So, Why Do I Call This English?

Bruce A. Sofinski

For the last thirty years, the terms *interpreting* and *transliterating* have been used to identify two disciplines common to assessment and education within the broader field of sign language interpreting (Solow 1981; Frishberg 1990). Historically, the various definitions of sign language interpreting have included working between the languages of (spoken) English and American Sign Language, or ASL (Solow 1981; Colonomos 1992; Frishberg 1990; Stewart, Schein, and Cartwright 1998; Solow 2001; RID 2001). Until relatively recently, the various published definitions of transliterating have agreed that the practitioner works between spoken English and some form of manually coded English, or MCE (Solow 1981; Frishberg 1990). Although more recent definitions of transliterating have expanded that definition to include various elements of English and ASL, most definitions continue to posit that transliteration is a "word-for-sign" representation of English using manual communication in "English order" (Stewart, Schein, and Cartwright 1998; Solow 2001; Kelly 2001).

Anecdotal accounts by many students, certified interpreters, and interpreter educators indicate that, although this latter definition of transliteration is representative of the literature in the field, it does not accurately describe what many competent transliterators do. In other words, while many consumers prefer and many situations lend themselves to a more word-for-sign or literal rendition of the spoken English source message, many other consumers and situations still call for a product that many peo-

This chapter was initiated as an independent study in the spring of 2000 as part of my graduate studies in linguistics at Gallaudet University. I thank Robert E. Johnson for his guidance and for his willingness to share his insight on ASL and his passion for the study of language. I also express my sincere appreciation to Ceil Lucas for all of the times she has gone to bat for me. Special thanks to Melanie Metzger, Scott Liddell, Nancy Yesbeck, and Laura Sanheim for our illuminating discussions with respect to various topics included in this chapter.

To my loving wife, Elaine, and my children—Jacob, Eliza, and Nicholas—I love you all very much. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to do something that I love.

ple would identify as more English-like, yet not a word-for-sign rendition. Although these products often follow the ordering of constituents that are common in English (e.g., subject-verb-object), they do not necessarily follow the order of elements contained in the spoken English source message. Additionally, except for instances where a literal conveyance is critical (e.g., proper names, titles), many competent transliterators (i.e., those who possess an RID Certificate of Transliteration) do not necessarily provide a literal rendition that provides a word-for-sign product mirroring the spoken source.

As the field of interpreting continues to mature, the literature is slowly moving away from a nearly absolute dependence on anecdotal accounts or personal theory to define interpreting and moving toward definitions that include more instances of scientific, empirically based descriptions and analyses. For interpreting, this trend has involved using various studies of ASL, including linguistic and sociolinguistic analyses, to describe the target for a sign language transliterator. The trend has also involved examining the product of the practitioner and the elements and strategies that he or she uses to work between English and ASL (Winston 1989; Siple 1993; Sofinski, Yesbeck, Gerhold, and Bach-Hansen 2001). Over the course of time, this in-depth examination of ASL has led to studies investigating instances of naturally occurring phenomena such as Pidgin Signed English, or PSE (Woodward 1973), also referred to as contact signing (Lucas and Valli 1992), including the identification of elements of English and ASL recurring in the data.

In contrast, the linguistic examination of an individual actually using one of these codes of manual communication designed to represent English has been lacking. Instead, the corpus of literature that presently exists largely comprises the published descriptions of the systems by the inventors of particular code: Seeing Essential English, or SEE 1 (Anthony 1971), Signing Exact English, or SEE 2 (Gustason, Pfetzing, and Zawolkow 1975), Linguistics of Visual English, or LOVE (Wampler 1971), and Signed English (Bornstein 1983).

In Padden's (1998) description of the ASL lexicon, she suggests that linguists have typically selected signs in their analysis of ASL grammatical structure that are considered to be native, relegating by default all other vocabulary to be considered part of "Sign English" (also expressed by others as "Signed English"). The result of this practice is the ill-defined linguistic description of "Sign English," which instead, has been debated more in terms of ideology than its component structural properties.

The present study is the linguistic examination of a sign language narrative, "How I met My Husband," that uses the elements described as contact signing (see appendix A for the full English translation). The selection of the narrative was based on several factors, including the narrative author's description of it as being "more English with a mix of ASL" (Personal communication, Beverly Bailey in a letter to Sofinski, September 2001) and the background of the signer (a deaf adult who attended a residential school for the deaf for thirteen consecutive years and married a deaf spouse, both of whom use this type of "sign language" as their primary mode of communication). The goal is to provide a detailed account of selected language elements used by a specific consumer who typically prefers sign language transliteration, as opposed to interpretation.

THE HISTORY OF INTERPRETING

Although the impetus of what was to become the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, Inc. (RID), the first organization to represent sign language interpreters in America, can be traced to a 1964 meeting at Ball State University, in Muncie, Indiana, people had been acting in the role of sign language interpreter in America for at least 150 years before then. These individuals had little if any training (no formal sign language interpreter training programs existed before RID); they were largely children of deaf adults (CODAs) or professionals, most notably, educators and counselors who worked in other fields providing services to individuals using sign language. Between the time of the Ball State conference and the first national sign language interpreter evaluation in 1972, the professional service delivery of sign language interpreting was recognized in law (Stewart, Schein, and Cartwright 1998).

The Difference between Interpreting and Transliterating

In 1972, the RID evaluation system formalized the notion of two disciplines within sign language interpreting—interpreting and transliterating. Interpreters work between ASL and spoken English whereas transliterators work between spoken English and English-based signing (RID 2001).

The Continuum

To better understand what is meant by English-based signing within the paradigm of manual communication, one must understand a prevailing theory of the last 30 years—the continuum. First posited in the 1970s, this concept of a continuum represented a range with ASL and English at polar ends. Throughout the 1980s, several publications outlined this concept, placing PSE, or contact signing, in the middle of the range. Baker-Shenk and Cokely called the concept the "bilingual continuum" (1980, 74) or the "ASL-English continuum" (77); Solow (1981, 2001) identifies this idea as the "Communication Continuum" (1981, 12; 2001, 16). In discussing language competencies necessary for interpreters, Frishberg (1990) stated that interpreters "must also have excellent sign language skills, including a range of variation from American Sign Language through a multitude of ways of incorporating English into a visual-gestural code" (26).

AMERICAN SIGN LANGUAGE (ASL)

In the description of this continuum theory, ASL is a naturally occurring language with a history, syntax, and grammatical structure separate and distinct from English. ASL is found primarily in the United States and Canada, and it "is a defining characteristic of the American Deaf community" (Moores 1994, 190). A critical mass of literature describes ASL, the community that uses this language, and the culture of this community (Stokoe, Casterline, and Croneberg 1965; Klima and Bellugi 1979; Liddell 1980; Padden and Humphries 1988; Smith, Lentz, and Mikos 1988; Rutherford 1993).

FORMS OF MANUALLY CODED ENGLISH (MCES)

At the other end of the continuum is English (i.e., the spoken variety that is commonly used in much of the United States and Canada). Placed in close proximity to English on the continuum are the MCEs. During the 1960s, an influx of federal funds promoting the development of methods intended to increase the effectiveness of teaching English to deaf children spurred the development of various MCE systems (Moores 1994). The four most widely documented efforts are Seeing Essential English (SEE 1), Signing Exact English (SEE 2), Linguistics of Visual English (LOVE), and Signed English (Bornstein 1973). Baker-Shenk and Cokely (1980) posit that these systems are codes, and as codes, linguists argue that they will

never be able to adequately convey or completely represent the English language.

CONTACT SIGNING, OR PIDGIN SIGNED ENGLISH (PSE)

The area of the continuum between ASL and English is labeled with terms indicating a mixture of ASL and English elements. These terms include "contact variety" (Solow 2001) and "pidgin signed English" (Baker-Shenk and Cokely 1980).

PSE is a term coined in the early 1970s (Woodward 1973) and has been commonly used to refer to a natural phenomenon that occurs when two or more individuals who are bilingual and who possess varying levels of facility in both English and ASL communicate with one another. Lucas and Valli (1992) found that this phenomenon is more appropriately characterized in linguistic terms as language contact or contact signing because "contact signing is a third system resulting from the contact between ASL and English and consisting of features from both languages" (104). In addition to being naturally occurring, contact signing varies from artificially invented MCEs in two other important ways: (a) it is not intended to represent the structure of English, and (b) it is not linguistically prescriptive but, rather, is descriptive in that the incorporation of specific English and ASL features vary by individual use, depending on the situation and context (Baker-Shenk and Cokely 1980).

Lucas and Valli (1992) provide a list of English and ASL features occurring in contact signing that were identified in their data. These English elements include conjunctions (e.g., but, because); prepositions; verb with prepositions; invented morphemes (e.g., #ING, IT, I); mouthing of English words; English word order; and unusual initialization (e.g., R-elatives). Some ASL elements that were identified include nonmanual negation, gaze, pronouns, ASL word order, rhetorical question, lexical signs with no mouthing, locative verbs, and role shifting.

What was found in the corpus of Lucas and Valli's (1992) data was equally as critical to their work as what was not contained: "For example, even though some individuals use more ASL features than other individuals, we see very few examples of important ASL nonmanual syntactic markers such as occur with topicalization (with the accompanying word order)" (105). The accompanying word order that is alluded to is object-subject-verb, which requires accompanying nonmanual signals for the sentence to be grammatically acceptable in ASL (Liddell 1980).

Lucas and Valli (1992) used a judging system in which individuals with an extensive background in linguistics, called master judges, were asked to label twenty clips of discourse from the data as being "ASL" or "not ASL." Independently, a group of thirty people "who were Deaf ASL users who had learned ASL natively or at a very early age" (69) were asked to judge the same twenty clips in the same way. Five of these clips, judged as ASL by the master judges, were judged as "not ASL" by the majority of the Deaf ASL users. Four of these five clips share two important ASL features even though the overall structure was contact signing. "We suggest that establishment of topic and use of body shifting and eye gaze are salient ASL features that carry a lot of weight, even if the overall structure of a clip cannot be said to be ASL" (103).

Channels

A channel is any distinct mechanism for producing information important for accurate communication to occur. Various channels are used in communication (Davis 1989). For example, both the mouth (oral) and the ear (aural) channels are critical in communication using spoken English. In ASL, the mouth (oral) and hand (manual) channels are used to communicate.

ASL AND ENGLISH FEATURES FOUND IN THE MOUTH CHANNEL

In Davis's (1989) investigation of language contact phenomena in ASL interpretation, occurrences in the mouth channel was one area of focus in which he identified three different features. First, "full English mouthing" is the complete "pronunciation" of an English word, generally without voice. In contrast, the second feature, "reduced English mouthing," is the partial pronunciation of an English word, still without voice. Finally, "lexicalized mouthing" is the severely reduced mouthing of an English word that accompanies an ASL sign.

Similar to Davis's "lexical mouthing" is the concept of "word pictures" found in Sign Language of the Netherlands (SLN) (Schermer 1990). As described in Johnson (1994), "word pictures" are actually features of ASL that are influenced by English mouthing.

> These facial gestures . . . are to be distinguished from attempts to gloss each sign with an exact English mouth movement . . . Some word pic-

> tures, such as the facial movement accompanying HAVE or that accompany LARGE, are linked strongly to specific lexical signs and occur almost invariantly, while other seems to be more variable in their occurrence. (13)

Adverbials are another mouth channel feature noted in the literature. These mouth movements are a basic element of ASL and provide information similar in function to English adverbs (Baker-Shenk and Cokely 1980).

ASL AND ENGLISH FEATURES FOUND IN THE HAND CHANNEL

Handshape, location, and movement were the three parameters of ASL signs identified by Stokoe, Casterline, and Croneberg (1965). In addition, palm orientation is a fourth manual parameter of ASL lexical items.

Padden (1998) provides examples of vocabulary in the ASL lexicon. In this description, native vocabulary notably includes classifier structures, plain and agreement verbs, adjectival predicates, and the pronominal system. However, Padden's description further illuminates the occurrence of foreign vocabulary in ASL. Padden posits that loan signs (Battison 1978), name signs, sign-fingerspell compounds, and sets of initialized signs (e.g., signs representing the seven days of the week, signs for colors) all share a common origin in the American fingerspelling system.

Although English features per se do not occur in the manual channel, gestural, or extralinguistic, features are important to communication by people who use spoken English. In addition, occurrences of "English influence," such as Padden's foreign vocabulary, are found in the hand channel.

In spoken English, gestures frequently co-occur with speech to provide more precise information (Scott Liddell, February 2000, personal communication). For example, pointing in the specific direction of an item that can be seen in the immediate surroundings while simultaneously saying "I want that one!" identifies the precise item that is the object of the speaker's desire.

English influence in the hand channel of a contact signing product can also be seen in other forms, including (a) syntactical influence in word order (especially when "full English mouthing" co-occurs in the mouth channel) and (b) influence during particular events in fingerspelling when there is an intentional representation of English orthography using ASL signs (Davis 1989).

Borrowing, Codeswitching, and Code-Mixing

Borrowing occurs between the phonological systems of two languages. In contrast, lexical initialization is an example of ASL morphemes being used to represent an English orthographic event (Davis 1989 in Lucas and Valli 1992).

Codeswitching is a term used when bilinguals literally change from one language to another during a conversation. During contact signing, codeswitching would necessitate one who is signing to stop signing and begin speaking. This phenomenon generally occurs intersententially. In contrast, code-mixing occurs when elements of both languages coming into contact are produced simultaneously. Code-mixing can also apply when the "shifting" between the languages occurs intrasententially (Lucas and Valli 1992).

Borrowing, codeswitching, and code-mixing are all terms that have been used to describe contact between ASL and English. These are important concepts to consider when discussing the existence of English in a manual form rather than English in a form that is spoken or represented orthographically.

METHODOLOGY

Selection of Narrative

The narrative selected for analysis is a signed narrative that is two minutes and twelve seconds long—one that was predominantly viewed as "more English-like" by competent, working sign language interpreters and interpreter educators who viewed the selection. This narrative is demonstrative of the type of English-like signing that is used by many consumers of sign language transliteration services.

About the Signer and Addressee

The signer, whom I shall call Mary, was born and raised in the suburbs of Philadelphia where she matriculated at the Pennsylvania School for the Deaf (PSD) in Mt. Airy. Mary entered PSD at the age of five and lived in the PSD dorms for the next thirteen years until her graduation. When asked where she grew up, Mary stated, "In dorm all my life . . . (from 1945–1957)."

The communication mode for Mary's experience is consistent with other accounts of the time. In class, the use of any type of manual communication or gesture was forbidden, and only speech was allowed. Outside of class, Mary used "ASL" everywhere else.

Mary was born deaf, the cause of the deafness being unknown. She characterized her own use of sign language while at PSD as "home sign and ASL . . . before [I] got older." Mary describes her use of sign language as an adult to be "ASL and English mix together." She illustrated the difference between English and ASL, explaining that English is "I will go to the store" whereas ASL is "Go to store."

Despite the fact that her hearing mother has lived with her for some time now, her parents never learned to sign. Her husband is deaf and uses a similar, English-like sign language as his primary mode of communication. Her three hearing children all sign to varying degrees, but Mary said they all sign "well enough to communicate on any subject." Mary is an active member of the Deaf community in her local area, a community in central Virginia where she has lived for more than forty years.

At the time of the taping, Mary was in her "late fifties." Her audience was a hearing man in his early thirties. Mary had known the addressee professionally and socially for approximately ten years. The addressee is fluent in ASL, being a nationally certified sign language interpreter (RID, Certificate of Interpretation [CI] and the Certificate of Transliteration [CT]) and having received an Advanced Plus rating on the Gallaudet University Sign Communication Proficiency Interview (SCPI) at about the time of the taping. Both Mary and the addressee consider each other to be friends. The story analyzed is typical of the type of signing Mary uses when regularly communicating with the addressee.

Procedure

The focus of the linguistic analysis of this product was narrowed to two channels: the hands (or manual channel) and the mouth (or oral channel). The features identified through an analysis of the manual and oral channels were charted and synchronously matched with each other; with the establishment of areas of space to be used as referents, which Liddell (1995) called tokens and surrogates; and with accompanying nonmanual signals (NMS) found in the following channels: head (tilt, turn, nod, and shake), eyebrow (raised, lowered), eye (actions of lid and pupil), and upper torso (including shoulders). The use of these two channels in this

product was scripted using glossing and other conventions (Smith, Lentz, and Mikos 1988). Then, the instances and frequencies of occurrences within the oral and manual channels were noted and tabulated.

RESULTS

Examples of ASL and English Features in Contact Signing

Using the same characteristics as identified in segments of contact signing by Lucas and Valli (1992, 101–2), the analysis of this segment revealed that occurrences supporting a proportion of eight out of twelve of the English features and nine out of fourteen of the ASL features were identified. Examples of English features include the following: seven instances of conjunctions (but, and, because), including one without sign support (or); sixteen occurrences of prepositions (in, to, until, for, with); three instances of a verb with preposition ("go to school"); three instances of invented morphemes (I, #WAS); mouthing of English words (see section below); English word order, collocation ("go with another boy . . . date"); one instance of comparison ("like him better"); and three examples of unusual initialization (A-rea, V-ery, E-D-ucation).

Simultaneous Mixing of English and ASL Features

Perhaps the phenomenon in this analysis more striking than simply the occurrence of code-mixing is the preponderance of examples where an ASL feature and an English feature occur simultaneously in different channels of this product. This preponderance is striking in that most descriptions of contact signing portray a "switch" from ASL to English. In this case, the contact signing involves not a switch but, rather, features of both languages co-occurring, or mixing. This mixing can be seen in figures 1–9. Figure 1 provides a more detailed example with a description of the various English and ASL features that are found to be mixing, or co-occurring, in the segment.

In figure 1, one can see the following: (a) an example of a "dropped" subject (an ASL language feature); (b) an instance of a preposition (*to,* TO) co-occurring in both the mouth and manual channels; and (c) an instance of a past-tense verb (*went*), an English feature, co-occurring with the ASL

NMS-Head:					
NMS-Eyebrow:	*A* →		*gz*-{SH}		*A* →
NMS-Torso:					
Mouth:	went	to	school	Mount Airy	
Manual:	GO TO##[SCHOOL]	TO	SCHOOL	M-T	A-I-R-Y

English Translation: (grew up in Pennsylvania.) *I went to school in Mt. Airy.*
Note: Mt. Airy is an Eastern suburb of Philadelphia.

FIGURE 1. *An example of code-mixing*

verb GO-TO, which is locatively influenced by the token [SCHOOL], both ASL features (GO-TO##[SCHOOL]).

However, the simultaneous production of English and ASL elements is not limited to this example. In fact, this type of phenomenon occurs abundantly in these data. For a clearer description of the use of English words and ASL features in the product, several segments of the synchronous gloss transcription are included in figure 1.

Mouth Channel Features

FOUR MOUTH MOVEMENT FEATURES CO-OCCURRING WITH SIGN SUPPORT

The mouth channel was descriptively analyzed for its use of four distinct features: full English mouthing, reduced English mouthing, lexicalized mouthing, and adverbials. In every instance, these four features were coproduced with an occurrence in the manual channel.

Of the 174 lexical items that were manually produced, 150 (or 86.21 percent) were produced with full English mouthing simultaneously occurring through the mouth channel. These mouthed English items included the following (see table 1 as well as figures 2 and 3): (a) ten occurrences of past-tense verbs (went, grew, met, was, told); (b) two instances where two English words occurred synchronously with a single ASL sign (*grew up,* RAISE and *don't care,* DON'T-MIND); and (c) nine instances of English pronouns being mouthed over PRO.X or POSS.X signs (*his* mouthed over POSS.3-WREN, *I* mouthed over PRO.1, *him* mouthed over PRO.3, and *me* mouthed over PRO.1).

TABLE 1. *Mouth Channel Features Co-Occurring with Signs in Hand Channel*

Mouth Channel Feature	Occurrences Identified Out of 174 Items	Percentage
Full English mouthing	150	86.21
Reduced English mouthing	7	4.02
Lexical mouthing/word pictures	6	3.45
Adverbials	4	2.3
None discerned	7	4.02
Total	174	100.00

SIGN SPACE *2–3*

(WREN) [SCHOOL]	NMS-Head				
	Eye/Brow:	***A*** →			
	Torso:	{shift away from (WREN)}			
	Mouth:	senior	I	was	freshman
	Manual:	SENIOR	PRO.1	#WAS	F-R-E-S-H-M-A-N

▲

English Translation: (My husband Wren was a) *senior; I was a freshman!*

FIGURE 2. *Example showing the mouthing of English words, an ASL pronoun, and the use of nonmanuals*

NMS-Head:				
NMS-Eye/Brow:	***A*** →	**(ec/gz)*	*gz-(wren)*	**(ec/gz)*
NMS-Torso:				

Mouth:	[meet]	@ there		[sweetheart]
Manual:	MEET##[SCHOOL]	@	*	GO-STEADY

English Translation: *We met at school, and we "went steady."*

FIGURE 3. *Example showing reduced English mouthing, gaze, and "dropped" subject and object*

SIGN SPACE *1–4*

(WREN) [SCHOOL]	NMS-Head:		(lean forward) pos
	NMS-Eye/Brow:	*	(*gz*) ***A*** →
	NMS-Torso:		
	Mouth:	* I met	Wren
	Manual:	* @ MEET	W-R-E-N
		*	WH: THERE-[SCHOOL]

▲

English Translation: (I grew up at school.) *I met Wren there.*

FIGURE 4. *Example of "dropped" subject in the manual channel*

USE OF FULL ENGLISH MOUTHING WITHOUT SIGN SUPPORT

A fifth feature, full English mouthing without sign support, also was noted in the product (see figure 4). Seven instances of full English mouthing without sign support were noted. These mouthed English items included the following: (a) two subjects (it, that); (b) four verbs, including one infinitive (to) and two copulas (was, 's); and (c) one conjunction (or).

Manual Channel

GRAMMATICAL CATEGORIES OF SIGNS

The manual channel was analyzed for instances of grammatical use: category, function, and order of grammatical constituents. Also, several instances of foreign vocabulary in ASL (Padden 1998) were also noted, including three instances of lexicalized pronouns (#HE, #HIM) and four occurrences of invented morphemes (Lucas and Valli 1992), which included two instances of lexicalized copulas (#WAS) and two instances of initialized pronouns (I).

In addition, several instances of ASL features were noted, including ASL word order (see figure 6) and eight occurrences where the subject of a sentence was "dropped," or not represented by a lexical item in the manual channel (as contained in figure 4).

EVIDENCE OF SALIENT ASL FEATURES

Lucas and Valli (1992) identified that four segments were contained within their study that were considered to be "ASL" by the master judges, even though the overall structure of each segment was contact signing, but

NMS-Head:	*tl*-forward *tl*-forward		*ht*-right, left, right			*tl*-forward	
					ht-side to side		
Eye/Brow:	***A*** →		(*ec*)		*squint*	(pause)	
Torso:							
			(hands clasped)				
Mouth:	I stay	until 57	(long pause)		How		
Manual:		I STAY-[PSD]	UNTIL 57.	*		HOW	*

English Translation: (My husband stayed at Pennsylvania School for the Deaf until his graduation in 1954.) *I stayed until 1957. So, how* (did we wind up getting married? He told me, "You . . .)

FIGURE 5. *An example showing an ASL rhetorical question, English preposition use, and invented morphemes*

NMS-Head:	**A** →					*			
Eye/Brow:	**A** →								
Torso:	**A** →								
Mouth:	already know	how	sign	they	require	(none)	(none)	strict	
Manual:	FINISH	KNOW	HOW	SIGN*	THERE?? [CLARKE]	REQUIRE	ONLY	ORAL	#STRICT

English Translation: (He) *already knew sign language. The Clarke school had a strict requirement of oral communication only.* (No sign language was allowed.)

FIGURE 6. *An example showing ASL word order*

SIGN SPACE *3–3*

(WREN) [SCHOOL]	NMS-Head:		nod++		nod	
	Eye/Brow:	***A*** →	eg-[RICH]		***A*** →	t →
	NMS-Torso:		*ln*-forward			
[RICH]	Mouth:	Wren	born	here	Richmond.	
	Manual:	W-R-E-N	BORN##[RICH]	HERE##[RICH]	RICHMOND	

▲

English Translation: *Wren was born here in Richmond.*

FIGURE 7. *Example showing use of referents and gaze*

that were considered to be "not ASL" by the Deaf ASL users. Lucas and Valli posited that salient ASL features incorporated into these segments caused this conflict between judging groups. These features are the establishment of topic and the use of body shifting and eye gaze (see figure 7).

Liddell (1995) conceptualizes the establishment of areas of space as referents in two different ways. A "token" is more typical of what has been described as a referent—an area of space with no specific physical features. In Mary's narrative, setting up "the school," later identified as "PSD," is an example of a token. In contrast, a "surrogate" is an area of space that is perceived to have specific physical features—as if a person were really occupying that area of space.

The identification of distinct physical clusters of signs produced in different locations was identified through a literal mapping of the signing space on the television screen. In "How I Met My Husband," seven of these clusters were identified (see figure 8).

These clusters of sign production, noted in figure 8, occurred at the locations where the signs were physically produced. The groupings were labeled to identify neutral space as well as a total of six clusters relating to three tokens and one surrogate identified in the discourse. Each of these clusters represents at least one group of signs that are either (a) pointing at or directed toward a representation of the same semantic entity—designated by -[TOKEN] or -(SURROGATE)—or (b) locatively influenced by the same semantic entity—designated by ##[TOKEN] or ##(SURROGATE). In other words, signs relating to Mary's husband (Wren) were produced in

-[CLARKE]

##[CLARKE] and [PSD]

-(WREN)

-[PSD] and sometimes ##(WREN)

-[CLARKE]

neutral

-[RICHMOND]

Note: The symbols ## and - as well as the word ***neutral*** indicate the approximate physical locations of these clusters as noted on the video monitor.

FIGURE 8. *Physical placement of signs in clusters*

one of two locations. Both of these locations were in relative proximity to each other when compared to the placements of all seven clusters.

Areas of sign production that were locatively influenced by the existence of a token or surrogate (indicated by ##) were produced between the "neutral area" and the token or surrogate by which they were influenced. Areas of sign production that were either pointing at or directed toward a token or surrogate (indicated by -) were produced in another area further from "neutral" and closer to the token or surrogate.

THE ESTABLISHMENT AND IDENTIFICATION OF REFERENTS

Lucas and Valli (1992) further describe the identification of referents prior to their use. They state that "a topic must be established at a point in space *before* it can be talked about using whatever structure" (95, emphasis added). In contrast, although Mary obviously establishes referents in space and consistently incorporates them into her narrative, she does not always establish the topic at a point in space prior to a sign being influenced by its existence.

For example, in figure 9, the sign GO-TO is directed toward the area subsequently identified in the discourse as SCHOOL and later specified as PSD.

DISCUSSION

As one of a large number of people who have learned ASL or "sign language" during the last twenty years, this researcher has been overwhelmed by the preponderance of published information and seemingly endless

SIGN SPACE *1–2*

[SCHOOL]	NMS-Head:				
	NMS-Eye/Brow:	*A* →			
	NMS-Torso:				
	Mouth:	went	to	school	
	Manual:	GO-TO##[SCHOOL]	TO	SCHOOL	

▲

English Translation: (I) *went to school* (in Mt. Airy).

FIGURE 9. *Evidence of token influencing direction of verb prior to overt identification of referent*

debate that relates to certain ideologies or persuasions rather than to linguistic or communicative descriptions of ASL or "Sign English." For example, in the present study of the narrative "How I Met My Husband," there are undoubtedly elements of English influence that proponents of one ideology or another can point to and say, "See, this is English!" However, the evidence found in this study simply does not support this claim.

Mouth Movements in Isolation

Although one can find obvious English influence in the mouth channel during this narrative, as attested to by the proliferation of "full English mouthing" and "reduced English mouthing" in the mouth channel of the product, a synchronous view of elements found only in the mouth channel does not result in the use of grammatically correct English. Figure 10 shows a script of mouth movements contained in the segment.

I grow up in Pennsylvania. Went to school Mount Airy in Philadelphia, in E . . . area East around. Grew up there. I met Wren. Wren go to school, too. That's how we met when Wren was a see . . . senior, senior. I was freshman.

Meet there. Sweetheart. Then he grad. Me still stay school 'til 1957.

It was funny. Wren born here Richmond, but moth-fath send him go to PSD school. That's how I met there.

One year later, his moth-fath *(ADVERBIAL)* want *(ADVERBIAL)* put Clark-ee Mass for oralism, and went to Clark-ee Mass school to talk with principal or "super" find that Wren can't enter school because he already know how sign. They require strict.

His moth-fath very upset. Wren don't care. Say happy where in our school, because have voke, have play sport. Where in Clarke *(ADVERBIAL)* voke, no sport, just school . . . ed-you . . . not right.

So, Wren prefer to stay until finish. I stay until '57. How? He told, "You go with other boy, date, because just young." *(ADVERBIAL)* but I like him better . . . for me.
(ADVERBIAL) . . . mare . . . move.

FIGURE 10. *Script of mouth movements from "How I Met My Husband"*

Punctuation, upper and lower case, and use of paragraphs are used to reflect the presence of nonmanual features indicating syntactic groupings (phrases and clauses) within the product.

English Influence on ASL Use Prior to the Development of MCEs

Contemporary terms such as *ASL, contact signing,* and *MCE* are relatively recent coinages. Padden and Humphries (1988) report that Deaf people in earlier decades recognized differences in signing but did not use these terms. Padden (1998) mentions the existence of a medium (film and videotape) for evidence of English influence on the use of sign language by fluent signers even before the advent of MCEs in the 1960s and 1970s. For example, the movies *A Cake of Soap* (1961) and *The Neighbor* (1963), films made by Ernest Marshall in the early 1960s, include numerous instances of English influence such as the concept of initialization (V-ery, L-ife, F-ind); English mouthing (*hotel-house* for FLAG^HOUSE); and the incorporation of English syntactic and morphological structure into a signed product (FIGHT OVER TREE). Padden characterizes the instances of initialized signs such as those indicated in the movies above as foreign vocabulary in ASL. Regardless of how they are characterized, however, all of these instances are also examples of English influence in the form of code-mixing.

Areas for Further Research

A detailed linguistic description of different varieties of naturally occurring contact signing. Particularly interesting is the delineation provided by Padden and Humphries (1988) differentiating "Sign English" and "various manual English systems." However, Mary's product lacks many of the features commonly described as being found in a form of MCE. Is this lack of features a common characteristic to most varieties of contact signing?

Effect on the definition and instruction of sign language transliteration. What implications does a product like Mary's have with respect to sign language transliteration? If the assertions of Baker-Shenk and Cokely (1980) and Padden and Humphries (1988) are correct (i.e., that the major difference between Sign English and

MCEs is that the former is naturally occurring and the latter is invented), then do these differences represent different varieties under the umbrella of ASL or English or interpretation? Outside of the training and testing environments, does the separate discipline of transliteration actually exist?

Patterns of English mouthing without sign support. In this study, seven instances of English mouthing without sign support were noted. Does a general pattern within contact signing (i.e., nouns, verbs, subjects) occur for this phenomenon?

Perception of a product being more English-like or ASL-like. Lucas and Valli (1992) investigated deaf people's perceptions of a product of another signer (i.e., was the product "ASL" or "not ASL?"). The standing of the signer in the Deaf community (i.e., deaf, hearing, Deaf from a Deaf family, etc.) appeared to have an effect on the viewer's perception. What if the hearing status of the signer is unknown? Do deaf people and hearing people who are fluent in sign language then have different perceptions of the same product?

CONCLUSION

So, why did I call this narrative product English? The above examples clearly show that Mary's narrative product contains a mixture of English and ASL features. This product contains uses of prepositions and the copula, features of English not shared by ASL. Likewise, instances of classifier predicates were identified, an ASL feature that is not shared by English. Additionally, four different types of mouth movements were identified in this product: two are English features, and two are ASL features. This description is consistent with the one of contact signing offered by Lucas and Valli (1992).

These data strongly suggest that the type of features (English or ASL) in the mouth and manual channels may guide the viewer's perception of which language has the most influence over the product as opposed to the signer actually "shifting" between the languages of ASL and English. This possibility is consistent with Lucas and Valli's claim that the existence of salient ASL features (use of space for referents and body shifting with gaze) causes a conflict when one tries to judge whether a segment is "ASL" or "not ASL."

Additionally, English is a naturally occurring spoken language with an

accompanying standardized orthographic system that cannot be traced with any degree of certainty to any one individual or group of developers. However, all of these MCEs have been artificially created during the last forty years for specific use in the educational setting as a tool to teach English to deaf children. The fact that one can find evidence of English influence on ASL prior to the creation of MCEs indicates that Mary's product is potentially an example of a third system (Lucas and Valli 1992) and may even be ASL-based rather than English-based.

The data also clearly show that Mary is bilingual. For example, she demonstrates the difference between the same verb in different tenses. Initially, she mouths the verb "grow up" and accompanies her mouthing with the ASL signs GROW and #UP. Several lines later, she uses a different ASL sign (RAISE) to convey the same concept but, this time, co-produces mouthing for "grew up"—the same English verb as before, but in the past tense.

Contrary to popular anecdotal description, in Mary's product, English and ASL features are simultaneously co-produced in different channels. In reality, this contact signing product is not English but, rather, appears to be marked by various English influences in the mouth and manual channels. This researcher posits that many people base their perception of a product as being more "English-like" or more "ASL-like" on the features contained within the oral and manual channels because these channels are where they can most readily find the "most clear evidence" of an English influence, often paying little attention to the existence of simultaneously co-occurring ASL features.

REFERENCES

Anthony, D. 1971. *Seeing Essential English*. Greeley: University of Northern Colorado.

Baker-Shenk, C., and D. Cokely. 1980. *American sign language: A teacher's resource text on grammar and culture*. Silver Spring, Md.: T.J. Publishers.

Battison, R. 1978. *Lexical borrowing in American Sign Language*. Silver Spring, Md.: Linstok Press.

Bornstein, H. 1973. A description of some current sign systems designed to represent English. *American Annals of the Deaf* 118:454–63.

Bornstein, H., K. Saulnier, and L. Hamilton, eds. 1983. *The comprehensive signed English dictionary*. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.

A Cake of Soap. 1963. Directed by E. Romero, Independent Theatrical and Cinema Club for the Deaf. Ernest Marshall Films. Gallaudet University Archives, Washington, D.C. Videocassette.

Colonomos, B. 1992. Process in interpreting and transliteration. Teleconference, 27 March, coordinated by Front Range Community College, Westminster, Colorado.

Davis, J. 1989. Distinguishing language contact phenomena in ASL interpretation. In *The sociolinguistics of the Deaf community,* ed. C. Lucas, 85–102. New York: Academic Press.

Frishberg, N. 1990. *Interpreting: An introduction.* Silver Spring, Md.: Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf.

Gustason, G., D. Pfetzing, and E. Zawolkow. 1975. Signing Exact English. Alameda, Calif.: Modern Signs Press.

Johnson, R. 1994. Possible influences on bilingualism in early ASL acquisition. *Teaching English to Deaf Students* 10(2):9–17.

Kelly, J. 2001. *Transliterating: Show me the English!* Alexandria, Va.: RID Press.

Klima, E., and U. Bellugi. 1979. *The signs of language.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Liddell, S. 1980. *American Sign Language syntax.* The Hague: Mouton.

———. 1995. Real, surrogate, and token space: Grammatical consequences in ASL. In *Language, gesture, and space,* ed. K. Emmorey and J. Reilly, 19–41. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lucas, C., and C. Valli. 1992. *Language contact in the American Deaf community.* San Diego, Calif.: Academic Press.

Moores, D. 1994. *Educating the Deaf: Psychology, principles, and practices.* 4th ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

The Neighbor. 1961. Directed by E. Marshall, Independent Theatrical and Cinema Club for the Deaf. Ernest Marshall Films. Gallaudet University Archives, Washington, D.C. Videocassette.

Padden, C. 1998. The ASL lexicon. *Sign Language and Linguistics* 1:1, 39–64.

Padden, C., and T. Humphries. 1988. *Deaf in America: Voices from a culture.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID). 2001. "Description of Rating Criteria for the CI and CT Performance Tests." RID web site, http://www.rid.org/crit.html

Rutherford, S. 1993. *A study of American Deaf folklore.* Burtonsville, Md.: Linstok Press.

Schermer, T. 1990. *In search of language: Influences from spoken Dutch on Sign Language of the Netherlands.* Delft, Netherlands: Eburon.

Siple, L. 1993. Interpreters' use of pausing in voice to sign transliteration. *Sign Language Studies* 79:147–80.

Smith, C., E. Lentz, and K. Mikos. 1988. *Signing naturally: Student workbook, level 1*. San Diego, Calif.: DawnSignPress.

Sofinski, B. A., N. A. Yesbeck, S. C. Gerhold, and M. C. Bach-Hansen. 2001. Features of voice-to-sign transliteration by educational interpreters. *Journal of Interpretation* 47–59.

Solow, S. 1981. *Sign language interpreting: A basic resource book*. Silver Spring, Md.: National Association of the Deaf.

———. 2001. *Sign language interpreting: A basic resource book*. Rev. ed. Silver Spring, Md.: National Association of the Deaf.

Stewart, D., J. Schein, and B. Cartwright. 1998. *Sign language interpreting: Exploring its art and science*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Stokoe, W., D. Casterline, and C. Croneberg. 1965. *A dictionary of American Sign Language on linguistic principles*. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.

Wampler, D. 1971. *Linguistics of visual English*. Pamphlet.

Winston, E. 1989. Transliteration: What's the message? In *The sociolinguistics of the Deaf community,* ed. C. Lucas, 147–64. New York: Academic Press.

Woodward, J. 1973. Some characteristics of Pidgin Sign English. *Sign Language Studies* 3:39–46.

APPENDIX A

How I Met My Husband

I grew up in Pennsylvania. I went to school in Mt. Airy, which is an eastern suburb of Philadelphia. I grew up there, and that's where I met Wren. He went to the same school. That's how we met when Wren was a senior and I was a freshman! We met and then we went steady for a while. Then, he graduated and I stayed at the school until my graduation in 1957.

It's really funny that we met there, because Wren was born here, in Richmond, Virginia, but his parents sent him to the Pennsylvania School for the Deaf (PSD). So, that's why we got the chance to meet at school.

After one year at PSD, Wren's parents looked into transferring him to the Clarke oral school in Massachusetts. They went on site to the Clarke school grounds and met with either the principal or superintendent of the school only to find out that he could not attend Clarke because he already knew how to sign. At the Clarke school there was strict enforcement of the oral-only approach. His parents were very upset at these developments, but it didn't bother Wren. He said he was happy at our school because we had vocational opportunities and sports teams in which he could participate, whereas the Clarke school didn't have these extracurricular opportunities. They focused solely on academics, and that's just not right!

So, he preferred to stay at the Pennsylvania School for the Deaf until his graduation in 1954. I graduated in 1957.

So how did we end up together? He told me, "you date and go with other boys because you're still young," but I liked him better. I knew that he was the one for me! Eventually we got married and moved to Richmond.

APPENDIX B

Transcription Conventions

▲= sight line direction of signer
A = eye gaze to addressee [*reduced English mouthing*]
"X" = handshape represents first English letter of GLOSS
* = NMS to indicate a break at end of constituent
( ) = TOKEN
[ ] = SURROGATE
-[ ] = sign pointed at or directed towards (TOKEN) or [SURROGATE]
#WAS = lexicalized fingerspelling
= body oriented so production of sign influenced by location of (TOKEN) or [SURROGATE]
gz = eye gaze
{SH} = strong hand
{WH} = weak hand
@ = feature synchronously occurs here
ht = head turn
n = neutral
ec = eyes close
tl = head tilt
ln = lean
?? = [PSD] "as" [CLARKE]
SIGN SPACE = the physical space in which signs are produced
+ = sign repeated once
++ = sign repeated twice
pos = NMS indicating affirmation

(In English translation sections): ( ) = product coming before or after the actual transcription; italic text = translation for actual transcription.