
The body, the mind and the arts: an investigation into the major metaphor types used in football match reports*

Cristiano Broccias & Daniele Canepa

Abstract

The language of sport in general and Football English in particular is still a rather neglected field of study within ESP. This paper deals with 'rhetorical' language in Football English by focusing on metaphors used in football match reports. We use a corpus made up of reports extracted from *The Times* over the second half of the 20th century and (a) analyse the most common metaphors employed in football match reports and (b) study whether changes in the rhetorical structure of football match reports occurred over the period in question. We show that two major metaphor types (or models) stand out: FOOTBALL IS FIGHTING and FOOTBALL IS ART. We observe that the former is by far the most frequently instantiated and can be related to the cognitively basic model known as the "billiard-ball model" (see Langacker 1991). These two types interact with other types (e.g. the reification model) thus producing a complex ontological network for the conceptualization of football matches. That is, specific metaphors may rely on the activation of various metaphor types, which testifies to the complexity and richness of Football English. Further, we show that reporters resort to an apparently unchanging stock of metaphors over the period in question.

1. Introduction

Little research has been done on the language of sport in general and on the language of football in particular. In the latter case, exceptions include Sabatier (1997) and Broccias (2001). Sabatier's (1997) study is a lexical-semantic one in that it aims to list

* We would like to thank the editors and two anonymous reviewers for their comments and suggestions. All remaining errors are our own, of course.

the most frequently used collocations in French football match reports. By contrast, Broccias's (2001) analysis focuses on the grammar of Football English (defined as the variety of English employed in football match reports). The present paper intends to explore another dimension, that of metaphorical language in Football English. Our aim is to provide a first characterization of the major metaphor types commonly used in written match reports. Our discussion is based on Canepa (2005), who investigates metaphorical language in a national quality newspaper, *The Times*, and in a regional newspaper, *The Western Mail*, a Welsh newspaper published in Cardiff. For our present purposes, we have relied exclusively on the former. Our corpus is made up of 51 articles (usually) reporting on World Cup matches played by England from 1949 to 2002 (i.e. covering the whole of the second half of the 20th century). When England failed to qualify for the World Cup finals, i.e. the final stage of the World Cup tournament, in 1974, 1978 and 1994, we used reports of friendlies played at roughly the same time as the relevant World Cup finals and/or matches played in the relevant World Cup preliminaries, i.e. the qualifying stages of the World Cup finals. A similar strategy was adopted when England were knocked out relatively early on in the World Cup finals (e.g. in 1950). We thus obtained about 12 articles every ten years (with the exception of the last time bracket, which is five years long, from 1997 to 2002, and includes 4 articles)¹.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 briefly reviews the two main approaches to metaphorical language, i.e. the Lakovian approach and the blending approach. Further, it argues that the latter is to be preferred in the analysis of Football English. Finally, it points out that metaphors can have different levels of activation in the language user's mind, i.e. some of them are hardly perceived synchronically as instances of figurative language. Section 3 explores the main metaphor types used in Football English, in particular those involving the fighting model and the exhibition model. It also stresses that other metaphors and cognitive processes, like reification, can be linked to them. Section 4 draws the main conclusions and shows that the use of metaphorical language seems to have largely remained constant over the second half of the last century. It also points to some topics for future investigations.

2.1. *Blending and rhetoric*

Over the last twenty years, metaphor and metonymy research has been a major concern of non-formal linguistics (see e.g. Taylor 2002: part 6 for a useful overview). It is generally agreed that metaphor, in particular, is not confined to rhetoric but is es-

¹ The dates of the 51 articles are as follows (day/month/year): 17.10.49, 3.7.50, 16.11.50, 10.5.51, 18.6.54, 21.6.54, 28.6.54, 11.11.54, 9.6.58, 12.6.58, 18.6.58, 1.6.62, 8.6.62, 11.6.62, 22.11.62, 12.7.66, 21.7.66, 25.7.66, 27.7.66, 15.1.70, 3.6.70, 8.6.70, 15.6.70, 24.5.72, 12.10.72, 25.1.73, 16.5.73, 13.5.74, 10.2.77, 1.6.77, 10.6.77, 13.6.77, 17.6.82, 21.6.82, 30.6.82, 6.7.82, 5.6.86, 9.6.86, 19.6.86, 23.6.86, 12.6.90, 18.6.90, 27.6.90, 10.6.96, 16.6.96, 19.6.96, 27.6.96, 3.6.2002, 8.6.2002, 13.6.2002, 22.6.2002.

essential to human life (see Lakoff & Johnson 1980, 1999). Within the Lakovian approach, for example, it is claimed that we think and make sense of the world by constantly engaging in mapping two domains onto each other. For example, we can map the source domain 'travelling' onto the target domain 'rational thought' so that travellers correspond to thinkers (A THINKER IS A TRAVELLER), departure points to premises (A PREMISE IS A STARTING POINT), arrival points to conclusions (A CONCLUSION IS A DESTINATION) and motion to reasoning (A LINE OF THOUGHT IS A PATH). Fauconnier and Turner (see especially Fauconnier & Turner 2002) have elaborated a more comprehensive mapping model between inputs (i.e., roughly, Lakovian domains) which is not necessarily limited to metaphor. They contend that the operation of "conceptual blending" is ubiquitous in human life, from mathematics to everyday speech. As a matter of illustration of how metaphorical expressions are treated within the blending model, consider the (conventionalized) metaphor A MARRIAGE IS A PRISON, as instantiated by (1) (see Taylor 2002: 530-533):

- (1) She's imprisoned in her marriage.

Alongside the two input spaces 'prison' (input 1) and 'marriage' (input 2), blending theory contends that a generic space and a blend are activated. The generic space specifies what is common between the input spaces (e.g. 'unpleasant situation'). The blend merges the two input spaces into a single space by selecting specific elements from both inputs and thus creates a new space which cannot be identified with either input 1 or input 2. For example, the woman could escape from her marriage (in the same way as one escapes from prison) but, if she did so, she would not incur the same consequences as a prison escapee.

2.2. A football illustration: *The Welsh dragon*

We believe that for our present purposes blending theory is a more satisfying approach to the description of metaphors employed in football match reports. Blending theory stresses the fact that more than two domains can be merged and that this operation results in the emergence of a domain (the blend) where fusion rather than substitution of elements occurs. Consider the following example:

- (2) [...] the powerful Charles kept the tail of the Welsh dragon lashing furiously with a second thundering shot that left Wood helpless (11.11.54).

(2) activates numerous mapping operations between various input domains. *The Welsh dragon* would traditionally be regarded as an example of metonymy (the dragon, which appears on the Welsh flag, is used to refer to the Welsh team). But this is clearly not enough since the use of the phrase *the Welsh dragon* is conducive to the activation of a more complex network of interpretations. *The Welsh dragon* can be analysed as resulting from the blending of Charles's team (Wales), input 2, with the mythical animal "dragon", input 1, because both are related to Wales (generic space).

Importantly, within Fauconnier & Turner's approach, we do not need to decide whether to call such a blending operation a metonymy or a metaphor. The crucial point here is that a blended space is created where the Welsh team inherits properties associated with dragons, for example the fact that dragons (are believed to) lash their tails. Since input 2 involves a football match, we interpret the dragon's lashing its tail as a sign of determination (see also the adjective *powerful* earlier on in the sentence) rather than, say, desperate resistance or irritation, as would be the case with animals like cats, for example. Further, we may interpret the tail of the dragon as referring more specifically to a subpart of the Welsh team, namely its (centre) forwards. We thus obtain the interpretation that the Welsh team are continuing to attack. Also, observe that Charles is at the same time, paradoxically, both 'internal' and 'external' to the dragon. As a member of the Welsh team, he is the dragon lashing furiously but, at the same time, he is the person capable of directing its actions, as evidenced by the use of the verb *keep*. This is so because both input 1 and input 2, the dragon and the Welsh team respectively, are blended with another input, which we can identify with 'physical objects', by virtue of the fact that both teams and dragons, like objects, are, to some extent, controllable (or manipulable) entities. Crucially, the type of control Charles can exercise upon the Welsh dragon is implemented not by physical manipulation (as would be the case when riding a horse, for example) but by shooting the ball, i.e. performing a football-related action. In other words, the instrumental prepositional phrase (PP) *with a second thundering shot* refers back to the football input, rather than the dragon input. Finally, notice that the PP itself relies on a metaphorical mapping: the shot is described as thunderous, i.e. football actions are blended with atmospheric phenomena thanks to their (possibly) above-the-norm intensity.

In conclusion, (2) shows how complex blending operations can be found even within a single example. Although in the rest of our discussion we will focus on specific metaphorical mappings, it should not be forgotten that metaphorical expressions often involve the simultaneous activation of mappings belonging to different input domains.

2.3. "Dead" (or almost so) metaphors

We can also use example (2) to make another important point about the level of activation of metaphorical expressions. Croft & Cruse (2004: 205-206) point out that the hearer is often faced with expressions which may have lost their metaphorical nature (at least to some degree). Whereas in a sentence like *They had to prune the workforce*, *prune* is interpreted metaphorically by most speakers in that it strongly evokes the domain of arboriculture, this is probably not so in *There is a flourishing black market in software there*. Historically, *flourish* derives from the Old French arboricultural verb *florir* but the use of *flourish* in connection with businesses has become so conventional that the average language user fails to make the metaphorical connection at all. In Football English, a similar situation probably obtains with the noun *shot* (see (2)), and the related verb *shoot*. Although the verb originated from the sense

of “to make a bullet or arrow come from a weapon” (*LDCE*), it is interesting to observe that dictionaries include for this verb the meaning “to kick or throw a ball in a sport such as football or basketball towards the place where you can get a point” (*LDCE*). This can be taken as evidence that the metaphorical link has undergone ‘bleaching’. Consequently, in a sentence like (3):

- (3) In the feet of men like Pelé, Jairzinho and Rivelino, shooting from long range, there is packed dynamite (8.6.70)

the metaphorical mapping is probably only activated when readers come across *packed dynamite* at the end of the sentence rather than when they process *shooting* (but see also the discussion of (14) below).

Other lexemes which may have undergone bleaching include *attack*, *beat*, *defeat* and *defend* (together with their derivatives). They all originally involved the metaphor FOOTBALL IS FIGHTING (see next section) but are now clearly part and parcel of any football match report. Once again, note that dictionaries may include sport-related meanings for such cases. For example, *attack* is glossed as “an attempt by a player or group of players to score goals or win points” in the *LDCE*.

Although Croft & Cruse would claim that such expressions do not activate metaphorical mappings, Lakoff would contend that they reveal the pervasiveness or entrenchment of the FOOTBALL IS FIGHTING metaphor, a view which might seem to contradict the former position. How can this be the case? In order to solve this paradox, it may be useful to consider an apparently unrelated phenomenon, that of plural formation. Cognitive linguistics (see for example Taylor 2002: 298-309) claims that frequently occurring plural lexemes like *cats*, *dogs*, etc. – which are analysed as being derived from the corresponding singular nouns by way of *-s* suffixation in traditional analyses – are actually stored as units in the language user’s mind. No constructive effort is required when we want to refer to more than one cat or dog. Still, the fact that the majority of plural nouns have a final *-s* in English strengthens the plural schema NOUN-*s*, which captures the commonality among them. In other words, tokens (i.e. specific instantiations of the plural schema) may be stored as units (which are therefore analysable into smaller chunks only *a posteriori*) but the overall plural NOUN-*s* schema, i.e. the type, is deeply entrenched and thus very productive. Similarly, in the case of metaphor, the token *shoot* is possibly accessed as a non-metaphorical expression. Nevertheless, it may have contributed to the productivity and entrenchment of the FOOTBALL IS FIGHTING metaphor (i.e. the type)².

To sum up, the discussion so far has revealed the complexity underlying the use of blending operations in football match reports. Although the importance of

² As is argued below, it should be noticed that the pervasiveness of the FOOTBALL IS FIGHTING metaphor is also due its being linked to a basic cognitive model, i.e. the “billiard-ball model” (see section 3.1. on this notion). The high frequency of specific lexical items is therefore only one factor contributing to the entrenchment of a given metaphor type.

metaphor and blending as conceptual operations, i.e. as operations that are constitutive to our way of thinking, cannot be denied (see also below), it is apparent that cases like (2) and (3) above are clearly used for rhetorical purposes, i.e. to get the reader interested in the description of a match by using figuratively charged language. In what follows we focus on some general football metaphor types.

3. Input spaces

3.1. *The body, the mind and the arts*

It lies outside the scope of this paper to provide a very detailed list of metaphor types found in football match reports. Rather, we aim to discuss some of the more common types as they emerge from the texts considered for this paper. Further, since the exact formulation of metaphorical mappings is often a bone of contention (see for example Clausner & Croft 1997), we prefer to identify input 1 (the “source domain”) rather succinctly by referring to nouns (possibly deverbal nouns) which activate certain models of reality (‘idealized cognitive models’ in cognitive linguistics parlance). For example, football events are sometimes described by way of the ‘sea model’ as a source domain:

- (4) a. Banks, who kept the English ship just afloat (12.6.58)
- b. A solid wave of attacks (12.10.72)

Teams can be metaphorical ships which players struggle to prevent from sinking, as in (4a), and offensive actions on the pitch can be equated with waves, as in (4b) – incidentally, note that *solid* activates another metaphor, namely WAVES ARE BUILDINGS. The exact details of what instantiations the FOOTBALL IS LIFE AT SEA (or similar formulations) metaphor has is, in our view, of secondary importance with respect to the elucidation of the motivation behind the use of such metaphors (i.e. the activation of specific idealized models and their relation to how we conceptualize the world surrounding us). Strictly speaking, therefore, we are not offering a description of metaphorical mappings but rather a ‘schematic’ description of possible types of blending that involve the football domain (input 2) and some other domain (input 1), like the ‘sea domain’ (or ‘sea model’).

Our data show that the most frequently used source domain is, perhaps rather unsurprisingly, the ‘fighting model’, followed by the ‘exhibition model’ (see next section for some quantitative data). Illustrative examples are offered below:

The fighting model

- (5) But they departed [...] with all their **guns firing** (28.6.54)
- (6) Wales might count themselves unlucky not to have gained a material share of the **spoil** (11.11.54)
- (7) They **surrendered** (9.6.58)
- (8) They will win the **war** in the end (12.7.66)
- (9) In the fevered game of football, they are the No. 1 **target for destruction** (3.6.70)

- (10) Their precarious **survival** was achieved (10.6.77)
- (11) **Fighting** for the ball Evans moved his pass on (25.1.73)
- (12) Wilkins's blistering **volley cannoned** off Seaman's body (21.6.82)
- (13) The speed of Lineker and Beardsley would be a far more dangerous **weapon** (9.6.86)
- (14) Instead of attacking the apparent weakness of the Irish full backs, the wingers were forced on the **retreat** to assist a defence which was almost constantly **under siege** (12.6.90)
- (15) England finally did **aim** correctly (13.6.2002)

These examples indicate that a football match can be conceptualized as an instance of fighting where, for example, firearms are used, losing is surrendering and not losing is just a matter of survival. Of course, the degree of activation of the metaphorical mappings under discussion may be a matter of degree. In other words, it may be the case that *defence* in (14) may be felt to be more metaphorical than in other cases since fighting-specific phrases occur both before and after it, i.e. *retreat* and *under siege*. Be that as it may, it is clear that the fighting model is very well entrenched in Football English.

It is important to observe at this juncture that Langacker (1991) has stressed the importance of the so-called billiard-ball model for the structuring of human experience. He introduces the billiard-ball model as follows:

[w]e think of our world as being populated by discrete physical objects. These objects are capable of moving about through space and making contact with one another. Motion is driven by energy, which some objects draw from internal resources and others receive from the exterior. When motion results in forceful physical contact, energy is transmitted from the mover to the impacted object, which may thereby be set in motion to participate in further interactions.

Let us refer to this way of thinking about the world as the **billiard-ball model** (Langacker 1991: 13).

The fact that many metaphors in Football English involve the fighting domain can therefore be related to the primacy of the billiard-ball model in our minds. Fighting obviously involves the transmission of energy and further structures the events unfolding on the pitch in an easy-to-grasp way. The fighting model contains well-defined elements (arms, armies, enemies, sieges, etc.) and also conjures up the world of epic poems. As in epic poems, players are often referred to as heroes, and actions on the pitch may be due to supernatural forces, like fate, rather than the actual players (observe that fate itself undergoes metaphorical construal in (17) since it is personified, as the use of the motion verb *stalk* indicates):

- (16) Those three truly were Ireland's **heroes** (24.5.72)
- (17) Fate all the time was stalking [...] with a **hatchet** (18.6.58).

Not only does football involve fighting, but football can also be a stage (which is quite natural since football matches unfold before our eyes in the same way as

plays or films). Players can show their performing talents as artists, jugglers, magicians, and poets, for example. Accordingly, events on the pitch can be construed as exhibitions possibly based on a script:

- (18) Dumitrache [...] became intoxicated with his own **artistry** (3.6.70)
- (19) The **jugglery** and accuracy [...] is done at a slow tempo (28.6.54)
- (20) Matthews was the **entertainer** supreme [...] the **magician** (18.6.54)
- (21) Broadbent with a **poetry** in every **syllable** of his jinking dash (18.6.58)
- (22) Eusebio, a dark blur, accelerating with all his **lyrical**, lithe movement (27.7.66)
- (23) Towards the end of this **exhibition** England were offered a bigger **part** (10.2.77)
- (24) Yesterday afternoon's **script**, for once, followed a more usual course (19.6.86).

We refer to the model instantiated by the examples above, which is blended with the football input, as the 'exhibition model'. Both the fighting model and the exhibition model point to the extraordinary qualities players should possess in order to survive and impress. Consequently, players, like all human beings, can do so by using their extraordinary wit and ingenuity:

- (25) England did not have the wit to spare themselves from defeat (22.6.2002)
- (26) The **genius** was England (16.11.50).

We therefore conclude that very basic models are employed in Football English reports. PLAYING FOOTBALL IS FIGHTING (i.e. the domain of the body), USING ONE'S SKILLS AND INTELLIGENCE (i.e. the domain of the mind) and PERFORMING (i.e. the domain of the arts or aesthetics, which relates the performers on the pitch to the spectators off the pitch).

3.2. Reification

The billiard-ball model does not simply account for the pervasiveness of fighting metaphors but also probably motivates the frequent use of reification in Football English. The fact that we conceptualize reality in terms of energetic interactions also means that we tend to conceptualize the entities involved in such energetic exchanges as physical objects. Indeed, teams (or parts of them, like defences) are sometimes described as buildings (which can be smashed, for example) or any other relatively solid structure (which can be penetrated/affected in some negative way. Incidentally, observe that example (35) also activates the fighting model since it names a war implement, i.e. *shield*):

- (27) The English defence **sagged** (10.5.51)
- (28) The Uruguayan defence began to **shudder** (28.6.54)
- (29) Broadbent [...] **split** the defence (18.6.58)
- (30) Allowing a tight England defence to **seal itself** and **screw in any bolts** that might have been loosened by the clever approach play of Graca, Coluna, Augusto and Simoes (27.7.66)
- (31) England's wall was about to **collapse** (8.6.70)

- (32) They **probed** England's defence (10.6.77)
 (33) To avoid the central strength England merely tried the **side doors** (21.6.82)
 (34) Martin, whose selection had prompted fears about the **solidity** of the centre of England's defence (19.6.86)
 (35) Those who formed a secure protective **shield** in front of him (18.6.90)

Further, matches (or subparts of them, like goals) can be reified into objects which teams can own, lose and come to possess:

- (36) The match could have **slipped from our hands** (12.6.58)
 (37) The second half **belonged** to England (12.6.58)
 (38) Russia **snatched** the match (18.6.58)
 (39) There was Müller to **grab** his ace goal (15.6.70)

It is also worth pointing out that these examples show that metaphorical motion (or lack of it, as in (37)) is another important feature in the conceptualization of football matches. More specifically, football actions are often equated with 'fluid motion', i.e. a kind of motion comparable to that of (liquid or air) streams, which is conceptualized as being (relatively) unimpeded:

- (40) The ball was kept **flowing** (16.11.50)
 (41) Wilson and Cohen [...] **streamed** down the wings (12.7.66)
 (42) The Dutch **poured** out 16 consecutive passes (10.2.77)
 (43) Whenever he was on the run [...] **gliding** smoothly into position (23.6.86)

Observe that visual perception is not only involved in the categorization of certain actions as being fluid but is also responsible for the equation between increases/decreases in 'luminosity' and the quality of the game unfolding on the pitch:

- (44) He **faded** almost to become anonymous (22.11.62)
 (45) He could lead England out of their three hours of **darkness** (9.6.86)
 (46) Jones [...] provided new **flashes** of hope (15.1.70)

Ultimately, the richness in metaphor types observable in Football English reports involves the identity established between life and football so that all aspects of life can be employed as source domains. For example, source domains can be 'food', 'non-human living creatures' (e.g. plants and animals), 'machines', 'money' and even other sports:

source domain = food

- (47) Dzajic, who for most of the night **roasted** Mills beating him inside and outside (12.10.72)

source domain = plants/trees

- (48) The England **rose** was beginning to **flower** (17.10.49)
 (49) Keegan's supporting industry **withered** away (10.6.77)
 (50) Chaloupka was eventually booked for the ugly **felling** of Francis (21.6.82)

source domain = animals

(51) Yashin [...] with his **octopus** reach (9.6.58)

(52) Apart from the tireless bristling **terrier** efforts of Mahoney and Hockey (16.5.73)

source domain = machines

(53) Yugoslavia **recharged their batteries** (12.10.72)

(54) Having **run out of gas** against the Swiss [...] England [...] were pacing themselves in an undistinguished first half (16.6.96)

source domain = money

(55) These Brazilians are a **currency** that no foreign exchange can control (8.6.70)

source domain = other sports (e.g. chess, boxing)

(56) It was a fine move that broke the ragged **stalemate** (13.5.74)

(57) Up came Charlton again pressing for the **decisive blow** (12.7.66)

4. Conclusion

We have shown that recurrent metaphors used to report on football matches rest on the activation of basic cognitive models like the billiard-ball model. This model explains the pervasiveness of reification and the description of football actions as involving forces being exerted onto objects. The billiard-ball model is activated by the fighting model, which is the most commonly used input space in football-related metaphors. Indeed, the fighting model can be taken as an instantiation of the billiard-ball model and can be linked to an epic construal of the world we live in. Further, the fighting model is the realm of the body and is obviously connected to the mind and the arts: fighting, and hence winning, requires skills and talent, wit and ingenuity. At the same time, fighting is also a spectacle, which should entertain the audience. We have also pointed out that perception not only involves the apprehension of artistic 'brilliance' but also 'visual' brilliance: PLAYING BADLY IS BEING INVISIBLE/IN THE DARK and, conversely, PLAYING WELL IS BEING IN THE LIGHT, see (44)-(46). In fact, vision is also involved in the conceptualization of football actions as fluids, since they are described as such when they are perceived as being unimpeded, like a free-flowing stream.

We would like to conclude our paper by mentioning two areas of research that deserve further attention in future investigations. One involves the study of whether changes in the use of metaphors can be observed over time. We tried to establish if this is the case in the texts considered here by concentrating on the two more frequent metaphor types, i.e. fighting and exhibition metaphors. In the former case, we excluded words like *defence*, *attack*, *tactic* and *flank* since, although metaphorical in origin, they are the obvious choices to be used to refer to the concepts they evoke (i.e. they are unmarked options). In the latter case, we excluded *performance*, because this noun can simply refer to "how well or badly a person, company etc. does a particular job or activity" (*LDCE*), without necessarily activating the exhibition model. The results are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Fighting and exhibition metaphors in *The Times*

article date	no. of words	war metaphors	exhibition metaphors	war metaphors (per 1000 words)	exhibition metaphors (per 1000 words)
17.10.49	868	7	2	8.1	2.3
3.7.50	265	1	0	3.8	0.0
16.11.50	849	3	3	3.5	3.5
10.5.51	1062	4	2	3.8	1.9
18.6.54	807	4	3	5.0	3.7
21.6.54	514	2	2	3.9	3.9
28.6.54	1433	9	9	6.3	6.3
11.11.54	1211	4	3	3.3	2.5
9.6.58	1101	5	0	4.5	0.0
12.6.58	883	6	2	6.8	2.3
18.6.58	1072	4	4	3.7	3.7
<i>subtotal</i>	10065	49	30	4.9	3.0
1.6.62	714	1	0	1.4	0.0
8.6.62	759	5	0	6.6	0.0
11.6.62	896	2	0	2.2	0.0
22.11.62	962	5	3	5.2	3.1
12.7.66	998	5	4	5.0	4.0
21.7.66	1109	3	1	2.7	0.9
25.7.66	603	1	3	1.7	5.0
27.7.66	1279	4	5	3.1	3.9
15.1.70	778	0	3	0.0	3.9
3.6.70	1283	4	4	3.1	3.1
8.6.70	1263	8	4	6.3	3.2
15.6.70	1324	7	1	5.3	0.8
<i>subtotal</i>	11968	45	28	3.8	2.3
24.5.72	847	1	3	1.2	3.5
12.10.72	876	1	1	1.1	1.1
25.1.73	759	2	2	2.6	2.6
16.5.73	805	2	1	2.5	1.2
13.5.74	754	2	3	2.7	4.0
10.2.77	935	0	2	0.0	2.1
1.6.77	713	0	4	0.0	5.6
10.6.77	817	1	2	1.2	2.4
13.6.77	734	0	0	0.0	0.0
17.6.82	1681	1	4	0.6	2.4
21.6.82	771	7	0	9.1	0.0
30.6.82	761	2	2	2.6	2.6
6.7.82	947	4	1	4.2	1.1
<i>subtotal</i>	11400	23	25	2.0	2.2

5.6.86	1033	1	1	1.0	1.0
9.6.86	1097	2	2	1.8	1.8
19.6.86	1099	3	2	2.7	1.8
23.6.86	834	3	1	3.6	1.2
12.6.90	762	3	0	3.9	0.0
18.6.90	790	0	1	0.0	1.3
2.7.90	878	2	0	2.3	0.0
<i>subtotal</i>	6493	14	7	2.2	1.1
10.6.96	836	2	0	2.4	0.0
16.6.96	1086	2	2	1.8	1.8
19.6.96	820	2	1	2.4	1.2
27.6.96	1141	4	1	3.5	0.9
3.6.02	602	0	1	0.0	1.7
8.6.02	969	1	1	1.0	1.0
13.6.02	843	1	0	1.2	0.0
22.6.02	939	2	0	2.1	0.0
<i>subtotal</i>	7236	14	6	1.9	0.8

Table 1 offers a breakdown of the 51 texts into (roughly) 10-year-brackets (with the exception of the last two so as not to have only 2002 texts in the last bracket). This is shown, in a hopefully self-explanatory fashion, in the subtotal rows. If we assume that the figures per 10,000 words can also be taken as statistically valid in the last two time brackets³, then a statistical measure of independence like the chi-square test can be conducted (since frequencies per 10,000 words are greater than 5). We thus obtain that the decrease in the use of the two metaphor types under investigation which can be observed in Table 1 is in both cases highly significant ($\chi^2=23.96$, $p<0.01$ for war metaphors and $\chi^2=17.60$, $p<0.01$ for exhibition metaphors). This may be evidence of the fact that football reports have perhaps become more factual in the last few decades.

The second issue we would like to postpone to future research involves whether different cultures (e.g. Italy vs. Britain) handle football metaphors differently. We conducted a preliminary analysis using three dailies, two qualities (*La Repubblica* and the *Corriere della Sera*) and a sports newspaper, *Gazzetta dello Sport*. We collected 30 articles for a total of 15,020 words⁴. We counted 46 war metaphors and 22 ex-

³ Observe that the word total in both cases is less than 10,000 contrary to what is the case for the other time brackets. The figures per 10,000 words provided for the last two brackets are therefore based on the assumption that the ratio of metaphors to words in a text does not change as the number of words increases. This has also been assumed in the analysis of the Italian data below.

⁴ The details of the selected articles are as follows (date, newspaper, match; C=*Corriere della Sera*, G=*Gazzetta dello Sport*, R=*La Repubblica*): 30.10.05, R, Milan-Juventus; 30.10.05, R, Sampdoria-Inter Milan; 31.10.05, R, Roma-Ascoli; 31.10.05, R, Fiorentina-Cagliari; 31.10.05, C, Fiorentina-

hibition metaphors; in other words, the frequency of the former is 3.1 per 1,000 words (i.e. 31 per 10,000 words) and the frequency for the latter is 1.5 per 1,000 words (i.e. 15 per 10,000 words). Although these data seem to point to a greater use of both metaphor types in Italian texts compared to English ones (especially if we take the last time bracket in Table 1 for comparison), the difference (with the last time bracket in Table 1) is not significant ($p > 0.05$ in both cases). Hence, we may speak of a tendency in Italian texts to use figurative language more frequently but its actual statistical relevance should be studied more carefully using larger corpora.

To be sure, these observations on diachrony and cross-cultural variation demonstrate that much remains to be done in the field of metaphor as applied to Football (English). Not only, for example, should studies be carried out as to whether differences in the use of metaphor types obtain across different cultures, but also as to whether, even within a given culture, variation obtains across different modes (e.g. written reports vs. spoken commentaries). All these are, of course, topics for future research.

References

- Broccias C. 2001. Grammatica e *Football English*. *Linguistica e Filologia* 13: 151-183.
- Canepa D. 2005. *Metaphors in Football English. An Analysis of English Newspaper Reports from the Second Half of the Twentieth Century*. Tesi di Laurea, Università di Genova.
- Clausner T. & W. Croft 1997. Productivity and schematicity in metaphors. *Cognitive Science* 21(3): 247-282.
- Croft W. & D. A. Cruse 2004. *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fauconnier G. & M. Turner 2002. *The Way We Think*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lakoff G. & M. Johnson 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff G. & M. Johnson 1999. *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- Langacker R.W. 1991. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Vol. 2: *Descriptive Applications*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- LDCE: *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (2004, 3rd ed.) on CD-Rom.
- Sabatier P. 1997. Un lexique-grammaire du football. *Linguisticae Investigationes* 21(1): 163-198.
- Taylor J. R. 2002. *Cognitive Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cagliari; 31.10.05, C, Reggina-Lazio; 31.10.05, C, Roma-Ascoli; 27.11.05, R, Milan-Lecce; 27.11.05, G, Milan-Lecce; 27.11.05, G, Livorno-Chievo; 27.11.05, G, Brescia-Atalanta; 27.11.05, G, Ternana-Mantova; 27.11.05, G, Triestina-Crotone; 27.11.05, G, Albinoleffe-Bologna; 26.11.05, C, Milan-Lecce; 28.11.05, R, Juventus-Treviso; 28.11.05, G, Juventus-Treviso; 28.11.05, G, Roma-Fiorentina; 28.11.05, G, Messina-Inter Milan; 28.11.05, G, Parma-Udinese; 28.11.05, G, Cagliari-Sampdoria; 28.11.05, G, Ascoli-Palermo; 28.11.05, G, Siena-Reggina; 28.11.05, G, Empoli-Lazio; 28.11.05, G, Cremonese-Vicenza; 28.11.05, G, Genoa-Lumezzane; 28.11.05, C, Juventus-Treviso; 28.11.05, C, Messina-Inter Milan; 28.11.05, C, Roma-Fiorentina; 28.11.05, C, Empoli-Lazio.