Speaking the Enemy's Language: Representations of Multilingualism and Translation in *Crimean*

Düşmanın Dilini Konuşmak: *Kırımlı*'da Çok Dillilik ve Çeviri Temsilleri

Research/Araştırma

Aysun KIRAN

Research Assistant Dr., Marmara University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Department of Translation and Interpreting, aysun.kiran@marmara.edu.tr, ORCID ID: orcid.org/ 0000-0003-1551-3776

ABSTRACT

This article examines the depictions of multilingualism and translation in *Crimean* (*Kırımlı*, 2014), which recounts the story of a Crimean Turk called Sadık Turan, who was taken hostage as a prisoner of war during the Second World War. Adapted from Cengiz Dağcı's 1956 memoir-novel entitled *Horrible Years* (*Korkunç Yıllar*), the film presents a multilingual narrative through its incorporation of Turkish, German, Russian and Polish. The study aims to identify the role of multilingual interaction and linguistic mediation in narrating this story of war and conflict on screen. Chris Wahl's (2005) characterisation and categorisation of polyglot films based on the role of multilingualism in character and plot development will serve as a reference point for discussing the functions of multilingualism in the movie. In doing so, the analysis will explore how each language is represented in the story, and, if applicable, how language representation is complementary to the portrayal of a character speaking a particular language. The second part of the article focuses on the identification of the purposes of translation, and more specifically diegetic interpreting, that is, "any act of (oral) interpreting which takes place within the story world through the agency of a character in the narrative" (O'Sullivan 2011, p. 80). This will facilitate the identification of any tacit connection between being multilingual and/or acting as an interpreter and having the upper hand in a particular situation. The article thus demonstrates how the conflict finds expression on the linguistic level in the film in conveying a character's engagement with the language that s/he uses as well as with the enemy on the battle zone.

Keywords: multilingualism, diegetic interpreting, multilingual film, Turkish cinema

ÖZET

Bu makalede Sadık Turan isimli bir Kırım Türkü'nün İkinci Dünya Savaşı sırasında savaş esiri olarak rehin alınmasının hikâyesini anlatan *Kırımlı* (2014) filmindeki çok dillilik ve çeviri temsilleri incelenmektedir. Cengiz Dağcı'nın 1956 tarihli *Korkunç Yıllar* adlı hatırat romanından uyarlanan film, Türkçe, Almanca, Rusça ve Lehçe dillerinin kullanıldığı çok dilli bir anlatım sunmaktadır. Çalışmanın amacı, çok dilli etkileşimin ve dilsel arabuluculuğun bu savaş ve çatışma öyküsünü beyazperdeye aktarmadaki rolünü belirlemektir. Chris Wahl'un (2005) çok dilli filmleri çok dilliliğin karakter veya hikâye gelişimi üzerindeki rolüne dayanarak tanımlaması ve sınıflandırması filmdeki çok dillilik işlevleri tartışılırken bir referans noktası olacaktır. Bunu yaparken, her dilin hikâyede nasıl temsil edildiği ve, uygulanabilen durumlarda, dil temsilinin belli bir dili konuşan bir karakterin betimlenişini ne şekilde tamamladığı film analiziyle araştırılacaktır. Makalenin ikinci bölümünde, çevirinin, ve özellikle de, "anlatıdaki bir karakterin kılıcı rolü aracılığıyla öykü dünyasının içinde gerçekleşen her türlü (sözlü) çeviri eylemi" (O'Sullivan, 2011, s. 80) olan anlatı-içi çevirisinin işlevlerini belirlemeye odaklanılmaktadır. Bu sayede, çok dilli olmak ve/ya bir çevirmen rolü oynamak ile belli bir durumda avantajlı bir pozisyonda olmak arasında örtük bir bağlantı olup olmadığı da belirlenebilecektir. Böylece, makalede, filmde bu çatışmanın dilsel düzlemde kendini nasıl ifade ettiği, bir karakterin çatışma alanında düşmanıyla olan ilişkisinin yanı sıra, kullandığı dil ile kurduğu ilişkinin yansıtılması üzerinden gösterilecektir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: çok dillilik, anlatı-içi çeviri, çok dilli film, Türk sineması

1. Introduction

The post-1990s cinema of Turkey has witnessed the emergence and rise of multilingual films which feature different forms of interlingual mediation and depict fictional translators and/or interpreters. While multilingualism has not been unique to any specific genre, it has particularly constituted a distinguishing aspect of the post-1990s historical period films which address the involvement of multiple countries as in the case of an occupation or a war. This article focuses on discussing the depictions of multilingualism and translation in Burak Cem Arlıel's *Crimean* (*Kırımlı*, 2014), which is deemed as the first film to be made on the Second World War in Turkish cinema. It aims to identify the functions of multilingual interaction and linguistic mediation in narrating this story of war and conflict on screen. Adapted from Cengiz Dağcı's 1956 memoir-novel entitled *Horrible Years* (*Korkunç Yıllar*), *Crimean* recounts the experiences of a Crimean Turk called Sadık Turan as a war prisoner of the Germans. The film, which is based on a true story, incorporates the use of several languages other than Turkish, such as Russian, German and Polish. Therefore, linguistic diversity and its by-product, translation, arguably play a constitutive role in the development of the characters and the presentation of the story therein. "Translation" is used here to encompass two related practices of "translation" and "interpreting" for convenience since the article both discusses the functions of the presence or absence of translation and analyses the portrayals of an interpreter in the film.

Chris Wahl's (2005) characterisation and categorisation of polyglot films based on the role of multilingualism in character and plot development will serve as a reference point for discussing the functions of multilingualism in *Crimean*. In doing so, the analysis will explore how each language is represented in the story, and, if applicable, how language representation is complementary to the portrayal of a character speaking

a particular language. This will facilitate the identification of any tacit connection between being multilingual and having the upper hand in a particular situation. The second part of the article focuses on the depictions of diegetic interpreting, that is, "any act of (oral) interpreting which takes place within the story world through the agency of a character in the narrative" (O'Sullivan, 2011, p. 80). It will explore how translation plays a role in the film's treatment of its subject matter. The article will, thus, demonstrate how the conflict finds expression on the linguistic level through multilingualism and translation in conveying a character's engagement with the language that s/he uses.

The article is divided into four sections. It first outlines the characteristics and functions of multilingualism and translation in film, being followed by a brief overview of the factors that facilitated the uses of linguistic diversity in Turkish cinema. This review will also allow for analysing the functions of multilingualism in the selected film, with a focus on the characterisation of speakers of different languages in the third section. In establishing the role of multilingualism in *Crimean*, the article will also note the presence or absence of code-switching, that is, "the alternation between two languages, dialects or language varieties" (Barnes, 2012, p. 247). Additionally, it will identify the forms and purposes of diegetic interpreting in this example of multilingual cinema. Finally, the conclusion will briefly summarise the findings of the analysis and suggest potential avenues for future research that could probe further into the representations of multilingualism and translation in Turkish cinema.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical Background: Multilingualism and Translation in Film

Multilingualism can be characterised as being "worded in different languages" (Delabastita and Grutman, 2005, p. 15). Dirk Delabastita and Rainier Grutman state that "multilingual texts were very much frowned upon back in the 1980s but are seen […] as a sign of the times in today's world" (2005, p. 11). Relatedly, the use of the term "multilingualism" was limited to written texts before the expansion of the concept into art forms such as cinema (Martinez-Sierra et al. 2010, p. 15). The number of multilingual films has increased since the 1980s and 1990s in association with economic motives, especially in terms of Hollywood films (Meylaerts and Şerban, 2014, p. 8).

Multiple terms are used to refer to the same phenomenon.[1] For instance, Chris Wahl (2005) utilises the term "polyglot" instead of "multilingual" by claiming that the former signifies the presence of more than one language and therefore includes bilingual films, whereas the latter requires the presence of three languages. However, Rainier Grutman dismisses any differentiation between "bilingual" and "multilingual" or between "polyglot" and "multilingual" by defining multilingualism as "the co-presence of two or more languages (in a society, text or individual)" (2009, p. 182). This study will follow suit and adopt Grutman's definition of "multilingual" since no attention is given

---

[1] Additionally, terms such as plurilingualism, heterolingualism and polylingualism are encountered as synonyms for multilingualism.

to the number of languages in the discussion of interlingual communication and mediation in *Crimean*.

The case of monolingual cinema has mostly been discussed with reference to Hollywood cinema. For instance, Ella Shohat and Robert Stam note that especially after World War II, everybody, from Madame Bovary to God, spoke in English in Hollywood films (2006, p. 107). Hollywood's policy was that "foreign characters would all speak in English with a thick accent, even to people of their own nationality" (Sanderson, 2010, p. 51). This unexceptional use of English by non-English characters in Hollywood films was interpreted as cultural colonisation by the West in general and of the film industry by Hollywood in particular. Drawing on the use of Tove-Skuttnabb Kangas' term "linguicide", Lukas Bleichenbacher (2012) discusses Hollywood films as examples of linguicist representation due to the use of English as the lingua franca.[2] Accordingly, a linguicist representation features "an absolute limitation […] of non-English dialogue altogether, as well as a distorted representation of code-switching or similar phenomena of multilingual discourse" (Bleichenbacher, 2012, p. 158).

On the other hand, the primary aim of multilingual films is "not to make the film more accessible to all audiences but to represent language diversity as its protagonists experience it" (Berger and Komori, 2010, p. 9). Contrasting multilingual cinema with Hollywood films, Wahl underlines that the former depicts the diversity of language use as opposed to the abolition of linguistic difference in the latter. However, Wahl also notes that not every film where different languages are heard on its acoustic level is a "genuine" polyglot. Accordingly, in "genuine" polyglot films, languages are used in the way they would be used in reality. In other words, they are "marked by the naturalistic presence of two or more languages at the level of dialogue and narrative" (Dwyer, 2005, p. 296). Therefore, polyglot films are "anti-illusionist in the sense that they do not try to hide the diversity of human life behind the mask of a universal language" (Wahl, 2005). In Tessa Dwyer's view, "genuine" polyglot films "script language contact into their narrative, dialogue and setting" (2005, p. 307).

Further, they "celebrate the multiplicity of languages by making (mis)translation and miscommunication central to the film's rationale" (Dwyer, 2005, p. 307). Therefore, in these films, multilingualism is included not only to represent authenticity but also to contribute to the plot and character development. For instance, multilingual interactions in cinema can be deployed here as a means for exerting power and (re)negotiating interpersonal hierarchies (King, 2011, p. 162). Relatedly, the decision to incorporate multiple languages in a "genuine" polyglot film may also constitute "a strategy for a critical assessment of linguistic and social hierarchies" (Smith, 2010, pp. 37-38). Codeswitching may be deployed as a device for exerting authority over one another or restructuring asymmetrical relations (see Smith, 2010; King, 2015; Barnes, 2012). Addi-

---

[2] Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, one of the proponents of the theoretical foundations of linguistic human rights, uses the term "linguicide" to refer to "the deliberate extermination of a language" in a given context (see Skutnabb-Kangas, 2006).

tionally, the absence of code-switching can also be revealing, especially when it is coupled with the lack of diegetic interpreting and linguistic prejudice, as will be delineated below in the analysis of *Crimean*.

In contrast, multilingualism carries a minor role rather than a pivotal one in films that are not "genuine" polyglot films. It is included only for "postcarding", in Wahl's (2005) terms. In other words, foreign dialogue is used "merely as ornament, to mark location or nationality" (O'Sullivan, 2011, p. 84). In a similar manner to the examples which (re)produce the monolingualist mindset, these multilingual films can be labelled as illusionist in that they provide an inauthentic representation of the linguistic diversity present in real life. Therefore, multilingualism fails here to reveal the tension between the speakers of different languages or to challenge the "dominant" status of the majority language in a film.

While multilingualism evokes the presence of two or more languages, translation takes place "within and in between multilingual entities" (Meylaerts, 2010, p. 227). In most cases, extra- or intra-diegetic interpreting techniques accompany multilingual interactions in a film. While subtitling, dubbing and voiceover constitute examples of extra-diegetic interpreting techniques, which are placed onto the narrative, intra-diegetic interpreting techniques are "forms of translation contained within the narrative structure of the film" (Cronin, 2009, p. 116). While it may be performed by a professional interpreter, diegetic interpreting may also be provided by a character, who happens to mediate thanks to her/his presence in the environment and knowledge of the languages involved (O'Sullivan, 2008, p. 83). Additionally, diegetic interpreting can take place in the form of self-translation when a character translates her/his own words for another person in the environment (Martinez-Sierra et al., 2010, p. 22).

In terms of the variety of terminology that appears in the literature, some scholars use "filmic language-helper" and "linguistic go-between" to refer in general terms to these characters that mediate between the speakers of different languages (Chiaro, 2016, p. 25). Some others opt for more specific terms to reflect the backgrounds and characteristics of these diegetic interpreters. For instance, Giuseppe de Bonis uses "non-professional interpreter" and "lay interpreter" as interchangeable terms to highlight a character's lack of experience and training in interpreting (2016, p. 44). Delia Chiaro also deploys the term "fortuitous interpreter" to note the element of coincidence in situations where some characters happen to act as interpreters on screen (2016, p. 26). In contrast, liaison interpreting is utilised to indicate that the "interpreter" character has a professional background in translation (De Higes-Andino, 2014, p. 222). This instance of interpreting differs from conference interpreting in two respects. It is, first, two-way in that "the interpreter works from and into both languages", and, second, consecutive in that "the interpreter waits for the speaker to finish before speaking" (O'Sullivan, 2011, p. 81). The analysis in the present study will use the terms that de Bonis and Chiaro deploy in their works since the character who appears as an interpreter in the selected film is non-professional.

In terms of its diegetic functions, the scholarship notes that translation and interpreting may be deployed to slow down the pace of the story and thus increase suspense

(De Bonis, 2016, p. 56). Relatedly, diegetic interpreting may be employed to manipulate the viewer's curiosity and create mystery (Delabastita, 2009, p. 109). Additionally, directors may treat the socio-political potential of translational actions by addressing the "themes of movement such as migration, flight, displacement, wandering, restlessness or uprooting in film" (Kaindl, 2014, p. 4). Fictional representations of translators and interpreters in a film are therefore likely to tap into the intricacies of operating between languages and cultures against the backdrop of political, religious and/or ethnic conflict. Likewise, the questions of power and treachery may also come to the fore in depicting the multiple faces of the interpreter in times of war and conflict as a misinformer, manipulative language teacher, intercultural mediator and traitor (Takeda, 2014). The analysis below will note to what extent these traits are featured in the portrayals of the character performing linguistic mediation in the context of the Second World War. However, before proceeding any further, the following section will provide a brief insight into the overall approach to language representation in Turkish cinema.

2.2 Historical Background: Multilingualism in Turkish Cinema

Yeşilçam cinema, which dominated the traditional film sector in Turkey until the 1980s, represented the popular type of filmmaking similar to Hollywood cinema. Yeşilçam, which means "green pine" in Turkish, used to refer to the name of a street in Istanbul that housed offices of film producers. The films that were produced in the golden years of Yeşilçam cinema lacked depth and full-blown characters. The stories largely rested on the stereotypical "boy meets girl" narrative (Erdoğan, 1998, p. 265). Typical motifs included the dissolution of a family or separation of a couple, which was perpetuated by false accusations, misunderstandings, and infidelity, revenge, honour or class differences (Dönmez-Colin, 2008, p. 30). Serendipitous events played a crucial role in the resolution of the protagonists' struggles and obstacles in life.

In terms of its approach to linguistic diversity, Yeşilçam cinema was also similar to Hollywood films in terms of the prevalence of a homogenising tendency to disregard any differences based on language and ethnicity. Accordingly, "the universal language myth to which both Wahl and Dwyer alluded was adopted in the pre-1980s period" (Kıran 2016, p. 142). The official language prevailed in the language of cinema, and dubbing constituted a mainstream practice in the country's film sector during this period (Arslan 2011, p. 22). Therefore, the "assertion of the supremacy of the national language and its unchallenged political, economic and cultural power within the nation's boundaries" characterised Yeşilçam cinema through the dubbing practice (Danan, 1991, p. 612). Accented Turkish was spoken only by characters who were implied to be non-Turkish, to create a comic effect or by Turkish ones to point to their rural background (Dönmez-Colin 2008, p. 42). However, the post-mid-1990s witnessed a break from the monolingual(ist) conventions of Yeşilçam cinema in that the uses of multilingualism and translation emerged as a distinguishing aspect of the film productions.[3]

---

[3] Film scholars and critics also acknowledged this novelty in Turkish cinema as a shift from a monolingual and homogenising film production into one perceptive to linguistic and ethnic differences (see Dönmez-Colin, 2008; Suner, 2010; Arslan, 2011; Onaran and Yücel, 2011).

Several factors facilitated this novelty in Turkish cinema. For instance, Turkey joined Eurimages in 1990, the film funding scheme of the Council of Europe that was founded in 1989 (Göktürk, 2002, p. 205). In addition to the Ministry of Culture, Eurimages thus became a major sponsor of the film projects during the 1990s. In parallel to this development, the post-mid-1990s witnessed an increase in the number of multilingual films co-produced and co-financed with European producers from different countries such as France, Germany and the Netherlands. Some examples include Kutluğ Ataman's *Lola and Billy the Kid* (*Lola + Bilidikid*, 1999), a Turkish-German co-production, and Yeşim Ustaoğlu's *Journey to the Sun* (*Güneşe Yolculuk*, 1999), a Turkish-German-Dutch co-production. Relatedly, the emergence of film directors of Turkish origin who live and produce in Europe also contributed to a rise in these co-productions. For instance, Fatih Akın and Ferzan Özpetek based in Germany and Italy, respectively, produced films that revolved around the themes of journey and border crossing. Turkish was occasionally incorporated into their films through Turkish migrant characters or Turkish songs heard in the background.

Crucially, the use of multilingualism and translation is not unique to one specific genre in Turkish cinema but ranges across different genres from period films, to comedy films, to war films. For instance, in some cases, multilingualism is deployed to exhibit the ethnic and linguistic diversity of the populace only for the reasons of authenticity and representational concerns. To illustrate the point, historical period films such as Mustafa Şevki Doğan's *The Last Ottoman: Knockout Ali* (*Son Osmanlı Yandım Ali*, 2007) and Russell Crowe's *The Water Diviner* (*Son Umut*, 2014) incorporate multilingualism to highlight the multi-ethnic and multi-cultural encounters against the background of war and conflict. In other cases, linguistic diversity emerges as an indispensable aspect of international co-productions which shed light on historical incidents representative of diplomatic relations between Turkey and other countries. For instance, Mitsutoshi Tanaka's *125 Years Memory* (*Ertuğrul 1890*, 2015) depicts the two historical incidents that deepened the friendship between Turkey and Japan. Likewise, Can Ulkay's *Ayla: The Daughter of War* (*Ayla*, 2017), based on a true story, portrays the development of a strong bond between a Turkish soldier and a little Korean girl whose parents are killed during an attack in the Korean War.

Additionally, the uses of multilingualism and translation can serve as a tool of humour in some post-1990s films of Turkey. The language barrier and lack of linguistic mediation are highlighted in these films to create a comic effect through the instances of misunderstanding and miscommunication between the speakers of different languages. For example, Can Ulkay's *Turkish Ice Cream* (*Türk İşi Dondurma*, 2019), which is mainly a historical war film, rests on their characters' lack of English and difficulties or failures of translation to create humorous situations in the presence of tension and conflict. Unlike this example in which multilingual humour takes on an ancillary function in the dramatic story, Sermiyan Midyat depends on the elements of intercultural miscommunication and cultural stereotyping in his comedy films such as *Ay Lav Yu* (2010) and *Ay Lav Yu Tuu* (2017). The use of multilingualism as an instrument of humour is even brought to the fore in these films' titles.

This brief overview provides a glimpse of the different categories of films which are not necessarily "genuine" polyglot films, in Wahl's terms, but feature linguistic diversity and related themes in varying degrees. Such a wide-ranging list of examples arguably testifies to the growing interest in the representative potential of multilingualism as a narrative device in Turkish cinema. As Michael Cronin notes, the thematisation of translation in such multilingual films provides a significant resource that can be used to initiate discussions about several topics, pertinent to the practice and theorisation of translation, such as fidelity versus infidelity, domestication versus foreignisation, and visibility versus invisibility (2009b, p. xi). In a similar vein, the following inquiry will discuss the thematic aspects of multilingualism and translation in *Crimean* in consideration of the film's genre as a historical war drama.

3. The Depictions of Multilingualism and Translation in *Crimean* (2014)

Based on a true story, *Crimean* portrays the transformation of Sadık Turan from being a war prisoner into a soldier fighting for the Nazi army. To provide a summary of the film's story, it starts with a flashback into Sadık's childhood when the Russian soldiers take control of his hometown and order everyone to learn Russian. The scene subsequently cuts to Sadık's adulthood where he is seen wearing a Nazi uniform and speaking German at a train station where he meets Maria, a Polish woman who feigns being German. Sadık tells her throughout their journey how a Crimean Turk like himself ended up fighting along with the Nazis against the Russians. The first half of the film thus narrates that he is first taken as a prisoner by the Germans and then assigned as an interpreter and orderly for the Lieutenant thanks to his multilingualism. After gaining the trust of his superiors, Sadık is offered to lead a unit made up of Muslim soldiers such as Turkmens and Crimean Turks against the Russians. In return, this alliance would result in an independent state of Crimea, which is later found out to be baseless. Sadık and his friends' struggle for their homeland ends with their tragic defeat and death.

As Ella Shohat and Robert Stam (2006) point, language and power "intersect not only in obvious conflicts concerning official tongues but also wherever the question of language difference becomes involved with asymmetrical political arrangements" (p. 127). This dimension of how power is exercised in relation to multilingualism and translation in *Crimean* is identified in the imposition of Russian at the expense of a minority language such as Crimean Turkish at the start of the film. Specifically, the opening sequence touches on the Russian acquisition of an unnamed Crimean town and its repercussions on the identity of Crimean Turks such as Sadık Turan and his family living therein. The Russian soldiers storm into the classroom and begin to distribute the booklets in Cyrillic script, forbidding the use of Turkish. After hanging their alphabet on the blackboard, their leader says, "You will learn the Cyrillic alphabet from now on."

Despite triggering fear and terror in other students as well as the teacher, the Russian soldiers face the young Sadık's defiance in Turkish against their imposition of the Russian language. The child asserts himself by saying that he is not a Russian but a Crimean (Turk) and he is not scared of them. One of the soldiers whispers the translation of Sadık's words from Turkish into Russian into the ear of the group's leader. Therefore,

the act of translation is rendered visible but inaudible in this particular scene. The fact that whispered interpreting takes place here is indirectly made clear when the recipient of translation takes Sadık by the arm to the window to show the extent of destruction outside in his hometown, adding: "Are you still unafraid of us?"

This opening sequence is crucial in three respects. First, this multilingual interaction enables the film to highlight its awareness of the linguicidal practices involved in the aftermath of the Russian annexation. Second, it provides an insight into a childhood trauma essential to Sadık's character development, which involves the suppression of his mother tongue. The film thereby informs the viewer how the protagonist realised the significance of learning to speak the enemy's language from an early age. Third, and relatedly, this flashback exhibits the origins of Sadık's engagement with the Russian language itself as a polyglot who can also speak Turkish and German. It is also made clear here that the conflict will be narrated from the perspective of this character who suffered from being a minority in a multilingual context. Consequently, the sequence sets the framework for discussing language representation and translation in the film.

3.1 Language Choice and Representation of Turkish vs German

In identifying the functions of multilingualism in *Crimean*, language choice serves as a tool through which to ascribe a character to both a specific language and the speakers of that language. Accordingly, the characterisation of one language may be defined based on the positioning of the other language as the language of the oppressor or the oppressed in the context of a conflict. Given the perspective from which the story is told, Turkish and German stand out as the two languages that attain meanings in relation to one another through language choice in *Crimean*. The conversations between two polyglots, Sadık and Maria, are particularly worth discussing here in terms of the unexceptional use of Turkish as their preferred language of choice.

Maria is introduced to the viewer at the train station where the Nazi soldiers are seen conducting identity checks and asking questions about her passport. They doubt the authenticity of her passport, noting that she speaks German with a Polish accent. As the soldiers prepare to detain Maria, Sadık comes to her rescue, telling the troops on duty that he knows her. This scene illustrates the discriminatory practices of Nazi Germany to identify potential enemies based on their accents. Considered together with the suppression of Crimean Turkish by the Russians, the film thus continues to highlight that the war also operates on the level of language.

This is also linked to the language choice between Sadık and Maria, which gives away information about the film's deployment of linguistic diversity in the context of an ongoing conflict. After getting aboard the train, Maria initially questions Sadık's motivation for saving her from detention. After finding out, to her surprise, that he is a Crimean Turk, Maria switches from German to accented Turkish, a language which she learned during her six-year stay in Istanbul. Thereafter, Sadık begins to recount in Turkish how he ended up fighting along with the Nazis. The viewer does not ever again hear either of the two speaking German when talking to one another.

Any miscommunication or misunderstanding is conspicuous by its absence in the interaction between Maria and Sadık. On the contrary, a sense of trust and connection is conveyed to the viewer from the moment when their language of communication is switched to Turkish. As they are united in their sense of not belonging to the German language, Turkish is positioned as a language in which they can take shelter. As opposed to the German language which they use as an outsider in disguising their ethnic identity or real intentions, Turkish proves the one in which they feel free to share secrets and open up their hearts to one another. In parallel, it can be argued that any instance of code-switching is deliberately omitted as a manifestation of the absence of a power struggle or conflict of interest between the two.

This aspect of the film can be considered as being complementary to the total absence of any need for linguistic mediation between Maria and Sadık. Michael Cronin notes that "the symbolic as opposed to the informational function of language" comes to the fore as a dimension specific to minority languages in translation (Cronin, 2009a, p. 171). In this case, translation serves beyond making communication possible and is undertaken to establish identity or enact a form of resistance against the dominant status of the majority language (Cronin, 2009a, p. 171). Relatedly, the presence/absence, as well as the direction of translation in a film, may provide us with insights into how languages relate to one another in a multilingual communication (Lee, 2012, p. 445). When considered in terms of the language choice and multilingual exchanges in *Crimean*, it is essential to note that the absence of translation is accompanied by the lack of linguistic prejudice between Maria and Sadık. Therefore, it can be argued that the omission is linked to the film's conception of translation exclusively as an act of mediation between two conflicting parties. This also coincides with the fact that, while highlighting multilingualism as an asset, the director accentuates the perception of language difference as an obstacle and speakers of minority languages as a threat on the part of the Russians and Germans.

As opposed to the representation of the Turkish language as a "shelter" language, German is exclusively heard being spoken by the Nazi characters or those serving them. The depiction of the German-speaking characters, such as Bauer and the Lieutenant, signifies tension and oppression for the captives in the camp. Denigration and disgust mark the behaviour of the Nazi soldiers toward anyone who is not a German and/or speaks accented German. Calling Sadık the "Russian garbage" and "Russian pig", Bauer reminds him of the fact that he is a Turk even when allying with the Germans. He further adds that Sadık must feel lucky for wearing a German uniform. Likewise, the Lieutenant reveals the rationale to his wife for asking for the alliance of Sadık and other Turkmens: "What matters is to ensure the continuation of the German race." Therefore, the German-speaking characters largely trigger a sense of distrust and antagonism in the characters speaking other languages such as Turkish and Polish.

Given that the story is, albeit fictional, a re-enactment of the past, *Crimean* can be described as a multilingual historical film. It falls beyond the scope of this study to discuss the film's loyalty to historical accuracy. Yet, the representation of language use

in multilingual contexts can be treated as a marker in assessing a film's concern for authenticity. Accordingly, *Crimean* features an authentic depiction of multilingualism in that the characters speak the language used as it would be expected in a real situation. Moreover, language choice and representation in the film manifests that "language functions not only as a vessel of meaning but as a socially loaded and complex tool which is far from neutral" (King, 2014, p. 78). Therefore, the film constitutes a "genuine" polyglot film in terms of the role of language choice and representation in the narration of the story and the development of the characters therein.

3.2 The Power of a Prisoner-of-War as an Interpreter

The significance of reliability for successful communication is intertwined with the translator's or interpreter's power that can be used or abused for different purposes. Gemma King indicates that a fictional interpreter is mostly portrayed as "a figure equipped with the potential for wielding power" (2014, p. 79). These characters, especially those in a position of submission or oppression, exploit their multilingualism to exert authority or manipulate others to renegotiate hierarchical relations (King, 2017, p. 6). These questions of trust and use of linguistic power also come to the fore in the depiction of diegetic interpreting in *Crimean,* which addresses a hierarchical and antagonistic relationship between Turkish and German characters.

More specifically, Sadık finds himself acting as a fortuitous interpreter, in Chiaro's (2016) terms, right after being captured as a prisoner of war and taken to the camp. The Lieutenant orders all the captives to get off the truck and run to the camp's entrance. Anyone who falls behind due to the shortness of breath or hunger while running is killed on the way. The Nazi soldiers, pointing at the captives with guns, order them to run and add that "it is forbidden to eat the cabbages along the wayside." Sadık takes on the self-assigned task of translating the soldiers' orders from German into Russian for those who do not understand German to warn them against being shot to death. Therefore, language and power relations are incorporated into the story as an element of suspense, as multilingual interactions take place against the background of war violence in *Crimean*. Likewise, diegetic interpreting takes on a vital function in saving the captives' lives, since any misunderstanding or failure to understand the rules and orders may easily result in their death.

In another instance, Sadık comes forward to stop Bauer from beating up Halil, another Crimean prisoner like himself, when he fails to follow the order. Sadık intervenes by saying in German: "He does not understand you. Nobody here understands you." Although this bold move initially results in Sadık getting a punishment, interpreting later serves as a stepping stone for him to gain a more advantageous position than other prisoners. After deliberately refusing to obey an order, the protagonist faces the risk of being shot in the head by Bauer. However, right before that, Sadık takes up the courage to explain in detail (and in fluent German) why one bullet would suffice to kill him from that short distance with the particular gun in Bauer's hand. His knowledge of German, in addition to Russian, enables him to demonstrate his militaristic expertise and convince the Nazi Lieutenant that he is a competent soldier and hence can be of great use

to them. It also leads on the Lieutenant to think that this polyglot captive can act as a mediator between them and other prisoners if needed. On the one hand, this hints at the instrumentalisation of interpreting on the part of the occupying or warring powers such as the Russians and Germans. On the other hand, multilingualism allows Sadık not only to escape execution but also to become the orderly of the Lieutenant.

Studying the translation of multilingual films is beyond the scope of this article. However, it is essential to note here that the presence of extra-diegetic translation may inform the function of diegetic interpreting in a film. Especially in the case of a multilingual film like *Crimean*, the use of subtitling reminds viewers of the multilingual nature of characters and does justice to the authentic representation of linguistic diversity. As Cronin underscores, the subtitles "confer a form of reflexive awareness on spectators as they see how interpreters or language mediators have to negotiate exchanges between languages" (Cronin, 2009b, p. 107). In the selected film, the presence of Turkish subtitles renders visible the manipulative use of linguistic power at the discretion of the mediator in the context of the war.

Specifically, the interpreter's agency manifests itself in the cases when Sadık resorts to the strategy of avoidance in his translation from German into Russian and Turkish. For instance, Bauer asks Sadık about the total number of captives in his cell. He then orders them to draw a proper circle with white lime and dig a pit hole large enough to put all of their bodies inside. After Sadık draws the circle, Bauer asks him to finish the work with the help of others. Sadık translates it from German into Russian in reported speech ("He asks us to dig a deep pit here"). However, when another Crimean Turk approaches him to ask why they need such a big pit hole, Sadık lies by saying that Bauer did not give any information about it. He decides that they may find it upsetting to know the intended purpose of the pit.

In depicting Sadık as an interpreter in that tense situation, the film recognises the ambivalent character of his identity as "subordinate and powerful, faithful and dubious, oppressed and uncontrollable" (King, 2017, p. 9). Indeed, considering Bauer's lack of empathy for any of these prisoners, Sadık's choice not to translate disturbing information serves two more purposes. First, it prevents Bauer from achieving the desired effect with his blatant directness. Second, it elucidates that Sadık has the room to manoeuvre around the restraints involved in his intermediary position because neither Bauer nor other Nazi soldiers are able to examine or verify Sadık's translations due to their monolingualism.

Relatedly, the film also highlights that speaking the enemy's language gives Sadık the upper hand that his fellow friends do not have. For instance, Sadık takes advantage of his position as an orderly to steal from the Lieutenant's lunch after collecting the tray from his house. He, in turn, uses the snacks to negotiate a deal with the medic and save a friend from the medical unit where the sick and wounded captives are left for dead. Additionally, thanks to his position as an orderly, Sadık is informed about the opportunity to get out of the camp with his Crimean friends for joining the unit of Turkmen soldiers to fight for an independent Crimea against the Russians. Therefore, while not attempting to establish authority at the expense of any other captives, the protagonist

largely wields his power in favour of the prisoners of the same ethnicity. Overall, the characterisation of Sadık as an interpreter is informed by his professional and ethnic identity as a Crimean soldier with a strong sense of longing for a homeland, coupled with the deep-seated feelings of resentment, exclusion and oppression.

4. Conclusion

This study has situated the deployment of linguistic diversity and diegetic translation in *Crimean* in the context of the changes that informed the film production in Turkey since the mid-1990s. In doing so, it has also provided an insight into the factors which facilitated the emergence of multilingual productions in Turkish cinema as well as the range of films that incorporated linguistic diversity into their narratives. Subsequently, the analysis has demonstrated that the selected film's utilisation of multilingualism exhibits an effort to adhere to a realistic depiction of language practices in multilingual encounters. It has also shown that multilingualism is included not only to represent authenticity but also to contribute to the plot and character development as linguistic prejudice and conflict come to the fore in the interactions between the Russians, Germans and Crimean Turks. Therefore, the film deploys multilingualism and translation as an instrument to highlight linguistic and social hierarchies, and thereby constitutes a "genuine" polyglot film in Wahl's (2005) terms.

More specifically, the analysis has drawn attention to the time and place in which the story took place because the context (both temporal and spatial) plays a defining role in the film's presentation of translation as an act of facilitating communication between the parties that are in an asymmetrical and hierarchical relationship with one another. Relatedly, multilingualism serves to accentuate the tension between the groups with different interests and reflect their lack of trust and sympathy towards one another in the context of the war. In parallel, the discussion has shown that the interplay between language and power in the film manifests itself in the characterisation of the interpreter as a polyglot soldier who speaks the enemy's language and uses it to the advantage of his own people, that is, the Crimean Turks, in precarious situations.

As is also noted in the survey of the literature on multilingualism and translation in film, the studies on the role of diegetic interpreting are relatively fewer, in comparison with the research on extra-diegetic translation in the field of audio-visual translation. Nevertheless, existing scholarship, though still emerging, has provided significant observations for the analysis in this article. The significance of this area of inquiry lies in that the fictionalised representations of translators and interpreters can be treated as a source that offers insights into the predominant perception and conception of translation in a specific context. When considered from that angle, this article represents an attempt to examine the thematisation of translation in Turkish cinema. Further research on the films of the same category, that is, historical war films, can facilitate the identification of similarities and differences in the role of multilingualism and translation in these narratives. Given the increasing number of multilingual productions in Turkish cinema, more studies on such films of different genres can be carried out with a focus on this novel aspect of the national cinema from a translational perspective. These inquiries

may provide potential avenues for future research in exploring the translation of these multilingual films and the interaction between diegetic interpreting and extra-diegetic translation.

References

Arlıel, B. C. (Director). (2014). *Crimean* (*Kırımlı*) [Film]. TFT Production.

Arslan, S. (2011). *Cinema in Turkey: A new critical history*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ataman, K. (Director). (1999). *Lola + Bilidikid* (*Lola and Billy the Kid*) [Film]. Boje Buck Produktion, Westdeutscher Rundfunk (WDR), Witch, and Zero Film GmbH.

Barnes, L. (2012). The role of code-switching in the creation of an outsider identity in the bilingual film. *Communicatio: South African Journal for Communication Theory and Research*, *38*(3), 247-260.

Berger, V., Komori, M. (2010). Introduction. In Verena Berger and Miya Komori (Eds.), *Polyglot cinema: Migration and transcultural narration in France, Italy, Portugal and Spain* (pp. 7-12), Berlin: LIT Verlag Münster.

Bleichenbacher, L. (2012). Linguicism in Hollywood movies? Representations of, and audience reactions to multilingualism in mainstream movie dialogues. *Multilingua*, *31*(2-3), 155–176.

Chiaro, D. (2016). Mimesis, reality and fictitious intermediation. In Rachele Antonini and Chiara Bucaria (Eds.), *Non-Professional Interpreting and Translation in the Media* (pp. 23-42). Bern: Peter Lang.

Cronin, M. (2009a). Minority. In Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha (Eds.), *The Routledge encyclopaedia of translation studies* 2nd edition (pp. 169-172), London: Routledge.

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

Crowe, R. (Director). (2014). *The Water Diviner* (*Son Umut*) [Film]. Fear of God Films, Hopscotch Features, RatPac Entertainment, Seven Group Holdings, and Seven West Media.

Dağcı, C. (1956). *Korkunç yıllar* (*Horrible Years*). Istanbul: Varlık Yayınları.

Danan, M. (1991). Dubbing as an expression of nationalism. *Meta: Journal des traducteurs*, *36*(4), 606–614.

De Bonis, G. (2016). Mediating intercultural encounters on screen. The representation of non-professional interpreting in film. In Rachele Antonini and Chiara Bucaria (Eds.), *Non-Professional Interpreting and Translation in the Media* (pp. 43-64), Bern: Peter Lang.

De Higes-Andino, I. (2014). The translation of multilingual films: modes, strategies, constraints and manipulation in the Spanish translations of *It's a Free World. Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series- Themes in Translation Studies*, *13*, 211–231.

Delabastita, D., Grutman, R. (2005). Fictional representations of multilingualism and translation. *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series–Themes in Translation Studies*, *4*, 11-34.

Delabastita, D. (2009). Fictional representations. In Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha (Eds.), *The Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies* (pp. 109-112), London: Routledge.

Doğan, M. Ş. (Director). (2007) *The Last Ottoman: Knockout Ali* (*Son Osmanlı Yandım Ali*) [Film]. Özen Film.

Dönmez-Colin, G. (2008). *Turkish cinema: Identity, distance and belonging*. London: Reaktion Books.

Dwyer, T. (2005). Universally speaking: Lost in translation and polyglot cinema. *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series – Themes in Translation Studies*, *4*, 295-310.

Erdoğan, N. (1998). Narratives of resistance: national identity and ambivalence in the Turkish melodrama between 1965 and 1975. *Screen*, *39*(3), 259-271.

Göktürk, D. (2002). Anyone at home? Itinerant identities in European cinema of the 1990s. *Framework: The Journal of Cinema and Media*, *43*(2), 201–212.

Grutman, R. (2009). Multilingualism. In Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha (Eds.) *The Routledge encyclopaedia of translation studies* (pp. 182-185), London and New York: Routledge.

Kaindl, K. (2014). Going fictional! Translators and interpreters in literature and film. In Klaus Kaindl and Karlheinz Spitzl (Eds.), *Transfiction: Research into the realities of translation fiction* (pp. 1-26), Amsterdam /Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Kaindl, K. (2016). Fictional representations of translators and interpreters. In Claudia V. Angelelli and Brian James Baer (Eds.), *Researching translation and interpreting* (pp. 71-82), New York: Routledge.

Kıran, A. (2016). Rendering visible or blurring the boundaries: presence or absence of subtitles in the multilingual post-1990s films of Turkey. In Grzegorz Moroz and Jacek Partyka (Eds.), *Representing and (de)constructing borderlands* (pp. 137-147), Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

King, G. (2014). The power of the treacherous interpreter: multilingualism in Jacques Audiard's *Un prophète*. *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series- Themes in Translation Studies*, *13*, 78-92.

King, G. (2015). Code-switching as power strategy: multilingualism and the role of Arabic in Maïwenn's *Polisse* (2011). *Australian Journal of French Studies*, *52*(2), 162–173.

King, G. (2017). *Decentring France: Multilingualism and power in contemporary French cinema*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Lee, T. (2012). Translation and language power relations in heterolingual anthologies of literature. *Babel*, *58*(4), 443-456.

Martinez-Sierra, J., Martí-Ferriol, J. L., De Higes-Andino, I., Prats-Rodríguez, A. M. & Chaume, F. (2010). Linguistic diversity in Spanish immigration films: a translational approach. In Verena Berger and Miya Komori (Eds.), *Polyglot cinema: Migration and transcultural narration in France, Italy, Portugal and Spain* (pp. 15-29), Berlin: LIT Verlag Münster.

Meylaerts, R. (2010). Multilingualism and translation. In Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* (pp. 227-230), Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Meylaerts, R., Şerban, A. (2014). Introduction: Multilingualism at the cinema and on stage: a translation perspective. *Linguistica Antverpiensia – New Series*, *13*, 1–13.

Midyat, S. (Director). (2010). *I Love You* (*Ay Lav Yu*) [Film]. Plato Film Production.

Midyat, S. (Director). (2017). *I Love You Too* (*Ay Lav Yu Tuu*) [Film]. Bird House Productions, IFP Istanbul Film Productions, TAFF Pictures, and TIMS International.

Onaran, G., Yücel, F. (2011). Introduction. In Gözde Onaran and Fırat Yücel (Eds.), *Cinema Turkey: new times, new tendencies* (pp. 4-5), Altyazı Project Office: Istanbul.

O'Sullivan, C. (2008). Multilingualism at the multiplex: a new audience for screen translation?. *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series–Themes in Translation Studies*, *6*, 81-95.

Sanderson, John D. (2010). The other you. Translating the Hispanic for the Spanish screen. In Verena Berger and Miya Komori (Eds.), *Polyglot cinema: Migration and transcultural narration in France, Italy, Portugal and Spain* (pp. 49-71), Berlin: LIT Verlag Münster.

Shohat, E., Stam, R. (2006). Cinema after Babel: language, difference, power. In Ella Shohat (Ed.), *Taboo memories, diasporic voices* (pp. 106-137), Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2006). Language policy and linguistic human rights. In Thomas Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 273-291), Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Smith, A. (2010). All quiet on the filmic front? Codeswitching and the representation of multilingual Europe in *La Grande Illusion* (Jean Renoir, 1937) and *Joyeux Noel* (Christian Carion, 2005). *Journal of Romance Studies*, *10*(2), 37-52.

Suner, A. (2010). *New Turkish Cinema*. New York: I.B. Tauris & Co.

Takeda, K. (2014). The interpreter as traitor: multilingualism in *Guizi lai le* (*Devils on the doorstep*). *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series-Themes in Translation Studies*, *13*, 93–111.

Tanaka, M. (Director). (2015). *125 Years Memory* (*Ertuğrul 1890*) [Film]. Toei, Ministry of Culture and Tourism of the Republic of Turkey, Kinoshita Group, Toei Video, Dentsu, YTV, Creators' Union, Pia, Innovation Design, Noritsu Koki, The Yomiuri Shimbun, ABC, Mainichi Newspapers, BS Fuji, MX Entertainment, and the Kita Nippon Shinbun.

Ulkay, C. (Director). (2017). *Ayla: The Daughter of War* (*Ayla*) [Film]. Dijital Sanatlar Production.

Ulkay, C. (Director). (2019). *Turkish Ice Cream* (*Türk İşi Dondurma*) [Film]. Dijital Sanatlar Production.

Ustaoğlu, Y. (Director). (1999). *Journey to the Sun* (*Güneşe Yolculuk*) [Film]. IFR, Celluloid Dreams, Medias Res Filmproduction, The Film Company, and ZDF/ARTE.

Wahl, C. (2005). Discovering a genre: the polyglot film. *Cinemascope 1 – Independent Film Journal*. Retrieved 15 July 2013 from http://www.madadayo.it/Cinemascope_archive/cinema-scope.net/articolo07_n1.html.