Book Section:
Sternberg, C (2016) From Pig Farmer to Infidel: Hidden Identities, Diasporic Infertility, and Transethnic Kinship in Contemporary British Jewish Cinema. In: Abrams, N and Lassner, P, (eds.) Hidden in Plain Sight: Jews and Jewishness in British Film, Television, and Popular Culture. Cultural Expressions of World War II: Interwar Preludes, Responses, Memory . Northwestern University Press , Evanston, Illinois , pp. 181-204. ISBN 978-0-8101-3282-5

In: Nathan Abrams, ed. Hidden in Plain Sight: Jews and Jewishness in British Film, Television, and Popular Culture. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2015.

From Pig Farmer to Infidel: Diasporic Infertility and Transethnic Kinship in Contemporary British Jewish Cinema

Claudia Sternberg

Introduction

This chapter analyzes two British-Jewish cinematic comedies, Leon the Pig Farmer (Vadim Jean and Gary Sinyor, 1992) and The Infidel (Josh Appignanesi, 2010).[1] Both films are examples of the ethnic diversification in British cinema that gained momentum in the 1980s, and the increased on-screen visibility of Jewishness and Jewish characters since the 1990s. This visibility is narratively constructed as relational. Leon places contemporary British Jewishness in comical juxtaposition to a dominant culture cast as Gentile, rural, and English, whereas, nearly twenty years later, The Infidel teases out issues of Jewish locatedness and identity within urban British multi-culture. It does so by humorously activating post-9/11 and post-Zionist sensitivities and relating "the Jew" to Britain's most marked constituent of the first decade of the 2000s: "the Muslim." Relationality, however, is also expressed historically and generationally within the British Jewish diaspora. It is the interplay between these relations that is the focus of this chapter. This reading supports the wider argument that Leon and The Infidel embrace the normalization of Jewish visibility while at the same time – tongue-in-cheek – draw attention to historical and communal legacies which account for a specifically "Jewish" negotiation of a place in culturally diverse Britain. Central to the two narrations is the motif of hidden ethnic identities that will out. Paradoxically, the Jewish

body remains a site of cultural and social inscription, but its reproduction becomes a vehicle for negotiation.

Leon and The Infidel are constructed as comedies of identity in which the male protagonists experience the destabilization of their previously unambiguous ethnic and religious selves due to unexpected revelations about their parentage and descent. The eponymous Leon Geller (Mark Frankel) is an attractive, if slightly awkward young Jew, who discovers that his parents had sought assistance from a fertility clinic due to his father's low sperm count. As it turns out, Leon's two brothers were conceived through artificial insemination of their father's sperm, whereas in Leon's case, his mother had accidentally received sperm from the donor Brian Chadwick (Brian Glover), a pig farmer. In contrast, in The Infidel, Muslim mini-cab driver Mahmud Nasir (Omid Djalili) is clearing the home of his recently deceased mother to find out that he was adopted as an infant. Upon pursuing the matter further, he learns that he had been placed for adoption by Jewish birthparents.

The two films derive humor from these revelations, but they are only the starting point for further complications. Leon leaves North London to meet the sperm donor and his family in the remote northern English village of Lower Dinthorpe in Yorkshire. The Chadwicks warmly welcome Leon and eventually seek to accommodate his Jewish difference by acts of assimilation. Leon, in turn, tries to take on pig husbandry, but when assisting the local veterinarian during the insemination of sows, he inadvertently fills a syringe with sheep semen. As a result, a cross-bred pig-sheep is born which has to be hidden from Brian, who, according to the vet, "don't like no-one messing with his pigs." Mahmud of The Infidel learns that his biological father lies dying in a Jewish care home, but he, a Muslim, is barred from seeing him by a rabbi (Matt Lucas) who acts as the old man's guardian. To break down the rabbi's resistance, Mahmud turns to Lenny (Richard Schiff), an expatriate American Jew, hoping that this disaffected divorcé can teach him the ways of

being and acting Jewish. At the same time, however, Mahmud is under pressure to support his son Rashid (Amit Shah) who is about to get married. Rashid's fiancée is the stepdaughter of Ashrad Al-Masri (Igal Naor), an Islamist cleric from Egypt, who demands assurance that his diasporic future in-laws are devout and "proper" Muslims.

While Leon and The Infidel have family plots and include ethnically marked weddings, food scenes, and generational squabbles, it is notable that the films avoid the recurring themes of interethnic romance, the vagaries of intermarriage, clashes between traditionalism and modernity, or the struggle for queer/female emancipation. Rather, they build their narratives on a divergence between biological and social parenthood. The films offer a humorous take on the charged terrains of (in)fertility and adoption and thus, by implication, address questions of reproduction, genealogy, and kinship. Such questions are interlinked with old and new discourses of religion, race, and ethnicity, eugenics and "purity," social and genetic engineering, assimilation and mixing, and the physical and cultural survival of minority ethnic communities. These discourses relate to specific histories and "diverse bids for control over reproductivity."[2] Control mechanisms can include internal group restrictions or invasive and destructive practices imposed from the outside. Among the latter are policies of forced adoption/child removal, compulsory sterilization, and ultimately genocide which have featured across the histories of ethnic and social minorities, indigenous peoples, and victims of war-time occupation. Reproductive choices, possibilities, and limitations also signify on the level of religious law and doctrine and in community history and memory; they are debated by society at large and regulated by the (secular) state, often with reference to the larger fields of human rights and the ethics of science. Religious leaders, minority activists, legislators, and service providers position themselves in response to them when supporting groups or individuals. Last but not least, the discourses and histories of reproduction play a role in the theorization of culture and

appear as theme and metaphor in cultural representations, as it is the case in the two popular films examined here.

Alys Eve Weinbaum sees reproduction as "a highly condensed sign that performs ideological work" (2). She places reproduction alongside Raymond Williams's keywords of modernity; for her, "competing understandings of reproduction as a biological, sexual, and racialized process became central to the organization of knowledge about nations, modern subjects, and the flow of capital, bodies, babies, and ideas within and across national borders" (ibid.). In a more narrowly defined understanding of Jewishness as an embodied experience, Howard Eilberg-Schwartz states that "[i]deas about how Jews reproduce themselves physically have always provided ways of thinking about how Jews remake themselves culturally."[3] Leon and The Infidel are not intended to represent the social reality of infertility treatment and adoption or offer a commentary on bioethics. Yet the compromised conceptions of Leon and Mahmud and the films' various incongruous transformations actualize, by narrative design, some of these competing understandings and associated knowledges, which include traces of pre-modern religious signification as well as pointers to postethnic performativity. The films also employ their genealogical models as a means through which the history and contemporary position and condition of British Jewry are critically discussed.

The Gametes of Galut: Biological and Social Kinship in Leon the Pig Farmer

In Judaism, becoming Jewish is possible through formalized conversion. However, as Weinbaum points out, most Jews are the "products of genealogy. Certain kinds of sexual unions produce Jewish children; others do not. [...] A Jew is a person born a Jew" (ibid., 1). According to the combined logic of biological and ethno-religious genealogy, therefore, a commitment to procreation and the acceptance (or at least awareness) of restriction on

reproductive choices forms the basis of Jewish communal and thus cultural continuity. In Leon, the protagonist is confronted with a number of threats to Jewish self-preservation through reproduction, ranging from infertility and the irregularities of his own descent to the (genealogical) implications of having either no or a non-Jewish partner.

In the first scene in which the Geller family openly discusses the insemination, Leon's mother Judith (Janet Suzman) exclaims: "What did you want us to do?" She evokes God's commandment to be fruitful and multiply (Genesis 1:28, 9:1, 9:7 and 35:11), whose importance is reinforced in biblical and Talmudic texts by the exclusion of infertile men from marriage and the possibility of divorce after ten years of childlessness.[4] Three decades earlier, Leon's father, Sidney (David de Keyser), would have faced the general social stigma of infertility and its threat to family lineage as well as the specter of a scriptural tradition of potentially limited participation in community and domestic life. More important, however, would have been the modern histories of persecution and the Holocaust on the one hand and of assimilation and secularization on the other, which continue to have a significant impact on the understanding of a need for procreation defined as Jewish. Religious and ethno-historical discourses blend in the explicit pronatalism of Israel and among haredi Jews,[5] but they also inform non-haredi diasporic communities whose numbers are contracting due to an ageing population, low birth rates, out-marriage, and a decline in group affiliation. The awareness of the effect that genocide had on the Jewish population also remains acute and is manifest in demographic analysis as well as post-Holocaust thought. For Jewish philosopher Emil Fackenheim, after Auschwitz "even a mere collective commitment to Jewish group-survival for its own sake is a momentous response".[6] "[T]o cease to be Jews (and to bring up Jewish children)," Fackenheim asserts, "would be to abandon our millennial post as witnesses to the God of history."[7] It is against this legacy of a disappearing people that the title character of Leon is (or assumes to be) constantly pressured into marriage and

fatherhood and, during the first half of the film, suffers anxieties about his own fertility and – thus – communal underperformance. To accentuate collective expectations, screenwriters Sinyor and Michael Normand use the ploy of giving voice to an opinion-rich North London Jewish community by including a number of – usually unsolicited – verbal interventions.

In light of the reproduction imperative, rabbinical authorities have responded positively to advances in science, and – with some variation – approved of ways that improve chances of procreation and support domestic happiness. For example, the prohibition of "spilling seed" (Genesis 38:7-10) has been waived for fertility testing and treatment, and there "is usually no [orthodox] Jewish objection to homologous artificial insemination (AIH), provided there are safeguards to ensure the sperm of the husband is being used" (Hirsh, 17). In the film, Judith states that her sons should be proud because they "were one of the first in the country." Leon reads out a (Jewish) newspaper article from 1960 about the Geller story which duly celebrates the couple's success to conceive and fulfill "one of the most positive commandments in the Jewish religion, to procreate," indicating both rabbinical and communal approval. It is insemination by donor, however, which is revealed as having taken place in the case of Leon, if unintentionally, and it is the presence of a third party which puts conventional family genealogy and ethno-religious identity at risk. Hirsh summarizes the respective position within Orthodox Judaism during the 1990s, the period of the film's production: "Orthodox objections to donor insemination (DI) are based on the subterfuge created by the treatment. The false registration of a father is seen as dishonest and unlikely to create a foundation suitable for child rearing due to the confusion of paternal inheritance and genealogy"; furthermore, "[i]n terms of the technique of DI, the analogy with veterinary methods is considered undignified" (18). The above medico-cultural concerns of subterfuge, confusion, and dishonesty are activated in the film

for serious and comic effect. In an ironic twist, the socially silenced practice of fertility treatment becomes less of a concern for the family than its potential "hidden" effects.

Once the Gellers have become aware of the donor insemination, two implications of this intervention are referred to in the film's dialogue. Sidney exclaims: "My God, it's rape! They raped my wife!" to which Leon responds: "Dad, I think that's a bit much. At worst it's adultery." From a clinical or secular perspective, donor insemination would not bring associations of either rape or adultery, but religious debate over the use of third-party sperm and whether it constitutes a form of extramarital and therefore adulterous intercourse dates back to "Talmudic and medieval discussions on 'generation sine concubito'" (ibid., 18). While Judaism does not render children born out of wedlock illegitimate, according to rabbinical law, the offspring of a married Jewish woman and a (Jewish) man other than her husband would be considered a mamzer, who would face social restrictions with regard to Jewish marriage (as would the mamzer's children into the tenth generation). Mamzers can also be created through – equally illicit – incestuous unions. Reproductive technologies have reinvigorated discussions about mamzerim and forbidden relationships (Kahn, chapters 2 and 3), and one recommendation has been to circumvent inadvertent incestuous insemination by the use of "non-Jewish" sperm. The "non-Jewishness" of Brian's sperm rules out mamzer status, but it prompts another concern relating to Leon's ethno-religious identity, which is also expressed by Sidney: "Is he Jewish?"

Judith reproaches her husband for calling their son's Jewishness into question on account of the erroneously administered sperm of the Yorkshire farmer, and Leon himself stresses the principle of matrilineal descent as determining a person's Jewishness.[8] Despite this halakhic reassurance and his cultural Jewish self-identification, however, Leon is compelled to investigate his biological descent, which brings him face to face with his own and his family's Other: the extended Chadwick family. Brian, well into his fifties, affirms

his English rootedness and ties to the land through his farm, which was established in 1867, a period of increased general but also Jewish representation in British politics (Jews Relief Act of 1958, Reform Act of 1867). Chadwick's enduring virility is demonstrated through a relaxed body culture, casual conversations about human and animal sexuality, and the fact that he shares his table not only with his attractive current wife Yvonne (Connie Booth), but also his two ex-wives. Brian is constructed as antithetical to the anxious, excitable Sidney, whose inconspicuous suburban lifestyle and net curtain business render him as weak as Leon, whose feelings alternate between intrigue, desire and abjection in his encounter with Gentileness, the latter being coded as physical, assertive, and untouched by the self-consciousness and angst of the Ashkenazi Jewish diaspora.

Additionally, a crude parallelism of assisted animal rearing and donor insemination is constructed in the film by making Brian a farmer and linking up the practicalities of breeding with Leon's humiliation at the fertility clinic as well as the risk of "human error" that can lead to subterfuge and even, in the filmmakers' imagination, inter-species reproduction. As befits the comic take on Jewish custom, Leon seeks rabbinical advice on the pig-sheep, only to find that the two rabbis consulted expose the incompatibilities of positions within a diverse Judaism: The American-accented progressive rabbi sees before him the materialization of "kosher hams," symbolizing the (impossible) integration of sameness and difference. By contrast, the strictly orthodox rabbi, featuring an exaggerated Jewish accent, is unable to resolve the "difficult question" of reproductive manipulation and xenogenesis, which exemplify the unprecedented possibilities of the modern present.[9] The rabbis' learned confusion differs little from the diverging viewpoints expressed by the other Jewish characters who exercise social control over Leon's private life. Their divided opinions externalize one of Leon's further concerns with regard to mixing, namely the implications of his relationship with Madeleine (Maryam D'Abo), the non-Jewish woman

he literally bumps into after his visit to the fertility clinic and who personifies the allure of a(nother) forbidden relationship.

In line with the film's principle of maximizing Jewish discomfort, circumstances, and the new relations pose a constant challenge to Leon's religious observance and sensitivities. His biological father turns out to be a pig farmer and entices him to impregnate sows in rural Yorkshire. Leon is expected to masturbate for a sperm test in a glass-paneled high-rise building overlooking London and has intercourse with Madeleine during her period, which carries the association of ritual impurity. He endures the Chadwicks' fondness of pork and Madeleine's appetite for lobsters,[10] and last but not least models Christ on the Cross for her Church of England stained glass windows.

Leon is, therefore, both Jewish and not Jewish enough, and the film invites the (Jewish) spectator to sympathize with and be amused by his twofold anguish. At the same time, it shows that Madeleine is and remains ignorant of Judaism and expresses no interest in Leon's life, family or community. Her surface-level ethnophilia is simply a rebellious gesture directed at her off-screen father; Madeleine feels attracted to Leon because "Daddy hates Jews." While such unmitigated negative racialization appears outdated in the 1990s, the father's attitude is nevertheless suggestive of surviving residues from a long history of British antisemitism. In the twentieth century, it included xenophobia and anti-immigration legislation, political and physical racism inspired by fascist ideologies, ambivalent responses to refugees, Holocaust survivors and the State of Israel and, last but not least, an upper-class tradition of social restrictions and exclusion. Conversely, Brian's philosemitism, while as uninformed as Madeleine's ethnic infatuation (he refers to the movie Ben Hur [1959] as his educational source and mistakenly associates the Qu'ran with Judaism), is motivated by his admiration for "the way Jews believe in the family." As representatives of British majority culture, Madeleine and the Chadwicks are barely aware of British Jewry as an actual

presence with whom they share a national history, nor can they relate to the Jewish diaspora's collective memory of scapegoating and persecution, the uncertainties of assimilation or concerns about (self-inflicted) communal decline.

Leon humorizes this ignorance and discrepancy in a number of ways. When Brian says to Leon that "[i]t's good to have you home," the incommensurability of homes, views and lifestyles is underlined rather than negated. The Chadwicks attempt to increase Leon's comfort by making their home more like that of the Gellers. They adjust their home decor, change their spoken and body language, develop new attitudes towards family, gender and nation, and engage with such American-Jewish classics as Leo Rosten's Joys of Yiddish (New York, 1968) and Philip Roth's Portnoy's Complaint (New York, 1969). The Chadwicks thus try to perform Jewishness, but Leon points out their lack of a socially acquired essence: "Look, you're just fulfilling stereotypes. You don't understand the fundamental concept of guilt. Without guilt it's meaningless. Guilt isn't a word, it's...it's a way of life." The complexity of Jewish guilt runs through the film, from its images of the crucified (Jewish) Christ and suggested breaches of the Covenant (deferred procreation, non-Jewish semen, a non-Jewish partner) to a more abstract "persistence of a certain reflectiveness, an inability to take things for granted, a continuously nagging sense of difficulty and problem."[11]

Leon purposely merges biological, religious, and cultural elements and undermines any possibility of a hermetic logic of Jewish descent. At the same time, the film also employs these elements to illustrate the need of and capacity for self-irony and self-assertion among Anglo-Jews in a largely oblivious wider culture. The flawed reproduction plot serves as a conceit to playfully juxtapose stereotypically Jewish features of the "hybrid" Leon such as poor eyesight, a repulsion towards treife animals and food, as well as his dread of being exposed naked in the Chadwick bathroom[12] with his other side: his distaste for family

secrets and "white lies" (which renders him hapless as an estate agent), his lack of business sense, and his failure to settle and procreate like his brothers. Leon feels drawn to the sensual and voyeuristic Madeleine, whose assertion that windows "fulfill a real need" and "allow you to see and be seen" resonates with him, as does her view that net curtains, which represent Sidney's petty bourgeois trade and stand for an unnecessarily veiled or hidden existence, stop "people enjoying the window from both sides." Madeleine fails, however, to ever position herself on the other side and develop respective sensibilities. As a consequence, Leon also remains fond of the young Jewish woman Lisa (Gina Bellman), but for her he is too familiar (that is, too Jewish). She has turned to Eastern spirituality in her search for excitement through difference.

It is through Lisa and Leon's relationship and the pig-sheep that the film is brought to its conclusion. The animal has remained off-screen throughout, but has nevertheless triggered responses from the other characters: The vet considers it an abomination; the rabbis disagree on its halakhic status; Brian first proposes its isolation and later, when vying with Sidney for Leon's filial attachment, its commodification. The responses towards mixed-race-ness cover the ground of racial purity, religious doctrine, social models of segregation, and exoticization for profit. It is only Leon who engages directly and emotionally with the creature, the foil of his own predicament. To him, the pig-sheep looks "happy" and is "getting on very well with the other pigs." When he fears for its life, he takes it away and releases it into the wild. Only Lisa wants to know what made him decide "to run away with the pig." Having given up a 24-hour chant, she reflects on her fellow chanters and, implicitly, her own desire: "All just trying to be different." Leon complements her statement: "Without knowing why." Although Leon reminds Brian that something "good" can come from "cross-breeding," becoming Leon the Pig Farmer is not an option for him at the end of the film. The accident of his birth is not equated with social or cultural

reorientation. Leon spiritually reconnects with the Jewish community when a fiddler plays "Hava nagila" in a restaurant, while the pig-sheep remains an anomaly which fends for itself in the English countryside. The latter's future prospects are unclear, but itleaves the Gellers and the Chadwicks at the beginning of a friendship beyond mutual stereotypes, and Lisa and Leon as the made-for-each-other romantic couple.

Leon's narrative gambit of diasporic infertility alludes to the (perceived) crisis of community continuity, which dominated the discourse of the then Chief Rabbi, Jonathan Sacks, in the 1990s. It found expression in a new organization for community development, Jewish Continuity (1993-98), and underpinned much of the subsequent social research into British Jewish demographics, attitudes, and lifestyle choices.[13] Through the insemination plot, the film offers a subversive rejoinder to this alarmist stance. Rather than dwell on anxieties associated with biological, genetic and ethno-religious succession, the filmmakers espouse an understanding of genealogy that sees hybridity and heterogeneity in a positive light. Despite its critique of purism and sympathies for cross-cultural exchange, however, Leon is critical of disowning cultural specificity. The comedy also utilizes the reproduction narrative to assert Jewish identity (and masculinity, in particular) and to present it as enduring in its own right. The relationship with Madeleine is treated as an interlude, and no plotline is developed relating to the prospects of intermarriage, which is frequently regarded as the single biggest threat to cultural (and, to a lesser extent, biological) Jewish survival in the post-Holocaust age.

Sarah Franklin contends that "[n]ew reproductive technologies not only create new persons; they create new relations, in both senses of the term."[14] In Leon's case, these relations are established between an increasingly assertive British Jewry and a reasonably tolerant non-Jewish majority in need of awareness and insight. The Infidel is more aligned with the wider category of multiculturally-informed narratives of the late 1990s/2000s as

described by, among others, Sander Gilman, Efraim Sicher, and Linda Weinhouse.[15] Nearly two decades after the release of Leon, cultural diversity in Britain has been further normalized, but also unsettled by both a rise in antisemitism and a preoccupation with Islam and the Middle East after 9/11 and 7/7. The Infidel responds to these modified coordinates by shifting the focus to inter-diasporic relations between Muslims and Jews in a narrative which relegates white English Christian ethnicity to the sidelines.

The Name of the Father: Transracial Adoption and the Subversion of Ethnic Matching

In The Infidel, it is the main character's Muslimness that is called into question when he finds out that he is an adoptee, a fact that had been concealed from him until the death of both adoptive parents. While adoption, unlike artificial insemination, does not involve bodily intervention, it nevertheless "figures among the technologies conjoined in the generation of families and is arguably a form of assisted reproduction."[16] Like other reproductive technologies, it occupies, in religious and social discourse, a dominant position in debates around genealogy. Judaism shares with Islam the concern with lineage and ancestry, but before The Infidel turns to questions of Mahmud's newly-discovered Jewishness, the complexity of social parenting in Muslim families is introduced as a further dimension of the adoption plot and its associated myth of hidden identities.

After establishing Mahmud's family and diverse aspects of modern British Muslim life (including work, religious practice, dress codes, and media representation), the film introduces the adoption theme by drawing attention to the role that looking after orphaned and abandoned children plays in Islam. When packing up the belongings of his dead mother, Mahmud is touched by the words of a hadith which is displayed in a frame on the wall. It relates the Prophet Muhammad's saying that, "He who looks after an orphan, shall be in paradise."[17] Mahmud, who lost his (adoptive) father when he was a child, is now parentless,

and in the ensuing exchange with his son Rashid the connection is made with Muhammad, whose father died before he was born and whose mother died when he was six. The Prophet grew up with several (foster) carers and, later in life, adopted a freed slave as his son whom he initially gave his name: Zayd ibn Muhammad. This adoption was eventually dissolved in response to the revelations that were to be compiled in the Qu'ran: "NEVER has God [...] made your adopted sons [truly] your sons [...] [As for your adopted children,] call them by their [real] fathers' names: this is more equitable in the sight of God [...]" (Surah 33, Ayat 4 and 5). The pre-Islamic practice of adoption was replaced by kafala, a form of fostering, which "involves the obligations of guardianship and maintenance without the creation of legal ties," and "does not sever the biological family bonds of the child or alter the descent lines for the adopting family."[18]

In The Infidel, Mahmud's adoption is based on a secular legal process. It is a closed adoption, and no link between birth and adoptive family is maintained. This is in conflict with kafala which rejects "obliterating lineage" and "dissimulation through naming" (ibid., 8, 7). Mahmud, who feels he has been deprived of his biological identity and family name, demands immediate access to his case file from a reluctant social worker, explicitly referring to Islamic patrilinearity: "Please, in my culture, a man's name is really important to him." With the revelation of Solly Shimshillewitz as Mahmud's pre-adoption name, however, a dramatic shift occurs: the issue of family lineage is replaced by the question of collective descent. Just as in Leon, a transethnic component challenges automatic assumptions about the link between biology and ethno-religious identity and subverts the (normalized) principle of ethnic matching. After forcefully gaining access to his adoption record, the patronymic Shimshillewitz not only confirms Mahmud's non-Muslim roots, but also improbable (and thus funny) cross-cultural relations between Jews and Muslims in

Britain. As the social worker explains, "In common with many people living in this area at the time you are by birth Jewish."

Solly Shimshillewitz therefore stands for biological descent ("by birth") and ethnic over-determination (Lenny says: "Why didn't they just call you 'Jew Jew Jew Jew Jew' and be done with it?"), but the social worker's line goes further by localizing ("in this area") and historicizing ("at the time") the fictional event. The absurdly un-Anglicized surname and the anachronistically dubbed Whitechapel Branch of the Waifs and Strays' Society,[19] which administered the placement, conjure up the image of an historical East End. Although the screenwriter does not provide a backstory for the migration background and circumstances of Mahmud's birthparents, at least the British-Jewish viewer will associate the Whitechapel ward in East London with Jewish migration and settlement in England. In modern history, Whitechapel absorbed thousands of Eastern European migrants arriving between the 1880s and 1914, refugees fleeing Nazi persecution, a smaller number of young survivors who came in 1945, and Polish Jewish soldiers who had fought under the British High Command in the Second World War. As the Kindertransport statue by Frank Meisler, located outside Liverpool Street Station, commemorates, the borough also received many of the ten thousand Kinder of 1938/39. The Jewish child refugees experienced separation, displacement, and orphaning as well as transnational and, in some cases, transethnic adoption and fostering. At the same time, the 1939 British White Paper restricted Jewish migration to Palestine and, from 1940 to 1941, male adult Jews without British citizenship were among those interned as "enemy aliens."[20] It was against this background that Jewish migrants eventually made new lives in Britain, and established British Jews negotiated their Britishness and Jewishness, some of whom lived in the East End of London, which had been a bombing target during Blitz.

The Infidel's imagined placement of a child born to Whitechapel Jews in a Muslim shopkeeper's family in the 1960s (the same period as that of the insemination in Leon) therefore points to a Jewish heritage, but also to (post)colonial migration after 1945 and further demographic change. Implicit is not only the notion of similar diasporic histories, but also belonging to a lower socio-economic class. In the 2000s, Mahmud's birthfather lives in a care home in Golders Green, which stands for the social mobility of Jewish Britons and their suburban self-invisibilization,[21] whereas Whitechapel and the East End, while remaining sites of continuing high migrant and diasporic visibility, are now predominantly Asian and Muslim.

The above historicity of place and populations is mainly a sub-textual effect evoked by the dialogue in the adoption services scene. Location shots are limited, with the exception of a multicultural sequence filmed at Walthamstow Market in East London. More striking for the audience is the (unlikely) establishment of Jewish-Muslim kinship through adoption. As in Leon, assisted reproduction is presented as additionally charged when it involves what is perceived as ethno-religious transgression. While adoption has been common throughout history, it has also been stigmatized as falsehood, associated with social risk and thus often hushed up. The practice of transracial adoption has been particularly controversial. Adoption across national, religious, ethnic, and racial boundaries became more widespread after the mid-twentieth century as a humanitarian response to concerns about the welfare and opportunities of children in the care system or those orphaned or abandoned due to war, persecution, famine, natural disasters, ill health, poverty, and gender bias. Historically informed arguments against such placements foreground instances of authorized domination and/or child removals built on racial hierarchies.[22] Critics also suggest that even consensual adoptions are based on ethnic and class inequalities within nation-states and, in international adoption, on global inequities. Placing minority ethnic

children into families representing a dominant culture has been interpreted as a threat to the cultural continuation of respective communities, an argument that is notably also voiced against intermarriage. From a social position, it has been argued that ethnic (and religious) matching is a better enabler of identity formation in adoptees than trans-placements where children have to negotiate their place in mainstream culture and develop a positive sense of their ethnic (and/or religious) birth identity.

Read culturally and against The Infidel's adoption plot, the latter positions once again emphasize a threat to community autonomy and survival. Mahmud's adoption suggests the notion of an "unlived past or heritage,"[23] albeit one which is not automatically suppressed by assimilation into a majority culture. A different reading sees adoption as the manifestation of a "common humanity" model[24] and not as an interaction between competing social, ethnic, and religious groups. Just like the intermingling of seeds and genes, adoption can "inform the way we read other social relations and the regulatory mechanisms, policies, and practices that allow us, as individuals and society, to recognize and connect with one another."[25] Understood in this way, Mahmud's case offers a number of new narrative and conceptual possibilities. Central is the possibility to swap or rather double perspectives and thus bring into contact two diasporic minorities of unequal size, differing traditions and conflicts of interest and affiliation.[26]

The generative moment is Mahmud's interpellation as a Jew. In Louis Althusser's conception, the unborn child is already ideologically constituted because of the certainty that it "will bear its Father's Name."[27] Adoption subverts this certainty by way of the ambiguity outlined above. In Judith Butler's words, "[b]eing called a name is [...] one of the conditions by which a subject is constituted in language."[28] Notably, Butler refers, among others, to adoption papers as a source for an "interpellative name" (Butler, 34). Mahmud is called quite literally by the name of his biological father but he is also labeled as a Jew, a

contextually contentious ascription. In her analysis of "injurious" speech, Butler approaches interpellation in a way which echoes the dual reading of adoption. She states that

> [o]ne is not simply fixed by the name that one is called. [...] the name holds out another possibility as well: by being called a name, one is also, paradoxically, given a certain possibility for social existence [...]. Thus the injurious address may appear to fix or paralyze the one it hails, but it may also produce an unexpected and enabling response (ibid., 2).

Initially, being called a Jew means for Mahmud to actualize and be faced with stereotypes. The adoptee, who is removed from the social worker's office after forcefully gaining access to his file, lies claim to an instant racialization when he transforms from Mahmud to Solly: "You find out you're Jewish, and suddenly a bloke in a uniform is leading you away. Ridiculous." Jewishness is associated here with state-sanctioned maltreatment, and a comic effect is achieved by drawing on the popular knowledge of Nazi Germany's antisemitic practices and superimposing them on a scene unrelated to matters of ethnicity. The scene also suggests an automatic Jewish persecution complex rooted in memory and history rather than present-day experience. In the course of the remaining screen time, Mahmud encounters further moments of paranoia, but he is also confronted with the spectrum of old and new (or repackaged) stereotypes, even setting off a few of them himself to test the attitudes of his British Muslim colleagues. His "hailing" continues in a dream sequence where Mahmud mishears his family members' words and imagines that they "Jew" him linguistically. He also visualizes his new identity through images of himself as a haredi Jew, a concentration camp inmate, and an effeminate entertainment performer.[29] Mahmud's online research via the fictional search engine "Perplexed," named in direct allusion to Maimonides's twelfth-century Guide for the Perplexed, shows the ubiquity of antisemitic words and images by presenting numerous entries leading to conspiracy theory websites,

caricature collections, neo-Nazi community platforms, and militant anti-Zionist propaganda. The presence of such antisemitic subcultures constitutes a persistent threat and leads to heightened vigilance within the British-Jewish community. When Mahmud calls at the home where his birthfather lives, his arrival has been anticipated. He is informed that Jewish care homes "share info" for protection. A swastika is sprayed onto Mahmud's house after he has revealed his adoption and Jewish descent, not only to his family but also – due to the film's eccentric plotline – on national television.

Mahmud's interpellation, however, also triggers the character's efforts to inhabit, embody, and put into practice his Jewishness. It becomes, in analogy to Butler's discussion of gender, "a corporeal style, an 'act,' as it were, which is both intentional and performative,"[30] externalizing through diegetic and extradiegetic (en)acting that "the body is always an embodying of possibilities both conditioned and circumscribed by historical convention" (ibid., 521). This effect is further enhanced by the screen acting of the British Iranian Bahá'i Omid Djalili who performs the British Pakistani Muslim Mahmud who performs the British Ashkenazi Jew Solly Shimshillewitz, drawing – as do the Chadwicks in *Leon* – on a set of iconic texts, behaviors, and practices. Blurring the boundaries between performance (as in acting a role) and performativity (as in assuming and constructing an identity) is part of a postethnic playfulness that is not restricted to Mahmud: The filmmakers deliberately cast a Jewish actor (Igal Naor, an Israeli of Iraqi descent) in the role of the Egyptian Muslim Arshad Al-Masri. The screen character claims to trace back his lineage to eighth-century Medina, but is unmasked as the reincarnation of a 1980s English pop icon with racist leanings, who grew up in a white Scientologist family from Manchester and, infatuated with charismatic otherness, reinvented himself as an Islamic leader.

Adoption plots and the fantasy of unknown kindred and heritage abound in the English literary and popular imagination, particularly in the nineteenth century, and have

been read as reflections on adoption per se and "as allegories for other issues."[31] George Eliot's title character of Daniel Deronda (London, 1876) is English literature's canonical Jewish adoptee. [32] Also unaware of his Jewish descent at the outset, Deronda eventually encounters his birthmother whose disaffection with Judaism led her to place her son with the wealthy Sir Hugo Mallinger. In contrast, Mahmud's meeting with his birthfather (and mother) is forever deferred. He cannot connect with his Whitechapel Jewish heritage through his birthparent and thus needs to reconcile his own diffuse awareness of Jews and Jewishness, suggestibly acquired through British schooling, media coverage, and political Islam, with what Lenny has to offer. His mentor can be read as a parodic version of Deronda's cultural fosterer Mordecai.[33] Lenny is only of limited vision in terms of the foundations of Judaism and the Zionist project – still a utopia in Eliot's novel –, but he has more mundane answers to Mahmud's questions about "Jews." Among others, he attempts to provide the wider context into which Mahmud has been interpellated:

> Let's start with me, the archetype: the American Jew. [...] Like my fellow countrymen, I didn't think there were any other Jews in the whole fucking world, especially not Britain. Britain, Land of Hope and Pork! A Jew in Britain, that's just weird! [...] But no, in London alone you've got your Hampstead liberal intellectual Jew, you've got your Pinner secular accountant Jew, you've got your Hendon orthodox lawyer Jew, your scum-of-kosher-scum Essex Jew, of which heritage my recently ex-wife. [...] And then you've got your Israeli Jews, you know Jews without angst, without guilt, so really not Jews at all.

Lenny here touches on the hegemonic role played by American Jewry after the Second World War, especially in the Anglophone world, and the lack of recognition for British Jews, despite their diasporic history that dates back to the medieval period.

The Infidel also addresses the low-profile Jewishness has held in British multiculturalism. In one of the film's media scenes, screenwriter and TV persona David Baddiel appears as himself in a fictional episode of Channel 5's topical debate show The Wright Stuff, dedicated to Mahmud's televised coming out as Jew. Before Baddiel can respond to a question posed by the program's host about the footage, the other panel guest jumps in and appropriates the incident: "This guy is multiculturalism made flesh. He is a hero for our times. Somebody that we have to use." Who is included in the speaker's "we" remains open, but ignoring the Jewish voice may be indicative of the fact that "[n]ot only have Jews often been suspicious of multicultural discourse, [but] scholars interested in multiculturalism and minority issues in Britain have rarely considered the Jewish experience" (Kahn-Harris and Gidley, 171). The public discourse of constructing the Jewish diaspora as a model community can act as a disincentive to draw attention to ethnic or religious particularity, dissent and grievances,[34] but even where this is not the case, Jews may face, as Efraim Sicher argues, "a postcolonial agenda that has tended to exclude consideration of Jewish issues or anti-Semitism, while making 'Palestine' the center of political consensus."[35] Such silencing is counteracted by the film itself, however, which purposely unites Muslims and Jews rather than pitching minority experiences against the majority culture or each other.

In line with adoption's deconstruction of "naturalized versions of national, racial, and cultural belonging" (Castañeda, 284), the interpellative plot of The Infidel not only leads to identity adjustments, a new consciousness, and redirected sensibilities, but plays out the implications of a transethnic kinship on several levels. "Mahmud" shares physical features with "Solly" and can easily pass as either Muslim or Jew.[36] Further alignments include rituals and bodily manifestations (Lenny realizes that a circumcised penis would neither confirm nor dismiss Mahmud's claim to Jewishness), dress codes (Mahmud puts his taqiyah

over the kippah he tried on earlier), and shared places of arrival (such as London's East End). Mahmud places Chumash and Qu'ran next to each other when he sets out to challenge Al-Masri, and addresses the similarities of belief, text, and language in his final confrontation. A further commonality is the – albeit split – vested interest in Israel/Palestine and respective diasporic loyalties and various community demands for solidarity. Mahmud feels obliged to attend a pro-Palestinian demonstration, but – as Solly – he is also expected to support Israel. Self-identifying as a modern Sunni whose Muslim identity is easily compatible with multicultural coexistence, Mahmud feels more alienated when he "performs" an Israel-hating anti-Semitic act than when attempting to "enact" Jewishness.

Lenny and Mahmud eventually join forces against the dogmatists of religious purity, personified by the dying father's rabbi, whose guardianship lacks humanity, and by Al-Masri, who wants to prevent the marriage between Rashid and his stepdaughter Uzma (Soraya Radford). On the DVD commentary track, the filmmakers are outspoken about their critique of "gatekeepers" who lay claim to defining identities for others. They not only refer to their own film, but also to institutions such as the Board of Deputies of British Jews and the Muslim Council of Britain. The Infidel deconstructs the hollow demands of agitators and the narrow-mindedness of the community establishment and favors the friendship and disputations of Lenny and Mahmud. The response to the task set for Mahmud by the rabbi – "Think what it means to be a Jew?" – is an affirmation and embrace of cultural and ethnic diversity and hybridity – based on humor that will continue to need stereotypes and adversity, but clearly distances itself from Anglo-Jewish parochialism and itinerant Islamism alike.

Conclusion: A Cinema of Irregular Reproduction

Paul Morrison, the writer-director of two historical British Jewish films, Solomon and Gaenor (1999) and Wondrous Oblivion (2003), stated in an interview that having come of age in the late 1950s and early 1960s, his upbringing reflected the unease associated with the status of Jews in Britain as existing "on sufferance" and conditions of assimilation.[37] Morrison also described the "acute depression" in post-war British Jewry, situated "on the edge of the Holocaust," and what he later realized was the ambivalent part played by British Jewry in connection with British politics in the 1930s and 1940s. He remembers growing up in a "self-denying world," in which he was told "not to be a loud Jew," where "hiding" was a "big thing" and he had felt proud that he "could pass as a non-Jew." Unlike Morrison, the screenwriters of Leon and The Infidel belong to a generation whose formative years fell into the 1970s[38] and whose protagonists are also products of the 1960s. Director Josh Appignanesi, born even later in 1975, underlines this significant generational shift. He draws attention to

> the notion that new generations are questioning those inherited prejudices upon which the continuity of communities has rested. What remains most radical here is perhaps the vexed and shifting notion of community itself, so closely allied to the idea of the family, but also, crucially for filmmakers, to the idea of the audience.[39]

Irregular reproduction serves as metaphor for the "new Jew" who emerges from hiding and who, despite some caveats, finds himself (or herself) in a Britain in which models of community and their survival can be challenged (Leon) and where shared diaspora space and histories can be imagined (The Infidel). The stories of empowered Jewishness without negation of a distinctive history and multicultural conviviality fall into step with the broader developments in British society during the 1980s and 1990s. Concepts of identity and community determined and circumscribed by genetics, biology, religion, race or ethnicity are juxtaposed with more ephemeral, malleable, and flexible models of subjectivity. In the

films' attempt to undermine foundational birth narratives, notions of impurity are presented as life-giving[40] and thus relevant to the history and future of diasporic (British) Jews.

The above reading of Leon and The Infidel treats the two productions as representative of (British) Jewish and a wider diasporic (European) cinema, privileging an ethno-religious approach to analysis. Leon and The Infidel, however, also belong to a growing number of international feature films about fertility, assisted reproduction and adoption. Some of these are dystopian narratives that envision a collapsed biopolitical order of entire societies (*The Handmaid's Tale*, 1990; Children of Men, 2006); others address the psychological impact of infertility treatment (Forget Paris, 1995; Maybe Baby, 2000), stillbirth (Return to Zero, 2014), surrogacy (Baby Mama, 2008), miscarriage and adoption (Then She Found Me, 2008) on individuals. Irrespective of whether the films employ comedy, romance, social realism or science fiction as styles, they invite reflection on contemporary lifestyles, bioethics and the institution of the family. Furthermore, they position themselves vis-à-vis issues of race and class (Secrets and Lies, 1996), religion (Kadosh, 1999), sexuality (Two Mothers, 2013) and gender (Mother and Child, 2009).[41]

If Leon and The Infidel are read as contributions to this particular cinema, most notable is, apart from the focus on British Jewishness, the masculinist approach they take throughout: Leon and Mahmud are driven to connect with their biological fathers. Leon's mother appears in the story, but more emphasis is placed on Sidney's reactions. Mahmud's adoptive mother has died, and his birthmother, usually a central figure in the adoption triangle, is never referred to. While both films could be subject to a feminist critique for their eclipse of women's roles and experiences, the "irregularity" of their cinematic Jewish masculinity is productive in its own right. It exemplifies the "shift towards more subtle, nuanced, playful and even outrageous representations of the Jewish male body" [42] on the

screen and offers a particular thematic variation, thus expanding the archive of the cinema of reproduction at large.

---

[1] Leon the Pig Farmer. Dir. Vadim Jean and Gary Sinyor. London: Leon the Pig Farmer Plc, 1992. The Infidel. Dir. Josh Appignanesi. London: Infidel Films Limited, Slingshot, Met Film Ombadsman; developed in association with BBC Films, 2010. A musical version of The Infidel premiered at the Theatre Royal Stratford East in London in October 2014.

[2] Alys Eve Weinbaum, Wayward Reproductions: Genealogies of Race and Nation in Transatlantic Modern Thought (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press; Chesham: Combined Academic, 2004), 2.

[3] Howard Eilberg-Schwartz, "Introduction: People of the Body," in Howard Eilberg-Schwartz (ed.), People of the Body: Jews and Judaism from an Embodied Perspective (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992), 1-15; 2.

[4] Deuteronomy 23:2 also excludes men who have not reproduced from serving as high priests or on the Sanhedrin. For a summary see Anthony V. Hirsh, "Infertility in Jewish Couples: Biblical and Rabbinic Law," Human Fertility 1.1 (1998), 14-19; 15.

[5] Pronatalism is common to all religions, but the Jewish case in the State of Israel has generated special interest; see, for example, Susan Martha Kahn, Reproducing Jews: A Cultural Account of Assisted Conception in Israel (Durham: Duke University Press, 2000).

[6] Emil Fackenheim, "The 614th Commandment" (1967), in Michael L. Morgan (ed.) The Jewish Thought of Emil Fackenheim: A Reader (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987), 157-60; 158.

[7] Emil Fackenheim, *God's Presence in History: Jewish Affirmations and Philosophical* Reflections (Northvale, N.J.: J. Aronson, 1997 [1970]), 71.

[8] The contradictions of reproductive logics can be further exemplified here: Despite the overarching matrilineal principle, patrilineality is found in the Torah and applies to the priestly castes of Cohen and Levi for whom ancestral descent is constructed through the male line. Paradoxically, patrilineality can also feature in Reform and Progressive Judaism, where the Jewishness of either parent is considered to establish community membership. Nazism constructed its own version of Jewishness in a generational model based on a combination of religious identification, and racialization.

[9] In the mid-1980s, the Indonesian pig-like animal babirusa was discussed as a food source which might be kosher. For more recent references to "kosher pigs" in the context of reproduction technologies, see David J. Bleich, Bioethical Dilemmas: A Jewish Perspective, Vol. II (Southfield: Targum, 2006), 31-2, and Miryam Z. Wahrman, Brave New Judaism: When Science and Scripture Collide (Lebanon, New Hampshire: Brandeis University Press, 2002), 192-4.

[10] On the DVD commentary track, Leon's filmmakers acknowledge their indebtedness to American Jewish culture, in particular film: "We only stole from other Jewish films." One example of citational reverence is the use of lobsters which alludes to the well-known sequences in Woody Allen's Annie Hall (USA 1977).

[11] Eugene Goodheart, "Jew d'Esprit," in Ethan Goffman and Daniel Morris (eds.), The New York Public Intellectuals and Beyond (West Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University Press, 2009), 35-43; 42.

[12] On the recurring bathroom trope in contemporary cinema see Nathan Abrams, The New Jew in Film: Exploring Jewishness and Judaism in Contemporary Cinema (London: IB Tauris, 2012; New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2012), 183-206.

[13] On the reflexive turn, strategy of insecurity and initiatives for community enhancement in the 1990s, see Keith Kahn-Harris and Ben Gidley, Turbulent Times: The British Jewish

Community Today (London and New York: Continuum, 2010), 13 and 38-55. Findings of the Institute for Jewish Policy Research from the 1990s and 2000s can be accessed at http://www.jpr.org.uk/.

[14] Sarah Franklin, Embodied Progress: A Cultural Account of Assisted Conception (London: Routledge, 1997), 4.

[15] Sander Gilman, Multiculturalism and the Jews (New York and London: Routledge, 2006) and Efraim Sicher and Linda Weinhouse, *Under Postcolonial Eyes: Figuring the "jew" in* Contemporary British Writing (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2012).

[16] Claudia Castañeda, "Incorporating the Transnational Adoptee," in Marianne Novy (ed.), Imagining Adoption: Essays on Literature and Culture (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004), 277-99; 278.

[17] The quotation is taken from the film's dialogue. The full hadith in the Sahih al Bukhari (Volume 8, Book 73, Number 34) reads: "The Prophet's said, 'I and the person who looks after an orphan and provides for him, will be in Paradise like this,' putting his index and middle fingers together."

[18] Muslim Women's Shura Council, Adoption and the Care of Orphan Children: Islam and the Best Interests of the Child (American Society of Muslim Advancement, August 2011), 6.

[19] Baddiel appropriates the name of the Waifs and Strays' Society, founded in 1881, which was renamed the Church of England Children's Society in 1946 and, since 1982, is called The Children's Society.

[20] Screenwriter David Baddiel's novel The Secret Purposes (London, 2004) deals with the experience of German Jewish civilian internment in Britain during the Second World War.

[21] Assimilation through de-ghettoization, economic and professional achievement, and socio-cultural inconspicuousness have rendered large parts of British Jewry "invisible," making them less vulnerable to marginalization than other religious minorities, non-white or

non-middle class ethnic groups, but also less vocal and interventionist in the larger debates around integration and social cohesion.

[22] Children were taken from Eastern European countries for "Germanization" in Lebensborn homes between 1939 and 1945, from Aboriginal families in Australia in the years 1880-1970, and from Native American communities in the United States until the Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978.

[23] Vincent J. Cheng, Inauthentic: The Anxiety over Culture and Identity (Piscataway: Rutgers University Press, 2004), 68 and 178. See here also the wider discussion of transracial adoption and of Jewish "authenticity" in Chapters 4 and 5.

[24] Elizabeth Bartholet, Family Bonds: Adoption and the Politics of Parenting (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1993), 143.

[25] Jill R. Deans, "'File it Under "L" for Love Child': Adoptive Policies and Practices in the Erdrich Tetralogy," in Novy (ed.), 231-49; 247.

[26] The 2011 Census for England and Wales enumerated 263,346 Jews and 2,706,066 Muslims at 0.5 percent and 4.8 percent of the total population respectively.

[27] Louis Althusser, "Ideology and the State" (1970), in Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays (New York and London: Monthly Review Press, 1971), 127-186; 176.

[28] Judith Butler, Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative (New York and London: Routledge 1997), 2.

[29] Like in Leon, some of these scenes make reference to Annie Hall.

[30] Judith Butler, "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory," Theatre Journal 40:4 (1988), 519-531; 521-2; emphasis in the original.

[31] Marianne Novy, Reading Adoption: Family and Difference in Fiction and Drama (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005).

[32] Adoption must not be understood in legal terms here; the institution was not formalized in the same way as it is today.

[33] The biblical Mordecai adopts – or fosters – his orphaned cousin Hadassah who becomes Babylonian queen under the name of Esther (Book of Esther 2:7).

[34] See, for example, the then Prime Minister Tony Blair's speech on June 13, 2006, on the occasion of the 350th anniversary of the resettlement of Jews in England at http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20040105034004/http://number10.gov.uk/page9676. Accessed August 20, 2013.

[35] Efraim Sicher, "The Image of Israel and Postcolonial Discourse in the Early 21st Century: A View From Britain," Israel Studies 16:1 (2011): 1-25; 3.

[36] It is not uncommon for Jews in Europe to be mistaken for members of a (larger) Muslim minority. Baddiel reports his experience of having been beaten up twice, once for being Jewish and once for being Pakistani (DVD commentary).

[37] Interviewed with author, 11 Jul. 2007. Solomon and Gaenor. Dir. Paul Morrison. London: APT Films, APT Productions, Arts Council of England, 1999; Wondrous Oblivion. Dir. Paul Morrison. London: APT Films, Met Film Production, Met Film, 2003.

[38] Normand and Sinyor were born in 1958 and 1962 respectively; Baddiel was born in 1964.

[39] Josh Appignanesi, "Unothering the Other: Ajami/The Infidel," Jewish Quarterly (July 2010), http://jewishquarterly.org/2010/07/unothering-the-other-ajamithe-infidel/. Accessed July 8, 2013.

[40] British Jewish author Clive Sinclair, who addresses Jewish reproduction in his own work (Blood Libels, London, 1985; The Lady with the Laptop, London, 1996; A Soap Opera from Hell, London, 1998), cites Primo Levi's The Periodic Table (first published in Italian; Turin, 1975) for whom impurity "gives rise to changes, in other words, to life" (in The Lady with the Laptop [London: Picador, 1996], 175-83; 176).

[41] *The Handmaid's Tale*. Dir. Volker Schlöndorff. Bioskop Film, Cinecom Entertainment Group, et al., 1990. Forget Paris. Dir. Billy Crystal. Castle Rock Entertainment, Face Productions, 1995; Secrets and Lies. Dir. Mike Leigh. Channel Four Films, CiBy 2000, Thin Man Films, 1996; Kadosh. Dir. Amos Gitaï. Agav Hafakot, MP Productions, 1999; Maybe Baby. Dir. Ben Elton. Pandora Cinema, BBC Films, 2000. Children of Men. Dir. Alfonso Cuarón. Universal Pictures, Strike Entertainment, Hit & Run Productions, 2006. Baby Mama. Dir. Michael McCullers. Michaels-Goldwyn, Relativity Media, 2008; Then She Found Me. Dir. Helen Hunt. Odyssey Entertainment, Killer Films, et al., 2008; Mother and Child. Dir. Rodrigo García. Everest Entertainment, Cha Cha Cha, Mockingbird Pictures, 2009; Zwei Mütter/Two Mothers. Dir. Anna Zohra Berrached. Filmakademie Baden-Württemberg, ZDF, 2013. Return to Zero. Dir. Sean Hanish. Cannonball Productions, 2014.

[42] Nathan Abrams. "From Jesus to Jeremy: The Jewish Male Body on Film, 1990 to the Present", in Santiago Fouz-Hernández (ed.) Mysterious Skin: Male Bodies in Contemporary Cinema (London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 2009), 15-29, 15.