

Discourse Phases, Schemas, Speech Acts & Implicature of Bribery in English and Arabic

Zainab Kadim Igaab^{1*}, Basim Yahya Jasim Algburi²

¹University of Thi-Qar, College of Education for Humanities, Department of English, Iraq

²University of Mosul, College of Arts, Department of English, Iraq

Corresponding Author: Zainab Kadim Igaab, E-mail: zaineb-k@utq.edu.iq

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received: June 07, 2021

Accepted: August 03, 2021

Published: September 30, 2021

Volume: 10 Issue: 5

Advance access: September 2021

Conflicts of interest: None

Funding: None

ABSTRACT

Verbal offences are language crimes that are committed by uttering utterances of certain words or expressions. One of those offences is bribery. Bribery has extensively been studied and compared in different legal systems and legislations, yet, the linguistic aspects of this crime has not been given due interest. The present study attempts to bridge this gap by studying this offence from a pragmatic perspective in terms of discourse phases, schemas, speech acts and implicature in English and Arabic. This study tries to achieve the following aims: Shedding light on the similarities and differences in bribery between English and Arabic in terms of discourse phases, schemas, speech acts and implicature and showing in which community bribery is more common than the other: English or Iraqi-Arabic. The data of this study consisting of 10 complaints in English and Arabic were collected from Courts of Appeal in Iraq, Britain and the United States. They are analyzed in terms of an eclectic model constructed from Shuy (2013), Searle (1975) and Grice (1967). The results indicate that the bribery cases have the same phases and schemas in both languages. The locutionary acts, in both English and Arabic bribery, are expressed by verbs. But in terms of illocutionary acts, bribery is different between English and Arabic. As far as implicature is concerned, bribery is expressed by different linguistic structures in English and Arabic.

Key words: Phases, Schemas, Speech Acts, Implicature, Bribery, English, Arabic

INTRODUCTION

Crimes either occur on the life, body, freedom, dignity of human beings, or against the public job (Betti, 2019: 69).

Bribery is one of the most dangerous crimes against the job duties, the public welfare and the public administration of the state. It is a social disease, a bad behaviour and a violation of social values. Bribery spreading reflects the financial and administrative corruption which affects any community negatively in all its aspects of life. With the bribery spreading, the confidence in the officials will totally be missed.

This study is significant because no study has shown bribery legally, pragmatically and contrastively. The research questions are:

1. Which similarities and differences can be found in bribery between both languages in terms of discourse phases, schemas, speech acts and implicature?
2. Which one is common? Bribery in Iraq or bribery in Britain and the US?

The study under investigation aims at:

1. Shedding light on the differences between the two languages in bribery in terms of discourse phases, schemas, speech acts and implicature;
2. Showing in which community bribery is more common than the other: English or Iraqi-Arabic.

Two hypotheses are put for this study which are:

1. English and Arabic are different from each other in expressing bribery in terms of discourse phases, schemas, speech acts and implicature.
2. Bribery in Iraq is more common than that in Britain and the US.

The data of this study consists of a number of complaints of bribery. The English data is taken from Juettner (2009) in addition to various websites while the Arabic data is taken from judges of investigation in the court and investigators in the police centers in Thi-Qar Province, south of Iraq. Writing the examples in the Arabic section follows two steps which are: a) Translating the example into English; b) and transliterating it. The study is limited to five English bribery cases and five Arabic ones, and English refers to American and British English while Arabic refers to Iraqi Arabic.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Bribery Legally Considered

The government grants official competent authorities to be used under law. If the official violates the rules of the job, this will result in a breach in public welfare protected by law and then there will be disorders of the society system. Thus, the most dangerous breach in the job duties is changing them

to a trade (Al-Durra, 2009: 47 and Aziz, 2016: 547). When you give someone a valuable item, intending to induce that person to act in a particular way within his official capacity, this can lead to bribery (Bek, 1926).

Bribery is one of the crimes which breach job duties. It is defined as an attempt to secure illegal effect on an official or a person responsible for public welfare by paying a bribe. Within this crime, an agreement is made between two persons (bribers and bribees). A person asks another person who is an official (government officials in addition to witnesses in court cases) to do an act within his job against law and society. So, there are two sides: offer and acceptance. A person will offer a benefit, a gift, a promise and an official will accept it. Sometimes, there is a third person who either plays the first person's role or the official's to complete the crime. This crime has also a mental component in which the item of value should corruptly be offered or received for the purpose of affecting the official action (Al-Haidary, 2014: 66-67; Al-Durra, 2009: 48; Al-Haydary and Betti, 2020a: 23; Solan and Tiersma, 2005: 194-195 and Hasany, 1962 and). But when the official is retired or kicked out from his job, he will not be regarded as a bribee (Al-Nuaimy, 2014: 13). With bribery, there is no threat but offering a reward (Juettner, 2009: 14).

The *actus reus* of bribery is represented by the official's act who is asking a person to give him some money or accept whatever is given to him from a person. That official is focused on by law because he/she trades in his/her job. Asking for or accepting a benefit, a gift or a promise is the topic of the official's act. Then for that gift or promise, the official will promise to do what is required from him to do or prevent to do one duty of the job, something which is refused by law. The result is a breach of the job duties. The process of asking for the benefit or gift or promise is fulfilled either verbally, by writing or by signals (Al-Haidary, 2014: 69-83 and Al-Durra, 2009: 51-56).

Bribery is a deliberate crime which requires availability of the criminal intention which is embodied in intention and knowledge. The first person must know that a person is an official and the benefit or the gift that is given or offered to do what is required from him/her to do or prevented to do a duty of the job is unaccepted by laws, systems and instructions. In addition, the official must know that he/she is the person who is responsible for doing acts within the job and he/she must also know that this gift or benefit is accepted to do the act which is against law and society. The official's intention is to accept that gift or benefit (Al-Haidary, 2014: 83-84; Al-Haidary and Betti, 2020b: 27; Al-Durra, 2009: 68 and Ubaid, 1966).

Bribery Pragmatically Considered

Background

Bribery is an offence against the administration of justice; it is a danger against the authority, the job, and the social system because of missing the confidence between the official and his job and at the same time, the citizens' confidence in the job will be weakened. So, its purpose is to harm the public welfare. It is related to the improper effect on people in certain positions of trust. Bribery is against achieving justice

since people are of different financial levels. There are some who are rich and can pay for the official to complete their deals easily and others who are poor and unable to pay to make their deals complete. Thus, bribery will end the social justice. No safety is in that job because all its secrets will be revealed to others. This is what the English and Iraqi laws and communities agree on (Betti, 2019: 18; Al-Haidary, 2014: 66-68; Garner, 2009: 217; Martin, 2003: 56 and Al-Sa'dy, 1939: 144). Thus, the existence of bribery in the community will result psychological worry, fear, confusion for people due to missing security and stability in their country (Abdul-Mu'ti, 1975: 231).

Every public official who is asked to accept for himself or for others an amount of money or anything which is of a benefit for him, or a promise to do something or not to do something within the job, or to obstruct the job duties, is regarded as a bribee. Sometimes, the official asks for a bribe. But there is what is called a bribe offer when a briber offers and it is not accepted by the official (Juettner, 2009: 14-15 and Abdul-Munim and Amir, 1996: 419).

Bribery is illegal. It is exploited by public officials to take money from others as one consistent of their perks of their jobs. The victims feel themselves in an equally awkward position. They will be in a perilous position (Zakariya, 1997: 89 and Jnih, 1988: 4). In a bribery case, public officials should present benefits to the community but they do to the companies which send bribes. Thus, bribery benefits the rich and harms the poor. As a consequence, bribery puts democracy itself at risk (Juettner, 2009: 11). Bribery negatively affects the development and progress of the community.

One of the reasons for spreading bribery in Iraq widely is the American colonialism for a long period of time. So, the weak secure control in the government institutes and absence of the citizens' national spirit pushed many officials to commit that crime. Other reasons are lowering the buying power of the Iraqi currency and the rise of prices.

Bribery as a speech act

The theory of SAs belongs to pragmatics because it requires a S implying (encoding) a message and a hearer (H) inferring (decoding) that message (Betti, Igaab and Al-Ghizzi, 2018: 252). However, the context or situation plays an important role in the process of inferring the S's intended meaning. Furthermore, without such information, it is impossible to know the S's intended meaning (Betti and Hasan, 2020: 43).

In general, bribery is done in a surreptitious way because it is a criminal act. The requests in bribery are either made directly or indirectly for the purpose of politeness. There can be another reason as politicians call 'plausible deniability' which means making a bribe in this way that one can later on claim that it was never a bribe. For example, concerning corruption among election officials in Chicago, it has been known for aldermen to accept a bribe indirectly by saying when they respond the bribers "It is not really necessary." One of the interviewed aldermen gave a description for that utterance through 'a different language', 'a different code'; how to say 'yes' and 'no' at the same time. It is common to be said by a person who received an unexpected gift,

and who means to say, “You didn’t really have to give me this gift, but I thank you and accept it” (Solan and Tiersma, 2005: 196). Offering and accepting bribes can be done not only indirectly but non-verbally. The physical acts of the briber’s giving or the bribee’s receiving something like money are achieved through words. The briber may offer something of value which is not necessary to be given at the moment of offering. Under English and Iraqi laws, bribery was analogized to contracts. So, the crime would be incomplete if there is an offer, but it is not followed by accepting that offer. Today, an acceptance is not necessary to be required, bribery is illegal with offering the item of value only; it is also illegal for government officials to request a bribe or to agree or accept it. Three different speech acts are included: offering, requesting and agreeing (Solan and Tiersma, 2005: 195).

Sometimes, promising is related to bribery. A requirement of the federal bribery law and the Iraqi law is that a public official is given money in exchange for a promise by the official to engage in some future act. For example, Congressman Myers from Pennsylvania was trapped when his meeting with the representatives was video-taped as an evidence. When the representatives mentioned possible immigration problems, Myers responded, “Absolutely. Where I could be of help in this type of a matter, first of all, is private bills that can be introduced... if I wanta keep somebody in the country, all I do is introduce a private bill.” At the end of the meeting, the Sheik’s representative handed Myers an envelope with \$ 50,000 in 100 bills. “Spend it well”, he said. Myers replied, “pleasure” (ibid: 196).

There are some situations which motivate a person to offer a bribe, for example,

The legitimate owner must personally attend in front of me.

(*lazim yd3y ?almalik ?alfar9y faxSiyan*).

The legitimate owner is unable to come to the registration office because he is either dead or he is under a very difficult circumstance which prevents him from going to that office.

Your passport is expired and its renewal is not easy.

(*d3awazak mintihi wata3dida Sa9ub*).

Make us happy, we will make you happy.

(*farriHna nfarHak*) (Algburi, 2019: 18-19).

In criminal cases of bribery, the speech acts of offering, denying, accepting, apologizing, and may be others are often important (Shuy, 2007: 100). So, bribery is both an illocutionary act and a perlocutionary act. The perlocutionary effect of accepting is preferred, with a benefit, and it is positive and well-disposed for both the briber and the bribee while the perlocutionary force of denying is not preferred, without a benefit, and negative for the briber (Algburi, 2019: 29).

THE MODEL FOR BRIBERY ANALYSIS

Bribery occurs in speech events whose structural requirements are available; participants have individual schemas and agendas; they use language to offer, extort, or agree to give or receive bribes; conversational strategies are achieved to accomplish their wishes. So, bribery cases in both languages: English and Arabic will be analysed in terms of an

eclectic model constructed from Grice (1967), Searle (1975) and Shuy (2013).

This model consists of linguistic tools which are as follows:

a) Speech events

The notion of speech events begun with Dell Hymes’s (1972) proposals as an objection to Noam Chomsky’s (1965), bold proclamation.

Speech events can be defined as identifiable human activities where the way language is used has an important role in giving a definition for that speech event. These activities depend on the language. How the person uses language heavily depends on the speech event where that language is used (Shuy, 2013: 43-44).

As a way of appreciating the work of the sounds, morphemes, words, sentences, speech acts, and conversational strategies, for instance, there should be a look at how those language units work during being affected by those larger patterned speech event structures (ibid: 45).

In many speech events, there is an element of power asymmetry. One participant has a superordinate position like (the doctor, the judge, the therapist, the boss, the teacher) but the other participant has a subordinate one like (the patient, the witness, the client, the worker, the student). So, the individual’s contributions will be affected by this power relationship (ibid: 46).

Speech events include their own prescribed social norms, types of information discussed, expected sequence, and ritualized requirements. When those norms are successfully achieved, they will be taken for granted. We are unable to be conscious of them until they have been violated. Such norms are related to Grice’s cooperative principles (ibid: 50).

Within the role of ritualized social relationships in speech event, the way how participants talk to each other reveals the power asymmetry, using address forms: Mr. Ms. Mrs. Doctor, Your Honour, Your Highness, Reverend, Sister, or Father with strangers. An appearance of agreement with the other speaker can be given following the cooperative principle (Grice 1975), even when there is no intention of that.

This linguistic tool includes five discourse phases which are problem, proposed negotiation, offer, completion, and optional extension. Those phases represent identifying the sequential information flow in speech events. According to the nature of speech events, there is a tendency to impose the acceptable sequence where participants are permitted to proceed in that event (Shuy, 2013: 52- 53).

b) Identifying Schemas

The next important step after identifying the speech event where the conversation happens is to reveal the schemas of the speakers. No one can know what there is in the speaker’s minds but their language can give clues to their schemas. When participants find themselves in a conversation with their previous knowledge and idioms in mind, each brings their information, attitudes, beliefs, ideas, and values which they already have. When something new is heard, it is evaluated and applied to what they already know. So, the process of bringing the previous knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, and values to newly acquired information was called “schemas”

by Frederic Bartlett (1932). Then such a construct has been boosted further by other cognitive psychologists. Though a schema is a psychological construct, it can be discovered and analysed through the language by which they are revealed, which makes schemas a linguistic tool and a psychological one (Shuy, 2013: 55).

c) Identifying Agendas: Topics and Responses

The main source of their clues to intentions is the language itself. People talk since they have something to say, and what they want to say forms their conversational agendas in which topics are identified. The beginning of a new topic is marked semantically, phonologically, and through various conventions; recycled topics are identified.

Bringing the speakers' topics up again when they are introduced previously makes many things clear. Recycling is considered as a very good clue to what there is in the speakers' minds or what their conversational intentions may be. When the speakers are not satisfied with their topics, recycling is necessary, which adds a focus on their own conversational agendas.

Then responses of the bribees are also identified. Neither linguistics nor any other science is able to read the minds of speakers. In the conversations, linguists can only refer to visible and auditory evidence and depend on a number of clues to refer to the agendas of speakers like the way how they respond to the topics introduced by others. So, they are able to recognize them, respond to them, ignore them, modify them, or amplify them. What is important of these responses is understanding and analyzing the overall interaction. Different ways of the response can occur negatively, positively, indifferently, by offering a feedback marker like "uh-huh", by changing the subject, or saying nothing at all (Shuy, 2013: 56- 61).

d) Identifying Speech Acts

Language is not only used to say things (to make statements) but to do things (perform actions). Such a conviction pushed J.L. Austin to make a theory of what he called "illocutionary acts", "speech acts", "illocutionary force", "pragmatic force", or "force". Things are done by words. There are no statements or questions but there are utterances with performative verbs to do actions:

I declare the meeting open. (Rühlemann, 2019: 16; Khudhair, 2017: 120-123; Adrawy, 2011: 73; Abu-Zaid, 2009: 26-30; Boqra, 2009: 186; Proost, 2006: 994; Achiba, 2003: 1-2; Grundy, 2000: 48-50 and Thomas, 1995: 28-36).

e) Identifying Smoking Gun Expressions

The data of the present study is small passages which are indicated as "smoking gun" passages. In bribery cases, the smoking gun passages are usually found at or near the point in which a bribe is offered and agreed upon, although there is a number of important and relevant pieces of conversation which precede and follow it. Those smoking gun passages can be individual sentences, phrases or words but in both criminal and civil cases, meaning which is discovered through the context can be ignored.

f) Grice's Theory of Implicature and Cooperative Principle (1967)

Language is a powerful means of human communication. Via using language, the sender can deliver his/her intended

meaning to the receiver. According to Grice, the communicative activity should go smoothly and straightforwardly. Thus, Grice postulates the cooperative principle. The cooperative principle (CP: for short) says that people should be cooperative in their communication. As a result, Grice supports the cooperative principle by four maxims, which speakers should follow. The quantity maxim says that the sender should be informative as is required, the quality maxim states that the speaker should be truthful, the maxim of relation means that the speaker has to produce the relevant information only, and finally the manner maxim says that people should deliver clear and abridged information (Betti and Yaseen, 2020: 43-44).

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF ENGLISH BRIBERY CASES

Five bribery cases are collected to be analysed and discussed. Their analysis is to be according to an eclectic model suggested by Grice (1967), Searle (1975) and Shuy (2013).

1. The bribery event of a member of a city legislator

a. Speech Event

Milwaukee alderman Michael McGee is a member of a city legislator or city council. The alderman asked the liquor store owners for a bribe for himself by forcing the victims to pay an amount of money and then to contribute to his campaign through the election.

Phase 1: Problem

McGee exploiting his political dominance asked the store owners to give him a bribe otherwise he would pull their licenses. So, under threat, the store owners are forced to give that member of city council or legislator a bribe.

McGee: "**I will pull your licenses if you do not pay me a bribe.**"

McGee uses the force with those owners under the cover of politics and because of being a public official. McGee was self-confident that he could get away with it. He did not care to that behaviour because he considered it as one of the perks of his job.

Phase 2: Proposed Negotiation

This phase does not exist in this case since the store owners were forced to pay a bribe to stop their worry about pulling their licenses. They thought that no one would believe them and even if they were believed, McGee would have enough time to pull their licenses before going to jail.

Phase 3: Offer

The owners did not offer any bribe. On the opposite, McGee asked them for a bribe which should be in cash ranging from \$500 to \$2.500.

Phase 4: Completion

The process of bribery was complete. The store owners were forced to pay that member of a city council otherwise they would lose their work which was the financial source for them and their families. Then, bribery was not enough for him but those owners should work hard to make him win in his elective campaign.

Phase 5: Optional Extension

McGee was in need for those store owners in addition to other relatives and friends of those owners to support him in the campaign.

b. Schemas

McGee as a public official in the same city where the store owners live and work, was well-known by being dangerous and unfair, and ready to take money as bribes from anyone and ask them to make his campaign successful. He was ready to make them lose their licenses before going to jail. He really made use of his job to hurt people.

c. Agendas: Topics and Responses

Two main topics were introduced by McGee: asking for bribes and contributing in his campaign. Although the owners accepted to do those two acts with a negative response, they did what he wanted them to do.

d. Speech Acts

The speech act which distinguished that case is **asking** the store owners to give a bribe by force. The second is **threatening** those owners to pay for him and participate in his campaign. Asking by force and threatening are two illocutionary acts. Making them worried about their work and creating the horror in their hearts are the perlocutionary acts.

e. Implicature

McGee was so clear and unambiguous in asking for bribes. Although they were socially unrelated, the topics were relevant. So, indirectness did not exist. That speech event is related to Grice's cooperative principles.

2. The bribery event of the Vice President of Veco

a. Speech Event

In 2006, Rick Smith, the Vice President of Veco, an oil field services company phoned Pete Kott, the Speaker of the House in Alaska's State Legislature to fulfill two actions for the benefit of the oil company.

Phase 1: Problem

Smith was in need of Kott's position while he still had it. Smith wanted Kott to do two things: First, convincing the legislature to keep the new petroleum production tax (PPT) at 20 percent. Such a step is important for Smith since with every percentage point of increasing the tax made oil companies lose hundreds of thousands of dollars. This would postpone the tax for the next legislature session. Second, Smith wanted Kott to convince the legislature to allow oil companies to build a natural gas pipeline.

Phase 2: Proposed Negotiation

"I need a job," said Kott.

"You've got a job," Smith replied. "Give us a pipeline."

Phase 3: Offer

Kott was in a need for a job. Smith made use of that need and offered him a job.

Phase 4: Completion

Smith wanted to exploit Kott's position to keep the new petroleum production tax at 20 percent. Kott did kill the PPT bill for Veco. Then Alaska decided to build a gas pipeline.

Phase 5: Optional Extension

Smith wanted Kott to convince the legislature to help him build natural gas pipelines and support him in keeping the petroleum production tax at 20 percent.

b. Schemas

Smith knew Kott well that Kott needed a job. Smith was also sure that if he asked Kott to do anything concerning his position, Kott would do for getting the job.

c. Agendas: Topics and Responses

Kott asked Smith for a job and Smith agreed but Kott should achieve what he wanted. The requirements were keeping the petroleum production tax at 20 percent by convincing the legislature and getting their agreement to build a natural gas pipeline by oil companies.

d. Speech Acts

More than one speech act exists in this case. The first is when Kott made a **request**, that request was exploited by Smith to **offer** a bribe. The third is Kott's **agreeing** that bribe.

e. Implicature

All those speech acts are indirect. Kott needs a job and Smith made him get a job with doing so and so without mentioning anything about the bribe.

Smith was qualitative. He did not say more but he could express his desire. Kott's request was clear but Smith's offer was unclear and ambiguous. They knew each other well and the topics that they talked about were relevant. So, bribery is related to indirectness and Grice's maxims with violations.

3. The Bribery Event of Former Alaska State Representative

a. Speech Event

This was one of the Alaska corruption cases in which both kinds of audio tapes were used by investigators. The phones of two of Veco's executives, CEO Bill Allen and vice-president Rick Smith were tapped. In addition, audio bugs and video recording equipment are also planted in Suite 604 of the Baranof Hotel. That hotel room was used by Allen and Smith through lobbying in Juneau which is Alaska's capital.

Former Alaska State Lawmaker Pete Kott commented:

"I'll sell my Soul to the Devil."

Phase 1: Problem

Before one night of the legislature's special session on the petroleum production tax, Kott talked to Allen via mail by referring to him 'Uncle Bill', saying:

"Uncle Bill... Things start tomorrow; just want to get what our instructions are."

But there is a problem which should be solved by Kott. The PPT bill should be delayed by damaging the vote on Senator Fred Dyson's abortion bill.

Phase 2: Proposed Negotiation

Kott added on what he had to go through to kill the PPT bill:

"I had to cheat, steal, beg, borrow, and lie. EXXon's happy. Bp's happy."

Smith with bragging:

"Well, that will stay in this room."

Phase 3: Offer

Bill Allen was pulling hundred dollar bills from his front pocket and giving them to legislators. Before handing them a bribe, Allen said:

"Let me count first."

Phase 4: Completion

Dyson was known as being a strong opponent of abortion. Dyson's abortion bill hostage was held by Kott. His desire was to use it as a bargaining chip with Dyson. About the abortion bill, Kott said:

“When Bill Allen [then president of Veco] tells me he’s ready to vote ‘er out, then I will vote it out.”

Phase 5: Optional Extension

Kott was bargaining with Dyson. He attempted to convince Dyson (all knew him that he did not accept bribes), to vote with the oil companies on the PPT.

On the other hand, Vic Kohring (the Chairman of the House of Special Committee on Oil and Gas) told Smith:

“I was mainly calling just to touch bases with you and Bill and let you know anything that comes along that I can help with, if I can be an information source or if I can lobby on your behalf, if I can consider modifications to legislation or whatever, you please let me know, OK?”

Then Kohring said to Smith:

“I wanted you to know I stand by to do anything to help. I know I say that so many times, I do want to be of assistance and if I don’t hear from you guys I’ll just keep following the course that I do as far as advocating for good things for you guys, including this gas line.”

b. Schemas

Bill Allen and Rick Smith, executives of Veco at an oil fields services company, knew that Kott and the Former Alaska State Representative Vic Kohring would accept any payoff shown to them. Then, Kott also knew Senator Fred Dyson that he did not accept any bribe, so he did his best to convince him to accept it through bargaining.

c. Agendas: Topics and Responses

The topic of this case is affecting the special session which would be convened by the legislator on the PPT. One responded positively and the other responded negatively and achieved what is required after convincing and bargaining.

d. Speech Acts

Offering, accepting, denying which changed to **accepting**, and **promising** are found in this case. Offering a bribe was done by Allen’s pulling hundred dollar bills out of his front pocket; Kott and Vic Kohring accepted the bribe easily; Dyson denied the bribe and he accepted it after convincing and bargaining. At last, Kott promised Allen and Smith that he would complete what is required and he was ready to do anything like stealing, begging, cheating, borrowing, lying, etc.

e. Implicature

Through the conversation between Allen and Kott, Kott’s acceptance of the bribe and readiness to do anything to achieve their purposes were indirectly expressed. Even Kott’s attempting to make Dyson accept the bribe was indirectly done. The accepting, promising were fulfilled unclearly and ambiguously; Kott did not tell Dyson the truth concerning what he wanted exactly since Dyson was known of denying the bribes and doing acts which were legally prevented. So, there is more than one violation of Grice’s maxims.

4. The bribery event of the price of a used riding lawn mowing

a. Speech Event

Accepting bribes by Alaska politicians in the rooms in the hotels Suite in Juneau by Veco shocked the State and news stories about corrupt politicians were published in American newspapers every day.

Phase 1: Problem

It was known that Veco executives, Rick Smith and Bill Allen, gave bribes to lawmakers to get favour and advantage in the state government.

Phase 2: Proposed negotiation

This phase does not exist in this case.

Phase 3: Offer

Veco executives handed out hundred dollar bills to lawmakers, for a used riding lawn mower. All were shocked because a used riding lawn mower did not deserve offering a bribe.

“The fact of the matter is,” says Laskan comic Mr. Whitekeys, **“We all want to bribe a politician. We all thought it’d take a Mercedes or a Porsche. Nobody knew you could buy a politician for the cost of a used riding lawn mower.”**

Phase 4: Completion

When the investigation became public, Alaska governor, Sarah Palin asked for a new special session of the legislator. She wanted to give legislators a chance to make a revolting on the PPT:

“Those that are left”.

She did not want any member of the legislator to accept any bribe from Veco executives concerning any topic.

Phase 5: Optional Extension

Rick Smith and Bill Allen were also supported by Mr. Whitekeys in his readiness to bribe a politician to get what they want which is of course illegal.

b. Schemas

Because of the strong relationship among the bribers who were the executives of Veco and lawmakers, an opportunity was given to them to know who accepted a bribe and who did not.

c. Agendas: Topics and Responses

The topic of the bribe did not deserve to be mentioned and to sacrifice themselves to be in a jail. The Veco executives agreed with a politician for a used riding lawn mower.

After revealing the process of bribing publically, Alaska governor wanted to warn other politicians to behave legally with PPT.

d. Speech Acts

Direct speech acts of **offering** and **accepting** were used. The Veco executive offered the bribe and the politician accepted it directly.

e. Implicature

Clarity and non-ambiguity were available.

5. The Bribery Event of Operation Tennessee Waltz

a. Speech Event

The beginning of the Tennessee Waltz was in Memphis in 2005. There was more than one bribery case on contracts at the Shelby County Juvenile Court. A legislative corruption was in Nashville.

Phase 1: Problem

This case was described as being tough because who took bribes and who offered them were unknown for the FBI investigators. A company under the name ‘E-Cycle Management’ was established. E-Cycle executives offered bribes to legislators to sponsor a bill which would give

E-Cycle an opportunity to buy used computers from the state, without having to go through a competitive bidding process.

Phase 2: Proposed Negotiation

The former state senator, John Ford, came to a worker (who was working for E-Cycle as Ford thought of) and said:

“You’re talking to the guy that makes the deals.”

No worker suspected him at that time.

The Ford brought a draft of a bill to E-Cycle and said:

“This is a draft and we can change anything you want to.”

Phase 3: Offer

The worker, LC McNeil counted out fifty \$100 bills, and gave them to Ford who put them in his pocket.

Phase 4: Completion

After completing what is required from Ford, the latter phoned McNeil again to tell him:

“Yeah, send me a little money.”

When the investigation was about to end, Ford took \$55,000 as bribes from E-Cycle. Then he faced separate charges for accepting \$800,000 in bribes from state contractors.

b. Schemas

E-Cycle was established to know the bribers and the bribes. So, when one of the workers in the company offered a bribe to Ford, this happened after having a relationship with him because they did not know each other.

c. Agendas: Topics and Responses

This bribery case was so difficult to control and solve but establishing E-Cycle made it easy to capture the bribers and the bribes. In fact, no bribers were found since they were FBI agents. That company was established to buy used computers from the state and there was no need to go through a competitive bidding process.

d. Speech Acts

This case is different from other cases in having a variety of speech acts. That case began with a direct **request** from John Ford to E-Cycle’s worker. Ford asked that worker to give him a number of bribes not only one bribe. Ford took bribes from E-Cycle workers and also from state contractors. He asked for a bribe more than one time.

“Yeah, send me a little money.”

John Ford **accepted** a bribe from McNeil. Then he **promised** that company to do anything they want from him to do.

“This is a draft, and we can change anything you want to.”

e. Implicature

The bribery cases were fulfilled directly, clearly and unambiguously. Those bribery speech acts were accompanied with a speech act of **threatening** that is the illocutionary act. Ford threatened a federal witness:

“If you are FBI, I will shoot you and kill you.”

The perlocutionary act is intimidating that witness.

5. Analysis and Discussion of Arabic Bribery Cases

Five Arabic bribery cases are chosen to be analysed and discussed.

1. A Traffic Policeman Asked an Iraqi Citizen to Give him a Bribe

a. Speech Event

The bribee is a traffic policeman, Rahman, who forces the drivers to pay bribes in a public way. That policeman

becomes famous for taking bribes. The drivers should pay for him to remove the traffic imposed regulations like not walking very fast, not having some car equipment. Rahman can ignore any mistake done by them instead of imposing regulations on people.

Phase 1: problem

A driver, Ali, wanted to work and gain money from his taxi. From the very morning, in spite of doing nothing wrong, a traffic policeman, Rahman, stopped him and forced him to pay a fine otherwise his taxi would be confiscated:

A traffic policeman said: **“I will make you a receipt of ID 20 as a penalty”.**

(?aguS-lak waSil b 9ifriin alif dinar).

The driver replied **“I have not worked yet, I need your help.”**

(ba9adni ma misteftiH. ?ariid mruwwitak).

Phase 2: Proposed Negotiation

Such a phase does not exist because there is no negotiation between the bribee and the briber.

Phase 3: Offer

A traffic policeman said: **“You do not want your taxi to be confiscated, pay me ID 10,000 and go peacefully.”**

Phase 4: Completion

The driver forcefully paid for the traffic policeman what he wanted and went to complete his work day peacefully.

b. Schemas

All drivers in Baghdad know that that traffic policeman is a bribee. They could not pass that way without paying bribes.

c. Agendas: Topics and Responses

Without being subjected to control of law, an official behaved in this criminal way which is bribing people in front of all people’s eyes and in the middle of crowd roads. Officials exploited the weakness in the government. In addition, drivers who left their families for gaining money and food were compelled to pay bribes to come back homes peacefully.

d. Speech acts

Asking by force and **agreeing** existed in this bribery case.

e. Implicature

Both happened directly, clearly, and unambiguously.

2. The Bribery Event of House Removing Decision

a. Speech Event

An owner of a house, Mohammed, should pay a bribe for two officials in order to avoid the decision of removing the house in the pretext that that house was built in a non-suitable area which is archeological.

Phase 1: problem

That house was built by an archeological building without being subjected to building conditions in the archeological areas. This was what the two officials said and it was of course wrong. It was a matter of threatening the owner to pay them money.

Phase 2: Proposed Negotiation

The first official said: **“Your house is situated by an archeological building and this is forbidden.”**

The owner of the house asked: **“What can I do to cancel this decision.”**

The second official replied: **“You are the master of those who know what to do.”**

(baytake mulaaSiq libinaya ?aΘariyah wahaða memnuu9).

(Jasawy Hatta haða -lqarar yillGy).

(?inta sayad ?al9arfin).

Phase 3: Offer

The owner was asked to pay the two officials 15 million dinars to issue a temporary decision of cancellation. Then 50 million dinars should also be paid to get a final decision of cancelling the disappearance.

Phase 4: Completion

Handing out the two officials the two bribes will lead to achieve cancellation of removing the decision.

Phase 5: Optional Extension

After getting amounts of money, the two officials agreed with Heads of the Departments at Estate Registration to stop the decision of removing by pretending that their judgment of removing the house was wrong. The address of the house was not this and it was not situation by any archeological building.

b. Schemas

The two officials and the owner of the house did not know each other.

c. Agendas: Topics and Responses

The owner responded to the two officials' asking positively but forcefully to avoid performing that unfair decision.

d. Speech Acts

The speech acts available in this case are **asking** by the two officials for a bribe more than one time; **agreeing** by the owner even if it was by force; and **threatening** the owner to fulfill the decision of removing if he did not pay them bribes.

e. Implicature

This bribery case was based on the implicit meaning, falsity, ambiguity, and non-clarity. So, all Grice's maxims were violated.

3. The Bribe Event of the Retirement Office

a. Speech Event

An official at the National Retirement Office/Department of Issuing Documents in Fallujah, Mr. Ahmed, made falsification of documents of Terrorism martyrs. So, their families were suffering from that official.

Phase 1: problem

Most of terrorism victims' families were poor and without jobs. They were in need for their martyrs' salaries. That official and his associates asked those families to give them bribes otherwise their retirement documents would not be issued.

Phase 2: Proposed Negotiation

The official said: "Brother, believe me I live in a hiring house and I have two graduated sons without jobs."

A member of one of the families begged: "Ok, I'll pay you but make the process of receiving my salary easy. Mercy on your parents."

-(Sadigny ya?axy ?ana ga9id bil-?iid3ar w9indy wilid ?iΘnien xirriid3iin 9aTTala baTTala).

-(Sar bas sahhilha 9alayya yirHam waldiek).

Phase 3: Offer

That official asked the members of those families a quarter of their salaries. Then those bribes would be divided into portions for that official and his associates.

Phase 4: Completion

After paying the official and his partners a bribe, they issued the terrorism martyrs' documents to receive their salaries.

Phase 5: Optional extension

That official agreed with one associate to obstacle receiving the salary and another associate to facilitate the task after handing out them the required amounts of money.

b. Schemas

That official and his partners and the terrorism martyrs' families lived in the same area, Fallujah, in the West of Iraq. So, they knew each other, i.e. that official was of bad reputation as being a bribee and asking for bribes publically.

c. Agendas: Topics and Responses

The topic of the bribery case was mentioned above. The members of the families should respond positively but by force. Some refused giving that official a bribe and went to the police to submit a complaint against that unfair man.

d. Speech Acts

The same speech acts of the bribery cases are repeated which are **asking** by force and **agreeing**.

e. Implicature

There is implicature by asking for bribes indirectly although that official was known as being a bribee. He did not tell the victims' families the truth by being poor and in need of money. He was so clear with them by asking them for a portion of their salaries to issue their documents.

4. The Bribery Event of the Private Lessons

a. Speech Event

The main task of every teacher is human by feeding the students' minds with honour, noble characters, and loyalty. The second intermediate students at one of the schools in Iraq wrote a number of words as a slogan on the board:

Pay a big bribe for the teacher otherwise your disappointment will be so heavy.

(?idfa9 ilmu9alim rafwa tfibira wa?illa xibtak HatSiir Θgila).

Phase 1: Problem

A teacher of mathematics did not teach his students in the class by saying that the material is so difficult and it needs so much explanation and exerting of efforts. For this reason, the teacher asks each student a bribe to be able to succeed in the practical exams.

Phase 2: proposed Negotiation

The teacher of mathematics said: "It is better for you all to attend the private lessons. Mathematics is difficult to pass. Do not say I did not tell you of that."

Most students affirmed: "Yes sir, what you said is surely right."

(?idxil daris xuSuSy ?aHsan ?ilak. ?alriyaDiyat Sa9b-ilnad3aH bii. Muu tguluun ma gilit).

(HaDir ?ustað ?akiid Ht3aytak hiyal-SaHiHa).

Phase 3: Offer

Every student should hand the teacher out 20.000 ID at the end of each private lesson.

Phase 4: Completion

All the students paid that amount of money for the teacher of mathematics. So, all the students passed this material in that year as the teacher promised them.

Phase 5: Optional Extension

There was a deal between that teacher and the assistant of the manager in the school. That assistant of the manager was cancelling the absences of the teacher and his students every two days of the week. Of course, the teacher gave the assistant an amount of money for helping him completing his inhuman job.

b. Schemas

The teacher of mathematics was well-known of being a bribee. So, most families whose lazy sons were registered as students in that school to ensure their success in mathematics.

c. Agendas: Topics and responses

Giving the private lessons is for the benefit of the teacher and the loss of the students financially.

The clever students felt unhappy and disappointed because they refused the principle of the private lessons but they forcefully paid bribes for the teacher. So their responses were negative while the lazy ones felt happy and self-confident because they would pass mathematics without any efforts.

d. Speech Acts

Asking the students to give the teacher bribes, **agreement** of some students; and hidden **refusal** by a few students were the available speech acts in this case. In addition, the students were **threatened** by the teacher that they would fail in the exam and lose their future if they did not pay him what he wanted.

The teacher threatened the students by saying: “**If anyone do not attend the private lessons, they will fail in the exam and lose their future. And you are free.**”

(?illy maydxil yrsab wyxsar mustaqbala w?intu kefkum).

e. Implicature

The teacher was so obvious, true, and unambiguous with his students. There was no implicit meaning, he talked with them directly.

5. The Bribery Event of the Building Loan

a. Speech Event

A citizen, Mazin, needed money to build his house. So, he went to Al-Rafidain Bank in Babylon to get a building loan. But he was faced with obstacles.

Phase 1: Problem

An official who was responsible for distributing building loans told Mazin that completing the loan required a number of procedures and much time; the piece of land should be examined but not at the present time because they were very busy in the bank; the building loan must be divided into more than one time to be received by the citizen. Last, the government had a share in the loan.

Phase 2: Proposed Negotiation

The official said: “**Giving you the building loan needs procedures and examination of the piece of land. You will not receive it as a whole, it will be divided into more than one time and the government will take an amount of that loan.**”

The citizen replied: “**How can you solve it. Help me, please. You will get what you want.**”

(?amy hay yradilha ?id3ra?at wyrad kafif 9alquT9a wilsilfa titqasam bd9at wildawla ?ilha HuSa).

(wilHal flon? Bally t9awny w?inta t?amir ?amur).

Phase 3: Offer

The official asked Mazin to give him \$300 as a bribe.

Phase 4: Completion

When Mazin paid the official an amount of money, the latter facilitated the procedures of receiving the building loan and Mazin received it in the same day without any obstacle. Mazin promised the official that his friends will reward him in the same way. This is the way to offer the official future bribes.

Mazin added: “**My friends who submitted their papers to receive the building loan will reward you too, just like me.**” (?aSdiqa?i ?illy mqadmiin raH ykrmuk miOly ?ana).

b. Schemas

Mazin had no knowledge of that official or what was happening in the bank but he became well-known for Mazin's friends.

c. Agendas: Topics and Responses

This was previously mentioned.

d. Speech Acts

In addition to a speech act of **agreeing**, there are two types of the speech act of **offering**: the official's offering to get a bribe and the citizen's offering to facilitate the procedures for his friends.

e. Implicature

Although what was done by the official is asking for a bribe indirectly, it was so clearly to be understood that the official would not do anything without a bribe. The official did not tell him the truth. There was also a type of ambiguity in his speech with Mazin.

CONCLUSIONS

General Conclusions

1. It is an uneasy task to define a crime in comparison with determining what the behaviour is criminal or not. Deciding about the criminality of a behaviour is concerned with the society and its values.
2. The crime of bribery includes multiple participants who act together in a willing way or not, to achieve an illegal act. The critical speech acts are requesting and agreeing. Two actions are inherently cooperative.
3. If there is no perlocutionary act, there is no verbal offence. The perlocutionary act is the characteristic feature of the verbal offence.
4. A clear difference concerning bribery between English and Arabic, is in the cultural and social norms. “The legal field, to which law belongs, constitutes an independent culture with powerful vocational norms that give sense and reinforcement to the individual's behavior” (Betti and Hashim, 2018: 277). For example, giving monetary tips for good services, political campaign contributions are not regarded as criminal bribery in the US.

Similarities

1. Concerning the term ‘pragmatics’, there is a correspondence between English and Arabic. The Western scien-

tists' efforts and the ancient Arabs' are complementary in terms of the study of pragmatics.

2. English and Arabic are similar to each other in terms of the legal language and its features.
3. English and Arabic agree on the locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts. The same is with direct and indirect speech acts. But they are different from each other in terms of the way of classifying speech acts.
4. In English and Arabic, the bribery cases include proposed negotiation, completion, and optional extension which are the discourse phases in addition to the schemas. This refutes the first hypothesis.
5. Bribery is expressed by verbs. As a verbal offence, it has both illocutionary and perlocutionary acts.
6. Most bribery cases in English and Arabic involve a threat.
7. Most English and Arabic people respond negatively when they want to pay the official a bribe because they do that act by force.
8. Bribery is socially unacceptable in English and the Iraqi- Arabic communities.
9. There is implicature in bribery which is expressed by different linguistic structures. So, bribery is mainly based on implicature.

Differences

1. In English bribery cases, the officials asked people for paying bribes, while in Arabic, most people offered bribes to the officials.
2. The speech acts which exist in the English bribery cases are requesting, agreeing (accepting), denying, promising and offering while in the Arabic bribery cases, they are offering and agreeing.
3. English bribery cases occur with indirectness, violation of Grice's maxims but there is a little directness without a violation of Grice's maxims while in Arabic bribery cases, directness exists without a violation of Grice's maxims but in very few cases, indirectness and a violation of Grice's maxim are available. This also supports the second hypothesis which is there are differences between the two languages in bribery in terms of implicature.
4. In most English bribery cases, the officials ask for more than one bribe while in Arabic bribery cases, a few officials ask for more than one bribe.
5. In most English bribery cases, there is the third person, i.e., the intermediary person in addition to the briber and the bribee while in Arabic bribery cases, there is a direct contact between the briber and the bribee. The above points of differences support the first hypothesis.
6. Occurrence of bribery is due to transgressing law. Bribery spreads widely because there is no government control which is of need to rehabilitated staffs. Because of political reasons, spreading of bribery in Iraq becomes more common than that in Britain or the US. This point supports the second hypothesis.
7. After presenting the points of similarity and difference above, the two research questions of this study are answered.

REFERENCES

- Abdul- Munim, Sulaiman and Mohammed Zeky Abu-Amir (1996).
 Lebanese Penal Code: The Private Section. 1st ed. Beirut: University Institute for Studies, Publishing and Distribution.
- Abdul- Mu'ti, Abdul- Basit Mohammed (1975). "Development and Bribery Ideology". In National Criminal Journal. 18 (1-3): 231-243.
- Abu- Zaid, Nawary Suoudy (2009). Pragmatics of Literary Discourse: Principles and Procedures. Satif: Wisdom House for Publishing and Distribution.
- Achiba, Machiko (2003). Learning to Request in a Second Language: A Study of Child Interlanguage Pragmatics. Sydney: Multilingual Matters LTD.
- Adrawy, Al- A'yashy (2011). Implicature in Tongue Pragmatics. Algeria: The Difference Publications.
- Al-Durra, Mahir Abid Shawaish (2009). Explaining Penal Code: The Private Section. Cairo: Al-Atik for Industrializing the Book.
- Algburi, Basim Yahya Jasim (2019). Offering Bribes: A Legi- Pragmatic Perspective. Mauritius: LAMBERT Academic Publishing.
- Al-Haidary, Jamal Ibrahim (2014). Explaining Sentences of Private Section of Penal Code. Baghdad: Al-Sanhoory Library.
- Al-Haydary, Jamal Ibraheem, and Mohammed Jasim Betti (2020a). The Objective Penalty Protection of The Responsibles for the Educational and Learning Process in Public Defamation. Multidisciplinary International Journal, 6: 15-29.
- Al-Haydary, Jamal Ibraheem, and Mohammed Jasim Betti (2020b). The Goals of the Law of Protection of Teachers, Supervisors and Educational Counselors NO. (8) (2018) and Its Legal Basis. International Journal of Law, Management and Social Science. 4 (2): 25-38.
- Al- Khalaf, Ali Hussein and Sultan Abdul-Qadir Al- Shawy (2010). General Principles in Penal Code. Cairo: Al-Atik for Industrializing the Book.
- Al- Nuaimy, Mohammed Abdullah Sharif (2014). "Bribery Crime is one of the Pictures of Financial and Administrative Corruption." In The Honesty and Transparency for Researches and Studies.
- Al-Qulaly, Mohammed Mustafa (1948). In the Criminal Responsibility. Cairo: University of the First Fuad.
- Al- Sa'dy, Dawood (1939). Explaining Baghdadi Penal Code. Baghdad: Al-Naqidh Private Printing.
- Al-Seady, Mohammed J. B. (1998). The Employment of English Lexicons by Adolescent Speakers of Nasiriya Iraqi Arabic as Determined by Sex Differentiation. Al-Qadisiya Journal. 3 (2): 72-9.
- Al- Zubaidy, Nawar Diham Mutar (2016). "Penalty Responsibility of Bribery Crime in the Private Section". In Tikrit University Journal for Laws, pp: 346- 384.
- Aziz, Saman Abdullad (2016). "Towards the Associates of Bribery Crime under Strict Circumstances: An analytic Study". In Tikrit University Journal for Laws. 1 (1): 547- 580.

- Bek, Ahmed Ameen (1926). Explaining the Local Penal Code: The Private Section. 1st ed. Cairo: Al-Sanhoory Library.
- Betti, M. J. (2007). "Jokes in Iraq: A Study of coherence and Cohesion". In Journal of the College of Education. University of Wasit, 1(1), 399-411.
- Betti, Mohammed Jasim and Hashim, Thura Ghalib (2018). The Lawyer's Discourse in the Courtroom: A Contrastive Study in English and Arabic. International Journal of English Linguistics. 8 (3): 276-296.
- Betti, Mohammed Jasim, Igaab, Z. K., & Al-Ghizzi, M. T. H. (2018). The Iraqi EFL Learners' Use of Permission, Obligation and Prohibition. International Journal of English Linguistics. 8(3): 251-269.
- Betti, Mohammed Jasim (2019). The Objective Penalty Protection of the Responsibles for the Educational and Learning Process. Unpublished MA thesis. Najaf: Al- Alamein Institute of Higher Studies.
- Betti, Mohammed Jasim and Hasan, Ahmed Abd (2020). The Iraqi EFL Learners' Ability to Use Speech Acts in MA and Ph.D. Theses Defense. Education, Language and Sociology Research. 1(2): 41-65.
- Betti, Mohammed Jasim and Yaseen, K. S. (2020). The Iraqi EFL Learners' Use of Conversational Maxims at the University Level. Education, Language and Sociology Research. 1(1): 43-60.
- Boqra, Nu'man (2004). Contemporary Linguistic Schools. Cairo: The Arts Library.
- Carr, Claudia and Maureen Johnson (2014). Beginning Criminal Law. London: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.
- Elliot, Catherine and Frances Quinn (2004). Criminal Law. 5th ed. London: Longman.
- Garner, Bryan, A. (2009). 9th ed. Black's law Dictionary. New York: A Thomson Reuters Business.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). "*Logic and Conversation*". Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Grundy, Peter (2000). Doing Pragmatics. Oxford: OUP.
- Hasany, Mahmoud Najib (1962). Criminal Contribution in the Arab Legislations. Cairo: Al-Sanhoory Library.
- Hayawy, Nabeel Abdul-Rahman (2011). Penal Code: No. 111, 1969 and its amendments. 5th ed Revised. Baghdad: Law Library.
- Herring, Jonathan (2010). Criminal Law: The Basics. London: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.
- Jnih, Abdul- Ameer Hasan, et al. (1988). Crimes of Bribery and Embezzlement: Their Reasons and Ways of Committing them. Baghdad: Al-Shurta Printing.
- Juettner, Bonnie (2009). Blackmail and Bribery. New York: GALE, Cengage Learning.
- Khudhair, Basim Khairy (2017). Imam Ali's Discourse Strategies: A Pragmatic Study/Showing Responsibility. 1st ed. Karbella: Institute of Nahj Al-Balagha Sciences.
- Martin, Elizabeth, A. (2003). Oxford Dictionary of Law. 5th ed. Oxford: OUP.
- Namoor, Mohammed Saeed (2005). Explaining Penal Code: The Private Section: Crimes against Persons. Amman: House of Culture, Publishing and Distribution.
- Naseef, Nashat Ahmed (2010). Explaining Penal Code: The Private Section. Cairo: Al-Sanhoory Library.
- Proost, K. (2006). "*Speech Act Verbs*". In Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics.
- Rühlemann, Christoph (2019). Corpus Linguistics for Pragmatics: A Guide for Research. London: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.
- Scheb, John M. and John M. Scheb (2009). Criminal Law. 5th ed. Australia: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Solan, Lawrence, M. and Peter M. Tiersma (2005). Speaking of Crime: the Language of Criminal Justice. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Shuy, Roger, W (2007). "*Language in the American Courtroom*". In Language and Linguistics Compass, pp. 100-114. 1/1-2, 10. London: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Shuy, Roger, W. (2013). The Language of Bribery Cases. Oxford: OUP.
- Thomas, Jenny (1995). Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics. London: Longman.
- Ubaid, Raouf (1966). Explaining the Private Section. 3rd ed. Cairo: Al-Sanhoory Library.
- Ubaid, Raouf (1985). Crimes against Persons and Property. Cairo: Arab Thinking House.
- Arabic Language Dictionary: Al-Waseet Dictionary (1989). 2nd ed. Istanbul: Invitation House.
- Vol. 1. Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (2009). 5th ed. Harlow: Pearson.
- Merriam- Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (2003). 11th ed. Revised edn. Springfield, Mass: Merriam – Webster.
- The Oxford English Dictionary (2010). 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- The Law Commission No. 177 (1989). Criminal Law: A Criminal Code for England and Wales. Vol 1. Report and Draft Criminal Code Bill. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

APPENDIX

A List of Arabic Symbols (Betti, 2007: 409-410; and Al-Seady, 1998: 77) /f/ as in / fiil/ “an elephant”

/Θ/ as in /Θa9lb/ “fox”

/ð/ as in /ðabha/ “he threw it”

/D/ as in /DabuT/ “an officer”

/s/ as in /suug/ “market”

/S/ as in /Sabur/ “patience”

/z/ as in /zraar/ “button”

/t3/ as in /t3aali/ “bank of the river”

/ʃ/ as in /ʃmaalak/ “What is wrong with you”

/x/ as in /xubuz/ “bread”

/G/ as in /Graab/ “crow”

/h/ as in /hnaa/ “here”

/H/ as in /Hariim/ “women”

/b/ as in /baab/ “door”

/t/ as in /timman/ “rice”

/T/ as in /TamaTa/ “tomatoes”

/d/ as in /tdanna/ “be nearby”

/D/ as in /Daal/ “staying”

/k/ as in /ka9ak/ “cake”

/q/ as in /qadiim/ “old”

/ʔ/ as in /ʔams/ “yesterday”

/d3/as in /d3amaal/ “beauty”

/g/ as in /ga9ad/ “he set down”

/m/ as in /minhuu/ “Who is it?”

/n/ as in /nibaH/ “barked”

/l/ as in /limna/ “gather us”

/w/ as in /wajjaana/ “with us”

/j/ as in /jamta/ “when”

/9/ as in /9aali/ “high”

/r/ as in /ramul/ “sand”

/p/ as in /parda/ “curtain”

/i/ as in /mi9da/ “stomach”

/ii/ as in /biina/ “in us”

/a/ as in /saliim/ “healthy”

/aa/ as in /salim/ “safe”

/oo/ as in /tilifoon/ “telephone”

/u/ as in /ummii/ “my mother”

/uu/ as in /9uud/ “stick”