„Zoophilologica. Polish Journal of Animal Studies"
Nr 1/2015 *Zwierzęce*
ISSN 2451-3849

Zuzanna Szatanik
University of Silesia

Whether Animals
Pondering Animality in Lorna Crozier's Poetry

The main title of this paper, "Whether Animals", does not make sense. Whether animals *what*? The title is not a question but a suggestion of one; a hint that some alternative possibilities concerning animals might be examined. Consequently, a "whether animal", as dreamed up for the sake of this paper, is not reducible to an *it*, nor does he or she, however, report to an academy in the manner of Kafka's Red Peter[1]. He or she is always "filtered through or clogged up in this thick but transparent mesh (or mess) of history, culture, public opinion, [and] received ideas"[2], and thus becomes an animal conceivable and describable to humans. Yet rather than simply *being*, a "whether animal" *embodies* the problem of animality and its shifting boundaries, and "opens the border inherited from the separation of nature and culture"[3]. The redefinition of "animal", which results from such an opening, has been the focus of human-animal studies.

A relatively new academic field[4], this interdisciplinary project has examined "the cultural, philosophical, economic and social means by which humans

[1] In Kafka's story "A Report to an Academy" (1917) an ape called Red Peter, who has learned to behave like a human, presents the story of his transformation.

[2] K. Weil: *Thinking Animals. Why Animal Studies Now?*. New York 2012, p. 93.

[3] R. Broglio: *Incidents in the Animal Revolution*. In: *Beyond Human. From Animality to Transhumanism*. Ed. C. Blake, C. Molloy, S. Shakespeare. London 2012, p. 32.

[4] It is often assumed that the publication of Peter Singer's *Animal Liberation* in 1975 marks the beginning of Human-Animal Studies.

and animals interact"[5]. For the reason, that it subverts the dichotomy and hierarchy between "animal" and "human", it has been viewed as controversial and blasphemous[6]. For the reason, that it refuses to fully theorize the animal out of his or her living (or dead) body, and yet applies posthumanist perspectives to analyze him or her, it has also been deemed "unscientific" and inconsistent, with every scholar in the field apparently playing the role of an awkward Elizabeth Costello[7].

At the same time, some of the dilemmas that human-animal studies faces within academia, have been reflected in present-day western popular culture. The striking contradiction inscribed in the notion of "animal" that it is either *like* me or *unlike* me has been perhaps most clearly reflected in film and literature, although it has also had an impact upon dietary trends (whereas 2014 was declared "the year of the vegan"[8], 2013 was "the year of Paleo"[9]). On the one hand, accordingly, there has been a plethora of animated movies in which animals such as penguins, squirrels, and ponies[10] are anthropomorphized, and countless photographic memes, gifs, and homemade shorts spread over the Internet, which mostly by means of emphasizing the baby-like qualities of animals humanize pets and de-humanize animal abusers. On the other hand, however, starkly negative images of aggressive animal rights activists, or deranged "eco-terrorists", have permeated the media. What these contradictory examples bring to light is the slippery grounds on which animals are subdivided and hierarchized, and the discrepancies between humans' reactions to cultural images of animals and to actual animals. For instance, although pigs, together with dolphins and chimpanzees, are considered to be among the most intelligent of animals, and their representations often emphasize their cuteness (e.g. the *Babe* movies), real pigs "[disappear in masses] to become pork and ham"[11].

[5] P. Armstrong, L. Simmons: *Bestiary: An Introduction*. In: *Knowing Animals*. Ed. P. Armstrong, L. Simmons. Leiden 2009, p. 1.

[6] In Poland, whose Constitutional Tribunal has declared ritual slaughter legal, far-right journalists see animal studies as a continuation of gender studies which, according to them, is a part of the western "culture of death" which aims to destroy the family, propagate abortion, and overturn the Catholic Church. See: http://wyborcza.pl/1,75478,15462718; Nowy_wrog_po_gender__animal_studies.html; http://www.tokfm.pl/Tokfm/1,103085,17178738,Terlikowski__Zwierzeta_nie_maja_praw__A_ochrona_ich.html.

[7] A character in J.M. Coetzee's novels *Elizabeth Costello* and *The Lives of Animals* (who also appears in *Slow Man)*; a scholar and an awkward speaker who makes her audience uncomfortable because she chooses the subject of animal abuse over that of her own writing, and – in what seems to be a far-fetched analogy – compares abattoirs to concentration camps.

[8] http://www.onegreenplanet.org/news/is-2014-the-year-of-the-vegan/.

[9] http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/12/17/most-googled-diets-of-2013_n_4426726.html.

[10] *Penguins of Madagascar* (2014), *The Nut Job* (2014), *My Little Pony*.

[11] H. Tiffin: *Pigs, People, and Pigoons*. In: *Knowing Animals…*, p. 250. It is pigs, in fact, that are most "like us in terms of anatomical and physiological composition" which is why they are "bred to supply humans with replacement organs" and that "share [our] emotional responses" (Tiffin 245). From the few "accounts of the flavor of human flesh" we also know that it tastes like pork (Tiffin 244), hence the name "long pig" given to humans by cannibals from the Marquesas Islands of Polynesia.

Apes and dolphins, on the other hand, have been used by humans in a variety of experiments aimed to explore the "human-animal border"[12], as demonstrated in two acclaimed documentaries, HBO's *Nim Project* and BBC's *The Girl Who Talked to Dolphins*, released in 2011 and 2014 respectively. The former offers a critical look at an experiment conducted in early 1970s on a chimpanzee named Nim Chimpsky; the latter opens to debate the story of another experiment conducted in the 1960s on a dolphin called Peter. Both had tragic consequences for the animals in question, and both revealed what has commonly been referred to as the *humanity* of the animals and the *animality* of the humans.

The publication of Jared Diamond's *The Third Chimpanzee* in 2006, in which he asserts that "not only are humans not distinct from animals and other chimpanzees, [but they] 'don't constitute a distinct family, not even a distinct genus'"[13], confirmed the status of apes as the most "borderline" animals. This was manifest in an Internet debate which was under way in the summer of 2014, about the legal rights to a selfie taken by a black macaque. In December that year, a twenty-nine-year-old orangutan, Sandra, became "the first non-human animal recognized as a person in [the Argentine] court of law"[14] which granted her the right to (relative) freedom. In the same vein, "we feel something uncanny", as Brian Boyd has it,

> when we hear that a female chimp can leaf through *Playgirl* to masturbate over the pictures, or that an elephant in the wild can return for months and months to the site of her mother's death to caress the mother's skull, or that a dog can have a nervous breakdown out of guilt[15].

"Whether animals", these transgressive figures "question the way we habitually define ourselves by excluding others […]"[16], as they inhabit the "site of thinking otherwise"[17].

This ambiguous space has provided a setting for many classic works of poetry and fiction. Virginia Woolf, Italo Calvino, Mikhail Bulgakov, and Franz Kafka all explored the possibility of "writing animal" in their novels[18], while poets such as William Blake, Emily Dickinson, T. S. Eliot and Ted Hughes, to name just a few, pondered animality in some of their most renowned verses. In recent years various writers have fantasized the perspective of a dog (e.g., Paul Aus-

[12] B. Boyd: *Tails Within Tales*. In: *Knowing Animals*…, p. 233.

[13] J. Diamond qtd. in: G.A. Mazis: *Humans, Animals, Machines. Blurring Boundaries*. New York 2008, p. 4.

[14] http://www.wired.com/2014/12/orangutan-personhood/.

[15] B. Boyd: *Tails Within Tales*. In: *Knowing Animals*…, p. 227.

[16] Ibidem, pp. 233–234.

[17] K. Weil: *Thinking Animals. Why Animal Studies Now?*. New York 2012, p. 28.

[18] Virginia Woolf *Flush*, Italo Calvino *Cosmicomics*, Mikhail Bulgakov *The Heart of a Dog*, Franz Kafka *The Metamorphosis*, *A Report to an Academy*, *Investigations of a Dog*, *The Burrow*.

ter's 1999 novella *Timbuktu*, John Berger's 2000 *King: A Street Story*, or Garth Stein's 2009 *The Art of Racing in the Rain*), a rat (Sam Savage's 2006 *Firmin: Adventures of a Metropolitan Lowlife*), a pigeon (Patrick Neate's 2004 *The London Pigeon Wars*), and a spider (Benjamin Kunkel's 2014 *My Predicament: A Story*). Two notable examples from English-Canadian literature are Barbara Gowdy's *The White Bone* whose narrators are African elephants, and Bill Richardson's *Waiting for Gertrude* narrated by Alice B. Toklas reincarnated as a cat.

By no means can these two animal species, elephants and cats, be "nationalized" as specifically "Canadian". However, since Canada has been stereotyped as a land of "nature" and "wilderness" animals, and wild ones in particular, have been inscribed within the country's poetry and prose, including the literature of the First Nations, and of French and English colonizers. For the sake of the following analysis, it is more potent, however, to take into account the affinities between gender, animal, and English-Canadian studies, and to see Canada as a possible "whether" space, one which is metaphorically undermined by the nation's constitutional question of "where is here?"[19]. The aim of this paper then is to discuss the poetic creation of such a transgressive landscape and the animals that inhabit it, in the works of Canadian author Lorna Crozier. It is, however, beyond the scope of this article to perform a thorough reading of Crozier's poetry. Instead, I intend to use her poems as illustrations and inspirations to my ponderings upon the "whetherness" of animals.

Two labels which have been used the most often to describe Crozier are "a feminist" and "a prairie poet". The former relates mostly to the author's earlier poems, notably her two series titled "The Sex Life of Vegetables" from the 1985 collection *The Garden Going On Without Us*, and the "Penis Poems" from the 1988 *Angels of Flesh, Angels of Silence*. Regardless of Crozier's use of irony and humor, or maybe for the very reason that she uses them, both have been deemed particularly controversial (and consequently branded "feminist"). Crozier's subversions are also manifest in her retelling of Biblical stories, which has continued throughout her collections. It is the Biblical Creation Myth specifically that Crozier has undermined a number of times, by means of "queering" it, or reversing its patriarchal logic. Simultaneously, she has also been creating poetic landscapes inhabited by a whole variety of "wild" creatures, such as hawks, crows, mice, snakes, and rats, as well as domesticated cats, dogs, and horses. Importantly, Crozier's feminist inclinations undoubtedly shape her "prairie" poetry, as "related to [her] rejection of Old Testament myths of origin that privilege the order of the phallus, […] is her rejection of myths of Canadian west, those

[19] "In 1965, in the concluding essay to the first *Literary History of Canada*, Northrop Frye wrote that the question "Where is here?" was the central preoccupation of Canadian culture". http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/alh/summary/v013/13.4henderson.html.

patriarchal meta-narratives that configure the Canadian west as battleground between 'man' and nature'"[20].

Theories of Canadianness, or Canadian national identity, have been constructed on the fundamental assumption that Canadian wilderness has a powerful impact upon the psyche of its inhabitants, who are always at risk of going "bushed"[21], and therefore have to defend themselves against the snowy, hostile vastness. Separating themselves from the threatening realm of nature, Canadians develop the "garrison mentality", which is a concept coined by Northrop Frye in 1965, and live by the principle of law. They must keep together and protect their humanity through adherence to the strict, patriarchal order. Similar ideas shaped the works of other thematic critics of the twentieth century, including Margaret Atwood, William Kilbourn, and W. L. Morton, who in his 1961 essays *The Canadian Identity*, argued that:

> Canadian life … is marked by a northern quality, the strong seasonal rhythms … the wilderness venture […] the return from the lonely savagery of the wilderness to the peace of the home […] the puritanical restraint which masks the psychological tensions set up by the contrast of wilderness roughness and home discipline. The line which marks off the frontier from the farmstead, the wilderness from the baseland, the hinterland from the metropolis, runs through every Canadian psyche[22].

One of the main assumptions of this article is that Lorna Crozier positions her lyrical "I" at the borderline conceptualized by Morton. The line, however, does not separate and divide, but constitutes a meeting point, or an intersection, between the human and the animal worlds.

Therefore, Crozier refuses to see the prairie landscape as wilderness that needs to be subdued and tamed; nor does she see it as a "pristine sanctuary where the last remnant of an untouched, endangered, but still transcendent nature can for at least a little while longer be encountered without the contaminating taint of civilization"[23]. Instead, she brings into being landscapes which are inherently transgressive, ones that you cross rather than inhabit, which are always "rooted in longing, which is to say a desire for alignment of ourselves with the natural world […]"[24]. What Crozier's poems make painfully obvious is that such "align-

[20] M. Rose: *Bones Made of Light: Nature in the Poetry of Lorna Crozier*. http://canadianpoetry.org/volumes/vol55/rose.html, p. 2.

[21] "Bushed" is the title of Earle Birney's poem describing a man's journey into wilderness, which is also his journey into madness.

[22] W.L. Morton qtd. in: E. Mackey: *The House of Difference. Cultural Politics and National Identity in Canada*. Toronto 2002, p. 45.

[23] W. Cronon qtd. in: P. Banting: *Magic is Afoot: Hoof Marks, Paw Prints, and the Problem of Writing Wildly*. In: *Animal Encounters*. Ed. T. Tyler, M. Rossini. Leiden 2009, p. 28.

[24] M. Rose: *Bones Made of Light*…, p. 3.

ment" is never complete, if only for the reason that the "capacity for language-use possessed by our species cuts us off from the world in a way […]"[25]. It is mostly through representations of animals that Crozier's works narrate the engagement between the self and the landscape, which is impassioned and driven, but which is always already marked by lack.

If there is one category that has represented a seemingly impassable boundary between humans and animals, it is that of language. In Cartesian tradition "speech marks a clear and infallible line of demarcation between humans and animals"[26]: "I can speak therefore I am human: it cannot speak therefore it is not human"[27]. This is why experiments which involve "borderline" animals, including Nim and Peter, have focused on teaching them how to communicate with humans *on human terms*. Although some of these attempts have been relatively successful, with a number of apes learning sign language[28] the success has been seen in transforming the animal into a lesser human, with his or her intelligence being compared to that of a child or at best a simpleminded adult[29]. Crozier's animals, conversely, have an uncanny relationship with language, as it is, so to speak, their *terra firma*. They do use language sometimes like a "chickadee crying *me me me*"[30] in "The Solstice Bird" or coyotes "talking to themselves"[31] in "Night Walk", but mostly it is language that *uses* them. In her "If a Poem Could Walk", for instance, a poem is "the perfect animal"[32], both "tame and wild", with its paws or hooves leaving tracks in the sand: "Something to make you stop / and wonder / what kind of animal this is / where it came from / where it's going". This poem/animal is always on the go, heading "right off the page", its meaning ungraspable.

Both the lyrical "I" in Crozier's poetry and this poem/animal look for "a way out of [the] prison-house of language"[33] (Weil 12) by means of subverting the Law of the Father. In Crozier's work, this may indicate the feminist undermining of Judeo-Christian grand narratives and the problematization of the concept of "communication", as well as resistance against the urge to produce meaning. Animals remain "beautifully by us misunderstood" (*SM* 28), as Crozier writes

[25] P. Zwicky qtd. in: M. Rose: *Bones Made of Light*…, p. 3.

[26] K. Weil: *Thinking Animals*…, p. 8.

[27] R. Broglio: *Incidents in the Animal Revolution*. In: *Beyond Human. From Animality to Transhumanism*. Ed. C. Blake, C. Molloy, S. Shakespeare. London 2012, p. 34.

[28] Washoe, a female chimpanzee (1965–2007) was the first animal to use American sign language and was able to combine signs in new and even metaphorical ways.

[29] For this reason, theorists of human-animal studies critique "assimilation as a process that gives voice only by destroying the self that would speak. […] If they learn our language, will they still be animals?" (Weil 6).

[30] L. Crozier: *Small Mechanics*. Toronto 2005, p. 7.

[31] Ibidem, p. 28.

[32] L. Crozier: *The Blue Hour of the Day. Selected Poems*. Toronto 2007, p. 37.

[33] K. Weil: *Thinking Animals*…, p. 12.

in "Night Walk", although they are "at the very origin of our systems of representation". So far, however, as Kari Weil suggests, these representations have mostly served to "increase the distance between us and them, if not between us and the animals we are"[34]. To "speak animal" in Crozier's poetry is, therefore, to "point to or imagine an 'elsewhere' outside of language"[35], and "represent their being outside our terms of reference and without claiming an essentialized otherness"[36]. Crozier imagines such an "elsewhere" in her "Lesson in Perspective"[37], in which a cat creates the world with words he or she makes "with a paw's touch, with a stroke of whiskers". This is an alternative creation myth, in which it is the body that speaks, and in which body and language are inseparable. The exploration of "elsewhere", which Donna Haraway calls "otherworlding", is possible under the assumption that "it is not human tool use, consciousness, reason, spirit, language or syntax – not our speech, our handwriting or our opposable thumbs – which *separate* us from other animals but rather our footprints which *link* us with them"[38].

In her *When Species Meet* Haraway envisions an "embodied communication" between humans and animals, which is "more like a dance than a word"[39]:

> The flow of entangled meaningful bodies in time whether jerky or nervous or flaming or flowing, whether both partners move in harmony or painfully out of synch or something else altogether is communication about relationship, the relationship itself, and the means of reshaping relationship and so its enactors[40].

Haraway imagines "our flesh and our language as a metaplasm"[41], with us incorporating "aspects of the other into what [we] … become"[42]. Animals of all species including *Homo Sapiens* are "earthbodies", to use Glen A. Mazis's term, and as such they relate with the world "in such a way that [they] are woven into its fabric"[43]. In Barbara Smutts's terms, similarly, what characterizes a "person" is not his or her intelligence or power, but his or her ability to be in relation with others: "when a human being relates to an individual nonhuman being as an anonymous object, rather than as a being with its own subjectivity, it is the human,

[34] Ibidem, p. 12.
[35] Ibidem, p. 16.
[36] Ibidem, p. 27.
[37] http://www.lornacrozier.ca/poems.html.
[38] P. Banting: *Magic is Afoot*…, p. 42.
[39] D.J. Haraway: *When Species Meet*. Minneapolis 2008, p. 26.
[40] Ibidem.
[41] G.A. Mazis: *Humans, Animals, Machines. Blurring Boundaries*. New York 2008, p. 5.
[42] Ibidem.
[43] Ibidem, p. 15.

and not the other animal, who relinquishes personhood"[44]. Lorna Crozier's poetry, I believe, "does not try to find an idea in the animal, […] is not about the animal, but is instead the record of an engagement with him"[45]. This engagement, however, takes different forms, as the lyrical "I's" relations with animals of different kinds vary. Although she claims that she "[loves] the world too much / … [and praises] its paws and hooves, / its thick-furred creatures"[46] *indiscriminately*, there are animals she gets close to and touches lovingly, ones she admires from a distance, and others that have been banished from her poetic landscape. Only sometimes is her lavish love requited.

Animals, pets in particular, have often been presented as lovable, but the question of whether animals are love-able has been thought unscientific and beside the point. It is only in recent years that it was demonstrated that at least cats and dogs can love both other animals and their own human companions since their oxytocin levels rise significantly in the company of the loved ones[47]. More abstract questions concerning the relationship between animals, love, and language were raised in response to a study conducted by Irene Pepperberg on her African Grey Parrot, named Alex. It was the last words addressed to Pepperberg which Alex uttered before he died, namely, "I love you", that stirred debate on both animals' ability to feel love, and their ability to express it. "To wonder what Alex recognized when he recognized words", as Verlyn Klinkerborn proposes, "is also to wonder what humans recognize when we recognize words"[48]. "How do we know what our lovers mean when they say 'I love you'?"[49].

In Crozier's poetic realm, where language is open to question, love is "[signified] in the flesh"[50]. It is expressed through "semiotic dancing in which all the partners have faces, but no one relies on names"[51]. Borderlines between "animal" and "human" are crossed in her poems, and both "animality" and "humanity" are expressed through the body. The lyrical "I" then "[is her] own big dog / … every night at her feet / [she is] a big sack of sleep / stinking of [her]"[52]. If a poem were a dog, Crozier presumes in her hilarious retelling of "If A Poem Could Walk", one "more loyal / than anything you've ever written"[53], its "fat tongue [would slide]

[44] B. Smutts: *Reflections*. In: *The Lives of Animals by J.M. Coetzee*. Ed. A. Gutmann. Princeton 1999, p. 125.

[45] J.M. Coetzee: *The Lives of Animals*. Ed. A. Gutmann. Princeton 1999, p. 58.

[46] L. Crozier: *Small Mechanics*, p. 30.

[47] http://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2014/04/does-your-dog-or-cat-actually-love-you/360784/2/.

[48] V. Klinkerborn qtd. in: K. Weil: *Thinking Animals*…, p. 9.

[49] K. Weil: *Thinking Animals*…, p. 9.

[50] D.J. Haraway: *When Species Meet*. Minneapolis 2008, p. 16.

[51] Ibidem, p. 26.

[52] L. Crozier: *What Comes After*. In: *Whetstone*. Toronto 2011, p. 15.

[53] L. Crozier: *Small Mechanics*, p. 83.

from [a woman's] ankle to her knee"[54], or else it would "wetly [hump] / the trousered leg of the shyest person in the room"[55]. Cats are also omnipresent in Crozier's poems – her new collection published in March 2015 is actually entitled *The Wrong Cat* – they play with other ghost cats, or climb "the slow branches of the pear"[56], or construct a new religion ("the warm wheels of devotion / whirring inside their flesh"[57]). In "Midnight Watch", a cat is an intermediary between "the animals and you, so you won't feel unblessed / in your strange human skin"[58]. When Crozier anthropomorphizes animals, she does it *critically*, in ways which involve "[opening] ourselves to touch and to be touched by others as fellow subjects and […] [imagining] their pain, pleasure, and need in anthropomorphic terms, but [stopping] short of believing that we can know their experience"[59]. Such anthropo-interpretivism, as Nik Taylor calls it[60], does not assume human superiority, but makes feasible the creation of borderline spaces where human and non-human animals come into contact.

Although anthropomorphism has been "a dirty word of the scientific discourse"[61], in its critical form it has been somewhat redeemed by human-animal studies for a variety of reasons. First, it calls into question the hierarchy inscribed in between an animal and a human, and "threatens careful boundary maintenance"[62]. Second, it disputes "the morality of our social practices" as it is no longer possible to justify "current (ab)uses"[63] of animals once we see that they "do feel in similar ways to humans"[64]. The problem of "how to express animal pain or animal death, of how [one] can give a testimony to an experience that cannot be spoken or that may be distorted by speaking it"[65] does not only guide Crozier's work, but also connects animal studies and trauma studies[66].

Suffering associated with death, both animal and human, is an important topic of Crozier's poetry. She narrates/mourns the death of her parents, and of her

[54] Ibidem, p. 82.

[55] Ibidem, p. 83.

[56] L. Crozier: *Hoping to Fix Up, a Little, This World*. In: *Whetstone*. Toronto, McClelland and Stewart, 2011, p. 43.

[57] L. Crozier: *A New Religion*. In: *Small Mechanics*, p. 68.

[58] L. Crozier: *Small Mechanics*, p. 83.

[59] K. Weil: *Thinking Animals…*, p. 19.

[60] N. Taylor: *Anthropomorphism and the Animal Subject*. In: *Anthropocentrism. Humans, Animals, Environments*. Ed. Rob Bodice. Leiden, Brill 2011, p. 265.

[61] Ibidem, p. 266.

[62] Ibidem, p. 267.

[63] Ibidem, p. 268.

[64] Ibidem.

[65] K. Weil: *Thinking Animals…*, p. 6.

[66] Both "[stretch] to the limit questions of language, epistemology, and ethics that have been raised in various ways by women's studies and postcolonial studies: how to understand and give voice to others or to the experiences that seem impervious to our means of understanding;

dear friends, and scrutinizes her own aging body. In her short "Grief Resume"[67] the poet lists deaths she has grieved, including those of three dogs, two cats, and a parrot. The lyrical "I" also experiences awe when faced with a dead owl that "filled the kitchen with a presence / [she] couldn't name"[68], or a dying snake "unable to crawl / out of its pain"[69]. However, as Crozier's poems often venture into the eerie worlds inhabited by various ghosts, I see in them what Ron Broglio refers to as "animal spectre": a reflection, if you will, of animals whom the lyrical "I" dismisses. I am, therefore, going to conclude my ponderings with a reference to what represents absence, and what it is *tasteless* to discuss. Meat is a special kind of "whether animal", one whose body is transformed into food, and whose death can only be incorporated "through eating (literally and figuratively)"[70]. Both transformative processes seem to be hidden from view, as we "keep *something* from being seen as having been *someone*"[71] or keep "the moo away from the meat"[72]. I agree with Broglio that "with eating the other there is a certain indigestion, an inedible element in the eating"[73], which is why I sense a certain incongruity in Crozier's outwardly empathic poetic perspective. Namely, the poet creates rural landscapes where death abounds, and animals (including humans) kill other animals (including humans), yet she refuses to confront an elephant in the room, which is the systematic and systemic objectification and slaughter of "farm animals", including cows and chickens (who are present in her poems as benign providers of milk and eggs respectively), and pigs (who are absented from her work). If, as Crozier suggests, animals communicate with us through their bodies, "it is the living flesh of [*any*] animal that is its argument"[74], as Elizabeth Costello says in her problematic lecture. In poetry and elsewhere, this is the kind of argument that humans have yet to learn to swallow.

how to attend to difference without appropriating or distorting it; how to hear and acknowledge what it may not be possible to say" (Weil 6).

[67] L. Crozier: *Small Mechanics*, p. 68.

[68] Ibidem, p. 70.

[69] L. Crozier: *The Blue Hour of the Day. Selected Poems*. Toronto 2007, p. 31.

[70] R. Broglio: *Incidents in the Animal Revolution*. In: *Beyond Human. From Animality to Transhumanism*. Ed. C. Blake, C. Molloy, S. Shakespeare. London 2012, p. 14.

[71] C.J. Adams: *Post-Meateating*. In: *Animal Encounters*. Ed. T. Tyler, M. Rossini. Leiden, Brill 2009, p. 48.

[72] Ibidem.

[73] R. Broglio: *Incidents in the Animal Revolution…*, p. 14.

[74] J.M. Coetzee qtd. in: R. Broglio: *Incidents in the Animal Revolution…*, p. 21.

Abstrakt

Czy (też nie) zwierzęta
Rozważania nad zwierzęcością w poezji Lorny Crozier

Punktem wyjścia dla zaproponowanej tu analizy twórczości kanadyjskiej poetki Lorny Crozier jest dyskusja nad zmianami w postrzeganiu zwierząt, które zachodzą we współczesnej kulturze Zachodu. Granica między człowiekiem a zwierzęciem jest dzisiaj szczególnie płynna, czego dowodem są, między innymi, zmiany w zapisach prawnych regulujących status małp człekokształtnych. Tradycyjna dychotomia człowiek – zwierzę bądź kultura – natura wydaje się natomiast szczególnie interesująca w kontekście kanadyjskim, gdzie dzikość natury postrzegana była przede wszystkim jako zagrożenie, przed którym należy się bronić. Teoretycy „kanadyjskości" ustanawiali więc jednoznaczne granice między naturą a cywilizacją. Lorna Crozier – kanadyjska poetka prerii – postrzega jednak te granice nie jako linie rozłamu, ale jako miejsca spotkań człowieka i zwierzęcia, w których komunikacja między – lub ponad – gatunkowa staje się możliwa.

Słowa klucze:
poezja kanadyjska, wizerunki zwierząt w poezji, *animal studies*

Абстракт

Животные ли (или же нет)
Рассуждения о зверином в поэзии Лорны Крозье

Исходным пунктом для предложенного здесь анализа творчества канадской поэтессы Лорны Крозье является дискуссия над изменением в восприятии животных, которое происходит в современной культуре Запада. Граница между человеком и животным сегодня особенно неустойчива, доказательством чего являются, в частности, изменения в правовых записях, регулирующих статус человекообразных обезьян. Традиционная дихотомия человек – животное, или культура – природа, кажется быть зато особенно интересной в канадском контексте, где дикость природы воспринималась прежде всего как угроза от которой надо защищаться. Теоретики (канадскости) устанавливали четкие границы между природой и цивилизацией. Лорна Крозье – канадская поэтесса прерии – воспринимает эту границу не как линию раскола, а как место встречи человека и животного, в котором коммуникация меж-или транс-видовая становится возможной.

Ключевые слова:
канадская поэзия, образы животных в поэзии, animal studies