

OFFERING BRIBES: A LEGI-PRAGMATIC PERSPECTIVE

Basim Yahya Jasim AL-GBURI*

Abstract

Offering a bribe is generally thought of as giving something of value with corrupt intent to influence an action of a civil servant in his official capacity. This act can be accomplished physically or verbally hiding behind elaborate code words built in socio-pragmatic norms specific to a given community so that they can easily mislead those outside the transaction. The present paper approaches this offence from two perspectives: legal and pragmatic. It shows how it has been perceived in criminal laws and how it is realized through socio-linguistic expressions which can potentially be understood by the interactants as signs of offering bribes. The study is guided by two research questions: Are there linguistic expressions from which the speakers of Iraqi Arabic can typically infer that the speaker is offering bribes? And what insights can the pragmatic analysis offer the judge or trier of facts in evaluating the evidence on this offence? The major argument in the present paper is that the linguistic evidence can have no less evidentiary value in detecting the corrupt intent of bribery than the circumstantial evidence.

Keywords: *Bribery, Pragmatic analysis, forensic linguistics, criminal evidence, Iraqi context bribery in Iraq.*

1. Introduction

In everyday interaction people use verbal and nonverbal means of communication to convey the message to their interlocutors. Offer, agreement, disagreement, warning, accepting, refusing, requesting etc., can be performed by nonlinguistic means using gestures, body movements, hands or signs. Using language to request something or someone to do something, offering something to someone or agreeing to do something to someone are all actions that can also be performed through language. Such verbal actions are not suspected or incriminated. They are commonly used in normal communication. They are suspected and indicted only when they contain illegal elements. That is when what is being offered, requested or accepted is illegal or illegitimate. Technically speaking, when what is exchanged is illegal *quid pro quo*.

To most people bribery is no more than offering someone some money for doing something which he should not do and the other party, usually a public official, agrees to do it. It is the practice of enticing someone to do something he is otherwise unwilling or reluctant or legally forbidden to do, with money or gift. But bribery is much more complicated than this. It is applicable only when the transaction is forbidden by law either explicitly or implicitly and requires one party to break a law, or neglect his duties and typically involves a public official who agrees to do this illegal action. Bribes can hide behind terms ranging from direct to indirect using various strategies of indirectness and elaborate code words built in socio-pragmatic norms that are specific to a given community group and can easily mislead those outside the transaction.

The present paper attempts to consider offering bribes from two perspectives: legal and pragmatic

focusing on the pragmatic aspect. This is because the pragmatic manifestation has not been given its due interest in the literature on bribery despite the fact that the words that accompany the acts of offering, requesting, and accepting can change these physical acts into punishable crimes. This paper provides a data-based evidence on offering bribes with all its verbal manifestations in the Iraqi context in all its phases and from which interactants can easily infer the intended meaning which the speaker wants to convey. The major argument in the present study is that the linguistic evidence can have no less evidentiary value in detecting the corrupt intent of bribery than the circumstantial evidence. It is guided by two research questions: Are there linguistic expressions from which the speakers of Iraqi Arabic can typically infer that the speaker is offering bribes? And what insights can the pragmatic analysis offer the judge or trier of facts in evaluating the evidence on this offence?

Bribery: Legally Considered

Bribery is commonly thought of as a corrupt behaviour or a misconduct of a public official accused of betraying the public trust by requesting or accepting money, an article of value, or a benefit in return for his official responsibility. Collin (2000:36) defines it loosely as “the crime of giving someone a bribe-money offered corruptly to someone to get him to do something”. Oran and Tosti (2000:61) view it as the offering, giving, receiving or soliciting of anything of value in order to influence the actions of a public official”. Martin (1997:52) stipulates that the offer, reward, or advantage be given to a servant of a public body “in relation to any matter with which that body is concerned. A more comprehensive definition of bribery is provided by West’s Encyclopedia of American Law;

* Department of English, College of Arts, University of Mosul, Iraq. e-mail: algburi55@gmail.com

where bribery is seen as “the offering, giving, receiving or soliciting of something for the purpose of influencing the action of an official in the discharge of his or her public or legal duties. A bribe may consist of money, or of personal favour or benefit, a promise to later payment or privilege, or anything else the recipient views as valuable. “ (Hooper, 1968:118)

Bribery, as such, overlaps with related acts such as extortion and blackmail and grafts. For Perkins and Boyce (1982 in Garner 1999:605) the dividing line between bribery and extortion is shadowy. If one other than the officer corruptly takes the initiative and offers what he knows is not authorized fee, it is bribery; if the officer corruptly makes an unlawful demand which is made by one who does not realize it is not the fee authorized for the service rendered, it is extortion. For Martin (1997: 181) extortion is an offence committed by a public official who uses his position to take money or any other benefit that is not due to him. Lindgren (1993: 1695-1702) distinguishes between two types of extortion: extortion by threat and fear and extortion under colour of office. Coercive extortion refers to the illegal use of threat or fear to obtain property or advantages from another; extortion under colour office is the seeking of a corrupt payment by the public official because of his ability to influence official action.

By contrast, bribery seeks not only to have a preferential treatment but also to influence the official action in his or her favour. Thus, “the same envelop filled with cash can be a payment extorted under the influence of unfairly positive treatment”(Ibid:1700).

Blackmail is the act of getting money or a benefit from someone by threatening to make public information of a secret which a person does not want it to be revealed. Elliott and Quinn (2006: 219) and Martin (1997: 47) consider a person guilty of blackmail when he makes any unwarranted demand with menaces for the purpose of financial gain. Menace is the major criterion for distinguishing extortion and bribery from Blackmail.

Graft also overlaps with bribery. It is defined as offering, or receiving money, a benefit, or an article of value as a reward for a past official decision in an attempt to receive favourable consideration in the future. . Various states in the United states declare it a crime because the public is deprived of the right to receive honest and faithful service.

Thus, blackmail and extortion are similar to bribery in that both involve receiving money or advantage as an inducement for doing or omitting to do something. They differ from bribery in that bribery is an offence of a public official while blackmail and extortion are not. Also, both blackmail and extortion have varying degrees of menace, whereas bribes are mostly given voluntarily. Graft differs from bribery in that graft, unlike bribery, does not require an intent to influence or to be influenced .

Legally, bribery comprises three distinct types of acts: bribery of public officials, bribery of elections and

bribery of and by agents. The present paper is restricted to the first type of acts, namely, bribery of public officials.

In bribery of public officials two important elements must be available: a public official and a corrupt intent to influence or to be influenced in carrying out a public duty to wrongfully gain a financial or other advantage for himself or herself. And in order to find the defendant guilty of this offense most of world statutes, including Iraqi penal code No. 111 of 1969 Articles No.207-214 (amended), stipulates that the prosecutor must prove each of the following three elements beyond a responsible doubt: 1) That the accused offered, gave or promised something of value to a public official; 2) That the person(s) who solicited or received the money or article of value was at that time a public official; and 3) That the offerer and/ or the public official did so corruptly with the intention to influence an official act as a remuneration for the advantage or promise given.

The first element in bribery is that the public official must be a government officer or employee acting for or on the behalf of the government. The official act is usually understood as any decision or action which may at any time be pending or be brought before any public official, in such official capacity, or in such official's place of trust. The decisions or actions are those which are generally expected of public official.

The corrupt intent is the second important element in bribery which must be proved by the prosecutor beyond any responsible doubt. The court must contend beyond a reasonable doubt that a person who offers money or a thing of value corruptly to a public official acts knowingly and intentionally with the purpose of accomplishing an unlawful end regardless whether the act was successful or not.

Because of the importance of proving or disproving intent in bribery a detailed discussion of this concept will be made paying special attention to physical and verbal representation of the corrupt intent in bribery.

Intent is commonly viewed as a psychological phenomenon (De Jong 2011:1). It is a “mental state that a person may have regarding the doing of a future act” (Tiersma 1987:324). Black's Law Dictionary distinguishes between intent and motive. Unlike motive which is the inducement to do some act, intent is the mental resolution or determination to do it. It is the state of mind accompanying an act especially a forbidden act. (pp. 813-814). Various types of intent can be identified: intent can be general or pertaining to specific crimes; immediate relating to wrongful act or implied from speech or conduct. A person's intent cannot be easily proven by overt behaviour or witness's testimonies. The court, therefore, has to infer it from the subtotal of the circumstances including factual presumptions (Kadmi 1994 in Azuelos-Atias 2007:101).

In Bribery, the corrupt intent must be proved in the act of offering, soliciting and/ or accepting money or the items of value by the public official which will influence the discharge of his official duties in return for the payment. More specifically, “the item of value must be corruptly offered with the intent to induce that person to act in a particular way in his or her official capacity” (Solan&Tiersma 2007: 194). Likewise, the prosecution must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant, the public official acted with corrupt intent in exchange for the illegal *quid pro quo*.

It is not necessary to show that the public official to whom the bribe was offered was actually corrupted by the offer. Similarly, there is no need to show that the official accepted the bribe. Some statutes pass that regardless of who initiates the deal. Either party can be found guilty of the crime independently of the other. Saudi Arabia Anti Bribery Law in Resolution No.175 on 28-12-1412 AH provides in Article (9) that “any person offering a bribe, and which is not accepted from him shall be punished with imprisonment not exceeding (10) years or fine not exceeding one million Rials or both”. Article 313 of Iraqi Penal Code No.111 of 1969 provides that “anyone who offers a bribe to a public official and is not accepted from him shall be punished with imprisonment or fine”. This implies that there must be a corrupt intent in the mind of one of the parties; therefore it is personal not joint in nature. Yet, bribery is generally regarded as an offense of a public official and the offerer of the bribe is deemed an accessory whose punishment is derived from the punishment of the public official.

Bribery: Pragmatically considered

The act of bribery is partly physical and partly linguistic. The physical act is usually expressed through offering, or promising to offer, requesting, accepting or taking money, an article of value or a benefit. Linguistically, the act of bribery is usually expressed indirectly through words but its intention can be guessed by the interactants through various types of contextual and paralinguistic cues. Pragmatics, the study of the intended meaning of the speaker, the choice he makes, the effect his use of language has on other participants in an act of communication (Leech,1983;Crystal 1991;Yule1996) is particularly relevant to the linguistic analysis of bribery.

Pragmatists postulate that on any occasion the verbal action performed by a speaker consists of three related acts: locutionary; illocutionary, and perlocutionary (Austin,1962; Searle,1979). A locutionary act is the basic act of utterance or producing meaningful linguistic expressions: An illocutionary act is the use of well-formed utterances to perform specific communicative function(s): to make a statement, an offer, a suggestion ,and the like...The perlocutionary acts refer to the effect, the speaker wants to create upon other participant(s) while producing his utterance. Pragmatics, in fact, focuses on what is not explicitly

communicated and on how utterances in situational contexts are interpreted. It is concerned “not so much with the sense of what is said as with...what is communicated by the manner and style of an utterance” (Finch 2000:150). This is why the act of bribery can have pragmatic implications.

Speech Act Theory

An essential topic that exists in almost all books on pragmatics is speech acts. Speech act theory originally initiated by J. Austin (1962) in his book “How to do things with words” and developed by the philosopher John R. Searle assumes that a significant part of our use of language is to perform certain acts, and that utterances can be regarded as events in a similar way to other actions. Austin first distinguishes between constatives and performatives. Constatives are utterances such as statements and questions where actions are being described or asked about rather than explicitly performed. Performatives on the other hand are utterances the saying of which perform the actions named by the verbs (Finch 2000: 181). In order for specific utterances to be counted as performatives, a number of conditions must be met. These conditions are called felicity conditions. Austin (1962 in Levinson 1983 : 229) distinguishes three main categories of these conditions;

- a) There must be a conventional procedure having a conventional effect, and the circumstances and persons must be appropriate as specified in the procedure.
- b) The procedure must be executed correctly and completely, and
- c) Often the person must have the requisite thoughts, feelings and intention, as specified in the procedure and if consequent conduct is specified, then the relevant parties must do.

In addition to the felicity conditions, Yule (1996: 50) points out that in everyday contexts among ordinary people there are at least six preconditions on speech act. There are the general conditions, that they understand each other and are non sensical, content conditions, that the content of the utterance must be about a future event; preparatory conditions, that each act has its own preparation; sincerity conditions, that the speaker genuinely intends to carry out the future action; and essential conditions, that the utterance changes the state of action or being and create new state or obligation. In bribery, for example, the general condition is that each party ,the offerer and the offeree are serious and want to complete the transactions. The content condition is available in that offering bribes is for doing a future act. Sincerityconditions is met since both the parties intend to perform what they commit themselves to do.

Many suggestions have been offered to classify speech acts. The most important classification is the one presented by Searle (1977 in May 1993: 131). Searle distinguishes five main types of speech acts: representative, directives, commissives, expressives

and declarative. Representative speech acts represent a state of affairs where the intention is to make the words fit the world e.g. statements. Directives aim at directing the hearer towards doing something e.g. orders. Commissives are those types of speech acts in which the speaker commits himself to doing something e.g. promise. Expressives involve expressing a certain psychological state e.g. congratulations. Declarations are speech acts that bring about something to the world e.g. marriage and divorce (Cf. Leech 1983: 205-206; Finch 2000: 182).

Indirectness: Characteristics and Strategies

Speech acts of the kinds already mentioned can either be direct or indirect. A speech act is said to be direct when the form of the utterance coincides with what the speaker is intending to convey i.e. when the utterance directly, openly, plainly and bluntly communicates what it intends to communicate. By contrast in indirect speech acts there is a mismatch between expressed and implied meaning. In indirectness, Searle (1979: 31-32) notes that "the speaker communicates to the hearer more than he actually says by way of relying on their mutually-shared background linguistic and non-linguistic knowledge together with the general powers of nationality and inference on the part of the hearer.

Indirect speech acts are quite common in everyday conversation. Pinker et al (2008: 833) point out that people often do not blurt out what they mean in so many words; they, instead, veil their intentions in innuendo, euphemism, or double speaker. When people speak, they often insinuate their intent indirectly rather than stating it as a bald proposition. Examples include: sexual come-ons, veiled threats, polite requests, and concealed bribes. Because of most bribery acts are done indirectly a detailed discussion of the indirect speech acts is going to be made so as to provide a linguistic background for subsequent discussion.

Indirectness is an immediate and central concern of pragmatics. Obeng (1994: 42) views it as "a communicative strategy in which the interactants abstain from directness in order to obviate crises or in order to communicate difficulty and thus make their utterances consistent with this face and politeness". Indirectness is often appealed to for a variety of reasons. Thomas (1995: 143-6) points out that indirectness is universally used for four reasons: interestingness, increasing the force of the message, competing goals and politeness, and regard of face. In other words indirect speech is used to make the message more interesting, more forceful and effective and more politely expressed, to save face, avoid embarrassment, and to achieve the sense of rapport that comes from being understood without saying what one means. Dews et al (1995 in Alkhaffaf 2005: 94) believes that indirectness provides immunity to the speaker and frees him from full responsibility of what

he has meant. The speaker can easily claim that he is responsible for what he has actually said not for the indirect meaning that the listener attaches to what he has said.

A closer look at the various aspects of indirectness reveals that it has a number of characteristic features. Indirectness is said to be: a universal, intentional, non conventional, rational and risky linguistic phenomenon (Leech,1981;Levinson,1983; and Grundy,2000). It is a universal linguistic phenomenon because it is found in almost all cultures and societies although different cultures vary widely in how, when and where to use it. It is intentional in the sense that its aim is to "produce specific effect upon the hearer utilizing shared and/ or background knowledge, and interlocutor's rationality and inference" (Thomas 1995: 119). It has non-conventional forms, most of them use non conventional forms i.e. forms which are not commonly used to communicate the function intended. It is rational in that "speaker is behaving in a rational manner to avoid embarrassment or face threatening" (Dascal1993 in Ibid: 121). Finally, indirectness is costly and risky: it takes longer time for the hearer to understand what the speaker wants to convey; and the hearer may not understand the speaker's intention or he may misinterpret the intended meaning that is expressed indirectly (Ibid).

In everyday communication, the frequent use of indirectness is said to be governed by a number of variables the most important of which are: the relative power of the speaker upon the hearer, the social distance between the interactants, and the degree of imposition, rights and obligations each party enjoys (Thomas 1995: 124-9). The employee, for example tends to be more indirect when expressing his dissatisfaction about his employer. By contrast, you feel in less need to employ indirectness when you feel close to someone, or similar to his age, social class, occupation etc. You need to use indirect speech when the size of imposition is relatively great as when you ask someone to do something to you which might be greater than his ability or beyond his ability. Finally indirectness depends on whether or not the speaker has the right or obligation to affect the hearer's behaviour.

Indirectness can be expressed in various ways. In relevant literature, these are called strategies of indirectness. Research work on indirectness (Brown and Levinson 1987, Obeng 1994, and Bull 2003 in Alkhaffaf 2005) identify six strategies in which indirectness find expressions: metaphors, innuendoes, euphemism, proverbs, circumlocution and evasion.

A metaphor is a twisted speech or writing used by a speaker or writer to embellish his/her utterance or writing by asserting that something is equivalent to another which in most ways different. It is sometimes appealed to save face and to give the indication that the speaker possesses good speech. Innuendo or insinuation is an indirect suggestion often with harmful connotation.

Innuendo is often resorted to when the interactants are engaged in delicate issues without being engaged in direct verbal dueling (Obeng 1994: 53). The user of the innuendo can easily claim immunity provided that it is used responsibly without mentioning the name of the person whom the innuendo is directed at.

Euphemism is usually appealed to when talking about delicate things or topics to overcome unfavourable implications or unpleasant connotation of a word or phrase by another which has less harsh and more cheerful expressions (New mark 1963 in Naoum 1995: 5) as when a man saying that his wife's physical structure is changed instead of saying that his wife has become pregnant. This strategy is said to flout Gricean maxims of perspicuity in that it is less clear (Obeng 1994: 58). Yet, it can be seen as witty and eloquent and saves one's face.

The strategy of using proverbs is by far the commonest strategy in which indirectness finds expression. Obeng (Ibid: 43) notes that the impersonal nature of the proverb helps the user to claim immunity from any social or individual penalty that might otherwise have been imposed.

Circumlocution is a roundabout way of stating things. It is defined by McArthur (1981: 367) as "the use of a large number of unnecessary words to express an idea needing fewer words especially trying to avoid directly answering a difficult question". The excessive use of words may communicate to the interlocutor that the speaker does not like to answer the question directed to him or to talk about the point under question. Circumlocution again, flouts Grice's maxim of manner "be brief"; yet it is recommended to maintain face and a polite way for refusing or accepting a controversial view point.

Unlike circumlocution, evasion is derived from the verb evade "to get out of the way or escape from" (McArthur 1981: 620) It is a sort of tricky avoidance of answering delicate or embarrassing question which one has no option but to answer. It is a kind of face maintenance answer to a face threatening questions. Bull and Mayer (1988 in Al khaffaf 2005: 26) summarize the options available to the speaker to evade critical or embarrassing questions among which are: ignoring the question asked, attacking the question, apologizing, or declining to answer the question, stating that the question has already been answered or repeating the answer to a previous question. Again, evasion flouts Grice's maxim of reference 'be relevant'; yet it an indirect strategy to keep up cooperation, overcoming face threatening and saving face in a tricky manner.

Having identified the strategies that are commonly used in indirect speech act, the question to be addressed now is: how is it possible for the hearer or interactant to uncover the intended meaning of the speaker "the unsaid" from "the said", i.e. the literal meanings of the words uttered by the speaker? Put it

simply, how does the interactant get to the indirect meaning the speaker aims at?

Considerable research has been devoted to provide an answer to this question. Grice (1975:) maintains that the interactant is able to guess the implied meaning of the speaker because competent language users are usually cooperative and observed the shared rules of conversation which are subsumed under what he called cooperative principle. This principle dictates that the speaker's contribution is supposed to be informative, truthful, relevant, brief, clear, unambiguous and orderly. Technically speaking, the speaker's contribution should satisfy the maxims of quality, quantity, relation and manner. (Cf. Levinson 1983; Grundy 2000). Violating one or more of these maxims will lead the hearer to make what Grice calls "Conversational Implicature". Grice's theory of implicature tries to explain a hearer gets from what is said to what is meant in occasions when the speaker conveys more than, or different from, the literal meaning of his words and expressions. To this end, Grice distinguishes, first between conventional and non-conventional or conversational implicature. Conventional implicature is evident from using specific lexical expressions and does not depend on special contexts for their interpretation. The use of 'but' and 'yet' in any sentence have the implicature of contrast; 'even' implicates 'contrary to expectation' (Yule 1996: 45). By contrast conversational implicature is context dependent. It depends for their interpretation on a wide range of contextual information including information about the participants and their relationship with each other (Finch 2000: 167).

The Speech Act of Offering Bribes:

In everyday situations offering may be accomplished through physical and/or verbal acts (i.e. through language). Nobody is convicted for offering a service, an assistance, or money to another for humanitarian purposes. Yet an offer is indicted when the offer involves an illegal element i.e. when the offer is made in remuneration to an illegal act to be done by the offeree. Shuy (1993: 43) notes that "the difference between an offer and a bribe lies in: *in the quid pro quo* of a bribe". Before we identify the distinctive features of the speech act of offering bribes, a review of the speech act of offering, in general, is required.

Offering is commonly understood as presenting or promising to present something (money, thing, or service) to express acknowledgement, or to maintain positive social relationships leaving the offeree the choice to accept or deny the offer. Hickey (1986, cited in Al-Sha'baan 1999: 15) argues that as a speech act, offering involves a sort of commitment on the part of the speaker independent of the hearer. Following Searle's (1979) classification of speech acts, Hancher (1979: 7) views offering as a commissive – directive speech act requiring two participants to act: the offerer who looks forward towards the completion of the act by

a positive response from the offeree. Tiersma (1986: 190, 197-198) argues that the speech act of offering must adhere to two basic types of rules: those that regulate the process of offering and those that count as placing the offerer under the obligation to carry out the terms of the bargain. These must be accompanied by a particular intent.

Addaraji et al. (2012: 4) suggest that the speech act of offering be accounted for in terms of orientation: whether the offer is speaker-oriented, hearer-oriented or speaker-hearer-oriented depending on the speaker's intent to commit himself, the hearer or both. In speaker-oriented offers, the speaker commits himself to do something to the hearer who is a mere observer, e.g. *Shall I get you a chair?* In hearer-oriented offers, the speaker directs the hearer to do an act if the hearer accepts the offer, e.g. *Have a coke!*; while in speaker-hearer-oriented offers, both the speaker and hearer commit themselves to do an act on condition that the hearer accept the offer, e.g. *Perhaps we should have other cups of tea.*

The speech act of offering is also said to be culture-bound. The ways offering is done have cultural implications and differ from culture to culture (Leech, 1983). The ways offering is made or expressed are considerably affected by the cultural value, customs and tradition and have, therefore, different implications.

In terms of politeness theory, the speech act of offering is seen as a face threatening act. Within politeness theory, 'face' is understood as every individual's feeling of self-worth or self image; This image can be damaged, maintained or enhanced through interaction with others (Thomas, 1995: 169). Brown and Levinson (1987: 13) distinguish between two types of face wants: positive and negative. Positive face is reflected in the speaker's desire to be approved of, respected and appreciated by others; whereas negative face refers to the speaker's desire to be unimpeded, or put upon and to have the freedom to do what s/he wants to do. Within this framework, offering is done baldly or directly when the offer is in the hearer's interest. By contrast, offering is made indirectly when it is in the speaker's interest, when it is highly demanding on the part of the hearer, when the speaker expects that his offer might be denied by the hearer, or when the offer damages the hearer's self-image or his reputation in the eyes of others. For these reasons, the speaker uses various strategies of indirectness to mitigate his offering.

The speech act of offering bribes share the general speech act of offering in several respects. First, it is speaker-hearer-oriented in the sense that the offerer commits himself to what he has promised to offer only when the offeree does or promises to do what is required from him by the offerer in response to the remuneration received or promised to receive. Second, there must be an intent-the offer intends to pay or present or do something and the offeree intends to do something to the offerer. Third, it is a face-threatening

act in that offering a bribe can have a bearing on both interactants and is normally refused and might lead the offerer to jail. It is, therefore, most often made indirectly to leave a chance for denial by both parties.

The speech act of offering bribes, however, has a number of features which set it apart from the general speech act of offering. To me, the characteristic features of offering bribes are the following:

First, Applying Austin's felicity conditions to bribery, in order for the speech act of offering bribery not to misfire, the offeree must be a public official having specific power or authority, and both the parties perfectly know that what they are doing is illegal, yet they intend to accomplish the deal to the end.

Second It is a speech act of corrupt intent. The offerer promises to present money, an article of value or a service to a public official in exchange for a benefit an illegal act done by the public official for the benefit of the offerer. It is this corrupt intent which is incriminated by law.

Third, it is mostly done indirectly. The offerer rarely uses bald-on-record strategies (to use Brown and Levinson's 1987 terms) in offering. This is because it is highly face-threatening act. S/he most often use indirect strategies and conversational implicatures to communicate his corrupt intent. S/he may use double meaning expressions, jokes, overstatements, maneuvering, etc., to save his face in case that the offeree does not accept the offer and also not to harm the offeree's reputation or self-image. Indirectness is also appealed to because these strategies can help him to easily deny his corrupt intent and thereby escape from punishment.

Fourth, it may be preceded by negotiations with a third party especially when it occurs for the first time so that the offerer comes to the offeree (the public official) with full background knowledge about her/him and prior agreement about what, when, where and how it will be paid. When there is no third party, preparatory strategies such as requesting for help, explaining the problematic situations, checking the person(s) who can help doing what s/he wants and whether the person can accept a bribe to complete the corrupt transaction. Fifth, it is speaker-hearer oriented in the sense that both the offerer and the offeree benefit from the transaction when the offer is accepted by the offeree.

Sixth, it is a bilateral corrupt contract. The offerer commits himself to pay what he promises to offer and the offeree (the public official) commits himself or promises to do what is required from him by the offerer.

Seventh, it is socially-conditioned and culturally-bound. What is sometimes regarded as a grant, a present or a gift in a given situation or context in one society might be regarded as a bribe or a graft in another society.

Eighth, it is context-dependent. The words or expressions uttered by the offerer have context-dependent meaning which are usually more or difficult from what the words might literally say. They are, therefore, understood differently by different

participants in a given communicative event. This will help the offerer to claim that his/her words have been wrongly understood.

Ninth, the offeree must be a public official and the act to be done must be within his capacity.

From a socio-linguistic perspective, offering bribes is to be viewed as a speech event of special type. A speech event is "a piece of linguistic interaction, a communicative happening consisting of one or more utterances" (Criper and Widdowson, 1975: 185). As a speech event, offering bribes consists of a series of predictable events which seem to be recurrent in most bribery cases. They usually take four phases: stimulation, negotiation, agreement/disagreement, and extension (cf. the four phases of bribery-problem, proposal, completion and extension-suggested by Shuy, 1993: 21-24).

In Iraq, the phases of offering bribery usually take the following route: A problematic situation is stimulated by expressions of some kind uttered by a public official indicating that the application cannot be managed in a normal way, or a contravention of special type which requires paying a lot or being demanding is committed. Next, a negotiation starts either directly or indirectly through a third party as a mediator in order to overcome or help solve the problematic situation. Then, the transaction may either succeed- when both agree on the terms of the deal or fail -when one of or both the parties disagree on the terms or the transaction itself. Finally, extension can be made when the parties agree to extend the agreement to include future transactions.

Data Collection procedure and Analysis:

Participants:

In order to collect the data on the verbal act of offering bribes two groups of people were purposefully selected for providing the expressions and utterances that are commonly used by the interactants in the speech event of stimulating, negotiating, agreeing/disagreeing, and extending phases of offering bribes. The first group included public officials who were in direct contact with people and applicants in special institutions where offering, requesting and/or receiving bribes are quite probable. The public officials were randomly selected from those who work in the Vehicle Registration Department, police officers who work in criminal investigations, and public servants who work in immigrations and passport office especially those responsible for issuing passports, and civil servants working in property conveyance section in Real Estate Registration office – Mosul Branch, and those working as tax assessors in the General Commission of Taxation – Mosul Branch. The participants in this group were asked to write down as many occasions and cases as possible that stimulate or drive the applicants to have their things done illegally and even tend to offer bribes indirectly to have their affairs completed. They were also asked to write down

expressions that are typically regarded as an indirect offering of bribes.

The second group of participants were solicitors, auctioneers, lawyers who are regularly in direct contact with the groups above and pursuants who apply for the offices mentioned above for one reason or another. The participants in this group were asked to write down the cases and circumstances that force them to follow illegal means and ways to have their applications done and their affairs completed.

Instrument

The instrument that was found to be appropriate to collect the data was two versions of an open-ended questionnaire. The first version was presented to the first group. It reads as follows: "owing to your position in the office, being responsible for performing or supervising actions or applications directly pertinent to a large class of people and in direct contact with those who want to have their applications or business done, you come across people who persist on having their things done quickly and perfectly, legally or sometimes illegally. Would you kindly write down the cases or occasions when those people offer or promise to offer directly or indirectly money, service, article of value, benefit and the like to have things done for them; and the recurrent expressions as far as you remember from which you infer that they are indirectly offering bribes"?

The second version was presented to the second group. It reads as follows: "Due to your business as a regular pursuant or solicitor, being in direct contact with public servant especially those working in the Directorate of Traffic office, Passports Office, Real Estate registration, the General Commission of Taxation and the like, would you kindly write down the cases in which you have no way but to offer a bribe to have your application done quickly, and the expressions from which you infer that you should have to pay or promise to pay, money, an article of value or, a benefit if you want to have your business or application done quickly and smoothly.

In addition to the questionnaire, interviews with a number of public officials, solicitors, auctioneers, and lawyers were made asking them to remember as many expressions as possible from which one infers that the speaker offers a bribe of some kind to have his business or application done.

Data analysis and discussion

The data collected were put into four categories: the expressions that indirectly stimulate the applicant to think of an illegal way to have his application or business done; the expressions commonly used in negotiation; the expressions that signal that the offer is accepted or denied; and the expressions which indicate that the transaction can be extended to other cases.

Below are the expressions that stimulate the applicants to think of illegal ways to have his business done from the points of view of the public officials in the institutions already mentioned.

Expressions	No.	Translation
السيارة عليها شارة حجز.	1.	There has been a sign of attachment on your car in the vehicles register.
رقم الشاسي مختلف عما مثبت في السجلات.	2.	The chassis number of your car is different from the one fixed in our records.
لازم ترجع الى الكمارك لتدقيق رقم الشاسي.	3.	You have to go back to custom office to check up the chassis number again.
لازم ترجع على الفحص وتفحص السيارة مرة أخرى.	4.	You have to go back to the inspection office to check up your car again.
أرجع إلى نفس الدائرة لختمة ثانية. الختم غير واضح.	5.	The stamp is not clear. You have to go back to the same office to stamp it again.
لازم بجي المالك الشرعي شخصياً.	6.	The legitimate owner must personally attend in front of me.
تعال بعد يومين بلكي يصلك السرة.	7.	Come back in two days, I will put your application in the queue.

The expressions above are quite normal in the vehicles registration office. There is nothing in them that leads or stimulates the interactant to offer bribes. What changes these expressions into stimulations that motivate some interactants to offer bribes to have their business done illegally is the communicative event or circumstance of the individual interlocutors and the background knowledge the public official has about the applicant.

To begin with, expression No. 1 above stimulates offering a bribe when the applicant perfectly knows that the car has been officially attached and wants to lift the attachment sign illegally. Expression No. 2 leads to offering bribery when the applicant knows that the number of the chassis was fake or tampered with or does not want to go to the custom office to fix it correctly. Expressions No. 3, 4 and 5 lead to think of offering a bribe when the applicant has had painful experience in the custom office and that checking up

the chassis number in the custom office or in the inspection office where very long queues of cars are waiting for him require a lot of time. Here, the interactant has no way but to negotiate with the public official to solve the problem. Expression No. 6 leads to think of offering bribes when the applicant is not the legitimate owner and that the owner cannot attend personally either because he is dead or very difficult for him to attend the registration office. Expression No. 7 enhances negotiation with the public official and may sometimes offer a bribe when the applicant is from another governorate, lives in the suburbs, or his residence is far away from the custom office and cannot stay for days in a hotel waiting for his business to be done.

The frequent expressions reported by those working in direct contact with people in the passport office and found to be leading to offering bribes were the following:

Expressions	No.	Translation
صعب وتجديده منتهي جوازك.	1.	Your passport is expired and it's renewal is not easy.
تعمل ترجع لازم تصحيحه وصعب خطأ الجد أسم جديد من المعاملة.	2.	Your surname is wrong and you need to check it and the whole application should be renewed.
العامّة للمديرية أبعثها لازم ينشال وصعب منع عليك.	3.	You are prohibited from travelling abroad and lifting the prohibition mark is not easy.
تدبرلك إستمارة ولازم خلصت الإستمارات.	4.	The application forms have finished. You have to obtain one.
تبدلها لازم قديمة بالمعاملة المدنية الأحوال هوية.	5.	The identity card is expired. You need a new one.

The first expression may lead the applicant to offer bribes to have his passport renewed when he needs to travel abroad urgently. Utterance No. 2 stimulates offering bribes to correct the surname because the applicant perfectly knows that the legal route may take days or weeks but can be easily corrected by the public official in charge himself. The same applies to utterance No. 3 where the applicant absolutely knows that he will not be allowed to travel

abroad unless he negotiates with the officer in charge to convince him to overlook the prohibition issued against him and permits him to travel. Utterance No. 4 stimulates the crooked way to get an application form only when it is limited in number but essential for the application for a passport. Utterance No. 5 has nothing on the face of it. It obliges the applicant to think of an illegal way only when he learns that changing the

identity card is a very difficult task and needs a lot of time and effort.

The cases that were reported to invite offering bribes in the taxation office mostly come under the following circumstances:

Expressions	No.	Translation
لم تراجع منذ مدة والضريبة عليك كثيرة	1.	You have not shown up for a long time. I'm afraid the tax is high.
عندك أعذار حتى نساعدك بالضريبة	2.	Have you got excuses to help you?.
معاملتك طويلة عريضة وتحتاج وقت حتى نصفيها روح تعال بعد أسبوع	3.	Your application needs a lot of time to finish. Come back next week.
معملك عليه ضريبة مضاعفة لأن مكانه من منشأ أوربي	4.	Your factory will have a high tax because its machinery is of European origin.
تعال غداً حتى نطلع معاك كشف على معرضك	5.	Come back tomorrow. We will assess the tax on your show on the spot.

The first utterance incites the applicant to think of a wrapped way to bribe the public official only when he knows that the tax will be high. The second utterance arouses in the applicant the tendency to offer a bribe when he understands that the excuses decrease the amount of the tax but he has no excuses and wants the public official to help him in this respect. In the third case, the utterance instigates the applicant to bribe the public official when he has no time to wait for a week or more and wants his business done quickly. The fourth utterance greatly invites the applicant to think of

a twisted way to change the place of origin of his machinery or a way which may reduce the amount of tax which he is supposed to pay. The fifth utterance invokes the tendency to offer a bribe when the applicant utterly knows that on the spot inspection will make the tax assessor increase the tax considerably.

In the real estate registration office, the following cases were reported to invite the applicant to think of an illegal way to have things done for his benefit in the most appropriate way.

Expressions	No.	Translation
البيت عليه شارة حجز بالسجل	1.	There is a sign of attachment on your house in the registrar.
الحمل مال البيت ما مثبتت بالسجل	2.	The buildings have not been fixed in the registrar.
لازم نطلع كشف حتى نقدر نقدر الرسوم	3.	We have to see your house to estimate the charge.
السند قديم ولازم تطلع سند جديد بالعقار	4.	The title deed is old. You need a new title deed for your house.
تحتاج لجلب كتاب من دائرة القاصرين احد الورثة قاصر	5.	One of the inheritors is a minor and you need to bring a certificate from the Minor's Affairs office.
لازم تروح إلى بغداد تجيب صورة قيد دارك	6.	You have to go to Baghdad to bring a copy of your house record.

In the utterance No. 1, the claimant wants to lift the attachment sign at all costs because this sign prevents him from selling or buying the real estate. In the utterance No. 2, the claimant wants to fix the buildings on his land and recognizes that this needs a lot of time and effort a case which motivates him to pay something to have his buildings fixed. Utterance No. 3 invites the inquirer to convince the public official not to go on spot inspection to assess the charges especially when he perfectly knows that on the spot assessment would be much higher. Utterance No. 4 may motivate the applicant to think of convincing the public official to overlook the date especially obtaining a new copy of the title deed takes time and a lot of effort. Utterance No. 5 stimulates the inquirer to ignore this certificate when he finds it difficult or impossible for him to obtain such a certificate from the minor's' Affairs office. Finally, utterance No. 6 invokes thinking of a twisted way to persuade the public official to ignore this

certificate by offering a bribe especially when obtaining such a certificate is not very much necessary or when going to Baghdad is costly and risky.

From the view points of solicitors', auctioneers', lawyers and regular pursuants who are regular customers in the offices above, some public officials in those offices are artful in creating obstacles or demanding the applicants to submit documents most of which can be overlooked leaving no choice for them but to pay or promise to pay a bribe to have his application or business done. The utterances above were mostly attached by expressions from which one may indirectly infer that the pursuant has to pay in order for his business to be completed.

A part from the minute differences in the expressions that are recurrent in each office, solicitors, auctioneers, lawyers and regular pursuants reported a number of utterances that are regularly attached to the situations already mentioned:

Expressions	No.	Translation
بسبب شوفنا ونشوفك	1.	Simple, scratch my back and I'll scratch yours.
فرحنا نفرحك	2.	My happiness is your happiness.
فيد وأستفيد	3.	Mutual benefit.
أدهن أيدك وبسيطة	4.	Show me kindness.
حرك أيدك حتى أتحرك	5.	Move your hand to make me move.
شوية حركني ليش واقف خامل؟	6.	Do something, do not just stand there.
معاملتك تحتاج خروج	7.	Your application needs wheels.
مع هذا شغلتك بسيطة بس ينرادلها مصرف	8.	Your work is easy but it will cost.
لا تشيل هم بس خالي للسيارة بانزين	9.	Don't worry, just put fuel in the car.
سهلة بس لا تنسونا	10.	Don't worry, but keep us in mind.
بسبب بس شوفني البطاقة الحمراء	11.	Consider it done. Just show me the 'red card'.
الشغلة ينرادلها دفعة	12.	Your application needs a push.
أريد أكمل معاملتك بس أخاف لا باص الدائرة يفوتني	13.	I want to complete your application, but I'm afraid that I might miss my bus.
هذي تمشي بدقتر	14.	This needs (copybook)ten grand to be completed.

The expressions above are commonly uttered by the public officials when the pursuant or applicant please them to help him giving different reasons. Unlike the expressions provided by the public officials which are constatives and stating facts and have informative functions, the expressions provided by the second group - auctioneers, solicitors, pursuants, applicants and the like, are performatives and negotiable. They are performatives in that when uttering them the speaker is not telling facts or imparting information; he is, actually, requesting, or urging his interlocutor to negotiate or bargaining with his job in exchange for a personal benefit. Still, unlike the expressions of the first group, almost all the expressions used are indirect employing a variety of linguistic strategies to convey them. Of course, these are commonly uttered when the public official feels the difficulty that would face the applicant in providing the documents he requests or the task he is required to perform to have his application request or claim carried out. Also, these expressions are most often said by the public official sarcastically with tricky laughter to save his face when his interlocutor refuses the transaction or misunderstands his intention, leaving a space to deny his intention to solicit a bribe and that his words have been wrongly interpreted.

The expressions above were reported by the auctioneers, pursuants, solicitors and those in direct contact with the public officials who are fully aware that all the words and expressions above refer to one thing, namely, a bribe paid to the public official to have him nudge the applicant's business or application under his charge.

The question now is: how is it possible for those people to make a relationship between "what is said" with "what is implicated" in different situational contexts. The answer to this question was provided by Grice (1975) who maintains that the interactants are able to understand each other's intended meaning owing to conventions agreed upon in a given

communicative event subsumed under what he called "cooperative principle" and conversational maxims. The cooperative principle suggests that one's contribution to be "such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (Levinson, 1983: 101). To have an effect, the utterance made by the speaker is expected to follow four maxims: of quality-be truthful and never say what you believe to be false; of quantity-make your contribution as informative as is required; of relevance-be relevant to the topic you are talking about; and of manner-be brief, orderly and avoid ambiguity (Ibid: 101-102).

Relevant to the cooperative principle is the notion of presupposition which is a proposition taken for granted by the speaker and is supposed to be known by the hearer although it is not explicitly stated (Cruse, 2006: 137). Presupposition is of two types: semantic and pragmatic. Semantic presupposition is conventionally triggered by using certain words or expressions such as iteratives, verbs that indicate a change of state, implicatives, verbs and certain grammatical constructions; whereas pragmatic presupposition is inferred from the situational context (for details, see Yule, 1996; Saeed 1997; and Grundy, 2000).

In addition to the speech act theory, these two notions are highly relevant in bribery cases. They can help in explaining how the intention of the offerer, solicitor and acceptor can be understood without being explicitly stated. Thus, the utterances reported by the auctioneers, pursuants, solicitors etc., are not uttered to impart information. They are uttered to negotiate with their interlocutors the terms of bargaining of the act to be performed with the public official for the applicant's benefit in exchange for the money, article of value or a benefit to be given or promised to be given by the applicant.

The expressions reported by the second group where each of which can attach to any of the utterances

regularly reported by the first are obviously speech acts. These speech acts communicate one basic communicative function- that of requesting bribes. This communicative function has mainly been communicated indirectly using various strategies of indirectness. The speaker depends on the presuppositions he assumes on the part of his interlocutors and his interlocutors are mostly able to figure out the speaker's intended meaning on the basis of their background knowledge, contextual clues, in addition to the cooperative principle, and conversational maxims already mentioned. Thus, when hearing the utterances above, the rational applicant is fully aware of how to care for, , what 'hand oiling', 'hand movement', 'trucks' mean in the context under question, how the application 'costs' and what 'putting benzene in the car' suggests; what 'remembering' implies and what the 'red card' connotes, how to nudge the application, what 'missing the bus' hints, and what 'notebook/buck' refers to. Counting on the presupposition, conversational implicature and contextual cues, the speaker assumes that the listener understands his metaphors like 'oil your hand', 'put

trucks', 'red card' or 'notebook'. In the Iraqi context people conventionally use the phrase 'oil/lubricate your hands' to refer to giving money, 'trucks' to 'facilitate doing something' and the "red card" to refer to the bank-note of 25 thousand Iraqi Dinars and the "book" to "bucks" i.e. 100 US dollars.

Of course, loading these expressions with double meaning to indirectly refer to money or an article of value is a maneuver to cover the malicious intent, to save face and deny any accusation of him for soliciting bribes assuming that he has never asked for money and that the words he uttered were wrongly and maliciously interpreted.

Soliciting bribes can or cannot be instigated by the public official. In fact, very few public officials working in the offices above solicit for bribes in comparison with those subjected to various cases of offering bribes without being solicited. The following expressions were reported by the public officials who completed the questionnaire and were interviewed in the present study and subjected to various cases of offering bribes:

Expressions	No.	Translation
أله يخليك مشيها واني حاضر	1.	Please, let this slide and I'll be ready for everything you want.
أدفعها وأتعاكب موجودة	2.	Nudge it, and I'll make it worth your while.
أشتأمر أني حاضر بس خلصني	3.	I am ready for everything. Just finish it please!
كملها وما راح أقصر ويأك	4.	Just finish it and I'll do what you want.
هلا هلا بينا بالضريبة وتندل	5.	Reduce the tax amount and I am ready for whatever you say.
بس خلصني من الكمر ك وأشتأمر أني حاضر	6.	Just help me with the custom duties and I am ready to do what you want.
بس شيل الحجز المنع واللي تأمر بيه تندل	7.	Just lift up the compounding prohibition and say what you want.
صاحب /عندي بنزينخانة /إذا تحتاج شي أنا صايغ صاحب معرض سيارات /مطعم	8.	If you need anything I am a goldsmith/ I have a petrol station / a restaurant in Al-Majmu'a/car showroom/ dealer.
بس سوي البنجر والهوا موجود	9.	Just do the puncture and the air is handy.
أعجنها والخمرة موجودة	10.	Knead it and the yeast is at your hand.

The utterances above signal the third phrase of offering bribes. These utterances usually follow the ones uttered by the public officials indicating that negotiations can be made and a sort of compromise can be reached. In the first four utterances the applicants request the public officials to make their applications up and that they are ready to offer the interactants what they want-usually money-in exchange for what the public officials are going to do illegally or illegitimately for him. These utterances were quite normal and recurrent in almost all public offices and reported by almost all participants and interviewees in the present study. Utterances five and six were particularly used in Real Estate Registration Office and General Commission of Taxation Office because the tax and custom can be very high, a case which leaves the door open for negotiation to reduce them

considerably. In utterance seven, negotiations to lifting up the attachment sign is recurrent in the Real Estate Registration Office while prohibition from traveling abroad is commonly found in Passport Office. Canceling the attachment sign or prohibition from traveling abroad is not an easy task and the applicants are sometimes ready to pay millions of Iraqi Dinars for such canceling. This is why there have always been rooms for negotiations and offering bribes.

Utterances No. 8, 9 and 10 are different from their predecessors in that they are highly indirect. They can be approached pragmatically because the speaker says something and means a completely different thing. In the utterances above, the words do not say what they mean. They are not answers to questions like what do you do for living? From the context in which they are used, the presupposition the speaker made on the part

of the listener, social background knowledge, the cooperative principle and implicature in addition to the conversational maxims already pointed out. The utterances “I am a goldsmith”, “I have a petrol station” and “I have a restaurant in Al-Majmu'a” or “I have an auto show” have only one communicative function: “I am rich, I have a lot of money and I can pay what you say, just process my application within your authority”. The same applies to utterance No. 9 where the speaker uses a metaphor “puncture” to refer to the application which failed to move smoothly and to “the air” to refer to the bribe (the money) which can help in making the application proceed again. The same relationship applies to the “dough” and the “ferment” which changes the dough to bread. Again, the application which needs to proceed is linked to the dough which needs to be “knead” and the “ferment” which turns the “dough” to bread is linked to the money which can be paid in exchange making up the application in an illegal way.

The communicative function of offering bribes can be easily understood by those who were used to hear such expressions and to work on the basis of the

promise given. Those who are outside such types of communicative events and transactions may not understand what these utterances exactly mean and why they have been uttered in that situation. This will give the interactants additional immunity and safety and help them escape from the accusation of offering and of soliciting bribes claiming that their utterances mean what they say and that the interpretations given to their utterances were not right.

Offering bribes can also be viewed as a commissive speech act in which one party commits himself to give or do something to the other party. In the transaction, the offerer commits himself to pay money, a service, or a benefit to the public official in exchange for processing the application legally or illegally. By contrast the public official commits himself to process the application in exchange for the money, service or benefit he got or will get from the offerer. This transaction is negotiable in the sense that one party, usually the public official, may accept or deny the terms of the deal. The following expressions were reported by the interviewees as verbal signs of agreement by either party.

Expressions	No.	Translation
أعتمد بسيطة.	1	I can manage it. You can count on me.
تنتكل.	2.	With pleasure.
ما أركك.	3.	You can not be denied.
صار.	4.	Done.
أتفقنا.	5.	It is a deal!
أعتبرها منتهية/خلص.	6.	You can consider it finished. It's done.

As for the expressions used to decline an offer, the following utterances were also reported by the same interviewees to be regularly used for declining the offer.

Expressions	No.	Translation
أسف، ما أقدر.	1.	Sorry, I can't.
هلا بيك بس الشغلة ما تصبر.	2.	You are welcome, but your application cannot proceed!
كامل المعاملة/أشئو أنت ووين تشتغل ما يهمني.	3.	I do not care who you are or what you do, complete your documents.
حالك حال الناس أنت ما أحسن منهم.	4.	You are like all the people here. You are not better than them.
أنت تريد ترشيبي؟ أخبر عليك الشرطة؟	5.	Do you want to bribe me? I'll call the police.
طلبك غير قانوني وما يمشي عدنا.	6..	Your request is not legal and cannot proceed.

Unlike the expressions that are commonly used in negotiating and offering bribes, the speech act of accepting or denying bribes are direct, non-negotiable, said with falling intonation and predetermined. The perlocutionary force of the utterances of accepting bribes is usually favourable, beneficial, positive and well-disposed for both parties. By contrast, the perlocutionary force of the utterances of denying the offer is usually unfavourable, non-beneficial and negative for one party-the offerer rather than the other-the public official. The tone in accepting is commonly warm, sympathetic, approving, conciliating and promising; whereas the tone in denying is usually expressionless, aggressive, reproachful and even threatening. Thus in the utterances above that show agreement, utterance No. 1 is promising and confidential; utterance No. 2 is encouraging and warm; utterance No. 3 is cordial and sincere; utterance No.

4 is determined and definite; utterance No. 5 expresses agreement and settlement; while utterance No. 6 implies complete agreement and assurance. On the other hand, in the utterances that show refusal of the offer, utterance No. 1 and 2 are discouraging; utterance No. 3 is denying and face-threatening; utterance No. 4 is assertive and offensive; utterance No. 5 is suspicious and threatening; while utterance No. 6 is destructive, unquestionable and non-reconciling.

The final phase of offering bribes is the extension phase. Here, the agreement or acceptance of the offer can be extended to include future deals and transactions. This case happens when both the parties the offerer and offeree were satisfied with the terms of the transaction and each commits to perform what will be required from him in the future. The utterances that were reported by the interviewees to be regularly said by the offerer were:

Expressions	No.	Translation
راح أبعث فلان عليك هم عنده شغلة مثلها	1.	I will send X to you. He has the same issue.
عندي معاملة أخرى تسويها؟	2.	I have another application. Can you process it?
أجيك كل مرة، ها؟. صرنا عرف	3.	We have become acquaintances. Can I come to you every now and then?
أمرك إذا صار لي شغلة، زين؟	4.	I will come to you if I have a problem, is that ok?

In the utterances above, the offerer wants to consolidate his relationship with the public official and would like to be sure if he can come back to him whenever he faces a problematic situation in his office. These utterances are pragmatically direct, less face-threatening, because they are in favour of the interlocutor. They all have one communicative

function, namely, that of consolidating social and utilitarian relationships between the interactants paving the way to future deals and transactions.

The utterances that were reported to be recurrent in the discourse of the public officials to express consolidation for future deals were:

Expressions	No.	Translation
أني الممنون	1.	I appreciate it.
تندلل وأهلاً وسهلاً	2.	Most welcome.
أني حاضر لأي شغلة أخرى	3.	I am ready for any other work or business.
تعالني وشتريد يصير	4.	Come to me and we'll do whatever you want.

In the utterances above, the speaker-the public official-wants to ensure his interactant that he is ready for any future deal or transaction. Pragmatically, these utterances communicate the speaker's readiness and confirmation of doing similar work in the future. These expressions herald the preclosing stage in this deal which is often ended by *عليكم السلام* (peace be upon you) and its response *السلام و عليكم* (peace be upon you too).

Conclusion

The present paper aimed to provide a research-based evidence on the pragmatic dimension of offering bribe viewing it as a speech act based on the speaker's presupposition on the listener's background knowledge, socio-cultural knowledge and conversational implicature making use of cooperative principle and conversational maxims. The major argument is that the verbal manifestations of offering bribes are no less essential evidence than the physical evidence in the court of law on the corrupt act of bribery

The sole physical evidence almost available in incriminating offering bribes is catching the accused *flagrant delicto* in the act of offering bribes. This material evidence is a beyond doubts evidence; yet, it is not always easy to obtain. Actually, most of offering bribes are done in safe places like restaurants, cafés, clubs, and the like. The public official rarely receives money or articles of value in his office. This is why most of the bribery cases are difficult to prove. It seems to me, therefore that viewing offering bribes as an independent offense a part from being accepted or denied can mostly be proved by analyzing the utterances made in a given speech event from a socio-pragmatic perspective. Analyzing the utterances from this perspective can substantially help in bringing to light the malicious intent, if any, and thereby aids the judge or trier of fact in his discretion of the circumstances that surround the act of offering bribes. To our mind, accounting for the expressions from which a lay person can infer the corrupt intent of the offerer and analyzing them socio-pragmatically, can greatly serve in capturing a lot of bribery cases which can otherwise flee from criminal justice.

References

- Ad-Darraj, Hadher A., Foo, Thomas C V., Ismail, Abdul Malik, and Abdulah, Eabah S. (2012). Offering as a Comissive and Directive Speech Act: Consequence for Cross-Cultural Communication. International Journal of Scientific and Research Publication. Vol.2. No.3.PP.1-5
- AL Khaffaf, Suha.(2005). Indirectness in the written Diplomatic Discourse. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Mosul
- Al-Sha'baan, Kawkab S. M. (1999). The Speech Act of Offering in English-Arabic Translation. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. University of Mosul.
- Austin J.L. (1962). How To Do Things With Words: The William James Lectures Delivered at Harvard University. Oxford: The Claren Don Press.
- Azuelos-Atias, Sol (2007). A Pragmatic Analysis of Legal Proofs of Criminal Intent. Amsterdam: John Benjamin's Publishing Company.

- Betza, Ann. (2008). A Questionnaire-based Comparative Study of Irish English and Polish Speech Acts of Requesting. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Silesia.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Collin, Peter, H. (2000). *Dictionary of Law*. London: Bloomsbury
- Criper, C. and Widdowson, H. G. (1975). "Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching". In Allen, J. P. B. and Corder, S. Pit (eds.) *Papers in Applied Linguistics*. Vol. 2, Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 154-217.
- Cruse, Alan. (2006). *A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.
- De Jung, Ferry (2011). *Theorizing Criminal Latent: A Methodological Account*. *Utrecht Law Review*. Vol. 7, issue No. 1, pp. 1-15
- Elliot, Catherine and Quinn, Frances. (2006) *(Criminal Law) 8th edition*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited
- Finch, Geoffrey. (2000) *Linguistic Terms and Concepts*. London: Macmillan Press LTD.
- Finch, Geoffrey. (2000) *Linguistic Terms and Concepts*. London: Macmillan Press LTD.
- Garner, Bryan (ed.) (1999). *Black's Law Dictionary*. St. Paul, Mann: West Group
- Grundy, Peter (2000). *Doing Pragmatics*. London: Arnold
- Hancher, M. (1979). "The Classification of Cooperative Illocutionary Acts". *Language and Society*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 1-14.
- Hooper A. y.(1968) *Harris's Criminal Law*. London: Sweet and Maxwell
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman
- Lindgren, James. (1993).*The Theory, History, and Practice of the Bribery-Extortion Distinction*. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*. Vol.141, No.5., PP.1695-1740
- Martin, Elizabeth A. (1997). *Oxford Dictionary of Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mc Arthur, Tom. (1981). *Longman Lexicon of Contemporary English*. Beirut: Librari Du Liban
- Mey, Jacob (1993). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Naoum, A (1995). *Euphemism in Arabic with reference to English*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. University of Mosul
- Obeng, S.G. (1994). "Verbal Indirectness in Akan Informal Discourse." *Journal of Pragmatics* Vol.20, No.1, 37-67
- Oran, Danial J. D. and Tosti, J. D. (2000). *Oran's Dictionary of the Law*. Thomas Learning Tm: West Legal Studies, West Encyclopedia of American Law, 2nd ed.
- Saudi Arabia: *Anti Bribery Law* (1994). *Arab World Quarterly*. Vol. 3, No. 3. pp. 283-287.
- Searle, John (1975). "Indirect Speech Acts". In Cole, Paul and Morgan, J. (eds.). *Syntax and Semantics: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press.
- Searle, John (1979). *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shuy, Roger W. (1993). *Language Crimes: The Use and Abuse of Language Evidence in the Courtroom*. Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Shuy, Roger W. (2005). *Creating Language Crimes*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sifianou, M. (1999). *Politeness Strategies in England and Greece: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Solan, M., and P. Tiersma (2005). *Speaking of Crime: The Language of Criminal Justice*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Thomas, Jenny. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman.
- Tiersma, P. (1986). "The Language of Offer and Acceptance: Speech Acts and the Question of Intent". *California Law Review* Volume74 No. 1 pp. 189-232 .
- Tiersma, Peter M. (1987). "The Language of Defamation" *Texas Law Review*. Vol. 66, No. 2. pp. 303-350
- Tsuda, Sanae (1993). "Indirectness in Discourse: What Does it Do in Conversation". *Inter- cultural Communication Studies*. Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 63-74.
- Yule, George. (1996) *Pragmatics*. Oxford. Oxford University Press