The Impact of Multilingualism on the Narrative Construction of Quentin Tarantino's Inglourious Basterds

Auteur : Martens, Matthieu
Promoteur(s) : Hamers, Jérémy
Faculté : Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres
Diplôme : Master en communication multilingue, à finalité spécialisée en communication économique et sociale
Année académique : 2022-2023
URI/URL : http://hdl.handle.net/2268.2/19015

Université de Liège
Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres
Département Médias, Culture et Communication

The Impact of Multilingualism on the Narrative Construction of Quentin Tarantino's *Inglourious Basterds*

Mémoire présenté par Matthieu MARTENS

en vue de l'obtention du grade de Master en Communication Multilingue, à finalité économique et sociale

Année académique 2022 / 2023

Acknowledgments

I could not have undertaken this journey if Professor Jeremy Hamers had not inspired me during my master's degree. His lessons introduced me to the world of cinema studies, which awoke in me an interest in this field and pushed me to write a thesis on the topic under his supervision. I would also like to thank him for his feedback and patience.

I am particularly grateful to my parents. They have supported me throughout this thesis and encouraged me all the way albeit the numerous challenges that I have faced during these last years.

Lastly, I'd like to mention the friends who supported me and cheered me up when difficulties emerged. They helped me to maintain a motivated state when it was lacking through their presence and encouragement.

Table of contents

I. INTRODUCTION

The incorporation of multilingualism in movies has become a common device among many productions ranging from war films to dramas, comedies, fantasy, and science fiction. Notorious examples include films such as *Joyeux Noël* by Christian Carion, David Ayer's *Fury*, or Cédric Klapisch's *L'Auberge espagnole*, which incorporate multiple national languages in their dialogues. Besides these examples, we may also observe the use of fictional languages, such as in James Cameron's *Avatar* or Denis Villeneuve's *Arrival*. Although these two categories of movie differ in the type of languages that they depict, real and fictional, these productions do share one common trait; they acknowledge the existence and explore the potentialities of multilingualism for the construction of their narrative. Hence, languages are more than mere thematic issues. Simber Atay expresses how multilingualism affects audiovisual productions:

> multilingual movie represents now a particular aesthetic, a particular critical vision and a cosmopolite irony. Multilingualism is a perfect environment for film directors to create hyper- realist historical atmospheres, cultural chronotopes and briefly artistic aura, moreover it provides possibilities to make historical and political criticism. (142)

Atay claims that multilingualism enriches the cinematic industry. It becomes an integral part of plot development in films as much as it encourages the audience to endorse a critical view of history and politics.

Cinematographic works are complex objects, which can be approached from a variety of angles. Meylaerts and Serban state that "every film is a multisemiotic text, in which image, sound and speech interact dynamically to convey meaning" (Meylaerts & Serban 4). Likewise, multilingualism covers a broad research spectrum: "multilingualism represents a large multicompetence territory spreading within linguistics, philology, history, film studies, and cultural studies" (Simber Atay 140).

The study of multilingualism in fiction has already been developed by an array of scholars, who particularly focused on literature. Yet, works that focus on the relationship between multilingualism and plot of audiovisual productions are scarcer. Among them, we

can mention Lukas Bleichenbacher's work *Multilingualism in the Movies*, which merges film theory and linguistics in order to analyse issues linked to the integration of languages in films. Jane Hodson's *Dialect in Film and Literature* also sheds a light onto the use languages for narrative purposes and characterization. Other scholarly articles focus on specific films or categories of film: Alison Smith focuses on the role of multilingualism in *la Grande Illusion* and *Joyeux Noël*, while Giuseppe de Bonis studies *Le Concert*. However, works that essentially focus on the interaction between languages, dialogue, and the narrative construction of this film are rarer.

This thesis is hence an attempt at filling this gap and provides a modest contribution to the literature about the study of multilingualism and its role in the narrative construction. This paper aims at investigating their interaction within the multilingual film *Inglourious Basterds* by Quentin Tarantino, a quintessential example of the exploitation of multilingualism for narrative construction. The dialogue of *Inglourious Basterds* is riddled with instances of German, English and French, while also including Italian lines. In short, multilingualism is at the heart of this work; it provides a substantial amount of matter to analyse and constitutes therefore a relevant subject of study.

We will examine how the various potentialities of multilingualism are explored and scrutinize the effects on the narrative construction. We will try to answer Delabatista and Grutman's questions:

> How does the text linguistically orchestrate the various characters and narrative voices? . . . how and why is that done? What is the function or effect of all this? (16)

To answer this question, we will develop an analysis about the relationship between multilingualism and the components of the film's narrative by targeting the main vehicle of multilingualism within audiovisual works: the dialogue. We will outline how national languages are represented, how they interact, hence unveiling their role while connecting them to the various components of the film's narrative construction. We will therefore be approaching the film from a communicational perspective, drawing concepts from both the fields of linguistics and narratology.

The work is divided into four chapters, which include this preliminary introduction. The second chapter will provide a summary of the film, thus briefly introducing the plot which will be detailed in the analytical part. The third chapter will elaborate on the various concepts that may prove useful during the analysis, thus providing an theoretical framework and reminding the reader of various relevant principles that pertain to languages and cinema that may prove useful. Then, we will analyse various scenes of the film under the scope of selected themes developed in the theoretical section. Finally, the conclusion will summarise our findings, comment on the research process, and delineate the limitations and recommendations for future works.

II. FILM SUMMARY

Inglourious Basterds is a war film written and directed by Quentin Tarantino, released in 2009. It stages a fictional plot that eventually leads to an alternative ending to the Second World War in which Hitler and his high command die during an attack. The film follows two parallel timelines, which eventually collide at the end of the film.

On the one hand, Shosanna Dreyfus is a Jewish girl who hides from the Nazis by passing for Emmanuelle Mimieux, the owner of a cinema called the Gamaar. When she was younger, a Nazi colonel called Hans Landa murdered her family, but she escaped. Years later, she meets private Fredrick Zoller, a German soldier who became the star of a German film called *The Nation's Pride* after his exploits on the war front, directed by Minister Joseph Goebbels. As the private becomes infatuated with the girl, he will successfully convince Minister Goebbels to change the venue of the premiere of his future film to Shosanna's cinema. Many Germans will attend the premiere among which colonel Hans Landa. Hence, Shosanna will plot to burn down her cinema with all the Germans trapped inside thanks to her lover, Marcel.

In parallel to Shosanna Dreyfus's plot, the film follows the story of the Basterds. The Basterds is an outfit of American soldiers led by Lieutenant Aldo Raine whose purpose is to disrupt Nazi activities on the French territory to prepare the allied landing. The outfit is composed of soldiers of Jewish origin, who seek revenge on Hitler. While their main strategy of guerrilla warfare proves to be efficient, they take part in a plot organised by the OSS, which aims at bombing the premiere of *The Nation's Pride*, thus killing as many members of the German high command as possible, potentially leading to the end of the war.

Eventually, both Shosanna and the Basterds's plan reaches a successful conclusion, ending the war as they succeed in killing every member of the Nazi high command, among which Hitler.

lll. THEORETICAL TOOLS

In this first chapter, we will uncover the concepts that will guide the analysis. The aim of this section is to break down and define the various components of the narrative form, before outlining relevant linguistic concepts that will be involved in the discussion. To clarify and sustain some ideas, the concepts will be illustrated with appropriate examples drawn from the film, which may be discussed in depth in the following chapter.

A. CINEMA

The comprehension of the vocabulary of the metalanguage of films is fundamental to analyse films. We will start with definitions of basic terms, including narrative, story, and plot before delineating the components of the narrative, including dialogue. We will also tackle the subject of character construction, before discussing the two communicative levels of films.

1. Narrative

Inglourious Basterds unequivocally adopts the narrative form to tell its story. Its narrative conforms to Bordwell and Thompson's definition in *Film Art: An Introduction*: "a chain of events linked by cause and effect and occurring in time and space . . . we make sense of a narrative, then, by identifying its events and linking them by cause and effect, time, and space" (73). The term narrative also refers to the story of a film, as opposed to the plot. The plot is the filmmaker's manipulation of chronology, points of view, and presentation to design a story, which is displayed on-screen during the movie duration. Hence, while watching the film, the audience strives to order the plot into a story.

Bordwell's book is the main resource for this chapter, and the structure of his presentation of the relevant elements constitutive of the narrative will be kept unaltered for the sake of clarity.

a. Causality, Time, and Space

Bordwell argues that there are three aspects to a narrative: causality, time, and space. The director's manipulation of each creates multiple effects.

Causality

The events of a film are connected by a causal relationship. Generally, as something happens in a scene, we witness its effect sooner or later in the movie. In the case of *Inglourious Basterds,* the murder of Shosanna's family during the expositional scene is a cause, whereas her motivation to kill the nazis in the theatre during the premiere is the effect.

Causality occurs mainly by means of the characters and their dialogues: "In any narrative film, either fictional or documentary, characters create causes and register effects. Within the film's overall form, they make things happen and respond to events. Their actions and reactions contribute strongly to our engagement with the film" (Bordwell & Thompson 77). More precisely, they occur through dialogue hooks. For example, as Landa asks Bridget to have a word with her before transitioning to his office and strangling her, he asks: "Fräulein, may I have a word with you in private?" When we see both characters in an isolated room, we understand that it is probably Landa's office, where no one will disturb them. Such dialogues provide the audience with background concerning the locale of the action where the characters progress, about the relationships between characters, transitional information between scenes, and other information that could require inferences.

Time

Most films skip parts that are unrelated or irrelevant to the story, such as when characters sleep or eat. While some abstracts of aforesaid events can be used to serve causality, showing them for their full duration is not relevant. Skips are an effect of modification of temporal duration; filmmakers can extend moments or shorten narrative time at will. A few years have passed between Shosanna's family murder and the scene where we see her owning a cinema; yet, only a few minutes have passed in terms of screen time. Additionally, flashbacks are instances of a play on temporal frequency, which is the reintroduction of visual or auditive abstracts of a previous scene. The evocation of Landa

during Shosanna's meal with Joseph Goebbels took her back to the day that she escaped from LaPadite's farm, showing this past event for the second time, before switching back to the present.

Directors can also disturb the *temporal order* of events by placing chronological events in a non-chronological order. The two instances where a narrator discusses both Stiglitz's back-story as a Nazi-killer, and the description of the nitrate films used for the burning down of the theatre are plays on the temporal order. They are to be distinguished from a manipulation of temporal frequency, for the events, images, or sounds depicted never appeared previously in the movie; they consist of new material anterior to the main story.

Space

Movies represent only a few varieties of locales. Using framing, only a selected portion of these locales are represented on screen: we only see portions of France throughout the film. The exterior and interior of La Louisianne tavern, the exterior and interior of the Gamaar theatre. Sometimes we also only have access to the interior of buildings: the café where Shosanna and Zoller meet, or the restaurant in which Shosanna meets Goebbels, for example. What is more, some places are mentioned but never shown, like the Piz Palü, which is referred to several times.

b. Patterns of Development

Films unfold in three sections: openings, development and closing. During the opening, the *exposition* of the initial situation and the back-story occur. The opening sets up the viewer for what will be following. *Inglourious Basterds's* exposition is lengthy, because three points of view are introduced in the beginning: Landa's, Shosanna's, and the Basterds'. They are all main characters of the story, each with their own back-story.

Causal effect within films generates various patterns of development. According to Bordwell and Thompson, the most common are patterns involving a change in knowledge: "A character learns something in the course of the action, with the most crucial knowledge coming at the final turning point of the plot" (86). Tarantino's movie is no exception: a change of knowledge occurs after the tavern scene, when Bridget von Hammersmark

discloses the information about Hitler's presence during the premiere. Consequently, the Basterds will organise an attack during the premiere that will take place in Shosanna's theatre. *Inglourious Basterds* follows a *"*goal-oriented plot, in which a character takes steps to achieve an object or condition" (Bordwell and Thompson 86). The Basterds and Shosanna both want to murder the nazis at the premiere, and the plot moves towards that resolution.

The concept of deadline is also important: the Basterds, Shosanna, and the audience all know that the premiere is the crucial moment in which the story will be resolved, successfully or not. The premiere scene constitutes the *climax* of the film: the "high point" of the development, where "the action is presented as having a narrow range of possible outcomes" (Bordwell and Thompson 87). As a consequence of this climax, tension rises as the story can only end in two ways: either the Basterd's and Shosanna's plan succeeds, or it fails.

c. The Flow of Story Information

Bordwell's book gives an insight into narration: "the plot's way of distributing story information in order to achieve specific effects" (88). When analysing a film, it is important to evaluate who holds which information. Manipulating information can have multiple effects, such as creating expectation as to what the character's next actions will be. For example, when Landa discovers Frau von Hammersmark's shoe in the tavern, he knows she was involved in the gunfight, but the other characters do not know yet that he has learned this piece of information. The audience witness Landa discovering the shoe, which creates a set of expectations for the following events: the Basterds's plan is probably compromised because Landa has the upper hand.

There are two ways of displaying the range of flow of information. An unrestricted flow grants the audience access to more information than any character, whereas restricted narration allowing only for a limited access to knowledge; namely viewers experience events through the eyes of one single character and share his knowledge. The manipulation of the flow of information can create effects such as surprise, curiosity, and tension, for both the viewers and the characters.

2. Dialogue

Quentin Tarantino's film is heavily loaded with dialogues. As they constitute the main material targeted for a language analysis of the film, we must set out some issues they raise. We will explore Sarah Kozloff's ideas from her book *Overhearing Film Dialogues*, which highlights the importance of dialogue and its meaning.

As Kozloff puts it, the personal use of language by a character, conveys an array of information: "issues of power and dominance, of empathy and intimacy, of class, ethnicity, and gender are automatically engaged every time someone opens his or her mouth" (26). Delving into these aspects should lead to a better understanding of the impact that characters and their language can have on the film's narrative. The author assigns nine functions to dialogue, the first of which are involved in the communication of the narrative. Hence, we will focus on these six functions plus another, which focuses on dialogues' exploitation of language.

a. Anchorage of the Diegesis and Characters

Alongside with the visuals and the titles of a movie, the dialogue also anchors and identifies the fictional space and time in which the action takes place: the diegetic world. Obviously, titles can locate the story, though the exchanges between characters convey more precise information: the place vaguely identified as "somewhere in Nazi-occupied France" is LaPadite's milk farm, where he has been living for a while with his three daughters in the neighbourhood of Jew farmers, some of which have not yet been found by the visiting colonel. The identification of space by the audience is mainly enabled by dialogues and titles.

b. Communication of Narrative Causality

As mentioned earlier, a narrative is composed of a sequence of cause and effects brought forward mainly by the characters' discourses. They communicate "'why?' and 'how?' and 'what next?' to the viewer" (Kozloff 38). Besides, they shape the viewer's understanding of the film by explaining what is happening on-screen, through repetition of crucial information and telling ideas that can hardly be disclosed through images. Moreover, the characters' lines shape the film's back-story. Specifically, we hear about events that took place before the action that we witness. For example, only through LaPadite's utterance do

we learn that his farm had already been searched before Colonel Landa's visit. This information builds the back-story of the film, but this incident will not be depicted during the movie; it only contributes to the enrichment of the fictional world. Sarah Kozloff details that these discourses are designed for the audience's comprehension of causality within the film, not for the characters. Discussions are thus not incidental; they are carefully steered to serve the movie's intentions.

c. Enactment of Narrative Events

Kozloff draws on Austin and Searle's speech-act theory to discuss the character's acts performed through dialogues such as requests, promises, thanks, and encouragement. She makes a distinction between major events that bring the narrative forward: predominantly physical events, yet occasionally speech-related incidents. She refers to the Stanislavskian acting theory, mentioning that "in each 'beat' of dialogue, a character is performing an action: X is trying to persuade Y to do Z" (Kozloff 41).

Such speech acts are central events of a story: "As a general rule, the most common event is the disclosure of a secret or of a crucial information, information vital to the plot, whose revelation poses some risk or jeopardy" (Kozloff 41). *Inglourious Basterds* precisely follows this pattern. Frau von Hammersmark's revelation of Hitler's presence during the premiere of *The Nation's Pride* puts an end to the audience's aching for her revelation, teased at the beginning of the chapter within which it takes place. Furthermore, this information initiates a sense of urgency through the creation of a *deadline*: the Basterds must promptly come up with a plan to sneak into the cinema, replace the German-speaking Basterds who died during the tavern shootout and kill the Nazi targets in a relatively short span of time, otherwise they risk missing their shot at ending the war.

Drawing on Bordwell, Kozloff mentions that "declaration of love is the second most important verbal event in Hollywood films . . . the declaration of love 'solves' the romance plot" (42). In the case of Tarantino's film, there is a clear divergence from many classic Hollywoodian films in its romance resolution as the romance intrigue is one-sided from the beginning: Shosanna's indifference towards Fredrick Zoller and their conflicting interests will eventually lead to their mutual deaths.

Kozloff mentions Seymour B. Chatmann's concept of kernel, which is important for this analysis. He argues that the events of a narrative are not equally organized: "some are more important than others" (Chatmann 53). The plot of a film entails a series of key events, which Chatmann terms kernels. Kernels are characters' physical or speech-related acts that advance the plot by "raising and satisfying questions" and "force movement into one of two (or more) possible paths" (Chatmann 53). Kernels are to be distinguished from satellites, which are "minor plot events . . . [they] entail no choice, but are solely the workings-out of the choices made at the kernels . . . Their function is that of filling in, elaborating, completing the kernel" (Chatmann 54).

d. Character Revelation

The characters are defined not solely based on their appearance, but also on the premise of their personal use of language during dialogues. We learn the protagonists' names through utterances, and we make assumptions about one's background and demeanour from the colouration of his language: "is his accent 'upper class' or 'hillbilly'? Is he or she polite? Brusque? Thoughtful? Quick? Lazy?" (Kozloff 43). Dialects, accents, inflections, verbal mannerisms, and others tint the characters' speech. The assumptions that we make based on these take part in our perception of a character's identity and role in the narrative.

Additionally, some lines are explicitly written to give an insight about a character's behaviour. These can stem from the character himself or come from another. Hans Landa exemplifies this idea of self-revelation through dialogues when the Basterds plan approaches success: he displays a new trait unseen before. The colonel shows his willingness to help the allies to win the war for personal gains. It breaks the audience's assumptions about the colonel, which throughout the film appears as a dedicated and selfless Jew hunter whose sole purpose is to serve the third Reich as well as possible with his talents.

Other comments are meant to "keep our attention focused on the central figure and reinforce his or her special qualities, exalted status, or air of mystery" (Kozloff 44). For example, Aldo Raine knows the German's nickname of Donny Donowitz, "the Bear Jew". So, as he threatens the soldiers to get the Germans' positions on the map, he mentions his name and emphasises his gruesomeness. The parallel with the soldier's narration of the

events in front of Hitler adds to the legendary image of the Sergeant and excites the audience, eager to see the legend in action. Undoubtedly, the Germans' nicknames for the Basterds play a role in our perception of the characters and their status.

e. Adherence to the Code of Realism

Kozloff explains that realism is a cultural construct. A realistic text is a text that "adheres to a complex code of what a culture at a given time agrees to accept as plausible, everyday, authentic" (47). Enhancing realism in a film allows it to reinforce the suspension of disbelief, to "sustain the illusion that the viewer is observing the action as a fly on the wall" (Kozloff, 47).

The observation of realism, or verisimilitude in a work of fiction is possible because of the realistic nature of film dialogues. Although film dialogues are mostly free from hesitation markers and other verbal parasites that sprinkle real-life verbal interactions, the "fictional discourse should, and typically does attempt to, imitate real language use, evoking an illusion of real-life conversations" (Pragmatics of fiction, 464). Hatim and Mason describe how directors steer the film dialogue to imitate reality and impact the viewer, "characters on screen address each other as if they were real persons while, in reality, a scriptwriter is, like a novelist, constructing discourse for the sake of the effect it will have on its receivers" (Hatim and Mason 433–434).

In most American films, some lines of dialogues are only said to create a realistic environment for the characters as they interact with extras at a station, a café, a restaurant: Kozloff labels them "conversational wallpapers". These are solely performed to "replicate everyday encounters" and add to the audience's suspension of disbelief (47). An instance of such replicas in the film occurs when Landa exits the car upon arrival on LaPadite's farm and exchanges a few words with the soldiers accompanying him. The dialogues that can be overheard in the main hall before the premiere also take part in setting a realistic sound background to immerse the audience in the action and allows it to observe the situation as a fly on the wall. Generally speaking, such film dialogues are not essential to the plot progression, but they add realism and aesthetic effects. In Quentin Tarantino's film, however, conversational wallpapers always serve a purpose, such as characterisation or anchorage of the diegesis.

f. Control of Viewer Evaluation and Emotions

Dialogues also serve the purpose of guiding the audience's reactions to the action. Firstly, they control the pacing of a film: they abruptly end an exchange and move the story forward or they prolong moments of tension. Furthermore, they give meaning to what appears on the screen and appeal to other senses than just hearing and seeing: characters can describe what they feel, smell, and taste. Other utterances are meant to emphasise a crucial element, such as objects that are meaningful for the story. Finally, dialogues can work on the audience's emotional response: Kozloff takes the example of lines such as "Oh God, it's moving towards you!... Move! Get out of there!" from *Alien* (Kozloff 51). In conjunction with extra-diegetic music, they frighten the spectator. Such emotional impact also occurs during "rabble-rousing" lines: when the hero finally punishes the villain of the story. In *Inglourious Basterds* when Stiglitz tells Hellstrom "say auf Wiedersehen to your Nazi balls", satisfaction arises as the audience aches to see the SS Major is finally silenced.

g. Exploitation of the Resources of Language

This function of dialogue is concerned with the poetic function of language, jokes, and irony. Firstly, the poetic function focuses on including poetic elements in the text, such as stylistic devices: analogies, metaphors, euphemisms, to name a few. Landa for instance makes use of an analogy when he compares the Germans to eagles and Jews to rats. Secondly, jokes can take place during a movie. They have two origins: a particularly witty character or the audience's superiority over a character based on omniscience. Irony is a by-product of the latter: when the viewers know facts that characters do not, it can create ironic situations. In that respect, viewers can safely assume that Fredrick's interest for Shosanna will amount to nothing unless Tarantino decides to break the audience's expectations. She loves her man and hates the Germans, who murdered her family, whereas he is a war hero; the conflicting relationship between both characters is made clear from the beginning. As a result, Fredrick's vain attempts at seducing Shosanna may raise an ironic smile.

Another element pertaining to this thematic is the use of storytelling by characters. During the tavern scene, Hicox explains why he has such a strange accent by telling the story of his family and how his brother was part of a film. Such episodes serve a "change of tempo

and character revelation" (Kozloff 56). Hicox loosens the tension of the scene and shows his ingenuity through his explanation.

3. Characterisation

We have dissected various aspects of the narrative, including the functions of dialogue. We have also determined that characters are the main agents of causality in the film: their actions and dialogues spawn cause and effects, which in turn affect the narrative. The following paragraphs will elaborate on how the concept of characterisation is also involved in this process. We will apply the same structural principle as before, by breaking down the concept of character, character constellation, character identification and characterisation, explaining relevant knowledge for a deeper analysis of the film's protagonists and their role in the plot.

The main resource used for this section is the book *Characters in Fictional Worlds, Understanding Imaginary Beings in Literature, Film, and Other Media* by Jannadis, Lauer, Martinez and Winkos. It describes how characters are built in literary and audiovisual pieces, among others. We will use the authors' terminology, which is relevant for this work: the media will be referred to as the "text", whereas the audience will be called the "recipient" (Jannadis et al. 4).

a. Characters and the Plot

Our first preoccupation is with the definition of the word character. The simplest definition provided by the book will prove satisfactory: "Characters are most frequently defined as fictive persons," or "fictional analoga to human beings" (Jannadis et al. 4). Although vague, this definition is sufficient for our work: we will not discuss the ontology of characters, and all characters of the subject film are exclusively human.

E.M. Forster considers action and characters to be partners in his definition of the term plot, which is "the causal and logical connections which exist between the actions of the characters in a story, and which underlie the temporal sequence in which the story is presented (Jannadis et al. 24). His reasoning is in line with what we have established earlier through the study of the works of Bordwell, Thompson, and Kozloff, so it makes sense to adopt it. Such a definition of the plot has the following implication: "The logic of the story then automatically implies the logic of the character's intentions and hopes as to future

events" (Jannadis et al. 24). In order to comprehend a story, the recipient must understand the "aims, wishes, feelings and drives" of a character, which in turn shapes expectations regarding their actions (Jannadis et al. 24).

b. Character Constellation

The characters of any story are related to each other and compared to each other in terms of their relationships, values, similarities, hierarchies of relevance, the way they interact, communicate, their hopes, desires, or power hierarchies, to name a few. (Jannadis et al. 26) The interrelation between characters frames the character constellation of a story.

Character constellation helps us distinguish the roles of each character. These roles have different names depending on the theories being referred to. Yet, two distinctions are firmly established since Aristotle's theorisation of the concepts: the "protagonist" is the main character of a narrative or a play, whereas the "antagonist" is its main opponent. (Jannadis et al. 20) A role may be fulfilled by various characters, which is the case here: both Aldo Raine and Shosanna are the protagonists of the story, whereas Colonel Hans Landa is the antagonist.

Many theorists have pursued the study of such narrative roles. For example, Greimas's actantial model is an important tool to analyse the characters' position in the constellation, extending the basic concepts of protagonist and antagonist. According to him, stories are "expressions of an underlying narrative grammar composed of six actants ordered into pairs: the hero (also *sujet*) and his search for an object; the sender and the receiver; the hero's helper and the opponent" (Jannadis et al. 26). It is important to note that some roles might be filled by various characters.

Greimas's model will guide this analysis. The authors argue that all theoretical bases have their problems, but all contain similar core functions, which are part of most narrative works (Jannadis et al. 21). Hence, Greimas's model is as acceptable as any other.

c. Character Identification

Each media uses a set of devices to make characters identifiable by the recipients. Audiovisual media combine "stills, moving images, spoken and written language, sound and music, and can therefore also combine different techniques of identification" (Jannadis et al.

29–30). The first time we see or hear a character is called the introduction, whereas the following time is termed identification.

The main tool used by writers to identify characters is the use of anaphoric references, which adopt various forms in a text. Firstly, direct reference occurs when a character speaks of another by using his name, definite descriptions, or personal pronoun. This is the case for the scene where Hitler mentions Donny Donowitz's nickname: "The one… that beats my boys with a bat! The one they call 'The Bear Jew'".

d. Characterisation

To better understand characters and evaluate the impact of language on their actions and on narrative construction, we need to understand how they are characterised. The broadest definition of the concept of characterisation includes the ascription of psychological, social, physical, or physiological traits, information about a character's habitual actions, its motivations, also including "information about time, place, actions, and events connected to the character" (30–31). In short, characterisation is "the process of connecting information with a figure in a text to provide a character in the fictional world with a certain property, or properties, concerning body, mind, behaviour, or relations to the (social) environment." (Jannadis et al. 32) The recipient infers information about a character based on information conveyed by a text.

Characterisation can be direct or indirect. Direct characterisation is the main tool of language-based media such as books, "the explicit naming of traits" (Jannadis et al. 32). The recipient thus receives information about the physical or psychological traits of the characters via their descriptions. On the other hand, indirect characterisation functions through inferences: "the traits, and the entire personality of a character needs to be guessed from words, opinions and actions" (Jannadis et al. 32). Yet, it should be remembered that direct and indirect characterisation must be understood as a continuum. It is difficult to differentiate them, both in literature and audiovisual films. Consequently, characterisation should be referred to as "more or less direct" (Jannadis et al. 33).

Furthermore, one must distinguish altero-characterisation and self-characterisation: "Information about characters can be provided by agencies other than the character (the narrator, for instance, or other characters in the same fictional world), or the character may

ascribe properties to him – or herself" (Jannadis et al. 33). The reliability of each of these forms of characterisation is variable, for many elements can affect it, whether a character's subjectivity, its personal system of values and beliefs, its aims, and motivations; these are only a few examples of the potential sources of misdirection of the recipient. To illustrate this idea, as Hitler tells his officers that Donny Donowitz is heard to be a golem, we contemplate an instance of unreliable information. The audience knows that Donny is human, so this description is unreliable. What is more, this characterisation works the opposite way: it characterises Hitler as gullible or superstitious because he believes the exaggerations spread among German soldiers. A line that would have led to a potential characterisation of Donny is in reality a characterisation of Hitler himself.

Inferences made by the audience play a major role too: recipients viewing Landa for the first time can safely assume that he is a Nazi officer, based on a few clues: his uniform, his language, the titles. The characters' names can also hint at "individual characteristic qualities, features or habits" (Jannadis et al. 37). The western literature of the 17th and 18th centuries have often referred to religion by giving literary characters biblical names, thus providing them with similar psychological features as their counterparts (Jannadis et al. 37). In the case of Tarantino's movies, the names of characters sometimes have significance; the director has mentioned that some of his characters' names are free alteration of other visual media characters or stars that have made an impression on him in previous films.

Then, an important distinction must be made between literary and audiovisual characterisation. Film directors rely on actors to play their characters. Hence, some characters' attributes heavily rely on the actor's features, such as his voice, gestures, facial expressions, and appearance. By extension, they also determine the "age, gender, ethnicity, character and social milieu" of the characters. In short, a character is already partially characterised by its actor, therefore, "the individual way in which they execute body movements, speech acts and actions is of central importance for an understanding of theatrical and audiovisual characterisation" (Jannadis et al. 38).

Finally, languages can play a role in characterisation. Elena Sanz Ortega mentions that "In polyglot films, languages are used as a means of characterisation as they signpost the

cultural, social and personal backgrounds of characters, thus playing their social function" (Ortega 22). This paper will work out how language takes part in characterisation.

4. Communicative Levels

This work will sometimes distinguish the level of the audience from the level of characters, following Dynel's conceptualisation.

When it comes to communication in a fictional story, one must differentiate between two separate levels: "communication between the collective sender or film production crew and the television or film audience on one level, and the fictional interaction between characters on another" (Messerli 45). This work will oscillate between the analysis of both levels, which will be referred to as the "inter-character level", or "the audience level". The differentiation will allow us to alternatively focus on one aspect or the other with the appropriate terminology. Furthermore, it will put forward the discrepancy between the information received by the audience, or the characters.

B. LANGUAGE

The plot of Inglourious Basterds rests on multilingualism, which will be at the centre of the analysis. We must hence define some language-related concepts, starting by discussing broader ideas such as multilingualism before zooming-in and defining narrower concepts like languages and accents. Finally, we will tackle some linguistic concepts that will be used in the analysis.

1. Multilingualism

The term multilingualism can be defined in various ways, some more complex than others. Simber Atay mentions that "multilingualism is a complex subject that can be approached from various angles: It covers 'a large multicompetence territory spreading within linguistics, philology, history, film studies, and cultural studies" (140).

Dirk Delabatista and Rainier Grutman provide the simplest definition for the term: a multilingual text is when "a text is worded in different languages" (15). More precisely, while some scholars consider that bilingualism is already multilingualism, others like Knauth expand on the idea that multilingualism is the use of at least two or three languages (Atay 143). Finally, Delia Chiaro and Giuseppe De Bonis provide a more precise definition, linking multilingualism to cinema, culture, and the importance of language in the narrative:

> While in relation to cinema, at first sight the term multilingual appears to refer to the portrayal of cross-cultural encounters in which at least two different languages co-occur, in reality, multilingual films represent a somewhat variegated set of movies whose common feature is that multilingualism itself plays a relevant role in both their storyline and their discourse. (687)

Multilingualism is a central theme of *Inglourious Basterds*: cross-cultural encounters happen throughout the film and a variety of languages co-occur.

2. Languages

When discussing the concept of languages, Dirk Delabatista and Rainier Grutman vouch for a definition that comprises the variety of national languages that may be encountered in

different countries, why also acknowledging the many subvarieties ranging from regional variations of the same language to singular idiolects:

> We favour a very open and flexible concept which acknowledges not only the 'official' taxonomy of languages but also the incredible range of subtypes and varieties existing within the various officially recognised languages, and indeed sometimes cutting across and challenging our neat linguistic typologies. (Delabatista and Grutman 15)

We will discuss the varieties of language that we encounter when relevant: Dialects, national languages, idiolects, or slang, to name a few possibilities. However, As Delabatista and Grutman argue, when going for a text-internal analysis of languages such as in this paper, "What matters more is their textual interplay" (15).

3. Accents

The tavern scene shows that accents have a direct impact on the plot. Yet, they also take on other roles, such as characterisation.

Macarthur et al. define the accent as a "way of speaking that indicates a person's place of origin and/or social class" (9). In this regard, it might be safe to assume that it takes part in characterisation. In this work we will take the case of Aldo Raine's southern American accent, among others.

4. Code Switching

In bilingual communities, scholars have observed a phenomenon called code-switching, "the use of material from two (or more) languages by a single speaker in the same conversation" (Thomason et al. 132). *The Cambridge Handbook of linguistic code-switching*, published by Barbara E. Bullock and Almeida Jacqueline Toribio deeply covers this topic.

Code-switching can further be defined as "the ability on the part of bilinguals to alternate effortlessly between their two languages" (Bullock and Toribio 1). Many characters of *Inglourious Basterds* use code-switching, namely Hans Landa, who seamlessly switches between German, his native tongue, and every other language included in the film: French, English, or Italian. Other examples of characters who switch between languages are Frau

von Hammersmark, Fredrick Zoller, Archie Hicox, and private Wilhelm, to name a few. Each character knows at least one other language than his native.

Code-switching manifests itself in various forms: “Its linguistic manifestation may extend from the insertion of single words to the alternation of languages for larger segments of discourse" (Bullock and Toribio 2). Landa’s switch to English during his conversation with LaPadite is an example of the latter. It is also “produced by bilinguals of differing degrees of proficiency who reside in various types of language contact settings, and as a consequence their code-switching patterns may not be uniform (Bullock and Toribio 2). Finally, code-switching can have a range of different motivations: “filling linguistic gaps, expressing ethnic identity, and achieving particular discursive aims, among others” (Bullock and Toribio 2). The analytic part will provide material for discussing the multiple forms of code-switching. Exposing the way in which the filmmaker manipulates code-switching through the film’s dialogues will provide us with items to fuel the discussion on the impact of language on the narrative.

The subject of code-switching is complex, and scholars disagree on some terminological aspects. Some scholars distinguish code-switching from code-mixing, the former being a switch of language from one sentence to the other, while the latter labels switches that occur within the same sentence. Like Thomason, we will simplify by using the term code-switching to refer to both concepts of code-switching and code-mixing (132).

The analysis will highlight instances of code-switching and delve deeper into their implications, which we briefly covered in this introductory part. Moreover, code-switching is one among various forms of linguistic interferences. We may expand upon other forms of interference when relevant.

5. Pragmatics of Fiction

The linguistic concepts which will be developed in this part originate from the field of pragmatics, which can be broadly defined as the study of language in its context. It is concerned with how speech is organized among speakers, what they expect from exchanges, which rules they do or do not follow while conversing, speech acts, and many others. As established earlier, film dialogues share a lot of common points with everyday

conversations; it tries to reproduce them to add to the audience's suspension of disbelief and giving the impression of following a real conversation.

Consequently, it makes sense to use tools from the pragmatics field to comment on interactions between characters. Applied to the study of the subject film, pragmatics can shed a light on the way characters use language to achieve their aims, but also on how their speech achieves characterisation, or how their conversations underlie power hierarchies, to name a few.

6. Participation Framework

Understanding the participation roles of an encounter between two or more people in real-life is crucial to examine the impact of language on the narrative.

Thomas C. Messerli gives an overview of the approaches that investigate the roles of participants in telecinematic discourse. He firstly discusses E. Goffman's works, who introduced the concept of ratification. On the one hand, two people enter what Goffman calls a state of talk when they "have declared themselves officially open to one another for purposes of spoken communication and guarantee together to maintain a flow of words" (*Footing* 34). Hence, they are granted the status of ratified or official participants.

On the other hand, unratified or unofficial participants are not officially taking part in the interaction between the ratified participants (Goffman, *Interaction Ritual* 8). Goffman describes various qualifiers to differentiate such participants. To start with, the hearer, recipient, or listener; hearing signifying "the process of auditing what a speaker says and following the gist of his remarks" (*Interaction Ritual* 7). It must be remembered that to qualify as hearer, the participant must listen to the speaker, which is the norm, but is not always the case. Unratified participants can also follow a conversation, either by purposefully eavesdropping, or unintentionally overhearing, which separates an eavesdropper from an overhearer (*Interaction Ritual* 8). Bystanders are participants who have minimal access to an encounter but are "perceivable by the official participants" (Goffman 1979:8). Although bystanders may be in the visual range of the ratified speakers, they may also be in aural range, in which case they potentially become hearers, switching to a temporary overhearing or eavesdropping position (*Interaction Ritual* 8).

A further distinction brings us to the concept of addressed hearer: “the one to whom the speaker addresses his visual attention and to whom, incidentally, he expects to turn over the speaking role” (Goffman, *Interaction Ritual* 8). In the case of an encounter involving more than two participants, a speaker can address all the hearers equally, or focus on one person, granting the other hearers the status of unaddressed hearers.

Finally, Goffman lays out that “speakers will modify how they speak, if not what they say, by virtue of conducting their talk in visual and aural range of nonparticipants” (*Interaction Ritual* 10). In other words, speakers will behave and speak accordingly, depending on where the interaction takes place, whether in a crowded place, or an empty one where the ratified participants stand alone.

During the first scene of *Inglourious Basterds*, it looks as if there are only two participants when LaPadite’s daughters leave the room: Landa as the speaker and LaPadite as the addressed hearer. However, the audience soon discovers that the Jews hidden underneath the floorboards are listening to their exchange, which makes them eavesdroppers. Yet, their status eventually shifts to bystanders when the colonel voluntarily switches from speaking French to English, excluding the eavesdroppers from the conversation, and giving him room to finish his questioning without being listened to by undesirable eavesdroppers.

Not only does the participant roles characterise the status of characters, but they also categorise the audience. Kozloff’s point of view is that the viewer is an overhearer, which is the party taken by this work. Although the audience overhears, its ability to eavesdrop in this film is dependent on the use of subtitles, a topic which must briefly be delineated.

7. Subtitles

The original version of the film contains many subtitled sequences, which makes sense because of its use of foreign languages. For the English-speaking audience to make sense of the film’s dialogue, foreign languages must be translated one way or another: either via subtitles or interpreters. As we will see, the film makes use of both strategies, though we will discuss the role of interpreters in-depth later in this work.

Although *Inglourious Basterds* is geared towards an English-speaking audience, English is hardly the dominant language of the film. In fact, German, French and English are given almost equal prominence within the film. Consequently, the general audience will have to rely on subtitles to access information.

The movie makes an abundant use of what scholars of audiovisual translation name part-subtitling, as opposed to conventional subtitles, which Carol O'Sullivan defines as

> a strategy for making a film shot in two or more languages accessible to viewers . . . [They] are appended to part of the dialogue only, are planned from an early stage in the film's production, and are aimed at the film's primary language audience. (1)

Inglourious Basterds capitalises on part-subtitling to convey meaning: the film stages French, German and Italian dialogues which are subtitled for the most part, and they are primarily oriented at an anglophone audience. Besides, the film's script states which part must and must not be translated before the filming took place.

Finally, O'Sullivan mentions that the integration of subtitles to a film is not solely used as "ornament, to mark location or nationality but becomes a vehicle for plot and character development" (84). With this idea in mind, the analysis will investigate the impact of subtitles upon the narrative construction of the film.

C. CONCLUSION

This section elaborated on the various theoretical concepts that will be explored throughout the analysis of the film. We will focus on underlining the functions of dialogue that were raised by Kozloff and the various narrative principles that were discussed in this part, while paralleling them with linguistic concepts. Hand in hand, the linguistic and narratological ideas developed will help us in following up with conclusions about the role that multilingualism plays in the narrative of *Inglourious Basterds*.

IV. ANALYSIS

The analytical part of this work will focus on various scenes which involve multilingualism to underline its role in the narrative. Its structure consists in four parts. The first and second sections will follow three of Kozloff's rules: the anchorage of the diegesis, narrative causality and adherence to the code of realism. These roles are focal points of this work as they will allow us to discuss many dialogue and language-related issues. Then, we will take interest in the analysis of the participant roles, which will highlight additional linguistic interactions between the film's characters and their effects. Finally, a comparison of the original version of the film with the French version will let us further elaborate on the impact of languages of the film's narrative construction, namely by highlighting the differences due to the translation of some lines of dialogue. The dialogue-analysis will be consistently paralleled with the narrative concepts delineated in the theoretical part to establish the link between multilingualism and narrative.

A. ANCHORAGE OF THE DIEGETIC WORLD AND NARRATIVE CAUSALITY

In this section, we will study how dialogues provide the viewer with information regarding the time and space of each scene, how it shapes the back-story, while also studying how it links the scenes or events to one another before evaluating in which way they interact with national languages. Since most information concerning the diegetic world and characters take root in the expositional scenes of the story, we will analyse the first part of the film, up to the first scene of the chapter *Operation Kino*. We must, however, remember that anchorage does not solely occurs in the beginning of movies; it is integral to films from beginning to end:

> It would be a mistake to think that this function is confined to any one section of the text . . . Movement through space, flashbacks to previous events, ellipses forward in time, and the introduction of new characters will call for dialogue anchorage. (Kozloff 48)

The analysis of the first chapters will provide the reader with enough insight as to how Kozloff's roles are fulfilled and how language also plays a part in this regard, although we could extend such an analysis to the entirety of the film.

This section is divided into five parts, starting with a preliminary discussion about the use of titles in the film. Then, each subsection will investigate a particular scene and begin with an introductory paragraph contextualising it before diving into an analysis of the information conveyed to the audience by the dialogues, evaluating the importance of languages and linking them to Kozloff's first functions. The analysis will then be followed by a general conclusion which will summarise the section's main ideas.

1. Titles

First, we must mention how titles already give information about the diegetic world. The use of chapters to divide the action is characteristic of Tarantino's cinema. Before Inglourious Basterds, the director divided *Kill Bill volume 1, Kill Bill volume 2* and *Pulp Fiction* in several chapters.

In the case of *Inglourious Basterds*, the action is divided into five chapters, each with its focus. Even before displaying images of the first scene, a title appears on-screen, "chapter one: once upon a time in nazi-occupied France", immediately followed by the date in which the action will take place as the camera fades in: 1941. These headings alone already give context about the space and time of the action: the film depicts France under German occupation in the beginning of the Second World War. The viewer can safely assume that the first images displayed on screen thus take place in the French countryside, rightly so since this is soon confirmed by the first lines of dialogues, spoken in French. Besides, the titles also inform the viewer about the multilingual setting in which the story will take place, sparking expectations for a potential encounter between representatives of both nations, namely France and Germany. The director precisely endorses this expectation as the audience soon gets acquainted with the German colonel Hans Landa, who will meet and converse with Perrier LaPadite, a Frenchman.

In short, each chapter's title gives the viewer information about the events that will follow: the chapter titled "Inglourious Basterds" introduces Aldo Raine and his team, while the chapter "Operation Kino" introduces the briefing of the secret services' mission and its setup.

We can argue that the titles spark expectations from the audience by explicitly referring to ideology and nationalities: "Nazi-occupied France", "German night in Paris". The

languages that the film displays after these titles match the expectations of the audience regarding the locales of the film and the nations involved.

2. Once Upon a Time in Nazi-Occupied France

The first chapter of the movie introduces us to Hans Landa and Perrier LaPadite. This scene sets out Shosanna's back-story and her link to the main villain of the story, which she eventually meets. It starts with the arrival of the colonel Hans Landa on LaPadite's property and the introduction of each character to each other before the interrogation takes place in the farmer's house. The colonel's purpose is to force LaPadite to admit that he hides the Dreyfus family, which he accomplishes by putting pressure on the Frenchman throughout a discussion that Hans Landa portrays as an ordinary routine inspection. The scene ends in the murder of the family members, while Shosanna successfully escapes.

This first scene is an expositional scene. It should fulfil its role of providing the audience with information about the film's setting and characters, which it does. The first line of dialogue is already loaded with meaning: "papa". Through this sole utterance, the relationship between the wood-cutting farmer and the girl that appear on screen is established: this is a father and his daughter. Besides, it may be interesting to stress the multilingual aspect of the word "papa", which exists in many European and extra-European languages, from French, Italian or German to Swedish, Dutch, Japanese and Russian, to name a few. We can argue that the use of a word that echoes through so many languages worldwide are already, whether intentionally or not, a commentary about one of the film's main themes: languages.

The farmer then immediately instructs his daughters who dashed out of the house to go back inside, in French: "Go back inside and shut the door." Just as the title gave the indication that the action takes place in France, the first utterances spoken in French, identify the characters appearing on screen as being French people. On the other hand, the Germanic origin of the soldiers can surely be inferred solely based on their appearance and the context of occupation, but language reinforces this primary assumption as the colonel exchanges a few words in German with his escorts, removing any doubt regarding the soldiers' origin.

The first characters then introduce themselves to each other, and mention the place where their encounter takes place, giving the audience more information about the situation, namely the characters' names, unknown up until then, and the fact that the locale is LaPadite's property. It is also implied that Landa and the Farmer are meeting for the first time, and the characters speak French:

> LANDA: Is this the property of Perrier LaPadite?
>
> LAPADITE: I am Perrier LaPadite.
>
> LANDA: It is a pleasure to meet you, Monsieur LaPadite. I am Colonel Hans Landa of the SS.

The introduction of characters through on-screen meetings and greetings is underlined By Kozloff; it is a classic way of presenting characters to the audience:

> Narrative films need not only to identify and create their time and space but also to name the most important elements of that diegesis, the characters. Dialogue . . . frequently manages to introduce characters to the viewer via on-screen greetings and meetings. (36)

Shortly after, the context of their meeting is brought forward. The purpose of the colonel's visit is stated, though vaguely: "I was hoping you could invite me inside your home, and we may have a discussion". The transition from the exterior of LaPadite's property to the interior of his house is facilitated by this preceding exchange; the characters are now inside LaPadite's home.

The French farmer proceeds to introduce the SS colonel to his daughters. As he contemplates the farmer's daughters, Hans Landa says, "The rumours I have heard in the village about your family are all true. Each one of your daughters is more lovely than the last." This is an instance of character revelation: Landa behaves politely and displays a relaxed attitude from the beginning, but this line already presupposes that he has gathered intelligence about this family; he is well informed and might cause trouble. He gathered evidence in advance of their meeting, going as far as knowing about the rumours that circulate in the village. Although the colonel seems harmless at first glance, the audience and

characters are made aware that concealing anything to this informed soldier might be difficult.

We learn about LaPadite's relationship with the occupying forces: "The Germans looked through my house nine months ago for hiding Jews and found nothing." This builds the farmer's back-story and gives a piece of information that Landa will adroitly exploit a few minutes later: his family is harassed by the German army. Then Landa goes on mentioning that "all the Jewish families have been accounted for except the Dreyfus. Somewhere in the last year, it would appear they've vanished." This takes part in the construction of the back-story of a character which did not appear yet: Shosanna, one of the children of the Dreyfus family.

The dialogue soon shifts to the explanation of the colonel's mission in France: "rounding up the Jews left in France who are either hiding or passing for Gentile". Yet, we do not know at this point if this is why he came to LaPadite's property. As Landa keeps talking, he never mentions directly that he is searching for Jews in his house until he finally explains "Now, my job dictates that I must have my men enter your home and conduct a thorough search before I can officially cross your family's name of my list," abruptly changing the tone of the scene. Once more, this change gives an insight into Landa's character and methods: the colonel seemed friendly at first, but subtly pressured the farmer line after line until he finally asked the question: "are you sheltering enemies of the state?" From the beginning, Landa manipulated the farmer's emotions and persuaded him to admit that he was secretly hiding Jews. This drastic change precipitates the scene's conclusion, which ends in the shooting of Shosanna's family. After the shooting, Landa will immediately identify Shosanna as she escapes from under the floorboards: "That's the girl," before saying her name: "Goodbye, Shosanna."

In short, we can argue that the first few minutes of the film do fulfil the functions of dialogue conceptualised by Sarah Kozloff. Firstly, the first scene takes an active part in anchoring the diegetic world: we learn about the characters' names and back-stories, the locales, and the context of Landa's visit. Simultaneously, the events of the scene set the motion film's plot in action as they introduce the audience to the villain of the story, whose cruel actions motivate Shosanna's revenge, fulfilling the function of narrative causality.

Finally, we have observed instances of character revelation when Landa spoke about the rumours concerning LaPadite's family, but also when he abruptly changed his attitude during the interrogation.

National languages play a minor role in this scene, at least in terms of anchorage of the diegesis, narrative causality or character revelation. They primarily allow the identification of the character's nationalities without explicitly having the director writing lines such as "I am German, and you are French". The German language reinforces the conclusion for which the vision of the soldiers' uniforms calls, namely that they are Germans.

3. Inglourious Basterds

This chapter introduces us to Aldo Raine and his team, the Inglourious Basterds. The scene mainly consists in Aldo introducing himself and explaining his outfit's mission in France, followed by the successful aftermath of an ambush that they organised in France, during which they will interrogate two German soldiers: Sergeant Werner Rachtmann and Private Butz.

The scene starts by displaying the title of the chapter on a black screen during which we hear a character shouting "ten-hut", a phrase that serves to bring soldiers to attention in the American military. This utterance may already spark expectations as to where the following scene will take place and who it will involve; the audience might expect American soldiers on allied territory, which is soon revealed by the images and dialogue.

Quentin Tarantino opens Aldo's monologue by making him introduce himself to his soldiers: "My name is Lieutenant Aldo Raine", followed by the Lieutenant's intention: "I'm putting together a special team, and I need me eight soldiers. Eight Jewish American soldiers." He sets the scene for the next events of the chapter, causally linking them:

> We're going to be dropped into France dressed as civilians. Once we're in enemy territory, as a bushwhacking guerrilla army, we're going to be doing one thing and one thing only, killing nazis.

Moreover, he insists on the peculiarity of his outfit: "When you join my command, you take on debit (…) Each and every man under my command owes me 100 Nazi scalps." Taken together, these pieces of information prime the audience to immediately recognise

the Basterds in Hitler's subsequent dialogue and in the close-up of the scalping that occurs shortly after the dictator's speech.

The film's credits reveal that Aldo Raine's strong accent is manufactured. We read that Brad Pitt worked with a dialect coach to play Aldo Raine's role. We can therefore infer that the character's accent was crafted with a specific intent in mind, which was to make him sound like a true Southern American. Indeed, upon reading the script, we notice that Tarantino planned for him to sound like a "hillbilly" (19). We will discuss this matter deeper in the section about the adherence to the code of realism. Aldo discusses his southern American origin and narrates his travel, enriching the character's back-story:

> I sure as hell didn't come down from the goddamn Smoky Mountains, cross 5000 miles of water, fight my way through half of Sicily and jump out of a fucking aeroplane to teach nazis lessons in humanity.

After Aldo's introduction, the film suddenly jumps forward in time and cuts to Hitler's reaction to the Basterds's deeds. Admittedly, the visual contrast is clear: the Nazi iconography appears in the background and on Hitler's arm in the form of swastikas, but the transition is even more abrupt because the tone of the character and his language are radically different from Aldo. We contemplate a furious Hitler who shouts in German, while frantically smashing his fist on a table, starkly contrasting with Aldo's calmness, smirk, and southern American language. Both the images and sound, including the exploitation of language difference, creates a sudden change in mood.

Then, the audience is introduced to soldier Butz. Hitler forgetting who this soldier is, giving a pretence to introduce him to the audience: "He's the soldier you wanted to see personally. His squad was ambushed by Lt Raine's Jews. He was its only survivor." As the film cuts to the soldier's entrance and Hitler's interview with him, he narrates the event of the Basterds's ambush, creating a frame narrative in which we contemplate the aftermath of the event.

The framed-narrative scene gives more information about the back-stories and identity of the Basterds. The viewer hears about Wilhelm Wicki: "Wicki here, an Austrian-Jew, got the fuck out of Munich while the getting was good. Became American, got drafted,

come back to give y'all what for." He is the Basterds's translator, so later, when Aldo calls his name when private Butz tells him he does not speak English, we know Wicki will provide a translation for Aldo and Butz, enabling mutual comprehension. We will cover the topic of interpreters later in this work.

Hugo Stiglitz's back-story is also introduced. It is important to note that the film's temporality was already disrupted by Butz's reminiscence, creating a frame narrative. Stiglitz's story therefore occurs within a scene that already is a past event. Although it could get easily confused, the transition to the flashback is smooth. After Raine's introduction of the character and Rachtmann's answer: "Everybody in the German army has heard of Hugo Stiglitz," a subtitle appears in front of the renowned soldier followed by an abstract of a German newspaper's headline about him, guiding the viewer in understanding what this part is about: Stiglitz's past. We are also introduced to an exterior narrator, who directly addresses the audience, reinforcing the perception of this part as a digression from the current events.

Additionally, the viewer understands how the private survived the encounter, tying both scenes together:

> Now, when you report what happened here you can't tell them you told us what you told us. They'll shoot you (…) So tell them, we let you live so you can spread the word through the ranks what's going to happen to every Nazi we find.

This speech is shortly followed by Hitler's reaction: "You are not to tell anybody anything. Not one word of detail." We have two points of view about the scene, and the immediate reaction of Hitler on screen strengthen the relationship between the two places and times. There is also a difference between character and audience knowledge, since Hitler does not know about the information that the soldier disclosed; the audience learns that that Butz is lying to escape execution.

Finally, Donowitz's comment about Aldo's knife skills matters: "You know, Lieutenant, you're getting pretty good at this." This line implies that marking Nazis on their forehead is a common practice for the Lieutenant. The questions that he asks before the marking are echoed in the final scene, before Landa gets marked too.

In short, this chapter is as illustrative of Kozloff's first rules of dialogue as the previous scene. Unlike the film's first scene, the anchorage of the diegesis occurs more through verbal events than actions. Once more, we learn the names of characters, their roles, and their back-stories. The back-stories of Raine, Wicki and Stiglitz are explicitly described through dialogues, whereas Shosanna's back-story rests almost exclusively on Landa's actions. The superimposition of various locales and timelines requires some clarification, which the dialogue deliver. Thus, it ensures narrative causality between the various parts: the audience easily understands that time has passed from Aldo's introduction to Hitler's interview of Butz, while the jump back to the ambush is made clear by Butz's account of the ambush.

In this case, language gave information about the scene before it even started; the colloquial "ten hut" gives information about the speaker and general setting of the scene. It also served characterisation through Aldo's hillbilly accent. Languages also served as a contrasting factor between the Americans' and the Germans' point of view, reinforcing the frame narrative's distinction between the two timelines of Hitler and the Basterds.

4. Operation Kino

After the first hour of the film, we are introduced to a new character: Lieutenant Archie Hicox, a British spy. He meets General Ed Fenech, who will question him about his knowledge of the German cinema industry before briefing him about Operation Kino and his next meeting with the Basterds and Bridget von Hammersmark in France.

Just as Aldo's accent gave away his American origin, the protagonists' British accents indicate that they are British soldiers. His escort's line "This way Lieutenant" is already a clear hint of the switch to a British point of view; his pronunciation of the word "Lieutenant" vastly differs from the American pronunciation. British people pronounce the word /lefˈten.ənt/, while Americans pronounce it /luːˈten.ənt/; the American audience would undoubtedly instantly identify the difference and infer the origin of the soldiers.

We learn about the Lieutenant and the General's names, and about Hicox's back-story: before the war started. He was a critic who wrote about German cinema before the war.

General Ed Fenech introduces the operation by directly mentioning its name, which was already given in the title of the chapter: “Operation Kino”. He states that he will introduce it: “Lt Hicox, at this point in time I’d like to brief you on Operation Kino.” This line and the following help the audience to remember the name and stakes of this operation, which will matter in the elaboration of the plot. Indeed, the briefing of Archie Hicox sets the stage for the film’s climax. In the same way that Shosanna wants to burn down the cinema, the British spy’s mission will be to explode it. Besides, this scene gives information about the place, people and the following events:

> You’ll be dropped into France about twenty-four kilometres outside of Paris. The Basterds will be waiting for you. First thing, you go to a little village called Nadine. Apparently the Gerrys never go there. In Nadine, there’s a tavern called La Louisiane. You’ll rendezvous with our double agent, and she’ll take it from there. She’s the one who’s going to get you into the premiere. It will be you, her, and two German-born members of the Basterds. She’s also made all the other arrangements you’re going to need.

Hicox’s proficiency in German is crucial for the mission to be a success. This scene plants the seed for the growing tension that will arise in the tavern scene as the Lieutenant will be questioned twice about his “peculiar” German accent. Causally linking the tavern scene to its premise.

This first scene describes the plan and how it should go, whereas the following scene primes the viewer for the potential failure of this plan. As the audience’s point of view switches from the Briefing scene to the exterior of the La Louisianne, the causal link is, due to the preceding lines of dialogue, which introduced the next locale. There is also a jump in time between this scene and the preceding, but the context is made clear, and the jump in time thus makes sense. The concern for the place of the rendezvous is referred to several times, for example, as Aldo says: “You didn’t say the goddamn rendezvous was in a fucking basement,” echoed later by Donowitz’s line: “whose idea was it for the deathtrap rendezvous?” Such exchanges are indications for the viewer about the potentiality for things to go sideways during the tavern scene. Hicox’s line foreshadows the following events: “If we

get into trouble, we can handle it. But if trouble does happen, we need you to make damn sure no Germans, or French for that matter, escape from that basement."

The scene shifts from the Basterds's hideout to the tavern as Hicox says, "she wasn't picking a place to fight. She was picking place isolated and without Germans." This line taps into the audience's concern, as the camera immediately cuts to a shot of a German-speaking soldier drinking at a table. Because of the cause and consequence schema of Bordwell, the audience can immediately infer that the place depicted is the inside of the tavern, in which there are unexpected German soldiers. In this case, language change serves irony: Just after Hicox's mention of the place being free from Germans, we hear Germans discussing at the place where they are supposed to go, further adding to the potentiality of the events to go sideways.

In summary, the main information conveyed in this scene, apart from Hicox and Fenech's names and origins, are elements about the tavern scene. Most lines are directed at setting the stage for the contrast between the audience's knowledge of the normal execution of the plan, and the problems that might arise, mentioned by the Basterds, among which the presence of Germans. Furthermore, the protagonist's accents give us clues as to the origin of the soldiers involved in the briefing scene, but also serves as a transition from the Basterds's hideout to the tavern. If things were to go according to plan, no German should be heard in the tavern. However, the first sentences uttered in the basement are in German. Languages and dialogue work together in priming the audience to the mission's failure. The anchorage thus helps in managing the tension that will arise in the scene.

5. Conclusion

This first section aimed at highlighting the interaction between languages and two of Kozloff's roles: the anchorage of the diegesis and narrative causality.

We have observed how the dialogue of the first hour and a half of the film introduces many characters, their back-stories, the action, the temporality, and spatiality of the story thanks to dialogue and titles, while also linking the scenes and characters together through narrative causality.

Languages convey some information related to the diegetic world and causality too. They serve the anchorage of the diegesis by helping us to distinguish French people from Germans and Americans during the first scenes unlike many Hollywood productions in which every character speaks English: Landa and Hellstrom speak German, Shosanna and Marcel speak French, Raine and Hicox speak English. Moreover, the audience can guess the locales of the action, whether Germany or allied territories. Lastly, it plays a role in establishing causality within the story, as much as it serves irony: it abruptly foreshadowed the problems that may arise in the La Louisianne tavern as the scene shifts from Hicox's reassuring words related to the absence of Germans in the tavern, to the German-speaking soldiers of the tavern's interior.

Before ending this conclusion, we must remember that the scenes that have been analysed are not the only ones that convey an array of information to the audience. For instance, the restaurant scene with Goebbels and the veterinarian scene, which follows the events in the tavern, also provide the viewer with many relevant plot-related information. It must be remembered that, the anchorage is not solely confined to the first scenes of a movie but occur throughout the entirety of it, as mentioned in the introduction of this part.

Anchorage of the diegesis and narrative causality are two of Kozloff's functions influenced by languages. Yet, we did not discuss how they could influence other aspects, such as the realistic aspect of the film's setting, which heavily relies on the exploitation of multilingualism.

B. Adherence to the Code of Realism

In one of his interviews, Quentin Tarantino discusses how the erasure of linguistic diversity in films negatively impacts both the suspension of disbelief and plot of films: "Forget about the fact that I don't buy it, it's also the fact that you've got possibly one of the most suspenseful sequences here, but you're pissing it away by German being English" (Brad Pitt and Quentin Tarantino Interview 13:34–13:44). An important idea emerges from his answer, which will fuel this section of the work: he believes that monolingualism in films in which the context calls for multilingualism breaks audience immersion; we do not "buy it". In his film, languages matter: "I wanted to really make a big deal about language . . . it's practically what the movie is about" (Brad Pitt and Quentin Tarantino Interview 12:18-12:25). This section is about how languages are used to sustain the illusion of reality, and we will work based on Kozloff's assumption that it is directly linked to realism.

Bleichenbacher states that the notion of realism in the representation of multilingualism means that "multilingualism in the text is motivated by the desire to represent a situation of language contact in the story as faithfully as possible" (Bleichenbacher 26). In other words, realism coincides with mimesis: the imitation of nature. It must be remembered that the film takes place during the Second World War in occupied-France, and that the film does include many language-contact situations. Consequently, some aspects of this war must be accurately represented to maintain the suspension of disbelief, including the public's expectation regarding the variety of languages that one may encounter in Europe in times of war.

On the other hand, Kozloff contrasts the concept of mimetic realism with surface plausibility, which also aims at sustaining the suspension of disbelief (Kozloff 47). For instance, a sci-fi film is not unrealistic because it takes place in space. It is unrealistic if the characters can breathe in space without any previous justification from the plot. In contrast to Bleichenbacher's definition, making the idea that a character would breathe in space coherent within a story would reinforce the surface plausibility of the film, not its realism in the sense of depicting reality as accurately as possible. Quentin Tarantino verbalises this idea himself during the Cannes press conference for the film:

> The way I look at it is this: My characters changed the outcome of the war. Now, that did not happen, because my characters did not exist. But if they had existed, if there had been a Fredrick Zoller who did what he did, Goebbels very well might have made a movie about him, because he did make a movie in the vein of this at that time of the war. And if that had happened, everything that happens later in the movie is plausible (Inglourious Basterds Full Press Conference 4:35-05:01)

The director insists on the process that allowed him to build a plausible story: logical coherence.

This section aims to explore realism and suspension of disbelief in the film through the analysis of languages. The term realism will encompass both the mimetic ambition and the search for plausibility to maintain the audience's suspension of disbelief. It will be subdivided into four parts. We will first discuss the film's mise-en-scene in the light of multilingualism, realism and suspension of disbelief. The following section will be dedicated to the identification of conversational wallpapers within the film, which highlights the role of dialogue in creating a realistic environment for the film. Then, we will tackle the question of the national languages involved in the plot before analysing how they come in contact during the film. We will therefore include a discussion about the role of interpreters and accents.

1. Realism and the Film's Mise-En-Scene

Inglourious Basterds takes place in the context of the Second World War, a conflict which involved several nations, among which Germany, France, the United States and Great Britain. Such context will lead to language contact between the parties involved, whether between militaries or civilians, or both. It is important to note that the setting is already grounded in reality, in the sense that Second World War existed and that these countries are not made-up: France, Germany and Great Britain do exist outside of the film. Although these statements may sound obvious, discussing them is crucial as they play a predominant role in the director's main obligation regarding the audience's expectations: a realistic mise-en scene. Bordwell argues that "filmmakers can use mise-en-scene to achieve realism" (Bordwell & Thompson 113). It includes aspects such as the setting of a story, lighting, costumes, colours, to name a few (Bordwell & Thomson 115–140). Since this work focuses on dialogue and languages, this section will focus on how realism is achieved in the film's setting using dialogue and titles.

Since the film is based on real events and places, Tarantino must picture Second World War in France's cities or countryside in a way that would coincide with reality, or at least with what the audience would accept as plausible, otherwise it could break the suspension of disbelief. To take an extreme example, the audience would frown at a sub-Saharan desertic landscape identified by characters as being Ireland. Yet, many Hollywood movies' locales are filmed at other places than the one for which they stand, namely in studios. Sarah Kozloff explains how films trick the viewers into thinking that what they see on screen is the actual location mentioned by characters:

> Production practices always allow for one location to substitute for another: Canadian cities can double for New York, Morocco can be Kafiristan . . . What is important to me here is how implicated the dialogue always is in defining the fictional space. In a real sense, "naming" constitutes "creation. (Kozloff 36)

This idea is exploited by Quentin Tarantino in the first scene. The title gives the indication that the cabin in the countryside stands in Nazi-occupied France, so the audience is willing to accept it. The cabin could reasonably stand anywhere in Europe, but the title anchors it in

France, and the audience deems it plausible. In the same way, Ed Fenech's mention of the La Louisiane tavern being in the village of Nadine situates it in this village, which is plausible if the village's aspect corresponds to the audience's mental representation of such a village. Briefly, the suspension of disbelief is maintained by the interaction between the filmed fictional space, its naming via titles or dialogue, and the audience's assumptions regarding such space.

Nazi-occupied France provides a fertile soil for international contact, as illustrated by the film: German soldiers and French people may interact daily. The French people will inevitably have contact with the Germans, resulting in various relationships, marked by hostility like Shosanna and Fredrick's, or collaborative like Goebbels and Francesca's. In representing the lives of everyday people living in an occupied country and their differences in the enemy's welcoming, Tarantino puts forward historically accurate relationships. Indeed, one may be all too familiar with Belgium and France's history during the Second World War, and the varying attitudes between the Germans and the locals. Furthermore, the interference of other nations is plausible, as long as the plot justifies their presence to maintain surface plausibility. English and Americans do set foot on the fictional French territory: Hicox and the Basterds, and their presence is plausibly justified by guerrillas and spying.

Although the film is firmly grounded in a realistic historical setting, the film's storyline is not. Any viewer with basic knowledge of history knows that Hitler did not die in the explosion of a theatre in 1944, but the film makes it a plausible fictional alternative. The suspension of disbelief is maintained by the film's logic and coherence; the film builds coherence and justify Hitler's presence in this theatre by grounding it in the dialogue. From Shosanna's encounter with Fredrick to her meeting with Goebbels and the venue change, all the way to the Führer's on-screen decision to take part in the premiere of the film, the film coherently shapes a fictional plot in which Hitler is killed. Although this plot does not accurately depict reality, it is made plausible by the film's dialogue and causal chain.

In conclusion, *Inglourious Basterds*'s storyline is utterly unrealistic from an historical point of view: Hitler and his high command did not die in a blown-up theatre somewhere in Paris while watching a movie. In any case, the historical accuracy of the plot is not the filmmaker's aim, although crafting a realistic setting is non-negotiable if the audience's

suspension of disbelief is to be maintained. Hence, based on the elements provided in this part, we can attest that the film is plausible, at least in terms of its mise-en-scene. Tarantino successfully represents a realistic vision of France during the Second World War as he provides the audience with an imaginary but coherent story through his mise-en-scene for it portrays believable fictional places, international interactions, and justifies its plot events via dialogues and titles.

2. Conversational Wallpapers

Kozloff states that some films bank on what she terms conversational wallpapers to enhance realism. Such short exchanges with extras allow us to distinguish one among several of the director's ways of creating the illusion of reality in his scenes through dialogue.

We may first analyse a short abstract of the film's last chapter: as Hitler exits his loge during the premiere, he asks a soldier for a chewing gum. Donny Donowitz is seen spying from the corner of the corridor, and the audience watches the scene from Donny's perspective, but it also witnesses his reaction to this sighting. As we peek at Hitler through his gaze, we observe the action like flies on the wall, creating an illusion of reality. Besides, Hitler could plausibly randomly ask a soldier for a chewing gum, although this short exchange primarily serves causality within the film: it confirms the Basterds's suspicion that Hitler was indeed in the loge in which they thought he was, and it shows it to the audience. Moreover, it serves to release tension in the middle of the tense events taking place before the climax of the film. The idea that the leader of the Nazi Party, around whom such a fuss is made from the beginning of the film, could ask for such a trivial thing as a chewing gum creates a humorous break in expectations and is concurrently an instance of conversational wallpaper.

A second instance of such conversational wallpapers is the moment before the premiere begins, as secondary characters tell the audience: "Take your seats. The show is about to begin." This line is directed at the crowd gathered in the hall and allows the transition to the screening room, but it also gives the information that the show is beginning to the audience, transitioning the central action to another diegetic space for both the characters and the audience.

The final example is less of an instance of verbal wallpaper, but it is nevertheless an exchange with an extra. It occurs before the fourth chapter, when Hans Landa comes to the La Louisianne tavern and comments on whom the dead Basterds's identities to a soldier who remains silent while listening to the colonel. The soldier's presence gives the colonel a pretence for his soliloquy and conveys the audience information about his knowledge regarding the involvement of the Basterds and Frau von Hammersmark in the incident of the tavern, which sets up for the failure of the Basterds's mission. If Hans Landa had been speaking alone, it may have broken the suspension of disbelief, or influenced Landa's characterisation as he would mutter conclusions alone in an empty room. The soldier's presence makes the scene more plausible.

Following Kozloff's reasoning, we can assert that her concept of "verbal wallpaper" indeed serves realism in this film, but it also serves many other purposes. In *Inglourious Basterds*, instances of such secondary dialogues are scarce; almost every line of dialogue is directed from one main character to the other, without interference from extras. The examined evidence suggests that no line was designed for the simple sake of realism; they always serve other purposes such as conveying information or breaking tension. Realism is not necessarily the aim but is in any case a concurrent effect to the other roles fulfilled by dialogue.

Up until now, this chapter briefly evaluated how realism is construed through the mise-en-scene and dialogue to sustain the audience's suspension of disbelief. Yet, we still have not tackled the issue of languages within the dialogue, which are an important aspect when it comes to realism. If the film's aim is to maintain the suspension of disbelief from beginning to end, a plausible setting, and conversational wallpapers are not sufficient. In his article, Ralf Junkerjürgen insists that "le plurilinguisme est en règle générale une marque de réalisme, et un film sur un événement historique ne peut se passer d'être réaliste s'il ne veut pas perdre toute vraisemblance" (312). The author insists on the role of language representation to sustain the plausibility of war films.

3. Dialogue and National Languages

For any war-film director, the subject of national languages' representation is crucial, particularly when verisimilitude is to be achieved. Yet, American directors are faced with a specific issue: most Hollywood movies are primarily destined for a monolingual American

audience, which is not accustomed to watching subtitled films. Therefore, when confronted to the problem of foreign languages, filmmakers use different approaches: they can either represent them faithfully or replace them using different strategies, ranging from the complete elimination of foreign languages to their full integration to the text (Bleichenbacher 23). Kozloff mentions that "the most prevalent tactic is to recast the foreign language into English . . . Typically, this English will be spiced with some of the accents and idioms of the original language to foreground the fact that the characters are foreign" (81). Yet, as Brad Pitt points out while referring to the multilingual cast of the movie, the film director went for a different strategy:

> I appreciate the international cast . . . to bring all these people from different countries. That was true to the respective languages: he casted Germans for Germans, French for French, Americans for Americans and so on and so forth. (Inglourious Basterds Full Press Conference 05:23-05:38)

Brad Pitt involuntarily implies that *Inglourious Basterd's* director opted for a representation called presence strategy, discussed by Bleichenbacher (23–24). This strategy depicts the characters speaking their native languages, which, thanks to the subtitles, allows for "[languages'] integrity and unique expressiveness, while still preserving the dialogue's narrative functions for American filmgoers" (81). What is more, Meir Sternberg, in his article "Polylingualism in reality and translation as mimesis", defines two possibilities for filmmakers to handle multilingualism in cinema: the homogenising convention or Vehicular matching (223–224). On the one hand, the homogenising convention promotes linguistic uniformity: a film geared towards an English-speaking audience will feature foreigners speaking English instead of their native tongues, hence going as far as "[hinging] on the anti-historical Englishing of the polylingual discourse" (Sternberg 224). On the other hand, vehicular matching is the strategy used by Quentin Tarantino for his film: "the framed heterolingual or polylingual speech events are replicated and in this sense given full communicative autonomy" (Sternberg 224). Germans will speak German, as do French with the French language. In doing so, vehicular matching "Far from avoiding linguistic diversity or conflict, accepts them as a matter of course, as a fact of life and a factor of communication, and sometimes even deliberately seeks them out" (Sternberg 223). We can therefore agree

that the combination of the presence strategy and vehicular matching promotes realism. Yet, the representation of languages does not solely affect the film's realism or the anchorage of the diegesis.

Besides indirectly anchoring the space and time of the diegesis, languages influence the interactions between characters and have various effects on the audience. This section will focus on various aspects of multilingualism within the film's dialogue; we will comment on the use of interpreters, accents, and characters.

a. Interpreters

Bleichenbacher and Sternberg's works helped us to shed a light on how Tarantino's treats the subject of multilingualism in his film. Characters native of the same nation are displayed discussing in their native tongues: when Hitler addresses his officers or private Butz during the first chapter, he speaks German, as do Bridget von Hammersmark and Hans Landa when they meet. Similarly, Marcel and Shosanna always speak French to each other. It would make no sense for Marcel and Shosanna to speak English if they were real French people having a discussion. These premises alone allow the film to stage interesting communicative issues involved in such an intercultural setting; language difference and monolingualism may create misunderstanding. Although a film could probably build an entire plot around miscommunication between characters of differing nationalities, Tarantino complexified the dialogue by introducing translators to the film, allowing cross-comprehension in contexts in which monolingual speakers would not be able to communicate.

In the second and third chapters, we are introduced to various interpreters: Wilhelm Wicki, Francesca Mondino, and to a lesser extent, Major Hellstrom's chauffeur. Integrating interpreters to a story is one way to compensate the drop in comprehensibility due to the integration of languages foreign to a destined audience, "subtitles being the favoured tool for mainstream movies in such cases" (Bleichenbacher 173). Furthermore, Serban addresses the double role fulfilled by the interpreters: "They have a mediating role between the other characters on screen, while at the same time translating for the audience of the film" (translation as alchemy 45). In other words, the interpreters' role impacts the audience as much as they impact characters.

The first instance of verbal translation occurs when Wilhelm Wicki provides a translation of private Butz's words to Aldo Raine as they discuss the German position on the map. The communicative setting conforms to the following schema repetitively: Aldo asks a question in English, followed by Wicki's translation in German, then Butz answers in German, before a second translation is issued by Wicki into English:

"ALDO: Ask him if he wants to live.

Wicki translates into German

BUTZ: Yes, sir.

ALDO: Tell him to point us on this map the German position

Wicki translates into German

ALDO: Ask him how many Germans

Wicki translates into German

Butz answers

WICKI, *translating into English*: Around about twelve.

LANDA: What kind of artillery?

Wicki translates into German"

This part of the dialogue is not subtitled. Hence, to understand the information conveyed by the soldier, Aldo and the audience both depend on Wicki's translation.

The second part of the encounter consists of Aldo telling the German soldier what he is to say to his superior when interrogated about his survival and asking the questions that lead to the German soldier's mutilation. On the contrary of the preceding lines, Butz's German replies are subtitled, in addition to being translated by Wicki. In this case, Wicki's translations do not convey the information to the audience, but only to the monolingual characters. Bleichenbacher argues that this strategy, particularly in this case, is less efficient than subtitling alone: "Everything is uttered twice, so that for those viewers who understand the [original language], the effect is one of (potentially tedious) repetition" (183). Yet, there

most certainly is a reason for the use of translation: “While instances of interpreting are rarer than the other comprehensibility strategies, they are often exploited for specific narrative purposes” (183). These reasons will be evaluated in section D about alienation and isolation.

The second instance in which an interpreter appears occurs before the restaurant scene. Hellstrom’s chauffeur translates the Major’s lines as he asks Shosanna to come down and sit in the car. The interpreter provides the characters with translations from German to French and conversely. Although Shosanna’s lines are subtitled throughout the film, the German language is treated differently. Hellstrom’s French words “Mademoiselle Mimieux” are subtitled, but the Gestapo officer’s audible German words to the chauffeur are not, displaying that neither Shosanna, nor the non-German audience can understand the exchange.

The chauffeur fittingly provides a translation in French, which is subtitled in English, solving the problems raised on both levels of communication. As she asks what she has done, the chauffeur’s translation to the Major is subtitled: “She wants to know what she’s done.” Thereafter, Hellstrom’s answer “Get your ass in that car” remains untranslated but is subtitled; Shosanna visibly understood what was meant because she complies, probably based on non-verbal cues or by inferring meaning from the situation, in which she appears to have a limited set of choices, to say the least.

Throughout this short scene, the subtitles alone provide the audience with information since no English lines are spoken by the protagonists. What is more, the presence of an interpreter who does not translate every utterance creates a discrepancy between the nuances perceived by the characters and the audience: Shosanna might not have perceived the rudeness of the Major’s words when he asked her to climb into the car. Once more, the interpreter is not meant for the audience who has access to subtitles, but for the protagonists, who need someone who can translate in their native language.

Thirdly, the restaurant scene introduces us to Francesca Mondino, a French professional translator who follows Goebbels and provides translations for the minister when he interacts with French people. Shosanna and Goebbels’s first interaction is marked by a lack of translation of the minister’s German words: “Your reputation precedes you,

Fräulein Mimieux." The lack of translation gives Fredrick Zoller a natural pretence for the introduction of the new character to Shosanna and the audience: "And normally, this is Her Goebbels's French interpreter, Mademoiselle Francesca Mondino," describing her function and implying that she did not fulfil her job at this precise moment. This line therefore plays the role of anchoring the diegesis through non-translation. After Hellstrom's German lines, which will remain untranslated by Francesca, Goebbels will directly address Shosanna, and the interpreter will provide with a translation in French. Each of Goebbels's utterance is subtitled, but Francesca's are not.

> *"*GOEBBELS: I must say, Fräulein, I should be rather annoyed with you.
>
> *Francesca interprets...*
>
> GOEBBELS: I arrive in France, and I wish to have lunch with my star...
>
> *Francesca interprets...*
>
> GOEBBELS: Little do I know he's become the toast of Paris, and now he must find time for me.
>
> *Francesca interprets...*
>
> GOEBBELS: People wait in line for hours, days, to see me. For the Führer and Private Zoller, I wait.
>
> *Francesca interprets...*
>
> GOEBBELS: So finally, I'm granted an audience with the young private, and he spends the entire lunch speaking of you and your cinema.
>
> *Francesca interprets...*
>
> GOEBBELS: So Fräulein Mimieux let's get down to business.
>
> *Private Zoller interrupts—*
>
> ZOLLER: Herr Minister Doctor Goebbels, I haven't informed her yet.

> GOEBBELS: Unless the girl's a simpleton, I'm sure she's figured it out by now. After all, she does operate a cinema. Francesca, tell her."

After Zoller's interruption, Shosanna cannot understand the dialogue, for she is not provided with a direct translation. Francesca then plainly tells Shosanna the reason for her presence at the table, in French, and the interpreter is soon interrupted by the soldier who wanted to tell the news himself:

> "FRANCESCA: What they're trying to tell you, Emmanuelle, is Private Zoller has spent the last hour at lunch, trying to convince Monsieur Goebbels to abandon previous plans for Private Zoller's film premiere and change the venue to your cinema.
>
> *Zoller reacts.*
>
> FRANCESCA: What?
>
> FREDRICK: I wanted to inform her.
>
> FRANCESCA: Shit. I apologise, Private. Of course, you did.
>
> GOEBBELS: What's the issue?
>
> FRANCESCA: The young soldier wanted to inform the Mademoiselle himself."

The structure of this scene's dialogue is awkward: Shosanna is oblivious as to what the characters are telling her, or as to what they are discussing about in German. It illustrates the difficulties linked to a communicative setting in which monolingual characters confront and rely on translators to cross-communicate. Nevertheless, there is still a confusion provoked by the characters' misunderstanding, which reflects some defaults of natural. Additionally, we once more contemplate how characters are alternatively isolated depending on whether they have access to a translation of the interpreter or not. While Shosanna expresses her inability to understand through facial gestures oriented at the audience, Goebbels vocalises his inability to understand the exchange between Shosanna and Francesca: "What's the issue?" Interpretation and lack thereof are therefore insisted upon by the production crew and made to be noticed by the audience.

It is interesting to note how the audience has full access to most of the ideas conveyed from one character to the other, thanks to the subtitles. As mentioned before, the repetition of information is also tedious, as every information is repeated twice to the audience, in three languages: Once in German through Goebbels's utterances, once in French through the interpreter's translation, and once in English through the subtitling of the minister's utterance. This repetition of information is necessary to sustain the suspension of disbelief: a monolingual character will not spontaneously understand what another monolingual character would say, unless non-verbal cues were to be particularly evocative. What is more, in every scene analysed in this subsection, there is a delay between the comprehension of the meaning of a character's words by the audience who acquires it instantly thanks to the subtitles, in contrast to the information that the characters receive.

This subsection confirms what we have discussed earlier: the interpreters play a role in bridging the gap between the various characters, and their lack of translation disturbs the flow of information between the various characters. In doing so, Tarantino realistically portrays the difficulties of language contact as they can occur in real-life. We have also seen that Tarantino purposefully left Butz's words unsubtitled; thus, the audience learns information at the same time as the characters. In the case of the restaurant scene, we have access to information before Shosanna does, if she ever does, which creates a discrepancy between the elements that audience and those that the characters understand.

We have observed how interpreters play a role in developing realistic dialogues, and unequally distributing information. Yet, we still did not discuss the various forms that languages can take. Therefore, we will now take a look at how accents may influence the narrative.

b. Accents

To maintain the suspension of disbelief in any film, an American soldier who speaks English should not speak with a British accent. Rosina Lippi-Green provides clear examples:

> U.S. audiences may or may not suspend disbelief when Robin Hood sounds like he grew up in Nevada, but it would be harder to cast someone with an

> upper-class British accent as Ronald Regan or Richard Nixon and not do serious harm to credibility, audience expectations and reception. (108)

We have already mentioned several times that the native language of characters matches their nationalities. In addition to using various national languages to build its narrative, the film portrays regional variations of the same language in the form of accents, or even register difference. These varieties add another layer of realism and take part in characterisation and plot advancement. We will start by discussing the ways in which the varieties manifest, then discuss how the cast members were selected based on their linguistic proficiency.

Native (L1) and Non-native (L2) Accents

The film portrays various speakers of German and English, both with their accents which can be divided based on two categories: accents of L1 speakers and L2 speakers of a language. Primarily, L1 speakers are native speakers whose accents are "structured variation in language", demarcated by geography but also by "socially bound clusters of features which are superimposed on the geographic" (Lippi-Green 45).

Native accents have an impact on characterisation. We established in the theoretical section that they can give away the origin and social class of characters. On the one hand, Aldo's American accent can be characterised geographically: a Southern accent, as well as socio-culturally, because he is part of a social community of speakers with similar accents: a hillbilly accent. On the other hand, Archie Hicox's British accent can be geographically characterised as the London variety or Received Pronunciation, often associated with "images of 'elegance', 'propriety' and 'refinement'" (Mugglestone 50). Such association is, however, possible based on the audience knowledge of language diversity: Americans would probably easily identify a British accent, as would the British for the American accent, while at the same time making associations based on clichés or stereotypes linked to the variety.

The same pattern applies for the L1 German speakers: As Major Hellstrom points out in the tavern scene, Hugo Stiglitz's accent is geographically linked to Frankfurt, whereas Wilhelm Wicki's is linked to München. However, if stereotypes are deliberately used for characterisation in the case of these characters, it may be hard for a non-German-speaking audience to notice such nuance and evaluate the character as intended by the director.

L2 accents are also a major feature of the film, as many characters speak other languages than their native one. Fredrick Zoller's French is marked by phonological features of German, as is Bridget von Hammersmark's French, among others. Since the characters' accents can give away their nationality, the audience could guess a character's origin based solely on his speech, but it would require an ear for accents. Anyhow, such information is already provided by the context of war, ranging from the use of uniforms of the various nations involved in the conflict to character's lines as they explicitly mention their origins, to name a few.

Apart from providing the film with a realistic environment, accents take an active role in the plot development. Both the tavern and Italian scene's outcomes are the result of language variation: Archie Hicox raised suspicions from both Hellstrom and Wilhelm before he betrayed himself through his non-verbal language. On the other hand, Aldo and the other Basterds immediately gave themselves away when uttering Italian words with an accent which Bridget had qualified as probably "atrocious".

In short, the characters' L1 accents play a role in their characterisation and gives the film a more realistic flavour in addition to giving the director original possibilities for managing the plot. For example, if Germans spoke English with an impeccable British accent, the suspension of disbelief may be hard to maintain. In contrast, the use of L2 accents is more of a consequence of multilingualism in the film than it is a production choice. The international cast inevitably brought in its accents: Germans and French actors speak with an L2 accent; consequently, their characters do too. The next part will discuss the links between the cast, their accents and how some accents were toyed with.

Cast and Characters

A legitimate concern when discussing the accents of the film is the origin of a character's accent, whether it is the residue of an actor's origin or an artificial construct. Initially, we should remember that "[an] actor's natural vocal qualities, combined with his or her vocal skills, greatly influence the viewer's perception of the character's personality" (44). When the cast of a film is selected, the characters who are portrayed are inevitably partly characterised by the actor's vocal and physical features, among others. Additionally, they bring their linguistic background into their interpretation: their accent, prosody, tone, unless

they work with a coach to erase their national features. Lippi-Green mentions that some actors “may undergo accent training of various kinds in an attempt to learn to imitate what they need for a particular role” (108), underlining the idea that accents are sometimes deliberately altered to fulfil a role planned by the collective sender.

Within the film, there are multiple L2 speakers with diverse accents of varying intensities. It may be useful to determine whether an actor’s accent corresponds with his character’s accent, or if there is a discrepancy between the two: whether it is exaggerated, reduced, or if an actor interprets an accent which would be different from his native accent. In any case, finding out whether an actor’s natural accent shines through his speech or whether he worked on altering it should provide us with some ground for exploration regarding the way accents shape the narrative and the film’s realism. The simplest, yet not most reliable way of comparing an actor’s and his character’s accent would be by taking a look at interviews in the target language and determining whether the actor shares the vocal features of his characters. Also, direct commentaries from the cast or the director about languages and accents in the film could also give us an insight in that respect.

To begin with, Bridget von Hammersmark’s accent should be particularly noticeable by the English-speaking audience during the veterinary scene, in which Aldo questions her about the bloody events of the tavern. Her first line in English “I’m Alive” is already marked by a German pronunciation of the end of the word, which is silenced: /v/ becomes a /f/. Similarly, in her following replicas, the “th” sounds typical of English words such as “that” becomes /z/ “You speak German better *than* your friends?” By taking a closer look, we can observe the lack of consistency in these consonant swaps, which could betray the inauthenticity of her accent, though her accent may be credible enough for people casually watching the film without looking for inconsistencies. When comparing Diane Kruger’s speech during interviews for the film in English with her English lines within the film (Inglorious Bastards (2009) – Diane Kruger Interview), we can observe that she does not have nearly as a strong accent as her character Bridget von Hammersmark possesses, although she is a native German actress (“Diane Kruger”), Diane Kruger mentions during a press conference that she took inspiration from Hildegard Knef, a German actress with a strong accent who always “talked a bit too loud” (Inglourious Basterds Full Press Conference 19:35-19:40); proving that her German accent within the film is therefore manufactured. The

reason why Bridget von Hammersmark would speak accented English is clear as the character is a native German actress, as Hildegard Knef. Diane Kruger drew inspiration from celebrities to depict a realistic version of how a German actress of the Second World War would talk like. As a result, she portrays a fluent English speaker, though her speech is marked by strong phonological interferences from her L1 perceivable by the public.

Hans Landa is played by Christoph Waltz, an Austrian-German actor who is proficient in German, French and English. The character is a German native like Diane Kruger, so it makes sense for him to have an accent when he speaks English or French. His German accent in English can be heard, though he speaks closely to the English Received Pronunciation. His L2 accents are the least noticeable of all characters; as he speaks a foreign language, Landa has a significantly purer language than the others in terms of phonological interferences from his L1, which coincides with the actor's speech.

Brad Pitt plays the character Aldo Raine. Both the character and the actor are southern American natives: Brad Pitt was born in Oklahoma ("Brad Pitt"), whereas Aldo mentions coming from Tennessee. Brad Pitt displays a southern accent in his interviews, although less marked than Aldo Raine's English (Inglourious Basterds Full Press Conference). Rosina Lippi-Green mentions three distinctive features that betray a southern Accent and that most Northerners would recognise as a such:

> the merger of /i/ and /e/ before nasal sounds so that 'pin' and 'pen' are both 'pin', 'hem' and 'him' are both 'him', the monophthongization of /ai/ to /a/ as in the words 'tie', 'rice', 'dime' which will sound something like 'tah', 'rahs', 'dahm'. And finally, 'you all' or 'y'all' for the second person plural pronoun. (Lippi-Green 213)

Aldo Raine's speech is marked by these features. They are audible signals to the American audience that the character is a southerner, which Tarantino wanted him to sound like, as stated in his script for the film: "A hillbilly from the mountains" (19). Once more, the depiction of an American soldier with an American accent makes sense when looking for plausibility, even more so as Aldo comes into contact with Hicox, a British soldier, creating a stark audible contrast that underlines their difference in origin. In order to portray Aldo

Raine, Brad Pitt seems to have emphasised certain aspects of his accent to sound as hillbilly as possible.

Archie Hicox is played by Michael Fassbender. Although the actor is Irish, he portrays a British officer with a London accent. His proficiency in German also allows him to pass for a German officer during the film, though his accent is qualified as being "odd" by Hellstrom during the tavern scene. A Farout magazine article mentions,

> the role required specific knowledge of the differences between German dialects and provincial pronunciations, and just like the role of Hans Landa, Tarantino needed just the right actor to bring the part to life. (Golsen)

In other words, the actor's knowledge of local German varieties was necessary for his role, once more illustrating the importance of accuracy in the depiction of characters of foreign origin, and the attention paid to the speech of the characters.

In conclusion of this subsection, we can confirm based on the evidence provided that some actors have deliberately emphasised national peculiarities of their speech, whereas others have spoken in their natural accent. In any case, the linguistic choices make sense when discussing the concept of plausibility: Aldo Raine must speak with a Southern American English if he comes from South America, whereas the upper-class Archie Hicox should speak the London variety of English, as he is a London spy. Bridget's accent is supported by the actor's naturalistic ambitions as she drew inspiration from a German actress of the time, whereas Landa seems to have kept his character's English close to his real-life speech, although with a slightly stronger German phonological influence.

Tarantino's insistence in bringing actors from all over the world to portray his characters to achieve a realistic ambition shines through the film; whether the accents are natural or altered by dialect coaches, they play a role both in creating a plausible context for the film and in influencing the plot development. The characters' accents match their origin and allow the audience to recognise the varieties, while associating stereotypes to the characters, therefore taking an active part in characterisation.

4. Conclusion

In this section, we have looked at various layers of the narrative that take part in refining realism within the film and maintaining the suspension of disbelief, while also discussing ideas related to the use of languages in the dialogue. Like mentioned in the introductory part of this section, Tarantino wanted us to "buy it", although the film's plot is fictional. We can argue that he succeeded.

We have discussed how the setting of the film lay the foundation for illustrating the interactions between members of each nation of the Second World War. The production's choice of anchoring their movie in a real-life historical timeline requires a series of elements to be plausible to guarantee the suspension of disbelief: a plausible mise-en-scene, among which the credible representation of the locales mentioned, among others.

Kozloff's concept of verbal wallpaper has provided a first glance at one way that allowed the filmmaker to pursue realism, while also caring for other roles of dialogue, such as the anchorage of the diegesis, although languages do not play a major role within this concept. In contrast, national languages play an essential role in providing realism in the depiction of character interaction. Quentin Tarantino opted for a presence strategy in his depiction of languages; every nation's protagonist is a native speaker of his language, which is uncommon for Hollywood productions: Germans speak German and French people speak French to each other, but they use a common language or an interpreter when speaking with foreigners. Within the fictional world, language difference leads to isolation, alienation and misunderstanding, to name a few, which are plausible consequences of language-contact situations.

Furthermore, we have discussed the role of interpreters, who take part in the narrative construction of the film in meaningful ways. Admittedly, their presence is not essential to the entirety of the dialogue's comprehensibility for the audience because subtitles already provide a translation for most of the foreign character's lines essential to the plot development. The same information is sometimes repeated various times to the public through subtitles and translations, which amounts to redundancy. Nonetheless, the interpreters fulfil other roles apart from securing comprehension on the audience level. We have seen how they play a pivotal role on the level concerned with characters: they bridge

the gap between monolingual characters, for whom language is an obstacle to communication. Secondly, interpreters care for the flow of information on the level of characters and of the audience: The information transmitted by private Butz is translated into English by Wicki, conveying information to both the monolingual audience and Aldo Raine who does not understand German either. Yet, the opposite is also true: The lack of translation isolates characters instead of allowing communication, disrupting the flow of information. Finally, we can affirm that the presence of interpreters sustains realism. Their presence in a language-contact zone such as occupied France is necessary for characters to understand each other, as some are monolingual. The setting of the film requires their presence, which reinforces plausibility.

Finally, accents fill a major role within the adherence to the code of realism and suspension of disbelief. Not only do characters speak the language of their nation of origin, but they speak with various accents depending on whether they are employing their native tongue or a second language. This is possible because of the cast of the film, as Tarantino mostly chose actors that coincided with his characters' nationalities. Therefore, the characters' native languages are spoken by natives, and they display varying degrees of proficiency in their second language. By picturing an array of language users of different nations, the film adds another layer of realism, further reinforcing plausibility within the film.

Surely, the film's plot and characters are fictional, but the setting, dialogues, languages, and accents create a realistic fictional world. Consequently, realism allows the audience to accept the alternate version of history provided by Quentin Tarantino as plausible and maintains the suspension of disbelief.

C. Language, Alienation, and Isolation – Analysis of the participant roles

Goffman's theory of the participant roles provides us with an interesting framework to analyse *Inglourious Basterds*'s dialogues and its impact on the level of characters. Applying the various concepts in the context of this multilingual film will let us better understand each character's role during discussions involving two or more characters, based on the languages each speaks and the code-switches they operate. We will also investigate the effects of these participant roles on the audience.

This section is divided into two parts, each focusing on an instance in which participant roles are influenced by code-switches. The scenes examined include abstracts of the exposition scene and from the third chapter. At the end of each part, a short conclusion will summarise the impact of languages on the participant roles and potential effects on the audience.

1. Alienation of the Germans and Instrumentalisation of Languages

The film's first scene introduces us to Hans Landa, whose proficiency in many languages is displayed throughout the film. Before evaluating the impact of his use of languages on the scene, we must consider the setting of LaPadite and Landa's first exchange, in which Landa exchanges a few words with his escort in unsubtitled German. The position of the camera indicates that LaPadite and the audience observe the soldiers from a distance, though both are in aural range. Whether the audience is anchored to his point of view is debatable, yet we can assume that we approximately hear what LaPadite hears of the exchanges. Then, we must look at the linguistic context: We can safely assume that LaPadite's knowledge of German is limited, since the colonel addresses the farmer in both French and English, but never in German. Consequently, if we consider that most of the audience does not speak German, the non-subtitling of the dialogue could have two implications, depending on whether we are indeed subjected to LaPadite's point of view or if we adopt an outsider's perspective; like "a fly on the wall" as Kozloff puts it (58).

In the first case, the subtitles would be subordinated to LaPadite's hearing senses: he does not understand German, or maybe he does but is too far to grasp what they say. Consequently, the audience is not granted comprehension either, stressing identification with or sympathy for LaPadite. In the second case, these first lines of German are not meant

to be understood at all by the public, regardless of LaPadite's comprehension, in order to alienate the soldiers. According to the official film's script, Tarantino explicitly mentions that the Germans were to be looked at "from a distance, like the farmer" (2), thus favouring the first interpretation. Nevertheless, we could combine both interpretations: the lack of translation of the German soldiers' dialogue takes part in stressing identification with LaPadite as much as it alienates the German soldiers on both the level of the audience and the inter-character level, because no one can understand what they say due to a lack of knowledge of the German language. This example illustrates how the film manipulates language and subtitles to create a certain effect on the audience and to give an insight into a character's inner world with the assistance of visual manipulation of points of view through camerawork.

We must then discuss the first instance of code-switching, which occurs as Hans Landa addresses LaPadite. As mentioned earlier, it is difficult to explain why code-switches occur in a particular context. Penelope Gardner-Chloros mentions three sociological functions of code-switching, which tend to overlap (110); two of which might explain Landa's introduction in French: bonding and dampening directness. As we will observe throughout the scene, the colonel will be polite and pleasant with LaPadite, only to drastically shift his stance as he approaches the closure of his inquiry. This could be a strategy from Landa to misdirect LaPadite about his intentions in order to bewilder him. Besides, it displays a conscious or unconscious knowledge from the director, who manipulates code-switching to reinforce Landa's inoffensive appearance: not only is he polite, but he addresses the farmer in his native language instead of German.

The second instance of code-switching occurs soon after and has a severe influence on the outcome of this scene. Whether Hans Landa's switch to English is linked to his lack of knowledge of French is dubious, to say the least. The French vocabulary and grammar that he employs are advanced; he could undoubtedly proceed in this language until the end. However, he asks for the permission to switch to English since he knows that LaPadite speaks English, impacting the communicative setting of the scene, without the audience being aware of it yet. Up to this point, the situation was organised as follows: Landa was for the greater part, the speaker, whereas LaPadite was the addressee; both are ratified participants to the communication process, and they keep these roles throughout the scene.

However, there are also unratified hearers underneath them: eavesdroppers, which LaPadite already knows, but the audience only discovers it when the camera films underneath the floorboards and reveals the eavesdroppers. The consequences of Landa and LaPadite's switch to English are lethal for the hidden Jews: Assuming that they do not speak the language, Landa expels them from their position of eavesdroppers, and they become bystanders, who will not grasp anything from the characters' words anymore. This change in stance will make it impossible for them to understand LaPadite's revelations to the colonel about their hiding place, thus making escape difficult. Eventually, Landa switches back to French to fool the hiding Jews and to dispose of them easily. Landa instrumentalises code-switching to deliberately select participants of a conversation and excluding others, while also using it as a strategy to influence his interlocutor's attitude towards him.

2. Shosanna's Isolation from the Germans

For most of the second chapter, Shosanna's lack of knowledge of German leaves her isolated: from the exchanges between the German soldiers and Zoller while they sit at the bistro, to the discussion between Goebbels and the "war hero".

After Emmanuelle Mimieux, formerly Shosanna Dreyfus, and private Fredrick Zoller met for the first time, they meet again in a French bistro. As she tells him that she wants him to stop pestering her, they are interrupted by another soldier, who looks very pleased to come across Fredrick. Both exchange a few words in unsubtitled German, inadvertently excluding Shosanna from the conversation. Identification with her situation is forced upon the non-German-speaking viewers, which do not understand the other characters either and can only rely on visuals to make out the significance of the interruption. Moreover, the script of the film explicitly states that the encounter was purposefully intended not to be understood by the audience: "They make a fuss over him in UNSUBTITLED GERMAN, which neither Shosanna nor the non-German-speaking members of the movie's audience can understand" (49). This is unusual because in other instances in which Shosanna appears in the presence of Germans, they are always subtitled. Obviously, Shosanna is intrigued as much as the audience is; until now, Shosanna and the viewer were led to believe that Fredrick was a simple soldier. Yet, he seems famous, which prompts her to ask the question: "who are you?" The question is left unanswered, and another German soldier and a girl immediately

interrupts them for an autograph. The girl escorting him turns to Shosanna and tells her in French: “You’re a very lucky girl, catching a brave war hero.” The audience and Shosanna both simultaneously discover that Fredrick is a war hero, uncovering the reason for the interruptions and his apparent fame, but remaining isolated up until then, managing suspense.

Essentially, language hides information that is audible, but which would need a translation to be understood. If we had access to subtitles, we would know the reason of Fredrick’s popularity since the first interruption. Yet, it is not before the second encounter that we understand it. The abrupt interruptions in a foreign language, which cannot be understood by Shosanna nor the audience, thus creates a sense of mystery around Fredrick. Additionally, the audience sympathises with Shosanna’s position; the viewer has no access to a translation and consequently understands as much as Shosanna does. Only information conveyed through non-verbal cues of the German characters; their gestures and tone of voice, among others. The scriptwriter’s use of language thus serves to delay the delivery of missing information for which the viewer aches and leads to identification with Shosanna.

Later, we observe another way of using languages and subtitles when Shosanna is pictured working on a ladder in front of her cinema. A black car approaches with two German soldiers stepping out, among which Major Hellstrom. As the Major asks his chauffeur to ask her whether this is her cinema, his utterance is not subtitled. In the same way that Landa’s words were left unsubtitled upon his entrance on the farm, Hellstrom’s words cannot be understood by Emmanuelle Mimieux; once more, the scene is staged from the perspective of a character that does not speak German, therefore further isolating her from the Germans and echoing the previous scene from Shosanna’s past. It should also be noted that the rudimentary French words uttered by Hellstrom’s chauffeur are subtitled for the English-speaking audience, which makes sense since the scene is filmed from Shosanna’s point of view up the ladder, and she is a native French speaker. Although Hellstrom’s utterances are left unsubtitled, there is an exception to this lack of subtitles: Hellstrom’s command to “get [Shosanna’s] ass in the car” is not translated by the soldier but subtitled. It would be hard to find an explanation other than the filmmaker’s will to let the audience directly perceive Hellstrom’s impolite behaviour towards her, creating a negative

expectation as to the following events, and further generate irony when Zoller tells her that he didn't know whether she would answer his "invitation" during the next scene.

The next scene goes even further in using language and subtitle manipulation to isolate Shosanna. She sits at the minister Goebbels's table with Fredrick, Hellstrom, and Goebbels's French translator: Francesca Mondino. This time, the audience is omnilingual and is granted comprehension of Germans via subtitling, unlike Shosanna who relies on Francesca's translations to make sense of the characters' words. The camera does not follow any of the character's point of view this time, as it sometimes travels behind different characters' backs and displays various angles on the speakers. This time, the audience is undoubtedly supposed to watch the scene from an overhearer's perspective, comprehending every utterance by the Germans and French speakers and giving the audience more information about the exchanges than Shosanna has access to.

This time, Shosanna's incomprehension is expressed through images, as she raises her eyebrows and displays a queasy smile, whereas it was expressed earlier through the lack of subtitles. Upon her arrival in the restaurant, she does not understand Hellstrom as he introduces himself to her and tells her to try the Champagne. It is only when Francesca Mondino's starts translating Goebbels's words that she can be characterised as the addressee. Without Francesca, Shosanna would have remained a bystander, unable to understand any of the exchanges in German. At some point, the characters speak French: Francesca directly addresses Shosanna to tell her that Goebbels is considering airing the Premiere of *The Nation's Pride* in her cinema. Fredrick interrupts her because he wanted to tell her the news himself, and Goebbels then eagerly asks in German: "What's the issue?" The Minister does not speak French, hence his need for a translator and his exclusion from the previous exchanges. This pattern is repeated when Fredrick tries to convince Goebbels to change the venue of the premiere. Shosanna was a bystander throughout this exchange, who could not grasp the meaning of their debate because of the lack of translation from Francesca Mondino. As the minister resumes his questioning regarding Shosanna's cinema.

Upon Landa's arrival, Goebbels and Fredrick leave the table, not before exchanging words that Shosanna does not understand. Thanks to subtitles, the audience knows what their private conversation should be about, but Emmanuelle can only speculate, and she

shows concern as Fredrick looks worried to leave them alone. There is a disconnect between what Shosanna and what the audience knows since we have access to the translation of Landa's words, whereas she does not: "No need for concern, you two. As security chief, I simply need to have a chat with the possible new venue's property owner." Interesting enough, the last time we saw Landa explaining that he just wanted to have a "discussion", it led to an interrogation, then followed by slaughter. There is ground to be concerned when the colonel expresses that he wants to "have a chat" with Shosanna. As an audience, we cannot trust Landa after the events of the farm, and Shosanna cannot either. Consequently, the comprehension of Landa's German words does not prevent the audience from showing concern for Shosanna's integrity. The audience knows as little as Shosanna does about the colonel's intentions.

The film's script reveals a fact that Tarantino wanted to share on the communicative level between director and audience. We remarked earlier that Hans Landa's switch to English in the first scene was surprising due to his fluency in French. Through the script, we now learn that "the fluency and poetic proficiency of the SS Jew hunter's French reveals to the audience that his feigning clumsiness at French with Monsieur LaPadite in the film's first scene was simply an interrogation technique" (65), which leaves no room for suppositions regarding his instrumentalisation of language.

3. Conclusion

The analysis of the participant roles highlights how languages can be manipulated to alienate or to isolate characters from one another, which by extension has a similar impact on the audience when identification is properly achieved, namely through camerawork.

We observed how LaPadite and the audience alienated the Germans as they approached the farm due to the lack of translation, before experiencing Landa's instrumentalisation of code-switching to fulfil his duty. Languages also take part in delaying the delivery of information to the audience or from one character to the other as we saw during the bistro scene. In the same vein, Shosanna's encounter with the Major was marked by the same processes as she could not understand Hellstrom or Goebbels without the help of translators. Finally, the scene of the restaurant illustrates how the comprehension of foreign dialogues by the audience and the characters can differ, although it does not enable predictability for that matter; Landa's actions during his meeting with Shosanna are not

foreseeable. In short, the comprehension, incomprehension, or manipulation of languages by the characters influences the flow of information among each other, while also impacting the viewer's experience.

D. ORIGINAL VERSION AND FRENCH VERSION

In the previous sections, we have analysed various roles that languages played in the narrative construction of Inglourious Basterds in its original version. Hollywood productions such as this are often meant to be exported internationally, and there are various ways of doing so. While the subtitling of the original version in a foreign language may be the cheapest and most widespread way, dubbing is also an alternative; Yet, dubbing a multilingual film such as this might come with some translational challenges regarding the choice of characters' languages, the translation of their idiolects, or the translation of cultural references, among others.

A comparative analysis of the French version and the original version of the film may therefore highlight how the multiple languages are altered, erased, or replaced. It will underline differences in the way the plot material is conveyed to the audience, how participant roles are altered, and how characterisation is impacted. In short, we will evaluate the two versions' use of languages and subtitles, before following with commentaries about the differences; we will weigh whether the transposition of effects from one version to the other is successful and emphasise the roles of multilingualism in such narrative. We will start by evaluating the difference in the languages spoken by characters and subtitles, then zoom in on the transposition of regional varieties of languages, analyse the difference in code-switching, cultural references, and characters' idiolects.

1. Language Transposition and Accents

In the original version, each character speaks its native language among his peers. The French version does things differently. While French characters still speak French, German characters' dialogues are treated differently, and English characters are dubbed in French, which leads to various issues that we will discuss here. We will start by commenting on the differences in the use of English and German by characters throughout the film, but also on how accents are managed.

a. English

Inglourious Basterds's plot involves British and American secret services during the war. In order to maintain the suspension of disbelief, it would make sense to give these characters the language that matches their nationalities. Yet, the French version neither pictures Aldo, Hicox, or Ed Fenech speaking English; they all speak French as if it was their native language. This has different impacts on the way characters may be perceived by the audience.

Firstly, the briefing scene, which involves both characters, takes place in French from beginning to end. Obviously, as this scene does not portray a situation of language contact, but a monolingual situation; translating the dialogue in French may have no repercussion. Yet, there is a loss in terms of the cultural stereotypes that may be conveyed through the use of British English. We have established that the London variety of English is considered upper-class, but this social stereotype is only conveyed by the characters' accents and mannerism. Furthermore, Archie Hicox mostly uses the *vous* form when addressing other characters, while Raine uses the *tu* form when talking to Landa, for example. Obviously, the character is still perceived as well educated due to his use of a formal register so the difference on the perception of his character is slight. In short, the English audience could make inferences about Hicox's education level based on his accent, whereas the French version erases this nuance, although his education is still reflected by his use of formal language.

Archie Hicox and Aldo Raine's language were heavily contrasted in the original version of the film; Both of their accents could be associated with stereotypes, thus taking part in characterisation, but also on the anchorage of the diegesis since it gave information about the character's background. The French version also sustains this contrast, but not by resorting to difference in accents. Aldo and Hicox both speak French but use language differently; their mannerism and registers are opposites.

Aldo Raine's speech is marked by contractions and a familiar language, which is equivalent to his speech in English:

> Bon alors, j'sais pas pour vous mais ce qui est sûr, c'est qu'jai pas foutu l'camp d'ma montagne, j'me suis pas farci huit mille bornes de flotte, j'ai

> pas arpenté la moitié de la Sicile et j'ai pas été largué par un zinc pour donner aux nazis des leçons d'humanité.

Besides, we should note that Aldo Raine's use of the French *tu* form while talking to anyone, regardless of their status, as opposed to Archie Hicox. The English version cannot make such distinctions since the polite form does not exist as it does in French by switching of the personal pronouns. Consequently, the French translators made a conscious choice when writing the way he would address other characters, which is revealing of Aldo's irreverent behaviour, thus taking part in his characterisation in a way that the English version could not.

There are small differences in terms of dialogue when it comes to the characters addressing each other while they discuss about their language proficiency. As a matter of fact, Aldo Raine does not ask private Butz if he speaks English like in the original version; he asks him "tu comprends?" The translators dodged the bullet as they did not make any reference to languages through this line. If Aldo had said "Tu parles anglais?", it would have sounded odd as they would proceed in French anyway, not in English. Likewise, in the tavern scene Wilhelm asks Aldo if he is American or British. While Aldo tells Wilhelm that he speaks English pretty good for a German in the original version, the French Aldo says "Ah ça fait qu'on n'est pas dans le même camp alors". The reference to language is erased another time. Although we could not consider these changes to have a particular impact on the audience, they are interesting challenges that translators face when translating characters' comments related to language use.

b. German

In the French version, the German language is almost untouched, apart from a few instances. Germans discuss in German while addressing each other. Yet, Bridget's interactions with Hans Landa are translated into French, although both are native Germans.

Consequently, the suspension of disbelief may be disturbed as the setting of the conversation would require a discussion in the character's native language. The dubbers' choice of French is illogical in terms of narrative coherence but makes sense to make the story more accessible to the French audience, as it is less packed with subtitles.

What is more, Bridget von Hammersmark's discussions oscillate between her having a German accent and it disappearing later in the film. During the Italian scene, Aldo and the Basterds could not possibly understand the conversation that Bridget and Landa held in front of them in the original version as it took place in German, whereas the French version implies that the Basterds do understand them since both Landa and Bridget speak in French. Hence there should be a switch in participant roles: while the Basterds were originally excluded from understanding the conversation held in German, they should understand the conversation this time. However, the French dubbers tried to indicate that Landa and Bridget's implied language during the scene is German. Bridget von Hammersmark had a German accent in the veterinary scene while she spoke French, but her accent disappears to give way to a native sounding French in the Italian scene. The French dubbing might hence imply that the veterinary scene takes place in a foreign language for Bridget, while the discussion held between her and Landa takes place in another language than Aldo and the Basterds'. The Basterds do not understand what Landa and Bridget are saying; the dubbers tried to make it clear through accents: when portrayed as speaking French, Bridget displays a German accent, but it disappears when she is portrayed speaking German. The disappearance of Bridget's accent might therefore lead to confusion regarding her mastery of French and the implied language that she and Landa speak in, since she speaks French in both cases.

This confusion may be reinforced by the fact that in the preceding scene, Landa exclusively speaks in German as he discovers the dead bodies of the Basterds and describes them to a German soldier. His switch in French in the following scenes therefore makes little sense, for Bridget is a native too.

c. Italian

The humorous effect of the use of Italian by Aldo Raine is transposed in the French version, while Landa's mastery is as clear as in the original version. While the pronunciation of Italian words by the Lieutenant was marked by an American phonology, Landa's Italian is identical to the original version. Therefore, the effects of Italian in the original version are translated in the French version.

2. Subtitles

Since the French version translates some foreign lines of dialogue into French, the film's subtitling is handled differently than the original version. This has an impact on the audience's perception of French and on the scene that involve interpreters.

Part-subtitles are aimed at the film's primary audience. In this case, the subtitles are written in French as they are meant for a French audience, and they translate English, German and Italian lines, except sometimes, such as Landa's German lines of the first scene. The first main difference thus lies in the fact that the French language in the French version is not subtitled as it is not a foreign language for the French audience. Therefore, we can argue that a difference in reception is inevitable depending on whether the character's language coincides with the audience's language or if it does not.

The use of subtitles differs particularly during the scenes that include interpreters. While the scene that involves Wicki remains unchanged in terms of subtitling, the restaurant scene is subtitled differently: German remains unsubtitled as long as Francesca translates. The difference between the French reception and English reception of the film lies in the idea that the English audience has to read Francesca's subtitled interpretation, while the French audience exclusively relies on verbal translation, since French is the language of the audience in this version. Like in the ORIGINAL VERSION, the German lines of Goebbels, Hellstrom, Zoller and Landa are subtitled. The flow of information and participant roles are maintained, as the spectators understand what the characters say in both French and German, while Shosanna remains excluded.

3. Reduction of Code-switching in Foreign languages

Code-switching in conversations does occur during the original version and the French version, although some differences in its execution can be noticed.

In the film's original version, Hans Landa code-switches from French to English. This structure is mirrored in the French version of the film, though with a difference in timing. In the original version, Hans Landa immediately switches to English after the line "I ask your permission to switch to English for the remainder of the conversation," which he justifies by his concern for his limited knowledge of the French language. However, in the French version, the dialogues diverge from the ORIGINAL VERSION. Landa does not mention his

embarrassment at speaking French poorly, but he justifies the incoming switch because he finds it amusing:

> Je dois dire que c'est toujours avec grand plaisir que je pratique la langue de Molière. Il se peut néanmoins que je passe à l'anglais pour m'amuser au cours de la discussion et vous me suivrez. Je crois savoir que vous parlez un anglais tout à fait correct, n'est-ce pas ?

Furthermore, he mentions that he will speak English only later in the discussion: "Puisque nous sommes ici chez vous, je vous demande la permission de commencer en français et de passer à l'anglais tout à l'heure." After this line, he keeps talking in French for a long stretch until he mentions: "Maintenant que tout le monde est à l'aise, si on s'amusait à parler anglais, vous et moi," consequently reconnecting the dialogues of the French version with the original version.

The amount of English spoken in this scene is significantly reduced to a minimum. The switch had to be preserved to deceive the hidden Jews; otherwise it would not have made sense in the plot for the Jews to stay hidden while knowing that Landa had found them. The delayed code-switch has an impact on the participant roles: the hidden Jews understand the length of the conversation up to the moment when Landa directly pressures the farmer in English, as opposed to the original version in which they do not understand from the moment he switches to English. Moreover, in the original version Landa's switch to English is as abrupt as his switch to Italian in the Italian scene; it allows him to display a complex vocabulary and an extreme ease with a second other language than French. In the French version, the reduction prevents him from drawing as much attention to his linguistic proficiency. Characterisation may be slightly impacted by this linguistic change.

On the other hand, Hans Landa's code-switch in Italian during the Italian scene is identical to the original version. He suddenly starts speaking fluent Italian out of the blue and the effect stays unchanged on the French audience. His unexpected code-switch leads to surprise.

4. Changes in Expressions and Cultural References

In the section about the anchorage of the diegesis, we have observed how language played a role in setting the scene's diegetic space, among others. In the first chapter of the

original version, the American expression “ten hut” gave information about the characters that would appear on screen the next second: these are American soldiers, as confirmed by the dialogue. The French version handles the situation differently. As the soldiers speak French, the expression is translated to “garde à vous”. Yet, this translation prevents the audience from inferring the speaker’s origin and links the soldier to the French army instead of American. Realism is impacted as there is a strong contrast between the French line and the appearance of the American lieutenant and his speech.

Likewise, the briefing scene starts with the words “this way Lieutenant” in the original version, whereas the French version replaces it by “Par ici, Lieutenant”. Although the content is equally informative of Hicox’s rank, it hides information regarding the place where the action takes place, namely the United Kingdoms. British people pronounce the word /lefˈten.ənt/, whereas Americans pronounce it /luːˈten.ənt/ (“Lieutenant”). This simple differentiation allows the American audience to instantly identify the place where the action takes place, and the origin of the characters. This identification is lost in the French version, as the public would not be able to distinguish the linguistic varieties of French that are to be heard.

There is also a difference in the way the different nation members use references from their countries. When being asked whether he speaks German in the briefing scene, Hicox answers “Comme un vrai p’tit Fritz”, instead of the “like a Katzenjammer kid” of the original version. The French dictionary Larousse defines the word “Fritz” as a familiar and pejorative word referring to Germans, more particularly German soldiers (“Fritz”). While “the Katzenjammer” might be a well-known cultural reference in Germany, it is less so the case for a European audience. As a side note, we could argue that putting the word “Fritz” in Hicox’s mouth takes part in his characterisation. His use of the word “Fritz” in the French version betrays his disdain for the Germans, while the original version did not entail this connotation. Furthermore, Aldo Raine mentions in the second chapter that he is looking for eight American soldiers but mentions that he comes from “ma montagne” instead of “Tennessee mountains”. The reason for that might be that the American audience could easily locate the mentioned mountains, whereas a European audience would have a harder time.

5. Conclusion

Since the film's plot plays around language difference, multilingual dialogue, and conflicting nations, one may be all too apprehensive of the result that a French translation could provide, as it might erase many effects. Yet, the film successfully exports them in the French dubbing, although some differences can be noticed.

Multilingualism is still part of the plot: many characters still speak their native tongues. The French people still speak French, while most Germans speak German, and the Italian dialogue is preserved. Yet, dialogue erases some references to nationalities, as we have seen in the first part of this section in the case of Wilhelm and Aldo's encounter. If a French speaker were directly called an Englishman, American or German, it would create a dissonance. In any case, realism is affected in the dubbed product, simply due to the difference between the actors displayed on the screen and the dubbers' lines:

> Dubbing, a 'natural', isosemiotic type of translation, generates a conglomerate expression in which the voices heard, severed as they are from the faces and gestures seen on screen, will never create a fully natural impression (Koolstra et al. 336).

Koolstra and his colleagues insists that dubbing distorts the original audio of the film. Aldo and Hicox's contrasting accents are lost in the process, and they have different pitch, tone, and inflections than in the original version. Consequently, dubbing influences characterisation and the perception of the audience by definition. In return, through the use of their opposed use of the *vous* and *tu* French forms, among others, their characterisation is impacted in a way that the English version could not express. The contrast between the two characters is still strong compared to the original version.

We have seen how the mixing of French and German for Landa and Bridget may also lead to confusion. There is a discrepancy between what language the film wants us to believe they are talking, and what we hear. Bridget and Landa are displayed speaking French with one another, although the film implies that they are both native German speakers.

Finally, code-switching also differs as we have seen in the film's first scene; its reduction changes the way the flow of information is distributed. The hiding Jews can understand what Landa says up to a later point. Yet, the participant roles are maintained in

many ways: like in the original version, Landa is othered, while Shosanna and Butz are isolated.

In short, we can argue that the French dubbing of Inglourious Basterds has mainly stuck to the original version's use of languages and strives to faithfully maintain the effects of the original version through various adaptations when the dubbers decided to translate some parts of the dialogue in French. Some effects are affected in the process, such as realism, flow of information or characterisation and participant roles, though to a relatively minimal extent.

V. CONCLUSION

The current thesis aimed to identify the role played by multilingualism in the narrative construction of Quentin Tarantino's *Inglourious Basterds*. More precisely, we focused on identifying the various effects that resulted from their interaction within the dialogue.

This paper has revealed how languages play an active part in the film's narrative construction. First, we examined how information about the diegetic world was transmitted on the level of the audience: hand in hand with images and titles, languages help to identify the diegetic space, the time of the action, but also to shape the characters of the film. By portraying various language users, each dotted with their own level of proficiency and motivations, Quentin Tarantino introduces the audience to a palette of complex characters and subtly conveys diegetic information. If all characters were monolinguals, the film would lose value in expressiveness and the subtle cues that builds the characters, places, and action of the movie. Then, we discussed the way languages took part in establishing a realistic mise-en-scene for the film by staging characters who speak multiple languages, regional varieties, and interpreters who mediate multilingual interactions. Tarantino's exploitation of multilingualism allows him to enhance the realism of his work by creating a plausible story that sustains the suspension of disbelief. Furthermore, the analysis of participant roles highlighted the role of languages on the inter-character level; the analysed scenes underlined how languages excluded some characters from conversations or how they took part in the alienation of others. We also contemplated Landa's instrumentalisation of languages to reach his goals. Finally, the comparison between the original version and the French version of the film allowed us to underline their differences and comment on the additional or lost effects linked to the translation of the dialogue, therefore emphasising the importance of multilingualism for the narrative construction of the film.

Thanks to his acknowledgment of the potential of multilingualism in the narrative construction of films, Quentin Tarantino's work provided us with an interesting study material. Since the film had already been analysed in the field of translation studies, the impact of multilingualism on its narrative appeared to be an original take on the subject.

There are obvious limitations to this work. Indeed, it only scratched the surface of the possibilities offered by an analysis of multilingualism on its narrative. Many other functions

could have been explored or deepened. While this work focused on the anchorage of the diegesis, causality, characterisation and realism, future works could focus on other themes involving dialogue analysis and multilingualism, whether by exploring the other functions developed by Kozloff, or by tackling subjects such as suspense management, linguicism or even by widening the subject, linking multilingualism to sociolinguistics, or postmodernism in the director's work, to name a few.

WORKS CITED

Atay, Simber. “Multilingualism and Cinema”. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics Studies*, vol. 2, nº 1, 2019.

Bleichenbacher, Lukas. *Multilingualism in the movies: Hollywood characters and their Language Choices*. Books on Demand, 2008.

Bordwell, David, Kristin Thompson, and Jeff Smith. *Film Art: an Introduction*. Vol. 7. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1993.

“Brad Pitt & Quentin Tarantino Interview ‘Inglourious Basterds’.” *Youtube*, uploaded by Jack Traven, 21 Oct. 2014, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y5trEojZZ1Y&t=1015s.

“Brad Pitt : Production, Artiste, Équipe de direction”. *IMDb*, https://www.imdb.com/name/nm0000093/. Accessed 10 Aug. 2023.

Bullock, Barbara E., and Almeida Jacqueline Ed Toribio. *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Code-switching*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Chatman, Seymour Benjamin. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Cornell University Press, 1978.

Chiaro, Delia, and Giuseppe De Bonis. "Multilingualism and Translation on Screen." *The Palgrave Handbook of Audiovisual Translation and Media Accessibility*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2020, pp. 687–711.

Eder, Jens, Fotis Jannidis, and Ralf Schneider, eds. *Characters in Fictional Worlds: Understanding Imaginary Beings in Literature, Film, and Other Media*. De Gruyter, 2010.

Delabastita, Dirk, and Rainier Grutman. "Fictional Representations of Multilingualism and Translation." *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series: Themes in Translation Studies* 4, 2005.

“Diane Kruger: Artiste, Production, Équipe Caméra et Electro.” *IMDb*, https://www.imdb.com/name/nm1208167/. Accessed 10 Aug. 2023.

"Fritz." *Dictionnaire Larousse*, https://www.larousse.fr/dictionnaires/francais/fritz/35341. Accessed 10 Aug. 2023.

Gardner-Chloros, Penelope. *Code-switching*. Cambridge university press, 2009.

Goffman, Erving. "Footing." *Semiotica*, vol. 25, no. 1–2, De Gruyter, 1979, pp. 1–30.

Goffman, Erving. *Interaction Ritual: Essays in face to face behavior*. Anchor Books, 1967.

Golsen, Tyler. "The Five-Minute Performance That Changed Michael Fassbender." *Farout Magazine*, 2 Apr. 2022, https://faroutmagazine.co.uk/the-five-minute-performance-changed-michael-fassbender/. Accessed 10 Aug. 2023.

Hatim, Basil, and Ian Mason. "Politeness in Screen Translating." *The Translation Studies Reader*, Routledge, 2000, pp. 430–445.

Hodson, Jane. *Dialect in Film and Literature*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2017.

Hughes, Arthur, Peter Trudgill, and Dominic Watt. *English Accents and Dialects: An Introduction to Social and Regional Varieties of English in the British Isles*. Routledge, 2013.

Inglourious Basterds. Directed by Quentin Tarantino, The Weinstein Company, 2009.

"Inglourious Basterds Full Press Conference – Cannes Film Festival 2009". *Youtube*, uploaded by FirstAndLastLook, 21 May 2012, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qlofJ9mlC1Q&ab_channel=FirstAndLastLook.

"Inglorious Bastards (2009) – Diane Kruger Interview". *Youtube*, uploaded by HitFix, 18 Aug. 2009. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CEod4dSkMIY&ab_channel=HitFix.

Junkerjürgen, Ralf. "Rompre l'incommunication: le Rôle du Plurilinguisme dans Deux Films sur la Première Guerre Mondiale (LA GRANDE ILLUSION; JOYEUX NOËL)." *Romanische Studien*, 2019, pp. 311–324.

Kill Bill volume 1. Directed by Quentin Tarantino, Miramax, 2003.

Kill Bill volume 2. Directed by Quentin Tarantino, Miramax, 2004.

Koolstra, Cees M., Allerd L. Peeters, and Herman Spinhof. "The Pros and Cons of Dubbing and Subtitling." *European Journal of Communication* vol.17, no.3, 2002, pp. 325–354.

Kozloff, Sarah. *Overhearing film dialogue*. University of California Press, 2000.

“Lieutenant.” *Cambridge Advanced Learner’s Dictionary*, https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/lieutenant. Accessed 10 Aug. 2023.

Messerli, Thomas C. "Participation Structure in Fictional Discourse: Authors, Scriptwriters, Audiences and Characters." *Pragmatics of Fiction*, edited by Miriam A. Locher and Andreas H. Jucker, De Gruyter Mouton, 2017, pp. 25–54.

Meylaerts, Reine, and Adriana Serban. "Introduction Multilingualism at the Cinema and on Stage: A translation Perspective." *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series* vol.13 no.1, 2014, pp. 1–13.

McArthur, Tom, Jacqueline Lam-McArthur, and Lise Fontaine, eds. *Oxford Companion to the English Language*. Oxford University Press, 2018.

Mugglestone, Lynda. *Talking proper: The rise of accent as social symbol*. OUP Oxford, 2003.

Ortega, Elena Sanz. "Subtitling and the Relevance of Non-verbal Information in Polyglot Films." *New Voices in Translation Studies* vol.7, no.1, 2011, pp. 19–34.

O’Sullivan, Carol. "Multilingualism at the Multiplex: a New Audience for Screen Translation?." *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series: Themes in Translation Studies* 6, 2007.

Pulp Fiction. Directed by Quentin Tarantino, Miramax, 1994.

Sternberg, Meir. "Polylingualism as Reality and Translation as Mimesis." *Poetics Today* vol.2, no4, 1981, pp. 221–239.

Tarantino, Quentin. “Inglourious Basterds.” Film script, 2009.

Thomason, Sarah Grey, and Terrence Kaufman. *Language Contact*. Vol. 22. Edinburgh University Press, 2001.