A PRAGMA-SEMANTICS OF BETTING LANGUAGE

Ndidi Celestina Mezue[1]
Department of Igbo, African And Communication Studies
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka
ndidimezue@gmail.com

Prof. Boniface M. Mbah[2]
Department of Linguistics & Other Languages
University of Nigeria, Nsukka
boniface.mbah@unn.edu.ng

Abstract
It is said that pragmatics and semantics are closely interrelated and that there is a considerable overlap between them to the extent that they can be regarded as sister disciplines. This research aims at investigating the relationship between them highlighting their similarities and detecting their differences through the languages used by betters. In order to fulfill the objectives of the study, the researchers conducted an oral interview in some betting shop were the data were gathered. A pragma-semantic analysis of the obtained results is provided, along with a discussion of the potential work. From the analysis, it was observed that home means when a football club stays in her club's stadium to play a match with another club who visits whereas away is when a football club visits another club in her stadium. Conclusions were made on the uniqueness of the languages being used in betting which is peculiar only to the betters or anyone who has learnt the languages.

Keywords: pragmatics, semantics, context, pragma-semantic, and betting languages

Introduction
Pragmatics and semantic analysis are two fields of study that are sometimes regarded as interdisciplinary because both share interest in those aspects of language that are meaning-dependent. Whereas semantics discusses meaning in a general sense, also being one of the major branches of Linguistics where Phonetics, Phonology, Morphology and Syntax are the others. Meanwhile, pragmatics is a sub-branch of semantics whereas meaning is not isolated but is transcribed or described based on the context of its usage. In the words of Mbagwu (2016), pragmatics is the study of the use of language in human communication as determined by the conditions of society, whereas Abdurrahman (2019), defines semantics as the study of the meaning of words, phrases and sentences. This implies that meaning of a particular utterance can vary in meaning depending on the context of its usage.

Betting, in the context of this study is an online sport business whereby individual invest money to gain more money from games played especially football by predicting on the matches. It is also regards as a gambling business. *Merriam-Webster* defines betting as an agreement in which one tries to guess what will happen and the person who guesses wrong has to give something (such as money) to the person who guesses right. As a specific business, various and unique terms or languages are used for the uniqueness of the business. As we have various sporting events such as; volleyball, handball, basketball, hockey, javelin, shot-put, relay races, etc. The scope of this study is betting in football. The data were gotten from betting centres located at Awka, Anambra State through an oral interview with the shop keepers/cashiers. We will be examining the languages used in betting industry.

Pragmatics
Pragmatics has a long history. Levinson (1983:1) suggests that the use of the term pragmatics is pioneered by the philosopher Charles Morris denoting a branch of semiotics (1938). Within semiotic traditions, syntax is concerned with the formal relations among signs. As for semantics, it is interested in the relations between signs and the objects they signify, while pragmatics investigates the relations between signs and their users.
According to Yule (1996:3), pragmatics is interested in the analysis of meaning as expressed via a speaker and understood via a listener. Thus, it can be said that pragmatic analyses are more concerned

with what people convey through using certain utterances than with what the words in those utterances may mean in isolation. It is worth mentioning that in pragmatics, meaning is not considered to be as stable as linguistic forms. On the contrary, it is dynamically created in the course of employing language (Verschueren, 1999: 11).

Mey (2001: 6) believes that a genuine pragmatic account has to deal with the language users in their social context; it cannot confine itself to those grammatically encoded aspects of context.

Broadly speaking, pragmatics is concerned with those facets of meaning that are context-variable. It endeavors to widen the scope of traditional linguistics by housing many issues and aspects that characterize language in use(Horn and Kecskes,2013: 356)

It is stated that certain events contribute to the emergence of pragmatics. These include: first, the innovation of speech act theory by Austin (1962) with its subsequent development by Searle, second, the appearance of Grice's (1975) notion of the cooperative principle supported by four maxims which can be infringed to generate conversational implicatures. Finally, the introduction of Sperber and Wilson's Relevance theory which is a developed version of Grice's theory (ibid: 357). Egenti (2016), states that pragmatics is the study of speaker's meaning; what people mean by their utterances rather than what the words or phrases might mean by themselves. She further explains that the statement and its interpretation should be contextually based. Furthermore, Mbagwu (2016) explains pragmatics as the study of the use of language in human communication as determined by the conditions of society.

Classification of Pragmatics
Classification of pragmatics will be made in this section.

a. Pragmalinguistics – the perspective is on contexts in relation to structural resources available in a language. This perspective is more linguistic-oriented.
b. Sociopragmatics – the study of the conditions on language use derived from the social situation.
c. General pragmatics – the study of the principles governing the communicative use of language especially as encountered in conversations. The principles may be studied as putative universals or restricted to the study of specific languages.
d. Literary pragmatics – the perspective is on the application of pragmatic notions to the production and reception of literary texts.
e. Applied pragmatics – studies the problems of interaction, arising in contexts where successful communication is critical, such as medical interviews, counseling, foreign language teaching etc.

Implicature
Implicature is derived from the verb 'to imply'. It is the pragmatic variant of implication
To imply means 'to fold something into something else' (from Latin verb *plicare*'to fold')
Hence, that which is implied is 'folded in', and has to be 'unfolded in order to be understood (Egenti, 2016)

Implicature vs. implication
Implication is a logical relation between two propositions (a linguistic representation of a state of affairs with a truth value)
p ………q (if p, the q)
The truth of the 2nd proposition concludes from the truth of the preceding proposition.
Example:
If you pass your degree exam (symb.*P)*
I'll take you to the US for your vacation (*q)*
P implies q.
Logically, the non-truth of the first proposition does not conclude to the non-truth of the 2nd i.e non-p does not imply non-q.
One could still do the contrary in spite of the non truth of the 1st of the 1st proposition.

Therefore, a logical implication does not have to correspond to what applies to everyday communication, hence, the need for a term that means beyond the logical 'implication'

Types of Implicature
Conversational implicature and
Conventional implicature

Conversational Implicature
  a. It is concerned with the way we understand an utterance in conversation in accordance with what we expect to hear.
  b. The basic assumption in conversationis that, otherwise indicated, the participants are adhering to the cooperative principle and the maxims.
  c. The following examples show a speaker conveying more than he said via conversational implicature
  d. People work in the assumption that a certain set of rules is in operation unless they receive indications to the contrary.
  e. Implicature can be undone or cancelled by further conversations.
  f. [implicature of some – not all]

  Example
  a: "I hope you brought the bread and cheese."
  b: "Ah, I brought the bread."
  g. Speaker B assumest hat A infers that what is not mentioned was not brought.

Conventional Implicature
  a. In contrast to the previous implicatures, these ones are not based on the cooperative principle's maxims. They are simply other meaning manifested by an expression regardless of use in conversation.
  b. They do not have to occur in conversation and do not depend on special contexts for interpretation.
  c. They are associated with specific words and result in additional conveyed meanings.

Trends in Pragmatics
There are many trends in pragmatics but the researcher discusses three of them here. Horn and Kecskes (2013: 366) believe that pragmatics is primarily an utterance-based field. Nevertheless, because utterance is not that easy to define and because utterance meaning is determined both by the linguistic components of a specific utterance and subsequent utterances, pragmatics has looked for meaning elements inside and outside the utterance. Consequently, three different approaches to pragmatics have emerged.

The first approach is referred to as pragma-semantics. It is pursued by the inheritors of Paul Grice and numerous scholars with a referential-logical background and with diverse degrees of commitment to truth conditionality. It concentrates on the construction of meaning through cognitive and formal models (de Saussure, 2007: 2).

A second trend, labeled pragma-dialogue, endeavors to attract attention to the dialogic nature of interaction through stressing the idea that interactants are actors who both act and react. Hence, the speaker-hearer not only interprets but also reacts to the other interactant's utterance. The dialogic principle identifies dialogue as a chain of actions and reactions (Horn and Kecskes, 2013: 366).

Another trend is pragma-discourse which goes beyond the utterance and shows a special consideration to socially determined linguistic behavior. It can be assumed that the crucial difference between pragmatics proper and discourse is that whereas the former concentrates on individual utterances(organized set of words) in context, the latter focuses on an organized set of utterances (ibid).

The relation between the components of utterances and the components of discourse is somewhat similar. It is assumed that discourses, just like utterances, possess properties of their own. Hence, an utterance is not the sum of the lexical items that forms it, nor is discourse the sum of the utterances that made it. Both single utterances and sequences of utterances are needed in order to uncover what is conveyed by interactants (ibid: 367). It is noteworthy that all the three trends discussed above try to discuss the issue of the speaker meaning, which is the basis of all of pragmatics.

Semantics

According to Abdurrahman (2019), semantics is the study of the meaning of words, phrases and sentences. Linguistic semantics deals with the conventional meaning conveyed by the use of words and sentences of a language. "Semantics is the study of meaning" (Lyons, 1977). In other words, semantics is the study of meaning in language. Furthermore, other scholars define semantics with different or similar perspectives. For instance, Saeed (1997) states that "semantics is the study of meaning communicated through language." In Lobner's (2002) perspective, "semantics is the part of linguistics that is concerned with meaning". However, Kreidler's (1998) opines that "Linguistic semantics is the study of how language organizes and express meaning." There are many types of meanings that could emanate from one's utterance or speech.

Types of Meaning

In semantics a lot of things join force to make meanings, hence the different types of meanings in semantics. The following types of meanings are discussed in this study.

Conceptual and Associative Meaning

a. Conceptual Meaning covers these basic, essential components of meaning which are conveyed by the literal use of a word. e.g. needle : thin , sharp, steel, instrument, etc.
b. Associative Meaning is the idea, connection what that specific word brings to you. e.g. needle : pain, doctor, illness, etc.

Semantic Lexical Relations

1. **Synonymy**: this is where two or more forms have very closely related meanings. e.g. broad – wide , hide – conceal
2. **Antonyms**: occurs when two forms are opposite in meaning .e.g. quick – slow. big – small
a. Gradable Antonyms: Antonyms that can be used in comparative constructions. e.g. bigger than – smaller than the negative of one member of the pair does not necessarily imply the other e.g. That dog is not old. (It does not have to mean "that dog is young")
b. Non-Gradable Antonyms (Complementary Pairs): Comparative constructions are not normally used, and the negative of one member does imply the other. e.g. deader / more dead => not possible e.g. that person is not dead : that person is alive.
3. **Hyponymy**: When the meaning of one form is included in the meaning of another, the relationship is described as hyponymy. e. g. rose – flower, carrot – vegetable, rose is a hyponymy of flower - carrot is a hyponymy of vegetable.
a. Animal (super ordinate) => horse / dog / bird
b. Horse, dog, bird => co- hyponyms of animal
4. Homophones and Homonyms
a. When two or more different written forms have the same pronunciation they are
Homophones as meet/meat, e.g. write/right
b. We use the term homonymy when one form (written or spoken) has two or more unrelated meanings. e.g. bank (bank – of a river) , (bank – financial institution)
5. **Polysemy**: When one form (written and spoken) has multiple meanings which are all related by extension. e. g . head => top of your body / top of a glass of beer / top of a company
6. **Metonymy**: Is a type of relation between words based simply on a close connection in everyday experience. e.g. bottle – coke (a container – contents relation) car – wheels (a whole – part relation) king - crown (a representative – symbol relation).
7. **Collocation**: The words that naturally go together. e. g. hammer – nail, table – chair, salt – pepper. They frequently occur together.

8. Presupposition: A presupposition refers to what is assumed by the speaker and/or assumed by him to be known to the hearer before he or she makes the utterance. Such semantic presupposition can be defined as a truth relation. As in the following example, if someone utters (a), then he or she must presuppose (b); otherwise, what he or she utters is nothing but nonsense:
(a) Mary's dog is barking. (p)
(b) Mary has a dog. (q)

Data presentation and analysis
In this section, we present the data according to their classification or contextual forms. We present many with semantic and pragmatic differences in a tabular form for easy identification and explanation whereas the remains would be written below with the discussions beside them.

Table 3.1: Betting languages

Words	Literal/semantic meaning	Bet meaning	Pragmatic meaning
1	An odd number	home win	this is when a club wins a match in her personal owned stadium. For example; Chelsea wins a match in Stanford Bridge, her stadium'
2	An even number	away win	'this is when a club wins a match in another club's owned stadium. For example; Chelsea wins a match in Old Trafford, Manchester United stadium'.
1x	Odd number and letter of the alphabet	home win or draw	'this is when a club either wins or plays draw in a match being played in her personal owned stadium'
X2	Letter of the alphabet and an even number	away win or draw	'this is when a club either wins or plays draw in a match being played in another club's owned stadium'
1-2	Odd and even number	anybody win (DC double chance)	'this is where either of the playing club is proposed/betted to win in the match'
Over 1.5	More than 1.5	2 or more goals	'this is when two or more than two goals are scored in a match'
Over 2.5	More than 2.5	3 or more goals	'this is when three or more than three goals are scored in a match'
Over 3.5	More than 3.5	4 or more goals	'this is when four or more than four goals are scored in a match'
Over 4.5	More than 4.5	5 or more goals	'this is when five or more than five goals are scored in a match'
Over corner 6.5	More than 6.5 corners	more than 7 corners	'this is when more than seven corner kicks are played in a match
Over corner 7.5	More than 7.5 corners	more than 8 corners	'this is when more than eight corner kicks are played in a match
Over corner 8.5	More than 8.5 corners	More than 9 corners	'this is when more than nine corner kicks are played in a match
Under 1.5	Below 1.5	1 or less goal	'this is when either one goal or less is scored in a match

Under 2.5	Below 2.5	2 or less goal	'this is when either two goals or less are scored in a match
Under 3.5	Below 3.5	3 or less goal	'this is when either three goals or less are scored in a match'
Under 4.5	Below 4.5	4 or less goal	'this is when either four goals or less are scored in a match'
Under corner 6.5	Below 6.5 corners	6 corners or less	this is when either six corner kicks or less are played in a match
Under corner 7.5	Below 7.5 corners	7 corners or less	this is when either seven corner kicks or less are played in a match
Under corner 8.5	Below 8.5 corners	8 corners or less	this is when either eight corner kicks or less are played in a match

1x and under 4.5   home win or draw and 4 goal or less
1x and over 4.5   home win or draw and 4 goals and above
GG   abbreviated form for goal goal   'this is when a goal is scored in a match'
NG   abbreviated form for no goal goal   'this is when no goal is scored in a match'
1x2/GG/NG   home or away win with either goal goal or No goal goal
M.G home   home win with specific goal difference
M.G away   away win with specific goal difference
Chance 1x   either of two options
ODD   goals scored should be counted as odd e.g. 3, 5, 7, etc.
EVEN   goals scored should be counted as even e.g. 2, 4, 6, 8, etc

Goal types
Shot   the goal must be scored with leg
Head   the goal must be scored with head
Penalty   the goal must be scored with penalty kick
1 win both   home should win both halves. The club in which the match is played in her stadium should win in both first and second halves
1 win either   home should win either of the halves either first or second
HT   half time (this is simply written in abbreviation)
Coupon slip   the ID that appear the bet slip
Ticket   also called bet slip or print out
Cashier   also called worker. This is the attendant in a bet house who administers the games to the betters.
Payout   payment made after every win
Cash-out   payment made after the interruption of a running ticket. When an individual wants to quit during ongoing games due to the fear of losing
out   entirely.
Running   on going game
Cut   no more going/running 'this occurs when one's series of betted games get stopped on the way as a result of a loss of one of the proposed positive assumed game'
Settled   paid or lost. This is the situation whereby the individual either wins and collects his payment or lose without any settlement.

Summary and Conclusion
From the data presented and analyzed, it is obvious that the betting languages are interesting and worth knowing even without the interest of the reader to venture into betting business. Moreover, as some of the jargons are simple and straight forward in understanding, others need clarification from someone into the business. For instance; *Head* 'the goal must be scored with head' and *Ticket* 'also called bet

slip or print out' can be easily be understood by a lay man without the knowledge of the betting jargon. Whereas *1x*   (home win or draw)   'this is when a club either wins or plays draw in a match being played in her personal owned stadium' can be only be understood by one who have consciously acquired the knowledge. It is also observed that *home* means when a football club stays in her club's stadium to play a match with another club who visits whereas *away* is when a football club visit another club in her stadium.

 It is therefore not a mere say that there is need for betting language vocabulary build up. This research has proven that the languages used in betting business are not difficult as many have thought. Furthermore, this is not educational background bound; which means that it can be understood by both the literates and illiterates. Though betters need knowledge of computer but it can also be possible as they will just be shown on the few movements to make with the mouse through the pointer of the cursor.

In conclusion, the semantics of the betting language could be pragmatically based or not. For pragmatically, it means that it is context based; whereas others are simply meaningful in isolation. Therefore, as some words that occur in betting are also used in other spheres of life, the meaning of the words used in betting is only known due to the context of its operation.

References

Abdurrahman, I.B. (2019). *Semantics*. College of Education for Women / Tikrit University. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/33251136 retrived on 1/12/2022.

De Saussure, L. (2007). *Procedural Pragmatics and the Study of Discourse*. Universite de Neuchatel.

Egenti, M. C. (2016). Pragmatics: Lecture presentation. Department of Linguistics: Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.

Horn, L. & Kecskes, I. (2013). Pragmatics, Discourse, and cognition. In Kreidler, C. W. (1998). *Introducing English Semantics*. London: Routledge.

Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lobner, S. (2002). *Understanding Semantics*. London: Blackwell.

Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantic*s, Vol.1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Mbagwu, D. U. (2016). Pragmatics: Lecture presentation. Department of Linguistics: Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.

Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. London: Blackwell publishing.

Saeed, John I. (1997). *Semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Verschueren, J. (1999). *Understanding Pragmatics*. London: Edward Arnold.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.