Introduction
Multilingualism at the cinema and on stage:
A translation perspective

Reine Meylaerts

KU Leuven, Belgium
reine.meylaerts@arts.kuleuven.be

Adriana Şerban

Université Montpellier 3, France
adriana.serban@univ-montp3.fr

1. Multilingualism, translation and the ideal of monolingualism

Defined as "the co-presence of two or more languages (in a society, text or individual)" (Grutman, 2009, p. 182), multilingualism is an inherent part of our actual life experience. Large migration waves after 1945, multinational companies, postcolonial literary texts and today's nomadic, polyglot citizens are just a few examples of multilingual environments, texts and people. And although Denison (1978) showed that, in multilingual contexts, people engage in functional plurilingualism rather than in translation, multilingualism and translation remain inextricably linked. In fact, at the heart of multilingualism we find translation. In the real world, translation does not take place *in between monolingual* cultures, messages and people but, rather, *within* and *in between multilingual* entities (Meylaerts, 2013).

The recent understanding of individuals, messages and cultures as multilingual brings into question the romantic ideal of one language for one people and one culture in one nation-state. In particular, the strong association between literature and the nation since the 19th century has resulted in multilingual writing, self-translation and language mingling being cast in a fairly negative light in literature (Meylaerts, 2013) and, later on, in film. Deeply rooted as it may seem, this ideal goes back only two centuries, and contributes in a significant way to making us unaware of multilingualism as an important historical reality (Forster, 1970). Conquests, colonization and settlements took place frequently during the Middle Ages. To give an example, many languages were spoken in medieval Britain: English, Cornish, Welsh, French, Latin, Old Norse, Dutch and Hebrew. Medieval writers and readers (admittedly, a small minority within the whole population in terms of numbers) were able to move between languages in various ways (Amsler, 2011). Language choice was (and remains today) not random, but followed strict patterns of functional distribution (see Ferguson, 1959): Latin for prestigious

genres and official documents, the vernacular for lower genres and informal situations. Dante, for instance, wrote his scientific treatises in Latin and his less serious works in the Florentine dialect. In Shakespeare's time, many writers still considered English as an inferior medium for literary production and the King and his court often attended theatrical performances in Latin. Shakespeare himself, however, opted for English, but made ample use of multilingualism in his theatre (see Delabastita, 2002 for *King Henry V*).

For a long time, moreover, the ideal of monolingualism infused the humanities and the concepts used in a number of disciplines. Thus, Literary Studies, Cultural Studies and Film Studies are not sufficiently aware of the importance and omnipresence of multilingualism and translation. They have often remained blind to the multilingual reality of their products, audiences and production contexts, and have constructed their concepts according to monolingual categories. Perhaps most surprisingly, in Translation Studies, translation has traditionally been defined as the conversion of a monolingual source product (written text, film, website, etc.) into a monolingual target product for a monolingual target audience. But since the late 1980s and early 1990s "descriptively oriented 'literary' translation scholars like José Lambert and several others" realized "the need to open up the field and to turn their attention to the study of multilingualism and translation in the wider social context (e.g., in the media […])" (Delabastita, 2010, p. 201). In a number of ways, this volume takes up the challenge, oriented as it is towards the translation of multilingual films, plays and operas: the issues at stake, the models and concepts needed for conducting research on the topic, and the ensuing plea for collaborative, intercultural and interdisciplinary work this should lead to.

2. Multilingual production processes and multilingual audiences in film, theatre and opera

Among other things, the idealizing monolingual reduction is crucially questioned by film, theatre and opera. Indeed, the production process, the finished products and the reception by the audience are more often than not characterized by multilingualism and translation. First of all, multilingualism and translation are an inherent aspect of the collaborative production process of many films, often involving directors, teams of actors and technicians with various linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Thus, Şerban (2012, p. 56) reveals how the sets of *Nostalghia* and *Offret*, two films by the Russian director Andrei Tarkovsky, were "a real tower of Babel". *Nostalghia*, for instance, was made in Italy and, while Tarkovsky knew enough Italian to communicate with most of the Italian speaking actors and crew, he needed an English interpreter to mediate his interactions with a Swedish actor and a Russian interpreter for another actor who could not understand his directions in Italian to the rest of the

crew. In **Takeda**'s article in this issue, concerning the bilingual (Chinese and Japanese) Chinese film *Guizi lai le*, we read how director Jiang Wen wrote the screenplay together with three other writers and kept rewriting it while shooting the film. Since he cast Japanese actors for Japanese characters and Chinese actors for Chinese characters, the script was translated into Japanese on-site by a Japanese actor.

The same applies to theatre and opera. As **Mateo** in this volume points out, multilingualism is often an inherent feature of the very genesis of operas. In 18th-century Europe, Italian was the dominant opera language throughout Europe and non-Italian librettists wrote their libretti in Italian. However, before being performed in English, German, and other opera houses in various countries, the recitatives of these originally fully Italian libretti were translated into the local language "probably in order to enable audiences to follow the plot more easily and increase their enjoyment of the performance". Translation thus was "an aid to understanding in the creation of these multilingual productions" (p. 343). Consequently, we need to reconsider the concept of source culture, which, in the production process of opera, film and theatre, is often intercultural and hybrid itself. Far from being isolated examples, these types of collaborative and multilingual creative project can also help us question the reductive focus on production processes as monolingual and producers as individuals in other domains such as news agencies, international organizations, business communication and literature. In this respect, the present volume is only a first step: more research is needed on collective and multilingual production processes, and on their implications for translation (in the broadest sense).

Second, as globally distributed media, films, operas and, perhaps to a lesser extent, theatre performances reach audiences scattered around the globe. How to present these cultural products, especially when they are multilingual, to audiences with different linguistic backgrounds? According to Egoyan and Balfour (2004), "every film is a foreign film, foreign to some audience somewhere – and not simply in terms of language" (p. 21). As a consequence, "the differentiated and staggered nature of the multiple reception of films complicates any simple readings of what it is that films might be doing" (Cronin, 2009, p. 25). This holds even truer for what multilingualism and translation are doing in films, and should prevent us from understanding too superficially the function and effect of various translation strategies in (multilingual) films, operas, and theatre performances. Moreover, audiences themselves can be, and often are, multilingual. The spectators' mastery of each of the languages involved, as well as their proximity or distance with respect to the cultures which are depicted, will inevitably have a considerable influence on their processing of the dialogues and of the visuals, and affect the way in which they perceive the narrative and the characters. These are important questions, taken up by **De Higes Andino**, **Takeda** and **Mateo** in this special issue. What happens, for instance, when migration and diaspora films that try to represent the multilingualism of today's

societies are translated into other languages, for distribution worldwide? With the aid of a special model for analysis that allows for distinguishing between technical and ideological factors involved in the omission of multilingualism, **De Higes Andino** examines the dubbing and subtitling into Spanish of one such film, Ken Loach's *It's a Free World…*. Concerning opera, **Mateo** stresses how the evolution from non-translation to multilingualism by means of surtitles sometimes in several different languages had important democratization effects on the audience. Whereas non-translation "meant the 'foreignization' of the genre and the exclusion of spectators with less refined tastes, who could not enjoy the opera in the source language", the multilingualism created through the use of surtitling is "more 'inclusive'" and has "attracted new social groups to the opera house, considerably increased the size of audiences, broadened companies' repertoires and introduced a greater variety of languages in them" (p. 347). In her study of the subtitles in three (Japanese, American and Chinese) DVD editions of the bilingual film *Guizi lai le*, **Takeda** makes a plea for more research on multilingualism and translation in cinema in relation to the expectations of the audience. She foresees that "multilingualism in society and global film distribution" will develop further due to "an ever-increasing transnational flow of people, goods and information" and that, consequently, "audience expectations for the representation of multilingualism in cinema may be changing, possibly toward a more realistic approach, because of their greater exposure to communication across languages" (p. 107).

Again, interesting avenues for further research on various reception issues are raised, for example, by **Mateo**. How do operagoers (who are increasingly multilingual themselves) evaluate multilingualism in opera "in source vs target contexts"? Since – and importantly so – it is often impossible or even irrelevant to establish the source culture and the source audience of a multilingual opera, Mateo rightly proposes comparing reception contexts "with or without the mediation of translation in the reception of a multilingual opera production" (p. 348-349).

3. Film, theatre and opera as multilingual products

As a product, every film is a multisemiotic text, in which image, sound and speech interact in a dynamic way to convey meaning. Notwithstanding the multimodal nature of the audiovisual medium, and regrettably so, "the linguistic code has received far more attention than other elements such as non-verbal information" (Sanz Ortega, 2011, p. 19; see also Corrius & Zabalbeascoa, 2011). In her contribution in this volume on the implications of multilingualism for audio description for the blind and the partially sighted, **Maszerowska** also criticizes the very same reduction, and relates it to a conceptual issue. For her, the notion of multilingualism must not be limited to the verbal

component but should also cover the level of visual narration. Visual multiplicity has, indeed, significant implications for audio description, and this leads Maszerowska to propose strategies for a "successful descriptive integration of the visual and the verbal" (p. 292), applied here to the film *What Dreams May Come*. Furthermore, whereas in American action films directed by John McTiernan **Angiboust** shows us verbal multilingualism is an important feature, for McTiernan meaning is first and foremost conveyed by the images which, unlike languages, are universal, according to him. Marking his distance with respect to McTiernan's claim of universality, Angiboust's analysis reveals how filmic devices (camera movement, the use of light, montage) are able to take over the function of interlingual translation.

In spite of the widespread myth of cinema as universal language, O'Sullivan (2011) points out, foreign languages and translation have played a central role in the development of film. Although early cinema tried to ban translation, due to the belief in film as a universally understandable medium, it simultaneously needed translation, in the form of intertitles, in order to spread out over the planet. Thus,

> By the mid-1920s, Sidney Kent – the vice-president of Famous Players-Lasky – claimed that his company was shipping film prints to the four corners of the globe, with intertitles in 38 different languages. (Cronin, 2013, p. 743)

With the birth of the talkies in the late 1920s, translation (in various forms) became more important and also more problematic. Until the early 1930s, "American film companies tried to solve the translation problem by producing multiple-language versions of the same film. […] sometimes as many as fifteen versions of a film were made" (Danan, 1991, p. 607). In similar vein, **Labate** reveals in this volume how Steven Spielberg made different versions of *Close Encounters of the Third Kind*, adding a scene in the 1980 Special Edition and changing the ending in the 1997 Collector's Edition, which he considers as the final and authoritative version. Can these versions be qualified as self-translations or are they, rather, translations? In the field of literature, where authorship has a stronger and more individual status and where technical reproducibility (see Benjamin, 1936) plays a less prominent role, one would probably choose the term "self-translation". For film, a collaborative medium born in the age of reproducibility and conditioned by technical evolutions, we tend to refer to "versions". These different labels inform us about the perceived dissimilarities between the various cultural fields, especially with regard to authorship, translatorship, and the status of the original. It could be useful, in this respect, to consider the concept of "multiple translatorship" to refer to "the multiple ways in which the translator's agency is intertwined with that of other parties in the process of bringing the translation into the world" (Jansen & Wegener, 2013, p. 1). In this issue, the ambiguity of authorship and translatorship in the audiovisual

field is most explicitly raised by **Brisset**, who reflects on the many modifications a script can undergo after being translated by one or more translators but before the audience sees the dubbed movie. As a result, the decision-making process is diluted, even though the translator is credited with the final product, Brisset concludes.

When characters' speech is dubbed, the original disappears, as in so many other types of translation where the target text replaces the original. Still, dubbing retains its specificity in comparison to other forms of translation because of the multisemiotic nature of film: to convey meaning, a dubbed translation interacts with images, music, gestures, non-verbal sounds, etc. According to Danan, dubbing presented important advantages for those countries, such as France, Germany and Italy, who tried to counteract American hegemony. Dubbed films lose their linguistic foreignness and become local linguistic productions. Dubbing is "an assertion of the supremacy of the national language and its unchallenged political, economic and cultural power within the nation's boundaries" (Danan, 1991, p. 612). Just as in literature, film – or at least the linguistic make-up of films – was thus closely associated with the nation, and with national economic, artistic, and ideological interests.

Subtitling is more commonly used than dubbing, and is cheaper and faster (Díaz Cintas, 2010, p. 344). It has the particularity of always creating multilingualism: even the subtitling of monolingual characters' speech adds an extra layer of multilingualism to a film, as surtitles do in theatre and opera. Subtitles and surtitles translate oral speech into written language, and both the original and the translated version remain accessible to the audience, like in a bilingual text edition or a bilingual website. Subtitling (as well as surtitling) contributes to

> experiencing the flavour of the foreign language, its mood and the sense of a different culture more than any other translation mode […] the audience is not allowed to forget about the foreignness of a translated film. (Szarkowska, 2005; see the section on subtitling as a form of foreignization, paras. 2 and 3)

As far as the relationship between dubbing and subtitling is concerned, the great majority of contributions in this special issue deal with dubbing (**Sanchez**, **Brisset**, **De Bonis**, **Voellmer & Zabalbeascoa**, **De Higes Andino**, **Monti** and **Labate**) and fewer with subtitling (**Sanchez**, **Takeda**, **De Higes Andino**), voice-over (**Sepielak**), or surtitling (**Ladouceur**, **Nolette** and **Mateo**). Next to the main types of film translation, which are subtitling and dubbing, audiovisual translation encompasses a whole range of other modes nowadays, partly as a result of a growing awareness of accessibility issues: subtitling for the deaf and the hard-of-hearing (see **Szarkowska**, **Żbikowska**, **& Krejtz**) and audio description for the blind and the partially sighted (**Maszerowska** in this volume), but also due to technological developments in the audiovisual

landscape: fandubbing, fansubbing, video game localization, etc. In this respect, Cronin (2013) observes a

> fundamental ambiguity of the digital in both enhancing and undermining diversity – not simply as technique but as part of the notion of universal convertibility that underlies the binary logic of informatics. (p. 744)

In other words, the ancient myth of universal comprehensibility has never disappeared altogether …

Multilingual interactions in cinema can take the form of code switching, code mixing, intralinguistic variation (sociolects, dialects, regional variants, archaisms, idiolects), invented languages (especially in science-fiction films), or, quite simply, silence. As is the case in literature, the theatre and opera (see above), multilingualism has always been present in film, and, of course, not only in Hollywood productions (Bleichenbacher, 2008; Heiss, 2004). O'Sullivan (2007, 2011) shows how untranslated foreign language, accented speech, and interpreting as part of a plot were key elements of filmmaking from the very beginning, and, what is more, are aesthetic and political choices (see also Viviani, 2008). All of these instances of multilingualism can have more or less important intradiegetic functions in terms of themes, story lines, character portrayal, voice, and point of view. But they also fulfil an extradiegetic role, and are used for the sake of authenticity or exoticism. As **King** observes in her article on the figure of the treacherous interpreter in Jacques Audiard's *Un prophète*, multilingualism in contemporary French cinema has simultaneously a mimetic (representing the multicultural French society) and a thematic function. For **Monti**, multilingualism and, in particular, code-switching are essential to plot development and characterization in films such as *Bend It Like Beckham*, *Ae Fond Kiss*, *Spanglish* and *Gran Torino*. **Komporaly** focuses on how multilingual theatre productions – in her case, a piece of documentary-style Romanian/Hungarian theatre entitled *20/20* – can construct subjective and collective identities and shape feelings of belonging in a context of inter-ethnic conflict. In Canada, as **Ladouceur** informs us, Anglophone theatre artists living in Quebec and Francophones in western Canada are bilingual, but only very recently has this bilingualism "found its way onto the stage" (p. 45). In the Chinese film *Guizi lai le*, too, language treatment is mimetic throughout, and "can be considered a full implementation of 'vehicular matching' (Sternberg, 1981)" (**Takeda**, p. 97).

But, of course, multilingualism does not always make its way into film, theatre, or opera. Sometimes viewers are invited to suspend disbelief and accept that not only English but also Dutch, Italian, Brazilian, or Chinese characters represented on screen express themselves in English (or whichever the language of the film happens to be) in contexts in which they would normally use another language; Bleichenbacher (2008) refers here to "the replacement strategy" (p. 55). According to Takeda

(p. 97), this is the case in "many mainstream movies such as *The Last Emperor* (1987), in which Chinese and Japanese characters speak English almost exclusively". As far as the United States is concerned:

> Linguistic diversity was an inescapable fact of the Old World, and part of the challenge for the New was what to do with this diversity. Cinema as a medium both produced by and watched by the migrants that poured across the Atlantic was inevitably going to become a site for the challenges and concerns which clustered around language difference. How were the many languages of the migrants to be "translated" into the new linguistic and cultural reality of the United States, the country which emerges after the First World War as the leading producer of motion pictures? (Cronin, 2009, p. 54)

The number of multilingual films has been on the increase since the 1980s and 1990s (Heiss, 2004). According to Mingant (2010), this is mainly due to economic motives:

> In order to please and attract foreign audiences, Hollywood films increasingly star foreign actors, and take place in foreign locations. Multilingualism is fuelled by a new desire to give a larger and more authentic representation of the non-American world. (p. 713)

Although **King** sees multilingualism as particularly salient in French cinema, most of the films studied by the contributors to this volume are by American (McTiernan, Allen, Tarantino, Spielberg, Eastwood, Brooks, Cameron, Marshall) or British (Branagh, Hitchcock, Loach, Chadha) directors. Two French filmmakers (Binisti and Audiard) and a Chinese director (Wen) are also present.

According to Cronin (2009), whereas studies on the technical aspects of subtitling and dubbing are numerous, there has so far been "no sustained attempt to examine the thematization of translation in films" (p. xi). Next to extradiegetic translation (subtitling, dubbing, voice-over, etc.), film – but also theatre or opera – can resort to intradiegetic translation techniques; these are "forms of translation contained within the narrative structure of the film" (Cronin, 2009, p. 116) involving the use of interpreters or translators as characters within the film. As is the case in literature, where fictional translators and interpreters are regularly present and play a more or less important role for plot development (Delabastita & Grutman, 2005), translators and interpreters often feature in film too (Cronin, 2009) – especially interpreters. Because of their necessarily physical and therefore visible presence, these often "become witnesses to any number of dramatic or key events" (Cronin, 2009, p. 111). In science-fiction films, for example, the interpreter or translator "is ideally positioned to bear witness to important shifts in the development of the narrative" (Cronin, 2009, p. 111). Thus, in **Labate**'s

contribution in this volume, the role of the interpreter in Spielberg's *Close Encounters of the Third Kind* is at stake. The film's main theme is communication between humans and extraterrestrials but also between the humans themselves. One of the main characters is a French ufologist who needs an interpreter to communicate with English-speaking characters; interpreting between French and English is, therefore, part of the film's narrative. Labate sets out to investigate what happens with the interpreting scenes when the film is dubbed into French. Since the dubbing language is also the foreign language in these scenes, there is a complete loss of multilingualism in the film. As a consequence, the theme of human communication mirroring that of communication between aliens and humans in the original version disappears in the French dub. **King**, on the other hand, shows how the main character in Audiard's *Un prophète*, the treacherous interpreter Malik, harnesses the power of languages in order to manipulate others, in the context of the prison he finds himself in. Similar issues of power and treachery, in times of war and conflict, are associated with the unreliable interpreter in *Guizi lai le*, discussed in **Takeda**'s article; a number of comic effects are also present, and the author discusses them.

5. The translation of multilingual films, theatre performances and operas

Research on the translation of multilingual films, theatre performances and operas started only a decade ago. It remains surprisingly scarce and illustrates the more general absence of work on the complex connections between multilingualism and translation. The present issue, however, illustrates the new and increasing interest in the topic. It is certainly no coincidence that so many young scholars – witness the authors who contribute to this volume – are taking up the challenge. The subfield is young, but taking off already. This may explain to a certain extent why many of the articles limit themselves to case studies of one film or one theatre piece. **De Bonis**'s study of the dubbed Italian versions of fourteen films by Alfred Hitchcock and **Brisset**'s analysis of the French dubbing of eight Woody Allen films covering 34 years of the director's career are exceptions. If the current interest persists, we are confident that wider-ranging studies, covering more languages (mainly the dominant Western languages are present in this volume) and more regions of the world, such as India, African countries (for a study of the promotion of multilingualism through subtitling in South Africa, see Kruger, Kruger, & Verhoef, 2007) or South America will soon be represented.

How can we best translate multilingual films, theatre performances and operas? Given the multisemiotic nature of these cultural products, the many forms multilingualism may take, the different functions it fulfils, as well as the tremendous variety of reception situations, the answer is not straightforward. Nor can there be a single

answer, an algorithm or a protocol that would work in every circumstance. Multilingualism is, then, negotiated through complex and diverse translation types, strategies and processes: dubbing, subtitling, voice-over, surtitling, audio description, non-translation, standardization, condensation, deletion, reformulation, normalization, and many more. In other words, translating multilingual films, theatre performances and operas is a considerable challenge. Is it possible to maintain the linguistic and cultural specificity of bilingual theatre in Canada (see **Ladouceur** in this volume), also taking into account the diverging linguistic background of audiences throughout the country (**Nolette**'s contribution)? For Ladouceur, surtitled bilingual theatre generates new forms of writing, translating and performing and transgresses the linguistic, cultural, and symbolic divides in Canadian society. In this special issue, **Sanchez** takes up Delabastita's (2002) recommendation of studying the film adaptations of *Henry V* and the treatment of multilingualism in them; he examines Laurence Olivier's and Kenneth Branagh's adaptations and concentrates on the French, Spanish (Latin American), Italian and German versions of Branagh's film. How can respectively subtitling or dubbing re-echo the different voices within a multilingual film such as *Henry V*, given the fact that dubbing domesticates the original dialogue and that subtitles involve simplification and uniformization, **Sanchez** asks? Which are the best strategies to use with a view to representing offensive language in subtitles (**Takeda**'s article)? And is it possible to dub religious Jewish technolect and Yiddish slang for a French audience without linguistic and other losses (see **Brisset**)? **De Bonis** expects that, when multilingual characters' speech is dubbed into one single language, this may have negative consequences for the suspension of linguistic disbelief. **Voellmer & Zabalbeascoa** combine their case study of the dubbed Spanish, Catalan, German and Italian versions of *Inglourious Basterds* with theoretical reflections on the translation of linguistically complex texts. They propose a model of eight possible translational options for translating foreign languages within films. This enables the authors to conclude that Toury's hypothesis of greater standardization must be partly falsified: translations *can* be as multilingual as their source texts, provided there is no coincidence between the target language for the translation and one of the languages of the multilingual source text.

Challenging as it is, the translation of multilingual films, operas and theatre performances gives rise to a multitude of forms of translation far beyond the traditional dubbing and subtitling. Although none of the contributions to this volume ventures into the study of fansubbing, crowdsourcing and other technology-driven innovations, **Szarkowska**, **Żbikowska & Krejtz** analyze creative forms of subtitling for rendering multiple languages for the deaf and the hard of hearing. Based on a survey of 135 Polish deaf and hard-of-hearing people, the study outlines strategies for ensuring that multilingual films are accessible (vehicular matching, translation and explicit attribution, translation and colour-coding, explicit attribution, linguistic homogenization).

According to Díaz Cintas and Remael (2007, p. 49), the final aim of translating multilingual films is to achieve intersemiotic cohesion, where meaning is conveyed through the interplay of semiotic modalities: extradiegetic visual information (camera movement), diegetic information (gestures, expressions, body language) and linguistic information (speech, subtitles). This is what **De Bonis** (following Baldo, 2009) labels "contextual translation": the overall context of the scene and the non-verbal information (images, sounds, etc.) help viewers draw the meaning of what they see on screen. "In other words, contextual translation 'exploits' the polysemiotic nature of audiovisual texts" (p. 171), whose distinctive feature is precisely the interweaving of semiotic codes. Two Italian subtitled versions of Hitchcock films follow this strategy and leave foreign languages apparently untranslated.

In any case, for many contributors to this special issue the translation of multilingual films, operas and theatre performances should not be restricted to linguistic aspects only. In Cronin's (2009) words,

> There is a sense in which the inescapable linguistic and cultural diversity of the planet must make its way back into the very structure and narrative of the films themselves. (p. 24)

The issue of reception contexts is of the essence here. In her discussion of the technique of exposition, which is an interesting form of non-translation for multilingualism in voice-overs, **Sepielak** illustrates this very well. Exposition leaves the original soundtrack audible without any translation, counting on the multilingualism of the audience. In Polish voiced-over films this is one of the most important strategies used, but Sepielak suggests it could also be combined with subtitling.

6. Conclusion

To conclude and leave the floor to the authors, multilingualism makes communication and mediation issues more visible (Cronin, 2009; also Şerban, 2012). When it appears in film, in opera or at the theatre, and of course in literature too, it creates a *mise en abyme* which stimulates the spectators' "multilingual imagination" (O'Sullivan, 2007) and invites them to reflect on what it means to be in a world in which we need interpreters and translators to mediate between us and more or less remote others – sometimes the other from within. It also stretches the limits of translation by making us see that it simply cannot be the "*full* transposition of *one* (monolingual) source code into *another* (monolingual) target code for the benefit of a *monolingual* target public" (Meylaerts, 2006, p. 5, emphasis in the original). The translation of multilingual cultural products is able to highlight the internal tensions within cultures, which can lead to conflict but may also be engines for positive change, for renewal.

This emerging subfield has tremendous potential to lay bare the blind spots of Translation Studies models, expose common assumptions which are, by and large, responsible for repetitive research, and enable us to question reductive binary oppositions which have outlived their day.

References

Amsler, M. (2011). *Affective literacies: Writing and multilingualism in the late Middle Ages.* Turnhout: Brepols.

Baldo, M. (2009). Subtitling multilingual films: The case of *Lives of the saints*: An Italian–Canadian TV screenplay. In F.M. Federici (Ed.), *Translating regionalised voices in audiovisuals* (pp. 117–135). Rome: Aracne.

Benjamin, W. (1936). L'œuvre d'art à l'époque de sa reproduction méchanisée. *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung. 5*, 40−68.

Bleichenbacher, L. (2008). *Multilingualism in the movies: Hollywood characters and their language choices*. Tübingen: Francke.

Corrius, M., & Zabalbeascoa, P. (2011). Language variation in source texts and their translations: The case of L3 in film translation. *Target, 23*(1)*,* 113−130.

Cronin, M. (2009). *Translation goes to the movies.* London: Routledge.

Cronin, M. (2013). Translating popular film [Review]. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *34*(7), 743−744.

Danan, M. (1991). Dubbing as an expression of nationalism. *Meta*, *36*(4), 606−614.

Delabastita, D. (2002). A great feast of languages: Shakespeare's bilingual comedy in King Henry V and the French translators. *The Translator*, *8*(2), 303−340.

Delabastita, D. (2010). Literary studies and translation studies. In Y. Gambier & L. van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies 1* (pp. 196−208). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Delabastita, D., & Grutman, R. (2005). Introduction. Fictional representations of multilingualism and translation. In D. Delabastita & R. Grutman (Eds.), *Fictionalising translation and multilingualism. LANS-TTS, 4,* 11−34.

Denison, N. (1978). On plurilingualism and translation. In L. Grähs, G. Korlén, & B. Malmberg (Eds.), *Theory and practice of translation (Nobel Symposium, Stockholm, 6-10 September 1976)* (pp. 313−319). Bern: Peter Lang.

Díaz Cintas, J. (2010). Subtitling. In Y. Gambier & L. van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies 1* (pp. 344−349). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Díaz Cintas, J., & Remael, A. (2007). *Audiovisual translation: Subtitling*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Egoyan, A., & Balfour, I. (2004). *Subtitles: On the foreignness of film.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Ferguson, C. (1959). Diglossia. *Word, 15*, 325−340.

Forster, L. (1970). *The poet's tongues: Multilingualism in literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grutman, R. (2009). Multilingualism. In M. Baker & G. Saldana (Eds.), *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (pp. 182–186). London: Routledge.

Heiss, C. (2004). Dubbing multilingual films: A new challenge? *Meta*, *49*(1), 208–
220.

Jansen, H., & Wegener, A. (2013). Multiple translatorship. In H. Jansen &
A. Wegener (Eds.), *Authorial and editorial voices in translation 1*:
Collaborative relationships between authors, translators, and performers (pp.
1–38). Montreal, QC: Éditions québécoises de l'œuvre, collection Vita
Traductiva.

Kruger, J.-L, Kruger, H., & Verhoef, M. (2007). Subtitling and the promotion of
multilingualism: The case of marginalised languages in South Africa. *LANS-
TTS, 6*, 35–49.

Meylaerts, R. (2006). Heterolingualism in/and translation: How legitimate are the
other and his/her language? An introduction. *Target, 18*(1), 1–15.

Meylaerts, R. (2013). Multilingualism as a challenge for translation studies. In
C. Millan-Varela & F. Bartrina (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of translation
studies* (pp. 519–533). London: Routledge.

Mingant, N. (2010). Tarantino's *Inglourious Basterds*: A blueprint for dubbing
translators? *Meta*, *55*(4), 712–731.

O'Sullivan, C. (2007). Multilingualism at the multiplex: A new audience for screen
translation? *LANS-TTS, 6*, 81–95.

O'Sullivan, C. (2011). *Translating popular film*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sanz Ortega, E. (2011). Subtitling and the relevance of non-verbal information in
polyglot films. *New Voices in Translation Studies*, *7*, 19–34.

Szarkowska, A. (2005). The power of film translation. *Translation Journal*, *9*(2).
Retrieved from http://www.bokorlang.com/journal/32film.htm.

Sternberg, M. (1981). Polylingualism as reality and translation as mimesis. *Poetics
Today*, *2*(4), 221–239.

Şerban, A. (2012). Translation as alchemy: The aesthetics of multilingualism in film.
MonTI, *4*, 39–63.

Viviani, C. (2008). Le sous-titrage dans le cinéma américain: De la plaisanterie à la
nécessité dramatique. In J.-M. Lavaur & A. Şerban (Eds.), *La traduction
audiovisuelle: Approche interdisciplinaire du sous-titrage* (pp. 17–26).
Bruxelles: De Boeck.