

УДК 81'42-115:801.82:791]-044.27

Eugene Lepokhin

ORCID: 0000-0002-6941-7467

AMBIVALENCE OF SOCIAL AND PRIVATE IN THE FILM TEXT *GATTACA* BY ANDREW NICCOL AND THE STORY *IVAN IVANOVICH* BY MYKOLA KHVYLOVY

The alignment of the studied discourses has been done under the rubric of similarities between heteromedial semiotic entities; their status is that of aesthetic objects. The paper focuses on the dilemmas of contemporary interart studies and is based on so-called poststructuralist theory (most notably in the work of Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze). The issues of the politics of human bodies, the excerpts of Jung's analytical psychoanalysis, Merleau-Ponty's "flesh of the world" notion, Sartre's returned look / gaze clarifications have been expounded in the paper. Various concepts and precepts that legitimately pertain to cinematograph and literature account for the general common things in the fictional world both on screen and within the cover of the book, as well as for the bodies in the worlds external to that screen and book. In this respect the recurrence concept, the shadow archetype, the illness / sickness dichotomy expounding, regime / diet interpretations have been articulated in the paper. The analysis of the characters has been conducted with reference to their actions and goals through the prism of the aforementioned categories.

Keywords: *body, identity, recurrence, character, society, narrator, image, ideology, transmediality.*

DOI 10.34079/2226-3055-2022-15-26-27-116-132

Intermediality serves to forging a path from one antagonistic medium to another in virtue of the pronounced intertextual patterns. Every so often, intertextuality implies the interweaving of one prime text with other texts made up of penned words. Although Julia Kristeva, as Jürgen E. Müller assumes (Brötz, 2015, pp.60–61), ascribes the term "text" to all entities that are in interactive processes, Werner Wolf (2017, p. 66) contends that "Intertextuality crosses textual boundaries, but remains in the realm of the verbal medium and is insofar 'intramedial'. 'Intermediality', on the other hand, crosses boundaries between *media* in the above sense, and *intermediality* is therefore complementary to 'intramediality'." Thus, intermediality implies a manifestation of intersemiotic intertextuality (Mocherniuk, 2017, p. 211). It means, exhibiting some common ground of a film text and a literary text (screen as the endowing of a film experience and paper as of a book experience; the production of subjectivity in the film-viewing situation and in the book-reading one etc.). In our case, we give an analysis of two semiotic entities that do not display apparent or distinct cross-relations. Comparative studies have always examined both direct, verifiable instances of contacts and "obscure" analogies drawn from similar economic, political, socio-historical or institutional situations. Under such premises Dunja Brötz (2015), for instance, appropriates a comparative approach for the analysis of *The Million Dollar Hotel* (2000, dir. Wim Wenders) and the parallels in content to the Fyodor Dostoevsky's *The Idiot* (1868) that have arisen without contact to the novel.

Being aesthetic objects, both cinema (*Gattaca*, 1997) and literature (the story *Ivan Ivanovich*, 1929) are developed from the projection of the fact that the disclosure of codes, meanings is the same for different domains of man's creative activity. In that event, it might be permitted to talk about "transmediality" issues in the semiotic complexes under scrutiny (Wolf, 2005, pp. 252–256). Therefore, it goes about identity preservation / loss issues, the government establishments that supervise and register citizens' activities, the unconscious zaniness and tomfoolery in the studied discourses.

The comparison is also made with regard to Andrzej Hejmej insights about the tendencies in literary comparative studies. By his convention, the scholar divides comparativistics into “traditional”, interdisciplinary and cultural. The latter one entails, firstly, interpretation praxis concerned with random contextualization of literary phenomena and, what is more important, related to them non-literary ones, establishing linkage and associations that are more likely “to be formed” in the actual of the interpreter *hic et nunc* rather than they “are” (Hejmej, 2010, p. 63). Secondly, it involves juxtaposing unrelated styles, “a collage method of conduct, with the necessity of working out a slightly different interpretation language each time, which imposes an idiographic approach and results in a case study” (Hejmej, 2010, p. 63). Thus, with a glance to Jeremy Bentham’s panopticon prison architecture as mentioned by Michel Foucault in his *Discipline and Punishment: Birth of the Prison* (1975), both a spectator and a reader are voyeuristic entities similar to the centrally positioned warden bird-dogging the inmates. In the case of Mykola Khvylovy, voyeurism equals to omniscience, omnipresence of naratee, since the heterodiegetic narrator of the story *Ivan Ivanovich* is in an extradiegetic situation and before each chapter he gives a brief account-preview of the plot events in it similar to the one done by Miguel de Cervantes, Daniel Defoe, François Rabelais, E. T. A. Hoffman to name a few. Both the reader and the film viewer are identified with the “panoptic” look of the larger social structures, the society itself where one is banished from its advantages owing to his genetic “corrosion,” and the other strives to keep on top though being inherently “corrodible.” Concurrently, the homodiegetic narrator in the extradiegetic situation of the story events presents the implied viewer of *Gattaca*, privileged to the “panoptic” view, to the story.

Thirdly, interpretation praxis is associated with “a comparative action as an existential need: the need to place things becomes a bare necessity to locate oneself in a certain (inter)cultural, social, political perspective” (Hejmej, 2010, p. 63). The studied discourses exemplify intersubjective relationships across social communities, for being a sort of “reality” mediations in its own right they unearth issues that require the receivers to respond to them, to participate in resolving outstanding queries by guiding their attention to the implied significance of an event. Similarly, a scholar as the addressee of the discourse interprets it in terms of mastery/transmission of meaning and articulating his subjective experience. The identification is done in compliance with the existential tenet of self-awareness as well as the constitution of subjectivity by virtue of establishing link between different semiotic complexes.

1. Recurrence as narrative topos, disguise as a recurring narrative scheme

The plot of Andrew Niccol’s film text *Gattaca* revolves around the recurrence, reiteration principle. Vincent’s parents (Ethan Hawke) give birth to their second child, and this time they resort to genetic engineering; the brothers compete in swimming (who has got enough snobs to go as far as one dares into the deep water and return if he got scared) both in childhood, and in adulthood; it is vital for Vincent to resort to hygiene practices every day as well as to do biochemical tests by doctor Lamar etc. However, the main evidence of repetition is the presence of Vincent’s twin – Jerome (Jude Law) or vice versa – Vincent impersonates Jerome, dons his social and genetic mask, and, i.e. plays Jerome’s part. The proofs of this, as shown in the film, are the biological remains of flesh, blood, urine, and other particles of the latter. In this regard, one may apprehend Julia Kristeva’s category of “abjection,” which entails physical excretion of saliva, urine, faeces, blood, sperm, and tears. Everything has the purpose to consider one of the notions of the film – achievement of objectives, accomplishment of goals. Besides, Vincent’s last remark do also focuses our attention on the concept of repetition, “Of course, they say every atom in our bodies was once part of a star. Maybe I’m not leaving... maybe I’m going home.” On the one hand, we have an illustration of an existentialist postulate on freedom of choice, the search for one’s identity, the process of creating inward nature. On the other hand, a parable about the will of power and the desire of achieving one’s dreams, fulfilling fantasies.

Mykola Khvylovy employs bicomponent literary and artistic anthroponyms with reference to the characters. Ivan Ivanovich, Methody Kirilovich, Hippolit Onufrievich, and Semen Yakovich are so-called derivative literary and artistic anthroponyms (names derived from the natural anthroponymicon) composed by name + patronymic name, whereas Marfa Halaktionovna will be original one. Ivan Ivanovich and his wife Marfa Halaktionovna do wear masks to carry on pretending conscientious, true party-officials at work and newfangled bourgeois at home, as Iryna Tsyupyak claims (Tsyupyak, 2002, p. 99). Ambivalence and dualistic theory of insincerity, duplicity, and hypocrisy is also manifested in the fact that all “pleasant” characters are mentioned by their first and middle (patronymic) names; they are also provided with the party nicknames (Comrade Jean and Comrade Halakta respectively) when it comes to crude materialism, sexual undercurrents, and hypocrisy. Those, who oppose and do not have any influence on the government officials, are impartial witnesses. The writer names them via the anthroponym formulae “appellative + name” (as a Soviet cook Yavdokha and governess Mademoiselle Lucy) or “appellative + surname” (as a dissentient “obstructionist” comrade Leiter).

Subject to the laws that regulate in the world of *Gattaca*, Vincent was doomed right from the very beginning, upon his natural conception, since his age of life, according to the experts’ evidences, would not exceed 30 years. The young man unwittingly impeaches the validity of bioethicists’ statements; by personal example, he refutes the seemingly unalterable dichotomies of freedom and power, intrinsic rights and the laws of society, the goals of the state and the goals of the person. In the film, the duel is illustrated by the example of Vincent’s (the best navigator of the Gattaca space agency) face-off with his younger brother, Anton, who has become a police detective. Vincent has a hereditary disposition towards heart issues, so the realm of celestial navigation and piloting spaceships is out of his reach. Instead, his brother is well-placed for this, inasmuch as the risk of being induced by generic illnesses in his case is rendered as small as possible.

The recurrence can be traced, foremost, at the narrative level because in the film diegesis the Ethan Hawke’s character, a homodiegetic narrator, goes back to the story behind his birth origin at the transition of exposition to retrospective (Platzgummer, 2003, pp. 28–33). In the context of the film discourse analysis, we regard repetition, recurrence, reiteration as the ability to remind (to recall?), to track the trajectory of the story events progression, their development, to fixate on the objects of the artistic world. The events of the film take place in the not-too-distant future, but as other scholars point out (Clayton, 2003, p. 185; Banner, 2011, p. 226), one may trace the features of the German National Socialism in the exterior, in retro fashion, in monumental buildings. The splitting of self is particularly displayed during the stay at the academy, where all have the same uniform whilst taking classes, being given instruction in exercises, gymnastics, sports, or when tidying the territory of the institution by the appropriate janitor service. The repetition has a cyclical pattern, since the film starts and ends with the same shot – an enlarged image of falling nails on the ground (after the closing credits one may again observe them in close-up).

Sharing the opinion of Valentin Platzgummer, we contend that in this way the authors of the film demonstrate the importance of small things governing both the life and fate of a person in *Gattaca*. Over the course of the film, the characters in different ways reiterate the idea that nothing but human genes count and not colour of the skin, not some religious beliefs, not gender. Because of them, there occurs segregation between “valid” and “in-valid”, degenerated. Vincent ranks with the latter, yet owing to his tenacity, determination, obstinacy he succeeds to fall into the opposite, the desired camp. In its turn, this development of the character supports Tzvetan Todorov’s narratological concept on the psychological and a-psychological motivation of the events’ progression. Sky Marsen lays an a-psychological model on the semiotic axis of Being and Doing, where the character’s factum determines his self (Marsen, 2004, p. 143). The

scholar emphasizes that the case study of Vincent exemplifies the manifestation of the “volition” modality.

Similarly, there is a recurrence of the narrative grammar in the satirical story *Ivan Ivanovich* by Mykola Khvylovy. Firstly, this repetition is already reflected in the onym title. The anthroponym “Ivan Ivanovich” and its French correlative “Jean” makes it instantaneously clear to the reader, who is the protagonist of the opus, allows tracing his chronotopic movement in it. Heterodiegetic narrator recounts the story of Ivan Ivanovich, his functioning (after Michel Foucault) in relation to the contemporary society, his status, indispensability, importance, efficiency. Secondly, the explicit author quite intensively resorts to the homogeneous semantic abundance of his text, where the same stylistic arrangement of phrases-refrains, paronyms has been used (as per Oleksandr Hrytsenko):

“Tell me where was your briefcase? Wasn’t it on top of Semen Yakovich’s bag?” she asked.

Ivan Ivanovich put one finger to his lip and thought. “Yes, I think it was,” said he after a while.

“Now it’s clear. Listen! Semen Yakovich himself must have put this document into your bag, and he must have done it by mistake.”

“How by mistake?” Ivan Ivanovich could not understand.

“I remember that he took something out of his bag. It must have been this secret booklet. He probably wanted to quote from it during his talk. Later he must have changed his mind, and of course by mistake he put it into your bag instead of into his own,” explained Marfa Halaktionovna (Khvylovy, 1960, pp. 200–201).

Owing to epanalepsis, the meaning of the first sentence or segment expounds and amplifies in the second one and so forth.

Both discourses explicate the notion of birth of a different person that in case of Vincent may validate his right to become an astronaut and stay invisible for being exposed of his social crime. Concurrently, for Khvylovy’s titular character it means to remain in the domain of social regulation, power system, and be among those involved in a public punishment spectacle. Eventually, Comrade Jean’s damning, herd impulses coupled with his selfish existence are first directed at an external object (obstructionist Leiter, governess Yavdokha) which, by being a mirror image of the subject, foreshadows the inevitable turning around of the aggression against the subject himself as evidenced later with the events’ progression. The story does also mockingly highlight the features of state socialist construction and transformation of Ivan Ivanovich, his wife Marfa Halaktionovna and their close friend Methody Kirilovich into phony communists’ bodies.

The reiteration the Ukrainian writer makes use of in an attempt to produce a comic, ironic effect, even to some extent an absurd one, complies with Mikhail Bakhtin’s (*The Problem of Content, Material, and Form in Verbal Art*, 1928) axiological relationship of the form to the content exposition and accounts for the syntax and stylistic aesthetic of the discourse. Moreover, this is already a sign of the author’s modernity, his affiliation to the best traditions of the European modernist literature. This is also what Yurii Bezkhutryi repeatedly underscores, warning against a narrow reading of the writer’s works in terms of psycho-realistic literary tenets solely. Further, still in *Ivan Ivanovich*, irony is the key tool to oppose the state socialism rhetoric and attitude towards the human being.

The reason for reminding Vincent of his past is the desire to say that he is a courageous and a self-confident entity, a new hero for the new time. Eventually, Dr. Lamar at the end of the duration of both the screen time of the film text and its story line says he is his son’s teen idol. He does also crave to become a pilot, though he is “in-valid”. One can trace in Vincent the demonstration of Carl Gustav Jung’s archetypes, in particular, that of a shadow. Ethan Hawke’s character, as noted before, lives in the “borrowed” social mask, under the guise of Jerome.

Vincent adopts Jerome's identity, moulds into his *proprium*, since owing to it the future pilot fits himself into the world, which *a priori* is inaccessible to him, legitimately different. The "imposter" owes this distinction to his parents, to his father in particular, who was so proud of his second childbirth that he considered him worthy to be named after him. Vincent's sib embodies the shadow archetype, that of an enemy; psychological and philosophical collision between them occurs in the water, which acts as the ordinary representation for the unconscious, according to the Swiss psychologist and psychiatrist (Jung, 1969, p. 18). An encounter with the "shadow of the father" is essential for the development of Vincent's identity because he excels in his role always to be in the background. Thus, we have a reversal of roles: both "perfect", genuine Jerome and his brother Anton are, in fact, personalized shadows. As Nila Zborovska observed, "Hostile clash of consciousness with the shadow is the prerequisite for comprehensive psychotherapy, which should result in rapport between the parties to dispute" (Zborovska, 2003, p. 136). This is what we have been observing in the brothers' relationship.

Consequently, Vincent appears as the constituent of the oppressed personality integral structure that compensates for his sublimated aggression by a significant advance in the hierarchical structure of the corporation. On the global scale, he develops a mental and behavioural pattern for the fulfilment of his social functions, having mastered his nature.

If in *Ivan Ivanovich* the concept of "major", cheerful, buoyant life in general and its protagonist in particular is a refrain, then in *Gattaca* such an artistic method is the protagonist's morning grooming. We learn that he constantly needs to keep his body germproof, sterile; otherwise it won't be identified with the superior, "valid" Jerome Morrow, only with the "defective degenerate" Vincent Freeman instead. Ethan Hawke's character always has to pretend to be someone else (the same is with the main characters of *Ivan Ivanovich*), to play the part chosen for himself; all the carefully rehearsed routines he re-enacts are not just some array of relations between them, this is his existence pattern under the circumstances. By applying it, the character, the implied spectator finds out whether there is point in it, according to what rules will it prove itself to be effective, hasn't Vincent happen to select his own false self?

Mykola Khvylovy's story features a similar duality, though with an entirely different connotation. The Ukrainian scholar Marta Rudenko points out that, "Either staying alone, or being among people, Ivan Ivanovich perpetually acts out, assumes an actor's mask, which is set to serve reality pertaining to the time, to conform to its rules and standards" (Rudenko, 2004, p. 115). Comrade Jean is therefore exposed under the micropolitical terms of the networks of power relations within local institutions. In *Gattaca* and *Ivan Ivanovich*, the world belongs to those who appear to be superior. Vincent Freeman's desire to be perfect and Ivan Ivanovich's to be influential and prepotent confronts those superior ones who may not be fully aware of their domination, for they are assigned to perform their duties in the micropolitical terms of the networks of power relations within local institutions (like Anton Freeman, among others, does in terms of lawful hosting the order of things). *Gattaca* partially follows the conventions of Joseph Campbell's *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*: Vincent must embark on a road of trials to be worthy of going to distant worlds. He is assisted by interim allies (subordinate father-figures, Caesar and Dr. Lamar, and his love interest Irene being positioned as subservient to the male) to go through the ordeal (to triumph over his brother Anton, *inter alia*) as well as Director Josef's inadvertent sacrifice as the resolution of conviction for a murder Vincent/Jerome has been suspected of.

2. Regulation and supervision of the "sick" bodies

Both characters (Vincent Freeman and Ivan Ivanovich) qualify as individuals with sick bodies. Vincent hides his permanent genetic frailty, which can be easily revealed; he has to profess Jerome in order to carry on pursuing his astronautic *telos*. The case of Vincent displays the functioning of social rituals; the prerequisite of being a potential new member of the group is to have proper innate inborn abilities and characteristics in one's disposal, most notably that of

confirmed health. Within the framework of the conceptual differentiation carried out, in particular, by Bryan S. Turner, the somatic case of Ethan Hawke's character (heart disorder) may be described as both "illness" and "disease" (Turner, 2008, pp. 174–176). We have a biological deviation from the established social health standard, the distinctive features of which are predetermined and projected by genetic engineers, and Vincent's parents conceived him naturally; he is one of the "faith births". Thus, his case pertains to that of a "disease", since it is "a personal experience of unhealthy" (Turner, 2008, p. 175). Concurrently, it does also display an "illness" in the sense that one is subjected to classification and Vincent Freeman as well as people alike fall into all those descriptions – "in-valid", "defective", "godchildren", "faith births", "blackjack births", "men-of-god", "deficient", "defectives", "genojunk", "ge-gnomes", "the fucked-up people".

Preventing himself from being banished and expelled from the academy, Vincent goes on with his studies and his surveillance by the tutors and doctors. Thus, he juxtaposes clinic and prison and remains under observation and control inasmuch as the spectator wrongfully believes he is in control over the character's image. Both the fictional character and the implied viewer should look together in the same direction to create an intentionality bond, to determine the human motivation to create value for one's life and get a sense of self through connecting with the world; through "sculpturing" one's figure in the world.

In addition, the rivalry between brothers has been displayed, one of which was born due to the assistance of geneticists. Escalation and resolution of this conflict comes through the sibs' swimming contest, which becomes a revelation for Vincent. He grows aware that he is not as feeble and weak as he has once thought, and that his brother is not so strong and successful. Alternatively, there's a profound opinion shaped regarding the falsehood of discrimination based on genetic predispositions. Vincent's alter ego Jerome is "preset" to be a swimming champion; however, he is nothing but a runner-up after all and will always be. Similarly, is Director Josef that has a genetically determined propensity to be calm, peaceful, and therefore, in theory, incapable of violence. He kills a person who could have interfered with the flight to Titan, thus destroying his essence, declaring the inevitable necessity of existence paradox. Sky Mersen equally sees in it the manifestation of the "volition" modality, which leads to his expectation's fulfilment, and above all that of Vincent. What counts is that Vincent Freeman achieves his ambition without transgressing the moral strictures. He does not kill anyone, though by most accounts, as well as from Anton's perspective, who have a different moral phenomena insight, pseudo-Jerome is a confidence trickster, an impostor. Given that he is a future astronaut, it is highly probable that other members of the team will be at risk if false Jerome has to act fast and decisively under pressure, and his imperfect physical condition will prove to be fatal.

If in *Gattaca* the human spirit immortality triumphs, the result of the endeavour to rise above one's fate is portrayed, the idea of I / You dialectical confrontation is proclaimed, then in *Ivan Ivanovich* we have the rendering of a man's ethical, moral improvement collapse in an atheistic, antihuman society. The ironic characterization just adds to the person's provincialism and sleaziness. Both Ivan Ivanovich and his wife Marfa Halaktionovna are narrow-minded and mean-spirited people living in the world of hypocrisy, deceit, and ignorance. Their sickness is foremost socio-cultural one (Turner, 2008, p. 56), as they are portrayed as double-face. The motif of ersatz kindness, dressing-up (mask), family, and duplicity – these are not symptoms of illness, but its progression. In general, it will not be a mistake to regard Khvylovy's eponymous character as a political body with a constantly managed, socially regulated life in the disciplinary society of early state socialism. We should notice here, that according to Foucault's description, disciplinary societies operate through discrete spatial enclosures which yield to coherent rules, like families, camps, prisons, factories, schools etc. He claims:

To sum up, it might be said that discipline creates out of the bodies it controls four types of individuality, or rather an individuality that is endowed with four characteristics: it is cellular (by the play of spatial distribution), it is organic (by the coding of activities), it is

genetic (by the accumulation of time), it is combinatory (by the composition of forces). And, in doing so, it operates four great techniques: it draws up tables; it prescribes movements; it imposes exercises; lastly, in order to obtain the combination of forces, it arranges 'tactics' (Foucault, 1995, p. 167).

Hence, all “pleasantly looking” characters of *Ivan Ivanovich* appear in their every-day household activities with the discussion of pressing political issues of the local party committee in the flat where the eponymous individual resides with his family. Thus, in the first chapter of the story we get to know the then existing society structure: factories, plants, Red Army, Komintern, Profintern, universal education, Octobrists, Pioneers, Komsomol etc. An exquisite hint to the state of affairs is also in this section stating that reality is defined by the Party, “...wonderful horizons enchant the soul with a quiet yearning that doesn’t stir one to rebel in the spirit of petty bourgeois impressionism, but, on the contrary, calms one with the joyous peace of monumental realism” (Khvylovy, 1960, p. 167). In other words, the socialist realist conventions promoted the production of grossly distorted true-life representations of the real world and history. Comrade Jean’s life-organisation pattern, that of a time-server, has gained such an advantage of protagonist’s consciousness that he unquestioningly believes in the ideals debated during the caucus and adheres to them. Commenting on the critical reviews of the story by Khvylovy’s coevals, Yurii Bezkhutryi notes, “that from the outset the communist revolution was associated with “Vicars of Bray,” people who were primarily concerned with their security and their well-being” (Bezkhutryi, 2006, p. 41). The narrator repeatedly draws the attention of the implied reader to this majorant in *Ivan Ivanovich*’s characterization, as it underscores the humanitarian catastrophe the Ukrainians of the newly established regime found themselves in: it is possible to survive physically, albeit not spiritually. Indicative, in this regard, is Comrade Jean’s use of a loudspeaker, radio, which according to him is one of the aspects of state socialism development. The narrator ironically interrogates:

Isn’t this a wonderful achievement of socialist construction? Take this very radio. Was it not for this that my hero shed his blood – in order that the proletariat might live in the fullest contentment, using all the means of modern technology? (Khvylovy, 1960, p. 181).

Erotema applied by Mykola Khvylovy creates an air of mockery, ridicule and derision, no direct communication implied. The aforementioned sarcastic remarks intend to be rhetoric, not comic ones.

A magnificent parallel between the conduct of the Party meeting and that of the church service displays *régime* that the family and the milieu of Khvylovy’s “pleasantly looking” character follow (Khvylovy, 1960, pp. 187–198, ch. IV). It is necessary to resort to semantics here; speaking of “regimen,” we keep in mind its etymological synonym – in Greek medical regimen, the term *diata* was employed meaning “lifestyle” with the living conditions, behaviour, and habits (today it is widely used in *stricto sensu* of human nutrition – a diet). In its turn, the origin is traced also to the Medieval Latin *diēta* – “day appointed for a meeting,” and thus “meeting (of legislators).” The change of clothes into old suits each time the characters attend meetings points to an exquisite satirical description-portrait of an institutional place. Yurii Bezkhutryi argues,

The reader has a kind of cultural intertext premised upon perfectly plain parallels: communist ideology is just another form of religion. Khvylovy was undoubtedly ahead of his time here; the awareness of this fact took place in society much later (Bezkhutryi, 2006, p. 42).

The repetition game played by *Ivan Ivanovich* and *Marfa Halaktionovna* adds to a certain dark carnival of the exemplified events. Leonid Plyushch goes even further, suggesting the Party cell meeting contains occult undertones (Plyushch, 2018, p. 413), the community gathering of those practising Satanism disguised as the hypocritical religious institution of communism. Much like the authors of *Gattaca*, Mykola Khvylovy creates a dialectic of identity and bodily

image. Comrade Jean tries to appear a committed Party member, an inventor, and a family man. However, he is puny in these acts of his. Khvylovy's "devoted hero" is able to bring about a unification of interior reality and exterior reality until he receives the word of purge of the apparatus. Subsequently, the character faces again dialectics: this time that of subjective and of objective, where the subjective is his perception, feelings, thought about relations with the Other, and objective – the way the Other recognizes him. This "other" is the maid and the cook Yavdokha, who sirs Comrade Jean, thereby affirming one of the social psychology tenets claiming a person requires and seeks confirmation of others regarding their identity. Since Ivan Ivanovich's Janus nature is under the threat of being disclosed, he evinces a strong desire to soften the image of himself:

"Yes, yes, Yavdokha," he said in a trembling voice, "I am no 'sir' to you. I am your friend and comrade. I have always told you to call me 'comrade'."

It is true that Ivan Ivanovich didn't himself believe that he had told Yavdokha to call him 'comrade', but he didn't believe it not because he never did such a thing, but because he might have forgotten about it (Khvylovy, 1960, pp. 209–210).

In this respect, the social identity of Ivan Ivanovich is at stake, and the Other (Yavdokha) poses one of the possible exposure risks. Comrade Jean is perceived by her as a lord, as a grand gentleman (though not quite overtly); this is the negative image the readers recognize too. Concurrently being the narrator, the explicit author provides the implied reader with a recognizable representation of a small fry in the socially conditioned field of vision. Ivan Ivanovich's social identity, in Sartre's terms, is intersubjective, since the protagonist's identification with the Other is dependent upon the latter vision field. Moreover, it is also associated with that of the implied reader's as well as with the implied spectator's one. Paraphrasing Christian Metz (1983), we do also identify ourselves during screening / reading, mainly with the "gaze", with the point of view of the explicit author, since we can clearly determine right and wrong. Therefore, we recognize ourselves as the objects of an unaware look of the Other – to Ivan Ivanovich's, to Marfa Halaktionovna's, to Semen Yakovich's in particular etc. What does Ivan Ivanovich proposes, is an attempt to disclose the "special angle" from which he would have liked Yavdokha to treat him under the new circumstances. A reader is to notice the kind of symbolic fall from a secure position in society to powerlessness, humiliation, and impotence. Concurrently, the explicit author's aim is to destruct a "positive" self-image of the characters (he elaborates on the scenes of their family life marked by far from proletarian abstinence), for they have got the false idea of themselves due to the system of illusory beliefs holding on the insincerity and adaptability.

Vincent Freeman, on the contrary, is irreducibly sane in his endeavours to become an astronaut, albeit he must be outside social institutions by default (due to his health conditions) because social institutions are regulated based on rational behaviour whereas his one is incoherent in their view. The film allows exploration of man's desires, wishes, and purports to display breaking away from the limitations of the abject body and thus becoming authentic and autonomous. He appropriates the role of the Law/the Father/the Symbolic – the sphere through which he overcomes a police-state controlling of society.

The bodily image cultivation in *Gattaca* depends, foremost, on the protagonist himself. He must manage the body in a very precise way. Gilles Deleuze argued that the body should be made to "pass through a ceremony, of introducing it into a glass cage or crystal, of imposing a carnival or a masquerade on it which makes it into a grotesque body, but also brings out of it a gracious and glorious body, until at last the disappearance of the visible body is achieved" (Deleuze, 2001, p. 190). Vincent does not simply need to disguise himself in order to hide his identity; he has to change the physical limits of his body: to increase the height by doing surgery on his feet, to wear contact lenses so that the eyes were of the same colour as of the true Jerome's, to maintain weight. However, as the (anti) hero of Khvylovy's story, Andrew Niccol's

character rings the changes when he leaves his flat: either directly to the training complex, to the restaurant or to the concert of the renowned pianist. The actions of both protagonists are deliberately intentional because in such a way, as noted by Sky Marsen, the focus on their individuality definition is confirmed (Marsen, 2004, p. 145). We find evidence of this in the following *passage* from Maurice Merleau-Ponty:

From the moment there is consciousness, and in order for consciousness to exist, there must be something of which it is conscious, an intentional object, and it can only bear upon this object insofar as it “irrealizes” itself and throws itself into the object, insofar as it is entirely within this reference to . . . something, and insofar as it is a pure act of signification. If a being is consciousness, it must be nothing other than a fabric of intentions (Merleau-Ponty, 2013, p. 123).

World perception in *Gattaca* rests on the human genetic blueprint; what counts solely is the within of the cells. Life, disposition, people's deeds both physical and mental ones may be anticipated, but not everything in the prediction list comes true, as Vincent's example demonstrates to us. The film shows that the body is a complex system of biological artefacts, but the one who is aware of his presence, of his *Dasein* in a given flesh, becomes indifferent to the 'core' that inspires this system. The main point of the recurrence principle is to follow the regime. Its constituents include morning cleaning of the body from one's genuine traces, the appliance of blood, urine, eyelashes, hair fragments, fingerprints to secure Jerome's mask, regular meetings with Dr. Lamar, transmission of reporting data to the central computer, cleaning of the workplace from one's tracks. This always occurs at the intersubjective level, on the "I" / "You" plane, where "You" postulates and outlines the boundaries of "I". Vincent's flesh is both a biological result of his mother and father somatic intimacy, the effect of their visual and haptic subjective intentionality, but, more importantly, it is also a step forward from the former 'Other' (doomed, frail, constrained). The last words uttered by the protagonist at the end of the film text reveal the "flesh of the world" and "flesh of the body" phenomena as well. According to Maurice Merleau-Ponty, "flesh of the world" is the location where the reversion of the one who perceives (perceiver) and what is perceived occurs; in the strict sense – of Vincent Freeman and Jerome Morrow, in the broader one – of Vincent and the entire world. The scholar claimed:

That means that my body is made of the same flesh as the world (it is a perceived), and moreover that this flesh of my body is shared by the world, the world reflects it, encroaches upon it and it encroaches upon the world (the felt [senti] at the same time the culmination of subjectivity and the culmination of materiality), they are in a relation of transgression or of overlapping — — (Merleau-Ponty, 1968, p. 248).

Such an "interchange" is exemplified in the relationship issues of Ethan Hawke and Jude Law's characters. In turn, these considerations are also confirmed in a certain way by the chosen setting of the depicted events. In *Ivan Ivanovich*, this is the locus of the house, the premises, whereas in *Gattaca* there are more of them: the beach and the sea, the characters' home residence, the premises of Gattaca Aerospace Corporation. Wherever the protagonist is, whatever the camera shows the spectator, one thing is clear, in particular, from his actions, his words: he wants to escape from this planet, where he feels himself an outsider with his biological flaws.

Thus, Vincent epitomizes the ambivalence of the external and internal space through the prism of the individualized self-seeking the meaning of its existence. The mental and physical criteria of identity forged by Ethan Hawke's character are posited, among other factors, by the sea locus. It is precisely to him the dual motive is attributed, which is shown almost at the beginning of the retrospective and already at the end of the plot narrative. In addition to this, the flashback, according to Valentin Platzgummer's observations (Platzgummer, 2003, p. 32), contains all the conflicts to be resolved during the film events progression. The rivalry of

brothers, which traces its roots in the protagonist's childhood, and on the global scale, is as ancient as the Cain and Abel's Old Testament tale is peacefully resolved. Vincent displays the magnanimity of the "in-valid" as opposed to his brother's "deficiency", who has always believed he to be better, but turns out to be envious. There also collapses Anton's confidence in the traditional Gattaca's value, that of biodeterminism.

3. Body, "truth" and ideology promotion

Another similarity between discourses is the title pointing directly to the things that pertain to them: in case of Khvylovy we have the name of the main character under scrutiny, in case of Niccol – the setting of the events. Ivan Ivanovich embodies a number of underlings pretending to be effective, but useless in fact, whereas Vincent Freeman believes in and proves his aptness for spacecraft journeys. Therefore, he may be considered more suitable for the Gattaca's society even with his genetic flaw, rather than pathetic but physically healthy Ivan Ivanovich and Marfa Halaktionovna for theirs. In Foucauldian terms, Comrade Jean and Comrade Halakta infringe the notion of "truth" by transgressing the ethical norms of human relations; still, the pity power they hold incites, induces, and seduces them (Foucault, 1983, p. 220).

Moreover, chapter IV of *Ivan Ivanovich* illustrates Foucauldian arguments towards the state's focused use of politicized torture or politicized elimination of the subject as exhibition. Here, the reader follows the characters in the party meeting, the topic of which is to criticize the obstructionist in the local communist cell. The thing this meeting is going to resemble a performance, a show, a spectacle of the punished body is that there will be all members of the Party coupled with the Chief (the sovereign) present in there to observe the individual (body-politic) under interrogation:

By now the cell gathered, so to speak, in corpore. All the members of the Collegium were there. Also present were all the heads of sections, all the chiefs and their assistants from the various bureaus, the head of the local Trade Unions with three officials, the head of the Communist Women's Organization with her two secretaries, and the wife of the local Communist Party chief, who like Marfa Halaktionovna, had no special post because, like Marfa Halaktionovna, she devoted her time to bringing up her children. Only the secretary and the chief, who was to deliver the talk, were still absent (Khvylovy, 1960, p. 189).

The body of obstructionist Leiter in effect morphs from a body that mattered (head of the trust library, hence, ideologically significant) to a body that no longer does (he is under interrogation and his elaborations fail due to advanced Party self-scrutiny, nobody tries to listen to his reasoning). As far as the political cause of the Party is concerned, his has become a disposable body. Leiter is a Jew, and therefore the proletariat should be protected from the ones alike and all the renegades are to be told apart and unearthed. Narrator, however, explicates that Ivan Ivanovich is indifferent to ethnic prejudices, for him as well as for Methody Kirilovich the ideological discourse discrepancies matter solely:

"I am really sorry for Comrade Leiter. His behavior will give our anti-semites a pretext: once again they can point to a Jew acting against the Party."

Methody Kirilovich began to tell then how deeply shocked he had always been by anti-semitism (for instance the Beyliss affair) and how much he liked the Jews. Moreover, he believed that the Jewish nation had produced the greatest men in history. "Let's take Christ, for instance," he said. "Our people don't even know that Christ was a Jew."

"And where is he working now?" asked Ivan Ivanovich.

"Who – Christ?" Methody Kirilovich looked surprised.

"No – Comrade Leiter, of course" (Khvylovy, 1960, p. 190).

Mykola Khvylovy applies a variation of zeugma here, in the manner of the renowned English satirical novelists, to underscore his gibe for both wretched characters.

The afore-cited episodes of both the briefcase and Comrade Leiter illustrate one more instance of recurrence concept, which mingles with the ideology construction. The setting of

Ivan Ivanovich is unmasking insecurity, uncertainty, and unrest in the early Soviet society. Bearers of alternative to the clearly defined state policy ideas were favoured or condemned depending on the political situation that was often grounded on the current leaders-executives' determination to eliminate rivals to their power. This is the reason for both Leiter's party apparatus trial at one level and for Ivan Ivanovich's cautious strategy and tactics of reciting only officially defined views at another level. To put it differently, he deprives himself of establishing standard social practice to integrate into subjectivity. Concurrently, a specific form of madness that corresponds to paranoia characterizes political despotic regime as described in *Ivan Ivanovich* and the vast impersonal machinery crushes one. In terms of the story, it is elaborately expressed with this image of the closed doors, whispering motif, overlooking motif the instances of which have been expounded by Viktoriia Zengwa (Zengwa, 2012, pp. 70–71). The only way to survive is to play roles, take cover in the interstices of an overarching oppressive system. Khvylovy comes close to metaphorizing life with its dark corners (*zavulok*) and mysteries in grotesque situations – and, by the same token, the inner life with all its hidden recesses:

Ivan Ivanovich walks over to the window, opens it and his eyes wander far away in deep meditation. Beyond the garden's end he sees where quiet fields and soft sky begin, where wonderful horizons enchant the soul with a quiet yearning that doesn't stir one to rebel in the spirit of petty bourgeois impressionism, but, on the contrary, calms one with the joyous peace of monumental realism (Khvylovy, 1960, p. 167).

Marfa Halaktionovna finishes her cup of coffee, helps Yavdokha to put all the dried dishes away and finally sits down opposite the window. Her eyes wander far away in deep meditation. Beyond the garden's end she sees where wonderful horizons enchant the soul with a quiet yearning which does not stir one to rebel in the spirit of petty bourgeois impressionism, but, on the contrary, calms one down with the joyous peace of monumental realism (Khvylovy, 1960, pp. 178–179).

Even in their thoughts to which the explicit author arranges interior passage, the characters evince their indisputably exposure to close political control.

A further distinctive stylistic and rhetoric feature of the story *Ivan Ivanovich* is that the narrator dubs the protagonist as “nice fellow” or employs an evaluative adjective “charming” with the reverse connotation where it is opportune to him, to his family and acquaintances. However, it is pertinent to consider that the English translation of the story often omits or uses not exact matches of the Ukrainian lexeme *sympatychnyi*. Hence, the lack of proper antiphrasis disturbs the ironic air of the narrative. Besides, there is also absent the brief synopsis (graphically marked by spacing) to each chapter of the story, indicative of its commitment to the world satiric tradition.

In the story, the implied reader follows the further transformation of the political and revolutionary bodies of Ivan Ivanovich, Marfa Halaktionovna into the phony ones. The description of their daily chores coupled with the meeting account produces the effect of delirium everyone is in, except for the extradiegetic narrator.

In both discourses, the dress changes, disguise is protracted as an acquired “body technique”, that is an activity mediated by the terms and conditions of the society, though not compulsory, but obligatory for the characters in order to carry on their function in terms of personal autonomy and survival. An imposed on themselves mode of living has voluntary and involuntary traits. For instance, when Vincent learns he needs to modify his body attributes he is unwilling to alter it, but eventually, he yields to it. Ivan Ivanovich and Marfa Halaktionovna's clothes behaviour is utterly deliberate and intentional, though it does not fool the implied reader regarding the hypocritical connotations. The characters of the studied discourses are shaping their destinies on a falsehood basis. Nevertheless, Vincent Freeman's intentions are expounded owing to natural injustice. Since it is possible to bypass the genetic flaws in advance, Vincent decides to find a similar loophole on his own, thus proving the saying “Where there's a will, there's a way”.

Ethan Hawke's character degrades the notion of "truth" in that respect that he switches the biological body parts of his onto Jerome's. Vincent assumes to everyone his validity, he changes their perception perspective and transforms into a full-fledged member of the *society of control*. Moreover, he controls every bit of his flesh to stay Jerome Morrow as long as he will manage. Deleuze argued, "[...] control societies function with a third generation of machines, with information technology and computers, where the passive danger is noise and the active, piracy and viral contamination." (Deleuze, 1995, p. 180). With regard to Vincent, it means technology is liable to mislead people, lie to us, counterfeit the subjective reality. Disciplinary society is grounded on the strategies of confinement, and for him, it is his flesh; he wants to break through the dominating power of society represented by the body. But Vincent cannot break away entirely from the system that he desires to escape from. That is why he sets an ultimate purpose for himself – to become an astronaut with his damaged body. However, according to Deleuze, after World War II we have started to move towards the control society in which confinement is no longer the main strategy, instead permanent sway and immediate communication prevail (Deleuze, 1995, p. 174). Nonetheless, the *Gattaca* premises resemble a sort of enclave to enter, which is not that easy. In this respect, Antonio says to his elder son, "For God's sake, Vincent, don't you understand. The only way you'll see the inside of a spaceship is if you're cleaning it!"

Both discourses have indicative prefaces: *Gattaca's* (one comes from the Holy Writ and the second one is the quote of Willard Gaylin, PhD Bioethicist) imply the right to defy one's destiny, one's self, the Other, the system who always tend to condemn or praise the object. It does also mean that one is able to distance oneself from the role he is unwilling to play. Hence, to become an emancipated body Vincent has to dispose of the true identity evidences every morning, to forge the medical tests, that is preparing himself to offer up a subjective version of the truth. Otherwise, he remains the body in pain. *Ivan Ivanovich's* (from volume 2 of Nikolai Gogol's *Dead Souls*) denotes three points essential for Khvylovy's entire oeuvre: that of a small fry, backstreet (*zaulok*) and the back of beyond (*hlush*). Nook and backwoods are the topos of a small fry existence, according to Viktoriia Zengwa (Zengwa, 2012, p. 64). Moreover, these are also the terminal points of the main characters' quest for *beau idéal* in the many works of the Ukrainian writer.

4. Conclusion

Thought is the process that cinema and literature stimulate, for it is produced by images that in their turn are the subject of both optic and mental processes. The studied works have been chosen for contrastive analyses by virtue of the same conceptual strain in them that of a thought, namely that both the implied reader and the implied spectator can be reflective towards the discourse, to process the obtained via communication data, are able to relate their feelings, but not just for the sake of comparison. The politics of "information", therefore, invests to ideological oppositions collapse as shown in *Gattaca* (the repugnance between "valid" / "invalid") and *Ivan Ivanovich* (the subjugation of a socially adapted human). Film text under scrutiny on the storytelling and plot level is characterized by motivation, and the narrative structure of it accounts for and articulates the *telos* achievement. Subject to David Bordwell's explications (2006), *Gattaca* belongs to classical Hollywood cinema (has the discrete part structure, double plotline and identification with a hero, both in introjective and projective sense). The psychological depth understanding of the characters' motivations and emotions in *Ivan Ivanovich* is explicated by virtue of psychosocial mask they apply. Both the author and the extradiegetic narrator intend the implied reader to establish personal connection to the characters by way of harmonizing the warring feelings evoked in them in the course of reading. Among the masks most prominently stands out that of "persona-mask" to aid mimicry (acquiring new social and economic standing). Film and narrative texts bring before the addressees the intersubjective "life-spaces" of the characters: it means we perceive, we grasp the "information" across temporalities and spatialities that are cohering the intersubjective world in one piece. The

studied discourses present that kind of both temporal and spatial reality which was familiar to the authors as well as they reflected the corresponding ideological spheres (corresponding social practices, structures, and contradictions).

What is at issue in the studied works is an idea that the inner identity requires to be concealed; this is why Vincent needs to renew the disguise practice each day which eventually takes him up in the rocket and this is why Khvylovy's titular character, who has become one of the perpetrators of the crushing state socialism machine himself, reverts to dressing up; he is socially ambiguous. Hence, there lies notable, essential difference in the characters: Vincent Freeman demonstrates nobility and grandeur of his persona; he sets the role pattern for others alike, he evolves from subjugated (oppressed) body (foremost due to the biological condition of his body) to a sovereign who reigns and controls it solely, whereas Ivan Ivanovich, on the contrary, proves to be a low ranker, the ego-constituting, narcissistic subject, one who is socially internalized and in whom sovereign law is applied, enforced and made visible. Thus, we get quite opposite evidences of contemporary male identity constitution, though it is split and fragmentary, not least because of paranoia (most notably in *Ivan Ivanovich*) which is at the heart of "the culture of surveillance" as per Foucauldian theory.

Бібліографічний список

- Безхутрий, Ю. М., 2006. Оповідання М. Хвильового «Іван Іванович». Іронія як засіб формування художнього світу. *Вивчаємо українську мову та літературу*, 19–21, с. 40–44.
- Зборовська, Н., 2003. *Психоаналіз і літературознавство: посібник*. Київ: Академвидав.
- Зенгва, В. О., 2012. *Художня антропологія прози М. Хвильового: герой як феномен культури*. Кандидат наук. Дисертація. Харків. нац. ун-т ім. В. Н. Каразіна.
- Мочернюк, Н. Д., 2017. Інтермедіальність: термін, концепція, методологія. *Прикарпатський вісник НТШ. Слово* [онлайн], 4(40), с. 207–214. Доступно: <<https://pvnth.nung.edu.ua/index.php/word/article/download/1173/1150>> (дата звернення 15 грудня 2022).
- Плющ, Л., 2018. *Його таємниця, або «Прекрасна ложа» Хвильового*. Київ: Видавничий дім «КОМОРА».
- Руденко, М. І., 2004. *Наративна структура художньої прози Миколи Хвильового*. Кандидат наук. Дисертація. Київський національний університет ім. Тараса Шевченка.
- Цюп'як, І. К., 2002. *Поетика повістей Миколи Хвильового*. Кандидат наук. Дисертація. Дніпро. нац. ун-т.
- Bakhtin, M., 1990. The Problem of Content, Material, and Form in Verbal Art. In: M. Holquist and V. Liapunov (eds.). *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays*. Translated by V. Liapunov. Austin: University of Texas Press, pp. 257–325. Available at : <<https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7560/704114>> (Accessed 15 December 2022).
- Banner, O., 2011. The Postracial Imagination: *Gattaca's* Imperfect Science. *Discourse*, 2(33), pp. 221–241. DOI: 10.1353/dis.2011.0015.
- Bordwell, D., 2006. *The Way Hollywood Tells It: Story and Style in Modern Movies*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Available at : <<https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/j.ctt1pn74s>> (Accessed 15 December 2022).
- Brötz, D., 2015. *Dostojewskis »Der Idiot« im Spielfilm: Analogien bei Akira Kurosawa, Sasa Gedeon und Wim Wenders*. transcript Verlag, Bielefeld. Available at : <<https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/9783839409978/html>> (Accessed 15 December 2022).
- Clayton, J., 2003. Genome Time: New Age Evolution, *The Gold Bug Variations*, and *Gattaca*. *Charles Dickens in Cyberspace: The Afterlife of the Nineteenth Century in Postmodern Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 166–189.

- Deleuze, G., 1995. *Negotiations, 1972–1990*. Translated by Martin Joughin. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G., 2001. *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*. Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galeta. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Foucault, M. 1995. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. 2nd ed. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books. Available at : <https://monoskop.org/images/4/43/Foucault_Michel_Discipline_and_Punish_The_Birth_of_the_Prison_1977_1995.pdf> (Accessed 15 December 2022).
- Foucault, M., 1983. The subject and power. In: H. Dreyfus, & P. Rabinow (Eds.), Michel Foucault: *Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*: 2nd ed.,). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, pp. 208-226.
- Hejmej, A., 2010. Komparatystyka kulturowa: interpretacja i egzystencja. *Teksty Drugie*, 5, pp. 53–64. Available at : <https://rcin.org.pl/Content/49167/PDF/WA248_66693_P-I-2524_hejmej-komparatystyka.pdf> (Accessed 15 December 2022).
- Jung, C. G., 1969. Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious. In G. Adler & R. F. C. Hull (eds.), *Collected Works of C. G. Jung*, 2nd ed. Vol. 9, Part 1: Princeton University Press, pp. i–iv. Available at : <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt5hhrnk.1>> (Accessed 15 December 2022).
- Khvylovy, M., 1960. Ivan Ivanovich. In: George S. N. Luckyj (transl. with an introd.) *Stories from the Ukraine*. New York: Philosophical Library, pp. 160–214. Available at : <<http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0005277>> (Accessed 15 December 2022).
- Marsen, S., 2004. Against heritage: Invented identities in science fiction film. *Semiotica*. 152(1/4), pp. 141–157. DOI: 10.1515/semi.2004.2004.152-1-4.141
- Merleau-Ponty, M., 1968. *The Visible and the Invisible, followed by Working Notes*. In: C. Lefort ed. Translated by Alphonso Lingis. Evanston: Northwestern University Press. Available at : <https://monoskop.org/images/8/80/Merleau_Ponty_Maurice_The_Visible_and_the_Invisible_1968.pdf> (Accessed 15 December 2022).
- Merleau-Ponty, M., 2013. *Phenomenology of Perception*. Translated by Donald A. Landes. New York: Routledge.
- Metz, Chr., 1982. *Psychoanalysis and Cinema : The Imaginary Signifier*. In: Stephen Heath and Colin MacCabe, eds. Translated by Celia Britton, Annwyl Williams, Ben Brewster and Alfred Guzzetti. London: Macmillan. Available at : <https://www.academia.edu/8739957/Christian_Metz_Psychoanalysis_and_the_Cinema_The_Imaginary_Signifier_1982> (Accessed 15 December 2022).
- Niccol, A., 2008. *Gattaca* [DVD]. München: Sony Pictures Home Entertainment.
- Platzgummer, V., 2003. *Die Errettung der Menschheit: Studien zu den Science Fiction-Filmen Gattaca und Matrix*. Marburg: Tectum Verlag. Available at : <<https://books.google.com.ua/books?id=5KpE7dlxZdcC>> (Accessed 15 December 2022).
- Turner, Br. S., 2008. *The Body & Society: Explorations in Social Theory*. 3rd ed. London: SAGE Publications. DOI: 10.4135/9781446214329.
- Wolf, W., 2005. Intermediality. In: D. Herman, M. Jahn and Marie-Laure Ryan (eds.). *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*. London: Routledge, pp. 252–256. DOI: 10.4324/9780203932896.
- Wolf, W., 2017. *Selected Essays on Intermediality by Werner Wolf (1992–2014): Theory and Typology, Literature-Music Relations, Transmedial Narratology, Miscellaneous Transmedial Phenomena*. In: Walter Bernhardt (ed.). Leiden / Boston: Brill / Rodopi, DOI: 10.1163/9789004346642

References

- Bakhtin, M., 1990. The Problem of Content, Material, and Form in Verbal Art. In: M. Holquist and V. Liapunov (eds.). *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays*. Translated by V. Liapunov. Austin: University of Texas Press, pp. 257–325. Available at : <<https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7560/704114>> (Accessed 15 December 2022).
- Banner, O., 2011. The Postracial Imagination: *Gattaca*'s Imperfect Science. *Discourse*, 2(33), pp. 221–241. DOI: 10.1353/dis.2011.0015.
- Bezkhutryi, Yu., 2006. Mykola Khvylovy's Short Story *Ivan Ivanovich*: Irony as the Means of Artistic World Construction [Opovidannia M. Khvylovoho "Ivan Ivanovich": Ironiia yak zasib formuvannia khudozhnoho svitu]. *Vyvchaiemo ukrainsku movu ta literaturu*, 19–21, pp. 40–44. (in Ukrainian)
- Bordwell, D., 2006. *The Way Hollywood Tells It: Story and Style in Modern Movies*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Available at : <<https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/j.ctt1pn74s>> (Accessed 15 December 2022).
- Brötz, D., 2015. *Dostojewskis »Der Idiot« im Spielfilm: Analogien bei Akira Kurosawa, Sasa Gedeon und Wim Wenders*. transcript Verlag, Bielefeld. Available at : <<https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/9783839409978/html>> (Accessed 15 December 2022).
- Clayton, J., 2003. Genome Time: New Age Evolution, *The Gold Bug Variations*, and *Gattaca*. *Charles Dickens in Cyberspace: The Afterlife of the Nineteenth Century in Postmodern Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 166–189.
- Deleuze, G., 1995. *Negotiations, 1972–1990*. Translated by Martin Joughin. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G., 2001. *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*. Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galeta. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Foucault, M., 1995. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. 2nd ed. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books. Available at : <https://monoskop.org/images/4/43/Foucault_Michel_Discipline_and_Punish_The_Birth_of_the_Prison_1977_1995.pdf> (Accessed 15 December 2022).
- Foucault, M., 1983. The subject and power. In: H. Dreyfus, & P. Rabinow (Eds.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*: 2nd ed.,). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, pp. 208–226.
- Hejmej, A., 2010. Komparatystyka kulturowa: interpretacja i egzystencja. *Teksty Drugie*, 5, pp. 53–64. Available at : <https://rcin.org.pl/Content/49167/PDF/WA248_66693_P-I-2524_hejmej-komparatystyka.pdf> (Accessed 15 December 2022).
- Jung, C. G., 1969. Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious. In G. Adler & R. F. C. Hull (eds.), *Collected Works of C. G. Jung*, 2nd ed. Vol. 9, Part 1: Princeton University Press, pp. i–iv. Available at : <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt5hhrnk.1>> (Accessed 15 December 2022).
- Khvylovy, M., 1960. Ivan Ivanovich. In: George S. N. Luckyj (transl. with an introd.) *Stories from the Ukraine*. New York: Philosophical Library, pp. 160–214. Available at : <<http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0005277>> (Accessed 15 December 2022).
- Marsen, S., 2004. Against heritage: Invented identities in science fiction film. *Semiotica*. 152(1/4), pp. 141–157. DOI: 10.1515/semi.2004.2004.152-1-4.141
- Merleau-Ponty, M., 1968. *The Visible and the Invisible, followed by Working Notes*. In: C. Lefort ed. Translated by Alphonso Lingis. Evanston: Northwestern University Press. Available at : <https://monoskop.org/images/8/80/Merleau_Ponty_Maurice_The_Visible_and_the_Invisible_1968.pdf> (Accessed 25 December 2022).
- Merleau-Ponty, M., 2013. *Phenomenology of Perception*. Translated by Donald A. Landes. New York: Routledge.

- Metz, Chr., 1982. *Psychoanalysis and Cinema: The Imaginary Signifier*. In: Stephen Heath and Colin MacCabe, eds. Translated by Celia Britton, Annwyl Williams, Ben Brewster and Alfred Guzzetti. London: Macmillan. Available at : <https://www.academia.edu/8739957/Christian_Metz_Psychoanalysis_and_the_Cinema_The_Imaginary_Signifier_1982> (Accessed 15 December 2022).
- Mocherniuk, N. D., 2017. Intermedialnist: termin, kontseptsii, metodolohiia [Intermediality: term, conception, methodology]. *Precarpathian Bulletin of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, Word* [online], 4(40), s. 207–214. Available at: <<https://pvnstsh.nung.edu.ua/index.php/word/article/download/1173/1150>> Accessed 15 December 2022]. (in Ukrainian)
- Niccol, A., 2008. *Gattaca* [DVD]. München: Sony Pictures Home Entertainment.
- Platzgummer, V., 2003. *Die Errettung der Menschheit: Studien zu den Science Fiction-Filmen Gattaca und Matrix*. Marburg: Tectum Verlag. Available at : <<https://books.google.com.ua/books?id=5KpE7dlxZdcC>> (Accessed 15 December 2022).
- Plyushch, L., 2018. *His secret, or Khvylovy's "Beautiful bed"* [Yoho taiemnytsia, abo «Prekrasna lozha» Khvylovoho]. Kyiv: Vydavnychiy dim «KOMORA». (in Ukrainian)
- Rudenko, M. I., 2004. *Narativna struktura khudozhnoi prozy Mykoly Khvylovoho* [Narrative Structure of the Artistic Prose by M. Khvylovy]. Kandydat nauk. Dysertatsiia. Kyivskyi natsionalnyi universytet im. Tarasa Shevchenka. (in Ukrainian)
- Tsyupyak, I. K., 2002. *Poetyka povistei Mykoly Khvylovoho* [Poetics of Stories of Mykola Khvylovyi]. Kandydat nauk. Dysertatsiia. Dnipro. nats. un-t. (in Ukrainian)
- Turner, Br. S., 2008. *The Body & Society: Explorations in Social Theory*. 3rd ed. London: SAGE Publications. DOI: 10.4135/9781446214329.
- Wolf, W., 2005. Intermediality. In: D. Herman, M. Jahn and Marie-Laure Ryan (eds.). *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*. London: Routledge, pp. 252–256. DOI: 10.4324/9780203932896.
- Wolf, W., 2017. *Selected Essays on Intermediality by Werner Wolf (1992–2014): Theory and Typology, Literature-Music Relations, Transmedial Narratology, Miscellaneous Transmedial Phenomena*. In: Walter Bernhardt (ed.). Leiden / Boston: Brill / Rodopi, DOI: 10.1163/9789004346642
- Zborovska, N., 2003. *Psykhooanaliz i literaturoznavstvo* [Psychoanalysis and Literary Criticism]. Kyiv: Akademydav. (in Ukrainian)
- Zengwa, V. O., 2012. *Khudozhnia antropolohiia prozy M. Khvylovoho: heroi yak fenomen kultury* [Art Anthropology of the Prose of M. Khvylovyi: A Hero as a Phenomenon of Culture]. Kandydat nauk. Dysertatsiia. Kharkiv. nats. un-t im. V. N. Karazina. (in Ukrainian)

Стаття надійшла до редакції 16.12.2022.

Є. Лепьохін

**АМБІВАЛЕНТНІСТЬ СОЦІАЛЬНОГО ТА ОСОБИСТОГО У КІНОТЕКСТІ
«ГАТТАКА» ЕНДРІО НІККОЛА ТА ПОВІСТІ «ІВАН ІВАНОВИЧ»
МИКОЛИ ХВИЛЬОВОГО**

Зіставлення досліджуваних дискурсів здійснено за ознакою спорідненості гетеромедіальних семіотичних одиниць, що мають статус естетичних об'єктів. Стаття висвітлює діалектику сучасних міжмистецьких досліджень і спирається на засади так званої постструктуралістської теорії (передусім у творчості Мішеля Фуко та Жюльєн Делеза). Вона є своєрідним ідейним продовженням опису неочевидних інтермедіальних переживань на прикладі творчості Миколи Хвильового, що вже

здійснювалося автором у дослідженні «Наратологічні контрасти і психоделічні полюси художнього тексту Миколи Хвильового і кінотексту Міхаеля Ганеке» (Кременецькі компаративні студії, вип. VIII, 2018). У статті розглянуто питання формування «політичного тіла», використано окремі аспекти аналітичного психоаналізу Карла-Густава Юнга, поняття «плоть світу» Моріса Мерло-Понті, уявлення Жан-Поль Сартра про погляд. Різноманітні концепції та ідеї, які можна приписати кінематографу та літературі через їх «трансмедіальність» (медіальну неочевидність, що виникає в середовищі без вказівки на відповідне медіальне джерело), пояснюють загальне, спільне у вигаданому світі як на екрані, так і в полі друкованої книги, а також у системах, що існують за межами екрана та книги. Відтак, у статті представлено концепцію рекурентності (повтору), висвітлено архетип тіні, експліковано дихотомію понять хвороба / недуга, розтлумачено значення понять режим / дієта. Аналіз персонажів здійснено з огляду на їхні вчинки та цілі крізь призму вищезазначених категорій. Результати проведеного аналізу будуть корисними усім, хто досліджує: дискурс українського літературного процесу 20-х – 30-х рр. XX ст., особливості розвитку української прози означеного періоду у співвіднесенні із загальноєвропейським контекстом, проблематику міжмистецької взаємодії, художні механізми творення прозотекстів Миколи Хвильового й порівняння його художньої манери з іншими мистецтвами, зокрема в оперуванні інструментами кінематографічної експресії. Перспективою подальших розвідок може стати аналіз прозотекстів українського письменника для фокусування на новаторських й сміливих формальних рішеннях митця; аналіз психологічного контексту експресивного творення художніх образів у «Повісті про санаторійну зону» крізь призму поняття образ-рух Жюльєна Делеза для відстеження вчинків персонажів відповідно до ситуацій, що в них вони опиняються; аналіз експресіоністського ототожнення простору зони як простору смерті із простором її компонуванням травматичного тіла.

Ключові слова: тіло, ідентичність, повторюваність, персонаж, суспільство, оповідач, образ, ідеологія, трансмедіальність.