



P-ISSN 2355-2794
E-ISSN 2461-0275

Analysis of Speech Act Patterns in Two Egyptian Inaugural Speeches

Imad Hayif Sameer*

University of Anbar, Ramadi, Anbar, IRAQ

Abstract

The theory of speech acts, which clarifies what people do when they speak, is not about individual words or sentences that form the basic elements of human communication, but rather about particular speech acts that are performed when uttering words. A speech act is the attempt at doing something purely by speaking. Many things can be done by speaking. Speech acts are studied under what is called speech act theory, and belong to the domain of pragmatics. In this paper, two Egyptian inaugural speeches from El-Sadat and El-Sisi, belonging to different periods were analyzed to find out whether there were differences within this genre in the same culture or not. The study showed that there was a very small difference between these two speeches which were analyzed according to Searle's theory of speech acts. In El Sadat's speech, commissives came to occupy the first place. Meanwhile, in El-Sisi's speech, assertives occupied the first place. Within the speeches of one culture, we can find that the differences depended on the circumstances that surrounded the elections of the Presidents at the time. Speech acts were tools they used to convey what they wanted and to obtain support from their audiences.

Keywords: Speech acts, pragmatics, discourse, critical discourse analysis, inaugural speech.

1. INTRODUCTION

The theory of speech acts was introduced by J. L. Austin in 1960 (Austin, 1962) and further developed by Searle (1969) and Bach and Harnish (1979). Three aspects of a speech act are distinguished by Austin (1962) to: the illocutionary act (saying something), the illocutionary force (what is intended to be done by speaking) and the perlocutionary effect (the effect of what has been said). Nowadays, the term speech act is often used to refer specifically to an illocutionary act and illocutionary force to

*Corresponding author, email: emadhaf6@gmail.com

denote the intended effect because the illocutionary act is considered as the real action performed by the utterance, while the effect of the utterance on the audience is manifested by the perlocutionary effect. Austin (1962) uses the term illocutionary act to refer to the speech act which is the center of his theory. This theory cannot be understood in isolation regardless of its intent which is pragmatics, which means the study of the use of utterances.

A speaker of a language must acquire extra-linguistic knowledge about the world in addition to his linguistic knowledge (vocabulary and rules of grammar) to succeed in communicating with others. The non-linguistic knowledge plays a major role in the production and understanding of certain utterances. An utterance cannot make sense without it being made in a suitable context that contains all necessary conditions required for the successful communication. These conditions, the speaker's communicative competence, his choice of linguistic forms and the relationship between the speaker and the listeners are all studied within the scope of pragmatics.

Accordingly, this paper intends to analyze the speech acts in the inaugural speeches of two Egyptian politicians, El-Sadat and El-Sisi. The author further wants to discover if there are any differences between the forms of these two speeches. The process of speech produced by these speakers has a complex set of intentions that would be interesting to describe in this research.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Speech Acts Theories

2.1.1 Austin's Theory

Austin (1962) and, later, Searle (1969) developed the theory of speech acts which clarifies what people do when they speak. In the lectures by Austin (1962), which were collected and presented with the title, "How to do Things with Words", says that the form of any sentence carries a message which requires an action from the addressee. Austin (1962) further says that a speech act is the attempt at doing something purely by speaking. Many things can be done by speaking. Anyone can make a promise, an order or can request somebody to do something, can ask a question, make a threat, pronounce somebody husband and wife, and so on. Each one of them reflects a particular speech act.

In a majority of cases, many utterances cannot constitute an appropriate speech act without the presence of appropriate conditions. An utterance like "clean up your room" is not appropriate if the speaker does not have an appropriate relationship to the addressee. No one can pronounce somebody husband and wife without having the appropriate authority. Yule (1996, p. 47) states that the sentence such as "You are fired!" must be uttered by a speaker with the power to "fire" someone because it is the act of terminating the employment of the addressee. Both the speaker and the listener are involved in this action that is surrounded by certain circumstances, which are called the speech event. The following sentence, "This tea is really cold" can be interpreted in two ways, either it is a complaint or it is praise. What determines the sense of this sentence is the state of the weather. If it is uttered on a really hot summer day, its

meaning is to praise, but if it is uttered on a bitterly cold, wintry day, its meaning will be the opposite or a complaint.

Austin (1962) uses the term illocutionary act to refer to the speech act which is the center of his theory. It is the action intended to be performed by the production of the locutionary act. Saeed (2006, p. 4) points out that the illocutionary act “is what Austin and his successors have mainly been concerned with: the use to which language can be put in society. In fact, the term speech acts is often used with just the meaning of illocutionary acts”.

Austin (1962) initiated the theory of speech acts as a reaction to many earlier theories of linguistics which disregarded language as action. It was first initiated as a theory of thinking but has been developed by him to be known as the “speech act theory”. After Austin, Searle (1969) adopted and modified it in his influential book “Speech Acts”.

Austin (1962) categorizes speech acts depending on the characteristics of verbs and their illocutionary forces. He classifies illocutionary acts into five types, even though such classification seems difficult to do or to understand since there are a lot of potential illocutionary acts, and in many cases the speaker’s intentions are vague. These types are (Austin, 1962, pp. 150-151):

(i) Verdicatives

This class of speech acts is used to express verdicts, judgments or findings such as to appreciate, characterize, assess, estimate, value, grade, etc.

(ii) Exercitives

This class of speech acts aims at showing the exercise of powers, rights or influence such as naming, sentencing, appointing, ordering, dedicating, dismissing, claiming, etc. For examples, when a judge says, “I sentence you to five years”, or when an angry boss says, “You’re fired”.

(iii) Commissives

The speech acts in this class indicate commitment or promises of different kinds or the taking on of an obligation or the expression of a future intention. The verbs belonging to this classification are promises, plans, guarantees, swearing in, betting, etc. They commit the speaker to doing something in the future. For example, “I promise to stand beside you”.

(iv) Behabitives

The verbs for this group of speech acts embrace expressions of attitude and social behavior such as apologies, congratulations, compliments, welcomes, etc.

(v) Expositives

According to Austin (1962, p. 152), this classification cannot be defined easily. The verbs of this type are not clear cut because they overlap with other classes but the general performative nature of individual utterances is often quite clear. Verbs such as hypothesize, expect, assume, remark, concede, etc., belong to this type.

2.1.2 Searle’s Theory

Searle (1969) claims the appropriate conditions by Austin are only accounted for ritual and ceremonial speech acts, such as pronouncing a couple husband and wife. Searle (1979) further criticizes the classifications Austin (1962) because he said they were based on overlapping criteria. Moreover, Searle (1979) says that Austin did not clarify the difference between speech act verbs and actual speech acts. He also noted

that some verbs can be found in more than one class, mentioning the verb ‘to describe’, which is included by Austin (1962) in the two classes of “verdicatives” and “expositives”. Besides, some verbs were classified under a certain type but they did not satisfy the definition for that type. For example, the verbs “appoint”, “nominate” and “excommunicate” do not designate the “giving of a decision in favor of or against a certain course of action”.

As a result, Searle (1979) replaced the classification of Austin (1962) with an alternative taxonomy based on appropriate conditions. It is important to note that Searle depends on twelve significant dimensions of variations in which illocutionary acts differ one from another but the focus is on three dimensions around which Searle builds most of his taxonomy. They are the illocutionary point, the direction of fit, and the sincerity condition Searle (1979). The dimensions are explained as follows (Searle, 1979, pp. 12-17):

(i) The Illocutionary Point

The point or purpose of a type of illocution that Searle calls the illocutionary point is part of, but not the same as, the illocutionary force. In this sense, it can be said that the illocutionary point of a request is the same as that of a command (both of them attempt to get the addressee to do something) but the illocutionary force is different. One can say that several elements participate to form an illocutionary force and that an illocutionary point is one of them.

(ii) Dimension of Fit

There are differences in the direction of fit between words and the world. Some illocutions have as part of their illocutionary point to match the world of words, others to get the world to match the words. Searle illustrates that by mentioning this situation:

A man goes to the supermarket with a shopping list given to him by his wife, on which are the words “beans, butter, bread and bacon”. Suppose that he goes around with his shopping cart, selecting those items, meanwhile he is followed by a store detective who writes down everything he puts in his cart. It is clear from this situation that both shopper and detective have identical lists. But the function of the two lists is quite different. In the case of the shopper’s list, the purpose of the list is to get the world to match the words; the man is supposed to make his actions fit the list. The reverse is true concerning the detective, the purpose of his list is to make the words match the world; the detective makes the list fit the actions of the shopper.

(iii) Propositional Content

Differences in propositional content are determined by indicating devices for illocutionary force. This dimension relies on the differences between a report and a prediction. A prediction must be about the future whereas a report is about the past or the present.

As for speech acts, Searle (1979) further divides them into five types: assertives (representative), directives, commissives, expressives and declaratives. They are further explained as the following:

(1) Assertive (Representative)

Searle (1979) states the aim of this class is to commit the speaker (in varying degrees) to something being the case, e.g., to the truth of the expressed proposition. The verbs belonging to this class are assert, complain, report, state, conclude, etc.

(2) Directives

These are attempts (in varying degrees) by the speaker to get the hearer to do something. They may be very modest “attempts” as when “I invite you to do it”, or “suggest that you do it”, or they may be very fierce attempts as when “I insist that you do it”. Verbs belonging to this class are ask, order, command, request, plead, beg, pray, entreat, advise, invite and permit.

(3) Commissives

This type commits a speaker to some future intentional action. It reveals the intention of the speaker. It denotes to vows, threats, pledges, warranties, contracts, promises, agreements, and oaths. For example, “I promise to drink eight glasses of water every day”. Thus, [Searle \(1979\)](#) states that the definition of commissives by [Austin \(1962\)](#) seems to him unexceptional, therefore he appropriates it as it stands with the caveat that several of the verbs that Austin listed as commissive verbs do not belong to this class at all, such as “favor”, “intend” and others.

(4) Expressives

The illocutionary point expressed in this class is to reflect a sincere wish about some condition or situation. Examples of verbs that belong to this class are “congratulate”, “apologize”, “condole”, “deplore” and “welcome”.

(5) Declaratives

This successful performance of one of its member verbs requires the correspondence between the propositional content and reality. For examples, if someone successfully performs the act of appointing someone else chairman, then he becomes chairman; if someone successfully performs the act of nominating somebody as a candidate, then he becomes a candidate; if the president successfully performs the act of declaring a state of war, then a war is on; if a judge successfully performs the act of marrying a couple, then the couple are married.

2.1.3 Bach and Harnish Model

A model synthesizing both Austin’s and Searle’s models were adopted by [Bach and Harnish \(1979\)](#) in which a communicative speech act involves four sub-acts ([Bach & Harnish, 1979, p. 40](#)):

(a) Utterance Act

An expression is uttered by the speaker to a listener in the context of an utterance.

(b) Locutionary Act

A speaker says to a listener in the context of an utterance so-and-so.

(c) Illocutionary Act

A speaker says such-and-such in the context of an utterance.

(d) Perlocutionary Act

A speaker affects the listener in a certain way.

[Bach and Harnish \(1979\)](#) describe many types of illocutionary acts in their taxonomy of speech acts. Their work is more comprehensive and has a detailed scheme to it. They distinguish six general classes which are based on the speaker’s psychological state or attitude, as it is called by them. Two of these classes are conventional: *verdicatives* and *effectives*, while the others are communicative speech acts such as *directives*, *commissives*, *constatives* and *acknowledgements*. The last four classes barely correspond to Austin’s *exercitives*, *commissives*, *expositives* and

behabitives, respectively, but they are close to those of Searle's which are directives, commissives, representatives and expressives.

(e) Constatives

These express the speaker's belief and his intention or desire that the listener have or form like a belief.

(f) Directives

These express the speaker's attitude towards some prospective action by the listener and his intention that his utterance, or the attitude which it expresses is taken as a reason for the listener to take action.

(g) Commissives

These express the speaker's intention and belief that his utterance obligates him to do something (perhaps under certain conditions).

(h) Acknowledgements

These express a certain feeling towards the listener or in special cases where the utterance is clearly perfunctory or formal. The speaker's intention is that that his utterance satisfies a social expectation to express certain feelings and his belief that it does.

(i) Effectives

These conventional illocutionary acts effect changes in institutional states of affairs; they are necessarily conventional in as much as they achieve their effect only because they are mutually believed to do so. For examples: "A student is graduated" and "A bill is voted".

(j) Verdicatives

These are judgments that by convention have official, binding impact in the context of the institution in which they occur. Calling a runner out, finding a defendant guilty and making a property assessment are not just to make a judgment and give authority to a judge but also to make them the case.

2.2 Pragmatics

An utterance cannot make sense without a suitable context that contains all necessary conditions required for the successful communication. These conditions, the speaker's communicative competence, his choice of linguistic forms and the relationship between the speaker and the listener or addressee are all studied within the scope of pragmatics.

According to [Bussmann \(1998\)](#) pragmatics is the science that studies the relationship between natural language expressions and their use in specific situations. The traces of this science extend to [Morris \(1938\)](#) who proposed the first definition of pragmatics. He stated that pragmatics refers to the relationship of signs to their user(s). [Morris \(1938\)](#) said that the difference between pragmatics and semantics is that both of them investigate different aspects of linguistic meaning. The first one deals with the function of linguistic utterances and the propositions that are expressed by them, depending upon their use in a specific situation while the latter studies the literal and contextually non-variable meaning of linguistic expressions or with the contextually non-variable side of the truth, conditions of propositions or sentences.

[Wales \(1989, p. 368\)](#) has said that the term pragmatics was originally derived from the Greek word "pragma" which carries the meaning of activity, deed and affair. [Crystal \(1997\)](#) argues that pragmatics and syntactics form the components or divisions

of semiotics. Crystal (1997) states that in spite of the fact that there is a clear difference between the two fields, they are interrelated and interwoven, since the total meaning of any piece of language in actual use is the product of its semantic and pragmatic aspects. In short, the foregoing discussion shows that the field of pragmatics occupies an area between semantics, sociolinguistics and extra-linguistic contexts. Crystal (1991) further says that pragmatics has witnessed a huge development to include the factors that govern the speaker's choice of language in social interaction. It also investigates the effects of this choice on others. Pragmatics draws and presents certain rules and principles (often conventional) that constrain the way people speak. Many expressions may have different meanings which are determined by pragmatic principles rather than by formal rules of language.

All the definitions mentioned above agree that the main role of pragmatics is to study two things simultaneously. The former is the use of language in context while the latter deals with studying the behavior of the speaker and the listener.

2.3 Discourse

Stubbs (1983) defines discourse as the language above the clause. Looking at the structural properties, such as organization and coherence, is the focus of the first approach while the second pays attention to the social ideas that inform the way people use and interpret language. A second approach by Brown and Yule (1983) has also received attention. They state that the analysis of discourse means the analysis of language in use because it cannot merely be restricted to the description of linguistic forms without focusing on the purposes or functions which these forms are formed or designed to serve in human affairs. Richardson (2007) also states that discourse implies the fact that language is used to mean something and to do something and that this meaning and doing is linked to the context of its usage.

According to Talbot (2007), the interpretation of any text in an appropriate manner needs to work out or discover what the speaker or writer is doing through discourse and link this doing to the wider interpersonal institutional, socio-cultural and material contexts. Talbot (2007, p. 9) states that "text refers to the observable product of interaction, whereas discourse is the process of interaction itself: a cultural activity". Thus, Fairclough (1992, p. 62) sees discourse in a different way, saying that it is a social practice which implies a two-way relationship between a discursive event (any use of discourse) and the situation, institution and social structure in which it occurs. Discourse is shaped by these, but it also shapes itself.

2.4 Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

The relationship between discourse, power, dominance and social inequality and how discourse reproduces and maintains these relations of dominance and inequality is the focus of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Dijk (1993) states that because of analysts' concerns with the analysis of the often opaque relationships between discourse practices and wider social and cultural structures, CDA practitioners take an explicit socio-political stance (Dijk, 1993).

According to Fairclough (2001), CDA is concerned with the analysis of text and interactions but it does not start from texts and interactions. Problems which face people in their social lives and issues which are taken up with sociology, political science

and/or cultural studies form the starting point and the milestones of this science. Fairclough (1992) further maintains that discourse (the use of language in speech and writing) should be regarded as a social practice. He states that every instance of language use has three dimensions: it is a spoken or written language text, it is an interaction between people involving processes of producing and interpreting the text and it is a piece of social practice. This view of discourse implies dealing with issues such as institutional circumstance of the discursive event and how that forms or shapes the nature of the discursive practices and the constitutive effects of discourse.

The analysis of linguistic structures, which are attributed a crucial function in the social production of inequality and/or equality, power, ideology and manipulation is the general thrust in CDA. Both linguistic structures and visual structures express ideological meanings and contribute to the overall meaning of texts. CDA focuses on the hidden ideologies that are reflected, constructed and reinforced in everyday institutional discourse. The definition of ideology falls into two broad categories: a relativist definition (denoting systems of ideas, beliefs and practices) and a critical definition (that allies with Marxist theory), which sees it as working in the interests of social class and /or cultural groups.

2.5 Inaugural Speeches

The most important political discourses are presidential inaugural speeches. They are of great significance to the new president, because they form a very special moment when he stands before the whole nation or even the whole world to express his fundamental political policies and principles for the country's development during the period of his presidency. Depending totally on this kind of discourse, the presidents' aims are at convincing citizens, boosting their morale, motivating the confidence of people and seeking the largest amount of support from his citizens. To achieve this task, they carefully weigh their words in their speech, and polish them by resorting to different language skills and strategies.

Metaphor is one of the strategies that can be used to convince listeners. It appears to be adopted widely and also used effectively. According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980), metaphors are pervasive in daily life, not just in language but also in thought and action. Conceptualizing a particular concept in terms of another is regarded the best way that enables addressees to understand some abstract concepts much easier and clearer than by adopting words that have concrete referents. Metaphor is a means to manifest or clarify the speech acts utilized by politicians.

Harry Caplan, as quoted in Campbell and Jamieson (1990), said that epideictic or demonstrative discourse motivates the speaker to impress his ideas upon the audience without action as a goal. If these characteristics are found, presidential inaugurals are epideictic rhetoric because they are delivered on ceremonial occasions, link or connect past with future in present contemplation, and affirm or praise the shared principles that have a significant role in guiding the incoming administration. They also ask the audience to 'gaze upon' traditional values, employ or use elegant, literary language relying on the heightening of the effect by amplification and reaffirmation of what is already known and believed.

The general qualities of epideictic rhetoric modified by the nature of presidential investiture generate five interrelated elements that define the essential presidential

inaugural address and differentiate it from other types of epideictic rhetoric (Moore, 2016):

- i). Unify the audience.
- ii). Rehearse communal values drawn from the past.
- iii). Set forth political principles of the new administration.
- iv). Enact the requirements and limitations of the office.
- v). Use appropriate epideictic address strategies.

3. METHOD

Two models were adopted to analyze two inaugural Egyptian speeches belonging to the same culture but delivered at two different periods. The first one was the one delivered by El-Sadat in 1970 and the second one was delivered by El-Sisi in 2014. The model by Searle (1969) was used to analyze the data specifying the kind of sentences produced, whether it is commissive or directive. This model is supported by the model of Ferrara (1980) in which she proves that speech acts contract relationships with one another in a sequence. In most cases, speech acts do not usually occur in isolation in real life but they come as clusters or sequences. These speech acts in sequences are normally related to one another; while they share a different status in the flow of the speaker's actions.

Ferrara (1980) also states that the assertion act can establish a justificatory relationship because its propositional context describes a state of affairs which, by virtue of a culturally shared belief, can induce a favorable attitude. Thus, in more general terms, the additional condition of success which must be met by a subordinate speech act in order to realize a justificatory relationship with the main act in the sequence is that it must be able to relate to a state of world capable of inducing a favorable attitude toward a set of actions to which the main act belongs. Her model depends on discovering the relationships among the speech acts within one sequence where she distinguishes three relationships which are: justification, contrastive apposition and amplification.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 El-Sadat's Inaugural Speech

S1 *I have received your directive (assertive), and I pray to Almighty God that I will perform the task (commissive) which you have entrusted to me in a manner satisfactory to our people and nation and compatible with the ideals laid down by the memorable leader (assertive) and for which he gave everything, from life to death (assertive).*

In S1 (S refers to Speech, meanwhile the number 1 refers to the first sample extraction presented in this paper), there are four speech acts corresponding to four messages which are contained or outlined above. The illocutionary point in the first speech act is to inform people around the world that this is the case in Egypt where the new president is elected according to a directive of the Egyptians. Its direction of fit is

words to world: the citizens elected the new president by their will. The expressed psychological state is belief (that P): the speaker believes the expressed proposition and tries to make the listener to believe it, too. The relevant speech act, therefore, satisfies or fulfills assertive conditions: it is an assertive speech act.

The illocutionary point in the second speech act, *"I will perform the task"*, is to emphasize that the newly elected president will do his best to be an ideal President and do the task in a manner that satisfies all Egyptians. The direction of fit is that of world to words. The expressed psychological state of this speech act is the pledge to do the task. In this regard, we face a clearly commissive speech act. This speech act carries the main goal of this paragraph where the first comes to be a justification of this main goal with a desire of motivation. The main goal is to ensure that the president will do his duty as an elected president while the sub-goal is to provide good justification for the pledge outlined in the second speech act. This is done via an expression indicating commitment to something being the case (*"I have received your directive"*). In other words, the first is the basis for the pledge that follows. The main point of the sequence is contained in the commissive, such that the assertive is merely a supportive device providing motivation for the main act. As the main act, the commissive dominates the illocutionary goal. The assertive, though a subordinate act, contributes to the achievement of the main goal by providing a sufficiently compelling reason for, or one that is at least capable of inducing compliance with the commissive. The realization of the main goal is, of course, the perlocutionary intention.

The illocutionary point in the third speech act, *"you have entrusted this task to me"*, presents an amplification of the first one but they are mediated by a commissive speech act. It informs the people that he is here to satisfy people's desires and will. The expressed psychological state is belief (that P): the speaker believes the expressed proposition and also wants the listener to believe it, too. The conditions of assertiveness are manifested in this speech.

The fourth speech act is *"the memorable leader gave everything, from life to death to do this task"*. Its illocutionary point is to inform the audience that this task needs sacrifice for it to be achieved and he is ready to do by imitating his fellow (the memorable leader, Jamal Abdul Nasser). The direction of fit is to make words fits the world. It amplifies the first and third ones because all of them have something in common. The first, third and the fourth come to provide a justification for the main speech act which is manifested in the second speech act. These three justifications can be mentioned before the main speech act but the last one mediates them for stylistic purposes.

In other words, it can be said that while the first comes to function as pre-justification, the third and fourth are for post-justification. The assertive and commissive speech acts of this paragraph have a hierarchical order occurring along a dominance-subordination line based on the intuitive notion of the main point. The main objective of this paragraph is to ensure that the new president will do the task in a way that satisfies all the people while the sub-goal is to provide justification for the main objective. The claim that the president has received the directive from the Egyptian people forms the basis for the pledge that follows. The third and fourth commissive speech acts contract a relationship of amplification with the first one aiming at providing reasonable justifications for the main speech act.

Table 1 shows El-Sadat's frequency of speech acts in his speech. From the table, it can be seen that commissive was used the most (45%), followed by assertive (35%) and directive and expressive, each with 10%.

Table 1. The frequency of speech acts in El-Sadat's speech.

<i>Speech Acts</i>	<i>Frequencies</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Assertive	11	35 %
Commissive	14	45 %
Directive	3	10 %
Expressive	3	10 %
Declarative	0	0 %
Total number of acts	31	100 %

4.2 El-Sisi's Inaugural Speech

S2 *It is high time for our great people to reap the fruits of their two revolutions (assertive). Our people have never spared any effort and (have) sacrificed their blood and (their) lives for realizing their legitimate hopes and aspirations (assertive). The success of revolutions lies in attaining their goals and their ability to (achieve) change(s) for the better and in being effectively able to build (assertive). It is high time to build a future which is more stable and establish a new reality for the future of this nation (commissive). It is a reality where we adopt hard work as a style of our life in an effort to guarantee decent living conditions and provide us with an opportunity to maintain and enhance the rights and freedoms within an aware and responsible framework away from chaos and through a comprehensive national march (commissive) in which every party listens to the other(s) in an objective and interested way (assertive). We may differ for the sake of the nation, but we never differ over the nation (assertive).*

The sample in S2 contains seven speech acts in all. The illocutionary point in the first speech act, “*It is high time for our great people to reap the fruits of their two revolutions*”, is to assert, as it were, the present reality of life in Egypt, as a way of expressing knowledge of what the people are experiencing. Its direction of fit is words-to-world: the words tell us what obtains — it is the case that Egyptians were going through a hard time while reaping the fruits of their two revolutions. The expressed psychological state of speech act is the belief (that P): the speaker believes the expressed proposition and also wants the listeners to believe it, too. In this connection, we are presented with an assertive speech act.

The second speech act amplifies the first one clarifying that the efforts and the blood of the Egyptians will get their “*fruits*” or results and that the Egyptians will attain their goal(s) and will have the ability to change their reality into a better one. Its direction of fit is words-to-world: the words tell us what is the situation in Egypt. Its expressed psychological state is belief (that P): this speech act, therefore, fulfills conditions that identify assertives.

The third speech act upholds the second speech act by telling the people that the success of these two revolutions depends on achieving the desired objectives. Its direction of fit is words-to-world: the words tell us that the two revolutions will succeed and achieve their goals. The expressed psychological state of the speech act is belief

(that P): the speaker believes the expressed proposition and also wants the listener to believe it, too. In this regard, we are faced with an assertive speech act.

The illocutionary point in the fourth speech act reflects a commissive speech act in which the new president promises to build a future which is more stable and (to) establish a new reality for the future of his nation. Its direction of fit is words-to-world: the words tell us that the newly elected president is aware of his responsibilities and (that) he will change the present situation into a rosy one in the future. Its expressed psychological state is that of a pledge.

The fifth speech act functions as amplification of the preceding one where the speaker emphasizes that to reach the objective of the fifth speech act he must be hard-working. It is thus a commissive speech act. The last two speech acts are assertive. They conjoin with the first, second and the third to form a good justification for the main speech act which is manifested in the fourth one.

Table 2 shows El-Sisi's frequency of speech acts in his speech. From the table, it can be seen that assertive was used the most (42%), followed by commissive (27%), directive and expressive, both with 12% each, and finally declarative (6%).

Table 2. The frequency of speech acts in Al Sisi's speech.

<i>Speech Acts</i>	<i>Frequencies</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Assertive	14	42 %
Commissive	9	27 %
Directive	4	12 %
Expressive	4	12 %
Declarative	2	6 %
Total number of acts	33	100 %

5. CONCLUSION

Speech acts are used in this genre because the speaker uses them as tools by which he can convey what he wants and get the support of his audience. Grammatically, speech acts can be realized in different syntactic structures (complex, compound or simple sentences, phrases, statements or expressions). They have no fixed standard forms and belong to the assertive category in general.

Semantically, metaphors are usually used to reflect meanings rather than to be literal. This is owing to the fact that their use and application to the situation is not literal or direct. The same speech act can carry more than one message; therefore a proposed model of two theories is adopted to emphasize that a specific sentence is a commissive one regardless of its form.

The most convincing classification is that of [Searle \(1969\)](#) since it describes illocutionary acts according to their communicative purposes in society. Nevertheless, the three classifications, those of Austin, of Searle and of Bach and Harnish, all run into some difficulties and are in fact unable to cover the whole range of speech acts in language. The theory of speech acts was realized by Arab leaders hundreds of years ago in the course of their investigations into pragmatic meaning as an essential part of general meaning. They placed the theory of speech acts within the general theory of rhetoric rather than within pragmatics.

Most sentences with this genre should be seen as speech acts since they are used in the context of every day communication with the same functions as those of

utterances. Thus, they often posit an order, prohibition, recommendation, warning, etc. In most cases, they are indirect speech acts in the sense that their meanings are metaphorical and derived indirectly on the basis of their literal interpretation.

Within the speeches of one culture, we can find differences depending on the circumstances that surround the election of the president. This is clear through the speeches of El-Sadat and El-Sisi. In El-Sadat's speech, commissives come to occupy the first rank. This is due to the difficult situation that El-Sadat faced at that time. Meanwhile, in El-Sisi's speech, assertives occupy the first place. This finding supports Ferrara's theory that says that this category comes to be justification of commissives and directives. Directives have the third rank in these two speeches. Expressives are in the fourth rank, whilst declaratives have very little value in these speeches.

REFERENCES

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do thing with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bach, K., & Harnish, R. M. (1979). *Linguistic communication and speech acts*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bussmann, H. (1998). *Routledge dictionary of language and linguistics*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Campbell, K. K., & Jamieson, K. H. (1990). *Presidents creating the presidency: Deeds done in words*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Crystal, D. (1991). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dijk, T. A. V. (1993). *Elite discourse and racism*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Critical discourse analysis*. In A. McHoul M. Rapley (Eds), *How to analyse talk in institutional settings: A casebook of methods*. London: Continuum.
- Ferrara, A. (1980). *An extended theory of speech acts: Appropriateness conditions for subordinate acts in sequences*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Moore, L. B. (2016). *Second terms, first impressions: A comparison of presidential inaugural addresses by Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush* (Doctor), West Texas A & M University, Texas.
- Morris, C. W. (1938). *Foundations of the theory of signs*. Illinois: Chicago University Press.
- Richardson, J. E. (2007). *Analysing newspapers: An approach from critical discourse analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Saeed, J. I. (2006). *Semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

- Searle, J. R. (1979). *Semantics*. London: T.J. Press.
- Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse analysis: The sociolinguistic analysis of natural language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Talbot, M. (2007). *Media discourse: representation and interaction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Wales, K. (1989). *A dictionary of stylistics*. California: Longman.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[Received 22 April 2017; revised 31 May 2017; accepted 02 August 2017]

THE AUTHOR

Imad Hayif Sameer works as an instructor at the University of Anbar. He has published many papers such as *The speech of warning in presidential speech*, *The syntactic aspects of the subject which cause difficulties to the undergraduate students of English at Anbar University*, *Cognitive study of certain animals in English and Arabic proverbs: A comparative study*, *Rhetorical and linguistic analysis of Bush's second inaugural speech*, *Cross-cultural differences in El-Sadat's and Bush's first inaugural speeches* and *The dependency on speech acts to convey messages in Suleiman's and Nixon's first inaugural speeches*. The title of his MA thesis was "Discoursal analysis of adjacency pairs in political interviews".