Experiencing the Interpreter's Role: Emotions of Involvement and Detachment in Simultaneous Church Interpreting

Sari Hokkanen

University of Tampere

sari.hokkanen@uta.fi

Abstract

This paper proposes an affective approach to examining the interpreter's role. More specifically, it suggests that by considering the interpreters' subjective feelings of involvement and detachment related to an interpreted event, we can examine the ways in which their role is constructed within and through a combination of personal, social, and material factors related to the setting and the interpreter's working conditions. As an example, I take the case of simultaneous interpreting in two religious settings, which I have studied with autoethnography. Thus, I analyze my experiences of interpreting in two religious settings and contrast these experiences to an "ideal" model of the interpreter's role in such settings: the fully involved participant. The analysis indicates that while an internalized ideal model of role may provide a point of reference for reflection, the actual experience of role emerges in a complicated interaction between personal, social, and material aspects.

Keywords: affect, interpreter involvement, detachment, interpreter's role, church interpreting, simultaneous interpreting, autoethnography

1. *Introduction*

The role of the interpreter in different settings has been a continuous topic in Translation and Interpreting Studies literature. Often, the focus has been on the performance of role as it emerges in interpreted interaction. Thus, researchers such as Wadensjö (1998), Diriker (2004), and Angelelli (2004a) have been able to demonstrate that through their communicative choices, interpreters tend to be involved participants, and not passive 'translation machines,' despite the imperative in professional codes of conduct to remain

impartial or even 'non-involved.' Many of the past studies on the interpreter's role, such as those mentioned above, have traced the manifestation of role in interpreters' performance, by analyzing their output and behavior in interaction with the primary speakers.

In this paper, I propose an additional perspective to the examination of the interpreter's role, one that does not put as much weight on the performance of role nor on the perception of role, but rather on the subjective experience of role. More specifically, I focus on feelings of involvement and detachment. Through this affective lens, my aim is to demonstrate the embeddedness of the interpreter's role in the interpreter's subjectivity, in the social context in which the interpreting takes place, and in the material working conditions affecting the interpreter's work. The discussion in this paper draws on research I have conducted on simultaneous interpreting in religious settings. In religious contexts, where interpreting is usually carried out by volunteers instead of professionals (e.g. Balcı Tison 2016; Karlik 2010), the interpreter's ideal role seems to be that of a fully involved participant (including social, interactional, and spiritual involvement; see Section 2), drawing this type of interpreting into sharp contrast with many other, professional interpreting practices. However, my aim is to demonstrate that 'ideal' models of the interpreter's role, whether depicting a more or less involved interpreter, are only one factor among many that influence the actual experience of role in a given interpreting event.

The religious settings investigated in this paper are the Pentecostal Church of Seinäjoki, Finland, and a summer conference organized by an Evangelical Lutheran organization which I call here "The Finnish Lutheran Community." I have studied these settings with autoethnography, performing in a dual role of simultaneous Finnish-to-English interpreter and researcher. Thus, I have conducted an ethnographic examination of my own experiences as a volunteer interpreter in these settings. Autoethnography, which seems to have been fairly rarely employed in Translation and Interpreting Studies as of yet, focuses on the interplay of social understandings and subjective experiences, which makes it a useful tool in the study of the ways in which personal, social, and material aspects come to bear on the experience of the interpreter's role.[1]

---

[1] Even though autoethnography is seldom the explicit methodological framework employed in studies of translation and interpreting, many researchers have made use of their personal positions and experiences as practitioners in a variety of research designs. In the study of interpreting, recent examples of such studies

In the remainder of the paper, I first review some of the earlier approaches to the study of the interpreter's role and detail my proposal for an affective approach in Section 2. Section 3 explains in more detail the methodology I have employed as well as the research materials investigated for the purposes of this study. Section 4 describes the two religious settings I have studied as well as their simultaneous interpreting practices. Section 5 moves on to a discussion of my experiences of the interpreter's role in terms of feelings of involvement and detachment in these two settings, and the concluding section summarizes the contribution provided by this affective scrutiny.

2. *Interpreter's Role from an Affective Perspective*

As stated above, the aim of this paper is to propose an affective perspective with which to examine the interpreter's role.[2] In this section, I discuss some of the earlier work conducted in Translation and Interpreting Studies on the interpreter's role, giving some emphasis on interpreting in religious settings. In addition, I contrast these earlier findings with my proposal of the affective perspective on role and attempt to point out the benefits of such an approach.

Previous studies focusing on the interpreter's role have paid attention to the intersubjective and social realities that give shape to how interpreters perform their role in interpreted interactions (e.g. Wadensjö 1998; Roy 2000; Bot 2005) and how interpreters themselves and the other communication participants perceive and negotiate the interpreter's role (Berk-Seligson 1990; Angelelli 2004b). As these and other studies have shown, interpreters in a variety of settings tend to assume a participatory role, taking part in guiding the flow of communication, despite the prevalence of the 'conduit model' in professional discourse and training that ascribes a non-involved, even invisible role to the interpreter (e.g. Diriker 2011). Furthermore, as Dickinson (2013, 136) points out in connection to British Sign-Language interpreters, this notion of "the interpreter as a neutral

---

include Camayd-Freixas (2013) and Ortiz Soriano (2015), both focusing on interpreters' codes of ethics and impartiality in legal interpreting. See also Napier (2011) and Hale and Napier (2013, 114–115).

[2] Throughout the paper, I use the concept of affect largely synonymously with emotion. Furthermore, my discussion of affect is decidedly sociological, as opposed to cognitive or physiological. For a more detailed theoretical discussion on affect from a sociological perspective in Translation and Interpreting Studies, see Hokkanen and Koskinen (2016).

and detached 'passer on' of information" remains "deeply embedded" also in interpreters' self-perception.

Questions revolving around the interpreter's role have also been considered in the studies focusing on interpreting in churches and other religious settings, even though this field of research is still relatively new. The studies conducted to date indicate that interpreters in religious settings are often expected to be involved, and in these mostly volunteer interpreting practices, the imperative of any professional distance, impartiality, or non-involvement does not seem to have had much influence. Rather, interpreters in religious settings have been observed to be involved on at least three levels: (1) socially, by having kinship and other close relations to the other participants (Karlik 2010) or by being members of the religious community in which they interpret (e.g. Kaufmann 2005; Hokkanen 2012; Balcı Tison 2016); (2) interactionally, by being involved in the co-construction of the interpreted sermon or other speech act (Vigouroux 2010; Downie 2014); and (3) spiritually, by personally receiving and supporting the religious messages they interpret (Balcı Tison 2016; Hokkanen 2016).

The studies conducted on the interpreter's role to date seem to have concentrated on the performance or perception of role, and not as much on the subjective experience of role, even though the conceptualization of role through *involvement* or *detachment* lends itself readily to an examination of affect. Indeed, as the work of Nadja Grbić (e.g. 2010) suggests, the negotiation of interpreters' social roles unavoidably generates subjective and affective experiences, such as "feelings of similarity and difference" (Grbić 2010, 114). In other words, whenever interpreters, together with the other communication participants, negotiate role, it triggers affective responses: different levels of familiarity, sympathy, foreignness, or even repulsion. Furthermore, the notion of involvement is regularly used in definitions of emotion. For example, sociologist Jack Barbalet (2002, 1) defines emotion as "an experience of involvement," which can be either positive or negative and varying in its intensity. On a similar vein, anthropologist Michelle Z. Rosaldo (1984, 143) maintains that "[e]motions are about the ways in which the social world is one in which *we* are involved" (emphasis in the original).

Approaching the interpreter's role from an affective perspective provides not only a more rounded view of the realities of interpreting (Barbalet 2002, 6; see also Furmanek

2006), insofar as one acknowledges the presence and influence of emotions in all human life, but such a perspective also allows for an examination of the ways in which both subjective and social aspects come to bear on the negotiation of the interpreter's role. Indeed, emotion has been described as "a necessary link between social structure and social actor" (Barbalet 2002, 4), because emotions are not only subjective and somatic but also fundamentally relational and social (Lutz & White 1986; Parrott & Harré 1996; see also Hokkanen & Koskinen 2016). In other words, emotions are dependent on subjective experiences and an individual's physiology, on the one hand, and on patterns of enculturation and an individual's material and relational environments, on the other. Furthermore, affect should not be seen in opposition to reason or cognition, but as an embodied mechanism of meaning-making by which individuals interpret their lived experiences (Wetherell 2012). Thus, along the lines of Embodied Cognition (e.g. Muñoz Martín 2010; Risku 2010), an affective perspective combines internal processes to external realities and thus allows for the investigation of subjective, social, and material aspects as they come to bear on the phenomena relating to translation and interpreting, including the interpreter's role.

3. *Method and Research Material*

This section provides a brief introduction to the methodology with which I have studied interpreting in religious settings and then discusses the research material that I have analyzed in the light of the interpreter's role. The materials were gathered in connection to my doctoral study on simultaneous church interpreting (Hokkanen 2016).

Autoethnography can be understood as ethnographic research that uses the experience of the researcher as a main component of the research design (Ellis & Bochner 2000). Thus, the position that researchers already have as social agents is not seen as a possible source of bias to be controlled, but as a source of data to be explored and examined (cf. Angelelli 2015). In autoethnography, then, researchers' subjective experiences are investigated in light of the social contexts within which they are embedded, commonly through a combination of introspection and cultural analysis (Chang 2008). Because autoethnographers are, by definition, involved in their object of study, their studies demand high levels of reflexivity: "constant (and intensive) scrutiny of 'what I know' and 'how I

know it'" (Herz 1997, vii–viii). The researchers' involvement in their objects of study also highlights the situated nature of the knowledge produced in autoethnography; since the study is rooted in the experience of the participant-researcher in a single or a limited number of actual settings, the results are particular rather than generalizable (see also Tracy 2010 on the lack of generalizability in qualitative methods).

Similarly to affect, then, autoethnography also combines subjective experience and social understanding, which is why the methodology is often used to study emotional, even traumatic experiences (e.g. Ellis & Bochner 2000). To take an example of an autoethnographic study on interpreting (albeit not explicitly conducted within Translation and Interpreting Studies), Hurd (2010) provides an autoethnographic account of his emotional journey of negotiating his role as a part-time in-house interpreter with very little interpreting training at "Centerville" Hospital, USA. Using excerpts from his "translator's log," Hurd traces his painful experiences of wanting to belong to the "professional elite" represented by the medical staff, but being denied that sense of belonging due to the transient nature of his work. Thus, Hurd's study connects the emotions related to the precarious role of a (part-time and untrained) medical interpreter to the rigid hierarchies prevalent in the social setting of the hospital.

In keeping with the ethnographic tradition, the main method for gathering data in autoethnography is often the field journal, even though it is often complemented with other research materials, as well. In my doctoral study, the field journal was the main source of data, but I also analyzed a document and a website produced by the church as well as audio and video recordings of my own interpreting practice.[3] Taking fieldnotes is essentially a narrative practice (Emerson et al. 1995), in that it entails the verbalization and storying of experiences in the field, even if in fragmented form. Fieldnotes, then, do not offer a direct window into experience, but rather present expressions of experience (Bruner 1986) and, as such, they are socially conditioned in that they draw on social vocabularies and culturally available storylines with which to make sense of experience (Polkinghorne 1988; see also Hokkanen & Koskinen 2016).

---

[3] For a more detailed description of the research materials used in my PhD research, see Hokkanen (2016, Chapter 5).

The research materials I have analyzed for the purposes of this paper include two sets of autoethnographic fieldnotes. The first set is a field journal which I collected for my PhD research when interpreting in the Pentecostal Church of Seinäjoki (PCS), my home church, between 2011 and 2014. This journal included notes on my own experiences of interpreting in church and comments on other church interpreters' work (covering a total of 28 church services), as well as reflections, observations, and comments on the discussions I had with church interpreters and members (a total of 20 entries). During the PhD research, I also happened to be invited to interpret for another Christian organization within the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland, which I call here "The Finnish Lutheran Community" (FLC), and decided to write fieldnotes about my experiences there. This second set of fieldnotes analyzed here are those collected from the summer conference of the FLC in 2012 and 2013, during which I interpreted in a total of 10 services or other events. These notes were excluded from the doctoral study, because it focused on interpreting within Pentecostalism. However, for the present paper, I have analyzed these entries from the perspective of the interpreter's role and contrasted them with the rest of my research materials.

4. *Social Settings: Simultaneous Interpreting in Two Religious Contexts*

In this section, I offer a brief description of the two social settings in which the interpreting experiences I examine in Section 5 below emerged. Since the present paper draws on an autoethnographic study, the discussion in this section not only describes the two settings from a general perspective but also from a personal viewpoint. Therefore, both my position in these social settings and my personal background come to bear on the phenomenon that I have studied. As a researcher of interpreting, I have been part of an academic community of Translation and Interpreting Studies, but I have also completed Master's-level studies in English translation and interpreting at the University of Tampere and worked as a freelance translator and interpreter for almost a decade (mostly part-time due to my Master's and doctoral studies, family life, and other work).

The first social setting that I analyze is the Pentecostal Church of Seinäjoki (PCS), my home church. The PCS offers simultaneous interpreting to visitors, exchange students, and recent migrants who cannot otherwise participate in the weekly Finnish-language

services. I have functioned as an English interpreter, along with some four to eight other volunteers, who do not have professional interpreting training. In addition, the church has offered simultaneous interpreting into other languages, such as Russian and, more recently, Farsi and Arabic. In order to provide simultaneous interpreting, the main hall of the church has two built-in interpreting booths together with conference interpreting equipment. Upon request, the English interpreters are sometimes provided with the preacher's notes on the sermon, which include references to the Bible the preacher intends to make. If these notes are available to interpreters, they are provided shortly before the service; otherwise, the interpreters do not have access to any preparatory materials. Furthermore, the simultaneous interpreters in the PCS work alone, interpreting an entire service lasting from 90 minutes to two hours and including a variety of speech genres, such as announcements, prayers, songs, and the sermon.

As a Pentecostal church, the PCS exhibits certain typical features of Pentecostalism that affect the church culture and, therefore, the interpreting practice in the church. One such feature is the emphasis given to personal religious experience, which can be understood as an encounter with God that manifests itself either in the inner experience of the believer or in his or her outward circumstances (Nelson 2005; see also e.g. Stark & Glock 1968). In church life, this emphasis on experientiality can be said to have led to a preference for spontaneity, when believers have wished to leave room for the Holy Spirit to move freely in services without the perceived rigidity of formal liturgies (see Kärkkäinen 2001). This has clear implications on the types of speech that are interpreted in the services. First (apart from direct quotes from the Bible), the prayers, sermons, and other forms of speech are spontaneous and not prewritten word-for-word. Thus, while there is a lack of written materials for interpreters to prepare with, spontaneous speech tends to pose fewer challenges for interpreting than speeches read from paper. Second, the emphasis on personal experience also affects the volunteer interpreters' attitude when interpreting; even when providing a service to the church and to God, they may expect to have personal religious experiences during and through simultaneous interpreting in church (Hokkanen 2016). Naturally, the realization of this social expectation may vary across individual interpreters, but I would argue that it may nevertheless color their experience of interpreting

in this church, because the interpreters are members of the church and, as such, highly familiar with such social meanings.

To return to the levels of church interpreters' involvement mentioned in Section 2 above, my position in the PCS covers all three levels: social involvement, interactional involvement, and spiritual involvement. I have been an active member of the PCS for some 15 years apart from the few years I lived elsewhere. I have volunteered as a simultaneous interpreter in this church since 2009, but I have also been involved in many other volunteer activities there, such as singing in and leading a worship team, giving a few sermons, and overseeing the roster for the English simultaneous interpreters. I met my husband in the PCS and we have found several close friends among fellow church members. Furthermore, I continue to perceive the PCS as my spiritual home.

The second religious setting that I analyze in this paper is "The Finnish Lutheran Community" (FLC), and more specifically, the national summer conference of the FLC, which is organized yearly. The FLC is part of the Evangelical Lutheran denomination, which, apart from single greater points of disagreement such as infant vs. adult baptism, adheres to a largely similar doctrine as does Pentecostalism. However, it differs, most notably, in terms of its somewhat more subdued church culture. For example, spontaneity in church services may not be perceived equally valuable, as evidenced by an adherence to formally agreed-upon liturgy and the custom of having both sermons and prayers prepared in written form in advance.

The FLC summer conference is organized yearly and it gathers several thousands of Christians to services, panel discussions, seminars, and concerts over a weekend. In the years that I was involved in the English interpreting of the conference (2011–2013), the conference venue situated in a different town in Finland each year, usually in a large indoor sports arena or tent. For simultaneous interpreting, the conference organizers provided a mobile conference interpreting system including a transmitter and microphone for the interpreter and headset receivers for the listeners, who were mostly guests from abroad. However, there were no booths, and the organizers had not prepared to provide headsets for the interpreter, who interpreted each event alone. In one venue, the interpreter was provided with a table, in another, I was able to request a table, but in one of the venues, there was no possibility for a table to be provided for the interpreter. In all three years, the interpreters

were volunteers, and none of the other interpreters I was in contact with had professional interpreting training. Since most of the speeches requested to be interpreted into English were pre-written, the conference organizers provided some of these for the interpreters in advance. Furthermore, the services during the conference followed the liturgy of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland, of which the church has published an official English translation on their website.

My relationship with the FLC differs greatly from that with the PCS, described above. I have family members who are actively involved in the FLC, and I was initially recruited to interpret their summer conference through one such family member who was a member of the organizing committee in 2011. The doctrinal emphases of FLC are not unfamiliar to me, and I have occasionally attended their services, which has given me some notion of their church culture. However, even though I respect the community as a fellow Christian denomination, it is not my spiritual home, nor have I volunteered in its activities aside from the simultaneous interpreting of the summer conferences. I initially agreed to volunteer as an interpreter from an ecumenical spirit, wishing to serve our mutual Lord with the skills He had provided me with (see Hokkanen 2016). Nevertheless, as described in the analysis in the following section, my experience of interpreting for the FLC was not as deeply personal and spiritual as that of interpreting for the PCS.

5. *The Affectivity of Involvement and Detachment in Simultaneous Church Interpreting*
This section discusses the affective experiences of involvement and detachment related to simultaneous interpreting in the two religious settings described above. The discussion covers social factors, specifically as regards the religious nature of the settings, and material factors related to the working environment, and the ways in which the interaction between them and my personal history come to bear on my experience of the interpreter's role when interpreting in these settings.

5.1. *Involvement (and Detachment) when Interpreting in the PCS*
The portrayal of the interpreter's role that I derived from my autoethnographic study within Pentecostalism (Hokkanen 2016) is that of a deeply involved interpreter, covering all three levels of involvement discussed in Section 2 above (social, interactional, and spiritual).

Thus, the normal expectation for me when interpreting in the PCS is that of feeling involved. The people whose speech I interpret, such as the pastors, are familiar to me and I am to them. I recognize and often exchange a few words with those listening to my interpreting. I come to church to interpret with an attitude that closely resembles how I would feel about coming to church on a regular Sunday: with an expectation to encounter God and be built up in my faith while hopefully being able to contribute to building up the faith of others.

Continuing from the description of the setting of the PCS in Section 4 above, certain social aspects in the church facilitate my feeling involved as an interpreter: specifically, aspects relating to church culture and displays of emotion. As mentioned, Pentecostalism highlights the importance of personal religious experience, and religious experience can be said to involve both "an internal narrative and an external performance" (Bowie 2003, 56). Both the internal and the external levels of religious experience are socially conditioned, because the narratives with which we understand the experience internally are drawn from culturally available stories (Nelson 2005), and the ways in which we learn to display emotions are learned in our enculturation into certain social groups (Parrott & Harré 1996). In the PCS, a musician, a preacher, or a consecutive interpreter standing on the platform next to the speaker may cry, evidently due to a personal religious experience, or a speaker may raise their voice in agitation or excitement. Such displays of emotion are processed by the simultaneous interpreters, as well, as they render those messages into English. However, being enculturated into that church environment, simultaneous interpreters may incorporate such emotional displays into their experience of God during interpreting, which further fosters their feeling of being personally involved.

As an example of an experience of feeling involved while interpreting, the following excerpt from my field journal shows how the roles of interpreter and participant coexist. The entry is dated on 27 June 2012.[4]

Example (1)

---

[4] This and subsequent excerpts are my translations of the original Finnish field journal entries. The names of participants have been changed.

Pastor Hannu talks about how love preaches the gospel louder than anything else we do and how we need more of it. At the beginning of his speech, he asks people to stand up and pray for someone next to them for a few minutes and just bless them, showing love for them that way. During the prayer time, nobody prays in the microphone or speaks, so I mute my microphone and pray, myself. I see an old Romani lady standing outside the booth window and lift my hand towards her as I bless her. After the prayer, the sermon continues. . . . During the last few songs, I'm silent as no-one seems to have their headphones on. I'm in prayer and even though I could join my husband in the hall, I just want to stay here. I felt that God spoke to me today, especially through the sermon, and I want to live closer to Him again. I feel joyful and grateful.

As illustrated by Example 1, my experience of the interpreter's role in the PCS is one of involvement; I participate in the service through prayer and I personally receive the messages I interpret. Thus, my role as an interpreter is intermingled with my role as a participant, and this deeply involved stance allows for a personally meaningful and emotional experience to take place during the simultaneous interpreting act.

Indeed, the prevalence of accounts of feeling involved in my fieldnotes from the PCS is as striking as the absence of those of feeling detached. The closest resemblance to a feeling of detachment in the field journal from the PCS is recounted below in Example 2, the original entry dated on 15 August 2014.

Example (2)
Ever since the passing of a close relative a few weeks ago, I've felt a little paralyzed. When I went to interpret in church on Wednesday, I felt kind of exhausted, because I've had so many shifts lately. It turned out that interpreting wasn't needed until the last twenty minutes or so of the service, when an Indian lady I had talked with before came to ask for a headset. But still, I sat in the booth for the whole service and didn't go out to sit in the pew. I guess I enjoyed the solitude and peace, even though I would've liked to sing along during the

worship. But even in the booth, God encountered me. We prayed together after the sermon and I felt the Holy Spirit work on my heart. It was a fresh start of sorts. But I was left thinking about the booth and the feeling of solitude and isolation it provides. Maybe it allowed me to feel like an observer. Or rather, it allowed me to spend time with God in the middle of the congregation but without feeling observed.

Even though not depicting positive and engaged experiences, Example 2 is nevertheless not a good example of a feeling of detachment. True, it describes my feeling detached from the social gathering in the service, but it also strongly links personal and spiritual experiences to the practice of church interpreting. The church's interpreting booth did not represent to me a place of work, first and foremost, where I would have needed to detach myself from personal issues in order to perform my duties as an interpreter. Rather, the material surroundings of the booth provided a place for a personal moment with God, a setting for a personal religious experience, which allowed me to continue working on personal issues instead of pushing them aside in order to fulfill the role of the interpreter.

5.2. (*Involvement and) Detachment when Interpreting at the FLC Summer Conference*
Unlike in the PCS, when I interpreted at the FLC summer conference, I entered a new working environment and a less familiar church culture and had to negotiate my role as a volunteer interpreter with the conference organizers. For example, before the first event in the 2012 conference, I came in contact with three of the organizers as I arrived at the venue. I introduced myself as the interpreter and asked where the interpreting equipment was. We also discussed my background as a church interpreter and as a professional translator/interpreter, which seemed to impress my conversation partners. However, our discussion mainly focused on the material set-up of the interpreter's working environment, rather than personal, let alone spiritual matters. Among other issues, I raised a question about the interpreter's microphone having a broken clip and the interpreter not having a table, in addition to requesting a receiver headset (which eventually could not be arranged). One of the organizers asked if I would like to have any of the speeches in printed form and I explained that it would facilitate my work greatly. During our interaction, I drew on the

knowledge I had gained from negotiating with clients from professional interpreting events, and therefore experienced my role more as that of a service provider than a fellow participant.

However, I not only had to negotiate my role as an interpreter with the organizers of the FLC summer conference, but also with myself. Facing a slightly differing and, to me, less familiar religious setting in which to volunteer as a simultaneous interpreter, I found myself repeatedly reflecting on my feelings of involvement and detachment, as the model of the entirely involved interpreter that was most familiar to me in religious settings did not seem to fit into this new setting. In the following, I begin with social aspects pertaining to the church culture and then move on material aspects of the working environment, discussing their influence in this continuing negotiation of the experience of role.

As mentioned in Section 4 above, the church culture in the FLC differs from that of the PCS in that it may be described as somewhat more subdued and as not promoting the open display of emotions to an equally high degree. This difference in church cultures and my reactions to it as the interpreter were a recurring theme in the fieldnotes I gathered when interpreting in the FLC summer conference. Example 3 below is derived from a field journal entry dated on 7 July 2012.

Example (3)
In this and previous events I've noticed how different prayers are here than in a Pentecostal church. They are short and dispassionate, many of them even pre-written. I don't feel the same kind of spirit of prayer when I interpret these. And it also feels different to pray here – somehow cooler and more rational. It seems no-one's getting excited in these events. I still don't interpret in a monotone, but use a lively intonation in order to make the message clearer. But it's not like I would get excited myself or get any religious experiences here.

This entry shows not only a contrastive analysis of some characteristics of the source text that I interpreted, but also my feeling of detachment from the interpreted genre. The difference in church culture, evident in the more subdued style of public prayer, and the ensuing feeling of unfamiliarity led me to feel less involved in the prayer. It may be argued

15

that I still participated in the prayer while interpreting it, even if it felt "more rational," but the experience certainly seemed to be engaging to a lesser degree.

As I mentioned before, the working conditions in the 2012 FLC summer conference for simultaneous interpreting were not optimal, and they raised repeated feelings of irritation and distraction throughout the conference weekend, which further contributed to my feeling of being detached from the social event. Despite my request, the organizers were unable to arrange for me a headset, which meant that I had to sit among the audience in the large indoor sports arena, listening to the source text from the main loudspeakers in the hall. Example 4 below describes the final event that I interpreted at the 2012 summer conference, dated on 8 August. By this third and final day of the conference, after trying two other spots in the arena, I had found a place at the front row of the balcony on the long, wooden pews that did not have a backrest.[5] This part of the arena provided me with a good view of the platform and it was situated directly in front of a loudspeaker. In addition, there were not many people walking back and forth near me, like they had elsewhere in the arena. However, some people came to sit quite near me, which created somewhat of a distraction, as described in the example below.

Example (4)

This was a family service, so the arena was full and there were a lot of children. Luckily, not many people came to sit right next to me. I still had to constantly monitor my surroundings, and once I turned to ask for a family with three small kids to maybe try to keep it a little quieter. I tried to do it as politely as I could, because I don't think the people around me realized what I was doing there. I spoke in English into this small microphone taped to my cheek, but otherwise there wasn't anything that separated me from a normal attendant, by appearances at least. This being the third day of interpreting in less than perfect conditions, my voice seemed to be a little strained, but otherwise the interpreting went fine. Somehow it all felt external to me, though. All the phrases and the vocabulary were familiar, but it didn't feel the same as interpreting at my home church.

---

[5] My husband was with me at the conference and he saw to the receiver headsets on the ground level.

As illustrated by Example 4, in the process of trying to make the best of the material working conditions I faced in this setting, I felt that I had to take initiative and protect my role as the interpreter, so that I would be able to render the service asked of me. Thus, I created a distance between myself and the other participants, both socially (by pointing out to the other participants that I was trying to interpret the service) and internally (by taking on the role of a service provided with expert knowledge as regards explaining the optimal working conditions in simultaneous interpreting for the conference organizers). This distance increased my feelings of detachment and externality.

The feelings of detachment and externality were also evidenced by my lack of participation in the religious practices at the FLC summer conferences. Example 5 below describes one such instance of non-participation at the 2013 conference, dated on 7 July.

Example (5)

I ended the interpreting of the service as the Holy Communion started, like I had agreed with the conference organizers. There were hundreds of people lining up to share in the bread and the wine and there wouldn't be much to interpret during it. As I was heading out from the venue, passing the long lines of people and thinking about lunch, it occurred to me that maybe I should've also joined in the Holy Communion. I hadn't even considered it. It's not like there were any theological or spiritual reasons for why I couldn't do it, but I somehow felt aloof. Kind of like being somewhere else.

The fact that my consideration to participate in a fundamental Christian practice such as the Eucharist was somewhat of an afterthought indicates that, in this setting, I had internalized more of a detached interpreter role instead of the fully involved co-participating interpreter role that I would usually assume when interpreting in a religious setting. However, as the discussion in this section has attempted to suggest, the experience of the interpreter's role in a religious setting is affected by personal, social, and material aspects that together contribute to varying feelings of involvement and detachment, leading to varying levels of the interpreter's participation.

17

6. *Conclusions*

The purpose of this paper was to propose an additional, affective, perspective to the examination of the interpreter's role. The analysis focused on the experience of the interpreter's role, more specifically, to feelings of involvement and detachment. The discussion was based on autoethnographic fieldnotes that were collected in connection with my experiences of volunteer Finnish-to-English simultaneous interpreting in two different religious settings.

The analysis presented in this paper indicates that while an internalized ideal model of the interpreter's role in a certain setting may provide a point of reference for reflection, the actual experience of role emerges in a complicated interaction between personal, social, and material aspects. In the first religious setting analyzed here, my experience of role was that of a completely involved participant-interpreter, which is also the most prevalent role model mentioned in the literature on church interpreting to date (see Section 2). Having internalized this 'default' role model, my experience of the interpreter's role in another, less familiar religious setting was perplexing in terms of the feelings of detachment it generated; I felt less like a fellow participant and more like an outside service provider. It is important to note, however, that the analysis focused on the subjective experience of role, not on the performance of role. Therefore, despite the positive, even if scant, spontaneous feedback I received from listeners in both religious settings, the discussion in this paper cannot provide evidence of audience expectations or satisfaction related to the interpreter's role in these settings.

The discussion in this paper, nevertheless, points to the research potential provided by emotions; far from being merely expressions of personal idiosyncrasies, emotions and their ethnographically oriented scrutiny allow for an examination of translation and interpreting phenomena that takes into account the embeddedness of agents and their activities in social and material realities. The purpose of this paper was to suggest an additional perspective to the study of the interpreter's role, and I hope that by combining this affective perspective, which focuses on the subjective experiences and emotions of interpreters, with perspectives on role that highlight role expectations and performance, we may arrive at a more holistic understanding of interpreters' roles in different social settings.

18

References

Angelelli, Claudia. 2004a. *Medical Interpreting and Cross-Cultural Communication*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Angelelli, Claudia. 2004b. *Revisiting the Interpreter's Role: A Study of Conference, Court, and Medical Interpreters in Canada, Mexico, and the United States*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Angelelli, Claudia. 2015. "Ethnographic Methods." In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Interpreting Studies*, edited by Franz Pöchhacker, 148–150. London & New York: Routledge.

Balcı Tison, A. 2016. *The Interpreter's Involvement in a Translated Institution: A Case Study of Sermon Interpreting*. Doctoral dissertation, Rovira i Virigili University, Tarragona, Spain.

Barbalet, Jack. 2002. "Introduction: Why Emotions Are Crucial." In *Emotions and Sociology*, edited by Jack Barbalet, 1–9. Oxford & Malden: Blackwell Publishing/The Sociological Review.

Berk-Seligson, Susan. 1990. *The Bilingual Courtroom. Court Interpreters in the Judicial Process*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.

Bot, Hanneke. 2005. *Dialogue Interpreting in Mental Health*. Amsterdam & New York: Rodopi.

Bowie, Fiona. 2003. "An Anthropology of Religious Experience: Spirituality, Gender and Cultural Transmission in the Focolare Movement." *ETHNOS* 68 (1): 49–72. Accessed February 17, 2017. DOI 10.1080/0014184032000060362.

Bruner, Edward M. 1986. "Introduction. Experience and its Expressions." In *The Anthropology of Experience*, edited by Victor W. Turner and Edward M. Bruner, 3–30. Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Camayd-Freixas, Erik. 2013. "Court Interpreter Ethics and the Role of Professional Organizations." In *Interpreting in a Changing Landscape. Selected Papers from Critical Link 6*, edited by Christina Schäffner, Krzysztof Kredens, and Yvonne Fowler, 15–13. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Chang, Heewon. 2008. *Autoethnography as Method*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Dickinson, Jules. 2013. "One Job Too Many? The Challenges Facing the Workplace
    Interpreter." In *Interpreting in a Changing Landscape. Selected Papers from Critical
    Link 6*, edited by Christina Schäffner, Krzysztof Kredens, and Yvonne Fowler, 133–
    148. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Diriker, Ebru. 2004. *De-/Re-Contextualizing Conference Interpreting: Interpreters in the
    Ivory Tower?* Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Diriker, Ebru. 2011. "Agency in Conference Interpreting: Still a Myth?" *Gramma: Journal
    of Theory and Criticism* 19: 27–36. Accessed February 17, 2017.
    http://www.enl.auth.gr/gramma/gramma11/Diriker.pdf.

Downie, Jonathan. 2014. "Towards a Homiletic of Sermon Interpreting." *Journal of the
    Evangelical Homiletics Society* 14 (2): 62–69.

Ellis, Carolyn, and Arthur P. Bochner. 2000. "Autoethnography, Personal Narrative,
    Reflexivity: Researcher as Subject." In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, second
    edition, edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, 733–768. Thousand
    Oaks, London & New Delhi: Sage.

Emerson, Robert M., Rachel I. Fretz, and Linda L. Shaw. 1995. *Writing Ethnographic
    Fieldnotes*. University of Chicago Press.

Furmanek, Olgierda. 2006. "The Role of Emotions in Establishing Meaning: Implications
    for Interpreting." *Journal of Specialized Translation* 5: 57–71. Accessed February 17,
    2017. http://www.jostrans.org/issue05/art_furmanek.pdf.

Grbić, Nadja. 2010. "'Boundary Work' as a Concept for Studying Professionalization
    Processes in the Interpreting Field." *Translation and Interpreting Studies* 5 (1): 109–
    123. Accessed February 17, 2017. DOI 10.1075/tis.5.1.07grb.

Hale, Sandra, and Jemina Napier. 2013. *Research Methods in Interpreting: A Practical
    Resource*. London, New Delhi, New York & Sydney: Bloomsbury.

Herz, Rosanna. 1997. *Reflexivity and Voice*. Thousand Oaks, London & New Delhi: Sage.

Hokkanen, Sari. 2012. "Simultaneous Church Interpreting as Service." *The Translator* 18
    (2): 291–309. Accessed February 17, 2017. DOI 10.1080/13556509.2012.10799512.

Hokkanen, Sari. 2016. *To Serve and to Experience: An Autoethnographic Study of
    Simultaneous Church Interpreting*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Tampere.
    Accessed October 11, 2016. https://tampub.uta.fi/handle/10024/99865.

Hokkanen, Sari, and Kaisa Koskinen. 2016. "Affect as a Hinge: The Translator's Experiencing Self as a Sociocognitive Interface." *Translation Spaces* 5 (1): 78–96. Accessed February 17, 2017. DOI 10.1075/ts.5.1.05hok.

Hurd, Ellis. 2010. "Confessions of Belonging: My Emotional Journey as a Medical Translator." *Qualitative Inquiry* 16 (10): 783–791. Accessed February 17, 2017. DOI 10.1177/1077800410383117.

Karlik, Jill. 2010. "Interpreter-Mediated Scriptures: Expectation and Performance." *Interpreting* 12 (2): 160–185. Accessed February 17, 2017. DOI 10.1075/intp.12.2.03kar.

Kaufmann, Francine. 2005. "Contribution à l'histoire de l'interprétation consecutive: le metourgemane dans les synagogues de l'Antiquité." *Meta* 50 (3): 972–986. Accessed February 17, 2017. DOI 10.7202/011608ar.

Kärkkäinen, Veli-Matti. 2001. "Church as Charismatic Fellowship: Ecclesiological Reflections from the Pentecostal-Roman Catholic Dialogue." *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 18: 100–121. Accessed February 17, 2017. DOI 10.1163/17455251-00901006.

Lutz, Catherine, and Geoffrey M. White. 1986. "The Anthropology of Emotions." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15: 405–436. Accessed February 17, 2017. DOI 10.1146/annurev.anthro.15.1.405.

Muñoz Martín, Ricardo. 2010. "On Paradigms and Cognitive Translatology." In *Translation and Cognition*, edited by Gregory M. Shreve and Erik Angelone, 169–187. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Napier, Jemina. 2011. "If a Tree Falls in the Forest, Does It Make a Noise? The Merits of Publishing Interpreting Research." In *Advances in Interpreting Research: Inquiry in Action*, edited by Brenda Nichodemus and Laurie Swabey, 121–152. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Nelson, Timothy J. 2005. *Every Time I Feel the Spirit: Religious Experience, Ritual, and Emotion in an African American Church*. New York University Press.

Ortiz Soriano, Adela. 2015. "Impartiality in Police Interpreting." English translation of the author's article "La imparcialidad en la interpretación policial." *MonTI* 7. Accessed February 17, 2017. DOI 10.6035/MonTI.2015.7.8.

Parrott, W. Gerrod, and Rom Harré. 1996. "Overview." In *The Emotions: Social, Cultural and Biological Dimensions*, edited by Rom Harré and W. Gerrod Parrott, 1–20. London, Thousand Oaks & New Delhi: Sage.

Polkinghorne, Donald. 1988. *Narrative Knowing and the Human Sciences*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Risku, Hanna. 2010. "A Cognitive Scientific View on Technical Communication and Translation: Do Embodiment and Situatedness Really Make a Difference?" *Target* 22 (1): 94–111. Accessed February 17, 2017. DOI 10.1075/target.22.1.06ris.

Rosaldo, Michelle Z. 1984. "Toward an Anthropology of Self and Feeling." In *Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self, and Emotion*, edited by Richard A. Shweder and Robert A. LeVine, 135–157. Cambridge, London, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne & Sydney: Cambridge University Press.

Roy, Cynthia B. 2000. *Interpreting as a Discourse Process*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stark, Rodney, and Charles Y Glock. 1968. *American Piety: The Nature of Religious Commitment*. London: University of California Press.

Tracy, Sarah J. 2010. "Qualitative Quality: Eight 'Big-Tent' Criteria for Excellent Qualitative Research." *Qualitative Inquiry* 16 (10): 837–885. Accessed February 17, 2017. DOI 10.1177/1077800410383121.

Vigouroux, Cécile B. 2010. "Double-Mouthed Discourse: Interpreting, Framing, and Participant Roles." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 14 (3): 341–369. Accessed February 17, 2017. DOI 10.1111/j.1467-9841.2010.00448.x.

Wadensjö, Cecilia. 1998. *Interpreting as Interaction*. London & New York: Longman.

Wetherell, Margaret. 2012. *Affect and Emotion: A New Social Science Understanding*. London, Thousand Oaks & New Delhi: Sage.