

Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine  
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv  
Educational and Scientific Institute of Philology  
Department of English Philology and Intercultural Communication

## **English in Football TV Coverage**

Bachelor's paper  
written by the 4<sup>th</sup>-year student  
of the 1<sup>st</sup> group  
of the bachelor's programme  
'English studies and translation  
and two Western European languages'  
Field of science – 03 "Humanities"  
Specialty – 035 "Philology"  
*Nataliia Bohatyrova*

Supervised by:  
*Prof. Belova Alla Dmitrivna*

«Допущено до захисту»

Протокол засідання кафедри англійської філології  
та міжкультурної комунікації

Протокол № 10 від 29.05.2023

Завідувач кафедри \_\_\_\_\_ проф. Белова А.Д.

Kyiv-2023

## CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	3
<b>1. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE SPORTS DISCOURSE ANALYSIS</b> ./.....	5
1.1. Discourse analysis in the 21st century.....	5
1.2. Classification of discourse types.....	8
1.3. The concept of “sports discourse”.....	11
<b>2. LINGUISTIC FEATURES OF FOOTBALL DISCOURSE</b> .....	19
2.1. Football terminology.....	19
2.2. Jargon in football discourse.....	25
2.3. Metaphors in football discourse.....	29
<b>CONCLUSION</b> .....	37
<b>LIST OF LITERATURE</b> .....	41

## INTRODUCTION

Sport is an important social phenomenon of the 21st century. In the modern world, sport is of interest to specialists in various scientific fields. Linguistic research on the peculiarities of sports discourse occupies a special place.

Sports discourse is a specialised language that has specific characteristics that differ from other discourses, such as politics, religion or advertising. From the linguistic point of view, the sports sphere is of great interest as a source of a large layer of new vocabulary, which is only increasing every year.

The most popular sport discourse is football discourse, as it covers all social strata of the population. Football, a highly competitive sport, has gained great popularity and evokes unforgettable emotions in almost all parts of the world. Like other sports, it has its own set of rules, regulations and positions of specific players that make this sport unique.

**The topicality of the research.** In modern languages, several varieties of football language can be distinguished, characterised by distinctive features of style, grammar and vocabulary. Sports observers and commentators all over the world try to outdo each other in using original and vivid words or phrases to break away from linguistic clichés.

**The aim of the paper** is to study the lexical features of English football discourse.

To achieve this goal, we have the following **objectives**:

- to consider discourse analysis in the 21st century;
- to study the classification of discourse types;
- to define the concept of "sports discourse";
- to study the peculiarities of football terminology;
- to study the peculiarities of jargon in football discourse;
- to analyse the peculiarities of metaphors in football discourse.

**The research object** is the vocabulary of English football discourse.

**The research subject** is football discourse.

The paper uses such **general scientific methods** as: *theoretical and discursive analysis* (to examine the research material in a certain discursive field), *observation, comparison and synthesis* (to compare and summarise the available information on the research material), *generalisation of scientific theories* (to determine the most optimal theoretical basis for the study). The following special **methods** were also used: *component analysis* (for consideration of the research material), *contextual analysis* (for consideration of football units), *structural-functional method, classification method, continuous sampling method and interpretive method*.

**The material of the paper** is based on the texts of the British edition of World Soccer for 2019-2021 and various Internet resources.

**The theoretical value** of the study lies in the study of English-language football discourse and the peculiarities of its terminology, jargon and metaphorical models.

The results obtained in the course of the study may be of **practical value** for students of higher educational institutions when writing research papers, as well as for sports journalists in terms of improving their professional competences. The knowledge of English football terminology and the peculiarities of its formation is extremely important for the correct understanding and coverage of sports processes.

**The structure of the research** is determined by its purpose and objectives. The paper consists of an introduction, two chapters, conclusions and references.

# 1. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE SPORTS DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

## 1.1. Discourse analysis in the 21st century

Today, discourse analysis is a consolidating research paradigm that is of interest to a wide range of social disciplines, including economics, history, sociology, philosophy, cultural studies and social psychology.

What is meant by the term “discourse analysis” continues to be debated, just as the concept of “discourse” itself is not clearly defined and varies depending on the context in which it is used.

Sara Mills explains that within linguistics, discourse is seen as language in its functioning, as opposed to language as a system [31; 47].

It is generally accepted that discourse is determined by the context that generates the text and determines its structure. The context is understood in the broadest sense of the word as “any factor – linguistic, physical, social – that affects the interpretation of linguistic signs” [43, p. 8].

It includes the *situational context* (or *external context*) – the situational conditions of communication, the *psychological context* (or *internal context*) – the psychological factors influencing the process of communication and the *pre-context* – the entire previous experience of the interaction participants [49, p. 8].

According to I. Kecskes, the pre-context is based on our previous experience, it develops through regularly recurring similar situations that we associate with the current situation [42, p. 215].

Teun van Dijk suggests a distinction between micro-contexts, which take place in situations of interpersonal communication (e.g. parliamentary speech or debate), and macro-contexts (parliament as an institution or democracy as a system) [54, p. 250].

Culture is also a context. In intercultural interaction it is the most important extra-linguistic factor that determines communicative behaviour and shapes ethno-cultural communication style [49, p. 9].

One of the most significant directions of discourse research is “critical discourse analysis” [36; 37; 54; 56], which incorporates the notion of power and analyses how power operates with language.

N. Fairclough, in his definition of discourse as a language of social practice determined by social structures [37, p. 14], emphasises the relationship between language and society, which is axiomatic for critical discourse analysis researchers [55, p. 43].

Consider a famous example from the work of Michael Foucault [39], where he notes that the vocabulary and grammar used by the doctor in conversation with the patient are context-specific and constitute a discourse that includes words from the following thematic groups: symptoms, body, diagnosis, prognosis, therapy, treatment, medication, etc.

In addition, as N. Fairclough describes, there is an implicit relational inequality in the doctor-patient dialogue: the doctor fulfils the role of an “expert” who is able to influence the patient's life by virtue of his professional knowledge [37, p. 2]. This unequal relationship indicates the presence of a hierarchical social structure that influences choice, in all strata of society.

Thus, based on the definitions of discourse discussed, it is clear that discourse analysis cannot be limited to a single approach. It should be seen as a series of interdisciplinary approaches that can be used to explore different social spheres in different types of research. Regarding the notion of power, we believe that it is primarily necessary for critical discourse analysis research in the study of a special type of discourse.

I. Kecskes explores the pragmatics of dialogic interaction, proposing a model he has developed to analyse such discourse, based on an understanding of the roles of speaker and listener and their shared knowledge [43]. Using a variety of linguistic

material, he demonstrates how a pragmatic dialogical model can help assess important nuances of verbal communication.

The article also discusses intercultural aspects of semantics and pragmatics, noting that when non-native speakers are involved in the communication process, there must be a clear correspondence between the utterance and the speaker's intention, otherwise the lack of shared background knowledge between the speaker and the listener may preclude communication.

The key concept, according to Kecskes, is that of graded salience [40], which refers to the information that the listener believes is central to the speaker at the time of the utterance.

Misunderstandings can arise due to its individual and cultural specificity, i.e. when meaning is determined by personal and culturally specific meanings, especially when non-native speakers are involved in the dialogue. The author argues that because of the complexity of the cognitive processes that take place in speech communication, approaches based solely on the analysis of the utterances themselves are bound to lead to incomplete understanding.

L. Alba-Juez gives an overview of the stages in the development of discourse analysis, which has its origins in text linguistics, the analytical paradigm of the 1970s and 1980s. She refers to scholars who define the text as a communicative event that must satisfy seven criteria, the first two of which (coherence and consistency) can be defined as intratextual and the other five (intentionality, accessibility, informativeness, situationality and intertextuality) as external [33].

The author notes that while the first two criteria still represent important objects of traditional linguistic research, the latter needs to be considered in linguistic descriptions relevant to discourse analysis as a now recognised multifaceted interdisciplinary research tool.

The term “discourse”, as the article notes, encompasses “text” and “context”, encompassing social, cultural and emotional aspects. Thus, a distinction is drawn between research on “text” (which focuses on aspects such as coherence and

coherence) and research on "discourse", which is a broader term that includes social, cultural and historical factors as well as features of a particular interactive context.

Proponents of the Anglo-American school, on the contrary, are more inclined to see pragmatics as one of the main components of linguistic theory, along with phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics. The author concludes that the developing theory of discourse analysis includes pragmatics as an integral part of the analyst's toolkit.

## 1.2. Classification of discourse types

In order to study any phenomenon in detail, it is necessary to create its typology. This statement fully applies to discourse. The problem of discourse typology has been touched upon by many researchers in their works: T. van Dijk, Prof. Karasik V. I., Y. Prokhorov, Prof. Kashkin V. B., Y. Rozhdestvensky.

The traditional basis for classification is the channel of information transmission. According to this criterion, discourse is divided into oral and written.

However, quite often in real communication, oral and written discourse are intertwined: in the process of communication, communicators may make some notes or transmit certain information to each other in writing.

That is why Professor Kashkin V. B. also identified a hybrid type of discourse that combines the features of oral and written types [8, p. 18].

In connection with the development of modern electronic means of communication, T. S. Yusupova also speaks of a new type of discourse based on the electronic method of information transmission. This includes messaging in chat rooms, communication via SMS, etc. This type of discourse is characterized by transience, informality, and the use of graphic methods of message transmission [8, p. 18].

A. P. Zagnitko and V. B. Kashkin distinguish between monologic and dialogic types of discourse. But there is also such a form of communication as a polylogue,

namely, the communication of several communicators, which accordingly indicates the existence of a poly logical type of discourse.

The next basis for classification is who it is aimed at. Accordingly, there are personal (personality-oriented) and institutional (status-oriented) types of discourse. In the first case, the speaker acts as a person with his/her own inner world, in the second case – as a representative of a certain social institution [29].

Professor V.I. Karasyk distinguishes two types of personality-oriented discourse: everyday and existential [4].

Everyday communication takes place between people who know each other well, and it is limited to maintaining contact and solving everyday problems.

This type of discourse is characterized by spontaneity, strong situational dependence, pronounced subjectivity, violation of logic and structural formality of statements. From the point of view of phonetics, slurred pronunciation is the norm here. When communicating at the household level, people resort to reduced and slang vocabulary, although statistically colloquial words make up no more than 10% of the lexical fund of expressions in spoken language [8, p. 19].

Everyday discourse is characterized by the fact that the addressee must understand the addressee at a glance.

Unlike everyday discourse, in everyday discourse, attempts are made to reveal one's inner world in all its richness, communication is extensive, and all forms of language based on the literary language are used. Everyday communication is predominantly monologic and is represented by works of fiction and philosophical and psychological introspective texts.

Professor V.I. Karasyk also developed a typology of discourse based on pragmalinguistic criteria. The following parameters are proposed as the basis for distinguishing types of discourse:

- uniplanarity/multiplanarity of meanings;
- setness/openness of reaction;
- seriousness / frivolity of communication;

- cooperative / conflictual communication;
- priority of content / form of communication;
- specificity/abstractness of the subject matter [8, p. 20].

Based on the proposed parameters, the researcher distinguishes the following types of discourse:

- one-dimensional / multidimensional;
- scripted / unscripted;
- serious / humorous;
- etiquette or cooperative/agonistic;
- informative / fascinative; performative / argumentative [8, p. 20].

In our opinion, this classification should be somewhat narrowed and generalized, since it does not reflect the whole variety of possible types of discourse.

In her collective monograph “Modern Theories of Discourse”, O.F. Rusakova offers her own typology of discourse. She distinguishes the following types of discourse:

- discourses of everyday communication (everyday conversations, friendly conversations, etc.);
- institutional discourses (legal, administrative, etc.); public discourse (discourse of public initiatives and speeches, diplomatic, PR discourse);
- political discourse (discourse of political ideologies, political institutions, political actions);
- media discourses; art discourses; business communications discourse (discourse of business negotiations, business communications);
- marketing discourses (discourse of advertising, sales, etc.)
- academic discourses (discourse of scientific communities, humanities);
- cultural and ideological discourses (discourses of cultural epochs, philosophical and religious movements) [8, p. 20].

There is no single view of the typology of discourse, so scholars offer different ways of classifying discourse.

We believe that discourse should be classified according to several criteria, for example: oral or written, monologue, dialogic or polyglot discourse, serious or humorous, public, political discourse or discourse of everyday communication, etc.

### 1.3. The concept of “sports discourse”

Today, the sports sector is an integral part of human life and society as a whole. It is a complex element that shapes the individual and society as a whole. It is important to note that when we talk about the importance of sport for society, we are talking not only about the idea of competition itself, but also about various aspects of economics, politics, and others. It is worth noting that sport is taking an increasingly important place in the culture of modern societies, and accordingly, the importance of scientific research in this area is growing [15, p. 226].

From the point of view of sociolinguistics, there are two main ones: personal (personality-oriented) and institutional (status-oriented) [24, p. 54].

The second type is of the greatest interest to us, as it is the basis for the concept of “sports discourse”. It should be noted that institutional discourse is communication within the deterministic framework of status-role relations, i.e. communication of representatives of social groups and institutions with each other [1].

There are different types of institutional discourse, and sports discourse is one of them. Sports discourse is defined as a speech activity within the field of sport [5, p. 48].

Moreover, sports discourse is understood as a sequence of speech acts that form a coherent text in an extralinguistic context, the purpose of which is to reflect the process of the maximum possible development of physical, mental and functional capabilities of an individual for their realization in training and competition processes in order to obtain the highest possible results [48, p. 350].

Consider the intersection of sports discourse with other discourses:

- scientific literature on sports and physical culture (issues of technical and psychological training of athletes, history of the sports and physical culture movement, etc;)
- pedagogical – educational and methodological texts for students of sports-related educational institutions, sports teachers and psychologists, etc;
- legal and official business – rules of the game, competition regulations, standards for awarding titles, etc;
- with political and military – in the field of competition, often used in
- in relation to the game process;
- in everyday communication, when “sport” is a topic for maintaining contact or a form of self-presentation;
- with the mass media – it largely determines sports discourse, dictates its form (TV, radio, newspaper); it is this media that helps to distinguish sports discourse in the field of journalism;
- with theatrical and stage – follows from the previous one: the audience perceives a sports competition as a spectacle [11, p. 58].

In order to describe a particular type of institutional discourse, it is necessary to consider its following components:

- 1) participants;
- 2) chronotope
- 3) types and genres [11, p. 65].

The main participants are the representatives of the institution (agents) and the people who address them directly (clients). In sports discourse, clients are advertisers, politicians, teachers, parents of young athletes, etc. Agents are of three groups:

- the first group includes the so-called mandatory participants who have the full scope of professional knowledge – athletes and their environment (coaches, referees, representatives of the administration);

— the second group includes optional participants whose knowledge is only partially related to the field of sports, for example, a massage therapist, a sports doctor;

— members of the third group can be both mandatory and optional participants – sports commentators, sports journalists and fans with spectators [15, p. 94].

Thus, unlike other discourses, there is no clearly defined pair of participants, as in the political “politician – voter” or medical “doctor – patient” discourse.

The chronotope of sports discourse consists of:

- a time-limited sporting event
- the time of preparation of the athlete for the competition
- the time of the competition broadcast;
- replays of sports events
- location of the sporting event (sports stadium, court, track, etc.)
- geographical location of the competition (country, city);
- location of preparatory events of a sporting event (showers, training facilities, etc.) [20, p. 32].

The genres of sports discourse were defined in the work of O.A. Pankratova, who distinguishes the genres of a scientific sports article, a medical-therapeutic conversation, physical education lessons at school, analysis of a training session or match, coaching an athlete, sports court, sports interview, sports press conference and sports memoirs [9, p. 8].

In addition, researchers divide sports discourse into television, newspaper and magazine, radio and Internet types [2, p. 179]. This classification is based on the fact that sports discourse is always close to mass media discourse, as it is the main channel for the implementation of sports discourse. Thus, we can distinguish several more genres: sports interview or reportage, sports TV and radio news, sports Internet

communication, sports TV commentary, various lectures, conferences, sports shows, etc.

There are general characteristics of sports discourse, namely:

— The mental (ideological) basis, which includes conceptual dominants, is the basic, system-forming conceptual universals that define the specificity and semantic, communicative and pragmatic uniqueness of texts of this type of discourse. Main concepts: subjects of sports activity, objects, attributes (rules), actions characteristic of sports, sports events.

— Presupposition is the expectation that the information received by the client is well known, either as general knowledge or as private knowledge acquired with special cognitive effort [9].

Non-isolation, which is manifested in the intersection of sports discourse with other discourses:

— with scientific – scientific literature on the problems of sport and physical culture;

— with pedagogical – educational and methodological texts for students of sports-related educational institutions, sports teachers, etc;

— legal and official business – rules of the game, competition regulations, regulations, etc;

— with political and military – in the field of atonality (competition);

— with everyday life – noticeable in communication when the topic of sports is in contact;

— with the mass media, and finally, with the theatrical and scenic, when the mass audience and the client take on the role of an observer, where sports events are a kind of performance with an unpredictable ending [52, p. 76].

The above postulates on the structure of the concept are the starting points for determining the components of the concept of “football”, which we consider as a

three-dimensional entity containing three components: conceptual, figurative and evaluative.

The concept is objectified in a certain type of discourse. According to O.S. Kubryakova, each natural language creates its own linguistic picture of the world, its own image of the mental world, which dictates a special way or style of world perception to those who speak a certain language. As a result, each language has its own system of influence on a person, especially noticeable in the field of conceptualisation and categorisation of the world. This influence should be studied on the basis of those forms of language that characterise different types of discourse [12]. The discourse reflects and constructs one of the “possible worlds”, for the objectification of which special linguistic means are used.

Discourse is understood primarily as the functionally determined use of language in the context of a particular socio-cultural situation [13]. In the potential dimension, discourse is a semiotic space that includes verbal and non-verbal signs oriented to serve a particular communicative sphere, as well as a thesaurus of precedent statements and texts. The potential dimension of discourse also includes ideas about typical models of speech behaviour and a set of speech actions and genres specific to this type of communication [23].

Sports concepts are actualised in sports discourse. The peculiarities of sports discourse are determined by the following qualities of sport as a kind of human activity:

- 1) the spirit of competition, competition;
- 2) creativity (search for reserves, new methods of achieving high results)
- 3) drama of struggle, overcoming difficulties (physical, psychological);
- 4) mass appeal, popularity, attractiveness;
- 5) aesthetics, spectacle, beauty, emotionality [16].

The constitutive features of sports discourse, in which sports concepts are objectified, include participants (athletes and fans). The chronotope of the discourse is the sports ground where the events take place.

The denotative space described by this discourse is the space of action. Unlike TV or radio reports about sporting events, newspaper reports are created after the events, which leaves an imprint on the content, structure and choice of linguistic means of communication. The task of a speaker who creates a news item is to describe the most important, essential moments of a sporting event, to convey his/her attitude to the game and players, as well as to provide background information that connects the news item with previous events.

One of the main tasks of the sports press is to convey the essence, character, complexity, tension of a sporting event, and the drama of the struggle.

G.Y. Solganik distinguishes the following genres of sports reporting: analysis, synthesis, description, narration, reasoning, evaluation [18].

Sports reporting is also characterised by two main principles of information organisation: neutral and authorial. The first corresponds to the purpose of event reporting, the second – to feature reporting. In an informational (event) report, a linear way of presenting material is used. The main semantic load is conveyed by motion verbs. According to L.G. Kaida, feature reporting is characterised by a complicated structure of the author's "I", in which events are presented through the journalist's perception. A high level of subjectivation of the text indicates empathy and involvement of the author [3].

The next feature of sports discourse is the dynamism of presentation. Given that dynamism is inherent in the very nature of sport, it cannot but be reflected in speech, in its structure and character. However, no matter how free the author is in the way he portrays the event, he must obey certain informative models that are used to build any report, including sports reporting. Scientists note that the main compositional principle of sports reporting is narrative. In such publications, it is important for a journalist to convey the sequence of actions, their development, relationships and results. In this way of constructing a text, attention is focused on verbs that name sequential actions or events [36].

The specificity of sports discourse, which belongs to the institutional type of discourse, is revealed in the type of social institution it represents. In the collective linguistic consciousness, this social institution is summarised in the key concept of this institution – “game”. Its values are concentrated in the motto: *Citius, Altius, Fortius* and are reduced to the need to move forward, to set new records.

### Conclusion to chapter 1

At present, discourse analysis is a consolidating research paradigm in which a wide range of social disciplines – economics, history, sociology, philosophy, cultural studies and social psychology – besides linguistics are interested.

What is meant by the term “discourse analysis” continues to be a matter of debate, just as the concept of “discourse” itself is not unambiguously defined and varies depending on the context in which it is used.

It is generally accepted that discourse is defined by the context that generates the text and determines its structure. Context is understood in the broadest sense of the word as “any factor – linguistic, physical, social – that affects the interpretation of linguistic signs”.

Such sentences should be used in the chapter, not in the conclusion

O.F. Rusakova offers her own typology of discourse: discourses of everyday communication, institutional discourses, public discourse, political discourse, media discourses, art discourses, business communication discourse, marketing discourses, academic discourses, and cultural and ideological discourses [29].

The sports discourse intersects with other discourses, such as scientific, pedagogical, legal, political, military, gaming, etc. The chronotope of the discourse is made up of: a time-limited sporting event; the time of an athlete's preparation for a

competition; the time of the competition broadcast; repetitions of sporting events; the locus of a sporting event; the geographical location of the competition; the locus of preparatory events for a sporting competition.

The genres of sports discourse were defined in the work of O.A. Pankratova, who identifies the genres of a scientific sports article, a medical-therapeutic conversation, physical education lessons at school, analysis of a training session or a match, coaching of an athlete by a coach, sports court, sports interview, sports press conference and sports memoirs [29].

The peculiarities of sports discourse are determined by the following qualities of sport as a kind of human activity: the spirit of competition, competition; creativity (search for reserves, new methods of achieving high results); drama of struggle, overcoming difficulties (physical, psychological); mass appeal, popularity, attractiveness; aesthetics, entertainment, beauty, emotionality.

## 2. LINGUISTIC FEATURES OF FOOTBALL DISCOURSE

### 2.1. Football terminology

Football, the full English name of the game “association football” is considered to be the most popular, spectacular, massive and emotional team sport in the world, the goal of the players of which is to score a goal against the opposing team in 90 minutes of playing time, using the technical and tactical skills of the players and the coach. Approximately 250 million players in more than 200 countries and territories consider football to be the most popular sport in the world [21].

It's only natural that the English national football team is one of the strongest teams in the world, as football as it is today originated in this country in the early 19th century. At that time, no uniform rules were established, and the teams had to discuss them immediately before each match. It was only in 1846 that the first uniform playing conditions were introduced with the Cambridge Rules.

The date of football's birth is generally considered to be 1863, when the Football Association was established in England. Although there are known facts that a similar game called “harpastum” appeared in Italy even earlier, it was the British who were able to promote this sport around the world, so they secured the right to be considered the ancestors of modern football.

FIFA and the International Olympic Committee use the term “football” as the official international name for the game.

Modern football was born in England in 1888, when the first domestic championship was held, and the world's first football league was born. In 1891, a well-known expert, John Penalty, proposed to add an eleven-metre free kick to the rules for foul play, or intentional play with the hand in the opponent's goal area. The first eleven-metre free kick was taken in the Irish Football League. The International Federation of Association Football (FIFA) was founded in 1904 and is still the largest

organisation in the world. In 1908, football was included in the Olympic Games programme, and since 1930, the FIFA World Cup has been held.

Football terminology in English is of great interest for study and analysis. This group of nominal units is frequently used, because football vocabulary has many users, as football is a popular sport in the world.

A complete description of the language of football should include all language levels, including phonological and phonetic structures, in particular in the language of fans (“chants”), morpho-syntactic structures, in particular in the language of radio and television broadcasts, lexical items and structures, stylistic features, linguistic aspects of the text, types of texts, and, of course, pragmatics and discourse analysis. In this section, we will look at some of the distinctive lexical features of the language of football.

The semantic-cognitive method of describing football terminology is presented in the approach to the pragmatic syntax of spoken language [41]. The use of Fillmore's semantic-lexical approach is proposed in the development of a multilingual football terminology database [53]. Both approaches will be presented and discussed below.

Fr. Jürgen's research is based on the pragma-linguistic theory of preferences [45, p. 332] or priorities [34, p. 34].

A football match consists of several recurring events that can be described using event types and actions. The basic and general event type is “play football”, which contains the following information [41, p. 119]:

- force, e.g. “Liverpool”, “Manchester United”, “Arsenal”, “Chelsea”, etc;
- place, e.g. “Narendra Modi Stadium”, “Michigan Stadium”, etc;
- progress, e.g. “after the first penalty”, “after the first half”, etc;
- time, e.g. “in the 2012 season”, “at the 2022-2023 FIFA World Cup”, etc;
- game equipment, e.g. “ball”, “goal”, etc;
- result, e.g., the score of the match – “2:1”, etc;

- modality, e.g. “deservedly awarded”, etc;
- reason, e.g. “he was disqualified after the first whistle”, etc.

In addition to the main type of event presented above, Jürgen defines other types: “to attack”, “to defend”, “to stop the ball”, “to move the ball”, “to score a goal” and “to fight a duel”. All these types of actions are included in the frame “to play football”. Football vocabulary can be described on the basis of its belonging to one of the different types of acts.

Of course, not all of the above functions are implemented in real text, i.e. in football commentary and reporting, as a rule, only the following are implemented: force of action, game equipment, result, place and time.

From the lexical and lexicographic point of view, it is interesting to organise lexical items by specific entities of the action type. In the action type "score a goal", the following lexical representations are possible as inventory: right foot, left foot, head/heel/knee or hand.

T. Schmidt [51] in his research focuses on lexicographic description, which is based on lexical semantics – both frame semantics and semantic relations between lexical items. The research is based on corpus data and aims to create a multilingual dictionary of football terminology, starting with English, German and French. Football terminology is organised into scenes and frames, prototypical structures of events in football. Examples of scenes are “Shot”, “Pass”, “Goal”, “Foul”, “Chance”, “Motion”, etc. Each scene contains at least one frame, for example, the Substitution scene contains three frames: “Bring off”, “Bring on” and “Substitute”.

From the point of view of correlation with the general vocabulary, football terms are heterogeneous. Many of these terms are common words whose lexical meanings have been transformed to express special football concepts. One of the distinctive features of football terminology is that it was largely formed on the basis of common words [14].

According to the traditional classification of terms according to their structure, they can be represented as word terms or phrase terms [28, p. 70]. Word terms consist

of only one component, while phrase terms have two, three or more structural elements.

Structurally, word terms are divided into the following types: non-derivative, derivative, compound and abbreviations [28, p. 70]. It should be noted that football terms in English include all the above structural types.

A considerable number of researchers note that football terms are mostly represented by derivatives. This group of vocabulary is represented by nouns, verbs and adjectives.

In English, there are several ways of word formation, one of which is affixation, including prefixation and suffixation [7, p. 14].

The following are the ways in which football terms have been formed from non-derivative words that have become derivatives (“challenger”, “defender”), classifying them by their part-of-speech affiliation:

### 1. Verbs

The analysis revealed terms formed by prefixation and suffixation. Examples of prefixation are the addition of the prefixes *dis-* “to dislodge” and *re-* “to replace” to the verb stem. An example of suffixation is the formation of a verb from a noun using the suffix *-ise* – “to equalise”.

### 2. Nouns

The study recorded the use of suffixes that, when added to a verb, form a noun indicating the performer of an action. Such suffixes are *-er* – “challenger”, “defender”; and *-ee* – “referee”.

The next group of suffixes also forms verbal nouns, but they denote abstract concepts, the process or result of an action. Productive suffixes are *-ion* – “possession”, *-tion* – “competition”, *-ment* – “infringement”, *-ence* – “offence”.

There are also word terms that are formed by adding a suffix to an adjective and denote a state, quality or property. For example: adding the suffix *-ness* – “quickness”, *-cy* – “captaincy”.

### 3. Adjectives

Few adjectives were found among football word terms. All of them are formed by adding suffixes to a noun. The suffixes that form such terms are *-ive* – “defensive” and *-less* – “goalless”.

The analysis has shown that the following types of terms are distinguished in the studied sublanguage:

Simple terms: “*bench*” – a place (bench) where the team's substitutes sit; “*relegation*” – relegation of a team to a lower football division; “*bruiser*” – aggressive tackling; “*custodian*” – goalkeeper; “*deflection*” – bounce of the ball, ricochet; “*caution*” – 1) warning; 2) yellow card; “*formation*” – 1) tactical scheme: 2) placement of players on the field; “*interception*” – interception of the ball from the opponent; “*margins*” – 1) line judges; 2) linesmen; “*minnow*” – an outsider, a deliberately weak team; “*nutmeg*” – 1) passing the ball between the opponent's legs; 2) passing “between the legs”; “*poacher*” – an attacker who constantly acts on the edge of offside.

Complex terms: “*drill-shoot*” – a twisted shot; “*far-post*” – the far post of the goal (bar); “*diving-header*” – 1) header in the fall; 2) dive – shot; “*clean-sheet*” – game on “0”; “*chip-shot*” – a parachute shot; “*centre-back*” – centre back; “*by-line*” – touchline; “*build-up*” – to start (build) an attack from your own goal; “*fake-step movement*” – stepping over the ball, fake movement; “*freekick formation*” – the formation of players when taking free kicks and free kicks; “*give-and-go*” – a game of give-and-take with a partner; “*local-derby match*” – a meeting between two teams from the same city or region; “*linkman*” – a central midfielder in a 3-4-3 formation that links the defensive line (3) and the attacking line (3); “*floodlights*” – artificial lighting; *local-derby match* – a match with a partner.

Coherent terminological combinations: “*whips in a cross*” – 1) a quick serve from the flank; 2) a serve with the first or second touch after receiving the ball; “*to mark a player*” – 1) to guard a player; 2) to hold an opponent's player during an attack by the opponents; “*to play to feat*” – 1) to give an accurate pass to a teammate;

2) to “put it in the foot”; “*ball trap*” – receiving the ball; “*blaze over*” – a shot above the goal; “*heel pass*” – a pass with the heel.

Phrase combinations: “*long-ball cross*” – a long pass in the direction of a teammate; “*one-touch quadrat*” – an exercise aimed at holding (controlling) the ball between players; “*outer-foot trap*” – receiving the ball with the outside of the foot; “*corridor of uncertainty*” – 1) a pass into an empty area behind the defending team players for a partner; 2) a pass to the goal; “*keep it on the carpet*” – 1) playing down low; 2) keeping the ball down, without using long passes and playing on top; “*man between the sticks*” – goalkeeper (a person between two posts); “*play to feat*” – 1) to give an accurate pass to a teammate; 2) to “put in a foot”; “*to cover lost zone*” – 1) to cover an exposed zone; 2) an option to insure a teammate who has forced or accidentally left the area of responsibility during defensive actions; “*to mark a player*” – 1) to guard a player; 2) to hold an opponent's player during an attack by the opponents; “*whips in a cross*” – 1) a quick serve from the flank; 2) a serve with the first or second touch after receiving the ball; “*to keep tight at the back*” – a tight defensive game with organised defensive lines.

Simple, complex terms and terminological combinations of football are represented by nouns, as they express the basic concepts of this field of knowledge.

In our analysis of terminological combinations, we found that most of the multicomponent coherent terminological combinations functioning in the sublanguage of football consist of two components, for example: “*injury time*” – compensatory time; “*match fixing*” – contractual match between teams; “*mexican wave*” – wave created by fans in the stands; “*miss out*” – missing a match.

In the terminology under study, there are two-component terminological combinations formed according to the following structural types:

— N+N:

“*key pass*” – decisive pass; “*heel pass*” – a heel pass to the partner; “*hospital pass*” – 1) hospital pass; 2) a pass to a partner resulting in possible injury after a collision with an opponent.

— A+N:

“*mexican wave*” – fans create a wave in the stands by raising and lowering their arms alternately; “*offensive players*” – attacking players.

Having analysed the terminological combinations, we found the next three-component terminological combinations, such as: “*local derby match*” – a meeting between two teams from the same city or region; “*free kick formation*” – formation of players for free kicks and free kicks; “*man between sticks*” – goalkeeper; “*one touch pass*” – one-touch ball pass; “*player's surface experience*” – experience of playing football on different surfaces (fields); “*play to feat*” – 1) give a precise pass to a teammate; 2) “put it in the foot”.

## 2.2. Jargon in football discourse

It is well known that the national language is heterogeneous: it consists of numerous linguistic subsystems, the presence of which is determined by the structure of modern society. Social groups can have different social, gender and psychological natures, which leads to the formation of respective sublanguages [10].

The set of linguistic features inherent in any social group will be called jargon, since, according to V. V. Khimik, jargon is a semi-open lexical and phraseological subsystem used to separate from the rest of the language community [17].

This definition can be applied to most sociolects, since the presence of “special” vocabulary in them is primarily due to the need to emphasise belonging to a particular social group. By using jargon, a speaker expresses his/her attitude to the surrounding reality from the perspective of the social group to which he/she belongs (cf.: the first lexical items that appeared in the sociolect of football fans were the names of fans of other clubs, which emerged on the principle of “friend or foe” opposition).

Jargon is socially labelled vocabulary. In the profession of a journalist, driver or scientist, there is a normative range used for official communication, and there is a

lowered, familial one with a jargon modus as a means of laughing at the world. Jargon is the colloquial vocabulary that exists in a certain corporate environment. When we communicate with each other, we develop a special subcode that unites us, separates us from others and serves as a distinctive sign: we are our own, we belong to the same environment.

Jargons are not complete communication systems. They are made up of speech features in the form of lexical items, phrases, and syntactic structures. The basis of jargon is based on the national language, so it does not fundamentally differ from it. In addition, due to the lack of clear boundaries, units from other language levels freely penetrate the lexical composition of a particular slang.

An important component of the identity of football fans' subculture representatives is language as a form of group consciousness and a reflection of group values and social solidarity. Speaking about the specifics of the speech of subculture representatives, linguists use the term "sociolect".

The football fan movement originated in England, the birthplace of modern football. In the 20th century, fans defending the honour of their club created stable social groups with their own culture and ideology. Football, being the most popular sport, has formed a certain subculture with its own rules of conduct, morals and language over the course of its more than a century of existence.

The subculture of football fans unites people who are completely different, but with a common idea and shared passions. The occupation of the fans can vary: the group includes university students, students of vocational schools (technical colleges), private entrepreneurs, workers and people without any particular occupation. Many fans have a well-developed taste in music, they prefer jazz and punk, many are well read, and the vast majority are well versed in clothing and fashion, as clothing is of great importance to any subculture [22].

Among football fans, the main function of clothing is inconspicuousness. All fans are distinguished by a high emotional background, with the emotional aspect of their personality overwhelming the logical.

In sports discourse, which is used by both spectators and participants, it is important to understand that what seems to an outsider to be obscure and similar to jargon may in fact often be simply obscure. The peculiarity of sports discourse is that jargon and slang function similarly in terms of frequency, and it often becomes difficult to draw a line. However, jargon is not aimed at concealing information, but rather at conveying it in the most appropriate way.

Football commentators are a great example, as they use slang and jargon, not only on the air, but also in newspapers and articles. The sources of football jargon are often the objects of the game, i.e. players, ball, field, goal, net; symbols and names of clubs, precedent-setting phenomena and famous personalities, and perhaps one of the determining factors is the viewer's emotional assessment of the game and its moments. Word formation, assignment of a different meaning, metaphor, and precedent phenomena form the basis for the formation of new units of jargon.

There are many expressions that describe both the game and the players. When we say “*he's solid*”, we mean a great defender, if we say “*he's a grock/chest*”, it means that the defender is tall and heavy, and sometimes not very smart; “*he has a shocker*” – he had a bad game; “*super sub*” (“sub” is short for “subscriber”) – a player who is always in the starting line-up and plays almost to the end; “*clean up man*” is usually a deep midfielder who keeps order and takes the ball back; “*that was savage*” is a description of a play so good that the opponent looks ridiculous; “*plonker*” is an idiot; “*corker*” is a terrific player; “*big game player*” is a player who scores and plays well in important matches, but usually shows an average level of play; “*in his pocket*” – a player, usually a defender, who dominated the target player so well that the target player had no chance to escape from his custody; “*sitter*” – a description of a moment when a player missed an almost certain chance to score a goal; “*skipper*” – the captain of the team; “*gaffer or godfather*” – the team coach; “*maestro*” – a midfielder who controls the game, passes at the right time and leads the team; “*mercurial*” – usually a great player of non-British origin, but who has a certain mystique; “*wing wizard*” – a fast and technical winger; “*a safe pair of*

*hands*” – a reliable goalkeeper; *“cruncher”* – a difficult tackler who does not break the rules; *“lineo”* – a referee on the line.

Football jargon has a decent set of phraseological expressions: *“to burn somebody”* in football means “to beat on the flank”; *“to dance through players”* – to go around several players at a time; *“to have somebody off”* – to make a player look foolish; *“to whip the ball in”* – to drive the ball into the goal with a step; *“to hit the post”* – to hit the crossbar or goal post; *“to hoof the ball”* – to kick the ball as far as possible to the opponent's goal; *“to lose the dressing room”* – to lose the support and respect of the team (in the case of a coach); *“to park the bus”* – to put the whole team on the defensive, minimising the attack, only occasionally going on the counterattack; *“to ping it”* – to strike a great shot or make a beautiful pass; *“to lace it”* – to kick the ball with the middle upper part of the foot (the area of the laces in the boots); *“flapped at it”* – a goalkeeper who missed a goal; *“to belt it”* – to strike hard.

Goals, shots and passes also have their own jargon units: *“top bin”* – a goal into the top corner of the goal; *“dink”* – a short, easy pass or shot; *“thunderbastard”* – a long, unstoppable shot at high speed; *“daisy cutter”* – a low shot along the ground; *“meg”* – a ball passed between the opponent's legs; *“screamer”* – an important, beautiful goal that causes a crowd to cheer; *“chip”* – a ball taken off the field over the spectators' heads; *“a pearler”* – a graceful pass or goal.

There is also a characteristic of the ball selection: *“leg breaker”* – a bad, dangerous selection. The method of taking a football penalty kick, in which the ball is hooked into the goal on a curve, is called the “Panenka” penalty kick after the Czechoslovakian midfielder Antonin Panenka.

There are also expressions created by commentators that have become part of the jargon due to their originality. For example, *“back of the net”* is how Alan Patridge describes “a good goal”; *“bouncebackability”* is when a team can win the next game after a defeat.

Without any particular categorisation, we can cite the following words: *“minnows”* – teams that are considered outsiders in matches with football giants;

*“total Football”* – a style of play in which every player can take any position; *“absolute limbs”* – a description of a crazy situation on the field. By the way, the first word has the expression *“absolute unit”*, which means “big, strong defender”.

When the score reaches “2:2”, the score is called *“desmond”*. The reason for this name was Archbishop Desmond Tutu, whose surname is a homophone of this score; *“poacher”* – a player who plays in the opponent's goal area and does not do much work in the rest of the game, in fact, the one who waits for the ball to be sent into the goal net; a light, elegant pass is described as *“silky”*. The expression *“squeaky bum time”* is used in two cases: 1) when a team is leading by 1 goal with about 10 minutes left in the match and the opponent is pressing hard; 2) when the race for points begins in the standings with few matches left.

When any “player got confused” and it led to a different result than expected, they say *“he bottled it”*. A team that is lucky because it plays frankly worse is unflatteringly referred to as *“it was a shite accommodation”*. On the contrary, when a team has played a good match, you can often hear that *“they played out of their skin”*. If the trajectory of a successful ball strike was unstable, you will usually hear something like *“oh, the swazz on that strike was filthy”*.

### 2.3. Metaphors in football discourse

The word “metaphor” has a wide range of definitions, and difficulties in defining the concept are due to the large number of approaches to the study of this phenomenon.

If we consider a metaphor as a concept, then its lexical and semantic field can include the following words: trope, analogy, similarity, comparison, transfer, likeness, association, contrast, simile.

For a long time, the attitude to metaphor was controversial. Due to N. Bose and P. Fontanier, a classification of stylistic tropes and their separation from figures of speech was developed. In this classification, metaphor was first considered separately

from other stylistic devices [38]. The twentieth century's "linguistic turn" made language the centre of philosophical analysis.

J. Lakoff and M. Johnson have made a significant contribution to the study of metaphor, considering it as a conceptual construction and arguing that our conceptual system is metaphorical in nature [19, p. 295].

We will consider the basic metaphor from the point of view of the cognitive approach, which assumes that metaphor is one of the tools of our vision and understanding of the world. It is not a figurative tool that connects two meanings of a word, but a basic mental operation that combines two conceptual spheres and creates the possibility to use the potentialities of structuring the source sphere with the help of a new sphere. Metaphor is a manifestation of the analogue capabilities of human thinking. Metaphors are inherent in the very conceptual system of human thinking; they are a special kind of schemes by which a person thinks and acts [26].

The main basic metaphors that define the cultural content of football reportage as a fragment of sports discourse are as follows:

1. Football is a war

This metaphorical model is the most studied. The military metaphor is the most popular model in sports discourse, as players are most often compared to warriors, fighters, and the game is compared to a battlefield [44].

The use of militaristic vocabulary most clearly describes a sporting event as a military battle between individual teams or athletes. Sports battles are dynamic and unpredictable:

*«Manchester United will battle Paris Saint-Germain and Real Madrid to sign the midfielder»*

*«Still undefeated at home, Hoffenheim took another step towards Champions League qualification with a sensational display of attacking power in their 5–3 win over Borussia Monchengladbach on Saturday»*

E. Malysheva identifies a number of frames in this metaphorical model [6]:

**Frame 1:** Struggle. Football matches are often compared to different types of struggle, whether military battles or one-on-one matches:

Football is a war:

*“Chile are the outsiders in a battle that is mainly being fought between Peru and Colombia – teams that met in the steaming afternoon heat of Barranquilla at the end of January”*

- Football is a duel

The vicissitudes of the game correspond to the events that can happen during a battle. The actions taking place on the football field are associated with the stages of a military campaign. The match between two big clubs is presented in football discourse as a battle of football titans, “a clash of giants”. The game is metaphorically understood as a duel (in the first round, the match between Atletico and Sevilla ended in a draw), a duel:

*“Arsenal came back into the game but found it difficult to break down Liverpool's solid defence and an enthralling first half duel ended goalless”*

*“A golden rule in German football is effectiveness in zweikampf situations, or face-to-face duels”.*

- Football is a fight:

*“We all want to do it as quickly as possible and we know that it is our responsibility to fight against the best teams in every competition, and that will not change”.*

**Frame 2:** The course of the war. Military vocabulary is used to describe the stages of football championships, the actions of players on the field, and the decisions of the coach:

- Warfare:

*“Wenger's other priority this summer will be "to strengthen his defence”*

- Warfare strategy:

*“It was however hard to understand Mourinho's 'tactics' in deciding to man mark the scintillating Eden Hazard with Herrera”*

- Results of the war:

*“Laporta's victory felt like something new, and yet it was rooted in nostalgia too, the memory of those days when they felt invincible; days that seemed ever further away”*

**Frame 3:** Personnel. Footballers are described as soldiers, fighters with a specific profile:

*“One of the most well-known defenders who could be on the move at the end of the season is Real Madrid's Raphael Varane”*

**Frame 4:** Weapons. This frame describes the use of weapons on the field, i.e. the ball:

*“In trouncing Sampdoria 5-1 at home, Lazio picked up a club record 11th consecutive win while their centre forward, Ciro Immobile, ‘scored two goals’ to consolidate his position at the top of the goalscorers' chart with 23 goals”*

During the study of football metaphors, we can identify our own frames of this metaphorical model:

- The opponent is the enemy

The transformation of someone else's team into an enemy team inevitably occurs in the minds of the players, actualising the focus on the fight. Identifying the opponent as an enemy allows players to arouse “sporting anger” – the desire to prove their superiority by any means necessary. This is how the enmity between the clubs gradually develops over the course of a long rivalry, based on the history of clashes between the parties and some stereotypes. Fans of successful teams with rich traditions are the most hostile to each other:

*“75,000 spectators at the Santiago Bernabeu Stadium saw the Galacticos beaten 2-1 by arch rivals Barcelona”*

- A win is a victory, the destruction of the opponent, a loss is a defeat

In the English discourse, a team that consistently eliminates serious competitors on its way “takes their scalps”:

*“Italy took the scalps of Holland and Germany in prestige friendlies.*

*‘Liverpool’ defeated ‘Chelsea’ in the semi-finals”.*

The club's winning streak and achievements can also serve as a target for attack and destruction:

*“Charlton destroyed Chelsea's perfect home record”*

This metaphorical realisation is typical for the English language.

- Successful team actions – destruction of the enemy's defences

Effective attacking play causes destruction in the opponent's defences. In order to score a goal, players can break, break through, tear, or push through the defence:

*“Could PSV break the defensive wall that had only conceded three goals en route to the Semi-Final”*

- A forward is a soldier who handles a weapon

The outcome of a match depends on the ability of a forward to use his weapon – a shot on goal – effectively. In sports discourse, a player who frequently threatens the opponent's goal is called a striker, and a player who scores a lot of goals is called a sniper:

*“The competition's top marksman”*

## 2. Team is a mechanism

The concept of “team” emphasises the importance of the coordinated work of athletes. The team members are compared to the parts of a fine mechanism, each of which affects the dynamic course of the game:

*“Clubs are queuing up to sign Celtic goal machine Odsonne Edouard”*

*“Thus, to have him firing on all cylinders and full of confidence will do no harm”*

*“Much more, he and teammates such as Lorenzo Pellegrini, Bryan Cristante and Roberto Gagliardini have played very few games together. Meaning that many basic schemes, movements and mechanisms are obviously not yet instinctively in place”*

Often in the football world, players can act as part of an organism.

3. Team is an organism:

*“We know they are better than us, a very good team, with a lot of experience’, added Ranieri. ‘But we have a very big ‘heart’, a very big effort, we helped each other and I think we deserved this goal”*

4. Football is the animal world

This metaphorical model allows us to learn the characteristics of a football player by comparing his appearance, personality traits, and behaviour with the image of an animal:

*“The Valcke who, on his return to Zurich, was very briefly suspended by FIFA only to re-emerge like a butterfly from its chrysalis as lieutenant to Blatter?”*

5. Football is a house/dwelling/building

What happens on the pitch is often explained by the metaphor of building a house. Footballers “build” the attack, and the defending side “destroys” it. Fans call their home stadium a fortress, a home where they spend their best hours:

*“If a club can only have five foreigners among their starting 11, then they will have to build on their own youth system”*

*“A Ronaldo free-kick from 35 yards failed to clear the defensive wall”*

*“All Spurs fans are looking forward to life in our new stadium. We must hope we can make it the “fortress” we enjoyed in our last year at White Hart Lane”*

5. Football is other sports

Football is closely related to other sports, such as chess or equestrianism. In football discourse, grandmasters are players who have proven themselves to be the best. A match between teams that have been rivals for many years, representing the same city or region, is called a derby:

*“I’ve been all over the world, but I’ve never known anyone quite like Moggi.*

*He acts as if he is the grandmaster of football”*

*“The Merseyside derby is a huge highlight of the Premier League gameweek”.*

5. Football is art

Football is compared to different types of art, matches are dramatic or tragic, players and coaches play the role of actors and directors. Aesthetic appreciation of events comes to the fore:

*“There he honed his skills on local miniature dirt pitches in the 1960s”*

*“At the end of another dramatic Serie A season on Sunday, those were the final verdicts”*

*“His performances would catch the eye of the aptly named Ultimate Strikers Academy. Always with elegance, his words in describing his approach to coaching and the "role" played by the players”*

## Conclusion to chapter 2

A complete description of the language of football should include all language levels, including phonological and phonetic structures, in particular in the language of fans, morpho-syntactic structures, lexical items and structures, stylistic features, linguistic aspects of the text, etc.

In English, there are several ways of word formation of football terminology, one of which is affixation, including prefixation and suffixation. In this study, we examined the ways in which football terms were formed from non-derivative words that became derivatives, classifying them by their part-of-speech affiliation: verbs (prefixes *dis-* and *re-*; suffix *-ise*), nouns (suffixes *-er*, *-ion*, *-tion*, *-ment*, *-ence*, *-ness*), adjectives (*-ive*).

The sources for the formation of football jargon are most often players, ball, field, goal, net; symbols and names of clubs, precedent-setting phenomena and famous personalities and the viewer's emotional assessment of the game and its moments. Word formation, assignment of a different meaning, metaphor, and precedent phenomena form the basis for the formation of new units of jargon.

The main basic metaphors that define the cultural content of football reporting as a fragment of sports discourse are: *football is a war*; *team is a mechanism*; *team is*

*an organism; football is the animal world; football is a house/dwelling/building;  
football is other sports; football is art.*

## CONCLUSION

Today, discourse analysis is a consolidating research paradigm that, in addition to linguistics, is of interest to a wide range of social disciplines, including economics, history, sociology, philosophy, cultural studies and social psychology.

The question of what is meant by the term “discourse analysis” continues to be debated, just as the concept of “discourse” itself has no unambiguous definition and varies depending on the context in which it is used. It is generally accepted that discourse is determined by the context, which gives rise to the text and determines its structure. At the same time, context is understood in the broadest sense of the word as “any factor – linguistic, physical, social – that affects the interpretation of linguistic signs”.

The question of a single universally recognised classification of discourse is still open, as each researcher offers his or her own variants based on different conditions determined by the personal position of each of them.

In her collective monograph “Modern Theories of Discourse”, O. F. Rusakova offers her own typology of discourse: discourses of everyday communication, institutional discourses, public discourse, political discourse, media discourses, art discourses, business communication discourse, marketing discourses, academic discourses, cultural and ideological discourses.

Sport occupies an increasingly important place in the culture of modern societies, and the importance of research in this area is growing accordingly. From the point of view of sociolinguistics, there are two main types: personal (personality-oriented) and institutional (status-oriented). The second type is of the greatest interest to researchers, as it is the basis for the concept of “sports discourse”.

Sports discourse is defined as a speech activity within the field of sport. Moreover, sports discourse is understood as a sequence of speech acts that form a coherent text in an extralinguistic context, the purpose of which is to reflect the process of the maximum possible development of physical, mental and functional

capabilities of an individual for their implementation in training and competition processes in order to obtain the highest possible results.

The sport discourse intersects with other discourses, such as scientific, pedagogical, legal, political, military, everyday, gaming, etc. The chronotope of the discourse is made up of: a time-limited sporting event; the time of preparation of an athlete for a competition; the time of broadcasting a competition; repetitions of sporting events; the locus of a sporting event; the geographical location of a competition; the locus of preparatory events for a sporting competition.

The genres of sports discourse were defined in the work of O. A. Pankratova, who identifies the genres of a scientific sports article, a medical-therapeutic conversation, physical education lessons at school, analysis of a training session or a match, coaching of an athlete by a coach, sports court, sports interview, sports press conference and sports memoirs.

The peculiarities of sports discourse are determined by the following qualities of sport as a kind of human activity: the spirit of competition, competition; creativity (search for reserves, new methods of achieving high results); drama of struggle, overcoming difficulties (physical, psychological); mass appeal, popularity, attractiveness; aesthetics, entertainment, beauty, emotionality.

Football is considered the most popular, spectacular, massive and emotional team sport in the world. Football terminology in English is of great interest to lexicographers. This group of nominal units is frequently used, because football vocabulary has many users, as football is a popular sport in the world.

Football as it is today originated in this country in the early 19th century. In 1846, the first uniform playing conditions were introduced with the Cambridge Rules. The date of football's birth is generally considered to be 1863, when the Football Association was established in England.

From the point of view of correlation with common vocabulary, football terms are heterogeneous. Many of these terms are common words whose lexical meanings have been transformed to express special football concepts. One of the distinctive

features of football terminology is that it was largely formed on the basis of common words.

A complete description of the language of football should include all language levels, including phonological and phonetic structures, in particular in the language of fans, morpho-syntactic structures, lexical units and structures, stylistic features, linguistic aspects of the text, etc.

In English, there are several ways of word formation of football terminology, one of which is affixation, including prefixation and suffixation. In this study, we examined the ways in which football terms were formed from non-derivative words that became derivatives, classifying them by their part-of-speech affiliation: verbs (prefixes *dis-* and *re-*; suffix *-ise*), nouns (suffixes *-er*, *-ion*, *-tion*, *-ment*, *-ence*, *-ness*), adjectives (*-ive*).

The analysis has shown that the following types of terms are distinguished in the studied sublanguage: simple terms, complex terms, coherent term combinations, phrase term combinations.

When analysing term combinations, we found that most of the multicomponent coherent term combinations functioning in the football sublanguage consist of two components, while three-component combinations are less common.

The peculiarity of sports discourse is that jargon and slang function in the same way in terms of frequency and it often becomes difficult to draw a line. The sources for the formation of jargon in football are most often the objects of the game, i.e. players, ball, field, goal, net; symbols and names of clubs, precedent-setting phenomena and famous personalities, and perhaps one of the determining factors is the viewer's emotional assessment of the game and its moments. Word formation, assignment of a different meaning, metaphor, and precedent phenomena form the basis for the formation of new units of jargon.

Football jargon describes a set of phraseological expressions, as well as describes the game, players, ball selection, goals, shots and passes. The study also

examines expressions created by commentators that have entered the jargon due to their originality.

The main basic metaphors that define the cultural content of football reporting as a fragment of sports discourse are: *football is a war; team is a mechanism; team is an organism; football is the animal world; football is a house/dwelling/building; football is other sports; football is art.*

## LIST OF LITERATURE

1. Англо-український словник. URL: <https://www.dict.com/>
2. Бабенко О.В., Шекера О.О. Спортивний інтернет-дискурс як предмет лінгвістичного дослідження. Молодий вчений. Філологічні науки, 2017. –178-181 с.
3. Бакіко В.М. Омелянець О.О., Лазебний В.С. Організація телевізійного виробництва. Конспект лекцій, 2018. – 162 с.
4. Бегас Н. О. Вербалізація ціннісних концептів українського етносу у фольклорному дискурсі. Архів кваліфікаційних робіт, 2020.
5. Білоус І. М. Вербалізація оцінного компоненту в англomовному фітнес-дискурсі. Вісник ХНУ, 2012. – 47-52 с.
6. Блощінська О.В. Метафора як засіб формування термінологіки футболу. Проблеми семантики, прагматики та когнітивної лінгвістики 21, 2012.
7. Богданова В. С. Структурні особливості футбольних термінів (на матеріалі англійської мови). Науковий вісник міжнародного гуманітарного університету, 2015. – 21-23 с.
8. Боренко М. С. Лінгвопрагматичні та лінгвостилістичні характеристики німецьких репортажів сучасного медійного дискурсу. BS thesis. КПІ ім. Ігоря Сікорського, 2020. – 71 с.
9. Васильченко О.А. Еволюція норм та девіацій у сфері спорту : автореф. дис. ... канд. соц. наук : спец. 22.00.04 «Спеціальні та галузеві соціології». Запоріжжя, 2006. –16 с.
10. Дзюбишина-Мельник Н. Сучасний жаргон і сучасне розмовне мовлення, 2002. –14-18 с.
11. Дискурс як когнітивно-комунікативний феномен / Під заг.ред. Шевченко І. С.: монографія. Харків: Константа, 2005. – 356 с.

12. Живіцька І.А. Мовна картина світу як відображення реальності. Філологічні студії: Науковий вісник Криворізького державного педагогічного університету 4, 2010. – 20-25 с.

13. Зубарева О.І. Дискурс соціального контролю як об'єкт соціологічного теоретизування: методологічні реконфігурації. О. Гончара. Дніпропетровськ, 2015. – 1-23 с.

14. Кустол Я. Особливості української та польської футбольної термінології, 2015.

15. Люта Л.П. Сутність інституту спорту як агента соціалізації. Вісн. Київ. ун-ту імені Тараса Шевченка : Соціологія. Психологія. Педагогіка, 2003. – 94-97 с.

16. Малієнко І. О., Кирилова О.В. Сучасна структура спортивного дискурсу. Система національних ЗМІ в сучасній Україні: Нова Візія, 2010. – 20 с.

17. Мартос С. А. Жаргонно-сленгові страти в міському спілкуванні, 2013. – 1-8 с.

18. Назар Р. Характеристика репортажу як жанру мовлення, 2009. – 209 с.

19. Овчаренко Н. М. Метафора: особливості визначення поняття. Сучасний рух науки: тези доп. II міжнародної науково-практичної інтернет-конференції, 28-29 червня 2018 р. Дніпро, 2018. – 560 с.

20. Потапенко С. І. Мовна особистість у просторі медійного дискурсу (досвід лінгвокогнітивного аналізу): монографія. Київ: Видавничий центр КНЛУ, 2004. – 359 с.

21. Процик І. Термінологія в мовленні футбольних фанатів, 2011. – 212-217 с.

22. Процюк І. Мовна картина світу футбольних фанатів. *Studia Ukrainica Posnaniensia* 3, 2015. – 239-247 с.

23. Савелюк Н. М. Психологія розуміння релігійного дискурсу, 2017. – 400 с.
24. Селіванова О.О. Сучасна лінгвістика: термінологічна енциклопедія. Полтава: Довкілля, 2006. – 716 с.
25. Словник футбольних термінів. URL: <http://ru.wikipedia.org>
26. Тарабарова Ю. В. Метафора як мовний та когнітивний феномен. Заступники головного редактора, 2017. – 82 с.
27. Це ти маєш знати: футбольні терміни. URL: <http://www.sport-kids.ru/coach/knowledge/advise/44/>
28. Шарманова Н. М. Мова професійного спілкування: навчальний посібник, 2014. – 58 с.
29. Шерстюк Н. В. Дискурс: від становлення поняття до соціально-конструкціоністських теорій дискурс-аналізу, 2012. – 1-11 с.
30. An English-language football magazine. — URL: <https://www.worldsoccer.com/>
31. Brown G. Discourse analysis. Cambridge university press, 1983. – 288 p.
32. Bublitz W., Norrick R.N. Introduction: The burgeoning field of pragmatics. Foundations of pragmatics. De Gruyter Mouton, 2011. – 1-20 p.
33. De Beaugrande, Robert-Alain, and Wolfgang U. Dressler. Introduction to text linguistics. Vol. 1. London: longman, 1981. – 286 p.
34. Dik C. The theory of function grammar part 1: The structure of the clause. Mouton de Gruyter, 1997. – 433 p.
35. Englex. Короткий англійський словник футбольного фаната. URL: <http://englex.ru/the-dictionary-of-a-football-fan/>
36. Fairclough N. Language and power. London-New York: Longman, 1989. – 259 p.
37. Fairclough N. Language and power second edition. London: Longman and power relations in Nigerian newspaper headlines. Nebula 4.1, 2001. – 218-245 p.

38. Fontanier P. Manuel classique pour l'etude des tropes (1821). LUX, 1979. –124 p.
39. Foucault M. Naissance de la clinique: une archeologie du regard medical. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1963. – 300 p.
40. Giora R. On Our Mind: Saliency context and figurative language. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003. – 272 p.
41. Jürgens Fr. Auf dem Weg zu einer pragmatischen Syntax: Eine vergleichende Fallstudie zu Präferenzen in gesprochen und geschrieben realisierten Textsorten. Vol. 207. Walter de Gruyter, 2013. – 338 p.
42. Kecskes I. Intercultural Pragmatics. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2014. – 288 p.
43. Kecskes I. Word, context and communicative meaning. Russian Journal of Linguistics 1, 2014. – 7-153 p.
44. Lavric E. The linguistics of football. Vol. 38. Narr Francke Attempto Verlag, 2008. – 424 p.
45. Levinson S.C. Pragmatics. Cambridge university press, 1983. – 417 p.
46. Merriam Webster Dictionary. URL: <http://www.merriam-webster.com/>
47. Mills S. Discourse. London and New York: Routledge, 1997. – 176 p.
48. Müller T. Football, language and linguistics. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 2007. – 356-362 p.
49. Ponton D. M., Larina T. V. Discourse analysis in the 21st century: Theory and practice (I). Russian Journal of Linguistics 20.4, 2016. – 7-25 p.
50. Schirato T. Sports discourse. A&C Black, 2013. – 224 p.
51. Schmidt T. The Kicktionary–A multilingual lexical resource of football language. Multilingual FrameNets in computational lexicography: methods and applications. de Gruyter, 2009. – 101-132 p.
52. Scollon R. Mediated discourse as social interaction: a study of news discourse. – L.-N.-Y.: Longman, 1998. – 315 p.

53. Taborek J. The language of sport: Some remarks on the language of football, 2012. – 237-253 p.
54. Van Dijk, T. A. The discourse-knowledge interface. *Critical discourse analysis: Theory and interdisciplinarity*, 2003. – 85-109 p.
55. Verdoolaege A. *Reconciliation discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2008. – 238 p.
56. Wodak R. The discourse-historical approach. In Wodak, Ruth and Meyer, Michael (eds) *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: Sage, 2001. – 63-95 p.

**Football terms**

bench	dug-out	to cover lost zone
crossbar	fake-step movement	to mark a player
post	freekick formation	whips in a cross
relegation	give-and-go	to keep tight at the back
bruiser	local-derby match	injury time
custodian	linkman	match fixing
deflection	floodlights	mexican wave
caution	floodlights	miss out
formation	local-derby match	key pass
interception	whips in a cross	heel pass
margins	to mark a player	hospital pass
minnow	play to feat	mexican wave
nutmeg	ball trap	offensive players
poacher	blaze over	successful dribbling
drill-shoot	heel pass	local derby match
far-post	long-ball cross	natural football turf
diving-header	one-touch quadrat	free kick formation
clean-sheet	outer-foot trap	indirect free kick
chip-shot	corridor of uncertainty	man between sticks
centre-back	keep it on the carpet	one touch pass
by-line	man between the sticks	player's surface
build-up	play to feat	play to feat

### Football jargon

“he's solid”	to burn somebody	screamer
“he's a grock / chest”	to dance through	chip
“he has a shocker”	players	a pearler
super sub	to have somebody off	leg breaker
clean up man	to whip the ball in	back of the net
“that was savage”	to hit the post	bouncebackability
plonker	to hoof the ball	minnows
corker	to lose the dressing	total Football
big game player	room	absolute limbs
in his pocket	to park the bus	absolute unit
sitter	to ping it	desmond
skipper	to lace it	poacher
gaffer /godfather	flapped at it	silky
maestro	to belt it	“he bottled it”
mercurial	top bin	it was a shite housing
wing wizard	dink	they played out of a
a safe pair of hands	thunderbastard	skin
cruncher	daisy cutter	“oh, the swazz on that”
lineo	meg	strike was filthy