

Jonas Høiseth Aagaard

# Norwegian subtitling of American taboo language in Reservoir Dogs

Bacheloroppgave i Engelsk  
Veileder: Anja Katrine Angelsen  
Mai 2019



Jonas Høiseth Aagaard

**Norwegian subtitling of American taboo  
language  
in Reservoir Dogs**

ENG2123 Translation

Bacheloroppgave i Engelsk  
Veileder: Anja Katrine Angelsen  
Mai 2019

Norges teknisk-naturvitenskapelige universitet  
Det humanistiske fakultet  
Institutt for språk og litteratur



## **Contents**

2	<b>Introduction</b>
3	<b>Theory and background</b>
7	<b>Method</b>
7	<b>Data and analysis</b>
12	<b>Discussion</b>
13	<b>Conclusion</b>
15	<b>Appendix</b>
20	<b>References</b>

## Introduction

Audiovisual translation has been contested as an area of translation which was difficult to research and discuss due to the field's young age. There have been claims that subtitling, which is generally a written reproduction of on-screen dialogue, is *not* a form of translation, but rather a form of adaptation (Pérez-Gonzales, 2009, p. 260). Audiovisual translation has therefore been contested in its definition, e.g. as 'constrained translation'—limited in its freedom by e.g. the co-existence of sound channel and voice channel<sup>1</sup>.

The language of the cult-classic film *Reservoir Dogs* (1992) makes its subtitles applicable for analysis in the context of audiovisual translation. Directed by Quentin Tarantino, it was released in 1992 and produced by Live America and Dog Eat Dog Productions Inc. The Los Angeles-style American English spoken is largely explicit in nature—Tarantino's emphasis on taboo elements and violence has given the movie an R rating in the US and an age restriction of 18 years in other countries (IMDB, "Parents Guide"). The language is used vividly yet creatively, giving the translator a choice to retain or omit taboo utterances which may or may not contribute to the personality of the characters and setting.

The opening scene of *Reservoir Dogs* is split up into two parts, plot-wise<sup>2</sup>. The first part opens with Mr. Brown (Quentin Tarantino) talking about what Madonna's song, 'Like a Virgin' is actually about, correcting what appears to be a common misconception about "a nice girl who meets a sensitive boy" (Tarantino, 1992). After the group briefly trails off about 'True Blue' and Madonna as an artist in general, Mr. Brown gets back on track and says that the character in the song is so used to sleeping with different men that she essentially has forgotten what it was like being a virgin—until a new man comes along and makes her feel "*something she ain't felt since forever.*". He subsequently reveals this feeling to be pain, which in turn reminds the character of how it once was to have sex 'Like a Virgin'. After this, the topic of the conversation shifts.

---

<sup>1</sup> Gambier (2004) calls this 'transadaptation'. This spans over a variety of subgenres, including three subtitling strategies of dubbing, voice-over, surtitling and audio description.

<sup>2</sup> The group discusses two main topics during the introductory scene. One concerns the meaning behind Madonna's 'Like a Virgin', while the other concerns tipping culture. This thesis concerns the first part.

This essay will discuss the categorization of subtitling as *audiovisual translation* (AVT), along with its inherent nature of often creating redundancy between ST and TT for the sake of viewer readability and coherence. In the case of Tarantino's film, it will argue that *loss* in translation—what Ávila-Cabrera calls 'toning down' (2016, p. 33)—is dominant over *gain*.

José Javier Ávila-Cabrera's essay, *The treatment of offensive and taboo terms in the subtitling of Reservoir Dogs into Spanish* (2016) and Javier Franco Aixelá's article, *Culture-specific Items in Translation* (1996) are used as base references for this project to support how both culture and formal rule sets define the way which the film's dialogue is translated into interlingual subtitles, with the focal point of the analysis situated in Toury's descriptive theories. In identifying which techniques are used in the translation of *Reservoir Dogs*' dialogue, I will be referencing Vinay and Darbelnet's two strategies, *direct/literal translation* and *oblique/free translation*, as well as the seven procedures they collectively comprise (1995/2004, p. 128-37). Finally, the nature of taboo language must be analysed in a sociolinguistic context to gauge in what way it is relevant for Tarantino's film. As a secondary, I will briefly assess whether or not potential breaches of the Netflix guidelines occur in order to further the characteristic of taboo language in *Reservoir Dogs*.

## **Theory and background**

As mentioned, subtitles generally serves as a representation of what is being said on-screen, and differs from *captions* in that they only transcribe dialogue, whereas captions also transcribe "sound effects, relevant musical cues and other relevant audio information" (W3C, 4.7.12.). Subtitling is commonly referred to as a type of *audiovisual translation*, or AVT for short (Dias Cintas & Remael, 2007). Pérez-Gonzales (2014) refers to the term as concerning cross-language transfers of *multimodal* and *multimedial* texts (p. 13). The former encompasses a range of semiotic resources such as language, music, image and color, while the latter synchronizes these resources or 'modes' together for the viewer through various media such as the coordination of screen and sound (Pérez-Gonzales, 2014 p. 13). Subtitles complement the audiovisual text which is projected, played or broadcast on-screen, and are either *interlingual* (between different

languages), *bilingual* (simultaneous display of two languages) or *intralingual* (in the same language) in nature, as mentioned by Gambier (2003, in Pérez-Gonzales, p. 14-15). The latter is today closely related to *subtitling for the deaf and hard of hearing*—also called ‘closed captions’.

Aixelá argues that the Western World sees a clear trend towards what Toury defines as ‘reading [a text] as *an original*’ (Toury, in Aixelá, 1996, p. 54). However, literary critics, publishers and other roles who have the final say in accepting or rejecting the translator’s TT through sanctioning may end up *domesticating* the text, where the target reader recognizes the cultural references to such an extent that the cultural *other* becomes falsely familiar. Venuti (1998, p. 241), quoting Schleiermacher (1813/2012), describes the ethnocentric effect of *domestication* as “[leaving] the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moves the author toward him”, while *foreignization* “entails choosing a foreign text and developing a translation method along lines which are excluded by dominant cultural values in the target language” (Venuti, 1998, p. 242). Overly appropriating whatever culture the ST seeks to illustrate to the TT audience may be considered both dishonorable to the source culture and misleading to the target culture. Toury (1985, p. 32) briefly visits this clash between ST and TT cultural dominance in what he calls ‘adequate translation’. Admitting that no translation is fully ‘adequate’, Toury still gauges the TT translation against whether or not it accurately reproduces ST textual relations, in areas such as cultural or linguistic accuracy by ‘mapping’ the TT onto the ST to see correspondence and differences. This process involves evaluating one expression in two different languages as ‘coupled pairs’ (Toury, 2012, p. 103). Toury implies that the value of literary translation—provided the source material be fiction—must satisfy two prerequisites in order to be as close as possible to adequate:

1. **It must be a worthwhile literary work in TL (target language)**, occupying the appropriate position in the target literary polysystem.
2. **It must be a translation**, constituting a representation in TL of another pre-existing text in SL, the latter of which belongs to the polysystem of the source and occupies a certain position within it (Toury, in Aixelá, 1996, p. 52-53).



Toury (2012, p. 31-4/102) introduces *norms* in his *descriptive translation studies* (DTS) which can help identify patterns in each translation. His definition of norms is;

*the translation of general values or ideas shared by a community—as to what is right or wrong, adequate or inadequate—into performance instructions appropriate for and applicable to particular situations.* (Toury, 2012, p. 63)

He considers translation to be an activity which is governed by norms, since they “determine the (type and extent of) equivalence manifested in actual translations” (Toury, 2012, p. 61).

As norms are sociocultural constraints specific to a culture, society and time, Toury uses a cline to place them between ‘rules’ on one end and ‘idiosyncrasies’ and ‘conventions’ on the other. We can therefore judge norms to be ambiguous, being “*options* that translators in a given socio-historical context select on a regular basis.” (Toury, 2012, in Baker, 2009, p. 190). Consequently, Toury stresses that norms are a ‘graded notion’: A translator’s behaviour cannot be expected to be fully systematic (Toury, 2012, p. 67). Nevertheless, norms can be used to assume choices taken by the translator, and if replicated, can create patterns in the process.

Before studying the data of the film it is helpful to have an overview of what is considered *taboo*. The word comes from Polynesian Tongan, and means ‘holy’ or ‘untouchable’ (Gao, 2013, p. 1). It is defined by Wardhaugh (2000, p. 234) as “the prohibition or avoidance in any society of behavior believed to be harmful to its members in that it would cause them anxiety, embarrassment, or shame” (Gao, 2013, p. 1), and by *The New Oxford Dictionary of English* (2001) as “a social or religious custom prohibiting or restricting a particular practice or forbidding association with a particular person, place, or thing.” (Gao, 2013, p. 1). Western civilization in particular is accustomed to refuse to use certain language to talk about specific things if these are of cultural sensitivity. Examples used by Gao (2013) of taboo language are bodily excretions (related to defecation and urination), death and disease, sex and discriminatory language (p. 2-3). He mentions that the breach of a linguistic taboo can have severe consequences depending on the country’s culture, but also that the public opinion of taboo language has changed to an increasing sense of tolerance through the years.

Aixelá (1996, p. 57) refers to *culture-specific items* (CSI) to define what components in a language are cultural as opposed to linguistic or pragmatic, while also recognizing the definition's flaw in that everything in language is in fact culturally produced. Local institutions, historical figures, names and artworks are all arbitrary areas of a culture's linguistic system. Nevertheless, by claiming that the taboo language component of *Reservoir Dogs* is deliberately targeted to exist within the cultural dimension, we may conclude that this language is an example of CSI. As we will discover, Quentin Tarantino's utilisation of taboo language is not merely due to shock value, but to showcase a sort of cynical and sarcastic cultural identity to both the setting and the characters.<sup>3</sup>

Ávila-Cabrera (2016), citing Wajnryb (2005), Hughes (2006), and Jay (2009), utilises a taxonomy of taboo and offensive language to categorize its different types used in the film:

<b>Profane/blasphemous</b>	<i>Jesus Christ</i>
<b>Animal name terms</b>	<i>You know what these chicks make</i>
<b>Ethnic/racial/gender slurs</b>	<i>[...] like a bunch of fucking niggers</i>
<b>Psychological/physical condition</b>	<i>He went crazy</i>
<b>Sexual/body part references</b>	<i>Like a Virgin was a metaphor for big dicks</i>
<b>Urination/scatology</b>	<i>I gotta take a squirt</i>
<b>Filth</b>	<i>You shit in your pants and dive in and swim</i>
<b>Drugs/excessive alcohol consumption</b>	<i>I wasn't gonna be Joe the Pot Man</i>
<b>Violence</b>	<i>I'm gonna fucking blow you away</i>
<b>Death/killing</b>	<i>He was gonna blow you to hell</i>

<sup>3</sup> The release of the film over 15 years ago likely caused more language-related controversy than if it was to have been released today.

## Method

This thesis focuses on a small data set which is analysed in some depth. The data is retrieved from the Netflix version of *Reservoir Dogs*, using the Norwegian subtitles provided for the film. As Ávila-Cabrera (2016) says in his essay, the translator's job of transferring meaning and flow from the ST to the TT is restricted by formal guidelines and requirements which are both technical and practical in nature. In this context, taking source material which is originally intended for an American audience in the 1990s and appropriating it for the subtitles of a 2010s Netflix version is culturally challenging.

Ávila-Cabrera's (2016) terms are helpful for recognizing patterns in language transfer, partly in order to see if there has been any form of censorship done:

*... offensive and taboo terms have been **toned up, maintained** (i.e. the offensive/taboo load is kept), **toned down** (i.e. the offensive/taboo load is softened), **neutralised** (i.e. the offensive/taboo load disappears in the TT as it is rendered in more neutral terms) or **omitted** (i.e. the offensive/taboo load is null).*  
(Ávila-Cabrera, 2016, p. 33)

Using Toury's three phase methodology model for systematic DTS (2012, p. 31-4/102) and Aixelá's CSI we can analyse how the subtitles of *Reservoir Dogs* have been implemented, and—referencing Vinay and Darbelnet (1995/2004)—identify which translation procedures have taken place.

## Data and analysis

It is helpful to know what formal standards are in place for the dimension which the data—the subtitles—exist in. Netflix partly relies on crowdsourcing. Through this they have developed descriptive guidelines for subtitling. On the topic, Netflix states,

*Subtitles must encompass the spoken dialogue intended to be understood that differs in language from that of the subtitle file. Subtitles must also translate any narrative burned-in text that is in a different language from the subtitle file.*  
(Netflix, 5.3. "Subtitles as a Separate File")

On the 'special instructions' section on the *Norwegian Timed Text Style Guide*, it calls for dialogue to "never be censored", and that expletives "should be rendered as faithfully as possible." (Netflix, "Norwegian").

In terms of reading speed, Netflix has decided the maximum reading speed to not exceed 400 words-per-minute, and the duration of the subtitles must not extend 7 seconds per subtitle event (Netflix, 5.1. "Timed Text Timing Rules"). Both the English and Norwegian *Timed Text Style Guide* have criterias of a maximum of 42 characters per line (Netflix, "Norwegian"), and in the case that the text is longer, it shall be split up (Netflix, "General Requirements").

The translations' position in the social and literary systems of the target culture determine the translation strategies that are employed. Tom Kabara (2015) says that a translator might choose to withhold or supply information from the viewers depending on the cultural boundaries that may or may not exist between themselves and the ST language.

Film critic Roger Ebert gave the film 2.5 out of 4 stars, saying he liked the movie but that he thought the characters were not fleshed out enough, and that Tarantino "let them talk too much" (Ebert, 1992). At the same time, Derek Malcolm of The Guardian praised the actors for their performances, yet warned about the film's violent nature to susceptible viewers (Malcolm, 1993). Since the Norwegian translation is the one being examined, placing the film in its cultural context is necessary in order to consider its "significance or acceptability" within the target culture system. One reason for the limited number of Norwegian reviews might be that *Reservoir Dogs* is a cult classic which did not receive widespread appeal and recognition on an international scale until several years after its American release. A 2009 review from *Filmfront* opens with the statement, "The sad thing about seeing Quentin Tarantino's debut film is that one automatically compares it to his later masterpiece works." (Filmfront, 2009), which in a way echoes Ebert's request for Tarantino to "move on and make a better [film]" (Ebert, 1992)<sup>4</sup>. However, the same reviewer also stated that what makes the film great is Quentin Tarantino's detail to quick witted dialogue. It is clear that whatever opinion the

---

<sup>4</sup> *Pulp Fiction* (1994), *Kill Bill* (2003/2004), *Inglourious Basterds* (2009) and *Django Unchained* (2012) are examples of Tarantino's success following *Reservoir Dogs* (1992).

audience has on the themes and context of the dialogue itself, the fact of the matter is that they play a central role in shaping the film's identity. Furthermore, the reason for why the film became a cult classic might lie partly in the controversial nature of said dialogue. Tarantino's films have since followed the same style of violence as Reservoir Dogs, of which the director has built a trademark. It is worth to note that the fact that the film is available at all through the Norwegian version of Netflix is a testament to how it has stood the test of time.

The very first piece of dialogue in the film already focuses on taboo language within the sexual references paradigm (Ávila-Cabrera, p. 29, 2016). After being interrupted by the discussion of 'True Blue' as well as that of an old address book, Mr. Brown gets back on track:

**Mr. Brown (ST)** *Let me tell ya what 'Like a Virgin''s about. It's all about this **cooze** who's a **regular fuck machine**.*

*I'm talking morning, day, night, afternoon... **dick, dick, dick, dick, dick, dick, dick, dick, dick, dick!***

**Mr. Brown (TT)** *"Like a Virgin" handler om ei **fitte** som er ei skikkelig **knullemaskin**.*

*Morgen, middag kveld... **pikk, pikk, pikk, pikk, pikk!***

...

**Mr. Brown (ST)** *Then one day she meets this **John Holmes motherfucker**, and it's like, whoa baby.*

*I mean, this **cat** is like Charles Bronson in "The Great Escape." He's diggin' tunnels.*

**Mr. Brown (TT)** *Så møter hun en **kødd** med **John Holmes-pikk**, og wow, baby!*

*Som da Charles Bronson gravde tunneler.*

The Norwegian translation uses *literal translation* and *borrowing* to transfer names and titles such as 'Like a Virgin', 'John Holmes', 'Charles Bronson' and 'The Great Escape' (Vinay & Darbelnet, 1995/2004). The CSI is retained. Apart from John Holmes, a porn

actor, these names are recognizable for a significant part of the Norwegian audience or simply implied to exist within American pop culture<sup>5</sup>. In other words, the translator has chosen not to change them into something more culturally relevant for the target audience. The change from “John Holmes motherfucker” to “kødd med John Holmes-pikk” is a sort of explicitation and modulation where both additional taboo language is added in the TT and the expression is rephrased.

What does change in the translation is mainly the length of the dialogue—it is shortened in the subtitles in order to synchronise the speed of which Mr. Brown is talking with the readability of the target audience. Gottlieb (1994) uses the term *intrasemiotic redundancy* about subtitle-related redundancy within the same channel. What this means is that repetition of the same word over and over in the ST will result in a reduction in the TT subtitles simply because the additional information is redundant. Consider the repetition of the word ‘dick’: Although Mr. Brown’s repetition of it serves to prove his point, in the dialogue it is repeated nine times, which is already a reduction from that of the script, where it is repeated 11 times (Tarantino, 1992). The Norwegian subtitles, on the other hand, sees the word uttered a mere five times.

Also, in terms of taboo slang for genitalia, ‘cooze’ is translated to ‘fitte’, while ‘dick’ is translated to ‘pikk’. ‘Fuck’, a swear word which is highly versatile as an English taboo expression, here has multiple meanings—according to IMDB (“Parents Guide”, “profanity”), the film has 270 uses of “fuck”. In this particular instance, ‘fuck machine’ is translated to ‘knullemaskin’, while ‘motherfucker’ has become ‘kødd’. This method of translating explicit taboo words by replacing the original with a TT cultural equivalent is an example of *adaptation* in *oblique translation* (Vinay & Darbelnet, 1995/2004).

**Mr. Brown (ST)**      *But when this **cat fucks** her, it hurts. It hurts like the first time.*

**Mr. Brown (TT)**      *Men når denne **kødden knuller** henne, gjør det vondt som første gang.*

‘Cat’, a word which falls into another category of Ávila-Cabrera’s taboo taxonomy table, ‘animal name terms’, is translated to ‘kødd’ or ‘dick’ in Norwegian. The reasoning for the

---

<sup>5</sup> Many of the references in the dialogue of the film are recognizable in the context of 1990s-and-earlier culture. This may cause them to appear more alien than intended to a modern audience.

translation shift is likely because this animal name term is not commonly found in Norwegian.

**Mr. Brown (ST)**      *Now she's gettin' this serious **dick** action, she's feelin' something she ain't felt since forever. Pain. Pain.*

**Mr. Brown (TT)**      ***Skikkelige greier.** Hun føler noe hun ikke har følt på lenge. Smerte. Smerte.*

At this point, the subcategory of 'violence' also comes into play. Granted, although violence in this instance is not associated with hurting someone deliberately (as far as we know), it concerns inflicting pain. The change from "Now she's gettin' this serious dick action" to "Skikkelige greier" is an example of omission.

**Mr. Brown (ST)**      *It hurts. It hurts her. It shouldn't hurt, y'know? Her **pussy** should be **Bubble-Yum** by now. ...*

**Mr. Brown (TT)**      *Det gjør vondt, selv om **fitta** burde vært **god og vid** nå.*

*Bubble Yum* is a 1970s brand of chewing gum, and Tarantino makes a sexual link between the woman's genitalia and (what is alluded) the consistency of bubble gum. The comparison in its context is likely meant to be humorous, but depending on the viewer it may be considered distasteful. As the average Norwegian viewer is unlikely to recognize the brand *Bubble Yum*, the translator has made the choice of converting the metaphor to its intended meaning, "god og vid", or "nice and wide". This is another example of explicitation—the audience is supplied with explicit information to the implicitness which is revealed in the ST (Vinay & Darbelnet, 1995/2004). This example of what Aixelá (1997) calls *absolute universalization* is a result of a preference to replace any foreign connotations with neutral references (Aixelá, in Blažyté, 2016). It causes the CSI to be replaced through omitting the taboo word.

Using Ávila-Cabrera's taxonomy as a reference point for Tarantino's introductory scene, it is clear that **profanity/blasphemy, sexual references and violence** are dominant subcategories. Quoting Wajnryb, *profanity* "can be understood as "swearing through the

use of words that abuse anything sacred” (Wajnryb, 2005, p. 21). Hence, vilifying God or Jesus in particular is not necessarily a given, although in the context of Tarantino’s work as a piece of American fiction Christian profanity is a plausible choice. *Blasphemy* is somewhat similar—it “deliberately vilifies religion or anything associated with religious meaning” (Wajnryb, 2005, p. 17). Where these differ is mostly in the deliberacy of the use. For instance, ‘Jesus Christ’ or ‘jeez’ for short may be said as an utterance of distress. However, deliberately saying it to offend a devout Christian would be blasphemous (Ávila-Cabrera, 2016). In turn, *sexual references* and *violence* can be considered taboo aspects depending on the target culture, age, language etc. (Wajnryb, 2005, in Ávila-Cabrera, 2016).

It seems the translator has made the choice of retaining culture-specific items which are likely recognizable in the target culture while changing the ones that are not. Taboo language—whether it be profanity/blasphemy, sexual references or violence (Ávila-Cabrera, p. 29, 2016)—are changed to match their Norwegian counterpart, and if there is none, to something which saves the same purpose as the original. From this, we can draw the conclusion that the translation of taboo language is the category which undergo the most obvious changes.

## **Discussion**

The analysis of the subtitling of *Reservoir Dogs* shows that there is a clear preference for foreignization between English ST and Norwegian TT—that is, translation where values in the source culture are prioritised over those in the target culture. The transfer of most foreign words and concepts as they occur in ST is a nod to the target audience’s inferred ability to understand American culture, while the translation of alien taboo words which is a necessary action to make the target audience identify with the context and often the emotional reactions which prompt said utterances and the ones they generate. Apart from this, there is a clear preference for omission/toning down/loss of language as it is transferred. This is due to both reader cohesion and the formal guidelines which Netflix has set for their translators, which in this case results in the Norwegian TT to usually become shorter than the American ST counterpart.



Taboo language is also mostly retained in its meaning, without further need for explication<sup>6</sup>, which both conforms to the Netflix guidelines for censorship (Netflix, “Norwegian”) and serves as an identifier for the individual characters and the setting they find themselves in.

Toury’s descriptive translation studies (DTS) highlight the reproduction of textual relations from ST to TT and whether or not they are ‘accurate’, partly according to *norms*. In short, an ideal translation should be read as *an* original, paying tribute to the original text and its distinctive parts while simultaneously altering certain things to create cohesiveness where the ST expression is considered alien. Additionally, many words are omitted because of the redundancy effect: In order to comply with the formal standards of subtitle length the translator has had to shorten the text from what is actually said by the characters. It should also be noted that a large portion of the dialogue in the film is colored by free, natural speech, where repetition, pauses and digressions are central to the mood of the scenes. As a result, much of the dialogue is naturally omitted by the translator because the point which a character is making usually requires fewer lines of written subtitles than what is said.

## **Conclusion**

In *Reservoir Dogs*, director Quentin Tarantino actively uses taboo language such as profanity, sexual references and violence as cornerstones for his thematic expression. The natural flow of dialogue which he builds not only helps set the tone for the environment which the characters find themselves in—it also presents itself as highly receptive to spontaneous occurrences of taboo language, either deliberately in order to push the plot forward or redundantly in order to add flavour to a conversation. Of these options, the translator has chosen to mostly retain those expressions which have a place in the plot, being more reluctant with including language which does not serve much purpose other than filling empty space. In this sense, the subtitles appear noticeably less spontaneous in their presentation than the dialogue does, since the translator must

---

<sup>6</sup> Explication—although present—is rare enough to avoid developing a pattern: There is little need for overtranslation and unhinging the natural ‘rhythm’ of the text in order to further explain what is already said.

consider both requirements of audience coherence and those of Netflix's subtitling guidelines. Finally, the Norwegian audience is expected to have some knowledge of the ST culture, thus causing foreignization to be preferred over domestication, and translation loss to be more frequent than translation gain.

## Appendix

Character	English audio	Norwegian subtitles	Literal translation NO — ENG
Mr. Brown	<i>Let me tell ya what 'Like a Virgin' is about. It's all about a girl who digs a guy with a big dick.</i>	<i>Sangen handler om ei jente som liker en fyr med stor pikk.</i>	<i>The song is about a girl who likes a guy with a big dick.</i>
Mr. Brown	<i>The entire song is a metaphor for big dicks.</i>	<i>Den er en metafor for store pikker.</i>	<i>It is a metaphor for big dicks.</i>
Mr. Blonde	<i>Nah, it ain't. It's about a girl who's very vulnerable.</i>	<i>Nei, den handler om ei sårbar jente.</i>	<i>No, it is about a vulnerable girl.</i>
Mr. Blonde	<i>She's been fucked over a few times, and then she meets a guy who's very sensitive-</i>	<i>Hun har blitt kjøddet med noen ganger, og så møter hun en følsom fyr.</i>	<i>She has been fucked with a few times, and then she meets a sensitive guy.</i>
Joe	<i>Toby...</i>		
Mr. Brown	<i>Whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa... Time out, Greenbay. Tell that fuckin' bullshit to the tourists.</i>	<i>-Toby, selg det til turistene.</i>	<i>Toby, sell it/that to the tourists.</i>
Joe	<i>Toby... who the fuck is Toby?</i>	<i>-Hvem faen er Toby?</i>	<i>Who the fuck is Toby?</i>
Mr. Brown	<i>'Like a Virgin' is not about some sensitive</i>	<i>"Like a Virgin" handler ikke om ei følsom jente.</i>	<i>'Like a Virgin' is not about a sensitive girl.</i>

	<i>girl who meets a nice fella.</i>		
Mr. Brown	<i>That's what 'True Blue's about... no, granted, no argument about that.</i>	<i>-Men "True Blue" handler om det.</i>	<i>But 'True Blue' is about that.</i>
Mr. Orange	<i>What's 'True Blue'?</i>	<i>-Hva er det?</i>	<i>What is it?</i>
Nice Guy Eddie	<i>Ah, you ain't heard 'True Blue'? It was a big-ass hit for Madonna. I don't even follow that Tops In the Pops Shit, and even I've heard of 'True Blue'.</i>	<i>En Madonna-hit. Følger du ikke med på hitlista?</i>	<i>A Madonna hit. Do you not follow the hit list?</i>
Mr. Orange	<i>Look, asshole, I didn't say I ain't heard of it, y'know? All I asked is how does it go? Excuse me for not being the world's biggest Madonna fan.</i>	<i>Hvordan går den? Jeg er ikke noen stor Madonna-fan.</i>	<i>How does it go? I am not a big Madonna fan.</i>
Mr. White	<i>Personally I can do without her.</i>	<i>Jeg kan klare meg uten henne.</i>	<i>I can do without her.</i>
Mr. Blue	<i>I used to like her early stuff... 'Borderline', but once she got out into that 'Papa Don't Preach'</i>	<i>De tidlige tingene hennes var bra, men nå har jeg stått av.</i>	<i>The earlier things were good, but now I have stood off.</i>

	<i>phase I tuned out.</i>		
Mr. Brown	<i>But, you guys are making me, like, lose my train of thought here. I was sayin' something, what was it?</i>	<i>Jeg skulle til å si noe. Hva var det?</i>	<i>I was going to say something. What was it?</i>
Joe	<i>Oh, Toby, that little Chinese girl... What was her last name?</i>	<i>Toby, den lille kineserjenta... Hva var etternavnet hennes?</i>	<i>Toby, the little Chinese girl... What was her last name?</i>
Mr. White	<i>What's that?</i>	<i>-Hva er det?</i>	<i>What is it/that?</i>
Joe	<i>Ah, it's an old address book in a coat I haven't worn in a coon's age. What the fuck was that name?</i>	<i>-Ei gammel adressebok.</i>	<i>An old address book.</i>
Mr. Brown	<i>What the fuck was I talking about?</i>	<i>Hva faen snakket jeg om?</i>	<i>What the fuck was I talking about?</i>
Mr. Pink	<i>You said 'True Blue' was about a guy and... sensitive girl who meets a nice guy,</i>	<i>Du sa at "True Blue" handlet om en fyr og ei følsom jente.</i>	<i>You said that 'True Blue' was about a guy and a sensitive girl.</i>
Mr. Pink	<i>but 'Like a Virgin' was a metaphor for big dicks.</i>	<i>"Like a Virgin" var en metafor for store pikker.</i>	<i>'Like a Virgin' was a metaphor for big dicks.</i>
Mr. Brown	<i>Okay. Lemme tell you what 'Like a Virgin's about. It's all about this cooze who's a regular</i>	<i>"Like a Virgin" handler om ei fitte som er ei skikkelig knullemaskin.</i>	<i>'Like a Virgin' is about a cunt who is a real fuck machine.</i>

	<i>fuck machine.</i>		
Mr. Brown	<i>I'm talking morning, day, night, afternoon... dick, dick, dick, dick, dick, dick, dick, dick, dick!</i>	<i>Morgen, middag, kveld... pikk, pikk, pikk, pikk, pikk!</i>	<i>Morning, dinner, night... dick, dick, dick, dick, dick!</i>
Mr. Blue	<i>How many dicks is that?</i>	<i>-Hvor mange pikker er det?</i>	<i>How many dicks are that?</i>
Mr. White	<i>A lot.</i>	<i>-Mange.</i>	<i>A lot.</i>
Mr. Brown	<i>Then one day she meets this John Holmes motherfucker, and it's like, whoa, baby!</i>	<i>Så møter hun en kødd med John Holmes-pikk, og wow, baby!</i>	<i>Then she meets a dick with John Holmes-dick, and wow, baby!</i>
Mr. Brown	<i>I mean, this cat is like Charles Bronson in The Great Escape. He's digging tunnels.</i>	<i>Som da Charles Bronson gravde tunneler.</i>	<i>Like when Charles Bronson dug tunnels.</i>
Mr. Brown	<i>Alright, now, she's getting this serious dick action, and she's feelin' something she ain't felt since forever.</i>	<i>Skikkelige greier. Hun føler noe hun ikke har følt på lenge,</i>	<i>Real stuff. She feels something she has not felt in a long time.</i>
Mr. Brown	<i>Pain. Pain.</i>	<i>-Smerte. Smerte.</i>	<i>Pain. Pain.</i>
Joe	<i>Chew? Toby Chew?</i>	<i>-Chew? Toby Chew?</i>	<i>Chew? Toby Chew?</i>
Mr. Brown	<i>It hurts. It hurts her. It shouldn't hurt, y'know? Her pussy should be</i>	<i>Det gjør vondt, selv om fitta burde være god og vid nå.</i>	<i>It hurts, even though the pussy should be good and wide now.</i>

	<i>Bubble-Yum by now.</i>		
Mr. Brown	<i>But when this cat fucks her, it hurts. It hurts, just like it did the first time.</i>	<i>Men når denne kødde knuller henne, gjør det vondt som første gang,</i>	<i>But when this fuck fucks her, it hurts like the first time,</i>
Mr. Brown	<i>See, the pain is reminding the fuck machine what it was once like to be a virgin.</i>	<i>og minner knullemaskina om den gangen hun var jomfru.</i>	<i>and reminds the fuck machine about the time she was a virgin.</i>
Mr. Brown	<i>Hence, 'Like a Virgin'.</i>	<i>Derav tittelen.</i>	<i>Hence the title.</i>

## References

- Aixelá, J. F. (1996). Culture-specific items in translation. *Translation, power, subversion*, 8, 52-78.
- Ávila-Cabrera, J.J. (2016). *The treatment of offensive and taboo terms in the subtitling of Reservoir Dogs into Spanish*. Retrieved from:  
[http://www.trans.uma.es/Trans\\_20/Trans\\_20\\_A2.pdf](http://www.trans.uma.es/Trans_20/Trans_20_A2.pdf)
- Bender, L. (Producer), & Tarantino, Q. (Director). (1992). *Reservoir Dogs* [Motion picture]. USA: Live Entertainment.
- Blažytė, D., & Liubinienė, V. (2016). Culture-specific items (CSI) and their translation strategies in Martin Lindstrom's "Brand sense". *Kalbu Studijos*, (29), 42-57.
- Diaz Cintas, J., & Remael, A (2007). *Audiovisual Translation: Subtitling*. NY: St Jerome.
- Dictionary. *Idiosyncrasy*. <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/idiosyncrasies>
- Ebert, R. (1992). *Reviews: Reservoir Dogs*.  
<https://www.rogerebert.com/reviews/reservoir-dogs-1992>
- Filmfront. *De Hensynsløse*. <http://www.filmfront.no/omtale/996/de-hensynsloese>
- Gambier, Y. (Ed.) (2003). Screen Translation. *The Translator*, 9(2).
- Gambier, Y. (Ed.) (2004). Traduction audiovisuelle/Audiovisual translation. *Meta*, 49(1).
- Gao, C. (2013). *A Sociolinguistic Study of English Taboo Language*.  
<http://www.academypublication.com/issues/past/tpls/vol03/12/23.pdf>



IDMB. *Reservoir Dogs: Full Cast & Crew*.

[https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0105236/fullcredits?ref=tt\\_cl\\_sm#cast](https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0105236/fullcredits?ref=tt_cl_sm#cast)

IDMB. *Reservoir Dogs: Parents Guide*.

<https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0105236/parentalguide>

Kabara, T. (2015). What is Gained in Subtitling: How Film Subtitles Can Expand the Source Text. *TranscUlturAl: A Journal of Translation and Cultural Studies*, 7(1), 166-179. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21992/T90P86>

Malcolm, D. (1992). *Film: Reservoir Dogs*.

<https://www.theguardian.com/film/1993/jan/07/1>

Munday, J. (2016) *Introducing Translation Studies*. London: Routledge.

Netflix. *Netflix Licensed Content Delivery Specification and Operators Manual* (ver. 8.1).

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B9DJydDVOVKKLVDcdlF2cFVDVEE/view>

Netflix. *Norwegian Timed Text Style Guide*.

<https://partnerhelp.netflixstudios.com/hc/en-us/articles/216015647-Norwegian-Timed-Text-Style-Guide>

Netflix. *Timed Text Style Guide: General Requirements*.

<https://partnerhelp.netflixstudios.com/hc/en-us/articles/215758617-Timed-Text-Style-Guide-General-Requirements>

Pérez-González, L. 2009. Fansubbing anime: Insights into the 'butterfly effect' of globalisation on audiovisual translation.

<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09076760708669043>

Toury, G. (1985). A rationale for descriptive translation studies. *Dispositio*, 7(19/21), 23-39.

(1978/2012). The nature and role of norms in literary translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *Literature and translation* (pp. 83-100). Leuven: ACCO.

Lawrence, V. (1998). *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. London: Routledge.

Vinay, J.-P., & Darbelnet, J. (1995/2004). A methodology for translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.) (pp. 128-37).

W3C Recommendation (14.12.17). 4.7.12. *The track element*. In HTML 5.2.

<https://www.w3.org/TR/html5/embedded-content-0.html#the-track-element>

