DOI 10.15826/qr.2018.2.309
УДК 778.5+791.221.51

THE FRAGILITY OF DOMESTIC SPACE WITHIN CORRUPTIVE NON-PLACE IN ANDREI ZVYAGINTSEV'S *LEVIATHAN**

Andrew James McGregor
Robert John Lagerberg
University of Melbourne,
Victoria, Australia

In this article the authors analyse Andrei Zvyagintsev's feature film *Leviathan* (2014) from the perspective of domestic space using Marc Augé's theory of non-places. As in Zvyagintsev's film *Elena*, the film uses a framing technique, placing the domestic space in question, in this case the site of Nikolai's house, in the film's central role. From the outset the house is depicted as somehow fragile and unprotected from the outside world, and, as the plot progresses, this vulnerability increasingly comes into play. The main instigation for the events which follow comes from the town's corrupt mayor, who plans to purchase Nikolai's house for a fraction of its true value and build a church on its site. This action brings Nikolai's former army colleague Dmitry, now a successful Moscow lawyer, into the action, leading directly to infidelity on the part of Nikolai's wife (Liliya), and, ultimately, her death, presumably at the hands of the corrupt mayor. The external corrupting force of non-place and non-language, seen clearly in scenes such as that at the city court, where the clerk reads the court's decision at an improbably fast tempo, increasingly enters Nikolai's home and family situation, and, ultimately, undermines, then destroys, the integrity of private domestic space and the lives and identities of those who inhabit it.

Keywords: Post-Soviet Russia; National Identity; Domestic Space; Leviathan; Andrey Zvyagintsev; Non-places; Marc Augé.

Авторы анализируют художественный фильм Андрея Звягинцева «Левиафан» (2014) с точки зрения изображения в нем домашнего пространства, опираясь на теорию «ничейных пространств» Марка Оже. Подобно тому,

* *Citation*: McGregor, A. J., Lagerberg, R. J. (2018). The Fragility of Domestic Space within Corruptive Non-Place in Andrei Zvyagintsev's *Leviathan*. In *Quaestio Rossica*, Vol. 6, № 2, p. 504–515. DOI 10.15826/qr.2018.2.309.

Цитирование: *McGregor, A. J., Lagerberg, R. J.* The Fragility of Domestic Space within Corruptive Non-Place in Andrei Zvyagintsev's *Leviathan* // Quaestio Rossica. Vol. 6. 2018. № 2. P. 504–515. DOI 10.15826/qr.2018.2.309.

как это происходит в «Елене», в «Левиафане» режиссер использует технику кадрирования, благодаря которой домашнее пространство – в данном случае дом Николая – играет ключевую роль. Снаружи дом выглядит уязвимым и незащищенным от внешнего мира, и по мере развития сюжета эта уязвимость обретает все более важное значение. События фильма разворачиваются вокруг коррумпированного мэра города, который хочет выкупить дом Николая за бесценок и построить на его месте церковь. Николай прибегает к помощи старого сослуживца Дмитрия, теперь успешного адвоката, что впоследствии ведет к измене Лилии, жены Николая, и ее гибели, предположительно от руки мэра. Разрушающая сила не-места и не-языка, проявляющаяся, среди прочего, в сценах из городского суда, где секретарь с неправдоподобной скоростью зачитывает постановление суда, постепенно проникает и в домашнее и семейное пространство Николая, подрывая и постепенно разрушая его, а также жизнь и личности его обитателей.

Ключевые слова: постсоветская Россия; национальная идентичность; домашнее пространство; Левиафан; Андрей Звягинцев; не-место; Марк Оже.

The Russian feature film *Leviathan* (Andrei Zvyagintsev, 2014) was released in 2014 to generally very positive acclaim, both by critics and at various film festivals. For example, Peter Bradshaw in *The Guardian,* in a glowing appraisal, awarded it the maximum five stars (see: [Bradshaw]); it was selected to compete for the 'Palme d'Or' in the main competition section at the 2014 Cannes Film Festival, it won the best film of the year at the 2014 London Film Festival and was nominated for (but did not win) an Academy Award for Best Foreign Language Film at the 87th Academy Awards. In Russia itself, the film has attracted both positive and negative critical responses, though, as A. Fedorov makes clear, such reactions are generally dependent on the respective political views of critics: more conservative views have tended towards a more hostile reception of the film, something heightened by the fact that the film received state funding, yet proceeded to 'bite the hand that feeds', while more liberal views have taken a rather macabre pleasure in the pessimistic picture of Russia depicted so masterfully by Zvyagintsev and his impressive cast of actors [Fedorov].

Other, more academic, approaches to the film have concentrated on the theological, especially the biblical theme of the Book of Job (Ch. 41) and the whale, thus corresponding also to the literal meaning of the title of the film 'Leviathan'. This feature is visually reinforced by the stranded carcasses of whales seen at various points in the film and the conversation between Nikolai and Father Vasilii concerning Job's fate. D. Kondyuk, for example, examines the film from the point of view of apophatic theology and the relationship of the film's characters with the Other (God) [Kondyuk]. Ultimately, however, the characters, particularly Nikolai, though seemingly searching for answers to their metaphysical questions, are unable to find any, primarily because they are emotionally closed to the possibility of hearing any such answers, thus making their questions apophatic and rhe-

torical in essence: a good example of this is Nikolai's almost rhetorical question, 'Why, Lord?' (*За что, Господи?*), as he stares out to sea immediately after Liliya's corpse is found. Little to date, however, seems to have been made of the title's other allusion, i. e. Hobbes's *Leviathan*, though clearly the notion of the social contract and the ubiquitous body of the state entering into even the most intimate details of people's private lives is one which requires further research. C. Părău touches on it in an article which examines *Leviathan* in terms of the ways in which the 'work of narrative' and the question of post-Christian guilt are played out in the construction of postmodern narratives of the Fall [Părău]. As the author states, 'The narrative of the Fall, in this film, is constructed around the political idea of the social contract defined as a contract with the Devil, from which there is no escape or turning back until one loses everything. <...> The "work of narrative" in *Leviathan* is another attempt to make visible an inhuman eye, the eye of the "sea monster", the governmental collective body's eye, watching from behind things or from behind the order of things' [Ibid., p. 137].

Thus, while much of the criticism, in both senses of the word, has concentrated either on theological aspects of the film or its commentary on Russia's current socio-political situation, the approach of this article is somewhat different. Zvyagintsev's cinematic work is complex and multi-layered, and, therefore, able to be analysed from a whole range of intellectual perspectives. The aim of this paper is to some extent similar to our previous analysis of Zvyagintsev's *Elena*, in so far as it sets out to investigate the main location of the film (i. e. Nikolai's house) in an attempt to identify the role of place/non-place and its relationship to identity [McGregor, Lagerberg]. This is not to dismiss any political message, but merely to approach a complex film from one particular, aesthetic angle. The setting of the film in Russia's sparsely populated north and, indeed, the house itself, which is spacious and rural, perhaps also distance the plot from a more stereoptypical view of Russia.

A theoretical approach which is particularly well suited to an analysis of cultural concepts connected with (domestic) spaces in the modern context is Marc Augé's theory of *non-places*, as developed in his seminal work *Non-Places: An Introduction to Supermodernity* [Augé].[1] Though, clearly, there are differences between the two recent films directed by Zvyagintsev, *Elena* and *Leviathan*, it is also evident that both films concentrate, from the point of view of plot alone, on the theme of domestic space. This is immediately apparent from the respective opening and closing frame shots in both films (the modern apartment in *Elena*, (the site of) Nikolai's house in *Leviathan*), as well as the central structural and thematic importance of domestic spaces in both films (the two main apartments in *Elena*, Nikolai's house (and its location) in *Leviathan*).

[1] Augé's work was originally published in French in 1992 by Seuil under the title *Non-Lieux, Introduction à une anthropologie de la surmodernité,* which was subsequently translated into English and published in 1995 by Verso under the title *Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*. Reference in this chapter is made to the second edition of the English translation, which was published in 2008 by Verso.

This paper will, therefore, examine *Leviathan* in the light of Augé's work, in particular the extent to which his theory of *non-places* may, in certain instances in this supermodern globalised world, be as applicable to the domestic space as it is to the increasingly ubiquitous and dehumanising public spaces of airports, hotels, shopping centres and other typical *non-places*. While the home may be defined as private and personal, as opposed to public and impersonal, it will be argued here that, as in the film *Elena*, the domestic space is depicted as a space constantly under threat of being undermined and, ultimately, destroyed, along with the identity and lives of those who inhabit the given space. It will be argued here that the domestic space, far from being a comforting and reassuring destination in itself, can be read as liminal [Thomassen, p. 322], as transitory, as a space 'in-between' or constantly under threat of invasion and corruption from the leviathan of *non-place* which surrounds it.

Augé defines *place* as 'relational, historical and concerned with identity'. It stands to reason, therefore, that he should define *non-place* as 'a space which cannot be defined as relational, or historical, or concerned with identity' [Augé, p. 63]. Augé hastens to point out, however, that the distinction between *place* and *non-place* is not to be imagined as a mutually exclusive binary opposition:

> [The non-place] never exists in pure form; places reconstitute themselves in it; relations are restored and resumed in it… Place and non-place are rather like opposed polarities: the first is never completely erased, the second never totally completed; they are like palimpsests on which the scrambled game of identity and relations is ceaselessly written [Augé, p. 64].

Indeed, as it shall be argued in this chapter in relation to the domestic space: 'The possibility of *non-place* is never absent from any place' [Augé, p. 86]. The focus of this paper is, then, on the role of *non-place* in *Leviathan*, in particular the corrosive effect of the exterior *non-place* (the state or Hobbesian 'Leviathan') on the interior *place*, which ultimately subsumes and, thereby, destroys the latter along with the lives in it. While the film takes place in a particular Russian setting, we would argue that the overall theme takes precedence over the specific Russian context, a fact borne out by the unusual geographical setting in Russia's north, i. e. at the social and spatial periphery of the country. At the heart of the film's argument is, then, the notion of *place* within (*non-*)*place*, a paradox and impossibility depicted in the course of the film by the fragility and ultimate destruction of the latter.

Just as in the film *Elena*, as mentioned above, *Leviathan* uses a framing technique which employs the central domestic space in the film, Nikolai's house, or, at least, its site, since, of course, at the film's end the house itself will be destroyed and replaced by an Orthodox church. At the film's opening the camera first explores the harsh north-Russian environment, in particular the sea, before concentrating on the house itself. As in *Elena*, the scene takes place in the early hours of morning just before dawn, and

the house is thus depicted in semi-darkness and without dialogue: human existence is secondary to nature, it is enveloped by it both physically and temporally. In this way, the domestic space itself features as the key element in the film, filtered from the vast world outside and containing human lives within itself. At the same time, however, the somewhat unstable aspect of Nikolai's home becomes clear: it has no fence or clear boundaries, it stands on a slope within a harsh environment (as shown in the opening frames of the film) and the first action, so to speak, involves a departure in a car by an as yet unknown person. Indeed, in course of the film the constant arrivals and departures from Nikolai's house serve to develop further the sense of transience and instability which characterise the house. Though it is a domestic space, from the outset its fragility is apparent both from its physical location in a harsh environment and the sense of movement away from it, and, therefore, its status as *place* is constantly under threat. As the film progresses, there is an increasingly clear motif of the corrupting influence of the wider space (society/state) on the micro-space of domesticity (home) and the lives it contains.

The plot itself is set in motion (thus, the *завязка*) and resolved (thus, the denoument (*развязка*)), so to speak, by the house itself, in particular, the efforts – ultimately successful – of the corrupt mayor to exploit Nikolai by purchasing it for less than its actual value and building a church on the site. This is done in collusion with the rather venal, not to mention, unethical bishop. Although, at the very beginning of the film this is not yet clear to the audience, the initial car journey from and back to the house results directly from it. Nikolai is, in fact, driving to the local railway station to pick up an old friend who now works as a lawyer in Moscow and will be able to aid him in his bid to resist the mayor's (Vadim Sergeevich Sheleviat) efforts to oust him from his home and leave him with only a portion of the money he would receive for the house if he chose to sell it under normal circumstances. From the outset, therefore, the already rather delicate balance of family and domestic space is undermined by the exterior *non-place*, i. e. the state or the 'Leviathan' in the persona of the mayor, since Nikolai's family consists, in fact, of his son, Roman, and the boy's stepmother, i. e. his second wife. Space within any state (or Hobbesian 'Leviathan') cannot be hermetically sealed, and the corrosive influence from the outer circle seeps into the interior spaces of domesticity, ironically here, in the person of Dmitry, i. e. Nikolai's friend.

Although it is underplayed at the film's beginning, one of the most direct effects of the mayor's actions is the arrival of Dmitry and his essentially intrusive presence in what is already a somewhat strained domestic situation. The erosion of Nikolai's domestic space thus begins both at the macro and micro level. Liliya, it soon becomes clear, is Nikolai's second wife and, therefore, the stepmother of Roman. In a tense early scene, Roman refuses to greet his stepmother with a 'good morning', prompting a stern rebuke from her, and in turn the comment 'She's not my mother' (*Не мать она мне*) and a slap on the head from his father when he arrives

back home with Dmitry. As the plot progresses, Dmitry undermines and ultimately destroys Nilolai's marriage by sleeping with Liliya. This in turn leads to Nikolai's demise at the macro level by giving the mayor the perfect motive for framing Nikolai for his wife's murder, i. e. Nikolai's threat to kill her in earshot of other characters at the picnic, as well as the (quasi-) rape of his own wife which gives the police the evidence for the purported rape and murder. The macro *non-space* leads directly into the already fragile domestic space, destroying the latter space in every possible way, ultimately even literally by a wrecking machine as its arm pulls the house to pieces. Interestingly, in an early scene, when the mayor arrives uninvited at Nikolai's house in order to intimidate him, Nikolai propehetically refers to his car as a 'hearse' (к*атафалк*): in virtually the final scene of the film, a cortege of such 'official' black cars is shown crossing the bridge at the site of Nikolai's fomer house, an image rich in irony and allusion.

In addition to the fragility of Nikolai's domestic space in terms of the composition of the people living there, the physical features of his home also contribute to its sense of liminality. In particular, its lack of fencing or other boundaries, its position on a slope and its proximity to the river and a bridge give it a sense of unsettledness. Indeed, on multiple occasions in the film, the exterior of the house is presented in connection with the arrival or departure of cars. The first view of the house at dawn involves the silent departure of the main protagonist, Nikolai, and the film's conclusion shows a cortege (the hearse, *катафалк*, mentioned above) of cars leaving the site of the newly built church and proceeding across the bridge. In one of the earliest scenes in the film, Liliya waters her plants and does her make-up in the gaze of the traffic officer who waits below for Nikolai to arrive home: one of the features of the house is the large amount of windows which make the interior highly visible from the exterior, thereby heightening the foreboding sense of vulnerability, both in terms of the house's physical structure (threatened with demolition) and the fragile structure of the family living within it – a second marriage undermined by adultery and a recalcitrant son, as well as by external pressures exerted by the invasive, destabilising forces of a corrupt State (Fig. 1).

1. The house. Still from *Leviathan*. A. Zvyagintsev. 2014

This liminality and vulnerability to what lies outside reaches its climax at the end of the film as the wrecking machine reaches, claw-like, into the house, knocking over the furniture and destroying the windows as it does so, the exterior *non-space* now entering and enveloping the private domestic space. The innovation of filming of this scene of destruction from within the home being demolished reinforces, with powerful and dramatic effect, the sense of invasion of personal and domestic space. Building demolitions are typically filmed from a safe distance, suggesting an efficient, clinical operation in which safety is paramount, and from which the onlooker remains at a reassuring physical and psychological distance. To witness the physical destruction of the family's domestic space from within generates an almost unbearably unnerving effect on the viewer. The fact that the house has evidently not been emptied of furniture nor of the family's belongings prior to the demolition adds to the sense of violation of the family's living space. The subjective vulnerability of the viewpoint imposed by the filming of the destruction from within, and the immediacy of the act committed without due preparation of the space, represents a clear lack of consent on the part of the family whose home is being destroyed. This invasion and violation of clearly-marked and unprepared domestic space is tantamount to a rape of that space as well as to its murder, in effect, therefore, a metaphor for what has now occurred in Nikolai's personal life.

The fragility of Nikolai's domestic space and the intrusion of the exterior *non-place* is well illustrated some 26 minutes into the film when Nikolai and Dmitry drink vodka and the former shows his friend a photo of the house dating back many years. 'Here is my entire life' (*Здесь вся моя жизнь*) he says, before first Liliya cuts him short in a rather patronising manner, and then the mayor with his thugs appears on his property, drunk, abusive and threatening. It seems that even the smallest attempt to explain the sense of place which he feels with his own domestic space is misunderstood, while, at the same time, the actual domestic space is in the process of being taken from him. The next day the two friends drive into town to hear the court decision in their case as they vow to 'fight the entire town' (*со всем городом воевать*), as Liliya later puts it. In one of the most striking scenes of the film, the essential dysfunctionality of the world at large is laid bare as the court's decision is read out by a clerk of the court at great length and at breakneck speed, the only pauses taken are literally to take breath. The language of the state becomes *non-language*, it loses all meaning and connectedness with its surroundings by its uncompromising refusal to engage in normal human communication. As the state becomes a monstrous leviathan, a monster crushing everything in its path, language becomes a hideous travesty of its own true essence, little more than an automated text. This linguistic dysfunctionality is then mirrored by actual dysfunctionality, as Dmitry searches through the legal institutions of the town to find anyone in a position of authority, only to be told that there is no one (*Нету никого*).

The role of nature in the film is also not without significance. It frames the film, in particular with the nocturnal image of the sea and waves crashing

on to the shore. Essentially the imagery portrayed is of cold indifference which, ultimately, will have the last word: at the film's conclusion, all that has happened in the course of the film now appears irrelevant in the wider scheme of time and space. As individual people are subject to the laws and customs of the particular Leviathan they live in, so the Leviathan state itself is ultimately locked in by space and time and will eventually be reduced to nothing but bones, like wrecked hulls of ships and the carcasses of whales stranded along the littoral. Just prior to her death, Lilia stares out into this abyss and sees a live whale, but the earlier imagery of the dead whale underlines both her own and Nikolai's imminent fate.

The use of the symbolic figure of the dead whale is reminiscent of the scene of the beaching of a monstrous sea creature at the conclusion of Federico Fellini's *La dolce vita* (1960). The creature, or at least its carcass (in fact, it is not clear if the creature is still alive or already dead), in Fellini's film can be seen to represent the corruption of the protagonist Marcello's (Marcello Mastroiani) ultimately unsatisfying unabashed hedonism of his party-going jet-set lifestyle, especially when contrasted with the purity of the image of the Umbrian angel Paola in the very last shot of the film, from whom Marcello bids an unconvincing and rather pathetic farewell as he resigns himself to a meaningless and apparently morally reprehensible life of self-indulgence. Likewise, in *Leviathan*, the carcass of the whale represents the rotting decay of a corrupt society, this time at the hand of a powerful and intrusive State and of a self-serving religious hierarchy that has strayed all too far from its core values. There is a certain irony in the fact that in order to depict the rotten 'state of the State', as symbolised by a decaying whale carcass (i. e. an element of nature, which suggests that corruption is an entrenched, engrained and indeed 'natural' part of the local landscape), Zvyagintsev had to have the model man-made out of metal, as, presumably, no naturally occurring skeletal remains were convincing enough as a depiction of the magnitude of man-made corruption at play in the context of the film, and, presumably in contemporary Russia. Therefore, the apparently 'natural' symbol takes its place, like the church that will replace the family home, as part of the 'built' environment; it too is contrasted with the natural beauty of the landscape, which can be seen to survive, endure and outlast even the most reprehensible acts of the darker elements of mankind.

Perhaps the only other significant scene of nature in the film is when several of the characters drive to a bleak, but picturesque spot for a picnic. On this occasion, it would be hard to claim that humans are portrayed here in harmony with their surroundings: the prominent activity of the day, other than drinking, is firing rifles. While actual violence from these firearms is only suggested and the shooting is only for target practice (though portraits of former state leaders are also considered), the mood is somewhat threatening. In fact, what transpires is a key element in Nikolai's ultimate demise: his friend Dmitry is spotted having sex with Liliya by the children, who misconstrue the act as one of violence. Though we are not given access to the subsequent violence, Dmitry is severely beaten up, as the subsequent scenes reveal: he lies in bed in a hotel with Liliya, his face

a hideous canvas of cuts and bruises. Even nature, therefore, gives an element of danger and violence to the sense of domestic space and balance.

With this scene of adultery, Nikolai's domestic space is effectively destroyed, not physically, but from the point of view of its existing structure and relationships, and his demise is now assured. From both the outside and then the inside, his domestic space has been usurped and violated. In spite of everything, however, Lilia is drawn back to the house and her marriage, but the corrupting influence from without is unstoppable. Roman increasingly becomes a stranger in his own house, often escaping to the sanctuary of a now crumbling and non-functioning church, while Nikolai's relationship with Lilia is now so strained that their final amorous encounter is, in fact, a non-consensual sex scene, witnessed by Roman and leading to his total alienation from his father and home. Ironically, of course, this same scene takes place as the contents of the house are being packed away, following the decision of the court in the mayor's favour. The domestic space is now clearly in the area of *non-space*, domestic relationships are being terminated as the physical home itself is dismantled (Fig. 2).

2. Roman near the skeleton. Still from *Leviathan*. A. Zvyagintsev. 2014

Within the dichotomy of space and non-place, an interesting subtext is played out with the theme of religion and the two priests. While the bishop is connected with officialdom, and his language (see below) represents non-meaning, the priest who Nikolai encounters towards the conclusion of the film, as he enters his darkest hour, is clearly in a different category. While the bishop is essentially venal and his language couched in platitudes aimed at achieving his own ulterior motives (the construction of the church and, presumably, the maintenance of his luxurious lifestyle), Father Vasilii speaks with clear religious conviction and humanity. In spite of Nikolai's vicious jibes – 'Where is your God… your merciful God?' (*Где твой Бог… милосердный?*) –, he remains lucid and sympathetic, explaining to Nikolai the meaning of the legend of Job and his path from suffering to joy. The general appearance of this priest, his demeanour, clothes and modest house, all suggest authenticity, while the bishop seems to exude falseness. Genuine identity in this film is, therefore, linked with disconnectedness

from the official world at large and its corrupting influence which leads to a negation of space, language and identity. In another variation of this theme, the old and decrepit church where Roman and his friends go to socialise, which is ironic, by modern western hedonistic standards, exudes a certain spirituality and sanctuary, while the newly built church, which is seen in the film's conclusion, represents falsehood in both its conception and current state. Indeed, after Liliya's unexplained disappearance, Nikolai also sits in the church with the boys for a few minutes, drunk, but able to contemplate the religious painting which still adorns the walls in the flickering firelight.

The final spoken scene in the film is heavily ironic: an inaugural service is held at the newly built church which now stands on Nikolai's former domestic space, and the bishop delivers a lengthy sermon, which, inter alia, discusses two types of truth, that which is real, *истина* (from Greek *αλήθεια*), and that which is just, *правда* (*δικαιοσύνη, δίκαιον*), and comes immediately after a scene in which the mayor sits in a restaurant and orders more vodka to celebrate the news that Nikolai has been sentenced to 15 years in prison with hard labour. The camera also takes in the congregation, with, at one point, the mayor informing his young son that this is their Lord and 'He sees everything' (*Он всё видит*). It is all, of course, heavily ironic, in fact, once again, a kind of *non-language*. The unjust way in which Nikolai has been divested of his home and his subsequent framing for murdering his wife with a lenghty spell in prison with hard labour is, as it were, discussed in the very location where a few weeks before he had been living a relatively happy life, making the philosophical sermon about different types of truth and acting not through strength, but through love (*Не силой, а любовью*) (2.07′) entirely and tragically preposterous. The concepts of truth and justice, then, are absurd in the extreme, as is the notion that a just God sees this and does nothing. This *non-language* of the bishop is the counterpart of the legal *non-language* mentioned above which occurs when the second decision of the court is read out at breakneck speed by the female clerk. It is also related to the obfuscation of truth which is conducted in the police station when Nikolai is interrogated and charged. Although the policeman speaks rationally and clearly, the hopeless situation becomes clear to the viewer and the inebriated Nikolai, and the resulting dramatic irony as we see and grasp Nikolai's clear bewilderment and grief is a powerful statement on the tragic demise of the 'little man' in the face of the Leviathan of state power. The final voice heard in the film is the bleak cry of a raven over the deserted and windswept landscape.

* * *

In this article, Andrei Zvyagintsev's film *Leviathan* is analysed from the perspective of Marc Augé's place/non-place. The film's use of framing technique establishes the site of Nikolai's house as the main thematic focus. From the outset, Nikolai's home is depicted as a somewhat liminal, exposed and vulnerable space, both in physical and abstract terms: the house itself is not separate from the outside world, while the relationships inside the house

are already strained. The actions of the mayor lead directly to the arrival of Dmitry in this already fragile domestic space, and force Nikolai to engage in a discourse of non-language in the world outside. Soon, however, it is clear that the 'little man' is powerless in the face of the Leviathan of power, particularly one which erodes identity and home and subverts language, place and even truth. *Leviathan* is, then, primarily concerned with the fragility of place and domestic space. At the film's conclusion, Nikolai is imprisoned for the (non-)murder of his wife, the space which Nikolai has held as his own all his life is bulldozed, and, as an elegy, the bishop, on the very site of the victim's recent abode, expounds on the essence of truth and love, as opposed to lie and strength, as the congregation gazes and nods in almost robotic fashion. The bleak message of the film is of the home as a transitory, liminal space, vulnerable to the corruption and destruction from the external and ever-increasing force of the outside world, the Leviathan of officialdom, which negates all that is inherent to and necessary for human identity. It would seem that through the death of truth (in favour of non-truth), of marriage (in favour of a charade of marriage, or indeed of a non-marriage), and of the family (wrested from its nuclear whole by divorce and re-marriage, and left as a dysfunctional and disintegrating non-family), the individual, in the face of the State, becomes a non-entity (indeed, a non-individual), collateral damage, as it were, in the State's quest for self-perpetuation at all costs. Take the individual out of the equation and the State will thrive in its non-truth, turning domestic space into a place which, given the corrupted means by which it came into being, is, effectively, a non-place.

Список литературы

Augé M. Non-Places : An Introduction to Supermodernity. 2th ed. L. ; N. Y. : Verso, 2008. 98 p.

Bradshaw P. Leviathan Review – a Compellingly Told, Stunningly Shot Drama // The Guardian [website]. URL: https://www.theguardian.com/film/2014/nov/06/leviathan-review-story-of-job (mode of access: 02.06.2017).

Fedorov A. Leviathan and Sunstroke: Opinions of the Russian Film Critics // Intern. J. of Media and Information Literacy [website]. 2017. № 1. URL: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2919224 (mode of access: 25.07.2017).

Kondyuk D. Sensing and Longing for God in Andrey Zvyagintsev's *The Return* and *Leviathan* // Religions. 2016. № 7. Paper 82. URL: http://www.mdpi.-com/2077-1444/7/7/82/htm (mode of access: 25.07.2017).

McGregor A., Lagerberg R. Aspirations of Home in Post-Soviet Russia: Domestic Spaces and National Resonances in Andrey Zvyagintsev's *Elena'* // Quaestio Rossica. 2016. Vol. 4. № 2. P. 80–94. DOI 10.15826/qr2016.2.159.

Părău C. Through the "Eye of the Machine": Poetics of the Inhuman in Andrey Zvyagintsev's Films // Ekphrasis. 2016. № 1. P. 129–138.

Thomassen B. Liminality // Routledge Encyclopedia of Social Theory / ed. by A. Harrington, B. L. Marshall, H.-P. Müller. L. : Routledge, 2006. P. 322–323.

Список фильмов

Звягинцев А. «Левиафан». Россия : Компания «Нон-Стоп Продакшн». 2014. 141'.

References

Augé, M. (2008). *Non-Places: An Introduction to Supermodernity*. Ed. 2. L., N. Y., Verso. 98 p.

Bradshaw, P. (2014). Leviathan Review – a Compellingly Told, Stunningly Shot Drama. In *The Guardian* [website]. URL: https://www.theguardian.com/film/2014/nov/06/leviathan-review-story-of-job (mode of access: 02.06.2017).

Fedorov, A. (2017). 'Leviathan and Sunstroke: Opinions of the Russian Film Critics'. In *Intern. J. of Media and Information Literacy*. No. 1. URL: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2919224 (mode of access: 25.07.2017).

Kondyuk, D. (2016). 'Sensing and Longing for God in Andrey Zvyagintsev's *The Return* and *Leviathan*'. In *Religions*. No. 7. Paper 82. URL: http://www.mdpi.-com/2077-1444/7/7/82/htm (mode of access: 25.07.2017).

McGregor, A., Lagerberg, R. (2016). 'Aspirations of Home in Post-Soviet Russia: Domestic Spaces and National Resonances in Andrey Zvyagintsev's *Elena'*. In *Quaestio Rossica*. Vol. 4. No. 2, pp. 80–94. DOI 10.15826/qr2016.2.159.

Părău, C. (2016). 'Through the "Eye of the Machine": Poetics of the Inhuman in Andrey Zvyagintsev's films'. In *Ekphrasis*. No. 1, pp. 129–138.

Thomassen, B. (2006). Liminality. In Harrington, A., Marshall, B. L., Müller, H.-P. (Eds.). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Social Theory.* L., Routledge, pp. 322–323.

Film References

Zvyagintsev, A. (2014). *Leviathan.* Russia, Non-Stop Production. 2014. 141'.

The article was submitted on 29.01.2018