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Abstract:
In their coverage of the relationship between Meghan Markle and Prince Harry, the news of their engagement and the royal marriage, British newspapers exhibited a range of different responses, from fascination and approval to absolute criticism. On one hand, some newspapers demonstrated disparaging reactions which emphasized the fact that entrenched racism may not change in the British society. On the other hand, further British newspapers viewed the marriage of Prince Harry to a biracial American divorcee as proof that Britain has become more egalitarian, inclusive, and diverse. Therefore, the present study aims to analyse via the application of the Appraisal Model, as a theoretical framework, the racist attitude as might be reflected in eight different British newspapers with regard to the new Duchess of Sussex who has recently become a controversial figure. The study demonstrates whether the embedded attitude to racism in the British society has changed or been sustained. Attitude to racism is examined through the analysis of varied emotional reactions, judgement of behaviours and evaluation of entities. The discourse semantic structures utilized in the sample newspaper articles prove that the British society continues to embody the traditional idea of identity and that the marriage episode, though evidences change, fails to conceal its real picture.
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1. Introduction
Prince Harry’s relationship to Meghan Markle which started two years before they announced an engagement in November 2017until their marriage in 2018, has spurred a “fever pitch of media coverage and global public interest”, for which the bride’s identity and origin as a biracial American divorcee are the main reasons. (Rodriguez, 2018, par.1). In the coverage of this relationship, two main narratives have emerged: the first one emphasizes the fact that the royal wedding marks a break from royal traditions and signals a monarchy which is willing to adapt to changing social norms and to loosen its rigid rules. The second narrative foreshadows the royal wedding as a “splash of coffee in the premier symbol of whiteness in the UK”, according to Kehinde Andrews, an associate professor of sociology at Birmingham City University. In fact, both narratives overlook the intricate history of blood and race that has long existed in the British establishment. It should be noted that royals are obsessed with the idea of ‘royal blood’ and consider the interference of any distinct blood a scandal. However, some experts claim that Meghan Markle, whose father is white and whose mother is African-American, may not be the first black royal in British history as some historians argue that Queen Charlotte, the German wife of King George III, was Britain’s first black queen. They believe she has descended from a Portuguese royal family that had its origins in Africa. Nonetheless, other experts on the royal family dismissed this matter and considered it insignificant. According to some historians, “some mixed-race marriages among European royalty often went unacknowledged due to racism within both the royal family and European society at large” (Blakemore, 2018, par. 2).

Historically, the discriminatory practices of exclusion enacted in the British monarchy revealed racist connotations. For instance, in 1936 Edward VIII caused notoriety when he announced that he had to abandon the throne to marry the woman he loved: Wallis Simpson, who was “the only other American divorcee to marry into the royal family”. (Richardson, 2018, par. 1). Another instance of embedded racism was in the early 1950s when Queen Elizabeth II disapproved of Princess Margret’s marriage to a divorced pilot. Therefore, in light of these past instances, Meghan Markle “will likely be given the title ‘Her Royal Highness,’ rather than ‘Princess of Meghan’ because she does not come from ‘royal blood’” (Carrington, 2017, par. 9). As a matter of fact, “when it comes to identity there is always a wolf lurking somewhere ………Identity is an integral part of how we relate to people as individuals and as groups” (Younge, 2019: 10-11).

1.1. Aim of the Study
This study undertakes to explore newspaper writers’ attitude as manifested in the British press once news broke of a relationship between Prince Harry, the fifth-in-line to the throne and the feminist advocate Meghan Markle who is an American biracial divorcee. Eight newspaper articles are selected as samples to examine the two narratives that emerged during that time. The appraisal model is adopted as a theoretical framework and approach, since it best serves to explore and describe the linguistic resources by which writers reveal their attitudes towards the content of the discourse under analysis. Moreover, the study seeks to investigate by examining the three main aspects of attitude, namely: affect,
judgement and appreciation, whether or not the entrenched attitude to racism in the British society has changed or is still deep-rooted. During the course of the analysis, it is emphasized how these aspects may be positive or negative and ‘inscribed’ (explicitly presented in the articles) or ‘invoked’ (indirectly implied).

1.2. Research Questions

The present study seeks to answer the following questions:

- To what extent is the entrenched attitude to racism manifested in some British newspapers?
- How far is the appraisal model able to reveal how open and democratic Britain has become with regard to the royal marriage?
- What aspects of attitude are best deployed to reveal whether the entrenched ideologies of ethnicity and racism in Britain have changed or become relentless?

1.3. Research Methodology

The appraisal theory is implemented as an effective framework in the course of the analysis. “As a relatively new approach to linguistics, Appraisal System is compatible with the features of news reports” (Zhang and Liu, 2015: 2).

Hence, this study selects eight articles from some British newspapers as the object of the research with the purpose of revealing the newspaper writers’ attitude to the royal marriage of Prince Harry and Meghan Markle. The following subsections present a brief overview of the appraisal model and its main research methods: attitude, engagement and graduation. However, the domain of attitude is central to the analysis with its three main categories or values, namely: affect, judgement and appreciation.

1.3.1. The Appraisal Model: An Overview

The appraisal model of evaluation is groundbreaking in the field of linguistics, especially in the study of interpersonal meaning in different types of discourse. It evolved within the general theoretical framework of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), which “is a multi-perspectival model to provide analysts with contemporary lenses for interpreting language in use”, in the sense that, it focuses on the idea that “language is a resource for mapping ideational, interpersonal and textual meaning onto one another in virtually every act of communication” (Martin and White, 2005: 7).

Studying interpersonal meanings from the perspective of SFL proves insufficient with regard to “the interpretation of evaluative meaning—the speakers’ feelings, estimations, and their judgements on the values of various phenomena and experiences” (Martin, 2000: 124).

Therefore, Martin and his colleagues thought it was important to “shift their focus from grammar to lexis and accordingly, developed a systemic lexico-grammatical framework called Appraisal Theory” (Wei, Wherrity & Zhang, 2015: 235). In other words, there is a shift of focus from the level of clause to “a more lexically-based perspective, triggered in the first place by the need for a richer understanding of interpersonal meaning in monologic texts” (Martin and White, 2005: 8).

According to white (2001: 1), the appraisal framework is an approach “to exploring, describing and explaining the way language is used to evaluate, to adopt stances, to construct textual personas and to manage interpersonal positionings and relationships”. In other words, it refers to the discourse semantic resources such as words, structures and phrases that are used by writers or speakers to express their emotional reflections or responses, pass judgements on individuals’ behaviours/utterances according to the social norms, and appreciate phenomena or processes. Appraisal theory puts emphasis on “the linguistic resources by which writers or speakers can show their attitudes, take part in propositions, and classify the assessments of meanings. It is a multi-dimensional system which is made up of attitude, engagement, and graduation” (Zhang and Liu, 2015: 2).

Attitude is concerned with “resources speakers utilize for expressing positive and negative feelings involved in the construal of three main semantic domains, namely affect, judgement and appreciation” (De Souza, 2006: 532). Engagement is concerned with the semantic resources which serve as a means for the voice of the writer or speaker “to position itself with respect to, and hence to ‘engage’ with, the other voices and alternative positions construed as being in play in the current communicative context” (Martin and White, 2005: 94). Engagement is divided into two sub-systems, namely: ‘monogloss’ and ‘heterogloss’. The former is the ‘un-dialogized view’ in which the writer/speaker prevents any negotiations from other sounds by referring to bare assertions that do not need alternative viewpoints, while the latter exemplifies the writers/readers’ attitudinal assessment that creates a wide range of sounds and implores the readers to participate in these assumptions.

Graduation deals with “the upscaling and downscaling of negative or positive values and is oriented to amplifying feelings and blurring of categories” (Mugumya, 2013: 58), hence constitutes a general property of all attitudinal meanings of affect, judgement and appreciation. There are two axes across which graduation operates: force and focus. The former is concerned with “gradability of intensity or amount”, while the latter relates to “grading according to prototypicality and the preciseness by which category boundaries are drawn” (Martin and White, 2005: 137). In other words, ‘force’ can raise or lower the intensity of utterance; whereas ‘focus’ operates in terms of sharpness or softness of values.

It is worth mentioning that each of these three main semantic systems which constitute the appraisal model is further subdivided into subcategories according to specific attitudinal and linguistic aspects. It should be noted that this study focuses only on the attitudinal resources manifested in the eight British newspapers.

The forthcoming sub-section is devoted to analysing the first key sub-system of the appraisal model which is attitude.
1.3.1.1. Attitude in the Appraisal Model

Attitude, as a principal resource, relates to “feelings especially emotions, judgement of human behaviour and assessment of objects. It is revealed through a wide range of grammatical structures especially adjectives and is in turn constituted by three semantic regions, namely emotions, ethics and aesthetics” (Mugumya, 2013: 54). These semantic regions correspond to the sub-systems of affect, judgement, and appreciation respectively which are thoroughly scrutinized in the subsequent discussion.

1.3.1.1.1. Affect

According to White (2004: 11), affect “is concerned with emotional response and disposition”. It is realized via a wide range of grammatical structures. “These realisations comprise modification of participants and processes, affective mental and behavioural processes, and modal Adjuncts” (Martin and White, 2005: 46). Hence, the following examples are illustrative of the different manifestations of affect: affect as ‘quality’

- Describing participants: a sad captain
- Attributed to participants: the captain was sad
- Manner of processes: the captain left sadly

Affect as ‘process’

- Affective mental: his departure upset him
- He missed them
- Affective behavioural: the captain wept

Affect as ‘comment’

- Desiderative: sadly, he had to go

(Adapted from Martin and White, 2005: 46)

Some discourse semantic resources are suggested by Martina and White (2005) through which emotions are manifested. These resources are ordered by means of a typology of six variables:

Feelings can be positive or negative, in accordance with the fact that culture is responsible for constructive feelings on account of the negative or positive experiences.

Positive affect: the boy was happy
Negative affect: the boy was sad

Feelings can be manifested as “a surge of emotion involving some kind of embodied paralinguistic or extralinguistic manifestation, or more internally experienced as a kind of emotive state or ongoing mental process” (Martin and White, 2005:47). The difference between the ‘extralinguistic manifestation’ and an internal experience is elaborated as follows: behavioural process the boy wept

- Mental process/state: the boy disliked leaving/the boy felt sad
- Feelings can be manifested as “directed at or reacting to, some specific emotional Trigger or as a general ongoing mood” (Martin and White, 2005: 47). The difference between the two states can be codified as follows:
- reaction to other: the girl disliked the nanny
- undirected mood: the girl was sad

According to Martin and White (2005), there is a scale of intensity on which feelings can be graded towards a lower or a higher valued end.

- low: the woman disliked her job
- medium: the woman hated her job
- high: the woman detested her job

Feelings can involve intention “rather than reaction” vis-à-vis a stimulus that is “irrealis rather than realis” (Martin and White 2005: 46-49). This means there is a difference between feelings related to future and feelings that pertain to the present:

- realis affect: the man disliked the job
- irrealis affect: the man feared the job

It is worth noting that irrealis is further divided into fear and desire:

- fear: shake, cautious
- desire: propose, miss, yearn

The last variable categorizes emotions into three major sets that can be positive or negative:

un/happiness: the girl was cheerful/grief-stricken
- in/security: the girl was assured/anxious
- dis/satisfaction: the girl was involved/bored with

The following table demonstrates the three sets of emotions and their sub-categories:

Adapted from (Pekarova, 2011: 32)
The semantic domain of judgement refers to the assessment of human behaviour and character positively or negatively by reference to a set of moral, legal, and personal institutionalized norms. Thus, judgement is a term that evaluates socially acceptable or unacceptable demeanours, moral or immoral ways of conduct, legal or illegal behaviours and normal or abnormal appearances or performances. Martin and White (2005: 52) divide judgements into two broad categories: “those dealing with ‘social’ esteem and those dealing with ‘social sanction’.”

Judgements of ‘self-esteem’ involve evaluating a person’s performance and esteem in the community which can be positive or negative. They are divided into categories of ‘normality’ (“how special one is”, e.g., normal, eccentric), ‘capacity’ (“how capable one is”, e.g., expert, unaccomplished), ‘tenacity’ (“how dependable one is”, e.g., reliable, obstinate). While judgements of ‘self-sanction’ include positive or negative evaluations of issues pertaining to morality and legality; hence, corresponds to the two terms ‘propriety’ (“how far beyond reproach one is”, e.g., kind, snobby) and ‘veracity’ (“how truthful one is” e.g., credible, deceptive) respectively. (Martin and White, 2005: 53).

It is worth mentioning that judgements can be explicitly encoded ‘inscribed’ via attitudinal lexis which carry the judgement value. However, judgement values can be evoked or ‘invoked’ by ‘tokens’ of judgement, where judgement values are text-bound and triggered via ‘ideational meanings’, which have the potential in the culture to induce evaluations in readers who share the writer’s interpretations of the tokens or indications of the text. These evaluations depend on the readers’ cultural and social position.

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Un/happiness</th>
<th>unhappiness</th>
<th>Misery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>happiness</td>
<td>Antipathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In/security</td>
<td>Insecurity</td>
<td>Disquiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Surprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dis/satisfaction</td>
<td>Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>Ennui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Interest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.3.1.2 Judgement

Appreciation, as a semantic domain, incorporates values which fall under the “general heading of aesthetics, as well as a non-aesthetics category of ‘social valuation’” (White, 2004: 15). In other words, it is the system that encompasses the interpersonal resources used by speakers/writers to evaluate states of affairs, processes, natural phenomena, policies, products, entities and plans, either negatively or positively. Appreciation, according to Martin and White (2005: 56), can be divided into three sub-categories: “Reactions to things (do they catch our attention, do they please us?”, e.g., engaging and splendid vs. tedious and grotesque), ‘their composition (balance and complexity)’, e.g., harmonious and intransite vs. discordant and plain) and ‘their value (how innovative, authentic, timely, etc.)”, e.g., deep and original vs. insignificant and conventional.

In the foregoing discussion of attitudinal meanings of affect and judgement, a light has been shed on the fact that any discourse can reveal ‘inscribed’ or ‘invoked’ evaluations. Likewise, appreciations can be either explicitly presented in the text via attitudinal lexis, or implied in which language is used to denote negative or positive meanings; nevertheless, the interpretation of the meaning depends on the reader’s background.

### 1.3.1.3 Appreciation

It is worth mentioning that there are some strategies which writers/speakers use to indirectly instantiate attitudinal meanings of affect, judgement and appreciation. The first strategy is the use of lexical metaphors, which according to Martin and White (2005), are deployed for having the capacity to cause attitudinal responses in readers. Another strategy for indirect encoding of attitudinal meanings involves the use of ‘non-core lexical items’ which have “in some sense lexicalised a circumstance of manner by infusing it into the core meaning of a word” (Martin and White, 2005: 17). For instance, the word “toil can be unpacked as the ‘more’ core item work +the circumstance of manner hard and thus connotes and intensifies and attitudinal meaning of positive judgment (tenacity)” (De Souza, 2006: 535).

The forthcoming section is devoted to analysing the three attitudinal sub-systems, namely: affect, judgement and appreciation. It is shown that the varied semantic discourse structures which the writers of the British newspapers have utilized, has helped in delineating the mixed reactions of people in the British society following the news of a relationship between Prince Harry and Meghan Markle until the royal ceremony that took place in May 2018. Eight articles from different British newspapers have been selected as the corpus of this study.

### 2. The Analysis

The first article is from The Guardian and is entitled: The Royals and race: from Victoria and Abdul to Harry and Meghan. This article is written by Kate Williams who is a British author, historian and Professor of History. She echoes her
criticism on the importance of “unbroken lines of inheritance” in the British establishment, in order to ensure the flow of the “blue blood” as emblematic of “racial superiority”. Williams mentions some historical incidents as illustrative examples of the long embedded attitude to racism in Europe and the British establishment. As news broke of a relationship blossoming between Prince Harry and Meghan Markle and speculations of an anticipated engagement, she questions the idea of whether or not the British society is adapting to the changing social norms. However, her findings pinpoint the fact that the British society may not change their views because of the obvious manifestations of “racial undertones” by the British press. Williams uses a variety of discourse semantic structures for construing interpersonal meanings in this article.

In the opening statement, the writer states that “our society is still obsessed with ‘purity’ and is shocked that a royal could marry a person of color” (cf. Appendix1, extract1). Since the word ‘society’ stands for the British people, there is an ‘inscribed’ (explicit) judgement value of negative normality in which the writer criticizes the eccentric behaviour of the British people whose minds are still haunted by the idea that people of colour are not entitled to marry from the royal family. They think this will spoil the royal blood and break the "line of inheritance". Moreover, the adjective ‘shocked’ references an emotional reaction, hence indicates an ‘inscribed’ instantiation of negative affect because British people are said to be generally in the emotional state of insecurity because of the royal marriage.

The writer continues to say that “the obsession with bloodlines makes the idea of royals marrying people of color----difficult for the press and the public to stomach” (cf. Appendix1, extract2). The idiomatic expression ‘difficult to stomach’ indicates an implied or ‘evoked’ judgement value of negative capacity in which the press and public are pictured as unable to accept the royal marriage of Prince Harry and the divorced biracial American actress Meghan Markle. They conceive of her as an outcast who does not relate to the royal family. The writer continues to depict how the British society regards the idea of royals marrying people of color by saying “To bring non-white blood into the royal family is seen as the ultimate scandal” (cf. Appendix1, extract3).

'Ultimate scandal' is a phrase that inscribes a judgement value of negative propriety as according to the British establishment, marrying someone of color breaches the system of morality/immorality that is codified in the British culture. The author continues to highlight the entrenched racism in the British community by recalling how people behaved when Disney created a black princess called Tiana: “there was an outcry that she wasn’t a ‘real princess’” (cf. Appendix1, extract4). The word ‘outcry’ indicates a negative judgement value of normality because the writer criticizes people’s strange demonstrations of strong and angry protests against Tiana just because she was black.

Another article in The Telegraph entitled “Let Prince Harry and Meghan Markle’s wedding be a great national occasion” outlines the Telegraph’s views on the royal wedding. The article advocates the idea that a glimpse of hope is detected in the British establishment since 2002 when the Church of England blessed the marriage of divorced people and welcomed the marriage of Prince Harry and Meghan Markle. As indicated in the title, the article supports the royal marriage and believes it to be revolutionary, in the sense that, the rigorous old-fashioned beliefs and customs about royals marrying people of colour have changed and been substituted with new beliefs of openness and diversity.

The adjectives ‘great’ and ‘national’ in the title indicate a positive aesthetic evaluation of the impact of the royal wedding. The opening statement of the article states: “A divorced, mixed-race, Hollywood actress ----is to marry the next king. Such a sentence could simple not have been written a generation ago” (cf. Appendix B, extract1). The series of adjectives ‘divorced’, ‘mixed-race’ and ‘Hollywood actress’ that are used to describe Meghan, indicate an ‘inscribed’ negative evaluation of reaction in the British society who find it hard to accept Meghan’s identity and origin. These adjectives constitute intrinsic properties of the appraised human subject. The last sentence of the opening paragraph “such a sentence could simple not have been written a generation ago” is a token of judgement that suggests a judgement value of positive capacity because the writer praises the British establishment for its ability to change and become more inclusive and diverse.

The second paragraph states that the royal marriage is “emblematic of a nation that has changed utterly, no longer hidebound by stuffy tradition” (cf. Appendix B, extract2). The phrase ‘stuffy tradition’ is an instance of ‘inscribed’ negative appreciation of the intrinsic properties of the British establishment; it is a negative evaluation of the impact of the very serious, formal, boring and old-fashioned beliefs that lasted for long in the British monarchy, but which have, as the article emphasizes, changed when the royals decide to embrace the royal marriage. There is a sentence in the article that has been repeated twice to stress the fact that the royal marriage is seen as an emblem of change in a society that suffers from disintegration: “If there is ever an event that can draw our fractured nation together then this is it” (cf. Appendix B, extract3). The word ‘fractured’ instantiates an explicit ‘inscribed’ negative appreciation of the composition of the British nation that lacks harmony and unity. The article stresses the fact that the marriage of Prince Harry and Meghan Markle is able to unify the nation in order to pursue democracy and equality.

Further article from The Guardian, written by the editorial board and entitled “The Guardian View on Prince Harry and Meghan Markle: they’re engaged. That’s nice”, has been selected to echo the “racist undertones” following the announcement of the marriage of Prince Harry and Meghan Markle. The article depicts the royal marriage as something of little significance and impact via the usage of some adjectives and sentences. Moreover, it highlights the divisive attitude of the British society once engagement is announced. People’s differing responses are represented by the board as justifiable and acceptable.

The opening statement of the article encompasses some adjectives which describe the royal marriage “A royal wedding is a happy distraction. Fascinating, yes. Delightful, yes. Significant, not very” (cf. Appendix C, extract1). The usage of these adjectives “happy”, “fascinating” and “delightful” indicates an ‘inscribed’ positive appreciation of the impact of the marriage on the society; however, other adjectives are meant to depreciate and attenuate its effect “In a constitutional
sense, this wedding is not really an important event. It isn’t epochal” (cf. Appendix C, extract2). The description of the event as “not very significant”, “not really important” and “isn’t epochal” indicates an explicit negative evaluation or appreciation of the impact of the wedding. Moreover, tokens of appreciation which provoke a negative evaluation or appreciation of the royal marriage as being insignificant are illustrated in the following sentences: “it shouldn’t bear too much weight” and “Presidents and premiers need not be invited” (cf. Appendix C, extract2).

The article continues to emphasize the fact that there is a remarkable split in the British society by stating that “some will look in the other direction but a lot more will tune in--------There is nothing wrong with either response” (cf. Appendix C, extract3). The last sentence is a token of judgment which provokes a judgement value of positive normality because the board think that the discrepancy exemplified in the people’s differing responses is acceptable by virtue of the social norms, cultures and ideologies that are embedded in the British society. The fact that “some will look in the other direction” underlies feelings of rejection and anger, which shed lights on racism as an entrenched attitude that may not change regardless of the shift in the British establishment.

The article proceeds to explain the fact that Meghan’s identity and origins are “unprecedented-----but the striking thing is that such issues do not matter in the way they might once have done” (cf. Appendix C, extract4). The phrase ‘striking thing’ indicates a negative appreciation of the reaction of the British establishment towards the royal marriage, in the sense that, the issues of identity and origins used to constitute hindrances to the royals who wanted to marry people outside of the royal family, but currently, a drastic change is detected; however, is regarded by the society as unusual and upsetting.

Another article from The Guardian entitled “Wave of abuse: how Harry and Meghan endured media scrutiny”, sheds light on the British press’s attitude to racism as Prince Harry reveals his relationship with Megan Markle. The author of the article is plays extracts from a statement that was issued in 2016 by the communications secretary on behalf of Prince Harry. The statement attacks the British press because of “introducing ‘racial undertones” and highlights Prince Harry’s aversion for the abhorrent attacks on Meghan Markle. As indicated in the title of the article, the word ‘endured’ involves a judgement value of positive capacity because the writer praises the couple’s patience and perseverance in the face of the media which demonstrates an underlying racist attitude towards their relationship. The article quotes some sentences from the statement which reflect the Prince’s negative emotional responses towards these attacks: “the prince highlighted his distaste for the ‘racial undertones”’ (cf. Appendix D, extract1)and “Prince Harry is worried about Ms Markle’s safety and is deeply disappointed” (cf. Appendix D, extract2).

The three words ‘distaste’, ‘worried’ and ‘disappointed’ are explicit instantiations of affectual meanings construed as negative feelings in which Prince Harry is the emitter and the media attacks are the trigger. These words are inscriptions of unhappiness, insecurity and dissatisfaction. Moreover, the statement claims that Meghan “had been subjected to a wave of abuse and harassment” (cf. Appendix D, extract2). This sentence involves an explicit judgement value of negative propriety via the usage of the attitudinal words ‘abuse’ and ‘harassment’. The Prince’s press condemns the immoral and unjust behaviour of the media in its coverage of the relationship between Harry and Markle.

The article quotes some comments of the British editor and journalist Rachel Johnson on the royal marriage. Johnson’s comment if Prince Harry and Meghan Markle had children was: “the Windsors will thicken their watery, thin blue blood and Spencer pale skin and ginger hair with some rich and exotic DNA” (cf. Appendix D, extract3). The adjectives ‘watery’, ‘thin’ and ‘blue’ that she uses to describe the royal blood , ‘ginger’ to describe their hair and ‘Spencer’ and ‘pale’ to describe their skin, constitute intrinsic characteristics of the royal family, hence are all indicative of ‘royal superiority’. They suggest an appreciation value of positive composition which is concerned with the degree of detail and complexity an entity or a human subject presents. The fact that the royal marriage results in an undesirable change in the composition of these characteristics, implies a token of appreciation of negative composition. In other words, this foreign DNA has a negative impact on the delicate composition of the royal family.

An article from The Independent entitled “Meghan Markle: the royal family needs a desperate update—could a Trump-bashing American actress be the answer?”, and written by Will Gore, highlights media reaction upon the announcement of Prince Harry’s ‘anticipated engagement’ to Meghan Markle. The author conceives of the marriage as ‘major global news’ and thinks the British society has ‘moved on’ and has started to embrace ‘progressive values’ of openness and inclusion. However, he expresses his distress with ‘some of the forces’ which might fight ‘modernity’ and ‘globalisation’.

As indicated in the title, the phrase ‘desperate update’ suggests a judgement value of negative capacity because the writer thinks there is little hope in expecting the royals to change their deep-rooted old-fashioned customs and beliefs. In describing the horrible reaction of the media to the announcement of an anticipated engagement between Prince Harry and Meghan, the author uses a lexical metaphor which reflects the impact of the news “An erupting volcano is Bali was a mere trifle by comparison” (cf. Appendix E, extract1). As exemplified in the metaphor, the news of the anticipated engagement is compared to a volcano that erupts. This is a token of judgement that suggests a value of negative capacity because the public and the media are unable to accept news of the engagement.

The lexical metaphor implies negative affectual responses of anger and rejection which draw the attention to the entrenched attitude of racism in the British society. The deployment of this metaphor provokes negative attitudinal responses in the readers. The author describes the royal family twenty years agoas “most dysfunctional” (cf. Appendix E, extract2), which suggests a judgement value of negative normality. The writer criticizes their inability to exhibit usual and normal interpersonal behavior or interaction with regard to changing social norms. However, as news broke of an anticipated engagement, the writer wonders about Markle’s “ethniciy” as not being “a point of great debate—as it should be”(cf. Appendix E, extract3). He suggests that “the lack of agitation” means “that the British society has largely moved on.
and that the royal family has moved on with it: this union thus stands as important statement about the degree to which progressive values and diversity have been entrenched in the UK mainstream” (cf. Appendix E, extract3).

The fact that Meghan’s ‘ethnicity’ is not ‘a point of debate’ and that the royal family ‘has moved on’ are suggestive of a judgement value of positive propriety in terms of the royals’ acceptance of and adaptation to the changing social norms and standards. Moreover, considering the ‘union’ of Prince Harry and Meghan Markle as “important statement about the degree to which progressive values and diversity have been entrenched in the UK mainstream”, is again a token of judgement that indicates a judgement value of positive propriety since it indicates that Britain has become morefair, inclusive and diverse.

Towards the end of the article, the writer expresses his feelings of concern about some people who might not be able to cope with the idea of changing norms. He states that “anxieties about globalisation and fear of modernisation are threatening to drive a reversion among many in the British society to the insular attitudes of a bygone age” (cf. Appendix E, extract4). The three words ‘anxieties’, ‘fear’ and ‘threaten’ are explicit instantiations of negative affect; they construe negative affectual meanings of insecurity that might be experienced among some British people as response to ‘modernity’. The writer also inscribes a judgement value of negative capacity and tenacity because believes that some British people, as a result of their fear of change, might lack the ability and perseverence to ‘move on’ in a changing world.

The Telegraph has published an artice entitled “Prince Harry and Meghan Markle: a seismic shift for the establishment” in which the author Harry Mount references some historical instances which emphasize how the Royal establishment ‘was rebuilt’ and ‘revolutionised’. He starts by referring to Diana’s divorce and death, the divorce of three of the queen’s children, moving on to the marriage of Prince Charles and Camilla Parker who are both divorced, and finally refers to the marriage of Prince Harry and Meghan Markle. The phrase “seismic shift” in the title of the article and the writer’s description of the royal marriage as a “glorious fairytale” imply a positive valuation utilized by the author to express the social significance of the royal marriage in relation to the culturally and ideologically established conventions in the British society.

Moreover, the author’s usage of sentences such as “revolutionized the royal family” (cf. Appendix F, extract1) and “Windsor was rebuilt more beautifully and safely” (cf. Appendix E, extract2) invoke judgement of positive capacity. The writer praises the royals’ ability to change and adapt to the modern age. He elaborates on the same idea by stating “Again, the royal family is playing catch-up with an increasingly multicultural Britain” (cf. Appendix E, extract3). The idiomatic expression ‘catch-up with’ invokes a judgement value of positive capacity and tenacity because the author thinks the royals are trying to cope with the changing norms with patience, bravery and perseverence. It is worth mentioning that the author in the article refers to some historical occurrences when the monarchy was ‘a little behind the mood of the nation’. He starts by referring to Edward VIII who had to abandon the throne to marry the American divorcee Wallis Simpson whom he loved.

A similar situation was when the monarchy prevented Princess Margret from marrying the divorced Captain Peter Townsend. Building on these past incidents, the author states that Prince Harry “is just returning to a century-old tradition in finding bride outside England” (cf. Appendix E, extract4), and he further stresses the idea that “for a royal to marry an American isn’t unprecedented”. These two declarations invoke a judgement value of positive normality because the writer believes that the Prince Harry’s choice to marry outside of the royal family is not something original or inappropriate. As a matter of fact, these two tokens of judgement provoke readers to develop judgement responses with regard to the royal marriage.

Two articles whose titles include the word ‘racist’ highlight the fact that attitude to racism is entrenched in the British society no matter how the British establishment is trying to adapt to the modern age. Few extracts are taken from these articles. The two articles are from The Independent and are entitled “Princess Margret of Kent wears ‘racist’ brooch to Queen’s Christmas lunch attended by Meghan Markle” and “Meghan Markle and Prince Harry receive ‘racist letter’ in package containing white powder”.

The first article refers to the event when Princess Michael of Kent wears a ‘blackamoor brooch’ at a Christmas lunch that was attended by Meghan Markle. In fact, this kind of jewellery is a ‘European art style’ that portrays African males in ‘subservient forms’. The first line of the first paragraph states “Princess Michael of Kent has caused controversy by wearing a ‘racist’ brooch” (cf. Appendix G, extract1). This sentence invokes a judgement value of negative propriety by reference to the system of morality/immorality. The Princess is thought to have breached this system. The author continues to say that “she was widely condemned for wearing the ‘blatantly racist’ piece to the palace” (cf. Appendix G, extract2).This sentence invokes a judgement value of positive propriety. The people condemn the Princess for such an unethical action. Towards the end of the article, the author states that “The brooch is not Princess Michael’s first brush with racial controversy” (cf. Appendix G, extract3). This sentence invokes a judgement value of negative propriety because the author accuses the Princess of demonstrating blatant racist attitude beforeto ‘black New Yorkers’.

The second article demonstrates an incidence when a ‘racist’ letter has been sent to ‘Prince Harry and his fiancée Meghan Markle’ in a ‘package containing white powder’ which is confirmed ‘as non-suspicious’. The article states that the “anti-terror team were investigating after ‘malicious communications’------in what they have branded as ‘racist hate crime’” (cf. Appendix H, extract1). The phrase ‘malicious communications’ is an explicit evaluation of the negative reaction of this letter on Meghan Markle because of its hateful quality. Moreover, the word ‘hate’ construes negative affectual meanings of unhappiness and dissatisfaction which the British people experience as emotional reflections to the royal marriage. These two instances are evident of the entrenched attitude to racism in the British society.
3. Conclusion

The present study has aimed to analyse newspaper writers’ attitude once news broke of a relationship between Prince Harry and Meghan Markle. Eight British newspaper articles have been selected as samples to scrutinize the two emerging narratives which are evident of a fracture in the British society. During the course of the analysis, it is witnessed that some British newspapers advocate the idea that the royal marriage is emblematic of how egalitarian the British monarchy has become, and conceive of it as a positive step towards openness and diversity. Nonetheless, other newspaper articles question this change and launch severe attacks on Meghan in the form of ‘racial undertones’ and abusive nominations.

It should be noted that the appraisal model has helped in highlighting the fact that despite the evident shift and remarkable change in the British establishment as exemplified in the royal marriage of the biracial Meghan Markle to Prince Harry, it has been proven that racist attitudes and conceptions are entrenched in the British society; moreover, linguistic aspects of attitude, namely: affect, judgement and appreciation, which are deployed in the course of the analysis, have substantiated that these ‘stuffy’ racist views may not change despite the ‘seismic shift’ in the British establishment. Concerning the values of affect, some semantic discourse structures are utilized in some British newspaper articles to express the negative emotional reflections with regard to the marriage of Prince Harry and Meghan Markle. These emotional responses are exemplified in words such as ‘hate’, ‘fear’ and ‘distaste’. Furthermore, judgement values of negative / positive capacity, propriety and tenacity are deployed to shed light on the old-fashioned traditions and beliefs of the British establishment as demonstrated in eccentric behaviours and racist attitudes versus an evident capacity for change. Finally, reaction, composition and valuation as values of appreciation are evident in the course of the analysis for expressing the positive and the negative evaluation of some entities and human subjects. For instance, appreciations are exemplified in the description of Meghan Markle as ‘divorced biracial Hollywood actresses’ and the royal marriage as ‘great national occasion’.
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The Guardian: The Royals and race: from Victoria and Abdul to Harry and Meghan.

Extract1
Our society is still obsessed with ‘purity’ and is shocked that a royal could marry a person of colour

Extract2
The obsession with bloodlines makes the idea of royals marrying people of colour – or even having non-white heritage themselves – difficult for the press and public to stomach. Royals tend to be offered a small circle of potential spouses – the same class, religion and ethnicity. Thus Diana Spencer, from a pre-eminent aristocratic family, was celebrated as the “first commoner” to marry an heir since 1659. And after her divorce, when the princess dated first the surgeon Hasnat Khan and then Dodi Fayed, the press hysteria had racist undertones.

Extract3
To bring non-white blood into the royal family is seen as the ultimate scandal. In 1664, Louis XIV of France’s second daughter, Marie Anne, was born early. The rumour grew that she was a black child, probably fathered by the queen’s African dwarf, Nabo. But witness accounts say she was not black but “very dark”, and it may be that she was of the purplish colour that can denote oxygen deprivation in premature babies – she had a weak constitution and died not long after her birth.

Extract4
Similarly, when Disney created a black princess, Tiana, in their retelling of The Princess and the Frog in 2009, there was outcry that she wasn’t a “real princess”. Princesses, it seems, must be pale, blue-eyed and beautiful and anyone who is not is of a lesser status. When the food writer Emma McQuiston, who starred on the cover of Tatler as “Britain’s First Black Marchioness”, married the heir to Longleat, Viscount Weymouth, the groom said his mother’s reaction was: “Are you sure about what you’re doing to 400 years of bloodline?”

The Telegraph: “Let Prince Harry and Meghan Markle’s wedding be a great national occasion”

Extract1
A divorced, mixed-race, Hollywood actress who attended a Roman Catholic school is to marry the son of the next King. Such a sentence could simply not have been written a generation ago.

Extract2
The forthcoming nuptials of Prince Harry and his American fiancée Meghan Markle are emblematic of a nation that has changed utterly, no longer hidebound by stuffy tradition and populated by Establishment courtiers seeking to prove Shakespeare’s observation that the course of true love never did run smooth.
After his time in the Army he has become a champion for disabled ex-servicemen and women, playing a prominent role in helping to set up and promote the Invictus Games, which were staged for the third time in Toronto in September. Their success is a tribute to Prince Harry’s hard work and commitment to the cause. If there is ever an event that can draw our fractured nation together then this is it.


A royal wedding is a happy distraction. Fascinating, yes. Delightful, yes. Significant, not very

In a constitutional sense, this wedding is not really an important event. It isn’t epochal. It shouldn’t be asked to bear too much weight. Prince Harry is only fifth in line to the throne, and about to sink to sixth. He is not going to be head of state. Presidents and premiers need not be invited.

The younger Harry could often be foolish, but there’s rightly a lot of affection for him these days – and everyone likes a wedding. When the big day comes, some will look in the other direction, but a lot more will tune in. It will be a public celebration. There’s nothing wrong with either response.

Ms Markle’s Americanness, mixed race, acting career and divorce are all interesting. None of them, though, is unprecedented among the royals. The striking thing is that such issues do not matter in the way they might once have done.

In revealing relationship with mixed-race US actor, the prince highlighted his distaste for the ‘racial undertones’ of British press

The prince’s press secretary accused the media of introducing “racial overtones” into comment pieces on his relationship with Markle and claimed that she had been subjected to a “wave of abuse and harassment”. It added: “Prince Harry is worried about Ms Markle’s safety and is deeply disappointed that he has not been able to protect her.”

As speculation about their relationship grew in the months before this statement, articles had included a Sun piece headlined “Harry girl’s on Pornhub”, which was about clips of Markle from the legal drama series Suits appearing on an adult website, and a comment in the Mail on Sunday by Rachel Johnson that said if the couple had children “the Windsors will thicken their watery, thin blue blood and Spencer pale skin and ginger hair with some rich and exotic DNA”. Markle’s father, Thomas, is white and her mother, Doria Ragland, is African American. Johnson denied the comment was racist, but the prince was upset.

The announcement of Prince Harry’s widely anticipated engagement to the US actress Meghan Markle sent the world’s media into paroxysms of excitement. An erupting volcano in Bali was a mere trifle by comparison. Indeed, with all eyes on the betrothed couple as they took a photocall in the grounds of Kensington Palace, the volcano might just as well have gone back to sleep.

Perhaps we shouldn’t be surprised. Harry is a member of the world’s most famous royal family, while Markle is a poster girl for American television: he, the product of a British aristocracy at its most dysfunctional; she the mixed-race child of an LA psychotherapist and an Emmy award-winning lighting director. It has modern-day fairytale written all over it.

What is interesting insofar as the upcoming nuptials are concerned, however, is not that her ethnicity is a point of great debate; but that it is not. That is as it should be, yet it is hard not to suspect that in the not so distant past there would have been a great deal of flustered twittering both in aristocratic circles and among certain sections of the wider public.
The lack of agitation suggests that British society has largely moved on and that the royal family has moved on with it: this union thus stands as important statement about the degree to which progressive values and diversity have been entrenched in the UK mainstream.

**Extract4**

Paradoxically, some of the forces which have taken us down the road to EU withdrawal – anxieties about globalisation and fear of modernity – are threatening to drive a reversion among many in British society to the insular attitudes of a bygone age.

*The Telegraph*: “Prince Harry and Meghan Markle: a seismic shift for the establishment”

**Extract1**

We all know how that fairytale ended. Princess Diana’s free, unbiddable spirit, her divorce and death revolutionized the Royal Family – and put a rocket-booster under the glacial evolution of the Establishment.

**Extract2**

A quarter of a century on, and the Royal Family is on far firmer foundations. Windsor was rebuilt more beautifully and more safely. Royal finances were boosted by opening Buckingham Palace to the public. And, slowly, royal mores caught up with the nation’s outlook.

**Extract3**

What is certainly unprecedented in British royal circles, however, is Meghan Markle’s mixed heritage background. Again, the Royal Family is playing catch-up with an increasingly multicultural Britain. Even the upper classes live in a less hermetically sealed world than one might think.

**Extract4**

Meghan’s foreign origins are hardly a problem, either. In fact, Prince Harry is just returning to a centuries-old tradition in finding a royal bride outside England. Before his father’s wedding to Lady Diana Spencer in 1981, the last English girl to marry the heir to the throne was Lady Anne Hyde, who, in 1660, married the Duke of York, later James II.

*The Independent*: “Princess Margret of kent wears ‘racist’ brooch to Queen’s Christmas lunch attended by Meghan Markle”

**Extract1**

Princess Michael of Kent has caused controversy by wearing a “racist” brooch to the Queen’s Christmas lunch at Buckingham Palace, that was also attended by Prince Harry’s mixed-race fiancee Meghan Markle.

**Extract2**

It is not clear if Princess Michael was still wearing the brooch - which depicts a black man in a gold headdress - as the two met. But she was widely condemned for wearing the “blatantly racist” piece to the Palace.

**Extract3**

The brooch is not Princess Michael’s first brush with racial controversy. In 2004, she denied telling a group of black New Yorkers to “go back to the colonies” because she felt they were being rowdy in a restaurant.

*The Independent*: “Meghan Markle and Prince Harry receive ‘racist letter’ in package containing white powder”.

**Extract1**

“Officers are also investigating an allegation of malicious communications which relates to the same package, and it is being treated as a racist hate crime.”