

# **Translating Directive Speech Acts of the Canadian Prime Minister Speech on Covid-19: Applied Pragmatic Study**

ترجمة الأفعال الكلامية التوجيهية لخطاب رئيس الوزراء الكندي حول  
كوفيد-١٩: دراسة تطبيقية في علم اللغة العملي.



**Dr.Ahmed Ibrahim Abed**

د.احمد ابراهيم عبد

University of Imam Ja'afir Al-Sadiq (PBUH)/ Branch of Salah al-Din/  
College of Arts / Department of English

جامعة الإمام جعفر الصادق عليه السلام / فرع صلاح الدين / كلية الآداب / قسم اللغة الانجليزية

م.م نسرين خالد عباس

**Nasrin Khaled Abbas**

جامعة سامراء / كلية التربية / قسم اللغة الانكليزية

University of Samarra - College of Education - Department of English  
Language



## Abstract

Pragmatics is the study of communicative action which includes not only speech acts such as requesting, greeting, and so on but also participation in conversation, engaging in different types of discourse, and maintaining interaction in complex speech events. This paper falls within the field of translating directive speech acts, attempting to discuss the translatability of directive speech acts found in the speech of the Canadian Prime Minister, Justin Trudeau, on Covid-19. In this paper, the model adopted is Searle's taxonomy (1969) of speech acts. The kinds of directive speech acts are distributed among requests, recommendations and suggestions. Accordingly, the form of the utterance is different from the meaning depending on the illocutionary force of the utterance. The paper's findings show that some subjects were aware of pragmatic dimensions of the text and this is reflected in adequate translation they produce in translating the directive speech acts into Arabic.

**Key words:** Applied Pragmatics, Translation, Speech Acts, Directives.

## المخلص

تُعتبر دراسة علم اللغة الاجتماعية Pragmatics دراسة للعمل التواصلي الذي يشمل ليس فقط الأفعال الكلامية مثل الطلب، والتحية، وما إلى ذلك، بل أيضًا المشاركة في المحادثة، والانخراط في أنواع مختلفة من الخطاب، والحفاظ على التفاعل في الأحداث الخطابية المعقدة. تقع هذه الورقة ضمن نطاق ترجمة الأفعال الكلامية التوجيهية، وهي تسعى لمناقشة قابلية ترجمة الأفعال الكلامية التوجيهية الموجودة في خطاب رئيس الوزراء الكندي، جاستن ترودو، حول كوفيد-19. في هذه الورقة، النموذج المعتمد هو تصنيف سيرل Searle للأفعال الكلامية (1969). تُوزع أنواع الأفعال الكلامية التوجيهية بين الطلبات، والتوصيات، والاقتراحات. وبناءً على ذلك، فإن شكل العبارة يختلف عن المعنى اعتمادًا على القوة الإلزامية للعبارة. توضح نتائج الدراسة أن بعض الأفراد كانوا على دراية بالأبعاد التفاعلية للنص، وهو ما ينعكس في الترجمة الملائمة التي قدموها عند ترجمة الأفعال الكلامية التوجيهية إلى العربية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التداولية التطبيقية، الترجمة افعال الكلام، فعل الكلام التوجيهي.

## Introduction

People will be good at understanding an expression by learning about speech act. Speech act is the branch of pragmatics. Generally speaking, 'Speech Act Theory' was found first by Austin in his book 'How To Do Things With Words', and now it is widely used in linguistics. Austin states that in uttering a sentence, the speaker is doing things as well as saying things. Many linguists state that speech acts are actions performed by speakers via utterances, and there are many types of speech acts and one of the them is 'directives' (which is our main concern) that refers to the utterances which carry an attempt by the addresser to direct the addressee to do an action (Parker and Riley, 2005:12-13 ; Arnoff and Miller, 2002:4). For instance, Levinson (1983:240) confirms that when one utters a sentence like 'can you give me that book, please?', he/she produces a speech act of request. The illocutionary act which is produced by the speaker can be performed by addressing a particular speech act type and the action tends to be done by the addressee. It is crucial things in communication to make the conversation meaningful. A successful communication only can be achieved if the hearer and the speaker are able to understand thoughts, desire and feeling of each other.

Yule, (2010: 127) stated that communication depends on not only recognizing the meaning of words in an utterance, but recognizing what speakers mean by their utterances. Yule (1996:47) proposes that speech acts is performed action via utterance. He claims that performing an action via utterances is commonly given more specific labels, such as complaint, command, apology, invitation, and promise or request. Directives utterance is type of speech acts. Kreidler (1998: 189) states that directive utterance is the utterance which has the intention the speaker tries to get the listener to perform some acts.

## Applied Pragmatics

Mey ( 1993: 35) opines that pragmatics is interested in the process of producing language and in its procedures, not just the end- product, language. Aitchison (1999: 97) suggests that pragmatics deals with how speakers use language in ways that cannot be predicted from linguistic knowledge alone. Pragmatics deals with how listeners arrive at the intended meaning of speakers. Crystal (2008: 379) adds that pragmatics



is "the study of language from the point of view of users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication". In other words, pragmatics is the study of communicative action which includes not only speech acts such as requesting, greeting, and so on but also participation in conversation, engaging in different types of discourse, and maintaining interaction in complex speech events.

Crystal(2008) emphasizes that applied pragmatics focuses on problems of interaction that arise in contexts where successful communication is critical, such as medical interviews, judicial settings, counseling and foreign-language teaching. Levinson (1983: 376) mentions pragmatics has potential application to all fields with a stake in how utterances are understood. Such fields include not only the study of rhetoric or literature that are not immediately concerned with practical problems, but also it is concerned with fields aiming at solving problems in communication. It is here that the applications of pragmatics are likely to have direct practical importance.

#### **Pragmatics of Speech Acts:**

For decades, linguists were interested in the analysis and description of language from a structural perspective as they focused on phonological, morphological, syntactic and semantic properties of language. However, in the recent years, those linguists have turned into new branches of linguistics such as pragmatics, semiotics, sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics. These new branches are concerned with the function of language for the aim of making successful communication. Thus, in order to use the language properly, there must be a pragmatic value to such a language, and the addresser must have extra-linguistic and non-linguistic knowledge about the world. Moreover, the social relationship between the addresser and the addressee should be taken into account (Morris,1938:33 )

The theory of speech acts has been initiated as a reaction to many earlier linguistic theories which disregard language as action . This theory had its origin in the British philosophy. It was initiated as a theory of thinking by the British philosopher J.L. Austin (1911-1960) . Austin presented his theory of speech acts in a series of lectures



delivered in 1955 which were published in a book after his death in 1962, entitled "How to Do Things with Words". Austin's theory has been modified and developed in the course of time to be known as "speech act theory", and later adopted and further developed by the American philosopher Searle (1969). (Mey 1993:109).

The most essential motivation leading to the discovery of the speech act theory is that the limitation of semantic analysis based on truth – condition; restriction of semantic treatment to a mere class of sentences, the so called "statements" or declaratives whose existence requires that a sentence be verified as true or false according to certain truths about the world. If one says :

(1.) It's cold outside, we can verify the truth of this sentence by going outside and checking whether it is true or not. However, we cannot do so in:

**(2.) Have a nice time .**

We cannot talk in (2) about the truth or falsity of this utterance as we realize that the speaker is not here stating something, rather, he wants to express his feeling or wish towards a particular person or persons (Adams, 1985:4). Austin (1962:12) argues that we often do things with words, when we use them to perform actions such as promising, welcoming, boasting, affirming, advising, etc. Mey (ibid:110) adds that in addition to the particular class of statements, there are other types of utterances that are issued to perform certain actions in the world which constitute an integral part of how language is used in a community; such lists of sentences are speech acts since their occurrence requires performing or doing things. Moreover, Adams (ibid:46) confirms that the interpretation of speech act is often governed by the fact that the speaker intends to achieve a certain effect on the hearer by utilizing the social convention. He (ibid.) distinguishes between intentional and conventional speech acts. He believes that most speech acts are intentional in the sense that they are communicative. In making promise, for instance, the speaker intends to oblige himself to the future act. It is his intention rather than convention that obligates him to the future act. Conventional speech acts are greatly influenced by the circumstances in which speech acts occur. They are often not difficult to understand, i.e. we can make promises to people in different situations but we only 'fire' certain



people under certain circumstances. Compare:

**(3.) You'll be fired .**

**(4.) You are fired.**

Each of (3) and (4) represents a different interpretation :(3) is considered an intentional speech act since it is open to interpretation and misunderstanding ,whereas (4) which is conventional speech act , uttered under the appropriate circumstances, is not open to such interpretation and misunderstanding.

In this theory, Austin (1962) leads himself away from the question of "What do sentences mean?" towards the question "What sort of act do we perform in uttering a sentence?" since language is used to express many other functions and we normally use language to make suggestions, promises, requests, commands, and so on.

### **3.1. Austin's Version of SAT**

Austin (1962) divides the acts into three kinds namely: locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts. According to him (ibid.: 94), the locutionary act is the act of uttering a particular utterance in certain construction with a certain meaning. Correspondingly, Austin (ibid.: 99) puts forward the view that the illocutionary act is the act that has the force of the utterance sine it deals with the way in which we use speech in a particular context and this way makes a great difference whether we are advising, ordering, suggesting, promising, etc. Similarly, Searle (1969: 58) mentions that the illocutionary acts embrace making a statement, asking a question, giving an order, making a promise, apologising, thanking, and the like. With regard to the perlocutionary act, Austin (1962: 121) views it as the achieved effect of the illocutionary act on the hearer which has a consequence(s) for him/her. As Sadock (1974: 8) puts it, the perlocutionary act is the by-product of the act of communication.

Searle (1969: 101) considers the perlocutionary act as the influence of the illocutionary act on the hearer or the consequential effects upon the feelings, thoughts, or the actions of the interlocutors. The three-act scheme is summarised by Van Eemeren and Grootendorst (1983: 26) as follows:

1. Locutionary act: the act of saying something.
2. Illocutionary act: the act done in saying something.



3. Perlocutionary act: the act done by saying something.

Austin (1962: 101) provides an example of a man who witnesses a locutionary SA and his example is best explained by Al-Hindawi (1999: 12-13):

(1) He said to me "shoot her!" meaning by "shoot" shoot and referring by "her" her (locution).

(2) He urged (or advised, ordered, etc.) me to shoot her (illocution).

(3) He persuaded me to shoot her (perlocution).

This also can be revealed by the following simple example:

(4) Would you turn off the light, please?

a. Locutionary Act, What is said

b. Illocutionary Act, What is meant

c. Perlocutionary Act, What is understood

More importantly, Haverkate (1979: 11) as cited in Al-Hindawi (1999: 14) introduces the term "allocation" as a new dimension of the speech act. To him, an allocation refers to "the selection by the speaker of those linguistic devices which he thinks optimally serve the purpose of eliciting from the hearer a positive reaction to his speech act. Allocutionary acts, therefore, determine the strategy of verbal interaction". Moreover, the three kinds of acts are explained utilizing the following points:

Locutionary act: which can be regarded as the main act of utterance or making a meaningful linguistic expression. Therefore, this act has to do with the meaning of the utterance (Yule, 1996: 48). Examples of this act:

(5) It is hot in here.

(6) The locker is heavy.

The above mentioned examples illustrate the actual situation. The first example indicates the temperature inside the particular room and the second indicates the weight of the locker.

In this respect, Austin (1962: 76) says that to say anything is:

A. always to perform the act of uttering certain noises (a phonetic act)

B. always to perform the act of uttering certain vocables or words (a phatic act)

C. generally to perform the act of using that [sentence] or its constituents with a





Certain more or less definite 'sense' and a more or less definite 'reference', which together are equivalent to 'meaning' (rhetic act).

Illocutionary act: is produced by the communicative force of an utterance depending on the communicative purpose, which means an utterance is used to denote a request , offer , explanation, statement, etc. Therefore , this act has to do with the force of the utterance (ibid, 1996:48 ) .Examples of this act :

(7) It is hot in here .

(8).The locker is heavy .

The above mentioned examples illustrate that the first example indicates a request to open the door ,and the second indicates a request to lift the locker .

The illocutionary act is defined as an act performed by the speaker in producing a given utterance. Therefore, it is closely related to speaker's intention . For example(stating, questioning, promising, requesting, giving commands, threatening etc. (Jameel,2017:9).

3. Perlocutionary act: This act depends on the effect intended by the speaker which the hearer recognizes ,for example to account for a wonderful smell or get the listener to drink coffee .Therefore, this act has to do with the effect of the utterance (ibid, 1996:48 ). Examples of this act :

(9) It is hot in this room .

(10) The locker is heavy .

The above mentioned examples show that we could infer that the first sentence is uttered by someone during opening a door and the second sentence is uttered by someone during lifting the locker .

Austin (1962) starts with distinguishing between statements which he prefers to call "constatives" and another type of utterances which he calls "performatives". On the one hand, constatives are statements that describe a state of affairs and their production is subject to the truth and falsehood test. But on the other hand, performatives are utterances which denote the performance of actions and their production is rather happy or unhappy according to whether they meet a set of "felicity conditions". For this reason, performatives such as swearing an oath, sentencing a criminal, and naming a ship are not subject to the truth and falsehood test. Austin, then, concludes that all utterances whether they



are constatives or performatives have both a "doing" element and a "saying" element (Al-Hindawi, 1999: 7).

#### Searle's Version of SAT

After Austin's (1962) SAT, Searle (1969), Austin's student, develops SAT and gives it its final formal form. Searle (ibid.: 33) distinguishes between two sorts of rules that control SAs which are constitutive and regulative rules. Searle's (ibid.: 34) constitutive rules, as the name suggests, constitute, create, or define a particular activity, whereas regulative rules regulate a pre-existing activity. Given an illustrative example, Stevenson (2000: 25) points out that in playing tennis, there are constitutive rules without which it is impossible to imagine the game of tennis since they constitute the game such as point scoring, volleying, and the like. On the other hand, there are regulative rules which are the definite rules of conduct that regulate the activities of the competitors and prevent unfair play.

Searle (1975:369) uses different dimensions to classify speech acts and the following are the important ones:

1. Illocutionary Point: determines the main pragmatic function of speech act. For example a request attempts to get the hearer to do something.

2. Direction of Fit: shows how the propositional content of Speech Act is related to the world. Searle was not specific about the concept 'world'. The speaker is faced with an external world

which consists of objects and states of affairs and where the listener is also placed .e.g; the existence of certain states of affairs can be stated with the help of the information content of the SA in the direction from word to world.

3. The expressed psychological states: the speaker attitude to the propositional content, e.g, when a speaker performs an assertion, he indicates his desire that the listener must do something.

4. Propositional content: the content of the speech act, e.g., in request, the propositional content is "hearer to do action". For a promise "speaker to do action" (Searle, 1969:4-9).

Searle (1969) further develops a taxonomy. It is an attempt to systematize Austin's theory of SAs, so that he proposes:

1. Representatives, this class of SAs aims at "committing the speaker (in varying degrees) to something's being the case, to the truth of the



expressed proposition, for example; The earth is flat.

2. Directives, the illocutionary point is to direct the hearer towards doing (or not doing) something, for example; Could you lend me a pen, please?

3. Commissives, they are SAs in which the speaker is committed to some future course of action, for example; I'll be back.

4. Declarations, this class of illocutions brings into existence the state described in the proposition, for example; Priest: I now pronounce you husband and wife.

5. Expressive, they are SAs that express "the psychological state specified in the sincerity condition about a state of affairs, for example; I'm really sorry.

According to Searle (1975 a: 335; Searle, 1976), directives are utterances addressed to an interlocutor in order to "make him/her do something". However, Ervin- Tripp (1990:308) declared that directive illocutionary force also exist in any move "which could be interpreted either by the speaker or hearer as an attempt to affect the behavior of an interlocutor". Linguistically, directive speech act can be realized by means of imperatives, interrogatives, and declaratives.

### **The Concept of Directive Speech Act**

Yule stated that directives speech acts are those kinds of speech acts that speakers use to get someone else to do something (1996, p. 54). Directives speech acts embody an effort on the part of the speaker to get the hearer to do something. These are based on the illocutionary point. In addition, to the varied syntactic structures, directives are perceived in a different manner through the interaction based on the degree of politeness (Brown and Levinson, 1987), therefore directives are recognized as begging, request, suggestion, advice, demand, command, order, etc.

The directive is a kind of speech act that the speaker tries to get the hearer to do something. It means that hearer does what the speaker wants. It is usually used to give order thereby causing the hearer to take a particular action, request, command, or advice (Arnawa,N, 2016:117). According to Jose Maria , directive speech acts is a wide and complex category such as like commands, questions, pieces of advice can be including of directive (Dylgjeri,A, 2017:22). The typical expression of



this type usually uses imperative structure; however, there are so many ways of expressing this type, they are not imperative but also interrogative and declarative structure are often used to perform the illocutionary directive act (Gil, J, M, 2019: 404).

### **The Translation of Speech Acts:**

every language is unique by itself , i.e. , the patterns and systems a language manifests characterize that language as being distinct from other languages . From a purely linguistic viewpoint , Beaugrande (1994:2) considers the uniqueness of language as an axiom through maintaining that every natural language can be envisaged as a specific abstract system of forms organized in a specific way with each form standing in an arbitrary relation to its meaning. English and Arabic belong to different language families . English belongs to the Indo-Europe family, whereas Arabic belongs the Semitic family of language.

#### **5.1. Formal , Dynamic and Functional Equivalence:**

Formal equivalence presents priority to form (syntax) , but not at the expense of content . This entails that in this kind of equivalence both form and content are considered (Munday , ibid:37-41) . Thus formal equivalence seeks closest possible match of formal and semantic features between the source text (ST)and the target text (TT). Dynamic equivalence , on the other hand , is message – oriented . It entirely centers around the notion of “equivalent effect”. This type of equivalence is based on three linguistic levels: syntactic, lexical and semantic. Nida (1964:166)suggests making relatively free adjustments to the ST to match the linguistic and non – linguistic features of the TL.

Functional equivalence is the result of the progress achieved in the field of text linguistics (House ,1977:28) . The unit of translation , has, then become the text which functions in a certain situation , or culture and not in others . The establishment of the functional equivalence , then, results from the analysis of the whole text , each as a unit connected to what precedes and what follows. The SL text is, therefore, comprehensively analyzed stressing its intention and functional aspects.

### **The Translation of Speech Acts:**

When grammatical rules and orderings are violated, ill-formed expressions result, but when pragmatic rules are violated, ambiguities are often caused which lead to misunderstandings and miscommunications. Utterances, may, semantically speaking, mean



something, but pragmatically convey a totally different thing.

To clarify this point, consider the following examples which illustrate the illocutionary forces which are not represented in the words and forms but are implied from the text as a whole .

الهي و ربي من لي غيرك اسئلك كشف ضري و النظر في امري " ( 53. ).....

( My God and my Lord ! Have I any but Thee from whom to ask removal of my affection and regard for my affairs ?

Hatim and Mason (1997:57) confirm that pragmatic meaning would provide the translator with insights into intentionality (The intended meaning) . They cite the following example :

نحن مستضعفون ( 55. )

When this utterance is said by ordinary group of people , it has a semantic meaning and it is rendered into English in one of the following ways:

( 55.a ) ( We are hopeless ) .

( 55.b ) ( We are helpless ) .

( 55.c ) ( We are hopeless and helpless ) .

Quranic aayas (verses) are full of pragmatic utterances in which messages are expressed in forms not usually used for those purposes , i.e., in some cases, question – type utterances are used not to ask for information but to warn people of their misbehavior and what consequences they might expect otherwise . Note the following aaya where a rhetorical question is used as a linguistic form expressing the speech act of prohibition ( الخ , 1972 : 328 ) .

99 : يونس مؤمنب ياؤنو حيي النس ه تا أآن ( 56. )

“ Wilt thou then compel mankind against their will , to believe ! ”  
(The Glorious Qur'an , 10 : 99) .

Pragmatic Analysis of Speech Acts:

Although different points of view towards the analysis of speech acts have been forwarded to further this subject.

Bach and Harnish (ibid:3) believe that speech acts should be studied in terms of communicative purposes . They think that a speaker conveying something to a hearer has a certain intention and that an act of communication cannot be said successfully unless this intention is



identified by the hearer. They stress the fact that the successful issuance of an illocutionary act requires that this intention be recognized by the hearer. Indeed, Bach and Harnish have adopted an elaborate model (of both Austin's (1962) and Searle's (1969;1979) in which a communicative speech act is seen as composed of four further acts:

1. Utterance Act: Speaker utters expression from language to hearer in context of utterance.
2. Locutionary Act: Speaker says to hearer in context of utterance so – and – so.
3. Illocutionary: Act Speaker does such – and – such in context of utterance.
4. Perlocutionary Act: Speaker affects hearer in a certain way. (ibid:3)

### 6.1 Classification of Speech Acts:

Bach and Harnish (ibid: 44-55) have adopted a more comprehensive detailed scheme in their taxonomy of speech acts in which a great many types of illocutionary acts are described. They have recognized six general classes on the basis of the speaker's psychological state which they call speaker's "attitude". Two of these classes are conventional: "effectives" and "verdictives". The other four types are communicative speech acts: constatives, directives, commissives and acknowledgements.

#### 1. Constatives

Constatives express the speaker's belief and his intention or desire that the hearer have or form a like belief. They include the following subgroups: assertives(3), perdictives, retrodictives, descriptives, ascriptives, informatives, confirmatives, concessives, retractives, assentives, dissentives, disputatives, responsives, suggestives and suppositives, e.g. assert, affirm, report, conclude, suppose, suggest, etc. (pp.42 – 6).

#### 2. Directives

Directives, correlated with Searle's, express the speaker's attitude and intention towards some prospective action by the hearer that his utterance or the attitude it expresses, be taken as reason for the hearer's action, e.g. request, ask, demand, advise, warn, etc. (pp.47-9).

#### 3. Commissives



Commissives are speech acts in which the speaker is committed to some future course of action . The promiser attempts to make the world fit his words . The issuer of a promise intends to do something by uttering his words , e.g. promise , swear , plan , bet , guarantee , vow, commit , etc . (pp. 49\_51) .

#### 4. Acknowledgements

This class had its origin in Austin's behabitives. Acknowledgements express a certain feeling towards the hearer, especially in cases where the utterance is obviously perfunctory or formal. This class embraces expressions of attitude and social behavior, e.g. welcome, congratulate, thank, apologize, greet, accept, compliment, etc. (pp. 51 – 55).

#### 5. Effectives

These conventional speech acts affect some change in institutional states of affairs . For example :

( 15 ) A student is graduated .

( 16 ) A bill is voted . Verbs denoting effective acts are: resign, vote, bequeath ,etc.(pp.110-11).

#### 6. Verdictives

This class of verbs is used to give verdicts , findings or judgements, e.g. estimate , value , appreciate , assess , etc. ( pp. 111ff ) .

#### 7. Covid 19: Notion and Existence

Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) is an irresistible illness caused by serious intense respiratory disorder coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). It was to begin with identified in December 2019 in Wuhan, China, and has come about in an continuous widespread. The primary case may be followed back to 17 November 2019.[12] As of 7 June 2020, more than 6.89 million cases have been detailed over 188 countries and domains, coming about in more than 399,000 deaths. More than 3.08 million people have recouped. (Hui, 2020:264).

#### 8. Data Analysis

In this paper, our modified model of pragmatic for the directive speech act will be applied to different utterances derived from (www.Yotube.com) to identify the category of directive speech acts. The analysis will be extended to the translation of these acts in Arabic to see how the acts in question are realized. Five utterances have been chosen



from the Canadian's prime minister speech on Covid-19. However, five utterances were given for five BA students in the university of Imam Jaafar AlSadiq-SalahAldin/Department of English/ in translating the directive speech act verbs into Arabic. Here are the utterances and their analysis:-

SL Text (1): Your daily routine might be different and the way of coping might be more difficult to manage and it could be a source of anxiety and stress.

Context: The prime minister directing his people)

TL Texts:

١. ربما يكون روتيننا اليومي مختلفاً و تأقلمنا معه اصعب وهذا هو سبب التوتر والقلق.
٢. قد تولد الرتابة اليومية في اداء الهام المنزلية البسيطة و بعض التوتر والقلق.
٣. ليكن يوماً مختلفاً فالاعتياذ هما من مصادر الاضطراب والقلق.
٤. قد تكون الوتيرة اليومية في اتمام المهام المنزلية البسيطة كمصدر للتوتر والقلق.
٥. قد يصبح للملل اليومي في المهام المنزلية مصدراً للتوتر والقلق.

Proposed Rendering:

قد يكون الروتين اليومي في اتمام المهام المنزلية البسيطة مصدراً للتوتر والقلق

### Discussion:

It can be noticed that the subjects No.(1,3,4) have succeeded in achieving the illocutionary act of directive speech act and conveying the illocutionary force of recommending. They did due attention in their translations to the degree of strength of the directive speech acts of recommending , e.g “ might be” ( قد تكون , ربما يكون،ليكن). The speaker uses the directive speech act of recommendation. He suggests different ways people can resort to them when they feel anxious. The illocutionary force embedded in this utterance that people should be accustomed to the daily procedures and not to feel bored because it is for their interest. The form is declarative whereas the function is a recommendation.

SL Text (2): Face time them or give them a call





Context : (The prime minister is requesting his people)

TL Texts:

١ . اتصل بهم اتصالاً مرئياً أو صوتياً.
٢ . اتصل بأصدقائك من خلال التطبيق ( فيس تايم )
٣ . اتصل بهم بمكالمة فيديو على تطبيق الفيس تايم او مكالمات عادية
٤ . اقضي وقتاً على برنامج الفيس تايم
٥ . حاول على متابعه برنامج الفيس تام

Proposed Rendering:

اتصل بأصدقائك من خلال تطبيق ( الفيس تايم ) او بمكالمة عادية

### Discussion:

Pragmatically , three subjects have understood of what the SL text intends and not what the speaker says because the form is different from the intended meaning of the speaker. They have conveyed the illocutionary act of requesting from English into Arabic. In this utterance, the speaker uses the directive speech act of request. The form of the utterance is imperative whereas the function is a suggestion. The illocutionary force is embedded in the form of the utterance, whereas the form is an order but the context in which it is used refers to the request. The form is declarative whereas the function is a request.

SL Text (3): checking in friends and neighbors who you think might be struggling.

Context : ( The prime minister is requesting his people)

TL Texts:

١ . تفقد أصدقائك أو جيرانك أن كنت تعتقد أنهم يعانون أمراً
٢ . تأكد من سلامة اصدقاءك و جيرانك من حيث عدم معاناتهم لشي ما خلال هذه الأزمة
٣ . تفقدهم ان كانوا على خلاف معك
٤ . اطمئن على اصدقائك وجيرانك أن كانوا يمرون بأمور صعبة



٥. تفقد اصدقائك و جيرانك أن كانوا يعانون الأمرين

Proposed Rendering : تفقد اصدقائك و جيرانك ان كانوا يعانون الامرين:

### Discussion:

Here , subjects (1,3,5) have performed during their renderings the illocutionary force of Request. The illocutionary force in this utterance is to recommend people about the importance of staying at home and the importance of mental health in making life better. In this utterance, the speaker uses the directive speech of request to convince people to be in touch with their beloved ones. Hence, the illocutionary force, in this utterance, is to urge people for their stay at home. He uses the means to make them feel comfortable and not to go out due to the virus. The form of this utterance is imperative whereas the function is a request.

SL Text (4) By connecting socially with people online, we can let people know they are not alone

Context : (The prime minister is suggesting his people)

### TL Texts:

١. بإمكاننا أن نقضي على شعور الوحدة من خلال التواصل مع معارفنا على منصات التواصل الاجتماعي
٢. بالتواصل الاجتماعي مع الناس فنحن نشعرهم أنهم ليسوا وحيدين
٣. الاتصال بالأصدقاء على منصات التواصل الاجتماعي يوضح بأنهم ليسوا وحيدين
٤. التواصل على منصات التواصل الاجتماعي هو المنفذ الوحيد بعدم شعوركم بالوحدة
٥. لكي لا نجعلكم تشعرون بالوحدة، تواصلوا على منصات التواصل الاجتماعي

Proposed Rendering:

لا يمكننا أن نسمح للناس بالشعور بالوحدة عن طريق التواصل معهم اجتماعياً

### Discussion:

The above TL texts reveal that subjects ( 2,4,5) have captured the intended meaning of the illocutionary act of suggesting directive verb “let” during the process of translation. In this utterance, the directive speech act of suggestion is used. Illocutionary force of this utterance is to keep people in touch and not to feel bored in the period of staying at



home because of imposing the social distance between people. Thus, the application of speech act theory is highly manifested in these utterances. The form is declarative whereas the function is a suggestion.

SL Text (5): If you have a tough time, please reach out to people you can trust.

Context : ( The prime minister is requesting his people)

TL Texts:

١. تواصل مع من هم مقربين لك، في حال كنت تعاني من أمراً ما
٢. إذا كانت أيامك عصيبة أذهب إلى أناس تثق بهم
٣. إذا مررت بظرف عصيب تواصل مع أشخاص تثق بهم
٤. قم بزيارة أناس تثق بهم إذا مررت بيوم عصيب
٥. إذا كانت لديك صعوبة، تفقد بالناس الذين تثق بهم

Proposed Rendering:

إذا مررت بظرف عصيب تواصل مع أشخاص تثق بهم

### Discussion:

It shows that the Subjects (1, 3) have taken the intended meaning into account while rendering the directive speech act of requesting "reach out" into Arabic "تواصل". Here, the speaker uses the form of the conditional sentence, to make a request to his people. He tells them the reachability of those people whom they trust and they are not infectious or even be in touch with other sick people to keep their families safe and secured from covid-19.

**Table (1) Findings**

Utterance No.	Form	Function
1	Declarative	Recommendation
2	Imperative	Request
3	Imperative	Request
4	Declarative	Suggestion
5	Declarative	Recommendation



## 9. Findings

This part contains the explanations of the data findings of data analysis. The study proved that the Speech Act Theory of Searle's model can be applied to the political speeches. According to this paper, three directive speech acts are used namely: request, recommendation and suggestion. This paper comes up with following findings:

The type of directive speech acts that were analyzed in 'the speech of Canadian Prime Minister on Covid-19' are ten. In the result that showed above, the request has the largest portion after recommendation type, then the suggestion type. The researcher has found five utterances of speech acts of request, three of recommendations and two of suggestions.

Most of the types of directive speech acts, by form are either declarative or imperative and by function are either requests, recommendations and suggestions.

The illocutionary force is embedded in the form of utterances to convey implied meanings.

The speech is highly organized as a form of request to give instructions to the people of Canada.

5.. Some subjects did not pay due attention in their renderings to the mode of achieving the acts under translation whereas the others succeeded in conveying the intended meaning of directive speech act verbs during the process of translation.

6. most of the inaccurate translations were due to the lack of he shared background knowledge in capturing he intended meaning behind uttering such verbs by the speaker.

## 10. Conclusion

This study comes with the following conclusion:

The present study focuses on Directives in the speech of Canadian Prime Minister "Justin Trudeau" and how they are comprehended utilizing the illocutionary force . The study proved that the Speech Act Theory of Searle's model can be applied to the political speeches. Most of the ten utterances are directive speech acts of request. The directive speech acts are comprehended explicitly and implicitly in selected data of this study. Performing the speech act of directives in political speeches carries a pragmatic value, i.e. either to direct the hearer to do an action which is beneficiary to him/her or to make him/her avoid doing it when it carries bad consequences. Syntactically



speaking, the use of passive voice in expressing directives is very rare in the selected data, whereas imperatives and declaratives are highly used in the data. Directive speech act is a unique type of speech act since the action will be accomplished by the hearer, and it is a feature which makes directive speech act distinctive from other speech act types. The illocutionary force differs from one directive speech act into another. That is, the degree of the strength of the illocutionary force is not the same in all directives. For instance, order has a stronger illocutionary force than that of request.

## References

1. Adams , J. ( 1985 ) Pragmatics and Fiction . Amsterdam : John Benjamins publishing Co.
2. Al-Hindawi, F. H., Al-Masu'di, H. H., and Fua'd Mirza, R. (2014). "The Speech Act Theory in English and Arabic". In Open Journal of Modern Linguistics,4, 27-37.
3. Al-Hindawy, F. (1999). Iraqi EFL Learners' Use of the Speech Acts of "Command" and "Request". Ph.D. Dissertation, Baghdad: University of Baghdad.
4. Ardita Dylgjeri, Analysis of Speech Acts in Political Speeches, European Journal of Social Sciences Studies Vol. 2 No. 2, (Albania, 2017), p. 22
5. Arnawa, N. Children Indirect Speech Acts at Age 18-24 Months Old: A Case Study
6. Arnoff, M. and Miller, J. (2002).The Handbook of Linguistics. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
7. Austin, J.(1962).How to Do Things with Words. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
8. Austin, J. L. (1962) How to Do Things with Words. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
9. Bach , K. and R. Harnish ( 1979 ) Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts . Cambridge : The MIT Press .
- 10.Beaugrande , R . ( 1994 ) . " Cognition , Communication , Translation, Instruction : The Geopolitics of Discourse " in Language , Discourse and Translation in the West and Middle East . R . Beaugrande , A. Shunnaq , and M.H.Heliel ( eds. ) Amsterdam : Benjamin's , PP : 1- 22 .
- 11.Crystal, D. (2003). A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- 12.Hatim , and Munday , J. ( 2004 ) Translation : An Advanced Resource Book . London : Routledge .
- 13.Hatim , B. and Mason , I. ( 1997 ) The Translator as Communicator . London : Routledge .



14. Holtgraves, T. (2002). *Language as Social Action*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. New Jersey.
15. Hui DS, I Azhar E, Madani TA, Ntoumi F, Kock R, Dar O, et al. (February 2020). "The continuing 2019-nCoV epidemic threat of novel coronaviruses to global health—The latest 2019 novel coronavirus outbreak in Wuhan, China".
16. Jose Maria Gil, *Face-Threatening Speech Acts: An Interpretation Speech Acts and Face invading*
17. Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman Group
18. Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
19. Malmkjaer, K. (2002). *The Linguistic Encyclopedia*. (2nd ed.) Published in USA and Canada by Routledge.
20. Mey, J. (1993). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, Ltd.
21. Morris, C. (1938). *The Foundation of the Theory of Signs*. Chicago: Chicago University press.
22. Munday, J. 2001 *Introducing Translation Studies : Theories and Applications*. London : Routledge .
23. Munday, J. 2001 *Introducing Translation Studies : Theories and Applications*. London : Routledge .
24. Nida, E. (1964) *Toward a Science of Translation*. Leiden : E.J. Brill.
25. on Indonesian Language Acquisition by Balinese Children, *International Journal of Language and Linguistics* Vol.3 No. 3, (IKIP PGRI BALI, 2016), p. 117.
26. Parker, F. & Riley K. (2005). *Linguistics for Non-Linguistics*. Library of Congress Cataloging in Publishing Data, printed in USA.
27. Searle, J.R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
28. *Speech Acts: An Interpretation of Politeness phenomena*, *International Journal of Linguistics*, Vol.4 No.2, (2012), p. 404.
29. ....(1975). "Indirect Speech Acts". In P. Cole and J.L. Morgan (eds.), PP. 59-82. Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
30. Stevenson, N. (2000). "Questions of Hermeneutics: Beyond Empiricism and Post-modernism". In Burton, D. (ed.). *Research Training for Social Scientists: A Handbook for Postgraduate Researchers*. London: Sage Publications, pp. 21-32.
31. Van Eemeren, F. And Grootendorst, R. (1983). *Speech Acts in Argumentative Discussions*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
32. Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

