

STUDIES IN PHYSICAL CULTURE AND TOURISM
Vol. 16, No. 1, 2009

JAN OŹDŹYŃSKI
Pedagogical University, Kraków, Poland

PROFESSIONALISMS, SUBLANGUAGES AND REGISTERS OF SPORTS UTTERANCES

Key words: utterance, professionalisms, sublanguage, cognitive linguistics, sport language.

ABSTRACT

The article is a thorough analysis of professionalisms, sublanguages and registers in sport commentaries in the present-day media. The author demonstrates a cognitive framework and socio-linguistic situation of the language of sport and scrutinizes the media coverage of tennis matches as an example of implementation of different aspects of sports utterances. Cognitive linguistics is a fundamental trend of thought which attempts to reconcile heterogeneous characteristics of colloquial and professional sport utterances. It emphasises the language of sport being treated as a manifestation of feelings and values.

Professionalisms are defined as “words, expressions or phrases with a limited range of usage within a professional group. Within professionalisms an area characterized by official terminology can be distinguished as well as vocabulary and phraseology used colloquially while at work by the representatives of a given profession” [1]. Realizing that the dichotomy which exists between scientific (specialist) knowledge and common knowledge is not distinct, we indicate the fundamental connections between professionalisms and the spoken and colloquial varieties of language [2]. A reference to the understanding of common knowledge and common (emotional) evaluation (within the realm of values perceptible in a practical way) [3] becomes particularly helpful. Professional utterances illustrate characteristic vocabulary in addition to phraseology. The former demonstrates a detailed recognition of a given sector of reality on one hand, while on the other a defined emotional stance on particular subjects and phenomena important to a given profession, trade or environment [4]. In this way, professional

lexis which constitutes a predecessor of many technical terminologies forms a link (similar to a family resemblance) to official scientific and technical terminology, the origins of which are strictly connected with the development of scientific literature. Simultaneously, professional lexis indicates a relation to professional jargon, which in itself is a reaction to the cold intellectualization of official terminology [5]. Interesting perspectives on the implementation of analysis techniques of cognitive structures take shape here, which refer to the semantic model relating to context, situationalism, vagueness, comparativity and extensibility of respective units and linguistic expressions [6]. Cognitive semanticists are of the opinion that within the vernacular of an individual speaker various semantic representations of a single expression can co-exist and are explicated by him/her with difficulty. This is mainly due to the fact that they are formed differently by reason of diverse contexts [7]. A semantic representation depends not only on the mental structure and the psychophysical personality of a speaker, but also on

his/her social status, and predominantly on the context and consituation of a communicative act (the pragmatics of an utterance) [8].

Sublanguage (Germ. *Subsprache*) constitutes a variety (?) or a version of natural language which is classified based on sociological parameters and formal attributes. A speaker chooses elements from his/her repertoire of linguistic resources, which in a way corresponds to a sociological conception of “the discipline of linguistic behaviours”. The speaker makes his/her choice based on criteria such as the characteristics of the listener and speaker in relation to the time, place and the arrangement of communication roles [9]. The potential of linguistic behaviour predominantly constitutes its semantic potential, i.e. what a speaker (writer) can express. This leads to the model of language as a network of alternative choices made on different levels, namely those of phonology, grammar (including lexis), syntax and text (discursive) [10]. Sublanguages fill a whole range of language activity whereby only limited grammatical and lexical phenomena occur in a given sublanguage. A large proportion of lexical and grammatical material appears in several or even in all sublanguages, which allows for the referring to a given natural language as a whole – see a distinction made by L. Hoffman of a “Gesamtsprache” marking the entirety of all linguistic resources wherefrom all sublanguages (“Subsprachen”) take the material to achieve specific communicative acts [11]. Within the selected sublanguages specialist terminology usually comes to the fore. Specialists use this specialist terminology to attempt an ordering and systematization of their section of para-linguistic reality as explicitly as possible. The reference here is to specialist sublanguages (*Fachsprachen*) or professional languages which are defined as “variants (utterances) used to recognize and define objects specific to a given specialty as well as for the purpose of communication about them” [12].

The notion of code (sub-code) as an element of a sociolinguistic situation refers to the language used by a speaker: the speaker using a specific variety (or version) simultaneously indicates what social linguistic community group he or she belongs to [13]. The term “sublanguage” referring to the sociology of language has a clearly hybrid character and is vague in meaning. B. Wolniewicz has written about the misunderstandings which stem from the confusion of codes with languages (within a wider semiotic perspective) [14].

Attempts to define sublanguages using topological concepts (such as set theory or structure theory) appear appealing [15]. Such a depiction refers to a language subset which differentiates a selected set (configuration) of texts and/or utterances characterized by their functional peculiarity; the entirety of linguistic resources constituting this subset is called a sublanguage. At the same time it is assumed that a sublanguage X includes such linguistic phenomena which could also occur in other sublanguages. A sublanguage X thus defined is communicatively autonomous, i.e. it includes all linguistic elements needed to construct a given type of text or utterance. Such a procedure allows for the classification of theoretically an infinite number of sublanguages [16].

Register constitutes the third term quite commonly used in recent linguistic and stylistic literature. It is defined as a consistent changeability of language “conditioned on its usage within a specific social context” of an industry, domain or topic of an utterance [17]. The subject as a motive of specialist vocabulary usage (professionalisms) is one of many factors used to determine the industry (or professional specialization) [18]. The term *domain* is borrowed from Fishman who defines it as a “cluster of social situations typically constrained by a common set of behavioural rules” [19].

J. Bartmiński uses the term “register” (as neutral, emotional, informal, and careful) when referring to the diversification of the conversational style: “The resources of the conversational style are diversified relative to the significance of the function of this style and its various situational uses. Within those resources peculiar situational registers of forms can be designated, i.e. their types (marked stylistically in the narrowest sense) in relation to the degree of formality, seriousness, familiarity, substance, figurativeness, emotionality, etc” [20]. The most significant division, prominent especially in colloquial vocabulary concerns the attitude either towards an objective representation or a subjective valuation of the subject matter of speech [21].

According to T. Gizbert-Studnicki, the consideration of numerous elements of a socio-linguistic situation simultaneously has the following consequence: a set of utterances, determined as register, is not characterized by its peculiar linguistic characteristics if those linguistic characteristics peculiar to a given set of utterances are interpreted as those, which cannot occur in utterances not

belonging to that set. “Register as a whole does not consist of any peculiar linguistic characteristics; however, the entire set of those characteristics can be described as peculiar” [22]. Understanding register as a peculiar configuration of functional choices made at different linguistic levels approximates the concept of “sublanguage”. What proves to be interesting within this conception is the complexity of the depiction as well as the clear placement of this phenomenon within discourse [23]. The difference between register and discourse consists, among other things, in register being a complete set of all linguistic phenomena characterizing a given type of texts or utterances, whereas the nature of discourse is relative, i.e. its specifications grow in value in comparison with the specifications of other types of discourse where the expression of analogous meaning requires the use of a different set and a different interpretation of linguistic elements [24].

When looking for fundamental discriminants of a register type, which are understood as the components of a separate configuration of linguistic elements, one can refer to the operating model of communicative grammar. This operating model includes at least three execution levels of a speech act:

- a) The level of periphrasis derivation and the factualization of a speech act (i.e. the use of the parameters of time, place and aspect);
- b) The level of interactive grammars, including rematically-thematic indicators (the actual segmentation of a speech-act); indicators of pragmatic functions such as: informational relating to a presentation and verification of the interlocutors’ knowledge of the world (the functions of question, negation, acceptance, including persuasive and modal functions); axiological functions, behavioural (illocutionary); cataloguing indicators which along with the indicators of communication clarity create a deictic model (net) of a speech act;
- c) The level of discourse management (incl. dialoguing, condensation, anaphora and cataphora derivation, the set of presuppositional indicators, and the set of discourse-aid indicators in the form of ritualisms and manipulators, etc.) [25]. The model of communicative grammar, upon an appropriate modification, may also be helpful in defining the degree of complexity of lexical and textual conceptualizations (within a cognitive representation) [26].

Heading towards the implementation of the enumerated settlements we will take a closer interest in the spoken (expressed) sports journalism variety (a television commentary and a tennis game coverage) [27]. What appears interesting here is the juxtaposition (within the professional sublanguage) of the functional registers which are conditioned on the sociolinguistic situation and the subject matter of the utterances: these are a television commentary produced in an official situation of mass media communication and that of the variants used in professional instruction in a situation of direct contact between a coach and the competitor [28]. Due to sociolinguistic parameters (in relation to linguistic and paralinguistic practice) it seems useful to assign a primary register (in our case that of coaching) and a functionally secondary one (journalist) [29].

The mechanism of accommodation (a functional adjustment to norm) [30] within textual structures best be traced through the sequences realizing diverse types of utterance modality (and axiology) [31]. Generally speaking, a scientific utterance is directed towards an objective reflection of the relationship between the symbols and objects being described [32]. A technological utterance (“working”, “professional” or “industrial”) emphasizes the effectiveness of symbols as practiced by a language user, a process which is accompanied by a valuation within the scope of utilitarian values (which are noticeable in practice). These utterances have two goals. The first goal is to cause and control an action (namely, imperative and optative types of speech-acts expressing a request, a wish, an instruction, a demand, an order, a command, a pro-hibition, etc.; and an instructory type of a speech-act to provide counsel, instruction, advice, etc.). The other may be to define the postulates, directives and conditions of effective action (commissive and directive types of speech-acts) [33].

From the point of view of action theory, commissive and directive components are within the realm of motivational indicators and have normative characteristics. The following indicators connected mutually by ‘a net’ of pragmatic relations are mentioned [34]:

- a) postulative indicators such as *one should, one ought to, it is necessary to..., one needs to..., it is advisable to...*;

- b) auxiliary verbs of permission and prohibition: *may – may not, can – cannot (do something), be enough – not be enough (?)* and others;
- c) deontic indicators (of an order or recommendation): *X must do something, X ought to do something, X has to do something*, and others;
- d) valuative indicators, such as: *it's worth – it isn't worth (doing something)*, adjectives: *valuable – valueless, fair – unfair, valid – invalid, useful – useless, appropriate – inappropriate, important – unimportant, indifferent – not indifferent*, and others [35].

Each of the aforementioned indicators is additionally involved in an array of complicated pragmatic contexts. For example, the term '*should*' can be understood in at least five different ways, which may lead to numerous instances of misunderstanding [36]. Specifically, we are dealing here with the following meanings:

- 1) normative (in a speech act where someone is directly commanding or forbidding someone else to do something);
- 2) directive (goal-oriented) in a speech act where someone is being advised or a recommendation is being made as to how to behave in order to reach a certain goal;
- 3) evaluative or valuative when the speaker expresses approval or disapproval for some state determined by the phrase *should (do it)* meaning 'it's good if X does that';
- 4) prognostic, in an utterance where X expresses a conviction that, based on some knowledge (adequate or inadequate to reality), the occurrence of one fact which is causally inter-linked to another will lead to the occurrence of the other: "If someone's proposal has fulfilled all formal requirements, it should be considered.";
- 5) in a descriptive sense – an utterance of "obligation" *X should do Z* can be synonymous with the following variants:
 - a. 'due to some existing norm X is commanded to do Z';
 - b. 'I'm estimating that it would be good if X did Z';
 - c. 'I advise X to do Z if he wants to achieve goal C' [37].

The meaning of the predicate '*powinien*' (should), which is fundamental to axiology, can be explicated with the aid of *dobrze* (well) or *źle* (badly); see the following TV commentator's utterance: *nie powinien zostać nie skończony* =

powinien być skończony (it shouldn't have been unfinished = it should have been finished) whereby 'the speaker believes that the most significant aspect of the matter will be for X if the volley is won' [38].

Here is an example of utterance by Polish TV sports commentator, Karol Stopa, hereinafter referred to as K.S.: ... Here Jacob Hlasek's mistake. The first volley, well, practically *should've been finished*, but it didn't happen... not for the first time does Hlasek make such a mistake... And the result is that the Americans have another chance at a break... [Swiss break service]...

The subject matter of this information is the judgment of the commentator about the lack of value (a negative "value") of the state of affairs being described (which is unanimous with the opinion of those who are knowledgeable about tennis). The directive value of these sentences, and thus the wish to have an influence on the listener, so crucial to professional variants of utterances (achieved in direct contact between the trainer and competitor), is not indicated openly but is implicit or even neutralized (in this context it is non-functional), left to some extent to inference and the good will of the listener, which can clearly be seen in the following constructions with illocutionary force: *Musisz to skończyć!* (You must finish it! – encouragement in the form of a command), *Powinieneś to skończyć!* (You should finish it! – an excuse, a reprimand, a rebuke of the competitor after an unsuccessful play [which is a statement TO SOMEONE] [39]).

In this manner, the modal, narrative and rhetorical perspective of discourse changes fundamentally in the descriptive register of a journalist statement. The discourse is fixed not so much at instruction or a correction of mistakes (as in the direct contact between a trainer and competitor), but at the assessment and appraisal of technical elements observed during the provided coverage of a meet – see the following seemingly modal construction *można ocenić* (it can be assessed, where *można* means 'there exists the possibility of'), which is interpreted as either a common announcement or is classified as so-called alethic modality [40].

Here is another fragment of utterance by Polish sports commentator Zdzisław Ambroziak hereinafter referred to as Z.A.: ... Yes...

you *can easily see* how effective a service straight into a person is (as they say unkindly)... straight into the opponent, ehm... it's just as awkward as playing into the middle [of the court] or close to the side line...

Statements stating a possibility, which are ordinary announcement should be differentiated from statement of permission, for example, *możesz sobie pozwolić* (you can afford to) in the sense that 'wolno ci' means 'you may' (as expressed in a statement 'to someone'). Compare this to a changed narrative perspective (as expressed in a statement 'for someone'), in the form of an assessment sequence of a TV commentary, a meta-image utterance, an ostensive function (referring someone to visual information) [41], a micro-situation defined by the deictic formula of "I'm speaking to YOU (French: VOUS)" or "I'm telling YOU (French: VOUS)", you, who are the TV audience gathered in front of the monitors [42]:

Z.A.: ... Great! Great! Did you see [Becker's] very active backhand [43] at Courier's second serve... Courier, well, he can't afford to serve safely after ruining the first serve, because the result is what we see here right now... [visual information: Becker's won a ball]

It appears that in the Polish language, sentences expressed with the predicate *powinien* (ought to) always express a standpoint of the speaker (at least their approval), whereas sentences using *trzeba*, *wolno*, *nie wolno* (you have to, you may, you may not) can express both the beliefs of the speaker as well as the opinions of others being reported by him [44] – see the following sequence of an emotional evaluation of the TV commentary:

K.S.: ...Beautiful! A beautiful stop-volley [45] backhand, a cross-court shot [46] too. A very difficult play... Courier has hit the ball running... you *have to* have an amazing feel for the ball in order to hit it in such a way... [I.W.: a replay of the scene from a VCR] Here you go... below the knee with a feel for it ... a beautiful ball...

Statements, which are always an expression of the axiological stance of a speaker ought to be differentiated from those in which the speaker solely reports the postulates and directives of others, see the following clearly descriptive

expressions with *powinien/powinna* (ought to), *należy – nie należy* (should – shouldn't):

K.S.: ... This is the type of coach who doesn't so much pay attention if the right leg *should* be moved five centimeters to the left at a forehand [47], or, I don't know... if ... the racket *should* be ... held at a greater or smaller angle, but he's a master of motivation... I think this may be an element which Becker needed the most...

K.S.: ... but also coaches hope, teach that you *shouldn't* play from a backhand along the line in this spot because the net there is the highest

The use of professionalisms in a journalist's statement on television, although it has an incomparably wider reach as it takes place in mass media, it still clearly has a secondary character (the character of stylization) in comparison with a natural situation of working instruction which takes place directly between a trainer and a competitor, for example during a coaching session or a test match. In the journalist register of a professional utterance professionalisms function within a deictic structure: *I'm telling you (French vous) how it should be*, or *that it shouldn't be done, because that's the way it is done in coaching practice*, see the following constructions in spoken language described as liaison/clustering [48]:

K.S.: ... alright... at this level playing... such high returns [49]... you *shouldn't* do that... This is an invitation for the attacking player to finish ['get further points']...

A change of illocutionary (and deictic) perspective is clearly noticeable when compared with *You can't do this!* (having the characteristics of a rebuke or reprimand).

Deontic modality, connoting a degree of requirement or obligation (from Greek *deon* meaning obligation, duty) characterizes postulative statement informing of a volitive-evaluative stance of a speaker. Axiological information contained in these statements constitutes a combination of judgments (*badly – well*), of negation as well as include a volitive element (exerting pressure on the listener) [50].

A recommendation (a command) of a state of affairs to be achieved is more imperative from its evaluation in case of the version (register) of a professional community (coaching community)

utterance. It involves placing the listener in a state of obligation with a clear intention of fulfilment (completion) of postulated actions, for example, *You must attack at the net!* ('if you don't do this, it will be bad). In the journalist register of a statement (in connection with the use of the 3rd person of the verb *musi* 'has to'), the narrative perspective of a postulative statement changes, where a speaker pronounces solely his or her conviction of the positive value of the state of affairs being communicated through the use of a propositional component (which is in unison with the community's opinion) – see the following fragments of a TV commentary:

Z.A.: ... Yes, on such a [as we can see] fast court even a player who mainly plays at the back line of the court (Courier is such a player)... *has to* try to attack at the net... He did it well in this exchange [of balls]...

Z.A.: We'll get back [to that] in a moment, but now Jimmy Courier with a score of five four is serving and he *has to* win this game point [51] in order to be able to stay in the game...

Z.A.: ... he *has to* win this game point in order to reach a tie-break [52]...

A descriptive meaning of the following normative expression: *X must accomplish behaviour Z under the circumstances O* may emerge in several variants, depending on four different interpretations:

- a) logical;
- b) dynamic: 'in a given set of circumstances there exist such factors which inevitably will lead to the fulfillment of behavior Z';
- c) axiological: 'based on the judgment of a subject it would be good if X exhibited behavior Z under the circumstances O';
- d) psychological: 'I'm absolutely convinced that X under the circumstances of O must exhibit behavior Z' [53].

One of the levels of a cognitive depiction, where an ordering of the elusive outer world takes place, is the cognitive structure. Within this cognitive structure paralinguistic and linguistic information is comparable to and noticeable in the form of a finite set of rules representing conceptual well-formedness rules [54]. Thus, something in the form of a convenient and linguistically filtered model of the world is constructed, where every concept is an entity juxtaposed with an appropriate lexeme

(a notification); a lack of a lexeme (of a professionalism) indicates a cognitive void whereas cognitive macro-entities constitute a kind of semantic representations of a sentence (of time, segment or sequence) within discourse [55].

In the case of a television commentary it is possible to assign suitable verbal and textual sequences (correlates, analogues, and information substitutes) to particular perceptive situations of a journalist's speech-act (the codes and sub-codes of a show). These assigned sequences within verbalized information can be in the form of one-word notifications, facial contortions (a sign of emotion), expressions, phrases (functioning as independent utterances), sentences and sentence fragments, and finally as complete fragments of a spoken text (its time, segments and narrative structures) [56], see the following:

- in a sequence referring to the sub-codes of perception and identification – in order to determine a person (a figure) noticed but not identified (*a young lady*), because she is unknown, in a situation of a perceptive minimum:

Visual information follows (hereinafter referred to as I.W.): a close up of one of Jimmy Courier's coaches;

Z.A.: ... and this is Jose Higuera... one of the two ... [coaches] unfortunately being blocked by *this young lady* [visible on screen]... I've said [that already]... Jose Higuera, eehm and Brad Steinem... they have been in charge of Jimmy Courier's career for almost two years

- to determine a recognized person (in conditions of a perceptive minimum):

K.S.: ... A moment ago, *John's brother* Patrick McEnroe rushed by in a grey t-shirt... [conceptualization registering in "action landscape"]... This is an interesting person, because is a person who he changed the order of the development of his career... Everyone drops out of school and universities and, ehm... and sacrifice everything for tennis... But he finished Stanford first, and only then did he give himself over to tennis... [conceptualization problematizing in "consciousness landscape"] [57];

- with reference to the shades and colours of the outer world:

Z.A.: ... And this greenest [58], which actually isn't even *green*... (as we can see) but has this *bluish-purplish* color [in a landscape of visual image retrieval]... It was supposed to be an invention, ehmm... this pavement was actually created in Ponte Vedra, where there is one of the headquarters of ATP [59]... it was supposed to be an answer to those dangerous hard cement courts which you often play on in America... [conceptualization in "consciousness landscape"].

When characterising professionalisms we have been referring to the concept of common knowledge and common evaluations (within the domain of values which are perceptible in a practical way). The entire area of common knowledge [60] can be divided into three fundamental parts:

- 1) General knowledge (and common-specialist knowledge) which would consist of convictions and judgments common to a specific social group (including valuative judgments) which are not subject to dissolution in the long-term memory of that social group, which in turn stands out from the general public due to its work field (or interests) and adopts the quantifier: 'each (specialist or person interested in tennis) knows that X' – see the following TV commentary sequence:

Z.A.: ... Yes, now then in this fourth set everything so far is going according with the doubles rule of maintaining games, or winning games during own service [61].

- 2) Personal knowledge which consists of discursive information relating to a speaking micro-world or a micro-world of those who speak, which is subject to dissolution in long-term memory and which adopts the quantifier: 'at least one of the interlocutors (commentator) knows that X' – see the following meta-image utterance:

Z.A.: ... And Rudi Berger (now on your screens) is leading in this game... Rudi Berger who we remember, ehmm, from two years ago... he [was] a supervisor on behalf of ATP at the Philip Morris Challenger...

K.S.: ... in Warsaw...

- 3) Catalogued knowledge which consists of information arrived at from sensory

impressions of interlocutors at the moment of conversation (sportscast) and adopts the quantifier: 'at least one of the interlocutors is observing that X' – see journalist modifications of jargon tennis terminology in an evaluative sequence of the following utterance:

K.S.: ... Beautiful play by John McEnroe... Please pay attention [during a replay], how deeply, ehmm.. he can get into the net [62]... Most tennis players, ehmm, when playing a volley already stop in the area of, ehmm... the service line [the middle of the court]... John McEnroe is playing th... this volley running and ...and finished the hit practically hanging on the net...

- 4) Information obtained during a process of inference, i.e. a characteristic mechanism of inference allowing for the acquisition of new information which a given announcement does not include. This information is obtained through the application of a set of pre-selected factors which is a fragment of an adequately organized knowledge area which in turn constitutes the cognitive basis of an entire inference process [63] – see an utterance sequence which may lead to the conclusion that a cognitive dissonance exists and results from a conflict of values between fair play and a natural attempt at obtaining an advantageous result:

Z.A.: ... Yes, John McEnroe played straight into his opponent... Here, in such a situation, ... during such a game [playing for such stakes], and actually in any game, it's difficult to speak of any kind of gallantry on court, grace... After all, he didn't do it to cause... ehmm, his opponent pain, but just to, ...ehmm to get a point.

The inconsistency within a motivational account of someone who is interpreting facts and between an actual event on court results from a twofold interpretation of the fair play principle with reference to general norms of behaviour and those in place during a sports competition.

Inconsistencies surfacing in the representation of common knowledge are of operational nature, depending on the type of an inferential situation, i.e. a set of pre-selected suggestions and convictions required to take a given inferential step. This can be proved by adding to each formulated

(inferred or deduced) conviction the following formula: “not always and not everywhere”, including an individual opinion along with the interlocutors’ observations – see a different fragment of a commentary:

Z.A.: ... It’s worth it to look at the outfit of the American, which many compare to, eehhmm,... kind of a baseball style... He [Courier] likes baseball very much, plays it fairly well and the t-shirt really isn’t a model of tennis style ... [which, as we know, traditionally supposes a white outfit]

In this way, two contradictory tendencies can be observed within the area of a spoken text of a professional commentary which result from a dichotomy between scientific knowledge, of which the purpose is to experience, describe and explain reality – and that of common knowledge which aims merely to create a cognitive base necessary and sufficient for linguistic activity on an individual scale [64].

Frequently, seemingly contradictory tendencies can be observed within a single sequence or several dialogue calques of a report and commentary discourse. These tendencies can be explained solely based on cognitive linguistics, for example:

a) the use of units with ambiguous or a hazy meaning which are dependent on the context of the usage (common knowledge) while at the same time using the terminology of a specialist register – see the following simple evaluative sequence:

K.S.: ... An attempt to get into the net with such a slicing backhand [65]... unsuccessful...

b) a tight link between or an insufficiently clear separation of the ontological and axiological layers of utterances (of intuitive meanings and apparent knowledge) [66] – see the following fragment of an emotional statement of assessment:

K.S.: ... Wow! Great play! Great play! ... that is exactly the doubles’ craftiness, that is the hint of genius... McEnroe’s sharp cross-court forehand [67]...

I.W.: [replay of play from a VCR]

Z.A.: ... Let’s see it, let’s see it because it’s worth it... to play a forehand in such a way... only McEnroe can do that

Expression can encompass all possible psychological experiences, and thus not only a desire (or a will) but also other diverse emotions, such as delight, surprise, irritation and finally the experience of a conviction (judgment) which is something different than an announcement intended to inform a listener, and still different from causing in him a certain state of knowledge [68].

Cognitive linguistics becomes for us a fundamental trend of thought which attempts to reconcile these heterogeneous, although natural, characteristics of colloquial and professional utterances. Cognitive linguistics treats language as a fundamental form of experiencing reality; it emphasises strict relations between a human’s cognitive apparatus, its changes and the rules of the set of its ideas, and – what is also significant – it emphasises language being treated as a manifestation of feelings and values.

All sources quoted in the article come from the archives of the Chair of Logopedics and Educational Linguistics of the Institute of Polish at Pedagogical University of Cracow (Katedra Logopedii i Lingwistyki Edukacyjnej Instytutu Filologii Polskiej Uniwersytetu Pedagogicznego, Kraków).

FOOT-NOTES

- [1] Encyklopedia wiedzy o języku polskim (Encyclopedia of the Polish Language), S. Urbańczyk, ed., Ossolineum, Wrocław 1978.
- [2] S. Gajda, Z. Adamiszyn, ed., Język potoczny jako przedmiot badań językoznawczych (Colloquial language as a subject of linguistic research), Opole 1991; Anusiewicz J., Nieckuła F. eds., Potoczność w języku i kulturze (Colloquialism in language and culture), Język a kultura, vol. 5, Wrocław 1992.
- [3] J. Puzynina, Język wartości (Language of values), Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 1992.
- [4] Encyklopedia wiedzy o języku polskim (Encyclopedia of the Polish Language), S. Urbańczyk, ed., Ossolineum, Wrocław 1978.
- [5] S. Gajda, Wprowadzenie do teorii terminu (Introduction to the Theory of Terminology), Opole 1990.
- [6] I. Nowakowska-Kempna, Aproksymacja semantycznego continuum (Approximation of Semantic Continuum), (in:) Język a kultura (Language and Culture), vol. 8: Podstawy metodologiczne semantyki współczesnej (Methodological Foundations of Modern Semantics), Wrocław 1992, pp. 125-156.
- [7] R. Langacker, Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, vol. I, Stanford, California, Stanford University Press, 1987.
- [8] R. Jackendoff, Semantics and Cognition, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass. 1983.

- [9] J. Fishman, Who speaks what language to whom and when, *La linguistique* 2, 1965, pp. 67-88.
- [10] M.A.K. Halliday, Explorations in the functions of language, Edward Arnold & Co, Baltimore 1973.
- [11] L. Hoffman, Kommunikationsmittel Fachsprache, Akademie Verlag, Berlin 1976.
- [12] D. Möhn, R. Pelka, Fachsprachen: eine Einführung, Max Niemayer Verlag, Tübingen 1984; Wojnicki S., Subjęzyki specjalistyczne (Specialist sublanguages), (in:) Teoretyczne podstawy terminologii (Theoretical foundations of terminology), F. Grucza, ed., Ossolineum, Wrocław 1991, pp. 61-77.
- [13] Z. Bokszański, A. Piotrowski, M. Ziółkowski, Socjologia języka (Sociology of language), Wiedza Powszechna, Warszawa 1977.
- [14] B. Wolniewicz, Języki i kody (Languages and Codes), (in:) Zagadnienia socjo- i psycholingwistyki (Issues in Sociolinguistics and Psycholinguistics), A. Schaff, ed., Ossolineum, Wrocław 1980, pp. 7-37.
- [15] J. Bańcerowski, J. Pogonowski, T. Zgółka, Wstęp do językoznawstwa (Introduction to linguistics), Wydawnictwo UAM, Poznań 1982.
- [16] S. Wojnicki, op. cit., p. 66.
- [17] G.N. Leech, English in advertising: A linguistic study of advertising in Great Britain, Barnes & Noble, London 1966; Crystal D., Davy D., Investigating English style, Longmans, Green and Co., London 1969.
- [18] J. Lyons, Semantyka (Semantics), vol. 2 trans. Weinsberg A. Warszawa 1989, pp. 188-206.
- [19] J.A. Fishman, The sociology of language, Newbury House, Rowley, Mass. 1972.
- [20] J. Bartmiński, Styl potoczny (Vernacular style), (in:) Język a kultura..., vol. 5, pp. 37-54.
- [21] T. Gizbert-Studnicki, Język prawny z perspektywy socjolingwistycznej (Legal Language in a Sociolinguistic Perspective), Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, vol. 26, Kraków 1986, p. 94.
- [22] Ibid.
- [23] B.Z. Kielar, Problemy tłumaczenia tekstów specjalistycznych (Issues in translation of specialist texts), (in:) Teoretyczne podstawy..., pp. 133-140.
- [24]²⁴ J. Lehrberger, Automatic translation and concept of sublanguage, (in:) R. Kittredge, J. Lehrberger eds., Sublanguage, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin 1982, pp. 81-106.
- [25] A. Awdiejew, Model gramatyki komunikacyjnej (research project) (Model of communicative grammar – research project), (in:) Studia nad polszczyzną mówioną Krakowa (Studies in spoken Polish), B. Dunaj, K. Ożóg eds., Kraków 1991, pp. 9-38.
- [26] A. Wierzbicka, Lexicography and Conceptual Analysis, Ann Arbor, Caroma 1985.
- [27] The text of the television commentary comes from two commentators: Zdzisław Ambroziak (Z.A.) and Karol Stopa (K.S.), It refers to a tennis game, Masters Tournament finals, between Boris Becker and Jim Courier held in the Frankfurter Festhalle on 29 November 1992 (rebroadcast) as well as from the Davis Cup doubles final (USA-Switzerland) on 5 December 1992.
- [28] J. Ożdżyński, Funkcjonalne warianty wypowiedzi w środowisku sportowym (Functional varieties of sport utterances), *Socjolingwistyka*, 1980, 3, pp. 69-103.
- [29] J. Ożdżyński, Mówione warianty wypowiedzi w środowisku sportowym (Spoken Varieties of Sport Utterances), Wrocław 1979.
- [30] T. Skubalanka, Wprowadzenie do gramatyki stylistycznej języka polskiego (Introduction to stylistic grammar of the Polish language), Lublin 1991, pp. 10-16.
- [31] R. Grzegorzczakowa, Wprowadzenie do semantyki językoznawczej (Introduction to linguistic semiotics), Warszawa 1990, pp. 134-153, (unit IV: „Problemy modalności” (Problems of modality).
- [32] S. Gajda, op.cit., pp. 23-26. J. Lukszyn, Lingwistyczne problemy badań terminologicznych (Linguistic Problems in Terminological Research), (in:) Teoretyczne podstawy..., pp. 79-96.
- [33] Z. Ziembliński, M. Zieliński, Dyrektywy i sposób ich wypowiedzenia (Directive and their utterances), Warszawa 1992, in particular Part II: M. Zieliński, Wypowiedzi dyrektywne w praktyce językowej (Directive utterances in language practice), pp. 69-101.
- [34] Ibid.
- [35] M. Nowakowska, Teoria działania (Theory of action), Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, PWN, Warszawa 1979; J. Puzynina, op. cit.
- [36] M. Zieliński, op. cit., pp. 81-86.
- [37] Ibid.
- [38] Polish *wolej* from English *volley* – a kick or hit in which a player returns a moving ball before it touches the ground.
- [39] J. Lalewicz, Komunikacja językowa i literatura (Language communication and literature), Ossolineum, Wrocław 1975.
- [40] J. Antas, Projekt metodologii badań relacji obraz-słowo w przekazie telewizyjnym (Methodology of Research of the Image-word Relationship in Television Broadcast), *Zeszyty Prasoznawcze*, 1981, no. 2.
- [41] Ibid.
- [42] W. Miodunka, A. Ropa, Z zagadnień socjolingwistycznego opisu sytuacji. Na przykładzie sytuacji telewizyjnych (Problems of sociolinguistic situational description), *Socjolingwistyka*, vol. 2, 1979, pp. 65-75.
- [43] Polish *beehend* from English *back-hand* – a hit in which the right arm is brought across the body with the back of the hand facing the same direction as the hit itself, (left-handed players the other way round).

- [44] R. Grzegorzczkowska, op. cit., pp. 150-153.
- [45] Polish *stop-wolej* from English *stop-volley* – a softly hit volley that barely falls over the net and cannot be reached for a return.
- [46] Polish *kros* from English *cross (shot)* – a stroke played diagonally across the court.
- [47] Polish *forhend* from English *forehand* – a hit in which the palm of the hand which is holding the racket faces the same direction as the hit itself.
- [48] N. Iwanowa-Perczyńska, Wybrane cechy składniowo-stylistyczne polszczyzny mówionej (Selected syntactic and stylistic characteristics of spoken Polish), Prace Instytutu Języka Polskiego (Works of Institute of Polish Language), nr 7, Wrocław 1975.
- [49] Polish *return* from English *return* – the action or an instance of returning a ball.
- [50] R. Grzegorzczkowska, op. cit., p. 150.
- [51] Polish *gem* from English *game* – part of a tennis match which consists of points.
- [52] Polish *tajbrek* from English *tie-break* – extra play at the end of a game when both teams or players in tennis have the same points, to decide who is the winner.
- [53] M. Zieliński, op. cit., pp. 85-86.
- [54] R.S. Jackendoff, op. cit., p. 17.
- [55] Ibid.
- [56] More about it can be found in my article: Kontekst wizualny wypowiedzi telewizyjnej (Visual context of television utterances), (in:) *Zeszyty Prasoznawcze*.
- [57] J. Bruner, *Actual minds, possible worlds*, Cambridge 1986.
- [58] *Greenset* – type of tennis court surface similar to Tartan surface.
- [59] ATP – Association of Tennis Professionals.
- [60] A. Awdiejew, Wiedza potoczna a inferencja (Common knowledge and inference), (in:) *Język a kultura...*, op. cit., vol. 5, pp. 21-27.
- [61] Polish *serwis* from English *service* – the act or manner of putting the ball into play; serve.
- [62] Jargon: ‘get into the net’ ‘play very close to the net’.
- [63] D. Sperber, D. Wilson, *Relevance*, Blackwell, Oxford 1986.
- [64] A. Awdiejew, *Wiedza potoczna...* op. cit., p. 22.
- [65] Polish *slajs* or jargon *szlajs* from English *slice* or German *Slice* – hit the bottom of the ball so that it does not bounce very high when it hit the ground; J. Ożdżyński, *Polskie współczesne słownictwo sportowe (Modern sport vocabulary in Polish)*, Wrocław 1970.
- [66] J. Biniewicz, Potoczny a naukowy obraz świata w tekstach nauk ścisłych (Common and scientific image of the world in scientific discourses), (in:) *Język a kultura...* op. cit., vol. 5, pp. 111-118.
- [67] What is meant here is playing a forehand diagonally when the ball hits the service area of the opponent close to the net (jargon also: tight cross-court).
- [68] R. Grzegorzczkowska, op. cit.; J. Puzynina, op. cit.