



## efqli 2011 Conference: 17 & 18 September

# ABSTRACTS

## Plenary presentations

### Saturday

Keynote Speaker – Prof. **Christian Rathmann** (Germany)

***From Text into Sign in different discourse modes: information reception, processing and production***

**Sharon Neumann Solow** (USA)

***Sight Translation with meaning in a signing world***

Sight translation is an area that Sign Language interpreters have varied experience with. Many have very limited or no formal training in sight translation. Furthermore, it is sometimes viewed as a simple task, whereas nothing could be further from the truth. The truth is, it is complex and has its own set of protocols and more and less effective approaches.

This presentation will go through some of the basic challenges and benefits of sight translation. We will discuss differences and similarities with spoken language interpreters' experience with sight translation. Our discussion will cover some basic Do's and Don'ts in our sight translation work.

We will focus the majority of our time on challenges in language processing and prosody, which will be discussed in depth. Often when interpreters do sight translation, their work lacks natural prosody. We will discuss and, if time permits, practice some sight translation tasks, focusing on structuring space, natural pausing, rhythm and cohesion.

Participants will engage in discussion sharing their individual experience with sight translation. Participants will leave with a list of effective strategies, tactics and best practices in sight translation.

**Stuart Anderson** (Scotland – UK) & **Donna Ruane-Cauchy** (England – UK)

***Sight translation and sign language translation: two young and eager cousins of sign language interpreting?***

As a Sign Language interpreting training provider, a module on sight translation has always been part of our interpreter development courses, covering a specific (non-compulsory) unit of the Signature qualification for sign language interpreting.

However, recently, Signature have moved to providing interpreting qualifications for Deaf interpreters and are currently looking into developing a qualification for sign language translation, which will be open to Deaf and hearing people with a high level of BSL and English. We have been part of this process and would like to share in this presentation our thoughts on why we think a full qualification for sign language translation is timely and needed and how we think this qualification could work.

We will look at what we have been covering in our teaching of the one-day sight translation module for our interpreting courses and will explore how course content has developed over the time we have been teaching this qualification.

The presentation will then discuss the reasons for expanding teaching on translation and extending from sight translation into other areas such as sight interpreting (via palantype and auto-cue for example) and other translation techniques, including building up vocabulary and word banks, preparation and post-prep methods and the specific issues of translation between English and BSL. We will also explore the need for expanding the specifications of the qualifications to cover the wider demands of sight translation and discuss reasons for making this module mandatory.

The presentation will end with an outlook to the way this new qualification may change the interpreting profession and how the skills range of sign language professionals will broaden. We believe that this will be beneficial to the whole community of sign language professionals. We will also explore new areas this may cover and new job opportunities that may arise in the future.

**Sarah Bown** (England – UK) & **Kristiaan Dekesel** (Belgium– UK)

***Phased by translation: identifying the challenges and solutions in sight interpretation***

Sight translation has traditionally been utilised as a stepping stone within interpreter training, but equally, it could easily be seen as a cornerstone to the development of interpreter practitioners. Within this study we will be exploring the challenges faced by trainee and professional interpreters during the process of sight translation.

Extracts from a range of written English texts were presented to interpreters from across a continuum of skill and qualification levels. They were asked to sight translate each extract into British Sign Language and evidence their translation process, focussing on any issues they had encountered, via an anonymous online forum. The interpreters taking part also included a small sample of Deaf Interpreters, who have sight translation experience.

An overview will be provided of the key areas of difficulty both perceived and experienced, which were highlighted by the interpreters during the interpretation activity. Our analysis will be accompanied by the interpreters' own thought processes, which they were asked to document. This provides us with valuable clues as to their language processing, issues around the search for equivalences and justification

of decisions made during the sight translation task.

From the areas of challenges identified by the participants we are able to extrapolate their individual training needs. These range from expanding their source language proficiency/comprehension, determining target language word to sign equivalences, source language to source language restructuring, knowledge of possible syntactical structures, target audience awareness, understanding of the topic area, productive lexicon (neologisms) and context dependency.

Feedback from participants in the study reported in particular the experiential benefits of being able to observe and access co-participant's thought processes, which facilitated an open yet anonymous forum for the experimentation and discussion of sight translation strategies (finding a way around a problem) with a range of texts in a safe and developmental environment.

### **Giuseppe Amorini (Italy)**

#### ***How should a sign language interpreter prepare to perform a sight interpretation of a signed text?***

The issue that I will be covering in my presentation is "Strategies for the translation of written texts in LIS." I'd love to share my personal experience with the participants.

To date I have used two types of strategies that relate to two different situations in which texts can be found: translation of books and subtitled television programs, before an audience of Deaf people with low literary skills.

Usually, I find myself translating texts that had been read and internalized, and where the interpretation in sign language is done in the register accessible to the audience.

The other situation, I have found myself interpreting in, is at the ENS (Deaf club), but especially with my Deaf family, interpreting films from the subtitles, this is because my family cannot access the subtitles, in the way they are presented and for their speed, so it is often my role to provide such access.

The two situations that I have presented are quite different. In the translation of the written text, in fact in one, come into play the need to reflect the possible emotions and subjective images of the characters. In the translation of television programmes, the movements and expressions of the actors are already on screen, therefore what it is left for me to do is to provide access to the subtitles to support what it is been watched.

So the techniques used are different, in the case of subtitling translation is influenced by the images, in the case of a text, the translation has more space for creativity and it is also subjective.

### **Julia Pelhate (France)**

#### ***Deaf Translator, a new profession – which context, which limits?***

##### ***Being a translator and Deaf, is it possible?***

In France, the rate of illiteracy is phenomenal: 80% of deaf population has a very low level of reading and writing skills. The interpreter profession has emerged in France at 1970's – 80's. It was the famous period of "Awakening of the Deaf". Interpreting to Sign Language is not only intended to be a tool of communication and accessibility for deaf people. It is also a bridge between two cultures and a tool of

integration.

Knowing that the translation is done by interpreting the meaning of a text from the source language, then produce a text having a meaning and effect equivalent for the reader who have different language and culture: the final (Target) language, which is usually the mother tongue of the translator. Therefore, who is best placed to translate a French text into Sign Language?

### ***Deaf translator: a new profession***

The deaf translator profession has been created by the cooperative society of WebSourd (based at Toulouse). WebSourd works for several years to deaf accessibility via new technologies (including bilingual news on a site, a VRS service, etc.). WebSourd decided that to have optimal quality translations we must have professional translators who have LSF like the primary language

Professional deaf translators did a training course with hearing students of interpreting and it's 2 years studying. Since, 5 deaf translators are graduated in France – the first of France, and maybe Europe too? The profession of deaf translator is relatively new. So we often encounter problems and limits related to translation into LSF.

We will reflect about some questions:

- Hearing interpreter or deaf translator?
- What's the best formation for deaf translators?
- It is a new profession, what are the limits?
- And what is the future for deaf translators?

**Knut Weinmeister** (Germany)

### ***Requirements for translation of sign language films in multimedia context from German into German Sign Language***

In my presentation, I am going to outline which requirements deaf sign language translators have to fulfil when producing translations in multimedia contexts such as the internet, CD ROM or DVD. Having worked as a deaf sign language translator for eight years now, I will draw on my practical experience in this field to illustrate my argumentation further.

I am going to explain which particular demands translators are faced with when producing translations from written German into German Sign Language (DGS), referring to concepts taken from translation theory. These concepts include the preparation and editing of signed texts<sup>1</sup> and the production of translations in multimedia contexts<sup>2</sup>.

In addition, I am going to present a reference framework of competences required from sign language translators which I have developed myself and which is based on the *Competences for professional translators, experts in multilingual and multimedia communication*<sup>3</sup> compiled by the EMT expert group in 2009. The competences I will refer to include language, inter-cultural, research and thematic competences as well as competences in the areas of service provision, technology and presentation skills relevant to working in the media field.

---

<sup>1</sup> Stone, Christopher A. (2005): Towards a Deaf Translation Norm. University of Bristol: Centre for Deaf Studies (unpublished dissertation)

<sup>2</sup> Kurz, Ingrid (2003): Mediendolmetschen. In: Snell-Hornby, Hönig, Kußmail und Schmitt (Hrsg.): Handbuch Translation. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag

<sup>3</sup>[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/translation/programmes/emt/key\\_documents/emt\\_competences\\_translators\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/translation/programmes/emt/key_documents/emt_competences_translators_en.pdf)

**Valeria Buonomo (Italy) & Pietro Celo (Italy)**

**Translating Poetry**

Our presentation takes its inspiration from the difficulties encountered in translating a written text like poetry into sign language; this is inter-semiotic translation or, as others define it, “sight” translation, where, on the basis of our knowledge and experience, limits and sensitivities, we interpret, or rather translate, moving between different linguistic areas; handling poetry with courage and a little poetic license, sharing this passion with the readers, accompanying them, as far as possible, into these areas, is a difficult and complex objective, which we would like to share with the audience.

The dilemma between remaining faithful to the text and artistic beauty is misleading: it is not possible simply to translate the text without risking a dry superimposition of forms and meanings, we cannot all be poets capable of translating the work of other poets, have a literary soul and knowledge of literature. It is also not possible simply to base the translation solely on knowledge of the context, whether this is linguistic, geographical, social or cultural. The fact of having a linguistic or non-linguistic context does not solve the problem of translating or interpreting a literary text. An approach, which attempts to package the translation and interpreting simply in the act of constructing, performing and deciding what is legitimate or not, is therefore misleading.

In performing a translation, we can borrow a foreign word or expression, we can translate with cultural equivalence or with adaptation and although this may be considered legitimate in general, in this case neglects the literary aspect of translation. The problem of how to render the poetic spirit and meaning, or rather the poetic intention of the author, and how to avoid abuse of the literary text, is not solved; in attempting to be poets ourselves, we risk creating a free adaptation of the text in question and not a genuine translation.

A more complex view of this topic, which takes into account the formal and literary part of the poem, the context of the author’s message and the spirit (why not?) of the translator allows us perhaps to approach the problem of translation between spoken languages and, more cautiously, between written spoken languages and signed languages.

Only recently, we were given the opportunity to imagine easily that, in this latter case, it is a translation between languages of equal rights, but also, and above all, an inter-semiotic or trans-modal translation, where faithfulness has specific meanings which are far from the common ones. For example, it is difficult to imagine a lexical correspondence between a language like Italian, with its rich literary tradition, and Italian Sign Language, which has only recently made an approach towards the literary aspect; a grammatically stable language, with a noble and important written part, and an oral language, used only within the Italian deaf community, a language of which the signer is a grammatical part, the rule of space, a constituent part thereof. The concept of poetic musicality, beloved of certain translations, therefore takes on uncertain and undefined contours. It is perhaps by excluding, partly for structural reasons, grammatical, semantic, syntactic and phonetic faithfulness to the text, that we can save adherence to the poem itself, identify its aims and its values, in its profound meaning and structure.

In translation, in general, the ultimate purpose is restoring the meaning of the original text, and this is the purpose in particular of translation from written vocal languages into oral sign languages. Therefore, understanding the original meaning allows us to find the means of restoring it to the

reader (or “listener”) of another language. In our case, the non-manual components of the text in the target language (Sign Language) therefore restore the meaning to pragmatic subtleties of the poetic text, not to the words or grammar, but to the tone, the feeling, the profound sense of the poem.

In our reflection, in our experience of translation, we have studied the text, the poet, the context, in order to understand the meaning of the poem; we have reflected, chosen independently, appreciated our text for its similar temperament and conception of the world we have seen there, but we have also disliked it for its difficulties, for the remoteness of its affections and correspondence with our soul. We are not poets, but interpreters, perhaps poetic ones.

It seems like proceeding by fragments, seeking with Crocean philosophy the beautiful verse, rather than the beautiful translation, performed almost by chance; but this is not the case, and we will try to demonstrate this through detailed analysis of the poem of Primo Levi, *Se questo è un uomo*, which struck us for its strength (in both the source language of Italian and the target language of sign language), in its entirety and its warning which, like a scream, we believe has not been affected at all by the translation.

It is perhaps metaphorically a kind of comparative text, which has the acoustic essence of the music of a black vinyl disc, which makes even the lines and acoustic flaws vibrant and almost allows us to see the fingers strumming the guitar, offering us genuine emotions; it is a way of observing how expression lines on our forehead restore to us a profound sense of this musicality.

*Valeria Buonomo and Pietro Celso 2010: L'interprete di Lingua dei Segni Italiana. Hoepli Ed. Milan*

*Pietro Celso 2003: "L'interprete" in Lilia A. Teruggi, edited by: Una scuola, due lingue. Franco Angeli Editore. Milan.*

*Pietro Celso 2009: I segni del '900, Editore Cafoscarina, Venice.*

*Giacomo Debenedetti and Alfonso Berardinelli 1998: Poesia italiana del Novecento. Garzanti Editore. Milan*

*Rachel Sutton-Spence 2008: Analysing Sign Language Poetry. Palgrave Macmillan Ed., Basingstoke, Hampshire.*

## Sunday

**Carmela Bertone (Italy)**

### ***The use of interrogative sentences in the translation from written texts to signed language***

This paper will discuss the importance of linguistic structures such as a kind of interrogative form, which are commonly considered very informal but they are functional to translation, overall when it is necessary to be rapid and effective, for example in sight translation.

Written language is not a simple transcription of the oral language, it is the result- of mental elaboration of speaking community down the centuries that led to specific properties in the orthography, in the linguistic structures, and in communication.

In the written text, the thought is defined in fixed and controlled forms and the definition of the concepts are set down to fewer words but better organized and structured; the linguistic structure of written text privileges subordination with respect to coordination (Chafe 1982).

Sign languages do not have a recognized written form. As a consequence, sign languages share more characteristics with languages with an oral tradition than with languages with a written tradition, for example the use of coordinated structures instead of subordinated ones and the use of interrogative sentences in order to introduce the new information into the discourse

(Aiello 1997). For example in fairy tales: “What did the wolf do? It ate the granny”. The focus in LIS is introduced by an interrogative sentence.

In the process of translation from the written text to a signed language, the new proposal requires the creation of linguistic structures appropriate to convey the original sense respecting the style of the original text. Anyway signed languages are less formal and “more colloquial” than a written text. To be effective it is necessary to convey the information using the interrogative form, which, breaking down a complex sentence, assures the shift of attention from the interlocutor to the new information. The use of more formal structures would increase the risks compromising the comprehension of the sense of the discourse.

Ajello R. (1997) *Lingue vocali, lingue dei segni e «l'illusion mimétique»*. In Ambrosini R. , Bologna P., Motta F., Orlandi C. *Scribthair a anim n-ogaim Pacini Editore*, pp. 17-30.

Chafe W.L. (1982) *Integration and Involvement in Speaking, Writing and Oral Literature*, in Tannen “Spoken and Written Language: Exploring Orality and Literacy. Ablex, Nordwood (NJ), pp.35-53.

**Daniel Gile (France), Brenda Nicodemus (USA), Laurie Swabey (USA) & Marty Taylor (Canada)**

### **Interpreting Scripted speeches: An examination of expert interpreters**

Increasingly, signed language interpreters are called upon to interpret formal, public speeches, which are highly scripted and delivered as performances. Speeches that are fully constructed prior to delivery have linguistic characteristics that are different from spontaneous communication.

However, interpreters are rarely taught how to prepare or interpret speeches that are scripted. Furthermore, little research has been done to examine how expert interpreters handle the cognitive overload that may occur when rendering a scripted speech.

In this presentation, we explore these issues by sharing the results of a collaborative study conducted by researchers, who are also interpreters and interpreter educators, from France, Canada, and the US.

The study examined how ASL/English interpreters prepared for and rendered a tightly constructed speech for a highly public event - the inaugural address of President Barack Obama. After interpreting the speech into ASL, each participant viewed their videotaped interpretation and engaged in a retrospective Think Aloud Protocol (TAP) about the work.

The cognitive processes of the interpreters were analyzed in two ways: 1) by categorizing the number and type of errors that occurred, and 2) by analyzing the errors in light of the comments made during the TAP process. Finally, the error patterns in the signed language interpretations were compared with spoken language renditions of the same text, in order to discover similarities and differences across language pairs and modalities.

The presenters discuss the theoretical and practical implications of the results and provide possible strategies for educators and interpreter practitioners to prepare and render formal, scripted speeches.

**Nadja Grbic** (Austria), **Karin Hostaetter** (Austria) & **Christian Stalzer** (Austria)

***Sign language translation as cooperative action: A theoretical model and an example from practice***

In sign (as well as spoken) language interpreting, working in teams has been a standard practice for many decades. Due to highly complex cognitive demands and complex communicative situations, team interpreting is not only practised in many settings, it has also been a subject of research and an important component of interpreter training all over the world. That is why we know quite a lot about the processes of collaboration and diverse approaches to teamwork, about various problems that might occur as well as possible solutions.

With regard to sign language translation practice, the “younger cousin” of sign language interpreting, however, we do not know much about the processes involved. We know about the growing demand for translations of websites, tests, literature, to name but a few common examples, but there is only a handful of empirical studies, which tell us more about how those translations from a written text into a fixed sign language video are carried out.

This paper aims at filling the gap by presenting the Theory of Translational Action by Justa Holz-Mänttari, adapting and applying it to sign language translation and checking it against an example of a website translation from German into Austrian Sign Language. Holz-Mänttari places special emphasis on the aspects of the action of the translation process, analysing the roles of participants and the conditions in which translations take place. One of her prime concerns is the question of expertise and cooperation. Based on Holz-Mänttari’s theory, we will analyse the translation of a website into Austrian Sign Language which was done as a collaborative translation by a team comprising a hearing and a deaf translator. In our analysis, we will discuss both the individuals’ roles and the situational conditions of the process, as well as some special characteristics of the finished product. (This website will also be analysed by our colleague Anna Wiener but from a different perspective and with another focus).

# Poster presentations

**Jens Heßmann** (Germany), **Eeva Salmi** (Finland), **Graham H. Turner** (Scotland – UK) & **Svenja Wurm** (Germany/Scotland/Finland)

***From EUMASLi to EUMASLiT? Placing sight interpretation and translation in the context of a European master programme in sign language interpreting***

The first round of the European Master in Sign Language Interpreting (EUMASLI) is coming to an end. The programme, jointly delivered by Magdeburg-Stendal University of Applied Sciences (Germany), Humak University of Applied Sciences (Finland) and Heriot-Watt University (Scotland) since 2009, has offered a platform for 16 experienced sign language interpreters from 8 countries to develop further in the areas of research, policy making and interpreting in international settings at Masters level. One of the most successful aspects of EUMASLI, commented on by students and staff alike, has been the opportunity to exchange views, developments, problems and solutions by drawing on the experience and knowledge of colleagues engaged in sign language interpreting as professionals, researchers and policy makers from various European backgrounds.

In this paper we will take the opportunity to draw on this network to investigate the practice of sight interpreting and translation between written and signed texts at a cross-national, European level and, more specifically, how this topic has been tackled in the EUMASLI curriculum. This paper traces the theme through the programme, showing how the specific concerns of sight interpreting and translation relate to the contents of the different modules and how they informed student work. The emerging notion of sign language translation of recorded documents now additionally, more explicitly offers the opportunity to draw on the much wider field of (written-written) Translation Studies, enlarging the theoretical and methodological basis for conducting rigorous research. It further presents the possibility to reflect on changing practices in the field of Sign Language Interpreting more generally, particularly exploring issues relating to changing consumer relationships, the evolving roles of deaf and hearing professionals, and policy making. To add a 'T' for 'translation' to the acronym EUMASLI may well be apposite for a study programme that tries to stay abreast of developments in the professional field.

**Paul Michaels** (England – UK)

***The answer is in the question: the difficulties in interpreting multiple-choice question examination situations***

Many of us can appreciate how stressful examination situations can be but consider the additional stress of having to rely on examinations being translated and maybe we can then appreciate how our Deaf clients feel.

However, it's not only the Deaf client that feels stress at this time; the interpreter may also be under pressure and may be experiencing stress, in which case, they may have to consider the following:

*Lack of preparation* – the interpreter may have a schema of the situation they are entering but may not have had access to the questions in advance so, will need to rely on their skills in sight translation to make sure that the text is translated correctly. What coping strategies are employed by interpreters when faced with this?

*Leading the examinee* – The way the interpreter chooses to translate a text may inadvertently provide the Deaf person with the answers to the questions. So, how does the interpreter overcome this?

*Neutrality* – The Deaf client and interpreter may have a long-standing relationship and therefore, there is the possibility that the interpreter may inadvertently sign in a manner, which could reveal the answer to the question. How does the interpreter remain totally neutral?

*New vocabulary* - How is the negotiation of new vocabulary established under exam conditions, bearing in mind this may link to the three areas mentioned above?

The aim of the presentation will be to respond to these questions and equip interpreters with some of the coping strategies employed by their colleagues in the UK.

**Anna-Lena Nilsson** (Sweden) & **Maya Rohdell** (Sweden)

**What should I write?: Some do's and don'ts when translating signed corpus material for the web**

Signed languages are essentially “spoken” languages, i.e. they have no written form. With recent technological developments it is, however, possible to capture signed language on video – and then make it available on the Internet. To make this material accessible also to non-signers, translations into spoken or written language are often added.

Signed language corpora are currently being created in e.g. Great Britain, Holland, Ireland, Germany, and Sweden, with more plans under way. The Swedish Sign Language Corpus will contain approximately 70 hrs of video recordings of 40 deaf people in signed dialogues. The aim is to make most of these recordings available to the public on the Internet. In addition to the videos, there will be glosses for the signs (Wallin, Mesch & Nilsson, 2010), as well as translations into written Swedish of all of this signed material. (Pollitt, 2010, describes similar work in Great Britain.)

In this presentation, we will present some of the problems we have faced when producing a written translation of dialogues in a language that has no written form. Who will read this? What knowledge does s/he have about deaf people and sign language? How much contextual information is needed to make the dialogue understandable for non-signing reader/s? How do we resolve the different amounts of visual information and regarding spatial relations required by the two languages? Finally, the written translation will be read *as if* it is a sight translation of the spontaneous signing seen on the screen, despite the fact that it is a prepared translation.

We will also discuss the fact that we, as translators, are not the intended addressees – the sign language users know each other and are providing information accordingly (Liddell & Vogt-Svendsen, 2007).

Liddell, Scott K. & Vogt-Svendsen, Marit. 2007. “Constructing Spatial Conceptualizations from Limited Input: Evidence from Norwegian Sign Language.” In: Duncan, Susan D., Cassell, Justine, and Levy, Elena T. (eds.) *Gesture and the Dynamic Dimension of Language. Essays in Honor of David McNeill. Gesture Studies 1*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. pp 173-194.

Pollitt, Kyra. 2010. “Well, it’s green here, but I’ve seen green and green...: issues in translating the BSL Corpus.” Presentation at the 2010 conference of the Association of Sign Language Interpreters (ASLI), 17 October 2010. Nottingham, England.

Wallin, Lars; Mesch, Johanna & Nilsson, Anna-Lena. 2010. *Transcription guide lines for Swedish Sign Language discourse. (Version 1.)* Stockholm University, Department of Linguistics.

**Raija Roslof (Finland)**

***Translation, spoken and signed language collaborating in sign language interpreter studies***

Diaconia University of Applied Sciences runs a four-year full-time (240 credits) sign language interpreter training programme. Most of the students do not have sign language skills upon entering the training. When students have finished all required studies they become fully qualified Finnish Sign Language Interpreters. It is a great challenge to the training to accomplish this but over the years we have developed some working methods that are beneficial to the aim.

After the basic theoretical lectures on interpreting and translating, the actual interpreting studies start with doing translation. The aim is to have the students realize specific features of converting language – text, ideas, thoughts – to another language and then to be able to apply this knowledge also to interpreting. Doing translation first helps the students to see that interpreting is not simply putting words/signs after one another but instead one needs to do a deep analysis of the source and combine both theoretical knowledge and practical skills.

One very useful practice has been a joint task with three lecturers: Finnish and Sign Language lecturers and translation lecturer. The students have been working in pairs translating a text from a Finnish book into Finnish Sign Language. The courses that have been involved are:

- Finnish Language: Text analysis
- Finnish Sign Language: Styles and register
- Translation: Practice

The lecturers have had joint workshop lessons, where students can have instructions and guidance with their work from any of these three lecturers – if their problem has to do with the source, they will ask the Finnish Language lecturer, if it has to do with the actual techniques or strategies of translating, they go the translation lecturer and if the issues deals with the way something is expressed in the target language, they can discuss it with the Sign Language Lecturer.

In my poster I will share the actual working methods more closely and also tell more about the theoretical background of the practice.

**Cynthia Roy (USA)**

***Teaching the history of sign language interpreting and sight translation***

As we move into the next decade of this century, our past falls further and further behind. As educators retire, and remarkable Deaf and hearing interpreters in the field pass on, knowledge about the history of SL interpreting begins to be lost. Students no longer recognize terminology, important events, the use and development of sight translation, the progress of ideas, or people who were instrumental in the development of our field.

I will describe a course that focuses on historical insights and philosophies regarding the development and practice of the profession, and follows the progress of research in SL interpreting. I will share course activities such as interviews with practicing interpreters and consumers that recover the past, finding web links that provide historical context, and a final paper/presentation that traces the course of an interpreting issues over the past thirty years.

In addition, I will share a reader (in preparation) of essays on SL interpreting which will make available primary sources of the thinking and information on historical issues and outcomes. Many of the early studies or thought-provoking essays were published in journals or conference proceedings that are no longer in print, some were conference papers that were never published. While the progression through the articles is somewhat chronological (1960-2000), the articles are also separated into sections by their focus on research or their focus on professional practice.

This course plan and reader can be incorporated into an introductory course or become a course of its own.

**Anna M.J. Wiener** (Austria)

***The difference between translation and interpreting in sign language. Specific problems of written text transfer in Austrian Sign Language – A case study***

As a result of technological advances in media, such as the development of the internet, DVDs, etc. and concurrent socio-political initiatives, an increasing number of written texts are being translated into sign language (SL) and recorded. For SL interpreters and translation/interpreting (TL/IT) scholars, this type of transfer is uncharted territory.

This presentation (based on my Master thesis) focuses on a case study and the hypothesis, which asserts that SL-TL, as opposed to SL-IT, does in fact exist. Furthermore, the challenges we face with those new aspects of SL-TL and -IT will be presented.

First, traditional and new activities of interpreters in the field of SL-TL and IT and the differences between spoken and written language TL and IT will be discussed.

Subsequently, the study will be presented, which contains an analysis of parameters used to differentiate between TL and IT. These parameters provide the theoretical basis for the analysis.

Afterwards the object of analysis and the methods used in the case study will be described. This step encompasses an interview and the analysis of 48 parameters, which have hitherto been used to differentiate between TL and IT.

The analysis of a website “translated” into Austrian SL aims to determine how many of the 48 parameters indicate that the website was either translated or interpreted. This task is carried out by analysing the text itself and by evaluating the interviews of two of the website- translators.

The results of my thesis represent the main part of the presentation. It will be furthermore shown that there is a substantial need for training programs for (Deaf and hearing) SL translators. Moreover, traditional definitions of TL and IT should be reconsidered and there is a need to pay attention to quality assurance in this new field of practice.