

Metaphorical Conceptualization of SPORT Through TERRITORY as a Vehicle¹

Rahim Najjari² & Mohammad Mohammadi³

Received: 29/03/2017

Accepted: 02/12/2017

Abstract

WAR as a vehicle and SPORT IS WAR as a conceptual metaphor (CM) seem inadequate to account metaphorically for SPORT. To cater for an inclusive vehicle/CM, we selected WIN and LOSS lexicon from the news coverage of Brazil's football team loss to Germany and tested them through the Corpus of Contemporary American English. Then, the data were studied through the 3 stages of metaphor research. In the identification stage, the metaphorical use of the WIN and LOSS lexicon was determined through metaphor identification procedure. In the interpretation stage, the metaphors were revealed to be recontextualized from discourses like war, earthquakes, floods, landslides, and the like. Then, on the basis of a generic source for such discourses, TERRITORY as a vehicle and A SPORT FIELD IS A TERRITORY as a CM were proposed. Finally, in the explanation stage, the ideological implications of the proposed vehicle/CM were argued on the discourse reproduction of Brazil's problems.

Keywords: Recontextualization; Conceptual Metaphor (CM); Vehicle; Ideology; Territory; War

1. Introduction

Brazil's national football team crushing defeat to Germany 7-1 in the world cup 2014 semifinals provoked very different reactions from the media around the world. The words and expressions used in the news headlines to describe and report the WIN and LOSS triggered us to seek a relationship between sports, especially football, and words that have been discursively used to report the results like *loss*,

¹Please cite this paper as follows:

Najjari, R., & Mohammadi, M. (2018). Metaphorical conceptualization of SPORT through TERRITORY as a vehicle. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, 9(1), 127-147.

²Corresponding author, Department of English Language and Literature, Urmia University, Urmia, Iran; mirana32@yahoo.com

³Department of English Language and Literature, Urmia University, Urmia, Iran; mohammadi680@yahoo.co.uk

defeat, shock, rout, tragedy, nightmare, debacle, lightning, disgrace, demolition, and so on.

Regarding the literature, to date, SPORT activities have generally been likened to WAR or vice versa (Chapanga, 2004; Lakoff, 1991; Vierkant, 2008). Accordingly, the SPORT IS WAR conceptual metaphor (CM) has been proposed (Charteris-Black, 2004). This is due to the fact that CONFLICT is the most common source domain for metaphor and WAR is central to cognitive approaches (Charteris-Black, 2004). Although likening SPORT activities to WAR has been shown to be logical and grounded in the literature, to our views, it could not be inclusive, at least, in the case of football to embody all the words conveying WIN and LOSS concepts.

On the basis of recontextualization, “according to which ‘external discourses (and practices) are internalized within a particular organization’” (Fairclough, 2013, p. 368), it seems that the WIN and LOSS lexicon has been metaphorically recontextualized from the discourses like war, earthquakes, floods, landslides, tornados, volcanoes, and so on. Accordingly, a common thread of thought exists through the metaphorically recontextualized words from the external discourses because they seem to be derived from a more general and inclusive source domain likened to a football field. To this end, attempts were made to take a new look at a vehicle for SPORT in order to propose an alternative vehicle/CM on the basis of WIN and LOSS lexicalizations in sports.

2. Literature Review

According to Charteris-Black (2004, p. 19), the word *metaphor*, originally derived from Greek, consisting of *meta* meaning “after/with” and *pherein* meaning “bear/carry.” It is also associated with motion of meaning from one context to another. Interestingly enough, the words *motion* and *emotion* share the same etymological source, implying that metaphors often serve as bearers of meaning that carry a heavy load. A set of metaphors can be represented through a CM if they are related to one another. Additionally, any CM has two domains which are a topic (target domain) and a vehicle (source domain). The topic refers to what is being spoken or written about, whereas what is metaphorically used to speak and talk about the topic is the vehicle. Thus, a CM embodies a kind of transfer of meaning, or to use Lakoff’s (1993) term, *mapping* from a source domain to a target domain so that the target domain is identified by the source domain. Besides, a number of related CMs imply “a higher level metaphor” called a *conceptual key* (Charteris-Black, 2004, p. 16).

Regarding the literature of SPORT studies, WAR and WAR themes have been used as (1) conceptual realization of SPORT and (2) a vehicle/CM for SPORT and ARGUMENT.

2.1. Realization of WAR in SPORT

McKay (1991) studied the telecast and presentation of Super Bowl XXV that happened simultaneously with the war in the Persian Gulf War. He pointed to their similarities in which four jets appeared in the sky in the opening ceremony of Super Bowl XXV while bystanders with the American flags in their hands were singing the national anthem. Also, during the half time ceremonies, the film of American soldiers in the Persian Gulf War was shown and war-related songs were played. In a similar vein, Trujillo (1995) found that militarism and violence appeared in Monday Night Football (National Football League in the US) telecasts by describing football as a war-like activity through a militaristic narration.

Some inconsistency began to appear when Bergh (2011) analyzed the realization of WAR-inspired terminologies in a live football commentary instead of comparing actions between WAR and SPORT. Although he demonstrated the validity of conceptual parallelism of SPORT and WAR, he also found that there was more to the conceptual connection between WAR and FOOTBALL than just the metaphorical expressions. In this regard, as far as the football commentary was concerned, it often contained a wider selection of vocabulary which was only marginally relevant to a WAR domain.

2.2 WAR a Vehicle/CM for SPORT and ARGUMENT

Vervaeke and Kennedy (1996) argued generally against Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) stance on WAR as the vehicle for CMs and specifically against ARGUMENT IS WAR. They state that words like *defend* or *attack* used in ARGUMENT IS WAR are not just derived from the abstract conception of WAR. These words are used through conceptual relations with other nonmilitary terms in the discourse about argumentation. They argue that the new senses of words like *attack* and *defend* in argumentative discourse are more abstract than their original senses in WAR discourse and interpretable on the basis of CMs. They also argue that the grouping of metaphors reveals pitfalls in positing a CM because it faces the problem of generality for which there are no criteria. Unfortunately, one problem as regards their argument is that it is based on examples that are interpreted in a limited way though extended reasonably. Consequently, they have made a controversial claim against the single CM by just resorting to new senses of words, for example, *attack* in ARGUMENT IS WAR.

Also, Ritchie (2003) challenges Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) stance on CMs. Like Vervaeke and Kennedy (1996), he tacitly maintains that multiple and indeterminate roots exist for metaphor, but he does not use it as an excuse for rejecting a single CM. He tries to show that WAR is not the primary metaphor for ARGUMENT and that CMs such as ARGUMENT IS WAR often arise from a field of interconnected concepts, which can be metaphorically used in place of one another.

In fact, Ritchie extends the interpretation of CM from the underlying literal concepts based on the embodied physical experience to where it can be interpreted abstractly. This is due to fact there is a natural, automatic, and unconscious origin for primary metaphors and everyone can use them for abstract concepts (Ritchie, 2003).

A comprehensive blend of the realization of WAR in SPORT and WAR as a vehicle for CMs is Charteris-Black's (2004) corpus study (Bank of English and the online version of the *Times* newspaper). Influenced by the CONFLICT concept given by Lakoff and Johnson (1980), he studied 21 words related to the CONFLICT lexicon. The quantitative analysis of the study accounted for the frequency of the selected words, and the qualitative analysis investigated the role of CONFLICT-related categories in creating a textual cohesion. He found that, at the generic level, SPORT IS WAR and, at the specific level, FOOTBALL, RUGBY, CRICKET IS WAR. However, he finally asserted that SPORT IS WAR was incongruous until the incongruity was resolved by the conceptual key SPORT IS A STRUGGLE FOR SURVIVAL so as to extend it to the domains of politics and business. His suggestion of the conceptual key for resolving the incongruity of the CM served the same purpose as that of Ritchie's (2003) multiple interpretations, which intended to extend metaphorical concepts to the internal and external fields.

Because these studies have been inspired by the WAR metaphor in SPORT, they are limited in this sense and have overlooked other themes, which can play a role in the SPORT metaphor. They have considered only a concrete overlapping (CONFLICT) which is mostly manifested through actions between SPORT and WAR. As for the words related to CONFLICT and WAR in CMs in the argumentative discourse, they have nothing to do with WAR (Vervaeke & Kennedy, 1996). Moreover, the vehicle WAR can be interpreted in multiple ways and extended to other fields (Ritchie, 2003). Regarding the use of CONFLICT and WAR for the SPORT vehicle and SPORT CM, there is a need to include a conceptual key to resolve the incongruity in the vehicle (Charteris-Black, 2004). Meanwhile, SPORT IS WAR is extremely interpreted in different all-out wars (Ritchie, 2003).

Unlike the aforementioned studies in the literature that have dealt with only the CONFLICT and WAR lexicon, we view the nature of SPORT from the recontextualization of the WIN and LOSS lexicon from other discourses as well as the SPORT discourse to account for an inclusive vehicle for SPORT. Then, we will take the interrelated nature of the revisited vehicle and SPORT into account through cognitive, linguistic, affective, and cultural dimensions as well as rhetorical devices. Finally, we will discuss the ideological orientation, which the proposed metaphor may follow.

3. Method

3.1. Materials

van Dijk (1988) believes that topics of news discourse or reports are routinely expressed in headlines with summary functions, and Charteris-Black (2004) states that headlines provide a frame through a CM. Therefore, we preferably focused on the news headlines and news stories from Brazil's football 7-1 loss to Germany in the World Cup 2014 Semifinals. Following the selection of the materials on the basis of opportunistic sampling, we searched and downloaded news reports, newspapers, and stories about this match from the Internet in audio and written formats. All attempts were made to include as many as news report resources in the study. Most of the data were retrieved from *Associate Press*, *Reuters*, *NBC News*, *Washington Post*, *AFT*, *CNN*, *India Today*, *USA Today*, *The Guardian*, *BBC*, *New Zealand Herald*, *Fox Sports*, *ABC News*, *Bloomberg*, *News-Times*, *Sporting News*, and *Times Daily* (see Appendix A, parts 1 & 2). In all, we collected 130 pieces of news stories, which had nearly 20,000 words for written files. The number of words was not counted for audio files because they were not transcribed.

3.2. Procedure

After retrieving the words or linguistic expressions to report WIN and LOSS from the news headlines and news stories, we checked the words and expressions through the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) to ensure they matched those of the SPORT category in COCA. This was considered a valid and tangible platform for an unbiased and objective selection of possible WIN and LOSS words and expressions

Afterwards, Fairclough's (2013) three stages of metaphor research—identification, interpretation, and explanation—were applied. In the identification phase, we tried to determine whether the selected WIN and LOSS lexical expressions were literal or metaphoric. To this end, we applied metaphor identification procedure (MIP; Pragglejaz, 2007), according to which a lexical unit in a discourse is considered metaphorical when its contextual meaning does not correspond to its basic meaning until the inconsistency in meaning is resolved through a comparison between the contextual and basic meanings. Accordingly, we determined the contextual meaning of each WIN and LOSS word and expression, and, then, consulted *Merriam-Webster's 11th Collegiate Dictionary* (2004) to see whether its contextual meaning differed from its basic meaning. In case of differences, we sought how this difference could be resolved by comparing the contextual meaning with the basic meaning. In the interpretation phase, the metaphorically used WIN and LOSS words were explored for a possible vehicle and CM. Then, the conceptual, affective, cultural factors contributing to the choice of suggested vehicle and CM were catered for. Following this, the linguistic forms and

devices which could be evoked and motivated by were also addressed. Finally, in the explanation stage, the discourse function of the proposed vehicle/CM to establish its ideological and rhetorical motivation was elaborated. Needless to say that these stages, sometimes, overlapped each other.

4. Results

4.1. Identification

Of the words representing WIN and LOSS concepts across the written and oral data, 27 words existed in the COCA. The frequency of the words were reported in parentheses on the basis of COCA in descending order: *loss* (4,390), *defeat* (741), *shock* (350), *rout* (260), *cry* (264), *collapse* (202), *tragedy* (183), *nightmare* (172), *shame* (158), *blowout* (133), *crush* (90), *debacle* (84), *lightning* (57), *disgrace* (37), *demolition* (30), *devastation* (24), *massacre* (24), *seismic* (24), *thrash* (23), *humiliation* (22), *catastrophe* (17), *weep* (12), *implode* (9), *mourn* (8), *annihilation* (4), *blow away* (3), *Blitzkrieg* (2), and *trounce* (2). Following this, the MIP analyses revealed that the screened WIN and LOSS lexical expressions were metaphorically used. Every four-stage of MIP for each word was tabulated in Appendix B. For example, the contextual meaning of the word *rout* in the following headline by AP “Germany *routs* Brazil 7-1, reaches World Cup final” is to *defeat completely*, whereas its basic meaning is “to force out as if by digging.” Thus, there is a kind of inconsistency between the contextual and basic meaning of *rout*. This inconsistency can be resolved by likening the win of German’s team to a kind of driving Brazil’s team out of football field. Therefore, *rout* was used metaphorically in the headline.

4.2. Interpretation: Conceptual, Affective, and Cultural Considerations

To find the relation between all of the metaphorically used WIN and LOSS lexical expressions, we took the context (discourse) of their basic meanings into account and noticed that they were not recontextualized from just the WAR discourse. For example, *shock* refers to the effect of one object violently hitting another, which might cause damage or a slight movement. It tends to be more compatible with an earthquake discourse. Or, the most appropriate context for *blow away*, which refers to something to be moved or make something move on a current of air, lends support to be used in the context of winds, tornados, and storms. In the same way, the word *devastate* refers to “a complete destruction of a place or a thing” (*Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary*, 2004). In terms of context of use, both natural and unnatural disasters such as earthquakes, tornados, cyclones, floods, avalanches, and bombs usually have such effects.

Conceptually, the common thematic senses running among the discourses of the metaphoric words support TERRITORY as an inclusive source domain/vehicle for the lexicalization. This can be due to the fact that a territory is

affected by or receives *lightning, annihilation, Blitzkrieg, demolition, devastation, massacre, blowout, debacle, catastrophe, and rout.*

Affectively also, the primary motive for defining a superordinate category is based on expectations and emotional responses it triggers rather than a particular property of vehicle (Keysar & Glucksberg, 1992). In other words, the effect of a metaphor is through the emotions, sensations, and expectations which are reflective of the cognitive states of metaphor in a specific situation (Ritchie, 2003). Thus, extending the psychological and affective dimensions to the suggested vehicle, it can be put forward that TERRITORY residents (considered as synecdoche as a rhetorical device) receive *defeat* as a *tragedy, nightmare, crush, disgrace, humiliation, and shock* while *weeping, crying, and mourning over its loss.*

Culturally, throughout history, sport and national identity have been inextricably linked, as well. Sport, along with literature and popular music, has been one of the cultural fora in which these identities have been constructed and played out (Charteris-Black 2004; Porter & Smith, 2013). Sports teams globally represent territorially defined nations or regions. This fits with primordialist view on nationalism, which asserts that nationalism is rooted in the land (Jarvie, 2013). Thus, it implies that participants in team sports represent towns, those in international sports represent nations, and identification with a sports team binds people to place simply through ascription (Bale, 1986). As cited in Bale (1986, p. 18) from John Rooney, a doyen of sports geographers, “sport provides a glue which bonds people to their place.” In addition, a kind of “vernacular regionalization” map exists among ordinary people who attribute a special kind of sport with a region.

If we take the argument that sport and national identity are related and nationalism originates in land, this idea arises that sport and land are related, and what happens to a land (TERRITORY) affects its nation, as well. Furthermore, this implicit link between a SPORT field and a place (TERRITORY) is more strengthened when some journalists have utilized rhetorical devices like allusion and juxtaposition (putting two items side by side) to refer to *Mezzreino* where Brazil lost to Uruguay in the 1950 World Cup held in Brazil, too. *Lance* (newspaper) claimed that this defeat lost its terrible effect in comparison with the new defeat. Even some new agencies like *Associated Press* went far to address Brazil team as *Seleção*. *Seleção* is a Portuguese word, meaning “the selection of team players who represent a nation.” Remarkably enough, the *NBC News* agency, relating soccer directly to a country and a nation, reports that,

It’s not just the darkest night in the history of Brazilian soccer—it’s one of the darkest nights in Brazilian history. Soccer runs through the bloodstream of the country like it does through no

other nation on earth. It defines the country. Soccer is what Brazil excels at. No other nation has won five World Cups.

Taken conceptual, affective, and cultural considerations into account, it can be said that the entailment of the vehicle (i.e., TERRITORY) applies to subject (i.e., football). Like a TERRITORY, a SPORT field (1) needs to be defended, (2) is identified by nationality, (3) makes people feel proud of their own land, (4) is a belonging, (5) can be lost, and (6) has terrible loss consequences (like making their occupants *weep, cry, wail, get shocked, and get traumatized*).

Some of the abovementioned interpretation can be conceptually and affectively applied to WAR as a vehicle for SPORT. For example, WAR actions can also be considered as a *lightning, eclipse, blitzkrieg*, and the like which result in *annihilation, demolition, devastation, massacre, blowout, debacle, catastrophe, defeat, and seismic loss*. Accordingly, soldiers and conquered people psychologically and affectively receive *defeat* as a *tragedy, nightmare, crush, disgrace, humiliation, and shock* while *weeping, crying, and mourning over its loss*. Notwithstanding, WAR is just one of the discourses that depict WIN and LOSS. Moreover, WAR and SPORT are related to TERRITORY in that “they [*SPORT and WAR*] both usually involve control of TERRITORY in which gains and losses can be measured. Success in both requires attributes of *physical and mental* strength as well as team spirit” (Charteris-Black, 2004, p. 125).

More importantly, Charteris-Black (2004) believes that SPORT IS WAR has been overshadowed by a higher order conceptual key, that is, SPORT IS A STRUGGLE FOR SURVIVAL. Remarkably enough, the same conceptual key can be represented efficiently with WIN and LOSS as one’s *defense, identity, possession, pride, win*, and so on serve his or her survival both in a SPORT field and in a TERRITORY. By extension, one may survive disasters that occur to his or her TERRITORY like an *earthquake, a tornado, a volcano, a storm, war*, and the like, as he or she can survive the loss of sports competitions. Likewise, one may survive from the psychological and physical loss like *humiliation, shock, destruction, demolition, debacle, defeat*, and so on. With these accounts, a SPORT field as a subject or target domain is more probably likened to a TERRITORY as a vehicle and, thus, A SPORT FIELD IS A TERRITORY seems to be more plausible to represent the metaphorically recontextualized words from different discourses.

4.2.1. Linguistic interpretation

The co-occurrence, lexical/textual cohesion, of WIN and LOSS concepts and expressions implying TERRITORY-related concepts and connotation was abundant in news stories. Take the following examples (note the TERRITORY-related concepts and connotations are *italicized*):

- (1) Brazilians saw their dream of winning a World Cup on *home soil* disappear for a second time after allowing a record seven goals against Germany. (*Bloomberg*)
- (2) Germany *advanced* to the World Cup final on Tuesday night, *shocking* the hosts with five unanswered goals in the first half to *eject* Brazil, 7-1, from their own tournament. (*Fox Sports*)
- (3) Many said Tuesday's loss at the Mineirao Stadium in Belo Horizonte *eclipsed* the trauma felt by Brazil when it lost the final to Uruguay *at home* in 1950. (*i24 News*)

In the first example, the journalist could skip *on home soil*, but it was mentioned not only to connote *a home soil* as a sign of TERRITORY but also to make the first unhappy experience of Brazil's loss in its TERRITORY recollected. In the second example, the word *advanced* could be interpreted as a WAR activity because it meant that German football team like soldiers in WAR-moved forward on a TERRITORY. Moreover, the word *shocking* is an action that could happen to a place through earthquakes or the word *eject* means to evict from property (TERRITORY). In the third example, *loss* was conveyed through *eclipse*, meaning when "a celestial body is totally or partially shadowed by another celestial body" (*Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, 2004). In fact, the German football team was considered as an earth planet which had *eclipsed* Brazil as another planet.

More examples are provided in Appendix A (part B); taken all together, the co-occurrence of WIN and LOSS lexical expressions in the examples is replete with TERRITORY-related or connoted words and expressions like *soil*, *ground*, *country*, *home*, *home soil*, *nation*, *identity*, *history*, and so on. Consequently, this metaphorical juxtaposition suggests comparisons, expectations, and emotions which may be reactance and mirror cognitive responses of a metaphor (Ritchie, 2003; 2006). All of these also in one or another way connote that a TERRITORY was considered by the destructive or offensive factors such as *debacle*, *loss*, and *conquest*, which psychologically cause its dwellers to *mourn*, *wail*, *get shock*, *get embarrassed*, and the like.

The co-occurrence of TERRITORY-related words and the WIN and LOSS lexicon can also be supported by Lakoff's (2008) interpretation of *frames* as the mental structures forming the way we view the world. In fact, frames are the connotations with words that carry values in certain contexts. Though they are unconscious, they affect the way we decide, act, and process.

4.2.2. Rhetorical devices: Metonymy, synecdoche, and personification

Nearly in all the headlines from different news agencies and newspapers, the psychological association of the source domain (TERRITORY) was foregrounded and preceded by resorting to the metonymic use of Brazil football team as a country or a nation. For example, in sentence (4), the verb *implode* follows Brazil as a subject; in sentence (5), the word *collapse* precedes Brazil. The point is the word *Brazil* in both sentences connotes a country or a place that has been destroyed from the inside:

- (4) A minute later it was 3-0—Toni Kroos thumping home from the edge of the penalty area as Brazil *imploded*. (*CNN*)
- (5) But this also was a total *collapse* for Brazil, an abdication that will be chewed over for decades. (*Fox Sports*)

Also in example (1), Brazilians are addressed as a nation/country as if people of Brazil played football and lost the game.

Furthermore, a special case of metonymy which is also prevalent in headlines is synecdoche representing a whole thing by one of its parts. What we speak, think, and do and how we view things are framed through metonymic concepts (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980), which are blended with CMs to activate the schema (Charteris-Black, 2004). In the following examples, Brazil fans are represented as synecdoche showing Brazil as a nation or a country:

- (6) Brazil fans crushed by 7-1 loss to Germany. (*Connecticut Post*)
- (7) Brazil fans humiliated by shocking 7-1 World Cup defeat. (*News.com*)
- (8) Brazil fans heartbroken after 7-1 thrashing by Germany. (*The Guardian*)

Additionally, Brazil's loss to Germany was relayed more through nominalizations accompanied by adjectives tending to add to the gravity of situation. Some of the examples are *semifinal humiliation*, *total collapse*, *seismic impact of defeat*, *a great disappointment*, *terrible disaster*, *historic shame*, *terrible nightmare*, *merciless destruction*, and so on. What nominalization does is changing concrete actions and processes into abstract concepts that can be applied to any person, any place, and any time. Indeed, by turning verbs to nouns, verbs are removed from their original contexts so that they can be adapted to new conditions in any time (Iedema, 2003).

Another noteworthy point was personification, which is to assign “real or imagined human characteristics, intentions, motivations, or emotions to nonhuman objects” (Connell, 2013, p. 462). Brazil was anthropomorphized metonymically

referring to the whole nation or a country that had suffered a terrible trauma, as follows:

- (9) “Losing 7-1 is a great disappointment, something that will go down in history,” Luiz Carlos, a 52-year-old cook, said in Rio. “Brazil will never be able to erase that shame. (*Bloomberg*)
- (10) President Dilma Rousseff urged Brazil to ‘shake off the dust’ but where Brazil goes now is anyone’s guess following their World Cup semifinal humiliation against Germany. (*The Guardian*)
- (11) Brazil will wake up, shake its head and pray it has all been a terrible nightmare. (*The Guardian*)

4.3. Explanation: Revisited Vehicle/CM and Critical Discourse Analysis

Traditionally, metaphors had the role of enhancing stylistic elegance through linguistic ornamentation, but the interaction view of metaphor with cognitive orientation, developed by Richards (1937) and Black (1962), puts metaphor analysis within the critical discourse analysis (CDA). As a result, metaphors are used persuasively to convey evaluation and, therefore, constitute parts of the ideology of the text (Tsakona, 2012). Besides, news reporting follows an ideological discourse, which potentially informs readers’ way of thinking of how the world is and should be (White, 2006). Indeed, “media follow a certain discourse for its objectives” (Azimi, 2015, p.79).

Instead of just reporting the sports news neutrally through some specific jargons common in a football match for representing LOSS, news writers and reporters made their audience perceive the undesirability of Brazil team’s LOSS. They did it by recontextualizing words from discourses like an earthquake, a volcano, a tsunami, a landslide, an eruption, a tornado, and so on that can affect a place (a TERRITORY). This kind of conceptualization also carries social, emotional, and aesthetic values that influence the interpretation of the utterance (Musolff, 2012). In fact, it deals with more “fundamental, social and political issues and problems of which discourse is an expression” (van Dijk, 2010, p. 4).

The ideology behind this way of discourse practice in this case was represented through lexicalizations which acted like ideological-discursive metaphorical markers to form ideology. Fairclough (2013, p. 37) states that “a lexicalization becomes naturalized to the extent that ‘its’ ideological discursive formation achieves dominance, and hence the capacity to win acceptance for it as ‘the lexicon,’ ‘the natural code.’” Similarly, van Dijk maintains that (1988), “lexical choice is an eminent aspect of news discourse in which hidden opinions or ideologies may surface” (p. 177). Ideologically, journalists took advantage of

recontextualized WIN and LOSS lexical expressions to address Brazil as a country rather than as a football team. This way of lexicalization was more prone to refresh the socio-economic condition with which the Brazil government had grappled, to recontextualize protest-evoking themes, and to arouse their pity over how Brazil was demolished. These kinds of ideological tendencies are prevalent in news reports:

- (12) It (Brazil' loss) also forces the country to turn its attention again to the reality of high inflation, an economy now in its fourth year of lackluster growth and widespread discontent about poor public services and heavy World Cup spending that fueled street protests over the past year. (*Reuters*)
- (13) This was not just a beating. This was a merciless destruction, not just of a football team but of a nation's football heritage. (*CNN*)
- (14) This World Cup of course was shadowed by protests over lavish expenditures and broken promises and one must wonder now if that same rage will boil back to the surface. (*Fox Sports*)
- (15) Brazil's World Cup performance is important to Rousseff not only as a matter of national pride, but as a matter of politics. "If we had won," one Brazilian told CNN's Isa Soares, "the people would have forgotten all the money spent; at least, now the realities are back in focus." (*CNN*)
- (16) But Brazil's President Dilma Rousseff can expect repercussions. She has identified herself with the team and the cup. With their defeat, she can expect a rougher ride as she seeks re-election in October. She had hoped to ride a wave of "feel good" popularity after a Brazilian triumph at this World Cup. There will be no such wave. (*NBC News*)
- (17) Brazil spent \$11 billion preparing to host the tournament, the first on home soil in 64 years, with the national squad tasked with delivering nothing less than a record-extending sixth title. Memories of the failure may last longer than the pain endured six decades ago when Brazil lost the final game to Uruguay in Rio de Janeiro's Maracana stadium. (*Bloomberg*)

Some newspapers made references to the President of Brazil's run for next election, like:

- (18) The disastrous end to Brazil's hopes of winning the tournament on home soil for the first time could certainly hurt Rousseff's poll numbers in the near term and some fans booed her along with the team on Tuesday." (*Reuters*)

Remarkably, some news writers seized this opportunity to address the condition of the next Brazil presidential election, that is, how it could be affected by Brazil's loss. More importantly, it seems that the bodies of all news stories have nearly treated Brazil's economic, social condition on the pretext of reporting football news. Sentences 12 through 18 refer to the recollection of economic and political problems of Brazil, which would seem to be forgotten or overlooked to some extent if Brazil team won the game. The justification for this way of interpretation can probably be due to the existence of an intertextual relation between the CM, that is, A SPORT FILED IS A TERRITORY, and its analogical interpretations. The interpretations pave the way for the prediction of a certain atmosphere and for the emotional, discursive involvement of, at least, part of the readership, thus creating a fertile soil in which certain ideological contexts may be subtly developed in the construction of the text (Kitis & Milapides, 1997).

5. Conclusion

WAR as a vehicle and SPORT IS WAR as a CM have already been used for SPORT. As an innovatively alternative consideration on SPORT, TERRITORY as a vehicle and SORT IS WAR as a CM were proposed in the study. This proposal was on the basis of the WIN and LOSS lexical expressions, which were metaphorically recontextualized from a variety of discourses. This was substantiated by conceptual, affective, and cultural considerations between a FOOTBALL field as a source domain and TERRITORY as a target domain. In addition, the use of rhetorical devices like metonymy and synecdoche and the ideological orientations of the data were found to be satisfactorily interpretable with the proposed vehicle and CM.

Although the data were checked in the SPORT category of COCA corpus to become sure that they were valid, a more definite conclusion that can be applied to all sports requires further studies on the nature of WIN and LOSS lexical expressions in other fields of sport like volleyball, basketball, and so on. It also remains to be further clarified whether our findings apply for sports like boxing when the recipient of a blow is unable to continue, no contest decision is declared, and, thus, no win and loss are recorded for either fighter.

The final point for further study is the legitimacy of recontextualization of metaphors and metaphorical expressions. van Dijk (1988) questions the legitimacy of metaphor when immigrants are portrayed through "a set of metaphorical expressions, borrowed from the style register of various types of aquatic disaster, such as stream, low, torrent and wave [and] even in terms of an invasion, which suggests the imminent presence of a hostile foreign army" (p. 183). Likewise, Musolff (2012) states that a critically oriented, cognitive metaphor analysis has, at least, a potential impact on communication ethics which demand writers' or speakers' accountability. It presents a lacuna which needs to investigate how ethical

the conceptual embodiment of SPORT field is in terms of TERRITORY in pursuing political and ideological orientations, and whether writers and speakers can be held accountable for what they recontextualize.

References

- Azimi, H. (2015). Hollywood post-9/11 alien films: Recontextualization of George W. Bush's discourse. *Research in Applied Linguistics*, 5, 75-87.
- Bale, J. (1986). Sport and national identity: A geographical view. *The British Journal of Sports History*, 3(1), 18-41.
- Bergh, G. (2011). FOOTBALL IS WAR: A case study of minute-by-minute football commentary. *Veredas on Line Tematica*, 2, 83-93.
- Black, M. (1962). *Models and metaphors: Studies in language and philosophy*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Chapanga, E. (2004). An analysis of the WAR metaphors used in spoken commentaries of the 2004 edition of the Premier Soccer League (PSL) matches in Zimbabwe. *Zambezia*, 31, 62-79.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgra Macmillan.
- Connell, P. M. (2013). The role of baseline physical similarity to humans in consumer responses to anthropomorphic animal images. *Psychology & Marketing*, 30, 461-468.
- Deignan, A. (2005). *Metaphor and corpus linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Abingdon: Taylor & Francis
- Iedema, R. (2003). *Discourses of postbureaucratic organization* (Vol. 5). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jarvie, G. (2013). *Sport, culture, and society: An introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Keysar, B., & Glucksberg, S. (1992). Metaphor and communication. *Poetics Today*, 13, 633-658.
- Kitis, E., & Milapides, M. (1997). Read it and believe it: How metaphor constructs ideology in news discourse. A case study. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 28(5), 557-590.
- Lakoff, G. (1991). Metaphor and war: The metaphor system used to justify war in the Gulf. *Peace Research*, 25-32.

- Lakoff, G. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (2nd ed.; pp. 202-251). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G. (2008). *Don't think of an elephant! Know your values and frame the debate*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- McKay, J. (1991). Hawk(e)'s doves and Super Bowl XXV. *Social Alternatives*, 10(1), 58-60.
- Merriam-Webster, I. (2004). *Merriam-Webster's collegiate dictionary*. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster, Inc.
- Musolff, A. (2012). The study of metaphor as part of critical discourse analysis. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 9(3), 301-310.
- Porter, D., & Smith, A. (Eds.). (2013). *Sport and national identity in the postwar world*. London: Routledge.
- Pragglejaz. (2007). MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically-used words in discourse. *Metaphor & Symbol*, 22(1), 1-40.
- Richards, I. (1937). *The philosophy of rhetoric*. NY and London: Oxford University Press.
- Ritchie, D. (2003). ARGUMENT IS WAR—Or, is it a game of chess? Multiple meanings in the analysis of implicit metaphors. *Metaphor & Symbol*, 18(2), 125-146.
- Ritchie, D. (2006). *Context and connection in metaphor*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan Ltd.
- Trujillo, N. (1995). Machines, missiles, and men: Images of the male body on ABC's Monday Night Football. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 12(4), 403-23.
- Tsakona, V. (2012). The Greek state and the plaster cast: From the Greek military junta of 21 April 1967 to the IMF and EU's rescue mechanism. *Metaphor & the Social World*, 2(1), 61-86.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1988). Semantics of a press panic: The Tamil invasion. *European Journal of Communication*, 3(2), 167-187.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2010). Elements of critical contextual studies. *Journal of Research in Applied linguistics*, 1(1), 3-27.
- Vervaeke, J., & Kennedy, J. M. (1996). Metaphors in language and thought: Falsification and multiple meanings. *Metaphor & Symbol*, 11(4), 273-284.

Vierkant, S. (2008). *Metaphor in German live radio football commentaries*. Berlin: Freie Universität Berlin.

White, P. R. R. (2006). Evaluative semantics and ideological positioning in journalistic discourse. In Lassen, I. (Ed.), *Image and ideology in the mass media*, (45- 73). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Appendix A

Part 1: Samples of News Headlines

Note: The *italicized* words and expressions refer to WIN and LOSS concepts:

Germany *routs* Brazil 7-1, reaches World Cup final – (AP)

Germany celebrate their *thrashing* over Brazil – (AFP)

Brazil's *Blowout Defeat* Not Such a Surprise – (WSJ Online)

Brazil's loss to Germany is the most *devastating loss* in – (USA Today)

The Maracanazo: Brazilian *Tragedy* and the 1950 World Cup sites – (Duke)

David Luiz after Brazil *debacle*: Apologies to all the – (The National)

Stunning World Cup *Loss* Deals Heavy Blow to Brazil – (NBC)

Brazil *humiliation* to Germany in World Cup greeted with *shock* – (Washington Post)

Brazil vs. Germany: Fans *weep over loss* at World Cup – (Canada.com)

A stunning *defeat* for soccer-crazed Brazil – (SFGate)

Brazil's World Cup ends in *humiliation* with 7-1 semifinal – (New York Daily News)

Football: Brazil *humiliated* by Germany – (New Zealand Herald)

World Cup 2014: Scolari says Brazil *humiliation* his 'worst day' – (Sporting News)

World Cup 2014: Brazil *mourns a humiliating defeat* – (The Guardian)

Football: Brazil press *decry* World Cup '*Shame of Shames*' – (Straits Times)

Germany *embarrass* sorry Brazil, *advance* to World Cup final – (Fox Sports)

"The *disgrace* of all disgraces": Brazil's press savage – (Mirror)

Today is Brazil football's darkest day – (The Courier-Mail)

Brazil *lost* a competitive match on home soil for the first time – (USA Today)

Brazil fans *humiliated* by shocking 7-1 World Cup defeat to – (News.com)

Brazil fans *crushed* by 7-1 loss to Germany – (Connecticut Post)

Brazil fans *crushed* by 7-1 loss to Germany – (Greenwich Time)

Brazil fans crushed by 7-1 *loss* to Germany – (News Times)

Brazil coach apologizes for '*catastrophic*' World Cup loss to – (Commercial Appeal)

Football World Cup: For heart-broken Brazil fans, the *tears* – (Rediff)

Brazil fans heartbroken after 7-1 *thrashing* by Germany – (The Guardian)

German *blitzkrieg* blows away Brazil – (Financial Express)

Brazil *traumatized* after German *humiliation* – (CNN)

Part 2: Samples of Selected Statements From News Stories

Note: The *italicized* words and expressions refer to TERRITORY/territorial features and to WIN and LOSS concepts:

Many said Tuesday's *loss* at the Mineirao Stadium in Belo Horizonte *eclipsed* the trauma felt by Brazil when it *lost* the final to Uruguay *at home* in 1950 – (i24 news)

Brazilians saw their dream of *winning* a World Cup *on home soil* disappear for a second time after allowing a record seven goals against Germany – (Bloomberg)

A minute later it was 3-0—Toni Kroos *thumping* home from the edge of the penalty area as Brazil *imploded* – (CNN)

But this also was a total *collapse* for Brazil, an abdication that will be chewed over for decades – (Fox Sport)

Germany *advanced* to the World Cup final on Tuesday night, *shocking* the hosts with five unanswered goals in the first half to *eject* Brazil, 7-1, from their own tournament – (Fox Sport)

Brazil's newspapers reflected the *seismic* impact of the defeat, wailing with anguish at what one daily described as "an embarrassment for eternity – (i24 News)

Germany poured in the goals today to hand Brazil its heaviest World Cup loss ever with an astounding 7-1 *roust* in the semifinals that stunned the *host nation* – (New Zealand Herald)

The 7-1 scoreline was the worst *defeat* in the soccer-crazed *nation's* history, dashing hopes of overcoming the *national tragedy* of losing the final game of the 1950 World Cup *at home* – (Bloomberg)

Their anguished faces and tortured bodies tell of some terrible *disaster* – (The Guardian)

Newspapers and TV commentators called the defeat the "Mineirazo," an allusion to the Mineirao Stadium in Belo Horizonte and Brazil's traumatic World Cup defeat *at home* in 1950 known as the "Maracanazo." The sport's daily Lance called the *crushing loss* "The Biggest *Shame in History*" – (Daily Lance)

The top of Folha de Sao Paulo newspaper's website was titled "*Historic Shame*" after Brazil equaled its worst *defeat* in the *national team's* 100-year history. But with superstar Neymar injured and captain Thiago Silva suspended, the *Selecao* couldn't create at one end and couldn't cohere at the other – (AP)

It's one of the darkest nights in *Brazilian history*. Soccer runs through the bloodstream of the *country* like it does through no other *nation on earth*. It defines the *country*. Soccer is what Brazil excels at. No other *nation* has won five World Cups – (NBC news)

Daily newspaper Folha de Sao Paulo has a spectacular front page with the stadium in darkness and just the scoreboard light up with the final result. Its headline on its online edition reads simply: "*MASSACRE!*" The morning after the night before, Brazil will wake up, shake its head and pray it has all been a terrible *nightmare*. Left disorientated, punch drunk and

confused by the 7-1 *annihilation* in the Estádio Mineirão it will take time for the full implications to sink in for *a country* that had so much invested –in all senses of the word – in World Cup success – (Guardian Today)

Brazil's World Cup *trouncing* by Germany threw a bucket of cold water on *a nation*. For the German media there was disbelief and delight as reflected in tabloid Bild's headline: "7-1 Madness. *Lightning* German team *knock out* Brazil – (Reuters).

Appendix B
Metaphor Identification Procedure (Pragglejaz, 2007)

Word	Metaphor Identification Procedure	Analysis
Shock	1.Contextual meaning 2.Basic meaning 3.Contextual meaning vs. basic meaning 4.Is it metaphorical	1.Something that causes disturbance 2. A quivering or shaking which is the effect of a blow, collision, or violent impulse 3. Yes 4. Yes
Rout	1.Contextual meaning 2.Basic meaning 3.Contextual meaning vs. basic meaning 4.Is it metaphorical	1. A disastrous defeat 2. To force out as if by digging 3. Yes 4. Yes
Tragedy	1.Contextual meaning 2.Basic meaning 3.Contextual meaning vs. basic meaning 4.Is it metaphorical	1.A disastrous event; misfortune 2.A serious drama typically describing a conflict between the protagonist and a superior force (as destiny) and having a sorrowful or Disastrous conclusion that elicits pity or terror 3. Yes 4. Yes
Nightmare	1.Contextual meaning 2.Basic meaning 3.Contextual meaning vs. basic meaning 4.Is it metaphorical	1. Extremely unpleasant event or experience or possible event or experience 2.An evil spirit formerly thought to oppress people during sleep 3. Yes 4. Yes
Blowout	1.Contextual meaning 2.Basic meaning 3.Contextual meaning vs. basic meaning 4.Is it metaphorical	1. An easy or one-sided victory 2.A bursting of a container (as a tire) by pressure of the contents on a weak spot; an uncontrolled eruption of an oil or gas well 3. Yes 4. Yes
Crush	1.Contextual meaning 2.Basic meaning	1. To upset or shock somebody badly 2. To press or bruise between two hard bodies; to squeeze, so as to destroy the natural shape or integrity of the parts, or to force together into a mass; as to crush grapes

	3.Contextual meaning vs. basic meaning 4.Is it metaphorical	Yes Yes
Debacle	1.Contextual meaning 2.Basic meaning 3.Contextual meaning vs. basic meaning 4.Is it metaphorical	1.A complete failure 2. A breaking or bursting forth; a violent rush or flood of waters which breaks down opposing barriers, and hurls forward and disperses blocks of stone and other debris 3. Yes 4. Yes
Demolish	1.Contextual meaning 2.Basic meaning 3.Contextual meaning vs. basic meaning 4.Is it metaphorical	1.To defeat 2.The act of overthrowing, pulling down, or destroying a pile or structure; destruction by violence; utter overthrow; opposed to construction; as the demolition of a house, of military works, of a town, or of hopes 3. Yes 4. Yes
Devastation	1.Contextual meaning 2.Basic meaning 3.Contextual meaning vs. basic meaning 4.Is it metaphorical	1. A complete loss 2. To bring to ruin or desolation by violent action (a country devastated by war) 3. Yes 4. Yes
Massacre	1.Contextual meaning 2.Basic meaning 3.contextual meaning vs. basic meaning 4.Is it metaphorical	1.Complete defeat 2.The act or an instance of killing a number of usually helpless or unresisting human beings Under circumstances of atrocity or cruelty 3. Yes 4. Yes
Thrash	1.Contextual meaning 2.Basic meaning 3.contextual meaning vs. basic meaning 4.Is it metaphorical	1.Defeat decisively 2.To separate the seeds of from the husks and straw by beating 3. Yes 4. Yes
Humiliate	1.Contextual meaning 2.Basic meaning 3.Contextual meaning vs. basic meaning 4.Is it metaphorical	1.To cause someone to lose respect 2.To reduce to a lower position in one's own eyes or others' eyes 3.Yes 4.Yes
Catastrophe	1.Contextual meaning	1. An utter failure

	<p>2. Basic meaning</p> <p>3. Contextual meaning vs. basic meaning</p> <p>4. Is it metaphorical</p>	<p>2. A violent usually destructive natural event (as a supernova)</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p>
Annihilate	<p>1. Contextual meaning</p> <p>2. Basic meaning</p> <p>3. Contextual meaning vs. basic meaning</p> <p>4. Is it metaphorical</p>	<p>1. To win over</p> <p>2. To destroy or eradicate, as a property or attribute of a thing</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p>
Collapse	<p>1. Contextual meaning</p> <p>2. Basic meaning</p> <p>3. Contextual meaning vs. basic meaning</p> <p>4. Is it metaphorical</p>	<p>1. Complete loss</p> <p>2. A falling together suddenly, as of the sides of a hollow vessel</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p>
Implode	<p>1. Contextual meaning</p> <p>2. Basic meaning</p> <p>3. Contextual meaning vs. basic meaning</p> <p>4. Is it metaphorical</p>	<p>1. Great failure</p> <p>2. To collapse inward as if from external pressure; also: to become greatly reduced as if from collapsing</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p>
Seismic	<p>1. Contextual meaning</p> <p>2. Basic meaning</p> <p>3. Contextual meaning vs. basic meaning</p> <p>4. Is it metaphorical</p>	<p>1. Extraordinary effect</p> <p>2. Of, subject to, or caused by an earthquake</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p>
Blitzkrieg	<p>1. Contextual meaning</p> <p>2. Basic meaning</p> <p>3. Contextual meaning vs. basic meaning</p> <p>4. Is it metaphorical</p>	<p>1. Attacks</p> <p>2. A sudden attack involving aircraft and forces on the ground, which is intended to surprise and quickly defeat the enemy</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p>
Blow away	<p>1. Contextual meaning</p> <p>2. Basic meaning</p> <p>3. Contextual meaning vs. basic meaning</p> <p>4. Is it metaphorical</p>	<p>1. To defeat soundly</p> <p>2. To dissipate or remove as if with a current of air</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p>
Disaster	<p>1. Contextual meaning</p>	<p>1. A misfortune</p>
	<p>2. Basic meaning</p> <p>3. Contextual meaning vs. basic meaning</p> <p>4. Is it metaphorical</p>	<p>2. An unpropitious or baleful aspect of a planet or star; malevolent influence of a heavenly body</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p>

ounce	T 1.Contextual meaning 2.Basic meaning 3.Contextual meaning vs. basic meaning 4.Is it metaphorical	1.Defeat 2.Beat severely with a whip or rod 3.Yes 4.Yes
eclipse	E 1.Contextual meaning 2.Basic meaning 3.Contextual meaning vs. basic meaning 4.Is it metaphorical	1.hide 2. An interception or obscuration of the light of the sun, moon, or other luminous body 3.Yes 4.Yes
Lightning	1.Contextual meaning 2.Basic meaning 3.contextual meaning vs. basic meaning 4.Is it metaphorical	1.Attack 2.Discharge of atmospheric electricity, accompanied by a vivid flash of light, commonly from one cloud to another, sometimes from a cloud to the earth 3.Yes 4.Yes
disgrace	D 1.Contextual meaning 2.Basic meaning 3.Contextual meaning vs. basic meaning 4.Is it metaphorical	1. Great discredit 2. The state of being dishonored, or covered with shame; dishonor; shame; ignominy 3.Yes 4.Yes
Shame	1.Contextual meaning 2.Basic meaning 3.Contextual meaning vs. basic meaning 4.Is it metaphorical	1. Being ashamed of 2. A painful sensation excited by a consciousness of guilt or impropriety, or of having done something which injures reputation 3.Yes 4. Yes
Loss	1.Contextual meaning 2.Basic meaning 3.Contextual meaning vs. basic meaning 4.Is it metaphorical	1.Failure to win 2. The act of losing possession; to miss from one's possession or from a customary or supposed place 3. Yes 4. Yes
Defeat	1.Contextual meaning 2.Basic meaning 3.Contextual meaning vs. basic meaning 4.Is it metaphorical	1.Win victory over 2. Destroy 3. Yes 4. Yes