

EDITORIAL **OPEN ACCESS**

Minority Languages and Documentary Media: Representation, Translation and Power

Dafydd Sills-Jones 

Te Wānanga Aronui o Tāmaki Makau Rau – Auckland University of Technology, Aotearoa – New Zealand

Elin Haf Gruffudd Jones 

Centre for Advanced Welsh and Celtic Studies

The relationship between documentary media and minority languages is both politically significant and ethically complex. Documentary has long occupied a distinctive position within public culture as a form associated with testimony, representation, and the mediation of lived realities. Yet language within documentary is never neutral. The inclusion, exclusion, translation, or framing of language – and of languages – shapes not only how audiences understand a film, but also how communities, identities, and cultural authority are represented on screen.

These questions have become increasingly urgent in the contemporary period. UNESCO estimates that nearly half of the world’s approximately 7,000 languages may disappear by the end of the twenty-first century, a situation intensified by globalisation, platform capitalism, migration, the climate emergency, and the dominance of a small number of global languages within media systems. Minority languages therefore exist within conditions of considerable asymmetry. They are often politically marginalised, economically disadvantaged, or historically suppressed, yet they also remain central sites of cultural continuity, resistance, and identity formation.

Documentary media occupies an important position within this landscape. Documentary can contribute to language preservation and revitalisation, but it also does far more than simply “document” or “record” endangered languages. Documentary mediates language through systems

**Journal on Ethnopolitics and
Minority Issues in Europe**
Vol.25, No.2, 2026

pp.1–9

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.53779/DAED0906>

AUTHORS:

Dafydd Sills-Jones, Te Wānanga Aronui
o Tāmaki Makau Rau – Auckland
University of Technology, Aotearoa –
New Zealand

dafydd.sills-jones@aut.ac.nz

Elin Haf Gruffudd Jones, Centre for
Advanced Welsh and Celtic Studies
elin.jones@uwtsd.ac.uk

LICENCE:

Copyright (c) 2026
Dafydd Sills-Jones and Elin Haf
Gruffudd Jones



This work is licensed under a creative commons
attribution 4.0 international License.

of production, translation, circulation, aesthetics, and institutional power. Minority languages on screen are therefore not only objects of preservation but also sites of negotiation: between filmmaker and participant, local and global audiences, accessibility and authenticity, visibility and appropriation.

This special issue examines how documentary media engages with minority languages across a range of political, cultural, and technological contexts. The contributions collected here explore documentary as a space in which linguistic identity is constructed, contested, translated, and circulated. They address questions of representation, subtitling, multilingualism, participatory ethics, indigenous sovereignty, and emerging forms of immersive and interactive media. Taken together, the issue argues that language in documentary should not be understood merely as a vehicle for communication, but as a political and aesthetic force that shapes how truth, identity, and cultural legitimacy are produced on screen.

Minority languages occupy a particularly charged position within documentary practice because they frequently carry histories of exclusion, colonialism, and cultural suppression. Indeed, the term ‘minority language’ itself immediately locates a language group on the margins, on the peripheries, or on the fringes of the mainstream, the dominant, or even the usual. This can be problematic for several reasons. Firstly, it suggests that this marginality is the day-to-day lived reality and shared perspective of all speakers of such languages. It privileges the non-minority to the position of being the normal. Secondly, it suggests that a ‘minority’ language is merely descriptive of social condition of the language group, almost a natural or unquestionable normal condition for that language group to be in, as there is no recognition or visibility given to any process that may have led to this position. Finally, it suggests a static condition, without recognising that the status and condition of languages can change over time, and that these are driven by political processes, agents, and factors. For these reasons, the term ‘minority language’ is nowadays contested – and rejected – by some scholars and activists, particularly in its all-encompassing sense that aims to include all languages that are not the official and dominant language of a sovereign state. Alternative terms that are entering into academic and activist discourses, often emanating from Basque, Breton, Catalan, Galician and Welsh narratives, include ‘minoritized languages’, especially in communities where the process of political minoritization is increasingly recognised as an important perspective through which the sociolinguistic dynamics can be understood.

Not all players in the field of so-called minority languages take this position. Some language groups, especially those whose language is shared by dominant groups in a neighbouring state, are of the view that the term ‘minority’ reflects their position accurately. Some groups favour the emphasis on the other factors, such as ‘endangered’, ‘regional’ or ‘indigenous’ languages. Nevertheless, ‘minority’ continues to be the terminology used at a global level to include all such groups by the United Nations through its Special Rapporteur and Forum on Minority Issues.

As the term carries such a positionality, the presence of ‘minority languages’ within documentary therefore often exceeds purely informational function. The use of Welsh,

Māori, Inuktitut, Cherokee, Sámi, or other minority, minoritised, endangered, or indigenous languages can become an assertion of cultural continuity and political visibility within media systems that have historically privileged dominant languages. At the same time, documentary filmmakers must navigate difficult ethical questions concerning translation, access, authorship, and audience positioning. These tensions form the central concern of this collection.

Documentary, Language, and Power

Documentary has often been associated with ideas of authenticity, testimony, and truth-telling. However, documentary scholars have long argued that documentary does not simply present reality transparently, but actively constructs meaning through framing, editing, narration, and representation. Language is central to this process. Decisions about which languages are spoken, translated, subtitled, or left untranslated fundamentally shape how documentary authority is established and how audiences interpret the people and communities represented on screen.

Bill Nichols' influential work on documentary modes demonstrates how formal choices shape relationships between filmmakers, participants, and audiences (Nichols, 2017). Language operates within these representational structures both aurally and textually. The decision to privilege voiceover narration in a dominant language, for example, often positions minority-language speakers as objects of explanation rather than as agents of discourse. Conversely, documentaries that foreground minority languages without extensive mediation may reposition audiences, asking viewers to encounter linguistic difference rather than consume it seamlessly through translation.

These questions are particularly significant in postcolonial and indigenous contexts, where language has historically functioned as a site of political struggle. Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o (1986) famously argued that language is central to cultural autonomy and decolonisation, while Spivak (1988) highlighted how systems of representation frequently mediate and reshape marginalised voices through dominant institutional frameworks. Documentary media inevitably participates in these dynamics. Even projects motivated by preservation or advocacy can reproduce unequal relationships of cultural authority if minority languages become aestheticized, exoticized, or subordinated to dominant-language narration. Recent documentary practice demonstrates both the possibilities and tensions of linguistic representation.

Merata Mita's *Patu!* (1983), for example, incorporates te reo Māori in ways that refuse complete accommodation to non-Māori audiences, asserting indigenous linguistic presence within a politically-charged documentary context. Similarly, Alethea Arnaquq-Baril's *Angry Inuk* (2016) foregrounds Inuktitut perspectives within debates around seal hunting and indigenous sovereignty, challenging external media narratives that have historically marginalised Inuit voices.

At the same time, contemporary scholarship has warned that documentary representation alone does not necessarily guarantee ethical engagement. Tang and Zou's (2025) analysis of *Ashiq: The Last Troubadour* demonstrates how ethnographic documentary can

inadvertently reproduce linguistic hierarchies even while appearing sympathetic to minority communities. Such examples highlight a recurring tension within documentary practice: the gap between visibility and agency. Minority languages may be present within documentary media while still being framed through structures that privilege external interpretation.

The politics of documentary language therefore extends beyond simple questions of preservation or inclusion. Language in documentary is bound to broader issues of authorship, legitimacy, institutional access, and cultural power. Minority-language representation is never simply descriptive; it is constitutive. Documentary does not merely depict linguistic communities but participates in shaping how those communities are understood within public culture.

Translation, Accessibility and Ethics

Questions of translation and accessibility sit at the centre of contemporary documentary practice. Documentary filmmakers working across languages must constantly negotiate tensions between fidelity to linguistic specificity and the practical realities of audience comprehension. Subtitles, captions, dubbing, and voiceover narration are not neutral technical processes but interpretive acts that shape how meaning travels across cultural and linguistic boundaries.

Nornes (2007) argues that subtitling should be understood as a form of ideological intervention rather than a transparent mechanism of translation. Choices concerning timing, phrasing, omission, and emphasis influence how audiences perceive participants and communities. This becomes particularly significant when minority languages are involved, since subtitles frequently mediate the only access non-speakers have to linguistic content. Translation can therefore simultaneously expand visibility while flattening cultural nuance.

Documentary filmmakers have responded to these tensions in different ways. Some prioritise accessibility through extensive subtitling and explanatory framing, while others deliberately preserve linguistic opacity. Trinh T. Minh-ha's *Reassemblage* (1982), for example, famously refuses conventional ethnographic explanation, including moments of untranslated speech that challenge audience assumptions about comprehension and authority. Such strategies reposition viewers by making the limits of translation visible rather than concealing them.

Recent scholarship has increasingly framed translation and accessibility as ethical questions rather than purely technical concerns. Romero-Fresco (2017, 2019) argues that translation and accessibility should be integrated into documentary production from the earliest stages rather than treated as post-production additions. This is particularly significant in multilingual documentaries, where translation choices shape not only audience understanding but also the ethical representation of participants. Because subtitles and other forms of audiovisual translation mediate how participants are presented, they become part of the documentary's editorial practice rather than a neutral technical process.

Participatory documentary practices offer one important response to these concerns. Projects that involve communities directly in production, translation, and circulation processes can help redistribute representational authority. Indigenous and community-led documentary

initiatives such as Video in the Villages in Brazil have demonstrated how collaborative media production can challenge extractive documentary traditions by positioning communities as co-creators rather than subjects of observation. At the same time, participatory approaches do not eliminate ethical tensions entirely.

Documentary production remains embedded within broader systems of funding, festival circulation, academic discourse, and digital distribution that frequently privilege dominant languages and institutional norms. Filmmakers from minority-language communities often face structural barriers relating to financing, translation resources, and international visibility. Questions of linguistic justice are therefore inseparable from broader media inequalities.

These dynamics are further complicated by the rise of global streaming platforms and digital distribution systems. While online platforms have created new opportunities for minority-language documentaries to reach wider audiences, algorithmic recommendation systems and platform economies continue to privilege dominant-language content. Minority-language documentary therefore occupies an ambivalent position within digital culture: simultaneously more visible and yet still structurally marginalised.

What emerges from these debates is the need to move beyond simplistic understandings of documentary as either preservation or advocacy. Documentary is better understood as a contested site of linguistic mediation in which translation, accessibility, and representation are continually negotiated. The ethical challenge is not merely to include minority languages within documentary media, but to develop forms of representation that allow linguistic communities meaningful agency within these processes.

Documentary Futures

Emerging documentary forms are creating new possibilities for linguistic engagement and experimentation. Interactive documentaries, virtual reality projects, immersive environments, and participatory digital platforms have expanded the ways audiences encounter minority languages within media contexts. These technologies allow documentary makers to move beyond linear narration and create more embodied, relational forms of engagement with language and place.

Projects such as *Kusunda: Speak to Awaken* (Galeazzi et al., 2025), developed in collaboration with the Kusunda community in Nepal, suggest how immersive media can generate forms of emotional and spatial connection that differ from conventional documentary viewing. Research associated with the project indicates that virtual reality experiences may foster stronger feelings of presence and immersion, while more traditional two-dimensional documentary forms remain important for accessibility and collective viewing contexts. Such work suggests that linguistic engagement increasingly operates across multiple media forms simultaneously.

Interactive documentary projects have also begun to reposition audiences as participants rather than observers. *My Grandmother's Lingo* (SBS, 2016), for example, combines documentary storytelling with language-learning interaction, allowing users to speak and

practise words from the endangered Marra language. Here documentary functions not only as representation but as participation and transmission.

However, technological innovation also introduces new inequalities and ethical concerns. Immersive documentary production often depends upon access to specialised infrastructure, funding, and technical expertise that may not be available to many minority-language communities. Digital experimentation can therefore reproduce global asymmetries even while attempting to address cultural marginalisation. The politics of access remains central.

For this reason, recent projects have increasingly emphasised collaborative and community-led approaches to technological experimentation. The most effective contemporary examples tend to position technology not as spectacle but as infrastructure for linguistic and cultural connection. This shift is significant because it reframes innovation away from technological novelty alone and towards questions of participation, sustainability, and community agency.

Documentary futures therefore involve more than the adoption of new media forms. They require critical attention to how technologies shape linguistic visibility, cultural authority, and access to representation. Minority-language documentary continues to evolve across digital and immersive contexts, but the ethical and political questions surrounding representation remain fundamentally unresolved.

The Special Issue

The contributions collected in this special issue examine minority-language documentary practices across diverse political, cultural, and technological contexts. Across these different approaches, a common concern emerges: the need to understand language within documentary not as transparent communication but as a political and aesthetic practice. Minority languages on screen are inseparable from broader struggles concerning visibility, legitimacy, historical memory, and cultural self-determination.

The common thread running through these articles is the conceptualisation of documentary media as a site of “epistemic disobedience” (Mignolo, 2009), where minority languages are not merely preserved, but actively used to challenge dominant linguistic hierarchies and state-imposed narratives. Documentary serves as a political and aesthetic force that moves beyond the “discourses of sobriety” (i.e., the purely informational or didactic) to provide a sensory, emotional, and lived representation of what it means to exist within a marginalised linguistic world.

The contributions to this special issue are woven together by a shared interest in how the documentary form acts as a site of linguistic reclamation, aesthetic innovation, and political negotiation. This journey begins with a look back at the historical roots of filmic advocacy in Maria Seijo-Richart’s study of the Galician *correspondencia* film. In the early 20th century, pioneer José Gil utilised his “automotor cine” to create visual letters that functioned as an early form of “communicative travel” for the Galician diaspora in America. While the official intertitles often defaulted to Spanish due to the era’s linguistic diglossia, Seijo-Richart

illustrates how Gil strategically deployed Galician words to evoke *morriña* (longing) and assert a personal, cultural identity that defied official state narratives.

From this historical outward-facing “travel”, the focus shifts inward to the very structure of the cinematic image in Chen Chen’s exploration of the Zhuji dialect. Drawing on her documentary *Little Potato*, Chen argues that dialect is more than just a marker of regional realism; it is a generative aesthetic system. By applying the Xiang system – a framework consisting of physical form (*Xiang*), subjective fusion (*Yi Xiang*), and philosophical comprehension (*Yi Jing*) – she demonstrates how the tonal cadence of her grandmother’s speech dictates the film’s “heart rhythm”. This approach transforms linguistic features like “morpheme order reversal” into an editing logic of reverse sequences, mirroring the temporal disorientation of dementia and asserting that the poetic is embedded in the mundane textures of speech.

The aesthetic weight of language takes on a more overt political dimension in Özgür Çiçek’s analysis of Kurdish worlds under erasure. Çiçek introduces the concept of the “Scar of Tongue” (*Dil Yarası*), the psychological wound inflicted by the institutional “invisibilisation” of Kurdish languages in Turkey. She frames documentary as a tool for “epistemic disobedience” functioning alternately as an “audiovisual dictionary” that restores audibility to Zazaki words and as a “classroom” that exposes the mechanisms of state-enforced linguistic erasure. By “bringing the world to the dictionary”, these films allow marginalised speakers to move beyond institutional silence and reclaim their mother tongue as a lived reality.

This struggle for legitimacy in the face of linguistic plurality is further nuanced in Sergiusz Bober’s study of the German minority in Upper Silesia. Through an analysis of the *Schlesien Journal*, Bober explores how short documentaries navigate a complex “plurilingual landscape” of German, Polish, and Silesian. He identifies a form of “linguistic pragmatism” where German is prioritised as the “legitimate” identity marker through voice-overs and subtitles, even when participants are more comfortable in Polish. By mapping a territory that is both real and symbolic, these documentaries consolidate a sense of belonging that balances local Silesian rootedness with broader cosmopolitan ties to the German diaspora.

Finally, the collection moves into the realm of modern practice-led research with the insights of Alastair Cole. Drawing on works like *Colours of the Alphabet* (2016) and *Iorram* (2021), Cole treats the documentary process as a public-facing research methodology that can reveal “unseen” political and historical contexts attached to language use. He bridges the theoretical concerns of the preceding chapters by demonstrating how emerging technologies – such as VOD platforms and generative AI – are democratising the circulation of minority-language content. Ultimately, Cole’s work suggests that the “indexicality to the real” inherent in documentary provides a unique opportunity for global language advocacy, ensuring that these persistent cultural worlds are not only preserved but actively heard in the digital age.

Collectively, these articles demonstrate that language in documentary is never neutral. From the historical “visual letters” of Galician migrants to the “heart rhythms” of the Zhuji dialect and the “audiovisual dictionaries” of Kurdish survivors, documentary media functions as a contested site of linguistic mediation. By reattaching language to lived experience, these

researchers and practitioners move beyond mere preservation, asserting the persistence of cultural worlds that exist beyond official linguistic regimes.

This special issue therefore contributes not only to documentary and media scholarship, but also to wider debates within minority studies, linguistic justice, indigenous media, and ethnopolitics. At a moment when linguistic diversity faces increasing pressure from globalised media systems and platform economies, the politics of representation remains urgent. Documentary media continue to offer important possibilities for minority-language visibility and cultural expression, but these possibilities are always shaped by questions of translation, access, authorship, and power.

The articles gathered here do not offer a single model for ethical representation. Instead, they collectively demonstrate the complexity of working across languages, communities, and media systems. What they share is a recognition that documentary media remains a significant site in which linguistic identities are not only represented, but actively negotiated and contested.

References

- Arnaquq-Baril, A. (Director) (2016). *Angry Inuk* [Documentary film]. Unikkaar Studios.
- Cole, A. (Director) (2016). *Colours of the alphabet* [Documentary film]. Mosaic Films.
- Cole, A. (Director) (2021). *Iorram (Boat song)* [Documentary film]. Urgha Community Cooperative.
- Galeazzi, F., Parameswaran, G., Gaedtke, F., & Swami, V. (2025). Exploring the revitalisation of endangered intangible heritage and languages through multimedia storytelling and immersive technologies: A case study of virtual reality and 2D film with the Kusunda community in Nepal. *Frontiers in Computer Science*, 7, Article 1488802. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomp.2025.1488802>
- Mignolo, W. D. (2009). Epistemic disobedience, independent thought and de-colonial freedom. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 26(7–8), 159–181. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276409349275>
- Mita, M. (Director) (1983). *Patu!* [Documentary film]. Awatea Films.
- Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o (1986). *Decolonising the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. James Currey.
- Nichols, B. (2017). *Introduction to documentary* (3rd ed.). Indiana University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt2005t6j>
- Nornes, A. M. (2007). *Cinema Babel: Translating global cinema*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Romero-Fresco, P. (2017). Accessible filmmaking in documentaries. in *TRAlinea, Special Issue: Building Bridges between Film Studies and Translation Studies*. <https://www.intraline.org/specials/article/2251>
- Romero-Fresco, P. (2019). *Accessible filmmaking: Integrating translation and accessibility into the filmmaking process*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429053771>
- SBS Australia. (2016). *My grandmother’s lingo*. <https://www.sbs.com.au/mygrandmotherslingo>
- Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271–313). University of Illinois Press.
- Tang, R., & Zou, Y. (2025). Language, cultural identity, and spirituality – A case study of the representation of minority ethnic subjects in Chinese ethnographic documentary. *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism*, 25(2), 180–199. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sena.12447>
- Trinh, T. M. (Director) (1982). *Reassemblage* [Documentary film].