

EXERCISE: AS 4

Module:	Transfer Skills
Type of Exercise:	Observation and analysis of a professional interpreter's performance - whispered interpreting
Topic:	Trial verdict in an Italian <i>direttissima</i> trial
Learning Outcome(s):	On completion of this exercise, trainees will be able to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• analyse a professional interpreter's rendition of a verdict and identify the main translation challenges• use appropriate formulaic language typical of an Italian trial verdict.
Language (Combination):	Italian/Spanish
Equipment:	N/A
Time:	Approx. 1 hour
Suitable for:	Introductory/Intermediate For class use or self-study
Contributed by:	Annalisa Sandrelli, LUSPIO University, Rome (Italy)
Notes:	This text can be used for a number of training purposes. Initially, it can be used to teach trainees to observe critically an interpreter's performance. The transcript also contains set phrases typical of trial verdicts that trainees can be asked to research. Consider using it as the basis for a whispered interpreting exercise: all the

interpreter's renditions may be deleted and the rest can be recorded to serve as practice material.

This text links with AS 1 (Pre-trial), AS 2 (Defendant examination) and AS 3 (Witness testimony).

This is a transcript of an actual court case brought before the Rome Criminal Court. All names and other personal references have been deleted to preserve privacy.

CASE OUTLINE

An Argentinean woman and her boyfriend have been arrested in Rome for drug dealing. The police found a small greenhouse with marijuana plants in their flat and significant quantities of the drug ready for sale. The girl had been living somewhere else but had left her flat because of problems with her flat mate, another girl. She had only been in her boyfriend's flat for three days when the two were arrested. In the following transcript the girl is the defendant.

Read the following transcript of a verdict and analyse the interpreter's renditions into Spanish.

TRANSCRIPT

Pubblico Ministero: Eh... allora alla luce dei fatti dichiarati dall'Imputata e agli attestati di convalida nonché per quanto rappresentato oggi dai testimoni che abbiamo sentito non possa pervenirsi con certezza alla pronuncia di grave responsabilità dell'Imputata, posto che dobbiamo dare per accertato il fatto provato comunque in mancanza di elementi contrari che ella vivesse fosse ospite in quella stanza da pochi giorni. La sostanza è stata rinvenuta all'interno di un cofanetto. Parte della sostanza l'aveva indosso l'altro imputato. La disposizione a carico dell'Imputata ha dato esito negativo; è vero c'era questa motivazione che fu celata da un cellofan nero all'interno della stanza ma si trattava di una coltivazione avviata ben ormai da diverso tempo quindi appare assai ardua attribuirne la responsabilità a una persona che alloggiava all'interno di quella stanza da pochi giorni quindi si chiede l'assoluzione della stessa per non avere commesso il fatto.

Avvocato: Giudice la richiesta del PM è comunque condivisa da questo difensore. La giurisprudenza che regola il caso sul punto è pacifica quindi mi associo alla richiesta del PM.

Interprete: *Están diciendo que tienen que declararte inocente, no tienes nada que ver con los hechos.*

Interprete: *El juez acepta lo que acaba de decir el señor fiscal, que van a absolver, que vas a salir hoy día porque...como son tres días que vivías allí, la valija [sic] llena, las plantas dicen ya que era un cultivo viejo, no es que en tres días tu hubiera podido ayudarlo a cultivar...*

Giudice: Il Tribunale di Roma visti gli articoli 442, 530 del codice di procedura penale assolve “_” “_” per non aver commesso il fatto. Revoca la misura della custodia cautelare in carcere nei confronti dell’Imputata e ne ordina l’immediata liberazione se non detenuta per altra causa

Interprete: *Resultaste inocente, te absolvieron, te revocan la custodia en la medida de la cárcel vas a salir y ordenen inmediata liberación. Aclararon que no tienes nada que ver con los hechos del cultivo del señor*

EXERCISES

Use the following criteria in your observation of the interpreted interview. Record your observations by placing a tick (✓) in the relevant box.

1. FAITHFULNESS OF INTERPRETATION

	Yes	No	Partly	Notes
1.1 Looking at the interview as a whole, was the interpretation provided faithful?				
1.2 Was any message <u>summarised</u> in the interpreter’s rendition?				
1.3 Were any parts of the message <u>omitted</u> from the interpretation?				
1.4 Was anything <u>added</u> in the interpretation?				
1.5 Was anything <u>changed or distorted</u> in the interpretation?				

POINTS FOR DISCUSSION

1. The interpreter omitted all reference to the relevant articles in the Italian criminal code. Was that an ethically acceptable choice? What other options are available under the circumstances?
2. Ask trainees to identify all the missing bits of information, all additions, all distortions, etc.

2. LANGUAGE USE

	Yes	No	Partly	Notes
2.1 Did the interpreter use correct grammar and syntax in Spanish?				
2.2 Did the interpreter successfully translate specialist Italian terms into Spanish?				
2.3 Did the interpretation reflect the same register as the original? (i.e. formal, colloquial, conversational etc)				

FURTHER POINTS FOR DISCUSSION

1. The interpreter summarised the judge's verdict. What can you say about the interpreter's choices in terms of language register?