AnOther Language

by

Carah Dawn Ronan

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

Master of Science and Natural History Filmmaking

in

Media and Theater Arts

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

November 2007

©COPYRIGHT

by

Carah Dawn Ronan

2007

All Rights Reserved

APPROVAL

of a thesis submitted by

Carah Dawn Ronan

This thesis has been read by each member of the thesis committee and has been found to be satisfactory regarding content, English usage, format, citation, bibliographic style, and consistency, and is ready for submission to the Division of Graduate Education.

Dr. Walter Metz

Approved for the Department Media and Theater Arts

Dr. Walter Metz

Approved for the Division of Graduate Education

Dr. Carl A. Fox

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Master's degree at Montana State University, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

If I have indicated my intention to copyright this thesis by including a copyright notice page, copying is allowable only for scholarly purposes, consistent with "fair use" as prescribed in the U.S. Copyright Law. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this thesis in whole or in parts may be granted only by the copyright holder.

Carah Dawn Ronan

November 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. ANOTHER LANGUAGE…….....1

REFERENCES CITED.....19

ABSTRACT

Through revisionist anthropology, postcolonial theories and feminist theories, an alternative language in film can come to light. The analysis of spoken words in film calls attention to the use of language as a cinematic tool. *Las Hurdes* uses narration to construct a fictionalized society presented within the context of a documentary. This unconventional approach encourages viewers to view films more skeptically, while *Everest: Beyond the Limits*, reinforces the dominant ideologies of the west. Films without spoken words also call attention to the use of language that is conveyed to viewers in film. Films such as *Playtime* and *Triplets of Bellville* must connect with the audience through gesture and emotion, using few or no words at all. *Surname Viet Given Name Nam* calls attention to the use of voice-over in film and examines the issue of traditional interviewing with a solution of multiple voices and highlighted artifice. As Jacques Derrida points out, all language is a crisis. A solution can be found through a reading of the works of filmmakers and theorists. No single language exists without the larger context of work. The theorists whose work influences this approach include James Clifford, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, Michael Ryan, Amy Lawrance, Hélène Cixous and Kaja Silverman. By analyzing language within both social and linguistic frameworks, a framework for reading and viewing films through an unspoken language can be constructed.

AnOther Language

Language as a device to communicate information from one person to another can unveil new understandings, challenge assumptions or play into old stereotypes. The textual encoding of language in film presents problems for cross-cultural analysis for audiences and filmmakers alike. Language has been a key discussion point within cinema and film theory for decades. Who is speaking within the text, to whom are they speaking and to what extent they are allowed to speak, all combine to create the text as a whole. The film also speaks to the audience through various other means, such as the mise-en-scène and editing, combining more layers to the film's language. A key issue within cross-cultural analysis of films is the interpretation or misinterpretation of the text that the film presents. Within the political voice and linguistic constructions, language can be shaped and used to present the audience with more than just words. However, within language there are restrictions, frameworks that are established cannot always be understood by the reader of the text. Within the frameworks of language, I argue, a language of understanding already exists. Through the analysis of political and social context, translation, and silence and voice-over within film, a new path of understanding language and meaning will be constructed.

This argument draws from postcolonialist theory, feminist theory and revisionist anthropology. When combining theories from the camps listed above, the theorists with seemingly disparate viewpoints in fact hold together in support of one another creating new meanings and terms for reading language. In order to come to an understanding of a new language within film, one must look beyond one individual theory, for it is through

the use of multiple theorists' works that one will be able to best understand a new meaning for language. Looking at how spoken language and political voice are set up within our society and how voice functions in film in the form of voice-over, a new language will emerge.

Would you listen to what I have to say if you knew who was speaking? Who is given the voice in film is more than just a simple question followed by a simple answer. Within the scope of cinema it is both a political and cultural question. Michael Ryan's writings examine the politics in film through discourse, psychoanalysis and ideology. He uses a full array of theoretical approaches within his writing to read the same text. "In transcoding social discourses, films offer for identification and internalization either old values or new valorizations (either, say, the independent woman as witch or as admirable and emulatable model); film discourse can help recode the existing social discourses or systems of significance" (Nelson 481). Within the political framework of cinema, the voices of women have been suppressed, modified and silenced for much of cinema's history. The dominant ideologies of capitalist patriarchal society that operate within both social and political frameworks carry over into cinema, creating texts that navigate and negotiate who is able to speak and thus listen. Films that attempt to stop women from speaking "rupture classical conventions of representation, however, and expose the way patriarchy uses language, image, sound, and narrative to construct and contain 'woman'"(Lawrence 32). How women and their voices are and are not constructed in cinema tends to uphold dominant ideas of Western society.

Postcolonialist theory examines the colonization by the West of the Other. The identity of a culture that has been colonized and in what ways that culture is being presented by the colonizer are crucial to the ways in which the Other is represented to the world. For example, when looking at films about Everest, or the regions surrounding it, the media in the West is constantly filled with white guys climbing to the top of the peak. No easy feat, I agree, however the only images presented to Western audiences are images and ideals that uphold the dominant ideologies of the West. We see men conquering nature, men as the embodiment of strength, the pinnacle of achievement to be one of the lucky few to overcome hardships and come out on top of the world. Rarely is the focus of these films or special TV series focused on the fact that without expensive permits, supplemental oxygen, and the help of regional porters, some of whom are even women, these men would never make it to the top. Upheld in these films are the ideologies of capitalism and patriarchy, or to put it in other terms, money and men. How women of the region are affected by the influx of tourism and the dangers of family members leaving to work in climbing camps are silent realities that are never allowed to come to voice on film.

In Discovery Channel's reality series *Everest: Beyond the Limits*, the audience sees that "the determination of the human spirit has driven a team of amateur climbers to challenge the highest mountain on earth… finding hope and strength in the face of tragedy." The show's narrator introduces the team of climbers in an 'all-star' lineup, introducing them by their designated nickname: the leader, the risk taker, and the novice. Each introduction is followed by a quote from the climber i.e., "mama didn't raise a

quitter." Through the narration of a male voice, words that emphasize capturing dominance over the mountain are used again and again, building upon the dominance and patriarchal ideologies of the West. The voice-over in the film revolves around a technological language that adds to the ideologies at play within the text. One must then assume the position of the scientific elite in order to decode the language within the show. Access is given to the male, the dominant voice of the West. The mountain is to be dominated by man, no matter the cost or skill level of the climber.

In the series, there is a single female climber. The male narrator points out that she is the weakest link, and that she lacks any experience. The narrator fails to point out these same deficiencies in the male climbers. Thus, she upholds the ideologies of the West, female as the weaker of the sexes. When she fails to have the mountaineering knowledge to climb a practice thirty-foot ice wall, she nevertheless remarks to the camera, "I am a really fast learner. I can do it I know I can, I have as good of a chance as anyone." The shows plays up the fact that the team is built around novice climbers, conveying to the viewers that anyone with a dream can climb the world's highest mountain, all that is needed is a "truckload of determination." Not once in the program is the audience presented with a view of the mountain from the perspective of the culture that actually makes every climb on Everest possible. Instead we are spoon-fed the same ideologies that surround us in the West; a male with money can dominate all.

Just as seen through the narration in *Everest: Beyond the Limits,* the voice-over is used as a key element in constructing the contextual meaning of the show. In the same ways, a voice when heard alone without an image, or without visually seeing the person

speaking the words, can lead to a different interpretation of the text by the audience. One of the greatest examples of this within cinema is presented in Luis Buñuel's, *Las Hurdes (Land Without Bread)*. In his film Buñuel uses the voice of a narrator to present the story of the Hurdanos over images of the Hurdanos in their villages. The narrator presents the way in which the images are viewed. In one scene, as a mountain goat is seen walking along the cliffs the narrator states that the Hurdanites eat meat when a goat falls from the cliffs. If the audience was only listening to the narrator to guide them through the film, they may believe, and many viewers do, that the mountain goats on lucky occasion slip from the cliffs to their death. However, the visual image shows a puff of smoke appearing out of the corner of the screen indicating that a gunman had shot the goat off the cliff. Buñuel's film plays on the use of voice-over and image, thereby forcing the readers of the film to decide if what they are hearing and seeing are real. This points out the ability for language to act as a source of power within film and also it points out how a situation with or without voice-over can change the outcome of the reading of the text.

Voice as language itself plays many roles within cinema. "The voice thus understood is *an interface of imaginary and symbolic,* pulling at once toward the signifying organization of language and its reduction of the range of vocal sounds to those it binds and codifies, and toward original and imaginary attachments" (Lawrence 24). The words that are spoken in the film become one of the texts that the audience reads. Both tone and emphasis within the voice add to the interpretation by the audience. For a viewer the voice may be seen as a key element within the text. Voice adds to the

filmic experience for many audience members in creating an ambience in which they feel more engaged.

> Western metaphysics has fostered the illusion that speech is able to express the speaker's inner essence, that it is "part" of him or her. It locates the subject of speech in the same ontological space as the speaking subject, so that the former seems a natural outgrowth of the latter. The fiction of the authenticity of cinematic sounds thus promotes belief not only in presence but in self-presence (Silverman 43).

Language can be used to create new meanings, to demonstrate power, teach us about the world and how to behave within it. Sapir has warned speakers to not fall mercy to their language, that they must continually question language and how it is used (Thomas 27). Without an audience who is willing to question the voices within a film, the film itself is at risk of becoming dead to the audience, with no one to read the language it is producing as a whole.

James Clifford points out that anthropology, thus linguistics, exists as a set of practices embedded in the context of power as part of a system. He states that the "movement of ideas from one field into another field is never simply a matter of transporting an object form here to there, but is always really a matter of translation. And through the process of translation in the new context what's brought across is made new; it takes on unexpected dimensions" (Clifford 55). These unexpected dimensions that occur with translation can be detrimental to the film text and its meaning.

As individual readers of any cinematic text, the viewer must come to recognize that their own personal experiences and knowledge play a tremendous role in the way the film's text plays to each individual. This is extremely apparent in foreign language films.

For example, if the viewer's native language were English with no other language experience, their reading of a French film would rely heavily on the subtitles in the film. However, if they possessed experience with the French language, they may not rely on the subtitles at all. If one does rely on subtitles, they are forced to read the text of the film through another person. There are many problems that arise when looking at how film texts are interpreted across languages. One of which is deeply tied to cultural assumptions and knowledge and another, with how the codes of each signified system work within the language to convey meaning of the cinematic text.

Susan Sellers points out that the language within the text of Helen Cixous' writings is inventive, words playing on one another and being played upon by the gender that they are assigned within the French language.

> A passage in which the subject is in the feminine gender in French will most usually be translated into English by the neutral "it," unless it is clear that the feminine is synonymous with female…The loss is particularly consequential in terms of Cixous' work on gender...Cixous deliberately employs the suggestions produced by language itself in her writing…Tronc ("trunk") begets donc ("therefore/thus"); hazard (most usually "chance") spawns bâtard ("bastard")…Much of this play disappears in translation. (Sellers 3)

Another example can be seen when viewing French films. The translation of the word *you* within these films can cause viewers to miss a pertinent point contained by the text. In French the two words meaning you, *vous* and *tu*, are used either in formal settings (vous) or in familiar settings (tu). In a translated film if character A referred to a friend in a debate or argument with vous instead of tu, the viewer could read the use of language as an added blow by character A to his friend, with the intended insult of not being familiar

with the friend. In an English translation the word *you* carries no formal signifiers, thus this simple play on the word *you* would be lost to the viewer.

In the course of filming *sherpa, Sherpa*, I learned about a new dimension in linguistic communication. In the Sherpa communities of the Himalayas, the use of words and interpretations were presented to me in a whole new light. There I discovered that it is not only the interpretation of the word, but the word's meaning within the culture that is significant. While interviewing women in the village of Khumjung for the film, a monk kept asking if he too could be interviewed. Though I was only focusing on the women for my film I wanted to hear what the monk had to say. He began to tell me about the tourists coming to their villages and how this he felt was neither good nor bad, but just the way the texts that he followed told him it would be. He told me that in his scripts he was told that vultures would come to their mountains and bring great change. I knew it, I thought: the tourists are the vultures draining the life from the valley and his people. But then he continued, the vultures came to us as airplanes and brought a new way of life. I thought about this story he told me for days and weeks after. The single word vulture made me jump to my own cultural assumptions, the images of vultures as ravenous scavengers. The monk, however, did not associate this negative connotation with the word as I did. The single word vulture takes on many readings worldwide, conveying different meanings to those who hear the word, pointing out the continued complications by cross-cultural analysis of texts.

Cinema can also present films to foreign audiences that can be read without the use of oral language. I will present two cases for this, both French language films, one

animated, the other a live action comedy. The first, a film by Sylvain Chomet, *The Triplets of Belleville*, which contains almost no dialog whatsoever, and the bits of dialog that it does have are not mandatory to understanding the text of the film. The animators of the film have found a brilliant way of communicating with their audience through gestures and facial expressions. By giving the audience a text to read which is not lingual, the film transcends the linguistic barriers of a foreign language. It demonstrates relationships between people through expressions that almost any audience member can recognize. The base from which the audience reads the film is built from the first scenes. Madame de Souza, Grandmother of the young boy Champion, is trying to fill a void for the young boy, to find anything to make him happy. She gives him a piano, a puppy, train set, and while viewers can see that a young Champion is content, there is still something missing in his life. When Madame de Souza sits at the table to read her paper one day, she finds a hole where someone has cut out a picture. Young Champion looks in the other direction, appearing busy and hoping she has not noticed. As she makes his bed in the next scene we see a photo taped on the wall of a young couple on a bicycle with the words, “mama et papa”. Madame de Souza tucks the covers under the bed and something falls to the ground with a thud. She reaches under the bed and pulls out a photo album full of photos cut from the newspaper with people on their bikes, winning the tour de France, among others. In the next scene we see that Grandmother has purchased a tricycle for young Champion and with glee he claps his hands and proceeds to ride his tricycle in circles in the front courtyard.

These scenes, all of which have no vocal dialog, work with the ambient audio and music within the film to build the base of the text in which the audience watches the film. We know that Madame de Souza is left to watch after her young grandson with the will to go to any length to try and make him happy. We know that Champion is not a fussy boy or one to complain, rather, he is content. As the film continues, it takes the audience through its text with a visual dialog that draws the audience into its world. Asking them to relate through human interactions creates a readership beyond its original French audience. A silent film makes the viewer feel as though she is continuously in charge of reading the text without worrying about missing something or wondering about the accuracy of the interpretation.

Playtime, created in 1967, thirty-six years prior to *Triplets of Bellville,* contains more dialog, but again the dialog within the film is not necessary to understanding its meaning. *Playtime* is a visual comedy for audiences in which access to the text is granted through visual interactions between characters, buildings and objects. Tati invites the audience members to add their own experiences to create the text of the film, thus being unique to each viewer, and to Tati's hopes, unique each time it is viewed. As the main character Monsieur Hulot arrives at an office building made of glass the audience is presented with a series of scenes that are and can be read with no dialog present.

Monsieur Hulot enters the building and hands a slip of paper to a doorman, who looks it over. He leads M. Hulot to a chair and gestures for him to have a seat. As the doorman puts down his cigar he walks over to a large machine mounted to the wall. It is overwhelmingly large, with many knobs, switches, levers and a gleaming red light. As

the doorman stands in front of the system he hesitates and grumbles to himself and then tweaks the knobs one by one, pausing between each to calculate the next move. Not only to the doorman, but also to the audience, this piece of gadgetry is unfamiliar and overwhelming. The audience may ask, what is that thing anyway and how does it work? Finally, a voice comes on as the doorman peaks back to the box and then shuts down the system with a sigh of relief. A man appears through the far door and ushers M. Hulot down a long corridor and shows him to the glass waiting room, which he is sitting directly in front of. With no words exchanged, M. Hulot enters the glass waiting room and looks around awkwardly. From the slippery new floor to the chairs with pop-back action, the audience can tell that this space is new to M. Hulot and an awkward one at that. As another man enters who is very comfortable in the space, it presents M. Hulot as that much more out of his element.

Tati is able to take the lack of dialog within his film to his full advantage. He asks the readers of his text to step within the dialog of the film and relate to it on the basis of human interactions through the gestures of the doorman, or murmuring, making the viewer work to relate to his characters and situations and playing that up instead of feeding it to his audience in a linguistic voice. In this way both Tati and Chomet avoid the problems created through having their texts interpreted on screen for their audiences, and by having no or little dialog they can be assured that their text will be presented and read in the ways in which they intended.

Voice-over in film, as well as translation present questions and problems within a text. In an interview between Issac Julien, Laura Mulvey and Trinh T. Minh-ha, the

questions of interviews within film are brought to light. In her documentary film *Surname Viet Given Name Nam,* Trinh uses the styles of voice-over and interview to play with the idea that things within a documentary are not constructed.

> Thus, interviews that operate the dominant role in documentary practices- in terms of authenticating information; validating the voices recruited for the sake of the argument the film advances (claiming however to "give voice" to the people); and legitimizing an exclusionary system of representation based on the dominant ideology of presence and authenticity- are actually sophisticated devices of fiction (Brand 196).

Through her film she is able to tackle the role of translation as a theoretical issue through "the production of meaning, of identity, culture, and politics…to problematize both the role of translation in film and the role of film as translation" (Brand 202). She uses interviews with Vietnamese women speaking English, overlapped by women speaking Vietnamese, accompanied by text on screen, all at once demanding the readership of the viewer. The viewer is thrown into a whirlwind of voices, which to choose to listen to without a straightforward answer as Trinh would have it.

The interviews with the women are constructed in a way that they are meant to point out the fact that they are constructed scenes. In one scene the camera is positioned behind the woman being interviewed, looking over her shoulder, one with a woman pacing back and forth in front of the camera's frame, leaving and coming back within the shot and never straying too far from the shot which the camera and filmmaker have set up. In another interview, two young women sit speaking on the floor in front of a fireplace, again both perfectly positioned within the frame of the camera and filmmaker. Trinh positions the viewer to ask the questions of who is speaking within her film. Is it her, is it the women we see, or are the women we see actresses retelling another's story?

What is important is that the audience must begin a process of questioning and as Sapir suggested, the audience should not let the language of film own them, but instead constantly call into question the assumptions that are given. Throughout the film Trinh calls upon the audience through the voices within her film to state the problems of translation:

> Is a translated interview a written or a spoken object? ...Interview an antiquated devise of documentary, truth is selected, renewed, displaced and speech is always tactical…so how many speeches in the overall? Who do you chose? In one case 150 interviews were made for the film, five were retained in the final version. What criteria? Age, profession, economic situation, cultural regions North, South and center, critical ability, personal affinity, spoken, transcribed and translated from listening to recording speech to writing you can talk, we can cut, trim, tidy up. The game often demands, the response to the content rarely the way content is framed. Spoken and read between a language of inwardness and that of pure service (Minh-ha 1:04).

Within her film she points out that she has constructed the interviews, framed them within a context for viewing, to her a matter of question and awareness needing to be seen by her audience. Toward the end of her film text plays over still photographic images, which depict the images of war. The text states: "These images call for human compassion toward countries in war. There is no winner in a war. These are images that are emotionally moving. They can change the way you think. For example if you do not like war and you see images of mothers holding their child in their arms to flee from war you'll be moved and stirred to do something to help. These images are very painful" (Minh-ha 1:39). Photography, a basic element of film, is viewed without the accompaniment of linguistic voice, yet the images themselves possess the ability to transcend cultures and reach to people's inner cores and provoke reactions without saying

a word. Thus, the images presented on screen possess the ability to speak to audiences without uttering any words.

Through her film she constantly calls into question the use and idea of translation. “Do you translate by eye or by ear? Translation seeks faithfulness and accuracy and ends up always betraying either the letter of the text, its spirit, or its aesthetics. The original text is always already an impossible translation that renders translation impossible” (Minh-ha 1:08). Minh-ha’s subjects speak in the language that is most foreign to them within the film. Thus, the players translate the words once, and the audience who listens to and views the texts again translates the words. Through this method, a clear indication of who is “really” speaking is not given, making the point that it is not who is “really” speaking in the text that matters, but the contradiction and build up of the films discourse. As a result, Minh-ha creates a use of language that at once plays with the traditional film aesthetic and creates an aesthetic that pulls at the core of translation as a theoretical problem.

Problems of film in translation, of voice-over, context, and political and social interpretation all add to the idea that there is no one unified language in cinema that can speak to all audiences. Loss of words, context and meaning seemingly close the door to a unified language, or does it? As silent films would suggest, there is a language within cinema that is at play, even when words are not, constructing and deconstructing, loudly gesturing toward the audience with a story that is never verbally told. The ability to communicate through gestures and feelings within cinema is what I believe to be a universal language that speaks to all and transcends the problems voice. As Jacques

Derrida points out in his writings, no such thing as "a" language exists, every language is in fact a language of the Other, impossible of being owned. "We only ever speak one language and we never speak only one language or I only speak one language, (and, but, yet) it is not mine" (Derrida 27). He points to the inner core of human thinking: there is a language that exists in each of us, not belonging to any of us, it keeps us from only being able to speak one language. Here I would argue that the language we speak is a linguistic one and the other, which we do not speak, is an internal language that exists in the way we think and process but is never completely uttered in the form of external words. This language is similar within all people, as any one individual cannot possess it. You may share this internal voice with someone you have never met, you may not share it with your neighbor next door, but it is a language of similarities and differences that each person speaks. It is an active language within each person that is at play everyday in everything we do. As seen in the example of the Buñuel film, what is solely heard can be interpreted in a way that is entirely different from what is heard when paired with an image. This inner voice adds to the voice in which we already speak and interpret and takes us to another level of understanding. By pairing what we are hearing with what we are seeing, our inner voice is calculating reactions within each of us.

Silence becomes the communicator within Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's text. Her critiques of postcolonialist theory within feminist frameworks let her transcend the traditional boundaries of a single discipline. What is unable to be "said" within the spaces created with silence are where the most is to be taken in and learned. "The archival, historiographic, disciplinary-critical, and, inevitably, interventionist work involved here

is indeed a task of 'measuring silences.' This can be a description of "investigating, identifying, and measuring…the *deviation*…the notion of what the work cannot say becomes important" (Nelson 286-7). What in a text is not uttered in words appears loudly within the text: through a language that cannot be spoken, as Derrida would suggest. Listening to the points within a text where there are no verbal words being spoken requires a level of consciousness in order to make the discourse possible. When audiences view films, whether silent, live-action or documentary, they must actively view the film and read between the lines. Once readers start analyzing the silent spaces, searching the screen for the language that is in each of us, yet not spoken, they can cross the cultural boundaries to understanding without verbal interpretation.

Spivak states that "no speech, no 'natural language' (an unwitting oxymoron), not even a "language" of gesture, can signify, indicate, or express without the meditation of a preexisting code" (Spivak 213). Within an internal secretive language, however, I argue that the ability to read gestures, facial expressions, while coming from a preexisting code, can exist within each of us as a universal text. Looking back to Minh-ha's film *Surname Viet Given Name Nam* and the photography sequence with a woman running from destruction with a child in her arms, a mother protecting her child in a time of war is a painful picture that can be read without words, across cultures and understood without verbal text. By looking closely at hesitations on screen, how people do not speak, how their eyes wander, tear up or how they sit and fidget, all play into a language that can communicate a story or text with more intensity because even if these images are presented in words that the audience does not speak, they are speaking in a language that

is universal. Understanding is located in the ability to actively view the text, to look and listen beyond the verbal and to the gaps and spaces when no one is saying a word. It is to watch how the story affects the storyteller, not just while the person is speaking, but also after, when their inner language is reviewing the words they just spoke.

Films can have more impact in the spaces beyond the speaking. The most emotional parts within a film, whether in the viewer's native language or not, usually come after the interviewee finishes speaking. In the silence of the text as that person stares into the camera, or off screen, within their eyes, if one looks carefully there is more to the story they just told. Pain emanates, laughter is at play, and nervousness adds a sense of shame or the awareness that the words spoken are a lie. All of this occurs usually when the camera cuts, denying viewers the ability to read with their inner language. The camera and editing control the images and what the audience is allowed to see. Thus, key elements that could add to the story the filmmaker is trying to tell are left out, to comply with the tight succinct editing style of Hollywood. There is rarely any space in which the film can breathe and just be silent. And when these moments do occur, they are magical and penetrate deep within the audience.

If audiences engage with a higher level of consciousness when viewing films they will tap into a language that some may not often recognize is within them: a language of the Other that is at once their own, and yet not belonging to them. This language is speaking to the audience, interpreting a text that is plain for those who are willing to see it. "Language englobes us and inspires us and launches us beyond ourselves, it is ours

and we are its, it is our master and our mistress…To live language, inhabit language, what luck and what a venture" (Sellers xix). Inhabiting a place in the language of cinema that encompasses all is quite the place to be. A place where human emotion and interactions are felt and deeply understood and recognized by audience members as they read even the most foreign of texts. Feelings are neither spoken, nor are they explained. There are no loudspeakers cueing the audience when to feel, cry, or laugh. The feelings instead are communicated within the spaces where no one is telling the audience what to do.

Through disjunctive images and language the audience must work to find their truth within the text. In *sherpa, Sherpa*, the images that are shown seem disjoined from the subtitles. For example, when one woman states that the only difficulty in her life is that she is illiterate, she is smiling. This is not the image one would expect to see, but it is the reality of the moment. The smile takes on new meaning, as if to say to the audience, this is my life and though it is difficult, I am not letting it keep me from being the strong woman I am. With no b-roll to cover over the jump cuts between what the women are saying, the filmmaker is able to point out the constructed nature of the film. The audience is hearing over three different spoken languages within the film, at the same time, English subtitles and the images of the women all compete on screen. As a woman makes a statement and is waiting for the translator off screen to convey what she has said, she looks at the camera and acknowledges the moment at which she thinks the translator just made her point, the point at which she is unveiled to the audience. The multiplicity of

texts that are at play within the film point out that language is everywhere and nowhere all at once.

Through revisionist anthropology, postcolonial theories and feminist theories a collision of alternative language is brought to light. The analysis of spoken words in film calls attention to the use of language as a cinematic tool. *Las Hurdes* uses narration to construct a fictionalized society presented within the context of a documentary leading viewers to view films more skeptically, while *Everest: Beyond the Limits,* reinforces the dominant ideologies of the West, encouraging viewers to go forth and dominate. Films without spoken words also call attention to the use of language that is conveyed to viewers in film. Films such as *Playtime* and *Triplets of Bellville* must connect with the audience through gesture and emotion, using few to no words at all. *Surname Viet Given Name Nam* calls attention to the use of voice-over in film and examines the issue of traditional interviewing with a solution of multiple voices and highlighted artifice. As Derrida points out, all language is a crisis. A solution is brought to light through the works of filmmakers and theorists combined, as no one language can exists without the context of the larger body of work taken into account. Through examining the works of Clifford, Spivak, Ryan, Lawrance, Cixous and Silverman the framework for reading and viewing films is rebuilt, allowing for a new cinematic language to emerge.

REFERENCES CITED

Brand, Peggy Zeglin and Carolyn Korsmeyer, eds. *Feminism and Tradition in Aesthetics.* Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State UP, 1996.

Buñuel, Luis. *Las Hurdes.* 1933, 30 min.

Chomet, Sylvain. *The Triplets of Belleville.* Sony Pictures Classics: 2003, 81 min.

Clifford, James. *On the Edges of Anthropology (Interviews).* Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press, 2003.

Colthurst, Dick. *Everest Beyond the Limit: Dream Chasers.* Discovery Channel: 2007, 43:38 min.

Derrida, Jacques. *Monolingualism of the Other; or, The Prosthesis of Origin.* Stanford: Stanford UP, 1996.

Lawrence, Amy. *Echo and Narcissus: Women's voices in Classical Hollywood Cinema.* Berkeley: U of California Press,1991.

Minh-ha, Trinh T. *Surname Viet Given Name Nam*. 1987, 108 min.

Nelson, Cary and Lawrence Grossberg, eds. *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture.* Urbana: U of Illinois Press, 1988.

Sellers, Susan, ed. *The Hélèn Cixous Reader.* London: Routledge, 1994.

Silverman, Kaja. *The Acoustic Mirror: The Female Voice in Psychoanalysis and Cinema.* Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1988.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing Histography." New York: Methuen, 1987.

Tati, Jacques. *Playtime.* The Criterion Collection: 1967, 124 min.

Thomas, Linda and Shân Wareing, eds. *Language, Society and Power: An Introduction.* London: Routledge, 1999.