Humboldt Universität zu Berlin
Centre for British Studies

The British media and the monarchy

Elizabeth the Dutiful or Elizabeth the Last?
The press perception of Queen Elizabeth II in the UK 1997-2007

Master thesis in the MBS Course 2006/2008

Emilia Zaperta
Krausnickstr 23
10115 Berlin
Tel: 0151-14467347
Email: e_zaperta@hotmail.com
Matriculation number: 512547

Supervised by:

Rita Gerlach

Contents

1 Introduction

"If the present Queen were ever to acquire a soubriquet like Alfred the Great or Edward the Confessor, it would surely be "Elizabeth the Dutiful""[1], concluded the *Daily Telegraph* in an article published in the year of the Queen's golden jubilee. The *Guardian*, however, has been engaged in the debate about the end of the monarchy and thus labelled Queen Elizabeth II "Elizabeth the Last"[2]. These two examples illustrate the interest of the British press in the discussion about the monarchy in the United Kingdom, and in particular about the present sovereign, Queen Elizabeth II. The institution of monarchy has survived in Britain for over one millennium[3], with Queen Elizabeth II occupying the throne for the last fifty-five years[4]. Not surprisingly, the Queen has been an object of intense media attention throughout her whole reign, perhaps even more than the heads of state in other democratic countries. There are three main reasons as to why Elizabeth II generates such intense media interest. Firstly, she is considered to be the symbol of British nationhood. Secondly, she comes under the spotlight as an individual person together with her family. Last but not least, as a constitutional head of state and therefore the most important representative of the institution of monarchy, the Queen provides the focal point for the tentative debate that is taking place in the UK between the supporters of a monarchy and the advocates of a republic. The springboard for this debate is the mass media. Even though the Queen is not the subject of daily media

[1] Andrew Roberts. "A loss to remember before we rejoice in the Jubilee", *The Sunday Telegraph*, 6 January 2002, p. 25.
[2] Jonathan Freedland. "Elizabeth the Last", *The Guardian*, 21 April 2006, p. 6.
[3] In the British history there is an eleven-year period (1649 – 1660) of republican rule under Oliver Cromwell and his son Richard.
[4] Only three other British monarchs had a chance to celebrate their golden jubilees. These are: Edward III, George III and Queen Victoria, whereas only George III and Queen Victoria were sovereigns of both England and Scotland.

reports, key royal events such as important anniversaries or occasional public appearances result in intensive media coverage not only in the UK but also abroad.[5]

It may be surprising, but in the abundance of the material devoted to the present Queen, there is relatively little academic study dealing with the issue of Queen Elizabeth II's image in the mass media.[6] This thesis intends to contribute towards the analysis of the media's portrayal of the Queen by looking at the British press. I have specifically chosen to concentrate on the press analysis because of the importance of this medium in the British context. Not only are the British the third biggest newspaper buyers of the world, but also nearly eighty per cent of all households buy a copy of a newspaper each day.[7] I have confined my analysis to two well-established representatives of the British press, the *Daily Telegraph* and the *Guardian*. The reasons for that are twofold. Firstly, in terms of circulation figures both newspapers were leading in 1998 in the quality sector. Although by now the *Guardian* has been superseded by the *Times*, it is still the third most circulated quality in the UK. Secondly, since the discussion about the Queen may be determined by political factors, these newspapers represent the two ends of the political spectrum, the *Daily Telegraph* on the right and the *Guardian* on the left. Their Sunday sister papers, the *Sunday Telegraph* and the *Observer*, are under the same ownership and demonstrate the same political orientation as the respective dailies. Therefore, their content will be treated as an expression of their corporate identity. In this study I aim to answer the question how the Queen has been represented in these newspapers over the last ten years.

---

[5] See, for example: "Same procedure as every year", *Der Tagesspiegel*, 7 November 2007, p. 1; Thomas Kielinger. "Wie vor 60 Jahren: Erst Westminster Abbey, dann Malta", *Berliner Morgenpost*, 20 November 2007, p. 1.

[6] For a list of titles dealing with the symbolic representations of royalty in the British press see: Michael Billig. *Talking of the Royal Family*, London: Routledge, 1998 (1992), p. 14. The current interest in the topic may be discerned from a new Wikipedia entry on "Personality and image of Queen Elizabeth II" dating from September 2007. Available at: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Personality_and_image_of_Queen_Elizabeth_II. Last viewed 1 December 2007.

[7] James O'Driscoll. *Britain* (Rev. and upd. ed.), Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, p. 151.

When analysing the image of the Queen, it is impossible to neglect the issue of the symbolic role of the monarchy and its significance for British nationhood. In line with the recent view on nations as constructs, as imagined political communities[8], it is possible to regard national myths, values and collective memories as cultural inventions as well. According to Eric Hobsbawm, the splendour which permeates the public rituals and ceremonies of the British monarchy is such a late nineteenth and twentieth century invention.[9] David Cannadine perceives the invention of royal traditions in Great Britain as a result of the dramatic developments that the country was undergoing between 1870s and 1914.[10] A gradual withdrawal of British monarchs from politics and their simultaneous loss of power was substituted with the pageantry of royal rituals, which helped project the image of a powerless, but celebrated monarch as a binding symbol of continuity and national identity.[11] Of particular importance in the distribution of this new image of the monarch as a head of the nation was media development initiated in the 1880s.[12] The emergence of the popular press contributed to the elevation of the symbolic role of the monarchy by representing it not only in a straightforward and lively but also sentimental and emotional way.[13] As Michael Billig notices, the process is still ongoing. The constant media news about royalty ensures that the established nation-state is daily reproduced, and reminds the British citizens "about the family which symbolically represents [their] nationhood".[14]

The analytical framework of the present study of the press representation of Queen Elizabeth II embraces a blend of research areas. It is particularly deeply

[8] Benedict Anderson. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso, 1983, p. 6.
[9] Cf. Eric Hobsbawm. "Introduction: Inventing Traditions", in E. Hobsbawm and T. Ranger (eds) *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983, p. 1.
[10] Cf. David Cannadine. *Die Erfindung der Britischen Monarchie 1820-1994*, Berlin: Verlag Klaus Wagenbach, 1994 (1983), p. 24, (my translation).
[11] Cf. Ibid.
[12] Cf. Ibid.
[13] Cf. Ibid., p. 25.
[14] Billig, (1998), p. xii.

indebted to two currents within the contemporary study of culture. The first debt is to British cultural studies which, as a broadly understood text science, enables the analysis of cultural phenomena as texts.[15] The second debt is to media studies that have developed to examine the significance of mass media in contemporary society.[16] The common ground for both of these sciences is their preoccupation with texts in a broad sense. My approach to text in this framework is essentially linguistic, by text I mean the written text of a newspaper article. Therefore, layout and the visual organisation of pages will not be analysed in this thesis. Considering the media-cultural influence, it is necessary to point out the signifying power of the media, i.e. "the power to represent things in particular ways".[17] This is to a great extent a matter of how language is used. In the press articles about the present Queen, cultural analysts can find a treasure-store of information that may serve as a material for analysing the Queen's representations. It is partially possible thanks to Roland Barthes's theory of semiology. Semiotic methods, rooted in structuralist linguistics, are concerned with the process of linguistic signification, i.e. "the mechanisms by which meanings are produced".[18] Since signs are used "to describe and interpret the world, it often seems that their function is simply to 'denote' something", to communicate a fact.[19] However, along with the primary (denotative) meaning, every sign carries some further associations, called 'connotations'.[20] Thus semiotic approaches are useful for making explicit what is usually implicit in the texts.[21] The basic premise is that in various signs, like words, for instance, it is

[15] Cf. Roy Sommer. *Grundkurs Cultural Studies/ Kulturwissenschaft Grossbritannien*, Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Sprachen, 2003, p. 9.
[16] See, for instance: John B. Thompson. *The media and modernity : a social theory of the media*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1997.
[17] Norman Fairclough. *Media discourse*, London: Arnold, 1995, p. 2.
[18] John Storey. *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture : an Introduction* (3rd edn), Harlow [u.a.] : Longman, 2001, p. 64.
[19] Jonathan Bignell. *Media Semiotics. An Introduction* (2nd edn), Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002, p. 16.
[20] Cf. Ibid.
[21] Cf. Storey (2001), p. 65.

possible to decode cultural values and "ideologically potent categories and classifications"[22]. To decode these concealed, secondary meanings, it is necessary to identify linguistic signs and interpret them. The interpretation of a text is context-dependent and may be influenced by three aspects. These are: the location of the text (in the case of the present thesis either the *Guardian* or the *Daily Telegraph* or their Sunday sister papers), the historical moment, i.e. the publishing date and the events surrounding it, and the nature of the readers.[23] Therefore, any interpretation "is a product of an interface between the properties of the text and the interpretative resources and practices which the interpreter brings to bear upon the text"[24].

The present thesis will examine the press image of Queen Elizabeth II in the last decade. I will apply the tools of literary analysis[25] to interpreting press articles, i.e. non-literary texts, while keeping in mind the fundamental differences between fictional and non-fictional texts. To start with, I will examine the structure, style and argumentation manifest in the articles. Next, I shall focus upon such linguistic features as figures of speech, images and strategies implemented by the authors of the articles to illustrate their way of constructing the image of the Queen. The analysis embraces six articles selected from two British national quality dailies, the *Daily Telegraph* and the *Guardian*, and their Sunday sister papers, the *Sunday Telegraph* and the *Observer*, covering the period between 1997 and 2006. As far as the selection criteria for the articles are concerned[26], my first consideration was to find articles marking what could be defined as key events in the last decade of the

[22] Fairclough (1995), p. 24.
[23] Cf. Storey (2001), p. 66. See also: Catherine Belsey. "Textual Analysis as a Research Method", in G. Griffin (ed.) *Research Methods for English Studies*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005, p. 166.
[24] Fairclough (1995), p. 16.
[25] Preparing this thesis, I derived information about the elements of literary analysis from: Richard Taylor. *Understanding the Elements of Literature. Its Forms, Techniques and Cultural Conventions*, London: The Macmillan Press, 1981.
[26] For considerations about the difficulties in sampling for newspaper studies see: Magnus Ljung. "Newspaper Genres and Newspaper English", in F. Ungerer (ed.) *English Media Texts – Past and Present. Language and Textual Structure*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2000, p. 132.

Queen's reign. As a result, three events have been chosen. Since I shall comment on the circumstances surrounding these events in the analyses in Chapter 3, only a short outline of them follows. First, the comments on the Queen's reaction to the death of Princess Diana will be examined. Second, I will look at the comments dedicated to commemorate the Queen's fifty years on the throne. Third, I will analyse the press reactions to Elizabeth II's 80th birthday. Another criterion in the selection of the articles was the same date of the targeting articles. However, in one case I decided to make an exception to this rule. This concerns the articles marking the Queen's fifty years on the throne. Thus I have collected two articles from Sunday editions of the analysed dailies, the *Sunday Telegraph* and the *Observer* from 7 September 1997, one article from 3 June 2002 from the *Guardian* and one from the *Daily Telegraph* dating from 2 June 2003, and a pair of articles from 21 April 2006 from the *Daily Telegraph* and the *Guardian* (cf. Appendices). Bearing in mind the fact that "the outputs on Saturdays, Sundays and public holidays differ in major ways from those published on weekdays"[27], I have decided to prioritise other selection criteria over the attempt to gather articles from the weekday issues only. This was felt to be justifiable due to the cultural nature of my analytical approach and the character of the object of analysis, which is the Queen's representation in the press, rather than a systematic comparison of various newspaper issues. Further, I limited the genres of the material and looked for leading articles, or articles in comment or opinion sections of the papers rather than news reports. Finally, I tried to find articles of a comparable size to ensure a balanced data.

The structure of the present thesis is as follows. The thesis begins with a brief introduction into the nature of mass media. Since the thesis aims to analyse the press perception of Queen Elizabeth II, I will next narrow down my object of investigation

[27] Cf. Ljung (2000), p. 132.

to outline the press landscape in the UK. Subsequently, the two newspapers selected for my analysis, the *Daily Telegraph* and the *Guardian*, will be characterised shortly. The third chapter turns to the analysis of both the headlines and the selected press articles. This chapter consists of three subsections dedicated to the analysis of press comments on three important events in the Queen's life in the last decennium. First, the reporting of the Queen's reaction to the death of the Princess of Wales, Diana Spencer, in 1997 will be examined. Second, I will analyse the coverage of the fiftieth anniversary of the coronation that took place in 2003 and, finally, the press comments on the Queen's eightieth birthday in 2006. Finally, I will round up this section with a more comprehensive comparison of the similarities and differences in the representation of the Queen in the *Daily Telegraph* and the *Guardian*.

2 Mass media

As Negrine points out, "the mass media are at the heart of the processes of communication" in contemporary society.[28] The mass media, generally considered to be the major sources of information about current world events and about political and social affairs,[29] have immense potential power and influence to represent the world in particular ways, and, in turn, to contribute to the formation of specific attitudes and opinions among the public. In this chapter I will briefly discuss some conditions under which press messages are produced and communicated.

One of the most important features of mass media communication is its impersonal character. Newspapers, which are of particular importance for this thesis,

[28] Ralph Negrine. *Politics and the Mass Media in Britain* (2nd edn), London: Routledge, 1994, p. 2.
[29] Negrine (1994), p. 1. More specifically, the notion mass communication media is understood to embrace the following sectors: publishing, the press, broadcasting, film, and telecommunications industries. Cf. John Eldridge, Jenny Kitzinger and Kevin Williams. *The Mass Media and Power in Modern Britain*, Oxford [u.a.]: Oxford University Press, 1997, p. 4.

gather information about their readers mostly on the basis of advertising, circulation, readership surveys and occasional letters to the editor, which results in the tendency to treat them "as audiences – statistical aggregates of individuals",[30] in contrast to the actual readers, i.e. particular people. On the other hand, journalists are often understood as reflecting the newspaper's position.[31] According to Negrine, this is justifiable because journalists actually have only some limited writing autonomy, and they usually represent an institutional voice of a particular newspaper.[32] This is related to the journalists' dependence on "the power of proprietors – whether as individuals or as representatives of conglomerate ownership".[33] The relationship between the ownership and control of the editorial content of newspapers has major implications for the nature of its practices and texts, because "in general it is those who already have other forms of economic, political or cultural power that have the best access to the media".[34] This explains why media discourse may be interpreted as "an ideological representation of the world".[35] The mass media set the terms of what is significant and have the power to impress their own definitions of the world.

At this point, the general introduction into the nature of mass communication and its implications for the character of various media texts and practices should be complemented with an outline of the press landscape in the UK, which will provide a more specific socio-economic context for the subsequent analysis of press articles in Chapter 3.

[30] Peter Dahlgren. "Introduction", in P. Dahlgren and C. Sparks (eds) *Journalism as popular culture*, London [u. a.]: Sage Publications, 1992, p. 17.
[31] Fred Fiske. "Columnist vs. the institutional voice", *The Masthead*, Winter 1997. http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3771/is_199701/ai_n8752432. Last viewed 10 January 2008.
[32] Cf. Negrine (1994), p. 65.
[33] Cf. Ibid., p. 67.
[34] Fairclough (1995), p. 40. For a more detailed outline of the three approaches to the study of media production (organisational, political economy and culturalist), cf. Ibid., 37-52; Franklin (1997), p. 35-48.
[35] Bignell (2002), p. 80.

2.1 The British press

This chapter looks at some elementary features of the British press market.[36] In doing this, it will provide a context for the textual analysis that will be undertaken in Chapter 3. I will show here the particular position the press medium occupies in the UK. Firstly, a number of specific characteristics shared by the British press in the European context will be discussed. Secondly, I will sketch out the landscape of the press in the UK, paying particular attention to national newspapers. I will consider such questions as market structure, circulation figures, newspaper readership and their ownership. After this general outline, I will briefly characterise the two newspapers selected for my analysis, the *Daily Telegraph* and the *Guardian*, referring also to their Sunday sister papers, the *Sunday Telegraph* and the *Observer*.

In comparison to other European countries, the British press distinguishes itself in several respects. First of all, the UK holds the third position, after Germany and Estonia, regarding a total number of papers published daily.[37] Second, the British press market is the second largest in Europe (after Germany) in terms of the national daily newspaper circulation.[38] With reference to the circulation of daily papers per 1000 population in EU member countries, the UK comes in third, after Finland and Sweden.[39] Moreover, the British titles constitute nearly half of the twenty highest-circulation newspapers in Europe.[40] Finally, the UK has by far the largest market for Sunday newspapers.[41]

---

[36] On the UK's market there are more than 1000 newspapers and more than 10,000 magazines available. Cf. Colin Sparks. "The Press", in J. Stokes and A. Reading (eds) *The Media in Britain. Current Debates and Developments*, London: Macmillan Press, 1999, p. 41. Since I am concerned in this thesis with the Queen's representations in the national press, I will restrict the coverage to the leading national newspapers.

[37] The data covers the period 1995-2002. Cf. "Publishing Market Watch. Sector Report 1: the European Newspaper Market", 16 March 2004, p. 25. http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/ict/policy/publ-ind/sr01-eur-newspaper-market.pdf. Last viewed 28 December 2007.

[38] Cf. Ibid., p. 14.

[39] The data covers the period 1995-2002. Cf. Ibid., p. 22.

[40] The comparison was based on 2002 circulation numbers. Cf. Ibid., p. 20.

[41] Cf. Ibid., p. 19.

The importance of the British press in the European context can also be noticed on the national level. The press market in the UK is characterised by a number of features which account for its distinctive structure and organisation. First of all, it is possible to distinguish a number of important sections within the publication of British newspaper. The most significant distinction results from the geographical distribution of the newspapers. Taking this aspect into consideration, a differentiation between national, local and regional press can be drawn.[42] Newspapers in these groups can be further divided according to the frequency of appearance. As a result, it is possible to make a distinction between daily, Sunday and weekly newspapers.[43] Lastly, the press market in the UK also consists of paid-for titles and the so-called "'freesheets', pushed through people's doors, usually on a weekly basis and dependent entirely on advertising revenue for income".[44]

The most important segment of the UK press market is the national press. As Colin Seymour-Ure notices, the nationals "came to dominate British newspaper reading more recently than might be thought".[45] Between 1920 and 1923 they outnumbered the circulation of the provincial morning and evening papers, selling almost double as many copies as the provincials in 1945.[46] In the second half of the twentieth century, the UK newspaper market has undergone many changes.[47] Some of the national newspapers have disappeared or changed their profiles, like the *Sun*, but in their place new titles appeared, like the *Independent*. Today, the press market in the UK is dominated by ten national weekday papers (if the Scottish *Daily Record*

[42] For a discussion about the characteristics of local and regional press, see: Bob Franklin. *Newszak and News Media*, London: Arnold, 1997, pp. 103-109.
[43] Although provincial evening papers and local weeklies have been in decline, some remain strong, notably the London *Evening Standard*. Cf. "Average net circulation per issue in the UK", Audit Bureau of Circulations, October 2007, http://www.abc.org.uk/cgi-bin/gen5?runprog=nav/abc&noc=y. Last viewed 11 November 2007.
[44] Sparks (1999), p. 42.
[45] Colin Seymour-Ure. *The British Press and Broadcasting since 1945* (2nd edn), Oxford [u.a]: Blackwell, 1996, p. 16.
[46] Cf. Ibid.
[47] Cf. Ibid, pp. 16-58. For a detailed account, see also: Dennis Griffiths. *Fleet Street. Five Hundred Years of the Press*, London: The British Library, 2006, pp. 304-418.

is combined with its sister paper the *Daily Mirror*), complemented by their Sunday counterparts[48] (see Table 1). The Audit Bureau of Circulations distinguishes three categories of national newspapers in the UK: quality, middle market and popular.[49] The differences between these three sectors are to a great extent a result of the type of the advertising sold in each of them.[50] Advertising rates chargeable by the papers affect, in turn, the circulation figures, the readership's profile as well as the content and style of the newspapers in the respective sectors.

Table 1 lists the most important national newspapers in the UK, divided both in the three distinct sectors enumerated above (quality, middle market and popular) and according to the frequency of distribution (daily and Sunday), presenting their average circulation figures in 1998 and 2007 (these years approximately represent the period covered in the subsequent press analysis), and their ownership pattern.[51] The daily titles are particularly important since they account for "at least 99 per cent of the total circulation",[52] while the Sunday newspapers constitute the remaining one per cent (see Table 1). However, the division of the press market into quality, mid-

[48] There are a number of British newspapers classified as 'national' by the Audit Bureau of Circulations since they are nationally circulated. However, they are not considered 'national' for the purpose of this study. Among these newspapers is the sporting daily *Racing Post* and the *Sunday Sport*. Some Scottish papers, like the qualities *The Herald*, *The Scotsman* and their Sunday counterparts, *Sunday Herald* and *Scotland on Sunday*, are also categorized 'national' by the ABC. Within the popular sector, Scottish *Sunday Post* and *Sunday Mail* are enlisted. Cf. "Average net circulation per issue in the UK", Audit Bureau of Circulations. October 2007, http://www.abc.org.uk/cgi-bin/gen5?runprog=nav/abc&noc=y. Last viewed 11 November 2007. According to Colin Sparks, these Scottish titles and other important papers produced in Wales and Northern Ireland form a distinctive market and fulfil national functions in these regions. Cf. Sparks (1999), p. 42.

[49] Traditionally, the daily press was divided into the mass circulation 'popular' papers and the low circulation 'qualities', which corresponded with the differences in format: broadsheet 'quality' and 'popular' tabloid. Cf. Seymour-Ure (1996), p. 27; Negrine (1994), p. 58; McNair (2000), p. 14. However, the press market has been undergoing many changes which result in the blurring of these clear-cut differentiations. Many traditionally broadsheet newspapers adopted tabloid formats. Some media analysts even talk about the 'tabloidisation' of the editorial content and layout of quality press. Cf. Franklin (1997), pp. 7-10; Sparks (1999), p. 58. It is interesting to note that the extensive coverage of the royal family's affairs in the broadsheets is seen by Bob Franklin as the evidence for the 'tabloidisation' of the traditionally quality press. Cf. Franklin (1997), p. 9.

[50] Sparks (1999), p. 47. See also: Negrine (1994), pp. 67-70; Franklin (1997), pp. 92-95.

[51] Readership figures for any given title are usually around three times higher than the circulation figures. Cf. Mick Underwood. "Media ownership in the UK", 2003, http://www.cultsock.ndirect.co.uk/MUHome/cshtml/media/mediaown/html. Last viewed 13 November 2007.

[52] Cf. Sparks (1999), p. 44.

market and popular corresponds to the most distinct features of the national press and allows for some valid generalisations. The quality titles (daily: *Daily Telegraph, The Times, Guardian, Independent, Financial Times*; Sunday: *Sunday Times, Sunday Telegraph, Observer, Independent on Sunday*) account for approximately 23 per cent of weekly circulation.[53] They have the majority of their readers in socio-economic categories A and B.[54] These newspapers are "the most information-dense of the print media (in terms of wordage)".[55] Despite the recent changes that affected the editorial content carried by these newspapers often referred to as the process of 'tabloidization', they still devote the greatest share of their editorial resources to the coverage of economics and politics.[56] Sparks argues that they best fulfil the 'public enlightenment' function of the press in comparison with the newspapers in the two other segments.[57] The four mid-market newspapers (daily: *Daily Mail, Daily Express*; Sunday: *Mail on Sunday, Sunday Express*) make up 25 per cent of the national weekly circulation. They are largely read by people from social groups B and C1, who are concerned about politics and economics to a lesser extent, "mainly in so far as it affects their personal incomes and quality of life".[58] The popular press (daily: *Sun, Daily Mirror / Daily Record, Daily Star*; Sunday: *News of the World, Sunday Mirror, People, Daily Star – Sunday*), on the other hand, prioritises "the kinds of material that will sell vast quantities".[59] Popular newspapers usually contain little political news and their coverage is limited to sport, celebrity gossip and the so-

[53] I calculated the average circulation share of the newspapers in the three sectors on the basis of 2007 data (see Table 1).
[54] To illustrate the social composition of newspaper readers in the UK Sparks applies the social classification system created by the advertising industry to understand consumers' behaviour. The classification categories are the following: A (Upper Professional); B (Lower Professional); C1 (Routine Clerical); C2 (Skilled Manual); D (Unskilled Manual); E (Economically Inactive). They reflect societal differences of income, educational level and profession. The social grade of the chief income earner in the household constitutes the main factor in determining newspaper readership. Cf. Sparks (1999), p. 55.
[55] Cf. McNair (2000), p. 16.
[56] Cf. Sparks (1999), p. 58.
[57] Cf. Ibid., p. 53.
[58] Cf. McNair (2000), p. 16.
[59] Cf. Sparks (1999), p. 53.

called human interest stories.[60] They are market leaders in terms of circulation figures, accounting for approximately 52 per cent of the national weekly circulation. Readers of popular press constitute less than ten per cent of overall A and B readership and represent predominantly the socio-economic categories C2 and below. [61]

[60] Cf. McNair (2000), p. 18; Sparks (1999), p. 53.
[61] Cf. Sparks (1999), p. 55; McNair (2000), p. 18.

Table 1 Ownership and circulation of the national press in the UK

Quality	1998[a]	2007[b]	Publisher
Daily Telegraph	1,044,000	833,022	Telegraph Group Limited
The Times	377,000	608,554	News International Ltd
Guardian	418,000	314,344	Guardian Newspapers Ltd
Independent	390,000	190,273	Independent Newspapers (UK) Ltd
Financial Times	292,000	137,198	Financial Times Ltd
Middle Market	–	–	–
Daily Mail	1,689,000	2,167,490	Associated Newspapers Ltd
Daily Express	1,538,000	737,694	Express Newspapers
Popular	–	–	–
Sun	3,588,000	2,946,290	News International Ltd
Daily Mirror / Daily Record[c]	3,622,000	1,789,371	Trinity Mirror plc
Daily Star	808,000	641,565	Express Newspapers
Sunday Quality	–	–	–
Sunday Times	1,203,000	1,097,892	News International Ltd
Sunday Telegraph	562,000	619,014	Telegraph Group Limited
Observer	541,000	432,670	Guardian Newspapers Ltd
Independent on Sunday	385,000	168,958	Independent Newspapers (UK) Ltd
Sunday Middle Market	–	–	–
Mail on Sunday	1,960,000	2,128,927	Associated Newspapers Ltd
Sunday Express	1,692,000	659,562	Express Newspapers
Sunday Popular Fehler! Verweisquelle konnte nicht gefunden werden.	–	–	–
News of the World	4,725,000	3,106,223	News International Ltd
Sunday Mirror	2,678,000	1,294,923	Trinity Mirror plc

[a] Circulation figures are approximate averages for the first six months of 1998. Cf. McNair (2000), p. 15.
[b] Circulation figures in the period from 1 October to 28 October 2007 published by the Audit Bureau of Circulations. http://www.abc.org.uk/cgi-bin/gen5?runprog=nav/abc&noc=y. Retrieved on 11 November 2007.
[c] Includes figures for the *Mirror*'s sister paper in Scotland, the *Daily Record.*

People	2,130,000	634,879	Trinity Mirror plc
Daily Star - Sunday	808,000	366,112	Express Newspapers

Source: The Audit Bureau of Circulations. http://www.abc.org.uk/cgi-bin/gen5?runprog=nav/abc&noc=y. Retrieved on 11 November 2007.

Looking at Table 1, it is easy to notice two significant features of the British press market: a large concentration of ownership and falling circulation numbers. First, the national press market is characterised by a large concentration of ownership. Even a glance at the market share of various newspaper owners reveals the oligopolistic nature of the British press market. Five companies control around 90 per cent of sales. Within this general picture, News International[65] titles constitute a majority. The corporation owned by Rupert Murdoch, who is possibly the world's most famous media baron, is in possession of four titles (see Table 1) that account for approximately 35 per cent of total weekly circulation; Associated Newspapers claim approximately 19 per cent share of national newspaper circulation; Trinity Mirror, part of the Mirror Group Newspapers, share about 16 per cent; Express Newspapers, part of United MAI, enjoy a further 14 per cent of the market, while the Telegraph Group provide additional 7,5 per cent of national circulation. Such intense concentration is a result of "a series of takeovers and mergers between newspaper titles [, which] have been a constant feature of the newspaper landscape".[66] The growing concentration of press ownership is often seen as a limitation to "the range and diversity of expressed editorial opinion" and a threat to the quality of democracy,[67] although there are regulations concerning media cross-ownership.[68]

[65] News International is a subsidiary of Rupert Murdoch's international organisation, News Corporation. For a more detailed characteristic of Murdoch's operations on the British press market, see: Underwood (2003).
[66] Cf. Franklin (1997), p. 96. The owners of the national newspapers listed above often represent huge corporations with interests in other sectors of media industries. On cross-media ownership in the UK, see: Underwood (2003).
[67] Cf. Franklin (1997), p. 95.

The second significant feature of the national press market in the UK is a falling circulation. Almost all of the daily and Sunday national newspapers have registered a falling circulation over the last ten years.[69] This process has been associated with the increasing popularity of alternative media, such as television and the internet, which are seen to be challenging the popularity of newspapers. As a result, the British press is often regarded as a declining communicative medium.[70]

Despite the fierce competition from alternative media as well as the changes in socio-economic conditions in the UK, some of the British newspapers have managed to keep a relatively stable position on the market, of which the ten national leading titles are an example. Since the volume of this thesis does not allow for a detailed analysis of the representation of Queen Elizabeth II in all the twenty national titles, I was compelled to narrow down the press narrative of the Queen to selected newspapers only. Although an extensive interest in the royal affairs is usually associated with the popular press,[71] the research phase of this thesis revealed the frequency and prominence of royal issues in the quality newspapers. Therefore, I have decided to analyse two representatives of the quality daily newspapers, the *Daily Telegraph* and the *Guardian*, and their Sunday sister papers, the *Sunday Telegraph* and the *Observer*. These four titles are firmly established on the market. Moreover, in the quality sector they seem to have the most clearly defined profiles historically, which represent best the polarisation of the British press in terms of the political affiliation of their readers.[72]

---

[68] Cf. "Communications Act 2003", Office of Public Sector Information, 2003. http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2003/ukpga_20030021_en_1. Last viewed 29 December 2007.

[69] The exceptions are: the *Times*, the *Daily Mail* and the *Sunday Telegraph*, which have actually increased their circulation. For possible reasons for the rise in the circulation figures of the *Times* see: Griffiths (2006), pp. 396-400; of the *Daily Mail*: Ibid. pp. 403-405 and McNair (2000), p. 17; for the *Sunday Telegraph*: Griffiths (2006), p. 402.

[70] Cf. Franklin (1997), p. 69-71. See also: Sparks (1999), pp. 54-55.

[71] See, for example, Billig (1998), pp. 5-6.

[72] Cf. "Voting Intention by Newspaper Readership", MORI Survey, 2004. http://www.ipsos-mori.com/polls/2004/voting-by-readership.shtml. Last viewed 17 October 2007. Compare with: "How

2.1.1 The Daily Telegraph

The *Daily Telegraph* was established in London in 1855.[73] Its sister paper, the *Sunday Telegraph* was launched in 1961.[74] Both newspapers, alongside *The Scotsman*, are owned by the Barclay brothers, who purchased The Telegraph Group in 2005,[75] gaining as a result 7,5 per cent of national newspaper circulation.[76] Although on the national daily newspaper market the *Daily Telegraph* remains the last quality printed on a traditional broadsheet format, it underwent major changes in October 2005 (after the re-launch of the *Guardian* in a new Berliner format). Whereas the main part of the newspaper stayed broadsheet, the sports section converted to a tabloid format. Moreover, some of the broadsheet pages started to be published in colour, news coverage was extended and a new standalone business section was added.[77] These changes are significant as they are a sign of the newspaper's readiness to respond to popular trends.

Over the period covered in the subsequent press analysis, the *Daily Telegraph* was the highest selling quality daily in the UK, with the average circulation of 1,044,000 in the first six months of 1998 and 833,022 in October 2007 (see Table 1). The *Sunday Telegraph*'s circulation has risen from 562,000 in 1998 to 619,014 in 2007 as a result of the re-vamping that the newspaper underwent in 2005.

Britain Voted 1997", MORI Survey, 1997. http://www.ipsos-mori.com/polls/1997/ge_1997.shtml. Last viewed 17 October 2007.

[73] The *Daily Telegraph* appeared for the first three and a half months as the *Daily Telegraph and Courier*. Later *&Courier* was dropped from the masthead. Cf. Griffiths (2006), p. 96.

[74] Cf. Seymour-Ure (1996), p. 25.

[75] Cf. Griffiths (2006), p. 392.

[76] Cf. Underwood (2003).

[77] Cf. Griffiths (2006), p. 401.

In terms of political allegiance[78], both the *Daily Telegraph* and the *Sunday Telegraph* are right-of-centre and support the Conservative party.[79] This is also reflected in the political profile of their readers. According to a MORI survey conducted in 2004, 61 per cent of the *Daily Telegraph* readers express the intention to support the Conservative Party, in contrast to 17 per cent supporting the Liberal Democrats and 15 per cent who favour the Labour Party.[80] The political stance of the Telegraph titles reflected in the voting pattern of their readers has further implications for the newspapers' attitude towards the British monarchy. Ben Pimlott notices that the Conservative Party has "always identified itself particularly strongly with the Monarchy",[81] which finds expression in the *Telegraph*'s coverage of the Queen.[82] Not only has the *Daily Telegraph* been termed as "the monarchy's most loyal newspaper"[83], but also the *Sunday Telegraph* is seen to be "a true supporter of the monarchy".[84]

2.1.2 The Guardian

The *Guardian* appeared for the first time in 1821 as the *Manchester Guardian*.[85] In its early years it was published as a provincial weekly newspaper by a group of Manchester radicals[86] until it converted to a daily paper in 1855[87]. Despite a limited

[78] As Mc Nair points out, the political "partisanship of the press has always been allowed within the British system, and is an important element in the positioning of a title in the media marketplace." Cf. Mc Nair (2000), p. 140.
[79] Cf. "The UK's 'other paper of record'", *BBC News*, 19 January 2004, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/3409185.stm. Last viewed 18 December 2007.
[80] Cf. "Voting Intention by Newspaper Readership" (2004). Compare with: "How Britain Voted 1997" (1997).
[81] Ben Pimlott. *The Queen. A Biography of Elizabeth II*, London: Harper Collins, 1996, p. 292.
[82] See, for example: Mary Kenny. "We don't realise how lucky we are to have Her Majesty", *The Sunday Telegraph*, 18 November 2001, p. 25.
[83] Robert Blackburn. *King and Country. Monarchy and the future King Charles III*, London: Politico's, 2006, p. 18.
[84] Douglas Keay. *Elizabeth II. Portrait of a Monarch*, London: Ebury Press, p. 219.
[85] Cf. Franklin (1997), p. 77.
[86] Cf. Franklin (1997), p. 77
[87] Cf. Griffiths (2006), p. 373.

circulation and a base in Manchester,[88] the paper "had for more than one hundred years been the most successful – and influential – of all provincial dailies"[89], and enjoyed a national reputation. Its reputation helped the paper to successfully enter the national market. In 1959 it dropped *Manchester* from its title, becoming now the *Guardian*, and two years later, in 1961, it started to be published in London.[90] The *Guardian* acquired the *Observer* (the oldest Sunday newspaper in the world published since 1791) in 1993, thus gaining an important sister paper with similar political inclination.[91] The *Guardian* underwent a significant re-design in September 2005 when "*theguardian* – as it is now called in its new-look masthead" – was re-launched as a Berliner-size newspaper.[92] The *Observer* converted to the same format in January 2006. These changes have contributed to their image as innovative and resourceful. Both newspapers belong to the Guardian Newspapers, a branch of the Guardian Media Group, which shares around 3 per cent of national newspaper circulation.[93]

Looking at the circulation figures of the most important national newspapers in Table 1, it is possible to notice that the *Guardian*, with its average daily circulation of 314,344 in October 2007, lost its position as the second most circulated quality in the UK, having been superseded by the *Times*. The *Observer*'s position is relatively stable. With an average circulation of 541,000 in 1998 and 432,670 newspapers circulated every Sunday in October 2007, it has remained the third most circulated paper out of the four titles available in the Sunday quality sector.

[88] Cf. Seymour-Ure (1996), p. 18.
[89] Cf. Griffiths (2006), p. 373.
[90] Cf. Ibid.
[91] Cf. Ibid., pp. 54 and 377.
[92] Cf. Ibid., p. 400. See also: Claire Cozens. "New-look Guardian launches on September 12", Media Guardian, 1 September 2005. http://www.guardian.co.uk/media/2005/sep/01/theguardian.pressandpublishing. Last viewed 18 December 2007.
[93] Cf. Underwood (2003).

Politically, both newspapers represent the liberal tradition in the press.[94] They belong to the minority of liberal-left newspapers in the UK,[95] with the *Guardian* expressing slightly more moderate views than the *Observer* which is "Britain's most leftward Sunday".[96] The political orientation of these newspapers corresponds with the voting patterns of their readers. As the 2004 MORI poll revealed, 44% of the *Guardian* readers would vote for the Labour party; 37% were in favour of the Liberal-Democrats; whereas only 5% expressed the intention to vote in favour of the Conservative party.[97] The political views propagated by both of the newspapers have wider implications for their approach to the British monarchy. Both the *Guardian* and the *Observer* tend to argue against it, which was best reflected in the 2000 campaign for a referendum on the monarchy in which both the *Guardian* and the *Observer* were engaged.[98]

This chapter dealt with the characteristic features of the press market in the UK. After discussing the position of the British press in the European context, I touched upon such issues as the domination of the UK's national press market by ten daily newspapers and their Sunday editions and the division of the market into three sectors: quality, middle-market and popular. I further pointed to two important processes dominating the UK's press market: increasing concentration of ownership and falling circulations of newspapers. Finally, I sketched out the profile of newspapers selected for my analysis, the *Daily Telegraph* and the *Guardian*,

---

[94] Cf. Griffiths (2006), pp. 236-238 and 374-375.
[95] Cf. Mc Nair (2000), p. 40; Negrine (1994), pp. 52-55.
[96] Mandy Merck. "Introduction: After Diana", in M. Merck (ed.) *After Diana. Irreverent Elegies*, London [u.a.]: Verso, 1998, p. 3.
[97] Cf. "Voting Intention by Newspaper Readership" (2004). Compare with: "How Britain Voted 1997" (1997).
[98] See, for example: Peter Wilby. "Is it time to say goodbye? Yes", *The Observer*, 3 December 2000. http://www.guardian.co.uk/print/0,,4099757-103573,00.html. Last viewed 17 October 2007; "Magic or not, let in the daylight" (Leading article), *The Guardian*, 6 December 2000. http://www.guardian.co.uk/print/0,,4101151-103682,00.html. Last viewed 17 October 2007. On the jurisdictional consequences of the campaign, see: Blackburn (2006), pp. 154-163.

referring to their Sunday sister papers, the *Sunday Telegraph* and the *Observer*. I will now turn to the analysis of the representation of the Queen in these papers.

3 Press analysis

I shift now to the textual analysis of six newspaper articles (cf. Appendices) selected from two national quality dailies, the *Guardian* and the *Daily Telegraph* and their Sunday counterparts, the *Observer* and the *Sunday Telegraph*. Specifically, I will analyse four articles from the weekday issues and two from the Sunday editions. A short outline of them follows:

Topic (publication date)	**Newspaper**	**Article Title**
Princess Diana's death (7 September 1997)	*The Sunday Telegraph*	"The Princess is dead, long live the Queen"
	The Observer	"The crown tarnished before our eyes"
50 years on the throne (3 June 2002)	*The Guardian*	"The Queen's success: She does her strange job rather well"
(2 June 2003)	*The Daily Telegraph*	"Coronations will always be a time to rededicate the nation"
The Queen's eightieth birthday (21 April 2006)	*The Daily Telegraph*	"Subtly and silently, the Queen has bound our society together"
	The Guardian	"Elizabeth the Last"

My main concern will be with how these newspapers contribute to a particular construction of Queen Elizabeth II in the contemporary British press. However, bearing in mind the fact that the Queen represents the British monarchy which is of

crucial importance for British national identity, I am also interested in what is said about the institution itself and how Britain as a nation-state is in these articles reproduced. I will make an interpretation of the press articles by applying the analytical categories outlined in the introduction. In addition to the rhetorical aspects of the texts such as style, tone, figures of speech as well as imagery, I will also carefully analyse the headlines, structure, and the argumentative aspects. This will enable me to arrive at the underlying meaning of common-sense ideas coded by the linguistic signs adopted to represent it in the analysed newspapers.

3.1 Princess Diana's death

The death of Diana Spencer, the first wife of Prince Charles, on 31 August 1997 aroused an intense public and media reaction. The events following her death – but also the years that had preceded Princess Diana's divorce from Prince Charles – mark one of the most critical moments in Elizabeth II's fifty-five-year long reign. In the immediate aftermath of Diana's death, the royal family, but in particular the Queen, have been severely criticised for showing insufficient public grief.[99] The public outpouring after the event acquired a national dimension. This, in turn, sparked off a debate on the crisis of monarchy in the media critical of the institution.[100]

The articles I have chosen to analyse in this section illustrate the debate which dominated the press after the death of Princess Diana. Both articles were published one week after the accident in Paris, on 7 September 1997, and come from the Sunday issues of the analysed newspapers. The leading article entitled "The crown

[99] See, for example: Robert Hardman and Robert Shrimsley. "Blair defends the Queen", *The Daily Telegraph*, 4 September 1997, p. 1. The criticism directed at the British Queen in 1997 became the subject of Stephen Frears's film production entitled "The Queen" released in 2006, which shows the media's ongoing interest in the issues of monarchy.
[100] Marc Steel. "As a lasting memorial, close the firm", *The Guardian*, 9 September 1997, p. 17.

tarnished before our eyes" from the *Observer*[101] (cf. App. 1) will be compared with the article "The Princess is dead, long live the Queen" written by John Grigg for the *Sunday Telegraph*[102] (cf. App. 2).

3.1.1 The headlines

The headline of the leading article from the *Observer*, "The crown tarnished before our eyes" carries in part an intertextual reference to a commonly used phrase 'a tarnished crown' present in several book titles.[103] In addition to its literal meaning, it can also be interpreted metaphorically. 'The crown' is a symbol of monarchy and one of the signifiers of the British constitution. The word 'tarnish' is used metaphorically to evoke an image of the monarchy losing its reputation. In the present context, it implies the moment in which the Queen and her successor, Prince Charles, failed to timely respond to the public grief sparked off by Princess Diana's death. Further the author suggests that the demystification of monarchy was exposed to 'our eyes', in this context, the British citizens, who witnessed how the British monarchy lost its touch of mystique and came "down to [the people's] level"[104], as another headline in the *Guardian* suggests. In this sense, the headline implicitly articulates the hierarchical divisions of the society, and underlines the moment in which the Royal Family lost its touch of superiority.

The headline from the *Sunday Telegraph* is different in tone and implication. The phrase "The Princess is dead, long live the Queen" may be interpreted as a monarchist motto. It is a modification of an axiom traditionally used after the official text of the Proclamation of Accession is read out following the accession of a new

[101] "The crown tarnished before our eyes" (Leading article), *The Observer*, 7 September 1997, p. 7.
[102] John Grigg. "The Princess is dead, long live the Queen", *The Sunday Telegraph*, 7 September 1997, p. 28.
[103] See, for example: Anthony Holden. *The Tarnished Crown*, London [u. a.]: Bantam Press, 1993. The author brings up many questions relating to the future of British monarchy.
[104] Anthony Barnett. "Down to our level", *The Guardian*, 8 September 1997, p. 7.

monarch in the UK.[105] The author adapted the axiom to the 1997 events substituting the epanalepsis from the original phrase: "The King is dead, long live the King" with 'the Princess' and 'the Queen'. This strategy reveals that Princess Diana, just like the Queen, is considered to be a symbol of royalty (in contrast to the *Observer*, which interprets Diana as a republican symbol). Further interpretation of the figurative meaning of the phrase points to the underlying elements of ideology. The *Sunday Telegraph* suggests that the death of the Princess cannot undermine the institution represented by the Queen. Monarchy, central to the idea of British nationhood, stands for continuity, stability and tradition. The second part of the headline is also to be heard - in slightly modified version - in the second verse of the British national anthem: "Long live our noble Queen".[106] By alluding to texts that have been adopted to represent the British historical past,[107] the author reproduces Britain as a nation-state and reinforces the communal values of its inhabitants.

3.1.2 Structure, tone and style

The leading article from the *Observer* is skilfully constructed, which is reflected in its linguistic realizations. The text may be divided into three parts. In the first part of the text the author outlines what happened in "the most extraordinary week in recent British history" (App. 1: 1)[108]. At the beginning, the author pays a tribute to Earl Spencer for giving "the most moving speech ever made at a funeral in Westminster Abbey" (App. 1: 2). Next he goes on to interpret the consequences of Princess Diana's death for the British society. The change of the author's perspective occurs

[105] Cf. "The King is dead. Long live the King", Wikipedia, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_King_is_dead._Long_live_the_King!. Last viewed 10 January 2008.
[106] For a full text, see: "National Anthem", The Monarchy Today. http://www.royal.gov.uk/output/Page5010.asp. Last viewed 5 January 2008.
[107] Cf. Hobsbawm (1983), p. 12.
[108] With regard to the quotes from the articles under scrutiny, I will be using the following method of referencing in the analytical part: App. 1 indicates the number of the article as it appears in the appendices, whereas the number/numbers which appear after the colon indicate the paragraph/paragraphs from which the fragment is quoted.

in Paragraph 11. The nation starts to be referred to as ‘society’ (App. 1: 11x2, 14, 15, 18, 22) and this lexical change corresponds with the slight shift of thematic focus. In the second part of the *Observer* article the present-day British society is characterised, in contrast to the one from fifty years ago. This part of the article plays a very important role in the author’s line of reasoning, which is discussed in Chapter 3.1.3. In Paragraph 15 it is possible to identify yet another, third thought. The author directs the readers’ attention onto the future and challenges the survival of the institution of monarchy. Although he tries to present a detached, logical account of the analysed events and distance himself from the argument by avoiding the inclusive plural pronoun ‘we’ throughout the text, it is possible to discern slight emotional overtones at several points, particularly evident in the last two paragraphs of the article. The personal pronouns ‘we’ and ‘our’ appear here six times and the author, identifying himself for the third time in the article with the British (the first being in App. 1: 8: “our national culture”; the second in App. 1: 15: “our society”), talks in a fairly emotional manner about “our hearts” (App. 1: 21) being “profoundly touched” (App. 1: 22) by Princess Diana’s conduct.

In the *Sunday Telegraph*’s article it is possible to distinguish four different strands of thought. The first part starts with a *captatio benevolentiae*. In a very personal manner, using the personal pronoun ‘I’ (which reappears twelve times in the text in such combinations as ‘me’ or ‘my’), John Grigg, in contrast to the author of the *Observer* article who praises Earl Spencer, pays the Queen a compliment saying that “the broadcast on Friday evening was the best broadcast [he has] ever heard from her” (App. 2: 1). Employing this strategy, he expresses his respect for the Queen in the difficult moment and sets the pro-monarchist and patriotic tone of the whole article. Further in the first part of the text, the author discusses the nature of the public reaction to the death of Diana, which is described by him in terms of a

'cult' (App. 2: 2, 4, 5, 6). In the second part (from Paragraph 8) he sympathises with Prince Charles and criticises the monarchy's opponents calling them contemptuously "Windsor-bashers" (App. 2: 10). The choice of vocabulary in this part reveals emotional attitude of the author towards the subject matter. It is possible to detect emotional tone in such expressions as "an ugly current of vindictiveness" (App. 2: 8), "recklessly assailed" (App. 2: 9), or "a monstrous injustice" (App. 2: 9). The third string of thought (from Paragraph 11) is devoted to Queen Elizabeth II. Grigg compares the Queen's qualities with those of Princess Diana. This is the only moment in the text when the author admits some flaws in the Queen's character. The fourth part (from Paragraph 15) deals with the consequences of the Princess's of Wales death for the monarchy. What is important for the author, however, is to play down the seriousness of the crisis of the monarchy and portray it as a fleeting phenomenon, which is reflected in the figures of speech deployed by him (cf. Chapter 3.1.4). The article finishes in a rather pathetic tone when the author compares the British monarchy with the institution of Papacy. This comparison, however, acquires a heavy figurative meaning in the context of the whole article and reveals the author's proud attitude and reverence for the monarchy (cf. Chapter 3.1.4).

3.1.3 Argumentation

The author of the leading article published in the *Observer* (cf. App. 1) focuses his argument on the consequences of Princess Diana's death on the British society. The events surrounding Princess Diana's death are interpreted by the *Observer* as "a uniquely democratic event" (App. 1: 3) that initiated "a new democratic spirit" (App. 1: 5). The author tries to convince the readers that Diana's death affects the whole of Britain. Although he only uses imprecise quantifying terms such as "millions of

mourners" (App. 1: 5), "millions of Britons" (App. 1: 4) or "an audience running into billions" (App. 1: 1), these expressions constitute a powerful rhetorical element implying large public support. The *Observer* looks back in time at Diana's life to support its line of reasoning and the political position it stands for. Diana's engagement in charity work, argues the *Observer*, had led her to the "liberal wing of the spectrum" (App. 1: 13). However, the public outcry after her death only strengthened an already existing democratic spirit, initiated by Tony Blair's electoral victory in May 1997.[109] According to the author, both the electoral victory of the Labour Party and the public reaction to Diana's death are signs for the liberalisation of the British society. Since the British society has not only become "more liberal, kind and egalitarian" (App. 1: 14), but also "more individualistic, more insecure, less anchored in its values and more alone" (App. 1: 11), says the *Observer*, there is no space for traditional structures. Moreover, Charles as the future king has been discredited (App. 1: 15). As a result, argues the *Observer*, monarchy has no chance of survival. The newspaper even puts forward a tentative suggestion that the British royal family may decide to abdicate as an institution in the face of the constitutional changes taking place in the UK, intensified by the "democratic demand for voice" (App. 1: 9) that the events following Princess Diana's death sparked off. The frequency with which the author uses both the word 'democratic' (App. 1: 3, 5, 9x2) and 'demand' (App. 1: 4, 9, 14, 19) confirms their importance for the overarching line of reasoning present in the text. The author implies that constitutional monarchy is an undemocratic form of government. He opposes democracy and constitutional monarchy, implying that in a democratic country there is no place for "a constitutional role for the monarch" (App. 1: 15). The emotional public reaction to Diana's death is interpreted by the author as a sign that the British society demands a

[109] On the associations of Diana with Blairism, see: Emily Lomax. "Diana Al-Fayed: Ethnic Marketing and the End(s) of Racism" in J. Richards, S. Wilson and L. Woodhead (eds) *Diana, The Making of a Media Saint*, London [u. a.]: I. B. Tauris, 1999, pp. 88-90.

change in the form of government. This is underlined several times in the text by the writer's delivery which stresses the words:

- 'society' (App. 1: 11x2, 14, 15, 18, 22) versus 'nation' (App. 1: 1, 4),
- 'citizens' (App. 1: 4, 7, 20) versus 'subjects' (App. 1: 4),
- "individual well-being" (App. 1: 12) versus "service and duty" (cf. Ibid.),
- "the need to express voice" (App. 1: 11) and "challenge the status quo" (App. 1: 20) versus "stoical acceptance of the status quo" (App. 1: 7).

By including patterns of these lexical combinations in the text, the author sets a democratic form of government, represented by the initial set of expressions, against a constitutional monarchy, which epitomises all the qualities enumerated in the second position. Although it is not stated in the text explicitly, it becomes clear that the *Observer* contrasts a republic with a constitutional monarchy, interpreting the reaction to Diana's death as a public call for a republic.

Along the argumentative lines of the *Observer*'s article, the protagonist of the text is neither the Queen nor Princess Diana, but actually 'the society'. The author juxtaposes the 1997 British society with the one of 1953, the year of Elizabeth II's coronation, and marks the gap between the two (App. 1: 11). He underlines the distance between the two moments in British history using the third person plural pronoun 'their', thus implying that the British fifty years ago had different values than the British in 1997, and the belief of 1953 that Elizabeth II was the "collective embodiment" (App. 1: 11) of the British can no longer be valid. As the author argues against the monarchy and for a republic, he deliberately avoids the frequent use of the word 'nation'. By doing so, he evades the connotation to nationalism, with which the British monarchy is so closely connected. The term 'society' connotes an abstract collectivity of lonely individuals who aspire to their "individual well-being" (App. 1: 12), as opposed to the 'nation', which connotes similarity and common purpose of an

'imagined community', to use Benedict Anderson's phrase.[110] Nevertheless, it is possible to discern a certain inconsistency in the author's reasoning. Although the *Observer*'s article may be read as an appeal for a 'democratic society', the public reaction to Princess Diana's death is described in national terms. The author talks about "the nation's affections" (App. 1: 1), rather than the 'society's' affections, and lets in such expressions as "a collective national property" (App. 1: 5) and "our national culture" (App. 1: 8), thus assuming that there exists a certain sense of belonging among the community members, based on similarities and loyalty to common norms and values. He further underlines the communal character of the public response to Diana's death by the use of such words as 'collective' (App. 1: 4, 5x2, 11), 'national' (App. 1: 5, 8) or 'shared' (App. 1: 5). In this sense, the *Observer* depicts the events following the dramatic accident as a national reaction, implicitly reinforcing the link between the monarchy and national identity, and reviving the idea of the nation as an 'imagined community'. The reproduction of themes central to the understanding of the nation-state is also discernible in the following quotes from the text. Although the author deliberately avoids any references to what could be interpreted as tenets of British eighteenth- and nineteenth-century nationalism (such as the superiority of the British over other nations propagated by texts dating from that time[111]), he admits the existence of "the core values of British society" (App. 1: 18), and, what he terms, a "hallmark of British life" (App. 1: 7, 10), regardless of individuality and inequality underlined at other points in the text. This carries an underlying assumption of the strength of British nationhood. The belief that certain qualities, values and norms are inherent in the character of the members

[110] Cf. Anderson (1983), p. 6.
[111] See, for example, the text of a British patriotic song "Rule, Britannia!" written in 1740 by James Thomson. Available at: http://www.know-britain.com/songs/rule_britannia.html. Last viewed 5 January 2008.

of a community is a central assumption of an idea of a constructed nation-state, superimposed among the community members over internal heterogeneity.[112]

In contrast to the *Observer*, which argues that the events following Diana's death exposed the monarchy's weakness, John Grigg, the author of the article in the *Sunday Telegraph* argues that they are "proof of the monarchy's enduring strength" (App. 2: 17). His line of reasoning consists in playing down the depth of the alleged crisis of monarchy, sparked off by the belated royal response to the public mood after Princess Diana's death. After the author admits the seriousness of the public outcry when he praises the Queen for restoring "the balance in a situation where it is badly needed" (App. 2: 1), he brings up several points to play down the effects of the events surrounding Diana's death on the institution of monarchy. The *Sunday Telegraph* explains the public reaction to Diana's death in terms of 'mass psychology'. The "collective state of mind" (App. 2: 4) produced by popular and media responses to Diana's death is described by the author as "a quasi-religious cult" (App. 2: 2). The notion of a 'cult' (App. 2: 2, 4, 5, 6, 17), which implies a saintly dimension, is particularly important for Grigg's argumentation. A cult, a personal worship, argues the *Sunday Telegraph*, is "unlikely to last" (App. 2: 3). The author uses two examples to support his argument: the worship of the Queen around the time of the coronation, and the public grief after John F. Kennedy's assassination were fleeting phenomena fostered by a privilege of youth (App. 2: 2, 5, 7), physical attractiveness and glamour surrounding both of them. He argues that a personal cult is usually a matter of fashion (App. 2: 19). By doing so, he implies that the cult of Diana should not be treated seriously and actually poses no threat to the survival of the institution of monarchy. This claim is supported with two further arguments. First of all, the cult of Princess Diana, according to the author, is not a cult of an

[112] Cf. Linda Colley. "Introduction" in *Britons. Forging the Nation 1707-1837*, New Haven [u. a.]: Yale University Press, 1992, p. 6.

individual, but first and foremost, a cult of the institution of monarchy and as such, in contrast to what republicans say, "should not be regarded as an anti-monarchist phenomenon" (App. 2: 17). Using Diana's authority, the *Sunday Telegraph* attempts to weaken the arguments of the republican opponents of the institution. Grigg argues that Diana was not, by definition, a republican figure. Her title – 'princess' – is in itself a sign of her royal status, which "added immeasurably to her romantic aura" (App. 2: 18). This claim bears unspoken elements of ideology with reference to the concept of royalty. It implies that royal figures are endowed with a magic touch, an extraordinary quality unattainable by the commoners.[113] The second argument emphasises the English (not British![114]) attachment to the institution of monarchy, which the seventeenth-century republican regime of Oliver Cromwell paradoxically reinforced rather than undermined. By talking about the "monarchist instincts of the English people" (App. 2: 15) and "the true sentiment of the country (…) still as monarchist as ever" (App. 2: 16), Grigg expresses in other words what Keay meant about the British saying that "there is something in the British psyche that hankers after continuity".[115] These statements carry implications fundamental to the 'imagined' British nationalism. Firstly, they convey the belief that the monarchy is an inseparable element of British 'imagined' national culture. Secondly, they imply that the British identify themselves through the royal family and the 'imagined', centuries-old tradition represented by them.

In line with the *Sunday Telegraph*'s argumentation that the public tribute to Diana is essentially a tribute to the institution of monarchy, Diana is not represented as a mere symbol of modernity. Although the author calls Diana a "modern goddess" (App. 2: 4), he argues that "too much should not (…) be made of her modernity"

[113] See also: Billig (1998), p. 73.
[114] For a discussion about the English/British confusion concerning the name of their nation, see: Billig (1998), p. 27.
[115] Keay (1991), p. 290.

(App. 2: 19) as she was basically "a creature of tradition" (App. 2: 19). Moreover, John Grigg downplays the significance of the quasi-religious worship of "the modern goddess Diana" (App. 2: 4) in the immediate aftermath of her death (App. 2: 3). Both of these arguments bear unspoken implications which become evident at the end of the text, where the British monarchy is compared to the institution of Papacy. Both institutions, argues the *Sunday Telegraph*, represent centuries-old traditions. In this way, the author juxtaposes modernity against tradition, which is also reflected in the linguistic combinations: fashion (App. 2: 19) versus "ideas which are the opposite of modern" (App. 2: 20); 'cult' versus universal values (App. 2: 20); "the will-o'-the wisp" (App. 2: 19) versus "the things that have always mattered and always will" (App. 2: 19). There is another layer of meaning in the juxtaposition of the British monarchy against the Papacy. Since the Papacy symbolises the Catholic religion, the British monarchy may be assumed to symbolise, what could be called, the national religion. The Pope and the Queen together symbolise an almost 500-year-old schism between England and Rome, which marks the country's division from the Continent and contributes to its 'imagined' island story of uniqueness and independence. Both the Queen, Defender of the Faith and the Supreme Governor of the Church of England, and the Pope, the head of the Church of Rome, symbolise the religious partition of the medieval world into Protestantism and Catholicism. Interestingly, the author addresses neither the Queen as Elizabeth II nor the Pope as John Paul II. On the one hand, the author talks about 'Diana', the object of personal cult which is "unlikely to last" (App. 2: 3), and 'the Queen' and 'the Pope', representatives of antique, holy institutions chosen by the Grace of God and endowed with "universal significance and appeal" (App. 2: 20).[116]

[116] Compare with: "Why I give way to righteous paranoia about Britain", *Telegraph* online, October 2000. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/opinion/main.jhtml?xml=/opinion/2000/10/12/do03.xml. Last viewed 18 September 2007; "Two monarchs and a puritan", *Telegraph* online, October 2000.

3.1.4 Figures of speech and imagery

In the leading article from the *Observer* the monarchy is often referred to metonymically: 'the Palace' (App. 1: 3, 5), 'the Crown' (App. 1: 4) and 'the Windsors' (App. 1: 10), which creates an image of a detached, impersonal institution. Queen Elizabeth II herself plays a very marginal role in the explicit layer of the text. She is directly addressed four times: as 'the Queen' (App. 1: 9, 12), as 'Elizabeth II' (App. 1: 11) and as the mother of Prince Charles (App. 1: 16). However, since she is one of the most important representatives of the institution of monarchy, it may be assumed that she is indirectly referred to whenever monarchy is meant by means of the figure of speech called circumlocution: "those higher in the social scale" (App. 1: 7), "those in high places" (App. 1: 8). In one reference to the Royal Family, it is possible to detect implied irony: "the family that purports to represent the nation" (App. 1: 4). Assuming an ironic tone, the author rejects the idea expressed in a metaphor of Elizabeth II as the 'collective embodiment' (App. 1: 11) of the British nation. The equation of the monarchy with the nation is played down by its juxtaposition with rational justifications. The Queen is seen as the head of the privileged establishment rather than the nation.

The *Observer*'s text abounds in powerful imagery. The most evocative image in the text is the image of a revolution. This image must be understood in the context of the events preceding the writing of the article and their significance for the British royal family. The author sees Diana as the "ultimate rebel" (App. 1: 10) and talks about her democratising potential and subversive influence for the monarchy, which was discussed in detail in the previous section. According to the author, Diana initiated a revolutionary spirit in the members of the British society. Such phrases as the "pressure from below" (App. 1: 3), "the momentum has simply been

---

http://www.telegraph.co.uk/opinion/main.jhtml;jsessionid=OQFLWAHLI4QCRQFIQMGCFGGAVCBQUIV0?xml=/opinion/2000/10/18/dl03.xml. Last viewed 18 September 2007.

unstoppable" (App. 1: 4) or "explosive dynamic" (App. 1: 6) create the image of rapidity and irreversibility of the process. The essence of the message carried by this image is reflected in the metaphor: "they are now sovereign: the Crown must follow where they lead" (App. 1: 4). In this metaphor, 'they', the British people, are no longer subjects, but 'the Crown', Elizabeth II and the Royal Family, are subject to 'them'. This ideological reversal illustrates the republican tendency of the *Observer* which does not want to imagine the British people as subjects, but as those in the position of command.

Another image present in the *Observer* issue, connotatively related to the first one, is the image of "a failing monarchy" (App. 1: 2). The author intensifies this image in several ways. First, it is by the use of such phrases as the monarchy's "passing, at least in its current form, is foretold" (App. 1: 9), "the end is approaching" (App. 1: 17), "the institution can stagger on" (App. 1: 17), but it is "severely dented" (App. 1: 2). Second, it is done through repetition of the phrase "no longer" (App. 1: 12, 15, 18, 19) in the text. Finally, it is by the use of the metaphor of "a long walk" and "slow steps" of the Prince of Wales (App. 1: 1). In the context of the *Observer*'s argumentative line, it becomes clear that instead of the literal walk of Prince Charles, the author means the gradual decline of the British monarchy. These literary devices were employed by the author to support his argument that the constitutional monarchy has no chance of survival as a form of government because people turned against it. The monarchy is portrayed as a weak institution, whose greatest pillar, the public support, has been shaken. The author skilfully contrasts the "spontaneous applause" that Earl Spencer's speech received with the "silent Royal Family" (App. 1: 2). Thus he underlines their weakness and defencelessness against the power of the people with the same ideological implications as mentioned above. The suggestiveness of the image of 'a failing monarchy' is intensified by the image

of a storm. This image may be discerned from the use of such metaphors as "hurricane of demands" (App. 1: 9) and "thunderous response" (App. 1: 22), which imply the scale of public involvement in the cause promoted by the *Observer*.

In the *Sunday Telegraph* neither the figures of speech nor imagery are as prominent as in the *Observer*. The most argumentatively important, although not very explicit metaphor in the *Sunday Telegraph*'s article, becomes voiced in the phrase in Paragraph 15: "to exploit the present tidal wave of feeling for republican purposes" (App. 2: 15). The implied meaning of this line can be decoded in the context of the surrounding words and a larger argumentative line (see Chapter 3.1.3). The nature of a 'wave' is that it comes and goes and the national outcry in the immediate aftermath of Diana's death will also be a fleeting phenomenon, argues the author. As such, it will not make the republican cause possible.

The *Sunday Telegraph*'s image of the Queen being "stampeded into some concessions by popular demand" (App. 2: 13) has to be interpreted in the context of the comparison between Diana and the Queen. The author says about Diana: "she acquired (…) a quite remarkable ability to get quickly on terms with every sort of person (…). She also had an exceptional flair for the spontaneous, imaginative gesture. These are vital attributes for a royal personage in our age" (App. 2: 7). The word 'imaginative' is the key word in this passage as Grigg later criticises the Queen for having "marvellous stability and quiet, reliable dignity, but very little imagination and a marked reluctance to depart from established routines". What is implied in the phrase "very little imagination" is the Queen's inability to take decisions "on her own initiative" (App. 2: 13). The Queen is too impersonal, too official and too inflexible, implies the *Sunday Telegraph*. She should learn from Diana who understood the popular mood and was able to respond to its demands. According to the author, "an amalgam of their virtues would be an ideal" (App. 2: 12). The word

'amalgam' and the word 'balance' from Paragraph 1 implicitly point to the Queen's weaknesses and carry concealed criticism at her failure to respond to popular demand of providing focus for grief in the aftermath of Princess Diana's death. In the future, the author expects the Queen to espouse "a rather less predictable way of conducting her life" (App. 2: 13) and "the principle of anticipating rather than following events" (App. 2: 14)

3.2 The Queen's fifty years on the throne

Princess Elizabeth was proclaimed Queen on 6 February 1952, the day of the sudden death of her father, King George VI. However, the coronation took place fourteen months later, on 2 June 1953. Since it was the first televised coronation in British history, it marks a milestone in the relationship between the monarchy and the media.[117] David Cannadine notices that the coronation of Elizabeth II may be interpreted as "a bridge between older times and a new development phase",[118] by which he means the possibility for huge numbers of the public to watch the royal rituals on television. It is said that the television era in the UK started with the coronation of the then Princess Elizabeth in 1953.[119] Since then, the public has had the opportunity to watch the Queen's jubilee celebrations twice. The Silver Jubilee in 1977, and the Golden Jubilee in 2002. Both events became the occasion to review the Queen's merits. As the YouGov poll revealed, at the time of the Golden Jubilee – in

[117] See, for example, Eldridge *et al*. (1997), pp. 87-88.
[118] Cannadine (1994), p. 56.
[119] Roger Mortimore and Jane Robinson. "Changing Social Values", Ipsos MORI, 10 June 2003. Interestingly, the same is said about television in Germany. Cf. Gerhard Schmidtchen. "Der Gesang des Denkens. Mein Weg zu Adorno", in S. Mueller-Doohm (ed.) *Adorno-Portraits. Erinnerungen von Zeitgenossen*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2007, p. 35. Anecdotally, the desire to watch the broadcast of the event was the biggest incentive in the sudden expansion of TV ownership not only in the UK but also abroad. *The Daily Telegraph* reported on 3 June 1953 that "including those in France, Germany and Holland, about 2,750,000 sets were receiving the memorable pictures" of the coronation ceremony. Cf. "Greatest day of British TV. Pictures that will live in memory", *The Daily Telegraph*, 3 June 1953, p. 11.

contrast to the critical press reaction to Elizabeth II's behaviour following Princess Diana's death – the Queen's credits were held in high esteem. Seventy one per cent thought the Queen hard-working, while eighty one per cent considered her to be a "good ambassador for Britain".[120] This resulted in positive press responses not only from the monarchy-friendly newspapers but also from the republican press, as the analysed articles will illustrate. The news about the Queen's 50 years on the throne dominated the media coverage from the anniversary of the actual accession in February 2002, through the Jubilee celebrations in June 2002, to the anniversary of the coronation in June 2003. I have chosen two articles that mark the one-year period of media reporting.

The first article I will analyse in this section is the leading article dating from 3 June 2002, the peak day of the Golden Jubilee Weekend celebrations, published in the *Guardian* under the title "The Queen's success: She does her strange job rather well"[121] (cf. App. 3). The second article analysed in this section was written by Ian Bradley for the *Daily Telegraph* on 2 June 2003 to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the coronation ceremony and is entitled "Coronations will always be a time to rededicate the nation"[122] (App. 4).

3.2.1 The headlines

The *Guardian*'s headline "The Queen's success: She does her strange job rather well" may be seen as a response to the results of the YouGov poll mentioned above. However, in this positive assertion, it is possible to discern a patronising tone. The

[120] "What we think of the Royals", The *Observer*/YouGov poll, 30 December 2001. http://observer.guardian.co.uk/uk_news/story/0,6903,625677,00.html. Last viewed 5 January 2008.
[121] "The Queen's success: She does her strange job rather well" (Leading article), *The Guardian*, 3 June 2002, p. 17.
[122] Ian Bradley. "Coronations will always be a time to rededicate the nation", *The Daily Telegraph*, 2 June 2003, p. 14. Ian Bradley is reader in practical theology and church history at the University of St Andrews. He is also the author of the book *God Save the Queen: The Spiritual Dimension of Monarchy*.

author presents the Queen's position as a 'job'. As Michael Billig notices, this use of language is "demystificatory, for it strips away mystique, making monarchy appear ordinary".[123] It implies that an ordinary person stands behind the extraordinary role of being a monarch. It attempts to reduce the mystery of the institution of monarchy and to bring the royalty "down to our [the people's] level"[124] by ridiculing the pretensions of its superiority.

The headline from the *Daily Telegraph*: "Coronations will always be a time to rededicate the nation" draws on a medieval, religious character of the ceremony and implies its unifying function for the nation. Using the word 're-dedicate', the author admits that contemporary Britain is in need of a new, re-thought role for the monarchy. Simultaneously, he suggests that the institution and its rituals can offer a point of reference and serve as an integrative element for the society. Intensified by the combination of words: "will always be", the headline highlights the centuries-long tradition of the monarchy and, directing the reader's attention onto the future, suggests that the medieval coronation ceremony can be adapted in any time so as to find new forms of expression in the face of constantly changing circumstances.

3.2.2 Structure, tone and style

In the *Guardian* article it is possible to distinguish two parts. In the first part of the article the author reflects briefly on Elizabeth II's reign and compares the Queen's 1977 silver jubilee with the golden one. It is possible to discern a sentimental tone in the passages referring to the past events. The change in tone is discernible in Paragraph 5. The author starts criticising the monarchy and calling for abolition of

[123] Billig (1998), p. 68.
[124] Barnett, *The Guardian*, 8 September 1997, p. 7.

some of the constitutional principles, such as the Act of Settlement. However, he keeps a respectful tone when referring to the Queen.

The *Daily Telegraph*'s text may also be divided into two parts. The first part concentrates on the role of the British coronation ceremony. In a language dominated by religious imagery, Bradley first explains the meaning of the coronation for the nation, supporting it with a number of historical anecdotes about the coronations of British monarchs. In the second part (from Paragraph 7), the author brings up some of the changes that the British society has undergone since the coronation service in 1953. He focuses on the religious changes that have touched the nation, in particular, secularisation and growing religious pluralism.

3.2.3 Argumentation

The author of the leading article from the *Guardian* introduces the Queen's 2002 golden jubilee celebrations as the occasion to provoke "the discussion about the challenge of change: change in Britain, change in the monarchy and how that relationship evolves in response to future change" (App. 3: 1). This strand of thought, however, does not acquire much prominence later in the text and is only touched upon in Paragraph 5. The reason for it, which the author is trying to communicate through his linguistic solutions, is that it is not a priority matter and can be dealt with after the bank holiday. This is a reflection of what meaning the jubilee celebrations carry for the author: "weekend's extended holiday" (App. 3: 1, 2, 6). Although the author associates Queen Elizabeth II's reign with continuity and stability, he expresses surprise at the fact that "the golden jubilee events [were] taking place at all" and, even more remarkably, were surrounded by "the general air of benevolence (App. 3: 3). In comparison to the 1997 jubilee, the *Guardian* notices many changes in the national mood (App. 3: 2). He underlines the differences by

means of an anaphora: “there were far more union flags, far more parties and far larger crowds (…), [but] the national mood (…) was also far more stressed” (App. 3: 2). The golden jubilee is successful because the Queen has done “her strange job rather well” (App. 4: 4) and “the palace has learned its lessons from [the events following Diana’s death] and has become more politically and media aware” (App. 4: 4), argues the author. In addition, there is a “general national prosperity” (Ibid.). In these favourable conditions, some members of the society, even devoted republicans, dream about the Queen.[125] At this point, the author breaks his line of reasoning claiming that these sentimentalities indicate the irrationality of monarchy. The author points to a number of aspects to support his new strand of thought: the monarchy is anachronistic, undemocratic, slow to change, it is judicially and administratively privileged, e.g. by tax breaks, and symbolises religious intolerance. But above all, the monarchy is “the embodiment of a primitive, superstitious aspect of the human condition” (App. 3: 5). It is irrational because the human condition is irrational, argues the *Guardian* (App. 4: 5). Nevertheless, one could use these arguments in favour of the monarchy. Centuries-old popular support for the monarchy suggests that it has something essential in itself, which fulfils many people’s needs. This argument is taken up and developed further by Ian Bradley in the *Daily Telegraph*.

Ian Bradley in the *Daily Telegraph* discusses a very interesting aspect of the myth of the British monarchy, i.e. its religious aspect, which is nowadays rarely brought up. The opening line evokes the coronation of Queen Elizabeth II, which was proclaimed as bringing England to “the kingdom of heaven” (App. 4: 1; cf. Chapter 3. 2. 4). Bradley supports his argument with a quote from two left-leaning sociologists, Edward Shils and Michael Young, to show that the coronation of 1953 had a religious dimension and a metaphysical meaning for the representatives of all

[125] For a discussion about the collective wish to have a chance meeting with a member of the Royal Family, see: Billig (1998), p. 77.

political orientations, even those that usually argue against the monarchy. Bradley further quotes historical authorities, notably Shakespeare, who contributed greatly to the royal and national image-making through his plays. According to Bradley, the coronation is an utmost expression of the divine quality. He underlines the symbolic and the sacred role of the coronation evoking "the divinity (…) that hedges around the monarchy" (App. 4: 1). The second role has a rather political and secular character. The coronation is seen as "an assertion of national values and ruling principles" (App. 4: 2). Interpreting it in this way, Bradley attempts to elevate the British coronation to a democratic event. This is argumentatively important for the second part of the article (from Paragraph 7), where Bradley discusses certain social processes in the UK. He is particularly concerned with the process of the secularisation of society. He acknowledges that the society has become more secular and juxtaposes secular republicanism against sacred monarchy (App. 4: 7). He also raises another argument, i.e. that the British society has become "much more pluralistic" (ibid.). There are so many religious minorities in the UK, argues the author, that the Church of England might have lost its significance. However, the large-scale public reaction to the deaths of Princess Diana and Queen Mother have proven that the Church of England can still have an integrative function in the society characterised by religious diversity. It is further explained in the *Guardian* that the mourning rituals of these two royal personalities fascinated the public because they "were essentially medieval rather than modern in character" (App. 4: 8). Bradley's most important argument for the relevance of the coronation ceremony in a pluralistic and secular society is to be found in the popularity of *Harry Potter* and *The Lord of the Rings.* Due to their magic dimension they appeal to the general public from various religious backgrounds. The author argues that the monarchy and the Queen belong to this world of magic and thus stand above the clash of cultures.

Talking of "the unifying presence of the monarchy" (App. 4: 10), the author of the leading article represents the Queen as a peaceful synthesis of all contradictions of "the British character" (App. 4: 10). The Queen and her coronation ceremony provide the point of reference for the representatives of all religious convictions present in Britain. They symbolise "the spiritual character" and "sacramental heart" (App. 4: 11) for the monarchists and practising Anglicans, "traditions of tolerance and openness" (App. 4: 10) for the republicans, as well as the "unifying force" (App. 4: 11) for Muslims and other religious minorities.

3.2.4 Figures of speech and imagery

The *Daily Telegraph*'s article is dominated by religious imagery and metaphoric. To start with, England is presented by means of a powerful metaphor of the "kingdom of heaven" (App. 4: 1), which implies Britain's special position in the world as a nation chosen by God's will.[126] Bradley does not put forward himself such a metaphorically laden phrase, but quotes the Archbishop of Canterbury, Geoffrey Fisher, who presided over Queen Elizabeth II's coronation. Bradley adds, however, that this opinion of the coronation was widely accepted.[127] Further in the text he supports his argument with quotes. The coronation, as quoted from Shils and Young, is called "an act of national communion" (App. 4: 1) and the monarchy "defender of faith and guardian of the traditions of tolerance and openness" (App. 4: 10). Both examples imply that the institution of monarchy and its symbolic manifestations have a

[126] See also: Cannadine (1994), p. 51.
[127] The MORI commentary on changing social values in the British society during the last half of the century reveals that it is impossible to measure directly the support for the monarchy at the time of the coronation. Apparently, the leading public opinion poll company, Gallup, did not ask the British about the attitude to the monarchy in 1953. According to Mortimore and Robinson, it "speaks volumes in itself" since it shows that the monarchy was not a debatable issue at that time. Cf. Mortimore and Robinson (2003).

significant role in a society, which highlights values relevant to the British and provides a sense of national identity.

In the *Guardian* the monarchy is metaphorically referred to as "the coping stone of an edifice of church and state" (App. 3: 5). Since the *Guardian* argues for the abolition of the constitutional laws for the monarch, this metaphor implies "the most blatant religious intolerance" (App. 3: 5).

The metaphor "queen of people's hearts" (App. 3: 6) present in the fragment quoted from Ben Pimlott in the *Guardian*'s article alludes to the phrase usually attributed to Princess Diana.[128] However, the *Guardian*, following Ben Pimlott, praises the Queen for *not* seeking to be the "queen of people's hearts" (cf. Ibid). Instead of pursuing a populist way of fulfilling her role, the Queen "continued to do what was expected of her" and she "knew and enjoyed her business".[129] This quote from Pimlott is in line with the *Guardian*'s argument (cf. Chapter 3. 2. 1). Pimlott evaluates the Queen's reign in 'business' terms. The Queen was consistent in her behaviour and performed her duties well, she did 'a good job', as the *Guardian* would say.

Both articles touch upon the issue of the spiritual dimension of monarchy. The *Daily Telegraph* attributes to the royalty a fundamental symbolic role in the life of the British. Despite the seeming criticism, the *Guardian* also confirms this essential, although in its eyes irrational, function of the monarchy, but tries to underplay the significance of this conclusion stating that monarchy in Britain is a symbol of religious intolerance. However, the *Guardian* does not scrutinise the problem. Ian Bradley, on the other hand, seems to have a more progressive approach although he writes for a newspaper that is regarded as conservative. He identifies the

[128] Lomax (1999), p. 90.
[129] Pimlott (1996), p. 580.

problem – religious diversity – and suggests a practical solution of how to adapt the royal rituals to the needs of today's society.

3.3 The Queen's eightieth birthday

On 21 April 2006 Queen Elizabeth II celebrated her eightieth birthday.[130] It became an occasion for the press to comment on the course of the Queen's reign and evaluate her achievements and failures. In this section I will analyse two articles: "Subtly and silently, the Queen has bound our society together" written by Tom Utley in the *Daily Telegraph*[131] (cf. App. 5) and "Elizabeth the Last" written by Jonathan Freedland in the *Guardian*[132] (cf. App. 6). Both articles were published on the 21 of April 2006.

3.3.1 The headlines

The *Guardian*'s headline - "Elizabeth the Last" - is an ironic play upon soubriquets that used to be attached to medieval monarchs such as Edward the Confessor or William the Conqueror for their extraordinary qualities or achievements. The word 'last' implies the end of the institution which the Queen represents. It also implies that Elizabeth II may go down in history not for her merits, but simply as the last British monarch. She is keeping the monarchy alive.

The *Daily Telegraph*'s headline - "Subtly and silently, the Queen has bound our society together" - is, on the other hand, patriotic in tone. The Queen is represented as a head of the society and a symbol of national unity and identity, who

[130] April 21 is the Queen's actual birthday. The official birthday marked in London by the Ceremony of Trooping of the Colour is usually celebrated in June.
[131] Utley, Tom. "Subtly and silently, the Queen has bound our society together", *The Daily Telegraph*, 21 April 2006, p. 24.
[132] Jonathan Freedland. "Elizabeth the Last", *The Guardian*, 21 April 2006, p. 6.

acts as a cohesive force on the society no matter the divisions and inequalities, exerting her influence in gentle and invisible ways. The author implies that the very presence of the Queen ensures stability, peace and consensus, an assumption that carries ideological dimension and is central to the 'invented' role for the monarch.[133]

3.3.2 Structure, tone and style

The writing style employed by both authors is different. Tom Utley in the *Daily Telegraph* writes in a very subjective and personal manner. His article consists of two parts. In the first part of the article, Utley adopts a very personal perspective. His subjective tone is also visible in the frequency with which the author uses the personal pronoun 'I', and its combinations: 'my', 'me' and 'myself', which appear thirty times in the first part of the text. This part is nostalgic in tone, which is visible in Utley's references to his father and his school days. In the second part of the text (from Paragraph 9), Utley discusses the factors that bind the British society together. The article becomes elevated and proud in tone. He speaks as a representative of the "huge numbers" (App. 5: 13) and "great majority" (App. 5: 9, 12) of the British society who share the affection for the Queen. This again correlates with the change of the personal pronoun from the first person singular to the inclusive first person plural. The number of words such as 'we', 'our', 'us' and 'ourselves' amounts to twenty eight in the second part of the text, whereas 'I' occurs only twice. The article ends in a glorifying and patriotic tone as the author modifies two lines of the British national anthem "God Save the Queen" to wish the Queen a happy birthday: "Long live the Queen! And long may she reign over us!" (App. 5: 16).

Jonathan Freedland's style in the *Guardian* may be described as academic in that he tries to present his arguments in an objective and balanced manner. It is

[133] Cf. Cannadine (1994), p. 24.

possible to distinguish three parts in the *Guardian*'s article. The first part focuses on the Queen's role for 'us' (the inclusive plural pronoun 'we' appears thirteen times in the first part of the text), i.e. the British society. In the second part (from Paragraph 10), Freedland shifts the thematic focus from the Queen as an individual to the institution of monarchy. He polemically weighs various arguments for and against the monarchy distinguishing between three positions: republican, strident monarchist and pragmatic royalist, or, in other words, traditionalist. Although the argumentative mode is present till the end of the article, it is possible to discern a separate strand of thought in Paragraph 16, where Freedland tries to answer the question why it matters to abolish the principle of hereditary monarchy. He concentrates on what a hereditary monarchy means for the British society, which is visible in the frequent occurrences of the plural pronouns 'we', 'our', and 'us' (they amount to thirty five in this part). Although the author admits that he will not gain the sympathy of his fellow countrymen proclaiming republican ideas, his polemic style is supposed to prove his arguments to be objective and credible.

3.3.3 Argumentation

Tom Utley's main argument in the *Daily Telegraph*'s article is based on his father's definition of what a free society is. The fact that the author took the example from his personal life and reinforced it with the authority of his father is supposed to increase the authenticity of the argument. In the biographical anecdote, Utley mentions his sister and his father to whom he owes "an entire political philosophy", i.e. an explanation of what is the essence of a free society. The greatest mark of a free society, according to the author, is "the spontaneous co-ordination of will and effort" fostered by various "factors that bind a society together" (App. 5: 3). This definition prepares the ground for Utley's argumentation. Queen Elizabeth II is represented as

one of the factors binding society together. The author argues that “our [the British] shared and unforced affection for her is one of the glorious marks of a free society” (App. 5: 16), thus implying that the admiration for the Queen is consistent with the conditions of a democratic society. The Queen binds society together stronger than anything else, apart from the language, argues the author. Although the British society has undergone many changes in the last fifty years, and the British from the time of the 1953 coronation were a more homogeneous nation in terms of “race, colour and language” (App. 5: 12) than they are now, the Queen has acted as a “cohesive force” (App. 5: 3, 7, 11) on the society embracing all the divisions, says the author. She has fostered the feeling of British national identity even among ethnic minorities. The author supports this argument with his linguistic choices. The word ‘bind’ connoting national identity and social cohesion appears nine times in the text in various combinations such as ‘binding’, ‘bound’, ‘bond’. According to the author, there are two main reasons as to why the Queen has become such an important figure for British nationhood. First, it is the duration of her reign. Since “well over half the population (..) have lived under only one monarch” (App. 5: 6), they associate the institution with an image of the Queen known to them from the media: “the handbag and the smile” (App. 5: 6). Second, the Queen, as a head of state above party politics, is a less controversial and divisive figure than elected presidents.

Jonathan Freedland in the *Guardian* takes up the debate between the monarchists and republicans, although it becomes evident from the text that he himself represents the voice of the republicans. His arguments against the institution of monarchy may be summarised as follows. First of all, a hereditary character of monarchy is criticised. An important institution, says Freedland, should be connected with professional competence rather than passed on from generation to generation by bloodline. In Freedland’s eyes an hereditary monarch is “as absurd as an hereditary

mathematician, or an hereditary wise man" (App. 6: 13). Second, he considers the privilege of a white, religiously determined dynasty on the throne to be racist. Freedland is especially concerned with this argument since the monarch, as the head of state, represents the country not only to the rest of the world, but above all, it "symbolises what kind of society [the British] are" (App. 6: 16). Third, the privilege of birth, according to Freedland, seems archaic in a modern society. Without the chance to achieve the top of the social ladder, says Freedland, the individuals lose the motivation to social advancement. Interestingly enough, this claim bears resemblance to the statement made by Malcolm Muggeridge in an article published in 1955 entitled "Does England Really Need a Queen?",[134] who concluded that the ""effulgence of royalty" shone on social distinctions, giving them validity".[135] He criticised the British monarchy as "snobbish, obsolete and disadvantageous".[136] The final argument concerns politics. The author of the *Guardian* article blames the royal prerogative for facilitating the over-centralisation of power in the hands of the executive and calls for its reform.

The republican line of reasoning notwithstanding, Freedland simultaneously attempts to counter-argue two claims propagated by the monarchists. This thought-through technique is supposed to vouch for his competence and make his case appear more reliable. First, Freedland argues against the case that the Queen is an attraction boosting tourist industry. He provides two examples to challenge this argument: Versailles and the White House attract many tourists without hereditary monarchs in residence. Second, monarchical tradition is not such an old and prominent feature of the British nation as "the restless pursuit of liberty and democracy" (App. 6: 21).

[134] Cf. Antony Jay. Elizabeth R. *The Role of the Monarchy Today*, London: BBC Books, 1992, p. 202. The article was first published in the *New Statesman* in 1955. However, seen as an attack on the consumerist age rather than the Queen, it did not spark off any serious debate. It was re-published in the New York *Saturday Evening Post* in 1957 on the occasion of the Queen's visit to the USA. Cf. Pimlott (1996), p. 285.
[135] Cf. Pimlott (1996), p. 285.
[136] Cf. Pimlott (1996), p. 285.

It is possible to discern another important argumentative line in the *Guardian*'s text centred upon the evaluation of the Queen's reign. Elizabeth II is characterised in the *Guardian* with the superlative: "one of the most accomplished politicians" (App. 6: 9). In the third part of Freedland's article (from Paragraph 16) it becomes clear why he uses this metaphor to describe the conduct of Elizabeth II. In a sophisticated way, after having presented the arguments in favour of the Queen, Freedland starts to counter these arguments in order to support his convictions. This is where the dialectics between a monarchist and a republican view of the monarchy begins, and remains present till the end of the text. On the one hand, Freedland admits that the British should celebrate their Queen since she has deserved it for "the near-faultless job" (App. 6: 11). On the other hand, he intriguingly reminds the British to keep in mind the fact that the conduct of the Queen's successor may not live up to expectations. He highlights the difference between the Queen, a "nice lady" (App. 6: 12), and the monarchy; between the person and, to paraphrase him, the shameful institution. With the acknowledgement of the Queen's qualities, Freedland attempts to avoid being classified as a prejudiced critical republican. He also tries to show that his republican arguments are objective and balanced. However, Queen Elizabeth II's eightieth birthday is the occasion for him to remind the British of the necessity to think about the future of the British monarchy as an institution.

3.3.4 Figures of speech and imagery

In the *Daily Telegraph*, Utley demonstrates the length of the Queen's reign by means of a comparison to a sporting achievement. According to him, the Queen fulfilled her duty with "the stamina of a marathon runner" (App. 5: 6). The author compares her reign to a long-distance run, underlining thus the continuity and stability she

represents. In terms of Elizabeth II's personal attributes, however, Utley is very laconic mentioning only "the handbag and the smile". In contrast to Utley, Freedland in the *Guardian* attempts to broaden the range of Queen's credits beyond her long reign.

The *Daily Telegraph*'s article bears references to historical enemies in order to support his argument. As one of the factors binding British society together in the aftermath of the second world war, Utley mentions the "suspicion of garlic" (App. 5: 13). The mechanism of stereotyping adopted here points to the inheritance of antagonistic attitudes to the French, described by the British as garlic-loving. This reference is also intensified by the contemptuous comment on the President of France, who is described by Utley as a "preposterous fraud, Jacques Chirac" (App. 5: 10). The role of the use of stereotyping in this article is worth pondering. By referring to historical enemies, Utley "uses history as a (…) cement of group cohesion".[137] As Colley points out, the 'invented' British national identity was fostered to a great extent by war.[138] The sense of British national identity was constructed in the opposition to 'the Other', to use Linda Colley's term. The members of a certain social or a territorial unit imagine other social units as 'them' in contrast to 'us'. A succession of wars between Britain and France in the eighteenth century, together with the threat of a French invasion and of losing their insular independence contributed to the fact that the British defined themselves collectively against the French. This was encouraged by frequent stereotyping. Since the British imagined the French to be "superstitious, militarist, decadent and unfree",[139] the reference to them underlines the *Daily Telegraph*'s argument built around the 'free' British.

[137] Hobsbawm (1983), p. 12.
[138] Colley (1992), p. 5.
[139] Colley (1992), p. 5.

Jonathan Freedland's article in the *Guardian* represents the Queen by way of a number of metaphors. The first one represents the Queen as "Britain's living memory" (App. 6: 5), which points to the length of the Queen's reign and implies what the *Guardian* in 2002 expressed: "the Queen is the only British monarch we [the British] have ever known" (App. 3: 1). The continuity of Elizabeth II's reign is also underlined in the second metaphor. She is represented as "a permanent part of [the British] landscape" (App. 6: 8) and as "the only constant" (App. 6: 6) in a rapidly changing world in which typical British symbols such as "the red telephone boxes", for instance, have disappeared. Moreover, Freedland attributes a very essential role to the Queen calling her "the human embodiment of the British nation" (App. 6: 17). The significance Freedland ascribes to the Queen reaches its apex when he describes her influence on the British society using Carl Jung's psychoanalytic terms. He presents the Queen metaphorically as existing "somewhere deep in our collective consciousness" (App. 6: 7). Thus Freedland confirms, similarly to Utley, that Elizabeth II has deeply permeated the individual lives of her British subjects.

Freedland in the *Guardian* does not only evaluate the Queen in psychoanalytic or socio-historical terms, but also attempts to assess her service using political standards. He mentions "sustained popularity and an ability to avoid trouble" as her major credit and contrasts this achievement with the social faux pas of Edward VIII, Prince Philip, the Queen's husband and her son, Prince Charles. According to Freedland, this qualifies her to be "one of the most accomplished politicians of the modern era" (App. 6: 9). Yet, this tribute to the Queen is not expressed uncritically. By calling a fan of the Queen a "bewildered member of the public" (App. 6: 1), Freedland does not only distance himself from being enthusiastic about the Queen, but even takes on a disrespectful tone quoting Ozzy Osborne who compared the Queen to "the world's biggest £20 note". Apart from "sustained

popularity and an ability to avoid trouble", Freedland does not mention any positive character traits of the Queen. He compares the Queen to "a kind of blue-blood Zelig". The implied meaning of this metaphor may be decoded due to the allusion to the main character of Woody Allen's 1983 film entitled "Zelig". The character of 'a Zelig' may be interpreted as a human chameleon who does not have a character on its own. By comparing the Queen to 'a Zelig', Freedland portrays her as a woman lacking characteristic personal qualities. She has been for him "a Zelig" who has let "slip barely a breath of an opinion" even in the most difficult moments in British history: "the dismantling of the British empire, the cold war, the industrial unrest of the 1970s and the Thatcher revolution of the 1980s" (App. 6: 8). Taking into consideration the seriousness of these processes, Freedland comments ironically on the Queen's non-engagement manner: "[t]hat is no easy feat" (App. 6: 9). Interestingly, the *Daily Telegraph* deals with the same quality of the Queen of keeping personal opinions to herself calling her a "no-nonsense woman" (App. 5: 6). This epithet implies the same message as the *Guardian's* direct praise of the Queen for "the way she has done her job" (App. 6: 7).

Both articles underline the length and continuity of Elizabeth II's reign and bring up the issue of neutrality with which she has fulfilled her role as a monarch. Despite the fierce criticism of the institution of hereditary monarchy as such, Freedland confirms, similarly to Utley, that Elizabeth II has deeply permeated the individual lives of her British subjects. Both authors consider her to be one of the most important identity-building factors in Great Britain. Whereas for Utley the Queen functions as the nation's "cohesive force", Freedland perceives her to be "the only constant" the British nation has.

3.4 Summary

The individual descriptive results of the analysis of Queen Elizabeth II's representation in the articles selected from two British daily quality papers, the *Daily Telegraph* and the *Guardian*, and their Sunday sister papers, the *Sunday Telegraph* and the *Observer*, are presented in the relevant sections above. Consequently, I want to provide only a summary account of those results which allow to some degree a generalisation from the examples selected to an overall similarity and difference in the representation of Queen Elizabeth II in these quality publications.

The *Guardian*'s view of Queen Elizabeth II is probably best illustrated by Jonathan Freedland: "nice lady, shame about the institution" (App. 6: 12). A strong differentiation between the Queen as a person and the institution of monarchy in the articles from the *Guardian* is central to the newspaper's position. The Queen represents an anachronistic, undemocratic and hierarchical institution with outdated rituals in egalitarian times. The paper is concerned with the messages manifested to the world by such a representative of British society. The *Observer* also underlines that the British do not need traditional structures any more because the national culture has changed. Therefore, in the last of the analysed articles the newspaper calls on to "bury this ludicrous institution with [Elizabeth II]" (App. 6: 22). Nevertheless, all the authors of the analysed texts from the *Guardian* admit that the person of the Queen in a paradoxical way ensures the stability of democracy, being "the only constant" (App. 6: 5) in times of growing individualism. The *Guardian* acknowledges the significance of the Queen as part of the consciousness of the entirety of British history, which is material to the survival of communal identity.

In contrast to the *Guardian*, the *Daily Telegraph* seems to absolutely identify the Queen with the institution of monarchy in its predominantly personal and emotional articles. All in all, the Queen in the Telegraph newspapers is considered to

form just a small part of a vast monarchical tradition. Due to her royal function, Elizabeth II is considered to be the embodiment of all things British: its history, its culture, the Anglican Church. According to the *Daily Telegraph*, she is essential to maintaining and strengthening the feeling of British nationhood.

It is noteworthy that the sympathy of the *Guardian*'s authors for the Queen has intensified over the years under analysis. The older the Queen, the more respect she receives from the *Guardian*. The *Guardian*'s sympathy for the Queen has reached its climax at her eightieth birthday, where the glorifying tone for the Queen has exceeded the *Telegraph*'s. It is possible to discern a growing tension in the *Guardian*'s position between an abstract refusal of monarchy and an actual admiration for Elizabeth II. This tension is as old as the constitutional monarchy itself. This form of government does not only enable the co-existence of the votaries of individual, democratic freedom, but also supporters of a personalised tradition. As becomes apparent, the popularity of a monarchy as an institution depends much more on the personality of the sovereign than the popularity of a republic on its governmental representatives.

Since all the analysed newspaper articles express admiration for the Queen as a monarch, it does not surprise that the rhetorical repertoire of both newspapers is similar. They use similar naturalised ideologies. The authors employ the same strategies when discussing the Queen as an individual and in relation to the British national identity. The difference consists in the presentation of the Queen in relation to the institution of monarchy. According to the *Guardian*, the Queen represents an anachronistic, undemocratic and hierarchical institution. *The Telegraph*, on the other hand, sees the monarchy as a an embodiment of the British nation, defender of faith and a bastion of freedom.

4 Conclusion

This thesis has shown that analysing the British press articles can provide valuable insights into how Queen Elizabeth II is portrayed in relation to other members of the British royal family, the constitutional monarchy as a form of government, and, most importantly, British nationhood. In this thesis I have analysed the representation of Queen Elizabeth II in two British quality daily newspapers, the *Daily Telegraph* and the *Guardian*, and their Sunday counterparts, the *Sunday Telegraph* and the *Observer*, covering the period from 1997 to 2006. Thus, a part of the British media sector provided the material for analysis.

Within media and cultural studies, texts are considered to be a powerful form of communication capable of contributing to particular beliefs and attitudes of the audiences. Because of the relationship of media outlets with broader political, economic and socio-cultural structures, they are often analysed with reference to their ideological representation of the world. The elements of ideological forms of representation of the British Queen and the monarchy have been discovered in the newspapers studied here.

The main purpose of the research presented here was to examine the representation of Queen Elizabeth II in the selected newspapers in order to show how the textual differences correspond with the paper's general political attitude. By comparing a sample of six articles, the analysis has aimed at discovering the similarities and differences in the Queen's representations in the *Daily Telegraph* and the *Guardian* and their Sunday sister papers, the *Sunday Telegraph* and the *Observer*. I have attempted to identify the most important coded messages and imagery circulated by these newspapers over a time course of ten years, from 1997 to 2006, to the degree that my intercultural competence allows. The analysis has enabled me to identify patterns of recurring themes which permeate the discussion

about the Queen. It revealed wider socio-cultural dilemmas, the values of modernity, tradition, democracy and freedom as well as constitutional monarchy as a form of government. The most prominent, however, were the themes concentrated around British national identity.

First of all, the analysis of the Queen's representations revealed that newspapers are the means whereby the sense of national culture can be reproduced. However, they can also provide the platform for some norms of a shared culture to be contested. Whereas the Telegraph newspapers act as a bastion to British traditional cultural norms and forms, the monarchy being one of the most important examples, the *Guardian* and the *Observer* may be seen as a challenge to some of the British cultural formations; again monarchy is here an example. However, the analysis of these newspapers' narratives of the Queen has pointed to a further issue, i.e. the dilemmatic position of the *Guardian* towards the British monarchy. The article analysis has revealed that the *Guardian* criticises the monarchy as an abstract, anachronistic, undemocratic institution, but that it cannot negate the merits of the Queen as an individual person. Fifty-five years of Elizabeth II's fairly successful reign has made it a bit more difficult to be a republican in contemporary Britain. Referring to the title of my thesis, one could say that the apparent antagonism between the two possible sobriquets for Queen Elizabeth II, Elizabeth the Dutiful or Elizabeth the Last, is not only the antagonism between the two British newspapers, the *Daily Telegraph* and the *Guardian*, but that it also points out, in a way, the contradictory position of the *Guardian* itself. The Telegraph readers do not have to face such complicated dilemmas. For them Queen Elizabeth has proven by her conduct and her personality that the monarchy is one of the fundamental pillars of British nationhood. The question to be faced in the future is how the evaluation of monarchy will change after the Queen's reign. It may result in a more apparent

polarisation between the republicans and the monarchists. The next British monarch may have an additional problem. Brought up in an era of intrusive mass media and pervasive publicity, whoever it will be, Prince Charles or Prince William, may not generate such respectful press reactions as Queen Elizabeth has done. Future press discussions are expected to be much more fierce and polarised than the relatively harmless differences between the *Guardian*'s and the *Daily Telegraph*'s representations of Queen Elizabeth II.

With the questions about the future of the monarchy in mind, this thesis has indicated that analysing newspaper material can provide an abundance of valuable information for media-culturally oriented research. However, it was beyond the scope of this study to analyse systematically the press representation of the British monarch and the wider issues associated with her role in the society over a longer period of time. Since "media texts constitute a sensitive barometer of sociocultural change"[140], an extended analysis of discursive practices of the press could manifest the changing social and cultural attitudes.

[140] Fairclough (1995), p. 52.

Appendices

Appendix 1

Leading article: The crown tarnished before our eyes

The Observer (London); Sep 7, 1997; p. 007

Full Text:

1. IF IT WAS a long walk yesterday for the two young princes, it was longer by far for the Prince of Wales. At the end of the most extraordinary week in recent British history, he had to maintain his dignity against the reproach of an audience running into billions in the most tragic of circumstances. Every slow step, he knew, could only enhance Diana's claim on the nation's affections even as it weakened his own. She will haunt him for the rest of his life, just as she will live on in the hearts of her devoted sons.

2. But he had yet to hear Earl Spencer's electrifying tribute to his dead sister - surely the most moving speech ever made at a funeral in Westminster Abbey. The cool anger Diana's brother directed against the Royal Family and press was stunning. As spontaneous applause broke out around the silent Royal Family, Charles and his sons must have wondered whether the consecration of their lives, with all its pain and sacrifice, to upholding a failing monarchy was any longer worth the candle. The institution's gathering obsolescence has never been more cruelly exposed than over the last week; its hold on popular sentiment - crucial to its legimitacy - has been severely dented.

3. Earl Spencer's intervention yet again underlined how subversive Diana's life and untimely death have become. He overturned tradition, setting the seal on what has been a uniquely democratic event and as such a mortal threat to the foundations on which monarchy rests. It was not merely that Elton John was allowed to sing - a decision that was handsomely justified - or that so many concessions over the character of the funeral were shaped by pressure from below; the Palace seriously misjudged not just the public mood but its own capacity to stay aloof from it.

4. The momentum has simply been unstoppable, with millions of Britons insisting on their right to participate - a demand of citizens rather than subjects. In 1997 people expect their individual right to grieve to be respected and the family that purports to represent the nation to be seen to share in the collective mourning at a pitch adjudicated by the people. They are now sovereign; the Crown must follow where they lead.

5. The criticism earlier in the week that the royals did not care enough was heartless and misdirected; grief is not reduced because it is expressed privately rather than publicly. But that was not the issue. Princess Diana is and was a collective national property in a way that only her death has exposed. The scale of the collective response and the feeling shared by her millions of mourners who feel they knew her personally is tribute to a new culture of intimacy, enabled by today's all-encompassing media and fostered by a new democratic spirit - and whose needs completely escaped the Palace.

6. The famous and celebrated are known more closely than ever before. But this intimacy, we now discover, is not one-way traffic and has its own explosive dynamic. The idea has taken root that the people have the right to know intimate personal details of those in public life. Princess Diana was a prime exponent and prisoner of this culture and, to the extent that her death was caused by paparazzi in search of intimate photographs, ultimately its victim.

7. Accompanying this culture of intimacy is a new confidence among ordinary citizens that their opinions are worth as much as those of anybody else. The deference to those

higher in the social scale, along with a stoical acceptance of the status quo that used to be a hallmark of British life, has disappeared completely.

8. This is in part because the media has removed the mystique of those in high places; in part because of the way women and their emphasis on the personal are occupying a more central place in our national culture; in part because a generation of comprehensive education, with its deep attachment to egalitarian values, has implanted a belief that everybody is empowered to an extent that a largely privately educated elite has yet to grasp; and in part because in these reflexive, uncertain times all values are in a state of flux.

9. Charles and his sons are in the eye of this hurricane of demands for intimacy and its accompanying democratic demand for voice - but they cannot respond without undercutting the very principle of monarchy. Kings can be neither democrats nor the objects of intense personal scrutiny without giving up what it has always meant to be a king in Britain, which is why the Queen sounded so awkward in emphasising her role as grandmother as well as monarch. It is why neither retreat to aloof dignity nor a full adoption of Princess Diana's affectionate, human approach to winning legitimacy work as ways forward for the monarchy. Thus its passing, at least in its current form, is foretold.

10. Indeed Diana herself, who at one time wanted to capture this new mood and put it to the service of the monarchy, towards the end of her life realised the attempt was beyond the capacity of the Windsors. The pass had been sold and she predicted that Charles's appetite for kingship was fading, as was the likelihood he would ever make it to the throne. She can hardly have guessed that she herself would play so important a role in creating what is approaching a revolution in British life - although in describing herself as the 'ultimate rebel' she may have suspected more than she let on.

11. However, intimacy and the need to express voice cannot alone explain the response that the funeral aroused. For Diana met the need of a lonely, secular society for solidarity and warmth - and for secular saints. The British of the egalitarian postwar years, creating a welfare state in which all had a stake, could unreservedly cheer Elizabeth II at her coronation as their collective embodiment - but the past 20 years of rising inequality, decaying public institutions and celebration of private activity in private free markets has created a new society that is more individualistic, more insecure, less anchored in its values and more alone.

12. Happiness is no longer gained from the service and duty that is at the core of the Queen's world view; it has to advance individual well-being in a world in which we all make it up for ourselves - hence the growth of quackery, crackpot cults, alternative lifestyles and, now we find, the sudden and irrational conferring of near-sainthood upon Princess Diana.

13. But canonisation would not have come Diana's way if she were not felt to be worthy, and here there is a truth that conservative commentators wish to play down or ignore. Diana would not be thought good if the causes she had espoused had been privatisation, workfare and the charity ball; her instincts, amazingly for one with her background and education, took her unerringly to the liberal wing of the spectrum of supportable causes. Homelessness, Aids and landmines are all issues with which the Conservative mind is instinctively uneasy - and an important reason why the responses of William Hague and the Conservative Party to the past week have been so feeble. They don't see the point of Diana's campaigning; the criticism levelled by her against them for their hopelessness on the landmines issue was well deserved.

14. Britain may be a less rooted and more individualistic society than it was but, it turns out, it is more liberal, kind and egalitarian than the metropolitan media and political establishment allow. Blair's victory last May was testimony to that and to the gathering demand for wholesale change; last week is but confirmation of what we should have known.

15. All this is important for the future. Our society can no longer sustain a constitutional role for the monarch. Charles himself, with any plans for marriage to his long-time lover Camilla Parker Bowles now doomed if he wants to inherit the throne, and seen by many as

the architect of Diana's tragic death, is too compromised a figure to make kingship work, even if he wanted to.

16. As the shockwaves radiate outwards from Earl Spencer's tribute - as devastating in its way for the monarchy as Sir Geoffrey Howe's resignation speech was for Margaret Thatcher premiership - Charles must decide whether he will allow the crown to pass directly to his son when his mother dies. If so the Prime Minister must decide in turn whether to support such a move or whether the role of monarch as constitutional head of state must go.

17. The institution can stagger on but amid so much other constitutional change - notably the elimination of the hereditary principle in the House of Lords, an important buttress to hereditary monarchy - it is clear the end is approaching. Indeed, the Royal Family itself may will it, so Britain becomes the first republic brought into being from above rather than by revolution from below.

18. Nor can the media ignore the impact on themselves of Earl Spencer's words. The balance Britain has struck in law between its scant protection for intrusion into the private and personal, its overprotection of reputation through draconian libel laws and stress on secrecy and non-disclosure of information no longer corresponds to the core values of British society, or the pressure points the media is generating.

19. A new balance has to be struck, with libel laws being relaxed and new rights to information being established - but with the press reciprocally accepting limits. A first move must be regulation of the way highly personal, intrusive pictures are obtained and published. To hope that the issue will go away is no longer possible; the incorporation of the European Convention on Human Rights into English law will provide a body of law that a privacy-conscious public will want to use - and the press would be advised to be proactive rather than seen as reluctant partners in responding to the demands for more responsibility that are now irrefusable.

20. The argument that nothing can be done to challenge the status quo because all laws can be evaded in a globalising world is a counsel of despair - and not true. Newspapers, like any citizen within British jurisdiction, must observe British law or suffer the consequences.

21. Yet Diana's capacity to touch our hearts was inseparable from her beauty and grace - something which she herself recognised in her ceaseless attention to her fitness, clothes and make-up. She deployed her beauty to support her mastery of her other attributes - to empathise, to feel, to confess, to nurture.

22. It is a sign of the times that such values, more easily expressed by women than men, are now so dominant in our culture that they have evoked such a thunderous response. The feminist revolution, to which she was the improbable midwife, has come of age. Monarchy and society alike have been profoundly touched by her; we are different from what we were. Whether we will grasp the opportunity to be better is in our own, now lonelier and sadder, hands.

Appendix 2

The Sunday Telegraph; Sep 7, 1997; p. 28

The Princess is dead, long live the Queen

John Grigg says last week's events are proof of the monarchy's enduring strength

THE Queen's broadcast on Friday evening was the best I have ever heard from her, proving (among other things) that she should always broadcast live, not least at Christmas. There was nothing defensive in her tone, though she said, interestingly, that there were "lessons to be drawn". She spoke firmly, as Queen and grandmother, and her words should have the effect of restoring balance in a situation where it is badly needed.

Throughout the past week I have been observing reactions to the death of Diana, Princess of Wales with growing wonderment. My mind has gone back to the early years of the present reign, around the time of the Coronation, when the Queen herself became, involuntarily, the centre of a quasi-religious cult. In the media, and by a large section of the public, she was treated with blind adulation and adoration. She was young, attractive and royal, so who would dream of criticising her?

The climate thus created seemed to me very unhealthy, not least because I was sure it would prove harmful to the Queen herself, and to the monarchy. No human being should be made an object of worship. Love and respect, where merited, yes; worship, no — because such treatment can only be exaggerated, and is unlikely to last.

In recent days I have felt enveloped in a similarly unwholesome atmosphere. Popular and media responses to last weekend's tragic news have been working on each other to produce a collective state of mind even more incense-laden than on the previous occasion. The cult of the modern goddess Diana is, indeed, more potent than that of the young Queen 40-odd years ago, and in some ways more disturbing.

The scale and character of the present cult is, however, for the moment understandable. As well as being a star personality, still young and beautiful, the Princess has been taken from us as the victim — like President Kennedy — of a sudden, violent death. The grief that her loss would anyway have caused is, therefore, compounded by shock, and by a painfully renewed sense of the fragility of life.

In the immediate wake of Kennedy's assassination overwhelming homage was paid to him throughout the world. Even the BBC's satirical programme *That Was The Week That Was* went into deep mourning and gave itself over to devotional material. In retrospect, the instant Kennedy cult seems embarrassing and quite out of proportion. JFK is now an historical figure, and as such has been subject to severe revisionism in both his public and his private life. He remains a substantial figure, but by no means the shining paragon that so many believed him to be at the time. It will always be so when too much is claimed at the outset.

Nevertheless the Princess's genuine reputation, as distinct from the present Dianamania, will rest, like Kennedy's, on more than youth and glamour and transitory emotion. Her good qualities were very good indeed, and should inspire her sons and other members of the royal family. She acquired, with some effort but triumphant success, a quite remarkable ability to get quickly on terms with every sort of person — particularly the old, the young, the sick, the shy, the inadequate, and those who felt that the world was against them — and to convey not just a sense of ease but positive comfort. She also had an exceptional flair for the spontaneous, imaginative gesture. These are vital attributes for a royal personage in our age. But of course she also had serious defects, of which history will have to take account.

What worries me about the present media-enhanced extravaganza of public grief is partly that it shows no awareness at all that there might have been any faults in Diana. Far worse, it seemed to contain — at any rate until Friday — an ugly current of vindictiveness against Prince Charles and the royal family in general, and was also clearly being used by republicans as a means of promoting their own cause.

I have criticised Prince Charles in the past, on various specific grounds, and shall doubtless have reason to do so again. But I profoundly sympathise with him now. He has been recklessly assailed as an utterly selfish and unfeeling man, the cause of all Diana's woes and the destroyer of their marriage. But she herself admitted, in her *Panorama* interview, that she was *half* to blame. When couples fall out it is wise for outsiders to avoid partisanship and to take a charitable view of both parties. The demonisation of Prince Charles — and of Camilla Parker Bowles, for that matter — is a monstrous injustice which desecrates this time of sadness.

Can the Prince's detractors not have the heart to understand that by vilifying him they may well be adding to the misery of two boys who had already suffered enough, in all conscience, from the break-up of their parents' marriage and the gratuitous exposure of the circumstances, even before they had to face the loss of their mother? All the evidence suggests that Prince Charles cares very much for his sons, and they for him. In any case, he is their father, and the royal family is theirs. Do the Windsor-bashers feel that the only blood-relations who count for them are on their mother's side?

It is no fault of those other members of the royal family who do an enormous amount of good work that they lack the star quality that the Princess possessed, shared in this century only by (in their different ways) the Duke of Windsor and Queen Elizabeth the Queen Mother. Even if they could all be stars, the total effect might be disappointing, because all-star casts do not necessarily give the best performances.

There is a most striking contrast between the Princess and the Queen herself, for whom, however, the former always expressed high regard. The Queen has marvellous stability and quiet, reliable dignity, but very little imagination and a marked reluctance to depart from established routines. With the Princess it was the other way round. An amalgam of their virtues would be ideal, but for a constitutional monarch, if one has to choose, steadiness is surely preferable.

> The mountains of flowers at the palace gates are tributes to an institution

Over the years the Queen has shown that she is capable of change, though usually only in reaction to events — as during the past week, when she has been stampeded into some concessions by popular demand articulated by the media. These are mostly, in themselves, relatively small, and of negligible significance for the longer term. But the astonishing manifestations that she has been witnessing, along with the rest of us, may help to persuade her that a rather less predictable way of conducting her life would be of huge benefit to the monarchy, without impairing the necessary degree of stability. There are changes that she could make *on her own initiative* which would be justifiable in their own right, while capturing the world's attention. (For instance, she could suggest that the Opening of Parliament be held in Westminster Hall, with all members of both Houses present, and with the Lord Chancellor no longer walking backwards after handing her the Gracious Speech.)

One must hope that Her Majesty will now anticipate rather than follow events

Above all, one must hope that the principle of anticipating rather than following events will, in future, be accepted. From whatever source constructive ideas may come, the Queen will always deserve the credit for acting on them.

Those who are seeking to exploit the present tidal wave of feeling for republican purposes must be exposed for the hypocrites and humbugs they are. According to one writer (Julie Burchill), Diana has done more for the republican cause than anyone since Cromwell. It would be hard to imagine greater nonsense. For a start, Cromwell's contribution to republicanism was nil. He was a monarchist at heart, and his abolition of the monarchy was reluctant and brief. His regime powerfully reinforced the monarchist instincts of the English people, and after his death the monarchy's restoration was swift.

Yet the 17th-century struggle also asserted the authority of Parliament, while at the same time giving rise to a new sort of monarchy, the constitutional sort. Constitutional monarchy is one of our country's most fruitful inventions. We should be proud of it and cherish it. Today most of the world's stable democracies, of which there are all too few, are constitutional monarchies. It would be an extremity of folly to tear down an institution which is the envy of the world. Despite what people may say to opinion pollsters, without thought and on the spur of the moment, I believe that the true sentiment of the country is still as monarchist as ever.

Indeed, the cult of Diana should not be regarded as an anti-monarchist phenomenon, but rather as proof of the monarchy's enduring strength. The mountains of flowers that have been laid at palace gates are not only tributes to an admired and loved individual; they are also — though some of her votaries may not realise it — tributes to an institution.

If the Princess had any republican inclinations, they were well concealed. After her divorce she remained Princess of Wales. She did not revert to her maiden name, as some divorced wives do. And it was not by her wish that the title HRH was removed from her (mistakenly, as I argued here at the time). In the eyes of the world she was still as royal as ever, and her royal status added immeasurably to her romantic aura. She was a "people's princess" in the sense of having a vast and world-wide popular following, and in having a great talent for communicating with people. But a princess is, by definition, not a republican figure.

Though she had some trendy associations, too much should not, I think, be made of her modernity. Essentially she was a creature of tradition — of the Whig aristocratic tradition and the (far longer) monarchical tradition. Modernity is a will-o'-the-wisp: never to be pursued for its own sake. What is fashionable today tends to be old-fashioned tomorrow. At her best the Princess was concerned with things that have always mattered and always will.

Two profoundly memorable events have lately occurred in Paris. One, of course, was the Princess's death, but we should not forget the other: the celebration by the Pope of an open-air Mass attended by a million young people. The Pope is an old and frail man representing ideas which are the opposite of modern. Yet all those young people were drawn to listen to him and to commune with him. It is also true that the Papacy is a monarchy, with universal significance and appeal. The only other is the British monarchy.

Appendix 3

Leading article: The Queen's success: She does her strange job rather well

The Guardian (Manchester); Jun 3, 2002; p. 17

Full Text:

1. Monarchy is much more about continuity than it is about change, yet the golden jubilee of Queen Elizabeth II is a recognition of both things. For most of us, the Queen is the only British monarch we have ever known, Prince Philip the only consort, and Prince Charles the only heir to the throne. These things have not changed at all in 50 years and they may not change for many more to come. In that sense there has probably not been a period of stability like it in the monarch's family for centuries. But it hardly needs saying that any period of 50 years is also a period of massive change in most other respects. Elizabeth II's first prime minister took part as a young man in one of the last major cavalry charges ever launched by the British army against an enemy. Her current one was not even alive when she came to the throne. Although the reason for this weekend's extended holiday is to mark and in some way, for most people, to honour the continuity of an exceptionally long reign, any discussion of that reign is primarily a discussion about the challenge of change: change in Britain, change in the monarchy and how that relationship evolves in response to future change.

2. Those who can remember the Queen's silver jubilee in 1977, to say nothing of those who can recall her coronation 25 years before that, will not need much reminding that things were very different then. Even in 1977, there were far more union flags, far more parties and far larger crowds than there have been this weekend. The national mood, at a time of double-digit inflation, high unemployment and IMF- imposed spending cuts was also far more stressed, and almost certainly more divisive, than the mood today, when the news (and the majority of people's bank holiday plans) is largely dominated by England's World Cup prospects. "The [silver] jubilee," wrote the historian David Cannadine, "was an expression of national and imperial decline, an attempt to persuade, by pomp and circumstance, that no such decline had taken place, or to argue that even if it had, it didn't matter." Whatever one may say about this weekend's events, they cannot really be invested with such apocalyptic importance.

3. Yet there is something remarkable, nevertheless, about the fact that the golden jubilee events are taking place at all. And there is something even more remarkable in the general air of benevolence with which most people, even some republicans and constitutional agnostics, seem to be approaching them. It is 10 years now since the marital separations, indiscretions and the Windsor fire that made up the Queen's annus horribilis. It is five years since courtiers feared that she would be widely booed by the public in the hysterical mood following the mishandling of the aftermath of the death of Princess Diana. Criticism and irreverence towards the monarchy in the past decade massively outweigh anything of the same sort in the previous 40. Six years ago, when the Queen marked her 70th birthday, she mostly stayed indoors and Buckingham Palace kept state celebrations to a discreet minimum; there was not even a commemorative postage stamp. This year, however, the Queen has been a much more public figure and the celebrations have been carefully and successfully choreographed.

4. Partly this is because the issues raised by Diana and her death have abated much more quickly than many predicted. Partly it is because the palace has learned its lessons from that period and has become more politically and media-aware. Partly it is because the jubilee has been a relatively low-key celebration at a time of general national prosperity. Partly it is because the deaths of Princess Margaret and, in particular, of the Queen Mother make it natural and proper for criticism of the Queen and her family to be more muted. But it would be both churlish and dishonest not to recognise something else. The main reason why the golden jubilee is both more successful and less divisive than some hoped and others

feared is because almost everyone agrees the Queen has actually done her strange job rather well.

5. The Queen is said to believe that when the people look at her they see someone who is honest and prosaic and not so very dissimilar to themselves. A surprising range of people on the other side of the palace railings may agree. Even the life-long republican, Neal Ascherson, admitted yesterday that he had recently dreamed about escorting the Queen into an old cinema and cautioned "Mind that broken stair, Ma'am" as he took her by the hand. Comments of this kind remind us that the British monarchy is irrational. It is the embodiment of a primitive, superstitious aspect of the human condition. Yet the human condition is part of the way that things are. The monarchy nevertheless remains an anachronism. It is undemocratic. It is slow to change. It survives in part thanks to legal and administrative privileges, such as the tax breaks on which we reported last week, in which the rest of the nation never shares. It remains the coping stone of an edifice of church and state that is held together by an Act of Settlement embodying the most blatant religious intolerance and which should be repealed. As a nation, we do not debate it with anything like the honesty and rationality that the subject deserves. It is no disrespect to the Queen to say that this debate needs to be sharpened and accelerated during the rest of her lifetime, because if there is to be change in the foreseeable future it must be in place before she dies.

6. That, though, is for after the bank holiday. The Queen's 50 years on the throne have not coincided with great British power or great British success. In some eyes, indeed, she is as often associated with national decline as with national success. Yet as Ben Pimlott wrote of her in 1996: "It was difficult to point to major achievements, yet it was equally hard to think of many mistakes. She continued to do what was expected of her - not much more, but certainly no less - taking pleasure in the routines and customs of a regulated life: reading and signing the papers that were sent to her, delivering the speeches others prepared, reacting to suggestions from advisers, meeting dignitaries, visiting, touring, taking part in ceremonies. She did not seek to be queen of people's hearts. But to watch her on a walkabout, in a hospital, or at a garden party, was to see a woman who both knew and enjoyed her business. Though the last few years had visibly aged her, she was in good health and resilient." In spite of the turbulent years since those words were first written, it remains a strikingly balanced judgment, and as anyone watching Saturday's Buckingham Palace concert must acknowledge, it is still true today.

Appendix 4

Coronations will always be a time to rededicate the nation

The Daily Telegraph (London); Jun 2, 2003; Ian Bradley; p. 14

Full Text:

1. When Geoffrey Fisher, having presided as Archbishop of Canterbury over the last coronation, solemnly announced that, on June 2, 1953, England had been brought closer to the kingdom of heaven, he was expressing a widely held view. For two Left-leaning sociologists, Edward Shils and Michael Young, the coronation of Queen Elizabeth II was nothing less than "an act of national communion". More than any other national institution or event, the coronation service underlines the divinity that, as Shakespeare so rightly observed, hedges around the monarchy. Packed with religious symbolism and imagery, it provides a particularly intense experience of communal sacred ritual.

2. In the absence of a written constitution, the coronation service carries another very important layer of meaning, providing the nearest that we have to an assertion of national values and ruling principles - the kind of statement that, in other countries, lies in the preamble to the constitution. This is especially true of the coronation oath, in which the monarch promises to govern the peoples of his or her realms according to their laws and customs and to cause law and justice, in mercy, to be executed in all his or her judgments.

3. At their coronations, kings and queens are not simply crowned and enthroned, but consecrated, set apart and anointed, dedicated to God and invested with sacerdotal garb and symbolic insignia. At the heart of every coronation in England for more than 1,000 years has been the act of anointing the new monarch with holy oil, a ritual directly based on the anointing of Solomon by Zadok the priest and Nathan the prophet.

4. Not all monarchs have taken their coronations as seriously as they should. Dunstan, abbot of Glastonbury, was appalled that after the anointing of King Edwy in 955 "the lustful man suddenly jumped up and left the fitting company of his nobles for the caresses of loose women". Dunstan and another cleric had to drag the king back and replace the crown which he had thrown on the floor. King John apparently laughed throughout his coronation, Richard II fell asleep (excusable, since he was only 10) and George IV periodically winked to his mistress, Lady Conyngham.

5. Several coronations have been marred by disasters and mishaps. During the crowning of William I, the Norman cavalry outside Westminster Abbey mistook the shout of acclamation inside for a riot and proceeded to massacre a group of Saxons. The oil used to anoint Elizabeth I was rancid and during James II's coronation the royal standard flying over the Tower of London tore in two. Victoria was left in considerable pain after the Archbishop of Canterbury shoved her coronation ring on to the wrong finger, and was shocked to find the altar of St Edward's Chapel covered in bottles and sandwiches when she withdrew there after the anthem.

6. In general, however, British coronations have enhanced both the spiritual aura surrounding the monarchy and the nation's sense of its identity. Shils and Young observed that the 1953 coronation was frequently spoken of as an "inspiration" and a "re-dedication of the nation". The ceremony had ``touched the sense of the sacred'' in people, heightening a sense of solidarity, and encouraging the affirmation of common moral values such as generosity, charity, loyalty and justice.

7. Fifty years on, academic sociologists are more likely to extol the benefits of secular republicanism than sacred monarchy. Is it possible that future coronations will carry anything like the level of metaphysical meaning or constitute the great national act of communion witnessed in 1953? We are a much more secular society now and significantly less touched by a sense of the sacred. We are also much more pluralistic. Can the country as a whole still

collectively be touched by an intensive contact with the sacred such as Shils and Young argued was achieved by the coronation of 1953, and can a future coronation be left to the Church of England to stage-manage?

8. Two significant royal events in recent years encourage a positive answer to both these questions. In their very different ways, the funerals of Diana, Princess of Wales in 1997 and Queen Elizabeth the Queen Mother last year touched the nation deeply. Both had at their centres the traditional ritual and liturgy of the Church of England. It is true that the public mourning for Diana in particular also inspired the piling up of flowers, candles and other votive offerings around the London palaces and parks. Even in this respect, however, the mourning rituals being acted out were essentially medieval rather than modern in character. The Queen Mother's lying- in-state in Westminster Hall evoked an even more medieval atmosphere, with the officers of the Life Guards standing at each corner of the catafalque.

9. Can an essentially medieval coronation service still speak meaningfully to people? Is there any room in a modernised, 21st- century monarchy for anointing with sacred oil and investiture with bracelets, spurs, orb and sceptre? In fact, the symbols and language of medieval chivalry that pervade the coronation may speak particularly powerfully to the up-coming generation. Those brought up on Harry Potter and The Lord of the Rings are well aware of the potency of magic and the epic quality of the quest for justice, truth, service and sacrifice symbolised in precious objects. Let us not throw out the wonderful pageantry and imagery of the coronation at a time when we are re-discovering the value of the iconic and the symbolic.

10. The acts of anointing, investing and crowning the new monarch should continue to lie at the heart of future coronations, which should take place in Westminster Abbey, although with much more ecumenical participation. But there are other elements that we should consider detaching from future coronation services. The enthronement of, and act of homage to, the next monarch could be made the central features of a new inauguration ceremony held outside London. Somewhere with a notably diverse population, substantial minority faith communities and strong Commonwealth links, such as Bradford, would be particularly suitable as the venue for such a ceremony, celebrating the unifying presence of the monarchy and its role as defender of faith and guardian of the traditions of tolerance and openness which are fundamental to the British character.

11. As we celebrate the Queen's coronation today, it is surely not too early to be thinking how the next coronation, whenever it comes, can best retain its spiritual character and sacramental heart, speak symbolically and relevantly of the deepest values of our nation and act as a healing and unifying force.

Appendix 5

Subtly and silently, the Queen has bound our society together

The Daily Telegraph (London); Apr 21, 2006; Tom Utley; p. 024

Full Text:

1. When my younger sister Catherine was about 12 years old, her English teacher instructed her to write a "very long sentence" for her homework, and then to parse it and punctuate it. She chewed her Biro for a while, gave up and asked for help. Our father, the blind Telegraph journalist T E Utley, took a deep pull on his cigarette, thought for about three seconds and began to dictate.

2. The sentence that he uttered was so sensationally long - and so gloriously unfitted for passing off as a 12-year-old's homework - that my siblings and I set ourselves the challenge of committing it to memory. It has stayed in my head ever since.

3. This is how it goes: "The factors that bind a society together, whether that society be large or small, whether it be a nation or a school, are multifarious and complex, not easily to be defined, nor succinctly to be expressed in any code of conduct or profession of faith, but exerting their cohesive force in subtle and silent ways; yet, strong as these factors may be, which make for the spontaneous co-ordination of will and effort - which is in some measure the mark of all societies, but which is in particular the glorious mark of a free society - they can never be so strong as to dispense with those penal sanctions against the vandal, the thief, the sworn enemy of society itself, which are part of the normal apparatus of civil government and the absence of which signifies not a lofty regard for freedom, as is commonly supposed by 'progressives', but a contemptible indifference to the conditions and limitations that alone make freedom possible."

4. It was more than 30 years ago when I learnt that sentence (more like two sentences, really - I reckon that the semi-colon after "subtle and silent ways" is a bit of a cheat). But it was not until much later that it first struck me how very much wisdom it contained: an entire political philosophy, summed up in... well, I was going to say a nutshell, but perhaps a large coconutshell would be nearer the mark.

5. I have only one slight quibble with it: one of the factors that has been binding our society together, subtly and silently throughout my life, can certainly be said to be easily defined and succinctly expressed. It (or, rather, she) is 80 years old today, and can be summed up in two words: the Queen.

6. I say the Queen, rather than the monarchy, because I was born in the November of Coronation year, which made me one of the first of the New Elizabethan generation. Like well over half the population, I have lived under only one monarch, and when I think of the institution, I think only of that small, no-nonsense woman with the stamina of a marathon runner, the handbag and the smile.

7. I am not going to pretend that the Queen still exerts as strong a cohesive force on the nation as she did during my childhood and youth. I remember reading, a great many years ago, a survey that found that a quite astonishing number of Britons dreamt about having tea with the Queen. I read it with a huge sigh of relief, because I had often had that dream myself. Perhaps I wasn't such a freak after all.

8. I still have the occasional fantasy that one day I will be walking along the Mall as the Queen is driving past in her carriage. A would-be assassin leaps out from behind a tree in St James's Park and levels a gun at her. Valiant Tom Utley interposes his person between his sovereign and the gunman, and takes the bullet for her. (In my fantasy, I suffer only a flesh

wound, which doesn't hurt a bit, but I am lavishly rewarded for saving the Queen's life: "Arise, Sir Thomas; do stay for tea".)

9. I suspect that many fewer people have such dreams and fantasies these days than in the 1950s and 1960s when I was growing up. But it is a huge credit to the character and conduct of Queen Elizabeth II that she remains as widely admired as she is. When we ask ourselves what we have in common with our fellow subjects - black, white, brown, rich, poor, young, old - one of the answers is not only that we all owe allegiance to the same sovereign, but that the great majority of us think that she is a Jolly Good Thing.

10. Elected presidents, with their partisan political allegiances, are much more divisive figures - as witness the recent upsurge of hostility across the Channel to that preposterous fraud, Jacques Chirac.

11. There are other factors, of course, that still bind our society together, but the cohesive force of almost all of them has weakened much more drastically than our affection for the Queen. There are some parts of our inner cities where even the English language - surely the strongest of all the bonds between us - is hardly spoken at all.

12. But then, the Britain into which I was born in 1953 was a very much more homogeneous nation than it is now. The great majority of us were bound together not only by our race, colour and language, but by a thousand other factors, too. There was only one broadcasting service, for example, and we all watched and listened to the same programmes, served up to us by Auntie Beeb.

13. We were bound, too, by our huge national pride in our recent defeat of the odious creed of Nazism. Huge numbers of us - whether dukes, dustmen or the sons of Telegraph journalists - knew the words and music of the same hymns, sung in morning assembly at school. We were bound by our suspicion of garlic, by our respect for the law, by what we had learnt at school (and have long since forgotten) about the dates of the principal battles of the Napoleonic wars... Oh, I could go on forever.

14. All these bonds have weakened over the years, while others - less powerful - have been conjured into being. Our high streets look increasingly samey, from Bristol to Bognor, each with its identical McDonald's and its Gap. We all suffer the same torments of junk mail, computers that don't work, and ever-more-officious demands from an ever-expanding bureaucracy. Subtly and silently, we are united by all these things.

15. But the Queen remains a stronger bond between us than almost any of them.

16. There are very, very few people who wish her anything but the happiest of 80th birthdays today. Our shared and unforced affection for her is one of the glorious marks of a free society. Long live the Queen! And long may she reign over us!

Appendix 6

Elizabeth the Last

The Guardian (London); Apr 21, 2006; Jonathan Freedland; p. 6

1. The Queen has a habit of leaving people she meets tongue-tied. They are overwhelmed by the moment and either say nothing or babble things that make no sense. So it must have been for the bewildered member of the public who, faced with the monarch, could only remark that the lady before her looked a lot like the Queen. "How reassuring," Her Majesty replied. The rock star Ozzy Osbourne, meanwhile, recalled that when he met the Queen, his only thought was that he was face to face with "the world's biggest pounds 20 note".

2. And somewhere in these two stories lies the essence of our relationship with the woman who turns 80 today, and who has represented us as our head of state for 54 years.

3. For the Queen is ubiquitous in our national life in a way unmatched by any other human being. Her silhouetted profile is on our coins and stamps, her face on our bank notes; we all see her every day, more often than we might glimpse the face of our own mothers. And this is how it has been for the entire lives of most of us, and for most of the lives of the rest.

4. Her life is intimately bound up with what now constitutes Britain's living memory. A newborn baby before the General Strike of May 1926, she was present during the abdication crisis of 1936. She was already a visible public figure, a princess and heiress to the throne, during the second world war. As Queen, she has received no fewer than 10 prime ministers: when Winston Churchill, a figure as remote from most young Britons as Horatio Nelson, served his final term at 10 Downing Street, his weekly audience was with the young Elizabeth. From Suez to the Beatles, the Sex Pistols to the miners' strike, from Lady Diana to Big Borther, she has been there throughout - a kind of blue-blood Zelig, present in the background (and sometimes foreground) of most of the major events of the British 20th century and beyond.

5. So much has changed over these years, she may well be the only constant we have. Think of anything else that has been around as long - from the BBC to the Labour party - and they are all utterly transformed. Watch a movie set in 1960s London and all of it has vanished: the red telephone boxes, the Routemaster buses, the Hillmans and Austins. But she is still here. She was the Queen before there was Elvis, when computers were the size of a large room, when a third of the nation believed she had been handpicked by God. From the age of the steam train to the era of satnav, she has been on the throne through it all.

6. It is no wonder that she is in our dreams (one survey reportedly found that the most common British dream was of taking tea with the Queen). She exists somewhere deep in our collective consciousness, a sole fixed point in a world that has changed beyond all recognition. If she finds it reassuring that she looks like the Queen, then so do we.

7. But it is not just length of service that makes her feel like a permanent part of our landscape. It is also the way she has done her job. She has served in a demanding role, that of head of state, for half a century and has barely made a mistake. The job requires her to be politically neutral and, despite 54 years of attention to her every utterance, that is precisely how she is perceived. Scan through newspaper clippings of the second Elizabethan era and you will not find gaffes and crises, leaks of private remarks and subsequent denials. Instead she has played it straight, watching the dismantling of the British empire, the cold war, the

industrial unrest of the 1970s and the Thatcher revolution of the 1980s, letting slip barely a breath of an opinion.

8. That is no easy feat. Think of her uncle, the short-lived Edward VIII, and his flirtation with Adolf Hitler; think of her own mother, and her sympathy for pre-war appeasement; think of her husband's regular, ethnically themed "jokes". Or, more immediately, think of her son, with his constant interventions in public affairs - on complementary medicine, architecture, organic food, religion, foot and mouth - typified least flatteringly by his bombardment of government ministers with long, exasperated letters. Angry of Highgrove. Not the Queen's style, not one little bit.

9. The truth is that, by the usual measures - namely, sustained popularity and an ability to avoid trouble - Elizabeth Windsor would have to be judged one of the most accomplished politicians of the modern era, albeit as a non-politician. There is only one substantial blot on the copybook: her failure to read the public mood after the death of Diana, Princess of Wales in 1997. Her belated response, the televised address to the nation once she had finally broken off her summer holiday in Balmoral, had the visual grammar of a hostage video - as if she was compelled to read the words in front of her in order to save her skin. Which, in a way, she was.

10. For monarchists, this astonishing record is something to celebrate. For republicans it is a cause of decades-old frustration. For more than half a century, it has been impossible to get traction on the question of how we choose our head of state simply because the present incumbent has performed so effectively. Reformers have been left making abstract arguments, each one a blunt arrow bouncing off the steel armour of "if it ain't broke, don't fix it".

11. Yet this week's 80th birthday could, paradoxically, begin to turn that logic on its head. Republicans could admit the obvious - that the Queen has done a near-faultless job - but nevertheless start to raise the wider questions about the merits of monarchy. And those questions would have a relevance now that they might have lacked before, for one simple reason: mortality.

12. Yes, the Queen has done a grand job, republicans can argue; but she will not be around to do it for ever. Surely when any holder of a senior position turns 80 it is fair to start thinking not only about their successor but about the manner of their selection. And it is on this ground that the notion of royalty is most vulnerable. For no matter how admired the Queen is as an individual, there are few strong arguments for the defence, in principle, of the set-up that she embodies. The common-sense view of the whole matter can be summarised very crudely: nice lady, shame about the institution; great Queen, shame about the monarchy.

13. Over the 10 years or so that I have been debating this question, I have noticed the same dynamic repeat itself. Make a republican case, and people will rush to defend Elizabeth. But acknowledge the Queen's remarkable decades of service; declare that she should continue to wear the crown until the day she dies; insist that, when she does, she be given a full state funeral with all the pomp and honour that would be owed by a grateful nation; and suggest that only then should we change the system to allow Britons to choose their own head of state . . . do all that and just watch how the debate shifts. A room that was three-to-one against a republic will become three- to-one in favour of it.

14. The arguments are simple and compelling, starting with the very notion of heredity. Even the most strident monarchist will usually dodge that idea rather than attempt to defend it. They can say little to rebut Tony Benn's well-worn line that we wouldn't trust the airline captain who announced over the public address system, "I'm not, in fact, a trained pilot - but don't worry, my dad was." Nor could they ever tackle Tom Paine, the great, woefully undervalued, British revolutionary, who believed that the notion of allocating positions of state according to birth was as absurd "as that of hereditary judges, or hereditary juries; and as absurd as an hereditary mathematician, or an hereditary wise man; as absurd as an hereditary poet laureate". We would not choose our prime ministers by bloodline - Mark Thatcher, anyone? - so why choose our head of state that way?

15. To that, the pragmatic royalist will ask why it even matters. The monarch has no real powers, they will say. She cuts a few ribbons, launches the odd ship, hosts the occasional state banquet: who cares? To which the answer is that the office of head of state matters enough that every country has it, even if it is sometimes combined with head of government. It matters enough that no ardent monarchist would ever countenance its abolition.

16. And it matters because it represents us, to the rest of the world, but, much more importantly, to ourselves. For better or worse, the head of state is the figurehead, the human embodiment of the British nation. What does it say about us if even now, in the 21st century, our symbol is the child of a single, white, aristocratic family, chosen solely by the blood in her veins? Much of British life used to be that way, when background determined all. We like to think we are different now, that our position is no longer a simple function of our birth. But in this single corner of our collective life, the old rules apply. And it is not just any corner, but the one that symbolises what kind of society we are.

17. Monarchists cannot have it both ways. They cannot say that this institution does not matter and, at the same time, insist that the core principle at its heart must never be changed. They should be honest about their true belief, that this institution is indeed important. On that, republicans would agree. As the Queen and her enduring place in the national imagination proves, the office of head of state matters a lot: it embeds itself deep in our collective marrow. By preserving it in perpetuity for a single, pampered family we send a powerful, subliminal message to every generation of Britons. You may work hard, we say; you may be full of talent and virtue. But you will never, ever, fill the highest office of the land. Your blood is not the right blood.

18. Most democracies abandoned such lunacy centuries ago, but here it persists. We talk the talk about social mobility, but on our national ladder, the top rung is always out of reach. Symbols matter and our central one says that Britain is a place where birth still determines rank.

19. Our politics is warped by this institution too. If we have an over-mighty, over-centralised executive it is because the prime minister is able to rule with quasi-monarchical powers, including the right to dole out seats in the upper house of our national legislature, under the crown prerogative. If we want to reform that, and we should, it will be near impossible to do it without touching the crown itself.

20. Traditionalists will say that our tourist industry will suffer. Republicans should point to Versailles and the White House in reply: two places that are hardly short of visitors, even though no hereditary monarch is in residence. Royalists will say that the monarchy provides much-needed continuity, with the Queen's place over the past 60 years an eloquent illustration. This is their best argument, but there is a reply.

21. For the Windsors do embody a certain continuity, but it is with the history of their own family and their own class. Their ancestors are important, but they do not account for our entire history; there is more to our island story than fables of kings and queens. There is our restless pursuit of liberty and democracy: from Magna Carta to the revolution of 1688, from the Levellers and the Peasants' Revolt to the Chartists and the Suffragettes. We yearn for continuity with that history too and monarchy will never provide it.

22. These are arguments that we need to have, and we need to have them now. If genes are any guide - and when it comes to royalty, you would think that they would be - Elizabeth could well live and reign for another 20 years, overtaking even Victoria's 64-year record. But the way this system works, her successor will be anointed the second she dies: there will be no pause for a debate. If we want one, we have to have it now, so that we might reach a national consensus before the moment arises, not wait until it is too late. So let's wish the Queen a very happy birthday; let's hope she has many more to come and in good health; let's thank her for all she has done. But let's decide now that, when she goes, we bury this ludicrous institution with her .

Bibliography

Primary Texts

Bradley, Ian. "Coronations will always be a time to rededicate the nation", *The Daily Telegraph*, 2 June 2003, p. 14. http://www.newsuk.co.uk/newsuk/advancedSearchDisplayRecord.do?SortType=reverseChronological&PageSize=25&ItemNumber=3&QueryType=quickSearch. Last viewed 15 December 2007.

"The crown tarnished before our eyes" (Leading article), *The Observer*, 7 September 1997, p. 7. http://www.newsuk.co.uk/newsuk/advancedSearchDisplayRecord.do?SortType=reverseChronological&PageSize=25&ItemNumber=3&QueryType=quickSearch. Last viewed 15 December 2007.

Freedland, Jonathan. "Elizabeth the Last", *The Guardian*, 21 April 2006, p. 6. http://www.newsuk.co.uk/newsuk/advancedSearchDisplayRecord.do?SortType=reverseChronological&PageSize=25&ItemNumber=1&QueryType=quickSearch. Last viewed 28 September 2007.

Grigg, John. "The Princess is dead, long live the Queen", *The Sunday Telegraph*, 7 September 1997, p. 28.

"The Queen's success: She does her strange job rather well" (Leading article), *The Guardian*, 3 June 2002, p. 17. http://www.newsuk.co.uk/newsuk/advancedSearchDisplayRecord.do?SortType=reverseChronological&PageSize=25&ItemNumber=36&QueryType=quickSearch. Last viewed 15 December 2007.

Utley, Tom. "Subtly and silently, the Queen has bound our society together", *The Daily Telegraph*, 21 April 2006, p. 24. http://www.newsuk.co.uk/newsuk/advancedSearchDisplayRecord.do?SortType=reverseChronological&PageSize=25&ItemNumber=1&QueryType=quickSearch. Last viewed 15 December 2007.

Secondary Sources

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso, 1983.

"Average net circulation per issue in the UK", Audit Bureau of Circulations. October 2007. http://www.abc.org.uk/cgi-bin/gen5?runprog=nav/abc&noc=y. Last viewed 11 November 2007.

Barnett, Anthony. "Down to our level", *The Guardian*, 8 September 1997, p. 7.

Belsey, Catherine. “Textual Analysis as a Research Method”, in G. Griffin (ed.) *Research Methods for English Studies*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005, pp. 157-173.

Bignell, Jonathan. *Media Semiotics. An Introduction* (2nd edn), Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.

Billig, Michael. *Talking of the Royal Family*, London [u.a.]: Routledge, 1998 (1992).

Blackburn, Robert. *King and Country. Monarchy and the future King Charles III*, London: Politico’s, 2006.

Brunt, Rosalind, “Princess Diana: A Sign of the Times” in J. Richards, S. Wilson and L. Woodhead (eds) *Diana, The Making of a Media Saint*, London [u. a.]: I. B. Tauris, 1999, pp. 20-39.

Cannadine, David. *Die Erfindung der Britischen Monarchie 1820-1994*, Berlin: Verlag Klaus Wagenbach, 1994.

Colley, Linda. “Introduction” in *Britons. Forging the Nation 1707-1837*, New Haven [u. a.]: Yale University Press, 1992.

“Communications Act 2003”, Office of Public Sector Information, 2003. http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2003/ukpga_20030021_en_1. Last viewed 29 December 2007.

Cozens, Claire. “New-look Guardian launches on September 12”, Media Guardian, 1 September 2005. http://www.guardian.co.uk/media/2005/sep/01/theguardian.pressandpublishing. Last viewed 18 December 2007.

Dahlgren, Peter. “Introduction”, in P. Dahlgren and C. Sparks (eds) *Journalism as popular culture*, London [u. a.]: Sage Publications, 1992

Eldridge, John, Jenny Kitzinger and Kevin Williams. *The Mass Media and Power in Modern Britain*, Oxford [u.a.]: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Fairclough, Norman. *Media discourse*, London: Arnold, 1995.

Fiske, Fred. “Columnist vs. the institutional voice”, *The Masthead*, Winter 1997. http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3771/is_199701/ai_n8752432. Last viewed 10 January 2008.

Franklin, Bob. *Newszak and News Media*, London: Arnold, 1997.

“Greatest day of British TV. Pictures that will live in memory”, *The Daily Telegraph*, 3 June 1953, p. 11.

Griffiths, Dennis. *Fleet Street. Five Hundred Years of the Press*, London: The British Library, 2006.

Hardman, Robert and Robert Shrimsley. “Blair defends the Queen”, *The Daily Telegraph*, 4 September 1997, p. 1.

Hobsbawm, Eric. “Introduction: Inventing Traditions”, in E. Hobsbawm and T. Ranger (eds) *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983, pp. 1-14.

Holden, Anthony. *The Tarnished Crown*, London [u. a.]: Bantam Press, 1993.

“How Britain Voted 1997”, MORI Survey, 1997. http://www.ipsos-mori.com/polls/1997/ge_1997.shtml. Last viewed 17 October 2007.

Jay, Antony. *Elizabeth R. The Role of the Monarchy Today*, London: BBC Books, 1992.

Jones, Aled. *Powers of the Press. Newspapers, Power and the Public in Nineteenth-Century England*, Hants: SCOLAR, 1996.

Keay, Douglas. *Elizabeth II. Portrait of a Monarch*, London: Ebury Press, 1992.

Kenny, Mary. “We don’t realise how lucky we are to have Her Majesty”, *The Sunday Telegraph*, 18 November 2001, p. 25.

Kielinger, Thomas. “Wie vor 60 Jahren: Erst Westminster Abbey, dann Malta“, *Berliner Morgenpost*, 20 November 2007, p. 1.

“The King is dead. Long live the King”, Wikipedia, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_King_is_dead._Long_live_the_King!. Last viewed 10 January 2008.

Ljung, Magnus. “Newspaper Genres and Newspaper English”, in F. Ungerer (ed.) *English Media Texts – Past and Present. Language and Textual Structure*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2000, pp. 131-149.

Lomax, Emily. “Diana Al-Fayed: Ethnic Marketing and the End(s) of Racism” in J. Richards, S. Wilson and L. Woodhead (eds) *Diana, The Making of a Media Saint*, London [u. a.]: I. B. Tauris, 1999.

“Magic or not, let in the daylight” (Leading article), *The Guardian*, 6 December 2000. http://www.guardian.co.uk/print/0,,4101151-103682,00.html. Last viewed 17 October 2007.

Merck, Mandy. “Introduction: After Diana”, in M. Merck (ed.) *After Diana. Irreverent Elegies*, London [u.a.]: Verso, 1998, pp. 1-14.

Mortimore, Roger and Jane Robinson. “Changing Social Values”, Ipsos MORI, 10 June 2003. http://www.ipsos-mori.com/mrr/2003/c030610.shtml. Last viewed 30 November 2007.

“National Anthem”, The Monarchy Today. http://www.royal.gov.uk/output/Page5010.asp. Last viewed 5 January 2008.

Negrine, Ralph. *Politics and the Mass Media in Britain* (2nd edn), London: Routledge, 1994.

O'Driscoll, James. *Britain* (Rev. and upd. ed.), Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

"Personality and image of Queen Elizabeth II", Wikipedia. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Personality_and_image_of_Queen_Elizabeth_II. Last viewed 1 December 2007.

"Publishing Market Watch. Sector Report 1: the European Newspaper Market", 16 March 2004. p. 7. http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/ict/policy/publ-ind/sr01-eur-newspaper-market.pdf. Last viewed 28 December 2007.

Roberts, Andrew. "A loss to remember before we rejoice in the Jubilee", *The Sunday Telegraph*, 6 January 2002, p. 25. http://www.newsuk.co.uk/newsuk/advancedSearchDisplayRecord.do?SortType=reverseChronological&PageSize=25&ItemNumber=1&QueryType=quickSearch. Last viewed 19 October 2007.

"Same procedure as every year", *Der Tagesspiegel*, 7 November 2007, p. 1.

Schmidtchen, Gerhard. "Der Gesang des Denkens. Mein Weg zu Adorno", in S. Mueller-Doohm (ed.) *Adorno-Portraits. Erinnerungen von Zeitgenossen*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2007, pp. 24-39.

Seymour-Ure, Colin. *The British Press and Broadcasting since 1945* (2nd edn), Oxford [u.a]: Blackwell, 1996.

Sommer, Roy. *Grundkurs Cultural Studies/ Kulturwissenschaft Grossbritannien*, Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Sprachen, 2003.

Sparks, Colin. "The Press", in J. Stokes and A. Reading (eds) *The Media in Britain. Current Debates and Developments*, London: Macmillan Press, 1999, pp. 41-60.

Steel, Marc. "As a lasting memorial, close the firm", *The Guardian*, 9 September 1997, p. 17.

Storey, John. *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture : an Introduction* (3rd edn), Harlow [u.a.] : Longman, 2001.

Taylor, Richard. *Understanding the Elements of Literature. Its Forms, Techniques and Cultural Conventions*, London: The Macmillan Press, 1981.

"The UK's 'other paper of record'", *BBC News*, 19 January 2004, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/3409185.stm. Last viewed 18 December 2007.

Thompson, John B. *The media and modernity : a social theory of the media*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1997.

"Two monarchs and a puritan", *Telegraph* online, October 2000. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/opinion/main.jhtml;jsessionid=OQFLWAHLI4QCRQFI

QMGCFGGAVCBQUIV0?xml=/opinion/2000/10/18/dl03.xml. Last viewed 18 September 2007.

Underwood, Mick. "Media ownership in the UK", 2003, http://www.cultsock.ndirect.co.uk/MUHome/cshtml/media/mediaown/html. Last viewed 13 November 2007.

"Voting Intention by Newspaper Readership", MORI Survey, 2004, http://www.ipsos-mori.com/polls/2004/voting-by-readership.shtml. Last viewed 17 October 2007.

"What we think of the Royals", *The Observer* /YouGov poll, 30 December 2001. http://observer.guardian.co.uk/uk_news/story/0,6903,625677,00.html. Last viewed 5 January 2008.

"Why I give way to righteous paranoia about Britain", *Telegraph* online, October 2000. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/opinion/main.jhtml?xml=/opinion/2000/10/12/do03.xml. Last viewed 18 September 2007.

Wilby, Peter. "Is it time to say goodbye? Yes", *The Observer*, 3 December 2000. http://www.guardian.co.uk/print/0,,4099757-103573,00.html. Last viewed 17 October 2007.

Statutory Declaration

I hereby declare that I have written this thesis on my own, without anyone else's help. I have also, to the best of my knowledge, acknowledged the sources of all passages and ideas used, and have placed in quotation marks all quotes used verbatim. I have used no other sources or aids than those indicated.

The thesis contains 20,191 words.

Emilia Zaperta, Berlin, 20 January 2008.