

Give an Envelope for the Boss/Give a Brown Envelope for the Boss - On the Semantics and Characteristics of the Metaphors for Bribe across Cultures: Focus on Cameroon and Nigeria

Lozzi Martial Meutem Kamtchueng
University of Maroua

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Lozzi Martial Meutem Kamtchueng, Department of Bilingual Letters, Faculty of Letters and Social Sciences, PO Box 644, Maroua, University of Maroua, Cameroon. Email:lozzimartial@yahoo.fr

This paper sets out to study in a comparative perspective the semantics and the characteristics of the metaphors for bribe used by Cameroonians and Nigerians and discuss the factors which can account for the choice of these metaphors. The data for the study were collected from participant observation, novels, interviews, scientific papers and online sources and the work is discussed from the vantage point of functional grammar and cognitive linguistics. The findings of the study reveal that in order to lessen the appalling nature of the act of asking for bribes, avoid sounding ridiculous and render incomprehensible the message of asking for bribe from people who are not familiar with it, these language users utilize various types of metaphors (object metaphors, anthropomorphic metaphors, vegetative metaphors as well as zoomorphic metaphors). These metaphors display some similarities (which can be accounted for by the geographical proximity between the two countries) and differences: both utilize almost the same types of metaphors and to a lesser extent the same lexical items to refer to bribe but in different proportions (object metaphors, anthropomorphic metaphors, vegetative metaphors as well as zoomorphic metaphors). Furthermore, it is found that the values conveyed by these metaphors fall under the domains of foodstuff and drinks, fauna, human beings and body parts, mailing and transportation as well as abstract realities. Also, some of these metaphors can be characterized as being meliorative, pejorative, vindictive and kinesthetic. Moreover, it is found that cultural, social and economic factors can provide insights to the understanding of the choice of the values used to refer to bribe by these language users. In addition, the values used to represent bribes in these countries are a depiction of their multilingual complex nature.

Keywords: bribe, metaphor, values, language users, lexical items, factors

The phenomenon of corruption is very commonplace in Sub-Saharan Africa and in other parts of the world (Cf Transparency International reports from 2008 to 2015). Due to its pervasive nature, it has developed its language with its own lexico-semantic features. One of the key features of the lexico-semantics of this language is the use of metaphors. These metaphors are central in the language of corruption since it enables people who ask for bribes to pass across their message

tactfully while rendering it incomprehensible from the non-users of this code so much so that a person who is not used to this code will face difficulties in getting what is being said. The semantics of these metaphors therefore need to be deciphered. The use of metaphors for bribe can be observed in the productions of Nigerians and Cameroonians as the data collected for the study indicate. These metaphors are not always the same as we move from one sociocultural

environment to another although there are some points of convergence. The study is therefore based on the following assumptions:

- The semantics and characteristics of the values used as metaphor for bribe by Nigerians and Cameroonians display similarities and differences.
- Cultural, social and economic factors can provide insights to the understanding of the choice of the values used to refer to bribe by these language users.
- The values used to represent bribes in these two sociolinguistic environments are a depiction of the multilingual complex nature of these countries.

The study is discussed from the vantage point of functional grammar ((Halliday & Matthiessen 2004), Thompson (2004)) and cognitive linguistics (Lakoff & Johnson (1980a), Lakoff & Johnson (1980 b) and Shelestiuk (2006)).

According to functional linguists, language consists of three metafunctions: the interactional (we use language to interact with people), the textual (language is used to create coherent and cohesive texts) and the experiential metafunctions (we use language to convey our experiences of the world (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004; Thomson, 2004). Metaphors are discussed in the experiential metafunction and more precisely under relational processes. This metafunction upholds that language is used to talk about the world, either the external-things, events, qualities, etc. – or our internal world – thoughts, beliefs, feelings, etc.” (Thompson, 2004, p. 86). So, language is a reflection of our worldviews which can be perceived in terms of processes, namely material, mental, verbal, behavioral and relational. Since metaphors “set up a relationship between two concepts” (Thompson, 2004, p. 86), they are discussed under relational processes.

The analysis of a relational clause in systemic-functional grammar implies the use of the following key terms: “carrier” Vs. “attribute” and “token” Vs. “value”. The terms “carrier” Vs. “attribute” are used in attributive relational clauses while the terms “token” Vs. “value” are used in identifying relational clauses. The terms “token” Vs. “value” are appropriate to the analysis of metaphors. Attributive relational clauses and identifying relational clauses are exemplified in (a) and (b).

- (a) Your arguments are false.
- (b) Peter is a lion.

In (a), “arguments” is ascribed the attribute “false” while in (b) “Peter” is identified in terms of a “lion”. So, in (a), “arguments” is the “carrier” and “false” is the “attribute” while in (b) “Peter” is a “token” and “lion” is the “value”. The identification of “Peter” in terms of “a lion” is based on the similarity between “Peter” and

a “lion”. It is possible here that some aspects of the character of Peter are similar to those of a lion. This point is in consonance with the theory of conceptual metaphor (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980a); Lakoff & Johnson (1980b) according to which “the essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing or experience in terms of another” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980a, p. 455). To be more precise, metaphors “involve understanding less concrete experiences in terms of more concrete and more highly structured experiences” (Lakoff & Johnson (1980a, p. 486). In other words, it is “a transfer (transposition) of a name of an object/phenomenon to another object/phenomenon on the basis of the similarity between them (Shelestiuk, 2006, p. 334). In (b) “Peter” is perceived in terms of a “lion”. In the conceptual metaphor theory, “Peter” belongs to the “target domain” while “lion” falls under the source domain. The common features which “Peter” share with the “lion” constitute “the ground” (Richards, 1990, p. 93).

As pointed out by Shelestiuk (2006, pp. 337-338), metaphors can be classified following structural and semantic approaches. In the present study, the second approach is adopted. Under the semantic approach can be identified three main classifications: the classification by associative link between the vehicle (value) and tenor (token), forming the ground of similarity: similarity of function (e.g.: the hands of a clock), similarity of form (a bottle’s neck), similarity of structure and substance (e.g.: a flood of tears); the classification based on the logico-grammatical meaning of the ground in a metaphor, describing the process of nomination in it. (e.g. a substance can be characterized through another substance, a substance can be characterized through an action, etc.) and the classification of metaphors based on the subject of the vehicle whereby metaphors are characterized as anthropomorphic, zoomorphic, vegetative metaphors, etc. (Shelestiuk, 2006, pp. 337-338). The first (classification by associative link between the vehicle and tenor) and the third classification (based on the subject of the vehicle) will be used in this study. This theoretical background will serve as the framework of analysis of the metaphors in the present study.

Many researchers in Cameroon (Meutem Kamtchueng, 2015; Safotso, 2015) and Nigeria (Bassey Ekpenyong & Bassey, 2014; Adeyemi Adegoju & Saheed Ake Raheem, 2015) have been interested in the language of corruption. Both in the Nigerian and Cameroonian contexts, this language has developed its own vocabulary and lexico-semantic features such as gradable synonyms, collocates, metaphors, idioms, clichés and coinages (Bassey Ekpenyong & Bassey, 2014), semantic shifts, borrowing, affixation, idiomatic formation, and stereotyped sentences (Meutem Kamtchueng, 2015). In the Nigerian context,

it makes use of pragmatic strategies such as blatant requests, cunning/subtle elicitations, proverbial/metaphoric cues and technical/bureaucratic non-formation (Adeyemi Adegoju & Saheed Ake Raheem, 2015). In Cameroon, this language has got a register (Safotso, 2015) and draws its lexes from background languages (Meutem Kamtchueng, 2015; Safotso, 2015). The following types of metaphors for bribe can be identified in Cameroon: anthropomorphic, zoomorphic, vegetative, abstraction and object metaphors (Meutem Kamtchueng, 2016). Also, social, traditional and cultural practices in Cameroon can account for the choice of the values used in the metaphors of bribery and corruption in this country. These metaphors delineate the social, economical and political plight of Cameroonians (Meutem Kamtchueng, 2016). It is recommended that in Nigeria, anti-graft agencies should track the nuances with which corrupt practices are coded so as to boost the anti-graft crusade in the country (Adeyemi Adegoju & Saheed Ake Raheem, 2015).

As opposed to the above mentioned studies, the present work analyses, in a comparative perspective, the semantics and characteristics of the metaphors for bribe in the Cameroonian and Nigerian sociolinguistic environments. As mentioned above, it is based on the following assumptions:

- The semantics and characteristics of the values used as metaphor for bribe by Nigerians and Cameroonians display similarities and differences.
- Cultural, social and economic factors can provide insights to the understanding of the choice of the values used to refer to bribe by these language users.
- The values used to represent bribes in these two sociolinguistic environments are a depiction of the multilingual complex nature of these countries.

Materials and Methods

The data analysed in this study were collected from written and online materials, participant observation and interviews.

Written and Online Materials

As concerns written material, the data were collected from scientific papers and novels written both by Cameroonians and Nigerians. They are the following:

a) Cameroonians

•Scientific papers

- Meutem Kamtchueng Lozzi Martial (2015) C'est ça que je mange?/Is that what I eat?-Examining the language of corruption in Cameroon. *International Journal of Language Studies* 10/1, 125-148.
- Safotso Tagne G. (2015) The metalanguage of corruption in Cameroon-part I: The registers of general administration, transport and education. *International Journal of English Linguistics* 5/2, 47-54.

•Novels

- Ambanasom S. (1999) *Son of the native soil*. Bamenda: Patron Publishing House.

b) Nigerians

- Bassey Ekpenyong and V. Bassey (2014) Language of corruption and anticorruption in Nigeria. *Journal of Contemporary Research* 11/2, pp. 45-59.
- Adeyemi Adeyemi Adegoju and Saheed Oke Raheem (2015) Gone are the days of 'kola (nut): New trends in language habits and coding of corrupt practices in Nigeria. *Marang: Journal of Language and Literature*. Vol. 26, pp. 155-171.
- Bamiro, Edmund (2015) "English in Nigerian Settings: Recent Lexicoining in Nigerian English". In Tunde Opeibi, Josef Schmied, Tope Omoniyi and Kofo Adedeji (eds) *Essays on Language in Societal Transformation: A Festschrift in Honour of Segun Awonusi*. Gottingen, Germany: Cuvillier Verlag, pp. 87-96.

The following online materials serve as a source for provision of the data:

- <http://cameroonjournal.com/national-news/conac-wont-name-corrupt-officials-in-anti-corruption-repo> (accessed on July 5, 2016)
- https://wikileaks.org/plusd/cables/08YAOUNDE913_a.html (accessed on July 5, 2016)
- <https://www.facebook.com/radiotiemenisiantou/posts/696678067037234> (accessed on July 5, 2016)
- <http://cameroonjournal.com/national-news/conac-wont-name-corrupt-officials-in-anti-corruption-repo> (accessed on July 5, 2016)
- <http://www.georgeehusani.org/home/index.php/papers> (accessed on July 5, 2016)

•Interviews

Also, part of the data was collected via interviews. One hundred informants were interviewed in both countries. These informants were civil servants, workers of the private sectors and students of both sexes. The questions found in the interview are the following:

1. Are you a Cameroonian/Nigerian?

2. What is your region/State of origin?
3. What is your occupation?
4. Have you ever heard of corruption?
5. What does that mean?
6. Have you ever practised or been a victim of corruption?
7. In which situation(s)?
8. What are the words or expressions used by the persons who corrupt or who ask for bribe?
9. What do they mean?
10. In which contexts are they used?

• **Participant observation**

Participant observation was used to collect data in the Cameroonian context only. The data about the metaphors for bribe used in the Nigerian context were collected only through written materials, online materials and interviews. The most sizeable proportion of the data obtained from participant observation were collected in the Yaounde administrative area, more precisely around the Ministry of Finance. This area is the point of convergence of all civil servants in Cameroon since their financial documents are treated there. It was very frequent to hear civil servant, in informal conversations, using terms such as “gombo” (gumbo), “motivation” (motivation), “pourcentage” (percentage), “parle bien” (“speak well”, etc. to refer to bribe. I have been hearing these expressions since 2007, date from which I started following up my documents of integration into the public service. From 2007 up to the present time, these terms and expressions are still used. Furthermore, other data collected from participant observation were heard from the conversations between policemen or gendarmes and car drivers (especially those who either have incomplete car’s documents or those whose car’s documents have expired) and between policemen or gendarmes and the passengers who either do not have their identity cards or whose identity cards are expired.

In order to avoid idiosyncratic data, only the lexis and expressions which were recurrent were finally analysed. For a lexis or expression to be included in the analysis, it should occur at least twice.

Results and Discussion

In this section are presented and analysed the data collected from the various research instruments. They are discussed in four subsections, namely, object metaphors, anthropomorphic metaphors, zoomorphic metaphors, vegetative metaphors and abstraction metaphors. For each type of metaphor, the examples will be provided into two groups, namely the data drawn from the Cameroonian and Nigerian contexts respectively.

Object Metaphors

Under this subsection are discussed metaphors for bribe whose value denotes lifeless material realities, more precisely those which can be seen and touched (e.g.: food, drinks, objects, etc.)

A) Cameroonian context

- 1)
 - (a) “Il faut *le vin du patron*”: There should be *the boss’s wine*.” (Safotso, 2015, p. 50)
 - (b) “Donne moi *mon whisky*, je te fais valider cette matière: Give me *my whisky* I will make you pass the course.

B) Nigerian context

- 2)
 - (a) “[...] the expression “*pure water* is not too small” is sometimes used to seek gratification. (Adegoju & Raheem, 2015, p. 163)
 - (b) “*Chop-chop*: A Pidgin expression for corruption (Bassey & Bassey, 2014, p. 54)
 - (c) “Glad you are here; I can rest assured *my lunch*/transport fare is fixed for today” (Adegoju & Raheem, 2015, p. 161)
- 3)
 - (a) “In making such a cunning request, a common Pidgin English expression “*you no chop remain?*” (*Have you no left-over?*) could be used” (Adegoju & Raheem, 2015, p. 163)
 - (b) “So, in Yoruba, the expressions “*E je kó gbon sile*” (*Let the crumbs filter down*)[...] (Adegoju & Raheem, 2015, p. 165)
 - (c) “*Dash*” may be offered in solid cash [...] the “dash” is an incentive (Bassey & Bassey, 2014, p. 49)

As indicated above, (1a) and (1b) are drawn from the Cameroonian context while (2a), (2b) (2c), (3a) and (3b) and (3c) are used in the Nigerian context. In these sentences, the lexis or expressions “le vin du patron: boss’ wine”, “mon whisky: my whisky”, “pure water: water in sachets”, “chop-chop: food”, “lunch”; “chop remain: left over”, “kó gbon sile: crumbs filter down” and “dash” are the values used to represent bribe. So, the metaphors used in these sentences can be paraphrased as follows: “(1’a) bribe is the boss’ wine”, (1’b) “bribe is whisky”, (2’a) “bribe is pure water”, (2’b) “bribe is chop-chop”, (2’c) “bribe is lunch”, (3a) “bribe is left-over”, (3b) “bribes are crumbs”, (3c) “Bribe is dash”. In (1’a) and (1’b), “boss’ wine” and “whisky” are respectively the values used in source domains to represent the target domain lexis “bribe” while “in (2’a), (2’b) and (2’c) the lexis “pure water”, “chop-chop” and “my lunch” are the vehicles used in the source domain to represent “bribe” in the target domain. In (3a), (3b) and (3c) the lexis “crumbs” and “left-over”

and “dash” are the values used to represent “bribe”. What is common to these values is that all of them belong to the lexical domains of foodstuff and drinks. Therefore, the above metaphors can be paraphrased as “bribe is food and drinks”. It is important to indicate that the above values used to represent bribe are just euphemistic. This concurs Meutem Kamtchueng (2015, p. 76) when he points out that “when a corrupt worker asks a person who needs his or her services to give him/her “kola nut” before he/she can attend to him/her, he/she does not certainly expect from him/her the fruit of the kola nut tree neither does he expect CFA 25 or CFA 50 which are roughly the price of a kola nut on the Cameroonian market”. This point is buttressed by Adeyemi Adegoju and Saheed Oke Raheem (2015, p. 161) who state that reference for “lunch” and “transport fare” in the expressions used to ask for bribe does not necessarily mean that what is expected from the interlocutor is not equivalent to what is requested. It should be observed that both Nigerians and Cameroonians use the values of **DRINKS** to refer to bribe (boss’ wine” and “whisky (in the Cameroonian context) and “pure water” (in the Nigerian context). Also, Nigerians use the value of **FOOD** to represent bribe (e.g.: “*chop-chop*: a Pidgin-English expression for corruption and bribery), “lunch”, “crumbs”, “left-over” and “dash”. Literally, “chop-chop” is the Pidgin-English word for food, “lunch” is “a meal that is eaten in the middle of the day (Cambridge Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, henceforth CALD, 2005, p. 758), “crumb refers to “a very small piece of bread, cake or biscuit” (CALD, 2005, p. 299) and “left-overs” means “food remaining after” (CALD, 2005, p. 724), a “dash” is “a small amount of something, especially liquid food, that is added to something else” (CALD, 2005, p. 314). These values point to the fact that one of the main factors which motivate people to take bribe is hunger and poverty. The images conveyed by the values of these metaphors go a long way to portray the abject misery of people in these countries: From these metaphors, it can be inferred that people ask for bribe on the grounds that they are hungry and thirsty. So, they want to satisfy one of their basic biological needs (eating and drinking). It is worth noting that the metaphors “pure water: water in sachets”, “left-over: food remaining after”, “crumb: a very small piece of bread, cake or biscuit” reinforce the abject living conditions of many people in these countries. The findings obtained from the study carried out by Action AID Nigeria (2015, pp. 45-57) reveal that there is a correlation between corruption and poverty. Many people in sub-Saharan Africa are poor and this can be a fertile ground for corruption. Uzochukwu (2016) sheds more light on this point when he states that

According to international standards of poverty, a person is said to be poor when he

lives under \$1.25 (₦210, though it varies) per day. There are many poor people in Nigeria, and poverty pushes them into corruption. According to World Bank Group, in 2004, 63.1% of Nigerians were poor. The poverty level increased in 2010. In 2010, 68% of the Nigerian populations were estimated to be poor. A person can take bribes to commit crime because he is poor. It is one of the reasons why the poor youths in the country collect bribes to work as thugs for Nigerian politicians (<https://soapboxie.com/world-politics/Corruption-in-Nigeria>, accessed on July 20, 2016).

What is said by Uzochukwu (2016) in the above quotation holds true for many African countries, especially those of sub-Saharan Africa.

In addition to using metaphors whose value belong to the lexical domain of food stuff and drinks to represent bribe, Cameroonians and Nigerian also make use of the metaphors whose values are drawn from other lexical domains.

C) Cameroonian context

4)

- (a) “Voilà votre *taxi*”: “That is your *taxi (fare)*” (Safotso, 2015, p. 53)
- (b) “Find me *an envelope*”: “Find *an envelope* for me” (Safotso, 2015, p. 53)

D) Nigerian context

5)

- (a) To give and receive *brown envelope* (Bassey & Bassey, 2014, p. 54)
- (b) “Glad you are here; I can rest assured my lunch/*transport fare* is fixed for today” (Adegoju & Raheem, 2015, p. 161)
- (c) “Among the notable expressions which have permeated the corrupt world of the country are “settlement”-any form of gratification, be it monetary or material; “brown envelope”-packaged money for inducement[...]“*Ghana must-go*”-massive money mopped up for influencing political decisions[...] (Adegoju & Raheem, 2015, p. 161).

Sentences 4(a) and 4(b) are drawn from the Cameroonian context while 5(a), (b) and (c) are drawn from the Nigerian context. The metaphoric constructions in these sentences can be paraphrased respectively as (4’a) bribe is taxi(fare), (4’b) bribe is envelope, (5’a) bribe is brown envelope, (5’b) bribe is transport fare, (5’c) bribe is Ghana-must-go (NB: Ghana-must-go (bags) which are multi-color bags mass-produced by Ghanaians to pack their belongings when they returned to Ghana en-masse as the economy of their country started to stabilize and improve in the 1990s; such bags, now used to load cash inducements,

have become a metaphor for corruption in Nigerian politics)(Bamiro, 2015, p. 90). In these sentences, “taxi (fares)”, “envelope”, “brown envelope”, “transport fare” and “Ghana-must-go” are the values used in the source domain to represent the token “bribe” in the target domain. What is common to all these metaphor values is that they belong to the lexical domain of mailing and transportation. So, it can be observed that both Cameroonians and Nigerians make use of the metaphor which are drawn from the domain of mailing and transportation to refer to bribe and in many situations, the lexes used are almost the same: “envelope: bribe”, “taxi (fare): bribe” (Cameroonian context); “brown envelope: bribe”, “transport fare: bribe” (Nigerian context). What could have motivated the choice of “envelope”, “taxi (fare)”, “brown envelope”, “transport fare”, “Ghana-must-go” in order to refer to bribe. It can be pointed out that in the language of corruption, some of the object metaphors used to refer to bribe denote the realities which can help to ease or facilitate an action, an activity or task: envelopes/brown envelopes helps to keep a letter, or any object made from paper; taxi facilitates the movement of people from one place to another, taxi(fares) or transport fares is money paid in order to be transported from one place to another and Ghana-must-go (bags) are multi-color bags produced by Ghanaians to pack their belongings when they returned to Ghana en-masse (Bamiro, 2015, p. 90). So, like taxi/transport (fares) which facilitates the movement of people from one place to another, like the envelope/brown envelope which helps in keeping documents for mailing, like Ghana-must-go (bags) which are the bags which ease the keeping and transportation of goods, bribe facilitates or eases the interaction between a corrupt official and the person who needs to be attended to and therefore enables the latter to get what he needs from the former no matter whether or not the latter is entitled to it.

Zoomorphic and Vegetative Metaphors

Zoomorphic metaphors refer to the metaphors whose values are related to fauna (i.e. animals) as opposed to vegetative metaphors whose values are drawn from flora (plants, vegetables, fruits, etc.).

E) Cameroonian context

6)

- (a) As-tu attaché *la chèvre* du proviseur? :
“Have you tied *the goat* of the principal (zoomorphic metaphor)
- (b) J’attends toujours *mon coq* pour ton dossier que j’ai traité: I am still waiting for *my cock* for your file that I treated (zoomorphic metaphor)
- (c) Donne moi un *pigeon*: give me *a pigeon* (Bribe of CFA 1000)(zoomorphic metaphor)

7)

- (a) “[...] They went straight to the DO’s com pound with their “kola-nut” [...] Achamba had influenced the DO’s decision” (Ambanasom, 1999, p. 143) (NB: the metaphor “kola-nut” is also used in the French language in Cameroon)(vegetative metaphor)
- (b) “Donne-moi *mon gombo*, je te fais réussir”: Give me *my gumbo*, I make you succeed (Vegetative metaphor).

F) Nigerian context

(c) “*To give kola or receive kola*”: to bribe or to be bribed (Bassey & Bassey, 2014, p. 54 (vegetative metaphor)

The metaphors in (6a), (6b), (6c), (7a) and (7b) are drawn from the Cameroonian sociocultural environment while that of (8a) is drawn from the Nigerian context. The metaphoric constructions in these sentences can be paraphrased respectively as “(6’a) bribe is goat, (6’b) bribe is cock, (6’c) bribe is pigeon, (7’a) bribe is kola-nut, (7b) bribe is gumbo, (8a) bribe is kola-nut. The values of the metaphors in (6a) (6b) and (6c) are zoomorphic (i.e. they have to do with animal (goat, cock, pigeon) while those in (7a), (7b) and (7c) are vegetative (they have to do with plants, fruits, etc.). It can be observed that some of the vegetative metaphors used in the Cameroonian context to refer to bribe are also attested in the Nigerian sociocultural environment. It is the case of the vegetative metaphor “kola(nut)” which is used in both contexts. Furthermore, a scrutiny of the data indicates that in addition to vegetative metaphors, Cameroonians, unlike Nigerians, make use of zoomorphic metaphors in order to refer to bribe. This is attested in the data by values such as “goat”, “cock” and “pigeon”. The choice of these values in order to represent bribe can be explained by some sociocultural practices which are common place in these neighboring countries. People in many ethnic groups in Cameroon and Nigeria during certain events perform sacrifices during which they slaughter goats, cocks. This is generally done during some traditional events (traditional wedding. As pointed out in Meutem Kamtchueng (2016, in press, *REAL Studies 10*)

the offering or sacrificing of goat(s) and cock(s) while performing these traditional and cultural practices aims at making in such a way that the event for which the animals are offered or sacrificed take place without hitch (marriage, for example), or find an everlasting solution (settling of a dispute, for instance); or that the benediction sought be granted to people, etc. These clues can enable us to understand the choice of the

values of zoomorphic metaphors “goat”, “cock” used [...] to refer to bribe. Like the goats and cocks which are offered during traditional and cultural practices to seek an everlasting solution to a problem, bribes are given by people so that the various problems they face in the treatment of their files by unscrupulous officials in various offices find a solution; legitimate services be rendered to them; their files be treated diligently, etc.

It should be mentioned that the choice of the value “pigeon” in order to refer to a bribe (bribe of CFA1000) can be explained by the fact that CFA1000 is generally the price of a pigeon. This metaphor is regularly used by policemen when they want to ask for bribe to a taxi-driver who has committed a traffic offence or who does not have all the car’s documents. With regard to kola (nut), it is important to say that it symbolizes friendship, familiarity, solidarity among people, especially in Africa. In many offices in underdeveloped countries, officials attend to people on the basis of their familiarity with the person who needs their services. Since kola(nut) is used to create familiarity, the person who needs services has to create this familiarity (by giving kola(nut)) before he is attended to. The choice of the value “gumbo” to refer to bribe can be linked to the nature of its substance. The substance of the gumbo fruit is slippery. So, “what is slippery does not stick to something and can therefore be easily slipped into a container. So, like gumbo (substance) which can easily be slipped into a container, bribe can easily and secretly be slipped into the pocket of the person who takes it for fear of not being noticed” (Meutem Kamtchueng, 2016, *REAL Studies 10*). From the above clues, one can understand why the values discussed above have been chosen by language users in these countries to refer to bribe.

In addition to drawing the metaphor of bribe from object-related entities, fauna and flora, language users in Cameroon and Nigeria draw the metaphors for bribe from human-related entities.

Anthropomorphic Metaphors

A metaphor is said to be anthropomorphic when its value is related to human beings (persons, body parts, etc.).

G-Cameroonian context

8)

- (a) “Fais comme un *bon Camerounais*: do/make like a *good Cameroonian*.
- (b) Parle comme *un grand homme*”: speak/talk like *a great man* (Meutem Kamtchueng, 2015, p. 70)

9)

- (a) “Il n y a rien pour les *pauvres*”: There isn’t any

thing for the *poor*

- (b) Il y a les *mange mille* en route: there are *1000-eaters* on the road (CFA 1000)

H) Nigerian context

10)

- (a) “*bottom power*”-female influence on male to get whatever is desired (Adegoju & Raheem, 2015, p. 161)
- (b) [...]“Anything there for *the boys?* [...]” (Adegoju & Raheem, 2015, p. 163)

Sentences (8a) and (8b); (9a) and (9b) incorporate metaphors for bribe which are drawn from the Cameroonian sociocultural environment while (10a) and (10b) have to do with the metaphors which are found in the Nigerian context. The metaphoric construction identified in the above sentences can respectively be paraphrased as (8’a) a good Cameroonian is the person who bribes, (8’b) a great man is the person who bribes, (9’a) workers are the poor, (9’b) Policemen/gendarmes are 1000-eaters (CFA 1000), (10a) bribe is bottom power, (10b) policemen/gendarmes are the boys. The values incorporated in these metaphors can be said to be anthropomorphic since they are related to human beings (“good Cameroonian”, “great man”, “the poor”, “1000-eaters”, “bottom power” (female influence on male to get whatever they want) and “the boys”. It can therefore be observed that both Cameroonians and Nigerians make use of anthropomorphic metaphors in order to refer to bribery. Let us consider the following sentences:

8)

- (a) “Fais comme un *bon Camerounais*: do/make like a *good Cameroonian*.
- (b) Parle comme *un grand homme*”: speak/talk like *a great man* (Meutem Kamtchueng, 2015, p. 70)

It is important to mention that these sentences are used by Cameroonian when asking for bribe. The values of the metaphors incorporated in these sentences have a flattery overtone (meliorative) (“*good Cameroonian*”, “*a great man*”). The overall aim of these meliorative metaphors is to flatter their interlocutor so that they can give them some bribe. It can be stated that these metaphors show the extent to which corruption is so widespread and has eaten deep into the fabric of the Cameroonian society so much so that it has become the norm: These metaphors suggests that a model Cameroonian citizen/a great man is he who corrupts. So, in Cameroon, being corrupt is the norm whereas not being corrupt is the exception.

Like sentences (8a) and (8b), (9a) (“Il n y a rien pour les *pauvres*”: There isn’t anything for the *poor*”) and (10b) “[...] Anything there for *the boys?*” are interrogatives used to ask for bribe. However, unlike the values of the metaphors in (8a) and (8b) which are meliorative (they have a flattery overtone), the values

of the ones used in (9a) (*the poor*) and (10b) (*the boys*) have a pejorative overtone. In other words, officials who ask for bribe call themselves “the poors” (in the Cameroonian context) while policemen who ask for bribe call themselves “the boys” (in the Nigerian context). By referring to them using the metaphors “the poors” and “the boys”, these official tactfully wants to arouse pity from the heart of the people to whom they are asking for bribe and in many situations they succeed in their ridiculous and shameful enterprise. Many officials, especially policemen and gendarmes in Cameroon excel in asking for bribe. Such an annoying behavior has brought many Cameroonians, especially, road users, to refer to them using the metaphors “1000-eaters” (this is due to the fact that they usually collect CFA 1000 from drivers). Sentence (9b) “Il y a les *mange mille* en route: there are *1000-eaters* on the road” serves as an illustration of this metaphor. It can be observed that the value of the metaphor in (9b) neither has a meliorative nor a pejorative overtone. Instead, it has a vindictive or derogatory overtone. This metaphor is an expression of the anger of the Cameroonian road users, especially drivers, who are fed up of this appalling behavior of these road officials.

If it is true that the values of the metaphors for bribe take the form of material entities, as it is the case of object metaphors, it is nonetheless true that immaterial entities are used as the metaphors for bribe. The example incorporated in (10a) can serve as an example.

(10a) “*Bottom power*”-female influence on male to get whatever is desired (Adegoju & Raheem, 2015, p. 161)

Many women use their sex organs as an inducement in order to get what they are unable to get or have access to using legal means or material things. This way of bribing is referred to in the Nigerian sociocultural environment using the metaphor “bottom power” (i.e. the power which consists in using one’s intimate parts to have what one desires). This situation is rampant in the school environment where many female students get good marks after that they have had sexual intercourses with their male teachers or lecturers. In Cameroon such marks are known as STM (Sexually Transmitted Marks). Also, “bottom-power” is used by women in other social domains in order to get a promotion, influence decision-making in their favor, etc.

The metaphors discussed in the following section denote immaterial realities, more precisely abstractions.

Abstraction Metaphors

These are metaphors whose vehicles refer to immaterial realities (i.e. realities which cannot be seen

and touched).

I) Cameroonian context

11)

- (a) “Faire *un geste*: to *make a gesture*” (Meutem Kamtchueng, 2015, p. 69)
- (b) “E don *oil yo mop* (Cameroon Pidgin English)”: “he has *oiled his mouth*” (Safotso, 2015, p. 49)
- (c) “Dem go *lock yo mop*”(Cameroon Pidgin English)”: “they will *shut his mouth*” (Safotso, 2015, p. 49)
- (d) *Shake skin* (Cameroon Pidgin English)”: *shake your skin*
- (e) *Fais vite tu pars: make fast and go*

12)

- (a) *Lave tes péchés: wash away your sins*
- (b) *Va pisser: go and pee* (used by gendarmes to ask for bribe at the Cameroon-Chad border)
- (c) “Gars, si tu *ne parles pas bien*, le proviseur ne t’acceptera pas dans son établissement: Guy, if you do *not speak well*, the principal will not admit you into his school”

J) Nigerian Context

13)

- (a) “[...] While the addressee is confronted with this seeming question which is actually an invitation for inducement, the speaker would follow up with another metaphoric utterance to ensure the case is pushed through the “express mode”. Therefore, in Igbo, the common expression “*Bba oku*” (*Flash your torch*) or “*Gbaa gburugburu*” (Run around to look for something) could be used” (Adegoju & Raheem, 2015, p. 164).
- (b) “[...] While the addressee is confronted with this seeming question which is actually an invitation for inducement, the speaker would follow up with another metaphoric utterance to ensure the case is pushed through the “express mode”. Therefore, in Igbo, the common expression “*Bba oku*” (*Flash your torch*) or “*Gbaa gburugburu*” (*Run around to look for something*) could be used” (Adegoju & Raheem, 2015, p. 164).
- (c) “In some other situations when the addressee is perceived to be well to do [...] an entreaty is made that he or she should give out from the abundance he/she possesses. So, in Yoruba, the expressions “*È jẹ kó gbòn silẹ*” (Let the crumbs filter down) or “*È ju nnkan silẹ* (*Drop something*) could be used for metaphoric invitations. The Igbo equivalent of the invitation to “*drop something*” is “*kpokom*” which is an onomatopoeic utterance usually accompanied with the body gesture (hand description) of the act of dropping something. (Adegoju & Raheem, 2015, p. 164)
- (d) Other similar expressions in Yoruba are [...] “È

ma da je o” (*Do not monopolise the largesse*).

(Adegoju & Raheem, 2015, p. 164)

- (e) There is also a proverbial expression which is deployed in the discourse of corrupt practices in Yoruba: “*E domi siwaju ke le teḷe to tutu*” (*pour water upfront so that you walk on a wet ground*) (Adegoju & Raheem, 2015, p. 165)

The metaphoric constructions in (11a), (11b), (11c), (11d), (11e), (12a), (12b) and (12c) are drawn from the Cameroonian sociocultural environment and can be paraphrased as follows: (11’a) Bribing is ***making a gesture***, (11’b) Bribing is ***oiling someone’s mouth***, (11’c) Bribing is ***shutting someone’s mouth***, (11’d) Bribing is ***shaking skin***, (11’e) Bribing is ***making fast and go***, (12a) Bribing is ***washing away one’s sins***, (12b) looking for bribe is ***to go and pee***, (12c) Bribing is ***speaking well***. The ones found in (13a), (13b), (13c), (13d) and (13e) are drawn from the Nigerian sociocultural context and can be paraphrased as follows: (13’a) Bribing is ***flashing one’s torch***, (13’b) Looking for bribe is ***to run around to look for something***, (13’c) Bribing is ***dropping something***, (13’d) Not bribing is to ***monopolise the largesse***, (13’e) Bribing is to ***pour water upfront so that you can walk on a wet ground***. All these metaphors are used to ask for bribe. Besides, despite the fact that they are drawn from two different sociocultural environments, they do not only denote abstract realities but also they have the same underlying characteristic. In other words, their value denote a kinetic reality, i.e. they involve some sort of movement of the body parts. It will be interesting to understand the meaning of such metaphors. Bribing is an illegal and illegitimate act which is sanctioned in almost all countries (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (henceforth OECD, 2008, pp. 42-48). So, when one bribes, the action of giving bribe should not draw people’s attention. This action should be stealthily. These clues can account for the use of expressions such as “making a gesture (11’a)”, “shaking skin” (11’d), “making fast and go” (11c), “dropping something” to refer to the action of bribing. The actions denoted by the values of these metaphors are stealthy and ephemeral and as such they do not draw people’s attention. Let us note that a gesture which involves body parts is generally ephemeral and stealthy. Besides, “to shake” and “to drop” are momentary verbs and one of the key characteristics of momentary verbs is that they denote actions which “have little duration” (Quirk & Greenbaum, 1973, p. 47). When an action denoted by a verb has little duration, that action can easily go unnoticed and so is the action of bribing. Such clues can help understand the choice of such metaphors to refer to bribing. Also, as mentioned above, some metaphors used to represent bribe are realities that ease or facilitate a movement.

This can justify the use of the metaphor “oiling someone’s mouth” (11’b). To oil means “to put oil on something, especially a machine, usually to make it work more easily without sticking” (CALD, 2005, p. 876). So, like oil which eases the functioning of a machine, bribe eases the interaction between the corrupt official and the person who needs his/her services. It should also be noted that one can bribe not only to get a service, but also to make in such a way that the truth is not revealed about an affair, or a judgment is said in his or her favor. For these to be done, one has to “lock” (i.e. shut) the mouth of the official, i.e. bribe him. This can account for the use of the metaphor “locking” (shutting) someone’s mouth (11’c). Furthermore, in order to convince their interlocutors to give them bribe, corrupt officials create a situation whereby their interlocutor will not feel at ease should he/she not give the bribe. This can be illustrated by instances such as “wash away your sins” (12’a), “do not monopolise the largesse (13’e)”. It should be said that the metaphor “washing away one’s sins” is used by policemen in Cameroon, in order to ask for bribe from taxi drivers who have either infringed the driving code or whose car documents are not complete. Not respecting road regulations or having a taxi with incomplete documents is equated to a ***sin*** which will be washed away not by prayers but by a ***bribe***. The rationale of the policemen to use the metaphor of “sin” to refer to a driving fault is to aggravate the fault committed in order to convince the taxi-driver to give them bribe. Also, in order to ask for bribe, corrupt officials also use some metaphors which have to do with the body function and which consist in getting rid of waste material. This can be illustrated by the metaphor for bribing in (12’b) “looking for bribe is ***to go and pee***”. The metaphor “to go and pee” is used by Cameroonian road officials at check points at the Chad-Cameroon border so as to ask for bribe. As pointed out above, the action of bribing is done secretly. In other words, it should be hidden for fear that it does not draw people’s attention. Under normal circumstances one does not pee in public. In order to pee, one has to do it far from the eyes of people. So, like the action of peeing which is hidden so that it does not draw people attention, so is the action of looking for bribe which will be given to a corrupt road official. It should be noted that the corrupt official generally put some sort of pressure on his interlocutor while asking him to look for bribe. The metaphor in (13a) “[...] or ***Gbaa gburugburu***” (*Run around to look for something*)” which originates from the Igbo language, serves as an illustration. The use of the metaphor “run around to look for something” to mean “run and look for bribe” shows that the person who asks for bribe puts pressure on his/her interlocutor. Should his /her interlocutor not give bribe, something bad might

happen to him/her (he might not be attended to, his file might not be treated, the information needed might not be given to him/her, etc.). Moreover, it should be stated that many corrupt officials would not give much importance to the service you need from them and for which they earn a salary unless you bribe them. For instance, when you arrive in some public offices in Cameroon, after that you have told you *raison d'être* coming there, a corrupt official might ask you to bribe him/her using the utterance “parle bien”/ “speak well”. From this utterance, one can say that when one asks for a service without bribing, he/she is not “speaking” well but when one ask for service and gives a bribe, one is “speaking well”. So, what makes much sense to the corrupt official is not the service you ask him/her to do for you but the bribe you give him/her for the service needed. As pointed out above, the values of many metaphors used to refer to bribe are realities which ease or facilitate a process. The metaphor in (13 a) “*Bba oku*” (*Flash your torch*)” drawn from Igbo, a language spoken in Nigeria, is a case in point. In this example, the value used to represent the token “bribing” is the action of “flashing one’s torch”. Generally, the torch is flashed so that light can be produced. So, like the torch which helps to produce light, bribe helps to facilitate the interaction between a corrupt official and their interlocutors. Also, as discussed above, one strategy used by corrupt people to ask for bribe consists in using some metaphors whose value either have a flattery overtone or which arouse pity from the heart of their interlocutor(s). The value of the metaphor in (13 d) [...] “*E ma da je o’*” (*Do not monopolise the largesse*) which originates from Yoruba, a language spoken in Nigeria, follows this trend. In (13d), the metaphor not to “monopolise the largesse” is used to refer to the action of bribing. It is worth noting that “largesse” is the “money given to poor people by rich people” (CALD, 2005, p. 713). The word “largesse” implies that the person who asks for bribe is one of “the poor” whereas his or her interlocutor is one of “the rich”. By using this metaphor, the corrupt official praises his interlocutor (insinuating that the interlocutor is rich) and belittles himself/herself (insinuating that he/she (the corrupt official) is poor). So, the interlocutor should give them that money (not monopolise the largesse) since it is meant for them (the poor). This metaphor goes in the same vein with the one found in (9a) which is used in the Cameroonian context (9a) “Il n y a rien pour les *pauvres*”: There isn’t anything for the *poor*” (Cf section 3.3).

As discussed above, some traditional practices can provide clues in the understanding of some metaphors used to refer to bribe. Also, it has been observed that some metaphors used to refer to bribe are realities which ease or facilitate a process, an activity, etc. The metaphor (13e) drawn from the

Nigerian context “(13e) *E domi siwaju ke le tele to tutu*” (*pour water upfront so that you walk on a wet ground*) is another illustration of this point. In order to perform some rituals in Africa, people pour libations and water is one of the liquid which is poured during libations. In other words, in traditional African cultures and traditions, pouring libations is a ritual usually involving the pouring of water (www.abpsi.org/.../2016firsttimeattendeehandout.pdf). The pouring of water or libation is done in order to thank the ancestors, requesting something like support, stability, clarity, spiritual cleansing or protection etc. (<http://www.africaspeaks.com/reasoning/index.php?topic>). So, like water which is poured in order to seek support, stability, spiritual cleansing and protection from the ancestors, bribe is given so as to help the person who needs the services of a corrupt official to be attended to, to have his/her file treated diligently, to be given the required information, bribe is given in order to ease or facilitate the interaction between the corrupt official and the person who needs his/her services.

K) Cameroonian Context

14)

- (a) Il faut *voir le patron* pour qu’il déblocue ton dossier: You should see [*meet*] *the boss* so that your file can be processed
- (b) As-tu déjà donné *la motivation* du patron pour le traitement de ton dossier-là?: Have you already given *the motivation* of the boss for the treatment of your file?
- (c) [...] to avoid problems: to bribe (<http://cameroonjournal.com/national-news/conac-wont-name-corrupt-officials-in-anti-corruption-repo>)

L) Nigerian Context

(15a) “In some cases when the speaker does not want to open up or give clear indicators as to the form of gratification desired, an open request may be presented in Yoruba thus: “*E ma a ri mi/wa ke to lo o*” (*You would see me/us before you go*). (Adegoju & Raheem, 2015, p. 162)

(15b) “*Motivation* could actually come in the form of a Greek gift as bait, employment given to a relation either on a contract basis, internship or absorption of a relation as a corps member to serve[...]” (Adegoju & Raheem, 2015, p. 167).

(15c) “Among the notable expressions which have permeated the corrupt world of the country are “*settlement*”-*any form of gratification, be it monetary or material*” (Adegoju & Raheem, 2015, p. 161)

(15d) “The giving and taking of bribe is the most widely known form of corruption in Nigeria, referred to by such euphemisms as [...] *family support and settlement*” (<http://www.georgeehusani.org/home/>)

index.php/papers-)

The metaphors for bribe in (14a), (14b), (14c) are drawn from the Cameroonian sociocultural context while those found in (15a) and (15b) are drawn from the Nigerian sociocultural environment. They can respectively be paraphrased as follows: (14'a) Bribing is seeing the boss, (14b) Bribe is motivation, (14c) Bribing is avoiding problems, (15'a) Bribing is seeing an official, (15b) Bribe is motivation. Let us consider the metaphors in (14a) and (15a) (Bribing is seeing an official). This metaphor is generally used in the contexts where someone is following the treatment of his/her file in a public office, when one has applied for a job in the public service, when one has written a competitive entrance examination into a training school, or when an enterprise applies for the award of public contracts (e.g.: to build a government infrastructure, to supply material to the government, etc.). In such situations the person who needs the services, the candidate or the applicant might be asked to "see [meet] an official", "see[meet] the members of the commission for the award of the contract" so that his/her file can be treated diligently, so that he is admitted into the training school or for his/her enterprise to be awarded a contract. In such situations, one does not "see" [meet] these officials for "seeing" [meeting] sake. In such contexts, "seeing [meeting] an official/members of the commission for the award of a contract" means "bribing him/them". As a result some workers recruited are not fit for their jobs, some government public works are poorly done. The overall consequence is that the output of these workers is very mediocre and populations continue to suffer.

Another value of the metaphor for bribe used in both countries is "motivation" as exemplified in (14b) and (15b) (Bribe is motivation). It is worth stating that motivation is "the enthusiasm for doing something" (CALD, 2005, p. 823). It should be pointed out that many workers of the public sectors in some Sub-Saharan Africa countries are poorly paid. This poor payment sometimes affects their output. That is why some of them are not very enthusiastic to do the work they are paid for. It is common place to hear some of them tell those who need their services "to motivate them". "Motivating" them in these contexts does not mean uttering words of encouragement to them. Instead, it means "bribing them". So, the person who needs their services has to create in these workers some sort of enthusiasm not by uttering to their regards words of encouragements but by giving them bribe. It should be noted that when one "motivates" (i.e.: bribes) these unscrupulous workers, it is said that you are (15c) "avoiding problem". So, bribing is avoiding problems. Sometimes, failure to bribe some of these officials might have some negative unforeseeable consequences on the treatment of the

file of some citizens, their application for recruitment into the public service or for the award of a contract no matter the conformity of their files (in the case of the follow-up of the treatment of file), the quantity and quality of their credentials (recruitment in the public service) or the performance of their enterprise (award of contracts). These clues can also account for the reference to bribe by Nigerians using the metaphor "settlement" as illustrated in (15c). It should be stated that a settlement is "an official agreement that finishes an argument" or "an arrangement to end a disagreement involving a law having been broken, without taking it to a law court, or an amount of money paid as part of such an arrangement" (CALD, 2005, p. 1163). However, in this context, it is used metaphorically to refer to bribe. The metaphor "settlement" used to refer to bribe suggests that under normal circumstances, the relationship between an official and a person who needs his/her services is not harmonious and that arguing with such an official about a treatment can be perceived as a breaking of the law and that is why one has to make arrangements with them by giving them money for "settlement" in order to end this disagreement.

It can be observed that the values of the metaphors for bribe identified in (14a) and (15b) (Bribing is seeing the official; (14b) and (15b) (bribe is motivation) in addition to the ones discussed earlier in this section reveal that in many situations Cameroonians and Nigerians make use of the same semiotic choices when it comes to choosing the values of some metaphors for bribe. In other words, the vehicles chosen to represent some metaphors for bribe in Cameroon are also attested in Nigeria. This can be accounted for by the geographical proximity of these two countries which favor the contact of populations.

As indicated in the report of Action AID Nigeria, (2015, pp. 45-57) there is a correlation between corruption and poverty. So, when people are poor, the probability for them to collect bribes is very high. This point is in consonance with Tanzi's (1998, p. 16) who found that one of the indirect factors which constitute a fertile ground for corruption is the low level of public sector wages. It should be noted that in these countries, the salary of the workers of the public sector is low. As a consequence, they are inclined to take bribes so as to satisfy their family needs. This clue can account for the reference to bribe in the Nigerian context using the metaphor "family support" as illustrated in (15d). So, people take bribes on the grounds that these will enable them help or support their family.

As mentioned above, a scrutiny of the metaphors for bribe used in the Cameroonian and Nigerian sociocultural contexts shows the multilingual complexity of these two countries. In other words, the values of the metaphors for bribe used in both

Table 1
Distribution of the types of metaphors per donor languages

| Types of metaphors | Cameroon | | | | Nigeria | | | | Total | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| | Donor languages | | | | Total | Donor languages | | | | | |
| | French | Eng | CamPE | HL | | Eng | NPE | HL | | NE | |
| Object metaphors | 4 | 4 | / | / | 7 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 17 |
| Anthropomorphic metaphors | 4 | 3 | / | / | 7 | 1 | / | / | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| Zoomorphic metaphors | 3 | 2 | / | / | 5 | / | / | / | / | 00 | 5 |
| Vegetative metaphors | 2 | 1 | / | / | 3 | 1 | / | / | / | 1 | 4 |
| Abstraction metaphors | 7 | 5 | 3 | / | 15 | 4 | / | 6 | / | 10 | 25 |
| Total | 20 | 15 | 3 | 00 | 37 | 11 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 23 | 60 |

countries draw from various languages as the table below illustrates. In the table, Eng, CamPE, NPE, HL, and NE respectively stand for English, Cameroon Pidgin English, Nigerian Pidgin English, home languages and Nigerian English.

The statistics presented in the table below show that there is much convergence as far as the choice of the value for the metaphors for bribe by Cameroonians and Nigerians are concerned: The type of metaphors which has registered the highest number of tokens in both sociocultural environments are abstraction metaphors (15 tokens in Cameroon Vs. 10 tokens in Nigeria), followed by object metaphors (7 tokens in Cameroon Vs. 10 tokens in Nigeria), anthropomorphic metaphors (7 tokens in Cameroon Vs. 2 tokens in Nigeria), zoomorphic metaphors (5 tokens in Cameroon Vs. 00 token in Nigeria) and vegetative metaphors (3 tokens in Cameroon Vs. 1 token in Nigeria). As a whole, 37 tokens are attested in Cameroon Vs. 23 in Nigeria. This outnumbering can be explained by the fact that the language of corruption is very commonplace in or around public offices and in Cameroon two official languages are used in the Cameroonian administrative life (English and French) as opposed to Nigeria where the language of administration is English. So, many metaphors for bribe used in French also have their English equivalents in the country. Moreover, the table indicates that all types of metaphors for bribe are attested in Cameroon as opposed to Nigeria where zoomorphic metaphors were not identified. Besides, it should be observed that the proportion of these metaphors in each country, to an extent, is a reflection of the power relationship among languages on the territory. In Cameroon, French and English are the two superstrate languages and Cameroon Pidgin is the mostly spoken hybrid language on the territory. Home languages are substrate languages. This power relationship among these languages can account for the following statistics. 20 tokens for French, 15 for English, 3 for Cameroon Pidgin English and none for home languages. In Nigeria, English is the superstrate

languages and that is what can justify the fact that the highest number of tokens (11 tokens) originate from the English language. Nigerian Pidgin English, home languages and Nigerian English are all influenced by the English language.

Conclusion

As a whole, it can be said that the choice of the values for the metaphors of bribe used by Cameroonians and Nigerians display some similarities and differences: If it is true that the lexical items and expressions for bribe used in both sociocultural environments are not always the same, it is nonetheless true that both language users utilize almost the same type of metaphors to refer to bribe but in different proportions (object metaphors, anthropomorphic metaphors, vegetative metaphors as well as zoomorphic metaphors (identified only in the Cameroonian context). Furthermore, the values conveyed by these metaphors fall under the same lexical domains: foodstuff and drinks, fauna, human beings and body parts, mailing and transportation as well as abstract realities. Also, it has been found that there are some values for the metaphors for bribe in both sociocultural environments which are the same. It is the case of “kola (nut)” (Cameroon) vs. kola nut (Nigeria) (Cf. (7a) and (7c), “motivation” (Cameroon) vs. motivation (Nigeria) (Cf. examples (14b) and (15b), “envelope” (Cameroon) vs. “brown envelope (Nigeria) (Cf. (4b) and (5a), taxi (fares) (Cameroon) vs. transport fares (Nigeria) (Cf. (4a) and (5b), “to see someone” (Cameroon) vs. “to see someone” (Nigeria) (Cf. (14a) and (15a). This can be justified by the geographical proximity between Cameroon and Nigeria which favors the contact between the citizens of these countries. It has also been found that cultural, social and economic factors can provide insights to the understanding of the choice of the values used to refer to bribe by these language users. Moreover, the proportion of lexical

items and expressions used as values for the metaphors for bribe in these sociocultural environments is a reflection of the multilingual complexity of these countries which is characterized by a power relationship among languages spoken therein.

References

- Action Aid Nigeria. (2015). *Corruption and poverty in Nigeria*. Abudja, Nigeria: ActionAid Nigeria.
- Adegoju, A., & Raheem, S. O. (2015). Gone are the days of 'kola(nut)': New trends in language habits and coding of corrupt practices in Nigeria. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 26, 155-171.
- Ambanasom, S. (1999). *Son of the native soil*. Bamenda, Cameroon: Patron Publishing House.
- Bamiro, E. (2015). English in Nigerian settings: Recent lexicoining in Nigerian English. In T. Opeibi, J. Schmied, T. Omoniyi & K. Adedeji (Eds.), *Essays on language in societal transformation: A festschrift in honour of Segun Awonusi* (pp. 87-96). Gottingen, Germany: Cuvillier Verlag.
- Bassey, E., & Bassey, V. (2014). Language of corruption and anticorruption in Nigeria. *Journal of Contemporary Research*, 11(2), 45-59.
- CALD (*Cambridge advanced learner's dictionary*). (2005). Cambridge, UK: CUP.
- Corruption: A glossary for international standards in criminal law. (2008). In *OECD (Organization for economic co-operation and development)* (Unpublished manuscript). Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/daf/anti-bribery/41194428.pdf>
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, Ch. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar* (3rd ed.). London, UK: Arnold.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980a). Conceptual metaphor in everyday language. *Journal of Philosophy*, 77(8), 453-486.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980b). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press Book.
- Meutem Kamtchueng, L. M. (2015). C'est ça que je mange? / Is that what I eat? - Examining the language of corruption in Cameroon. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 10(1), 125-148.
- Meutem Kamtchueng, L. M. (2016). Explicating the semantics of metaphors in the language of corruption in Cameroon. In J. Schmied & D. Nkemleke (Eds.), *Academic writing across disciplines in Africa: From students to experts* (pp. 165-182). Goettingen, Germany: Cuvillier Verlag.
- Safotso, T. G. (2015). The metalanguage of corruption in Cameroon-part I: The registers of general administration, transport and education. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 5(2), 47-54.
- Shelestiuk, H. (2006). Approaches to metaphor: Structure, classifications, cognate phenomena. *Semiotica*, 161-1(4), 333-343.
- Tanzi, V. (1998). Corruption around the world: Causes, consequences, scope and cures. *International Monetary Fund*, 45(4), 559-594.
- Thompson, G. (2004). *Introducing functional grammar* (2nd ed.). Oxford, UK: OUP.
- Uzochukwu, M. (2016). *Corruption in Nigeria: Review, causes, effects and solutions*. Retrieved from <https://soapboxie.com/world-politics/Corruption-in-Nigeria>