed, and Hannah herself suffered partial blindness. During that time, Hannah was only about two or three years old and injured. Despite orders for plantation workers to kill any elephant that entered the premises, Hannah was looked after by one of the workers until his brother, a professional mahout, arrived. His brother realized that she would be useless for work in the teak forests due to her limited vision and small stature. Releasing her into the wild would also likely lead to her demise. During this period, Hannah was acquired by Max L. Biedelman, who included her in his private collection of animals. Eventually, she became the property of the Max L. Biedelman zoo. For a span of forty years, Sam, Hannah's caretaker, has dedicated himself to her well-being. Alongside Sam, his wife Corinna also provides unwavering care, treating Hannah as their own child and prioritizing her happiness. Later on, Neva Wilson becomes part of Sam's efforts, joining him in tending to the elephant, who is the main attraction of a struggling zoo. Leveraging her connections within the zookeeping community, Neva collaborates with Sam to devise a plan that involves relocating the aging Hannah to an elephant sanctuary. This move is prompted by the detrimental effects on Hannah's feet due to prolonged standing on harsh concrete surfaces. However, Harriet Saul, an immensely ambitious new zoo director, is determined to restore the zoo's former glory and is unwilling to part with Hannah, the prominent star of the establishment. Despite her strong resolve, Harriet eventually succumbs to mounting pressure from various zoo officials. Consequently, as the novel concludes, Hannah is sent to the elephant sanctuary, as circumstances force Harriet's hand.

Instead of addressing the species as a whole, Hammond highlights Hannah's personal experiences, detailing her pain, suffering, and the comfort she finds in her companionship with her caretaker Sam. Within the fictional narrative, Sam, who takes care of Hannah, empathizes deeply with her and becomes her voice. The title of the novel – *Hannah's Dream* – stems from a recurring dream experienced by Sam, in which he envisions through Hannah's perspective. In this dream, Hannah runs freely alongside other elephants in a sanctuary. This dream is realized when Hannah is relocated to the pachyderm sanctuary near Sacramento, California, thanks to the combined efforts of Neva Wilson, Samson Brown, and his wife Corinna:

> He dreams he's an elephant in a wide open place with other elephants… He used to have that dream maybe a couple of times a month, but lately he's dreaming it four, five nights a week. He says it's Hannah's dream, and he doesn't know what to

> do with it except to bring her more Dunkin Donuts, and donuts don't make up for things beyond a point, though.[8]

Despite the wide range of texts about elephants, they remain relatively understudied in literary discourse. Elephants have been culturally represented in various ways across different societies, often symbolizing power, wisdom, and spirituality. In Hinduism, elephants are revered, especially the deity Ganesha, who symbolizes wisdom and prosperity. The white elephant is a sacred symbol of purity and strength in Budhhism. In African fables, elephants often appear as wise chiefs who resolve disputes among animals, embodying justice and benevolence. In Ashanti tradition elephants are seen as reincarnated human chiefs, symbolizing ancestral wisdom and continuity.[9] Elephants are the national animal of Thailand, representing strength, loyalty, and longevity. Many Thais hold the belief that walking beneath an elephant brings good luck. Elephants hold significant importance in Thai culture, a reverence that is deeply rooted in the nation's history and religion.[10]

The relationship between humans and elephants has evolved significantly over time, shaped by cultural, economic and ecological factors. Elephants have been domesticated and trained by humans for around four thousand years. Asian elephants have primarily been utilized in logging camps, religious ceremonies, and wildlife tourism in Asia, and they have also been kept in zoos and circuses worldwide. In contrast, African elephants are much less common, with most of the captive ones residing in zoos and circuses.[11] Elephants were domesticated for use in labour, particularly in Southeast Asia and India. They were utilized for logging, transportation, and construction due to their immense strength and ability to navigate difficult terrain. For example, in colonial Burma, a concealed labour process enabled the use of working elephants, involving their capture in the wild and subsequent training for labour.[12] In various cultures, elephants have held significant religious and cultural importance. Elephants were historically used in warfare, providing strategic advantages in battles due to their size and strength.[13] Today, elephants are

[8] Diane Hammond, *Hannah's Dream* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2008), 214.

[9] "Elefact Friday: Elephants Across World Culture," *Global Sanctuary for Elephants*. Accessed 12 July 2024, https://globalelephants.org/elefact-friday-elephants-across-world-culture/.

[10] Holly Collicot, "Elephants in Thai Culture," PHANG NGA. Accessed 13 July 2024, https://phangngaelephantpark.com/elephants-in-thai-culture-2-by-holly-collicott/.

[11] Ros Clubb and Georgia Mason, *A Review of the Welfare of Zoo Elephants in Europe* (Horsham, UK: RSPCA, 2002).

[12] Jonathan Saha, "Colonizing Elephants: Animal Agency, Undead Capital and Imperial Science in British Burma," *Bjhs Themes*, vol. 2 (2017): 169–189.

[13] John M. Kistler, *War Elephants* (Lincoln–London: University of Nebraska Press, 2007).

mainly captured and kept in captivity for entertainment purposes.[14] Many animals, particularly those in zoos, are confined in isolation with chains. They suffer from inadequate diets, untreated sores, and display repetitive weaving behaviours due to prolonged deprivation of external stimuli.[15] The process of becoming and living as a captive elephant is frequently marked by trauma, pain, and monotony.[16]

Some of the earliest known zoo elephants were captured in Syria and kept by a Syrian king in the ninth century B.C.[17] To conserve the species, some zoos engaged in breeding programs, while others prioritized attracting visitors over animal welfare. For instance, in 2016, Chai, a 37-year-old Asian elephant, passed away at the Oklahoma City Zoo after enduring over a hundred artificial insemination attempts. Keepers immobilized Chai with anchors, restraining her for extended periods while inserting a three-foot-long hose into her reproductive tract. Before the zoo acquired its first batch of elephant sperm, she experienced mock inseminations for two years. Subsequently, the artificial insemination procedures were performed as frequently as ten times per month in efforts to impregnate her.

Moreover, zoos often fail to provide the necessary space and habitat complexity for elephants, preventing them from forming the complex social groupings and bonds crucial to their natural society.[18]

Elephants are the largest land animals alive today, and they come in three distinct species. Their long trunks, which are essentially large teeth, enable them to explore even the smallest details of their surroundings. They are renowned for their intelligence and remarkable memories.[19] Elephants are structured into intricate social groups led by a matriarch, with females and calves forming the core of these groups, while males typically live alone or in small bachelor groups. After a gestation period of four to five years, female elephants give birth to a single calf and the entire herd of females helps in raising the young. Female calves typically stay with their maternal herd throughout their lives, while males leave as soon as they reach puberty. In contrast, forest elephant social groups usually consist of just

[14] "Elephants in Captivity: Traditions, Use & Abuse," *ElephantVoices*. Accessed 14 July 2024, https://www.elephantvoices.org/elephants-in-captivity-7/traditions-use-a-abuse.html.

[15] Clubb and Mason, *A Review of the Welfare of Zoo Elephants in Europe*.

[16] Jamie Lorimer, "Elephants as Companion Species: the Lively Biogeographies of Asian Elephant Conservation in Sri Lanka," *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, vol. 35, no. 4 (2010): 491–506.

[17] Frederick C. Sillar and Ruth M. Meyler, *Elephants Ancient and Modern* (New York: The Viking Press, 1968).

[18] "Elephants in Zoos: Shameful Cruelty that Must End," *Conservation Mag*. Updated 24 May 2024, https://conservationmag.org/en/wildlife/elephants-in-zoos-shameful-cruelty-that-must-end-2.

[19] "Elephants," *National Geographic*. Accessed 15 July 2024, https://education.nationalgeographic.org/resource/elephants-collection/; "Elephants 101," *Nat Geo Wild*. Accessed 13 July 2024, https://youtu.be/Aw6GkiCvcWs?si=OzQrdDmp1-Gan4Gc.

an adult female and her young, although they may form larger groups in forest clearings where resources are abundant. Elephants need vast areas of land to meet their ecological requirements, such as access to food, water, and space. Typically, an elephant dedicates up to eighteen hours a day to feeding and consumes several hundred pounds of plant matter each day. This need for large habitats often leads to conflicts with humans as elephants and people compete for resources.[20] Historically, they roamed vast regions of Africa and Asia. However, habitat destruction and poaching have led to declining elephant populations on both continents, with Asian elephants now classified as endangered.[21]

This article strongly criticizes the idea of human dominance over nature, as propagated by the western institutional zoo discourse, using a Foucauldian approach. Foucault's concept of biopower, although not originally intended for analysing human–animal relations, can offer insights into understanding the various aspects of the relationship between humans and animals.[22] Foucault's argument revolved around the idea of life detaching itself from the authority of sovereign power, which traditionally relied on sporadic acts of violence to conquer territories by means of deadly force. According to Foucault, the concept referred to as "biopower" designates the "technology of power centered on life."[23] Biopower functions across two tiers: one pertains to the general populace, referred to by Foucault as biopolitics or regulatory authority, and the other concerns the individual body, which Foucault termed anatomo-politics or disciplinary power.[24] However, it is important to note that there exists a potential distinction between "biopower" and "biopolitics." While biopower focuses on the methods of disciplining the human body to enhance its utility and compliance, biopolitics pertains to the management of human populations as a whole.[25] To put it differently, Foucault explores two power technologies: the 'regulatory approach to life' and the 'disciplining approach to the body'. Disciplinary power "centers on the body, produces individualizing effects, and manipulates the body as a source of forces that have to be rendered both useful and

[20] "Elephant," *WWF*. Accessed 13 July 2024, https://www.worldwildlife.org/species/elephant.

[21] "Elephants 101," *Nat Geo Wild*. Accessed 13 July 2024, https://youtu.be/Aw6GkiCvcWs?si=OzQrdDmp1-Gan4Gc.

[22] Lori Gruen, *Critical Terms for Animal Studies* (London: University of Chicago Press, 2018), 124–136.

[23] Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality. Volume I: An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978), 144.

[24] Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Vintage Books, 1977); Foucault, *The History of Sexuality Volume I: An Introduction,* 139; Chloe Taylor, "Foucault and Critical Animal Studies: Genealogies of Agricultural Power," *Philosophy Compass*, vol. 8, no. 6 (2013): 539–551, https://doi.org/10.1111/phc3.12046.

[25] Gardar Arnason, "Biopower," *ScienceDirect* 2012. Accessed 13 July 2024, https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/medicine-and-dentistry/biopower.

docile."[26] So, docile bodies are created through disciplinary power.[27] Stephen Thierman's exploration of Foucault's concept of the apparatus and its application to the examination of human-animal interactions is noteworthy. Thierman introduced the concept of the "apparatus of animality," which encompasses a complex web of elements including institutions like zoos, disciplines such as zoology, practices like animal exhibitions, legal regulations concerning cruelty to animals, discourses like those initiated by PETA, and cultural portrayals found in films and literature.[28] Animals are experiencing a growing imposition of biopower, encompassing diverse methods of control, surveillance, and training, with the intention of moulding them into compliant participants within capitalist markets.[29] Humans position animals in various imaginary, literary, psychological, and virtual realms, along with physical environments such as homes, fields, factories, zoos, and national parks.[30]

The institution of zoo is an apparatus of biopower where the lives of non-human animals are entrapped.[31] Zoos exert control over the lives of animals, managing their breeding, health, and behaviours. Surveillance is also used to monitor animal behaviour and health, akin to how biopower employs surveillance to maintain control over populations. Zoos often implement practices designed to normalize animal behaviours. This reminds us of Foucault's statement: "[t]his bio-power was without question an indispensable element in the development of capitalism […] the controlled insertion of bodies into the machinery of production and the adjustment of the phenomena of population to economic processes."[32]

In the novel, Hannah the elephant and other animals are confined within the walls of small cages at Max L. Biedelman zoo. In the zoo, they can no longer be called wild animals, because they have been tamed and trained to such an extent that they no longer experience any freedom. They have turned into 'zoo animals' who "share particular characteristics because of where they live, how they live

[26] Michel Foucault, *"Society Must Be Defended": Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975–1976*, trans. David Macey (New York: Picador, 2003), 249.

[27] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, 135–169.

[28] Stephen Theirman, "Apparatuses of Animality: Foucault Goes to a Slaughterhouse," *Foucault Studies*, no. 9 (2010): 89–110, https://doi.org/10.22439/fs.v0i9.3061; Taylor, "Foucault and Critical Animal Studies: Genealogies of Agricultural Power," 545.

[29] Nicole Shukin, *Animal Capital: Rendering Life in Biopolitical Times* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2009), 155; Gruen, *Critical Terms for Animal Studies*, 133.

[30] Andrea Bolla and Alice Hovorka, "Placing Wild Animals in Botswana: Engaging Geography's Transspecies Spatial Theory," *Humanimalia*, vol. 3, no. 2 (2012): 56–82.

[31] Thierman, "Apparatuses of Animality: Foucault Goes to a Slaughterhouse," 89–110; Matthew Chrulew, "Managing Love and Death at the Zoo: The Biopolitics of Endangered Species Preservation," *Australian Humanities Review*, vol. 50, no. 1 (2011): 1–15, https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/managing-love-death-at-zoo-biopolitics-endangered/docview/869517833/se-2.

[32] Foucault, *The Will to Knowledge: The History of Sexuality. Volume I*, 140–141.

and because of the ways they must share their lives with the continual presence of human beings."[33] The main categories of animals, classified by the spaces they occupy, include companion animals, domesticated 'livestock,' zoo animals, feral animals, and wild animals. Hannah's identity is also shaped by viewing her as a zoo-dwelling animal who predominantly resides within the confines of the zoo and is closely observed, in stark contrast to her untamed counterparts in the wilderness. "The thing is, elephants, especially female Asian elephants, are extremely social. They live in herds dominated by a single leader – usually a female, but in Hannah's case Sam is her herd. And her leader."[34] The idea of "zoo animals" aligns with Berger's portrayal of the marginalized animals within modern capitalist culture, as exemplified by those in zoos. Berger suggests that no matter how close you get to an animal in a zoo, even if it is right up against the bars and looking directly at you, it remains fundamentally marginalized. Your focus will never be enough to make it central. For Berger, zoo animals represent mere shadows or remnants of their species, and more importantly, of the overall human–animal relationship.[35] Hannah can be considered as a marginalized animal within modern capitalist culture. Her miserable living condition in the zoo is described as follows:

> [what] she's left with is a yard that's way too small, a barn that's a hellhole, chronically infected feet, and advancing arthritis, especially when she has to stand on a concrete substrate all day, which she will once Sam's gone because she won't be going on walks around the zoo anymore. Sam keeps her calm, but without him I wouldn't trust her out there, she's too skittish. So her entire world will shrink to about three thousand square feet of concrete and up to fourteen hours a day chained to a wall.[36]

From a different perspective, Hannah can be labelled a companion animal due to how Max treated her in her personal assortment of animals, and later by Sam within the premise of the zoo. Companion animals are primarily subjected to regulatory control over their bodies, which includes methods such as surveillance, discipline, behaviour control, health monitoring, and breeding regulation. This study addresses a fundamental inquiry: In what manner does the elephant named Hannah become influenced by the mechanisms of biopower? Moreover, how does Hannah's

[33] Garry Marvin, "L'animal de zoo* Un rôle entre sauvage et domestique," *Techniques & Culture*, vol. 50, no. 1 (2008): 102–119.

[34] Hammond, *Hannah's Dream*, 145.

[35] John Berger, *About Looking* (Pantheon Books, 1980); Hadassa Prattley, "Defamiliarising the Zoo: Representations of Nonhuman Animal Captivity in Five Contemporary Novels," M.A diss. University of Canterbury, 2012.

[36] Hammond, *Hannah's Dream*, 145.

identity, encompassing both her roles as a companion animal and a zoo animal, get moulded by the exercises of disciplinary power within the zoo environment?

Hannah as a Companion Animal

We have extensive knowledge about the ecology and behaviour of wild animals, as well as the cultural and economic importance of domesticated ones. However, the tangible aspects of interspecies relationships remain largely unexplored.[37] James A. Serpell claims that companion animals are characterized by their lack of economic and practical usefulness.[38] However, this does not mean that these roles are completely disregarded when categorizing them. It is when the primary focus shifts from their economic contributions to their role as companions that they can truly be classified as such. Companion animals represent a significant and expanding group of captive or domesticated animals, characterized mainly by their lack of practical or economic utility. However, these animals can also serve practical or economic roles.[39] For instance, Hannah, who is kept in a zoo, serves an economic purpose. Yet, for her caretaker, her primary role is to provide companionship. Max L. Biedelman, Sam, and Corinna viewed Hannah as an individual non-human animal and regarded her as a beloved companion, without considering her economic value as an exotic wild animal in private collections or zoos. The primary way a caretaker reinforces the unique identity of an animal companion is by giving it a name. Naming an animal is crucial for establishing its individuality, though traditional ethologists strongly oppose this practice.[40] In the novel, the elephant, who is the central character, is given the name Hannah by Max L. Biedelman to acknowledge her as an individual being.

One of the most significant characteristics attributed to companion animals, especially dogs, is their ability to offer 'unconditional love' and unwavering loyalty.[41] Throughout the novel, Hannah's unwavering affection and loyalty to Sam are evi-

[37] Jamie Lorimer, "Elephants as Companion Species: the Lively Biogeographies of Asian Elephant Conservation in Sri Lanka," *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, vol. 35, no. 4 (2010): 491–506.

[38] James A. Serpell, "Companion Animals," in *Anthrozoology: Human-Animal Interactions in Domesticated and Wild Animals*, eds. Geoff Hosey and Vicky Melfi (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019), 17–31.

[39] Serpell, "Companion Animals," 17–31.

[40] Clinton Sanders, "Actions Speak Louder than Words: Close Relationships Between Humans and Nonhuman Animals," *Symbolic Interaction*, vol. 26, no. 3 (2003): 405–426.

[41] Donna Haraway, *The Companion Species Manifesto: Dogs, People, and Significant Otherness*, 33.

dent through various occurrences. One such example is when Sam chose to depart from the zoo, and Hannah faithfully followed him. "Sam threw open the barn doors, picked up Hannah's tire and started walking with it. Hannah came out of her trance and trudged after him."[42] The possibility of being abandoned arises when human affection diminishes and when an animal does not live up to the expectation of providing "unconditional love."[43] If Hannah had been uncooperative and disloyal to Sam, she might not have received the same level of attention from him.

Hannah's experiences and subjectivities are significantly influenced by the apparatus she finds herself in, which happens to be a zoo. In this setting, she is subjected to various forms of control and dominance, leading to the construction of her identity and limiting her ability to respond freely. Her identity as a "zoo animal" can be overlooked in her relationship with her caretaker Sam, as he treats her as a "companion animal." This research focuses on the extent to which deep bonds can form between captive and exhibited animals and their caretakers in zoos. Bonding with zoo animals by zoo workers appears to be associated with frequent positive interactions and rare negative interactions. Animals also gain benefits from forming bonds with humans, which can include increased enjoyment and improved welfare.[44] Sam provided attentive care for Hannah, always considering her well-being, both physical and mental, just like one would care for a beloved companion animal. Sam would accompany Hannah on a walk once a day "because Sam thought it did her good to walk on grass or even the asphalt paths when she could – anything softer than concrete."[45] Frequently, he would drive a long distance and then return with Hannah's preferred donuts filled with custard and strawberry jelly. The strong connection shared between Hannah and her caregiver, Sam, resembles the bond often seen between humans and their beloved companion animals.

In the novel, Hannah is viewed as an integral part of Sam and Corinna's family, almost like their own daughter. The bond between a human being and their companion animal is often profound, with companion animal frequently regarded as family members.[46] The potential for the bond between humans and their companion animals to offer the same level of emotional intimacy and psychological fulfil-

[42] Hammond, *Hannah's Dream*, 214.

[43] Haraway, *The Companion Species Manifesto: Dogs, People, and Significant Otherness*, 33.

[44] Geoff Hosey and Vicky Melfi, "Human–Animal Bonds Between Zoo Professionals and the Animals in Their Care," *Zoo Biology*, vol. 31, no. 1 (2012): 13–26.

[45] Hammond, *Hannah's Dream*, 16.

[46] Aubrey H. Fine and Alan M. Beck, "Understanding our Kinship with Animals: Input for Health Care Professionals Interested in the Human–Animal Bond," in *Handbook on Animal-Assisted Therapy* (Academic Press, 2015), 3–10; Paul Harris, "More than Ever, Pets Are Members of the Family." *Posted July* 6 (2015); Karen D. Schaefer, "How Connections With Companion Animals Impact Relationships With Self and Intimate Others," in *Clinician's Guide to Treating Companion Animal Issues*, eds. Lori R. Kogan and Chris Blazina (Academic Press, 2019), 193–222.

ment as human–to–human relationships can be observed here.[47] In kinship studies, companion animals have been described as substitutes for children, offering emotional satisfaction.[48] Companion animals significantly influence the dynamics among human family members.[49] Sam and Corinna regularly dedicate time each week to watch movies together, often in the elephant barn: "Corinna took Sam's hand while Hannah watched the screen with her good eye, her trunk draped gently over Corinna's shoulder, chuffing now and then."[50]

While it is undeniable that their entangled relationship is built on empathy and care, it can also be argued that Hannah's body is rendered docile or submissive or compliant in the process. According to Foucault, "A body is docile that may be subjected, used, transformed and improved by various exercises and regimens."[51] Hannah undergoes training and disciplinary measures to exhibit specific behaviours, and further evidence from the text can shed light on this aspect.

> […] Sam led Hannah to the back of the barn and the windowless stall where she spent the night. She could hear the clanking of the chain and shackle as Sam secured her, turned on a nightlight, gave her one last yam, and tuned a radio to an easy-listening station.[52]

Hannah always complies with the arrangement of having Sam bind her legs with chains at night and only releasing her in the morning. Hannah was brought to the pachyderm sanctuary confining her in a cage and fastening her legs with chains. When Sam proceeded to remove the shackles, "She lifted her foot before he'd even asked."[53] Using a Foucauldian perspective, it becomes evident that shaping and domesticating companion animals to meet human ideals constitutes a type of manipulation. Various techniques are employed to govern the functions of the body, and these methods involve exerting a specific control aimed at making the body docile and useful. This approach could be termed as "disciplines."[54] Hannah is very

[47] Marta Borgi and Francesca Cirulli, "Pet Face: Mechanisms Underlying Human–Animal Relationships," *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 7 (2016): 298.

[48] Charles Nickie and Charlotte Aull Davies, "My Family and Other Animals: Pets as Kin," *Sociological Research Online*, vol. 13, no. 5 (2008): 13–26.

[49] Alan M. Beck and Aaron Honori Katcher, *Between Pets and People: The Importance of Animal Companionship* (Purdue University Press, 1996); Clinton R. Sanders, "Actions Speak Louder Than Words: Close Relationships Between Humans and Nonhuman Animals," *Symbolic Interaction*, vol. 26, no. 3 (2003): 405–426.

[50] Hammond, *Hannah's Dream*, 67.

[51] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, 136.

[52] Hammond, *Hannah's Dream*, 68.

[53] Hammond, *Hannah's Dream*, 245.

[54] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, 137.

close to Sam and Corinna because of her ability to reflect those human-defined characteristics that we seek in our companion animals. Companion animals adapt to living close to humans, and both humans and companion animals often find ways to communicate with one another.[55]

> "Hey, baby girl," Sam said softly when he reached the back of the barn. "How's my sugar?" Hannah lifted her trunk and rumbled a greeting, the same greeting she'd given him almost every day for the last forty-one years.[56]

Hannah's repeated act of greeting her caretaker Sam by lifting her trunk creates a soul "around, on, within the body."[57] This process allows individuals to understand themselves and be understood by others as "objects of knowledge" in line with humanistic ideals.[58] These "docile bodies" facilitate the ongoing reproduction of the disciplinary system.[59]

> While Hannah ate her donuts, Sam eased down beside her left front foot and unhooked the heavy chain from its shackle. The anklet had worn away the skin underneath and sometimes there were open sores. Not today. "Let Papa have a look at that foot, sugar." Hannah lifted her foot.[60]

In this scenario, the routine of tending to Hannah's injured foot causes the elephant's body to behave in a specific manner, akin to how disciplinary power treats the body as a machine that can be trained to carry out particular tasks.

Hannah as a Zoo Animal

The zoo functions as a site of power struggle through exhibiting animals: „[…] almost total control is exercised by humans over animals' movements and activities, with

[55] Janet M. Alger and Steven F. Alger, "Cat Culture, Human Culture: An Ethnographic Study of a Cat Shelter," *Society & Animals*, vol. 7, no. 3 (1999): 199–218; Sanders, "Actions Speak Louder Than Words: Close Relationships Between Humans and Nonhuman Animals," 405–426; David Redmalm, "Discipline and Puppies: The Powers of Pet Keeping," *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, vol. 41, no. 3/4 (2021): 440–454.

[56] Hammond, *Hannah's Dream*, 10.

[57] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, 29.

[58] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, 28.

[59] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, 138.

[60] Hammond, *Hannah's Dream*, 11.

minimal opportunity for the animal to exercise its own preferences and priorities."[61] Animals residing in the zoo are referred to as "zoo animals," occupying a unique space that can be seen as transitional or in-between. This is due to their presence in an environment different from their natural habitats and their representation of animals found in their original habitats. Hediger strongly asserts that animals in captivity lead better lives compared to their existence in the wild, citing several reasons that are predominantly anthropocentric in nature.[62] Zoo animals do not need to search for food, because it is provided to them. They are protected from predators by living in enclosed spaces, and they receive medical care as well as training to exhibit their natural behaviours. Although they must give up their freedom, the zoo can be seen as a system designed to create a controlled and ideal environment for them, resembling a paradise.[63] This argument frequently fails to acknowledge the harsh capture of wild animals and their miserable existence within zoos[64]. They are forcibly tamed and confined within concrete enclosures, far from their natural habitats, leading to deteriorating health conditions. This flawed arrangement deprives them of adequate space to roam freely, as they are constantly under the watchful eye of human managers and spectators.[65] The argument is further reinforced by the portrayal of Hannah's deteriorating health and her constrained existence at Max L. Biedelman zoo in Diane Hammond's novel, *Hannah's Dream*. Hannah endures an abscess in her foot, which developed from years of standing on concrete floor. Despite diligently following the medication prescribed by the zoo doctor, her foot remains unhealed: "Even through the ointment he'd slathered on, he could see that the foot was worse."[66]

The inception of zoos can be linked to their early beginnings as privately-owned gardens that represented man's authority over nature and dominion over the wild. Over time, these gardens evolved into public menageries, providing amusement and entertainment[67]. Today's modern zoos, in contrast, symbolize man as a saviour,

[61] Alan Beardsworth and Alan Bryman, "The Wild Animal in Late Modernity: The Case of the Disneyization of Zoos," *Tourist Studies*, vol. 1, no. 1 (2001): 88, https://doi.org/10.1177/146879760100100105.

[62] Heini Hediger, "From Cage to Territory," in *The World of Zoos: A Survey and Gazetteer*, ed. Rosl Kirchshofer (New York: Viking Press, 1968), 9–20.

[63] Hediger, "From Cage to Territory," 9–20; Chrulew, "Managing Love and Death at the Zoo: The Biopolitics of Endangered Species Preservation," 6.

[64] Although we often refer to all creatures as "animals," it is important to recognize that this is a very broad classification. Different species of non-human animals have distinct welfare requirements. Consequently, zoos can be oppressive and detrimental to varying degrees based on the species, especially if harm is defined as a decrease in quality of life.

[65] Chrulew, "Managing Love and Death at the Zoo: The Biopolitics of Endangered Species Preservation," 1–15.

[66] Hammond, *Hannah's Dream*, 25.

[67] Vicki Croke, *The Modern Ark: The Story of Zoos: Past, Present, and Future* (Simon and Schuster, 2014).

a messiah, striving to protect and preserve species. In the novel, Max L. Biedelman, who had an interest in wild and exotic animals, began collecting them and eventually established a private collection outside her home in the mid-1950s. This collection grew to become the country's leading exotic animal collection by 1995.

Max's accomplishments have earned her the respect of the entire city and the recognition as a ruler of nature. Her act of purchasing Hannah, a two-year-old elephant with partial blindness from Burma, and rescuing her from further exploitation or imminent death, solidified her role as a genuine saviour. Following her passing, the collection was transformed into a zoo and became the property of the city, welcoming the public for entertainment and enjoyment. At the end of the novel, the managing director's act of purchasing the ailing killer whale Viernes and providing a new home for the creature within the zoo further reinforces his image as a man with messianic qualities, embodying the role of a saviour.

The zoo compels animals to endure unwanted and unnatural closeness to humans.[68] The act of putting animals on display, a central aspect of the zoo's purpose, diminishes their wildness and dilutes the genuine message the zoo intends to convey.[69] Despite aiming to showcase nature, the superstructure of the zoo isolates and decontextualizes animals from their natural environments.[70] Emphasizing the exploitation and marginalization of zoo animals due to captivity, the destructive relationship between zoos, animals, and nature can be criticized for promoting a misguided view of humanity's role in the natural order, suggesting that animals exist solely for our enjoyment and to fulfil our needs.[71] People who cause suffering to animals are skilled at justifying, trivializing, or disregarding its presence. The agony of animals in zoos is deftly concealed beneath the institutional, cultural, and historical components of zoo activities. A zoo is a place where one may observe slow, silent abuse of animals because of practices that encourage the visual consumption of animals for human entertainment.[72] The discourse regarding the oppression of

[68] Bob Mullan and Garry Marvin, *Zoo Culture* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1999), 4–5.

[69] Irus Braverman, *Zooland: The Institution of Captivity* (Redwood City: Stanford University Press, 2012), 88.

[70] Mullan and Marvin, *Zoo Culture*, 78; Scott L. Montgomery, "The Zoo: Theatre of the Animals," *Science as Culture*, vol. 4, no. 4 (1995): 565–600, https://doi.org/10.1080/09505439509526406; Yoram S. Carmeli, "The Sight of Cruelty: The Case of Circus Animal Acts," *Visual Anthropology*, vol. 10, no. 1 (1997): 1–15, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08949468.1997.9966717.

[71] Bryan G. Norton, Michael Hutchins, Terry Maple, and Elizabeth Stevens, eds. *Ethics on the Ark: Zoos, Animal Welfare, and Wildlife Conservation* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1995), 192; Dale Jamieson, "Zoos Revisited," in *Ethics on the Ark: Zoos, Animal Welfare, and Wildlife Conservation*, eds. Bryan G. Norton et al. (Washington, D.C. and London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1995), 52–68; Dale Jamieson, "Against Zoos," in *In Defense of Animals: The Second Wave*, ed. Peter Singer (New York: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2006), 132–143.

[72] Paula Arcari, "Slow Violence Against Animals: Unseen Spectacles in Racing and at Zoos," *Geoforum*, vol. 144 (2023): 103820, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2023.103820.

other species and the destruction of the natural environment holds considerable importance. It involves the tangible experiences of human dominance over nature and animals, which are further strengthened by the material practices perpetuated through various systems of discourse.[73]

In the novel, the act of Hannah's painting and playing the drum are the manipulative and anthropomorphic tactics used solely to draw a larger audience and generate more revenue for the zoo:

> The young man with the notepad took several pictures of Hannah painting, and of Harriet and Neva watching. Then it was over. Hannah returned the paintbrush to Neva and walked off to her mud wallow without a backward glance. The visitors applauded.[74]

Captive animals often exhibit stereotyped behaviours that are rarely seen in their wild counterparts[75]. A primary goal of providing enrichment activities for captive animals is to decrease these behaviours and promote natural actions and stimulation[76]. Painting is one such enrichment activity used in zoos to fulfil this purpose and to attract visitors. However, a study of four captive elephants at the Melbourne Zoo, which involved them painting in front of an audience, challenges the belief that painting is a stress-relieving enrichment activity. The study found no impact on the performance of stereotyped or other stress-related behaviours before or after the painting sessions.[77] This practice can be seen as cruel, as it forces the elephant to perform an unnatural act that goes against her natural instincts. Moreover, the presence of the trainer serves as a constant reminder to the spectators that this behaviour is coerced and not something the elephant willingly engages in.[78] To Harriet Saul, the managing director of Max L. Biedelman Zoo, Hannah is nothing but a money animal: "Charismatic mega –vertebrates […] Whales, dolphins, ele-

[73] Tema Milstein, "'Somethin' Tells Me It's All Happening at the Zoo': Discourse, Power, and Conservationism," *Environmental Communication*, vol. 3, no. 1 (2009): 25–48, https://doi.org/10.1080/17524030802674174; Robert Cox, "Nature's 'Crisis Disciplines': Does Environmental Communication Have an Ethical Duty?," *Environmental Communication*, vol. 1, no. 1 (2007): 5–20, https://doi.org/10.1080/17524030701333948; Arran Stibbe, "Language, Power and the Social Construction of Animals," *Society & Animals*, vol. 9, no. 2 (2001): 145–161, https://doi.org/10.1163/156853001753639251.

[74] Hammond, *Hannah's Dream*, 88.

[75] Michael K. Boorer, "Some Aspects of Stereotyped Patterns of Movement Exhibited by Zoo Animals," *International Zoo Yearbook*, vol. 12, no. 1 (1972): 164–168.

[76] Ronald R. Swaisgood and David J. Shepherdson, "Scientific Approaches to Enrichment and Stereotypies in Zoo Animals: What's Been Done and Where Should We Go Next?," *Zoo Biology: Published in Affiliation with the American Zoo and Aquarium Association*, vol. 24, no. 6 (2005): 499–518.

[77] Megan English, Gisela Kaplan, and Lesley J. Rogers, "Is Painting by Elephants in Zoos as Enriching as We Are Led to Believe?," *PeerJ*, vol. 2 (2014): e471.

[78] Carmeli, "The Sight of Cruelty: The Case of Circus Animal Acts," 1–15.

phants. They're the money animals. They're what people come to see."[79] The zoo establishes a display relationship between human spectators and Hannah, the elephant. She becomes the center of attention as her body is constantly showcased in performances. "The elephant was playing a couple of steel drums, real fancy. Drew a big crowd and everything."[80] Hannah has been trained to play steel drums as part of an environmental enrichment program aimed at enhancing her quality of life. However, it is evident that the real intention behind these acts is to exert control over the elephant. This entire spectacle of the elephant's performance affirms the notion that "[…] exhibition is a process of power."[81] The absence of resistance from Hannah suggests a clear power dynamic, which aligns with Foucault's concept of a relationship of domination.[82] The zoo represents a form of controlling authority or "technology of power,"[83] actively participating in the subjugation and treating nonhuman animal subjects as mere objects: "It is certain that the mechanisms of subjection cannot be studied outside their relation to the mechanisms of exploitation and domination."[84]

The application of Foucault's panopticon concept in the context of a zoo becomes evident due to the interconnectedness of surveillance and power within this environment. Morin draws a comparison between the imprisonment of humans and the captivity of animals in zoos.[85] Both prisoners and nonhuman animals in the zoo experience captivity as they are confined within cages, a significant carceral environment. The underlying rationale for their imprisonment is identical in both scenarios: "to restrain a beast who is lacking in self-control, a human (usually male) who is seen to behave like a dangerous, brutal, coarse, cruel animal."[86] The continuous observation of Hannah, the zoo elephant, by spectators serves as a poignant reminder of the notion of a 'zoopticon.' According to Acampora, the 'zoopticon' represents a reversed version of the panopticon, where nonhuman animals are confined and disciplined to become accustomed to constant observation by humans.[87] This hierarchical dynamics between humans and animals stems from human dominance and control over the animal kingdom, which is further strengthened within

[79] Hammond, *Hannah's Dream*, 24.

[80] Hammond, *Hannah's Dream*, 173.

[81] Mullan and Marvin, *Zoo Culture*, 68.

[82] Clare Palmer, "Colonization, Urbanization, and Animals," *Philosophy & Geography*, vol. 6, no. 1 (2003): 47–58, https://doi.org/10.1080/1090377032000063315.

[83] Foucault, *The History of Sexuality. Volume I: An Introduction*, 140.

[84] Michel Foucault, "The Subject and Power," *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 8, no. 4 (1982): 777–795, https://doi.org/10.1086/448181.

[85] Karen M. Morin, *Carceral Space, Prisoners and Animals* (New York: Routledge, 2018), 122.

[86] Morin, *Carceral Space, Prisoners and Animals*, 122.

[87] Ralph Acampora, "Zoos and Eyes: Contesting Captivity and Seeking Successor Practices," *Society & Animals*, vol. 13, no. 1 (2005): 69–88, https://doi.org/10.1163/1568530053966643.

the zoo environment. In zoos, animals are moulded into docile beings for human entertainment and enjoyment.

According to Malamud, "the zoo experience is voyeuristic, imperialistic, inauthentic, and steeped in the ethos of consumer culture, which is antithetical to nature and ecology and hence a danger to animals."[88] At the zoo, the intensity of human observation is so potent that the animal transforms into a subordinate visual entity,[89] essentially becoming the "passive raw material for the active gaze of the human."[90] The human gaze at the zoo only bestows praise upon the animals based on their utility or perceived danger they might pose.[91] Initially, Hannah, the elephant at the zoo, garnered greater attention from spectators because of her exotic nature. However, as time passed, more visitors flocked to her enclosure for amusement, as Hannah was trained to showcase entertaining skills like playing the drum or painting with brushes, similar to how humans are entertained. Hannah is continually watched by human observers, and her activities of painting and playing the drums are controlled by the zoo committee. The zoo environment embodies the Foucauldian concept of the close relationship between surveillance and power. A more fitting term for this could be "zooveillance."[92]

Throughout history, there has been a profound connection between humans and animals, characterized by an unspoken companionship. However, in modern times, confining animals in zoos has transformed into a poignant reminder of their gradual disappearance from our cultural landscape.[93]

> The public purpose of zoos is to offer visitors the opportunity of looking at animals. Yet nowhere in a zoo can a stranger encounter the look of an animal. At the most, the animal's gaze flickers and passes on. […] They have been immunized to encounter, because nothing can any more occupy a *central* place in their attention. Therein lies the ultimate consequence of their marginalization.[94]

Hannah's gaze fell upon Reginald, for she had no other option but to observe the onlookers, while being trapped inside a cage: "Reginald turned around and waited to catch Hannah's eye. When he did, he said as softly and precisely as Sam, 'Hey,

[88] Randy Malamud, *An Introduction to Animals and Visual Culture* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 115.

[89] Irus Braverman, "Zooveillance: Foucault Goes to the Zoo," *Surveillance and Society*, vol. 10, no. 2 (2012): 119.

[90] Randy Malamud, "Animals on Film: The Ethics of the Human Gaze," *Spring*, vol. 83 (2010): 6.

[91] Malamud, "Animals on Film: The Ethics of the Human Gaze," 1–26.

[92] Braverman, "Zooveillance: Foucault Goes to the Zoo," 119.

[93] John Berger, "Why Look at Animals?," in *About Looking*, ed. J. Berger (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980), 1–26.

[94] Berger, "Why Look at Animals?," 26.

sugar'."[95] A comprehensive narrative of Hannah's life, starting from her birth in Burma and extending to her prolonged captivity in Max L. Biedelman zoo, reveals a significant truth: zoos do not primarily exist for the well-being of animals; instead, they serve to emphasize the distinction between humans and animals. The erroneous belief that zoos are built on the idea that animals exist solely for human pleasure and exploitation suggests a speciesist perspective.[96] However, this misconception is disproven when we examine Hannah's captive life in the novel.

Conclusion

Regardless of the extent to which the zoo animals receive compassionate treatment, they are always unable to experience life akin to their wild counterparts. They remain under the influence and authority of humans, devoid of the freedom enjoyed by their untamed counterparts. "If animals in nature taunt people with their innocence and freedom, zoos represent people's revenge."[97] The fictional portrayal of Hannah's captivity in the zoo also represents the same narrative of human control over animals. Viewing Hannah either as a domesticated companion animal or an exhibit in the zoo reflects humanity's inclination to categorize and tame wild animals, exerting control over them through both direct and indirect means. The novel does not simply depict Hannah as a captivated zoo animal but delves into her multifaceted life, portraying her as an individual being treated with empathy by her keepers while also being a victim of strategic exploitation. This dual perspective allows for a nuanced exploration of biopower and disciplinary power as theorized by Foucault, illustrating how these power structures operate within the zoo environment and affect Hannah's identity and behaviour. The novel criticizes the institution of zoos, depicting them as places where animals are subjected to control, surveillance, and manipulation for human entertainment. This aligns with the article's focus on the oppressive nature of zoos and their role in perpetuating human authority over animals. Through the relationships between Hannah and her keepers, particularly Sam and Corinna, the novel explores the themes of companionship, empathy, and the impact of captivity on animal identity. This supports the article's exploration of how human-defined categories shape and control animal lives. Hannah's story can be situated within the broader context of the history and evolution of zoos, from

[95] Hammond, *Hannah's Dream*, 176.

[96] Jamieson, "Against Zoos," 132–143.

[97] Malamud, *Reading Zoos: Representations of Animals and Captivity*, 14.

private collections to public institutions, reflecting on the changing perceptions for animal captivity. The article has examined how Hannah, the elephant, is portrayed as both an object and a subject simultaneously, and how this dual representation highlights the power dynamics that enable shifts between these roles.

Bibliography

Acampora, Ralph. "Zoos and Eyes: Contesting Captivity and Seeking Successor Practices." *Society & Animals*, vol. 13, no. 1 (2005): 69–88. https://doi.org/10.1163/1568530053966643.

Alger, Janet M. and Steven F. Alger. "Cat Culture, Human Culture: An Ethnographic Study of a Cat Shelter." *Society & Animals*, vol. 7, no. 3 (1999): 199–218.

Arcari, Paula. "Slow Violence Against Animals: Unseen Spectacles in Racing and at Zoos." *Geoforum*, vol. 144 (2023): 103820. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2023.103820.

Arnason, Gardar. "Biopower." ScienceDirect. 2012. Accessed 13 July 2024. https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/medicine-and-dentistry/biopower.

Bartos, J. M. and J. D. Kelly. "Towards Best Practice in the Zoo Industry: Developing Key Performance Indicators as Bench-Marks for Progress." *International Zoo Yearbook*, vol. 36, no. 1 (1998): 143–157.

Beck, Alan M. and Aaron Honori Katcher. *Between Pets and People: The Importance of Animal Companionship*. Purdue University Press, 1996.

Berger, John. *About Looking*. Pantheon Books, 1980.

Berger, John. "Why Look at Animals?" In *About Looking*, edited by J. Berger, 1–26. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.

Beardsworth, Alan and Alan Bryman. "The Wild Animal in Late Modernity: The Case of the Disneyization of Zoos." *Tourist Studies*, vol. 1, no. 1 (2001): 83–104. https://doi.org/10.1177/146879760100100105.

Bolla, Andrea and Alice Hovorka. "Placing Wild Animals in Botswana: Engaging Geography's Transspecies Spatial Theory." *Humanimalia*, vol. 3, no. 2 (2012): 56–82.

Boorer, Michael K. "Some Aspects of Stereotyped Patterns of Movement Exhibited by Zoo Animals." *International Zoo Yearbook*, vol. 12, no. 1 (1972): 164–168.

Borgards, Roland. "Introduction: Cultural and Literary Animal Studies." *Journal of Literary Theory*, vol. 9, no. 2 (2015): 155–160.

Borgi, Marta and Francesca Cirulli. "Pet Face: Mechanisms Underlying Human–Animal Relationships." *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 7 (2016): 298.

Braverman, Irus. *Zooland: The Institution of Captivity*. Redwood City: Stanford University Press, 2012.

Braverman, Irus. "Zooveillance: Foucault Goes to the Zoo." *Surveillance and Society*, vol. 10, no. 2 (2012): 119.

Carmeli, Yoram S. "The Sight of Cruelty: The Case of Circus Animal Acts." *Visual Anthropology*, vol. 10, no. 1 (1997): 1–15. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08949468.1997.9966717.

Carr, Neil and Scott Cohen. "The Public Face of Zoos: Images of Entertainment, Education and Conservation." *Anthrozoös*, vol. 24, no. 2 (2011): 175–189. https://doi.org/10.2752/175303711X12998632257620.

Charles, Nickie and Charlotte Aull Davies. "My Family and Other Animals: Pets as Kin." *Sociological Research Online*, vol. 13, no. 5 (2008): 13–26.

Chrulew, Matthew. "Managing Love and Death at the Zoo: The Biopolitics of Endangered Species Preservation." *Australian Humanities Review*, vol. 50, no. 1 (2011): 1–15. https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/managing-love-death-at-zoo-biopolitics-endangered/docview/869517833/se-2.

Clubb, Ros and Georgia Mason. *A Review of the Welfare of Zoo Elephants in Europe*. Horsham, UK: RSPCA, 2002.

Collicot, Holly. "Elephants in Thai Culture." *PHANG NGA*. Accessed 13 July 2024. https://phangngaelephantpark.com/elephants-in-thai-culture-2-by-holly-collicott/.

Copeland, Marion W. "Literary Animal Studies in 2012: Where We Are, Where We Are Going." *Anthrozoös*, vol. 25, no. sup1 (2012): 91–105, http://dx.doi.org/10.2752/175303712X13353430377093.

Cox, Robert. "Nature's 'Crisis Disciplines': Does Environmental Communication Have an Ethical Duty?" *Environmental Communication*, vol. 1, no. 1 (2007): 5–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/17524030701333948.

Croke, Vicki. *The Modern Ark: The Story of Zoos: Past, Present, and Future*. Simon and Schuster, 2014.

Derrida, Jacques and David Wills. "The Animal That Therefore I Am (More to Follow)." *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 28, no. 2 (2002): 369–418.

"Elefact Friday: Elephants Across World Culture." *Global Sanctuary for Elephants*. Accessed 12 July 2024. https://globalelephants.org/elefact-friday-elephants-across-world-culture/.

"Elephant." *WWF*. Accessed 13 July 2024. https://www.worldwildlife.org/species/elephant.

"Elephants," *National Geographic*. Accessed 15 July 2024. https://education.nationalgeographic.org/resource/elephants-collection/.

"Elephants 101." *Nat Geo Wild*. Accessed 13 July 2024. https://youtu.be/Aw6GkiCvcWs?si=OzQrdDmp1-Gan4Gc.

"Elephants in Captivity: Traditions, Use & Abuse." *ElephantVoices*. Accessed 14 July 2024. https://www.elephantvoices.org/elephants-in-captivity-7/traditions-use-a-abuse.html.

"Elephants in Zoos: Shameful Cruelty That Must End." *Conservation Mag*. Updated 24 May 2024. https://conservationmag.org/en/wildlife/elephants-in-zoos-shameful-cruelty-that-must-end-2.

English, Megan, Gisela Kaplan, and Lesley J. Rogers. "Is Painting by Elephants in Zoos as Enriching as We Are Led to Believe?" *PeerJ*, vol. 2 (2014): e471.

Fine, Aubrey H. and Alan M. Beck. "Understanding Our Kinship with Animals: Input for Health Care Professionals Interested in the Human–Animal Bond." In *Handbook on Animal-Assisted Therapy*, 3–10. Academic Press, 2015.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books, 1977.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality Volume I: An Introduction*. Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.

Foucault, Michel. *"Society Must Be Defended": Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975–1976*. Translated by David Macey. New York: Picador, 2003.

Foucault, Michel. "The Subject and Power." *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 8, no. 4 (1982): 777–795. https://doi.org/10.1086/448181.

Foucault, Michel. *The Will to Knowledge: The History of Sexuality vol. I*. (1976). Translated by R Hurley, 1998.

Gruen, Lori. *Critical Terms for Animal Studies*. London: University of Chicago Press, 2018.

Gruen, Lori. *Entangled Empathy: An Alternative Ethic for Our Relationships with Animals*. New York: Lantern Books, 2015.

Hammond, Diane. *Hannah's Dream*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2008.

Haraway, Donna Jeanne. *The Companion Species Manifesto: Dogs, People, and Significant Otherness*. Vol. 1. Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press, 2003.

Haraway, Donna Jeanne. "When Species Meet." In *The Routledge International Handbook of More-than-Human Studies*, 42–78. Routledge, 2008.

Hediger, Heini. "From Cage to Territory." In *The World of Zoos: A Survey and Gazetteer*, edited by Rosl Kirchshofer, 9–20. New York: Viking Press, 1968.

Hosey, Geoff and Vicky Melfi. "Human–Animal Bonds Between Zoo Professionals and the Animals in Their Care." *Zoo Biology*, vol. 31, no. 1 (2012): 13–26.

Jamieson, Dale. "Against Zoos." In *In Defense of Animals: The Second Wave*, edited by Peter Singer, 132–143. New York: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2006.

Jamieson, Dale. "Zoos Revisited." *Ethics on the Ark: Zoos, Animal Welfare, and Wildlife Conservation*, edited by Bryan G. Norton et al., 52–68. Washington, D.C. and London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1995.

Lorimer, Jamie. "Elephants as Companion Species: The Lively Biogeographies of Asian Elephant Conservation in Sri Lanka." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, vol. 35, no. 4 (2010): 491–506.

Malamud, Randy. "Animals on Film: The Ethics of the Human Gaze." *Spring*, vol. 83 (2010): 1–26.

Malamud, Randy. *An Introduction to Animals and Visual Culture*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Malamud, Randy. *Reading Zoos: Representations of Animals and Captivity*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1998.

Marvin, Garry. "L'animal de zoo* Un rôle entre sauvage et domestique." *Techniques & Culture*, vol. 50, no. 1 (2008): 102–119.

Milstein, Tema. "'Somethin' Tells Me It's All Happening at the Zoo': Discourse, Power, and Conservationism." *Environmental Communication*, vol. 3, no. 1 (2009): 25–48. https://doi.org/10.1080/17524030802674174.

Montgomery, Scott L. "The Zoo: Theatre of the Animals." *Science as Culture*, vol. 4, no. 4 (1995): 565–600. https://doi.org/10.1080/09505439509526406.

Morin, Karen M. *Carceral Space, Prisoners and Animals*. New York: Routledge, 2018.

Mullan, Bob and Garry Marvin. *Zoo Culture*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1999.

Norton, Bryan G., Michael Hutchins, Terry Maple, and Elizabeth Stevens, eds. *Ethics on the Ark: Zoos, Animal Welfare, and Wildlife Conservation*. Smithsonian Institution, 1995.

Palmer, Clare. "Colonization, Urbanization, and Animals." *Philosophy & Geography*, vol. 6, no. 1 (2003): 47–58. https://doi.org/10.1080/1090377032000063315.

Poll, Harris. "More than Ever, Pets Are Members of the Family." *Posted July* 6 (2015). http://www.theharrispoll.com/health-and-life/Pets-are-Members-of-the-Family.html.

Prattley, Hadassa. *Defamiliarizing the Zoo: Representations of Nonhuman Animal Captivity in Five Contemporary Novels*. Master's thesis. University of Canterbury, 2012.

Redmalm, David. "Discipline and Puppies: The Powers of Pet Keeping." *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, vol. 41, no. 3/4 (2021): 440–454.

Sanders, Clinton. "Actions Speak Louder than Words: Close Relationships Between Humans and Nonhuman Animals." *Symbolic Interaction*, vol. 26, no. 3 (2003): 405–426.

Schaefer, Karen D. "How Connections with Companion Animals Impact Relationships with Self and Intimate Others." In *Clinician's Guide to Treating Companion Animal Issues*, 193–222. Academic Press, 2019.

Serpell, James A. "Companion Animals." In *Anthrozoology: Human-Animal Interactions in Domesticated and Wild Animals*, edited by Geoff Hosey and Vicky Melfi, 17–31. New York: Oxford University Press, 2019.

Shukin, Nicole. *Animal Capital: Rendering Life in Biopolitical Times*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2009.

Sillar, Frederick C. and Ruth M. Meyler. *Elephants Ancient and Modern*. New York: The Viking Press, 1968.

Stibbe, Arran. "Language, Power and the Social Construction of Animals." *Society & Animals*, vol. 9, no. 2 (2001): 145–161. https://doi.org/10.1163/156853001753639251.

Swaisgood, Ronald R. and David J. Shepherdson. "Scientific Approaches to Enrichment and Stereotypies in Zoo Animals: What's Been Done and Where Should We Go Next?" *Zoo Biology: Published in Affiliation with the American Zoo and Aquarium Association*, vol. 24, no. 6 (2005): 499–518.

Thierman, Stephen. "Apparatuses of Animality: Foucault Goes to a Slaughterhouse." *Foucault Studies*, no. 9 (2010): 89–110. https://doi.org/10.22439/fs.v0i9.3061.

Taylor, Chloë. "Foucault and Critical Animal Studies: Genealogies of Agricultural Power." *Philosophy Compass*, vol. 8, no. 6 (2013): 539–551. https://doi.org/10.1111/phc3.12046.

Moumita Bala is a Senior Research Scholar (UGC SRF) and Teaching Assistant in the Humanities and Social Sciences Department of Indian Institute of Technology Patna, India. Her areas of interests include literary animal studies, environmental humanities and folklore studies. Her research papers have been published in the Scopus indexed journals. She has presented her research ideas at both national and international conferences. E-mail: moumitabala1338@gmail.com.

Moumita Bala jest starszym pracownikiem naukowym (UGC SRF) i asystentem dydaktycznym na Wydziale Nauk Humanistycznych i Społecznych Indyjskiego Instytutu Technologii Patna w Indiach. Jej zainteresowania obejmują studia literackie nad zwierzętami, humanistykę środowiskową i folklorystykę. Jej artykuły naukowe były publikowane w czasopismach indeksowanych przez Scopus. Swoje idee badawcze prezentowała na konferencjach krajowych i międzynarodowych. E-mail: moumitabala1338@gmail.com.

Smriti Singh is a Professor of English in the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Indian Institute of Technology Patna, India. Her areas of research and teaching are Indian writings in English, Literary Theory and ELT. She was the former Fulbright FLTA at the University of Texas at Austin. She has published three books and numerous research papers. She is currently the Chairperson of Postcolonial Studies Association (Invited Position). E-mail: smritisinghiitp@gmail.com.

Smriti Singh jest profesorem języka angielskiego na Wydziale Nauk Humanistycznych i Społecznych Indyjskiego Instytutu Technologii Patna w Indiach. Jej obszary badań i nauczania obejmują pisma indyjskie w języku angielskim, teorię literatury oraz ELT. Była beneficjentką programu Fulbrighta na Uniwersytecie Teksańskim w Austin. Opublikowała trzy książki i liczne artykuły naukowe. Obecnie jest Przewodniczącą Stowarzyszenia Studiów Postkolonialnych (osoba zaproszona na stanowisko). E-mail: smritisinghiitp@gmail.com.