


Appendices

Appendix A: Surveys

A.1 English
Thank you for agreeing to take part in this survey. This survey will help to form a better picture of what you expect from interpreters in CLW. In the survey you will find questions on your reasons for coming to church, your views on sermons and your views on interpreting. These are all useful in understanding your expectations of interpreters. Please answer all questions by circling or ticking the one option which best matches your view.

1. Sermons should challenge your behaviour more than your thinking

   Strong Disagree  Disagree  Neither Agree nor Disagree  Agree  Strongly Agree

2. The interpreter should render every detail of what is said

   Strong Disagree  Disagree  Neither Agree nor Disagree  Agree  Strongly Agree

3. The interpreter should add their own explanations to clear up potential misunderstandings

   Strong Disagree  Disagree  Neither Agree nor Disagree  Agree  Strongly Agree

4. The interpreter should act as a mediator and bridge gaps arising from cultural differences

   Strong Disagree  Disagree  Neither Agree nor Disagree  Agree  Strongly Agree

5. Sermons should challenge your thinking more than your behaviour

   Strong Disagree  Disagree  Neither Agree nor Disagree  Agree  Strongly Agree

6. Sermons that touch my emotions have more impact on me than those that make me reflect intellectually

   Strong Disagree  Disagree  Neither Agree nor Disagree  Agree  Strongly Agree
7. The interpreter should agree with the purpose of the church service.

8. The interpreter should be a mature Christian

9. The interpreter should give the gist of what is said

10. The interpreter should not allow their beliefs about the “truth” of the sermon to affect how they interpret

11. Sermons seem most compelling to me when I am moved emotionally

12. The interpreter should translate as faithfully as possible

13. I come to church primarily to be connected with people

14. Sermons should take a detached, academic approach to the Bible
15. The best Sunday services are those when I feel I have been touched by God

Strong Disagree       Disagree       Neither Agree nor Disagree       Agree       Strongly Agree

16. Noone outside of CLW should interpret in CLW church services.

Strong Disagree       Disagree       Neither Agree nor Disagree       Agree       Strongly Agree

17. The interpreter should remain entirely objective while they are interpreting

Strong Disagree       Disagree       Neither Agree nor Disagree       Agree       Strongly Agree

18. I come to church primarily to feel connected with God

Strong Disagree       Disagree       Neither Agree nor Disagree       Agree       Strongly Agree

19. If the preacher mentions something specific to German culture, the interpreter should

(please tick one):
Simply repeat what was said       □
Find a close equivalent in an English-speaking culture       □
Give an explanation

Umfrage zum Thema: Erwartungen an Dolmetscher in der Kirche

Vielen Dank, dass Sie einverstanden sind, an folgender Umfrage teilzunehmen. Die Umfrage wird dazu beitragen, Ihnen ein besseres Bild über Dolmetscher in der CLW zu verschaffen. In der Umfrage befinden sich Fragen zu Ihren Beweggründen in die Kirche zu kommen, zu Ihren Ansichten über Predigten und Dolmetscher. All dies ist für das Verstehen Ihrer Erwartungen an die Dolmetscher nützlich. Antworten Sie bitte auf alle folgenden Fragen durch Einkreisen oder Ankreuzen einer Option, die Ihren Ansichten am besten entspricht.

1. Predigten sollten mehr Ihr Verhalten als Ihr Denken fordern.

   Total dagegen  Stimme nicht zu  Weder dafür  Stimme zu  Stimme total zu noch dagegen

2. Der Dolmetscher sollte jede Einzelheit übertragen.

   Total dagegen  Stimme nicht zu  Weder dafür  Stimme zu  Stimme total zu noch dagegen

3. Der Dolmetscher sollte seine eigenen Erläuterungen hinzufügen, damit mögliche Missverständnisse ausbleiben

   Total dagegen  Stimme nicht zu  Weder dafür  Stimme zu  Stimme total zu noch dagegen

4. Der Dolmetscher sollte als Vermittler wirken und die, durch die kulturellen Unterschiede entstandenen Lücken, überbrücken.

   Total dagegen  Stimme nicht zu  Weder dafür  Stimme zu  Stimme total zu noch dagegen

5. Die Predigten sollten mehr Ihr Denken als Ihr Verhalten fordern
6. Die Predigten, die mich auf emotionaler Ebene berühren, haben mehr Einfluss auf mich als jene, die mich intellektuell reflektieren.


8. Der Dolmetscher sollte ein reifer Christ sein.

9. Der Dolmetscher sollte das Wesentliche wiedergeben.

10. Der Dolmetscher sollte die “Wahrheit” der Predigt nicht durch die Art und Weise seines eigenen Auslegens beeinflussen.

11. Predigten scheinen mir fesselnder, wenn ich emotional bewegt bin.
12. Der Dolmetscher sollte so getreu wie möglich übersetzen

Total dagegen  Stimme nicht zu  Weder dafür  Stimme zu  Stimme total zu noch dagegen

13. Der Hauptgrund meines Kirchenbesuchs ist, mit Menschen in Kontakt zu kommen

Total dagegen  Stimme nicht zu  Weder dafür  Stimme zu  Stimme total zu noch dagegen

14. Die Predigt sollte sich unabhängig sein und geistig der Bibel nahe stehen

Total dagegen  Stimme nicht zu  Weder dafür  Stimme zu  Stimme total zu noch dagegen


Total dagegen  Stimme nicht zu  Weder dafür  Stimme zu  Stimme total zu noch dagegen

16. Niemand außerhalb der CLW sollte auf CLW-Gottesdiensten dolmetschen

Total dagegen  Stimme nicht zu  Weder dafür  Stimme zu  Stimme total zu noch dagegen

17. Die Dolmetscher sollten während des Dolmetschens rein objektiv bleiben.

Total dagegen  Stimme nicht zu  Weder dafür  Stimme zu  Stimme total zu noch dagegen

18. Ich komme hauptsächlich zur Kirche, um mich mit Gott verbunden zu fühlen
Total dagegen  Stimme nicht zu  Weder dafür  Stimme zu  Stimme total zu
noch dagegen

19. Falls der Prediger etwas Bestimmtes zur deutschen Kultur nennt, so sollte der Dolmetscher (bitte kreuzen Sie eine Antwort an):

- einfach wiederholen, was gesagt wurde  □
- eine ähnliche Wiedergabe dessen  □
- in der deutsch - sprachigen Kultur finden
- eine Erklärung geben  □
Gracias por haber aceptado participar en esta encuesta, cuyo objetivo es el de contribuir a conocer mejor las expectativas que hay en torno a los intérpretes en la CLW. En la encuesta encontrará preguntas sobre sus motivos para ir a la iglesia y su opinión tanto de los sermones como de la interpretación. Todas ellas serán de utilidad para entender lo que se espera de los intérpretes. Por favor, responda a todas las preguntas señalando la opción (solamente una) que mejor refleje su opinión.

1. **Los sermones deberían estimularme más el comportamiento que el pensamiento**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo</th>
<th>En desacuerdo</th>
<th>Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo</th>
<th>De acuerdo</th>
<th>Totalmente de acuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. **El intérprete debería transmitir hasta el mínimo detalle de lo que se dice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo</th>
<th>En desacuerdo</th>
<th>Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo</th>
<th>De acuerdo</th>
<th>Totalmente de acuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. **El intérprete debería añadir sus propias aclaraciones para evitar posibles malentendidos**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo</th>
<th>En desacuerdo</th>
<th>Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo</th>
<th>De acuerdo</th>
<th>Totalmente de acuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. **El intérprete debería actuar como mediador y salvar posibles diferencias culturales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo</th>
<th>En desacuerdo</th>
<th>Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo</th>
<th>De acuerdo</th>
<th>Totalmente de acuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. **Los sermones deberían estimularme más el pensamiento que el comportamiento**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo</th>
<th>En desacuerdo</th>
<th>Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo</th>
<th>De acuerdo</th>
<th>Totalmente de acuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. **Los sermones que llegan a emocionarme me influyen más que los que me hacen reflexionar intelectualmente**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo</th>
<th>En desacuerdo</th>
<th>Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo</th>
<th>De acuerdo</th>
<th>Totalmente de acuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. **El intérprete debe estar de acuerdo con los objetivos de la ceremonia religiosa**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo</th>
<th>En desacuerdo</th>
<th>Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo</th>
<th>De acuerdo</th>
<th>Totalmente de acuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
8. El intérprete debe ser un cristiano convencido

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo</th>
<th>En desacuerdo</th>
<th>Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo</th>
<th>De acuerdo</th>
<th>Totalmente de acuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. El intérprete debería dar la idea esencial de lo que se dice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo</th>
<th>En desacuerdo</th>
<th>Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo</th>
<th>De acuerdo</th>
<th>Totalmente de acuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. El intérprete NO debería dejar que sus creencias en torno a la “verdad” del sermón afecten a la manera en que interpreta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo</th>
<th>En desacuerdo</th>
<th>Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo</th>
<th>De acuerdo</th>
<th>Totalmente de acuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. Los sermones que me parecen más convincentes son los que me llegan a los sentimientos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo</th>
<th>En desacuerdo</th>
<th>Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo</th>
<th>De acuerdo</th>
<th>Totalmente de acuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. El intérprete debería traducir de manera tan fiel al original como sea posible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo</th>
<th>En desacuerdo</th>
<th>Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo</th>
<th>De acuerdo</th>
<th>Totalmente de acuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. Voy a la iglesia principalmente para mantener vínculos con la gente

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo</th>
<th>En desacuerdo</th>
<th>Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo</th>
<th>De acuerdo</th>
<th>Totalmente de acuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. Los sermones deberían adoptar un enfoque imparcial, académico en torno a la Biblia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo</th>
<th>En desacuerdo</th>
<th>Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo</th>
<th>De acuerdo</th>
<th>Totalmente de acuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. Las mejores misas dominicales son aquellas en las que me siento tocado por Dios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo</th>
<th>En desacuerdo</th>
<th>Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo</th>
<th>De acuerdo</th>
<th>Totalmente de acuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

16. Nadie externo a la CLW debería interpretar en su iglesia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo</th>
<th>En desacuerdo</th>
<th>Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo</th>
<th>De acuerdo</th>
<th>Totalmente de acuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
17. El intérprete debería mantener una completa objetividad mientras interpreta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo</th>
<th>En desacuerdo</th>
<th>Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo</th>
<th>De acuerdo</th>
<th>Totalmente de acuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

18. Voy a la iglesia principalmente para sentir un vínculo con Dios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo</th>
<th>En desacuerdo</th>
<th>Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo</th>
<th>De acuerdo</th>
<th>Totalmente de acuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

19. Si el predicador menciona algún aspecto específico de la cultura alemana, el intérprete debería (seleccione una de las opciones):

- Simplemente repetir lo que se dice
- Encontrar un equivalente cercano en la cultura hispano-hablante
- Ofrecer una explicación
A.4 French

Nous vous remercions d’avoir accepté de participer à ce sondage. Il nous permettra de mieux connaître quelles sont vos attentes vis à vis des interprètes dans CLW. Dans ce questionnaire vous trouverez des questions sur vos motivations pour vous rendre à l’église, votre avis sur les sermons et votre avis sur l’interprétation. Tout cela est utile afin de comprendre vos attentes par rapport aux interprètes. Veuillez répondre à toutes les questions en entourant la seule option qui correspond à votre avis.

1. Les sermons devraient avoir plus d’impact sur votre comportement que sur votre manière de penser.

Absolument pas d’accord   Plutôt pas d’accord   Sans opinion   Plutôt d’accord   Tout à fait d’accord

2. L’interprète devrait transmettre chaque détail de ce qui est dit.

Absolument pas d’accord   Plutôt pas d’accord   Sans opinion   Plutôt d’accord   Tout à fait d’accord

3. L’interprète devrait ajouter leurs propres explications afin d’éclaircir les malentendus potentiels.

Absolument pas d’accord   Plutôt pas d’accord   Sans opinion   Plutôt d’accord   Tout à fait d’accord

4. L’interprète devrait jouer un rôle de médiateur et ainsi combler le fossé provoqué par les différences culturelles.

Absolument pas d’accord   Plutôt pas d’accord   Sans opinion   Plutôt d’accord   Tout à fait d’accord

5. Les sermons devraient avoir plus d’impact sur votre manière de penser que sur votre comportement.
6. Les sermons qui touchent mes émotions ont plus d'impact sur moi que ceux qui m'incitent à avoir une réflexion intellectuelle.

7. L'interprète devrait être d'accord avec le but de la réunion.

8. L'interprète devrait être un chrétien actif.

9. L'interprète devrait donner l'idée générale de ce qui est dit.

10. L'interprète ne devrait pas laisser ce qu'il considère être « vrai » à propos du sermon affecter sa façon d'interpréter.

11. Les sermons me semblent plus convaincants lorsque je suis touché(e) émotionnellement.
12. L'interprète devrait traduire le plus fidèlement possible.

13. Je viens à l'église principalement pour rencontrer des gens.

14. Les sermons devraient être présentés avec une approche académique, détachée de la Bible.

15. Les meilleures réunions du dimanche sont ceux pendant lesquels j'ai l'impression d'avoir été touché par Dieu.

16. Aucune personne extérieure à CLW ne devrait interpréter lors des réunions de CLW.

17. L'interprète devrait rester entièrement objectif lorsqu'il interprète.
18. Je viens à l’église principalement pour me sentir lié à Dieu.

Absolument pas d’accord  Plutôt pas d’accord  Sans opinion  Plutôt d’accord  Tout à fait d’accord

19. Si le prédicateur mentionne un trait spécifique de la culture allemande, l’interprète devrait (choisissez une solution) :

Simplement répéter ce qui a été dit  □
Trouver une référence équivalente dans la culture francophone  □
L’expliquer  □
Опрос о ваших ожиданиях относительно устного перевода в церкви

Спасибо за то, что согласились принять участие в этом опросе. Этот опрос поможет лучше понять, чего вы ожидаете от переводчиков в церкви «Живое Слово». В него включены вопросы о том, почему вы пришли в церковь, о ваших взглядах на проповеди и перевод. Все это важно для того, чтобы понять, чего вы ждете от переводчиков. Для каждого вопроса выберите один вариант ответа, наиболее соответствующий вашим взглядам обводя его кружочком или ставя рядом с ним галочку.

1. Проповеди должны в большей степени касаться поведения, а не мыслей

Совершенно не согласен Не согласен Ни то, ни другое Согласен Совершенно согласен

2. Переводчик должен переводить каждую деталь из того, что говорят

Совершенно не согласен Не согласен Ни то, ни другое Согласен Совершенно согласен

3. Переводчик должен добавлять свои собственные объяснения, чтобы прояснить устранить возможные недопонимания

Совершенно не согласен Не согласен Ни то, ни другое Согласен Совершенно согласен

4. Переводчик должен выступать в роли посредника и устранять непонимание, возникающее при соприкосновении различных культур.

Совершенно не согласен Не согласен Ни то, ни другое Согласен Совершенно согласен

5. Проповеди должны в большей степени касаться мыслей, чем поведения
6. Проповеди, застравивающие мои эмоции, влияют на меня больше, чем те, которые заставляют меня размышлять

Совершенно не согласен  Не согласен  Ни то, ни другое  Согласен  Совершенно согласен

7. Переводчик должен соглашаться с целью церковной службы.

Совершенно не согласен  Не согласен  Ни то, ни другое  Согласен  Совершенно согласен

8. Переводчик должен быть зрелым христианином

Совершенно не согласен  Не согласен  Ни то, ни другое  Согласен  Совершенно согласен

9. Переводчик должен передавать истинный смысл того, что говорится

Совершенно не согласен  Не согласен  Ни то, ни другое  Согласен  Совершенно согласен

10. Переводчик не должен позволять своим убеждениям об «истинности» проповеди влиять на перевод

Совершенно не согласен  Не согласен  Ни то, ни другое  Согласен  Совершенно согласен

11. Проповеди кажутся мне наиболее захватывающими, когда затрагивают меня эмоционально
Совершенно не согласен  Не согласен  Ни то, ни другое  Согласен  Совершенно согласен

12. Переводчик должен переводить как можно точнее
Совершенно не согласен  Не согласен  Ни то, ни другое  Согласен  Совершенно согласен

13. Я прихожу в церковь, прежде всего для того, чтобы ощутить связь с людьми
Совершенно не согласен  Не согласен  Ни то, ни другое  Согласен  Совершенно согласен

14. В проповедях должен использоваться беспристрастный, академический подход к Библии
Совершенно не согласен  Не согласен  Ни то, ни другое  Согласен  Совершенно согласен

15. Самые лучшие воскресные проповеди – это те, во время которых я чувствую, что ко мне прикоснулся Бог
Совершенно не согласен  Не согласен  Ни то, ни другое  Согласен  Совершенно согласен

Совершенно не согласен  Не согласен  Ни то, ни другое  Согласен  Совершенно согласен

17. Переводчик должен оставаться полностью объективным при переводе.
Совершенно не согласен  Не согласен  Ни то, ни другое  Согласен  Совершенно согласен

18. Я прихожу в церковь, прежде всего, для того, чтобы почувствовать контакт с Богом

Совершенно не согласен  Не согласен  Ни то, ни другое  Согласен  Совершенно согласен

19. Если пастор упоминает что-то характерное для русской культуры, переводчик должен
(пожалуйста, отметьте один вариант):

просто повторить то, что было сказано  □
найти близкий эквивалент в культуре языка перевода  □
дать объяснение  □
از اینکه در این نظرسنجی شرکت می‌کنید، از شما سپاسگزاریم. این پرسش‌نامه به شما امکان می‌دهد تجسم بهتری از انتظارات خود از مترجمان حاضر در CLW داشته باشید. در این نظرسنجی، پرسش‌هایی درباره دلایل حضور شما در کلیسا، همچنین نظرات شما درباره خاطره‌ها و ترجمه‌های شفاهی وجود دارد. تمام این موارد برای درک بهتر شما از انتظارات خود از مترجمان شفاهی مقیم هستند. لطفاً با کشیدن دایره یا علامت، یک گزینه را که به نظرات شما نزدیک تر است، انتخاب کنید.

1. خطبه‌ها باید رفتار شما را بیشتر از افکار شما به چالش بکشند
   - کاملاً مخالف
   - مخالف
   - بی‌طرف
   - موافق
   - کاملاً موافق

2. مترجم شفاهی باید تمام جزئیات خطبه را ترجمه کند
   - کاملاً مخالف
   - مخالف
   - بی‌طرف
   - موافق
   - کاملاً موافق

3. مترجم شفاهی باید برای جلوگیری از برداشت‌های نادرست از سخنان، توضیحات خود را نیز اضافه کند
   - کاملاً مخالف
   - مخالف
   - بی‌طرف
   - موافق
   - کاملاً موافق

4. مترجم شفاهی باید نقش یک واسط را داشته باشد و شکاف‌های ناشی از تفاوت‌های فرهنگی را پر کند
   - کاملاً مخالف
   - مخالف
   - بی‌طرف
   - موافق
   - کاملاً موافق

5. خطبه‌ها باید افکار شما را به‌یک و بیشتر از رفتار شما به چالش بکشند
   - کاملاً مخالف
   - مخالف
   - بی‌طرف
   - موافق
   - کاملاً موافق

6. خطبه‌هایی که احساسات من را بررسی انجام داده و احساسات شاد و اندیشه عقلانی من را پر کنند
   - کاملاً مخالف
   - مخالف
   - بی‌طرف
   - موافق
   - کاملاً موافق

7. مترجم شفاهی باید اهداف مراسم کلیسا را پیشبرد
   - کاملاً مخالف
   - مخالف
   - بی‌طرف
   - موافق
   - کاملاً موافق
8. مترجم شفاهی باید یک مسیحی تمام عیار باشد

کاملاً مخالف، مخالف، موافق، کاملاً موافق

9. مترجم شفاهی باید نکات مهم خطبه را ترجمه کند

کاملاً مخالف، مخالف، بی طرف، موافق، کاملاً موافق

10. مترجم شفاهی باید اجازه به دهد که عقیده او درباره صحت خطبه‌ها بر نحوه ترجمه تأثیر بگذارد

کاملاً مخالف، مخالف، بی طرف، موافق، کاملاً موافق

11. وقتی احساسات من برانگیخته می‌شوند، خطبه‌ها برایم قانع‌تر می‌شوند

کاملاً مخالف، مخالف، بی طرف، موافق، کاملاً موافق

12. مترجم شفاهی باید تا حد امکان وفاداره ترجمه کند

کاملاً مخالف، مخالف، بی طرف، موافق، کاملاً موافق

13. من در وهله اول برای ارتباط با مردم به کلیسا می‌آید

کاملاً مخالف، مخالف، بی طرف، موافق، کاملاً موافق

14. خطبه‌ها براید رویکردی علمی و مجزا از کتاب مقدس داشته باشند

کاملاً مخالف، مخالف، بی طرف، موافق، کاملاً موافق

15. بهترین مراسم یکشنبه برای من مراسمی است که در آن احساس کنم خدا به من نزدیک شده است

کاملاً مخالف، مخالف، بی طرف، موافق، کاملاً موافق

16. هیچ یک از افراد خارج از CLW نباید در مراسم کلیسای CLW ترجمه کند.
17. مترجم شفاهی باید هنگام ترجمه کاملًا بی طرف باشد

18. من در وهله اول برای احساس نزدیکی به خدا به کلیسا می‌آم

19. اگر خطیب به موضوعی اشاره کند که به فرهنگ فارسی مربوط می‌شود، مترجم شفاهی باید (لطفاً یک گزینه را علامت بزنید):

1. Kazania powinny bardziej prowokować do działania niż do myślenia

Zdecydowanie nie zgadzam się       Raczej się nie zgadzam       Nie mam zdania       Raczej się zgadzam
Zdecydowanie się zgadzam

2. Tłumacz ustny powinien dążyć do przełożenia każdego szczegółu wypowiedzi

Zdecydowanie nie zgadzam się       Raczej się nie zgadzam       Nie mam zdania       Raczej się zgadzam
Zdecydowanie się zgadzam

3. Tłumacz ustny powinien dodawać od siebie wyjaśnienia, aby zapobiec potencjalnym nieporozumieniom

Zdecydowanie nie zgadzam się       Raczej się nie zgadzam       Nie mam zdania       Raczej się zgadzam
Zdecydowanie się zgadzam

4. Tłumacz ustny powinien pełnić funkcję pośrednika i uzupełniać niedopowiedzenia wynikające z różnic kulturowych

Zdecydowanie nie zgadzam się       Raczej się nie zgadzam       Nie mam zdania       Raczej się zgadzam
Zdecydowanie się zgadzam
5. Kazania powinny bardziej prowokować do myślenia niż do działania
Zdecydowanie nie zgadzam się  Raczej się nie zgadzam  Nie mam zdania  Raczej się zgadzam
Zdecydowanie się zgadzam

6. Kazania, które oddziałują na moje emocje, mają na mnie większy wpływ niż te, które pobudzają do refleksji intelektualnej
Zdecydowanie nie zgadzam się  Raczej się nie zgadzam  Nie mam zdania  Raczej się zgadzam
Zdecydowanie się zgadzam

7. Tłumacz ustny powinien wierzyć w celowość obrzędów kościelnych.
Zdecydowanie nie zgadzam się  Raczej się nie zgadzam  Nie mam zdania  Raczej się zgadzam
Zdecydowanie się zgadzam

8. Tłumacz ustny powinien być dojrzałym chrześcijaninem
Zdecydowanie nie zgadzam się  Raczej się nie zgadzam  Nie mam zdania  Raczej się zgadzam
Zdecydowanie się zgadzam

9. Tłumacz ustny powinien dążyć do przełożenia istoty wypowiedzi
Zdecydowanie nie zgadzam się  Raczej się nie zgadzam  Nie mam zdania  Raczej się zgadzam
Zdecydowanie się zgadzam

10. Tłumacz ustny nie powinien dopuścić do tego, by jego własne przekonania na temat "prawdy" zawartej w kazaniu wpłynęły na tłumaczenie
11. Najbardziej zajmujące są dla mnie te kazania, które poruszają mnie emocjonalnie

12. Tłumacz ustny powinien dążyć do jak najwierniejszego przekładu

13. Przychodzę do kościoła przede wszystkim po to, by poczuć wspólnotę z innymi ludźmi

14. Kazania powinny charakteryzować się bezstronnym, naukowym podejściem do Biblii

15. Najlepsze nabożeństwa niedzielne to te, w czasie których czuję wyraźną obecność Boga
16. Ci, którzy nie należą do Kościoła CLW, nie powinni pełnić funkcji tłumaczy ustnych w czasie ceremonii kościelnych.

Zdecydowanie nie zgadzam się  Raczej się nie zgadzam  Nie mam zdania  Raczej się zgadzam  Zdecydowanie się zgadzam

17. Tłumacz ustny powinien zachować całkowitą obiektywność podczas tłumaczenia

Zdecydowanie nie zgadzam się  Raczej się nie zgadzam  Nie mam zdania  Raczej się zgadzam  Zdecydowanie się zgadzam

18. Przychodzę do kościoła przede wszystkim po to, by czuć łączność z Bogiem

Zdecydowanie nie zgadzam się  Raczej się nie zgadzam  Nie mam zdania  Raczej się zgadzam  Zdecydowanie się zgadzam

19. Jeśli pastor wspomina o czymś, co jest typowe dla polskiego kręgu kulturowego, wówczas tłumacz ustny powinien (proszę wybrać jedną odpowiedź):

Powtórzyć tylko to, co zostało powiedziane  □  
Znaleźć bliski odpowiednik w kulturze krajów anglosaskich  □  
Podać wyjaśnienie  □
### Appendix B: Detailed Survey Results and Statistics

#### B.1 Survey results tables – total answers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Sermons should challenge your behaviour more than your thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>The interpreter should render every detail of what is said</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>The interpreter should add their own explanations to clear up potential misunderstandings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Dis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>The interpreter should act as a mediator and bridge gaps arising from cultural differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Dis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Sermons should challenge your thinking more than your behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Dis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Sermons that touch my emotions have more impact on me than those that make me reflect intellectually</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Dis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>The interpreter should agree with the purpose of the church service.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Dis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q8  The interpreter should be a mature Christian  
SD       Dis     NAD     Agree     SA  
1         9        8      23       21  

Q9  The interpreter should give the gist of what is said  
SD       Dis     NAD     Agree     SA  
2         9        3      39       7  

Q10 The interpreter should not allow their beliefs about the “truth” of the sermon to affect how they interpret  
SD       Dis     NAD     Agree     SA  
1         3        7      31       21  

Q11 Sermons seem most compelling to me when I am moved emotionally  
SD       Dis     NAD     Agree     SA  
1         15       6      28       13  

Q12 The interpreter should translate as faithfully as possible  
SD       Dis     NAD     Agree     SA  
0         3        0      34       24  

Q13 I come to church primarily to be connected with people  
SD       Dis     NAD     Agree     SA  
4         27       15     13       3  

Q14 Sermons should take a detached, academic approach to the Bible  
SD       Dis     NAD     Agree     SA  
8         13       7      18       12  

Q15 The best Sunday services are those when I feel I have been touched by God  
SD       Dis     NAD     Agree     SA  
0         1        6      22       32  

Q16 Noone outside of CLW should interpret in CLW church services.  
SD       Dis     NAD     Agree     SA  
7         20       14     16       2
Q17 The interpreter should remain entirely objective while they are interpreting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>NAD</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q18 I come to church primarily to feel connected with God

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>NAD</th>
<th>Agr</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q19 If the preacher mentions something specific to German culture, the interpreter should

- Simply repeat what was said
- Find a close equivalent in an English-speaking culture
- Give an explanation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Simply repeat what was said</th>
<th>Find a close equivalent in an English-speaking culture</th>
<th>Give an explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B.2 Statistical significance of Group Membership on Item Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>15.896^a</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>15.175^a</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>10.883^a</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.539</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>8.721^a</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>10.373(^a)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>14.626(^a)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>15.909(^a)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Q9  | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>56.394$^2$</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>14.692$^2$</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q11</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>13.327$^2$</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q12</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>2.246$^2$</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q13</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>23.440$^2$</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>9.010(^a)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>11.542(^a)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q16</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>17.975(^a)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q17</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>23.797(^a)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Q18 | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2- |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>15.933$^*$</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>7.870(^a)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B.3 Statistical Significance of Language on Item Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>39.620⁸</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>41.499⁷</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>30.360⁸</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>34.081⁸</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

⁸ Significant at the 0.05 level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>69.317a</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>57.549a</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>30.577a</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>85.010a</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>56.394a</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>84.888a</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>42.725$^*$$^a$</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q12</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>23.032$^a$</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q13</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>43.253$^a$</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q14</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>44.946$^a$</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q15</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>37.564$^a$</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q16</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.357&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.707&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.206&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B.4 Reliability Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Cronbachs Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESI</td>
<td>0.633689</td>
<td>0.773019</td>
<td>0.308336</td>
<td>0.441217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>0.596499</td>
<td>0.743375</td>
<td>0.079253</td>
<td>0.340931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF</td>
<td>0.573904</td>
<td>0.798291</td>
<td>0.126705</td>
<td>0.614840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKOP</td>
<td>0.633835</td>
<td>0.775838</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.422623</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C: Interview Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Interview Length (mm:ss)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IEN</td>
<td>Ivonne</td>
<td>23:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEN</td>
<td>Ila</td>
<td>28:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEN</td>
<td>Adrien</td>
<td>08:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEN</td>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>12:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEN TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>72:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLW</td>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>34:32 + 01:41 + 02:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLW</td>
<td>Mario</td>
<td>12:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLW</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>25:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLW</td>
<td>Arabelle</td>
<td>03:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLW</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>11:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLW</td>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>03:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLW TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>95:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>168:28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Interview Scripts in Original Languages

D.1 Interview with Ivonne (IEN) – IFF1

1 Int: Et ça commence. Donc. Je veux remercier de m’avoir donné cette opportunité de vous
2 interviewer. Et il sera très utile de savoir ce que vous pensez de la traduction à la conférence de
3 Brighton cet été. Cet interview sera transcrit pour faciliter mais, et il sera possible de lier les
4 interviews avec les réponses aux questions, euh, sur les sondages. Cependant, personne, sauf moi,
5 sauf moi verra ni votre nom, ni votre adresse email, donc, euh, est-ce que vous êtes content de
6 continuer avec l’interview sous ces conditions.
7 Resp: Oui
8 Int : Donc. C’est les mentions légales. Merci. D’abord, d’abord, je vais vous poser des questions
9 générales sur votre expérience et vos attentes de la conférence. Et ceci vous aidera de devenir
10 confortable. Donc, au tout premier lieu, depuis quand allez-vous à la conférence européenne à
11 Brighton ?
13 Int : Depuis 2003. Donc ça fait
14 Resp : /depuis, euh, neuf ans.
15 Int : Neuf ans, déjà ?
17 Int : Huit ans [rie]. Donc, euh, pourquoi revenez-vous chaque année ?
18 Resp : [rie] parce que je traduis.
19 Int : [rie] C’est une bonne réponse, ça ! Il faut être là, parce que moi, je suis traducteur.
20 Resp : Mais non, parce que j’aime beaucoup, hm. Même, si, je traduisais pas, j’irais chaque année,
21 parce que, euh, je trouve que c’est un moment fort, où on entend excellent prédication, et aussi,
22 c’est un moment où on peut revoir des amies et se faire de nouvelles connections parce que COC,
23 c’est vraiment un réseau international. Et, donc, c’est aussi une raison.
24 Int : Donc, c’est pour vous, c’est une question de la prédication et des connections, c’est ça ?
26 Int : Et donc, euh, ça peut paraître un peu simple mais quelles sont vos attentes pour la conférence
27 cet année, la même chose ou quelque chose de nouvelle ?
28 Resp : Non. La même chose.
29 Int : La même chose ? Et, donc, maintenant, je vais vous poser des questions sur votre expérience de
30 la traduction, seulement à la conférence européenne. Et ça va être très bon, j’espère. Donc, euh,
pouvez-vous m', me parler d'une fois où la traduction allait très bien à la conférence ? Juste la conférence à Brighton.


Int : [rire] Où est l'interprète ?

Resp : J'ai jamais écouté la traduction. [rire]

Int : [rire] Mais, mais, euh, dans la, dans la cabine, euh

Resp: Ouais, dans la cabine. Oui, oui, oui, euh, parfois ça m'est arrivée que ça coule tout seul et je me demandais par quel miracle (rire) c'est possible.

Int: Donc, vous trouvez que c'est difficile d'être traducteur à la conférence?

Resp: Oui, c'est pas facile. C'est un travail, [oh j'essaie de le remettre]. C'est un travail, euh, [xxx].

C'est un travail qui est très fatigant et, euh, ça demande une énorme concentration et donc, euh, c'est pas facile.

Int: Donc, pourquoi, c'est pas facile? C'est une question des, du contenu des messages, des mots?

Resp: Non, c'est. Non, non, c'est une question de, c'est le travail en lui-même qui est pas facile parce qu'il faut se traduire simultanément, et, ben, au-délà il faut toujours être concentré et aller très vite. Il faut aller longtemps.

Int: Comme d'hab.

Resp: Après, effectivement, il y a les orateurs plus difficiles que d'autres, à cause de leurs accents et à cause de leurs façons de prêcher. Par exemple ceux qui ne sont pas structurés et qui passent une blague ou une pensée, ben, voilà, sont difficiles. [3:46]

Int: Et donc, euh, les fois où, il n'est pas si bien, c'est la faute des prédicateurs où c'était votre faute?

Resp: Ca peut être aussi de ma faute si je suis épuisée et dans un moment où je suis de mauvais humeur parce que c'est fatiguant donc j'ai moins de capacité mais souvent c'est la faute de l'orateur, quand-même!

Int: Donc, donc, c'est normalement la faute de l'orateur et le fatigue qui nous stressent, et vous serez


Int: Donc, euh, vous avez mentionné, ehm qu'il existait des orateurs qui ne prêchent pas très facilement.

Resp. Oui

Int: Moi, je me demandais aussi, si, s'il était important d'avoir une sorte de rapport avec le prédicateur. Et est-ce que vous pensez qu'il important qu'il existe une sorte de rapport entre vous et le prédicateur et entre le prédicateur et le publique?
Oui, je pense que c'est important parce que les prédicateurs comme Lee, que je connais très bien depuis des années. Maintenant je le traduis vraiment facilement parce que, euh, voilà on se connaît donc je connais aussi leurs façons de penser et par contre, bon, je pense que c'est important mais je pense que dans les grandes conférences, euh, où on est dans une cabine, tout simplement, matériellement, c'est pas possible de parler avec, euh, tous les orateurs juste parce qu'on est traducteurs/

/ donc

Je pense pas que ce soit possible mais si c'est possible, c'est une bonne chose. Maintenant, euh, si on peut leur parler, pendant dix minutes, je pense pas que ça changera grande chose. C'est plutôt une connaissance, euh, de long date avec l'orateur. Ça aide.

Donc, euh, est-ce qu'il existe des choses qu'on peut faire pour créer ce genre de rapport?

Je pense pas que ce soit possible mais si c'est possible, c'est une bonne chose. Maintenant, euh, si on peut leur parler, pendant dix minutes, je pense pas que ça changera grande chose. C'est plutôt une connaissance, euh, de long date avec l'orateur. Ça aide.

Donc, euh, est-ce qu'il existe des choses qu'on peut faire pour créer ce genre de rapport?

Je pense pas que ce soit possible mais si c'est possible, c'est une bonne chose. Maintenant, euh, si on peut leur parler, pendant dix minutes, je pense pas que ça changera grande chose. C'est plutôt une connaissance, euh, de long date avec l'orateur. Ça aide.

Donc, euh, est-ce qu'il existe des choses qu'on peut faire pour créer ce genre de rapport?

Je pense pas que ce soit possible mais si c'est possible, c'est une bonne chose. Maintenant, euh, si on peut leur parler, pendant dix minutes, je pense pas que ça changera grande chose. C'est plutôt une connaissance, euh, de long date avec l'orateur. Ça aide.

Donc, euh, est-ce qu'il existe des choses qu'on peut faire pour créer ce genre de rapport?

Je pense pas que ce soit possible mais si c'est possible, c'est une bonne chose. Maintenant, euh, si on peut leur parler, pendant dix minutes, je pense pas que ça changera grande chose. C'est plutôt une connaissance, euh, de long date avec l'orateur. Ça aide.

Donc, euh, est-ce qu'il existe des choses qu'on peut faire pour créer ce genre de rapport?

Je pense pas que ce soit possible mais si c'est possible, c'est une bonne chose. Maintenant, euh, si on peut leur parler, pendant dix minutes, je pense pas que ça changera grande chose. C'est plutôt une connaissance, euh, de long date avec l'orateur. Ça aide.

Donc, euh, est-ce qu'il existe des choses qu'on peut faire pour créer ce genre de rapport?

Je pense pas que ce soit possible mais si c'est possible, c'est une bonne chose. Maintenant, euh, si on peut leur parler, pendant dix minutes, je pense pas que ça changera grande chose. C'est plutôt une connaissance, euh, de long date avec l'orateur. Ça aide.

Donc, euh, est-ce qu'il existe des choses qu'on peut faire pour créer ce genre de rapport?

Je pense pas que ce soit possible mais si c'est possible, c'est une bonne chose. Maintenant, euh, si on peut leur parler, pendant dix minutes, je pense pas que ça changera grande chose. C'est plutôt une connaissance, euh, de long date avec l'orateur. Ça aide.

Donc, euh, est-ce qu'il existe des choses qu'on peut faire pour créer ce genre de rapport?

Je pense pas que ce soit possible mais si c'est possible, c'est une bonne chose. Maintenant, euh, si on peut leur parler, pendant dix minutes, je pense pas que ça changera grande chose. C'est plutôt une connaissance, euh, de long date avec l'orateur. Ça aide.

Donc, euh, est-ce qu'il existe des choses qu'on peut faire pour créer ce genre de rapport?

Je pense pas que ce soit possible mais si c'est possible, c'est une bonne chose. Maintenant, euh, si on peut leur parler, pendant dix minutes, je pense pas que ça changera grande chose. C'est plutôt une connaissance, euh, de long date avec l'orateur. Ça aide.

Donc, euh, est-ce qu'il existe des choses qu'on peut faire pour créer ce genre de rapport?

Je pense pas que ce soit possible mais si c'est possible, c'est une bonne chose. Maintenant, euh, si on peut leur parler, pendant dix minutes, je pense pas que ça changera grande chose. C'est plutôt une connaissance, euh, de long date avec l'orateur. Ça aide.

Donc, euh, est-ce qu'il existe des choses qu'on peut faire pour créer ce genre de rapport?
Int : Mais, dans, euh, un sens plus général, j’ai vu des, des, des, euh, des articles où ils ont dit qu’il est important de créer un rapport entre le prédicateur et le public avec peut-être des blagues, avec

Resp : Oui

Int : Avec les mentions des personnes. Est-ce que les interprètes peuvent aider ce genre de chose ?

Resp : Oui, alors pour moi, l’interprète peut aider, aider quand il traduit à côté du prédicateur. Par contre, en cabine, euh, je pense que c’est très très limité.

Int : Donc, euh.

Resp : Très limité parce que déjà ça va très vite donc, euh, c’est, parfois on arrive à traduire les blagues mais parfois pas du tout donc il faut l’accepter. C’est comme ça. Par contre, oui, euh, le traducteur à un grand rôle quand il est à côté.

Int : Donc vous pensez que la cabine crée une sorte de barrière entre le public et, et ?


Int : Donc, c’est, c’est très intéressant, ça parce qu’en fait cette réponse mène à la prochaine question, c’est que récemment, quelques prédicateurs ont dit que l’interprète et le prédicateur sont des partenaires dans la prédication. Que pensez-vous de cette idée ? C’est une bonne idée, c’est vrai ?

Resp : Oui, c’est, c’est, c’est très vrai, et c’est une très bonne idée parce que, euh, c’est une, ils sont des partenaires et une équipe, parce que, euh, eum, le prédicateur, par exemple, il doit faire attention à arrêter ces phrases suffisamment tôt pour que le traducteur, l’interprète, il a le temps de faire aussi sa phrase et de ne pas reprendre la phrase suivante trop tôt mais inversement, je pense que l’interprète, il doit vraiment faire attention, euh, comment dire, à, eum, garder le même ton que le prédicateur et il doit pas être un frein. Donc, le traducteur, il doit vraiment soutenir le prédicateur en essayant de faire le maximum comme lui. Voilà, il faut pas que ça perde en intensité ou qu’il soit, que le prédicateur ait l’impression que le traducteur le freine. Donc, en fait, des deux côtés, il doit y avoir un effort et parfois même, ils peuvent être une équipe dans le sens du, moi, j’ai eu des prédicateurs qui faisaient des petites blagues et qui, comment dire, s’il faisait un petit sketch et m’utilisaient en fait. Donc, même parfois, il peut avoir des petits jeux théâtraux, qui sont très sympa. Donc, c’est une vraie équipe, effectivement.

Int : Donc, ça peut se passer aussi à la conférence à Brighton où on utilise plutôt l’interprétation simultanée ?

Resp : Ah, c’est très très difficile, maintenant j’ai eu une fois un prédicateur australien qui, euh, regardait vers la cabine et s’excusait d’avance à chaque fois qu’il faisait un blague incompréhensible et au moins c’est qui était sympa c’est que ça faisait rire les français et puis on se sentait pas mis de
côté. Donc, euh, dans une certaine mesure, c’est assez limité mais un petit peu, aussi. Même c’est possible un petit peu.


Resp : Alors, mes critères, c’est quelqu’un qui a déjà, bon, une bonne compréhension, fin, indispensable, bonne compréhension, euh, de l’anglais, euh, comment dire, quelqu’un, voilà qui est rapide. Il faut que la personne soit rapide et, euh, il faut tester la personne pour voir si elle arrive en retranscrire rapidement ce qu’elle comprend parce qu’il y a des gens qui comprennent sans problème mais ils n’arrivent pas à le mettre à la vitesse nécessaire en français. Donc, c’est pas juste une, je cherche pas seulement quelqu’un qui est bilingue parce que même quelqu’un qui est bilingue, euh, n’est pas forcément un bon interprète. J’ai, euh, déjà vu, euh, quelqu’un qui comprenait parfaitement ne paraît pas traduire donc je pense que, voilà, c’est.

Int : Donc, vous cherchez plutôt, les, euh, les compétences techniques, au lieu des compétences spirituelles, comme des chrétiens matures, des, des autres prédicateurs ? Vous cherchez, en tout premier lieu, vous cherchez les compétences techniques, c’est ça ?

Resp : Euh, bon, là dans les exemples auxquels je pensais, c’était toujours des chrétiens matures donc c’est vrai que le problème ne s’est pas posé. Eum, oui. En cabine, ça ressemble moins grave si c’est pas un chrétien mature parce que comme je l’ai dit y a quand même une grosse perte, euh, une grosse perte, euh. Bon, c’est vraiment, en cabine, c’est vraiment retranscrire le message. On peut pas faire beaucoup plus. Alors, par contre, pour, euh, traduire un orateur sur scène, oui, il faut absolument que c’est un chrétien mature, effectivement... parce que, euh, parce que, euh, il faut tenir la, comment dire, la pression spirituelle qui est parfois aussi, est, est, difficile. Des fois, il y a de la pression parce que les gens, par exemple, le public soit est remué par la prédication ou même des fois s’imposent [xxx] et en fait on le ressent. Donc il faut quand même être, voilà, qui sait, euh, qui est solide spirituellement.

Int : Donc, euh, à votre avis, euh, il y a une grande différence entre l’interprétation en cabine, qui est plutôt quelque chose de technique,

Resp : Oui.

Int : Quelque chose de linguistique mais l’interprétation sur scène, c’est une question plutôt spirituelle, c’est ça ?
Resp : C'est très complet. Beaucoup plus complet. L'interprétation sur scène. C'est à la fois
technique, mais euh, c'est aussi théâtrale, spirituel, ça implique, euh, voilà, euh, presque, c'est
quasiment prêcher en français, euh, voilà, ce qui est prêché en anglais. Alors que, oui, dans la cabine,
c'est, pour moi, c'est beaucoup plus technique, à cause de la vitesse. Euh, voilà.
Int : Donc, euh, est-ce qu'on peut dire que la différence entre la conférence à Brighton et
l'interprétation à l'église, c'est, c'est une, c'est une, c'est une différence qui se trouve entre la
technique et le spirituel, entre le domaine linguistique et le domaine Biblique, le domaine spirituelle,
c'est ça ? Est-ce que, c'est ça la grande différence entre les deux ?
Resp : Non. Je pense que le domaine spirituelle passe quand même mais pour moi, euh, en cabine,
le, le message passe, mais euh, l'intensité etc., elle va être véhiculé par l'orateur et pour moi,
l'interprète [xxx] quand même assez limité. Donc, euh, voilà, euh, non, la dimension spirituelle reste
mais elle repose plus sur l'orateur à ce moment-là.
Int : C'est intéressant, ca. Le deuxième scenario est, est un peu plus complexe. Eum, imaginez-vous
que vous êtes en train d’interpréter un super message mais tout d’un coup, l’interprète, le
prédicateur appelle les français les « frogs », alors, euh, que feriez-vous ? [14 : 27]
Resp : Eh, je dire, je traduirais les mentions des grenouilles.
Int : Oui, eh,
Resp : Parce que, donc, je traduirais parce qu’en fait c’est pas ma responsabilité de ce qui est dit
devant.
Int : Okay, donc, euh, est-ce, est-ce que ça serait différent si vous traduisez dans l’église à Lille où
vous, vous connaissez les personnes et si vous, vous interprétez à Brighton, où il y a des gens que
vous ne connaissez pas ?
Resp : Euh, oui. Oui, à Lille, euh, je les connais donc je sais que tout le monde va rire. Et après, si les
gens, je les connais pas, je sais pas à quel point leur sens d’humour est développé mais après, ça
c’est leur problème avec l’orateur. Moi, je suis pas responsable, donc, moi je traduis, quoi. [rie]
Int : Donc, euh, les
Resp : Des fois, les gens disaient, moi, je traduirais les grenouilles où alors, les mangeurs des
grenouilles.
Int : Donc, euh, pour vous les interprètes sont plutôt, sont, euh, sont un peu comme des robots. On
transmit et on ne change rien, c’est ça, ou ?
Resp : Euh, oui, oui, oui. Pour ce qui est du vocabulaire, on ne change rien sauf si, par exemple, ils
disent « A-level », je traduirais par le bac. Voilà, pour que les gens comprennent. Des fois je vais
faire une adaptation culturelle, mais, euh, mais euh, frogs, je dis, euh, les grenouilles ou les
mangeurs de grenouilles. Ils vont comprendre tout de suite, je pense parce que, de toute façon, on nous la sort à chaque fois.

Int : Et, et, et donc, si le prédicateur dit quelque chose de raciste, est-ce que ça va, est-ce que ça va faire une différence ? Si, si c’est quelque chose de très offensif.

Resp : Oui, c’est désagréable à traduire pour moi mais je dois traduire quand même. [16 : 14]

Int : /Ok. C’est intéressant/.

Resp : On peut la, non, mais je, je traduis, bien sûr. Même si j’suis pas d’accord avec la prédication en quoi, je dois, je dois tout traduire.

Int : C’est intéressant, ca, parce que c’est un grand débat dans le, le, le domaine professionnel à ce moment. Donc, euh/

Resp : /d’accord/

Int : C’est une question intéressante. Et le dernier scenario, qui est beaucoup main difficile de comprendre, que faites-vous si le prédicateur prêche un bon message mais dans une voix monotone qui est très, très très ennuyeux. Est-ce que vous changez de ton/

Resp : /Voila. /

Int : Surtout dans la cabine à Brighton. Est-ce que vous changerez de ton ? Ou est-ce que

Resp : /Ouais/

Int : vous prêchez avec cette même voix ennuyeuse ?

Resp : Ah, ça m’est jamais arrivé mais c’est une bonne question. Si ça m’arrivait, euh, [rie], qu’est-ce que je pourrais. [Pause] Non, je crois que je, euh, je crois que je, je prêcherais avec le même ton,

euh, mais euh, naturellement, comme moi, j’ai un ton assez dynamique, je pense que je dynamiserais un petit peu quand même sans faire exprès, mais, j’en, c’est pas plus intentionnelle. Je, j’essaierais pas de rattraper le prédicateur mais je pense pas que j’arriverais moi à faire un ton très monotone pendant une demi-heure, non.

Int : /C’est difficile d’être/

Resp : /xxx/ Ca m’est jamais arrivé. Heureusement.

Int : Eh, merci, euh, on est sur le, le point de finir. Euh. J’ai, euh, je me reste que trois questions. Donc, euh, est-ce que vous avez enten, entendu la traduction lorsque vous avez traduit en dehors de la conférence à Brighton ? Peut-être dans le, dans l’église à Lille, ou, ou dans les écoles ?

Resp : Alors, euh, j’ai déjà traduit, donc, dans l’église à Lille, dans l’église à Dunkerque et sinon, il m’est arrivé aussi de traduire a un voyage en Allemagne, un voyage scolaire, euh, de traduire un discours de l’adjoint au maire. Donc, là c’était l’allemand au français. C’était pour mon groupe d’élèves.

Int : Wow. C’est, c’est fort, ca.
Resp : Mais, c'était, c'était une exception. En général, c'est dans l'église.

Int : Euh, et, euh, on a déjà touché ça mais à votre avis, quels sont les différences entre la traduction à Brighton et cette traduction que vous avez fait dans, pendant ce voyage. Quels sont les grandes différences ?

Resp : Euh, les vocabulaires, bien sûr, puisque là, c'était une présentation de la ville qu'on visitait, donc y avait beaucoup de termes politiques, historiques et tout ça, qui m'a un peu dérouté parce que je suis habitué à traduire un vocabulaire biblique et chrétien et cetera. Après, euh, [blows], non, y avait pas de grande différences, hormis que comme c'était pas une prédication, j'avais pas de gestes à faire, j'avais pas à me déplacer en fait. C'était presque statique. C'était juste une, en Allemagne, c'était juste de l'information. Donc, euh, moins d'implication, c'était purement technique, en fait.

Voilà.

Int : Et, le, la dernière question, [rie], si vous pouvez donner un conseil à quelqu'un qui allait traduire dans la conférence qui va se dérouler à Brighton cette année, que diriez-vous ? [Pause] Seulement un conseil.

Resp : Hm. Un seul conseil. Attends, je me réfléchis bien. Je dirais que, ouais, [clears throat]. En fait, le seul conseil que je dirais, c'est, euh, ne jamais se décourager parce que c'est en faisant qu'on apprend. Voilà.

Int : [rie]. C'est, c'est toujours, ça en IEN on apprend en faisant des choses.

Resp : Voilà. Je dirais, quoi qu'il arrive, ne jamais abandonner. Ha ha. Parce que c'est vraiment à force de le faire qu'on progresse et on apprend et on dit à meilleur. Donc il fait commencer et après, euh, on progresse. Moi, c'est ce qui m'est arrivé. [Laughs]

Int : Et un jour ça va s'améliorer.

Resp : [xxx] Un conseil, c'est ça.

Int : Merci bien, en fait, maintenant, j'ai fini l'interview.
D.2 Interview with Ila (IEN) – IFF2

Int: opportunité de vous interviewer. Il sera très utile de savoir ce que vous pensez de la traduction en église et, eh, surtout, à la conférence à Brighton. Cet interview sera transcrit pour faciliter l’analyse mais, et il sera possible de lier l’interview avec vos réponses aux questions du sondage que je vais vous donner la semaine prochaine. Euh, mais, cependant, personne, sauf moi, sauf moi ne verra ni votre nom, ni votre adresse email ni votre nom Skype, donc, ce sera totalement anonyme. Donc, euh, est-ce que vous êtes, euh, d’accord de continuer avec l’interview sous ces conditions.

Resp: Oui.

Int: Merci. Donc, d’abord, je vais commencer avec les questions générales sur votre expérience et vos attentes de la conférence cette année.

Resp: Oui.

Int: et ceci vous aidera à devenir confortable et ceci m’aidera aussi. Donc, euh, en tout premier lieu, depuis quand allez-vous à la conférence européen ?

Resp: Euh, depuis, au moins six ans, je dirais.


Resp: Ouais.

Int: je pense. Donc et, euh, et, euh, pourquoi revenez-vous chaque année ?

Resp: Euh, pour, euh, entendre la vision, être renouvelé dans la vision et euh, être refocalisée jusqu’à l’année d’après dans la vision IEN et puis, euh, voir les autres, entendre parler de ce qui se fait dans tous les autres pays et cetera.

Int: Donc, pour vous c’est un, c’est un temps de visionner, de parler avec les autres, c’est ça ?

Resp: Ouais.

Int: Donc, c’est comme visiter le docteur pour avoir des immunisations. [rire]

Resp: [rire] Non, je dirais pas ça. [rire]

Int: Et, hm, quels sont vos attentes pour, euh, la conférence cette année ?

Resp: A quel niveau ?


Resp: Eh, est-ce qu’on parle seulement au niveau de la traduction ou d’un niveau général ?

Int: D’un niveau très général.


Int: Et, euh, que fait un bon moment à la conférence à Brighton ?

Resp: C’est un moment qui va avoir un impact qui va durer pour, pour, l’après.
Int : Donc, euh, un moment de, de changement, de, de, challenge.

Resp : Ouais, eh, voilà, un moment de challenge et des bons moments de convivialité aussi.

Int : Et, euh, merci et maintenant je vais vous poser des questions sur votre expérience de la traduction à la conférence. Donc, pouvez-vous me parler d’une fois où la traduction allait très bien à la conférence ? [3:26]

Resp : Est-ce que vous pouvez répéter, s’il vous plaît ça ?

Int : Et oui. Et je vais couper mon vidéo parce que c’est ça qui a un problème, je pense. Peut-être, non. Ehm, pouvez-vous me parler d’une fois où la traduction allait très bien à la conférence ?

Resp : Euh, d’une fois où la traduction allait très bien.

Int : oui.

Resp : Euh, je ne sais pas. Euh, je pense que c’est à peu près toujours, euh, équivalent dans la traduction. Eum, ça dépend des orateurs, ça dépend du type de message. Je saurais pas dire d’un moment qui, euh, qui va très bien.

Int : Et de l’autre côté, pouvez-vous me parler d’une fois où la tard, ou la traduction n’allait pas si bien ?

Resp : Alors, ça c’est facile [rie]. La traduction, euh, pour moi, le plus difficile, c’est quand, euh, un orateur lit un texte qui n’est pas projeté, euh, en vidéo, ou alors lire, quand un orateur lit des articles, qui, de, de journaux, ou de débit ou des choses comme ça. A traduite en simultanée, c’est impossible.

Int : Donc, c’est une question de la qualité de ce que dit l’orateur et la vitesse, ou ?

Resp. Non, je pense que, comme c’est, euh, c’est quelque chose qu’il lit sur un support, ça va beaucoup plus vite donc, euh, on n’a pas le temps du tout de réfléchir et de [xxx] [rie]

Int : Et on fait, ça m’amène à la prochaine question.

Resp : Oui.

Int : Est-ce que vous pensez qu’il est important, qu’il est important qu’il existe un rapport entre le prédicateur et l’interprète, qu’ils travaillent ensemble, en fait ?

Resp : Qu’ils se connaissent ?

Int : Oui.

Resp : Pas obligatoirement.

Int : Oui.

Resp : Je, personnellement, c’est pas, c’est pas, je trouve pas ça nécessaire.

Int : Mais, est-ce que vous pensez qu’il faut qu’ils travaillent en équipe. [Pause] Même si c’est juste pendant la réunion.

Resp : Même s’ils ne se connaissent pas ?
Int : Oui.
Resp : D'accord. Oui, j’suis d’accord avec ça. Je pense que, euh, il faudrait préparer le travail, il faudrait que l’interprète puisse préparer le travail ans le mesure du possible, soit avoir des notes auparavant ou le thème du message, les versets qui vont être lu, euh, des choses comme ça. Si, s’il y des articles qui vont être lu, pouvoir les avoir à l’avance pour pouvoir les traduire et les préparer. C’est l'idéal.
Int : C’est une question de préparation, de, être conscient qu’un interprète sera là, et les choses comme ça.
Resp : Voilà.
Int : J’ai lu, euh, récemment, j’ai lu les articles qui ont dit qu’il est important qu’il existe une sorte de rapport entre le prédicateur et le public. Euh, est-ce que vous êtes d’accord avec cette idée ?
Resp : Eum, c’est bien s’il y a une connexion, euh, je [xxx] pas de mots, en compréhension.
Int : Oui.
Resp : Que l’orateur ou le prédicateur puisse se mettre à la hauteur du public, dans, établir une connexion, soit, euh amicale ou avec des plaisanteries ou parler un petit peu de lui-même, se présenter, euh, fin.
Int : Et en tant que, en tant qu’interprète, comment peut-on aider la création de ce rapport ?
Resp : En tant qu’interprète ?
Int : Oui.
Resp : Entre le public et l’orateur ?
Int : Oui. Oui.
Resp : [sourire] Euh, hm, je ne sais pas du tout.
Int : C’est une question difficile. Je sais que c’est assez difficile. En fait, ça fait partie d’une idée, hm, que l’interprète et, euh, et un partenaire dans la prédication. C’est une idée qui se trouve dans la, dans la théologie ou dans la théorie de la traduction aussi. Est-ce que vous êtes d’accord avec cette idée de partenariat.
Resp : Mais je suis pas contre mais je comprends pas bien le fonctionnement de cet idée.
Int : [rie] Est-ce qu’il peut trouver des pratiques qui peuvent [blows] qui peuvent, rendre cette idée plus pratique, plus, euh, faisable, en fait.
Resp : Certainement. [rie]
Int : Merci. J’ai beaucoup apprécié les réponses que vous m’avez données et donc, je vais faire quelque chose un peu différent maintenant. Vous êtes toujours là ? [pause] Oh. [pause] Ça va ?
Resp : Ouais, je suis là. Ah bon. [rie]
Int : Donc, eh, on va faire quelque chose un peu moins difficile. Je vais vous présenter trois scénarios.
Resp : Oui.

Int : et, eh, pour découvrir un peu plus sur le rôle de l’interprète à la conférence.

Resp : D’accord.

Int : Donc, premièrement, si vous avez besoin de trouver un interprète pour traduire à Brighton, quelles sont vos, vos critères ? Est-ce que vous préférez des chrétiens, des gens diplômés et des interprètes professionnels, euh. Quels sont vos critères ?

Resp : Euh, hmm, des, pas forcément, pas forcément des gens diplômés, euh, hmm, des chrétiens, ça dépend du type du message. Ça dépend du, du contenu du message mais, euh, pas forcément. Et, euh, et après, c’était quoi ?

Int : C’était, euh, les interprètes professionnels, ou peut-être les gens qui n’ont jamais interprété dans leurs vies.

Resp : Euh, hmm, pas des gens qui n’ont jamais interprété dans leurs vies parce que j’ai déjà entendu des personnes qui maitrise très bien l’anglais et le français par exemple, mais qui n’ont aucune, euh, compréhension de ce que fait la traduction, donc, c’était. [rie]

Int : Et, qu’est-ce que c’est la différence entre quelqu’un qui est bilingue et quelqu’un qui sait traduire ?

Resp : Quelqu’un qui sait traduire, il s’identifie à la personne qui parle donc elle ne, elle ne traduit pas juste le contenu mais elle se met à la place de la personne qui parle donc, c’est important de s’identifier au prédicateur ou à l’orateur.

Int : Donc, est-ce que vous préférez les gens qui ont prêché ?

Resp : Euh, pas forcément, non plus. [both laugh]

Int : Est-ce que vous avez des critères ?

Resp : [rie] Des personnes qui ont prêché déjà, euh, peuvent amener leur propre influence dans la traduction.

Int : Donc, est-ce que vous préférez quelqu’un qui est assez objectif, qui peut traduire sans, sans avoir leur propres opinions ?

Resp : Oui. Ça c’est, ça, c’est bien. Quelqu’un qui sait s’identifier au prédicateur mais qui ne laisse pas passer leurs opinions.

Int : Ca, c’est, c’est un rôle difficile, n’est-ce pas ?

Resp : Oui mais c’est le rôle d’un traducteur. [11:40]

Int : Et, euh, le deuxième scenario et un petit peu plus complexe. Imaginez-vous que vous êtes en train d’interpréter un super message mais tout d’un coup, le prédicateur dit quelque chose de raciste. Que feriez-vous ?

Resp : Jeeeee, je traduis, je traduis ce qu’il dit
Int : Oui.
Resp : Mais, probablement que je vais laisser passer sans vouloir, je vais laisser passer une gêne personnelle.
Int : Pourquoi, pourquoi on ne change pas ce qu’il a dit.
Resp : Mais, parce qu’on n’est pas la personne qui décide de ce qui est, on n’est pas la personne qui est responsable de ce qui est amené, euh, dans la conférence.
Int : Donc, euh, où se trouve la responsabilité de l’interprète ? Est-ce que ça, c’est juste une question de transmission ou quelque chose d’autre ?
Resp : C’est juste une question de transmission parce que s’il y a un problème, les personnes en anglais ont entendu le propos raciste.
Int : Oui.
Resp : Donc, c’est le, leur, le problème c’est pas la personne qui traduit d’ajuster les choses mais, euh, à la personne qui couvre la conférence d’ajuster les choses et l’ajustement sera traduit.
Int : Donc, euh, est-ce que ce sera différent si vous, si vous étiez dans une conférence et vous connaissez personne.
Resp : Euh
Int : parce que quelquefois on trouve les conférences où ils blâment l’interprète pour des, des, des propos racistes ou des, des, des gros mots.
Resp : Ah. Ah, euh, chou, chou, chou, c’est pas, euh, [rie]. J’ai jamais traduit dans des contextes comme ça personnellement, donc je sais pas comment je réagirai et je sais pas si j’irais traduire dans un contexte autre personnellement.
Int : Donc, euh, vous êtes seulement confortable de, de traduire dans un contexte IEN ou un contexte chrétien ?
Resp : Euh, hm, dans un contexte chrétien et des, et neutre ou neutre.
Int : Ou neutre. Donc, est-ce que, est-ce que c’est à cause du, du fait que dans les contextes chrétien, il y a une bonne chance que vous allez connaître les personnes dans le public ? C’est ça, la différence, ou est-ce que c’est la neutralité qui est, qui fait la différence ?
Resp : Non. C’est pas le fait de connaître les personnes dans le public, c’est au fait de savoir que, euh, euh, on est sûr, on est sûr du contenu de ce qui va être apporté. Donc je peux m’impliquer, je peux m’impliquer dans ce qui va être partagé.
Int : C’est intéressant, ca. Donc, c’est vous, la, la traduction, c’est une question d’être impliqué dans le contenu, impliqué dans la prédication, mais pas impliqué de manière où on se laisse dans les opinions, euh, bizarres.
Resp : Oui.
Donc, c’est un rôle important, c’est un rôle avec des limites. C’est ça ?

Ouais. Ouais.

Et la dernière, le dernier scenario, qui, qui est beaucoup moins difficile. Que feriez-vous si le prédicateur prêché un bon message mais dans une voix monotone qui est très ennuyeux.

Je traduis quand même. [rie] J’essaie de ne pas m’endormir.

Mais, euh, vous traduisez dans la même voix monotone ou est-ce que vous, vous introduisez un peu l’enthousiasme ?

Je pense que je traduirais sur le même ton mais je ferais quelques, je, je pense que je ne resterais pas neutre. Un peu d’humeur dans le micro.

Donc, c’est intéressant de savoir pourquoi la question de racisme ne vous fait sortir de la neutralité mais la question de le, de le ton du prédicateur vous faire quitter cette neutralité.

Pourquoi vous choisissez de sortir de cette neutralité.

Pour, euh, ne pas perdre, je pense que c’est pour ne pas perdre les personnes qui écoutent. Dans leur écoute. Pour les garder, euh, actif.

Donc, vous a, les interprètes ont une responsabilité vers le public, vers ceux qui l’écoute.

Oui.

Oui. Et, euh, donc, on est sur le point de finir, [16 :50] Il n’en reste que trois questions qui sont assez faciles. Est-ce que vous avez entendu la traduction en dehors de la conférence à Brighton ?

Pardon ?

Est-ce que vous avez entendu la traduction en dehors de la conférence à Brighton ?

Ouais, dans, dans des églises.

Donc, à votre avis, quels sont les différences entre la traduction a la conférence à Brighton et celle qui se passe dans les églises, peut-être à Dunkerque ou dans les autres églises ?

Euh, la différence, euh, c’est que, euh, à Dunkerque, on est par exemple ou dans les autres églises, la, euh, on traduit directement à côté de l’orateur, donc, euh, c’est pas simultané, donc on arrive a, je pense qu’on arrive mieux à communiquer avec le public, quand on, quand on, on traduit à côté que quand on doit traduire en simultané.

Et, et pourquoi ? Pourquoi, c’est plus difficile de communiquer en simultané ?

Qu’on, que nous-même, on communique visuellement avec les gens et je pense que, les, par exemple, à la conférence à Brighton, les ang, les personnes qui parle anglais sont, euh, sont actifs dans l’écoute mais que les personnes pour qui on traduit sont passif.
Int : Et pourquoi on a cette passivité ? Est-ce que c’est une question de, est-ce que c’est à cause du fait, du fait qu’ils ne voient pas l’interprète mais ils viennent toujours le prédicateur ? Pourquoi c’est pas assez ?
Resp : Parce que, il ne, les gens entendent le message avec du retard, donc, euh, les réactions sont un peu retardées.
Int : Oui
Resp : Euh, euh, a, c’est, c’est pas évident. Et, euh, il refus, le public français ou pour lequel on traduit ne peut pas se sentir impliqué à l’orateur, je pense.
Int : Hmm.
Resp : Directement.
Int : C’est intéressant. C’est intéressant pour moi parce que pendant l’entraînement, l’entraînement pour les interprètes professionnels à l’université, ils, ils disent toujours que le simultané et su, et beaucoup meilleur que l’interprétation à côté de l’orateur.
Resp : Ah, oh ?
Int : Mais dans les églises, on a cette grande différence entre les deux, donc vous préférez être, être un autre prédicateur à côté de l’orateur ?
Resp : Euh, pas dans le contexte de la conférence.
Int : Mais, à l’église c’est, c’est beaucoup mieux d’être là.
Resp : Oui. A l’église, c’est mieux, oui.
Int : Donc
Resp : Et aussi, avec l’église, le, le public français est le public principal et le seul public. Donc, euh, c’est normal que [rie], que le, que ce soit le plus, le plus, la-là.
Int : Plus intime. [rie]
Resp : Non, mais, euh, je sais pas. Je sais pas dire, mais.
Int : Donc, j’ai une question finale, qui est très, très simple. Si vous pouvez donner un conseil à quelqu’un qui allait traduire à Brighton, que direz-vous ? [Pause] Seulement un conseil.
Resp : Se reposer avant la conférence. [tous les deux rient]
Int : Est-ce que les in, les interprètes ont le temps de se reposer pendant la conférence ?
Resp : Non, non, avant !
Int : Avant.
Resp : Parce que pendant c’est pas la peine et, euh, avant la conférence, euh, hm. Je sais pas. [rie]
Int : Merci beaucoup, en fait, c’est très intéressant parce que j’aime avoir des perspec, en fait, maintenant on a, a fini l’interview officielle.
D.3 Interview with Adrien (IEN) – AFF6

JD : Et oup, ça commence. Donc, euh, j’ai dit, euh, personne ne verra ni votre nom, ni ce vidéo sauf moi et peut-être mon superviseur. Est-ce que vous êtes d’accord de continuer avec, euh, l’interview ?
Adrien : Ouais.
JD : Donc, depuis, depuis quand allez-vous à la conférence Européenne ?
Adrien : Euh, trois années.
JD : Et, pourquoi revenez-vous chaque année ?
Adrien : Euh, pour, euh, avoir une nouvelle fraicheur, une nouvelle, euh, connexion avec l’église de Brighton.
JD : Donc, euh, pour vous le but de la conférence, c’est un moment spirituel, un moment
Adrien : Voilà. C’est une mise à part en Dieu pour, euh, aller sur des nouvelles hauteurs.
JD : Et, euh, quelles étaient pour, euh, cette conférence cette année ?
Adrien : Euh, d’avoir des nouvelles directifs par Dieu, quoi, pour, euh, pour les mois qui ar, l’année qui vient.
JD : Et, euh, maintenance je vais vous poser des questions sur votre expérience de la traduction, eh, à la conférence européenne cette année et euh, les années dernières. Euh, pouvez-vous me parlez d’une fois où la traduction allait très, très bien à la, à la conférence ?
Adrien : Euh
JD : Pouvez-vous me parler d’une fois où la traduction allait très bien à la conférence ? [Pause] Euh, en fait, euh, est-ce que vous pouvez me, est-ce que vous pouvez me, me décrire une fois où la traduction était super ?
Adrien : Euh, ici ?
JD : Ici, à la conférence à Brighton.
Adrien : Euh, ouais, c’est, euh, la traduction, elle était super cette semaine, euh. Elle était, elle était, euh, très bien, comment dire, très bien interprété.
JD : Oui. Et, euh, est-ce que vous avez entendre des moments, peut-être cette semaine ou dans les années derniers où la traduction était pas si bien ?
Adrien : Oui. Il était déjà arrivé, oui.
JD : Et, euh, et, euh, quel était la cause de ces problèmes ? Est-ce que vous pouvez me décrire le caractère de problème ?
Adrien : Ouais. Je pense que c’est, parfois, euh, euh, problèmes de région, peut-être et des personnes ici qui a des misères à traduire, parce que, euh, la, l’auteur de la traduction, le
traducteur, elle a un peu de difficulté selon l’endroit où la personne vient et la compréhension déjà de la langue et de pouvoir interpréter selon aussi la connaissance de la langue aussi.

JD : Donc, euh, c’est un problème d’accent, de vitesse, ou ?
Adrien : Ouais.
JD : OK.
Adrien : Ouais.
JD : Et donc, euh, vous avez men, déjà mentionné, les accs, les accents, la vitesse, euh, je me demandais aussi s’il était important aussi d’avoir une sorte de rapport entre le prédicateur et le public. Est-ce que vous pensez que c’est quelque chose que, d’important ?
Adrien : Ouais, je pense que c’est important, ouais.
JD : Et, en, les interprètes, comment peuvent-ils aider la création de ce rapport ?
Adrien : Euh, je pense que, euh, en allant aussi avec le, le prédicateur sur la scène, je pense que ça peut apporter appuis.
JD : Donc, si les interprètes sont sur scène, c’est plus facile de créer le rapport, prédicateur-public, c’est ça ?
Adrien : C’est ça. Oui.
JD : et, euh, est-ce que vous pensez que c’est important d’avoir un rapport entre l’interprète et le prédicateur ?
Adrien : Euh, oui.
JD : Je, je, j’ai parlé la dernière fois que j’ai fait cet interview, je, j’ai vous demandé vos opinions sur l’idée de partenariat dans la traduction des sermons. Est-ce que vous pensez que le partenariat, c’est une idée importante ? … Entre l’interprète et le prédicateur.
Adrien : Ouais, je pense que c’est important d’avoir la connexion entre les deux, quoi pour voir lancer le même message, quoi.
JD : Ok, euh, donc, quel genre, c’est quel genre de partenariat ? Comment ça travaille dans un, dans un, dans une réunion comme ce soir ?
Adrien : Euh, je pense que, euh, pour avoir toujours un {xxx} entre les deux pour pouvoir retraduire toute le message.
JD : Donc, euh, c’est une question de, de partenariat au niveau de nom ou de niveau de présentation ou au niveau de quelque chose d’autre ? [4 : 21]
Adrien : Euh, je pense que c’est aussi au niveau de la langue aussi.
JD : Ok. Et donc, euh hm, c’est, j’aime, j’aime beaucoup ces, ces réponses parce que ils sont très in, très intéressant. En fait, maintenance, je vais vous présenter trois scénarios pour découvrir un peu plus sur le rôle exact de l’interprète. Premièrement, si vous avez besoin de trouver un interprète
pour traduire ici, à la conférence à Brighton, quels sont vos critères ? Est-ce que vous cherchez des chrétiens matures, des prédicateurs ?

Adrien : Euh, je pense que les chrétiens matures, oui, pourquoi pas. Bien c’est dire le, le sens des propos du message pour bien le traduire.

JD : Donc, euh, est-ce que vous pensez qu’il y a un sens profond qui est peut-être au-dessus des mots, Quelque chose qui est peut-être au-delà de seulement un message ?


JD : Et, euh, comment peut-on décrire, comment peut-on décrire ce sens profond ? Qu’est-ce que c’est en fait ?

Adrien : Euh, ben, c’est la parole de Dieu qui est important de bien retransmettre.

JD : Et donc, euh, le deuxième scenario est un peu plus complexe. Il y a une relation avec le premier.

Imaginez-vous que l’interprète est en train d’interpréter un super message mais tout d’un coup, le, le prédicateur dit un propos racisme. Euh, que doit faire l’interprète ?

Adrien : Euh, je pense que, il est, c’est pas lui qui est porteur du message. Je pense que l’interpréter doit, doit redonner le message comme il était donné au départ.

JD : Donc, on blâme pas l’interprète si on entend un propos raciste.

Adrien : Non, parce que lui, il est pas responsable du message.

JD : Et, euh, si l’interprète décide de changer ce message pour faire, pour faire plaisir au public, qu’est-ce que ça crée dans l’interprélation ?

Adrien : Disons que le message est pas reproduit comme elle était donnée au départ.

JD : Donc, on blâme pas l’interprète si on entend un propos raciste.

Adrien : Non, parce que lui, il est pas responsable du message.

JD : Et, euh, si l’interprète décide de changer ce message pour faire, pour faire plaisir au public, qu’est-ce que ça crée dans l’interprélation ?

Adrien : Donc, on blâme pas l’interprète si on entend un propos raciste.

Adrien : Ouais.

JD : Donc, le, la, le dernier scenario, qui est beaucoup moins difficile. Erm, que doit faire l’interprète si le prédicateur prêche un bon message, le contient, le contient, c’est bon, mais d’une voix monotone, qui est très ennuyeux ? Est-ce que l’interprète doivent, euh, injecter un peu d’enthousiasme, ou de, de ne rien changer ?

Adrien : Euh, moi, je pense qu’il doit quand même aussi avoir un peu d’enthousiasme pour, euh, donner un peu de, de, de, de punch, quoi, au message.

JD : Donc de peut-être changer le ton mais pas changer le contient ?

Adrien : Ouais.

JD : Donc de peut-être changer le ton mais pas changer le contient ?

Adrien : Voilà. Changer pas le contenu mais changer un peu le tonalité, en fait.

JD : Et, euh, maintenant, on a, on est sur le point de finir. J’ai, je n’ai que trois questions. Est-ce que vous avez entendu la traduction au dehors de cette conférence à Brighton ?

Adrien : Ouais.

JD : Euh, où ?
Adrien : Dans des églises locales.

JD : Et, qu’est-ce que, quelles sont les, les, euh, les différences principales entre traduire ici et traduire peut-être à Dunkerque ou à Lille ?

Adrien : Euh, je pense que, ici on traduit dans une cabine, alors que, euh, dans les églises locales, on est plus sur la scène avec le traducteur. Donc, il y a plus de contact avec le public.

JD : Donc, est-ce que ça crée une différence dans le, dans la manière d’interpréter ?

Adrien : Euh, je pense que, au niveau de la manière, oui, parce que, y, on fait pas, c’est plus de synergie avec le, le, le public, je pense.

JD : Donc, c’est plus un partenariat, c’est plus

Adrien : C’est plus d’un partenariat, ouais, avec le public, les g, le prédicateur.

JD : Donc comment peut-on décrire, le, la, la traduction ici, en cabine ? Est-ce que c’est plus

Adrien : Ouais, disons qu’on retransmet le message mais y a pas de, de comment je dirais, y a pas de xxx physique avec le traducteur et le public.

JD : Et, et ça change, qu’est-ce que ça change ?

Adrien : Ah, ça change quand même au niveau du, du message
D.4 Interview with Leon (IEN) – SFF2

1 JD: pendant l’interview parce que mon superviseur va vérifier donc
2 Leon: Ah, ouais, ouais.
3 JD: Même si, c’est bizarre dans COC.
4 Leon: C’est bon.
5 JD: Je vous remercie de m’avoir donné l’occasion de vous interviewer. Il sera très utile de savoir ce
6 que vous pensez de la traduction en église mais d’abord ici. Euh, il sera possible de lier l’interview
7 avec vos réponses du sondage mais, personne, sauf moi, et peut-être mon superviseur, ne verra
8 votre nom, ni le vidéo, donc, euh, vous êtes, d’accord de continuer avec l’interview sous ces
9 conditions.
10 Leon : Ouais, t’inquiète.
11 JD : Ok, euh, depuis quand allez-vous a cette conférence ?
12 Leon : On enregistre, déjà ?
13 JD : Oui.
14 Leon : Ah ok.
15 JD : Depuis quand allez-vous a la conférence ici ?
16 Leon : Euh, ça fait, alors, j’suis marié entre, dix-sept, dix-huit, vingt ans.
17 JD : Depuis vingt ans. Donc, au-delà d’être pasteur à (redacted), pourquoi revenez-vous chaque
18 année ?
19 Leon : [Pause] Ben, pour la présence de Dieu.
20 JD : Donc, c’est une question de, c’est un moment spirituel ici ? Euh.
21 Leon : Ouais, c’est un temps spirituel et, euh, un temps de ressourcement.
22 JD : Et, euh.
23 Leon : Et les relations avec les gens, en fait.
24 JD : Quels étaient vos attentes pour la conférence cette année ?
25 Leon : Euh, hm, un renouvellement et me réaligner dans la vision.
26 JD : Donc, euh, est-ce que vous pensez qu’il est possible de perdre la vision entre, entre les
27 conférences ?
29 JD : Donc, maintenant je vais vous poser des questions spécifiques sur votre expérience de la
30 traduction à cette conférence, donc c’est seulement à cette conférence. Pouvez-vous me parler
31 d’une fois où la traduction allait très bien ici.
Leon : Ben, souvent, à quatre-vingt pourcent, c’est bien. Elle est bien. On a du matériel pratique avec le système des earphones qui est très, très pratique, quoi.

JD : Donc, est-ce que vous pensez que ces ressources techniques vous aident à entendre les gens qui parlent avec accent, ouais. Et surtout le, euh, la personne qui traduit dans la boîte.

Leon : Ah, alors, euh, sur le plan technique ? Euh, sur le plan de capacité du traducteur ?

JD : Ou bien, euh, sur le plan technique, depuis que c’est cabine, au point de vue technique, on a l’outil nécessaire pour bien recevoir la traduction et après, sur le plan, par rapport au traducteur propre je dirais que ça dépend l’origine de la personne d’ou elle vient en fait, qu’elle a un accent australien ou un accent, je sais pas, euh, écossais [rie].


JD : Vous avez mentionné les gens qui parlent très vite, et, euh, hm, les gens avec les accents forts. En fait, j’ai, j’ai lu quelques articles qui ont dit qu’il est important qu’il existe un rapport entre le prédicateur et l’interprète. Est-ce que vous pensez que c’est une chose important ici ?

Leon : Euh, hm. Si, euh, le traducteur a déjà des relations avec des personnes la haut, oh là là, bon, c’est toujours positif parce qu’ils puissent communiquer mais c’est la personne a l’expérience, euh, sans connaître la personne mais elle connaît les différents accents et régions, je pense qu’elle se familiarise aussi avec la traduction. [3 : 46]

JD : Et, est-ce que vous pensez que c’est important d’avoir un genre de rapport entre le prédicateur et le public ? Je sais que vous êtes prédicateur.

Leon : Pour la traduction ?

JD : Euh, non, non, d’avoir

Leon : Pour le prédicateur, par rapport au public ? Oui. Oui mais, euh, ca, c’est des avantages de, euh, d’ici, quoi. On peut dire, euh, on l’a quand même par la traduction parce qu’on a la personne et on ressent l’onction qu’elle veut dégager.

JD : Et est-ce que, et est-ce que les interprètes peuvent aider la création de ce rapport ?
Leon : Oui, si elle est sur scène avec, parce qu’en fait la, elle le traduit simultanément le par
earphone, alors il continue à parler et on reçoit la traduction simultanément et que si, euh, si elle est
à côté, le traducteur qui parle, il s’arrête pour entendre, donc c’est beaucoup plus facile de faire
passer mais, euh, bon, c’est deux fois plus de temps, quoi.
JD : Donc, c’est peut-être plus difficile pour le public d’entendre pendant une heure, deux heures.
Leon : Ouais, peut-être. Ça dépend le sujet.
JD : En fait, euh, ça m’am, ça m’amène à la prochaine question. Euh, récemment, quelques
prédicateurs ont dit que l’interpréte et le prédicateur fonctionnent en équipe. Est-ce que vous
pensez que c’est, que c’est une idée importante ici, à la conférence? [S : 05]
Leon : Euh, c’est préférable.
JD : Oui.
Leon : Si, euh, y avait autant de public français a [xxx] une traduction française-anglaise, s’il y avait
autant de français que d’anglais, bon, voilà c’est préférable que le traducteur soit sur l’estrade parce
que les deux, les deux paniquent, alors que la y a peu près peut-être quatre cent anglais et que vingt
français donc, euh, on a accommodé les anglais et, euh, et bon, c’est peut-être que les français mais
l’année dernière y avait des russes, des allemands, alors qu’en fait, c’était prêche anglais et le
system earphone permet de traduire dans diverses pays. Donc, euh,
JD : Et dans un sens général, quand vous prêchez avec des interprètes, est-ce que vous essayez de
créer une sorte de partenariat avec l’interprète ?
Leon : Ben, c’est toujours, euh, sympa que les interprètes puissent discuter ensemble de certains
outils ou peut-être les techniques.
JD : Et même entre le prédicateur et l’interprète, est-ce que vous essayez de créer une sens de
partenariat entre le deux et si, si l’interprète et sur l’estrade?
Leon : Euh, nous qui sommes Chrétiens, c’est tout, s’ils traduisent sur l’estrade, c’est toujours bien
que le prédicateur puissent avoir avant la réunion un contact spirituel et humain avec le traducteur
pour, euh, faire passer, pourquoi pas, un bisou, donner une peu les références, les lignes directs
[xxx] de son message. C’est pour des moyens pour faciliter, pour faire passer la traduction. Mais bon,
après, si le traducteur est expérimenté, on va directement au [xxx] comme on dit.
JD : Donc, je vais finir maintenant avec trois scenarios et je vais vous donne, je vais vous demander
vos conseils à l’interprète.
Leon : D’accord.
JD : Donc, la, la première et un peu difficile. Su, eum, si vous avez besoin de trouver un nouvel
interprète pour traduire ici à Brighton, quel genre de personne chercheriez-vous ?
Leon : Euh, la compétence de comprendre l’anglais et retraduire en français.
JD : est-ce que vous préférez des chrétiens matures ou des, des pr, inte
Leon : Ben, je regarde surtout le don de traduction, sur chrétien ou non. Pour moi, euh, je préfère un
non-chrétien qui fait le, le travail qu, euh, que des fois, un chrétien qui dit qu’il traduit bien et, ben,
qui comprend un mot sur trois. C’est comme, c’est comme si un jour, j’ai un problème en justice,
que l’avocat soit chrétien, musulman, ou, euh, j’sais pas moi, hindou, n’importe quoi, je veux qu’il
m’aide à défendre ma cause à justice. Je prendrais plutôt la compétence de l’avocat pour qu’il plaide
ma cause. Je regarderais a la compétence et pas forcément à sa religion, euh.
JD : Donc, en tout premier lieu c’est la compétence.
Leon : La compétence et le don.
JD : Et, euh, le deuxième scenario et un peu plus complexe. Imaginez-vous que, que l’interprète, que
l’interprète et en train d’interpréter un super message mais tout d’un coup, le prédicateur dit un
propos raciste. Que, que, que voulez-vous que fait l’interprète ?
Leon : Ben, euh, je veux que l’interprète traduise exactement ce que l’orateur dit et moi, je me
ferrais ma propre opinion. Lui, il est qu’un canal, donc, on, on sert, ce sera pas lui qui sera jugé de
l’action de ce qui est dit, ce qui est retranscrit c’est ce qu’il entend, quoi, c’est son travail.
JD : Et si l’interprète essaie de, essaie de changer ce propos, est-ce que
Leon : Ben, c’est pas juste, pour moi, et, c’est couvrir l’erreur de l’autre. Ce qu’il traduit et c’est qu’il
entend et nous, on fera notre opinion de ce qu’on a entendu.
JD : Donc, vous blâmez jamais l’interprète. Si/
Leon : Non, non.
JD : Et, le troisième et le final scenario, c’est, uhm, si, imaginez-vous que, que, uhm, que, que
l’orateur parle d’une voix monotone. Qui est super ennuyeux. Est-ce que vous pensez que
l’interprète doit changer un peu le ton de ce message ? Est-ce que l’interprète doit, doit euh,
introduire un peu d’enthousiasme.
Leon : Euh, autant que possible s’il retraduit le tonalité et, euh, la façon de s’exprimer et il retranscrit
aussi ces choses-là, par rapport à celui qui parle, c’est toujours positif si, euh, la personne est
dynamique et que le traducteur est aussi dynamique, c’est toujours important, quoique des fois
dans les, dans certains messages, il y a les temps dynamiques, les temps plus posé et cetera donc, si
un interprète peut retranscrire ça, c’est toujours plus positif. Il rend la traduction vivante et
captivante. Maintenant, l’essential et de comprendre déjà, même si, aux mieux que c’est monotone
et qu’on comprendre que c’est dynamique et [laughs], qu’on comprend pas une phrase sur trois,
c’est pareil. Donc, euh, la compréhension de ce qui était transmis et toujours important.
JD : En fait, c’est intéressant parce que j’ai vu de recherche où les gens essayaient de juger l’interprète et toujours quand l’interprète est un peu monotone, même si l’orateur est monotone, ils jugent que l’interprète est, est euh, beaucoup pire.

Leon : D’accord.

JD : Juste pour une voix monotone. Donc, c’est une question intéressante. Merci beaucoup pour votre temps et pour votre réponse. Il y a seulement une que, une question qu’il y a. C’est, si vous pouvez donner un conseil à quelqu’un qui allait traduire ici, à Brighton, qui diriez-vous ?

Leon : Euh, bénévole ou payé ? [rie] C’est bénévole, c’est bénévole, on vous laisse et on se satisfait, euh, du bon vouloir de la personne, par contre si je paie quelqu’un pour être traduit, je m’attends a, a, quand même, euh, un retour de mon investissement, donc, euh, le conseil c’est que, ben, je pense que plus on traduit plus on devient bon. Il faut donner la chance. Faut donner la chance et puis, la personne, au départ on avait un traducteur qui n’était pas très, très bon mais à force d’exercer devient de, de, meilleur.

JD : Comme moi.

Leon : Voilà. Donc, ça, c’est bien et un défaut n’a rien à voir si tu [xxx] avoir quelque chose. Bon, voilà, si c’est du bénévolat, c’est toujours encourageant de voir la personne progresser. L’intention de payer quelqu’un pour ce service, bon, on s’attend à un résultat. Donc, du conseil, ben, uhm [shrugs], il faut se lancer et puis après, exercer, quoi, faut, faut pratiquer.

JD : Et qu’est-ce que, vous avez parlé de la différence entre bénévole et payé, est-ce qu’il y une différence entre traduire ici et traduire peut-être, à Lille ou à Dunkerque ?

Leon : Non, non, c’est pareil.

JD : C’est pareil.

Leon : C’est pareil, après, c’est l’outil, si c’est sur une plateforme avec l’orateur, si c’est comme la, avec earphones, c’est beaucoup plus difficile, parce que pendant que vous êtes en train de traduire, il faut déjà écouter la phrase suivant, qui est, si on est sur une plateforme, on écoute, on parle, c’est plus facile a. Bon, voilà, le conseil c’est bien se reposer et être en forme parce que ça prend dans le mental et intellectuellement , ça prend beaucoup d’énergie, dans la lapse de temps très court. Donc, euh, je pense que quand il y a les sessions de trois quarts d’heure, c’est bien de se relier parce que avoir plusieurs personnes et si la même personne, je pense qu’en bout d’un moment il doit saturer intellectuellement, quoi donc.

JD : Merci beaucoup.
JD: Would you rather that I make this completely anonymous or would you be okay with me using your name when I write the interview for my thesis?

IL: As long as it is just for research.

JD: Yeah. Just for research.

IL: Yeah. Yeah. Or citing, it's not going to be in the way, yeah, sorry.

JD: It'll just be in my university library.

IL: [laughs]

JD: So the first thing is, in your own words, how would you describe to me the vision of this church?

IL: Well, this is an international church, very outgoing church and, our goal is to see people, ah, coming to the knowledge of truth. Yeah, I mean, that is really the goal of our leadership: people like the Bible says in the book of Timothy, um, that all may come to the knowledge of truth. It's not God's will that any man should perish, um, but come to the knowledge of truth. That is really our.

JD: So how would you describe that process? Is it a process about mental learning or what kind of process is it?

IL: Well, one has, to hear the good news, and has to hear the gospel of the Kingdom, which is able to open the eyes and the understanding of somebody to come to that knowledge of truth. So that means, the gospel has to be preached in the church, out of the church and that's why you see every Sunday, like, people making decisions. Yeah.

JD: That was my next question, is what part, how do, how does the Sunday services help you to achieve the vision in the church?

IL: Ahhh, eh, repeat that again, please?

JD: How do the Sunday services help you to reach, eh, the vision of the church, help you to fulfil the vision?

IL: Well, you know like we, we, we, we preach the gospel of the Kingdom touching the people who are there. They go out changed, smiling. They meet somebody and say, hey what happened with you, you, you come to a church. So we, we focus on the people because once they are touched and healed, delivered, somebody's going to ask them, something's, something good has happened to you so they invite somebody else.

JD: So it sounds like the Sunday services are about bringing change to people. Is that a good way of?

IL: Yeah. That's fine.
JD: And what part do interpreters play in that process?

IL: A great one. [both laugh] Because, they, they help to convey that message from the preacher and, eh, like we saw in the last week, the interpreters are very, very crucial. They're very important people in this church being an international. From the, from God to the preacher, the preacher to the interpreter, the interpreter to the people [xxx], that's right, yeah. [2:53-2:56]

JD: And what's, do you think the interpreters have a different role in the church than they did at the times of refreshing conference?

IL: Ahh, you mean that they are doing a

JD: [Are they doing the same job, do they have the same, the same goal?

IL: Absolutely. Yeah.

JD: Is there a difference in the vision of the Times of Refreshing conference and the times, the vision of the church, CLW?

IL: Uh, the Times of Refreshing is very different in the fact that we have guests from outside. They all come. They don't know really each other. A few may know each other and so they, it is very different. In the church here they know each other, at least most.

JD: So moving on from the Sunday service and from the conference itself, how do you, when you're preparing a sermon, how do you begin to prepare your sermon?

IL: First, I have to pray, and then, begin to study. That is my thing. I just make a study. I can focus on one, one topic. Could be prayer, could be love, could be wisdom or gifts of the Spirit, whatever and I really go deeper. Before I prepare a message to people, I prepare to myself and I know what happens to me will happen to the congregation. If I cry, if I laugh in the, in my teaching, that's what exactly will happen.

JD: So is that what makes a good sermon, one that's already touched you first?

IL: Yeah. I, that [xxx], for close fifteen years now, the first person to preach to is me. Yeah.

JD: And what, I know there's a debate in theology about how much of preaching is about God doing something and the preacher just standing back and how much is God and the preacher working together, what's your position? Do you think it's all God? Do you think it's all the preacher? Do you think it's a mix?

IL: Well, eh, [laughs], it's both. God needs me. I need God. [laughs]. And God wants to do something, he has to work with that and we have to work with God so it's a, it's a two-way. It's a two-way traffic and, eh, we see, here is God wants to deliver Israel. He could have just said, get out of Israel, I mean out of [Country] but he had to come to a man (.) Moses. See and Moses who is very, eh, unqualified
at that time and in, God says, no, it is through my power. So, God has brought us on the earth that we may work together. Yeah.

JD: And what is it, are there any specific things that preachers can do to help the sermon be useful and be good?

IL: I believe in prayer. A prayer is eh, is eh, is something that Jesus began with, he continued with, he finished with it at the cross and he is still doing it.

JD: Yeah.

IL: After two thousand years, he's still praying. Hebrews chapter seven, verse twenty-five, and he lives to make intercession for them. Who are "them"? Us. So we see bef, first and foremost prayer and prayer is not just a monologue; it's a dialogue. Yeah.

JD: So moving on from sermons now. We've done the vision of the church. We've done sermons and they have a lot to do as well with interpreting. Now the first question is, have you ever worked with interpreters outside of a Christian, or a church setting?

IL: Yeah.

JD: So, where was that? Could you tell me more about that?

IL: Eh, outside the church setting?

JD: Yeah.

IL: [sigh] Okay, well, most of my, my work is in the church and, em, outside the church, I mean, outside the church is in the street, where we do the evangelism. You know. This, eh, so I don't know whether that still outside the such, the church setting. [laughs]

JD: It's borderline.

IL: Yeah, it's just around there but not really on the secular. Yeah.

JD: Okay. And so what would be the difference working with an interpreter if you're on the streets than if you were working with an interpreter during the Sunday service?

IL: A Sunday service is like, I know who I'm talking to, in the streets I don't know. I'm just sometimes, I'm not very good at that. [Laughs] {CL} is and sometimes I feel like I'm hitting on the wall. [Laughs]

That's why in the conference I say, I'm good at that, you know and I don't feel like I'm flowing. I'm preaching, yes but if I bring the same message to the church I feel I'm flowing.

JD: It sounds a whole lot easier to preach in the church.

IL: And, eh, yeah.

JD: Erm, and so, what would you say makes an ama, makes an excellent interpreter? How would you define one?

IL: He follows me (.) as you saw and actually that, I, Leelandin who did a great job and then erm, if I knelt down, he knelt down and eh he focussed . He's eh, he, he, follows and I know when I'm, when
the interpreters is with me, yeah? When he is fully focussed. If I’m doing things, he's doing things, you know. That is what I can say is a really good interpreter.

JD: It sounds like you're asking the interpreters not just to be excellent at language but almost to be preachers as well.

IL: That’s right, yeah. Yeah.

JD: And, erm, there was a recent paper that was brought out where some, where a pastor suggested that he sees the interpreter as his partner in preaching. D'you like that idea or do you think it is going too far?

IL: Ah, no. I totally, actually, when I'm praying with the interpreter, I say, Father use us. I, we see God saying, let us. God loves to work with people who love, who work with his son and the Holy Spirit and eh, so when I go into the preach, preaching, I don’t see as myself, I see as us. Yeah, so we make a good team.

JD: I, I, I, it's good to hear you say the word, "team". How do you feel about, because when you're working with an interpreter, you don't have the power to direct what they're saying. Are you, are you happy giving the power over to someone else because you know, you’re not doing the interpreting?

IL: [laughs] I fully trust that they will communicate what [laughs], what I’m giving them and, eh, you know in faith and I think I see the result at the end of the day that we were working as a team because I see, when I see people weeping and crying, God does love me and all that and these are probably people who don’t speak the language we speak, then, without the interpreter I couldn't have achieved that.

JD: I mean, that leads me onto my next question which is, when you're preaching on a Sunday, how do you think the interpreters help on a Sunday?

IL: Ah, greatly. Ah greatly. Without interpreters we probably, we are doing, I don't know what percentage we’d be doing. Okay, to the people who understand that language we are delivering but what about that one who doesn’t? So they really play a major role and I don't feel free, e, e, if I know there are people who are not taking what I’m preaching because I’m a people person.

JD: So, could you describe to me what you think the role of an interpreter is at a Sunday service?

IL: It is, it is a great, a great work really. As an in, an interpreter is as important as a speaker because without, without that speaker, just like you gave us an example, or {LL} was giving us an example of, of aw, Moses and Aaron, yeah? That was a very good example. Eh, here is Moses, the friend of God full of anointing. He is assigned to two million but then God, he, he, ah, has assigned his brother to Moses. So you can imagine, two million under one person and then without Aaron probably Moses couldn't have done as much as he could so he needed. You could see, in this time they were, eh, at
war, they were fighting. The Bible says Hur and Aaron, they lifted the hands of Moses, yeah, and as
long as his hands were up Israel was winning. As long as his hands were down, Israel was losing. So
you can imagine, these two men, were very, very, very important for Moses because Moses got tired
and for me sometimes I mean, I’ve been working with interpreters over fifteen year, call it actually
ten years. For me, when they, when I’m being interpreted, I have time to breathe a little bit [laughs].

JD: It’s really interesting for me that, as a researcher, it’s really interesting that you have this
conference which has a very different scope and a very different vision to a Sunday service in the
church.

IL: Yeah.

JD: But what you seem to be saying is, despite the fact that the interpreters work differently in the
two events, despite the fact that they have different visions, the interpreters seem to be doing the
same job. Is that a good way of describing what you’re saying?

IL: Oh yes. That's fine. I mean, I, I value them as I cou, I mean as I see as a very crucial person. If the
interpreter’s not there, to me my heart, man, I'm not free because, I am not complete, yeah?

Because I want all get the message. They have taken time. They have taken probably their, their
riches that, they have taken all that, their money, so somebody to go that I didn’t get anything, wow.

JD: So what’s common between the two events? What’s the same between the conference and the
church that makes interpreting the same job?

IL: Eh, what do you mean exactly?

JD: Well, usually, you have the conference and the church are very different but you’ve said the
interpreters are doing the same job

IL: Yeah.

JD: At both events so, why is it the same job at two very different events?

IL: Eh, the events differ for example, you could see our conference’s is eh focussed on the personal
development. We are stirring up people. Come on, get into your purpose, yeah? And that is, is very,
very important. At the end of the day we want people to leave as, you know, they're like, today we
had testimonies. What have you taken from this? And it was amazing. One said, I just took love. She
had suffered rejection but on Friday night, as I was talking about love, she said, I'm just, and she was
weeping so, at the end of the day, it’s like, what’d you take? And then like today we had the many
testimonies. We had a time almost thirty minutes of testimonies.

JD: Wow.

IL: People saying, what have I taken? I've taken so much. I've been changed and so forth. So, they do
the same work but then, eh, on a very different, probably, focus. Yeah.
JD: So it, so basically the conference and the church seem to be doing the same job but in a different way.

IL: Exactly. That's right, yeah.

JD: And I want to end with three scenarios that I'm going to give you and I just want you to tell me what you would do. The first one is, is very, very easy and that is, if you were looking for an interpreter, what kind of person would you look for?

IL: Prayerful. [laughs]

JD: [laughs] Could you explain a bit more? One word is...

IL: Eh, an interpreter, as I said, is as important as the preacher. I think we talked about this. That person has to be prayerful, has to be in the spirit, has to feed himself. He's not just coming to, to help me con, eh, pass the message like a postman, just deliver the letters. I dunno what things I deliver, you know. A person has to be, interpreter has to really know that this is a calling, as a calling of the, eh, for the pastor. You know, like, like eh pastor was telling us, the man who is helping to park the cars, he's faithful on that. He's faithful to the very end and he's doing it wholeheartedly. so the interpreter has to be prayerful, if I'm to look for and then he has to be in the spirit and then he has to be flexible. That, I think I emphasised. [laughs] Because, as I mentioned during the time we had with you, ah, sometimes I change my messages.

JD: Yeah.

IL: Yeah and so if the interpreter is, is very rigid then it's hard for me to work with that. Oh I didn't have the notes, or you've noted, then I'm not flowing but so I look for somebody who is flexible.

JD: So it sounds like you're kind of, underneath all of this, you're saying, at the very least, they have to be a Christian and they have to be spirit-filled.

IL: [laughs] If the, you know, like I'm talking from what I'm doing.

JD: Yeah.

IL: Yeah and if I'm doing that, because he has to be from that background because then he doesn't understand some of the terminologies that I use.

JD: Yep.

IL: If I, if I take somebody who doesn't know what it means to, ah, to be spirit-filled and the, he's translating me that then he's going to interrupt you, what does that mean? [laughs]

JD: So, so when you're talking about terminology, you're not talking about someone who can find the word in the dictionary

IL: No

JD: You seem to be talking about someone who's lived that word.
IL: Exactly. I need somebody who really understands what is the Bible and of so forth.

JD: Well, that brings me to the second scenario, which is, if the preacher says something, I know you probably wouldn't, you would never do this, but if you have a preacher who says something that is biblically wrong, so it's bad doctrine, what would you want the interpreter to do in that case?

IL: [laughs] We talk of faithfulness [laughs]. He can deliver [laughs] or probably, ah, [laughs quickly] not really say something that is, eh, to say something that is wrong, yeah? Probably what I could expect the interpreter to do is probably to signal the speaker, [whispers] oh by the way, that does not work here [/whisper] [laughs]. That may offend the listeners. I mean, that could help the preacher because, eh, there are things I have given examples especially in, then somebody, very good translators I've worked with, they said, in German it doesn't work. Eh, it comes different and immediately then I change so I could like also the interpreter to help the preacher, yeah.

JD: So the interpreter's almost then kind of helping you preach better in a way.

IL: Exactly. There are many things that have really helped me. Ah, in the sense that, if I'm bringing an example from maybe African background, ah, then i-he decides no, it doesn't work. It sounds in a different way so then from that time I know it doesn't work.

JD: Okay, I was only going to do three examples but I'll do four. So this is the third one. If you were preaching and you has misquoted the Bible so if, if you meant to read from Isaiah 6 and you said Isaiah 8, what would you expect the interpreter to do in that situation?

IL: [Sighs] Eh, does the interpreter realise that I made a mistake?

JD: Yes.

IL: Well, the interpreter could say, do you mean this, you know? And I made those mistakes, eh, maybe I caught it, I caught it the other way round, then they help me. That is a really good interpreter because I'm sometimes I misquote and, eh, I was recording a message and then later on my interpreter tells me, you quoted this but I corrected it. [Laughs] Which is really good.

JD: They're correcting you as well.

IL: That's right because if I said, ahm, proverbs 22, pro, pro- proverbs 10, 22, yeah? Probably without knowing, I said proverbs 22: 10. You get it? So and then so I'm speaking what is in proverbs 10: 22, the blessing of the Lord maketh one rich and he addeth no sorrow with it, so but I am now, I am quoting the first, the right scripture but the other way round, so they correct that and I congratulate them, I said, hey, [laughs]. In other words, I'm glad to be corrected.

JD: And, and the fourth one is, is maybe even easier. If you imagine that you have a preacher who's preaching an excellent message but they're so boring, the paper's coming off the walls, what would you want the interpreter to do? There's, should they be as boring as the preacher?
They should be as bold as the preacher because this I learned from my preacher. Not all, a-and I'll give you an example of that briefly. My preacher told me, that those ones who are preaching and they are like, just like, what are you talking? But there is this particular one that you are preaching to and you see this receiving so you focus on that one. You focus on that one. I was in England and, eh, I was preaching and this guy is, he is just folding his hands and I think this one is not even getting anything but when I called the altar, he is the first one who came and he is crying and telling me and, eh, I learned something, sometimes, you may look at the faces of the people and you think they are not listening but they are the most listening people, you know. So, sometimes we can be laid back faces. That's why God said to Jeremiah, don't look at their faces.

JD: So, so, even if, even if you have a preacher who's preaching in a very monotonous, boring voice that's making people fall asleep, you would have the interpreter echo that boring, monotonous voice.

IL: [laughs]

JD: Would you?

IL: Well, what did I say, I meant, the interpreter has to do what he's supposed to do. You get it? Because, at the end of the day, you, you are planting the seeds and, the, someone else is gonna water them and only God will bring the increase. Yeah.

JD: So how do you describe what the interpreter's supposed to do then?

IL: The interpreter's just to be faithful to deliver because, at the end of the day, you know the preacher is respon, is accountable to God and, eh, if we are faithful in the little then we are entrusted the, I don't know how you could take it but that's how I could, yeah.

JD: So, i, i, it's kind of, i mean, it's just to wrap up, it's really interesting how we have this balance here between the interpreter who's the preacher's partner and can correct the preacher

IL: Yeah

JD: but also the interpreter who's there to deliver what the preacher says

IL: yeah

JD: Are you happy with that balance? W-which, it's interesting that you hold both at the same time,

IL: Yes, I kind of over[xxx] because there could be that the preacher is low [laughs] so he needs help. He needs help and, and I'm a flexible person. I'm not a person who sticks to that. In the, as I've said, over ten years working with interpreters, I've learned from them and, eh, eh, quite a great deal and sometimes I would like to hear, eh, sit with them and ask the, what, how was it? What was hard for you? Then they tell me, here you were really hard so it's very hard for me to, to speak it out. Oh, I
didn't realise. Oh, when you gave this example, it was really hard. Ah, then and I love that because, if
they don't tell me, then I will, I will continue doing that so I, I, I mature from that and I love to, you
know, really talk with the interpreters, the, the, the ones that I've worked with.

JD: Yeah. It's really good to hear someone talk about interpreters not only as important but people
but as people you can learn from as well.

IL: Yes. [laughs]

JD: But it is something that I find that seems to be fairly unique to this church. Do you think there's
something special about CLW that encourages people to be so, to value the interpreters so much?

IL: Ah, I think, you know, being an international church of over fifty nations and I'm in charge of that
department, I really see the uniqueness and, eh, it, it is God's doing because if God is bringing all
these people, he has, he's like, hey, I have, have trusted you and we have to be faithful and, eh, my
motivation to all our leader is just, keep on doing what you're doing and ehm, as we do it in love,
that's the key, in love, we'll touch many people and that makes this church very unique. The pastor is
always emphasising, out of love, out of love. Not just out of, you know, ah, desperation or anything,
love is the key. It's the foundation therefore we have to minister and that's what brings the people.
In the conference, I emphasised, on Friday you heard, that love heals. Love, love protects. You know.

Love brings but hatred takes people away and, eh, love is in the heart. And, he, when we minister
from the heart in love, in wisdom, we'll see results. It doesn't matter where. [laughs]

JD: Thank you very much. That's fantastic.

IL: You're welcome.
JD: I have to say, erm, would you like it to be anonymous or do you mind if I?
CL: No, no, you can use my name.
JD: So, just, since we only have ten minutes, I’ll go through this quickly. Could you describe fairly quickly the vision of the church and how interpreters help to attain that vision?
CL: Yes. Now the vision of the church is that we reach all nations and all generations with the gospel and transform them into, eh, radical followers of Jesus Christ. Now the vision for the interpreters are as clear, because they help us to accomplish the mission to reach all the nations in our town and naturally, as, ah, many visitors are not, eh, eh, erm, having the f, the, eh, facility or having the, eh, the ability to speak in German so they speak in their language, a little bit like, eh, Acts 2.
JD: I love it. So the interpreters there, are they acting like a bridge or do you see the interpreters as kind of a ministry in itself or just as a bridge that helps other people minister?
CL: That’s, I think it’s both. It is an own branch but, eh, naturally they are the bridge, eh, for integration. Now we have different levels of internationals in our church. We have, what shall I say, foreign nationals, who w, will never learn the German language because they are maybe no only temporarily here for a job or because they live like in a ghetto or they, they all only have their friends who are in their nation. Then they, we have people who are living on, on both sides. They, they are going in the week into a national home cell group, like a Persian home cell group then they celebrate Jesus in their language in Persian but Sundays they are coming here to integrate and to, eh, celebrate Jesus in German language. But, erm, and the third level of integration are the fully integrated people, you know, people who have learned the German language, who, ah, want to integrate themselves into an international or German home cell group so and we try to reach all these levels at the same time.
JD: So you, it seems like you see interpreting as a way of helping people integrate.
CL: Yeah but, eh, eh, erm, eh, yes definitely, it is like that but we also, eh, are not so bossy. You know, there are churches who are very bossy. They say, you must integrate. You know, we do not say that at CLW. We say, if you are in your, ah, um, cosmos. It is a Greek word, you know cosmos is not only the geographical thing. Cosmos is also, we have many casinos in Bonn. For instance, we have the Chinese cosmos. You know, they all live in their restaurants, you know and it’s very brilliant how the Chinese home church here reaches that cosmos, you know and people who live in that cosmos know only, only speak Chinese. They, they are not able to integrate because they only live in that cosmos. So and that’s why we say, you do not have to integrate, you, you can stay in your cosmos but we want to equip you that you bring the gospel into your cosmos.
JD: And how do Sunday services, what’s your purpose for having two services on a Sunday?
CL: Erm, two services?
JD: Well also two services and what’s the purpose of the services in general?
CL: Okay. Right. Now, eh, we have, em, like in the New testament church, we have two, eh, um, columns, columns, yeah? So, we have, eh, like in Acts, they met in the temple to hear the preaching and the teaching of the apostle, to pray together, to, to, to praise God but in the home they were having communion. They had fellowship, breaking the bread, you know. So that is for us very important to have a balanced life.
JD: Yeah.
CL: In, uh, church there happens meeting of God with the whole people. That is very important for, I, uh, our identity. I’m not alone in the whole world. There are many others I can worship with, you know. We hear the vision of the church through the pastor, through the elders. We hear good, Bible-based teaching, you know but in the home cell groups, it’s also very important but because in a home cell group, eh, from first Corinthians 14, everybody can contribute something. That’s not possible here, so they are trained to live the Christian life in the home cell group so that, that is this balanced church life (xxx)
JD: You mentioned Bible-based teaching. Just quickly, because I’m trying to get through all my four headings, how would you describe what makes it a good, Bible-based sermon?
CL: A good Bible-based sermon?
JD: Yes.
CL: Three points. [laughs] No, I mean, you can, eh, bring a topic and try to pull the Bible to back up your topic, you know. I think that is poor preaching. I think we, we should preach Jesus Christ, you know. We preach the Word, not our own ideas, not our own theology or, you know, the new wave, you know. We, I think a preacher should live in the Word. Like the apostles, they said, we are willing to serve the Word and the prayers, you know, and, and, I think that should a good sermon be. It should come from a servant, someone who serves the Most High God and serves the Word and is in a, in a sense, a prophet but only in a sense, not in the ministry. A prophet is some, somebody who is speaking for God and he should not speak for his own theology or his own ideas but speak for the will of God, you know.
JD: So, it’s really starting with the Word and preaching what the Word says, is that?
CL: Yeah but you could also have maybe a sermon which is very legalistic, very biblical and Biblicism, which is also not the, eh, the best thing. I think the, the Bible as the Living Word, that is, I think the
best, that the Holy Spirit, inspiration of the Holy Spirit and the Word of God meet together and then are preaching that way.

JD: Moving from preaching, have you ever worked with interpreters outside of a church setting?

CL: Out of the, eh

JD: Outside of church.

CL: Yes, we preach on the street sometimes also with interpreters, yeah. ... And, I, I do, a, a, a youtube videos for muslims and I do that, erm, in, ah, ah, um, Farsi language and Arabic language.

JD: So, what would you say is the difference between interpreting on a Sunday and interpreting for the videos or out on the street?

CL: Eh, um, not much but yeah, I mean, ah, on Sundays, definitely we are teaching the Word, you know, but when I preach, I turn every service into an evangelism meeting so but when we do that on the street, naturally, or we are preaching on youtube, definitely, that is pure evangelism.

JD: Okay, erm, very (. ) quickly 'cause I've got three more questions, erm, what, how would you say interpreters help the Sunday services? What's the role of interpreters?

CL: Yeah, er, uh, I mean they are, um, the key or the heart, er, um, ministry for an international church. As we have the goal to be an international church the, there is no, no way to get there without the interpreters. That's why we have to minister together with them. We have to be a team.

So for me as a pastor, it was a learning episode or a learning process to have the preaching notes typed out mailed by email

JD: Yip

CL: er, have, er, copied them here so every Sunday they are coming, if they have not received it by email they can get it here and then they are prepared, you know. And, what, what I'm still on the road, I am not perfect in that, that will, will give testimony to that, I am too quick. I have to preach slower to get the, the interpreter.

JD: And just three very quick scenarios. The first one if you were, ehm, if you have a visiting preacher who said something that was theologically wrong so it wasn't biblical, what would you want the interpreters to say or to do.

CL: Heh heh. Yeah, yeah. I mean we had, I mean, I'm, I'm thankful to God we not had it regularly. We had it once that, a, a pastor was preaching something very wrong and our interpreter came to me after the service and I just was silent. I could not, I could not do it with my conscience to speak these words or to interpret and I said, you are right.

JD: Yeah.

CL: You're right. I mean we have as elders promised the church members that everywhere we preach in, on the pulpit or in the home cell groups, we will stick to the Word of God and will not
preach anything that is unappropriate [sic]. I mean what we did, wh, there was one time that was
two years ago and we made a church meeting and we were publicly discussing the points which
were anti-biblical.

JD: And so something that's less controversial, if the preacher says a Bible verse but says the wrong
verse, what would you like the interpreter to do?

CL: A Bible verse and the wrong quotation or?

JD: So like, say, if the preacher said Isaiah 6 but he actually reads from Isaiah 8,

CL: Uh-

JD: What would you want the interpreter to do then?

CL: Yeah. Normally I, I would, eh, encourage that they do it one to one because if you would
expect something more, I think you would, would eh load on the an extra, eh, eh, responsibility I do
not want them to carry. I mean if somebody is a real you know, there are people who are very much
responsible in their nature: they cannot live in another way. They have to correct it, I mean, let's go.

Do it. Feel free.

JD: And the very last question is, if you were looking for a new interpreter, so if you were bringing
someone new to interpret, what characteristics would you look for in an interpreting in CLW?

CL: Yeah, I mean we should be, uh, uh professional. He should really be able to interpret. If he's not
able then sorry (.) but rm, normally he should be a member of the church. That's what secures that
he is eh, erm, that he is, uh, erm, responsible in his lifestyle, in his words, you know because if he's
cursing there, you know, that's not very helpful but we also in, in the process of the postmodern, eh,
wind we are exposed to, we have also non-members translating but then we say, now look we have
a codex of values. You know, you should live, uh biblical lifestyle not with sexual affairs and so on
because if you put somebody there who's living outward an ungodly life, I mean, that's not helpful.

So we say, you do not have to be a member but please sign the codex, you know, of well there are
values and then.

JD: Okay, thank you very much.
JD: So, are you okay for me to record and transcribe the interview?
LL: Yes, please.
JD: And would you like it to be anonymous or do you mind if I use your name?
LL: Erm … you choose.
JD: Okay. That's fine. So the interview is really simple. I'm gonna start with questions on church, then
on sermons.
LL: Okay.
JD: Then on interpreting.
LL: Okay.
JD: So the first thing is, what first brought you to CLW? What made you first come to the church?
LL: Erm, well, when I came to Bonn, this was basically the first church I visited and I knew this is the church where I should be so …
JD: What, how did you know?
LL: … It's a Pentecostal church so. [laughs]
JD: Okay. And, erm, if you weren't interpreting, what would make you keep coming to the church?
LL: Well, I like it because it's very international. Erm. People are very open … and we have all kinds of
people from like every … every, erm, level of society, erm, yeah.
JD: And what, during the service, do you have particular parts of the service that you prefer? So do you prefer the singing to the sermon or do you prefer … hearing about what's going on? What's your favourite part of the service?
LL: I think the worship.
JD: Okay, erm, so … what do you think, erm, what do you think is the purpose of interpreting at the church? What does interpreting do for people?
LL: Interpreting helps … I mean … we interpret so that people can get the message.
JD: Okay. And have you ever interpreted, have you ever had conferences in church where you interpreted that weren't a normal Sunday service?
LL: Yes. We used to do this because we had, erm, we used to have some elders in the church who
don't speak German and so any meetings they were at we would, eh, interpret. Anything that was happening we would interpret but they have gone now.
JD: So is there anything special about interpreting on Sunday that's different to interpreting in a meeting?
LL: Yes, on a Sunday, it's, eh, easier because you always do it on Sundays and the words they use are
... come more like, naturally or, you know them better than if there is a ... meeting and in meetings
people speak ... faster and there is more interaction. It's not just one person speaking at a time.
JD: Does it, does it make it easier just having one voice that you have to listen to then?
LL: Yes.
JD: Okay, And, erm, moving on to sermons, this might be a strange question but what do you think
makes it a really good sermon ... as a listener, not as an interpreter?
LL: Well, for me, it's, eh, it makes it a really good sermon if I know the person's heart, it, it, it's in an, if
it's not just like so, not just so intellectual or just feel that if I know somebody's heart is in the
message. I don't know how to put it in words
JD: [So you like to be able to connect with the preacher?]
LL: Yeah, exactly.
JD: And what helps you connect with the preacher?
LL: His voice, the way he ... moves, like
JD: So more, his presentation than what he actually says or?
LL: Yeah, for me it's really important to, erm, to know or to notice that the person is really wanting
to, to not just have a, he is wanting to give something to the people, the p. He's not just bringing a
message but he really wants to leave something with them. I don't know how to put this.
JD: I [LL's phone rings. She silences it.] And going
on the other side, are there anything that
preachers can do that really put you off, that make it a bad sermon.
LL: Yes, many things. [Both laugh while a recorder is heard in the background]
JD: Yeh, name me some things that preachers can do that would put you off.
LL: [Laughs] Just as a listener. Er, um, if they ..., well if ... if they're just like, preaching at you
JD: Hm -mm.
LL: I don't know how to put this. Erm. ... L-like not on the same level but like preaching down at you
and
JD: Can you tell that maybe in how they speak or is it something about how they move or
LL: It's, it's partly what words they use. ... Erm. But also, erm, ... Yeah, I think it's mainly the words
they, I mean, it's the combination of the words they use and the way they move, I think.
JD: Hm-mm. And, coming back to good sermons, is there anything that makes a sermon really easy
to follow, when you're, just when you're listening.
LL: Well, I'm somebody, I really love to, I love Scripture, I love the Word of God, so ... I think it's
difficult to switch off the interpreter side [laughs]
JD: But that, but that's interesting to know in itself
LL: Yeah, because you know, I like people to, to present things from different perspectives not just
from one angle.
JD: Yep.
LL: Erm. So, yeah,
JD: Okay, moving on to interpreting, I want to start with interpreting in a really general way, so have
you ever interpreted outside of a church setting?
LL: Erm, I have to think. Of course, I have interpreted for friends when they have had, eh, yeah,
when they have had visitors who couldn't speak German 'cause that happens that people come
JD: And what makes interpreting in church different from say, interpreting for friends or interpreting
anywhere else?
LL: [Pause] I don't know
[Both laugh nervously]
LL: Well, well I could ... Of course, when you're interpreting in church, you always have this spiritual
aspect because like, erm, yeah, that m, I know if I don't feel right spiritually, I find it really, I really
don't want to interpret in church [laughs]. Yeah.
JD: So, does that kind of, does that make interpreting in church more personal or more difficult than
interpreting elsewhere?
LL: Yeah. For, for me, yes. It makes it more, eh, it makes it more personal and it makes it, it only
makes it more difficult when I have, erm, when there's something wrong on my side or I have a
JD: Have you ever had a time when you had maybe a problem with the preacher and you, would that
make it difficult to interpret, if you had fallen out with the preacher before the service?
LL: Yes. I've had this and yes it makes it hard. I mean, you can, I can still try, interpret but it's not so
(. ) nice but I can do it but.
JD: Wh
LL: [xx
JD: How does it make it difficult? Does it make it difficult to understand or to believe?
LL: [No. It doesn't make it difficult to
understand but I like to be a person as well as I interpret, I also want to interpret j, not just with my
head but with my heart and then you are torn. Erm. Because when I interpret in church or for a
preacher, I, I always say I try to get as close to that person and just be taken along. If you are
thinking about like a fish in the water and it just draws you along. So but if there is a problem in the relationship, you can't go so close. So it makes the difference.

JD: Go so close as in following the ideas or following, try to follow their heart? What do you mean by going so close?

LL: Yeah, I try to, erm, hear their heart, yes. So ... Yeah. ... Ja. And I'm somebody who also physically will some stand quite close to the people who I am interpreting.

JD: Does that make it more difficult when you're interpreting in the booth? Because you're physically further away from the preacher. Do you find it more difficult to interpret in the booth than onstage?

LL: Erm. ... Probably yes but I must say I normally don't sit in the booth. I normally sit on the gallery because we don't have enough booths for everybody and erm, because I have to co-ordinate as well a little bit so I am outside the booth and it's nicer for me because I have more space [laughs] and not so refined like the poor interpreters in their small booths.

JD: Well, you talked about co-ordinating, erm, I know you co-ordinate the interpreting in the church so if you're looking for, to add an interpreter to the team, what do you look for in a new interpreter?

LL: Well what I love to have is people who are, erm, who don't just want to translate or to interpret but who, eh, have a heart as well for the people they are interpreting for and ... eh on my team I have like both. I have people or different kinds of people. We have people who erm, who see that their, er, people group, they really want to get the message and there is nobody there to interpret so that's why they are doing it because they, they have a heart for the people but I also have had had people who come to say well, I don't want to lose my English so can I come and interpret [laughs].

And, eh, cause in church you don't really easily say no and we need people anyway so.

JD: Have you ever had to say no to someone?

LL: Erm, yes, if I don't know, if I'm not sure that they are, erm, ... if they are very young Christians or not so, er, mature then, erm. I mean, I've had to say no just because I didn't know this person so well and because when you are interpreting in church, erm, it's good that you are like (.) in the Lord somehow [laughs].

JD: So, do you see interpreting as very central to what the church is trying to do? Or do you think interpreting is just an extra thing?

LL: Well, I think it should be very central to what the church is trying to do and erm, ... in our church our international vision I think has gone down a bit. This is what I feel. Yeah. But it is central in a way because this particular church has really got a calling to be an international church so it, it should be central but it isn't at the moment.
JD: And, I know we mentioned this in our earlier conversation but you talked about interpreting and preaching and how you want the interpreters to preach but you don't want them to be preachers, is that what you said earlier?

LL: No, I said that, erm, oh well not quite. [Both laugh].

JD: Okay.

LL: I said that sometimes interpreters end up being preachers not in their ministry as interpreters but I, I have known people who used to be very well known good interpreters like in Germany and later on, they were like leaders of churches and they were preachers.

JD: Does that bring a danger that people see interpreting as a step towards preaching or?

LL: Mmm. I don't know. I don't think so. But I think some people who have maybe a gift in preaching might, you know, be discovered through their interpreting skills. [laughs]

JD: So. What makes, what would you say makes a good, a really good interpreter?

LL: What makes a really good interpreter for the person's heart to be in the interpreting, not even for the person to have, eh, a big vocabulary or know all the words but their heart has to be in it. I think that is really, really important. And, of course, in church, you should know your Bible and things.

JD: So would you use someone who really had a heart for interpreting but whose language wasn't perfect yet.

LL: Yes. I would.

JD: Okay.

LL: And I have s, uh, I have listened to people who have, eh, not so, whose language was maybe not so good, erm, and I have listened to some who were perfect in English and still the people whose language was not so good but who really put their heart in it and really wanted the message across, it wasn't just nicer to listen to them and you got, they communicated more. Than people who just.

JD: [So it sounds like you're saying interpreting is something that’s kind of helping people connect rather than helping languages connect, would that be a good, a good way of summarising the way that you see interpreting?]

LL: The, yeah I think at least in church.

JD: What, the, this is what I’m investigating is what church interpreting is like. Erm, moving onto really specific things, has there ever been a time when you've been interpreting in church and you felt you had to stop because you felt you didn’t agree with what was being said?

LL: Er, yes.

JD: Could you talk me through what happened and why you decided to stop?
LL: Erm, ... oh well, ... tch, then you’d better not put, do this, then you’d better do this anonymously [laughs].
JD: That’s okay. I can, I can anonymise it or I can delete that part.
LL: (laughs) Good. Because we had the issue of one of the people who was, eh, who was in the church leadership and he was getting very much into a particular, erm, how do you say, a particular kind of teaching which some people in church were not so happy with because what they were, what, what this direction was preaching was not so, it didn’t seem, they were saying like you can do anything and everything’s okay. It was very liberal. Let’s put it this way. And erm, ..., yeah ...and I remember one Sunday this person was like preaching because we have two sermo, eh, two services, erm. I was supposed to preach in the second service but I listened to the, erm, I was there in the first and was listening and was very unhappy with the sermon and afterwards the interpreters were also very unhappy. I actually went to talk to this person and said what you said I, I don’t agree with most of what you said (laughs) and I am not going to interpret for the second service and another one of the English interpreters said “well then, let me interpret.” And so this person interpreted but half way through the sermon, she got up, left the room and did not come back again.
JD: That gives the interpreters a lot of power that they can make that decision and say, “I’m not happy to do that.” Is that, are you happy with interpreters having that much power?
LL: Well normally it shouldn’t, it should not be like that, erm (.) and, erm, in this particular situation, I was talking to some of the interpreters afterwards. Some of them felt really guilty that they had, erm, that they had interpreted because they said something that they didn’t believe and erm, so they, afterwards they felt really bad. Erm, of course I wasn’t put in that place because I wasn’t interpreting in the first service, erm and we have had the situation that, erm, they have invited visiting speakers and there was, none of the leadership was there (laughs) and he would interpret and also sometimes he would not really be sure or happy because normally if I know the person who is preaching, even if I don’t understand or if I think they are totally off, because as an interpreter I trust this person and I know they are going somewhere, they are going to explain this, so it will be okay so I just say what I hear. Erm, but if it’s somebody you don’t know from outside and you, you’re just having to, you say what you hear because you have to trust the person you’re interpreting and there is nobody from the leadership sitting up front. Erm, yeah, so we talked to our leadership. They agree always to be there if there is somebody from outside so there, if we have doubts we can look at them (laughs) and they will, erm, show us, indicate through sign language that it’s okay.
JD: You kind of have, you sound like you have two different types of interpreting. You have interpreting from your heart and you have interpreting when you just say what you hear. Are you
aware of there being, can you listen to an interpreter and tell when they’re interpreting from their
heart and when they’re just saying what they’ve heard?
LL: Erm, well I think I can, yes. But also, I mean, erm, I also interpret, I mean I say what I hear but I
like to put my heart in it.
[Conversation in the background with another person]
JD: Ok, so you were saying about how you could tell the difference between the two?
LL: Yeah.
JD: Uh-huh. Could, do you think that the people listening can tell when an interpreter is just saying
what they have heard rather than believing what they’re saying?
LL: I think so. I think, erm, people might not consciously know it but, erm, they will know it and they
will say this, they will really say this is a really good interpreter and they will not even be able to say
why but that is what makes a difference.
JD: There has been some talk, some researchers have suggested that interpreters are almost like a
second preacher. Would you be happy with the interpreting being called the second preacher or do
you think that’s too far or?
LL: No. I think that’s, that’s correct but he doesn’t, he just doesn’t preach his own message. That’s
important. [Laughs]
JD: Have you ever found yourself having to explain or recreate what the preacher’s said, rather than
just saying straight what they’ve said?
LL. (.) Erm, … maybe but I wouldn’t do that in a Sunday service, if it was like a meeting or a Bible
study then … then I might do it but sometimes I, I, because I know the people listening or, I, I, I
remembered, I mean I know that sometimes a preacher said something and I know what they are
hearing because they’re Germans [both laugh] and erm, but if you are in front interpreting you can’t
explain. You can’t say, excuse me one moment let me just explain [laughs].
JD: So, you’re, you kind of put limits on the interpreter that they can only go so far. Do you explain to
interpreters when they are starting to interpret – you know, you can’t just stand up and explain what
was said, you have to say it or do you hope that they learn that themselves?
LL: Er, for me it's, erm, it dep, I mean I’d like to tell them but, eh, yeah. It's some, I guess. Well, we
don’t do so much training and, erm, if people don’t ask I hold back a little bit but, but I have, I have …
can I say something from like another experience?
JD: Sure.
LL: Kay, cause I've been like recently, there is an international Bible study I go to. It's another church
and there is somebody whom I know because we go to the same Bible study and she has interpreted
twice. I heard her interpret once somebody from out Bible study who comes from India in her
church. (.) And she did a lot of things I would not do as a trans, as an interpreter (.) And erm, I would really like to tell her but in Germany, I think you're a bit careful to tell people, I don't know. So the next time I heard her, she did the same thing again so …

JD: What kind of things did she do then?

LL: She, she would actually do what I said, told you I wouldn't do, she would sometimes say, erm, oh, she would try and explain what he ... was saying or she, for example she, she had a powerpoint okay and then she would comment on the PowerPoint saying, er, well, erm, of course you might not be able to read this because the words are very small and then she would like continue to say what he said and then she would kind of explain or explain some of the things he ... said or why she thought he said this. Erm, which he wasn't like saying so. I thought that was a bit extreme.

JD: So does that stop the interpreter being the second preacher? Does that make the interpreter something else entirely? If, if they're doing things like this, does that change what they're doing or?

... Cause we, you said earlier that you're happy with the idea of the interpreter being a second preacher.

LL: Yeah, if you preach, if she preaches the same message as the preacher. [laughs]

JD: Ah right. So she has to preach the same message but no change it too much.

LL: Yeah.

JD: Okay. Erm. Moving on to really specific ones, I've got three situations here. I think one, we've already covered but I'm just gonna read you a situation 

JD: And I want to you say what you think and interpreter should do if that happens

LL: Yeah

JD: So if you imagine that a preacher is preaching a good sermon but they say something which is theologically wrong, so it's not Biblical, what would you do as an interpreter and what do you think an interpreter should do? ... If the interpreter says something that's Biblically wrong

LL: ... Erm. ... Well, I think ... of course it depends on what the person is saying, if it's something major or something minor. At least, if I (.), if, if I saw that the church leadership is there, I would look at them, if they don't react I might in, I might say what he is saying but definitely people would notice that I am just as surprised as they are. And I would bring across that this is, I mean I would so what I normally wouldn't do and kind of show them in a way that, erm, I am really just saying what he is saying but I am confused. I might do this.

JD: And if it's something, if it as something really, really major?

LL: Then I would just not say anything.

JD: Not say anything
LL: I would just not say anything.
JD: And is that what you would tell the other interpreters to do as well?
LL: Yeah.
JD: Okay.
LL: Because for me the, yeah. Then they should just keep silent and then he has to repeat it again and again. [Laughs]
JD: Okay, eh, a slightly less controversial one. If you imagine that you have a preacher who's preaching a really brilliant sermon but his voice is incredibly boring. He's really, kind of, putting people to sleep with his voice. Do you think the interpreter should try to add something or should the interpreter preach with the same kind of boring, monotonous.
LL: He should try to add ... because he wants to bring the message across so he should just, erm, tch, put his emotions and his heart everything in it so that the message gets across.
JD: Have you ever had that happen to you?
LL: Erm, y, a little bit yes because when you're interpreting, yeah, yeah, I've had it happen and often you, if you are interpreting from a booth you have to put more in it, you have to go a little bit over the top (laughs). Yeah.
JD: Okay and the last one is really simple. If the, if you imagine the preacher's preaching their sermon and they have their Bible verse on the screen /
LL: Yeah
JD: but the verse that they say is different to the one on the screen so say they said it was Psalm 8 and the screen says Psalm 18, what do you think the interpreter should do?
LL: ... I would s, I would say what is, what is correct, what is
JD: What's on the screen
LL: What he is quoting, I mean. Yeah? If he , if he is, if he is reading Psalm 8 and the screen says Psalm 9, if he is reading Psalm 8 then I would say Psalm 8. Yeah.
JD: So, it sounds like, in, in the church here the interpreters have the power to be able to filter out things that aren’t right and the power to be able to almost become like a second preacher. Is that something that's, that you’ve deliberately tried to do or is that just something that’s happened because of what the church is like?
LL: I think maybe that’s something which, at least we have like the freedom to do because our church is very ... now, I dunno ... At least, I know they will trust me as an in, as an interpreter to, to do my best and to do what I think is best and, erm, yeah so.
JD: It's a word you’ve mentioned a lot, that word “trust”. You’ve talked about trusting the preacher, you’ve talked about them trusting the interpreters
JD: Where does that trust come from? Do you have to know someone for a long time before you trust them or do you just think, they're a pastor, I can trust them?

LL: Erm, yeah, yeah, I think you don’t have to know them necessarily for a long time because I’ve had like, not so long ago there was somebody from Iran who I was tran, interpreting and I just met him just before the service and what I really like is, because not many preacher do this but, I really liked, I knew he had actually, he had been doing a conference here in Germany. He had slept for less than one hour [laughs]. He had come from a long way and he still said, okay I would like to have like ten minutes with the interpreter, erm, then he taught me what message he wants to get across, you know, and then he asked me, this word, do you know what the German word means for it, ‘cause this is going to be really important. I said, well, yes we have a German word for it but if you think it’s really so important, erm, this part then why don’t you explain it a bit more and so erm. No normally, I don’t have to, I wouldn’t have to know a person long. I would trust them because they’ve been invited to church and, er, yeah.

JD: And how long does it take for you to be able to trust interpreters to make the right decisions when they’re working? Do you just say, well, you’re interpreting today, I can trust you? Or do you listen to them a few times before you trust them?

LL: I, erm, (. ) listen, well, first of all, normally because I don’t speak any of the languages of the other people interpret into, I don’t speak Chinese or Russian or Spanish or Polish, I would ask, eh, somebody who I know who is speaking that language to listen to them and also I would ask t, erm, their home group leader or somebody because most of the people we had interpreting in different languages were leaders of their people group anyway. They were maybe the home cell group leaders or people who really have a heart for, erm, that language and for the people. So them I could trust but if somebody new came on then I would ask them, do you think it’s okay? And I’ve only once said no to a person because I really didn’t know that person at all and I thought they were still a bit young in the Lord but this person is like, translating now so.

JD: (xxx) The question behind my PhD is looking at the different things that people expect from interpreters and why they expect certain things and it’s really interesting to me that you’re giving the interpreters a lot of power but you’re giving them power because you trust them and you know they might already be leaders and also it seems because interpreting’s so important to the church. Do you think, what do you think the church would be like if the interpreters were told, we don’t want you to make any decisions, we just want you to say what the preacher says and don’t think about it? Do you think that would make it more difficult for the church to achieve its vision?

LL: Yeah, I think so. Definitely.
JD: Cause it sounds like giving power to the interpreters is part of achieving the vision. I wasn’t sure
if...
LL: Yeah, because, erm, you’re not just interpreting words. You also have to interpret, at least I think
this would be anywhere the case, we are interpreting for people who are may new in Germany, who
eh, need to, eh, understand Germany as well and, erm, so you are always, erm, as an interpreter you
are always, it’s important to understand like both ends and to be a bridge. Erm ... Yeah.
JD: Okay. That was a really good interview. It’s made me think that there is more going on that I
thought before but it is a good place to start and I will stop the recording.
LL: Okay.
JD: Thank you.
JD: This is interview code LL. So, ehm, one question I forgot to ask you on Friday was what do you think is the purpose of a Sunday service at church?

LL: The purpose of a Sunday service is for people to, ehm, be able to hear from God (?), to, to worship God, to give thanks to Him and ... yeah, and also to receive a message something to take home with.

JD: Okay. Ehm. And you were talking about the interpreter not taking the stage from the preacher.

LL: Yeah.

JD: Could you explain what, what that means? ’cause you were talking about the interpreter should maybe stand back if they are taller than the preacher or.

LL: Yeah, I, I, think that the, eh, the focus has to be on the preacher and the interpreter is just the voice and what people receive, they should be receiving from the preacher, ehm, so, ehm, I don’t know how to explain it but I would not stand in front of a preacher and I would, ehm, if the preacher was short, I would stand a little bit behind, ehm, yeah.

JD: It’s kind of like giving the preacher the centre of the stage.

LL: Yeah.

JD: Okay.
D.7c Interview with Ila (CLW) – Part 3

1 LL: It’s, it’s, if you’re translating somebody who’s from England, it’s different if you are translating somebody who is from China or somebody who is from Persia. They might all be speaking, erm, English but I think it’s important to get that across as well as the interpreter.

2 JD: Okay.

3 LL: So, erm, the words I would choose would (.) for example people from Persia of from those countries, they use very flowery language and these ... so I think the interpreter should try and get that, that taste across as well so it’s not lost for interpretation.

4 JD: So it’s not just getting ideas across, it’s getting the feeling as well or ?

5 LL: Yeah. I think it’s also because like we are an international church and if we invite somebody who’s from China or from Persia, I would like the <concept?> also to for people to reserve, to receive contents of the message but also to receive that this from a Chinese and that they are a bit ... from another culture.

6 JD: Yeah.

7 LL: You know, because the mission of the church is not just getting the message.

8 JD: Okay.

9 LL: Do you understand what I mean?

10 JD: Yeah.

11 LL: Yeah?

12 JD: Uh-huh. Giving the a taste of what it’s like rather than just saying what the person said, I think.

13 LL: Yeah, so that this c-, you know ... That’s it’s not lost.

14 JD: Uh-huh.

15 LL: So that is what I mean about the dangers of a preacher is interpreting because some preacher, they are, they are, their English is also very good and erm, but the danger is always that they, that they bring themselves across too much, do you understand what I mean?

16 JD: So they kind of make it ...
D.8 Interview with Arabelle (CLW – Audience) – CA1

JD: I need to say, it will be completely anonymous but I will have to transcribe it just for my thesis but anything you say that can identify you, I take out. Is that okay?

CA1: Hm-mm.

JD: Okay. So the first question is, so what brings you to the conference today?

CA1: What brings me to the conference? My friend. A friend of mine invited me.

JD: Okay and, have you been here before?

CA1: No.

JD: Okay, erm, and what, according to you, what's, what would you say is the aim of this conference?

CA1: What's the aim? I think the aim is to bring people as well, people have the acknowledgement of who God the Father, ah so, Jesus, the Holy Spirit, to get that relationship, to rekindle it. As they call it, fresh, eh, refreshing. It is like refreshing one in the inside out, strengthening the inner man.

JD: So, it's really like meeting with God then?

CA1: Yea.

JD: Okay and the next question is, when you hear a sermon, what would you say is a really, really good sermon? Is there one that you've heard recently that you could describe or?

CA1: Well, not really, I can't really, I mean, this is a difficult question.

JD: Yeah.

CA1: it is a difficult question, okay. You can't really say that's a good sermon because everything is about, re, it's building the inner man and there are so different aspects in God. What we need to know where we are lacking and so you can't say, I can't say well, this is good because it's, eh, authority, this is good because it's finances. We need it all so 'cause God is all-rounded so we need to learn these different aspects of God or the attributes of God, in order to live that life.

JD: Is there anything specific that preachers can do that help you learn better?

CA1: What they can do to help me learn?

JD: Yeah, when they're preaching, is there anything they could do in a sermon that would make it easier for you to listen to or u

CA1: Yes, by making it practical.

JD: Okay, keeping it practical.

CA1: Yeah, keeping it practical.

JD: Okay, going to interpreting, how would you describe the perfect interpreter?

CA1: They're flowing, flowing. B- the perfect interpreter, he out of what, what's, what the preacher is actually speaking.
JD: Okay. And have you ever heard or worked with interpreters outside of a church setting?
CA1: If I’ve ever heard it?
JD: Yeah or worked with someone outside of a church.
CA1: No.
JD: Okay. And the last one is just three situations. So imagine that in your church you were looking for someone to interpret, what kind of person would you look for?
CA1: Hm. I would look for someone who know the Word, you know.
JD: So, someone who's already a mature Christian? Or
JD: Would you look for someone who had already preached or?
CA1: Not necessarily.
JD: Okay and the next one is, if the preacher says something and it's theologically wrong, so they say something that's not biblical, what would you want the interpreter to do with that?
CA1: Well, it's actually, it's up to the, erm, the interpreter, how that person, erm, bring it over.
JD: Okay.
CA1: Either the interpreter, she would hesitate and allow the preacher to repeat his question and hope he was going to describe what he was going to say differently or, sh, erm, I've had someone interpret me where automatically corrected what I sai and I was like, okay, that's how you say it properly, you know.
JD: Have you ever heard a preacher who's said something that;s not even been biblically right?
CA1: I don't go to that kind of church.
JD: [xxx] And the last one's really simple, imagine that the preacher's preaching and they say they're Bible verse but they get the wrong verse or the wrong chapter. Do you think the interpreter should correct them then?
CA1: Yes.
JD: Okay, th- [end of recording]
D.9 Interview with Anderson (CLW – Audience) – CA2

1. JD: If I do it. Right, so I need to say into this that I will keep it entirely anonymous and anything you say that identifies you, I will delete. So is that okay?
2. CA2: No problem.
3. JD: Right, the first question is, erm, what brings you to this conference?
4. CA2: ... Ah, ... Yeah, I thought about that, like, erm, I think, I think it's just to hear the Word of God.
5. JD: And do you hear the Word of God usually through the preaching or through the singing or? How do you usually hear the Word?
6. CA2: Both.
7. JD: Both. Erm.and how would you, what would you say is the purpose of this conference for you?
8. CA2: The purpose?
9. JD: Hm-mm.
10. CA2: I think it's, erm, the, it's, this is my own, I, erm, my own thinking, yeah? I think the purpose is to create an environment outside our normal environment where people can sit and just hear the Word of God.
11. JD: Do you find there are distractions in your normal environment that prevent you hearing the Word of God?
12. CA2: No.
13. JD: Okay.
14. CA2: I just think like, er, a normal environment leads to kind of routine and so in such environments you can, you're out from your normal, eh, erm, environment and so here you can more, let's say, concentrate, quote unquote, in the Word.
15. JD: And moving on to the Word, mostly what the interpreters have been interpreting has been sermons, so what to you makes a good sermon?
16. CA2: For me a good sermon to me is like it has a message. It's something I can relate to, something I feel like really touches, eh, upon a certain aspect of God.
17. JD: So what could preachers do to help you relate to the sermon?
18. CA2: Make it personal.
19. JD: Make it personal. So tell stories about them or?
20. CA2: Eh no. I think a personal exp, not like their personal experience but things normal people. You know we live, not as Christians we live amongst, eh, eh, other people, at work, at school, we, in the trains, whatever. Yeah? In environments so and there are a lot of things that happens, yeah, and it's there that also the manifestation needs to be seen in that environment, yeah? And so I find, eh, that
such preachings should actually relate to this because it's the only way that we can also get what we hear out there.

JD: Okay. And, erm, have you ever heard interpreters outside of church or outside of a Christian conference?

CA2: Inside a Christian conference?

JD: Outside of (.) anywhere els that's not Christian

CA2: Oh yes.

JD: Wh-where have you heard interpreters before?

CA2: In conferences.

JD: Okay. So have you been to many conferences with interpreters?

CA2: I was a researcher so I attended academic conferences.

JD: So what do you think is the difference between interpreting at an academic conference and interpreting here?

CA2: Eh both, I think, eh, in the, on the base of it the, eh, the principle should be the same. Eh, you sh, the, eh, the in, the interpreter needs to capture the meaning as it was originally said so that we do not lose the actual meaning ... So to me in that aspect, they are the same. When, either when you are interpreting a, eh, a scientific conference or you are doing a religious conference.

JD: So they're basically the same. Would you say there's anything different about interpreting here than at a scientific conference?

CA2: Erm, I mean, at the end of the day, it's on passing the message. You're interpreting because you are passing meaning. You are de-decoding eh, the meaning from one language to the other and this doesn't, eh, change because in the end of the day, the goal is to for the, for the participant to be able to know and to hear what the originator is trying to say.

JD: Okay, erm, and lastly, there's three situations that I want to give you.

CA2: Yes.

JD: And I want you to tell me what you would want the interpreter to do. So the first thing is, is if you were looking for someone to interpret at a conference like this one, what kind of interpreter would you look for?

CA2: I look for somebody who understands ... eh, who understands me in the sort of, erm, we, we, the art of speaking is different for each individual, eh? I would, eh, there are people who would speak quite rapidly. There are people who speak one word after another word and it's important for the interpreter to know how I speak so that they can be beh, they can be, eh, eh, betterly equipped to interpret what I'm saying. They can, they can anticipate what I intend to say or how I intend to say it. Yes.
JD: So it's not just about them being good at languages; it's about them understanding how you work.

CA2: Ye, yes exactly.

JD: Okay, erm, the second situation is, if you imagine you have a preacher who has said something which is not biblically correct, what would you want the interpreter to do?

CA2: ... Eh, eh, ah, repeat again?

JD: So if the preacher says something and it is biblically wrong

CA2: yes

JD: What should the interpreter do?

CA2: I think, eh, what do you mean like really wrong? Wrong like they said that there is only Jesus and and God and there is nothing like a Holy Spirit?

JD: Something like that, yeah.

CA2: I would think, ok, [laughs] I mean I think the preacher should, erm. ... The right meaning should pass to the u, to the, to the, to the listener. If I, if the pre, if the, interpreter detects there is a wrong message being passed, I think it's okay to, to, go back to the originator and erm, confirm if they really wanna say that or if they' er, maybe missed something.

JD: So what do you think would happen if the interpreter had just said what the person said without checking? What would that do?

CA2: Because I think the interpreter is not a machine. I think an interpreter is a person and if they are able to detect that there is, erm, something wrong said. Again wrong here is up for interpretation. That's why I say, if it's something that is really, really wrong then they should go back to the originator and say, okay, to try to see whether they really mean that and if they don't mean it either to make a, a conscious decision not to pass the wrong message over. So they, I would think it's okay to skip it.

JD: And the last one is a bit easier, if you imagine that the preacher has given a Bible verse and reads something different. So maybe he said Romans 8: 28 and he reads from Romans 6: 28, what should the interpreter do then?

CA2: Ehhhh. And he knows it's the wrong verse?

JD: He knows it's the wrong verse.

CA2: Yeah, I mean, either correct him, that it's okay, it's, eh, eh, I think maybe it's actually a wrong verse, yeah? Or reaffirm again whether he really intended to do this one or the other one.

JD: So it's interesting that you see interpreters as people who are passing the message but not as computers so is there any point where you think the interpreter, i, is there any point where you think the interpreter is going past their authority. What would you say is too much
CA2: I don't, I don't see two as one having the authority over the other. I think these are two distinct roles each is taking, is, is eh, erm, doing their own roles. One is preaching, the other is decoding that information, erm, and and passing it on to the other people. These are distinct roles. I don't see them as a, as a, as a, er, a hierarchical thing. I see them as power things and each performing a different role.

JD: Okay, erm, just one last question some experts in interpreting have suggested that the interpreter is the partner of the preacher. Do you like that idea or do you think that it's going too far?

CA2: Yes, because if they are not in tandem then a lot of things can go wrong. I've experienced a lot of this. Erm, eh, most, for instance, I'm Kenyan and a lot of people, preachers usually, even when the ones who are preaching in the village, they insist of having interpreters so you'll have, a, a, a, a, an occasion where the congregation is a hundred percent, can a hundred percent speak Swahili but there'll be an interpreter who, a, a, as the preacher is, will preach in English, maybe because they can't converse in Swahili but still it's preaching in English or in any other language and then have an interpreter and sometimes not all these interpreters can be able to interpret, eh, well. In the end, the meaning of what is being preached gets somehow, eh, erm, watered down.

JD: Okay and eh, which church do you go to normally?

CA2: Now or before or what?

JD: At the moment

CA2: [names non-CLW church]

JD: Okay so that will be interview code CA2.
JD: The interview will be completely anonymous and any personal details that you happen to give away, I will delete.

CA3: Okay.

JD: Is that ok?

CA3: Yeah.

JD: So the interview is really simple. I start with generally why you’re here.

CA3: Yeah

JD: Then I talk about sermons then I talk about interpreting.

CA3: Okay.

JD: Okay. So the first question: what brought you to the conference today?

CA3: What brought me to the conference today? Erm, it's cause I took part in the plumb line a month ago and this is like a, he told us about it then and this is a chance to refresh and make sure, eh.

JD: [So, wh, what do you mean by refreshing?]

CA3: Yeah just to make sure that, eh, I dunno, to, I dunno, I can't explain that.

JD: Erm, okay, the next question is what would you see as the purpose of this conference?

CA3: The purpose of this conference is to keep us free and serving God.

JD: Okay. Erm, and, outside, sorry, sermons first, when, when you are listening to a sermon, what would you say is a great sermon? What makes a sermon fantastic for you?

CA3: A real one that talks about real-life examples. The way we live today and how the Bible addresses that issue.

JD: So, it's kind of like applying the Bible to everyday life.

CA3: Hm.

JD: And is there anything particular that a preacher can do that makes it easier for you to connect with what they are saying?

CA3: Yes, stories and examples.

JD: And have you ever heard interpreters outside of church contexts?

CA3: Actually, I have in meetings and whatever for, I dunno, I heard it and seen it on TV and but not so much. The UN, they need translators for their, (.) er, climate meetings for people who speak every (xxx) but that's a different kind.
JD: 
[What would you say is the difference interpreting, kind of out there and interpreting in kind of a church or a Christian setting?]

CA3: The church has different language, I think. Er, we have more holy language that's only from King James or whatever and the German's have it as well so.

JD: So it's mostly kind of like a difference in terminology or?

CA3: Yeah, I think there is some difference between.

JD: Ok and the last thing is really simple. Is I am going to give you three situations and you've got to tell me what you think the solution is? There's no right or wrong answer.

CA3: Okay.

JD: First thing is, so imagine that someone said to you, we need and interpreter today? 

CA3: Yeah.

JD: What kind of person would you look for, for this conference?

CA3: For this conference, I would look for an interpreter for today, I'd look f, yeah, it has to be someone who speaks both languages, obviously, but

JD: 
[Would you look for a Christian?]

CA3: 
[I'd look for somebody more outgoing, actually.]

JD: More outgoing.

CA3: Someone who likes to talk. [laughs]

JD: W, would you look, would you say kinda they have to be a Christian or would you accept anyone?

CA3: 
[Actually, I would say, for this conference, you’d have to be. You have to have a, er, understanding of the terminology, If you're not a Christian, you're not gonna understand it all.

JD: Ok. Now, on terminology, I want you to imagine that you've got a preacher who's preached a good sermon but they've said something that's just theologically out there and wrong.

CA3: Yeah.

JD: What would you want the interpreter to do?

CA3: Ignore it. [laughs] No, to say, he's, to, basically, I think you can summa, summarise what he said and, eh, yeah, but I think you don't have to go on forever and ever and say it.

JD: So

CA3: Some people go into great lengths to defend their negative, or, er, wrong viewpoint. Ah so.

JD: So, like, if the interpreter just said exactly what the preacher said, what would, what difference would that make?
CA3: Actually, probably none, you're gonna have to, er, hope that the other person, I mean, everybody else has to filter it so I think, I'm too ...

JD: Okay,

CA3: I guess you can't really do it exactly but it's not so nice.

JD: The last one's really simple. If the pastor's kinda reading out a scripture verse. Like, say he's reading something from Isaiah 6 and he says Isaiah 8, what would you want the interpreter to say?

CA3: Just find, eh, know what the Bi, I mean some pastors actually give out notes ahead of time but if he says the wrong thing, just say the right thing.

JD: Okay. Thank you very much.

Addendum

CA3: I dunno. I sit there and like, What'd they say? What'd they say? Everyone's laughing and clapping and whatever and nobody's said anything, eh, that I could understand. And you're like

JD: it makes it really tough for the interpreter

CA3: And you're like, what? [laughs] I don't know exact but, you know, I mean, he maybe doesn't understand what the, eh,

JD: So what'd you reckon, like, when the preacher tells a story, do you want the interpreter to try and follow it all along or wait until the preacher's finished and then try and recap?

CA3: That actually is probably easier. If you're following along and you realise, actually sometimes, I've ha, I've actually seen it done (xxx) where the translator didn't quite get everything but he got, he translated in groups as it's going. So he'd day, they're talking about, they're saying these words and this and this and I can, ah ok, then you can put it goether 'cause you've got bits to work with but to nothing, I'm like why am I here? [laughs] You know. [laughs]

JD: Yeah.

CA3: I'm, maybe I don't come back here, any more because they really don't speak my language, you know. That's the hard part.

JD: yeah.
Appendix E: Codebook

**Skopos/Purpose**

This code is used for all mentions of the skopos or purpose of the event. It was also used for the purpose of the organisation, with the two sets of purpose being split in later analysis.

**Performance/Sermons**

These codes were used to cover all areas of performance, with subdivisions according to whether the data showed expectations of the performance of sermons or preachers employing performative devices, here meaning adding visual or physical means of emphasising or undercutting what they were saying.

The next four codes covered performative expectations of sermons, following the definitions given in the work of Allen (2004)

- **Ethos: relationship w. preacher, & their character**
- **Logos: ideas & their development**
- **Pathos: feelings stirred by sermon**
- **Embodiment**

**Preacher behaviour**

The above code was used when preachers used body language or other visual means to emphasise or undercut what they were saying.

The next three codes were used to mark my own reflections on the research process. Their coverage is self-explanatory.

- **On research process, timing, setup etc**
- **Research results, either reflecting on what someone said or its relation to theory**
- **On my role**

The following codes, from Equipment and Working Methods to Other, were used to mark data on interpreting itself, from the logistics of working methods, through to expectations of interpreters. Here, the medium grey “Performance” code covers my own evaluations and observations on how the interpreters worked. Such data was deemed irrelevant later.

The blue-green and green codes cover expectations of interpreters. While most of these are self-explanatory, it should be noted that “Connection” here means the ability to connect with the
preacher. This often went along with data relating to “Partnership”, which here means the interpreter actively working with the preacher, perhaps in terms of giving advice or reshaping the message. The two areas were distinct enough on the interviews to merit separate coding.

Very few expectations went “unclassified.” Just as very few data on interpreting more widely was filed under the “Other” category. Mostly, these were just used for holding purposes until data could be reanalysed.

- **Equipment and working methods**
- **Performance**
- **Expectations/Views of interpreting**
  - Normative (accuracy, neutrality, pleasant voice)
  - Performative (connection, personal character, attitude)
    - Personal Character/Spirituality
    - Connection
    - Embodiment both physical and psychological
    - Partnership
  - Unclassified
  - Other

**Purpose of interpreting**

The following codes were reserved for interaction between the named participants when interpreting was going on. In the case of “interpreter/leader interaction”, the only data on this was reported data in interviews.

**Preacher/Interpreter Interaction**
**Interpreter/Leader interaction**
This final code was used to mark code switching during a sermon.

Code switching
Appendix F: Coded Interview sample
Sample of Interview with Isabella (CLW) - LL

(Lines 109-186)
JD: Well, you talked about co-ordinating, erm, I know you co-ordinate the interpreting in the church so if you're looking for, to add an interpreter to the team, what do you look for in a new interpreter?
LL: Well what I love to have is people who are, erm, who don’t just want to translate or to interpret but who, eh, have a heart as well for the people they are interpreting for and ... eh on my team I have like both. I have people or different kinds of people. We have people who erm, who see that their, er, people group, they really want to get the message and there is nobody there to interpret so that’s why they are doing it because they, they have a heart for the people but I also have had had people who come to say well, I don’t want to lose my English so can I come and interpret [laughs]. And, eh, cause in church you don't really easily say no and we need people anyway so.
JD: Have you ever had to say no to someone?
LL: Erm, yes, if I don't know, if I'm not sure that they are, erm, ... if they are very young Christians or not so, er, mature then, erm. I mean, I've had to say no just because I didn't know this person so well and because when you are interpreting in church, erm, it's good that you are like (.) in the Lord somehow [laughs].
JD: So, do you see interpreting as very central to what the church is trying to do? Or do you think interpreting is just an extra thing?
LL: Well, I think it should be very central to what the church is trying to do and erm, ... in our church our international vision I think has gone down a bit. This is what I feel. Yeah. But it is central in a way because this particular church has really got a calling to be an international church so it, it should be central but it isn't at the moment.
JD: And, I know we mentioned this in our earlier conversation but you talked about interpreting and preaching and how you want the interpreters to preach but you don't want them to be preachers, is that what you said earlier?
LL: No, I said that, erm, oh well not quite. [Both laugh].
JD: Okay.
LL: I said that sometimes interpreters end up being preachers not in their ministry as interpreters but I, I have known people who used to be very well known good interpreters like in Germany and later on, they were like leaders of churches and they were preachers.
JD: Does that bring a danger that people see interpreting as a step towards preaching or?
LL: Mmm. I don't know. I don't think so. But I think some people who have maybe a gift in preaching might, you know, be discovered through their interpreting skills. [laughs]

JD: So. What makes, what would you say makes a good, a really good interpreter?

LL: What makes a really good interpreter for the person’s heart to be in the interpreting, not even for the person to have, eh, a big vocabulary or know all the words, but their heart has to be in it. I think that is really, really important. And, of course, in church, you should know your Bible and things.

JD: So would you use someone who really had a heart for interpreting but whose language wasn't perfect yet?

LL: Yes. I would.

JD: Okay.

LL: And I have s, uh, I have listened to people who have, eh, not so, whose language was maybe not so good, erm, and I have listened to some who were perfect in English, and still the people whose language was not so good but who really put their heart in it and really wanted the message across, it wasn’t just nicer to listen to them and you got, they communicated more. Than people who just...

JD: [So it sounds like you’re saying] interpreting is something that's kind of helping people connect, rather than helping languages connect, would that be a good, a good way of summarising the way that you see interpreting?

LL: The, yeah I think at least in church.

JD: What, the, this is what I’m investigating is what church interpreting is like. Erm, moving onto really specific things, has there ever been a time when you’ve been interpreting in church and you felt you had to stop because you felt you didn’t agree with what was being said?

LL: Er, yes.

JD: Could you talk me through what happened and why you decided to stop?

LL: Erm, ... oh well, ... tch, then you’d better not put, do this, then you’d better do this anonymously [laughs].

JD: That’s okay. I can, I can anonymise it or I can delete that part.

LL: (laughs) Good. Because we had the issue of one of the people who was, eh, who was in the church leadership and he was getting very much into a particular, erm, how do you say, a particular kind of teaching which some people in church were not so happy with because what they were, what this direction was preaching was not so, it didn’t seem, they were saying like you can do anything and everything’s okay. It was very liberal. Let’s put it this way. And erm, ..., yeah ...and I remember one Sunday this person was like preaching because we have two sermo, eh, two services, erm. I was supposed to preach in the second service but I listened to the, erm, I was there
in the first and was listening and was very unhappy with the sermon and afterwards the
interpreters were also very unhappy. Actually went to talk to this person and said what you said I
don’t agree with most of what you said (laughs) and I am not going to interpret for the second
service and another one of the English interpreters said “well then, let me interpret.” And so this
person interpreted but half way through the sermon, she got up, left the room and did not come
back again.

JD: That gives the interpreters a lot of power that they can make that decision and say, “I’m not
happy to do that.” Is that, are you happy with interpreters having that much power?

LL: Well normally it shouldn’t, it should not be like that, erm (.) and, erm, in this particular situation, I
was talking to some of the interpreters afterwards. Some of them felt really guilty that they had
Erm, that they had interpreted because they said something that they didn’t believe and erm, so
they, afterwards they felt really bad. Erm, of course I wasn’t put in that place because I wasn’t
interpreting in the first service, erm and we have had the situation that, erm, they have invited
visiting speakers and there was, none of the leadership was there (laughs) and he would interpret
and also sometimes he would not really be sure or happy because normally if I know the person who
is preaching, even if I don’t understand or if I think they are totally off, because as an interpreter I
trust this person and I know they are going somewhere, they are going to explain this, so it will be
okay so I just say what I hear. Erm, but if it’s somebody you don’t know from outside and you, you’re
just having to, you say what you hear because you have to trust the person you’re interpreting and
there is nobody from the leadership sitting up front. Erm, yeah, so we talked to our leadership. They
agree always to be there if there is somebody from outside so there, if we have doubts we can look
at them (laughs) and they will, erm, show us, indicate through sign language that it’s okay.
Appendix G – Field Notes

G.1 Field Notes from the IEN Conference and interviews

G.1a Note on 22nd July (F-22/7) on interviews with Ila and Ivonne

Apart from the fact that only my backup recorded properly, that went well.
1 From these two interviews, a few things are becoming clear.
   1) It seems that these two respondents are similar in their views about the limitations of
      an interpreter's role. They are there to identify themselves with the preacher and to say
      what they said. The identification, however, does not give license to change what is
      said, even to soften the blows of racist words. However, it does seem to allow limited
      scope for changes in presentation, even if these are as much due to personal speaking
      style as anything else.
   2) This would seem to lean towards Gile's idea of speaker loyalty and away from the
      interventionalist interpreting seen in Balci, although whether this is actually what
      happens remains to be seen.
   3) The interesting point is that mode shift seems to be an interesting variable. Sim is seen
      as disconnecting the audience and interpreter and, by extension, the audience and the
      speaker. This seems to lean towards a qualified acceptance of the co-preacher
      paradigm. When only one audience group needs interpreting, it would seem that SIC
      is preferred as it allows much more to be communicated than can be transmitted in
      sim. Note Ivonne's description of sim as being “more technical.” SIC would seem to
      encourage more performative interpreting.
   4) There is a slight difference in perspectives as regards the partnership principal. In Ila,
      this seems to be restricted to the passing/sharing of information to allow preparation.
      However, in Ivonne, this might include using the interpreter as part of an illustration.
      The definition of teamwork in Ivonne seems to include much more than in Ila. This is
      something that will be harder to explore with other respondents and may end up
      hanging.

Perhaps more interestingly, despite the identification idea, there seems to be only limited
leeway for interpreters to be active in creating a rapport/relationship between preachers and
the audience. Perhaps this is due to the limits placed on the interpreter's role. The point here
is that, especially in sim (see Ivonne transcript and notes), there seems little, if any way, for
the interpreter to do anything independent. Stuck in the role of “transmitter” or “alter ego,”
there is little they are able to do to help the preacher, besides linguistic transfer. I doubt very
much whether this actually holds true in actual interpreting. I am sure that, if I went through
my notes from the Nida School experiment, I could easily find interventionalist data.
However, I would need to somehow get Brighton data to see if this is the case there too.
Perhaps it is me who is wrong and there really is little scope for intervention in the booth.

On the other hand, Diriker seems to have found places where the interpreter shifts speaker
positions. Similarly, techniques like “he has said a joke, please laugh” are clearly not about
transmitting linguistic content. I must get into a convo with Ivonne and Ila over the
interpreting of jokes. Of course, these are special cases but they would show their relative
ease with changes. I might add in the joke thing to SFF1 who is also an experience
interpreter. TBH, even if I did have unlimited access to linguistic data, I would probably need
to isolate special cases like these to see what is going on. After all, in standard sermons, for
Christian interpreters, there will be little, if any, reason to shift positions or step out of the
prime role.

My comfort questions seem to be just that. It would take a ten ton truck to pull the answers to
them towards the answers to the rest. I just can't see a connection. Something should have
predicted this role.

THEORY LINKS SO FAR
Okay, I will do this much more humbly than I did at [Pilot] given my history there.

Standard skopos theory-
This seems pretty much blown out of the water. None of these expectations are text-based
and it is becoming pretty clear that even hypertext isn't as strong a predictor as we thought, at
least not in this case. The only way this could hold is if we create a wide hypertext called
“Christian meeting.” Even still, Alev's work kind of questions even this. Turkey and W.

Europe seem streets apart here.

Is culture a stronger factor than hypertext?

Gile's “sender loyalty”-
Maybe it is because of booth-bound restrictions but this seems to be holding up pretty well. Even in some rough waters (racism, boredom etc) it seems to be the default “home” position of the interpreter. In fact, it seems like even more than that – it seems like a port they don't want to leave.

New Homiletics-
In the sense that gesture is important and performance is even more than pure vocals, this seems to be working well. I need to investigate what exactly they mean by a connection between the preacher and interpreter.

It would be fairly easy to start wondering down ideas like “cultural capital” and the like but all that would really do is give me some convenient coat-hangers for stuff. I don't know what that would explain or offer that I don't already have.

What's still bugging me?
-Am I just hitting the surface? If so, how do I go deeper?
-Where did these restrictions come from? Are they mode-based?
-I am amazed how coherent the replies are, even when I probe. The role is incredibly well-established. But how?
-Does this role work?
-What am I missing?
First night of conference. We arrived late due to an accident on the road, which turned a 2½ hour journey into a 5 hour marathon. Still, it actually didn’t cause too much of a problem, given that one of my key gatekeepers Ivonne, was late too due a completely different incident on the road.

As soon as I heard that, I realised that God must be in this project. We arrived in time to hear the Chairman of the group of churches deliver his opening sermon. I think the remarks I have noted down give an interesting flavour of both the movement and the skopos of the conference.

I will write a brief summary after I write them.

In the notes that follow, the remarks in “” are direct quotes from his sermon. My contextualisations are in [ ] and the rest are my comments.

“‘It’s your time.’

[In a story about a pastor who has baptised many people in India]

“There are a lot of Indians.”

“It’s your time. We’re gonna say that ‘til it echoes in your heart.”

“Now is the day for Britain. Now is the day for France.”

“Your excitement will affect people. When they get around you, they will know that God’s alive.”

Even writing these few initial quotes, I now wonder whether the missing factor that explains the expectations I have seen is something to do with the nature of the event itself. Perhaps this is what Poechhacker is trying to get at with the idea of a hypertext skopos. However, what he misses is that the character of the exchange itself, and not just the purpose, will form all the others. As soon as you say “IEN conference,” you automatically define and restrict all
the other categories. This conference is either a hypertext in itself (which then suggests that
Hillsong conf/AOG conf and the like are also independent hypertexts, which is silly) or it
defines the hypertext that it can represent.

Say we had the hypertext of “Pentecostal church conference,” that would suggest that it is the
fact of being a representative case of this hypertext that gave IEN conference its character
and limits. Yet, even if we could find enough common, salient features between, say, IEN
conference, Hillsong conference and AOG conference, we would still be missing huge
chunks of what it going on. Each of these organisations has its own culture and its own set of
norms. Maybe this is what P means by the position of different cultures in his model. Still,
my data already suggests that there is something else that is defining the expectations,
owhether all these confs would generate identical (or near identical) expectations and,
honestly, I can’t see that happening. Otherwise, why are my interviews presenting so many
striking similarities between interpreting in church and interpreting at conference?

“Your country needs you. Your generation needs you.”

“God is waiting for our nation but He needs the fire that is in your belly.”

Does IEN culture trump national cultures? It is hierarchical. Helen has this idea of “strong
culture” (IEN, organisational norms/behaviours dictate expectations) and “weak culture”
(expressed in a scientific field, where the norms of the field might dictate expectations).

Lee’s performance. He is very animated. Is there an expectation for this to be portrayed in the
booth? He is one of the people who sets the culture.

[Lee was very careful to introduce the speakers and, later, the national leaders who were
present.]

[His delivery was marked by abrupt topic changes and many personal stories.]

“Let the urgency grip your heart.”

“The theme of this conference is: Reach the Harvest Field.”
I think I ought to explain. In much evangelical theology, the Harvest Field represents those who are not currently Christian who will become Christians. This theme therefore suggests an emphasis on evangelism, evangelistic techniques and work outside church walls. This was re-emphasised later when Lee talked about where the “Outreach” in IEN came from. It was put there to underline the commitment to going out and preaching the gospel to people who had not yet heard it.

“[It’s] our time to bring the real love of God to this world.”

“The urgency of the time. Lord put fire in my belly.”

“Let’s have a go. … Let’s believe God for a miracle.”

“Hope. H. O. P. E. It’s not spelt like that in French, I think.”

Obviously this demonstrates an awareness of the interpreters and their work. It also shows a consciousness that the point will not work in French.

“This is the time. This is the day.”

“If you have no hope, you are here at this conference so that you will be touched by God.”

Here is the purpose for individuals attending. Obviously, it demonstrates belief that God can use a conference to change people. I might have to explain the concept of a “touch of God” in my writing.

“[My birthday is] 21st {month}, if you want to send me a present.”

This is a nice attempt to build rapport with the audience.

[Pointing jokingly at someone in the front row after a joke.]

“What you laughing about?”

More connection/rapport!

“God’s going to touch people with joy.”
He also told the story of being in a service, listening to a negative preacher. This seemed to be one of those ‘everyone has been there’ moments, to build common ground with the audience.

“You are made in God’s image.”

He also pointed to one, well-known young couple in the audience and talked about the experience of having a baby as if the girl of the couple was pregnant. This could be seen as an example of connecting with the entire audience by building public rapport with a small section of it.

Yet again, he added in more personal stories. His experience seemed to form a large part of this message, especially since a previous pastor had earlier told him that it wasn’t his time.

“This is our time.”

“Let the spirit of God speak to your spirit. Let that thing inside of you … begin to sing and begin to dance.”

I no longer have the context of this but it could be related to the purpose of the conference.

He publicly honoured and greeted regional leaders from the Middle East and talked about their work in feeding street children. The purpose of this seemed to be to inspire others.

“Let us not just … chug along. There’s a passion that burns within our hearts. IEN was birthed with an incredible passion to meet the lost.”

He also mentioned work going on in Nepal and Thailand. This seemed to be one of his chosen times for talking about the work going on outside the UK and even outside Europe.

“I want them [those who believe that God is dead] to be absolutely convinced when they meet us that God is alive.”
“No matter how much excitement you may have, you still need the Holy Spirit. It takes people to say “Yes Lord, this is the accepted time. I need your presence. I can’t do it alone.”

He also once mentioned the recent shootings in Oslo and UK economic problems, referring to bad news.

“That God’s presence would abide in us and we would carry His power to the world.”

This was not just referring to the conference itself but to his own desire.

He then told a story of his baptism of the Holy Spirit and first speaking in tongues, including how he did not understand it at first and how his wife saw it as from God as only God could have led him to accept it and to change in the ways he did. This included him adopting the same position he was in during one of the very first times he spoke in tongues. In fact, in general, he would very commonly act out parts of stories or idea with his hands and body position.

//Does this explain the view of sim as less performative since the interpreter cannot do the same? If it does, this explains difference caused by modes.//

“The Spirit of God wants to come into your heart afresh.”

“If you lie in every day and are purposeless] You gotta get out of bed and dream again.”

Does this demonstrate the values of the church?

Am I looking at norms and not culture after all?

“Holy Spirit, let’s go.”

“I want to encourage you to get a dream. You gotta get a dream.”

“Everyone of you church leaders, you gotta have such an infectious dream that people want what you got inside.”

“This is our time to touch this world. Never forget the Holy Spirit.”
“We have many leaders here from different countries.”

[He then invited many up on stage and had them praying for the conference with him. A leader from Nepal prayed in his own language. He also called up a young person from the local church to represent the young people rising up. An Australian leader prayed in English. A {Country} leader prayed in tongues. The young person (say mid-20s) prayed in English and made prophetic declarations.]

(Lee) “I believe God is going to come during this conference. We are gonna pray to God to come on this event.”

“God’s favour wants to come on our movement.”

Having all the leaders on stage was talked about as a show of unity, following Psalm 133. I would also describe it as a performance, especially when he asked them all to hold hands and asked the congregation to do the same. This physical act was seen to demonstrate and show unity. Since unity is not a physical thing, it is perhaps some kind of synecdoche. It was to be perceived by those watching (and involved) as representing unity. Given Christian doctrine on the power of unity, this is significant.

He asked everyone to pray together (at the same time, using different prayers) that “God would bless us.”

[Referring to national leaders]

“These people carry authority in the spirit.”

Again, this is synecdochal, the idea is that the leaders carry authority in the spiritual real because of or in addition to their physical authority. There may be a subtle reference to the story of the Roman centurion’s servant.

Is IEN “culture” only decodable by those with Biblical knowledge? Bible stories and biblical ideas are peppered through his sermon with little or no introduction or explanation. This “christianese” may or may not create a de facto dividing line between those “in the know” (who understand the references and also know the IEN interpretation of these stories) and those who are not in this group. Does this even affect the “reading” of performative gestures?
It certainly seems to here. It also affects interpreting performance as the “culture” allows references that would not be available without prior experience. It would be very hard for a non-Christian interpreter to be able to pick these up easily, even if given full, complete talk notes. However, they need to be “read” correctly for the message to make sense. ‘Stand in agreement’ has a different performative value/illocutionary force to ‘pray for the same thing’ or ‘stand up and agree with each other.’ This might explain the preference for stricter renderings.

“Hold hands in agreement.”

He also mentioned that God wanted to put something in people’s hearts during the conference. My notes are illegible on precisely what.

Len’s (head of IEN Australia) prayer contained phrases that talked about prophesying things and “x will happen” “let x happen”. These should probably be read as prophetic declarations: statements that are seen to enact what they say, in the same way as “I pronounce you man and wife” enacts the joining in marriage. This might be another explanation for the strictness on interpreters.

Ben (a mid-20s non-leader) prayed “We prophesy an upturn … changes … salvations.” Since Lee’s body language suggested agreement, this is another example of a performative declaration.

In terms of data collection, I was blessed once more with two excellent gatekeepers who helped to distribute the surveys. This made my life much easier.

Today’s themes:

Prophesy and performativity: Does the perceived power of the words and declarations used somehow cause the restrictions on the interpreter’s role, especially when they are in the booth and cannot physically act out what the speaker is saying?

IEN “culture”: Is it actually the culture: norms, beliefs, language use, values and approach to life of IEN that causes the expectations on preachers and interpreters rather than the skopos
of the conference? Is Helen’s idea of “strong culture” (i.e. organisation led) and “weak
culture” (i.e. field/activity led) a workable one?

P’s framework: Can “culture” and “mode” trump hypertext or become such prominent factors
that they block out what is traditionally seen as skopos? What about text type? Obviously,
this fits into P’s model but might it become the largest factor? Have I been reading P’s model
wrongly? Is it hierarchical at all?
This morning, we registered at last. There we no badges this year. Instead, we received Pursuit wristbands. Our conference bags contained a bottle of water, a packet of mints, a full Pursuit branded pad, a conference schedule and an advert for Christian t-shirts. On the left side of hall as you enter are one small stand and two large one. The small stand sells water, the first large one sells resources from Vaughan, one of the preacher and the last stand, advertises the work of Global Compassion, the humanitarian arm of the church grouping.

I did not collect the surveys back in today as they had not yet been filled in. I had only given out 20 (2 IFFs, 15 AFFs, 3 SFFs). I will check with Lydie tonight but this may be the entirety of the French contingent. French is the only language where interpreting is offered this year.

Being known by the French people has definitely proved an advantage from the access point of view. However, it may somehow prejudice the results.

In session 1 this morning (see schedule), Lee publicly acknowledged the work of Lani, head of IEN Nepal, who has a church of 1,400 in Kathmandu and many satellite churches. Lee also stated that only 60 years ago, there were no Christians in Nepal.

Lani talked on the official recognition of Christianity in Nepal as it is now a secular country, instead of a Hindu one. He mentioned that he is an advisor to the committee drawing up a new constitution for the country and if it is adopted “Christians will have full authority to practise.”

Lani is also establishing Christian schools and IEN Nepal will soon have the authority to teach teachers even for Hindu schools. Their church has members from all castes and classes, including MPs, doctors etc.

Lani said “Every time I come to the conference, God has brought me to the next level.”

When Lani was finished, Lee commented that “Put a knife in his hand, he’d look like a gurkha.”

Then the national Chair of IEN Australia, Len was invited to preach. The entirety of the audience gave him a standing ovation as he came up to preach.
In talking about changing the world and all the work that was being done by IEN worldwide, he said “People without faith don’t do that.”

Talking to Scottish people he said “I got shipped out and came back a free man.” (This would seem to be a reference to Australia previously being a prison colony.)

He commented that prophesies did not guarantee that something would happen but that they were “a POSSIBILITY of a great life.”

Talking about leaving conference, he said “The reality is, you get home and there’s you.” This was to illustrate how it is one thing to be inspired at conference and quite another to actually change in the time following the conference.

In a similar vein, he also said “You hear the messages about ‘we can touch the world’ and go back home to 100 people.” ... “Something needs to happen that that word [a prophecy received at conference] becomes a reality.”

Any comments in “” are direct quotes from his sermon.

“God believes we can do something amazing.”

“Winning lost people must be the momentum of the church.”

“You go home to what we call the local church. A local church that is impacting my community.”

Going over some of these quotes, it would seem that Len sees the conference as a way of impacting leaders who can then apply what they have learned to their work in the local church. If the local church is there to see people become Christians then conference equips and trains and inspires them to do this.

“We go to every different culture.”

[I think this was about the work of IEN in general.]

“Be careful that we aren’t losing our impact in the nations.”
“I’ve chosen the rest of my life to live in the grace of God.”

“You got to know how to translate the power [received at conference] back into the local church.”

This is an interesting idea on the purpose and limitations of conference. In this case, the importance of interpreting would seem to hinge on its ability to help this happen.

“What you are’s gotta believe into people”

“You believe that (people) have got to go beyond where they are and win lost people. ... I’m not preaching to you; I’m preaching to me.”

Is this an attempt at connecting by identifying with the audience?

[Talking about his conversation with a member of staff who was spending a lot of time caring for people and not preaching to them] “I pay you to ... bring them to the Kingdom of God.”

“We are here ... employed by God to do the work of an evangelist.”

“It’s about the harvest.”

[This was not necessarily just about conference.]

[Talking about conference ‘that’]

“You should interpret that back into your situation.”

“Who can you reach?”

“Conference comes and dries us out by the fuel of the Holy Ghost” (so that God can set us on fire)

What importance does this give the actual messages?

“Interpret what’s happening in the bigger world into your world.”

[Talking about the young guy who had prayed on stage the night before and had apparently “rolled onto the stage”] “We can’t do it, that’s the only reason we don’t like it.” [jokingly]
In reference to his earlier comment about winning people to Christ, he said that winning lost souls had to come above loving people as it was the ultimate expression of love for people.

“You’ve got to interpret everything in the Bible to your situation”

What would the limits of this “interpretation” be? What does this suggest for interpreters?

[On prosperity preaching now that the West is not as rich] “Preach the same message from a different position.”

“Your belief system is so important and needs to be founded on the Word of God. ... If your belief system is not bearing fruit, change it.”

“This conference opens up something ... where we can be touched by God.”

Just as I take a break, Helen has asked me why it is taking me so long to write up my notes and what I have written down. Honestly, at this precise moment, I am not entirely sure what I am looking for, besides any obvious references to the purpose of the conference through people’s eyes and any reference to interpreting and/or relations between different national/cultural groups. I guess I felt it was useful to cast the net wide, rather than restricting myself. Unlike the interviews, where I have kept things fairly narrow and will need to narrow stuff down even more; these field notes contain a whole lot of possibly unrelated stuff. Still, I do feel that all of this is gradually forming some kind of whole. I am not sure what kind of whole but some kind of picture is definitely emerging.

The following notes were taken during the time in Tues Session 1, where Lamar and LeTacha were invited to share what was going on in (Country).

Lamar “This is a time for this area” [this area includes the entire Middle East and North Africa]

He talked exclusively in English (his second language at least) and described the post-revolution times as a “new season.” He explained that Christianity was now legal in Algeria and recounted stories of God moving in the Middle East, including the first legal church in Mauritania. He seemed genuinely grateful for the changes and new found freedom.
Once he was finished, Lee took the microphone and praised “the vision and the hand of God” on Lamar’s life and talked about the changes he (Lee) had seen over the 9 years he had been visiting the Middle East.

My interest in this incident is that it obviously showed work in a ‘non-Western’ environment, taking place under an {Country} leader. This is cross-cultural work in every sense. Of course, it is of interest that Lamar and his wife, who spoke on their work with street children in Cairo, both spoke in English but I feel that to make too much of that would be to miss the point.

Perhaps this is where my own bias comes in. A non-believer could hear this incident and read it as cultural or religious imperialism. I read it exclusively as the hand of God and as successful cross-cultural work. Surely, at some point, interpreters must have been at work (unless everything takes place in Arabic, which is a possibility). It is also significant that Lamar said that every time he comes to the conference he is lifted to a new level and something good happens in his church. We therefore have an audience/speaker expectation of being inspired.

Before I start writing session 2’s notes, I have to come back to this gatekeeper thing. I have a nagging thought that, as much as gatekeepers are an incredible access route, they might also present a restriction, as hard as it is to write that. I have a feeling they might assign me people to interview. I also wonder whether people will do the surveys in a group and give me responses that are too homogenous. We shall see what happens there. It is now Tuesday evening and I have no interviews yet. Pro-active patience is needed. I have SFF1 scheduled tomorrow and I am sure we can work together to get some more after that.

Tuesday session 2

Vaughan – visiting preacher from New Zealand

Out of everyone so far, this guy has impressed me the most in terms of preaching. It is probably leaving any sense of neutrality behind since what has impressed me most is how close his sermon was to my current private Bible study. Actually, that reminds me, I should mention that I have been using two notepads: one contains all my field notes and observations and the other is my standard set of sermon notes. I will probably end up with writer’s cramp by the end of this but I think it is the only way I can sustain my position as a participant observer. Frankly, I think a non-participant observer would be so bowled over by the uniqueness of the situation and the high degree of
167 intertextuality in the sermons that they would miss a lot. I think that, in this case, the neutral 168 position, if it exists, would probably lead to some kind of socio-political analysis and never actually 169 see the connections between the performative character of the sermons, people’s expectations of 170 the conference and their expectations of the interpreting.
171
172 By sitting in this, albeit precarious, position of researcher and participant, I can get an “insider’s 173 view” of what is going on. True, this probably means that I take a lot of stances on issues for granted 174 but it does allow me to dismiss things that are probably not relevant to my research question. As 175 interesting as some might find the relation between culture and politics in this move- 176 ment, it has 177 nothing to do with what I am looking at.
178
179 Anyway, let’s get back to session 2 proper, I am sure I will write more about my position as a 180 researcher later.
181
182 I notice that this preacher deliberately chose to connect with the audience by joining in the common 183 practice of honouring the other preachers and honouring the work Lee is doing. The most striking 184 attempt to connect with the audience was by telling us about his family: a wife and two children. 185 This included the story of his daughter’s first sermon, which she preached at the age of 3 ½.
186
187 He then talked about God calling him to Wellington, a call he ignored for some time until another 188 pastor mentioned that he felt God was calling John to the city. Summing up the story he said 189 “We have seen God build by His power.”
190
191 Before he plunged into his sermon, he prayed that the sermon would be “not a word of man but a 192 word of God.”
193
194 This is probably significant for what it means for the interpreters to work in this conference and 195 possibly even in IEN as a whole. You see, if the sermon is, on any level, a “word of God” then it has to 196 be handled carefully. This might not necessarily lead to a bare and boring literal rendition but it 197 could lead to an expectation that as much of the content as possible must be rendered, even where 198 the interpreter might not agree of might be offended by what the preacher says. The question of the 199 nature of the preacher-interpreter partnership would also seem to arise in this situation but this is 200 something I need to explore later.
Since his key text was Joshua and the walls of Jericho, he laced much of his sermon with intertextual analogies and references. Unless the interpreter was thoroughly briefed beforehand, this would be tough to handle.

Early on in his sermon, he was talking about how humans often put God in a box and expect him to always behave the same way or restrict Him to being powerful in only certain situations. He illustrated this with the story of how he had figuratively out his wife in a box by buying her exactly the same anniversary gift for two years in a row. The way he told the story invited connection with the audience by trying to get them to recognise where my might be going and what was likely to happen. It was as if the entire point was to relate this experience to something those in the audience would have already experienced.

One interesting incident happened later in the sermon. There was some sonic leakage from probably one or two of the interpreting headsets, which meant that the interpreter could be heard weakly throughout the room. On hearing this he said “if you could turn the radio off, it would be amazing.” Obviously, he had either not been briefed that interpreters would be there or did not connect this sound with interpreting.

His sermon structure used many repeated ideas and phrases that would be said frequently in one part and then picked up several minutes later. I felt that this would either make life easier for the interpreter by making prediction easier or put more pressure on her to pick up the idea perfectly the first time and remember how she had said or communicated the idea before. One slip or misinterpretation could surely lead to confusion later. In some cases, however, this would not be a problem as he merely illustrated similar ideas with different examples. It is unclear how much of a connection the interpreter would need to pick up each time.

He must have felt that the conference was aimed at leaders as he called it a “leaders and pastors conference.”

Another key part of the structure of his sermon were these two stock phrases:

“{x} leads to {y}. {y} leads to {z}.”

“It’s not the time of {a}; it’s the time of {b}.”

He also often returned to the verses he had given earlier in the sermon.
In his prayer at the end of the sermon, he prayed for moments and times during the conference where people would be “flooded by the presence of God.” He then handed back to Lee.

Going to bed now as it is too late. Tomorrow I will write up session 2a and b and the evening session.
Len, head of IEN Australia preached at Tuesday’s elective. He is one of the more direct preachers. He was talking on leadership, a word which is itself interesting as I have heard previously from Ivonne that it is calqued into French.

Once again, he mentioned the conference being aimed at church leaders. Perhaps this is the impression that preachers have given that the conference is much smaller than many of their own church services. Perhaps they feel that, since space is at a premium (especially in the evening), only pastors and leaders will be allowed to come.

One thing that he said that stood out was that prayer was less important than answered prayer. This illustrates the bias for action in IEN. I am sure my notes will show this topic again later, as Vince, who is not IEN, has been preaching very much in this regard. The same bias for action was present when he mentioned the Word of God as a way to change people.

IEN is a very driven movement. The expectation seems to be that people will hear what is said, discover its application and then do it in their lives. This hear – apply – do strategy must put significant amount of pressure on the interpreters to make sure that their part, the hear part, is correct.

Culturally, he touched on the historical relationship between the UK and Australia when he said “We all come from England in Australia,” another reference to Australia as a former prison colony.

He underlined that one seminar will not change people overnight. His point here seemed to be that leaders need to spend time with people. This was emphasised with his comment that “The people you want are a big investment so don’t lose any.”

Structurally, his sermon relied on a very simple movement pattern. He would simply end one section by saying “We’ve got through [subject X]. Now we are going to be talking about [subject Y].” This is a simple and effective signalling device and one that interpreters can easily deal with.

For him, the role of a pastor was that of a father and he saw all the other leaders in his church as co-equal sons, who needed to be able to get along without the ‘father’ being there.
Talking about his visit to Pastor Lamar’s church in [Country], he said “even though I can’t talk the language, we love one another.” This is a slight misnomer as Lamar speaks at least passable English. Perhaps Len was actually talking about the people in [Country]. Nevertheless, this quote does still suggest an underlying feeling that language is ultimately not a barrier as love can be transmitted through it anyway. In fact, it could be suggested that he sees language, and by extension, interpreting, as a minor matter as he says “Poor old Lamar runs around being the interpreter when he’s apostolic.” Thus, the role of the interpreter is seen as much lower than that of an apostle and it is seen as almost demeaning for the apostle to function as an interpreter.

He also said “I want to breathe on you the power of the Holy Spirit.” This case would suggest that a physical action (breathing, even taken as symbolic of prayer) carries a spiritual significance. Put another way, the act of breathing performs the coming of the Holy Spirit to people. A similar performative slant is found when he said “declare God tonight, the presence of Jesus.”
The preacher was keen to establish the ability of God to make real changes as he said “you serve a big
God tonight.” This, and all of his sermons, were delivered at a constantly high speed in a strong
South African accent. This would have caused some trouble for the interpreters, who were both
native French speakers. There may some references to the difficulties they faced in the interviews.

To illustrate that some people do not develop in their Christianity and confront the same issues over
and over again, he talked about going “round the same mountain” and walked round the pulpit as
he did so. This was probably a reference to his key scripture, which talked about the Israelites
doubting God could bring them into the Promised Land and so being condemned to 40 years of
wandering in the wilderness.

In response to the anticipated argument that it may be easier to see churches grow in Africa, he
cited the scripture saying “is anything too hard for God?” This is a rhetorical question in the Bible, to
which the assumed answer is “no.”

To further illustrate the story of the twelve spies being sent to explore the Promised Land in the
book of Numbers, he called up 12 young men (teenagers and just over 20), to act out the story.

During his sermon, and during this illustration, he referred to the purpose of the conference in these
terms “This conference is not just preaching, it is about getting principles of wisdom into you.”

Rhetorical questions were common in his sermon. Shortly after the previous quotation, he said:

“What kept Gideon in the winepress? What did Gideon believe about himself?”

These rhetorical questions were answered shortly later in his sermon, given that he was preaching
on the importance of having a good attitude. To show how such an attitude might be generated, he
said:

“When we focus on what God says, it fills us with possibility thinking.”

This may be a reference to the pastor of the Crystal Cathedral church in the US, who often uses the
phrase “possibility thinking.”
Shortly after this quote, he separated 2 of the young men he had called onto the stage to one side to illustrate how 10 spies returned with an evil report and 2 returned with a good report. He also used repetition to heighten the idea of the right attitude by continually repeating phrases beginning with the words “I can” during one short section of his sermon.

To illustrate the correct reaction to people rejecting the Christian message, he acted out the act of shaking dust off his feet (cf. Luke 9: 5). The main point here was not the rejection of the message by some but the reaction of those who are proclaiming it. This was in direct opposition to what he thought was not a suitable reaction – taking their rejection of the message personally. Related to this was his section on those who never seem to get over problems, which he illustrated by grabbing one of the “spies” and acting out crying weakly on his shoulder. In order to show what the correct reaction was, even in the toughest situation, he acted out crawling on the floor. This was part of a section where he suggested that if you cannot stand in a situation and thus cannot walk, you can crawl on all fours and if you cannot do that, you can use your elbow to propel you. The main thrust of this section was to refuse to be defeated by any situation.

He began the altar call (a call for prayer where people are invited to come and stand at the front of the auditorium for the preacher to place their hands on them while praying for them) with the words “It’s time to change by standing in God’s presence.” His invitation for people to come for prayer was couched in the following exact terms: “I’m gonna ask you as an act of faith to leave your seats. … You are making a declaration.”

In this way, the act of moving from a seat to the front of the church was seen as performing a spiritual or mental change that would follow.

Near the end of the altar call, Lee, the International President of IEN, said that conference was a lift but that people would need to keep listening to the messages repeatedly, even after the conference was over, in order to see lasting change in their thinking.

At this point in my notes, there is another reflection on the research process and my role in it. As much as those who acted as gatekeepers by giving me permission to carry out the study or by giving out surveys, I felt that my own role was that of a gatekeeper. After all, my own background knowledge and personal knowledge of this movement provided me with knowledge of this data.
outcropping, offered me the possibility of easier access to the people and the site and the
background knowledge to be able to process much of what went on. On the other hand, there is no
doubt that my own role as an ex-member of this group of churches, a trusted interpreter and even
an ex-church leader will have coloured or restricted my views.

As I have written elsewhere in my notes, my previous knowledge will no doubt have prevented me
from being overwhelmed by the data available but it will also have acted as a filter as I will have
taken some of what goes on for granted. In short, my dual-role as researcher and in-group
(ex)member is both an asset and a liability.
Wednesday Session 1

Mentioning the purpose of the conference once again, Lee said “Jesus wants to touch our lives that we would see things from an eternal perspective.”

In the middle of this meeting, I became aware of the difficulties of my position once again. Given the position of trust I have in this organisation, I did not feel comfortable recording any material that was not publicly available or that I had not asked permission to record or note down. For this reason, I have not recorded any of the candid comments made by interpreters or audience members during or after sessions, unless they were clearly intended to be recorded.

Lee welcomed Leelandert Maasbach, a recognised and beloved pastor who is not in IEN but has been friends with the movement for years. However he did this in front of, rather than on, the stage, making it doubtful that the interpreters, who were located at the rear of the hall, beside the sound desk, could have seen either Lee or Leelandert during this time.

Talking about the purpose of the conference, Leelandert said “God wants to take a hold of us and never let us go.”

The next comment in my notes is on my two notepads. I mentioned them previously in my first set of notes dated 26th July. I can’t believe it took me three days to get one day of notes finished!

One of the members of the UK leadership team, introduced the next speaker by reminding people that the “gospel is the power of God unto salvation.” He then handed the microphone over of Vince saying “in our midst is an apostle, a man of God.”
G.1g Second note on 27th July (F-27/7-2). Third day of the IEN conference.

At the beginning of his message, Vince asked the audience to “position our hearts to hear and pull on what God has to say to us.”

Very soon later, he described his message as “boot camp” or basic training, such as all officers in the army have to undergo and redo from time to time. He was very clear in his insistence that what he was about to do was not preaching but a workshop. However, this prediction was to be belied later and the actual ‘workshop’ part would not occur until at least 24 hours later. Relating the workshop again to military training he mentioned his time serving in the South African army and how he now feels that it was the wrong war but at the time he was told it was the right war. He mentioned that everyone in the South African military must undergo boot camp every three years. He related this to learning how to share the Christian message by saying “basics are essential.”

The purpose of his workshop or message, was, in his own words to “get you stirred up in the main thing again this morning.” He explored this with a story of fishermen who did just about everything to do with fishing but never fished. By mentioning “doctorates in fishiology,” he seemed to be pointing out that academic training without practical application was useless and that the emphasis should be on the latter.

He made passing mention of how very few people could correctly pronounce his name (redacted).

He obviously saw the purpose of conferences and in-church training sessions as to equip people for ministry, summed up in the words “come that you may go.” This was further emphasised with his point that a body of water must feed into another to be healthy, or, to use his own words “if there’s nothing that flows, it’s a swamp.”

Contrasting the purpose of this speech with that of an ordinary sermon, he said “I’m not going to edify you today, I’m going to ask you to be truthful.” This meant that, rather than the preacher making proclamations from the pulpit, he intended to ask more questions, to help people discover how effective they had been at proclaiming the gospel. This would give the sermon a much more individual and personal character.

Building a connection with the audience, he talked about his family: his children and his wife. Admitting that it was hard for him to be away from them, he said “when I talk about my wife, I get
distracted, I wanna go home.” Given that, with the exception of the two visiting speakers, most people would be there with their partners and family, this would no doubt have built a connection on common ground with the audience. After all, surely everyone with a family can associate themselves with missing them when they are away from them for a time.

It seemed that he was aware that he could easily be pulled into preaching, which he actually ended up doing this time, as he said “I’ll stay back so I don’t preach.” This referred to staying back from exploring fully some of the issues he had raised using Biblical examples. He seemed to want to differentiate the purpose of this session from an ordinary preach. In fact, in his next session, he was to talk about the audience spiritually pulling a sermon out of him.

He spent much of this session discussing the importance of preaching the Christian message in one on one contexts. Talking about the possible subtle opposition that might come, he said “the minute you allow the enemy to neutralise you, that’s when the momentum for soul winning stops.” This referred to the well-known fact that new Christians tend to be more enthusiastic about witnessing to their friends and neighbours than older Christians. The process by which this excitement is robbed was what he was referring to as the “neutralising” process. He wished to reverse this process by imparting the same kind of passion into those present. He remarked “how will they hear without a preacher? You are the preacher.” The first part of this statement was a clear reference to Romans 10: 14 in the KJV. By singling out his hearers as “the preacher,” he underlined the necessity for them to take the gospel to their friends.

This same emphasis on the individual as the person to lead someone to God was present throughout his preach. Shortly following the previous quote, he said “you are a soul winner,” underlining the position of the individual Christian, and more specifically the audience present, as called to bring others to God.

He recounted how he had met opposition in his ministry, even from those inside his church, who objected to certain kinds of people being present in the service. His response to this is summed up in his simple phrase: “the church is a hospital.” This painted the local church as a place where wounded people could find healing. He admitted that this might make people feel uncomfortable but actually seemed pleased with this outcome as he remarked that “we build a dangerous place, where anything can happen.” This meant that he tried to make sure that God could do anything He wanted in the church. This linked very clearly with his view that it was not his cleverness or talent that
brought people to church but instead the power of God. He said: “when the anointing falls, I know
we will get the results that God wants.”

I guess I’d better explain this. You see, in modern charismatic theology, “the anointing” refers to the
power of God in or on someone to allow them to perform a specific task. It can also refer to the
tangible or semi-tangible presence of God in a place. Thus, his phrase here meant that when he is
conscious of God’s power being in a place, he knows that God will do the work He wants to do, in
this case, bringing people to salvation.

Despite the evident usefulness of his session, he was adamant that the real change would come
when people took what he said and used it outside a church setting. He remarked that noone
outside the church was changing “while we’re sitting here.” The reaction to this in the audience is
perhaps even more interesting than the remark itself. In reply to this, an audience member, I
couldn’t tell who from my vantage point near the back, shouted “the church is outside.” “Yeah,”
replied Vince.

Going back to his previous points about the challenges of running a large, multi-site church, he
stated “when you have multi-generations and multi-cultures, you have challenges.” This was an
explicit reference to the fact that his church is rare in that it has a large amount of both black and
white South Africans as well as older and younger people.

However, despite the challenges he faces, he felt that things were tougher in other places. He
remarked that “the most difficult place to pastor is small communities.”

Returning back to the role of individuals, he said “We’re the servants of God. When man controls us,
the move of God stops.” Looking back at this quote now, I feel that it is yet another place where an
outsider may misunderstand or see it outwith its natural context. This statement could easily be
interpreted to mean that Vince is/was anti-authority, when, as the audience were to discover in later
preacher, the opposite is the case. Instead, the likely correct interpretation of this comment is that
people should aim to please God more than they aim to please people and should not allow the
views of people to prevent them from following what God wants them to do. Mind you, even this
idea can be easily misunderstood and it is hard to explain fully without a long discourse on the
nature or Biblical leadership, which is itself a controversial topic.
From an ideological perspective, it was interesting to see how he tried to remove any perceived sexism. In the line “when God has a plan, He finds a man ... and a man with a wo,” he showed awareness that, although his original phrase had a nice rhyme, it could be poorly received by women in the audience. Of course, there is still room for accusations there but there you go. From an interpreter’s point of view, this line would be almost impossible to interpret. After all, in French, there is no such relationship between the words “man” and “woman.” Given that the ellipsis here represents several seconds of exposition and that after this line he reused the idea of “man with a wo,” the difficulties for the interpreters could only get worse. It would be interesting to discover how the interpreters dealt with this line.

Referring back to his church in South Africa, he said that they have “all classes of society under one roof.”

He then moved on to stories of when he used to preach in the open air. Contrasting himself with neighbouring hail, fire and brimstone preachers, he recounted how people would stop and listen when he preached as he was preaching about the love of God. From this he suggested that angry preaching was not a useful or attractive way to present the Christian message.

Interestingly enough, shortly after this he became aware that he had said he was not going to preach but had ended up preaching anyway. He said “I said I wasn’t going to preach. I’m sorry I did.” This was not an apology for his sermon but instead that he did not manage to carry out the workshop he had mentioned at the beginning of the sermon. However, he also later was to appeal to the leaders in the audience to “preach messages that equip people.” This referred to the kinds of sermons that provide practical advice and principles for making some kind of change or performing a given kind of behaviour e.g., evangelism, leadership etc. He also put forward the idea that the primary focus of preaching was not to make people feel good when he said that preachers should “make people do something with that feeling.”

In fact, the vital link between preaching and resulting action was a major theme of the entire sermon. A little after the last quote, he said that “revival must lead to reformation.” This again will need to be explained. Basically, the key idea here is that renewed interest in Christianity and even large scale conversion must lead to lasting change in thoughts and actions. This theme led naturally to its application amongst the specific audience at the conference, with the words “you are called to
reach your world with the gospel.” This was specifically applied as an encouragement to announce
the gospel to those we meet in everyday life.

The sermon finished shortly after and Lee, visibly affected by the tone and force of Vince’s sermon
remarked “I think we should close the rest of the conference and go down town” to witness to
people. He then briefly mentioned the story of a preacher called “Mad Dog Monkford” who once
visited a church he used to pastor in Australia. Drawing parallels with that event and this one, he
said to Vince “you rattled our cage like anything.” His following remarks would have caused some
difficulties for the French interpreters. In France, IEN is translated as “[redacted],” given the
difficulty in finding a precise translation for “[word redacted].” Yet Lee remarked at this point in the
conference that he was glad that IEN is “not just [redacted]. … At least we got [redacted] in the
name. It’s a start anyway.” He then joked again that “I think we should close the conference.” He
then remarked to Vince “Be merciful to us please.”

Wednesday Session 2

This session began with a change in the leadership of IEN in the UK. Pastors Lance and Leona were
presented with gifts as they are leading the oversight team, having served on it for x years. During
the presentation time, Lee waved the microphone around a lot, which would have made it harder
for the interpreters to hear what he was saying. Lee chose to honour Ps Lance and Sharon publicly,
who were keen to pronounce publicly that they were staying in IEN and would still support the
movement.

He, along with all the other members of the UK and international oversight teams then inducted 2
new members, [redacted]. Ps Len, head of IEN Australia, talked about the nature of the office when
he said “oversight is a responsibility in the spirit.” For the moment, they were “set apart.” This is a
kind of probational period where they have the all the responsibilities of the role but are monitored
for one or two years, after which, they are ordained.

This was followed by the setting apart of several other leaders. Lee had difficulty pronouncing some
of their names. Instead of IEN’s normal ordination words, Lee simply said “Say I do ... [to] everything
I’ve heard in the last hour.” Praying for each of them in turn, Lee said “I thank you God that your
anointing will rest upon them.”
After this, Leeland was asked to introduce the next speaker. He mentioned that a sermon by the
next speaker was the only time “where God has run his big yellow highlighter through part of a
preach and say ‘this is for you’.” This was said about Ps Lisa.

Lisa chose to pray publicly before she began her sermon. She began her sermon by making reference
to the quote found on Anders Behring Breivik’s Facebook profile: “One person with a belief is equal
to the force of 100,000 who have only interests.” She then attempted to reuse of redeem this quote
to show the power that people in the church could have if they were committed to the cause of God.
She said “We are a family. We are an army. We are the body of Christ” part of the worldwide body
of Christ.

She then made a further mention of the English name of IEN when she said “We are {redacted}.” In
response to the previous message, she said “God’s stirring the pot again.” This seemed to be a
reference to previous creeping tendencies towards getting comfortable and not push hard enough in
new work and evangelism.

She then recounted the Biblical story of Saul of Tarsus, quoting word-for-word from the Bible. She
then had the congregation repeat the words “minister” and “witness,” two key words spoken over
Saul by Ananias, the first Christian to pray for him after his conversion. She quickly moved between
different verses of the story, not entirely in chronological order.

She then explained that the presence of God is what mobilised and motivates people. She then drew
symbolic parallels between a story in the book of 2 Kings where a woman prepared a room so a
visiting prophet could stay regularly and the lives of the audience. She then explained symbolic
parallels between the fact that this woman was given a son who died and was raised back to life and
events that might happen in the lives of people as they live with a passion for the presence of God,
this included a reference to the previous sermon.

At this point in my notes, I discussed the fact that the French audience are experienced users and
thus their views are based, at least partially, on their prior experiences with interpreting. In
interviews, they seemed more than capable of expressing strong opinions and backing them up with
thoughtful commentary and justifications.
She then drew parallels with the way that Elisha laid his eyes onto the eyes of the dead child and laid his lips on the child’s lips. She spoke about how this was symbolic of the fact that “God is breathing into your spirit.”

On this day I also interviewed Leon. The interview went well and I have no specific notes on it. It was fairly short, due to the necessity of fitting it into a tea break.

Wednesday session 3

Lee was the main preacher for this session. He began with a remark about Largo, the head of IEN in {redacted}. He remarked that many years ago, when both were in Australia, he was discussing Fred while in bed with his wife, Lisa. Lisa, obviously annoyed at this conversation said “Fred, get out of my bed.”

Commenting on the fact that his message related very closely to those given by other speakers, he said “I decided to do this before other guys preached.” At the time, I took this to mean that he had decided upon the topic of his sermon before he had heard the other sermons.

The topic of his sermon was “mateship,” which I originally misheard. It appears to be an Antipodean (NZ, Australian, South African) term for close friendship. This may have been a difficult term for interpreters to identify and render, especially since my interviews show that they are rarely, if ever, given notes before the sermons take place.

Referring to his move from being a commercial farmer to being international President of IEN, Lee said “I don’t know how I came to be international president; I just kept on going.”

Soon after this, he made a remark that revealed his intended audience. He said “The precious thing is that we are standing here in a vision together.” This revealed that he expected his entire audience to be IEN members who share equally in the vision and carry it together.

He began his sermon proper by recounting the bravery of some of the Australian soldiers during the First World War, when they had to fight their way to Beersheba. He remarked that there is an old Australian joke that actually, the soldiers were so keen to get there because someone told them
they were trying to get to “beer and sheilas.” A “sheila” in Australian English is a woman. It is difficult to see how any interpreter could find an adequate rendering of this.

Following a similar technique to his wife, he asked the entire audience to say the words “good soldier.” This was underlined with a section on the importance of how work with others can only be achieved by teamwork.

Shortly after this, he recounted stories of going on missions trips with pastor Largo. He then joked about “what he did to me.” This seemed to demonstrate the kind of camaraderie he was discussing in his sermon. A similar effect was achieved by him recounting a story of how he needed a donkey costume for a church performance – a friend made him a donkey’s head and then left instructions on how to wear it and how to make “ee-yaw” noises. Once again, it is unlikely that the last section of this joke would be translatable, unless donkeys make similar noises in French. The net result of these jokes being missed in the French would no doubt be to reduce the connection and feeling of ‘mateship’ that he obviously wished to communicate and, more importantly, demonstrate.

He then summed up his views on mateship by saying “When God has joined us together … then we can enjoy the harvest together.” Reading this now, there is a clear linguistic parallel between this and the tradition end of wedding proclamation in the United Kingdom “what God has joined together, let no man split asunder.”

Lee then explained that there would be no missions night this year. Missions night traditionally happens on the Thursday evening of conference and involves several presentations of the work that IEN and its charitable arms carries out all over the world. Instead, this year, Lee chose to flag up different projects at different times throughout the conference or, in his words to “pepper it all the way through.” He invited some of the representatives of the work going on across the globe to join him in front of the stage, where it would be difficult for the interpreters to see.
G.1h Third note on 27th July (F-27/7-3). Third day of the IEN Conference.

1 As Lee honoured and introduced each of those he called up, his microphone had intermittent faults.

2 Labov, a Serbian pastor, working in his home country, talked about the difference between the Greek words ‘chronos’ and ‘kairos,’ a distinction his words suggested that the audience would already be familiar with. Lee addressed everyone he called up as ‘apostles.’ He asked Roger, and indeed every one of those he invited onto the stage the same question: “what does IEN mean to you?”

3 Labov’s answer was simple, “IEN is people.” For him, clearly, the strength of the movement is found in the relationships built between those in the movement. Lee then invited Pastor Lamar from [Country] to take to the stage and asked him the same question as he asked Roger. In response, Lamar told the story of the first IEN Middle East conference and then said that he might have still been pasturing if it wasn’t for IEN but “without IEN relations, we would be unable to do the vision.”

4 Lee then introduced Pastor Lahore saying that he wanted to honour “apostolic men and women” and that “I don’t think too much about titles.” This was also in reference to the fact that he never wears robes and none of the IEN leaders do. He also reflected on the fact that people had told him that the gifts of the Spirit and apostles had faded away but all the work going on is enough to prove that such a view is incorrect.

5 For Pastor Lahore “IEN is family.” He then talked briefly about the work in India before Lee honoured Pastor Lani from Nepal, a country in which there were no Christians 60 years ago. He met Lani in a café in Australia and had no plans to visit the country. At that meeting, he was given a Nepalese hat, to which his reaction was “stupid thing, couldn’t even keep the sun off our heads.” However, his view began to change during the meeting with Pastor Lani and he commented “you gotta learn to see the grace upon a person.”

6 I have no record of what Pastor Lani said. Instead, I have the words of Pastor Largo from Malta who said “know that you have this body, this group of people behind you.” In response to the words of the Pastors on-stage, Lee said “I marvel at this.” He then introduced Pastor Virgil from {Country}, who was to be accepted into IEN during the conference. He related the fact that Virgil always sends him texts calling him “my dear President,” which would seem over the top in the UK and Australia. Lee joked that noone else called him that. Virgil explained that this was due to the fact that, in {Country}, leaders are never called by their names.
Ending the presentation of the leaders, Lee remarked that Len had said that “us old blokes don’t set
the culture of the church.”

I must admit that part of this section made me feel somewhat uncomfortable. After all, much time at
this stage was spent praising “we IEN” or IEN worldwide and saying how glad people should be to be
part of such a wonderful movement when I am no longer part of the movement. Yes, I could still be
happy for them but it was at this point that my identity as an outsider was most felt.

After the end of this session, I attempted an interview with Adrien. The interview went well but
sadly the equipment did not record so I had to carry out the interview all over again at a later point.

Wednesday Evening

Lee called up the youth pastors, to honour them in front of the entire audience. They received the
biggest cheer and clap of anyone, partially because the young people (13-18) had their own
conference during the day sessions. Lee commented to the youth pastors that “a good percentage of
you will end up church pastors.”

Today I had decided to go up front and dance with the youth, partially for scientific purposes and
partially to relieve past experience. It was hot and sweaty but not as smelly as people had joked it
would be. It did make you feel more a part of the conference and closer to those taking the
conference or playing music as you were physically closer to the stage and often in front of the front
row, which contained all the plenary speakers.

Lee then called Randeep up to speak again. Randeep has a thick Indian accent. He said “we live for
Great Commission and we will die for Great Commission.” The Great Commission is the portion of
the Bible (Matthew 28: 18-21), where Christians are called to go and make disciples of Jesus
everywhere they go. There was then a rap by a teenager, which was in English only and I had
difficulty making out many of the words. At this point, after watching him get a standing ovation, I
remarked in my notes how easily such ovations are given to people in COC. Every preacher, most
pastors and the youth pastors were all given similar standing ovations to this rapper. Truly, this is a
place of real and repeated appreciation.
New oversight member Steve Sutherland then introduced the preacher for the evening, Vince.

At said early on “God’s gonna move in this place tonight.” Unusually, he asked for someone to play the keyboard while he was preaching. He also said “Tonight, God can put another mark on you.” Talking about his preparations before he preached, he said “In my hotel room, I felt the Holy Ghost fire ... that will cause people to be who I want them to be.” The section within the ellipsis made clear that the ‘I’ referred to the Holy Ghost, not to Vince.

Vince’s message was pure gospel, with very few stories or attempts at direct connection with the audience, apart from a few uses of the phrase “my dear friend.” He interspersed the entire sermon with tagged and untagged Biblical references, in other words, only in some cases did he give the exact chapter and verse he was quoting from. Often during the sermon he would preface something with “tonight, God’s gonna,” followed by an action. He also remarked once that “One touch of God and you will never be the same again.” However, he was keen to underline the fact that what mattered much more was the effect of this touch of God on later behaviour. he said “All the preaching is not going to change us. We need a touch of God.”
Vince took this session. Just like last time, he stated his intention to run it as a workshop instead of preaching. However, even more there was more of a workshop element to the session, he did preach somewhat. There was a standing ovation for him when he came to the platform, as with every other time he preached, he was careful to direct the praise to Jesus. My notes also show that he had invited some musicians on the stage to sing and play while he took the session. I do not think that this lasted for the entire session.

He began to speak from John chapter 4, where Jesus talks about the fields being white unto harvest and made it clear that his intention was to take the audience “back to basics” in their ability to spread the Christian message.

He then discussed the fact that the church is always relevant as it consists of “ordinary people doing extraordinary things.” This was underlined by his suggestion that people will connect better with you when you share common ground and have had failures.

It was only at this point that I realised that he was a very fast speaker. He seemed to be speaking at about the maximum speed I was trained to cope with at university. For those who have not received professional training, he would have been very difficult to follow.

He then quoted from Matthew 5: 15-16 and talked on how preaching was about equipping others to do what God has called them to do. A running theme of this message was the importance of “winning your world for Jesus.” This centred on the idea of beginning to share Christianity with the people you already know and meet regularly.

He explained that preaching had limits and that evangelism, especially one-on-one evangelism was far more important. This was summed up with the words “you aren’t serving God sitting here on your bum.” He continued this idea with the words “we are here to reform our communities by changing one person at a time.” Therefore, while the emphasis of his preach was no doubt on the initial experience of leading someone to become a Christian, there was an undercurrent that doing would lead to long-term behavioural change.

He then asked people to either imagine what they were like before they became Christians, or, if they had been Christian from a young age, to imagine themselves as someone they work with or go
to school with who was not yet a believer. Since I became a Christian at a young age, I had to think of
someone I knew who was not a Christian. The idea of this exercise was to help people to practise
sharing Christian with someone. I found this exercise very difficult. It felt very uncomfortable to role
play as someone I know well and I ended up speaking out many of the actions that most people
would do with body language. It was also more difficult as I was paired with my wife for this exercise
and neither of us felt particularly at ease with it.

At the end of this exercise, which generated a lot of noise and excitement in some quarters, Vince
reminded us all that “the world is full of need.” He also reminded those there to use their testimony,
the story of what God has done in their lives, when witnessing to others. He said that, since it is a
record of what God has done, there should be no shame associated with it. He underlined that fact
that, since everyone has some kind of hurt or failing, no one can identify with someone who pretends
to lead a perfect life.

He then called up four volunteers onto the stage and asked them each one question from the sheet
of four questions he had had handed out at the beginning of the meeting. All seemed to do well.
None had obviously difficult accents. Interestingly enough, those asked the later questions spoke for
longer than those who were asked the earlier questions. He made sure that he encouraged each
volunteer after they had shared.

Near the end of his session, Vince talked about how he changes clothes for each of the four Sunday
services he takes each week in order to stay relatable to those who will attend. Each of the services
have different purposes and different audiences.
Thursday Session 2a

Vaughan spoke at this session and was introduced by Lawrie. His sermon began a bit comically as he knocked over a glass of water that was standing near one of the on-stage monitor speakers. He made a joke about visiting and ruining the equipment, however, nothing was broken.

He described his sermon as a “word dropped into my spirit” by God when John was at another conference. Lee had previously heard this sermon and had asked him to share it again. He then asked “last night, how many met with Jesus in a fresh way?” He then honoured his fellow speaker, Vince, by talking about Vince’s last session, saying “If I’ve experienced that ... who knows what God is going to do in your church.” His point here seemed to be that if God had used the last sermon to bring such a challenge to someone outside of IEN, then He must have something special planned for IEN.

He was very keen on audience participation, especially in the form of verbal encouragement. He said “you have to nod and smile because then I will preach much better because I will feel I am connecting with you.” It’s obvious from this, and from his whole approach to preaching, that he did not simply see it as information transfer but as connecting with his audience. This was added to when he commented that “as preachers ... we have to give a sense of build.” Unlike his next comment, this referred entirely to his sermon.

Now that his introduction was over, he began the main topic of his sermon: lessons we can learn from the pattern Jesus used in His work on earth or, as he put it “we learn from the intentionality of Jesus.” His point here was that Jesus had a specific reason for everything He did and that we can apply the principles behind his decisions to our own work. The entire sermon was illustrated by him drawing on a whiteboard but he did not begin to draw until later.

Introducing his key scripture, he said “if there is one verse of scripture that keeps me awake at night.” Looking again at this section of my notes now (15th August), I realise that, before I go any further, I need to clarify what is meant here. First off, I need to explain the concept of a key scripture.
There are several ways to approach preaching and put together sermons. One of the most popular and most highly regarded approaches is called expository preaching: this involves taking a single verse or set of Bible verses and spending the entire sermon explaining what they mean and how they apply. In this kind of preaching, the verses chosen are called your “key scripture” or “key verses.” By saying that these scriptures “keep him awake at night,” Vaughan was probably meaning that he gets so excited or encouraged or finds these verses so thought-provoking that he struggles to sleep if he thinks about them.

Returning to my notes, we find that I comment that, like many of the other speakers, he interlaced direct and indirect Bible quotes throughout his sermon. This is a feature that might make it difficult for non-Christians to interpret in church.

At one point in his sermon, he mentioned taking people from his church to a sports bar. This could have been controversial as not all Christians are okay with going into places serving alcohol. Vaughan’s response to what must have been quizzical or perhaps even challenging looks was “You’re all looking at me like I’m preaching in French.” This would, of course, have been challenging to interpret. It also suggests that he might have thought that the source of the confusion was the lack of understanding of the concept of a sports bar rather than any cultural offense.

He used the whiteboard to draw a labelled diagram of how Jesus built ministry momentum by starting with small successes in small towns before moving up to large cities and then open-air preaching. He noted that as momentum builds, leadership becomes easier but if you don’t have momentum, people will lose trust in what you say will happen in the future, as he put it “the words will fall from your mouth to the ground.”

He described the people in churches as value and resources.

As I said before, the entire sermon was concerned with relating Jesus’ work to modern day pasturing and church leadership. This was especially clear when he drew a symbolic connection between the story of Jesus raising a daughter of a synagogue leader from the dead and church leaders trying to revive work that was struggling in a church. He took care to point out that Jesus only brought in a few disciples to watch while he was raising the young girl. His point was that leaders have to be careful who they bring in to help revive an area of the church that is in trouble.
He must have felt that his sermon was challenging as he said “I’m slapping you in the eyes but it’s okay.” This may have been in response to his comment that having a church of 500 is not a cue to start creating more and more individual ministries.

He, like many of the other speakers obviously had a clear idea of the kind of audience he thought he was speaking to as he said “half the people here are pastors.”

Session 2B

I was in the booth for this session, as I have carried out all the interviews that were going to be possible. Considering I was interpreting for Vince, who had been speaking so quickly that the two other interpreters were exhausted, I felt it went surprisingly well. It did leave me wondering exactly why I found it so easy to cope with such a challenging preacher. Of course, I prayed hard before I got in the booth and while waiting for him to begin. The session would also have been made easier since it was a question and answer session and not a long preach. I must admit that I often simplified some of the questions, which were projected onto a large screen, to make them easier to interpret.

Strangely enough, I think I found myself repreaching what he was saying rather than sticking to a purely linguistic kind of interpreting. I am not sure how this would have been received by the audience. Occasionally, he said something that I found slightly shocking. In these cases, I found it helpful to increase my lag slightly to discover where the preacher was headed and what he was doing or aiming to do with what he said. Often, I think he would deliberately be slightly shocking to try to wake people up from doing the same thing all the time.

I have to admit that I didn’t have a lot of thought for the overall skopos of the conference and concentrated much more on establishing flow and making sure that my output would be easily understood. I also tended to try and keep in mind what the skopos or aim of the individual sermon or answer was and tried to use as many techniques as I could to ensure that I did not fall too far behind or miss something important. Hopefully, I managed to minimise any large gaps.

Thursday Evening

Last Night
Tonight, Pastor Virgil was ordained into IEN and as the head of IEN [Country]. Talking about the fact that IEN always ordains pastors in the same way, by calling them up the front and then asking regional and international leaders to lay hands on them, Lee said “nothing that we do in church is just a formality.” This seemed to link back to Lou’s comment that pastors and leaders carried authority in the spiritual realm that came on them at ordination.

Lee then handed the microphone over to Virgil but said to him “don’t preach, remember.” As the leaders prayed for Virgil and the audience stretched their hands forward towards him, Lee prayed for him “to join hands with people with an apostolic anointing of grace upon their life [in {Country} to increase the work of the church there] … Let the apostolic grace rest upon His life in a new way,” Then he prayed for Virgil’s wife that “where [she] is in {Country} right now, touch her with your power.” Lee then said about Virgil and IEN that “we are joined together in the spirit … in a vision for the world.”

Just as they were finishing praying for Virgil, Lee invited Fred to pray for him with the words, “Put your hand on ‘im too Fred.”

Lee then introduced Lawrie, who would do the offering message with the words “Lawrie’s gonna receive the offering.” Praying over the offering, Lawrie invited people to pray with the words “let’s declare into the spirit realm.”

Introducing the final speaker, Lou, head of IEN UK, described the effect of the conference with the words “I feel absolutely knocked about, to be honest, but I know this is God.”

Vaughan had the honour of speaking on the last night of conference. Once again, he encouraged audience participation with the words “the more you encourage me, the shorter I talk.” His choice of key scripture was Joshua chapter 1, where the Israelites cross into the Promised Land. He drew a parallel between God’s words to Joshua that Moses, the previous leader, was dead and the fact that for those there, the things of the past were gone and they needed to move on.

Later, he would describe the congregation with the words “we are God’s people from every nation and language.” He then returned to his sermon topic by describing the history of the Israelites from the time Abram was told by God to leave his home in Ur to the arrival of Joshua and the Israelite people at the edge of the Jordan, about to enter the Promised Land.
Looking back on this now (15th Aug), I now see that, despite the fact that the preachers had prepared their sermons separately, much of the preaching came from similar passages in the Bible. If you add this sermon to Vince’s first sermon on attitude, you realise that, while Vince was talking about why the previous generation of Israelites did not enter the Promised Land, Vaughan was talking about why the subsequent generation did enter the land.

Another parallel between the two is found in that fact that, much as Vince had previously used opposite sides of the stage to demonstrate the differences between the two groups of spies (one who said the people could not enter the land and the others who said that, with God’s help, they could), Vaughan also used the space of the stage to demonstrate points of his sermon. He deliberately moved repeatedly between downstage and upstage to demonstrate the differences between captivity/prison/[Country]/the past and the Promised Land and the future. He used centre-stage as a place to demonstrate that, in order to move from the past to the future, we need to go through a demarcation line, which he saw as a symbolic parallel to the River Jordan that the Israelites had to trust God to get them across in order to enter the Promised Land. This idea can be summed up in his ending of the sermon, some of the last words of the conference, when he said “Let’s get across the Jordan and into the Promised Land.”

End of Conference Meeting Notes

After the last meeting, while I was saying goodbye to my French friends and to some pastors, one of my respondents, Albert, came up to me, seeking to clarify his answer to my question on whether interpreters should be preachers too. He said to me “On ne peut pas demander au traducteur (of literature) d’être écrivain lui-même.”

End of Conference Summary Notes. Written from in-depth notes, written on the last night in my PO notepad.

I have realised that you have to be in this type of conference, both physically and spiritually to understand it. A range of perspectives: being up front dancing with the youth, in the booth interpreting, up the back of the main hall chatting, doing interviews over coffee, catching up with friends in the car park or in the toilets or in a restaurant all adds to the overall impression and experience.
As soon as I think of the word “hypertext,” I could soon plunge into conference types, stereotypes, with images of scientists, diplomats or engineers. But this is different. Perhaps these conferences are more like research conferences: as much goes on between the speeches as during them. The traditional notion of hypertext seems to locate the centre of the conference in the speeches or in the booth, as if the whole conference revolved around us interpreters, but it really doesn’t.

At the end of the day, what people seem to expect of interpreting, in general, is that it would almost do itself out of a job by allowing some level of pretending that it didn’t exist. In the interviews, no one really stood up for the interventionalist role of interpreters. No one really gave them a political place or a pulpit of their own. There was even a curious fear that, if interpreters were preachers, they might steal the show. Still, and interestingly, there was also a preference for interpreters to be visible but only so that more of their body could reflect the heart and message of the preacher.

In some way, this insight might move us closer to a more universal definition of the role of a conference interpreter, especially if we include the importance of the particular view of language that this conference brings to the fore. Here, in the sermons, language was all about declarations and proclamations that waited to be enacted. Language was like the words “gentlemen, start your engines” (words special to IEN). True, this sounds like an order, it sounds performative but it still requires the turn of a key and pressure on the pedal.

Here, words created a spiritual change that demanded a physical response, prophecies that awaited physical obedient fulfilment. In this context, approaching, as closely as possible, the authority and emphasis of the speaker and their speech acts is vital: “the fields are white unto harvest” cannot be interpreted as “a crop of grain awaits to be picked.” Sure, semantically, they are similar, but in this context, at this conference, only the first carries any weight at all.

So, in short, the function and importance of language is of greater importance than the specific conference skopos. As just about every interviewer said, interpreting here is very similar to interpreting in church, aside from the difference in mode.

With this in mind, we might actually link this conference more with court interpreting or interpreting at a wedding or job interview than with interpreting in a scientific conference of hospital. in the
latter case, aside from some terminological issues, language is largely a vehicle, an empty container that can be used and reused at will. “My throat is sore” and “my throat hurts” carry the same function and it is unlikely that anyone will pay close attention or derive spiritual significance from any particular phrasing over another. In court and in IEN, the opposite is obviously true.

This may lead us back to linguistics or to sociology or theology, who knows.

As I leave the field this time, that question is not exactly uppermost in my mind, Truthfully, spiritual questions weight more heavily on me that research ones at the moment but these notes are not the place for them. In terms of research, two things seem to compete for the best of my attention.

1) How do I relate this experience to the rest of the field? What do I say to those who might dismiss this work as only of interest to a small group of crazy Christians?

2) What does this mean for training?

End of notes.
We arrived today and, apart from a car ride and a twenty minute sit down I went straight to dinner with Mario and Daniel. This was a cross between an attempt to clarify organisational issues and a get to know you meeting.

The meeting itself was great although part of me is now trying to make it out that I was too talkative, too strong, too this, too that. I guess this is more about insecurity in a new situation than anything else. I will just have to get used to it and push against it? There is also the thought that I might come across as arrogant and all knowing. Hopefully, listening, instead of talking will help this. Perhaps a coaching style might work.

As the meeting didn’t strictly fall under the remit I agreed, I will just write down the things that really struck me.

The first is that, compared to org1, this church organisation has what I would call an “inside out” vision. In the words of Mario, they have “left behind the paradigm of being here to help the poor internationals. … Instead we tell them they are needed as only they can fulfil the international vision.”

Now, let’s pick aspects of this apart. Firstly, this goes against some organisational logic, which would say to invest in locals as they are more permanent in their community. What is going on in this org is that there is an emphasis in touching the wider world through investing in those from other national, interestingly called “internationals”.

This also means that the meaning of “international” here, as in “international church” is very different to IEN one. In IEN, it seemed to be linked to the planting of autochthonous churches in different countries, subject to a wider leadership and under training from a larger leadership team. In CLW, the emphasis is on being international by extension via training people who happen to be in Germany (Mariomentioned a prophecy that the internationals were not here by accident) as preparation for them to go home. Again, this is against most church growth theory.
By rights, working this way should have scared off the local population and left the church at the whim of migration waves. But the need for two services seems to show this is not the case. Why?

When I mentioned the issue of preachers saying something controversial, SP said that preachers should not stay controversial but that they should “stay in the centre of Scripture.” Useful to think on. Such a pity I went off on a theological tangent after that. Hmm.

IP still seems to think that my purpose here is to help the interpreters. This may be due to the way I sold the project. I need to watch this. I corrected this by underlining that data gathering was my purpose. Perhaps misunderstandings like this are always going to arise when we “sell” research in terms of its applications (which is the only way we CAN sell it to respondents) instead of on its scientific of philosophical merits.

One problem I had today was that both SP and IP would ask me questions that I was going to ask them later! My answers might prejudice the data gathered so I need to tread carefully. I did try to tread carefully but still, there could be issues. Nevertheless, it shows that the questions are “live” for this group, which is a good thing.

IP asked the same question several times, which I am still not sure I have an answer for. He asked “how can the interpreter, the preacher and the audience all flow together”. In his mind, the preacher brings the word, the interpreter carries the word and the audience receives the word. Interesting model although Tymoczko might take issue with it!

However you treat the model, it is a great question. One I am not sure I have an answer to.

I am also aware that SP is functioning spiritually on the kind of level I want to be on. This is a personal issue that I will need to be on the watch for. After all, I would not want personal admiration to colour my analysis of the data.

All in all, it has been a strange day. I have battled pride and low self-esteem in equal measure. I have been happy and castigated myself. I have worried about how others see me and then been in awe of what I see in them.
Perhaps this is the natural problem of data gathering in a field that has personal meaning for you. It is difficult to separate the “researcher you” from the “human you”. You become both the research leader and a worried follower. No doubt I will settle into the field, much as I settled into IEN, although perhaps not at the same speed.

If anything, this unease might be helpful. There is absolutely no risk of taking anything for granted here. Everything is new and surprising. Everything has the capacity to catch my attention. Language issues are keeping me on my toes, but not in the way I first thought. In some ways, I am living and thinking like a visitor to this town would live and think. There might be a lot of value in that, as opposed to the “knowing insider” position I easily adopted in field1.
The service began today with an equipment failure. No channel was working on the headsets until 1 came and fixed them around 5 minutes into the sermon. The fact that she is the only person who 2 knows how to use the equipment is something that has come up in the minutes of the interpreters 3 meetings.

The EN interpreter, whom I met in person later, worked outside the booth, with a mobile headset, 5 wired into the system. What this meant for those sitting next to her (she was sitting near us, at the 6 front of the upper floor) is a good question and one I wish I had followed up. However, there was 7 little sign of it causing a disturbance. I seem to remember that they were using headsets anyway so 8 there is not likely to have been a problem.

During the service, songs were sung in both German and English. This is a rather strange thing since, 11 according to LL, there are only 8 English members in a church where services can sometimes have 12 130 people in them. However, today, there was only around 60 or 70, I would estimate. When 13 people did sing in English, it was obvious that they were non-natives, as they tended to over- 14 -enunciate consonants.

The inside of the building was very hot. It was around 20°C outside and possibly pushing 25-30°C inside. 17 No interpreting was provided until the announcements. This seems to echo the pattern of org1, and 18 suggests that my emphasis on sermons in church interpreting is well-founded.

As part of the announcements, Daniel prayed for those who had recently graduated from a 21 leadership course. At least, this is what I thought was going on, since the equipment wasn’t working 22 and I had to work it out using the odd words in German I recognised. However, Mariodid provide 23 interpretation of IL’s prayer into English. A comparison between this and the status of interpreting in 24 org1 is waiting to be made.

Interpreting was eventually available in ES and EN.

The EN interpreter hesitated quite a lot during her performance. He rendering sounded very literal. 29 Interestingly, she covered both her ears with her headset. I found out much later from Isabella that 30 when she interprets, she wears the interpreters headset on one ear and a receiving headset on 31 another.
Going back to the lady who was interpreting into EN today, I have noted that there was not much evidence of self-monitoring. There were, as far as I can remember, no mistake corrections and some sentenced went unfinished.

Her task was made more technical since the preacher used many Bible verses and scriptural allusions, assuming Biblical knowledge both on the part of the audience and the interpreters.

I have noted some of the interpreter’s versions of his key points. His sermon was on the topic of “how do you respond when God calls?” Below are some more of his points that I felt were worth noting. Note that these do not relate as obviously to the hypertext skopos as in org1.

“God wants to work through people. I think he is taking a great risk”

“God does not need colabourers who do not need Him.”

Helen pointed out in this case that, in her view, a better version would be “God does not need colabourers who are independent of Him.”

“Moses had lost his identity as leader and prince and he was a shepherd.”

“Moses had to know the commissioner who gave him the job.”

During the sermon, I began to ask myself what result a reliance on interpreters has on people listening. We really have no option but to trust that the version they are giving is a true and accurate rendition. We also have to trust that they know what they are doing.

At one point, the preacher mentioned that John Wycliffe had a “bibliothek,” which I could tell meant “library” due to context and my knowledge of French. However, the interpreter could not find its English version and was thrown by this. It must have been almost a minute before she recovered enough to be able to resume interpreting. This is clearly a strategy issue and there is a need for teaching on problem-solving strategies.

The interpreter’s EN bible-knowledge was shown to be limited due to her resorting to very literal translations of the Bible verses cited. Someone who knew the Bible better would have been able to
give more familiar renditions at some points at least. This could easily turn into a speech act theory issue, much like some of the issues discovered in org1.

There were no sign of the interpreter using notes while she worked. The ES interpreter chose to work from the booth. There was no sign of him taking notes either. Here all interpreters work on their own throughout the service.

As much as some interpreting scholars may dislike the view that researchers can or should judge quality, as a trained interpreter using interpreting, I found it difficult not to make such judgments, even in a language pair where I do not know one of the languages. This raises two questions: 1) is the this the same for all users or am I just different given my training? 2) might this explain how and why users feel that they are able to judge quality?

One particular instance where I was able to notice a clear departure from the original is when the interpreter calqued the German word “wenn” [if] to “when”. This strikes me as evidence of an attempt to do word-for-word processing. It may also be evidence of too short a lag however, the effort needed check this on a regular basis was beyond me. On the occasions when I did check it, it did seem to be on the short side.

One of the drawbacks of doing research in this setting is that, since the texts are so interesting to me, I find I can easily drop out of my role as a researcher and become a listener. It takes great control to temper this. I will come back to this on Monday's notes.

The booths in CLW are situated on the upper floor balcony, which overlooks the lower floor stage. Access to the balcony is gained directly from the main entrance; you have to go downstairs to get to the lower level, which, incidentally, is where the headsets are found. The headsets work by infrared and the transmitted is sited so that most locations on both floors will have an adequate or better reception. However, it did seem that most interpreting users chose to sit on the upper floor.

We attended the 12pm service. There is a service at 9.30am and one at 12pm. For some interpreting booths, visibility of the stage could be an issue. There are six booths in total, three of which are in line, the rest are each pushed forward a little more to go round the curve of the balcony. Sonic leakage does not seem to be a problem.
On either side of the lower floor, extending to a height well above the floor level of the balcony are banners covered in flags of each of the nations represented in the church. There are, according to SL, 50-60 of these.

Further evidence of short lag and word-for-word processing from the interpreter was found in her interpreting the preacher’s invitation to close our eyes and pray as “let us close the eyes”, a phrase that sounds grammatically correct but highly unidiomatic in EN.

I talked to both the interpreter on duty and Isabella after the service. There was an interpreters’ meeting between the services, which I was meant to go to. An information mix-up meant I wasn’t there. Isabella said that, for the first time, a church leader was at the meeting, this was IL. She said that because of this, the interpreters talked so much and discussed issues to much that they didn’t have time to eat the food she had set out. I will want to explore some of this in later interviews.

I also heard from Isabella that people do tend to comment on interpreter performance, sometimes to the point of pointing out when wrong words have been used. This is definitely worth exploring!
One of the problems with doing fieldwork is that your schedule is not your own. You are entirely at the mercy of the people in the organisation you are studying. Whereas my original plan involved doing at least an interview per day, in cafes and working hard, it seems like all my data collection will be concentrated into small batches, once again, at conferences. I have no idea when the interviews will take place and need to keep reminding myself to push doors so that they will take place at all! Add to that the fact that I have not yet managed to register for the conference as of yet and you have a mixture that could lead to disaster!

Today, at lunchtime, I will text Isabella about the interviews and Daniel about the conference. Hopefully, everything can be organised and I can get my head on straight. Until then, I have a day off.
G.2d Note on 7th May. Day 4.

1 Today is another free day. I heard from Daniel and Isabella that I will be meeting with the
2 interpreters on Thursday and will hear more about doing interviews with the English speakers
3 tomorrow evening. At least this way, some progress is being made. I will need to make my own way
4 to the church on public transport on Thursday.
This is a supplement to my Isabella interview notes. While it was good to get one interview under my belt, obviously my technique needs work. Apart from that, what I am realising is that one or two questions can become key for an entire interview. The interview with Isabella really missed a sharp question on Isabella’s definition of the skopos of a Sunday service. This can’t be missed again. However, this data may be recoverable elsewhere.

It has become clear that my previous way of interviewing, focussing on interpreting itself and limiting the exposure to wider questions, was faulty. Ask people big general questions and you get answers that are a lot more fun to dig at. In fact, you can almost drop your interview schedule and play with what is there.

Based on this data and my pilot data, I am now nearing the point of being able to posit some real, testable relationships. There are, of course, still many mysteries. Some are for later work, such as “how and why is the prominence of IU and its effects on ESI so different in two groups that, on the face of it, have such similar ideals and theologies?” Others are a bit more pressing. The S->P relationship, which I deliberately didn’t attempt to plot, remains a complete mystery. The question is, does it even exist? Time may tell.

At least now, I am making progress. Although, access to listeners for interviews might be challenging. I may only get three or four of them. Still, three four listeners versus three leaders would be a good start. That is, if I get sufficient surveys to do a decent analysis.

Is anything still puzzling me?

Well, apart from the relationships and histories I mentioned above, the difference in the meaning of the word “trust” is puzzling. “Trust” in org1 means the interpreter trusting that the preacher knows what they are doing and just following. “Trust” in org2, while keeping some of this sense, seems to mean trusting the interpreters to make the right call. Although the need for leaders to be there is an interesting safety net. How far apart are these two conceptions of trust really? If they are close, which they actually may well be, why do they lead to such different ESI results?

It is rather odd that, with my big complex framework and my deep theorising, I am ending up at a fairly simple conclusion: the more central interpreting is to the vision of an organisation or to the
skopos of an event, the more freedom interpreters get. In this sense, the P->E relationship might well turn out to be much less important than I could have forecast. If centrality is the issue, this relationship is almost a moot point. On the other hand, if we are talking about connection (and I need to explore at some point how interpreters can help or hinder connection), then there may be a point to be made.

It has just occurred to me that perhaps the reason why the “co-preacher” issues was so little explored in org1 was that the ethos factor was low. In this sense, partnership is a foreign language: the preacher preaches the message, the interpreter acts as a kind of machine and passes it on. The place of partnership here is extremely limited, especially in sim, where the interpreter is isolated in a booth. Note the answers given by Isabella on interpreting on stage.

On the other hand, start talking to high ethos people and the answer is very different. The interpreter is a co-preacher, a partner, a second preacher. The interpreter needs to connect with God and the preacher to allow the people to connect with God and the preacher; in short, the interpreter is a bridge between people. How? By interpreting from their heart. The interpreter connects themselves to the message, allowing them to connect with people (note the similarities between the preacher connecting with the people and the interpreter interpreting from their heart) and allowing the message and the preacher to connect with people. The key is connection!

In this sense, logos and ethos people speak a different language. If we separate logos as being high IU and ethos & pathos as being high Perf then we see two different sides and two opposing approaches to interpreting.

Could it be that conference interpreting, which is traditionally high logos is not always this way? As Interpreting Studies uncovers more and more of the complexities of interpreting in community settings, could some of these be found in conference settings too? Is church interpreting the vital bridge?

I look forward to gathering more data.
Today, I had a meeting with many of the interpreters, a technician and IL. What was interesting was that this really gave me insight into the heart and head of interpreting here. It started with a long lunch and some interesting conversations. I deliberately haven’t written down too much of their content for privacy reasons.

After lunch, Isabella gave the vision for interpreting. Isabella likened interpreting to the ministry of Aaron in the Bible. He was the mouthpiece of Moses, who, in turn, was the mouthpiece of God. This presentation situated interpreting within the multicultural and multilingual nature of Bonn, comparing the languages that are spoken here with the ones offered in the church. The vision is to allow everyone to hear the gospel in their mother tongue. Isabella also said that interpreters needed to be competent, have a heart for people and need the anointing (specific power) of the Holy Spirit. Interpreting in this conception was all about bridging the language and cultural barriers that would stop people hearing the gospel. Isabella also said that the interpreter needed to be “spiritually well” and recounted a time where Isabella had asked another interpreter to take over due to not feeling spiritually up to it.

Next, a technician spoke on the kit they use here. It was all very complex but seemed to go down well. I was very surprised to see how much interest the interpreters seemed to be showing.

Then it was my turn. I used a modified, simplified version of Gile’s effort models and concentrated on some of the issues the interpreters had brought up. This was made easier by the fact that I had started by asking the interpreters what was one good thing and one bad thing about interpreting. The bad things centred on some of the classical issues: not knowing words, people speaking too quickly and dealing with repetition. Interestingly, one issue that was pointed out was that the interpreters are not always there for their language group: proof, if proof were needed that Isabella was right in looking for interpreters who have a heart for the language group.

Everything seemed to go well, although I did have the usual self-doubt issues afterwards. One interesting was that one interpreter seemed surprised at the idea of working idea-by-idea instead of word-for-word. It took a few attempts to show why this is the case. The interpreters seemed to find it really practical and the quality of questions was excellent. They did show the same general tendency as the profession to think and discuss in terms of war stories!
I do wonder what effect this might have on later data as Daniel was there and I haven’t interviewed Daniel yet. I do hope that the responses Daniel gives will not reflect what I said too much. Although, he seems very appreciative of interpreters and recognises the power and limitations of the ministry.

The general consensus of the interpreters was that they wanted to follow the preacher’s pattern and his/her path. This is a useful idea to note and one I need to follow in the interviews.

There was a lot of talk of the usefulness (or otherwise) of receiving the preacher’s notes. The consensus seemed to be that these were only necessary when the preacher was new to the church. This, in itself is an interesting issue. I must compare this to research we have.

Personally speaking, this meeting showed me that, unlike the first two pilots, where I was very research-focused, here my mind can slip easily. I got so caught up in helping the interpreters that I had to be reminded about the surveys. Oops! I also volunteered to come to a conference that would conflict with the Sunday service and gathering more interview and survey responses. Double oops! I will need to focus more at the conference and keep my eye on the ball.

The problem is that, as researchers, we can easily find ourselves either involved with our research subjects of totally distant from what would help them. Some median position really should exist but it is very easy to get caught up in one thing or another. Here, I have tended to slip into holiday or helper mode, which isn’t helpful for this project. I do need to smarten up a bit and get on with stuff, especially this weekend. This is a real disadvantage to staying in such a nice atmosphere with such nice people: it is easy to relax too much. Hopefully, I can shake myself up a bit and get on with things over the weekend!
Today marked the start of the Times of Refreshing conference and for me, the start of research proper. After so many days of rest and then the interpreters’ meeting, this was a welcome change of pace. In fact, the conference would see me return to some of the same issues and questions as I had had when researching org1.

The first interpreting I noticed was when delegates were welcomed to the conference. It was unclear, at first, whether the speaker should speak in English or German, given that both she and the interpreter were equally comfortable in both. It became even more interesting when she introduced herself saying “I am Maggie” and the interpreter seemed unsure whether he should adopt the speaker’s “I” or not. She gave her entire summary of the facilities available in one long intervention, which the interpreter had no option but to summarise, missing out some points. However, this information loss probably only affected a few people, as I would notice later.

My position as a participant observer was in the spotlight early on as Maggie realised I could do the sounddesk and asked me to adjust the levels as the singer’s microphone was too high. Singing was in both German and English with a few songs in each language. Some songs were even sung in one language and then the other. There was no interpreting during the praise and worship.

The interpreter doing most of the work at this conference was relatively inexperienced, having only interpreted for his father a few times and once before for Pastor Daniel. In this first session, the sermon was interpreted using SIC from English to German. Almost as soon as Pastor Daniel took the stage, my position was exposed again. He pointed me out as a visitor from Scotland who was here to do research. This made me feel somewhat self-conscious but may have aided me in getting more survey responses, who knows.

The interpreter made the interesting decision not to give the title of the conference in German but instead to do a direct calque of it whenever it was mentioned. His position was often alluded to throughout the conference and he was especially introduced by Pastor Daniel early on in this meeting. His early nervousness showed in his tendency to sway early on.

The skopos of the conference was identified by Pastor Daniel in the following words:

“Why are we here? We are here to minister to the Father. We are here to praise him.”
How this differed from the skopos of a church service was something I would explore in the
interview with him.

Normally, Pastor Daniel would stop at the clause or sentence level for the interpreter to interpret.
This seemed to show familiarity with the needs of interpreters, something else I had the opportunity
to explore later. He also used the interpreter as a visual aid once at this meeting, shaking him when
taking about “what comes out” of people when circumstances shake them up.

Interpreting at this conference was actually often to the fore. This evening, when the interpreter
struggled to find the German word for “torture”, members of the audience shouted out suggestions.
I would guess that this was an attempt at helping the interpreter and that no criticism was implied
but still, it did make the interpreter’s position and weaknesses very obvious. That none of the
preachers criticised the interpreter and that he actually won high praise several times is proof
enough that incidents like this one were not enough to dent his standing in their eyes. As later notes
and interviews will show, terminological accuracy is an issue who importance was up for debate
anyway.

A similar incident happened with the word “whosoever”, with the preacher this time inviting the
audience to offer solutions. One wonders if this could happen in any other setting and if so, whether
it would be interpreted (in a hermeneutical sense) in the same way. Here it did not seem to cause
any annoyance.

Performatively, the interpreter showed much sensitivity for the demands of interpreting sermons,
especially when he echoed the preacher’s movements, which were many. This didn’t necessarily
lead to all the preacher’s gestures being echoed but the interpreter did walk around with him. On
the other hand, even with my limited German, I could tell that the interpreter dropped the odd
framing device. One example of this is when Pastor Daniel had been preaching on one part of a verse
and then said “I love part two” before reading the second part. In this case, the interpreter simply
read the verse. Another example was found later in the sermon when Pastor Daniel’s phrase “maybe
I will illustrate this” was not interpreted, with the interpreter instead just giving the illustration.

Another related incident was when the preacher used the performatve tool of inviting the audience
to complete a verse with the final word. While this seemed very effective in English, the interpreter
simply chose to read the entire verse himself. Does this reflect the relative status of interpreters and preachers as performers or simply a personal preference?

At times, this even actually felt very like the conferences I examined in org1. My initial view that my position was lean more towards the “observation” side of participant observation were probably misplaced therefore. In actual fact, as later notes will show, I probably erred too much towards the participant side.

There was some evidence that the interpreter was parsing sentences on a word-for-word basis. The clearest example of this seem to be his difficulty in finding the German for the word “reasoning.” I wondered whether this was an issue with SIC in general or simply a strategy issue. Most of his hesitations or corrections seemed related with the need to find equivalents for single words. Mind you, this can only have been all the more tempting when Pastor Daniel dropped to one word interventions at one point.

There was one humourous instance where the preacher changed languages and the interpreter forgot to switch. Pastor Daniel has some, limited German and choose to say “und so weiter” instead of “and so on”. The interpreter, who was used to going into German, simply said “und so weiter” instead of providing an English version.

Pastor Daniel’s views on interpreters were made plain during the sermon, after the interpreter had gotten down on his knees to copy what Pastor Daniel did at one point. He said

“He is a good translator: he does what the preacher does.”

This was followed by a brief allusion to my research, which again exposed my position. Of course, being a ratified participant presented me with some great advantages. It made it so much more likely that people would agree to be interviewed and meant that I often had people helping me. On the other hand, there is always the possibility that this official recognition might have made people more conservative in their responses to my questions.

At this point, my notes show that the interpreter did directly calque some words from English. As the vast majority of the conference participants were fully bilingual, this would not have been much of
an issue. However, for those who only understood German, it may have caused problems of understanding.

I found it interesting that during the “prayer time” at the end of the first meeting, the interpreter and preacher were working together. As the preacher prayed for someone, the interpreter would interpret what he prayed, in much the same fashion as he interpreted during the sermon. At some points, the interpreter even prayed independently of the preacher or added his own prayers. He therefore seemed to have the status of an almost co-equal preacher.

Looking back at my notes, I find it interesting how often I felt I could tell what the interpreter was doing or where he was struggling. This is despite my lack of knowledge of the target language. Perhaps some kind of similar process goes on in the mind of those who listen to interpreting from a source language they do not know. Like it or not, people feel that they can judge interpreting, even when they do not know one of the languages. Much of this judgment, it would seem, would have to be based on general feeling or interpreter stumbles. This would therefore be a second, partially subconscious expectation.

END OF DAY’S NOTES
This was the second day of the Times of Refreshing conference and my last day there. Today, I managed to get three interviews with audience members. Due to having to fit them in between meals, sessions and a birthday party, which was on the conference program, they lasted between 3m 30s and 11minutes each. This is short but, even with my best attempts at exploring answers, this is as much as could be done. I will provide a deeper analysis of them later but what is sure is that they seemed to reflect much of the ideas I had come across at the conference for org1 and very little of the ideas given by Isabella.

The morning announcements were fully interpreted from English to German today. The one exception was the confirmation of numbers for the lunchtime meal, which was mostly in German with only a little English coming at the end. Since almost all attendees were bilingual, again this would have not represented much of a loss.

The fact that most attendees were bilingual had an impact on my data collection though. Most participants that I talked to seemed to reflexively listen to both the interpreter and the preacher. Since this is a variable I didn’t want to get into (as I was not theoretically prepared to handle it), I concentrated on those who listened mostly to the interpreters. Even still, two of the people I interviewed had enough German to listen to some of what the interpreter was saying too. This might have confused the picture somewhat.

After the announcements, there was an incident which provided as much of challenge to my role as the previous night had provided ratification to it. One lady, when introducing the preachers was intent on reiterating “do not get distracted”. Since the point of my research meant that I needed to be “distracted” in order to observe properly and that I needed to “distract” audience members for interviews, this was a real challenge. For the first time, I actually felt uneasy about my research. As my notes from the pilots show, it is not unusual for me to be aware of my double position. Usually, however, this meant nothing more than simply having two notepads to keep both personal and research notes. In this case, I realise it meant going against what was said publicly. For the first time, I felt like I was intruding. However, within a few minutes I settled on the position that, while an outsider could label doing research as a “distraction”, it could actually serve to minimise distractions later as it would be of help to interpreters, preachers and leaders.
Returning back to interpreting itself, the speaker this morning used lots of Very Short interventions, stopping before giving the verb. This presents a real challenge in German and may have led to ungrammatical sentences. The preacher was aware that her sermon title was language specific. She had called her message “An Attitude of Gratitude” and even remarked “it’s not as good in German, is it?” We therefore have awareness of linguistic issues but not yet the willingness to attempt a proactive engagement with them.

She again issued what could be seen as an indirect challenge to my position when she said “when we don’t concentrate on God and give him the glory, it is a slippery slope of morals.” Her aim here was to get people’s attention off of wasting time and overuse of the internet but, during the meeting, I read this as a challenge to concentrate exclusively on God during the service. Obviously, as a researcher, I would find this impossible. Yet, as a Christian, I would find being wholly “objective” (if such a position exists) impossible too. The only viable place for me was and is to be both at the same time.

Once again, we had evidence of lexical processing. The same interpreter was working as the previous evening and he found difficulty in finding the German for the word “foolish”. The preacher also used a similar trick to the preacher in the previous session when she switched to German and used the German for “nothing is impossible for God”. This time, the interpreter managed to switch languages. It seems therefore that there is an expectation that interpreters will be able to handle the performative use of languages. Not only that but, since the preacher spoke German too, there may be a case for seeing the presence of interpreting here as itself performative, given the unusual percentage of bilinguals in the audience. Further evidence for this idea was found when the German audience said “amen” to something before the interpreter had even finished his sentence!

However, a later quote from the sermon shows a slightly different attitude to languages:

“The reason why God made different languages was that without that nothing would be impossible to people and the world would be worse that is was now.”

At the end of this sermon, the preacher changed but the interpreter remained the same.

Session 2
The second preacher was the husband of the first preacher. His delivery differed from hers by the fact that, even though he spoke more slowly than she did, he tended to give longer interventions. There were only two points of note as far as interpreting was concerned. Firstly, he said “in English: BUSY means Being Under Satan’s Yoke”.

Obviously this would not work in any language other than English. I actually think the interpreter just explained the terms and the spelling. The preacher also jokingly commented that “before the Tower of Babel, everyone spoke English.”

In this session, Isabella was the interpreter, going from German to English. She was nervous about this since, while she regularly does simultaneous interpreting in this direction, she had not interpreted this way on stage for some time. The piano had been turned 90 degrees by the time I got back in, so that the worship leader could see the audience.

The preacher was a visitor from another part of Germany. Given my lack of German, everything attributed to him is actually the words of the interpreter. This in itself is an interesting point. After all, surely this is how monolinguals experience interpreting. One has no choice but to assume accuracy. Any attempt to judge quality than cannot be based on ST-TT comparison but instead on delivery and confidence. Perhaps this is even the same for bilinguals too. Still, it does make us ask whether ST-TT comparison is the only or best measure of quality.

The preacher said “I feel a nice sermon is not enough … [the question is] How do I put this into practice the day after?”

It is also worth noting that he used longer interventions than any of the English preachers but the interpreter did not seem to struggle.
At one point, the preacher chose to use the interpreter as part of an illustration. He faced her, she faced him and he used it as an example of two people having a conversation. In some ways, it could be suggested that this is what on-stage interpreting actually amounts to.

Again, I found myself judging quality. Given the placing of hesitations (which were remarkably few), Isabella seemed to be processing at a higher level than the other interpreters. In fact, she seemed to be performing at the level I would expect from a fully-fledged professional. Her voice modulation was excellent too. She also dealt very well the they occasional long segments. She had also brought her English Bible, unlike the first interpreter who didn’t bring his German one to the stage.

The only possible example of low-level processing was when the preacher actually used the English word “Sugar Daddy” in his sermon and the interpreter used the calque “Zußenpapa.” It is strange to note how often the preachers actually flipped languages.

At one point, the interpreter actually interrupted the preacher to begin her intervention.

Interestingly, when the conference host, IL, got up after this sermon and spoke in English, Isabella forgot to interpret into German and gave the first sentence back in English. This is interesting evidence of what could be cognitive overload. Perhaps an unspoken expectation of interpreters is that they can cope well with language flipping.

Afternoon Sessions

This part of the conference was unique. It was Daniel’s birthday so most of the afternoon was given over to a celebration with food, stories and testimonies of the people whose lives God had changed through him. This made interviewing during this tricky. People were mostly too busy in conversation and it felt rude to intrude. Besides, it took me until the end of this session to work out who precisely actually needed the interpreters besides me.

Some of the presentations and stories were in German. For the first few, there was no interpreting, leaving us monolinguals entirely out of the loop. While IL’s German was enough to understand, it was clear that his English was far better than his German.
This session reminded me what it is like to listen to another language when there is no interpreter. I had absolutely no idea what was being said. Since almost everyone else was practically bilingual, I found it incredibly isolating. The only way I could get an idea of what kind of thing was being said was by watching others’ reactions. This was especially the case during one very long testimony.

At one point, a pastor was called up to interpret. Yet, later, when one of the visiting speakers got up to say something, the first conference interpreter came up to interpret from English to German. He also interpreted in the other direction for a German visiting pastor. At one point, the interpreter interrupted a long intervention by a German visitor, who obviously was not used to working with interpreters. The speaker later flicked to English than, just as the interpreter was about to step in, flicked back to German.

I noticed that, one the interpreter was there on the stage, he stayed there and worked for everyone who shared. Why he was not there for the earlier testimonies is a mystery to me. I have written in capital letters in my notes the words PRESENCE MEANS EVERYTHING. If an interpreter is known to be in the room or nearby, their very presence means they can be asked to work and often will be. If there is no interpreter, at least part of the audience are completely lost!

This session must have been especially hard for the interpreter as at least one speaker used long, meandering sentences and resulting long interventions, which had to be handled somehow. The strain showed as, at one point, the interpreter completely missed a sentence Daniel said.

Evening Meeting

Yet again, there was an interesting example of language flipping when Daniel said “We will be saying ‘Auf Weidersehen’” which the interpreter interpreted into German until the ‘Auf Wiedersehen’, which he changed into “Goodbye.”

At this point in the sermon, I noted down some of my ideas from the interview with Anderson. This audience member, who came from a technical background, thus tending towards a very conduit-based model of interpreting. This was until I started launching the scenarios at him, at which point, he realised the problems with this model and gave alternative solutions to the traditional ones. This seems to simply underline Eraslan’s survey results. Most people tend to go conduit-based and IU based until they are presented with situations where relationships and personal responsibility are to
the fore. At this point, they reinterpret what they previously said. Interestingly, after the interview was finished, he asked me whether I thought computers would ever take over from human interpreters. These scenarios were the way I explained why I thought this was not possible.

During this meeting, the survey was introduced to the people and announced from the front. Unfortunately, Daniel said I was from “England,” which I made a public joke about.

Here, Mario was preaching in German. I was personally impressed both by his preaching and how he worked with the interpreter: he was obviously used to both. Early on, he congratulated Daniel on his birthday and thanked him, in German, for the invitation to his “Jubilee Birthday party,” which the interpreter calqued, without change into English. To this, the preacher replied “I think we had English-English there.”

While the preacher prayed at the start of his sermon, he and the interpreter overlapped each other’s interventions a few times. The key scripture, 1 Chronicales 11: 12-14, was read in English first (by the interpreter, who had his Bible this time) and then by the preacher in German. The word “barley” appeared and, when the preacher used the German equivalent “Gerste”, the interpreter had remembered it was “barley” in English and used this in his English version. The preacher, noticing this piece of terminological accuracy said [in German] “This man is good. I had to look that up in my lexicon.” A similar incident happened later when the interpreter managed to find the English phrase “intimidate you”, to which the preacher responded “Wow!” The interesting follow-on was that the interpreter, having spent so much cognitive effort in finding this phrase found it difficult to interpret the next, far easier section.

On the other hand, the preacher did occasionally help the interpreter out with terminology, such as when the interpreter couldn’t find the word “helpful”. After one intervention, the interpreter, obviously tired, simple responded with “yeah”, at which the preacher just laughed and said, in English, “He’s burnt out already.” The fact that this was able to be a joke, rather than a criticism of the interpreter shows the respect for the difficulty of the interpreter’s task in this church. Later on, the interpreter interpreted a short intervention with the words “somebody gets believed,” to which the preacher just looked at him with confusion on his face and said “ok”, especially since the preacher is bilingual. But then, the fact that the preacher did not openly correct the interpreter shows enormous confidence or respect.
Later on, the interpreter confused the German word “wenn” and the English “when” and used the word “diagnose” when the context suggested the noun “diagnosis”. This would seem to suggest either low-level processing or interference due to inexperience.

Yet again, the interpreter worked with the preacher during the prayer time. This time he was more stretched, however, as there was a prayer team consisting of all the preachers so far. He moved quickly from one person who required interpreting to another. He was back on stage again for the close of the meeting. This marked my last day at the conference as I needed to be at the church for both service the next day to ensure the surveys were done.
Today was my last full day in Germany and my last research day. It was also, by far, the busiest. In addition to seeing many surveys go out and collating them all, I interviewed Daniel and SL, attended both church services and helped to pack for going home. This is what hard research work feels like!

Yet today was also a day of consolidation. I had heard both of the interpreters working in the English booth before. The first was Isabella, who was a huge help with the surveys. Given my limited German and even worse knowledge of people in the church, she gave out every single survey that was filled in by people in the church. Her work was much harder at the second service where there were more “internationals” as the church calls them. In fact, with the surveys, her regular duties as chief interpreter and her scheduled interpreting time, she was overworked.

I had forgotten on the previous Sunday to note the banners that hang on the left side of the church, from the ceiling down. On one is written “Jesus baut eine internationale Gemeinde” [Jesus builds an international community] and contains flags representing some of the 50 countries whose nationals can be found in the church. On the other side, is a banner with the rest of the flags. This international vision was to come up a lot in the interviews.

The interpreters are located in single-person booth on the left-hand side of the balcony. On the wall of each booth is an XLR jack, to which the headphones are directly connected, with no independent volume control. Each booth contains one folding half-desk built into it. Visibility varies between booth but for all interpreters, views of the stage are limited and, unless preachers choose to preach from the stage itself, they will be entirely invisible. One people take their seats on the balcony, what little visibility of the stage the interpreters might have will completely vanish.

I realised that the survey translation had not gone as well as I planned. Isabella noticed a word missing in one of the German questions and I had already had to correct a terminological error in French and one which was pointed out to me by a Spanish interpreter on Thursday.

One thing that was very clear today was that I have been entirely reliant on Isabella as a gatekeeper, not only because of her German knowledge but because of her prodigious work rate. Every meeting I have gone to, she has either helped me get there or arranged transport there and/or back. All the surveys in the church were given out by her. She argued and pushed for the interview with Daniel and reminded Mario of our interview.
Knowing no German, I had no other possibility but to rely on gatekeepers, for better or worse. Oddly enough, I felt more at ease with my relationship with Isabella than I did with my relationships with gatekeepers in org1, despite the fact that there I knew the setup and the languages. Rather than restricting access, it felt like Isabella was positively opening doors. If anything, she helped me to keep pushing for opportunities.

However, it is obvious that not everyone in the church received a survey. If I wanted to be incredibly disingenuous, I could suggest that she selected people especially but if anything, the opposite would seem to be true. Watching her ask people to fill them in, she seemed to be heading for anyone and everyone. This is exactly the approach I would have wanted to take if I knew the church.

At the conference, I was reliant on Daniel announcing the surveys and gathering them in again. Once again, I could crow about possible selectivity but I really can’t imagine how or why he would do this. So, while I must be open to the possibility of gatekeeper bias, I really can’t see any real evidence of any. Only time will tell. What is a more interesting question is whether I would have achieved so much if I spoke perfect German and had tried to give everything out myself. I think not, to be honest.

Just before the start of the service, Isabella pointed out a timesheet to me that showed the timings of every part of the service, even to the minute. Both of us noted how this was very stereotypically German.

Like the interpreter the Sunday before, Isabella chose not the interpret from the booth but instead from the front of the balcony, using the same equipment. Again, there was little evidence of people being perturbed. There was some evidence of a good, professional quality lag. I also noticed that during the announcements, usually a tricky part of the service to interpret, there were no unfinished sentences in her version.

 Shortly after the announcements, since it was Mother’s Day in Germany, some of the kindergarten children put on a simple dance. This was very hard to see from the balcony. The interpreter actually said that the children were in the “kindergarten” but some looked older than the ages we would associate with this in the UK. During this dance, the interpreter even went to the bother of interpreting the words to the song, without singing them!
I noticed one small terminological slip: when someone was explaining about the church having a ministry that “hands out groceries”, the easier English word would have been a “foodbank” although this may be a fairly new term. Later on in the announcements and during the sermon, there were some long periods of silence.

The title of the sermon next week caught my attention. As it is Pentecost, the Pastor will be preaching on “God uses your language”. Perhaps it would have been good to be there during that week too!

Early on in the sermon, the interpreter seemed to shorten her lag. This was most obvious when the preacher used a pun and the interpreter said “One of the three year olds said and you can’t translate this as it is a play on words.”

Note here how her attention shifts from the beginning of the story to her apology for the untranslateable joke. The tricky thing is that it has to be supposed that her own voice starts at “and” yet, when you hear it as a sentence, you could easily assume that this is the beginning of the indirect speech of the three year old. Such is the strangeness of interpreting!

The lag seemed to return to normal later in the sermon. However, this may have been because the interpreter seemed to spend quite a lot of time on working out how to render single ideas or words. Sometimes, this led to production errors such as “[Noah] was the first drunk family father”, which is rather strange-sounding in English.
G.2j Second note on 12\textsuperscript{th} May (F-12/05-2). Day 9.

The Russian interpreters did not start working until midway into the sermon. I also noticed that,
even with my little knowledge of Russian, that it seemed like the lag he was using was pretty short
but this did seem to lengthen sometimes. I also noticed that not many people in the church seemed
to be wearing headsets. Is this evidence of dwindling numbers of people requiring interpreting or is
it just that most people sit downstairs? There seemed to be around 80-100 adults plus children.

During this service I was struck again by how challenging it is to do research when a sermon is
personally challenging to you. Once again, it was difficult for me to stay in the observer position
when what was being said was making me think. In this way, I was a participant observer, with
sometimes more emphasis on the first of those titles. I was also, in different capacities, an expert (in
interpreting) but a novice (in the ways of CLW), a researcher but also a Christian and a fellow
professional too. These are many roles to play as one person. The only way I could resolve them was
to see them not as contradicting identities but all as part of one identity, as different facets of me.

Like it or not, my understanding is fuelled, opening and limited by my beliefs and experience. This is
very similar to my conclusions from org1, where my membership both of the organisation and
Christianity was both a filter and a help.

I returned from the field then with lots of data but much call for reflection too. The roles of
gatekeepers was always on my mind. While they can provide unique opportunities, it would be a
naive researcher who was not aware of their power. This is a similar power to that wielded by
interpreters, who themselves can filter out information or provide access to it. My own role as
participant and observer and many other things also comes into focus here. It is very hard to avoid
the fact that my understanding and view of the data I gathered (well, perhaps the better term is
"produced") is coloured by my own beliefs.
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