Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 27/03/2012; 3B2 version: 9.1.406/W Unicode (May 24 2007) (APS_OT)
Dir: //integrafs1/kcg/2-Pagination/TandF/DWFS/ApplicationFiles/9780415687836.3d
Proof

9 "A double set of glasses"

Stanley Kubrick and the *midrashic* mode of interpretation

Nathan Abrams

Although not immediately noticeable or obvious in his films, the Jewishness of Stanley Kubrick (1928–1999) was indelibly inscribed, forming the bedrock of his filmmaking, what George Steiner referred to as "the pride and the burden of the Jewish tradition" (1961: 4). As Paula Hyman observed, "Even secularized Jews were likely to retain a strong ethnic Jewish identification, generally internally and reinforced from without" (1995: 91). Geoffrey Cocks put it thus, "there in fact was – and is – always one Jew at the center of every Kubrick film. The one behind the camera: Stanley Kubrick" (2004: 32). Using Kubrick's adaptation of Stephen King's 1977 novel *The Shining* (1980), as the author's case study, in this chapter he will outline a *midrashic* approach to film studies that originated both before and beyond the Euro-American/Western/Eurocentric traditions in order to allow space for non-Western influences, experiences, and modes of thinking and theorizing Western film.

Midrash (Hebrew: lit. "to investigate" or "study") is the oldest form of Bible exegesis. An ancient tradition, it began within the Bible itself. Developed in the rabbinic and medieval periods and continuing in the present, it is the Jewish method of interpreting and retelling biblical stories that goes beyond simple distillation of religious, legal or moral teachings (Jacobson 1987: 1). It is a means of formal or informal elaboration on Jewish scripture, as a form of commentary, in order to elucidate or elaborate upon its deeper, hidden meanings. It fills in many gaps left in the biblical narrative regarding events and personalities that are only hinted at in the text. Midrash can therefore be highly imaginative and metaphorical, not intended to be taken literally, and is often "a springboard for creative readings of the text that are often at odds with – or even invert – its literal meaning" (Eisen 2003: 370). At the same time, it may simultaneously serve both as a means to make the text relevant to contemporary audiences and as a key to particularly esoteric discussions in order to make the material less accessible to the casual reader.

When it comes to exploring Jews and Jewishness, however, midrash operates at odds with the general trends in current Euro-American film studies which, in general, have almost completely ignored Judaism as religion, as both an analytic category of study and methodology, tending to focus primarily on the Holocaust and/or the image of the ethnically defined "Jew" who is implicitly assumed to be

Taylor & Francis
Not for distribution
Proof

Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 27/03/2012; 3B2 version: 9.1.406/W Unicode (May 24 2007) (APS_OT)
Dir: //integrafs1/kcg/2-Pagination/TandF/DWFS/ApplicationFiles/9780415687836.3d
Proof

male (Michel 1994: 245, Vaman 2007: 3). Furthermore, to date, it has taken as its primary task, "the locating, describing and analysing of films in which identifiably Jewish characters appear or those in which Jewish issues figure into the plot," restricting itself to "*explicit* content, assuming that Jews and their life, society and culture are being discussed or referred to *only* when they appear directly on screen" (Michel 1994: 248, 249; emphasis in original). In this way, film studies has taken on a very limited definition restricted to *visible* ethnicity.

In contrast, midrash allows us to penetrate deep into the film text, challenging the widespread approach to the Jewish/ethnic image on film as limited to explicit "content" analysis. In its focus on the subsurface, "implicit" (Rosenberg 1996: 18), symbolic or conceptual Jewishness and Judaism, that is where Jews, both ethnically and religiously defined, are "literally *conceived,* more than *represented*" (Brook 2003: 124), a midrashic approach uncovers what Ella Shohat has called "a hidden Jewish substratum" undergirding film. Furthermore, it reveals that, despite the absence of any such "ethnic" designation, Jewishness and Judaism are often "textually submerged"; they inhere in film, not only in those where such issues appear on the "epidermic" surface of the text (Shohat 1991: 220, 215).

Midrash allows us to see "Jewish moments" (Stratton 2000: 300) in which the viewer is given the possibility of "*reading Jewish*" (Bial 2005: 70), but not with certainty. Reading Jewish employs "a largely unconscious complex of codes that cross-check each other" (Bial 2005: 70), relying on the viewer locating identifiably Jewish characteristics, behaviors, beliefs or other tics, either explicitly, or by a range of undeniable signifiers. The "real-life" status of the actor/actress behind the depiction, in its conflation of cinematic role/persona with real life, provides a good place to start. But off-screen Jewish identities, although key, are by no means the only way of reading Jewish. Other important clues include historical and cultural references such as looks, intellect, behavior, profession, names, physiognomy, foods, verbal and body language, phenotype, aural, visual or emotional/genre signs, speech patterns and accents, hairstyles, anxieties, neuroses, conflicts between tradition and modernity. All of these require a prerequisite and prior knowledge "allowing individual viewers to identify these clues that represent things Jews and elements that can be read as possibly Jewish" (Krieger 2003: 388).

Furthermore, according to Henry Bial, a Jewish audience

> may glean Jewish specificity from performances that a general audience decodes as universal. Only Jews (or those who know the codes) will interpret these elements of performance as Jewish. While general audiences may recognize these performance practices as unusual, urban, or ethnic, they will not necessarily recognize them as indicators of Jewish cultural difference.
>
> (Bial 2005: 152)

Taylor & Francis
Not for distribution

Reading Jewish thus operates in a mode summed up by David Mamet's response when it was suggested that the majority of his audiences would not recognize the Jewish symbolism within his work. Paraphrasing the great Jewish scholar Maimonides (1135–1204), he replied, "Those that do, do; those that do not, do

Proof

Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 27/03/2012; 3B2 version: 9.1.406/W Unicode (May 24 2007) (APS_OT)
Dir: //integrafs1/kcg/2-Pagination/TandF/DWFS/ApplicationFiles/9780415687836.3d
Proof

not" (quoted in Kane 1999: 362 n. 40). Leslie Kane suggested that Mamet's "response underscores the coded nature of the work, accessible on many levels" (1999: 362 n. 40). While Mamet's reply may be read as a sense of (defensive) insularity, suggesting a potential lack of desire for intercultural engagement, he is simply acknowledging that reading Jewish requires a frame of alterity to see beyond or beneath the explicit surface of a text. Daniel Bell described this as the individual who sees, "as if through a double set of glasses" (1980: 134) which, figuratively, creates a set of four additional eyes, consequently doubling Nöel Carroll's "two-tiered system of communication" (1998: 245) between Hollywood filmmakers and their audience. I would argue further that Mamet's approach is just as apt for midrash and reading Jewish in general.

Although, according to Frederic Raphael, Kubrick was "known to have said that he was not really a Jew, he just happened to have two Jewish parents" (1999: 105–106), using a midrashic mode of interpretation to read Jewish, the author will argue here that Kubrick's *The Shining* can not only be explored in a midrashic fashion, but also that Kubrick was offering up his own midrash and that his work itself is midrashic. Here, the author is influenced by the similarly midrashic models provided by Kane (1999) on Mamet, Rogovoy (2009) on Bob Dylan, and Diemling (2011) on Bruce Springsteen, all of whom considered their subjects in the manner which the author is proposing, that is to place Kubrick within Jewish cultural history in order to argue that a rewarding way to approach his work is to read it as the work of a mind immersed in Jewish (among other) texts and engaged in making midrash itself. Marc Michael Epstein (2011) cogently argues that not only does Jewish visual culture evince many examples of midrashic motifs but also that Jewish visual culture *itself* needs to be considered as a form of exegesis that mirrors, supplements, and occasionally subverts traditional midrash. Indeed, Kubrick was an enigmatic, elliptical, and frustratingly uncommunicative director. He refused to explain his films' purposes in part as a means to encourage, through exploration and experimentation, the possibilities of meaning and expression. "I think that for a movie or a play to say anything really truthful about life, it has to do so very obliquely, so as to avoid all pat conclusions and neatly tied-up ideas" (Kubrick 1960/1961: 14).

Taylor & Francis
Not for distribution

In his analysis of Kubrick's entire oeuvre, Thomas Allen Nelson observed,

> With the possible exception of *2001,* no previous Kubrick film contains as many important details or stimulates as many associative responses. *The Shining* requires several viewings before its secrets are released, and even though like a maze-puzzle it can be assembled into one or more interpretative designs, mysteries remain which intimate that there is still more.
>
> (Nelson 2000: 207–208)

For example, previous scholars have found some tantalizing but underexplored biblical echoes in *The Shining* (Žižek 2006; Hess 2010; Webster 2011). Most significantly, Paul Miers perceived this parallel: "the film ends with Nicholson bellowing in the maze like an Abraham just deprived of both the son and the ram" (1980: 1366).

Proof

Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 27/03/2012; 3B2 version: 9.1.406/W Unicode (May 24 2007) (APS_OT)
Dir: //integrafs1/kcg/2-Pagination/TandF/DWFS/ApplicationFiles/9780415687836.3d
Proof

Following Miers' suggestive analogy, and using a midrashic approach, the author will argue that the film can be read Jewishly, especially in its invocation of the binding of Isaac.

Certainly, in its central idea of a father seeking to murder or sacrifice his son at the bidding of a higher power, the narrative of *The Shining* resembles that of Genesis 22. Known as the *Akedah* (Hebrew: lit. "binding"), out of nowhere, God instructs Abraham: "Take now your son, your only son, whom you love, Isaac, and go to the land of Moriah, and offer him there as a burnt offering [*olah*] on one of the mountains of which I will tell you."

Abraham and Isaac then journeyed for three days to a place called Mount Moriah where, at the crucial moment, an angel stays Abraham's hand and a ram caught in a thicket is substituted for Isaac and sacrificed. Abraham named that place "*Yehovah-yireh*" (Hebrew: "the Lord will see/look") because "he saw Him on the mount."[1] Many of *The Shining*'s details parallel the *Akedah*. Just as God instructed Abraham, a mysterious force draws Jack Torrance (Jack Nicholson) to the Overlook Hotel, which sits high in the Colorado Mountains, an eternal place of mystery that transcends time according to Cocks (2004: 216). The name "Overlook" itself suggests a godlike higher power in its omniscience and omnipotence. One also cannot help noticing the coincidence of the words "Yehovah" and "Over" and that the word "*yireh*" can be translated as "looked." Danny (Danny Lloyd) is Jack's only son whom Jack tells, "I love you, Danny. I love you more than anything else in the whole world, and I'd never do anything to hurt you, never. . . You know that, don't you, huh?" Midrash also states that Abraham was silent during the three-day journey.[2] Likewise, as the family drives up the mountain to the hotel, Jack is irritable and bad-tempered, dismissive toward Danny's curiosity and distant from his wife.

Taylor & Francis
Not for distribution

Jewish tradition constantly stresses that it was never God's intention that Abraham kill Isaac. At no point in the biblical narrative does God explicitly instruct Abraham to sacrifice Isaac; rather that Isaac be brought up the mountain and be *prepared* as an offering. In an early form of what is today called intertextuality, the rabbis invoked other biblical sources to support this view, and no fewer than sixteen biblical passages prohibit child sacrifice as an abomination. Judah Goldin has written, "As everyone knows, nothing could be more repugnant to the God of Israel than human sacrifice" (1979: xiii). Yet in one midrash (*Bereishit Rabba* 56: 7), Abraham argues with God to let him carry on and complete the sacrifice. In this reading, Abraham is carried away, almost drunk with submission, obsessed by obeying God. In this respect, he compares to Jack who is literally drunk, as well as submissive to the higher power of the Hotel that orders the "correction" of his family. Since the declaration of Genesis 22 is clear – "Do not raise your hand against the boy, or do anything to him" – Jack is punished because he seeks to sacrifice his son against God's wishes. As Genesis 9:6 warns, "Whoever sheds man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." Deuteronomy 28 outlines the consequences of disobedience to God's word – "Your carcasses will be food to all birds of the sky and to the beasts of the earth" – a fate that clearly applies to Jack (once his body thaws) whose frozen corpse inside the maze provides a lasting image at the end of the film.

Proof

Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 27/03/2012; 3B2 version: 9.1.406/W Unicode (May 24 2007) (APS_OT)
Dir: //integrafs1/kcg/2-Pagination/TandF/DWFS/ApplicationFiles/9780415687836.3d
Proof

The *Akedah* is central to Judaism. It is the focus of many legends, myths, and folklore. It forms a key part of the New Year's Day service when the complete narrative is read aloud. Many midrashim (plural) have grown up around the *Akedah,* and there is more than one interpretation of it, reflecting the deeply troubling nature of this story. It has since been deployed in Hebrew literature lamenting the loss of homeland and people. During the Middle Ages, in particular, the *Akedah* obtained a prominent place in Jewish liturgy. In the context of the murderous Crusades, it was held up as a test of the worthy, an example of devotion in faith, and its merit was invoked when appeals were made for God's mercy (Wellisch 1954: 57–58). In more recent literature and popular culture, Franz Kafka, Wilfred Owen, Dylan, Woody Allen, as well as *The Believer* (dir. Bean, 2001), have all addressed it.

Furthermore, Kubrick previously deployed the device of the *Akedah* in his *Spartacus* (1960). During the film's denouement, spurned by the wife of Spartacus (Kirk Douglas), Varinia (Jean Simmons), Crassus (Laurence Olivier) orders Spartacus and Antoninus (Tony Curtis) to fight a gladiatorial match to the death. Aware that the winner will endure an excruciating and prolonged death by crucifixion, each vows to defeat the other. Spartacus tells Antoninus that he loves him like a son and then stabs him to spare him further pain.

> In this closed system of destruction designed by the Romans, no divine hand stays Spartacus and no ram is caught in the thicket to substitute for Antoninus. Choosing to spare Antoninus the greater suffering, Spartacus accepts for himself the more prolonged, painful death. There is no hope of redemption. (Burton 2008: 13)

Taylor & Francis
Not for distribution

In *The Shining,* in contrast, in the closed system of destruction designed by Kubrick, the divine hand stays Jack and Danny is spared. Instead, Jack, trapped in the maze, becomes the proverbial ram caught in the thicket, the offering that The Overlook demands. Furthermore, the blood gushing forth from the elevator recalls the Chronicle of 1096 that recounts the martyrs of Magenza (Mainz). Remembering the *Akedah and* faced with the prospect of certain death or conversion to Christianity, the Jewish residents of the town resolved to sacrifice each other and to offer themselves in sacrifice in sanctification of the Holy Name "until there was one flood of blood" (Spiegel 1979: 19). In this respect, it is significant that the opening music of the film is an electronic rendering of *Dies Irae* ("Day of Wrath"), a thirteenth-century Latin hymn, possibly derived from the prayer "*Unetanneh Tokef*" (Hebrew: "let us tell"), recited as part of the Rosh Hashanah liturgy when the Torah passage recounting the *Akedah* is also read. Legend ascribes the prayer's authorship to the legendary Rabbi Amnon of Mainz (c. 4700–4800).

Just as Abraham is considered to be the father of the Jewish people, midrash invites those wearing a double set of glasses to read *The Shining*'s Abrahamic figure, Jack, as Jewish. *Contra* Cocks, who argues that the film's "abstraction of indirection avoids Jewish stereotyping" (2004: 220), using a midrashic approach to reading Jewish, although nowhere explicitly identified, Jack can be identified as

Proof

Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 27/03/2012; 3B2 version: 9.1.406/W Unicode (May 24 2007) (APS_OT)
Dir: //integrafs1/kcg/2-Pagination/TandF/DWFS/ApplicationFiles/9780415687836.3d
Proof

a Jew through a series of stereotypical signifiers and other clues which, as a result, combine to give the viewer the possibility, if no certainty, at least conceptually or symbolically. As Nelson observed, "Jack appears to be a model of liberal politics and education – a writer and teacher, informally dressed in tweed jackets and sweaters, a man who apparently reads *The New York Review of Books*" (2000: 213). The novel certainly describes him as a "college fella" who talks "just like a book" (King 1977: 97). Thus, one of the first things that we learn is that Jack is defined by intellectual rather than physical activity, manifesting what is known as *Yiddische kopf* or "Jewish brains" (Gertel 2003: 132), tapping into a trend, dating almost as far back as to the invention of the medium itself, whereby Jews are defined by their minds rather than bodily traits. Jack is a city slicker, a wisecracking and humorous talker, all cinematic defining features of what Rogin has called "the Jew as brain" (1998: 49). In addition, Nelson's notion that Jack is a subscriber to one of the favored journals of the New York intellectuals is highly suggestive here, compounded by Patrick Webster's argument that Jack "may be losing his sanity and may soon be contemplating the murder of his family, but his liberal sensibilities were still shocked by the use of such politically incorrect and 'murderously' racist language" as "nigger" (2011: 111).

Furthermore, the use of yellow is prominent in *The Shining*. Jack drives a yellow Volkswagen during the entire three-minute opening sequence, as well as when he drives his family to the hotel. Nelson points out that as the film moves closer to Jack's madness, yellow becomes increasingly prominent (2000: 216). The Grady murder corridor is covered in faded yellow wallpaper; a lamp next to Jack's typewriter gives the paper a yellow texture; his face and eyes turn yellow like the yellow bourbon in his glass; the hallway in the Torrance apartment is decorated with yellow-flowered wallpaper; his face takes on a yellow hue while he stands

Taylor & Francis
Not for distribution

Figure 9.1 The Shining (Stanley Kubrick, 1980).

Proof

Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 27/03/2012; 3B2 version: 9.1.406/W Unicode (May 24 2007) (APS_OT)
Dir: //integrafs1/kcg/2-Pagination/TandF/DWFS/ApplicationFiles/9780415687836.3d
Proof

outside the bathroom with an axe; as he pursues Hallorann (Scatman Crothers), the interior lighting transforms the walls into evening yellow; and both the Gold Room and gold corridor suggest yellow. Further into the film, a waiter spills a tray of drinks over Jack. "I'm afraid it's Advocaat, sir. It tends to stain," he tells Jack. Advocaat is noted for its distinctive yellow color.

For centuries, yellow has historically connoted Jewishness. Jews were ordered to wear distinguishing yellow badges in the medieval period. A variety of sumptuary laws in fifteenth-century Italy established various markers as Jewish signs, including a circle cut out of yellow cloth for men and a yellow veil for women. A Jewish woman discovered in the street without her distinguishing yellow veil could be publicly stripped (incidentally, this was the sign used elsewhere to mark prostitutes who suffered the same punishment). Rebecca the Jewess in Walter Scott's *Ivanhoe* (1819), adapted into a 1952 film, wears a yellow turban, signifying her Jewish difference. These signs morphed into the yellow badge of the Nazi period, culminating in the yellow triangle for Jewish camp inmates. In this light, the Advocaat stain becomes emblematic of Jack's Jewish origins. It is a stain, a badge of shame, which points to his ethnic identification. The notion of "race" as stain was certainly a familiar one in the past. In 1920s England, for example, one anti-immigration Conservative MP argued that allowing any aliens to remain in Britain would be "a stain upon our British stock" (Schaffer 2008: 12). Later, George Orwell described the perception of Jewishness in the UK to "an initial disability comparable to a stammer or a birthmark" (1945: 167). Philip Roth also used it as the central motif in his 2000 novel *The Human Stain*. In a similar vein Daniel Boyarin wrote, "Jewishness is like a concentrated dye" (1997: 263). As Cocks puts it, "Grady spills the yellow liqueur Advocaat on Jack just as the Nazi 'law' marked Jews with the stain of prejudice, ostracism, and persecution" (2004: 246). Advocaat also sounds like the German, Dutch, French, and American English for lawyer (*advokat, advocaat, avocat*, and *advocate* respectively), a stereotypically Jewish profession. Finally, it links to Freud's essay on the uncanny, itself a source text for the film (Cocks 2004: 245).

Taylor & Francis
Not for distribution

Furthermore, Jack styles himself as "The Big Bad Wolf" of the Disney 1933 short *Three Little Pigs*. He utters the line, "Little pigs, little pigs, let me come in," as he chops down a door in his attempt to get at Danny and Wendy (Shelley Duvall). In the original Disney cartoon – and there are multiple references to these peppering the film – the wolf is disguised as a stereotypical Jewish peddler, complete with large crooked proboscis, eye glasses, black hat, thick Yiddish accent, and hand gestures. Although the wolf's disguise was later changed to that of a Fuller Brush salesman, the unaltered soundtrack remained until it too was re-edited (Cohen 1997: 25). Nevertheless, the anti-Semitic stain was not rubbed away.

Jack demonstrates other physical tics the West has historically ascribed to the Jew. In one sequence, he is framed inside the reflection of a bedroom mirror as he eats breakfast in bed, thus giving the illusion that he eats with his left hand. This draws upon age-old stereotypes of the Jew as "sinister." In medieval European Christian iconography, Synagoga and the Jews were typically represented as being on the left-hand side (in Latin, *sinistra* literally means "left") of Christ in depictions of the Crucifixion, the Devil's side (Lazar 1991: 54). Similarly, Wendy

Proof

Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 27/03/2012; 3B2 version: 9.1.406/W Unicode (May 24 2007) (APS_OT)
Dir: //integrafs1/kcg/2-Pagination/TandF/DWFS/ApplicationFiles/9780415687836.3d
Proof

physically disables Jack during the course of the film, crippling his right leg, emphasizing the ability of the left, tapping into this same discourse.

Jack's disability is reinforced in a twelve-second uncut sideways tracking shot of Jack dragging his limp foot as he pursues Danny. This is not only "a visual marker of his difference" (Larsen 2002: 81) but also a subtle allusion to his Jewishness that historically has been coded in crudely stereotypical terms by a "clumsy, heavy-footed gait" (Muscat 1909; quoted in Gilman 1991: 228). As Sander Gilman has written, "The idea that the Jew's foot is unique has analogies with the hidden sign of difference attributed to the cloven-footed devil of the middle ages" (1991: 39). Certainly, Jack is represented as a satanic figure, and there are multiple comparisons between him and the Devil, alluding to classic Christian Judeophobia in which Jews were perceived as the Devil's mediators on earth and "given all the possible attributes and qualifications, all the images and symbols that pertain to the prince of the netherworld" (Lazar 1991: 40).

Ultimately becoming the sacrificial victim, Jack "fulfills the classical requirements of scapegoat: he is broken, crippled, outcast" (Kane 1999: 293). At the same time, Jack's limp alludes to his biblical namesake. After Jacob wrestles with the angel, and is renamed *Yisrael* (Israel), the damage caused to his thigh causes him to limp, possessing the gait of the slow and weak. In this respect, Jack's forename is significant. Roland Barthes considered the proper name to be "the prince of signifiers; whose connotations are rich, social and symbolic" (quoted in Webster 2011: 94), and the name Jack is replete with biblical allusion. Jack is short for Jacob (Hebrew: *Ya'acov*), the biblical patriarch, whose sons were the ancestors of the Twelve Tribes of Israel. Jacob was the son of Isaac, who cheated his brother Esau out of his birthright by fooling his blind father, but becomes nonetheless the father of *B'nei Yisrael* (Hebrew: Children of Israel), after his name is changed from *Ya'acov* (Jacob) to *Yisrael* (Israel) following his struggle with the angel. In *The Shining,* like Jacob, Jack awakes from a terrifying dream in which he murders his family and from which he awakens in a fright. The accompanying music is that of Krzysztof Penderecki's *The Awakening of Jacob* suggesting "Jacob's Dream" of Genesis 28:10–18 in which he dreamt of a heavenly stairway which angels were ascending and descending. "Jacob awoke from his sleep and said. . . 'How awesome is this place! This is none other than the abode of God and that is the gateway to heaven.'" And the inserted elevator is none other than a mechanical ladder or a gateway/stairway to heaven (Cocks 2004: 255).

Taylor & Francis
Not for distribution

Where Jacob rested is, in midrash, identified with Mount Moriah, the very same place where Abraham sacrificed Isaac. Further intertextual connections link Abraham with Jacob: both were "awakened to obligation by a Voice calling their name" (Kane 1999: 224); both received a new name in addition to their given names at birth (Abram/Abraham; Jacob/Israel); their descendants are both blessed by God who promises them both that they will multiply. Unlike Jacob in Genesis 28, however, when Jack wakes from his dream, he does not realize that, "Surely the LORD is in this place" but rather "I did not know it." His death/punishment vindicates the presence of God, his frozen body and upturned eyes

Proof

Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 27/03/2012; 3B2 version: 9.1.406/W Unicode (May 24 2007) (APS_OT)
Dir: //integrafs1/kcg/2-Pagination/TandF/DWFS/ApplicationFiles/9780415687836.3d
Proof

seemingly saying, "How awesome is this place! This is none other than the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven."

It has not been the author's intention here to reduce Kubrick to a single message or to suggest that he made "Jewish films" (whatever that may mean) with purely literal and exhaustive meaning. Indeed, Kubrick's work can be enjoyed without recourse to its Jewish aesthetic or vision. Yet, rather than diminish the interpretative possibilities of Kubrick's cinematic oeuvre, a midrashic approach allows us to read Jewish, that is to read it backward, to understand the impact and sweep of history that inform his canon, to illuminate the sources and scope of his work.

A midrashic approach helps us to understand how a text such as *The Shining* which, at first glance, appears to be firmly embedded in the codes, conventions, and discourses of Hollywood (even if it is directed by an auteur who was considered something of a maverick/outsider in the Hollywood system), encodes deeper, and not always Euro-American readings. In this way, a midrashic reading necessarily effects a specific "de-Westernizing" of the text by reclaiming and foregrounding Jewish references in an act that not only specifically challenges Western perceptions or stereotypes but also challenges, subverts, and confronts wider opinions, stereotypes of Jews and Jewishness that are not necessarily western in origin per se. In this way, Kubrick, as part of the Jewish diaspora, can be seen as placing Jewishness as simultaneously within and outside of the "West." While such an approach may be particularly appropriate for Kubrick and Jewishness in film, it can be extended to any film or any non-visible minority. In this way, it moves us away from American and Eurocentric approaches to film studies to embrace non-Western ways of reading meaning into films, Western and otherwise, where it is not immediately apparent.

Taylor & Francis
Not for distribution

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Lindsey Taylor-Guthartz for her extremely useful comments on earlier drafts of this chapter.

Notes

1 *Yehovah* is a Hebraized version of the King James-type "Jehovah," a misapprehension based on combining the Hebrew consonants of YHVH with the vowels of "Adonai," but not actually a form that was ever used.

2 It is also suggestive that the opening sequence lasts three minutes.

References

Abrams, N. (2011) *The New Jew in Film: Exploring Jewishness and Judaism in Contemporary Cinema*, London: I. B. Tauris.

Bial, H. (2005) *Acting Jewish: Negotiating Ethnicity on the American Stage and Screen*, Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press.

Bell, D. (1980) *Sociological Journeys: Essays, 1960–1980*, London: Heinemann.

Boyarin, D. (1997) *Unheroic Conduct: The Rise of Heterosexuality and the Invention of the Jewish Man*, Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.

Proof

Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 27/03/2012; 3B2 version: 9.1.406/W Unicode (May 24 2007) (APS_OT)
Dir: //integrafs1/kcg/2-Pagination/TandF/DWFS/ApplicationFiles/9780415687836.3d
Proof

Brook, V. (2003) *Something Ain't Kosher Here: The Rise of the "Jewish" Sitcom*, New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Burton, M. (2008) "Performances of Jewish Identity: *Spartacus," Shofar: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Jewish Studies*, 27 (1): 1–15.

Byers, M. (2009) "The Pariah Princess: Agency, Representation, and Neoliberal Jewish Girlhood," *Girlhood Studies*, 2 (2): 33–54.

Carroll, N. (1998) *Interpreting the Moving Image*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cocks, G. (2004) *The Wolf at the Door: Stanley Kubrick, History, and the Holocaust*, New York: Peter Lang.

Cohen, K. F. (1997) *Forbidden Animation: Censored Cartoons and Blacklisted Animators in America*, Jefferson, NC: McFarland.

Diemling, M. (2011) "American Midrash: Biblical Motifs in the Work of Bruce Springsteen," in L. Dolezalová and T. Visi (eds.), *Retelling the Bible: Literary, Historical, and Social Contexts*, Frankfurt: Peter Lang, pp. 343–356.

Eisen, M. (2003) "Midrash in Emil Fackenheim's Holocaust Theology," *Harvard Theological Review*, 96 (3): 369–392.

Epstein, M. M. (2011) *The Medieval Haggadah: Art, Narrative, and Religious Imagination*, New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Gertel, E. B. (2003) *Over the Top Judaism: Precedents and Trends in the Depiction of Jewish Beliefs and Observances in Film and Television*, Lanham, Md.: University Press of America.

Gilman, S. L. (1991) *The Jew's Body*, London and New York: Routledge.

Goldin, J. (1979) "Introduction," in Shalom Spiegel, *The Last Trial*, trans. Judah Goldin, Philadelphia, Pa.: Jewish Publication Society, pp. i–xx.

Hess, N. (2010) "*The Shining*: All Work and No Play. . . ," *The International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 91 (2): 409–414.

Hyman, P. (1995) *Gender and Assimilation in Modern Jewish History: The Roles and Representation of Women*, Seattle, Wash.: University of Washington Press.

Jacobs, L. (1995) *The Jewish Religion: A Companion*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jacobson, D. C. (1987) *Modern Midrash: The Retelling of Traditional Jewish Narratives by Twentieth Century Hebrew Writers*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Kane, L. (1999) *Weasels and Wisemen: Ethics and Ethnicity in the Work of David Mamet*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.

King, S. (1977) *The Shining*, London: New English Library.

Krieger, R. (2003) ""Does He Actually Say the Word Jewish?' Jewish Representations in *Seinfeld," Journal for Cultural Research*, 7 (4): 387–404.

Kubrick, S. (1960/1961) "Words and Movies," *Sight and Sound*, 30: 14.

Larsen, E. (2002) *The Usual Suspects*, London: BFI Publishing.

Lazar, M. (1991) "The Lamb and the Scapegoat: The Dehumanization of the Jews in Medieval Propaganda Imagery," in S. L. Gilman and S. T. Katz (eds.), *Anti-Semitism in Times of Crisis*, New York: New York University Press, pp. 38–83.

Michel, S. (1994) "Jews, Gender, American Cinema," in L. Davidman and S. Tenenbaum (eds.), *Feminist Perspectives on Jewish Studies*, New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, pp. 244–269.

Miers, P. (1980) "The Black Maria Rides Again: Being a Reflection on the Present State of American Film with Special Respect to Stanley Kubrick's *the Shining*," *Modern Language Notes*, 95 (5): 1360–1366.

Nelson, T. A. (2000) *Kubrick: Inside a Film Artist's Maze*, Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press.

Orwell, G. (1945) "Anti-Semitism in Britain," *Contemporary Jewish Record*, 8 (2): 163–171.

Taylor & Francis
Not for distribution
Proof

Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 27/03/2012; 3B2 version: 9.1.406/W Unicode (May 24 2007) (APS_OT)
Dir: //integrafs1/kcg/2-Pagination/TandF/DWFS/ApplicationFiles/9780415687836.3d
Proof

Raphael, F. (1999) *Eyes Wide Open: A Memoir of Stanley Kubrick*, London: Ballantine.

Rogin, M. (1998) *Independence Day*, London: BFI.

Rogovoy, S. (2009) *Bob Dylan: Prophet, Mystic, Poet*, New York: Scribner.

Rosenberg, J. (1996) "Jewish Experience on Film: An American Overview," in D. Singer (ed.), *American Jewish Year Book, 1996,* New York: American Jewish Committee, pp. 3–50.

Roth, P. (2000) *The Human Stain*, New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Schaffer, G. (2008) *Racial Science and British Society, 1930–62*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Scott, W. (2009) *Ivanhoe*, New York: Signet Classics. First published 1819.

Shohat, E. (1991) "Ethnicities-in-Relation: Toward a Multicultural Reading of American Cinema," in L. D. Friedman (ed.), *Unspeakable Images: Ethnicity and the American Cinema,* Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, pp. 215–250.

Spiegel, S. (1979) *The Last Trial*, trans. J. Goldin, Philadelphia, Pa.: Jewish Publication Society.

Steiner, G. (1961) *The Death of Tragedy*, New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Stratton, J. (2000) *Coming Out Jewish: Constructing Ambivalent Identities*, London: Routledge.

Vaman, N. (2007) *The Jewess in Nineteenth-Century British Literary Culture*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Webster, P. (2011) *Love and Death in Kubrick: A Critical Study of the Films from* Lolita *through* Eyes Wide Shut, Jefferson, NC: McFarland.

Wellisch, E. (1954) *Isaac and Oedipus: A Study in Biblical Psychology in the Sacrifice of Isaac, the Akedah*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Žižek, S. (1989) *The Sublime Object of Ideology*, London: Verso.

——(2006) *How to Read Lacan*, London: Granta.

Taylor & Francis
Not for distribution

Proof