



'Language has a Heart': Linguistic Markers of Evaluation in Selected TRC Testimonies

Zannie Bock
University of the Western Cape, Bellville, South Africa

This paper explores how two testifiers at the Human Rights Violation hearings of South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission in 1996 used selected markers of evaluation (shifts in tense, the inclusion of direct speech and code-switching) to express evaluative meanings and position themselves, the police and their audiences in relation to their narratives. Both testifiers are mothers of young activists who were pursued, detained and tortured by police in the 1980s. The paper argues that it is through the subtle though significant linguistic choices the women make that their perspective is construed and their 'narrative truth' realized.

Keywords: Truth and Reconciliation Commission, evaluation, appraisal, code-switching, narrative, simultaneous interpretation

Introduction

The title of this paper is taken from an article by Ochs and Schieffelin (1989: 7), researchers working within an ethnographic and linguistic tradition, in which they argue that '(l)inguists have underestimated the extent to which grammatical and discourse structures serve...to intensify and specify attitudes, moods, feelings and dispositions'. Through the subtle choices that speakers make from the repertoire of linguistic options available to them, speakers index particular kinds of affect and provide an interpretive frame for their propositions:

Affect permeates the entire linguistic system. Almost any aspect of the linguistic system that is variable is a candidate for expressing affect. In other words, language has a heart as well as a mind of its own. (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1989: 22).

Ochs and Schieffelin use the term, *affect*, to refer to the way speakers encode feelings, attitudes and beliefs in their language. Other researchers have used terms such as *connotation*, *attitude*, *stance*, *evaluation*, and most recently *appraisal*, as terms to refer to the way speakers represent and position themselves. Thompson and Hunston (2000: 2), in their review of contemporary research in this field, refer to these terms as having broadly similar meanings although they prefer the term *evaluation* as a 'broad cover term for the expression of the speaker or writer's attitude or stance towards, viewpoint on, or feelings about the entities or propositions that he or she is talking about'. In this paper, I am using the term, *evaluation*, in this way.

This paper explores how two testifiers at South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) use three selected markers of evaluation, namely *shifts in tense*, the *inclusion of direct speech* and *code-switching*, to express evaluative meanings and position themselves and others in relation to the events they describe. My framework is informed by work on narrative and evaluation by Labov (1972), Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Schiffrin's (1981) study of the use of the historical present tense in narratives. The significance of Labov's (1972) and Labov and Waletzky (1967) theory is widely acknowledged (see *Special Issue of journal of Narrative and Life History*, 1997, published in honour of Labov & Waletzky's 1967 paper).

Labov (1972) and Labov and Waletzky (1967) argue that for a narrative to be successful, it must perform two functions: one is to tell a story (what happened to whom, under what circumstances); the second is to indicate *why* this story is worth telling. This latter function is achieved through the narrator's use of evaluative devices, or 'the means used by the narrator to indicate the point of the narrative, its *raison d'être*: why it was told, and what the narrator is getting at' (Labov, 1972: 366). They propose a six-part framework to describe the typical structure of oral narratives of personal experience, of which one stage is termed *evaluation*. In his later paper, Labov (1972: 369) extends this discussion by arguing that evaluative meanings are not limited to the evaluation stage and may also be dispersed throughout the narrative.

Thompson and Hunston (2000: 6) argue that evaluation generally serves three functions: firstly, it expresses the speaker's opinion, thereby reflecting something of the value system of that person and their community; secondly, it constructs and maintains relations between the speaker and listener; and thirdly, it organizes the discourse through signaling boundaries and connections between various parts of the discourse. These three functions expand Labov and Waletzky's two functions by recognizing that narrative and evaluation result from the interaction between the sender and receiver - in other words, they are co-constructed.

Theorists working within the Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) approach to language have recently developed the *appraisal* system to account for evaluation in language (Martin, 1997, 2000, 2003; Martin & Rose, 2003; Martin & White, 2005). The appraisal framework builds on Halliday's network of *interpersonal* meanings and refers to the way people use language to negotiate social relations and express their attitudes and beliefs about the world (Martin & White, 2005: 7). It is also interested in how texts position their audiences, as either sympathetic or dismissive of the opinions or experiences described (Martin, 2003: 171). Although I have not used the appraisal framework for my analysis of these texts, I use this analysis to make a more general comment on the appraisal framework.

Background on TRC Testimonies and Language Choices

The focus of this paper is on selected markers of evaluation in the testimonies of two women who testified at the Human Rights Violation (HRV) hearings of the TRC in 1996. This paper argues that these subtle linguistic choices are part of the way in which the testifiers express interpersonal meanings and construe their different perspectives, or to use the TRC vocabulary, their different 'narrative truths'. The *TRC Report Vol. 1* (1998:112) defines narrative truth as a personal or subjective truth which seeks 'to capture the widest possible record of people's perceptions, stories, myths and experiences' or, in the words of the TRC's chairperson, Archbishop Desmond Tutu, to give everyone 'a chance to say his or her truth as he or she sees it' (*TRC Report Vol. 1*, 1998: 112).

In line with the TRC's mandate to allow people to communicate in the language of their choice, the TRC set up an extensive interpreting service (Du Plessis & Wiegand, 1998; Lotriet, 1998). The majority of testifiers chose to testify in their mother tongues. Du Plessis and Wiegand (1998: 29) offered the following statistics for April-June 1996: Xhosa (37,73%), Zulu (28,48%), English (13,91%), Sotho (8,61%), Afrikaans (5,30%), Tswana (5,30%). Each testimony was simultaneously interpreted into English (if English was not the original language of testimony), Afrikaans (if requested) and into one or two of the African languages spoken in the region (Du Plessis & Wiegand, 1998: 28). The English interpretations were later transcribed and published on the TRC website as the official public record of the TRC. The only records of the testimonies in their source languages are the audiovisual recordings of the testimonies made by the South African Broadcasting Corporation (SABC), on which one can hear the source language as well as the simultaneous interpretation into English as a voice over.

The testimonies for analysis in this paper are drawn from the Helderberg- Tygerberg HRV hearings which were held at the University of the Western Cape on 5 August 1996. The analysis covers two testimonies, both by women from Bonteheuwel, a working class township near Cape Town. Both gave testimony as mothers of young activists who were harassed, detained and tortured during the anti-apartheid struggles of the 1980s. Both tell the suffering of their sons and their families at the hands of the police.

English and Afrikaans (and code-switching between the two) are the first languages for these particular testifiers. Dorothy de Souza gives her testimony in English, although she code-switches briefly into Afrikaans at one point, while Minnie Ferhelst testifies solely in Afrikaans. Their sons also testify in the same hearing, both in English, with some switches into Afrikaans. Code-switching and mixing between Afrikaans and English, and, in particular, local varieties of these languages, would have been a normal linguistic practice for these testifiers. In the following paragraphs, I digress briefly to give a short sociolinguistic profile of the testifiers, as this background becomes important for my argument.

Sociolinguistic Profile

In the absence of any sociolinguistic study of Bonteheuwel, its profile in the 1980s and 1990s can be understood by referring to McCormick's (2002) study of linguistic choices among residents of District Six in Cape Town during that same period. Bonteheuwel and District Six are demographically similar and have a shared cultural and linguistic history. Bonteheuwel was created as a settlement for coloured people who were removed from Cape Town, including District Six, under the apartheid legislation, the Group Areas Act, in the 1960s (*TRC Report Vol. 4*, 1998: 278).

According to McCormick (2002: 89), switching and mixing between the local varieties of English and Afrikaans in District Six was considered 'the only proper way of speaking to one's neighbour' - so much so that this practice could be considered the 'unmarked choice' (McCormick, 2002: 123). The local mixed vernacular generally consisted of an Afrikaans grammatical matrix into which a number of English loanwords were inserted (McCormick, 2002: 92). While the local mixed vernacular was valued as 'warm' and 'intimate' and a marker of solidarity (McCormick, 2002: 98), English was the language of choice for formal public events. Public occasions typically began in English, sometimes in standard English, but switched to the local variety of Afrikaans when the discussion became heated or emotional (McCormick, 2002: 167). In the 1980s, the local variety of Afrikaans was viewed by many speakers as an opposition to and a rejection of the white standard Afrikaans variety, which was viewed as the language of the oppressor and a symbol of the apartheid state (McCormick, 2002: 196).

Research Aims

In this paper, I explore how two testifiers at an HRV hearing of the TRC use selected linguistic markers, namely shifts in tense, direct speech and code-switching, as expressions of evaluation in their testimonies. In the case of Mrs. Ferhelst's testimony, which was given in Afrikaans, this paper also explores the extent to which these markers were accurately interpreted on the day of the hearing. In the case of Mrs. de Souza, it investigates how her code-switching was managed, first by the interpreter on the day of the hearing, and then by the transcriber of the interpreted version for the official TRC record. The Afrikaans transcriptions were made from audiovisual copies of the testimonies, and were compared with the official records which are based on the simultaneous interpretations into English and published on the TRC website (www.doj.gov.za/trc).

Theoretical Framework

A number of researchers have identified as significant the shifts between the past tense and the historical present and between indirect and direct speech (as a particular form of historical present shift) in oral narratives (Johnstone, 1987; Labov, 1972; Schiffrin, 1981). However, code-switching as a marker of evaluation has not been

explored in the evaluation literature. Ochs and Schieffelin (1989: 14) list code-switching and the use of dialects as examples of linguistic expressions of affect, although they do not explore it any further. The recent SFL appraisal framework does not include code-switching as a marker of evaluation, probably because the work to date has concentrated on monolingual English texts (Martin & White, 2005; Menard-Warwick, 2005; Page, 2003). On the basis of my analysis of the TRC testimonies, however, I will argue that code-switching should be recognized as an appraisal resource.

As noted above, this paper is informed by Schiffrin's (1981) work on tense variation in narrative, a brief summary of which follows. Schiffrin (1981: 58) explores how shifts from the past tense (P) to the historical present (HP) act as an evaluative device in that the historical present 'makes the past more vivid by bringing past events into the moment of speaking' thereby increasing the dramatic impact of the story. By historical present tense, she refers to 'the use of the present tense to refer to past events' (Schiffrin, 1981: 45).

This shift is illustrated in the following extract from the testimony of Colin de Souza, the son of Dorothy de Souza, where the events are understood as having occurred prior to the moment of speaking, even though clauses f-h contain verbs in the historical present. The verbs are italicised and those in the past tense are marked with a P while those in the historical present are marked with an HP:

- | | | |
|-------|--|----|
| (l)a. | At that time I <i>had</i> a firearm | P |
| b. | but it <i>was</i> for my own purpose | P |
| c. | 1 <i>took</i> out the firearm, | P |
| d. | 1 <i>put</i> it underneath my jersey, | P |
| e. | 1 <i>went</i> outside | P |
| f. | because I <i>check</i> | HP |
| g. | now <i>it's</i> too dangerous to be inside the house | HP |
| h. | and I <i>want</i> to move now, out of the area. | HP |

The use of the HP in the extract serves to make the events more dramatic and vivid and increases the narrative immediacy. It is also as though the narrator, De Souza, is, in Labov's (1972: 355) words, 'partially reliving' the experience in the telling thereof.

Schiffrin (1981: 58) further examines the use of direct quotes (as a form of HP) and argues that they act as markers of heightened emotional intensity in that they enable the narrator to 'increase the immediacy of an utterance which occurred in the past by allowing the speaker to perform that talk in its original form, as if they were occurring in the present moment'. This has the effect of shifting the central reference point from the present time context of narration (e.g. TRC hearing) to the narrative context (e.g. night of the shooting) thereby positioning the audience as witnesses and increasing their involvement.

Analysis of Two TRC Testimonies

To explore these ideas further, the testimonies of Mrs. de Souza and Mrs. Ferhelst will be considered. What is striking about the testimonies of both women is the centrality of dialogue to their testimonies. The women use remembered conversations to dialogically weave competing discourses (their own and those of the police) into their narratives. This allows them to contrast the opposing ideologies and judge their own as moral and acceptable, and those of the police as abnormal and immoral. It also reflects their role as parents who had to engage with the authorities in their attempts to protect their families.

Analysis: Dorothy de Souza

Mrs. de Souza's full testimony is 10 minutes long, and consists of a number of 'chunks' recalling or commenting on events. Extract 2 which follows represents one of these chunks from the beginning of her testimony. I have identified it as a narrative (using Labov and Waletzky's six-part framework) and my analysis traces how shifts from indirect into direct speech serve an evaluative function in this narrative.

According to Labov (1972) and Labov and Waletzky (1967), a typical oral narrative of personal experience may begin with an optional *abstract*, which summarises the main point of the story. This is followed by the *orientation* which sets the narrative in time and space, and often introduces the main participants. The next stage, the *complicating action*, refers to the events faced by the protagonist which culminate in a crisis which the protagonist is expected to resolve. However, before the *resolution* stage of the narrative, the narrator may evaluate the situation, thereby suspending the action this is the *evaluation* stage. The final stage is the *coda*, an additional optional element after the *resolution*, which may evaluate the whole event and return the story to the present. As noted at the beginning of this paper, evaluative meanings are not only presented in the discrete stage, *evaluation*, but may be dispersed throughout the narrative.

In the following extract from the beginning of her testimony, Mrs. de Souza describes how the Security Branch visited her on the eve of her son's court appearance. The extract is presented clause by clause and the narrative stages, including the evaluative clauses, are indicated. In addition, the uses of direct and indirect speech are marked as DS and IS, respectively, and clauses with past tense verbs are marked with a P. Elements which will be discussed in the analysis are italicised. (The same conventions are used in all the following extracts).

(2) Orientation

- a. For instance I just *recalled* the time
- b. when he said
- c. he had to go had to appear in Court at Goodwood
- d. that was with the second trial.

e.	That evening we <i>were preparing</i> to go to bed early because of the next morning	
f.	as we had to be there very early as his parents.	
g.	And I <i>remember</i>	
h.	while we <i>were sleeping</i>	
<i>Complicating Action</i>		
i.	there <i>was</i> a knock on the door	P
j.	and it was two security police	P
k.	and they <i>demanded</i>	P
l.	that my husband had to go with them	IS
m.	and I <i>refused</i> to let my husband out of the room.	P
n.	I said, no,	DS
o.	we should - you know as well - that	DS
	we should be tomorrow in Court very early to be with our son	
p.	as he is appearing.	DS
q.	They said, no,	DS
r.	but your husband must go with	DS
s.	because Colin is at Bellville police station	DS
t.	and he wants to see you.	DS
u.	And - as you know we had no confidence in the police	P/Evaluation
v.	because of what we went through as a family	P/Evaluation
<i>Resolution</i>		
w.	I refused	P
x.	and I asked them to give their names	IS
y.	and they didn't want to identify	IS
z.	and I said	P
aa	I had no trust in them	IS/Evaluation
bb.	and I'll never allow my husband to come out of the room,	DS/Evaluation
cc.	And I was trying to be tough there	P/Evaluation
dd.	and stood up with them	P/Evaluation
ee.	and they <i>left</i> .	P

The first eight clauses provide the orientation to this narrative as they introduce the setting, some of the participants and their behaviour. Mrs. de Souza frames her narrative with processes of remembering ('recalled', 'remember') and references to the temporal setting (the evening before his second court appearance). The complicating action is triggered by clause (i), 'there was a knock on the door', which signals a disruption to the usual sequence of events and predicts that what follows will be problematic. The shift in narrative staging is also marked by the change of tense, from the past continuous ('were preparing', 'were sleeping') to simple past tense ('was', 'demanded', 'refused'). The use of the past continuous tense in the orientation clauses is typical of oral narratives of personal experience, argues Schiffrin (1981: 49), as orientation clauses often report on

extended processes which may have begun before the narrative action itself.

In the extract, the central *complicating action* consists of a conversation in which Mrs. de Souza 'stood up' to the Security Branch and refused to allow them access to her home and family. The dialogue shifts between direct and reported speech modes: the first clause of remembered dialogue is presented in reported speech (clauses 1), but then, as her narrative gathers momentum, she slips into direct speech (clauses n-t) which culminates in an emotional high point when the police insist: 'but your husband must go with because Colin is at Bellville police station and he wants to see you' (clauses r t). This moment represents what was clearly for her a difficult choice: to believe the police and let her husband go to her son who was asking for him, or to choose to disbelieve their sincerity and deny them her husband, but simultaneously, to risk denying her son the support of his father. The *evaluation* in clauses (u) and (v) suspends this high point.

Her defiant action in refusing the police access to her husband temporarily resolves the crisis (the *resolution* stage), and she again uses the past tense and indirect speech for the last turns of the dialogue (clauses w-aa), although clause (bb), 'I'll never allow my husband to come out of the room', momentarily shifts back into direct speech and the historical present tense, perhaps signaling a moment of intense emotion in her recollection of the event. Her final evaluative comment, 'And I was trying to be tough there and stood up with them', is marked by a shift back to the past continuous tense ('was trying') as she evaluates her action (clauses cc dd). The narrative ends with the departure of the police without her husband and the narrative returns to the simple past tense as usuality is temporarily restored: 'and they left' (clause ee).

The analysis demonstrates how, in this extract, the shift into direct speech reflects an increase in emotional intensity as the narrator becomes caught up in the reliving of the experience, whereas the shift into indirect speech at the end signals a shift into a more reflective mode during which the narrator evaluates her actions.

In many TRC testimonies, testifiers quoted the words of the police verbatim in Afrikaans, as is evident in Extract 3 which follows. The combination of tense shifts and code-switching (marked in bold italics) marks this extract as an emotional high point in her testimony.

During this chunk, Mrs. de Souza recalls the conversation between Captain van Brakel of the Security Branch, and a policeman, a member of the ordinary South African Police Services, who arrived on the scene in response to the neighbour's calls for assistance and who, unlike the Security Branch police, wanted to help her. Mrs. de Souza's neighbours had called the police to assist the family when fellow comrades came to shoot De Souza at his home. The comrades were acting on disinformation circulated by the police that De Souza was an informer. This spreading of disinformation was a tactic

used by the police at the time to sow suspicion and mistrust in communities, and thereby to undermine their opposition and resistance to apartheid.

(3)

- | | |
|---|----|
| a. And so other people called the police | |
| b. and I was very hurt | |
| c. because of what the Captain said, Captain van Brakel over the phone to this policeman, | |
| d. he said to him | |
| e. I can't remember his name | |
| f. but I can picture him well | |
| g. He <i>said</i> to him | P |
| h. <i>Moenie notice neem nie van daai mense nie -</i> | DS |
| i. <i>hulle is mal,</i> | DS |
| j. <i>en, daar was nie geskietery nie</i> | DS |
| k. <i>daar was nie geskietery nie.</i> | DS |
| l. <i>En hy sê</i> | HP |
| m. <i>Meneer, die bewaarstuk is hierso</i> | DS |
| n. <i>die bewaarstuk is hierso</i> | DS |
| o. <i>en - en - daar was geskiet</i> | DS |
| p. <i>en die bullets is daar</i> | DS |
| q. <i>en die neighbours onderaan (?)</i> | DS |

The final word of this extract is not clear on the audiotape, but the interpreter on the day interpreted the Afrikaans dialogue as follows:

(4) He said to him, *don't pay any notice to them, they're crazy*. There wasn't any shooting, there was no shooting incident. And he said but *sir*, the evidence is here, the exhibits are here and there was a shooting incident and the bullets are there and the neighbours have confirmed it.

Interestingly, parts of the interpretation are omitted in the official transcript reproduced as Extract 5 below: the first instruction to ignore them because they are 'crazy' and the formal address as 'sir' have been omitted by the transcriber. (These omissions are italicised in Extract 4). The omission of both these details detracts from the interpersonal meanings Mrs. de Souza is making, namely that Van Brakel constructs the De Souzas as insane and that the ordinary police officer refers to Van Brakel in a respectful manner, as is appropriate to his rank.

(5) He said to him, there wasn't any shooting, there was no shooting incident. And he said but the evidence is here, the exhibits are here and there was a shooting incident and the bullets are there and the neighbours have confirmed it.

It is significant that in this central incident of her testimony, the dialogue is presented in direct speech, which, as indicated earlier, is a marker of heightened emotional intensity. This intensity is also reflected in the shift into the HP in the verbal processes themselves: namely, from the past tense 'said' in clause (g) to the present tense 'se' [says] in clause (1).

It is also significant that Mrs de Souza switches into Afrikaans to recall the dialogue between the two policemen. She would almost certainly have used Afrikaans herself for all her own interactions with the police, yet the first dialogue between her and the police (Extract 1) was recalled in English. There are, I think, two possible reasons for the switch to Afrikaans. Firstly, at the beginning of her testimony, she would have been careful to use English considering the formal public nature of the TRC hearings, but by this point, when she is caught up with the reliving of her experiences, she code-switches into Afrikaans, which would have been a normal linguistic practice for her (McCormick, 2002).

Secondly, her use of Afrikaans is evaluative and part of her characterisation of the police, who were predominantly Afrikaans speaking and representatives of the Afrikaans-dominated apartheid state. It is a strategy to create an authentic voice for the police and their ideology of racial domination, and to position them as 'different' and 'other' in relation to her.

While one might want to argue that her use of repetition ('daar was nie geskietery nie' and 'die bewaarstuk is hierso') further serves to amplify the force of what she is saying, from the viewing of the audiovisual tape, it appears that she is adjusting to hearing the interpretation which would have started up when she switched into Afrikaans and which she was able to hear through her earphones. It seems unlikely, then, that in this context the repetition functions as a marker of evaluation.

Code-switching in TRC Testimonies

The code-switching into Afrikaans for the words of the police is a pattern among many testifiers from a range of language groups at the hearings. When recollecting painful moments, the words of the police are remembered verbatim. For example, Nomonde Calata, widow of one of the Cradock Four who were killed by the Security Branch in 1985, gave her testimony in Xhosa at the East London hearings in April 1996. She recalled how she was harassed by security police one night when they came to her home and threatened her, in Afrikaans, about her husband who was away at the time:

(6) uMr Venter wabuza uphi umyeni wakho ndathi eRhawutini. Ubuza in Afrikaans wathi kum, jy kan vir jou man se, hy kan maar wegkruip en *jy kan hom maar wegsteek - die dag dat ons hom kry, dan sal hy kak.*

A literal translation of this policeman's words (highlighted in bold italics) would be: 'you can tell your husband, he can hide himself and you can hide him away - the day that

we catch him, then he will shit'. In the official transcript, based on the simultaneous interpretation into English on the day of the hearing, this incident is recorded as follows:

(7) Mr. Venter asked me where my husband was. I told them that he was in Gauteng. He asked me this in Afrikaans and he said, *the day we find him he's going to be in very big trouble*.

The omission of the first part of the quote can be explained by the lapse in time as the Afrikaans/English interpreter took over from the Xhosa /English interpreter. The second major difference, namely the interpretation of 'dan sal hy kak' (*then he will shit*) as 'he's going to be in very big trouble' is an example of how the interpreters tended to 'tone down' vulgar and offensive language, thereby leading to further loss of interpersonal meanings (Du Plessis & Wiegand, 1998: 27).

Similarly, Muhammad Ferhelst, son of Minnie Ferhelst and a comrade of Colin de Souza, recalled the Security Branch (SB) captain's words to him as follows. Extract 8 is from the official transcript of Ferhelst's testimony:

(8) This captain burst into the room where I was laying, I was still in a shorts. He pulled me up, he said - can I use the exact words because like it's hard for me to forget what that man said today and like I tried to forget, but it's always there, this captain his name is Van Brakel. He came into that room, he and about four or five other SB's, he said to me, *jou slym etter gemors, ons het jou, ons gaan jou nou vrek maak*. You piece of trash, we have you now, now we going to kill you.

The interpreter on the day interpreted this as 'you piece of trash, we have you now, now we going to kill you' and, interestingly, both the Afrikaans and the English translation were recorded by the transcriber in the official transcription (see Extract 8). A more literal translation of the Afrikaans, however, would be: 'you slimy pus-oozing rubbish, we have you now, now we are going to kill you', an altogether more crude and offensive statement than the interpreted one. The use of the word, 'vrek' (*die*) further points to the dehumanising effect of these words, as this term is reserved for animals, 'dood' being the equivalent for humans.

It is evident from Extracts 6 and 8 that the interpreters toned down the crudeness of the language of the security police. Bock *et al.* (2006) argue that this is one of the ways in which meanings were lost in the interpretation processes of the TRC. However, further meanings were lost when the verbatim quotes were only recorded in translation on the TRC website. For example, in the official transcript of Ferhelst's testimony, the Afrikaans words are recorded, as well as the interpretation into English (see Extract 8). However, in the official transcript of Calata's testimony, based on the simultaneous interpretation into English on the day of the hearing, only the English interpretation is transcribed and the Afrikaans words have been omitted (see Extract 7). This has the effect of downplaying the emotional intensity of the experience as described by the testifier, thus resulting in a loss of narrative intensity and evaluative meanings.

As indicated by the examples, TRC testifiers used code-switching into Afrikaans to recall particularly offensive language use by the police as a strategy to characterise the police as brutal and inhumane and to position them for moral condemnation. It is a distancing mechanism - a way of constructing the police as 'the other'. In Schiffrin's terms, it enables the audience to 'hear' and 'see' the evilness of apartheid, thereby serving to heighten the dramatic tension and intensify the evaluative meanings. It functions to insert an ideologically aligned voice into the testimonies.

In the light of the above examples, I would argue that in multilingual contexts code-switching serves a complex evaluative function and should therefore be included in the current appraisal literature as an evaluation resource.

Analysis: Mrs Minnie Ferhelst

Mrs Minnie Ferhelst chose to give her 13-minute testimony in Afrikaans in this case, Afrikaans was simply the medium of communication she chose to use on that occasion, not a special means to express evaluative meanings (Duncan et al. 2006). The analysis of her testimony illustrates how shifts into the historical present tense serve an evaluative function and how these shifts were subtly lost in the simultaneous interpretation into English.

Like Mrs de Souza and Mrs Calata, her testimony centres around the dialogues she had with (predominantly) the security police. In the extract which follows, she recounts how Captain van Brakel interrogates her when she goes to the police station to take clean clothes to her son, who is incarcerated. Instead of accepting her son's clothes, Van Brakel asks her to identify photographs of young comrades of Bonteheuwel. The following Extract (9) is transcribed from a SABC audiovisual recording of her testimony. Extract (10) which follows is the official English interpretation which is published on the TRC website.

In the extract, the dialogue is presented in the historical present, as direct speech, and hence is a marker of evaluation. However, the verbal processes shift from the past tense (*het gese* - clauses b and g), to the historical present (*vra en se* - clauses i and m) as Mrs Ferhelst recalls how Van Brakel accused her of 'lying' and her son of being a 'gunman'. In the interpreted version, the interpreter has maintained the direct speech, but the verbal processes are all in the past tense (clauses a, f, h and k) thereby subtly reducing the evaluative marking of the dialogue and therefore the intensity of the emotional meanings:

- (9)
- | | | |
|----|--|----|
| a. | Hy het later begin te skree op my | P |
| b. | en <i>gesê</i> | P |
| c. | JY | DS |
| d. | jy ken hulle | DS |
| e. | hulle's gewoonte by jou huis kom | DS |
| f. | ons het foto's van hulle daar - wat ons daar - op jou yard
gevat het. | DS |
| g- | En ek <i>het gesê</i> | P |
| h. | nee, ek ken nie vir hulle nie. | DS |
| i. | En hy <i>vra</i> toe vir my | HP |
| j- | dat ja, hoekom lieg jy so? | DS |
| k. | Jou seun en daar's nog 'n ander seun - | DS |
| l. | hulle twee is die twee gunmans van Bonteheuwel. | DS |
| m. | En ek <i>sê</i> | HP |
| n. | Mnr van Brakel, jy't my huis al honderde kere en yard
deursoek, | DS |
| o. | hoekom het julle dan nooit 'n gun wapen gekry nie? | DS |
- (10)
- | | | |
|----|---|----|
| a. | he then <i>said</i> to me | P |
| b. | you are lying | DS |
| c. | you know them, | DS |
| d. | they are used to coming to your house, | DS |
| e. | we have taken pictures of them in your yard. | DS |
| f. | And I then <i>said</i> | P |
| g- | I don't know them. | DS |
| h. | And he then <i>asked</i> me | P |
| i. | why are you lying like this, | DS |
| j- | your son and another boy are the two gunmen of
Bonteheuwel | DS |
| k. | I then <i>said</i> to him | P |
| l. | Mr. van Brakel you have been to my house | DS |
| m. | and you've searched my yard hundreds of times, | DS |
| n. | how come you haven't come across any weapons
there. | DS |

The analysis shows that while, on this occasion, the interpreter captured the meaning of Mrs Ferhelst's testimony very accurately, there are still subtle losses of evaluative

meaning which detract from a full understanding of how she perceived and experienced the events.

Conclusion

The TRC took the decision to invite testifiers to testify in the language of their choice and to tell their story 'in their own words'. Thus, people who gave their testimonies at the public hearings could choose, to a large extent, how to present themselves and their experiences. The public records of these testimonies are themselves the result of a series of linguistic choices, both during the transcription and, in the case of testimonies given in languages other than English, the interpretation processes.

In this paper, I have argued that testifiers use subtle linguistic markers of evaluation, namely shifts into the historical present, direct speech and code-switching, to construct positions for themselves, the police and their audiences. In particular, I have argued that in multilingual contexts, code-switching functions as an appraisal resource. The evaluative meanings which this paper has explored are part of what the TRC refers to as a person's 'narrative truth', or how a person experienced the events that happened. Without a close linguistic analysis of these testimonies in the languages in which they were originally presented, we would be unable to appreciate fully these subtle meanings and hence their narrative truths. We would also be failing to recognise how these linguistic choices have shaped the public record and therefore affected the TRC's mission to establish 'as complete a picture as possible' of suffering under and resistance to apartheid.

Correspondence

Any correspondence should be directed to Ms. Zannie Bock, The Linguistic Department, The University of the Western Cape, Linguistics, Private Bag XI7, Bellville, 7535, South Africa (zbock@uwc.ac.za)

References

Bamberg, M. (ed.) (1997) Special issue: Oral versions of personal experience: Three decades of narrative analysis. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 7(14).

Bock, Z., Mazwi, N., Metula, S. and Mpolweni-Zantsi, N. (2006) An analysis of what has been 'lost' in the interpretation and transcription process of selected TRC testimonies. *Spil Plus* 33(1), 1-26.

Duncan, P., Bock, Z. and Hattingh, N. (2006) An analysis of how the narrator's role and the interpreting process impact upon the construal of experience in selected TRC testimonies. Paper presented at International Association of Translators and Interpreters (IATIS) Conference, University of the Western Cape, 12-15 July 2006.

Du Plessis, T. and Wiegand, C. (1998) Interpreting at the hearings of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission: April 1996 to February 1997. In A. Kruger, K. Wallmach and M. Boers (eds) *Language Facilitation and Development in South Africa* (pp. 25-30). Pretoria: Blue Chip Printing Services.

Johnstone, B. (1987) 'He says...so I said': Verb tense alternation and narrative depictions of authority in American English. *Linguistics* 25(1), 33-52.

Labov, W. (1972) *Language in the Inner City*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Labov, W. and Waletzky, J. (1967) Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experience. In J. Helm (ed.) *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts: Proceedings of the 1996 Annual Spring Meeting of the American Ethnological Society* (pp. 12-44). Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.

Lotriet, A. (1998) Interpreter training in South Africa: Needs and challenges. In A. Kruger, K. Wallmach and M. Boers (eds) *language Facilitation and Development in South Africa* (pp. 91-94). Pretoria: Blue Chip Printing Services.

Martin, J. (1997) Analysing genre: Functional parameters. In F. Christie and J. Martin (eds) *Genre and Institutions: Social Processes in the Workplace and School* (pp. 3-39). London: Cassell.

Martin, J. (2000) Beyond exchange: Appraisal systems in English. In S. Hunston and G. Thompson (eds) *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse* (pp. 142-219). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Martin, J. (2003) Introduction. *Text* 23 (2), 171-181.

Martin, J. and Rose, D. (2003) *Working with Discourse: Meaning Beyond the Clause*. London: Continuum.

Martin, J. and White, P. (2005) *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

McCormick, K. (2002) *Language in Cape Town's District Six*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Menard-Warwick, J. (2005) Transgression narratives, dialogic voicing and cultural change. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 9 (4), 533-556.

Ochs, E. and Schieffelin, B. (1989) Language has a heart. *Text* 9 (1), 7-25.

Page, R. (2003) An analysis of appraisal in childbirth narratives with special consideration of gender and storytelling style. *Text* 23 (2), 211-237.

SABC (1996) Video footage of Tygerberg-Helderberg hearings, 5 August, Day I, South African Broadcast Corporation.

Schiffrin, D. (1981) Tense variation in narrative. *Language* 57 (1), 45-62.

Thompson, G. and Hunston, S. (2000) Evaluation: An introduction. In S. Hunston and G. Thompson (eds) *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse* (pp. 1-27). New York: Oxford University Press.

TRC Report Volume One (1998) *Truth and Reconciliation of South Africa Report, Vol. 1*. Cape Town: Juta.

TRC website. TRC transcripts. *Truth and Reconciliation of South Africa, Vol, 4*. Cape Town: Juta. On WWW at www.doj.gov.za/trc (Accessed 17/3/05).