SEMANTIC-FUNCTIONAL FIELDS, STYLISTIC-SEMANTIC DEVICES AND DISCURSIVE DYNAMICS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK FOOTBALL COMMENTARY: A CONTRASTIVE STUDY

Odilova Gulchiroy Xusniddin qizi
Andijon davlat chet tillari instituti o ‘qituvchisi
Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22943281

Abstract: The language of sports commentary represents a distinctive form of media discourse in which description, evaluation, interpretation and emotional involvement are produced simultaneously under severe time constraints. Football commentary is particularly significant in this regard because the commentator is required to verbalize rapidly changing events, identify participants, evaluate actions, interpret tactical developments and maintain continuous contact with an audience that is often watching the same event. The present article investigates the semantic-functional, field-based, stylistic-semantic and discursive characteristics of English and Uzbek football commentary from a contrastive perspective. The analysis focuses on three interconnected dimensions: the semantic-functional organization of lexical and phraseological units characteristic of sports commentators’ speech; the comparative realization of stylistic and semantic devices; and the discursive dynamics through which live commentary develops in accordance with changes in the match situation. The study argues that the lexical organization of football commentary can be represented as a system of interconnected semantic-functional fields, including action and movement, spatial orientation, competition, evaluation, emotion, result, tactical organization and participant identification. Although English and Uzbek commentaries share a common conceptual basis determined by the universal structure of football, their linguistic realization differs because of typological, cultural and media-discursive factors. English commentary tends to demonstrate a higher degree of lexical compression, terminological conventionalization, elliptical syntax and compact evaluative formulas, whereas Uzbek commentary frequently combines international football terminology with explanatory constructions, nationally marked evaluative units and emotionally intensified expressions. Stylistic devices such as metaphor, metonymy, hyperbole, repetition, epithet, comparison, rhetorical questions and exclamatory constructions contribute not only to expressiveness but also to the semantic framing of sporting events.

Keywords: sports discourse, football commentary, semantic-functional field, sports commentator, stylistic device, semantic device, English language, Uzbek language, discourse dynamics, metaphor, evaluation, media discourse, contrastive linguistics.

Аннотация: Язык спортивного комментария представляет собой особую форму медиадискурса, в которой описание, оценка, интерпретация и эмоциональная вовлечённость реализуются одновременно в условиях жёстких временных ограничений. В этом отношении футбольный комментарий имеет особое значение, поскольку комментатору необходимо оперативно вербализовать быстро меняющиеся события, идентифицировать участников, оценивать их действия, интерпретировать тактические изменения и поддерживать постоянный контакт с аудиторией, которая зачастую одновременно наблюдает за происходящим. В настоящей статье с сопоставительной точки зрения исследуются семантико-функциональные, полевые, стилистико-семантические и дискурсивные особенности английского и узбекского футбольного комментария. Анализ сосредоточен на трёх взаимосвязанных аспектах: семантико-функциональной организации лексических и фразеологических единиц, характерных для речи спортивных комментаторов; сопоставительной реализации стилистических и семантических

средств; а также дискурсивной динамике, в рамках которой прямой комментарий развивается в соответствии с изменениями игровой ситуации. В исследовании обосновывается, что лексическая организация футбольного комментария может быть представлена как система взаимосвязанных семантико-функциональных полей, включающих действие и движение, пространственную ориентацию, соревнование, оценку, эмоции, результат, тактическую организацию и идентификацию участников. Несмотря на то что английский и узбекский футбольные комментарии имеют общую концептуальную основу, обусловленную универсальной структурой футбола, их языковая реализация различается под влиянием типологических, культурных и медиадискурсивных факторов. Английский комментарий характеризуется более высокой степенью лексической компрессии, терминологической конвенционализации, использованием эллиптических синтаксических конструкций и кратких оценочных формул, тогда как узбекский комментарий нередко сочетает международную футбольную терминологию с пояснительными конструкциями, национально маркированными оценочными единицами и эмоционально-интенсифицированными выражениями. Такие стилистические средства, как метафора, метонимия, гипербола, повтор, эпитет, сравнение, риторические вопросы и восклицательные конструкции, способствуют не только повышению экспрессивности, но и семантическому моделированию спортивных событий.

Ключевые слова: спортивный дискурс, футбольный комментарий, семантико-функциональное поле, спортивный комментатор, стилистическое средство, семантическое средство, английский язык, узбекский язык, дискурсивная динамика, метафора, оценка, медиадискурс, сопоставительная лингвистика.

Annotatsiya: Sport sharhlovchilari nutqi tavsiflash, baholash, talqin qilish hamda emotsional munosabatni qat’iy vaqt cheklovi sharoitida bir vaqtning o‘zida yuzaga chiqaruvchi mediadiskursning o‘ziga xos shaklini tashkil etadi. Bu jihatdan futbol sharhi alohida ahamiyat kasb etadi, chunki sharhlovchi tez sur’atda o‘zgarib borayotgan voqealarni zudlik bilan verbal ifodalashi, ishtirokchilarni aniqlashi, ularning harakatlarini baholashi, taktik o‘zgarishlarni talqin qilishi hamda ko‘pincha ayni voqeani kuzatayotgan auditoriya bilan uzluksiz kommunikativ aloqani saqlashi talab etiladi. Mazkur maqolada ingliz va o‘zbek futbol sharhlarining semantik-funksional, maydoniy, stilistik-semantik hamda diskursiv xususiyatlari chog‘ishtirma nuqtayi nazardan tadqiq etiladi. Tahlil uchta o‘zaro bog‘liq yo‘nalishga qaratilgan: sport sharhlovchilari nutqiga xos leksik va frazeologik birliklarning semantik-funksional tashkil topishi; stilistik va semantik vositalarning qiyosiy namoyon bo‘lishi; shuningdek, jonli sharhning o‘yin vaziyatidagi o‘zgarishlarga mos ravishda rivojlanishini belgilovchi diskursiv dinamika. Tadqiqotda futbol sharhining leksik tashkil topishi harakat va siljish, makoniy yo‘nalish, raqobat, baholash, emotsiya, natija, taktik tashkil etish va ishtirokchilarni identifikatsiyalash kabi o‘zaro bog‘liq semantik-funksional maydonlar tizimi sifatida namoyon bo‘lishi asoslanadi. Ingliz va o‘zbek futbol sharhlari futbolning universal tuzilishi bilan belgilanadigan umumiy konseptual asosga ega bo‘lsa-da, ularning lingvistik voqelanishi tipologik, madaniy va mediadiskursiv omillar ta’sirida farqlanadi. Ingliz tilidagi futbol sharhlarida leksik kompressiya, terminologik konvensionallashuv, elliptik sintaktik tuzilmalar va ixcham baholovchi formulalar yuqori darajada kuzatilsa, o‘zbek futbol sharhlarida xalqaro futbol terminologiyasi ko‘pincha izohlovchi konstruksiyalar, milliy-madaniy xususiyatga ega baholovchi birliklar hamda emotsional jihatdan kuchaytirilgan ifodalar bilan uyg‘unlashadi. Metafora, metonimiya, giperbola, takror, epitet, o‘xshatish, ritorik so‘roq va undov konstruksiyalari kabi stilistik vositalar nafaqat nutqning ekspressivligini oshiradi, balki sport voqealarining semantik jihatdan shakllantirilishiga ham xizmat qiladi.

Kalit so‘zlar: sport diskursi, futbol sharhi, semantik-funksional maydon, sport sharhlovchisi, stilistik vosita, semantik vosita, ingliz tili, o‘zbek tili, diskursiv dinamika, metafora, baholash, mediadiskurs, chog‘ishtirma tilshunoslik.

Introduction

The rapid development of mass communication and digital broadcasting has considerably expanded the range of discourse types examined in contemporary linguistics. Sports discourse occupies a particular position within this system because it combines institutional communication, mass-media language, spontaneous speech, professional terminology, evaluation, entertainment and cultural representation. Among the different forms of sports communication, live football commentary is distinguished by its temporal immediacy and its direct dependence on a continuously changing extralinguistic event. Football commentary cannot be reduced to a simple verbal description of events taking place on the pitch. The commentator performs several communicative tasks simultaneously. He or she identifies players, follows the movement of the ball, reconstructs tactical relations, evaluates successful and unsuccessful actions, provides statistical and historical information, reacts emotionally to unexpected developments and attempts to preserve the audience’s attention. Consequently, commentary is situated at the intersection of narration, description, evaluation, interpretation and interpersonal communication. One of the earliest influential linguistic approaches to sportscasting was Charles Ferguson’s description of *sports announcer talk* as a specialized register. Ferguson identified such features as syntactic simplification, deletion, inversion, heavy modification and recurrent routines, arguing that these patterns function as register markers rather than random deviations from ordinary language (Ferguson, 1983). This approach established an important theoretical foundation for subsequent investigations of the connection between linguistic form and the communicative conditions of live sport. The relationship between linguistic structure and temporal pressure was later explored more specifically in football discourse. Müller’s study of time-critical utterances demonstrated that the timing of an utterance in relation to the non-linguistic event being described has a direct influence on the structural organization of spoken commentary. Verbless and reduced constructions, for example, should therefore be interpreted as functional responses to real-time communicative pressure rather than as incomplete language in a purely grammatical sense.[1]

Contemporary research has further expanded the understanding of sports commentary by focusing on pragmatic interaction, online sportscasting, multimodality, narrative organization and stylistic expressiveness. Chovanec treats live sportscasting as a complex discourse that combines information with entertainment and, particularly in digital environments, develops forms of interaction and audience co-presence. Recent research on televised football commentary similarly emphasizes that commentators do not merely transmit information; they interpret sporting events, shape audience perception and employ expressive stylistic resources as part of the broadcast experience. The comparative investigation of English and Uzbek football commentary is especially relevant because football terminology has historically developed under strong English influence, while its integration into Uzbek discourse has involved phonological, morphological, semantic and pragmatic adaptation. Recent studies of English-Uzbek football terminology have noted the importance of cross-linguistic interaction and the preservation of language-specific features in Uzbek sports vocabulary. Translation-oriented research has additionally shown that terminology, metaphorical expressions and discourse-specific meanings cannot always be transferred mechanically between English and Uzbek because functional and cultural adaptation is frequently required. Against this background, the present study

[1] Amiryan, N., & Vanyan, L. (2026). On some micro- and macrolinguistic features of English football commentary. Foreign Languages for Special Purposes, 19, 62–71. https://doi.org/10.46991/FLSP.2021.19.062. (Yerevan State University Journals)

examines English and Uzbek sports commentary as a multidimensional linguistic phenomenon. Particular attention is paid to football commentary because football produces an especially rich combination of rapid action, specialized terminology, strong emotional involvement and relatively stable communicative conventions.

The purpose of the article is to identify and contrast the semantic-functional fields, stylistic-semantic mechanisms and discursive dynamics characteristic of English and Uzbek football commentators' speech.

The study pursues the following objectives:

1. to determine the principal semantic-functional fields represented in English and Uzbek football commentary;
2. to identify their nuclear and peripheral linguistic constituents;
3. to investigate the communicative functions performed by football-related lexical and phraseological units;
4. to compare the major stylistic-semantic devices employed in English and Uzbek commentary;
5. to establish the relationship between stylistic form and pragmatic function;
6. to examine changes in discourse organization during different phases of a football match;
7. to determine language-specific and shared tendencies in English and Uzbek commentary;
8. to explain the role of cultural and typological factors in shaping commentator discourse.[2]

The central hypothesis is that English and Uzbek football commentaries are organized around similar conceptual and communicative fields because they describe the same type of sporting event, but the linguistic realization, degree of explicitness, stylistic intensity and discourse organization of these fields differ in accordance with the structural resources and communicative traditions of the two languages.

Theoretical Background of Football Commentary as Sports Discourse

A linguistic register is conventionally associated with a recurrent communicative situation and with the linguistic choices regularly made within that situation. Live football commentary satisfies these conditions because its communicative setting is highly predictable: there is a sporting event, one or more commentators, a mass audience, real-time transmission and a permanent requirement to correlate verbal output with visible or audible developments on the pitch. Ferguson's model of sports announcer talk remains fundamental because it demonstrates that linguistic economy is systematically motivated by the demands of live sport. Structures such as subject deletion, reduced predication, inversion and formulaic expressions enable the commentator to produce language at approximately the same speed as the event. Football commentary is therefore best understood as event-dependent discourse.

The semantic content of an utterance cannot always be interpreted independently of the visual situation. Consider representative constructions such as:

Into the area.
Back to the goalkeeper.
Now Salah.
Wide again.
Dangerous position.

In isolation, these structures may appear grammatically incomplete. Within live commentary, however, the missing information is recoverable from the match itself. The visual context functions as an additional communicative resource. This relationship between speech and extralinguistic action

[2] Bilkić Barić, M., & Peran, S. (2026). Stylistic features of sports commentators: The case of football match commentary. *Medijska istraživanja, 32*(1), 83–104.

explains why football commentary contains a considerably higher proportion of context-dependent units than many other forms of public discourse. Research on English football sportscasting has also emphasized the role of the phase of play, the medium of transmission, the commentator's professional knowledge and the relationship between descriptive, interpretative and evaluative discourse. This observation is important for comparative analysis because differences between English and Uzbek commentary cannot be explained solely by the structures of the two languages. They are also influenced by broadcasting traditions, commentator training, audience expectations and the degree of institutional standardization of sports terminology.

From description to discursive construction

A football commentator does not reproduce objective reality in a linguistically neutral form. Commentary necessarily involves selection. At any particular moment several actions may occur simultaneously, yet the commentator chooses which one to foreground.

For instance, the same event can be represented as:

The defender clears the ball.
An excellent defensive intervention.
He rescues his team once again.
The attack finally breaks down.

The physical event may be identical, but the semantic framing changes. The first utterance performs a descriptive function; the second adds evaluation; the third personalizes and dramatizes the episode; and the fourth interprets the event from the attacking team's perspective.

This capacity to reframe events demonstrates that sports commentary is a meaning-producing discourse. The commentator transforms physical actions into narratively and culturally interpretable events.

In Uzbek commentary, a similar event may be represented by such constructions as:

Himoyachi to'pni uzoqlashtirdi.
Juda muhim himoyaviy harakat.
Jamoasini muqarrar goldan qutqarib qoldi.
Hujum shu yerda yakunlandi.

The propositions overlap with the English examples, but differences may emerge in lexical elaboration, emotional intensification and preferred syntactic packaging.

The concept of the semantic-functional field The notion of a field is particularly useful for explaining sports vocabulary because linguistic units associated with football are not isolated. They form semantic networks organized around conceptual centres. A semantic-functional field may be defined in the present study as a structured set of linguistic units united by a shared conceptual domain and by related communicative functions. Such fields contain both central, highly specialized elements and peripheral units whose football-related meanings emerge contextually.

For example, within the field of ATTACK, nuclear units include:

attack, striker, forward, shot, cross, finish, goal, penalty area.

Peripheral members may include metaphorical expressions such as:

break through, unlock the defence, bombard the goal, tear the defence apart.

Uzbek equivalents include:

hujum, hujumchi, zarba, uzatma, jarima maydoni, gol, qanotdan uzatma, hujumga o'tmoq.

More peripheral expressive units may include:

himoyani yorib o'tmoq, darvozani ishg'ol qilmoq, bosimni kuchaytirmoq, mudofaani parchalamoq.

Thus, field analysis permits the researcher to combine terminological meaning, contextual semantics and communicative function within a single model.

Materials and Methods The investigation is based on a contrastive, semantic-functional and discourse-analytical approach to English and Uzbek football commentary. The linguistic material relevant to the study includes football terms, action verbs, evaluative adjectives, phraseological constructions, metaphorical expressions, discourse markers and syntactic patterns characteristic of live sports broadcasting.

The methodology combines several analytical procedures.

First, **semantic classification** is used to group commentary units according to common conceptual domains, including action, space, time, competition, tactics, evaluation, emotion and result.

Second, **functional analysis** identifies the communicative tasks performed by these units. The principal functions considered are descriptive, nominative, informative, evaluative, emotive, interpretative, predictive, persuasive, interactional and entertainment functions.

Third, **field analysis** differentiates between nuclear and peripheral constituents. Conventional football terms generally occupy the nucleus, while figurative, idiomatic and contextually specialized items form transitional or peripheral zones.

Fourth, **stylistic-semantic analysis** is used to investigate metaphor, metonymy, epithet, hyperbole, comparison, repetition, rhetorical question, exclamation, irony and other expressive mechanisms.

Fifth, **contrastive analysis** is employed to determine similarities and differences in the realization of corresponding meanings in English and Uzbek.

Finally, **discourse analysis** examines the sequential organization of commentary and the transitions between description, evaluation, interpretation and emotional reaction.

Because the present study focuses primarily on functional mechanisms rather than statistical frequency, examples are treated qualitatively. Representative examples illustrate recurrent structural and semantic patterns rather than functioning as claims about exact quantitative distribution.

Semantic-Functional and Field Characteristics of English and Uzbek Sports Commentary

The field of action and movement The semantic field of action constitutes one of the most central components of football commentary. Football is defined by continuous movement, and the commentator must linguistically encode this movement in real time.

English commentary makes extensive use of compact action verbs:

pass, cross, shoot, strike, head, tackle, clear, intercept, block, save, turn, run, dribble, flick, chip, curl, drive, press.

The semantic specialization of such verbs allows a commentator to communicate considerable information with minimal linguistic material. *He chips it*, for example, simultaneously identifies an action and the approximate manner of ball movement.

Uzbek commentary similarly uses verbs representing football actions:

uzatmoq, tepmoq, zarba bermoq, bosh bilan o'ynamoq, to'pni olib qo'ymoq, qaytarmoq, to'smoq, qutqarmoq, yorib kirmoq, aldab o'tmoq, bosim qilmoq.

An important contrast arises from the lexical typology of the two languages. English often possesses compact verbal units whose meanings integrate manner and action, whereas Uzbek may employ analytic combinations.

English: *He curls it towards the far post.*

Uzbek: *U to'pni burama zarba bilan uzoq ustun tomon yo'lladi.*

The Uzbek construction can be semantically precise, but it may require a longer phrase. Under conditions of real-time commentary, this difference influences syntactic organization and lexical selection.

Another characteristic feature is the high frequency of present-tense narration:

Rice wins it back, finds Saka, Saka turns, crosses...

A representative Uzbek version may be:

Rays to‘pni qaytarib oldi, Saka tomon uzatadi, Saka buriladi, qanotdan to‘p oshiradi...
The present tense creates simultaneity between action and verbal representation. The commentator linguistically follows the trajectory of the game.
The spatial field Football is inseparable from spatial organization. Consequently, location and direction constitute another nuclear semantic-functional field.
Common English units include:
inside the box, on the left, down the right, in midfield, near the touchline, at the far post, on the edge of the area, through the middle, behind the defence.
Uzbek commentary employs corresponding structures such as:
jarima maydoni ichida, chap qanotda, o‘ng qanot bo‘ylab, maydon markazida, yon chiziq yaqinida, uzoq ustun oldida, jarima maydoni tashqarisida, markaz orqali, himoya ortida.[3]

Spatial expressions perform more than a referential function. They reconstruct the match for the listener and direct the viewer’s attention. Radio commentary depends heavily on such localization, whereas television commentary may omit spatial information if the location is visually obvious.

This distinction supports the more general principle that the linguistic density of commentary is influenced by modality. In television, image and speech distribute communicative functions between them; in radio, language must perform most representational tasks independently.

The field of competition and confrontation Football discourse regularly conceptualizes the match as confrontation. This field contains both literal sports terms and figurative expressions.
English examples include:
battle, fight, duel, challenge, pressure, dominate, defend, attack, counterattack, break through, defeat, destroy.
Uzbek examples include:
kurash, to‘qnashuv, yakkakurash, bosim, ustunlik, himoya, hujum, qarshi hujum, qarshilik, taslim bo‘lmaslik.
This field often overlaps with military metaphor. Expressions such as *attack*, *defence*, *captain*, *shoot*, *target* and *battle* facilitate the conceptualization of football as organized confrontation.
The metaphorical potential of football discourse has remained an important research area. More recent studies of live football language continue to identify conceptual domains such as conflict, journey, force and construction as productive sources of metaphorical framing.
In Uzbek, the semantic structure of confrontation can be strengthened through expressions such as:
raqib mudofaasini yorib o‘tdi;
darvozaga hujum uyushtirdi;
maydon markazidagi kurashda ustun keldi;
raqibni bosim ostida qoldirdi.

The presence of similar metaphorical mappings in both languages demonstrates the universality of competitive conceptualization. Nevertheless, lexical realization is culturally and grammatically adapted.
The tactical-strategic field Modern football commentary includes an increasingly developed tactical vocabulary.
English examples include:
high press, low block, defensive line, transition, overlapping run, holding midfielder, inverted full-back, false nine, possession, build-up, counter-press.
Some of these units have direct or partially established Uzbek correspondences:

[3] Chovanec, J. (2008). Focus on form: Foregrounding devices in football reporting. *Discourse & Communication, 2*(3).

yuqori pressing, past blok, himoya chizig‘i, o‘tish fazasi, qanot himoyachisining oldinga chiqishi, tayanch yarim himoyachi, to‘p nazorati, hujumni boshlash, qarshi pressing.

The field demonstrates the impact of English on international football terminology. In Uzbek sports discourse, terms such as *pressing*, *aut*, *penalti*, *dribling*, *transfer* and *ofsayd* illustrate different degrees of borrowing and assimilation.

Research on Uzbek sports commentary has specifically drawn attention to the influence of foreign sports terminology and to phonological and morphological adaptation in actual usage. (Innovative Academy)[4]

The tactical field also demonstrates a distinction between specialist and general-audience commentary. A commentator addressing an expert audience may employ highly technical terminology without explanation. A commentator oriented toward a broader audience may combine a borrowed term with explanatory paraphrase.[5]

For example:

They are counter-pressing immediately after losing possession.

A functionally adapted Uzbek commentary might be:

To‘pni yo‘qotishi bilan darhol qarshi pressing boshlayapti, ya’ni raqibga hujumni tashkil qilish uchun vaqt bermayapti.

The second construction is longer but performs both terminological and explanatory functions.

Evaluation is one of the most important semantic-functional domains of football commentary. The commentator constantly assesses players, decisions, techniques and outcomes.

Positive English evaluative units include:

brilliant, excellent, superb, magnificent, outstanding, clever, composed, clinical, perfect, wonderful.

Negative units include:

poor, careless, weak, unnecessary, disappointing, reckless, wasteful.

Uzbek positive evaluation may be expressed through:

ajoyib, a’lo darajadagi, chiroyli, qoyilmaqom, mukammal, aniq, ishonchli, mahoratli, zo‘r.

Negative evaluation includes:

xato, noaniq, sust, ehtiyotsiz, keraksiz, muvaffaqiyatsiz, qo‘pol.

Evaluation in commentary performs several functions simultaneously. It informs the audience of the commentator’s professional assessment, enhances emotional engagement and creates a hierarchy of significance among match events.

Compare:

Good pass.

Brilliant pass.

An absolutely extraordinary pass.

The propositional core remains similar, but the degree of evaluative intensity changes.

The same gradation can be observed in Uzbek:

Yaxshi uzatma.

Ajoyib uzatma.

Favqulodda darajada chiroyli uzatma.

Such examples reveal the scalar organization of the evaluative field.

Conclusion

[4] Ergashov, K. (2024). Comparative analysis of football terminology in Uzbek and English languages. *Xorijiy lingvistika va lingvodidaktika, 2*(1/S), 684–689.

[5] Müller, T. (2007). *Football, Language and Linguistics: Time-Critical Utterances in Unplanned Spoken Language, Their Structures and Their Relation to Non-Linguistic Situations and Events*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

The analysis of English and Uzbek football commentary demonstrates that sports commentator speech represents a complex semantic, functional, stylistic and discursive system. The lexical organization of football commentary is structured through interconnected semantic-functional fields. The principal fields include action and movement, spatial orientation, competition, tactical organization, evaluation, emotion and result. Each field contains nuclear, transitional and peripheral units. Conventional football terminology generally forms the nucleus, whereas metaphorical, phraseological and strongly expressive units occupy more peripheral zones. The same lexical item can perform different communicative functions depending on discourse context. Football terms do not function exclusively as nominative units. They participate in description, evaluation, interpretation, prediction and emotional representation. Stylistic-semantic devices constitute an integral rather than decorative component of football commentary. Metaphor conceptualizes the match through domains such as conflict, construction, movement and force. Hyperbole increases emotional intensity. Epithets encode professional evaluation. Repetition reflects temporal continuity and suspense. Rhetorical questions and exclamations establish indirect interaction with the audience. Irony combines criticism with entertainment.

The linguistic organization of football commentary is directly influenced by the dynamics of the match. Relatively static phases allow complete, analytical constructions, whereas high-intensity attacking episodes produce ellipsis, lexical compression, short syntactic units and strong prosodic marking. Goals function as discourse climaxes and trigger rapid transitions from anticipation to emotional reaction and subsequently to analytical interpretation. English and Uzbek football commentary demonstrate a substantial conceptual and functional similarity because both represent the same sport and operate under comparable communicative constraints. Nevertheless, significant linguistic differences remain. English tends to rely extensively on compact, conventionalized football terminology and lexicalized action verbs. Uzbek employs both native resources and internationally borrowed terminology and may use more analytic structures to express meanings encoded by

Future research may extend the present analysis through quantitatively balanced English and Uzbek commentary corpora. Particular attention may be given to the frequency of semantic-functional fields, prosodic characteristics of goal episodes, gender differences among commentators, individual commentator style, code-switching, borrowed football terminology and differences among television, radio and online commentary. Corpus-assisted investigation would also make it possible to determine which stylistic devices form the stable nucleus of commentary discourse and which are associated with individual broadcasting traditions.

References

1. Amiryan, N., & Vanyan, L. (2026). On some micro- and macrolinguistic features of English football commentary. *Foreign Languages for Special Purposes, 19*, 62–71. https://doi.org/10.46991/FLSP.2021.19.062. (Yerevan State University Journals)
2. Bilkić Barić, M., & Peran, S. (2026). Stylistic features of sports commentators: The case of football match commentary. *Medijska istraživanja, 32*(1), 83–104. https://doi.org/10.22572/mi.32.1.4. (Hrčak)
3. Chovanec, J. (2008). Focus on form: Foregrounding devices in football reporting. *Discourse & Communication, 2*(3).
4. Chovanec, J. (2011). Constructing fun in online sports journalism: Humour in quasi-conversations. In M. Dynel (Ed.), *The Pragmatics of Humour across Discourse Domains* (pp. 243–264). John Benjamins. (Benjamins)

5. Chovanec, J. (2018). *The Discourse of Online Sportscasting: Constructing Meaning and Interaction in Live Text Commentary*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.297. (Benjamins)
6. Chukhno, A. A., & Kudryashova, A. N. (2018). Stylistic features of the English online sports commentary. *Philology. Theory & Practice*.
7. Ergashov, K. (2024). Comparative analysis of football terminology in Uzbek and English languages. *Xorijiy lingvistika va lingvodidaktika, 2*(1/S), 684–689. https://doi.org/10.47689/2181-3701-vol2-iss1/s-pp684-689. (IlmIz)
8. Ferguson, C. A. (1983). Sports announcer talk: Syntactic aspects of register variation. *Language in Society, 12*(2), 153–172. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500009787. (Cambridge University Press)
9. Jucker, A. H. (2010). "Audacious, brilliant!! What a strike!" Live text commentaries on the Internet as real-time narratives. In C. R. Hoffmann (Ed.), *Narrative Revisited: Telling a Story in the Age of New Media* (pp. 57–78). John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.199.05juc. (Benjamins)
10. Meier-Vieracker, S. (2022). The evolution of football live text commentaries: A corpus linguistic case study on genre change. *AILA Review*. https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.21001.mei. (Benjamins)
11. Müller, T. (2007). *Football, Language and Linguistics: Time-Critical Utterances in Unplanned Spoken Language, Their Structures and Their Relation to Non-Linguistic Situations and Events*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag. (Narr)
12. Pažanin, M., & Petrović, I. (2022). Sports live text commentary as a hybrid register. *ST-OPEN, 3*. https://doi.org/10.48188/so.3.14. (ST-OPEN)
13. Sokhibov, S., & Do'schonov, B. (2026). Translational challenges in football language: An English-Uzbek perspective. *Qo'qon DPI Ilmiy Xabarlar Jurnali, 8*(2), 338–345. https://doi.org/10.70728/b.series.v08.i02.053. (Journals KokandSU)
14. Zanozina, V. V. (2022). Analysing the genre specificity of football commentary by the material of the English language. *Philology. Theory & Practice, 15*(2). https://doi.org/10.30853/phil20220054. (Philological Sciences)