



Framing and Enframing: Events in Tarkovsky's *The Sacrifice*

ZHANG Qicai

School of Foreign Languages, Anhui University of Science and Technology, China

Received: January 17, 2022

Accepted: February 22, 2022

Published: March 31, 2022

To cite this article: ZHANG Qicai. (2022). Framing and Enframing: Events in Tarkovsky's *The Sacrifice*. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(1), 148–157, DOI: [10.53789/j.1653-0465.2022.0201.016.p](https://doi.org/10.53789/j.1653-0465.2022.0201.016.p)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.53789/j.1653-0465.2022.0201.016.p>

This article is supported and sponsored by the Anhui Philosophy and Social Sciences Foundation (No. AHSKY2020D129) and the Anhui Quality Project (No. 2020szsfkc0333).

Abstract: *The Sacrifice* of the Russian director, Andrei Tarkovsky, is imbued with conspicuous Christian elements, which involves the viewers' abandoning the conventional framing and adopting the Christian frame to appreciate the inner logic of the movie. In the film, Alexander conducts two sacrifices when humans are confronted with the nuclear apocalypse resulting from modern technology. The first sacrifice saves humanity from impending nuclear doom. Alexander presents the artwork that eulogizes God; meanwhile, he makes possible humanity's return to the real home. The movie, in a way, calls for the men to abandon the blind dependence on technology and explore a new direction under the guidance of art.

Keywords: *The Sacrifice*; framing; enframing; art; event

Notes on the contributor: ZHANG Qicai is a lecturer at the School of Foreign Languages, Anhui University of Science and Technology. His research interest includes film studies, gender studies, and the interdisciplinary studies of religion and literature. His email address is zhangqicaimartin@163.com.

1. Introduction

The Sacrifice is a 1986 Swedish film directed by Andrei Tarkovsky, the famous Russian director, which won the Grand Prix at the Cannes Film Festival. The story takes place on the birthday of Alexander, a former actor who gives up the stage to work as a journalist, critic, and lecturer on aesthetics. He lives in a big house with his wife Adelaide, stepdaughter Marta, and young son, "Little Man", who is temporarily mute due to a throat operation. The family, as well as Victor (Adelaide's secret lover) and Otto (Alexander's friend and a part-time postman), gather at Alexander's house for the celebration. Just when the dinner is about to begin, the TV announces the beginning of what appears to be a possible nuclear holocaust. In despair, Alexander vows to

God to give up all that he loves, even Little Man, if this impending doom may be undone and fear may be dispersed. Otto advises him to sleep with Maria (the maid in the house), who, according to Otto, is a witch. Alexander follows the advice, he and Maria copulate. When he awakes the following day, everything seems to be normal again.

Nevertheless, Alexander sets forth to give up all he loves and possesses. While the family members and friends are going out for a walk, he fires their house. Later on, he is forced into an ambulance.

2. The Framing of Christianity

One possible question about the film *The Sacrifice* is what on earth has happened? First, the threat of the imminent nuclear holocaust, and then after Alexander sleeps with Maria, who is believed to be a witch, everything seems to be back to normal. Is that just a dream of Alexander? Is it the meticulous arrangement of the director, or is it a flaw that undermines the perfection of the film? The film is referred to by Mark le Fanu as Tarkovsky's "last great, tragically flawed film" because of its "considerable narrative and thematic confusion" (qtd. in Moliterno). Giralt holds that "the film's narrative blends Alexander's internal and external worlds into one continuous reality without a stylistic cue separating the two, thereby creating an ambiguity that governs the entire structure of the narrative" (2005: 78). Yet Peter Green holds that the confusing episode is a genius stroke and happens in Alexander's dream:

The supposition that this whole central episode is but a dream is supported by a number of circumstances: by the many references to sleep, by the irrational dreamlike actions that occur, and, more conclusively, by Tarkovsky's use of a differentiating color code. The entire central nocturnal section of the film, from the time Alexander goes out into the garden to seek Little Man and finds Maria and the model of the house, to the time he wakes on the couch in the morning, is cast in the form of a dream and is photographed in darkly lit sequences virtually devoid of color. The everyday waking reality of beginning and end is painted in the pale, natural colors of the northern summer, framing the interior world of the dream. (1987: 118)

Tarkovsky wisely predicted, "I knew that the film would be open to a number of interpretations, but I deliberately avoided pointing to specific conclusions because I considered that those were for the audience to reach independently" (1987: 223).

The controversy over the configuration of the film is still ongoing. However, Žižek's theory of event may shed some light on this film and make it less confusing. From its inception, philosophy seems to oscillate between the transcendental approach and the ontological or ontic approach (Slavoj Žižek 2014: 4). The ontic approach is concerned with reality itself, in its emergence and deployment, the beginning and end of the universe, and our place in it. "The transcendental approach concerns the universal structure of how reality appears to us. Which conditions must be met for us to perceive something as existing? 'Transcendental' is the philosopher's technical term for such a frame, which defines the coordinates of reality, e. g. , should materialism or spiritualism be adopted? Should spirit be integrated into reality as a necessary component" (Slavoj Žižek 2014: 4)? Thus be it the history of thoughts or the history about politics, aesthetics, concepts, awareness, behavior, or



morality, the history to a large extent will be one dominated by one dominant mode of thinking. “The structure of thought is the structure of the world” (Michael Bell 1999: 19). The philosophical thought of Plato, based on the mode of arithmetic or algebra, is characterized by linear thinking, which dominated the philosophy of ancient Greece. In light of that line of thought, people would readily accept the correctness of conclusions resulting from detailed and systematic logical induction. They would feel confident in people’s ability to find the truth, beauty, and good by wielding knowledge. However, this mode of thinking is in essence, only a frame of thinking that once enjoyed a dominant position.

In *Event*, Žižek poses the question, “is an event a change in the way reality appears to us or is it a shattering transformation of reality itself ?” (2014: 5) which echos philosophy’s oscillation between the ontic and the transcendental approach. The question fits the discussion of *The Sacrifice*. To find out whether the chaos and confusion in the film happen in a dream or not, we the viewers should not only pay heed to the happenings in the film itself, we should also note how the film should be approached, i. e. the frame we adopt or the coordinates we find ourselves guided by in appreciating the film.

The film seems to be elusive, chaotic, and incomprehensible. It seems very difficult for us to accept the fact that when confronted with an impending apocalypse, the copulating of Alexander and Maria should restore order to this messy world. However, if the film is put into the fame of Christianity, the logic of it becomes fairly sensible to follow. The viewers may very easily find the film imbued with Christian elements. The first four minutes of the film are partly used to show the names of the cast against the backdrop of the religious painting of Leonardo da Vinci, “Adoration of the Magi.” After the terms of the model have been shown, a close-up of the image takes around one minute.

Moreover, the maid in Alexander’s home is named Maria, a name with profound biblical resonance. When Maria pours water into the basin and helps Alexander wash his face, we may easily discern the ritual element of baptism. In the frame of Christianity, whatever Alexander undertakes to do is real. The copulating of Maria and him is his sacrifice to God, through which he saves humanity. The turn to the frame of Christianity is an event. “At its most elementary, event is not something that occurs within the world, but is *a change of the very frame through which we perceive the world and engage in it*” [emphasis original](Slavoj Žižek 2014: 10).

3. The First Sacrifice: Conversion and Soul Purification

In Hollywood, the mother of all frames is, of course, the coming together of a couple (Slavoj Žižek 2014: 13). The film *Argo* superficially portrays the successful rescuing of the hiding U. S. employees from Iran, but the actual focus is unification and reconciliation of the couple formerly in marital trouble. In *The Sacrifice*, Alexander and Adelaide are also experiencing a crisis in their marriage. Judging from the talk between Adelaide and Alexander’s friend, Victor, we know that they are having an affair.

Adelaide: You can forget about me, and Martha, and the boy. . . But Alexander is your friend!

Victor: He always will be.

Adelaide: But he needs you!

Victor: He has a wife to take care of him. She ought to, anyway.

Victor, at this time tired of his relationship with Adelaide, announces his attempt to go to Australia and run

a clinic there. Adelaide still finds it difficult to part with him. “Adelaide has a grown daughter from a previous marriage who, in the film, is in sexual competition with her mother” (Johnson and Petrie 1994: 181). It seems that the film is sinking into the familiar kitchen of reconciliation of husband and wife with marital problems. However, the film differs from the Hollywood narrative structure in that it integrates the impending nuclear apocalypse, what Lacan would refer to as “the traumatic third.” The TV news forecasts the approaching nuclear destruction, meaning the impending annihilation of all, about which people can do practically nothing. The Real overflows the illusory frames of reality and invades it.

The topsoil of the wilderness is muddy, covered with rotting leaves and strewn with abandoned coins and scarfs; urban roads are covered with tiny pieces of paper, clothes, carton boxes, deserted cars, and chairs; people thronging out of the office buildings onto the roads and running hither and thither on the pedestrian crossing, jostling each other; the boy sleeps on the glass tainted with mud; the reflection of the upside-down buildings appears in the glass; the naked women chasing geese in the house: all these seemingly incomprehensible images very well demonstrate the Real that evades the Symbolic and defies the signification of language.

Confronted with what may be referred to as the ultimate event, the nuclear apocalypse, most of the people in the film have no clue as to what to do. Otto and Alexander, who have been partly anesthetized by the alcohol and accordingly temporarily freed from the restrictions of rational coordinates, in reality, can comport themselves relatively aggressively and positively. Originally Alexander does not believe in Christianity. When Otto inquires about Alexander’s idea of his relationship with God, “Say, how is your relationship to God?” the reply of Alexander is “Non-existent, I’m afraid.” Later on, under the strain of the impending doom, in a quite devout manner, Alexander kneels and makes the very formal prayer to God.

“Lord! Deliver us in this terrible time. Don’t let my children die, nor my friends... my wife... Victor... all those who love Thee, and believe in Thee... I will give Thee all I have. I’ll give up my family, whom I love. I’ll destroy my home, and give up Little Man. I’ll be mute and never speak another word to anyone. I will relinquish everything that binds me to life... if only Thou dost restore everything as it was before... as it was this morning and yesterday. I’ll give up my family, whom I love.”

When praying to God, Alexander gives up his former atheist stance and is somewhat converted to Christianity. To save himself and his family and friends, he is willing to give up his house, the symbol of material wealth; he is ready to give up his family who may support him emotionally; he is willing to give up his speech. This prayer is selfish since it is made for the safety of himself and his family. On the other hand, this prayer involves huge sacrifice and costs. In essence, this prayer is still rational, moral, and ethical.

When the prayer is done, Alexander falls asleep on the couch. After he wakes up, Otto, whom the film has shown suddenly falling temporarily unconscious earlier on, immediately presents himself to Alexander and tells him the only way to save the world is to sleep with Maria. According to Spiegel, the prophetic visions can be put into different levels, and “the highest prophetic vision consists in the prophet’s seeing angel who addresses him in a vision” (Shalom Spiegel 1964: 79). Since visions cannot appear anywhere, it can be safely assumed that Otto in his unconsciousness, must have seen the vision and got the message from either an angel of God. Otto may be



regarded as one who assumes the role of a messenger or a prophet. By profession, he is a postman. In times of crisis, he brings news from the upper realm, which is unknown to ordinary folks.

For Alexander, a man much given to philosophical thinking and restricted by strict ethical codes, to sleep with Maria shall be the last thing he would do. It seems to be ethically unacceptable and reasonably unreasonable. Yet people's pursuit of civilization and their religious faith, like the "two ends of a rope," are sometimes in conflict. On the one hand, we want reason and knowledge, and we also want to pursue the development of civilization. On the other, faith in religion involves our devout devotion and our "'proper' 'fear of God'" (Omri Boehm 2007: 89) which defies human or rational justification. "He had to deny knowledge, to make room for faith" (qtd. in Boehm 2007: 109). The kings who offer their sons sacrifices must have felt overwhelmed with guilt because of the loss of children and a sense of fulfillment. They perform *The Sacrifice* because of their devotion to God. When God asks Abraham to burn Issac as an offering, Abraham must have been filled with resistance and preoccupations, but somehow his ethics gives way to the ultimate religious belief. Likewise, in the case of Alexander, despite being caught in such a dilemma, he has to make a painful choice. Finally, he resorts to the unconventional undertaking by presenting his rationality and the formerly held ethics as an offering to God. And now, in the frame of Christianity, the copulation of Alexander and Maria is successfully performed and Alexander finds everything restored to the normal routine order and the nuclear threat gone.

In Otto's words, Maria is "a witch, of course in the better sense." "A witch in a good sense could be nothing other than an angel, the personification of all the goods, the divine, the nearest one to God" (Rajmohan). Moreover, Maria may allow for abundant associations. "She is a figure of many parts—mother, eternal womanhood and Virgin Mary all rolled into one" (Peter Green 1987: 115).

Accepting Maria as the image of Madonna, the getting together of Alexander and Maria can be regarded as the reunion of mother and son. Baby in the bosom of the mother, with her gentle patting and caressing, can always feel secure and humbled by the greatness of mother. Humans have been quite capable in that civilization has indeed been propelled rapidly by deliberate human efforts. But the problem is that man always feels insecure from all sorts of threats that hang over them. The so-called civilization gives rise to nuclear threats, distanced human relationships, oppressing governments, all of which may contribute to the sense of depression, helplessness, fragmentation, suffocation man suffers. Even nature, which was usually compared to a nurturing mother is now cold, indifferent even hostile. When Alexander and Maria meet, it is Maria who utters those most soothing words which could only be uttered by a mother to a child, "It's all right now, all right. You poor, poor man! There, there. There's nothing to fear. Don't be afraid. Nothing will happen to you here. Don't cry, don't cry. Everything will be fine." The getting together of Alexander and Maria not only infuses awe into the heart of Alexander but also ours. Capable as we are, we have been too proud. What we need is to keep a humble mind. Although we are accomplishing scientifically and technically impossible missions, we should try to restrain our bloated pride and try to seek our spiritual home and sense of belonging.

There are also signs that Maria may be regarded as Mary Magdalene. According to David Jasper and Stephen Prickett, "The character of Mary Magdalen is a composite figure in the Christian tradition who has developed out of some different gospel women—the sister of Martha and Lazarus in Bethany, the woman caught in the act of adultery and forgiven by Jesus, the woman who anoints Jesus and wipes him with her hair" (1999: 287). Mary Magdalene is also referred to in early Christian writings as "the apostle to the apostles." In the film,

Maria pours the water from the vase into the basin and hands Alexander the soup, which may seem to be his anointing. After the house is burnt, when Maria comes to see Alexander, Adelaide's utterance "don't touch him" can remind us of Jesus's "don't touch me" to Mary Magdalen at the moment of ascension.

Mary Magdalene in many works is portrayed as Christ's wife. She cares about him, understands him, and loves him. She also witnesses his resurrection. Accepting Maria as the image of Mary Magdalene, we may regard their union as an embodiment of pure love. Adelaide, the wife of Alexander, marries Alexander not for love but for the fortune he has. The love has in a way been contaminated. The sacrifice solves Alexander's problem, i. e., his unhappy romantic relationship. Pure love and understanding might be the only antidote to the troubled interpersonal relationship.

4. Enframing: The Framing of Technology Dominating All

"The eventual effect retroactively determines its causes or reasons" (Slavoj Žižek 2014: 2). Through retrospection, it can be known that the major contradiction results from the impending nuclear doom announced by TV, i. e., the key reason lies in TV and nuclear weapon, the two representatives of technological development. In "The Question Concerning Technology", Heidegger used the German word "Gestell", meaning "enframing" and what remains hidden beneath the surface of modern technology, i. e. the essence of technology. "The paradox of technology as the concluding moment of Western metaphysics is that it is a mode of enframing which poses a danger to enframing itself: the human being reduced to an object of technological manipulation is no longer properly human; it loses the very feature of being ecstatically open to reality" (Slavoj Žižek 2014: 31).

Humans, in the contemporary technological enframing, lose their freedom and initiative to control technology, reduced instead to the pawns of technology. The TV set in the house which is supposed to bring comfort and joy to the family now functions as the evil messenger. And when people need it the most for follow-up information, it breaks down. By contrast, Maria whose TV "went dead" thus is protected from knowing the danger and is blessed. Adelaide wants to make a phone call for solace after being informed of the news, but she cannot get through. In despair, she wails, "The telephone's dead. Oh, dear God... Why do we always do the opposite of what we want? Always!"

Nuclear bombs serve as the best example of the alienating effects of science and technology. During World War II, both America and Germany wanted to overtake the other in technical advances in weaponry, aspiring to an ultimate weapon that may strategically turn the overall war scenario. It is America that first made this breakthrough in nuclear weapons. Within decades after the debut of the nuclear weapon, the former Soviet Union, Britain, France, China, India, etc successively joined the nuclear weapon club. Nuclear weapons can not only influence the war, they come to their own in their capability of obliterating the humanities. To some degree, it is safe to assume that it is not humans that are taking the initiative to use nuclear weapons in a war, but instead, nuclear weapons have shaped humans' thinking. Human being progressively sidelined, highly developed nuclear and chemical productive forces abolish the foundations and categories according to which we have thought and acted to this point, such as space and time, work and leisure time, factory and nation-state, and even the borders between continents (qtd in Timothy Morton 2007: 85).



The other threat of the current enframing lies in its deprivation of humans' potential to acquire truth. "The actual threat has already affected man in his essence. The rule of Enframing threatens man with the possibility that it could be denied to him to enter into a more original revealing and hence to experience the call of a more primal truth" (Martin Heidegger 1977: 28). The truth has been concealed, and if humans don't strive for the right direction, chances are that they will never achieve truth.

Technology is a mode of revealing (Martin Heidegger 1977: 13). In ancient times, technology facilitates human's knowing truth. For example, to make a silver chalice as a sacrificial vessel, four causes have to be taken into account, the matter of silver, the form (eidos) of chaliceness, the aim or purpose for sacrifice, and the pondering of the silversmith. The four causes play different roles, but blend in the making of the product, during the process of which the silversmith comprehensively ponders over the other three causes. "Bringing-forth brings hither out of concealment forth into unconcealment" (Martin Heidegger 1977: 11).

The essence of modern technology lies in Enframing. Its holding sway belongs within destining (Martin Heidegger 1977: 26). Destining always starts man towards revealing, man, thus underway, is continually approaching what is revealed in order, and of deriving all his standards on this basis. Therefore the other possibility is blocked, i. e., man being admitted more and sooner and ever more primally to the essence of the unconcealed and its unconcealment, so that he might experience as his essence his needed belonging to revealing (Martin Heidegger 1977: 26). "Yet when destining reigns in the mode of Enframing, it is the supreme danger" (Martin Heidegger 1977: 26). This danger manifests itself to us in two ways. When the unconcealed exists not as an object but only as a standing reserve, man becomes only the orderer of the standing reserve and transforms himself as a standing reserve. However, without realizing the danger, a man poses as the lord of the earth and regards everything man encounters as existing only insofar as it is his construct. "Thus the challenging Enframing not only conceals a former way of revealing, bringing-forth, but it conceals revealing itself and with it that wherein unconcealment, i. e., truth, comes to pass. Enframing blocks the shining-forth and holding-sway of truth" (Martin Heidegger 1977: 27-28). As Alexander rightly observes, "I have a feeling that our maps have nothing to do with truth, either... We look, but don't see."

5. The Second Sacrifice: The Anti-enframing Art

"Because the essence of technology is nothing technological, essential reflection upon technology and decisive confrontation with it must happen in a realm that is, on the one hand, akin to the essence of technology and, on the other, fundamentally different from it. Such a realm is art" (Martin Heidegger 1977: 35). In ancient Greece, art contains multitudes and does not comport as an independent existence, covering religion, politics, and nearly every aspect of social life. Art in ancient Greece demonstrates man's close tie with all existences. Up until now, art still exists as an extraordinary realm where the world's promise is maintained. Differing from technology, art does not involve measuring, classification, or plundering of the resources on earth. Art is more about "taking part" in the process of coming to being and revealing what characterizes existence. As Heidegger sees it, art functions as a beacon in that the artist or the poet views the world as it is and as it reveals itself.

In the film, "Alexander" the name is imbued with unique implications. In history, the Empire of Alexander

the Great boasts the largest territory in its time. Alexander exerts tremendous positive influence upon the development of social culture by promoting the development of the culture of ancient Greece and the cultural communication between the east and the west, by encouraging inter-ethnic marriages and promoting inter-ethnic equality. Thus “Alexander” the name in the film has combined Alexander the Great who spreads the culture of ancient Greece and the era of ancient Greece where art serves as the thread that connects all the things in the world. Moreover, Alexander’s previous working experience as an actor in plays, and later on journalist, critic, and aesthetic lecturer may well qualify him as an artist.

As an artist, Alexander is gifted with insightful perception, which enables him to see the savagery of modern civilization and man’s blind dependence on technology, “The result is a civilization built on force, power, fear, dependence. All our ‘technical progress’ has only provided us with comfort, a sort of standard. And instruments of violence for keeping power. We are like savages! We use the microscope like a cudgel! No, that’s wrong. . . savages are more spiritual than we! As soon as we make a scientific breakthrough we put it to use in the service of evil.” As a result, we don’t see things or realize our danger. This in a way echos Heidegger’s worry for the people in the modern era, “Heidegger capitalized being to indicate that his concern was not with individual beings but with the sheer mystery of Being at all. Our everyday instrumental dealing with individual beings, whether human or not, deadens us to Being; and philosophical activity, as traditionally practiced, only reinforces this” (Michael Bell 1999: 20).

Confronted with the crisis of human survival triggered by modern technology, he conducted two sacrifices to save and offer guidance to mankind. In the first sacrifice, he is converted to Christianity by deserting rationality. In the second sacrifice, he sets his home ablaze. The burning of the house as a burnt offering can be interpreted on two levels of meaning. First, setting the house ablaze can be viewed as artwork for God from Alexander, the artist. “Through the work first lets the artist emerge as a master of the art” (Martin Heidegger 2002: 1). Alexander once works as an actor in plays, but he somehow “started feeling embarrassed onstage ,” and he “was ashamed to impersonate someone else, to play another’s emotions.” What he is really after is his true inner feelings or reality. Just as one art critic in the film comments, “As I understood Alexander’s words, he meant that it is peculiar for a man to change, of his own free will, into a work of art. Generally, the result of all poetic striving lies so far from its author that one can hardly believe that it is a man-made creation. In the case of the actor, though, the reverse is true. The actor is, himself, his creation, his work of art.” After sleeping with Maria, the order is restored to the world, and Alexander is filled with trust and awe for God. Making himself again an actor by setting the house ablaze, he expresses what he feels eager to convey to God, not only the fulfilling of the promise but also his literal heartfelt praise of God. He leaves his family a note, suggesting that they go out for a walk and not disrupt his rest. When the family is gone, he sneaks into the room, puts the chairs onto the table one by one, and then the drapes over the chairs and the table. The whole procedures of setting up the altar are meticulously systematic. The more careful and systematic he is when he evacuates the house and when he sets up the altar, the more awe he shows to God; the more fiercely the fire burns, the higher praise he sings for God. In the meanwhile, the greatness of God also finds expression in the burning fire for God shows himself to Moses in a burning bush in Exodus. “The setting up we refer to is an erecting in the sense of dedication and praise. Here, ‘setting up’ no longer means merely putting in place. To dedicate means to consecrate, in the sense that, in the work construction, the holy is opened up as the holy and the God is called



forth into the openness of its presence. Praise belongs to dedication as doing honor to the dignity and splendor of the god” (Martin Heidegger 2002: 22).

Moreover, burning the house symbolizes the possibility for a man to enter his real home. When Alexander sets fire to the house, he is placing his family in a state of homelessness which is capable of two ways of interpretation. There is inauthentic homelessness and authentic homelessness. The former is the homelessness which features tramping and being unable to find a way, which is experienced by people lost in modern technology; in the latter case, people see the truth and return to Being or the prior promise, just like seeing artistic “Ereignis” in great danger, which enables them to return to their own home and to be entrusted to the hearth (Martin Heidegger 1996: 105).

In the morning when Alexander is about to burn the house, Adelaide tells Victor in their walk, “I had a dream recently. I was walking the streets, begging. When I woke, I cried and cried.” Adelaide vaguely feels the sense of homelessness where she cannot figure out her way. When she says this, the house still stands intact, and the sense of homelessness is still unclear. When the physical house is burnt down, Alexander is forcing people to have a keener sense of their homelessness. Breaking their false illusions, Alexander forces them to think about their real situation and makes it possible for them to enter the real home. Alexander’s house serves as a symbol of the material existence of modern society. His burning of the house symbolizes breaking the technical enframing, which favors matter over spirituality. The fire from the house in a way shines like the light from the beacon house for a man to find their real home by giving them spiritual guidance.

6. Conclusion

“Little Man” may have the associations of being vulnerable, frail, and mortal. “Enosh” in the Bible also has a similar denotation. “Yet Enosh carries a different nuance from Adam: it is vulnerable man, ‘the little man’” (Kessler and Deurloo 2004: 68). Enosh in the Bible also marks a watershed in the Bible in that it is from Enosh that “people began to call upon the name of ‘God’” (Genesis 4: 26). In the end, Little Man retrieves the ability to speak. Could it be that after the sacrifice, with humans calling upon the name of “God,” that human makes a step for the better, a religion-oriented step?

“Sometimes the sacrifice is linked with the creation or with the continuation of life on earth” (*The Sacrifice*). In the *Bible*, we notice that there are two creation stories in Genesis. It is unclear whether Tarkovsky deliberately created a parallel between the Genesis creation stories and the double sacrifices. But the intertextuality does in a way emerge. Alexander’s first sacrifice saves humankind from the impending nuclear doom, enabling the sustaining of their survival and existence of them. Through the second sacrifice, Alexander composed the artwork eulogizing God, manifesting God’s name, and at the same time, he paved the way for humans returning home in the real sense.

References

- Bell, M. (1999). The metaphysics of modernism. In Michael Levenson (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to modernism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 9–32.
- Boehm, O. (2007). *Binding of Isaac: a religious model of disobedience*. New York: T&T Clark.

- Giralt, G. F. (2005). Andrei Tarkovsky's adaptation of motifs embedded in Leonardo Da Vinci's *The Adoration of the Magi*. *Canadian Journal of Film Studies*, 12(2), 71–83.
- Green, P. (1987). Apocalypse & sacrifice. *Sight and Sound*, 56(2), 111–118.
- Heidegger, M. (1977). *Concerning technology and other essays*. William Lovitt (Tran.). New York & London: New Garland Publishing.
- Heidegger, M. (1996). *Holderlin's hymn "The Ister"*. William McNeill and Julia Davis (Trans.). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Heidegger, M. (2002). *Off the beaten track*. Julian Young and Kenneth Haynes (Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jasper, D & Prickett, S. (1999). *The Bible and literature: a reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Johnson, V. T. & Petrie, G. (1994). *The films of Andrei Tarkovsky: a visual fugue*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Kessler, M. & Deurloo, K. (2004). *A commentary on genesis: the book of beginnings*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Moliterno, G. (2001). Zarathustra's gift in Tarkovsky's *The Sacrifice*. *Screening the Past*.
<<http://www.latrobe.edu.au/www/screeningthepast/firstrelease/fr0301/gmfr12a.html>>.
- Morton, T. (2007). *Ecology without nature*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Sacrifice. (2009). *Myths encyclopedia*. <<http://www.mythencyclopedia.com/Pr-Sa/Sacrifice.html>>.
- Odde, T. (2009). Time sickness in Andrey Tarkovsky's *The Sacrifice*. *Canadian Journal of Film Studies*, 18(2), 66–86.
- Rajmohan. (2008). *Sacrifice: the swan song by Tarkovsky*. <<http://www.chaosmag.in/sacrifice.html>>.
- Spiegel, S. (1964). *The last trial*. New York: Behman.
- Tarkovsky, A. (1987). *Sculpting in time*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Žižek, S. (2014). *Event*. London: Penguin Books.

(Editor: Jasmine Liu)