

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF EVALUATION IN SPANISH AND ENGLISH WORLD CUP REPORTS

Jeremy Munday
University of Surrey, United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

This paper takes the systemic framework of appraisal or evaluation, and applies it to reports from the 2002 football World Cup which appeared in two newspapers: *The Guardian* (UK) and *El País* (Spain). The contrastive analysis of the two corpora reveals similarities, with the frequent use of Appreciation. However, there are many more subtle or different forms of evaluation, such as attitudinally marked verbs in English, metaphors and augmentative suffixes in Spanish and, most interestingly, intertextual evaluation mapping the present onto a presumed shared knowledge base of past football experience and a shared ethical perspective of what football should be.

KEY WORDS: Appraisal, contrastive analysis, English, Spanish, systemic functional analysis, World Cup football reports.

RESUMEN

En este artículo se toma el marco sistémico de la evaluación para aplicarlo a reportajes del mundial de fútbol de 2002 publicados en *The Guardian* (Reino Unido) y *El País* (España). El análisis contrastivo revela semejanzas en el uso frecuente de la *apreciación*. Sin embargo, hay otras formas de evaluación diferentes y más sutiles, como los verbos en inglés que expresan actitud, las metáforas y los sufijos aumentativos en español, y la evaluación intertextual que traza el presente del fútbol tomando como base conocimientos supuestamente compartidos del pasado y una perspectiva ética compartida de lo que el fútbol debería ser.

PALABRAS CLAVE: evaluación, análisis contrastivo, inglés, español, análisis sistémico funcional, reportajes del mundial de fútbol.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper examines a small corpus of genre-specific texts in Spanish and English and investigates the realization of the language of evaluation or appraisal, an area of systemic functional linguistics (SFL) that is linked to the Hallidayan notion of modality. While the framework of SFL has traditionally been mapped on to the English language, over the years the blossoming of the discipline of translation studies has seen increasing incorporation of SFL categories into the functional

analysis of translated texts (e.g. House, *A Model, Translation*; Hatim & Mason, *Discourse, Communicator*; Taylor; Bell; Ramm et al.; Steiner). However, there still remains much detailed work to be done on the specifics of linguistic realization in different languages and in translated text pairs. The present paper seeks to make a small contribution to such a contrastive analysis of Spanish and English by looking at newspaper reports in the two languages of games played in the football World Cup held in Japan and South Korea in the summer of 2002.

2. THE DATA

The football reports examined were published in two serious and “quality” newspapers in the UK and Spain: *The Guardian* and *El País*. The newspapers have a similar reputation and political background (left of centre). Football reports were chosen since they represent a very closely defined genre; the focus of the World Cup ensured that the same matches would be reported in both newspapers, which would provide a constant against which to measure some of the evaluation variables. The assumption was also that these reports would be examples of original Spanish and English and less subject to interference from translation than might be the case with some other genres. For instance, a comparative analysis of war reports from the attack on Iraq in 2003 would most probably have found that some of the Spanish reporting was based on translated communiqués from the US and UK forces.

The football reports were taken from the respective websites of the two newspapers (<www.guardian.co.uk> and <www.elpais.es>). All references in the analysis section below will be to these web-based archives. A sample was checked against the hard-copy versions of the newspapers and showed that, although the format was different, the textual content was normally the same in the two versions.

A selection of 22 reports were studied in each language, namely all the games played by Brazil (the winners), Germany (the finalists), England (losing quarter-finalists) and Spain (losing quarter-finalists).

These countries were chosen because of their prominence: England and Spain clearly were a major focus for the newspapers in their respective countries, while the inclusion of Brazil and Germany allowed a comparison to be made of those teams’ progress all the way through the tournament and of the press reaction to that progress.

3. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

3.1. SPORTS REPORTS

Football reports have been the subject of a few discourse analysis studies: Adrian Beard’s *The Language of Sport* (Beard) is a basic student textbook analysing a variety of sporting genres, ranging from advertising to television commentaries, interviews with managers, autobiographies and fanzines. More detailed and specifi-



cally SFL analysis of football reports have been produced by Mohsen Ghadessy. His paper “The Language of Written Sports Commentary: Soccer —A Description” (Ghadessy, “The Language”) analyses 37 reports in *The Times*. It defines three major characteristics of a written sports commentary (20-21):

- (1) it is “primarily a narration of things that have taken place” with a combination of an objective report and an expression of the opinion of the writer;
- (2) it is “a written monologue directed at a large and unknown body of readers who provide no immediate feedback to the writers of these reports”; and
- (3) it assumes that “a large body of knowledge and values” are shared by the writer and reader.

The third point includes the shared use of specialist football terminology, which is one of the language categories used by Ghadessy in his analysis. The others he examines are participants, place and time adverbials and what he terms “involved language,” namely adjectives, adverbs and modals that indicate the writer’s opinion. Examples of involved language are adjectives such as *good, fine, better, best*; adverbs such as *superbly, brilliantly, dangerously*; and modals such as “it *could have been* 3-1.” A point which will be taken up in the present study is Ghadessy’s contention that certain verbs (e.g. *slice, hack* or *bend*) are attitudinally marked, although this is not something he dwells on in his study.

A later study by Ghadessy (“Development”) using the same data focusses on thematic structure in football commentaries. He identifies several potential characteristics of this genre, notably the fronting of animate participants (*Dalglish, Liverpool, The Kop*, etc.) and time adverbials (“*After four minutes*, the powerful Robson [...]”) to drive the discourse forward. One interesting though unrelated observation that emerges when Ghadessy incorporates van Dijk’s situational action model (van Dijk), is that “the writer of a sports commentary on a football match has a situational (episodic) model of the event and many other similar discourses as the background knowledge for the creation of a ‘new’ commentary” (Ghadessy, “Development” 143). In other words, the writer is constantly comparing the present match to previous matches in an intertextual framework which presupposes the involvement of a knowledgeable reader. This is a framework that will again be taken up in our analysis below.

3.2. THE LANGUAGE OF EVALUATION

Considerable work has been done in recent years from an SFL perspective on the language of evaluation or appraisal. White, drawing on Iedema, Feez & White, and Martin amongst others, clearly describes the way that appraisal frameworks have developed out of a broader SFL context and links these frameworks to categories analysed in Halliday’s *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. These appraisal frameworks are of particular interest to us since they are “concerned with how texts activate positive and negative assessments [...] and with how texts adopt



a stance towards these assessments” (White).¹ In other words, they are a means of understanding how opinion is being expressed and how that opinion is negotiated between writer and reader.

The most obvious form of evaluation is what Halliday (184) terms attitudinal epithets: *splendid*, *silly*, *fantastic*, etc., the same as Ghadessy’s involved language. But evaluation covers far more than this. The following is a brief and simplified summary of the three broad semantic domains of attitudinal meaning as they will be of relevance to our own analysis:

- (1) *Affect*, which is normally a verbal or mental process involving a conscious human participant. For example, “I am *disappointed* this happened.”
- (2) *Judgement*, where a proposal is advanced as to what is correct behaviour. Following Iedema, Feez & White, Judgement is subdivided into five categories that are linked to Halliday’s modal categories (Halliday 355-363):
- (3) *Appreciation*, where proposals are made as to the value of things or products.

JUDGEMENT CATEGORY	EXAMPLES	RELATED MODAL CATEGORY
normality	standard unfashionable eccentric	usuality
capacity	skilled strong slow	ability
tenacity	brave resolute rash	inclination
veracity	honest genuine deceptive	probability
propriety	moral just oppressive	obligation

For instance, “a *fantastic* final.”

The important difference between these categories is that, while Affect indicates emotion directly, with Judgement and Appreciation “these “feelings” are institutionalized in some way and are recast as qualities which inhere in the evalu-

¹ This is an online publication and there is no page number.

ated phenomenon itself” (White) Judgement and Appreciation may thus serve to obscure the emotion, the process, the active participant or the opinion.

Clearly, some of these categories are very culture-based. Some of the examples under normality, for instance, depend on context and whether a specific culture values standardness or eccentricity. Similarly, the emotions that can be “acceptably” communicated under Affect may vary according to culture, sex, and so on. Furthermore, as White points out, some evaluation will depend on implication and association, on the background knowledge of the readership. An example of this from the corpus we study in this paper is the comparison of the Brazilian star Ronaldo with former stars Pele and Maradona, which immediately triggers a positive evaluation on the part of the football-knowledgeable reader. As ever, though, context is crucial and evaluation can potentially be found everywhere. In this respect, White cites Malrieu that “it is difficult to conceive of any phrase which could be evaluation free. In context, even adverbs and complement such as ‘always’ and ‘with a knife’ have an evaluation” (134).

This section has briefly summarized some of the key areas of evaluative language as they have been applied to the study of English. In the next section, we shall turn to the study of the World Cup football reports to see how far evaluation in the data fits the categories outlined above and how much variation there is between the two sources, *The Guardian* and *El País*.

4. RESULTS OF ANALYSIS

It is perhaps not surprising that there is very little Affect, or overtly expressed emotion, in the reports. There are a very small number of exclamations of direct questions: “¡Ya era hora!” is how *El País* greets the news that, at last, Brazil and Germany will meet in a final (Brazil-Turkey 27 June 2002). Unusually, since it is seldom so direct, *The Guardian* almost has an exclamation in the report of Turkey’s near-miss in the same match: “An equaliser then and how Brazil would have regretted their slipshod shooting.”

There are also reports of the crowd reaction in the Spain-South Korea match (*El País* 23 June 2002), complete with several ¡*Obhhhh!* exclamations, and a few direct questions in other reports. Two appear in Germany-Cameroon (*El País* 12 June 2002), asking whether the yellow cards shown by the referee were merited, and another, which perhaps all commentators were asking themselves, concerning Ronaldinho’s goal against England: “¿Fue deliberada la trayectoria de la falta que sacó Ronaldinho?” (Brazil-England 22 June 2002).

Affect is seen in those relatively few cases where direct quotes are included from interviews with the players themselves. Such is the case with the emotional reaction to Spain’s controversial defeat by South Korea (*El País* 23 June 2002), although even then many of the players’ comments are either obscenities or reported speech of what the referee supposedly said. More obvious Affect can be seen in the German goalkeeper’s observations after his team’s fortuitous victory against the USA in the quarter-finals:

“Yes, *we were lucky* to win [...] They almost fought us into the ground and *I was amazed* at their power. We tried everything we could but in two days *no one will be dissatisfied* with our performance.” (*The Guardian* 22 June 2002)

However, these are exceptions since most direct comment from the participants belongs to the preview articles or analysis in the days following the matches. Many reports, including the final itself, in which Brazil defeated Germany by two goals to nil, contain evaluation with a range of other means, though attitudinal epithets of Appreciation are prominent. *El País* (1 July 2002) talks of “una *estupenda* final, la *más vibrante* de los últimos tiempos.” This is contrasted to the perceived poverty of the tournament as a whole: “En un torneo *de pésima calidad, lo mejor fue la final.*”

Similar evaluation is given of the two teams. Germany, though the losers, are “una *estupenda* Alemania” and their best player is “un *glorioso* Schneider.” There is also positive Appreciation of the performance of the German team (“una *honorable* actuación”) and positive Judgement related to propriety and capacity of the Germans (“*desplegó un fútbol interesante*”). Brazil, on the other hand, won because they had “los *mejores* futbolistas.” These include Ronaldo, the scorer of both goals. Here, positive metaphor is used to indicate his worth: he is “el rey del mundo” and “un mesías” and his amazing ability to return after a three-year absence through injury is nothing short of a miracle. A clear superlative, and an intertextual reference to greats of the past, indicates Ronaldo’s extraordinary capacity as a striker:

Visto en perspectiva, existían todas las razones para situarle a la altura de los genios, de gente como Maradona, Cruyff, Pelé o Di Stéfano. Si después de tres años vuelve en estas condiciones, es fácil imaginar lo que era antes, su grado superlativo como delantero. (*El País* 1 July 2002)

While the references to Maradona, Cruyff, Pele and Di Stéfano presuppose the reader’s background knowledge of football from the 1950s through to the 1980s. On other occasions the reporter’s stance is clearly transmitted by more traditional modal devices. In the instance below, these include modality of obligation (*no se debe*, which is propriety in White’s description), followed by a statement of truth containing an attitudinal adverb (“which Brazil made abundantly clear”): “Y la final la ganó el equipo con mejores futbolistas. Es una premisa que *no se debe* olvidar nunca y que *Brasil ha dejado meridianamente clara.*”

Modality of probability (veracity) and capacity is also used, negatively as in the two following examples, to show how impossible a previous thought had been or how different Brazil are from other lesser teams: “Ahora *resulta imposible* no pensar en un Brasil campeón”; “*Ninguna* selección puede reunir a tantos jugadores determinantes.”

The English report on the final in *The Guardian* (1 July 2002) does demonstrate some similar forms of evaluation in the use of Judgement and Appreciation epithets to describe the various performers and the quality of the game: “the *disappointing* Miroslav Klose,” “Carsten Ramelow was *outstanding*,” “an *absorbing* match.” Judgement of capacity is more often realized by adverbial forms and proc-



ess in the English, as in “Hamann *neatly* dispossessed the advancing Ronaldo” and “Ronaldo turned *slickly* on to a low cross.”

There is also an interesting use of epithets in the general summary of the match which blur the distinction between classifier and evaluation:

Germany’s *fast, physical* challenge was laced with *sufficient* quality to make *fresh* demands of Luiz Felipe Scolari and Brazil’s response to the challenge produced the *best* World Cup final since the West Germans lost 3-2 to Argentina in Mexico City in 1986.

Here, *fast* and *physical* are clearly positive attributes denoting capacity and tenacity, although they still retain a purely descriptive element relating the type of football played by the Germans. What strengthens the positive Judgement is the combination of these epithets with *sufficient quality* and *fresh demands*. The latter must be presumed to be positive in this culture where the football community wishes the best team to win and to overcome worthy opponents presenting difficult challenges. The response from Brazil produces the superlative “*best* World Cup final” since 1986; just as in the Spanish report, an intertextual comparison is made of the present with perceived greatness in the past.

Comparatives or superlatives are quite frequent in the English report of the final: the reporter refers to “the *most rewarding* aspect of the performance,” “[Brazil] ultimately did it [combining defence and attack] *better*,” “Edmilson [...] did *more* than anyone,” “Germany’s *best* hope of inspiration” and “Brazil are world champions for a fifth time because, having improved with each game once they reached the knock-out stage, they saved the *best* till last. And they needed it.”

This last example shows the reporter’s opinion of why Brazil won the tournament, presented as a statement of truth in the first sentence, followed by a modal of obligation in the second (“they *needed* it”). In general, in this report the authorial stance is often clearly visible lexically with attitudinal adverbs:

“*Naturally*, the bulk of the attention [...] was drawn to Ronaldo.”

“Though Ronaldo *undoubtedly* won the game [...]”

“The outcome was *virtually* beyond doubt [...]”

“The most rewarding aspect [...] was *surely* the way the team combined [...]”

“*Presumably* the emperor of Japan was *suitably* impressed [...]”

with adverbs related to normality:

“His left-footed shot was of a sort Kahn would *normally* have caught in his sleep.”

“*Seldom* has a footballer looked more free of care [...]”

and, in an echo of Ghadessy’s study (“The Language”), with modals of probability used to advance suggestions of alternative outcomes to the match:

“Brazil took a lead they were *never likely* to lose [...]”

“Brazil *might have been* forced on to the back foot.”

“They [Germany] *might have ended* it [the first half] three goals down.”

This kind of conditional analysis of what might have happened permeates the reporting in *The Guardian* especially over the course of a month-long tournament where the action ebbs and flows and where a team evolves, with their hopes and fears, as they progress in the tournament. Brazil's two matches before the final illustrate this well. The semi-final victory over Turkey (*The Guardian* 27 June 2002) is a moment to look forward to a hopefully exciting final:

So far this has been a classless tournament in every sense of the word. What is needed now is a touch of class to give it some lasting distinction [...] The sharply contrasting teams of Luiz Felipe Scolari and Rudi Völler may yet provide it.

The modal of obligation ("what is *needed*") is a forceful expression of authorial attitude placed in the context of the tournament as a whole. This perceived need is followed by a modal of probability or possibility ("*may* yet provide it") which gives a comment on the feasibility of a successful ending to the competition. At the same time, this forward-looking opinion is balanced by the following sentence which once again returns to the structure of assessment of the present (and in this case the forthcoming game) as gauged against the benchmark of the previous finals of 1998 and 1994:

At least Germany should give Brazil a better game than Brazil gave France in Paris four years ago, and it is hard to believe that the final will be as drab a business as Brazil and Italy provided in Pasadena four years before that.

Ronaldo's return to form is also considered against the "the disaster that overtook him shortly before the 1998 final, when he played in a stupor." The interplay of measurement against the past and hopes for the future is neatly demonstrated in this report where the journalist essentially appeals to the Affect of the readership which is presumed to hold a shared "fair-minded" perspective on the progress of the competition: "No fair-minded person would complain should [Ronaldo] finish on the winning side."

That possibility is then countered by an alternative scenario where Germany is the active participant in a mental process (*will believe*) and the authorial opinion is realized by the adverb *surely*: "Yet Germany, who went into the tournament beaten by Wales, *will surely believe* that if ever there was a chance to deny Brazil a fifth World Cup this is it."

The cut and thrust of juxtaposed alternative outcomes dependent on conditionals and a constant mapping of past events onto future hopes, where the authorial stance is expressed by rather indirect means, seems typical of the writing in *The Guardian*. This is perhaps at its most evident in the analysis of England's overall performance after their elimination in the quarter-finals by Brazil (*The Guardian* 22 June 2002). The analysis focusses on the England coach, the Swede Sven-Goran Eriksson:

When the Football Association appointed Eriksson it was made clear that the present tournament would merely be a prelude to what England hope to achieve in Ger-



many in 2006. The long-term ambition was to build a side capable of winning the World Cup not now but four years hence. Presumably this is still the aim.

Lexis of inclination, of hope and intention for the future, is abundant (“England hope to achieve,” “the long-term ambition,” “four years hence,” “the aim”) while there is also a constant shifting from past (when Eriksson was appointed in 2001) to present (a reassessment of the 2002 tournament) and future (a reconsideration or reiteration of the aim for 2006). The reporter then goes on to develop the sense behind the attitudinal adverb *presumably* which is seen to be a reassessment of the real opportunity England has squandered of winning in 2002:

But the likelihood of an England side again finding itself so close to the final with the likes of Argentina, France and Italy already eliminated would appear slim. The prize was there for England to grasp, but for a variety of reasons they could not get a grip on it.

The reporter’s opinion is couched in the probability modals *likelihood* and *would appear slim*, the truth statement “the prize was there” and the modal of capacity “*could not* get a grip.” Evaluation of the defeat itself, when England had been a goal up in the first half, and the analysis of their reasons for playing defensively is quite sympathetic though tentative with several prominent modal adverbs: “*Wisely, perhaps*, they did not risk getting overstretched in order to increase their lead. *Maybe* they wanted to save their stamina on a hot afternoon [...]”

In contrast, discussion of the winning Brazil goal, from a mistake by the England goalkeeper David Seaman, is much more critical with a modal of obligation: “Fluke or otherwise, Seaman *should not* have let it happen,” and with a comparison to an earlier “blunder” he had committed in a qualifying game against Germany.

The Spanish report of England’s elimination (*El País* 22 June 2002) is far less sympathetic and runs under the headline “Brasil hace un favor al fútbol.” The analysis centres on the negativity of the England team under Eriksson and the forward-looking analysis focusses more on the obligation to change their style than on any real chances of winning the tournament:

Agotados los resultados, el sueco *deberá* revisar su metamorfosis [...] Si no lo corrige, su apuesta resultará corrosiva y todo serán añoranzas de aquel fútbol inglés de ida y vuelta, emotivo y febril.

The idea that a country needs to remain true to its footballing roots is one that runs through the Spanish analysis of the England performances, starting in the first match (England-Sweden *El País* 3 June 2002), where negative epithets are abundant: “La perfumada Inglaterra de Beckham se presentó como un equipo descolorido, frágil y liviano.”

The use of *perfumada* is perhaps most interesting, since it suggests, by association, that the team led by David Beckham (sometimes ironically referred to as *el Spice* in the Spanish) is too lightweight and effeminate compared to the traditionally physical and pacy style of past England teams. This is emphasized in the analy-

sis of the defeat against Brazil: “Pocas veces se ha visto a un equipo más alejado de sus raíces, ni más satisfecho de abandonarlas.”

The concentration on the roots of football interestingly combines in the *El País* reports with national stereotypes. Thus, Germany is described as a machine (Germany-Cameroon 12 June 2002), as the “infame Alemania, fiel a su tradición” (Germany-Paraguay 16 June 2002), as “serios y marciales” (Germany-USA 22 June 2002) and as a team that has no dreams (Germany-South Korea 26 June 2002). *The Guardian* too describes them as “robotic and robust” against Ireland (6 June 2002). This is the most excessive treatment of any nation, but there are other comments, often seemingly gratuitous, that reinforce national stereotypes: Basturk, of Turkey, uses “todo el picante otomano” (*El País* Brazil-Turkey 27 June 2002); Hong, South Korea’s defender, performed “con una gravedad propia de un samurai” (Spain-South Korea 23 June 2002); and *The Guardian* sees that the effective but unexceptional Brazil “has about as much relevance to the samba as a clog dance” (Brazil-England 22 June 2002).

Negative football is the target of much of the worst negative evaluation, reflected in the negative language of the reports. England’s 0-0 draw against Nigeria draws the following conclusion from *El País* (13 June 2002): “[Inglaterra] hizo lo justo al principio y nada, absolutamente nada, después.” Later, Spain’s disappointing and controversial elimination by South Korea seems to have left the Spanish reporter with some bitterness at what he considers to be the Koreans’ lack of ability: “Corea estuvo al borde de la capitulación. No se puede decir otra cosa de un equipo sin ningún rasgo apreciable [...] sin jugadores de primer orden [...]”

It is Germany, however, who are on the receiving end of most criticism. Thus, their victory against Paraguay (*El País* 16 June 2002) receives the following accumulation of negatives:

Por lo visto *no* tienen recambio. Sus sustitutos *fracasaron* en una tarde donde *nadie* regateó a *nadie*, *nadie* sorprendió con un detalle de futbolista, *nadie* fue digno de jugar esta fase de la Copa del Mundo. *Ni* Ballack.

The Guardian’s report on the next round Germany-USA (22 June 2002) underscores the negative polarity of both the football and the language:

If Völler thought his side could get *no sloppier*, he could *hardly* have been warmed by events after the break. Germany *could not* stir themselves even to muster a shot on target.

At times, authorial stance and evaluation of progress is more evident even than such a negative description of events on the pitch. *El País* (Germany-South Korea 26 June 2002) suggests that this is very possibly the worst Germany team for 40 years, while coming to terms with the reality of Germany’s qualification for the final: “Durante un mes, lo que *parecía imposible* se convirtió en *improbable* y luego en *real*.”

A very similar sentiment, couched in similar terms of impossibility or derision, appears in *The Guardian* (Germany-Paraguay 16 June 2002):

A few months ago it would have been considered laughable, and for 88 mind-numbing minutes yesterday it seemed just as ludicrous, but by the end no one was in any doubt [...] Germany [...] appear destined for the semi-finals.

In addition to the Appreciation epithets *laughable* and *ludicrous*, the modal verbs of probability associated with appearance (*seemed*, *appear*) are prominent. On the other hand, the Spanish reports tend to realize this function as dependent on a condition or as a comparison with reality. For instance: “*Si así fue*, el gol pertenece a la categoría de lo genial” (Brazil-England 22 June 2002). In other words, if Ronaldinho really did aim to score, then the goal was a touch of genius. Similarly, in Germany-Cameroon (12 June 2002): “*Si no hubiera sido* por la actuación de López Nieto, el Alemania-Camerún habría pasado de inmediato, y merecidamente, al olvido.” If the referee, López Nieto, had not acted so eccentrically, then the match would have quickly been forgotten.

A blurring of reality and the virtual occurs in the report of the Spain-South Korea match (23 June 2002). Here the crowd follows action replays on a giant screen:

El público celebró las repeticiones en la pantalla gigante *como si* lo que pasaba en el campo *fuera* una realidad virtual y *hubiera* que superarlo con la evidencia incontestable de la imagen cinematográfica.

This use of *como si* (“as if”) followed by subjunctives (*fuera*, *hubiera*) highlights the alternative take on reality. There is another example of the structure in the same report: “Juanfran [...] saltó al campo en busca del árbitro *como si fuera* a agredirlo.” In this case, the Spanish player Juanfran runs on to the pitch at the end of the game looking for the referee *as if he were going to* attack him. The Spanish subjunctive allows the suggestion of the threat of violence while concealing it behind a veneer of virtuality.

The description of elements of a match by comparing them with alternative scenarios rather than the immediate reality extends to the use of alternative means of evaluation of events. Metaphor is one very frequent method of evaluation, most especially in the Spanish reports. The Brazil-Turkey semi-final (*El País* 27 June 2002) contains the following passage:

Brasileños y turcos dibujaron un encuentro magnífico, jugado en doble dirección, con los porteros a destajo toda la noche, con un amplio repertorio de regates, de toques de orfebrería. Y todo en medio del alto voltaje que siempre tiene una semi-final ajustada, en la que Turquía no fue ninguna cenicienta.

The exciting skill is described as *toques de orfebrería* (“touches of goldwork”), perhaps linking to the general Midas metaphor associated with Ronaldo; the edginess of the occasion itself is transmitted using a conventional high-tension metaphor (“en medio del alto voltaje”) and Turkey’s important contribution is emphasized by the rejection of the Cinderella comparison. Later on in the same report, the real difference between the two teams, the ability to score a goal out of nothing,



is again conveyed with metaphor: “[a Turquía] le falta la dinamita que separa a los elegidos de los buenos mortales. Ronaldo, que en medio del desierto y rodeado de espigas turcas se inventó un gol [...]”

Dynamite is a traditional metaphor for attacking power straight from football comics (“he has dynamite in his boots”), but the evaluation of Ronaldo’s goal above is much more dramatic and innovative, a natural image that perhaps rarely appears on the sporting pages: “in the middle of the desert and surrounded by Turkish thistles/spikes he conjured up a goal [...]”

Metaphors appear everywhere in the Spanish reports. Brazil-Costa Rica (14 June 2002) is described in terms of a battle between light infantry (Costa Rica) and powerful cavalry with missiles (Brazil). Similarly, Spain’s exit at the hands of South Korea (23 June 2002) sees Camacho, the Spanish coach, being openly compared to general Custer at the Battle of the Little Big Horn: “Trasladando el episodio a la mitología del lejano Oriente, se diría que ayer Camacho, como el general Custer al frente del Séptimo de Caballería, vivió su Little Big Horn particular.”

A major perceived reason for their failure is that Spanish players in their own league are excellent support players but unused to being real leaders. A series of metaphors is used to convey this, related to war (they are a terrific praetorian guard) and other sports (they are excellent *gregarios*, the team riders or *domestiques* of cycling). And the list is almost endless: England’s Campbell arrives like an ox to score against Sweden (*El País* 3 June 2002) in a match headed “la cerveza está aún caliente.” The metaphor of warm beer, in other words of an England not properly prepared or performing, runs through the report.

In comparison, the English reports contain relatively few such detailed metaphors. Where they are used, they seem to confer ironic evaluation. Thus, the prospects for the final (Brazil-Turkey 27 June 2002) are described in prosaic terms: “A Brazilian team lacking a magician’s wand will take on a German side possessing all the charm of a mechanical shovel.”

After the final (*The Guardian* 1 July 2002), Ronaldo’s joy is transmitted with a bizarrely archetypal English (not Brazilian) image of the 1930s and 40s comic actor and singer George Formby, which would probably mean little to many younger English people: “The George Formby grin was back on Ronaldo’s face as if he had never stopped cleaning windows.”

England’s exit from the World Cup is also described using an evocative metaphor that requires background knowledge of the footwear trade: “After promising to stride to the last four in seven-league boots they crept out of the World Cup in hush puppies” (*The Guardian* 22 June 2002). The meek acceptance of defeat is conveyed by the choice of *hush puppies* and the attitudinal verb form *crept out*, as opposed to the assertive possibility of *striding* into the semi-finals in macho *seven-league boots*.

The use of verbs such as *stride*, which have an inherently positive or negative association, is a prevalent means of appraisal in the English reports. They are what Ghadessy (“The Language”) suggested as “attitudinally marked” verbs. Some indicate a particular capacity (or, sometimes, incapacity) to control the ball or the successful use of considerable strength:



Hamann [...] dispossessed [...] Ronaldo, only to *dwell on* the ball and have it *mus-cled off* him [...]
 Ronaldo *drove* a low shot past Kahn (Brazil-Germany)
 [Ballack] rose [...] to *power* Ziege's waspish free-kick past Brad Friedel (Germany-USA)
 Klose then *thumped* Neuville's centre against the woodwork (Germany-USA)
 Neuville, *dancing* beyond Celso Ayala [...] (Germany-Paraguay)
 [...] only for the wing-back to cut inside his marker and *spoon* wastefully over the bar (Germany-Paraguay)

There are other cases of related epithets that perform a similar attitudinal, rather than classifying, function:

Jens Jeremies had a *sharp diving* header blocked (Brazil-Germany)
 Ronaldo's *sharp* follow-up (Brazil-Germany)
 Neuville [...] conjured a *blistering* first-time finish (Germany-Paraguay)
 the Bayer Leverkusen striker's *searing* effort (Germany-Paraguay)

Finally, certain marked verb forms are employed to evaluate a performance as a whole. Germany-USA (22 June 2002) is a good example, where the negative German team is contrasted to the vibrant Americans:

Germany could not *stir themselves* even to *muster* a shot on target [...]
 They *whipped up* a flurry of chances [...]
 Reyna might still have *plucked* the equaliser the Americans deserved.

In the first example both *stir themselves* and *muster* have a generally negative connotation in addition to the use of the negative modal *could not*. They do not suggest any great activity or desire for attacking play. On the other hand, *whipped up* and *plucked* in the other examples are much more positive and active processes.

The Spanish reports do not tend to use such a range of marked process verbs, though they are sometimes to be found. Thus, in the first Brazil-Turkey match (4 June 2002), the power of Sas's shot "*reventó la pelota contra la red.*" As a counterpoint, Spanish does use a device that is not available to English, namely augmentative suffixes. These can indicate power: "*un trallazo de Rivaldo*" (Brazil-Turkey); "*un balonazo contra Rivaldo*" (Brazil-Turkey); "*un cabezazo de Sanneh*" (Germany-USA); or some extraordinary or extreme quality (good or bad). In Brazil-England (22 June 2002), Ronaldinho's goal was from "*una falta alejadísima del área*" which beat the flat-footed England goalkeeper, "*tan pesadote a sus 38 años.*" Another example of how the extreme quality can be very negative is the "*partidazo del árbitro español*" the referee was criticized for showing so many red and yellow cards in the Germany-Cameroon match (*El País* 12 June 2002).

However, perhaps the most interesting form of evaluation in these reports is based on intertextuality and a shared footballing culture which the journalists assume the readers will recognize. This takes various forms. One of the most prevalent is evaluation of the present using the benchmark of the past. This is to be



found everywhere with only slight variations between the two countries. *The Guardian*, like other English papers, inevitably compares England's progress to the 1966 team which won the cup: "England had probably passed up their best chance to win the World Cup since 1966" (Brazil-England 22 June 2002).

El País includes the 1950s Real Madrid star Di Stéfano amongst the footballing geniuses (Brazil-Germany) whereas he may be less well-known in England than Pele, Cruyff and Maradona, who are also mentioned. More frequent is the fully shared background knowledge of the legendary Brazilian winners of the past:

If this latest success was hardly in the class of the World Cup triumphs of 1958, 1962 and 1970, it still deserves its place in the pantheon of Brazilian achievement on the football field. (Brazil-Germany 1 July 2002)

El País sometimes goes into more specific detail, comparing Rivaldo's goalscoring feats to Jairzinho's from the 1970 team (Brazil-Turkey 27 June 2002) or Seaman's age and lack of mobility to Peter Shilton's from 1986 and 1990 (Brazil-England 22 June 2002). This becomes most evident in the report on the Germany-South Korea semi-final (26 June 2002). One whole lengthy paragraph is devoted to enumerating the great performers in each of the World Cups from 1958 to 1986 compared to the mediocrity of the present tournament, summed up by three direct questions: "¿Quiénes son [las estrellas] ahora? ¿Figo, Beckham, Totti? ¿Qué se ha sabido de ellos? Nada."

The poor state of the German team is also conveyed by listing the greats of the past: "El país de Fritz Walter y Rahn, de Beckenbauer y Overath, de Schuster y Rumenigge, ha declinado poco a poco hasta caer en la caricatura."

Since these six players were members of the 1954, 1966-74 and 1982 teams respectively, one might question how many readers would actually know them nowadays. The point, however, is that they can be assumed to be top-class players whose yardstick (at least until Germany's strong performance in the final) remains hopelessly out of reach of the current team. Interestingly, *The Guardian's* report of the same match adopts a similar means of contrasting the past and present, listing the great German captains of the past, Walter, Beckenbauer and Matthäus.

But this type of evaluation presumes not only a shared knowledge base but also a shared value base. It seems that football followers have an almost ethical understanding of what football should be and an inbuilt rejection of any team or player who infringes that code. Knowledge of the Brazilian team of 1970 will normally presume that the reader is aware of the legendary status occupied in football lore by that attacking team and by the brilliance of the Mexico 1970 tournament as a whole. In the 2002 World Cup, in the view of *El País*, the antithesis of such good football is seen in the negativity of England (hence, Brazil "does football a favour" by eliminating them) and, of course, Germany: "Con su fórmula les basta, aunque es difícil precisar si se trata de fútbol. Probablemente, no" (Germany-USA 22 June 2002).

This comment strongly suggests that it is possible for a team to adopt an approach that is "non-football." In the report of the semi-final (Germany-South



Korea 26 June 2002), this idea is pushed even further to the extent that the whole current football climate is criticized for preferring image over substance and paying little attention to the quality of the football:

El partido tuvo un gran escenario, una brillante coreografía y una asombrosa deportividad. El celofán fue estupendo, pero el juego resultó deprimente. Puede que en estos tiempos valga más lo accesorio que lo fundamental, y que a nadie importe la calidad del fútbol, pero es decepcionante que la mayor competición del mundo no logre identificar el verdadero talento.

The many epithets of positive Appreciation (*gran escenario, brillante coreografía, asombrosa deportividad, el celofán fue estupendo*) are brought down to earth by the clear negative evaluation of the words *deprimente* and *decepcionante* and *nadie* and the contrast at the end between the greatest competition in the world and the failure to identify talent.

5. CONCLUSION

This article has examined a focussed corpus of football reports written in Spanish and English. There are inevitable limitations, in that we have considered just one genre, part of one tournament, one newspaper from each country. The reports have been written by a small number of journalists who have their own idiosyncratic approach to the task and their own linguistic characteristics. Nevertheless, the focus on specific matches from the World Cup 2002 has enabled a variety of comparisons and allows us to draw if not conclusions at least some hypotheses that may be tested in future studies. White's framework of appraisal has been useful in identifying certain features common to both sets of reports: there is very little Affect, which might be expected in interviews with players and managers but not in the narration and analysis of the events of a match. Evaluation tends to be more Appreciation, or sometimes Judgement, which, in White's terms, is more distanced or "institutionalised" evaluation. In both corpora, modals of obligation, intention and probability are used to analyse the teams' progress throughout the tournament and their chances for future matches.

However, the most interesting results were where either different evaluative methods were employed or where the evaluation was far more subtle. Thus, the Spanish reports frequently use metaphor (at times very original metaphors) and augmentative suffixes (*cabezazo, alejadísima*, etc.); the English reports, on the other hand, rely to an extent on what Ghadessy had termed "attitudinally marked" verbs ("stride," "power," etc.) with in-built evaluation. There is much subtle evaluation based on a comparison of the current tournament with tournaments of the past. Both the English and Spanish take for granted a shared knowledge of football history (perhaps slightly more so in the Spanish).

There is also, particularly in the Spanish, a feeling of inherent football ethics and values that are shared by all good football supporters, who will appreciate

good attacking football and who will condemn the negativity and the glitz of the contemporary game. This would seem to be a very important area to explore in this and other genres: how far is the audience expected to share social or ethical values with the writer and what effect does this have on the perception of events? The football report may be a very closed and restricted genre, but there is no reason to suppose that such shared assumptions are not present in more overtly ideological fields such as politics or financial reporting. Sharing assumptions in this way makes it far more difficult for the underlying ideologies to be challenged.



WORKS CITED

- BEARD, A. *The Language of Sport*. London/New York: Routledge, 1998.
- BELL, R.T. *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*. London/New York: Longman, 1991.
- DIIK, T.A. van. "Episodic Models in Discourse Processing." *Comprehending Oral and Written Language*. Ed. R. Horowitz & S.J. Samuels. New York: AP, 1987. 161-196.
- GHADESSY, M. "The Language of Written Sports Commentary: Soccer—A Description." *Registers of Written English: Situational Factors and Linguistic Features*. Ed. M. Ghadessy. London/New York: Pinter, 1988. 17-36.
- "Thematic Development and Its Relationship to Registers and Genres." *Thematic Development in English Texts*. Ed. M. Ghadessy. London/New York: Pinter, 1995. 129-146.
- HALLIDAY, M.A.K. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: E. Arnold, 1994.
- HATIM, B. & I. MASON. *Discourse and the Translator*. London/New York: Longman, 1990.
- *The Translator as Communicator*. London/New York: Routledge, 1997.
- HOUSE, J. *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1977.
- *Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1997.
- IEDEMA, R., S. FEEZ & P.R. WHITE. *Media Literacy*. Sydney: Disadvantaged Schools Program, NSW Dept. of School Education, 1994.
- MALRIEU, J.P. *Evaluative Semantics: Cognition, Language and Ideology*. London/New York: Routledge, 1999.
- MARTIN, J.R. "Beyond Exchange: Appraisal Systems in English." *Evaluation in Text*. Ed. S. Hunston & G. Thompson. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000. 142-175.
- RAMM, W., et al. *Discourse Grammar for German*. Report of the DANDELION Consortium. U Saarbrücken, 1995.
- STEINER, E. "A Register-Based Translation Evaluation: An Advertisement as a Case in Point." *Target* 10.2 (1998): 291-318.
- TAYLOR, C. *Aspects of Language and Translation: Approaches for Italian-English Translation*. Udine: Camponette, 1990.
- WHITE, P.R. "Appraisal: The Language of Evaluation and Stance." *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Ed. J.O. Östman & J. Verschueren. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2003. <<http://www.benjamins.nl/online/hop>>.

