

VIVIANA MASIA, IRENE CAMPO

Intra- and inter-semiotics in action:

Analysis of two translations of a CNN report¹

Abstract

This paper discusses the results of a comparative analysis of two translations of a CNN report, one from an intra-semiotic English-Italian translation, the other from an inter-semiotic Italian-Italian Sign Language (LIS) translation. Drawing on parameters developed within the IRA model (EUGENI 2017), the study aims at assessing the extent to which each translation differs from the source text. Notably, interpreters' translation strategies and solutions are inquired and compared in order to gauge how faithfully they rendered the source text and whether modality differences in the two linguistic combinations impinged on the accuracy of interpreters' translation choices.

Keywords: translation, Sign Language (LIS), linguistic combinations.

1. Introduction

This paper discusses the results of a comparative analysis of two translations of a CNN report. The analysis likens an English-to-Italian with an Italian-to-Italian Sign Language (henceforth, LIS) translation, the former epitomizing an intra-semiotic, the latter an inter-semiotic translation type (CAMPO 2018). The purpose of the study is to gauge the degree to which each of the two translated versions of the report drifts from the source text.

To this end, parameters developed within the IRA model (Idea-unit Rendition Assessment, cfr. EUGENI 2017) for the quality of subtitling services will be drawn upon to assess the strategies used by the two interpreters and how the different communicative modalities (phono-acoustic for the

1

Although the paper results from cooperation, VM has written Section 2 while IC wrote Sections 3 and 4. The authors have jointly written Sections 5 and 6.

intra-semiotic translation and visuo-gestural for the inter-semiotic one) impinge on the degree of distance or proximity of the translated texts to the source one.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 presents an overview of the structure of LIS (and, partly, of sign languages in general), being it the target language of the inter-semiotic translation of the selected report. Section 3 describes the purpose of the research along with the methodology used to carry out the analysis of the translated occurrences. Section 4 presents the data gathered from the analysis while Section 5 is dedicated to a discussion of the results.

2. Italian Sign Language (LIS): an overview

2.1. The "phonology" of the LIS

The status of sign languages today is robust in many world countries, which led to a more successful overcoming of communication barriers thanks to the development and gradual stabilization of qualified interpreting services. Nevertheless, Italy is one of the very few countries to have not officially yet recognized the linguistic status of the national sign language (LIS).

The legal recognition of sign languages in many countries has been strongly promoted by the advancements of scientific research on their structure, compared to that of verbal languages. A pioneering thread of research in this sense is led by William Stokoe (1919-2000), an American linguist with a solid grounding on the American Sign Language (ASL). Stokoe looked for evidence buttressing the similarity between ASL and English comparing the nature and behaviour of meaningful units in the two languages (STOKOE 1960). Starting from the function of phonemes (i.e. the smallest units of sounds capable of producing meaning differences) in verbal languages, he found that similar units were also present in ASL. Similarly to phonemes, these units do not carry an autonomous meaning but are capable of establishing semantic differences between minimal pairs, that is, words which are almost identical except for a sound, as in *pear/bear*, *see/bee*, *race/lace*, etc. Since the articulation of such units was entrusted to hand movements, he called them *cheremes* (from the Greek *cheir* "hand"), from which the term *cherology* caught on in the field to refer to the descriptive level devoted to the analysis of cheremic units (RUSSO CARDONA - VOLTERRA 2017).

Stokoe describes hand signs as originating from the combination of cheremes, and, similarly to the distinctive function of phonemes, cheremic features can also change thereby affecting the meaning of the sign as a whole. In Stokoe's contention, hand signs are holistic icons and have four

distinguishable formational parameters,² known as *handshape*, that is, the shape displayed by the hand during sign production (CORAZZA - VOLTERRA 2004); *location*, the space in which the sign is produced; *movement*, i.e. the direction of the articulated sign, and *orientation*, namely the direction of the palm when the sign is produced (RADUTZKY-SANTARELLI 2004).

Differently from verbal languages, in which linearity of linguistic units is a predominant feature, formational parameters in sign languages can be produced simultaneously. For example, the verb *dire* (“say”) in LIS is signed with the tip of the index finger (configuration) first touching the bottom of the chin (location) and then moving forward in a straight line (movement).³ An analogous pattern can be observed for the verb *dare* (“give”) realized in LIS with a closed 5–configuration and the hand palm facing upwards. The hand is moved in the direction of the addressee if he is the beneficiary of the action. Also in this case, configuration, movement and orientation are all simultaneously present in the coding of the hand sign.

2.2 The morphology

Due to the holistic nature of hand signs, words in sign languages tend to be monosyllabic or, at most, disyllabic. Simultaneity is a pervasive and extremely productive parameter at the morphological level as well. As a matter of fact, concatenative morphology is rare in signed languages, except for a few isolated cases like a nominal genitive affix in the Australian Sign Language, which signals possessive relationships between two nouns (JOHNSTON - SCHEMBRI 2001).

A common pattern to sign plurality in sign languages is *repetition*. In LIS, the noun *città* (“town”) is produced with both hands taking an “L-letter” configuration and making a vertical movement downwards. Plurality is encoded by repeating this movement twice.

In the verbal system, repetition marks aspectual nuances as well as the durational and continuous nature of an action. The sign for the verb *studiare* (“study”) in LIS, for example, is obtained with both hands taking the B-letter handshape and producing two short circular movements inward. To

2

Just like sounds in verbal languages are described according to a matrix of articulatory traits defining their physical properties, formational parameters of hand signs describe the physical structure of a sign.

3

For reasons of space, pictures of the hand signs described will not be displayed in this paper.

emphasize the repetition of the activity, the movement is repeated several times. For some classes of verbs, morphological modifications are also entrusted to facial expressions.

Grammatical agreement is another feature incorporated in the internal structure of signed verbs. For many transitive verbs, the direction of movement signals agreement either with the subject or with the object of the sentence. Let us take the verb *chiedere* ("ask") in LIS, as illustration. The handshape for this sign is that of a closed B-letter making short back-and-forth movements, with the palm of the hand facing the receiver (so as to say "I ask you"). This pattern entails that the subject agreeing with the verb is co-referent with the signer himself. If the sign were produced with the palm facing the signer and with the finger tips approaching the signer's shoulder, the subject would now be co-referent with the receiver and the direct object with the signer (as to mean "You ask me"). So, the grammatical category of person can be said to be "embodied" in the articulation of the verb.

2.3 The syntax

As in verbal languages, sentences in sign languages have a basic word order (FISHER 2014), which is SVO for the American Sign Language (ASL), for the Brazilian Sign Language (BSL) and for the Taiwan Sign Language (TSL) among others, and SOV for the Italian Sign Language (LIS), for the German Sign Language (DGE) and for the Japanese Sign Language (JSL). Needless to say, also for these languages word order can be modified in response to pragmatic pressures related to the givenness/newness of contents, to the illocutionary force of the utterances (namely, the speaker's communicative aim, cf. Austin 1962) and the communicative weight of sentence constituents. So, in LIS, a sentence like *I love dogs* would be signed as "I DOGS LOVE". But, if *dog* were selected as the topic of conversation (LAMBRECHT 1994), it may well be placed in sentence-initial position. This pattern often emerges in negative sentences; so, for example, a sentence like *Non mi piacciono I cani* (I don't like dogs), can be signed as *Cani, io piacere no* ("Dogs, I like not"). In such a case, "dogs" would no longer be signed after the verb, but as the starting point of the sentence, namely as its topic.

An extremely productive category of signed languages is represented by classifiers, namely, meaningful hand signals targeted at categorizing experience. (For space limitations, we will not discuss them at length, yet we refer the reader to the references at the bottom. Cfr., in particular, EMMOREY 2003 and SCHEMBRI 2003.)

Although our attention to LIS in the follow up of the discussion will essentially bring home to translation problems and faithful⁴ linguistic rendering, we thought that a preliminary outline of the most salient features of sign languages’ structure might help better understand the nature and reason behind the adoption of specific translation strategies on the part of the LIS interpreter in the second linguistic comparison considered.

3. The present study

Building on the theoretical premises set out in the previous sections, the second part of the paper will present and discuss the results of a comparative analysis conducted on a CNN report about a recent meeting held between the Italian Prime Minister, Giuseppe Conte, and the President of the United States of America, Donald Trump. The report was originally translated into Italian by a simultaneous interpreter and was then re-translated into the Italian Sign Language. Before moving to the details of the analysis, though, some state of the art and terminological reflection on the notions of inter-semiotic and intra-semiotic translation will come in useful.

3.1. *Inter- and intra-semiotic translation: theoretical views*

Despite their relatively recent application in translation studies, the concepts of intrasemiotic and intersemiotic translation date back to Roman Jakobson and his early reflection on the linguistic and cognitive mechanisms underlying meaning transfer from a linguistic system to another. In his 1959 essay *On Linguistic Aspects of Translation*, Jakobson draws up some general semiotic and semantic problems which translation can cause. The nature and scope of such problems obviously differ based on the translational dimensions being involved. On this account, he distinguishes between three types of translation processes (JAKOBSON 1959: 233):

- *Intralingual* translation, or rewording, is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language;

4

The notion of *faithfulness* in translation studies has been variously defined. It is generally thought to be a relative parameter often hanging on a “culturally determined intersubjective contract” (DRUSI 2016: 190). Unveiling the features of faithful translation is not the main concern in the present paper; therefore, we will essentially comply with Drusi’s characterization of faithful intersemiotic translation which he lays out as being expected to “maintain a relation of coherence with the enunciative choices of the source text” (DRUSI 2015: 190).

- *Interlingual* translation, or translation proper, is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language;
- *Intersemiotic* translation, or transmutation, is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign systems. (He chose the synonym “transmutation” to emphasize the idea of transformation.)

Jakobson chose the word “rewording” to distinguish intrasemiotic translation from more common types of translation, such as the interlingual and intersemiotic ones.

In DRUSI (2015), the term intersemiotic translation has also been used with reference to all semiotic systems, and not only to the linguistic code. LOUIS HJELMSLEV (1943) originally put forth the terms “transduction” to indicate translation as a process of interpretation, while ECO (2000) proposes to include the term intersystemic interpretation in which he spots remarkable variations in the substance of expressive forms. Intersemiotic translation, according to ECO (2000), is nothing more than mere *adaptation*, as it transforms, often radically, the previous text, inevitably explicating the unsaid” (DRUSI 2015: 184).

In a different tack, GOTTLIEB (2003, 2005), stressed the modality aspect of semiotic translation and suggests to characterize intrasemiotic translation as translation within a given sign system, and intersemiotic translation as involving two distinct systems of signs (usually both of verbal nature). Differently than Jakobson’s original definition, this outline of intersemiotic translation includes non phonico-acoustic verbal systems such as sign languages. Indeed, the verbal status of these visuo-gestural systems was probably not so well-grounded at the time when Jakobson formulated his first translation theories. As a matter of fact, the seminal studies of signed languages, and, notably of ASL, started to catch on in the fields of general linguistics by the early 60s. Since the present study aims at comparing the quality level of two translations involving both phonico-acoustic and visuo-gestural verbal systems, this latter outline by Gottlieb seems to better fit the purposes and research hypotheses of the proposed inquiry, which is why it will be adopted as working definition in our theoretical framework.

In the suggested comparison, the Italian rendering of the report from the original English version epitomizes an example of intra-semiotic translation because both languages are based on a phonico-acoustic modality; conversely, the LIS rendering of the Italian text features an inter-semiotic translation type since the former rests upon a visuo-gestural modality.

The analysis will therefore liken the two translated versions of the CNN report with a view (i) to gauging the extent and the way in which each translation departs from the source text, and (ii) to inquiring how the interpreters' translation choices differ for the intra-semiotic and the inter-semiotic translation type and what parameters constrains these choices.

3.2. IRA model: state of the art and methodology

The analysis has been conducted drawing on the IRA model (Idea-unit Rendition Assessment) developed by EUGENI (2017) within the CLAST project (LPE-99). This model was originally designed to evaluate the quality of intra-linguistic automatic subtitling. In the present study only simultaneous interpreting is taken into account; however, since subtitling brings about an intra-semiotic translation type, the taxonomy used in this model can be easily adapted to both the intra-semiotic/inter-semiotic comparison discussed in the present research.

A relevant distinction the IRA model entails is that between conceptual *sub-units* and *units*, which EUGENI (2017: 105) delineates as follows:

- *Sub-units*: meaningful units such as phrases, adverbs, parentheticals, etc.
- *Units*: any sentence type conveying a meaning, regardless of its degree of syntactic dependency.

To assess the features and consistency of the two types of translation, a further terminological pair will be considered, i.e., that between *rendered* and *not-rendered* units (EUGENI 2017: 106). Not-rendered units are those in which a message is not conveyed, due to omission of the unit itself. Conversely, rendered units are represented by those units faithfully translated as well as those altered at the level of sub-units. This latter grouping will be further analyzed according to a taxonomy elaborated by GAMBIER (2006) who distinguishes between the following translation strategies (EUGENI 2017: 106):

- a. EXPANSION: a conceptual unit is explained or disambiguated using a higher number of characters than those used in the source text (Ex: ENG - *Very strong on immigration like I am by the way*/ITA - *Abbiamo visioni comuni soprattutto per quanto riguarda l'immigrazione*).

- b. REDUCTION: a unit is characterized by partial omission and/or partial or total reformulation. There are two kinds of reduction, respectively: *omission* and *compression*, that are reported below:
- ENG - *Italy's Interior Minister Matteo Salvini visited the US President in 2016 on the campaign trail*/ITA - *Trump si è già incontrato con Salvini*. (Here, reduction is caused by a compression of the conceptual unit.)
 - ENG - *More than 600,000 refugees, most from North Africa, have landed in Italy in recent years*./ITA - *Con oltre 600,000 rifugiati arrivati in Italia negli ultimi anni*. (Here, reduction is caused by an omission of some elements of the conceptual unit.)
- c. ERRORS: altered sub-units due to human failure or malfunctioning of the software. (Ex: ITA - *E Salvini ha preso alcune idee di Trump per le sue campagne politiche*/LIS - *e (lui stesso) preso spunto idee sue Trump USA per sua [politica pubblicità]*).

The parameters through which rendered and non-rendered conceptual units (EUGENI 2017: 108) can be analyzed are laid out as follows (see Table 1):

- a. REPETITION: unit which is highly comprehensible due to its faithful verbatim reproduction of the words uttered in the source text. (Ex: ENG - *They're behind the President in his support of Vladimir Putin*/ITA - *L'Italia è d'accordo con la visione di Trump di aiutare il Presidente Putin*).
- b. OMISSION: it occurs when the software fails to reproduce a conceptual unit. (Ex: ENG - *Russia should be back in the G8*/ITA - [not rendered content])
- c. ALTERATION: the unit contains minor errors which however do not deteriorate the comprehensibility of the message for the end user. (Ex: ENG - *Sabrina, legal assistant in Rome, says*:/ITA - *Per esempio, Sabrina dice*:)
- d. MISREPRESENTATION: due to semantic errors which compromise the decoding of the source text. (Ex: ENG - *Although Italy has refused Trump's request to give more money to NATO*/ITA - *Per quanto riguarda la NATO, anche qui le vedute sono simili*).

NON-RENDERED UNITS		RENDERED UNITS			
Omissions	Misrepresentations	Repetitions	<i>Alterations</i>		
			<i>Reductions</i>		Expansions
			Omissions	Compressions	

Table 1. Parameters of the IRA model for automatic subtitling and translation

For the analysis of conceptual units, for both the intra-semiotic and the inter-semiotic translation (see Table 4 and 5 in the Appendix section), the following labels have been used.

Strategy	Symbols used for the labeling
Rendered Conceptual Unit	R
Not-rendered conceptual unit	NR
Omission	O
Misrepresentation	M
Repetition	R
Alteration	A
Grammatical error	GE
Lexical error	LE
Semantically relevant alteration	S
Semantically non relevant alteration	NS
Compression	C
Expansion	E
Other symbols used for the labeling	
Non rendered or modified elements in the translation of the conceptual unit	[...]
Conceptual unit found in the source text and not translated in the target text.	(...)
Conceptual unit repeated for practical purposes	<i>Italics*</i>

3.3 Results

The results of the two analyses are shown in Table 2. Drawing upon the evaluation procedure developed for the IRA model (to which we refer for further details), we report the percentages of occurrences of the strategies presented in Table 2, comparing the English-to-Italian and the Italian-

to-LIS data. The overall number of occurrences per each category of the IRA model is reported for the two translations considered (see Table 3 and 4).

Strategies	English-to-Italian		RENDERED UNITS (100%)	NON-RENDERED UNITS (0%)
	RENDERED UNITS (77%/)	NON-RENDERED UNITS (23%)		
<i>Omissions</i>	---	87%	18%	0%
<i>Misrepresentations</i>	---	13%	---	0%
<i>Repetitions</i>	56%	---	50%	---
<i>Alterations</i>	44%	---	50%	---
<i>Reductions</i>	77%	---	100%	---
<i>Compressions</i>	30%	---	82%	---
<i>Expansions</i>	23%	---	0%	---

Table 2. Data of the English-Italian and Italian-LIS translations

Category	n. occurrences
Rendered units	15
Non-rendered units	7
Alterations: 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Omissions: 7 • Compressions: 3 • Expansions: 3
Misinterpretations	1
Errors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lexical: 0 • Grammatical: 0

Table 3. N. of conceptual units for the English-Italian translation (total number: 35)

Category	n. occurrences
Rendered units	13
Non-rendered units	0
Alterations: 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Omissions: 2 • Compressions: 7 • Expansions: 0
Misinterpretations:	0
Errors:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lexical: 2 • Grammatical: 0

Table 4. N. of conceptual units for the English-Italian translation (total number: 24)

4. Discussion

4.1 *English-to-Italian*

What strikingly emerges from the above comparison is that the percentage of non-rendered units in the English-Italian translation is remarkably higher than that registered for the Italian-LIS translation. Among rendered conceptual units, repetitions exceed alterations by 12%, with alterations being chiefly represented by reductions and expansions, as shown in (1) and (2) (Table 5, Unit 4)

ENGLISH VERSION

(1) *Got to meet him*

ITALIAN VERSION

(2) *Non vedo l'ora di incontrare il Primo Ministro italiano*

and (3) and (4) (Table 5, Unit 5)

ENGLISH VERSION

(3) *Very strong on immigration like I am by the way*

ITALIAN VERSION

(4) *Abbiamo visioni comuni soprattutto per quanto riguarda l'immigrazione*

Interestingly, in both translations, there appears to be a modal bleaching from the English to the Italian version. In the (1)-(2) comparison, what is conveyed as a strong obligation or commitment of the speaker in the English source sentence (i.e. meet the Italian Prime Minister), seems to be rendered in Italian as an optative utterance, expressing a subjective and emotional evaluation of the speaker about the state of affairs described.

Misrepresentations generally involve fewer occurrences. An example is provided by the Unit 21 in Table 5.

ENGLISH VERSION

(5) *Although Italy has refused Trump's request to give more money to NATO*

ITALIAN VERSION

(6) *Per quanto riguarda la NATO, anche qui le vedute sono simili*

Here the Italian rendering reports that the Italian government and Trump see eye to eye with respect to giving more money to NATO, when in fact they do not. It must be pointed out that the selection of these strategies does not seem to be driven by systemic constraints of the Italian language, in the sense that the interpreter might well have opted for other (probably more faithful) translation strategies.

Within the category of reduced conceptual units, omissions (70%) generally involve informationally less relevant elements of conceptual units (see below Unit 23, Table 5).

ENGLISH VERSION

(7) *More than 600,000 refugees, most from North Africa, have landed in Italy in recent years*

ITALIAN VERSION

(8) *Con oltre 600,000 rifugiati arrivati in Italia negli ultimi anni* ("most from North Africa" is the omitted element of the conceptual unit in the Italian rendering)

The omission of a correlate for "most from North Africa" can be put down either to its being common ground information in the Italian socio-political context – provided that a very high number of immigrants so far landed in Italy set off from North-African countries, and so the interpreter did not consider providing that information relevant for the Italian audience – or, arguably, to the interpreter's intention to "objective" the immigrants' origin with a view to not damaging the reputation of their birthplace. Another possibility is that the interpreter simply neglected that sentence unit, thereby all the way omitting it in the Italian rendering.

As for non-rendered units, the 87% refers to entirely omitted conceptual units (Table 5, Unit 23 (ex. (9)), and unit 24 (ex. (10)).

(9) *Prime Minister Conte twitted: I agree with the President*

(10) *Russia should be back in the G8*

4.2 Italian-to-LIS

Differently than the English-Italian translation, the inter-semiotic rendering yielded a far more reduced difference between rendered and non-rendered units, the former representing 100% of the total. As it was to be expected from the structure of the LIS system, and of sign languages in general, the LIS translation has essentially rendered lexical words. Function words such as articles, prepositions or conjunctions have been translated through the Signed Italian system (ItalianoSegnato, cf. BERONESI et al. 2007). Omissions involve less informative elements (underlined) of conceptual units, as in the following example (Table 6, Unit 12):

ITALIAN VERSION

(11) *Trump ha capito o, gli è stato detto che l'Italia deve essere, in un certo senso, coccolata*

LIS VERSION

(12) *Trump capito, o qualcuno ha detto-lui: Italia deve essere coccolata*

in which the hedge expression (LAKOFF 1972) *in un certo senso* ("in some sense" or "so to say") has been removed from the LIS translation. Other omissions are obviously contingent on the absence of specific linguistic constructions in LIS, such as the passive voice, *gli è stato detto*, which requires a transitive rephrasing into *qualcuno ha detto lui*, or auxiliaries (*ha*) and preverbal clitic pronouns (*gli*), completely unknown to LIS users.

As can be noticed, alterations are mainly due to reductions (100%), which override those observed in the previous analysis, where compressions were much more abundant. Compared to the intra-semiotic analysis, the LIS translation reports a small presence of lexical errors. As a matter of fact, only two conceptual units display minor lexical errors, which however do not hamper the comprehensibility of the unit as a whole. An example is provided by the Unit 6 (Table 6), below as (13) and (14) indicating, respectively, the Italian and the LIS rendering:

ITALIAN VERSION

(13) *E Salvini ha preso alcune idee di Trump per le sue campagne politiche*

LIS VERSION

(14) *...e (lui stesso) preso spunto idee sue-T(rump) USA per sua politica pubblicità,*

In (14) the signed word *pubblicità*, as a translation for *campagna*, does not remarkably impinge on the communicative purpose of the message, so we did not deem it comparable to other cases of misrepresentation seen for the previous comparison.

Unit 23 (Table 6), below as (15) and (16), displays another case of minor lexical error in which a disjunctive conjunction and an adverbial expression (*o meno*) have been reanalyzed as a whole adverbial unit (*almeno*, "at least").

ITALIAN VERSION

(15) *"Bella figura" o meno, il Presidente Trump ha trovato un amico nel Primo Ministro italiano*

LIS VERSION

(16) *Bella figura [almeno] Presidente Trump trovato amico Primo Ministro Italia.*

On balance, the results obtained for the two comparisons are quite strongly suggestive of the different degrees of adherence of the translated texts to the source one. In this sense, the LIS translation of the Italian text seems to be a more faithful rendering of the source, as compared to the Italian translation of the original English version. Considering the different modalities and semiotic structures of the two language systems (Italian and LIS), this comes quite unexpected. Even more surprising, in this respect, is the higher number of not-rendered conceptual units in the English-Italian translation, with a smaller amount of misrepresented conceptual units as well. In the LIS translation, instead, omitted units are mainly represented by function words, most of them however coded through Signed Italian strategies. Therefore, with respect to the first research question (i.e. what is the extent to which each translation diverges from the source text?), the gathered data provide some backing to assume that the intra-semiotic translation has produced a more "distant" and source-independent text. Conversely, the LIS rendering can be regarded, to some extent, as a more accurate translation. As for the second research question (how do interpreting strategies differ in the two translations of the report?), the two types of translations mainly differed in expansion, compression and reduction strategies, with reductions significantly overriding the other strategies in both the intra-semiotic and the inter-semiotic translation type. It is easy to see how this trend can be put down to typological differences between English and Italian, on the one hand, and structural differences between verbal and signed languages, on the other. As a matter of fact, due to the lack of function words in LIS, subordination cannot be rendered in the same way as it is in Italian.

Analogous constraints obtain for prepositions as well as other particles carrying grammatical meanings.

5. Conclusion

This study put forth a methodological procedure to assess the quality of translation work. It capitalized on a model already devised for subtitling services, yet we sought to demonstrate that it can successfully serve the purpose of quality assessments in intersemiotic and intrasemiotic translation alike. The evidence gathered from the comparative analysis showed that not only do the two renderings of the report differ in the frequency with which certain translation strategies are used by the interpreters, but also in the resulting degree of faithfulness of the translation to the source text. As a matter of fact, while in the English translation alterations and misrepresentations often involved units encoding conceptual meaning, in the LIS version they essentially involved function words or smaller units endowed with lower informativity. Interestingly enough, if, on the one hand, the selection of some strategies could be thought to be constrained by typological differences between the languages considered, on the other, they were sometimes the result of arbitrary choices of the interpreter. This particularly obtains for the English-Italian comparison in which several instances of omissions or alterations of conceptual units have been registered which were not determined by structural divergences of the two languages. The degree of faithfulness of a translated (oral or written) text can therefore be estimated on the basis of how dependent is the adoption of a translation strategy on the typological nature of the target language (at the phonological, morphological, syntactic and pragmatic level) or on causal choices of the translator. On balance, defining objective parameters to assess the quality of a translation would cater professionals with useful and effective working tools to meet the ever-changing needs of an extremely competitive industry of translation and interpreting services. The length of the report taken into account does not allow predicting the scope and extensibility of the adopted model to all translation types. The working hypotheses set out in the paper, though, seem quite promising and definitely provide a useful groundwork to test the effects of analogous investigations in other domains of translation and interpreting studies.

References

- AUSTIN, J. L. (1962) *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- BERONESI, S., MASSONI, P. & M. T. OSSELLA (2007) *L'italiano segnato esatto nell'educazione bimodale del bambino sordo*, Torino: Omega Edizioni.
- CAMPO, I. (2018) *Interpretazione simultanea dall'inglese in italiano e LIS- Analisi concettuale di un servizio della CNN*, Tesi di laurea.
- CORAZZA, C., & V. VOLTERRA (2004) "Configurazioni", in VOLTERRA, V. (a cura di) *La lingua dei segni italiana - La comunicazione visivo-gestuale dei sordi*, Bologna: il Mulino, pp. 49-108.
- DUSI, N. (2015) "Intersemiotic translation: Theories, problems, analysis", *Semiotica*, 206, pp. 181–205.
- ECO, U. (2001) *Experiences in Translation*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- ECO, U. (2003) *Mouse or Rat? Translation as Negotiation*, London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson.
- EMMOREY, K. (2003) *Perspectives on classifier constructions*, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- EUGENI, C. (2017) "La sottotitolazione linguistica automatica: Valutare la qualità con IRA", *CoMe*, II(1), pp. 102-113.
- FISHER, S. D. (2014) "Constituent Order in Sign Languages", *Gengo Kenkyu*, 146, pp. 1-12.
- GOTTLIEB, H. (2005) "Multidimensional Translation: Semantics turned Semiotics", *Challenges in Multidimensional Translation: Conference Proceedings*, available at: https://www.euroconferences.info/proceedings/2005_Proceedings/2005_Gottlieb_Henrik.pdf (last access: 19/11/2018).
- HJELMSLEV, L. (1943) *Omkring Sprogteoriens Grundlaeggelse*, Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- JAKOBSON, R. (1959) "On linguistic aspects of translation", in R. Brower (ed.), *On translation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 232-239.
- JOHNSTON, T. & A. SCHEMBRI (2001) "Grammaticalization in Auslan (Australian Sign Language): Evidence from the Test Battery of Auslan Morphology and Syntax". Paper presented at the

Conference on Sign Linguistics, Deaf Education and Deaf Culture in Asia, Chinese University of Hong Kong, December, pp. 17-19.

LAKOFF, G. (1972) "Hedges: A Study in Meaning Criteria and the Logic of Fuzzy Concepts", *Papers from the Eighth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society 1972*, pp. 183-228 [Reprinted in *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 2(4), pp. 458- 508, 1973]

LAMBRECHT, K. (1994) *Information Structure and sentence form*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

RADUTZKY, E. & B. SANTARELLI (2004) "Movimenti e orientamenti", in VOLTERRA, V. (a cura di) *La lingua dei segni italiana - La comunicazione visivo-gestuale dei sordi*, Bologna: il Mulino, pp.109-158.

RUSSO CARDONA, T. & V. VOLTERRA (2017) *Le lingue dei segni- Storia e semiotica*, Roma: Carocci editore.

SCHEMBRI, A. (2003) "Rethinking 'classifiers' in signed languages", in EMMOREY, K. (ed.), *Perspectives on classifiers constructions in Sign Languages*, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

SIMONE, R. (2004) *Fondamenti di linguistica*, Roma-Bari: Laterza.

STOKOE, W. C. (1960) "Sign language structure: An outline of the visual communication system of the American Deaf" [Occasional papers, No. 8] *Studies in Linguistics*, University of Buffalo: Department of Anthropology and Linguistics.

SUPALLA, T. (1982) *Structure and acquisition of verbs of motion and location in American Sign Language*, (Unpublished doctoral dissertation) University of California: San Diego.

Appendix

Table 5. Analysis of the English-to-Italian (intra-semiotic) translation

UNIT ID	ORIGINAL VERSION	ITALIAN TRANSLATION	OUTPUT	STRATEGY
1	President Trump meets some European countries as foes,	Il Presidente Trump [<u>meets some European countries as foes, but</u>]	NR	O
2	But in Italy's Prime Minister Giuseppe Conte, he's got a friend.	Ha trovato un amico nel Primo Ministro italiano.	R	A/O
3	The new Prime Minister of Italy is great,	[...]	NR	O
4	Got to meet him.	Non vedo l'ora di incontrare il Primo Ministro italiano,	R	A/E
5	Very strong on immigration like I am by the way.	Abbiamo visioni comuni soprattutto per quanto riguarda l'immigrazione.	R	A/E
6	Closing ports and borders to illegal immigrants is one area where Trump and Italy see eye to eye.	[...] in effetti, i migranti sembrano rappresentare un punto di incontro per il Presidente Trump e il ministro Conte.	R	O; A/E
7	Italy's Interior Minister Matteo Salvini visited the US President in 2016 on the campaign trail	[<u>Italy's Interior Minister Matteo Salvini visited the US President in 2016</u>] Trump si è già incontrato con Salvini,	R	A/C
8	And ripped more than a few pages out of Trump's playbook for his own election campaign,	E Salvini ha preso alcune delle idee di Trump per le sue campagne politiche,	R	A/C
9	Even the winning slogan "Italians first".	Soprattutto se pensiamo allo slogan "Prima gli Italiani".	R	R
10	Prima gli italiani.	(Prima gli Italiani)	R	R
11	More than 600,000 refugees, most from North Africa, have landed in Italy in recent years.	Con oltre 600,000 rifugiati [<u>most from North Africa</u>] arrivati in Italia negli ultimi anni.	R	A/O
12	But in June, more than 600 refugees at sea were turned away from Italy.	[<u>But in June, more than 600 refugees at sea were turned away from Italy.</u>] La situazione non è facile, ultimamente	R	A/C

		Salvini ha stoppato alcuni sbarchi e in effetti, <i>alcuni migranti sono stati dirottati verso la Spagna.</i> *		
13	Salvini was defiant.	[...]	NR	O
14	“They will only see Italy in a postcard”, he said,	[...]	NR	O
15	“they were eventually accepted in Spain”.	<i>Alcuni migranti sono stati dirottati verso la Spagna.</i> *	R	R
16	Professor Federigo Argentieri says:	L'esperto Federico Argentieri dice che:	R	R
17	“Italy’s government is similar to Trump’s, in random decision making and in an apparent incoherent plan,	“Il governo italiano è simile all’amministrazione Trump per molti aspetti” [<u>in random decisionmaking and in an apparent incoherent plan</u>].	R	A/O
18	Trump has understood or, at least, he’s being told that Italy must be coddled,	Trump ha capito o, gli è stato detto che l’Italia deve essere, <i>in un certo senso</i> * coccolata,	R	R
19	So to speak,	<i>In un certo senso</i> *	R	R
20	Because it’s so far the only real similarity in Western Europe.	Perché finora l’Italia è il paese più vicino agli Stati Uniti, almeno nell’Europa occidentale.	R	R
21	Although Italy has refused Trump’s request to give more money to NATO,	Per quanto riguarda la NATO, anche qui le vedute sono simili. [<u>Italy has refused Trump’s request to give more money to NATO</u>].	NR	M
22	They’re behind the President in his support of Vladimir Putin.	L’Italia è d’accordo con la visione di Trump di aiutare il Presidente Putin.	R	R
23	Prime Minister Conte tweeted: “I agree with the President.	[...]	NR	O
24	Russia should be back in the G8”.	[...]	NR	O
25	Matteo Salvini’s made no secret of his admiration for Putin,	Matteo Salvini ammira molto Putin,	R	R
26	Calling him “one of the best politicians of our time”	Definendolo “uno dei migliori politici dei nostri tempi”,	R	R

27	And publishing a photo on Facebook wearing a Putin t-shirt in Moscow’s Red Square.	Ha anche postato una foto su Facebook nella quale indossava una maglietta con l’immagine di Putin [<u>in Moscow’sRedSquare</u>].	R	A/O
28	Italy’s government coalition received 69% of the vote in March elections,	[...]	NR	O
29	But not all Italians agree with their leaders’ support of President Trump.	Però non tutti gli italiani sono d’accordo con il sostegno dato da Salvini al Presidente Trump.	R	R
30	Sabrina, legal assistant in Rome, says:	Per esempio, Sabrina [<u>legalassistant in Rome</u>] dice	R	A/O
31	“Trump hasn’t made the best impression or “bellafigura” internationally,	Che Trump non ha fatto una bella figura a livello internazionale,	R	R
32	Especially, separating immigrant children from their families”.	Soprattutto quando ha separato i figli dai genitori nelle famiglie degli immigrati.	R	R
33	Anche lì, penso che Trump non è che abbia fatto sta gran bella figura.	(...)	R	R
34	“Bella figura” or not, in Italy’s government leaders, President Trump has got a friend in Europe,	Bella figura o meno, il Presidente Trump ha trovato un amico nel Primo Ministro italiano,	R	A/O
35	Something hard to come by these days.	Qualcosa che riesce un po’ difficile con altri leader.	R	R

Table 6. Analysis of the Italian-to-LIS (inter-semiotic) translation

UNIT ID	ORIGINAL VERSION	LIS TRANSLATION	OUTPUT	STRATEGY
1	Il Presidente Trump ha trovato un amico nel Primo Ministro italiano.	Presidente T(rump) USA-Primo Ministro italiano accordo, amico vede.	R	A/C
2	Non vedo l'ora di incontrare il Primo Ministro italiano,	Beh, non vedo ora (tempo) incontrare Primo Ministro italiano.	R	A/C
3	Abbiamo visioni comuni soprattutto per quanto riguarda l'immigrazione.	Noi due pensiero comune/simile, soprattutto riguardo immigrazione.	R	A/C
4	In effetti, i migranti sembrano rappresentare un punto di incontro per il Presidente Trump e il ministro Conte.	In effetti, migrare-persone sembra (fra i) due punto incontro accordo Presidente T(rump), Ministro C(onte).	R	A/C
5	Trump si è già incontrato con Salvini	T(rump) USA già incontrato con Salvini	R	A/C
6	E Salvini ha preso alcune idee di Trump per le sue campagne politiche,	e (lui stesso) preso spunto idee sue- T(rump) USA per sua [politica pubblicità],	R	r/el
7	Soprattutto se pensiamo allo slogan "Prima gli italiani".	soprattutto sapete slogan virgolette "Prima Italia persone".	R	R
8	Con oltre 600,000 rifugiati arrivati in Italia negli ultimi anni,	Sapete oltre 600,000 rifugiati arrivati Italia, ultimi anni <i>situazione facile no. *</i>	R	R
9	La situazione non è facile, ultimamente Salvini ha stoppato alcuni sbarchi e in effetti, alcuni migranti sono stati dirottati verso la Spagna.	<i>Situazione facile no *</i> , ultimamente Salvini bloccato alcuni sbarchi. Alcune persone dirottare (trasferire) Spagna.	R	A/C
10	L'esperto Federi[CO] Argentieri dice che:	Esperto Federico A(rgentini) dice:	R	A/C
11	"Il governo italiano è simile all'amministrazione Trump per molti aspetti,	governo italiano simile amministrazione Trump aspetti alcuni,	R	R
12	Trump ha capito o, gli è stato detto che l'Italia deve essere, in un certo senso, coccolata,	Trump capito, o qualcuno ha detto-lui: Italia deve essere (in un certo senso) coccolata,	R	A/O
13	Perché finora l'Italia è il paese che è più vicino agli Stati Uniti, almeno nell'Europa occidentale".	Perché finora Italia paese più vicino USA, almeno Europa Occidentale.	R	R
14	Per quanto riguarda la NATO, anche qui le vedute sono simili,	Riguardo NATO (difesa) anche qui parere simile.	R	R
15	L'Italia è d'accordo con la visione di Trump di	Italia d'accordo T(rump) USA aiutare Putin	R	R

	aiutare Putin.	(Presidente Russia).		
16	Matteo Salvini ammira molto Putin,	Matteo Salvini ammira molto Putin,	R	R
17	Definendolo "uno dei migliori politici dei nostri tempi",	dice "migliore uno politici tempi nostri".	R	R
18	Ha anche postato una foto su Facebook nella quale indossava una maglietta con l'immagine di Putin.	Anche postato/pubblicato FB foto indossare maglia immagine Putin.	R	R
19	Però, non tutti gli italiani sono d'accordo con il sostegno dato da Salvini al Presidente Trump.	Ma italiani tutti d'accordo Salvini supporta Trump? D'accordo no, tutti no!	R	R
20	Per esempio, Sabrina dice	Sabrina dice:	R	A/O
21	Che Trump non ha fatto una bella figura a livello internazionale,	Trump USA bella figura internazionale? Bella no!	R	R
22	Soprattutto quando ha separato i figli dai genitori nelle famiglie degli immigrati.	Quando figli e genitori separati famiglie (dentro) immigrati.	R	R
23	"Bella figura" o meno, il Presidente Trump ha trovato un amico nel Primo Ministro italiano,	Bella figura [almeno] Presidente Trump trovato amico Primo Ministro Italia.	R	r/el
24	Qualcosa che riesce un po' difficile con altri leader.	Qualcosa altri leader difficile!	R	R