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Abstract

This article discusses relay translation in subtitling, using the well-known Danish film 'Festen' (The Celebration) by Thomas Vinterberg and its translation into Hebrew as a case study. The article aims at assessing the relationship between the source-language text, various features in the transmission process(es), and the effect of relay on the end product. It thus focuses on whether deviations and errors can be attributed to the use of relay in translation. It is rounded off with suggestions for reducing erroneous renditions in relay subtitling.

Relay translation: a definition

In this article, I shall use Cay Dollerup’s definition of relay translation. Unlike “indirect translation”, which applies to “situations where two parties must communicate by means of a third intermediary realisation which has no legitimate audience,” Dollerup reserves the term “relay translation” for cases in which intermediary realisations are primarily intended for consumption in the language which later serves as the source language for subsequent translation(s). (Dollerup 2000: 19)

This is expanded upon as follows:

'relay’ can be defined as a mediation from source to target language in which the translational product has been realised in another language than that of the original; the defining feature is that the intermediary translation has an audience, that is consumers, of its own. Unlike the renditions rightfully termed ‘indirect’ .... these intermediary realisations do not exist in a vacuum or in an ephemeral interval between the original and the target language version under discussion. (Dollerup 2000: 19)

Relay translation and interpreting have been used from time immemorial and have spanned from Bible translations to today’s simultaneous conference interpreting. In literary translation, relay is often found in translations between ‘minor’ languages. By and large Israeli literature, for instance, has been translated from Hebrew into Danish via English and German translations. It is only in recent years that a couple of books have been translated directly into Danish.\(^1\)

Referring to literary translation, Dollerup submits that:

In books by esteemed Danish translators, I find at least one error (by my definition) per page of prose translation, and, inevitably, more in popular literature where translators and publishers take little care. No matter how we define ‘errors’ or deviations, it is clear that in written public translations, each translator us-
ing relay will normally add new ‘deviations’ to those made by predecessors in the chain. In relation to the original, there is thus an accumulation of deviations every time a work is relayed ... [R]elay is indeed a major source of deviations in written translation. (Dollerup 2000: 22)

Dollerup ascribes some errors in written translation to the fact that the original sender may not be available. He also points out that professional conference interpreters have the advantage not only of seeing senders and recipients but also of being able to observe their body language.

Subtitling falls in between. As in written translation, it is not always possible to have obscure points elucidated by senders. Conversely, as with body language in interpreting contexts, there are other semiotic signs that may help in decoding messages, such as pictures and sounds. We therefore might expect relay to cause fewer errors in subtitling than it does in written translation.

**Relay in audiovisual translation**

Henrik Gottlieb lists “four potential pitfalls” in [relay] translation:

1. repetition of translation errors present in the relay-language subtitles,
2. transfer of relay-language features not acceptable in the target language,
3. transfer of segmentation incompatible with the target-language syntax, and
4. transfer of subtitle layout and cueing that is inferior to national standards.

(Gottlieb 1997: 128)

Ieva Grigaraviciūtė and Henrik Gottlieb conducted a study of the Lithuanian voice-over of a sequence of a Danish television serial, *Charlott and Charlotte* (Grigaraviciūtė and Gottlieb 2000). An English translation of the Danish original served as the source text for the Lithuanian voice-over. The authors analysed the sequence in terms of structure and translational quality. The structure of the translation was evaluated in terms of volume (full translation, reduction, or total elimination), and the translational quality was evaluated in terms of the semantic contents of the Lithuanian voice-over. Instances of full translation (structurally) and full semantic correspondence dominated, although the authors found that 29% of the sentences in the original were reduced or eliminated in the Lithuanian voice-over. Many reductions were colloquialisms indicative of character personality. Grigaraviciūtė and Gottlieb concluded that “[h]eavy reduction in this field keeps viewers updated on the plot, but they never get inside the people they watch on the screen” (2000: 90). The number of pragmatic particles was also reduced: “… what the Lithuanian viewers get is stylistically and communicatively poorer than what the Danish viewers had …” (2000: 92). Slang, swear words, and
references to sex were also reduced mostly because of cultural differences (2000: 59-63). Total elimination of elements was most frequent with culture-specific elements.

Their study indicated that approximately half the structural reductions were introduced in the English relay translation. The Lithuanian translator, of course, had no chance of knowing about these reductions. In the semantic transfer to the final target audience, Grigaravičiūtė and Gottlieb found “missing information, over-explicitness, and standardization ...” (2000:100) as well as outright misinterpretation. Their conclusion is that although 80% was semantically fully correspondent with the original, there was loss of information. Common translation strategies such as standardisation and condensation in the English translation made the Lithuanian end-product less colourful.

Ingrid Hilwerda (2000) studied relay subtitling in the Dutch and Flemish subtitles of the film discussed in this article. Both versions were made from an English relay translation. Hilwerda documents that here, too, relay resulted in some inaccuracies and errors in the two end-products.

Divergent semantics in pronouns in the Danish-English-Dutch (Flemish) language combination led to erroneous renditions, mostly so because the English “you” has more than one lexical equivalent in the two target languages. The relay subtitles led to misrepresented names, notably two culture-bound ones. Other indisputable errors originated in erroneous renditions in the English relay version and sometimes ambiguities surfaced when the otherwise correct English translation served as a source text for the Dutch and Flemish. Hilwerda does not discuss condensation, but notes that the number of swear words is reduced in English and even more so in the final subtitles. Many discrepancies discussed were not caused by the use of relay, but by the Dutch-Flemish translators’ inability to understand the English version. Nevertheless, Hilwerda considers the use of relay detrimental to the quality of the final product and the number of mistranslations “unacceptably high” (Hilwerda 2000: 44. My translation). She concludes that although the film’s message is crystal clear in both Flemish and Dutch, the relay translation is made “at the expense of the correctness and accuracy of the Dutch and Flemish subtitles” (Hilwerda 2000: 44. My translation).

These two studies indicate that there are errors in relay subtitling. One is that of carrying on errors made by the translator of the relay version. Another is found when something in the original is translated adequately into the relay language, but, when subsequently interpreted from the end-target language it turns out to be ambiguous. Therefore, if the end translator makes an errone-
ous choice, it becomes a deviation, an ‘error’ in the end product. And, finally, relay robs the final translator of knowledge of the original phrasing.

**Dogme 95 and The Celebration**

In 1995, four Danish film directors, including Lars von Trier and Thomas Vinterberg, professed to a ‘vow of chastity’, *Dogme 95*. It was a protest against commercialism and excessive use of technology in contemporary films. Among their ascetic rules was that only hand-held cameras be used. Nothing was to be added to the films, which were shot on location with instantaneous sound recording. The action must take place here and now. The ultimate goal of a director is to be realistic and to “extort the truth from [the] characters and the sceneries”. Dogme 95 is a “back-to-nature” ideology.

*‘The Celebration’ by Thomas Vinterberg*

*The Celebration* was awarded the Prize of the Jury at the film festival in Cannes, France, in 1998 and has distinguished Danish actors in the cast. It describes the events unfolding on the occasion of Helge Klingenberg’s 60th birthday, when his family gathers at the family hotel-estate. His eldest son, Christian, a successful chef and restaurateur in Paris, is to deliver the main speech at the dinner. Helene, the confused daughter who never graduated, brings along her latest boyfriend. Helge’s youngest son, Michael, is accompanied by his wife Mette and their two children. Only the memory of Christian’s deceased twin sister, Linda, clouds the happy occasion. Led by Helmuth, Helge’s German “adopted son”, the family embarks on a luxurious celebration with excellent food and wine, speeches, and songs. Things take a grim turn. Opening the traditional round of speeches for the honouree, Christian offers his father a choice between two prepared speeches. Unsuspecting, Helge chooses “the speech of truth”, which turns out to be an account of how, with his wife’s tacit approval, Helge sexually abused his two eldest children. At first no one believes Christian’s horrifying description of his childhood, since his mother denies it and ascribes it to Christian’s alleged difficulties in telling fact from fiction. Helene and Michael support the denial and throughout the evening Helmuth remains Helge’s stalwart supporter, carrying out his duties as the toastmaster, insisting that nothing is wrong. Eventually, Helene finds a farewell letter from Linda, in which she explains the reasons for her suicide, and then everybody realises that Christian is indeed telling the truth.
Despite its serious topic, the film successfully balances between seriousness and humour. Thus Helene’s naivety and Michael’s low-class manners and altercations with his wife make the story bearable.

*From Danish via English relay into Hebrew*

I shall here examine how the Hebrew subtitles of the film reflect that it was made in relay in Dollerup’s sense, that is, from English subtitles originally made for an English audience, rather than directly from the Danish original. My main concern is whether an Israeli audience can respond in a way comparable to a Danish audience, notably in terms of whether Israelis receive the ‘same’ information in terms of Eugene Nida’s “equivalence of effect” (response) and “formal equivalence” (information) (Nida 1964). The latter calls for pedantic scrutiny, a word-by-word examination, whereas an assessment of the former is based on an intuitive feeling of whether the target audience receives “the overall message”. Furthermore, I also refer to Gottlieb’s earlier mentioned first three “potential pitfalls”.

*The chain of translational communication*

Danish filmmakers usually supply foreign purchasers with an English translation - which is meant as a guide only - and when requested, a transcription of the dialogue in Danish.

The subtitles in Hebrew were created as follows: Jonathan Sydenham, an experienced British subtitler translated the Danish dialogue into English, from the film itself as well as from a transcription of the Danish dialogue. He made (a) a complete written translation and (b) a subtitled version for broadcasting.⁴

In this case, the British subtitler used the full English translation for the English subtitles. The Israeli subtitler, Anat Trope, used the English subtitles (not the full English translation) and two copies of the film.⁵ One of these had the English subtitles and the other was ‘clean’. As is customary in Israeli cinemas, the subtitles had to be in both English *and* in Hebrew, so both languages had only one line in every subtitle. The Israeli subtitler based her work on the English subtitles and later reduced those that did not fit the one-line format. She then used the clean copy for cueing while she was watching the subtitled version to see how the English subtitles corresponded with the speech. Having used relay in films from Iran, Japan, and China, she had experience with the technique. In subtitling *The Celebration*, she felt it was difficult to determine the degree of aggression and the linguistic register: Thus,
she felt that, in English, Christian’s language is pleasant, whereas she had no
cue as to whether Michael was rude or not.

The method
I first compared the Danish original with the English translation provided
by the producers. Subsequently the Hebrew subtitles were compared to the
Danish original. All discrepancies were compared to the English relay trans-
lation in order to identify points of deviation.

In the following discussion, a ‘/’ indicates a new subtitle or line. The Danish
quotations are from the transcription of the Danish dialogue. This is fol-
lowed by the British-English subtitles made by the English subtitler. When
these are incorrect, I provide a literal translation of the Danish original. The
English subtitles, which were shortened to fit the one-line format, are referred
to as Israeli-English subtitles. The Hebrew translation is followed by a back-
translation into English to facilitate discussion.

Types of deviation
The deviations can be divided into the following categories:

Errors: the Hebrew subtitle has another sense than the original speech.
This category comprises general errors, errors due to ambiguity in the origi-
nal or the relay, errors in names, personal pronouns, and reference.
Culture-specific phenomena: these comprise misrepresentation or distortion
in the rendition of culture-bound features, swear words, sociolects, and the
like.

Inaccuracies: these are discrepancies, additions, and changes introduced
by either of the two translators.

Condensation, reduction, and omission: these imply that the Hebrew ren-
dition does not convey the entire meaning of the original.

Language norms: unidiomatic Hebrew, unacceptable syntax, bad subtitle
segmentation.

In the full report available from me, all errors and inaccuracies (except
condensations and reductions) are listed (with time codes). In this article, I
shall cite one or two examples of each type and indicate the total number I
have found of each type.

Errors
Errors provide Israeli viewers with a meaning different from that of the
original. The first error occurs when Christian is talking on a cell phone.
This error is made by the English translator. Conversely, it is the Israeli translator who commits an error when the father, Helge, asks Christian to mention the dead sister because he himself would weep:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Danish</th>
<th>British-English</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Back-translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>så står jeg bare</td>
<td>I’d just blub.</td>
<td>נפשך אנה נאם</td>
<td>I will just smal-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>og flæber.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>talk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This misrepresents Helge’s emotional involvement.

There are more errors that convey distorted views of the characters, most notably so of Michael and his wife (three cases).

The following example may possibly have been caused by culture-bound considerations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Danish</th>
<th>Literal translation</th>
<th>British-English</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Back-translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nu gider du ikke engang</td>
<td>Now you can’t even</td>
<td>You can’t even be</td>
<td>מחרה לא אפילים אתי</td>
<td>You don’t even</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gå i seng med en flot</td>
<td>be bothered</td>
<td>bothered/to look at a</td>
<td>יחרת בברחתה פוח להמבש</td>
<td>bother/to look</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pige mere</td>
<td>to sleep with a</td>
<td>pretty girl anymore.</td>
<td></td>
<td>at a beautiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pretty girl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>girl anymore.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The English translator toned down the original statement, but needlessly so, since it is acceptable to have pre-marital sex in England and in Israel. Furthermore, neither subtitler had problems with an accurate rendering of the statement “og så min faders stive pik rode rundt i håret på mig” [“and saw my father’s stiff dick rubbing my hair”], although this is, surely, much more shocking.

**Ambiguities**

Another type of deviation is caused by the Israeli translator’s failure to identify appropriate contextual meaning. This is particularly obvious in cases
in which non-ambiguous source-language elements are rendered by lexical equivalents that make for multiple senses in the relay translation and are then rendered into unambiguous – but erroneous – lexical equivalents in the final translation (also discussed by Grigaraviciūtė and Gottlieb 2000: 108).

The first of these errors occurs in a phone call. The connection is poor, and Christian ends the conversation by saying "du falder ud" ["you’re dropping out"].

The English translation is adequate, but because of a slight ambiguity, the rendition into Hebrew is inaccurate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Danish</th>
<th>British-English</th>
<th>Israeli-English</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Back-translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Here even a superficial knowledge of Danish intonation patterns would have revealed that the Danish sentence is not a question. This is also the case in the British-English subtitle, which ends with a full stop, not a question mark.

Another error of this type is caused by an understatement in English:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Danish</th>
<th>Literal translation</th>
<th>British-English</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Back-translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeg blev skidefuld og sådan noget.</td>
<td>I got bloody pissed and such.</td>
<td>I got a bit pissed.</td>
<td>הצלח עלון ידיים.</td>
<td>I was a bit pissed off.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Israeli translator mistakes ‘being pissed’ (being drunk) for ‘being pissed off’ (being annoyed), possibly because the English translation tones down Michael’s drunkenness.

There are ten deviations of this type between the Danish original and the final Hebrew version. Three can be ascribed to the English relay translation (e.g. ‘homeland’). The Israeli translator’s misinterpretations add four deviations (e.g. ‘pissed’). The last three errors are caused by ambiguity in English and are thus also caused by the use of relay, although it must be added that some of them might have been avoided by watching the film or the English punctuation. In short, more than half of these errors in Hebrew are in some way or other caused by the use of relay.
Errors in names, person, and reference

Some names are not rendered the way they appear or are heard in the original and this is due to the relay, since the Israeli subtitling follows the spelling of the English version.

The relay method causes two errors concerning person and gender: the English second person pronoun "you" may refer to both the singular and plural and does not indicate gender:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Danish</th>
<th>Literal translation</th>
<th>British-English</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Back-translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jamen du står ikke her på listen.</td>
<td>But, you [singular!] are not on the list.</td>
<td>I’m afraid you’re not on the list.</td>
<td>يتما مفيش اسم لعنير. برايشه.</td>
<td>I’m sorry, you [plural!] are not on the list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hej mor, hvor ser du flot ud.</td>
<td>Hi Mum [feminine!], you look great.</td>
<td>... You look great.</td>
<td>... نفلآ هبرآ أوه.</td>
<td>... You [masculine!] look great.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the first case, a Danish singular becomes plural in Hebrew. In the second one, the Israeli subtitler clearly does not check who is speaking in the original. It is a son paying a compliment to his mother, not the other way round.

In other passages, the English translator makes a shift in person, which, naturally, is retained by the Israeli translator, as when Christian’s original plural “We [my partner and I] are moving into Lyon and ...” is turned into “I’m moving into Lyon and ...” In this case, however, the translation does not misrepresent ‘reality’, although it is not lexically ‘equivalent’.

Only three of the fifteen deviations of names and personal pronouns from the original are made by the Israeli subtitler. Two errors are due to the ambiguity of the English “you”, but the other ten are found in the relay subtitles.

Culture-specific phenomena

Culture-bound phenomena pose a challenge to subtitlers who, limited by lack of time and space, do not have the option of explaining them. This is obvious in The Celebration in Hebrew. Some inadequate renderings must be ascribed to the British-English translation, whereas others are of the Israeli subtitler’s own making.
The renditions evoke different associations in the three languages. The speaker, Michael, is a “social loser”. His bistro is in ‘Sydhavnen’, a rundown, seedy Copenhagen neighbourhood. This ‘bistro’ contrasts starkly to his brother Christian’s two high-class restaurants in France. In English, some of the negative connotation is rendered in “cafeteria”, whereas the “docklands” are more likely to call to mind a fashionable London neighbourhood. The Hebrew ‘beach’ makes for Israeli connotations ranging from fancy beach restaurants to falafel booths with plastic seats. Both translations thus are associated with water and sea, whereas the Danish original calls to mind seediness – and no view of the sea. Although one cannot blame the relay translation for an Israeli audience’s unfamiliarity with ‘Sydhavnen’, it does deprive the Israeli translator of the possibility of coming up with a closer rendition, because she did not realise the associations of the original.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Danish</th>
<th>British-English</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Back-translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Jeg er blevet bedt om at spørge dig hvad din interesse er for logen. I mine øjenne ligner du ikke ligefrem en logebroder ... Og da Christian ikke selv er interesseret så ... kan du forvente at blive spurgt om du vil indtræde i Frimurerlogen. | I’ve been asked to inquire/ Whether you are interested in the lodge./ I don’t see you as one of the brethren, / I must say./ ... And as Christian is not interested, / you may expect to be invited ... / to join the Freemasons. | ההבקשה לברר את התעניינותך בעם אניНе видишь у вас весь интерес נתייחסותכם לאسامר של המשכן בהתייחסותם לאש אמאם ... אני לא מוכן ... הסבר להנה נציצים ל... ל.IMAGE. | I have been requested to find out if you are interested in the hostel. I have to say that you are not really in my eyes [the right] choice of son. ... Since Christian is not interested, you will possibly be offered to join the Freemason family.
Another cultural error, however, can be squarely put at the English translator’s door. Instead of translating Donald Duck’s nephews’ Danish names, “Rip, Rap og Rup”, into “Huey, Dewey, and Louie”, which are also their names in Hebrew, he renders the names as “the three little piggies”. This, in turn, becomes “three little piggies” (הודיון, רודון ולוויי), which do not bring to mind any familiar characters to Israeli viewers.

The gravest cultural error committed by the Israeli translator is in the passage (I’ve been asked) given opposite. The English translator renders the original into equivalent English terms and phenomena (“lodge” and “Freemasons”). The Israeli translator apparently fails to check these terms. Therefore, she transforms a turning point in the life of a character into a question of sharing quarters with a family called ‘Freemason’! If the Israeli subtitler had listened to the original soundtrack, she would have heard no such family name.

It is also the Israeli’s lack of familiarity with European culture that causes the following error:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Danish</th>
<th>British-English</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Back-translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for først var det kostskolen</td>
<td>first, boarding school/</td>
<td>בהתחלה בכולת.</td>
<td>In the beginning the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Og så blev det skoleskibet</td>
<td>Then the school ship.</td>
<td>המפה בכניסה.</td>
<td>boarding school. After that at the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>פורום בית.</td>
<td>school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The phenomenon of a "skoleskib", a ship used for disciplining young offenders is unknown to the Israeli subtitler, she leaves out part of the characterization of Michael. The original stresses that he had problems as a young man and was therefore on a ship for rehabilitation. Although the precise concept does not exist in Israeli culture, a re-formulation might well have rendered the associations more adequately.

The distortions discussed here are caused by mistranslations in the relay (“Rip, Rap og Rup”), possibly by an English neutralisation of cultural associations (“Sydhavnen”). Two are made by the Israeli translator alone (“Fri- murerlogen” and “skoleskibet”). These examples confirm that cultural phenomena misrepresented in the relay may be taken over by the end translation, and also that each translator makes his or her own mistakes, thus adding to the final sum of errors in the end-product (Dollerup 2000: 23).
**Loss of culturally bound features**

In Danish, Michael stands out by swearing and using a low-class sociolect. Swearing is highly culture-bound, both in terms of usage and of the definition of foul language. Therefore, it is hard to convey it adequately, notably so in subtitling, which presents speech in writing. In most cultures, swear words have a greater impact in writing than in speech, which therefore calls for a reduction of swearing compared to the original speech.

We are here clearly facing a controversial point. Scandinavian subtitlers, such as Ivarsson and Carroll (1998) and Lindberg and Søndergaard (1997), posit that it is not the subtitler’s task to exert censorship. They argue that directors choose the style of a film and that this style must be conveyed to foreign viewers (Ivarsson and Carroll 1998: 126-127; Lindberg and Søndergaard 1997: 18, 29). Søndergaard even grants formal equivalence priority, dismissing viewer complaints of strong language with the words “...they have a problem, not the subtitler, who with a clear conscience can refer to the dictionary” (My translation). My point is that these subtitlers do not take into account equivalence of effect in terms of culture (Nida 1964). In Hebrew, two swear words will have much the same effect as six in Danish. This is the point of departure for the subsequent discussion.

**Swearing and sociolects**

In the first place, some swear words in Danish are often used to express surprise, excitement, or happiness. This is the case when Michael meets Christian:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Danish</th>
<th>British-English</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Back-translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Hebrew expression רמאז Aleph [“some shit”] is negative and thus in stark contrast with the fact that Michael is ecstatic with joy. Therefore, I consider “some shit” an error by the Israeli subtitler, no matter whether it is a rendition of the English “damn it” or “fucking hell”.

[7]
In the Hebrew version of *The Celebration*, the speech of Michael and his wife Mette is less coarse than it is in the Danish original. In the following passage, the swear words not rendered in Hebrew are marked in bold, and other words left out are marked by italics in the Danish original and the British-English relay translation.

In Danish, Michael swears four times, in Hebrew hardly once, as אלוהים [‘God!’] is milder than “sgu”. Swearing is typical of the couple’s sociolect and as such, part of their character. In a scene where Michael is looking for his shoes, he and his wife use fourteen swear words. In English this is rendered by four and in Hebrew by one. In addition, Michael ends nearly all sentences with the filler-word ”mand” [‘man’], which is rarely rendered into English and not once in Hebrew. In the passage above, this “mand”-ending is found six times in Danish, but not in English or in Hebrew, which have no equivalent. In Danish, Michael also often finishes sentences with the word “ikke?” or “ikk?” which merely serves to keep the conversation going. The English equivalent in meaning and function is “right?” or “you know”, in Hebrew "有何". In terms of style or sociolect, this resembles young Englishmen’s use of ‘like’ and Hebrews’ "איהו". These might therefore have been used now and again by the translators in order to present the type of language spoken. In the Hebrew subtitles, Michael uses virtually no foul language. One reason is that swearing is rarer in spoken Hebrew than in spoken Danish, so the Israeli translator would have had to weed out some to avoid making Michael ruder in Hebrew than in Danish. At the same time, the English relay offered the Israeli translator no chance of knowing how much Michael swears. The Israeli translator might then have presented the Israeli Michael as an "ראס" (‘vulgar person’), by use of contractions and omissions of phonemes. In any case, Michael turns into a nice guy in translation, since the translators use a strategy that standardises the speech, promoting a homogeneous style at the expense of the heterogeneity of the source text. (*Bloody hell*) overleaf.

**Other culture-bound features**

There are some other cultural phenomena are conveyed, if only partially. The Danish habit of making toasts, speeches, and singing songs in praise of the honouree at a party is not practiced in Israel, and consequently the concept of a toastmaster in charge of proceedings is non-existent. In the film, the concept is rendered by the explanatory מנהל מסיבת ("party guide/ leader").

Danes are more familiar with German language than are Israelis. Therefore, the Israeli translator chooses to explain that Ruhr is a German region with steel industry (*Ich bin aus*) overleaf.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Danish</th>
<th>British-English</th>
<th>Israeli-English</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Back-translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael: Hvad fanden, det var <strong>sgu da min bror, mand.</strong> Det var <strong>sgu da min storebror, mand, hvorfor helvede siger du ikke noget, mand, hva?</strong> Mette: <strong>Ahr</strong>, som om jeg så ham, nå altså. Michael: Man skal <strong>kraftede-me</strong> ordne alt ting selv her, <strong>mand.</strong></td>
<td>Mi: Bloody hell, that's my brother./ My big brother! Why <strong>the hell</strong> didn't you say?/</td>
<td>Me: As if I saw him! I mean! / Mi: I have to do everything myself.</td>
<td><strong>דְוַדָּא</strong> אַלְמַּה לֶּאֱמַּת�ִּתְךָ <strong>לְאָּלְמַּת</strong>! אָמַרְתִּי לֶאֱמַּתְךָ?</td>
<td><strong>Mi: God, that's my brother. My big brother! Why didn't you say?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Danish</th>
<th>British-English</th>
<th>Israeli-English</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Back-translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ich bin aus Deutschland, Köln, Ruhr, die Stahlwerken. And also Helge is a Stahlwerk. Still going strong. Helge, mein Freund, mein dänisches Vater, ordet er dit.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ich bin aus Deutschland, Köln./ Ruhr, die Stahlwerken. / And also Helge is a Stahlwerk. / Still going strong. / Helge, mein Freund, mein dänisches Vater, over to you.</strong></td>
<td>I am from Germany, Köln. / Ruhr, steelworks area. / And also Helge is made of steel. / Still going strong./ Helge, my Danish father, over to you.</td>
<td>**קהֹלָל, אַלְמַּה לֶּאֱמַּתְךָ. אַוִּיר, רָוָּר חָבֲּל. מְפַלְּדָּא שָׁעִיִּתְךָ. מְפַלְּדָּא. אוֹפַּר. רָוָּר חָבֲּלָא. אָלְמַּתְךָ. <strong>אלָּלְמַּתְךָ. כָּלָא.</strong></td>
<td><strong>I am from Germany, the Ruhr part, the area of steel factories. Also Helge is made of steel. In his strength's fullness. Helge my friend. My Danish father. To you.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This explicitation strategy is mentioned by Nedergaard-Larsen (1993: 219) and corresponds to Carstensen’s “explanation” (1992: 79). In this passage, the explicitation is introduced in the Israeli-English final subtitle “the area of steel factories”, whereas the British-English version only renders “die Stahlwerke” [‘the steelworks’]. Likewise, the subsequent “mein Freund” is merely transferred to the British-English subtitle, while the Israeli-English subtitle leaves it out and only has “My Danish father”, although the Hebrew subtitle renders all of it to “my friend. My Danish father”. Part of the explanation is that it is difficult to render foreign words into Hebrew because of the differences in alphabets. In the context, it is unexpected, so even Israelis with a good command of German will hardly be able to make out the German in Hebrew letters. Therefore, Israeli subtitlers hardly have any choice but to translate or to provide an explanation.9

It was noted that the toastmaster mixes German and (incorrect) Danish. This is not conveyed to the Israeli audience. Thus he uses the wrong gender in Danish for the word ‘letter’ (*“en brev”). Because English has no gender, the English translator provides an adequate solution by omitting the indefinite article “a” before “letter”. But Hebrew has no indefinite article. Whenever a noun is used without the definite article, it is therefore indefinite, but the article does not display gender. It is therefore impossible to render this linguistic subtlety.

Other points concern the medium: Films are cultural portraits and many people enjoy learning about other countries’ culture from films. Thus, the type of bread served at breakfast, “franskbred”, is rendered as “French stick” in the British-English version, the equivalent of Danish “flutes”, rather than the correct equivalent of “white bread”. The Hebrew subtitle uses the word for a “roll” instead of the equivalent לחם לבן (“white bread”). “Pejsestuen” (a room with an open fireplace) becomes “the drawing room” in English and חדר אורחים (“the guest room”) in Hebrew. Although a drawing room is not an exact equivalent, it conveys the idea of a room where some men, namely the Freemasons, are gathered. However, the Hebrew “guest room” conjures up a room where all the guests (including women and men) gather. In this context, it does not tally with what takes place, namely a secret conversation about the Freemason lodge. Although the relay translation was not an exact lexical equivalent, it did not cause the misrepresentation in the Hebrew edition. The deviations are relatively subtle and do not affect the overall understanding of the film, so the objection is rather that they are not truly reflections of source-culture phenomena.
Adaptation to the target culture is also used in the film’s translations (Nedergaard-Larsen 1993: 217). Each translator chooses an ‘equivalent’ national liquor for the Danish “gammel dansk” (a kind of schnapps) from the target culture. Another one is a reference to political parties:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Danish</th>
<th>British-English</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Back-translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>og du havde meldt dig ind i V... i SF tror jeg det var</td>
<td>And had joined the Trotsk... / The Young Socialists, I think it was...</td>
<td>ת搋יקסטמע מיזמרפ</td>
<td>and you joined the Trotskists ... the “Young Socialists”, I think...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The English translator chooses the English equivalents for the Danish parties. This is duplicated, in Hebrew although these parties do not exist in Israel. This is the best solution since an explanation of the Danish parties is impossible and Israelis may be familiar with the British terms. Both translators choose the national equivalent for the song “For han er en af vor egne ...” (“For he’s a jolly good fellow”), since it exists in all three languages. All other songs in the film are translated more or less literally into both English and Hebrew and are not marred by translation errors. Neither translator renders rhythm and rhyme, but the audience gets the content. Nor do they render a birthday song by means of a national birthday song, but translate the Danish song word by word.

Culture-bound phenomena are thus sometimes not realised in the target text. In addition, the first subtitler’s choices narrow the options for the second subtitler.

**Inaccuracies**

There are nine inaccuracies that are neither indisputably wrong nor adequate representations of the original. Two additions are due to the English translator, one being:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Danish</th>
<th>Literal translation</th>
<th>British-English</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Back-translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Det er en slags sandhedstale.</td>
<td>It is a kind of speech of truth</td>
<td>It’s a kind of &quot;home truth speech&quot;.</td>
<td>מון זה &quot;האמת של תחום&quot; &quot;בכותרת&quot;</td>
<td>It’s a kind of &quot;speech about the truth at home&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is what Grigaraviciūtė and Gottlieb term “overexplicitness” (2000: 101). There is no need to explain that what follows concerns “the home”.

In some instances there are both errors and inaccuracies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Danish</th>
<th>Literal translation</th>
<th>British-English</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Back-translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... haft kontak med allerede af fremmede kulturer og folkeslag.</td>
<td>... the contacts you haven’t had with foreign cultures and peoples.</td>
<td>the contacts you haven’t had ... / with foreign countries and peoples.</td>
<td>שחלות הקשורים ל... לארץ אתנומים ...</td>
<td>And the connections you’ve had with foreign states and people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Hebrew, the correct rendition should be "תרבות" (cultures) and "עם" (peoples), which associate with travel and exotic peoples, whereas the words used are from political contexts and trade. It is, however, the English relay that leads to the first incorrect Hebrew equivalent. Conversely, the second term is due to the Israeli translator’s failure to notice the plural ‘s’ in “peoples”. All in all, five semantic inaccuracies are caused by the English relay translation and another four are added by the Israeli subtitler.

Condensation – reduction and omission

Because of the constraints of on-screen presentation, notably of speech, condensation is an integral part of subtitling. When condensing, subtitlers must decide which information is most important. In her study of subtitling of English into Slovene, Irena Kovačič distinguishes between “partial reductions” (condensations) and “total reductions” (deletions or omissions) (Kovačič 1994: 247). Both are found in the Hebrew version of The Celebration.

There are many examples, and one, a row between two characters in which the omissions are italicised and given in bold in Danish, will suffice here (well, you missed) overleaf.

Some condensations are due to features typical of spoken language, such as phrases that open or end sentences and keep the speech flowing: “listen”, “you know what”, “right?”, and the name of the person addressed. Kovačič also notes that “vocatives functioning as simple terms of address ... are left out” (Kovačič 1994: 249). The first Danish sentence would have been rendered more adequately by “if you don’t come to your sister’s funeral then you shouldn’t come to your father’s birthday, should you?” The condensation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Danish</th>
<th>British-English</th>
<th>Israeli-English</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Back-translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helene: <em>Hvis</em> du ikke kan komme til din søsters begravelse <em>skal du heller ikke komme til din fars fødselsdag vel?</em> Michael: <em>Prov at høre jeg synes sgu</em> ikke du skal blande dig vel? <em>Når du selv kommer for sent.</em> Helene: <em>Ved du hvad jeg blander mig ikke i hvad du laver.</em> jeg blander mig i hvad du ikke laver. At du ikke kommer til din søsters begravelse. At du ikke får ringet til mig på min fødselsdag, <em>at du ikke betaler de penge tilbage du skylder.</em> At du ikke interesserer dig <em>en skid for andre mennesker end dig selv Michael, det er det, jeg blander mig i.</em></td>
<td>Well, you missed your sister’s funeral./ Don’t poke your nose in./ I’m poking it into what you &lt;don’t&gt; do / You don’t go to her funeral./ You don’t phone me on my birthday. / You don’t show an interest.</td>
<td>You missed your sister’s funeral./ Don’t poke your nose in./ I’m poking it into what you don’t do / You don’t go to her funeral./ You don’t phone me on my birthday./ You don’t show an interest.</td>
<td>ולא שאתה לברומל��ים. \ לא אתה שאלת \ את ההלוחים שבא לא \ אתה לא טעני נ. \ לא אתה \ את ההלוחות בום \ השם עניין.</td>
<td>You didn’t come to your sister’s funeral. Don’t stick your nose in. I stick it into the things that you don’t do. You didn’t come to her funeral. You don’t call on my birthday. You don’t show an interest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
poke my nose into what you do ....”. There is no emphasis in the final Israeli-English subtitles and the sentence is awkward.

It is obvious from the table that more is omitted, but it is mostly for reasons of on-screen time and space: Helene is agitated and speaks fast. The English subtitler decided, for instance, that the sentence “at du ikke betaler de penge tilbage du skylder.” (“That you don’t pay back the money that you owe”) was unimportant and disregarded it.

Kovačić states that

“decisions about deletions are context dependent and hinge on the translator’s judgment about whether the viewer can have access to the intended interpretation without them” (Kovačić 1994: 250).

It is clear from the original Danish sound-track that Helene is annoyed. However, throughout the transfer process, the subtitler is facing numerous choices, so the subtitler at the end of the chain of relay has a limited number of choices compared to the options in the original: the first subtitler reduces options, leaving the next subtitler(s) with fewer options. If she had known the original, the Israeli translator might have chosen to stress that Michael does not pay back money rather than his failure to phone Helene on her birthday. But she had no such choice. Kovačić comments that deletion may have two effects:

On the one hand, the target audience is spared the effort of processing the missing part, but, on the other hand, they may find it more difficult to process the remaining part. It is up to the subtitler to decide which of the two prevails. (Kovačić 1994: 250)

This happened in the above example, in that the first subtitler emphasised a phrase referring to something omitted. This may have caused difficulties for British viewers and definitely does so when transferred to Hebrew without emphasis.

In the example (The bath?) overleaf, the parts of the Danish original that do not make it to the Hebrew version are marked in bold and italics.

This is a typical rate of condensation in the subtitling of this film. The dialogue is spoken, repetitive language. It is full of redundancy and the cogent written language calls for condensations as noted by Kovačić: “Whole utterances are deleted, especially when their relationship to a preceding one is basically that of expansion or explication” (Kovačić 1994: 250-251). It should be noted that most reductions are repetitions. Nevertheless, Helene’s agitation when she is hiding the letter does not come across in the target-language subtitles, although viewers listening to her tone of voice may catch it (i.e., by means of the extra-linguistic signals).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Danish</th>
<th>British-English</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Back-translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Л.: Бадекарет. Скאל</td>
<td>The bath? You want me to lie in the bath?</td>
<td>לאמכסה את רותו.</td>
<td>In the bath? Do you want me to lie in it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helene: Јег тагер лиге</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дие солбрiller аф.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Л.: Хива шале яг са</td>
<td>Lie down?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>læгге миу нэд и</td>
<td>And check if</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>бадекарет? Det kan</td>
<td>you see any-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>яг ду годт.</td>
<td>thing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helene: Prov at lægge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>диг нэд и єс се ом</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du ikke кан се ное</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>get er deroppe. Prov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at киг ... киг граундг</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efter оппе и лофт ом</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ду кан се ел елл ан-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>деть тегн элл и ен</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lille pil елл ное ... эн</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>больге елл ен фиск эл-</td>
<td>A sign or an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>лл ер</td>
<td>arrow./</td>
<td>Waves, a fish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A wave or a</td>
<td>or a bird./</td>
<td>or a bird./</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish or a bird./</td>
<td>Kind of like</td>
<td>It’s like ”Hot,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;getting warmer,&lt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cold”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It can go in he-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>re./</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They mustn’t find it/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okay, sådan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helene: Јет кан гот</td>
<td>It is possible to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ве ре хернеде, det кан</td>
<td>put it in here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>godt ве ре хернеде, де</td>
<td>They mustn’t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ма икке finde det, de</td>
<td>find it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ма икке finde det, de</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ма икке finde det.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okay, sådan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... There.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conversely, there is much less condensation in speeches, such as those delivered at the dinner. This can be exemplified by the following speech. *(A couple of months)* opposite.

This – as well as other – "speech" (e.g., by Christian and Else) and the suicide letter are much more ‘literate’ and may even have been written in advance, so they tend to be close to ‘written language’ with less redundancy and a slower delivery, which, in turn, calls for less condensation.

Overall, however, the use of relay withholds information from subtitlers working from the first relay. Translators working in relay should therefore
consult a translation of the complete dialogue in order to decide for themselves what condensations and reductions they should make.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Danish</th>
<th>British-English</th>
<th>Israeli-English</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Back-translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... <em>Her</em> for et par måneder siden, da min søster døde, gik det op for mig at Helge var en meget renlig mand, så tit som han gik i bad <em>og</em> jeg tænkte, det ville jeg <em>da</em> dele med resten af min familie, <em>det var jo</em> både sommer og vinter og <em>forår og efterår og</em> morgen og aften <em>og</em> ..., det skal de <em>da vide om min far, tænkte jeg.</em> Helge er en renlig mand og vi er jo <em>samlet her i dag for at</em> fejre Helge <em>på hans</em> 60 års fødselsdag. Der er nogen der kan. Tænk</td>
<td>A couple of months ago when my sister died... / I realised that Helge was a very clean man, with all those baths. / I thought I’d share it with the rest of the family. /</td>
<td>Baths summer, winter, <em>spring, autumn, morning, evening</em> ... /</td>
<td>עליי לודשים ... \ับבחיות אחת \בוך חורב \עם כל האמברות \אלא.</td>
<td>Two months ago when my sister died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagine living a long life/ and watching your children grow up!/ And grandchildren./</td>
<td>Imagine, he lived a long life and watched his children grow up! and grandchildren.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagine living a long life/ and watching your children grow up!/ And grandchildren./</td>
<td>Imagine, he lived a long life and watched his children grow up! and grandchildren.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But you didn't come to listen to me./ But you didn't come to listen to me./</td>
<td>But you didn't come here to listen to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We've come to celebrate Helge's sixtieth./ so let's do so./ Thank you for all those good years./ Happy Birthday.</td>
<td>We celebrate Helge's sixtieth birthday, so let's begin. Thank you for all the good years. Happy birthday.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagine, living a long life/ and watching your children grow up!/ And grandchildren./</td>
<td>Imagine, he lived a long life and watched his children grow up! and grandchildren.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagine, living a long life/ and watching your children grow up!/ And grandchildren./</td>
<td>Imagine, he lived a long life and watched his children grow up! and grandchildren.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

Even the best translators commit errors. However, the present study shows that – all things being equal - subtitling in relay introduces more deviations than a direct subtitling. The deviations of the first subtitler remain and the second (third etc.) adds new ones. Simple mathematics suggests that the longer the chain of relays the more errors there will be in the end-product. This is amply documented in 'relay' translation (Dollerup 1999: 109-145; 227-231; 300). Some of the effects of relay translation, such as the carry-on effect of errors, are independent of the language pairs involved, whereas others depend on the language pair involved.
The present study also highlights the fact that relay subtitling is a field within Translation Studies that is in need of empirical studies, such as the present one, rather than relying on guesswork, and that in order to assess the implications of relay, researchers must be aware of all factors involved (e.g., did the subtitler have access to the film? To a script?).

One shies away from using a word like ‘equivalence’. Formal equivalence was not always present for the simple reason that there was not a one-to-one correspondence between the Danish original and the Hebrew version.

If we talk more loosely about effect, the overall point of the film as well as many nuances got across. It is true that an Israeli audience would laugh less than would a Danish one, but I find that it was adequate in so far as the Hebrew relay translation does not change the overall ‘tone’ of The Celebration. Nevertheless, I do find that it influences the end product in some respects: there are indisputable errors, slight deviations, and condensation. Their effect is most obvious in the presentation of Michael, who, as subtitled in Hebrew, becomes only a shadow of himself. There are several features, notably swearing and culture-bound phenomena (here indicating class), that are particularly liable to mistranslation and condensation. On the other hand, a subtitled film is polysemiotic. Thus isolated errors in translation may not be crucial to the understanding of a character (or the film), since the plot is also conveyed by other semiotic signs, such as pictures and sounds. The attentive target-language audience also registers non-verbal factors such as body language, intonation, etc. Therefore the response to Michael’s character does not depend solely on the subtitles. Having modified the effect of the written subtitles in this way, I still find that the humans portrayed tend to become more mainstream.

On the basis of my findings and those of Hilwerda, Gottlieb and Grigan-raviciūtė, we can set up some basic and tentative general guidelines for relay subtitling. Subtitlers relying on another translation should carefully go over the original film. This is likely to do away with some errors caused by ambiguity. If possible, subtitlers should always use a translation of the complete dialogue of the original and not only a film with relay subtitles. In this way, the last subtitler will always be able to condensate independently of predecessors as well as take into account the context. If possible there should be a dialogue list of additional explanations. Thus, the first subtitler could explain not only specific choices of translation and cultural phenomena, but also draw attention to specific important or problematic elements of the dialogue.
Notes
1. Amos Oz. 1998. *En panter i kælderen* (Copenhagen: Rosinante); and Etgar Keret. 2002. *Buschaufforen der ville være Gud og andre noveller* (Copenhagen: Rosinante) were both translated directly from the Hebrew original.
4. I am indebted to René Nielsen at Nimbus Film for informing me about the exporting of *The Celebration*. The Danish film script was transcribed from the film itself, and this is the version Jonathan Sydenham used.
5. For information on the Israeli version, I am indebted to the subtitler Anat Trop. She had, however, subtitled *The Celebration* two years earlier and unfortunately did not remember all details.
6. Contact: e-mail: njacques@yahoo.com.
7. Anat Trop referred to the problem rendering swear words: “Sometimes they swear in English, when they don’t really mean to swear and the words function as interjections. I don’t write those words in Hebrew since they cannot have this latter function in Hebrew and will sound very rough. There is a serious cultural difference here.” (My translation) This corresponds to the findings of Grigaraviciūtė and Gottlieb.
8. The Israeli subtitler Aya Gazit uses this strategy to render such traits in Hebrew and gives an example: “what d’you think” is rendered “מהОсומך?” [ma taxosh əv] instead of “מהОсומך?” [ma atá xosh əv] (Gazit 1998: 89).
9. Aya Gazit mentions that it is common subtitling practice in Israel to explain difficult cultural phenomena and new words in brackets. Gazit, who has been translating the American cartoon *The Simpsons* for ten years, is happy if she succeeds in transferring 70% of the jokes of this particular serial. If a joke refers to a specific American image or personality unknown to Israelis, she writes an explanation in brackets, e.g. “football player” or “opera singer” (My interview, 2001). This is what Birgit Nedergaard-Larsen (1993: 219) calls “explicitation” in its most extended form.
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