

12. Bruns J. Die Persöhnlichkeit in der Geschichtsschreibung der Alten. – Kiel., 1897. – 84 s.
13. Eckert W. De figurarum in Titi Livi ab urbe condita libris usu. – Diss. Vratislaviae, 1911. – 103 p.
14. Kühnast L. Die Hauptpunkte der Livianischen Syntax. – Berlin, 1871. – 402 s.
15. Paulys-Wissowa. Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. – Stuttgart, 1926. – Bd. 25. – S. 816–852.
16. Schanz M. Geschichte der Römischen Literatur. – München, 1914. – 573 s.
17. Stacey S.G. Die Entwicklung des livianischen Stiles. – Leipzig, 1896. – 661 s.
18. Teufel W.S. Geschichte der Römischen Literatur. – Leipzig–Berlin. – Bd. II. – 1910. – 349 s.
19. Titi Livi. Ab urbe condita libri / W. Weissenborn. – M. Müller.lib. I–VI. – Lipsiae., 1910. – 396 s.
20. Titi Livi. Ab urbe condita libri / W. Weissenborn. – Bd. III. Buch. VI–X. – Berlin, 1876. – 220 s.

УДК 007(410)+791.233:613.885+316.346.2-055.1

DOI: 10.24144/2617-3921.2020.18.186-197

Filip Šera

Magister, Department of British and American Studies

Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice

orcid.org/0000-0001-7465-5825

Košice, Slovakia, 00421 911 218 475

filip.sera@student.upjs.sk

Gender in British media: homosexuality and masculinity in selected TV series

Анотація. Взаємодія між маскуліністю та гомосексуальністю представляє особливий інтерес в рамках розгляду структури тендерних владних відносин Коннелла. В ній геї, вважається, перебувають в підлеглому становищі у гетеросексуалів, таким чином асоціюючи їх з фемінністю (жіночністю). Для боротьби з атрибутами фемінності геї впроваджують широкий спектр стратегій, орієнтованих на гіпермаскуліність та прихильність до вищих соціальних класів, які обіцяють владу. Роль засобів масової інформації є ключовою у формуванні цієї образності. Метою цієї розвідки є проаналізувати два британські телесеріали, що зображують персонажів-геїв, щоб розкрити своєрідні особливості, які можуть вплинути

на сприйняття глядачів. Крім того, ці два серіали порівнюються з огляду на три аспекти: гедонізм, жіночність та розбещеність. Застосована методологія базується на психоаналітичній теорії Лакана та феміністичному фільмі Лори Малві. Через обмеженість телесеріалів, в дослідженні задіяна теорія Марселя Данесі. Результати вказують на те, що в представленні гейських маскулінностей спостерігається зміна у бік більшої консервативності. Порівняння також виявило, що розбещеність досі вважається широко розповсюдженою в гей-спільноті, тоді як ситуація щодо жіночності та гедонізму змінилася. Слід зазначити, що подібне зображення може бути обумовлене присутністю серіалів у гетеронормативних мейнстрімних медіа.

Ключові слова: гомосексуальність, засоби масової інформації, телебачення, маскулінність, гегемонія, чоловіки

Abstract. The interaction between masculinity and homosexuality is of interest when considering Connell's structure of gender power relations. Here gay men are considered subordinate to heterosexual ones, thus linking them to femininity. To fight the attributions of femininity, gay men have adopted a wide range of strategies all centred around hyper-masculinity and adherence to upper social classes, which carry the promise of power. The role of media is pivotal in shaping this imagery. It is our aim to analyse two British TV series portraying gay characters in order to uncover the identities, which may shape the perception of viewers. Furthermore, the two series are compared in regard to three aspects: hedonism, effeminacy and promiscuity. The methodology draws from Lacan's psychoanalytic theory and the feminist film of Laura Mulvey. Due to the constricted nature of TV series, it also includes theory of Marcel Danesi. The outcomes suggest that there is a shift in the portrayal of gay masculinities towards greater conservatism. The comparison also uncovered that promiscuity is still portrayed as widely accepted in the gay community, whereas positions of effeminacy and hedonism have changed. It must be pointed out that such portrayal may be motivated by the presence of the series within heteronormative mainstream media.

Keywords: homosexuality, media, television, masculinity, hegemony, men

Introduction. For a significant part of the modern discourse of homosexuality, which started forming in the 19th century, homosexual men were considered effeminate. However, a sudden change happened sometimes after the WWII, when the Gay Liberation started emerging and the definition of masculinity came to be challenged by women gaining social power. Nonetheless, when Raewyn Connell introduced her concepts of hegemonic masculinity and gender relations, homosexual men (alongside women) were still considered subordinate to the traditional masculinity, which encompasses such qualities as muscularity, physical strength, aggressiveness and sex drive. While initially the position of gay men carried a subversive potential able to challenge hegemonic masculinity, a shift from this

potential to adoption of hyper-masculine ideals occurred inside the gay mainstream culture. What started as a San Francisco subculture focusing on hyper-sexualized masculine traits, later became a way to fight stigma stemming from the AIDS crisis and finally, by entering the world of consumerism, its position became solidified as the golden standard of what a gay man should look like and how he should act. Just as Alan Kirby points out in his book on digimodernism, consumerism became the Western grand narrative which aims at transforming all practices into a consumable commodity [8, p.239] and without arguing, masculinity and homosexual identity became such commodities. In practice, this transformation is manifested in the inclusion of (predominantly male) gay characters into films and sitcoms and the internet made it considerably easier for millennial generations of LGBT people to access queer communities in a heteronormative world. Yet easier access and greater representation does not mean greater variety and, as Kay Siebler points out in his book, such practice may often cause more harm than good as gay men are exposed to one particular form of (masculine) homosexuality, which is easily accepted by the heteronormative world, and shames all other body types and personalities [17, p.4].

The attention should also be drawn to two aspects, which are imminently endangered by hyper-masculinity – to identity and health. According to a sociological inquiry published in the Archives of Sexual Behaviour, the authors have proven that the preoccupation with masculinity and negative feelings about effeminacy often reflect a crisis of identity among gay men. This is connected to the straight-acting phenomenon and homocon (i.e. homosexual conservative) which gay men adopt to be seen as ‘normal’ [16, p.116]. As to the latter aspect, more recent article in the same journal tried to uncover the relationship between masculinity and HIV risk among men who have sex with men (MSM). Unsurprisingly, adoption of masculine ideals among MSM often leads to a higher risk of contracting and transmitting HIV due to several reasons, for instance low condom use and engagement in multiple risky encounters [18, p.1983].

As illustrated above, the interplay of homosexuality and masculinity carries significant consequences and it is the aim of this thesis to analyse two TV series, *Queer as Folk* and *Cucumber*, to unearth the masculine symbolism and to prove or disprove the hypothesis that the selected TV series depict a shift in gay masculinities from subordination in the form of homosexuality with subversive potential to complicity in the form of homocon. The outcomes of the analysis are subsequently compared in regards to three chosen aspects based on stereotypization of homosexuality in heterocentric mainstream. These include hypersexualization of gay men, effeminate behaviour and hedonism presented in the overuse of alcohol and drugs.

Connell claims that major opposition towards hegemonic masculinity comes from homosexual masculinities and thus the Gay Liberation promised to spark a change in among gender relations. However, as Gay Liberation gained in success, the radical change has not created the essence of mainstream gay culture. Instead, a shift from femininity and adoption of hypermasculine styles may be observed: “Not

drag queens but ‘Castro Street clones’, equipped with jeans and T-shirts, moustaches and cropped hair, became the international leaders of style in gay communities in the later 1970s.” [5, p.218]. This is furthermore enhanced by the development of gay subcultures as described in *From Drag Queens to Leathermen* by Rusty Barrett. As he points out, gay subcultures are incredibly rich and even a subculture can have additional sub-subcultures [1, p.1]. Even though there is a consistent subculture of cross-dressing, it is not considered to be the mainstream of gay culture. Instead, the afore mentioned culture of clones evolved into yet another form hypermasculinity and that is the subculture of bears [1, p.87]. Although the gay culture was ravaged by the AIDS epidemic of 1980s, there was a flourishing subculture of homosexual men practising unprotected sex in the 1990s. Such practice, despite being hazardous, is commonly linked to the sense of representing sexual prowess and thus exhibiting one’s masculinity [1, p.148].

The choice of the two TV series from the hands of S. R. Davies was motivated by their status in popular culture (and it is especially important in queer culture), in which *Queer as Folk* (1999) is comparable to a legend as it was not only a great success among the audiences, but it was also well-received by critics. In 2010, an article in the *Guardian* ranked *Queer as Folk* by thirteenth place out of fifty top dramas of all time [9] which only further reinforces the importance of the series.

British TV industry recently saw Davies’s return to gay dramas with his trilogy *Tofu* (2015), *Banana* (2015) and *Cucumber* (2015). Unlike *Tofu* and *Banana*, *Cucumber* is frequently compared to *Queer as Folk* and it is for this reason that *Cucumber* became the choice for the analysis in this thesis. When compared to its predecessor, *Cucumber* is not a straight-forward success due to its mixed reception among audiences and critics.

Queer as Folk and *Cucumber* differ from each other in the same way that the British society of today differs from that of 1990s. *Queer as Folk* can be defined as a comedy revolving around homosexual stereotypes and serious topics, such as drugs and underage sex. On the other hand, *Cucumber* is rather a tragi-comedy as it is centred around a dull middle-aged life, which is interrupted by a sudden tragedy in the life of the protagonist

Methodology. Due to the visual nature of the analysed material, the methodology draws from the knowledge of film and cultural theories, yet it is modified to suit the more straightforward and time-compressed nature of television shows.

The contemporary film theory started to form in 1960s under the intellectual movement of structuralism, which was based on the Saussurean theory of signs. Theory of Ferdinand de Saussure, although concerned predominantly with language, has settled in various fields of cultural studies including film theory. Saussure defined sign as consisting of two facets – one signifying, that is related to its realization and the signified, which represents the concept. While for Saussure, both concepts were non-material, their contemporary usage has grown ever more material and thus the signifying component of sign is often considered to be a physiological manifestation (e.g. word) or an object (e.g. traffic signs). To avoid confusion, it must

be pointed out that to Saussure signs were not abstract, but rather immaterial and thus he believed that language was the most effective system, because “words are always at hand” [10, p.55].

Nowadays, comparing films to languages is a common practice and thus majority of inquiries are trying to uncover the language of cinema, that is code, which is required in order to decode the underlying meaning of films. Yet such comparison is, to a certain degree, inadequate for, at least, three reasons. In linguistics, the language, or *langue*, is understood as an abstract set of rules stored in mind, from which individual draws when producing the material realization in form of written or spoken words (i.e. *parole*). Therefore, a film is the manifestation of the cinematic language [4, p.9], yet what is important to note is that, unlike in natural language, in film the possibility of reciprocated dialogue is hindered by the nature of its realization and thus films only deliver concepts but do not receive feedback. Another reason which distinguishes film from language is embodied in the nature of the smallest analysable units of both systems. In natural language, the relationship between the signifier and the signified is arbitrary meaning that there is no direct connection between the object in real life and its pronounced representation, yet that is not the case in film, as its smallest unit – the shot, is motivated and thus essentially iconic [3, p.3]. In practice, images in films lack the conventionality exerted by natural languages and thus “an image of a rabbit shows a rabbit” [2, p.31]. The third reason is the sole fact that film is not a natural but rather semiotic language [12, p.86]. In practice, it would be challenging to deconstruct an image in a film into parts analogous with phrases in a sentence or parts of speech [12, p.31].

The proposition of this distinction between natural languages and films is often entitled to a prominent figure of structuralism, Christian Metz. According to Metz, film does not constitute a *langue* in the meaning of a language system, but it definitely represents “language in the looser sense of being a signifying practice characterized by recognizable ordering procedures” [3, p.3]. Apart from his view on the distinction between film and natural language, Metz also believes that the shot is not equivalent to the word, but rather to a sentence and he points out that, originally, films were purely iconic based on resemblance of objects from the real world [3, p.4]

As could be noticed in the previous paragraphs, not all signs are deliberately arbitrary. In reality, the relationship between the signifier and the signified varies according to the precision with which they try to capture the object in the real world. The first possible type of signs is the symbol, which is least iconic, arbitrary, and based on conventional associations. On the other hand, icons represent the perceived resemblance and traditionally, all pictures are considered to be icons, because they carry qualities assigned to the represented object. However, some scholars claim that there is no such thing as purely iconic representation and that even a photograph is an index. Index is based on continuation and thus it represents only a fragment of the object which is definitely existent [4, p.38-40].

It should be also mentioned, that apart from these three mentioned types of signs, there are also two special cases – metaphor and metonymy. Metaphor is often connected to language, yet it can also manifest in a visual form: “In film, a pair of consecutive shots is metaphorical when there is an implied comparison of the two shots. For instance, a shot of an aeroplane followed by a shot of a bird flying would be metaphorical, implying that the aeroplane is (or is like) a bird [4, p.127].”

As illustrated above, visual metaphor works on the principle of transferring of a certain feature or quality from one object to another. While metaphor is based on unrelatedness, metonymy replaces one signified with another and thus it is based on indexical relationship [4, p.129].

So far it is noticeable that structuralists utilized various techniques and knowledge related to linguistic research with the promise of identifying the code of a film in order to decode it and uncover the underlying meaning. This theoretical approach to cinema is nowadays known as classical film semiotics and is based on the existence of not only the core denotative meaning, but also on the elusive connotative meanings, which require cultural and intellectual knowledge to interpret [10, p.60].

A major transformation in film semiotics occurred in the late twentieth century under post-structuralism, which was influenced by Althusser’s marxist theory and Lacan’s psychoanalytical theory rather than linguistic approaches [12, p.101]. Jacques Lacan revisited and reinterpreted many concepts and notions proposed by Sigmund Freud and many of them were bent further more to fit into the field of film studies. Probably the most important concept proposed by Lacan is that of the mirror stage. In the development of a child, there comes a certain point when the child encounters the reflection of its material being in the real world. The reflection, however, does not represent the self (i.e. the inner experience of existing) but rather the other which results in a feeling of alienation and desire for the impossible ideal. The self and the other are connected to a third notion, the real, which is the pure state experienced before the mirror stage. The mirror stage is usually interpreted as the formation of the ego and rise of subjectivity [10, p.67]. Other important concepts are those of castration and the phallus. While Lacan chose to distinguish it from its anatomical analogue, it is still predominantly related to the sexual differentiation under which women are castrated men and thus the phallus represents the power which sustains the patriarchy. However, the phallus is generally understood as a semblance of plenitude, which comes at the exchange for eternal dissatisfaction in form of unfulfilled desires [10, p.69]. Lastly, Lacan introduced the notion of the gaze, which, in cinema, is often perceived as imaginary deception and thus, in this context, it should not be associated with the activity, but it rather constitutes an object with the purpose of evoking desire in the spectator [11, p.6].

Lacan’s mirror stage and the gaze became especially important in post-structuralist theories. Louis Althusser interwoven ideology into the mirror stage in a way that the ideology creates an imaginary filter behind which an individual does not perceive the world as it is, but rather as it is described by the particular ideology.

Therefore, there exists a split between the real body, which the child inhabits, and the imaginary body, which the child thinks it has. Althusser proposed that the ideology interpellates individuals and constitute them as its subjects [15, p.37].

Under the feminist theory, Laura Mulvey developed the concept of the male gaze. It is based around the premise, that the female characters in films are positioned as objects to be looked at by men for male audiences. The male gaze produces visual pleasure, yet this process is not passive but rather active as desiring spectator actively projects desire onto the female character and fantasizes about possessing her as a passive object [11, p.8]. Similarly, the queer gaze was characterized as inducing pleasure from seeing seemingly fragmentated images, which is the result of underrepresentation of queer characters in the cinema. This led to possible queer interpretation of films, which, at first glance, are lacking any such associations [13, p.47].

While Lacan's theory may produce the impression of flawlessness, his ideas were not devoid of criticism. Critically acclaimed by Metz, Lacan believed that film can be compared to natural language as he saw the images in it being based on arbitrary conventions. In addition, Metz rejected the comparison of film to a mirror of the mirror stage. He points out that if the mirror of the mirror stage initiates the child into the social world, the mirror of the screen, which the spectator watches, is placed in an already constituted social world [15, p.43]. Metz introduced two important concepts into the post-structuralist film theory. Firstly, he questioned the intentions of the audiences' motives for visiting cinema, which he compared to visiting a theatre. In the theatre, the audience observes real persons placed in a real space, which are altogether placed within a fictional scenario. However, in the cinema, the props and characters are imaginary as they were constructed in the past and no longer exist and thus the audience is spectating fictional objects in a fictional scenario. His propositions call for understanding the cinema as a series of mirror-effects rather than a mirror. Secondly, he points out that while audiences understand that the film consists of mere images, which are fictional, at the same time, they believe, that the action in film is real. In other words, the spectator knows that the images are constructed and manipulated but is oblivious to this fact as long as the film produces the expected pleasure. These two findings are conjointly known as fetishism [15, p.44-45].

Apart from the film theory, it is necessary to point out several features peculiar to television series. What is immediately apparent is the title, which may already disclose information about the underlying code. For instance, Marcel Danesi in his book *Understanding Media Semiotics* pointed to several sitcom titles, such as *Father Knows Best*, which implies that the underlying code is moralistic narrative centred around family problems [7, p.143]. There are also three effects related to the character of television series. Firstly, it is the history fabrication effect, which implies that an ordinary event invokes the feeling of a momentous happening. Secondly, the mythologizing effect creates characters perceived as mythical beings transcending time and being "larger than life" [7, p.144]. And thirdly, the limited

time of transmission creates narratives which are more obvious and straightforward. This came to be known as the cognitive compression effect and is typical for producing cognitively effortless television images [7, p.145].

So far, the theoretical background of the methodology utilized in the consequent analysis was outlined and it is the purpose of this paragraph to summarize it and modified it into a practical framework. The analysis focuses on the dominant imagery and its underlying meaning through usage of the afore mentioned knowledge in the field of film semiotics. In other words, the analysis draws attention to the utilization of symbolic language connected to the encoded representation of the interaction between masculinity and homosexuality. This symbolic language relies on the visual representation of these phenomena through usage of visual metaphors, and thus interconnections between seemingly unconnected scenes is explored. Moreover, the analysis explores the way in which the characters in both series are portrayed in regard to traditionally masculine traits i.e. whether they are portrayed in a rather masculine or feminine way. Lastly, apart from the visual aspect, the analysis focuses on the worded representation of characters' ideas and contrast them to the afore mentioned visual aspect, thus pointing out whether or not there is difference between what is said and how it is presented.

To unravel how such imagery affects the spectators, the analysis draws from Lacan's psychoanalytic theory and considers the visual material to be a mirror of the existing social context. Due to the dominant topic of the series and the target audience, the queer gaze in both series is redefined and thus rivals the male gaze, traditionally considered to be heterosexual. This means, that, unlike in the male gaze, the object of desire is not the body of a woman, but rather of another man and this desire is projected onto the visual representation of the analysed scenes. This visual representation is of great interest due to the problematic relationship between masculinity based on heterosexuality and the homosexual desire. In other words, while the society is used to the overrepresentation of the male gaze, the queer gaze may be considered shocking and uncanny, thus it carries a subversive potential.

Lastly, it takes into consideration the three characteristics of television shows provided by Danesi. The analyses of both series are introduced through a closer look at the titles of the series and what they might imply for the potential spectator. The analysis acknowledges the fact that the time and resources in TV series are limited and compressed and thus it takes into consideration that the symbolism may be less complex as in other forms of media and packed with more meaning.

Discussion. The analysis of *Queer as Folk* uncovered that two of the dominant characters – Stuart and Vince, are constructed as two extremes, with the first possessing qualities associated with traditional masculinity but hidden behind an effeminate behaviour and the latter living a closeted life, being passive and at some moments adopting opinions of the homophobic environment and pretending not to be gay. The protagonist, Nathan, enters the series as a 'tabula rasa' and is introduced through a symbolic rite-of-passage into the gay culture by Stuart. This initial introduction resulted in Nathan slowly becoming another Stuart – promiscuous,

adventurous and self-confident, yet fragile just as traditional masculinity can be. Later in the series, through the influence of Vince and Hazel, Nathan's personality started to take a different shape becoming more balanced and realizing his full potential in subverting hegemonic masculinity.

Cucumber, on the other hand, introduced the protagonist Henry, who is apparently dissatisfied with his life, suffers from a crisis of identity stemming from his sexual orientation and who is visibly conforming to the expectations of society to the point of adopting societal norms about traditional masculinity. Another supporting character, Lance, is presented as effeminate and subordinate to Henry and, when he tries to revolt against him, he has to face failure and eventually death at the hands of another straight-acting character.

The comparative analysis tried to point out, that among the most surviving stereotypes is the one that portrays gay men as highly sexually driven. This portrayal is present in both series, though in Cucumber it is mostly left in the sphere of imagination of the main character. When it comes to effeminacy, in *Queer as Folk*, it is accepted as an aspect of the gay culture without any negative or positive connotations. In Cucumber, both effeminacy and hegemonic masculinity are portrayed critically as Henry is unable to resolve his inner crisis and Lance's revolt and demise symbolizes that in current society, effeminacy cannot reach beyond subordination. The most significant difference is seen in the presentation of hedonism. The successful careers of Stuart and Henry allow them to exert certain amount of power and accumulate wealth, which definitely puts them among the upper strata of the middle class. Yet while Stuart turns these commodities into luxurious flamboyant lifestyle of clubbing, consumption of alcohol and usage of drugs, Henry is typical for his conformism. Both series carry a warning against uncontrolled hedonism and promiscuous life through the deaths of Phil and Lance.

As can be deduced from above, the analysis proves the hypothesis that the selected TV series depict a shift in gay masculinities from subordination in the form of homosexuality with subversive potential to complicity in the form of homocon, as by the end of *Queer as Folk*, Nathan's personality is balanced with potential for subversion of traditional masculinity, whereas Cucumber concludes with restoration of status quo in form of Henry regaining his conformist style of life.

Conclusion. While it is probably impossible to determine the origin of homosexuality, it was not until the second half of the 19th century that the social and legal circumstances allowed the formation of the contemporary homosexual identity. What may be observed in this dawn of sexology is the interconnection between homosexuality and femininity, which throughout the years became a common stereotype. Although nowadays it is generally accepted that not all homosexual men are effeminate, this assumption is still alive and has a considerable effect on the formation of gender identities of gay men. The mainstream gay culture faces yet another extreme and that is the fetishization of hypermasculinity. While the fetishization started with the rise of hypermasculine subcultures inside the gay community, it was not until the 1990s when both gender and sexual identity were

transformed into a consumable commodity. Although this transformation ensured greater representation of LGBT people in the media, it eradicated variety and thus gay men became overwhelmed by one particular form of masculine homosexual identity centred around social success and the cult of body. This overrepresentation of one particular identity does not correspond to the diversity of personalities and thus results in frequent crises of identity and the opposition towards the effeminate men inside the gay community.

When considering Connell's concepts of hegemonic masculinity and gender relations, the adoption of hypermasculinity offers an escape route from the subordinate position, yet at the same time removes the subversive potential of homosexuality, and thus gay men become their own oppressors. In this context, the main aim of the thesis was to analyse two TV series, *Queer as Folk* and *Cucumber*, to uncover the interplay between homosexuality and masculinity and to prove or disprove the hypothesis that the selected TV series depict a shift in gay masculinities from subordination in the form of homosexuality with subversive potential to complicity in the form of homocon. The outcomes of the analysis were subsequently compared in regards to three chosen aspects based on stereotypization of homosexuality in heterocentric mainstream. These include hypersexualization of gay men, effeminate behaviour and hedonism presented in the overuse of alcohol and drugs.

In *Queer as Folk*, it becomes visible that two of the dominant characters – Vince and Stuart, are constructed as two extremes of one scale. While Vince is closeted, straight-acting and able to come to terms with his identity, Stuart is a trickster, who, although already came out by the beginning of the series and lives a flamboyant and promiscuous life, is unable to liberate himself from traditionally masculine traits, thus becoming emotionally deprived. The protagonist, Nathan, enters the series as a 'tabula rasa' and initially, is influenced by Stuart's personality, yet later this influence is softened by Vince and his mother, thus becoming a balanced character in the end.

On the other hand, *Cucumber* presents the protagonist, Henry, as a dissatisfied gay man, who is facing an identity crisis stemming from his sexual orientation, which results in adoption of a conservative homosexuality centred around traditional masculinity. Henry's partner, Lance, is portrayed as a subordinate and effeminate gay man, who, after trying to revolt from his subordinate position, faces deadly consequences. This symbolism is crucial to the power-relations among the various masculinities as it portrays certain subjugation of the effeminate by gay men who are in complicity to hegemonic masculinity.

Furthermore, the comparison of the chosen aspects revealed that hypersexualization is a surviving stereotype, as promiscuity and sexual adventures are vividly portrayed in both series. The outcomes of such behaviour are, however, different as in *Queer as Folk*, it is accepted as a fact, while, in *Cucumber*, it is perceived rather negatively. Similarly, effeminacy among gay men is perceived as a part of gay culture in *Queer as Folk*, while it is presented in a negative and ridiculed

way in Cucumber. Hedonism, in sense of overuse of recreational drugs and alcohol, is visibly the most differing aspect of the three. While Queer as Folk is literally full of spending nights at clubs drinking, it is not so in Cucumber as it portrays Henry as a conservative character living an upper-middle class life. However, in both series, promiscuous and hedonistic lifestyles were presented slightly negatively, as this led to the deaths of the characters of Phil in Queer as Folk and Lance in Cucumber.

REFERENCES

1. Barrett R. From Drag Queens To Leather men. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017. 272p.
2. Bateman J. A. and Schmidt K.-H. Multimodal Film Analysis. New York: Routledge, 2012. 339p.
3. Braudy L. and Cohen M. Film Theory and Criticism. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. 926p.
4. Chandler D. Semiotics: the basics. New York: Routledge, 2007. 326p.
5. Connell R. W. Masculinities. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2005. 361p.
6. Cucumber [TV series]. Directed by David Evans, Alice Troughton and Euros Lyn. UK: Red Production Company, 2015.
7. Danesi M. Understanding Media Semiotics. London: Arnold, 2002. 264p.
8. Kirby A. Digimodernism. New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group, Inc., 2009. 288p.
9. Lawson M. Cucumber-Banana-Tofu Trilogy-first-look review [Online]. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/tv-and-radio/2015/jan/16/cucumber-bananatofu-russell-t-davies-review>"2015.01.16.
10. McDonald K. Film Theory. New York: Routledge, 2016. 207p.
11. McGowan T. The Real Gaze: film theory after Lacan. New York: State University of New York Press, 2007. 268p
12. Miller T. and Stam R. A Companion to Film Theory. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004. 436p.
13. Pullen Ch. Straight Girls and Queer Guys. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2016. 200p.
14. Queer as Folk [TV series]. Directed by McDougall Ch., Harding S. and Hunnam Ch. UK: Red Production Company, 1999.
15. Rushton R. and Bettinson G. What is Film Theory? New York: Open University Press, 2010. 219p.
16. Sanchez F. J. and Eric Vilain E. Straight-Acting Gays: The Relationship Between Masculine Consciousness, Anti-Effeminacy, and Negative Gay Identity. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*. 2012. Vol. 41, No. 1. P. 111-119.
17. Siebler K. Learning Queer Identity in the Digital Age. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016. 207p.

18. Zeglin R. J. Assessing the Role of Masculinity in the Transmission of HIV: A Systematic Review to Inform HIV Risk Reduction Counselling Interventions for Men Who Have Sex with Men. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*. 2015. Vol. 44, No. 1, p. 1979-1990.

УДК 81'316:19

DOI: 10.24144/2617-3921.2020.18.197-207

Оксана Шовак

кандидат філологічних наук, доцент кафедри англійської філології

ДВНЗ «УжНУ»

orcid.org/0000-0001-6016-7599

Ужгород, Україна, +38(095) 625 30 15

oksana.shovak@uzhnu.edu.ua

Non-verbal means denoting aggression in Modern English

Анотація. Стаття присвячена проблемам вербалізації агресивних станів людини в англомовних текстах художньої прози. Агресивні стани та агресивна поведінка особистості є однією з найважливіших соціальних проблем сучасності. Питання про співвідношення вербального і невербального в агресії складне і багатогранне. Воно включає в себе такі проблеми, як визначення емоцій, що стимулюють агресію, як частина загальних умов виникнення агресії, власне агресивний акт і емоційні стани, що виникають в результаті вчинення агресивного акта. На деякі з цих запитань відповідь можна знайти в процесі лінгвістичного аналізу художніх текстів.

Тексти художньої прози є сховищем емоційного досвіду людства. В них відображаються стереотипізовані уявлення носіїв мови про невербальний прояв тих чи інших емоцій в даній культурі, в тому числі і емоцій - складових агресивних станів. Вербалізації емоцій у художніх текстах набагато більше інформаційно навантажені, ніж у живій розмовній мові, оскільки вони представляють собою стилізовану репрезентацію уявлень про те, як повинна виражатися та чи інша емоція. У засобах опису агресивних станів, таким чином, міститься інформація про емоції, що стимулюють агресію.

З проведеного аналізу теоретичної літератури випливає, що агресія є фізичним (в тому числі і мовним) актом, поведінкою, що стимулюється і підтримується емоціями комплексу ворожості, в який, в свою чергу, входять емоції гніву, відрази і презирства.

Проведене дослідження стало підтвердженням того, що емоційна комунікація побудована насамперед на невербаліці, а слова, будучи містком між вербальними і невербальними, не дають можливості повністю відчутти в