**Posted by permission of the publisher from Pierre SCHMITT,
“Representations of Sign Language, Deaf People, and
Interpreters in the Arts and the Media”, *Sign Language Studies*,
volume 18, issue 2017 : 130–147. Copyright 2017 by Gallaudet
University.**

**Pierre SCHMITT
Laboratoire d'anthropologie sociale
Collège de France, EHESS, CNRS, Université de recherche PSL,
75005 Paris, France.**

PIERRE SCHMITT

Representations of Sign Language, Deaf People, and Interpreters in the Arts and the Media

Abstract

This article focuses on representations of sign language, Deaf people, and interpreters in the arts and the media, through the analysis of buzz—such as the Lydia Callis’s episode and the national anthem at the Superbowl—and of spaces granted to sign language users on various stages, such as concerts and theaters. Beyond “access” in the performing arts, this article argues that contemporary mises en scène of sign languages are sites of tension and confusion between a view of sign language as a means of communication and a view that allows sign language its own artistic expression and creativity. The author invites readers to reflect on models for shared public discourse space in which Deaf people are not only the recipients and beneficiaries of communication access laws but also the agents of the mise en scène of their language.

THE INCREASING appearance of interpreters and sign language users on television and the Internet, as well as in social media, has led to a buzz in their wake, particularly in some widely broadcast cases. This unprecedented media coverage of sign language is particularly marked in the United States but is by no means confined

Since 2015, Pierre Schmitt participates in research seminars on Deaf studies and on sign language in artistic practices at the School for Advanced Studies in Social Sciences (EHESS) in Paris.

This article was first published in French in *Glottopol* 27 in January 2016. I am grateful to Clara Mortamet and Richard Sabria for their permission to reprint this translated version. In addition, I am indebted to Luce Aubry for her translation.

to that nation, given that communication via social media inevitably circles the globe.

This article examines current representations¹ of sign languages and their users in the media by looking at the social media buzz around certain events, such as the signed national anthem at the Super Bowl, mayoral press conferences in New York City, Nelson Mandela's funeral, and Eurovision.² An exploration of how sign language is treated and represented is followed by a reflection on how such representations influence efforts to increase social engagement by the Deaf community.

As an extension of a doctoral research project that studies the use of sign language in artistic expression, this article describes the application of a cross-sectional model of semiotic analysis to the space occupied by sign languages and their users on stage and screen. This analysis is followed by a consideration of the tensions and confusion that can exist between a view of sign language as a means of communication and a view that allows sign language its own artistic expression and creativity.

Beginning with a look at the broadcast of the American national anthem in American Sign Language (ASL) at the 2014 Super Bowl game, I offer a critique of what is here referred to as the "prisoner of the bubble"³ and the consequences of its use on how viewers perceive sign language. I also take a look at the physical sidelining of concert interpreters and then reflect on how these images are captured, extracted, and forwarded on social media networks. In addition, my analysis compares these *mises en scène* to current practices in theater arts. Finally, I discuss the Lydia Callis episode and its offshoots in order to provide a basis on which to consider how communication access and artistic expression can be complementary within a new norm of bilingual communication, one that better meets the expectations of Deaf viewers and allows for an egalitarian presentation of spoken and signed languages. I close with a reflection on what can be achieved under this new norm.

Prisoner of the Bubble

The American national anthem has been interpreted into ASL at Super Bowl games since 1992.⁴ This public and political recognition of the language has been hailed by Deaf people while also garnering

criticism. In 2013, for instance, John Maucere delivered the anthem live in the stadium, but television networks did not broadcast his full performance.⁵

At the XLVIII Super Bowl in 2014, Amber Zion's performance was partially broadcast. I contend that the way her performance was broadcast contributes to, indeed promotes, the perception of sign language as an accommodation for a minority who have a handicap as opposed to a full-fledged language of artistic expression.

On the FOX channel, Amber Zion was seen in the proverbial bubble, with the exception of a few moments when she appeared full screen. This bubble, typically reserved for sign language interpreters (SLIs), is seen in broadcasts of proceedings of the National Assembly on French television. Such a *mise en scène* is technically feasible whenever Deaf artists are not sharing the stage with the hearing singer or other performer. The signed version of the anthem is set apart and backgrounded, both in the stadium and on the screen.

This unequal distribution of the visual space and the use of the bubble relegate the status of sign language to a language whose only usefulness is in interpretations of spoken messages. How can a viewer perceive Amber Zion as an artist in her own right when her image is set off to the side, in a space typically reserved for a hearing SLI? Is it even possible to appreciate her signed performance as a form of expression that is not subordinated to that of the hearing performer shown in the foreground?

These questions are the crux of this examination. The national anthem has been performed by countless artists, and its interpretation, has, likewise, been delivered countless times. Amber Zion worked many long hours on her performance, coached by the same John Maucere who had interpreted the anthem at the previous Super Bowl.⁶ As a Deaf performer, Amber Zion was not providing a simultaneous interpretation of the anthem's lyrics. However, nothing in the televised *mise en scène* conveys that she is Deaf or that her performance did not hinge directly on Renée Fleming's vocal performance.⁷

From an artistic point of view, a simultaneous interpretation of the anthem is far from satisfying,⁸ nor does it do justice to a text of such symbolic, poetic, and political weight. Hence we find prepared

translations of the American and French national anthems in the scant existing corpora we have on artistic performances in sign language.⁹

In the aftermath of the Charlie Hebdo shooting on January 7, 2015, a broadcast of the opening of the legislative session of the French National Assembly showed its members spontaneously singing *La Marseillaise*. The SLI for that day's proceeding, working in the standard bubble, mentioned to the public that the national anthem was sung but did not interpret it. We can understand her choice. Indeed, it would have been a curious task to deliver a simultaneous interpretation of that unexpected moment while there are, in fact, two accepted translations of the anthem in *Langue des signes française* (LSF), one of which has been recorded and published.¹⁰ However, in a context such as this, the issue is clearly not one of access to the meaning of the words, regardless of whether the anthem is performed vocally or in sign language. The delivery of a national anthem represents a moment in time when citizens come together and reflect on citizenship and nationhood. When sung collectively at sports or political events, the form rather than the substance of the anthem takes precedence, as has been long debated regarding the bellicose nature of the lyrics of the French anthem.

Thus, when the national anthem is sung at the Super Bowl in and by the entire stadium, the issue is not so much *access* to the meaning of the words as it is the collective participation in the delivery, the coming together of both Deaf and hearing people on an equal footing. In the case of the Super Bowl, the footing is far from equal as the bubble allows neither ASL nor English, and neither the Deaf nor the hearing users of these languages, to fully come together. Although the bubble intends to signify that an equivalent message is being delivered, its very presence confines ASL to an accommodation for Deaf people. Amber Zion is present so that viewers who are "deprived of their hearing" may access the anthem. One would be hard put to deny that this was the perceived result. But to stop at this premise does not allow for a consideration of either the artistic and creative dimensions of the signed performance or the extent of civic engagement afforded to the Deaf community.

Although no surveys or interviews of Super Bowl viewers were conducted, one can presume that many of them believed that Amber

Zion in her bubble was a hearing SLI giving a simultaneous interpretation into ASL of Renee Fleming's sung performance. A further drawback to the bubble is that it leads viewers to conclude that the performance is solely for Deaf viewers; this event could (or should) have been an opportunity to signal to a wide audience that users of ASL and English are on equal footing.

Access in the Performing Arts: The Interpreter on the Sidelines

From the perspective of semiotic theory, from the framework of objects of ethnography, or when examining the representations of sign language more broadly, the *mise en scène* of Amber Zion at the Super Bowl is similar to what we see in the context of the performing arts when SLIs or Deaf actors appear in shows or concerts that are either interpreted or adapted into sign language.

It should first be noted that interpreted or sign-adapted performances differ fundamentally from other performances in terms of the extent of consideration given to sign language in the process of creating a piece. In the cases described later, the sign language component is absent from the initial conception or aims of a performance. The sign language rendition is tacked on at the completion of the creative process as an auxiliary measure that can be added to or subtracted from any given production, analogous to captions for television programming.

In such a corpus, this is the most common *mise en scène* of sign language users on stage, whether SLIs or actors; they occupy a subordinate visual space on the sidelines, even at events that are widely known and anticipated for the interpretations of the show. One such event that received significant buzz was a Wu-Tang Clan concert during the Bonnaroo Festival of June 2013.

For several years the Bonnaroo Festival has called on a team of SLIs who specialize in musical performances. In the aftermath of these interpreted performances, commentators who weigh in on social media invariably resort to the trope that the interpreters steal the show, as was the case in a number of articles about Holly Maniatty, one of these SLIs.¹¹

Ever since this concert, postings and buzz about SLIs at concerts have surfaced regularly on websites in the United States. The ASL rap battle on the set of *Jimmy Kimmel Live!* in April 2014, in which Holly Maniatty took part, garnered close to 2,400,000 views on YouTube.¹² More recently, the final concert of the Grateful Dead at Soldier Field stadium in Chicago in July 2015 made headlines beyond the Deaf world.¹³ These SLIs specialize in the interpretation of musical performances. In the case of theater, where, as stated earlier, the sign language component is absent from the original conception of a piece, the addition of a signer on the sidelines of a performance has come to constitute a means of “access.” In France, the organization Accès Culture annually selects plays to be made accessible this way in Paris and in cities and venues throughout the country.

In the United States, this form of interpreted theater has been well established in New York since the creation of the Hands On organization in 1982. This organization is regularly involved in the provision of interpretation on and off Broadway, in collaboration with partner theaters such as the New Victory Theater and the Roundabout Theatre. Both the New Victory (for children) and the Roundabout on Broadway regularly provide interpreters for most of their shows.

At these performances, the SLIs are positioned as Amber Zion was in the Super Bowl stadium or as SLIs are at concerts. It is accepted—and assumed—that this convention stems from a desire to provide access and in no way diminishes the linguistic creativity that this type of interpretation requires. The mission of Hands On is “[p]roviding accessibility to arts and cultural events for Deaf and hard of hearing communities,”¹⁴ while Accès Culture states that its *raison d’être* is that “culture should be accessible to all.”¹⁵

In performances of this type, the action is center stage while the SLIs are on the sidelines. Having said this, I maintain that the distinction between communication access and a parallel signed “performance” or between the role of the SLI and that of Deaf actors is not that clear-cut.

Accès Culture intentionally makes use of Deaf actors in the interpretation of certain shows. As is the case with SLIs, these Deaf actors undertake a rigorous process of preparation and translation work prior

to a performance. During both rehearsals and performances, the actors develop strategies of coordination and synchronization so that their interpretation aligns with the action on the stage, which they cannot access auditorily.

Hands On is involved in similar work and sometimes uses Deaf actors as interpreters integrated into the team.

Some theater groups or troupes take matters a step further and assign a signer, Deaf or hearing, SLI or actor, in a few different configurations. One configuration that distinguishes itself markedly from the standard *mise en scène* is the integration of sign language and its users into the artistic ensemble. This sharing of the stage takes us beyond communication access. As an integral part of the creative vision, sign language is no longer relegated to the sidelines or to the background.¹⁶ The punk group Brassens's Not Dead¹⁷ includes Delphine Saint Raymond as a full-fledged member of the band in her role as *chan(t)signeuse*, which is the term that has been coined for her type of performance.¹⁸

Some performances, such as *Mon Brassens* by the group *Salé Petit Bonhomme*¹⁹ or *Eaux Vives et Terres Nues* and *Elle a tant* by the theater company *Rayon d'écrits*, integrate sign language directly into the artistic process. Sign language users are not only integral to a project from its inception but also members of the group, company, or ensemble and play a role in shaping the identity and direction of the group, at least during the lifespan of a given production. These productions showcase sign language as a language of artistic expression, not just a means of communication access, and as an art form that is accessible to all audiences—not just Deaf audiences. Sign language users are featured as artists on center stage, not merely as translators of the events on the stage. This shared linguistic space can be found outside the domain of the arts; a look at some examples will allow us to contemplate a broader set of options for the *mise en scène* of sign language in a variety of realms.

Shared Linguistic Space

In October of 2012 Mayor Michael Bloomberg of New York City gave an address to the residents of the metropolis shortly before Hurricane Sandy was about to make landfall. Standing next to him was an American Sign Language interpreter, Lydia Callis. Her “performance”

set off a storm on social media and the blogosphere and was picked up shortly thereafter by online media outlets such as the *New York Times* and the *Huffington Post*.

In the aftermath of this broadcast, which had been viewed by thousands, much of the reaction, discussion, and debate centered largely on this interpreter's facial expressions. The initial mockery of some commentators led to a proliferation of postings on blogs, forums, and comment pages explaining the linguistic function of facial expressions and how they are essential to the semantics of sign languages.

At issue here is not the interpreter's performance, regardless of how effective her work was when judged by professional colleagues and Deaf viewers. What I wish to focus on in the context of this analysis is the *mise en scène* of this interpreter. Setting aside the fact that some people viewed the work of the interpreter as an oddity, let us look at two aspects of this event: first, the fact that this press conference was broadcast to a wide audience and, second, the "stage" and the screen space that were allotted to the interpreter.

On screen we see Lydia Callis standing on a platform next to Mayor Bloomberg. The mayor is standing behind a lectern, and Callis is less than a meter away from him. This positioning allows Deaf members of the audience to have the presenter and the interpreter in the same line of sight, as is common in the logistics of conference interpreting. More important, the sign language user is not relegated to a marginal space such as a bubble or the sidelines. That Callis earned the status of celebrity on a par with the mayor's in the aftermath of these press conferences was almost certainly due in large part to this *mise en scène*.

One cannot help but wonder whether Amber Zion would have made a similar impression on the public had she been standing next to Renée Fleming in the stadium and taking up half of the television screen. My contention is that, aside from whatever wave of reaction might have occurred in such a *mise en scène*, Zion could *not* have gone unnoticed, any more than Lydia Callis had. Instead, as a prisoner of the bubble, she was given the screen treatment that viewers expect and to which they pay little attention.

It is important to note that Lydia Callis was producing a simultaneous interpretation of an official speech, having likely received parts or all of the speech before the event in order to ensure adequate

preparation. I state this to underscore that her interpretation was not in any way an artistic performance. Unlike the case of the national anthem, Callis's presence was a measure to ensure access to the mayor's message. Beauty, creativity, and artistry are not the criteria by which to evaluate her "performance." And yet the *mise en scène* far *surpassed* that found in many arts contexts, such as the aforementioned sidelining of interpreters at concerts and in theaters, as well as Amber Zion at the Super Bowl game.

The creators of The Real Interpreter website²⁰ likewise chose to split the screen space evenly between signed and spoken languages. This website is the creation of a group of interpreters, sponsored by the World Federation of the Deaf, which delivered a post hoc interpretation of the funeral tribute to Nelson Mandela. This was a means of repairing the affront that had been caused by the initial interpretation of the event by an imposter, which led to a heated reaction in the Deaf community.²¹

From Devaluation to Validation of Sign Language

Whether a speaker is the mayor of New York City or president of the United States, the person's distinguished social status is not an obstacle to the construction of a visual image in which equal space is dedicated to the language "doubles" who function as the speaker's "voice" in sign language. What, then, can be the justifications and perceptions of sign language and its users in a *mise en scène* that constrains the language to a bubble at the bottom of the screen?

I think it reasonable to claim that this type of *mise en scène* is distinct from one that I would call egalitarian and that it contributes to the devaluation of sign languages (Garcia and Derycke 2010). The use of the bubble as a means of communication access has long been criticized by Deaf people. It is not unprecedented for television programming that targets Deaf audiences to foreground the signed message, such as in the reporting on *L'Oeil et la Main*²² on France 5. The *mise en scène* used in these productions consists of backgrounding any hearing individual using spoken French, while the signed message is foregrounded. A similar foregrounding of sign language interpretations of the Eurovision finale, which were widely commented on, was seen on a Swedish television chain.²³

Thus, in spite of the fact that the case of the signed national anthem at the Super Bowl was a conflation of access and artistic expression, any distinctions between artistic expression and interpretation, between a creative work and communication access, are not sufficient to justify the choices of *mise en scène*. In other words, the fact that a show or concert has not been uniquely adapted for, or interpreted into, a sign language is not a reason for *not* foregrounding the sign language component.

Whether the context is one of creative expression or interpretation, there are—and could be many more—occasions to give sign language a visual space at least equal to the space allotted to spoken language users. Access would be enhanced, and the status of sign language as a language of expression in and of itself would be promoted.

To take matters a step further, although SLIs typically occupy much of the media space that is given over to sign language, there are precedents for Deaf artists and actors taking on the public face of sign language, such as was the case with Amber Zion or with the actors who perform for Accès Culture. Even when there is a need for an interpretation of a spoken source message, the interpretation can be delivered by a Deaf interpreter. Such a professional role exists in the United States, where Deaf individuals may attain the credential of Certified Deaf Interpreter. This certification is administered by the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, the national association of SLIs in the United States. In the context of an official press conference, for instance, a Deaf interpreter receives a first, “untreated” interpretation of a spoken message delivered by a hearing interpreter, after which the Deaf interpreter restructures the message to a more idiomatic form in order to make it accessible to the majority of Deaf viewers, including those whose language use has few English intrusions. Although the ethics and practice of Deaf interpreters are modeled on those for hearing SLIs (confidentiality, neutrality, faithfulness to the message), the skills they bring to bear approximate those used in the burgeoning profession of Deaf mediator/intervener in France.²⁴ Viewers in the United States came to learn of the profession of Deaf interpreter by way of Jonathan Lamberton, who interpreted a press conference given by Mayor Bill de Blasio of New York City. Even though some people believed this was another instance of a fake interpreter,²⁵ others

accused him of “stealing the show” from the mayor. The recurrence of these two themes leads me to point out the porousness of Internet platforms and the collective memory that develops around media attention on sign language users. On the Internet, the collective memory takes shape by means of the intertextuality in various articles, buzz, and videos. Put another way, beyond the compilation I have made of these texts, the comparison made between these events and their treatment in and by the media constitutes a corpus by virtue of their textual links.

Whether Deaf interpreters are deployed as a means of communication access or creative expression, it is worth underscoring Bill Moody’s position, which is that this deployment allows Deaf people, rather than hearing interpreters, to be the public face of their language.²⁶ Earlier I made the claim that Amber Zion might have been mistaken for an SLI instead of a performer, imprisoned as she was in the traditional interpreter bubble. Conversely, as laudable as it was to see Jonathan Lamberton on fully half of the television screen, he made it clear that his work was in no way a performance; he was employed to ensure communication access for the widest possible audience of Deaf viewers.²⁷ Thus the *mise en scène* of sign language in the arts and the media is far more than a matter of esthetics. At issue are the terms of social engagement afforded to Deaf people through their roles as artists, actors, interpreters, and viewers.

Toward a Norm of Bilingual Communication?

As we move forward in the twenty-first century, more than fifty years after the pioneering work of William Stokoe (Stokoe 1960) and close to forty years after the initiation of the *réveil sourd*²⁸ movement in France (Kerbouc’h 2012; Minguy 2009), the presence of sign language on our screens can no longer be the only measure of social progress or increased social engagement on the part of Deaf people.

From the interpreter bubble to shared screen space, from communication access for a minority with a “handicap” to validation of a minority language and its users, the presence of sign language is a social reality, but its framing is varied. It is the variety in the framing of these different representations of sign language and its users that I have sought to lay out and examine here.

What we do about—and to—sign language and its users in the media and on stage is not merely a reflection of how Deaf people are treated in society. What we do about and to sign language is an implementation, an enactment of a society's perceptions and values. Even though the provision of sign language interpretation is surely less and less radical, it is still possible to claim that “[although] interpreters are not surrogates for Deaf people, the way in which a society views the interpreting profession is wholly dependent on its political view of Deaf people” (Quipourt and Gache 2003, 109). What, then, can we say about the status of Deaf people who appear on our screens and stages?

In the world of the arts, older notions of doing *for* Deaf people have largely been discarded in favor of projects in collaboration *with* Deaf people and *for* the benefit of *all* audiences (Schmitt and Schmitt 2011). Allowing non-Deaf decision makers to restrict the representations of sign language in the media not only is risky but also falls far short of the aspirations toward democracy and citizenship extolled in France²⁹ and in the United States. And yet restricted perceptions of sign languages are reinforced every time they are represented primarily—or solely—as a matter of access on screen and stage.

This exposition and analysis of the corpus of “texts” surrounding Amber Zion, Jonathan Lamberton, and Lydia Callis lead to the following observations for reflection and future practice. As far as users of sign language are concerned, I submit that true political and linguistic equality—or should we say equity—will remain precarious, if not illusory, as long as sign languages remain relegated to the background or to the margins in the conception and production of any *mise en scène* in the media.

We have models for shared public discourse space, in which Deaf people are not only the recipients and beneficiaries of communication access laws but also the agents of the *mise en scène* of their language. These exemplars demonstrate creatively and convincingly what can be gained when there is greater Deaf participation in the social sphere. From the inauguration of the *Metling Signes* association in Bordeaux, France,³⁰ to the world-renowned bilingual SignMark hip-hop videos,³¹ when Deaf people have a say and are able to address all audiences, what we see emerge are norms for bilingual communication. In these norms neither language is merely an interpretation

of the other. Instead, signed and spoken languages are presented and captioned, sometimes in very creative ways, such that all participants are able to express themselves fully in a shared discourse.

In comparing the representations of sign language in various contexts, my goal was to investigate the place of this minority language within its social contexts. The frame of ethnography, which insists on describing only *observable* practices in all their diversity, allows the building of the sociolinguistics of sign language when no reified distinction exists between Deaf and hearing people *prior* to analysis. Building a frame that distinguishes but does not separate signed and vocal languages and their users, deaf and hearing, is what is at stake in an exploration of contemporary *mises en scène* of sign languages, where all of the participants have to play their part.

Notes

1. Translator's note: The original French term "*mise en scène*" is used frequently in this article to accurately convey the author's meaning.

2. In examining the positioning of sign language in the media, this article raises issues of language policy and the status of languages. Although much of the discussion is about sign language interpreters, including Deaf interpreters, the analysis presented here goes beyond the scope generally seen in recent interpreting studies. These have dealt primarily with the theory and practice of interpretation (Janzen 2005; Napier, McKee, and Goswell 2006), interpreter education (Marschark, Peterson, and Winston 2005), international research in the field (Nicodemus and Cagle 2015), or conceptual approaches that inform professional practice, such as when considering the issue of interpreter neutrality (Metzger 1999). Because interpreters are frequently the *de facto* public face of sign language, the analysis proposed here verges on a study of interpreters. But in the application of a theoretical treatment of sign language in the arts and the media as an ethnographic "object," interpreters end up occupying a prominent position in this research not due to any *a priori* sociolinguistic distinction on my part but because of the fact that they happen to be using sign language. My goal is to describe the linkages, the complementarities, and the tensions between the roles of interpreters and Deaf individuals when sign languages receive media attention.

3. The "bubble" referred to here is the oval space located at the bottom right of the screen, within which a sign language interpreter appears during televised broadcasts. Television viewers in France are very familiar with this

mise en scène when viewing debates of the National Assembly. The physical borders of the bubble may sometimes be rectangular rather than oval; however, the term “bubble” is maintained regardless of the actual shape of the space.

4. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_national_anthem_performers_at_the_Super_Bowl.

5. Maucere’s performance may be found on the YouTube channel of the National Association of the Deaf (NAD): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F0Yi_0DOgHE, where the following notice is posted:

Additionally, for those viewers wanting to watch the signing of the National Anthem and America the Beautiful prior to the kick-off, CBSSports.com will offer a camera angle titled “Fan Choice,” whereby actor John Maucere will perform these iconic songs in American Sign Language. (<https://www.nad.org/2013/02/02/nad-nfl-cbs-rally-to-improve-the-super-bowl-experience/>)

Two years later, NBC Sports, in partnership with the NAD, offered a similar service:

In partnership with the National Association of the Deaf (NAD), NBC Sports will provide on its website a dedicated camera feed showing the ASL performance of the National Anthem and America the Beautiful by deaf actress Treshelle Edmond at Super Bowl XLIX on February 1st!

In both of these instances, the broadcasting decision did not default to a full airing of the performance; rather, the camera angle was available only if viewed on specific websites.

6. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wm5nc-zBdUE>.

7. Renée Fleming is an American opera singer and the winner of multiple Grammy Awards; see https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ren%C3%A9e_Fleming. In general, artists who are chosen to sing the American national anthem at Super Bowl games are icons of American song, whether classical or contemporary, such as Aretha Franklin or Beyoncé Knowles.

8. In a recent anthology of poems in sign language, the editors said this of the poems that were translated by interpreters: “The interpreters, as is their professional practice, are interpreting simultaneously . . . It goes without saying that the translations are prepared in advance because an impromptu translation of poetic text is difficult even to contemplate” (Baumie 2015).

9. Two versions of the American national anthem are presented in *Signing the Body Poetic* (Bauman, Nelson, and Rose 2006).

10. A group of Deaf individuals from Marseille performed a translation of the anthem in June 2004 at the inauguration of the Bibliothèque de l’Alcazar. Their process for creating the translation was documented and published (Brahic 2008). On June 15, 2005, a group of Deaf individuals from Paris, including Emmanuelle Laborit, “sang” the national anthem in sign

language under the Arc de Triomphe. In April 2008 a screening event at the centre Pompidou showcased their effort: <https://www.centrepompidou.fr/cpv/resource/cMdAy9k/rRkexo>. Note that the subject of the documentary was citizenship rather than access.

11. See the interview with Holly Maniatty in *VICE* magazine: https://noisey.vice.com/en_au/article/rzy496/meet-holly-that-awesome-wu-tang-asl-interpreter-from-bonnaroo. This magazine also included an article on the association Deaf Raves in London.

12. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/video/news/video-1090107/Sign-language-rap-battle-Jimmy-Kimmel-Live.html>.

13. For example, it has been mentioned on pages affiliated with the *Wall Street Journal*: <http://blogs.wsj.com/speakeasy/2015/07/08/deafheads-marked-a-milestone-of-their-own-at-final-grateful-dead-shows/>. In the accompanying picture, we see Paddy Ladd, an important Deaf studies researcher, who toured with the band. He also contributed to the creation of the Glastonbury Deaf Zone, which welcomes Deaf artists such as Deaf Rave. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paddy_Ladd; <http://www.deafrave.com/>.

14. <http://handson.org/aboutus>.

15. <http://www.accessculture.org/>. The organization also specializes in captioning and audio description.

16. In the realm of American theater, since *Spring Awakening* on Broadway from Deaf West Theatre and *Tribes* by Nina Raine at the Royal Court Theatre in London and then in New York at the Barrow Street Theatre, many Deaf actors have been hired to play these Deaf parts in regional theaters throughout the United States. Even regional theaters are casting Deaf actors in roles written for hearing actors, and transforming the characters into Deaf characters (e.g., *Fiddler on the Roof* in Oklahoma; *The Healing off-Broadway*). After the NYC Deaf community outrage when a hearing actor was cast as the Deaf character in *The Heart is a Lonely Hunter*, the Arkansas Repertory Company hired two Deaf actors from New York for its production of the same play. *I Was Most Alive with You* (Huntington Theatre, Boston) also had a Deaf character and another signing hearing character. And mainstream movies are re-discovering Deaf actors: LA Deaf actor CJ Jones had a juicy role in the Hollywood feature *Baby Driver*, and is slated for a new movie soon, and young Deaf actress Millicent Simmonds was a smash at Cannes in Todd Haynes's movie *Wonderstruck*. I would like to thank Bill Moody, who provided this information and pointed out this recent renaissance of Deaf actors in the United States.

17. https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Brassen's_not_Dead; <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7PiV5BT-j3o>.

18. The term is used to let audiences know what they can expect to see in the show, using the term *chanSon et chanSigne* (Translator's note: The first of these italicized words is a play on the two syllables of the word *chanson*

[song]. By capitalizing the first letter of the syllable *-Son*, the syllable becomes the French word for “sound”; the word *chanSigne* creates a comparative term to describe a performance in which songs are signed.) Notable shows of this type are *Elle a tant* by Colombe Barsacq and Isabelle Voizeux (<http://www.rayondecrits.fr/creations/elle-a-tant>). Elix, an online dictionary for the Langue des signes française, includes an entry for *chanSigne*: https://www.elix-lst.fr/spip.php?page=signes&id_article=229155&lang=fr. (Translator’s note: This dictionary has a different spelling for this word: *chantsigne*.) The articulation of *chantsigne* uses the handshape and movement of *chanson* but shifts the location of the sign from the mouth to the palm of the nondominant hand. Other signs in the LSF lexicon distinguish spoken and signed forms of language, such as the word for “language” itself. The articulatory location of these language-oriented signs specifies the modality of linguistic expression, giving a “voice” to Deaf people, one that is both similar to, yet distinct from, the voice of hearing people.

19. <http://www.sale-petit-bonhomme.com/mon-brassens>.

20. <http://www.realinterpreter.com/about.html>; <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-lfHqYgGs6c>.

21. CNN invited Marlee Matlin to respond: <http://edition.cnn.com/videos/us/2013/12/12/ebof-intv-matlin-mandela-interpreter.cnn>. Likewise, the Deafness Cognition and Language Research Center, organizer of the 2011 conference on Theoretical Issues in Sign Language Research at University College in London, issued a public response about the “fake interpreter.” https://www.ucl.ac.uk/dcal/dcal-news/Mandela_Interpreter.

22. Translation: “The Eye and The Hand.”

23. <http://www.theguardian.com/tv-and-radio/video/2015/mar/16/tommy-krangh-sign-language-eurovision-sweden-video>; <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/newsvideo/viral-video/11475672/Swedish-sign-language-interpreter-steals-show-on-live-TV-singing-competition.html>. Here, too, this interpreter was said to “steal the show.”

24. See the diplomas offered by the University of Aix-Marseille and University Paris 8, as well as the description of a colloquium on this topic at the website of the French Ministry of Health: <http://docplayer.fr/919318-Sourds-et-sante-la-mediation-dans-tous-ses-etats.html>; <https://allsh.univ-amu.fr/licence-pro-T3S> (see the licensing information for health and social work mediators and interveners); <http://www.fp.univ-paris8.org/Mediateur-relais-sourd-entendant?fduree=6&fclass=8&fopen=9>

25. <https://twitter.com/marleematlin/status/526546689629229056>.

26. Commentary by Bill Moody on his Facebook page, which was followed by many Deaf and hearing individuals, American and French, in the Deaf world.

27. “[People who] talk about me ‘stealing the show’ . . . I’m happy people enjoy the ‘show,’ but I’m not there for that,” he writes. “I’m there so a wider

range of the deaf community can better follow the information.” <http://www.villagevoice.com/news/heres-how-mayor-bill-de-blasios-expressive-sign-language-interpreter-got-the-job-6715526>.

28. Translation: Deaf awakening.

29. See French law no. 2005-102 of February 11, 2005, on equal rights and opportunity, participation, and citizenship of persons with handicaps. <http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000000809647>.

30. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JlFXVt5Dnec>.

31. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oUtM8_DOVUI.

References

- Bauman, H-D., J. Nelson, and H. Rose, eds. 2006. *Signing the Body Poetic: Essays on American Sign Language Literature*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Baumie, B., ed. 2015. *Les mains fertiles: 50 poètes en langue des signes*. Paris: Éditions Bruno Doucey.
- Brahic, B. 2008. *Signer la Marseillaise*. Marseille: Images en manœuvres/ Association CAS 13.
- Garcia, B., and M. Derycke. 2010. Introduction. *Sourds et langue des signes: Norme et variation. Langue et société* 131: 5–17.
- Janzen, T. (ed.). 2005. *Topics in Signed Language Interpreting: Theory and Practice*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Kerbouc’h, S. 2012. *Le mouvement sourd: D’hier à aujourd’hui (1970–2006). De la langue des signes française à la reconnaissance sociale des sourds*. Paris: L’Harmattan.
- Marschark, M., R. Peterson, and E. A. Winston, eds. 2005. *Sign Language Interpreting and Interpreter Education: Directions for Research and Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Metzger, M. 1999. *Sign Language Interpreting: Deconstructing the Myth of Neutrality*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Minguy, A. 2009. *Le réveil Sourd en France: Pour une perspective bilingue*. Paris: L’Harmattan.
- Napier, J., R. McKee, and D. Goswell. 2006. *Sign Language Interpreting: Theory and Practice in Australia and New Zealand*. Annandale NSW, Australia: Federation Press.
- Nicodemus, B., and K. Cagle, eds. 2015. *Signed Language Interpretation and Translation Research: Selected Papers from the First International Symposium*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Quipour, C., and P. Gache. 2003. Interpréter en langue des signes: Un acte militant? *Langue française* 137: 105–13.

- Schmitt, F., and P. Schmitt. 2011. Art, politique et langue des signes. *Inter, Art actuel* 108: 52–55.
- Stokoe, W. C. 1960. Sign Language Structure: An Outline of the Visual Communication Systems of the American Deaf. *Studies in Linguistics, Occasional Papers* 8: 3–78. Buffalo: Department of Anthropology and Linguistics, University of Buffalo.