The Linguistic Features of Politeness in Qur'anic Dialogues: A Pragmatic Study of the Chapter of "The Cave"

Ghada Abdel Salam

Abstract

The scope of the study:

The present study attempts to investigate politeness techniques used on the Holy Qur'an using basically Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness (1987). The study mainly focuses on the dialogue between prophet Moses (peace be upon him) and the righteous servant in the chapter of the "Cave" in the English translation of the Holy Qur'an by Yusuf Ali (2007).The selected dialogue reflects the social communication between characters of different social distance and shows how politeness strategies may vary from situation to another according to social distance and relative power of the participants. The chosen dialogue also sets a great example for how should be the dialogue between a knowledgeable man and a knowledge seeker.

Methodology:

The study adopts a pragmatic approach. It attempts to test Brown and Levinson's model of politeness on the selected dialogue. The authors introduced four possible strategies to calculate the weightiness of politeness: bold on record, positive politeness, negative politeness and off record. For all utterances done by speaker and the hearer through the conversation, the type of strategy used is analyzed.

Findings of the research:

The present study has attempted to test Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness (1987) on the Quranic dialogue between prophet Moses and the righteous servant in the chapter of "The Cave". Throughout the analysis of the dialogue, it has become clear how the social variables which are the social distance between the participants, the power relation between them and the degree of imposition of an FTA have affected the participants' choice of the suitable politeness strategies during the social interaction in order to make a polite request. The findings have also shown how the relationship between the interlocutors including the three social variables affects the directness and the indirectness of the selected dialogue. For example, as seen during the analysis, prophet Moses adopted a more decent and polite way in making his request to learn using the negative politeness strategy of being indirect, "May I follow thee, on the footing that thou teach me something of the (Higher) Truth which thou hast been taught?"(no:66). On the other hand, when Alkhidr refused prophet Moses' request in the beginning, he was considerate to his negative face 'wants not to be impeded' that is why he chose to be indirect giving a reason for his refusal avoiding hurting Moses as the face threat of the act of refusal was so great. So, Alkhidr spoke off-record giving an association clue for the act of refusal, "Verily thou wilt not be able to have patience with me"(no:67).

In addition, House and Kasper's modality markers (1981) were used during the analysis to support Brown and Levinson's model of politeness (1987). For example, the use of the upgraders was most evident such as the use of intensifiers such as, 'verily and truly'. Thus, the findings have answered the research questions mentioned previously in the introduction as the analysis of the corpus of the study has reviewed politeness strategies used in the selected dialogue and why they are used .

علاقة الانسان بالحيوان في رواية "فلش" قراءة نقدية بيئية

غادة عبد السلام

الملخص

موضوع البحث:

تهدف الدراسة إلي تحري استراتيجيات أدب الحوار في القران الكريم طبقا لنظريه التأدب في الحوار لبراون و ليفنسون(1987)،وتتركز ماده البحث علي الحوار بين نبي الله موسي عليه السلام والعبد الصالح في سوره الكهف في ترجمه معاني القران الكريم ليوسف علي(2007)،حيث أن هذا الحوار المختار يعكس كيف يكون التواصل الاجتماعي بين شخصيات بينها بعد اجتماعي،كما يبين البحث كيف تختلف تلك الاستراتيجيات من موقف لآخر طبقا للبعد الاجتماعي ومدي قوه السلطة بين المتحاورين. ويعد الحوار المختار نموذجا رائعا عن كيف يكون الحوار بين العالم وطالب العلم.

المنهج المتبع في الدراسة:

تتبع الدراسة في تحليل مادة البحث منهجا براجماتيا ً سيقوم البحث بتطبيق استراتيجيات عنصر الأدب لبراون وليفنسون (1987) علي الحوار القرآني المختار، و قد حدد المؤلفان نموذجاً لأدب الحوار و أكدا علي أن الحوار المصاغ بطريقة مهذبة تحكمه ثلاثة عوامل :البعد الاجتماعي، مدي قوة السلطة بين المتحاورين و كذلك درجة السيطرة من قبل المتحدث علي المستمع، كما قدما أيضا ً أربع استراتيجيات أساسية لأدب الحوار و بناءاً عليه سيتم تحليل مادة البحث من هذا المنطلق.

النتائج التي توصل إليها البحث:

كما ذكرنا أنفا تهدف الدراسة الحالية إلي تطبيق نظريه أدب الحوار لبراون و ليفنسون (1987) علي الحوار القرآني بين نبي الله موسي عليه السلام والرجل الصالح (الخضر)في سوره الكهف. وقد تبين أثناء تحليل الحوار كيف أن العوامل الاجتماعية والتي تتمثل في البعد الاجتماعي بين المتحدث والمستمع، درجه قوه السلطة لأحدهما علي الآخر وكذلك مدي تأثير الطلب المرجو من الحوار علي المتحدث والمستمع، قد أثرت علي اختيار المتحاورين لاستراتيجيه أدب الحوار المناسبة للحدث أثناء الحوار من اجل الوصول إلي حوار يتميز بالأدب،كما بينت النتائج أيضا كيف أثرت العلاقة بين المتحاورين علي كيفيه التحاور من حيث التحاور بطريقه مباشره أو غير مباشره، فعلي سبيل المثال سلك نبي الله موسي عليه السلام مسلك غاية في الأدب كما رأينا عندما أراد أن يطلب من صاحب العلم أن يتبعه لكي يتعلم مستخدما طريقه السؤال المهذب لعرض طلبه (هل أتبعك علي أن تعلمني مما علمت رشدا،66)، وكذلك سلك الخضر مسلكا مهذبا عندما رفض طلب موسي عليه السلام في البداية حيث رفض طلبه بطريقه مهذبه مستخدما استراتيجيه غير مباشره مبديا سببا لرفضه تأدبا مع المستمع ومراعاة لشعوره وحفظا لوجهه من عبء الرفض(أنك لن تستطيع معي صبرا،67)، وهذا يبرهن ما تقترحه النظرية المطبقة (1987) حيث يؤكد المؤلفان أن استراتيجيات التأدب الغير مباشره تساعد المتحدث علي أن يقول مالا يستطيع قوله بطريقه مباشره وهذا ما فعله الخضر. وقد تم أيضا استخدام أساليب التلطف لكاسبر وهاوس (1981) والتي ساعدت المتحاورين علي تلطيف الأسلوب المستخدم في الحوار حيث تم استخدام المؤكدات مثل "حقا وبالفعل". وهكذا تمت الاجابه علي اسئله البحث حيث تم ذكر استراتيجيات أدب الحوار التي استخدمها المتحاورين.

0. Introduction:

The present study attempts to test Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness (1987) on the Holy Qur'an. It focuses on the specific type of dialogue that is related to human-human relations especially that dialogue which reflects the relationship between a knowledgeable man and a knowledge seeker. For the purposes of the study, Yusuf [1]Ali's translation of the Holy Qur'an is particularly chosen as it ranks as the most widely-known and used translation of the Holy Qur'an in the world. In his commentary on Ali's translation, Sherif (1994) emphasizes this fact as he notes that Ali's translation is "a standard reference in mosques and homes in the English-speaking Muslim world" and that the great reputation that Ali's translation was given is attributed to "the author's accurate rendering of the Qur'anic Arabic, command of English expression and erudition" (p.VII). The rendering of his translation is said to be that it contains the Arabic text, commentary and a summary of each surah (chapter). It was first published in 1934. In the preface of his first edition in 1934, Yusuf Ali points out that the aim of his translation is to communicate the beauty and uniqueness of the Qur'an to the reader:

> The English shall be, not a mere substitution of one word for another, but the best expression I can give to the fullest meaning which I can understand from the Arabic Text. The rhythm, music, and exalted tone of the original should be reflected in the English interpretation. It may be but a faint reflection, but such beauty and power as my pen can command shall be brought to its service (p:IV).

Since its first publication, Ali's translation has been published in many different countries worldwide such as in the U.S.A, Saudi Arabia, India and Syria, and was acclaimed in the Islamic and Western world, wherever English is read and understood (http://alquran.info/Translation/Yusuf=ali.aspx#PREFACE_TO_FIR ST_EDITIONonline Quran Project).

0.1. Background of the study:

The present study argues that Politeness is a universal phenomenon which generally expresses good manners during social interaction. Politeness also implies behaving or speaking in away that is correct for the social situations you are in and showing that you are careful to consider other people's needs and feelings

(Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English). Normally, people are polite to each other because they want to present a positive image of themselves, or to establish social rapport or to develop successful communication. According to Goffman (1967), People are obliged to protect both their own face and the faces of others during social interaction. Goffman (1967) defines the concept of *face* as "the positive social value a person claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact". It is "an image of self-delineated in terms of approved social attributes…" (p. 5). Adopting Goffman's notion of social self, Brown and Levinson (1987) define *face* as "the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself/herself(p. 61).Thus, Goffman's as well as Brown and Levinson's argue that *face* is something to be established, maintained, improved, misplaced, and rebuilt in social interactions.

Politeness is one of the areas of interest in [2]pragmatics which helps us recognize social norms and the rules of language use. Due to the importance of understanding social norms, politeness has received much scholarly attention. Many scholars agree that the major goal of using a certain phrase to express politeness is to strategically avoid conflicts and achieve social comity with others (Lakoff, 1973; Brown and Levinson 1987, Leech, 1983; Watts 2003). According to Reiter (2000), politeness is not something human beings are endowed with but something which people can acquire through a process of socialization. Hill et al. (1986) also note that politeness is one of the "constraints on human interaction, whose purpose is to consider others' feelings, establish levels of mutual comfort, and promote rapport" (p. 340).

Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness (1987), which is the basic theoretical framework of the present study, proposes that politeness in language use is concerned with showing concern for people's face. Face is a key concept in their model of politeness which is defined as the "public self image" claimed for oneself (Brown and Levinson, 1987, p. 61). The authors (1987) suggest that all members of a society have basic face wants and each member works towards maintaining his own face and the other's as well. According to the authors (1987), there are two types of face "positive face" and "negative face". Positive face is defined as the "positive consistent image or 'personality'(crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by

interactants". Negative face, however, is "the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, and rights to non-distraction-i.e. the freedom of action and freedom from imposition' or 'the want of every 'competent adult member' that his actions be unimpeded by others" (p. 61).

Brown and Levinson (1987) also introduced the notion of face threatening acts (FTAS). A FTA is any verbal or non verbal act a speaker (S) addresses to a hearer (H) which could be interpreted as intruding on the hearer's freedom of action. In order to mitigate the face threat of an FTA, the authors (1987) outlined four main types of politeness strategies: bold on-record, negative politeness, positive politeness, and off-record which are used by the interactants to help them redress the threat of their acts and save their own face and the others' as well. According to Watts et al. (1992), Brown and Levinson's theory has been the most influential as it provides "a paradigm for linguistic politeness that goes beyond a mere extension of the Gricean maxims" (p.7). It opened the door for further studies in the area of pragmatics. In this respect, the study attempts to answer two main questions:

1-What are the linguistic forms of politeness strategies used in the selected Qur'anic dialogue in the English translation of the Holy Qur'an and how this dialogue is conducted politely in the light of Brown & Levinson's model of politeness?

2-How does the relationship between the interlocutors including relative social distance, relative social power and the degree of the imposition of an illocutionary act affect the directness and the indirectness of the dialogue?

0.2. The significance of the study:

The present study attempts to investigate politeness rituals used and adapted during interaction in the Qur'anic dialogue between prophet Moses and Alkhidr that touches upon the human relationship between the knowledge seeker and the knowledgeable man and clearly shows how the teacher deals with his student politely and vice versa. This dialogue is specifically chosen as it is significant for showing how politeness strategies may vary during the course of action according to social distance, relative power dynamics between the interlocutors and the degree of imposition of an FTA. It also shows how language, through this dialogue, reflects and shapes

human relationships in social interaction. The lessons drawn from this dialogue could set examples for the teachers and students in the English-speaking world of the way of dealing with one another politely and respectfully within the framework of the politeness of dialogue as Islam confirms it. This research contributes to the study of pragmatics, especially studying politeness in the English translation of the Holy Qur'an. It opens the door for researchers to investigate more the Qur'anic dialogues that touch upon different human relationships such as the relationship between prophets and their people.

0.3. Methodology:

The present study attempts to test Brown and Levinson's model of politeness on the Qur'anic dialogue between prophet Moses (peace be upon him) and Al khidr (may Allah be pleased with him) in the chapter of "The Cave" verses (65:70). Brown and Levinson (1987) introduced four possible strategies to help the interlocutors produce a dialogue that is characterized by politeness and decency: bold on record, positive politeness, negative politeness and off record strategies. For all utterances done by speakers through the conversation, the type of strategy used is analyzed. This should help the present study to investigate how politeness strategies may vary from situation to another according to the three social factors (the social distance between the speaker and hearer, power relations and the degree of imposition of an FTA) which affect the speaker's choice of the proper politeness strategy concerned. House and Kasper's modality markers (1981) will be used in the analysis to support Brown and Levinson's model of politeness (1987).

In addition, the research will use the exegesis of the Holy Qur'an by the grand imam Al Hafiz Ibn Kathir (2005) in order to clarify matters and events that are included in the selected Qur'anic dialogues and the subject of each dialogue as well. This particular exegetic text is specifically chosen as it is among the most renowned and accepted explanations of the Holy Qur'an worldwide. It is one of the most comprehensive and complete explanations and commentaries of the Noble Qur'an.

1. Theoretical approach:

1.1. Speech Act Theory:

This section reviews of the Speech Act Theory to show how

its importance in opening the door for further study about politeness. It shows that people use language not only to say things but also to achieve different goals like requesting, promising etc and gain harmonious relationships with others as well. The idea of speech acts was pioneered by the American language philosopher J .L. Austin who is considered the father of the modern pragmatics for laying the foundation of the Speech Act theory. In his famous book 'How to Do Things with Words' (1962), Austin presented a new way of analyzing meaning in which meaning is described in relation to words/sentences and the situation where the speaker actually says something and intends to do it. Austin (1962) writes that "saying something will often, or even normally, produce certain consequential effects upon the feeling, thoughts, or actions of the audience or of the speaker or of other persons: and it may be done with the design, intention, or purpose of producing them" (p. 101).

According to Austin (1962) acts are classified into three types: **Locutionary** act (the utterance of a sentence with certain sense and reference); **Illocutionary** act (the making of a request, offer, promise, etc in uttering a sentence) and **Perlocuionary** act (the achieving of certain effects on the hearer by uttering the sentence) Austin provides the following example, illustrating these three types of acts:

Act (A) or Locution   : (He said to me, "You can't do that.")
Act (B) or Illocution   : (He protested against my doing it.)
Act (C.a) or Perlocution: (He pulled me up, checked me   )
Act (C.b)   :(He stopped me; he brought me to my senses)
(Austin, 1962, pp.101-102)

Austin (1962) focuses mainly on the second type, the **illocutionary** act; the term which the speech act has come to refer exclusively to that kind of act. According to Austin (1962), illocutionary acts are classified into five main categories : *verdictives* which are typified by the giving of a verdict as the name implies, by a jury, arbitrator, or umpire; *exercitives* which refer to the exercising of powers, rights, or influence such as appointing, voting, ordering, advising and warning; *commisives* which are typified by promising or otherwise undertaking; *behabitives* which are very miscellaneous group, and have to do with attitudes and social behaviour such as apologizing, congratulating, commending

and challenging; and *expositives* which make plain how our utterances fit into the course of an argument or conversation such as 'I reply' 'I illustrate' (Austin, 1962, p. 150 – 151).

Like Austin, Searle(1995), Austin's student and one of the proponents of the speech act theory, notes that we cannot interpret the meaning of a sentence without the situational context in which the sentence is uttered and that sentences are produced in the form of speech acts which are "the basic units of linguistic communication"(p.16). Focusing on **illocutionary acts**, Searle (1979) reclassifies illocutionary acts into five categories: *assertives* which commit the speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition such as stating, suggesting, boasting, complaining, claiming, reporting; *directives* which are intended to produce some effect through action by the hearer such as ordering, commanding, requesting, advising, and recommending; *commisives* which commit the speaker to some future course of action such as promising, vowing and offering; *expressives* which have the function of expressing, or making known, the speaker's psychological attitude towards a state of affairs which the illocution presupposes such as thanking, congratulating, tulating*,* pardoning, blaming, praising, etc; and *declarations* which are illocutions whose "successful performance…brings about the correspondence between the propositional content and reality" such as resigning, dismissing, christening, naming, appointing, sentencing, etc. (Searle, 1979, pp. 12-17).

Another contribution of Searle was the development of a theory of 'Indirect Speech acts' which he (1979) describes as "cases in which one illocutionary act is performed indirectly by the way of performing another" (p. 31). He also notes(1979) that "in indirect speech acts the speaker communicates to the hearer more than he actually says by way of relying on their mutually shared background information, both linguistic and nonlinguistic, together with the general powers of rationality and inference on the part of the hearer"(pp. 31-32).

Thus, this section has reviewed the Speech Act Theory which was the basis for other linguistic theories which appeared after that such as Grice's Theory of Implicature and Cooperative Principle (1975), Lakoff's Politeness rules (1973) and other influential politeness theories which look upon politeness not only as a

linguistic device but also as a social factor that has an important impact on the utterance and how it is done in conformity with the accepted social norms. Among these theories is Brown and Levinson's model of politeness (1987); the basic theoretical basis of the present study. Before proceeding to Brown and Levinson's approach of politeness, previous studies on politeness, which is an important linguistic tool for social interaction, should be reviewed. As such, the following section will focus on discussing politeness theories

2.1. Politeness Theories:

This section reviews politeness theories beginning from Grice's (1975) maxims of conversation until the face-saving (Brown& Levinson's model of politeness (1987). This should serve the present study in showing that Brown and Levinson's model of politeness (1987) proves to be the most comprehensive model of politeness that is universally applicable regardless of the culture.

2.1.1. The conversational maxim view of Politeness:

The conversational-maxim view is referred to as the traditional view in the first generation of theoretical studies concerning politeness (Terkourafi, 2005).The conversational maxim view of politeness is starts from Grice's work (1975). According to Grice, speakers are able to converse with one another because they recognize common goals in conversation and specific ways of achieving these goals. Grice (1975, p. 45) maintains that the most important principle in conversation is one he calls the Cooperative Principle; "make your conversational contribution such as is required …. by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged". Grice proposes the cooperative principle to explain why speakers imply expressions rather than explicitly state in order to convey messages in a rational behaviour. This principle (the CP) is associated with four maxims:

1-Quantity: Give the right amount of information: i.e.

a-Make your contribution as informative as is required.

b-Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

2-Quality: Try to make your contribution one that is true: i.e.

a-Do not say what you believe to be false.

b-Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

3-Relation: Be relevant.
4-Manner : Be perspicuous; i.e.
a-Avoid obscurity of expression
b-Avoid ambiguity.
c-Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
d-Be orderly.

<div align="right">(Grice, 1975, p. 46)</div>

Grice (1975) also argues that flouting any of these maxims leads the addressee to make what Grice calls ' implicature' in order to get the intended meaning of the speaker's message and interpret it correctly on the ground that both participants share a set of assumptions about what is happening and thus reinstating the CP. Grice's contribution cannot be denied as his views on interactional behavior have encouraged other scholars to produce a great deal of interesting work on the subject of politeness such as Lakoff's work.

Lakoff (1973) as Sifianou (1992) notes expands on Grice's views in her work on politeness. In her approach to politeness, Lakoff (1973) proposed two basic rules which she calls rules of pragmatic competence; 'Be clear' and 'Be polite'. Both rules consist of a set of sub rules. As for rule 1 (Be clear), it includes Grice's maxims. Lakoff integrates these maxims under her first rule and renames it the "rules of conversation" (p. 297). Rule 2 (Be polite) consists of three rules of politeness; Don't impose or keep aloof, Give options and Make A (addressee) feel good (p. 298) (as cited in Sifianou, 1992, p. 20).

Another important point about Lakoff's rules is that Lakoff (1973) points out that the two rules are not usually compatible with each other. Lakoff (1973) notes that in conversation, politeness is more important than clarity. That's why Lakoff (1973) contends that "when clarity conflicts with politeness, politeness supersedes" (p.297) (cited in Watts, 2003, p. 60). In other words, people are more interested in maintaining social relationships and avoiding offence and conflict rather than conveying cut-clear information. Thus, Lakoff's seminal work on politeness is, as Reiter (2000) notes, a major contribution as it expanded the scope of research on politeness to include not only the interpersonal aspects of interaction but also the use of specific forms and formulas as well.

After that, Leech (1983), like Lakoff, adopts Grice's system

of conversational maxims and provides a model of politeness in terms of principles and maxims within a pragmatic framework which accounts for how language is used in communication (Sifianou, 1992). According to Leech (1983), politeness is an interpersonal rhetoric which consists of three sets of principles: 1) Grice's (1975) cooperative principle (CP); 2) Leech's own politeness principle (PP); and 3) the irony principle (IP). Leech (1983) argues that Grice's CP is used to explain how utterances may be interpreted to convey an indirect message but it doesn't explain why people are sometimes so indirect in conveying what they mean. So Leech adds his PP to the CP on the assumption that it helps to provide an explanation for the conversational situations where the CP alone fails to interpret. As for the 'Irony principle', it helps the speaker when enforced to cause offence to convey his message indirectly and thus upholding the politeness principle. The major purpose of the PP is, according to Leech, to establish and maintain feelings of comity within the social group. Leech (1983) contends that his politeness principle regulates "the social equilibrium and the friendly relations which enable us to assume that our interlocutors are being cooperative in the first place" (p. 82).

Leech's (1983) politeness principle has six maxims: *tact, generosity*, *approbation, modesty, agreement and sympathy*. The tact maxim minimizes cost and maximizes benefit to others which is applicable to the impositives such as requesting, commanding or ordering as well as commissives such as promising or offering. The generosity maxim minimizes benefits and maximizes cost to self which is only applicable to impositives and commissives. The approbation maxim minimizes dispraise and maximizes praise of others which is only applicable to expressive speech acts such as thanking, blaming or praising and assertive speech acts including stating, complaining or boasting. The modesty maxim minimizes praise and maximizes dispraise of self which is only applicable to expressives and assertives. The agreement maxim minimizes disagreement and maximizes agreement between self and others which is only applicable to assertives. The sympathy maxim minimizes antipathy and maximizes sympathy between self and others (in assertives) (p. 132).

Leech's model of politeness has made important contribution to the politeness theory. Watts (2003) considers Leech's model "a

much more complex and finer grained attempt to elaborate on Gricean pragmatics than Lakoff's" and adds that Leech's maxims are not only descriptive and taxonomic but also explain more the general condition of the communicative use of language, rather than provide highly precise formalized syntactic or semantic rules. Fraser (1990), like Watts, calls it " a grand elaboration of the Conversational Maxim approach to politeness" (p. 224).

Thus, this section has reviewed the conversational maxim view which included Grice's work on conversation(1975), Lakoff's approach to politeness(1973) and Leech's model of politeness(1983).The following section will review Brown & Levinson's(1987) model of politeness which is known as the face-saving view.

2.1.2. The Face-Saving View:

After Leech's model of politeness, Brown& Levinson's theory of politeness (1987) appeared to present the second generation of the theoretical studies concerning politeness. Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness (1987) which is known as the face-saving view (Fraser, 1990) is the underlying theoretical framework of the present study. It's specifically chosen for being the most influential one so far. It provides a comprehensive model with efficient tools for analyzing speech acts in different cultures. It has been the basic theoretical model for many empirical studies on particular types of speech acts across cultures such as Greek (Sifianou, 1992), Hebrew (Blum-kulka, 1992) and Spanish (Reiter, 2000).

Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory is based on three universal assumptions of politeness in speech acts: 1) all individuals have "face" as self- esteem; 2) all speech acts have a potential to threaten a speaker's face; and 3) speakers employ various linguistic strategies in order to eliminate or minimize the effects of such threats. Brown and Levinson also set up these assumptions on the ground that both the speaker and the hearer are model persons (MP). A model person is a fluent speaker of a natural language who is endowed with two main characteristics: rationality and face. In other words, the authors suggest that rationality and face are the two main elements which govern the speaker's choice of the strategy deemed appropriate during the interaction. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), rationality means "the application of a specific

mode of reasoning which guarantees inferences from ends or goals to means that will satisfy these ends" (p. 64). In other words, the authors argue that the concept of politeness is based on rational choice and rational social members who are able to employ different means to achieve the desired goals.

As for the notion of face, it is a basic concept in Brown & Levinson's model of politeness. It's derived from Goffman's (1967) concept of face and the English idiomatic expressions 'losing face' and 'saving face'. Goffman (1967) defines face as "an image of self delineated in terms of approved social attributes" and a "positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he as taken during a particular interaction" (P. 5). As such, Goffman considers face as a public interpersonal image which is on loan from society in which every participant in the personal communication tries to maintain a certain type of face for the sake of establishing successful social relationships. Brown and Levinson (1987) adopted Goffman's concept of face and define face as the "public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself" (p. 61). Their theory proposes that in general, the members of a society work cooperatively with each other in order to maintain one's and other's face in the social situation and thus they can ensure a mutual sense of self-esteem, autonomy and solidarity in conversation.

Brown & Levinson's (1987) define two types of 'face' which the interlocutors desire to maintain during the social interaction: "positive face" and "negative face". 'Positive face' is defined as the "positive consistent image or 'personality'(crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants" and 'negative face' is "the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, and rights to non-distraction-i.e. the freedom of action and freedom from imposition or 'the want of every 'competent adult member' that his actions be unimpeded by others" (p. 61). Positive face is an individual's need to be accepted and liked by others and the desire that s/he shares common ground with the social group, while negative face is the desire not to be imposed upon and to have the right of independence.

Brown and Levinson (1987) suggest that certain acts intrinsically threaten face which they call 'Face Threatening Acts'(FTA). Verbal or non-verbal acts that violate the hearer's desire to maintain his/her self-esteem and social respect are called Face Threatening Acts

(FTAs). The authors also argue that in order to maintain face, the participants are supposed to minimize the risk that a FTA can cause (e.g. criticism, accusing, embarrassing ...etc) during interaction using an array of linguistic politeness strategies to avoid conflict and also maintain an impression of self-respect according to the social relationship and situational circumstances.

Therefore, Brown and Levinson (1987) outlined four main types of **politeness strategies**: bold on-record, negative politeness, positive politeness, and off-record).They point out that these strategies tend to be employed with a rational grounding, and that they serve as a form of self-defense to keep one's own face. The bold-on record strategy is the most face-threatening (e.g. Shut the door). The speaker, when using such a strategy, spares no effort to minimize the threat of losing face. The least threatening strategy is the off- record (e.g. It seems hot in here).The speaker gives a hint to the hearer to open the window without explicitly express his request. The off- record strategy only gives a hint without any explicit expression of the speaker's intention.

Between bold-on record and off-record strategies, there are the positive and negative politeness strategies as the speaker can go on record doing an FTA with a redressive action that pays attention to the negative or positive face of the addressee. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), positive politeness is concerned with the hearer's positive face and generally attempts to build solidarity and intimacy between the speaker and the hearer (e.g. give me a glass of water, honey). Brown & Levinson (1987) describe positive politeness as "approach-based" because it gives great interest to the hearer's face and in some respects indicates that the speaker wants what the hearer wants. It also confirms that the relationship between the participants is friendly and cordial.

On the other hand, negative politeness is concerned with the negative face of the H not to be imposed upon. Brown & Levinson (1987) note that negative politeness is "avoidance-based"; it is characterized by 'self-effacement, formality, and restraint, with attention to very restricted aspects of H's self-image, centring on his wants to be unimpeded' (p.70). In other words, in negative politeness, the speaker tries not to directly impose a task upon the hearer by asking for something. Instead, the speaker indirectly conveys the message to the hearer in a way that makes the hearer

realizes that the speaker needs something and that he is not enforced to answer the speaker's request. Consequently, "negative politeness" tends to occur in formal and social situations where the social distance between the hearer and the speaker is high. For example, if a subordinate makes a request to a superior, the subordinate tends to make his request in such a way that does not impede the superior's freedom or authority in the interaction. Therefore, the speaker may say, 'Could you shut the door?' or 'I don't want to bother you, but please shut the door for me'. The speaker here makes his request without politely avoiding imposing on the hearer.

The kind of politeness strategies that is applied to a certain speech act is determined by what Brown & Levinson (1987) call the **"weightiness"** which is calculated by the speaker according to three social variables:

1) The social distance (a symmetrical relation) between the speaker and the hearer, D(S, H).

2) The relative power (an asymmetrical relation) between the speaker and the hearer, P(S, H).

3) The degree of the imposition of the task/act (Rx) in a particular culture.   (Brown& Levinson, 1987, p.74)

Considering these social variables (D, P and R), they are added to define the amount of politeness required to be performed to save face. When the speaker's power over the hearer increases, the degree of weightiness increases as well. For instance, if the speaker estimates D, P and R as small, the speaker may go on record strategy without a redressive action. For example, a sentence like (turn on the light) may be said by friends or people who know each other because of the low power and low distance. On the other hand, one goes off-record when an imposition is small but the relative distance between the participants isgreat and where the hearer and the speaker are close but the imposition is great(Brown &Levinson, 1987).

As for the positive and negative politeness, Brown& Levinson (1987) note that when the social distance between the interlocutors increases, power relation between them increases and the degree of imposition of an FTA is high the weightiness of politeness increases as well. Accordingly, as the FTA danger increases, the speaker will choose less threatening strategies that serve best to minimize face threat. For example, a sentence like 'shut the door' may be said by friends or people who know each other

because of the low power and short distance. On the other hand, borrowing money needs a much less threatening strategy than borrowing a notebook because the former has a high weightiness, due to the higher rank of imposition of the task. That's why a sentence like "I' m terribly sorry to bother you but would there be any chance of your lending me just enough money to get a railway ticket to get home?" is used in such a situation (Brown& Levinson, 1987, p.81).Consequently, the three social variables are supposed to be evaluated by the interlocutors in order to choose the strategy suitable for the related situation.

Thus, this section has focused on Brown& Levinson's theory of politeness (1987) which is the theoretical work frame of the present study. As said before, the theory has been the most influential one. Watts et al. (1992) studied Brown and Levinson's work and commented on its good points. He said that one of its advantages that it "interprets polite behaviour as being basic to the maintenance of face wants" (p.7). They also examined different languages in an attempt to claim the universality of politeness. According to Holmes (2012), one of the major reasons for the appeal of Brown and Levinson's approach is "the detail with which they outlined the different kinds of strategies which could be used to express these different types of politeness in different cultures" (p. 211). Brown & Levinson devise a model of politeness with an array of different strategies that can be applied to different interactional situations across cultures. The following section will focus on revisiting Brown& Levinson's strategies of politeness (1987).

3.1. Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness strategies:

3.1.1. bold-on-record:

When using this strategy, the speaker explicitly expresses his/her intention directly with no redressive action to soften the impact of what he says on the hearer. He is not concerned about satisfying the hearer's face. Instead, the speaker wants to deliver his message in the first place. So, this strategy, as the authors note, is used when the speaker feels very little fear or no fear of offending his partner or when face redress is not necessary.

3.1.1.1. Bold-on record strategies:
1-Cases of non-minimization of the face threat where other demands override face concerns:

a)Great urgency or desperation such as" Watch out!" .

b) Speaking as if maximum efficiency is very important as in making an attention "Hear me out: ……".

c) Task-oriented (give the nails).

d) Doing the face threatening act in the interest of the hearer (your headlights are on!).

2-Cases in which bold on record is oriented to face:

a) Welcomes (Come in).

b) Offers (Don't bother, I'll clean it up).

<div align="right">(Brown& Levinson, 1987, pp. 94-100)</div>

3.1.2. Positive politeness:

Brown& Levinson (1987) note that positive politeness strategies generally used to refer to intimacy and closeness between the participants. In using a positive politeness strategy, the speaker recognizes the addressee's desire to be respected and he also wants to maintain a friendly relationship.

3.1.2.1. Positive politeness strategies:

1. Notice, attention to the hearer (his/her interests, wants, needs, goods): (What a beautiful vase this is! Where did it come from?).

2. Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with the hearer): (What a fantastic garden you have!).

3. Intensify interest to the hearer:

This can be done by making a good story (I come down the stairs, and what do you think I see?- a huge mess allover the place, the phone's off the hook and clothes and clothes are scattered all over…..

4. Use in-group identity markers:

To convey in-group membership, S can implicitly claim the common ground with H. This can be done by using address forms such as generic names and terms of address like Mac, mate, buddy, pal, and honey such as (Bring me your dirty clothes to wash, honey).

5. Seek agreement:

This can be done in raising safe topics and repeating part of what the speaker has said which help S to satisfy H's desire that he is right such as (I agree, Right. Manchester United played really badly last night, didn't they?

6. Assert or presuppose knowledge of and concern for hearer's wants:

Negative questions which presume 'yes' as an answer are widely

used as a way to indicate that S knows H's wants (I know you can't bear parties, but this one will really be good-do come!).

7. Offer, promise: offers and promises indicate S's good intention in satisfying H's positive face wants (e.g. I'll drop by sometime next week).

8. Give or ask for reasons:

Another way of including H in the activity is for S to give reasons as to why he wants what he wants (Why don't we go to the seashore).

9. Give gifts to the hearer (sympathy, understanding, cooperation or goods) (e.g. Have a glass of juice Terrific!).

(Brown& Levinson, 1987, pp.103-129)

3.1.3. Negative politeness:

For Brown & Levinson (1987), negative politeness is the heart of respect behaviour just as positive politeness is the kernel of familiar behaviour. Negative politeness strategy shows a certain degree of formality and distance between the interlocutors. Negative politeness strategy shows respect by minimizing the imposition put on the hearer's freedom of action. Accordingly, the speaker tends to use this strategy to mitigate the imposition and avoid conflict with the hearer.

3.1.3.1. Negative politeness Strategies:

Brown and Levinson (1987) provide ten sub-categories of the negative politeness, which are:

1. Be conventionally indirect:

S can show more politeness through indirectness as in polite requests (Could you pass the salt, please?).

2. Using questions or hedges. Questions are discussed in indirectness. As for hedges, a hedge is a particle, word, or a phrase that is used to soften or mitigate the face threat of an utterance or to emphasize the force of an illocutionary act. Brown & Levinson divide hedges into strengtheners or emphatic hedges such as really, exactly (He really did run that way) and weakners(e.g. just, sort of, little -You're quite right., I wonder if you know whether John went out).

3. Be pessimistic:

The speaker can redress the H's negative face by expressing doubt that the H may be not able to comply with his request (You couldn't possibly lend me your lawnmower).

4. Minimize the imposition:

One way of softening an FTA is to show that its seriousness is not

great (e.g. I just want to ask you if I can borrow a little paper).

5. Apologize:

There are many ways to communicate regret or reluctance to do a FTA such as:

a-Admit the impingement. (e.g. I'm sure you must be very busy, but…).

b-Indicate reluctance. (e.g. I'm terribly embarrassed to have to admit….).

6. State the FT A as an instance of a general rule:

This is another way of making Sand H away from imposition (e.g. passengers will please refrain from toilets on the train).

7. Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebting H:

S can redress an FTA by explicitly claiming his indebtness to H (e.g. I'd be eternally grateful if you would ….).

<div style="text-align: right">(Brown & Levinson, 1987, pp. 133-210)</div>

3.1.4. Off record strategy:

Brown and Levinson (1987) note that an act is done off record when it is not possible to be communicated in a direct way. In other words, the speaker tries to provide himself with a number of defensible interpretations to avoid the responsibility of doing a FTA. So, the speaker chooses to do it off record and the hearer decides how to interpret it and make some inferences to get the intended meaning.

3.1.4.1. Off record strategies:

1-Give hints: A sentence like (It's cold in here) may be a hint for the hearer to shut the door.

2-Give association clues: (My house isn't very far away. There is the path that leads to my house, please come visit me).

3-Use contradictions:

By stating two things that contradict each other, the speaker makes it appear that he can't tell the truth. (Are you upset about that? Well, yes and no.

4-Use metaphors: e.g. Harry is a real fish. This sentence may be interpreted as Harry is slimy like a fish or he is cold-blooded.

5-Use rhetorical questions:

Questions that require on answers may be used to do FTAs. For example, a question like what can I say? Can be used for criticism (Nothing, it's so bad).

6-Be ambiguous: e.g. John's a pretty smooth cookie. It may be a compliment or an insult according to the situational context.

7-Displace H:

S may pretend to address the FTA to someone other than the hearer and hope that the H perceives that the FTA is aimed at him. For example, a secretary in an office asks another to pass the stapler where a professor is much nearer to the stapler than other secretary.

7-Be incomplete, use ellipsis:

By leaving the FTA half done, S can let the hearer deduce the intended meaning without feeling that he is imposed upon (Well, if one leaves one's tea on the wobbly table…).

(Brown & Levinson, 1987, pp.215-227)

Thus, this section has focused on Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness strategies which will be investigated through out the analysis of the corpus of the present study and it will be shown how they are used by the participants of the selected dialogues. The following section will focus on discussing House and Kasper's (1981) modality markers which appear in help to support Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness strategies.

4.1. Modality markers:

It has been clear that House and Kasper's (1981) modality markers appear in support to Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness strategies. The authors named them downgraders and upgraders. Upgraders are used to strengthen the intimacy between the speaker and the hearer, while downgraders are employed to weaken the imposition of the task on the hearer. The following are examples of House and Kasper's (1981) downgraders and upgraders.

4.1.1. The downgraders:

1- Polite marker which is used to show deference to the hearer and to ask for cooperation (e.g. please).

2-Play-down such as the use of syntactical devices to reduce the imposition which an utterance can cause (e.g.I wondered if…..).

3-Consultative device to involve the hearer and ask for his cooperation such as the use of ritualized formulas (e.g. would you mind if …).

4- Downtoner which is a sentential modifier used to mitigate the impact of the request (e.g. perhaps, simply, just).

5-(minus)committer (Subjectivizer) to notify that the utterance is

from speaker's subjective opinion, thus lowering the assertive impression of the speech act (e.g. I think, I guess, I believe).

6-Forewarn which is a metacomment about what the speaker is about to do or a compliment made as a preliminary for a potentially offensive utterance or an invocation for a general principle which the hearer is about to flout (e.g. far be it from me to belittle your efforts, but…).

4.1.2. The Upgraders:

1- Intensifier which is an adverbial modifier used to intensify the impact of the head act on the certain elements of the proposition (e.g. very, so, really, quite, indeed).

2- (Plus)Committer which is a sentential modifier used to show that the speaker has a high commitment in the state of affairs (e.g. I'm sure, certainly, obviously).

3- Lexical intensifier: lexical items used to show negative social attitude (e.g. That's bloody mean of you, damn mess up).

<div align="right">(House & Kasper (1981), pp.166-170)</div>

Through out the analysis, modality markers will be used in support to Brown & Levinson's strategies of politeness (1987).

2. The analysis of the corpus of the study:

0.2. Introduction:

This section attempts to test and apply Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness on the Qur'anic dialogue between prophet Moses (Peace be upon him) and the righteous servant (Alkhidr) in the chapter of "Te Cave" in the English translation of the Holy Qur'an by Abdullah Yusuf Ali (2007).The aim behind the analysis is to show how politeness strategies vary during the dialogue according to the social distance between the interlocutors, relative power between them and the degree of imposition of an FTA in order to produce at the end a dialogue that is characterized by politeness and decency according to Brown and Levinson's model of politeness (1987) and how they affect the interlocutors' choice of appropriate politeness strategy. In addition, the lessons derived from this dialogue should set examples for both the knowledgeable man and a knowledge seeker of how to deal with each other politely and respectfully within the frame work of the politeness of dialogue as Islam confirms it.

The analysis is carried out through the following steps: First;

stating the politeness strategies that are used by the participants during the interaction referring both to their grammatical and their function in the specific contexts. Second; deducing the reasons why the interlocutors choose specific strategies according to the relationship between them. These steps will help to show how the selected dialogue is done politely and how the participants act politely putting into consideration the social distance between them, power relation and the degree of imposition of their FTAS producing a successful social interaction.

1.2. The dialogue between Prophet Moses (peace be upon him) and the righteous servant in the chapter of "The Cave".

1.2.1. The text of the dialogue is as follows:

65. So they found one of Our servants, on whom We had bestowed Mercy from Ourselves and whom We had taught knowledge from Our own Presence.

66. Moses said to him: "May I follow thee, on the footing that thou teach me something of the (Higher) Truth which thou hast been taught?"

67. (The other) said: "Verily thou wilt not be able to have patience with me!"

68. "And how canst thou have patience about things about which thy understanding is not complete?"

69. Moses said: "Thou wilt find me, if Allah so will, (truly) patient: nor shall I disobey thee in aught."

70. The other said: "If then thou wouldst follow me, ask me no questions about anything until I myself speak to thee concerning it."

The chapter of the Cave (verses: 65:70)

The Holy Qur'an by Abdullah Yusuf Ali (2007, p. 301)

1.2.2. The subject of the dialogue:

The dialogue between prophet Moses (peace be upon him) and the righteous servant (who is named according to Ibn Kathir (2005) Al khidr) is one of the most decent polite dialogues in the Holy Qur'an which shows how the dialogue between a knowledgeable man and a knowledge seeker should be. It's a dialogue between a prophet of Allah who wants to learn more and a righteous servant whom Allah has bestowed with knowledge. As mentioned in Ibn Kathir (2005), Prophet Moses (peace be upon him) was told about a man who has more knowledge than him and he decided to increase his knowledge and to learn more. So, prophet

Moses decides to look for Al khidr and ask to follow him in order to learn from him some of the knowledge that Allah granted him. It's a dialogue between two great personalities, one of them is a knowledgeable man and the other is a knowledge seeker.

1.2.3. The analysis of the dialogue:

In this dialogue, as mentioned in Ibn Kathir (2005), the participants are Alkhidr; a knowledgeable man whom Allah has granted knowledge which transcends human thinking and a prophet Moses who is a knowledge seeker. Accordingly, the high social distance between the participants dominates with high power relation, so, the use of bold-on record and negative politeness strategies will be most evident. This is what Brown and Levinson (1987) suggest in their model of politeness as they note that negative politeness is mostly used when the social distance between the speaker and hearer is high as the relationship between them is characterized by "formality and effacement"(p.70). As for bold-on record strategies, according to the model theory, they are used when there is greater power, more social distance and less imposition and this is the case here between the participants of this dialogue.

Prophet Moses wants Al khidr to teach him some of the knowledge that Allah has taught him. The request is a heavy imposition to the hearer's negative face "wants not to be imposed upon" that's why it is softened as the speaker's request of learning is preceded by another request to follow the teacher which is made in the conventional indirect form of making a polite request, " May I follow thee". The speaker's mitigation of his request to learn is emphasized by the possibility modal verb [3]"may". In this regard, prophet Moses adopts a decent and polite way for making his request to learn. First, he asks Alkhidr to get his permission to be a follower for him, then, he makes his request. Prophet Moses, thus, expresses his interest in and humbleness for the hearer making an indirect request using the question form. Being indirect is, as Brown and Levinson (1987) note a negative politeness strategy addressed to hearer's negative face wants not to be impeded. Thus, prophet Moses tries to mitigate his request and asserts the hearer that he is not imposed upon. That's why Searle (1979) argues that one of the important tools for the speaker to convey his message politely is indirectness.

Moreover, the request is also softened through the speaker's minimization of the size of his request to learn as appears in the utterance, "thou teach me something of the (Higher) Truth which thou hast been taught". Prophet Moses tries not to impose on the hearer that's why he tells him that he just wants to learn some of the knowledge that Allah granted him leaving him the choice to learn him as he decides. The act of minimizing the request using the minimzer 'something' is a negative politeness strategy addressed to the hearer's negative face "wants not to be imposed upon" and thus the speaker also saves his own negative face "not to be impeded". So, during the dialogue, both the participants' face is saved and this is what Brown and Levinson (1987) propose in their model of politeness as they note that during the social interaction, both the speaker and the hearer try to maintain each other's face in order to achieve a mutual sense of autonomy and solidarity in conversation and this is what prophet Moses did.

In addition, prophet Moses ends his request asserting his keenness to learn as the use of the expression "higher truth" adds more to the emphatic tone prophet Moses uses to support his request and his appreciation to the tutor and the knowledge that Allah has bestowed on him. He thus expresses his interest in the hearer paying tribute to his positive face wants to be appreciated and attended to. Thus, according to Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies, prophet Moses shows a decent and polite way in making his request. His indirect way in making his request helped him make a polite request and satisfies the hearer's negative face "wants not to be imposed upon", leaving him the choice to decide what to do without coercion.

As for Al khidr, as mentioned in Ibn Kathir (2005), he knows well that prophet Moses won't be able to be patient to what he will see as Allah has bestowed on Al khidr some knowledge about the unseen which Moses doesn't know about. Thus, he refuses prophet Moses' request to follow him. Of course, the act of refusal is a heavy threat to prophet Moses' negative face "wants not to be impeded" that is why the act of refusal is softened as it is done indirectly. The speaker goes off-record refusing Moses' request trying not to impose on him giving an association clue for refusing the hearer's request, "Verily thou wilt not be able to have patience with me". Alhkidr

indirectly refuses Moses' request giving a reason for his refusal that he will not be able to patient for what he will see. Giving a reason for the act of refusing is a positive politeness strategy addressed to the hearer's positive face wants to be cared for. In this respect, it should be noted that this indirect speech act is motivated by politeness considerations. He doesn't refuse the request of Moses haphazardly or arrogantly but he feels pity on him as he will not be able to forbear what he will see during his journey with Alkhidr. Thus, as the authors note, when the degree of the imposition of the act of refusing is high, the speaker has to choose a more polite way in order to mitigate the face threat and this is what Al khidr did when he chose to be off-record giving a reason n for his refusal. He, thus, pays attention to both Moses' positive and negative face "wants to be appreciated and not to be imposed upon".

This off-record answer includes, as Searle (1979) notes, a primary illocutionary act which is the speaker's disagreement to Moses' request and a secondary one which is the speaker's statement that Moses won't be patient. So, avoiding annoying Moses, Alkhidr just gives a clue for his refusal providing a reason for his refusal which is that Moses will not be able to understand what is beyond his knowledge. So, Alhkidr chooses to be indirect achieving a kind of balance between his need not to be imposed upon and the hearer's need not to be impeded. He thus, as the authors note (1987) succeeded in maintaining both his own negative face and the hearer's as well. This view is supported by Leech (1983) who notes that "the more indirect an illocution is, the more diminished and tentative its force tends to be" (p. 108). In addition, the speaker's stand of refusing to let Moses follow him is emphasized by the intensifier adverb "verily" which increases the impact of his refusal and asserts the speaker's great interest in the hearer. The speaker also attributes the cause of refusing the hearer's request to himself as his utterance; "with me" is a plus-committer used by the speaker, as House and Kasper (1981) note, to soften his FTA of refusal and thus the act of refusal is redressed as the speaker here ensures the hearer that his refusal is for the sake of his interest.

Moreover, Alkhidr exaggerates his interest in the hearer

paying attention to his positive face "wants to be cared for and appreciated"; that is why Alkhidr's justified refusal is followed by a rhetorical question sympathizing with Moses and ensuring that he won't be able to forbear because the matter is too difficult for his mind to comprehend, "And how canst thou have patience about things about which thy understanding is not complete?" The rhetorical question here helps the speaker mitigate the threat of his refusal and he thus pays a considerable attention to the negative face "wants of the addressee not to be impeded". The question here does not require an answer. It is, as Brown and Levinson (1987) note, an off-record strategy used by the speaker in order to convey his message in a more polite way without imposing on the hearer. The rhetorical question includes an implicit justification for refusing Moses' request and a strong emphasis that the refusal is in prophet Moses' interest. It is also, as House& Kasper (1981) propose, a non-committal expression used by the speaker to distance himself from being the cause of the refusal and asserts for prophet Moses that he wishes to help him, but the matter will be difficult for him. He thus mitigates his refusal saving his negative face "wants not to be imposed upon" and "the hearer's negative face "wants not to be impeded" as well.

The rhetorical question also shows the pessimistic tone the speaker uses to assert his sympathy with the hearer and his concern for him. Being pessimistic is, as Brown& Levinson (1987) note, a negative politeness strategy used by the speaker to redress the negative face of prophet Moses by expressing doubt that he may be not able to afford what he has no knowledge of. Therefore, it becomes clear that the teacher is so decent and considerate to the hearer's positive and negative face "wants to be cared for and not to be impeded". As seen above, the speaker's employment of different politeness strategies especially off-record strategies (such as the rhetorical question and the speaker's giving a clue for refusing the hearer's request) helps him make a polite refusal avoiding threatening the hearer's negative face wants not to be impeded as the face threat of the act of refusal is so great .

As for prophet Moses, his response to the teacher's reply is decent and polite. He adopts a true and humble attitude of a learner

towards his teacher. He insisted on learning as he gently replied to the teacher ensuring him that he will be patient and endure. Prophet Moses speaks directly using the negatively politeness strategy of going on record explicitly claiming his indebtness to the hearer, "Thou wilt find me, if Allah so will, (truly) patient". Prophet Moses' assertive tone is strongly supported by the determination modal verb "will" and the intensifier adverb "truly". In addition, prophet Moses' utterance, "Thou wilt find me, if Allah so will, (truly) patient" includes an implicit promise to the teacher to implement what he desires from him as he declares strongly his complete readiness to learn and heed his teacher's instructions. Prophet Moses' assertive tone is emphasized by the intensifier adverb 'truly'.

Moreover, prophet Moses intensifies his interest and respect to his teacher promising not to disobey his orders at all costs, "nor shall I disobey thee in aught". Prophet Moses' promise of being completely obedient to his teacher is emphatically asserted by the obligation modal verb "shall" and the speaker's phrase "in aught". Promise is a positive politeness strategy used by prophet Moses to show his interest in and consideration for the teacher and ensure his readiness to cooperate. Thus, prophet Moses paid tribute to the hearer's both positive face "wants to be respected" and his negative face "wants not to be imposed upon" adopting a decent way while talking to his teacher. His use of the negative politeness strategy of going on record claiming his indebtness to the hearer and the positive politeness strategies of showing interest in the hearer and promising to be obedient helped him make a decent polite request.

Alkhidr's response to Moses is also positive. Although the teacher knows well that prophet Moses won't be able to forbear, he finally agrees to his request as he doesn't want to disappoint him. However, the teacher's agreement is conditioned. The teacher agrees to let Moses follow him provided that no questions will be posed by Moses until he explains the matter to him. Alkhidr speaks on record out of the asymmetrical relationship that is between him and prophet Moses and high power he holds over him as he is the teacher. The speaker's conditional agreement is signaled by the conditional if clause, "If then thou wouldst follow me, ask me no questions about

anything until I myself speak to thee concerning it". Alkhidr, the teacher, shows his willingness to cooperate and thus he satisfies the hearer's positive face "wants to be cared for and appreciated". In addition, Alkhidr here is in a higher status and has greater power than prophet Moses that is why he has no compulsion to be more polite. Moreover, by going on-record, as the model theory suggests, Alkhidr declares his credit for outspokenness, his right to make a condition, and thus he avoids the danger of being misunderstood as imposing on the hearer. Moreover, the order here exhibits no threat to the hearer's face as it is a task-oriented from Alkhidr to Moses and so face redress is not necessary (Brown& Levinson, 1987).

To sum up, prophet Moses is so polite and decent in making his request. According to Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness (1987), the speaker's use of different politeness strategies helps him make a polite request such as the use of the negative politeness strategies of being indirect ,"May I follow thee on the footing that thou teach me something of the (Higher) Truth which thou hast been taught?", minimizing the imposition of the request through the use of the minizer 'something' and going on record explicitly claiming indebtness to the hearer, "Thou wilt find me, if Allah so will, (truly) patient". Moreover, the speaker's use of positive politeness strategy of promising the hearer to obey him, "nor shall I disobey thee in aught" helped him reply in a more polite way satisfying the hearer's positive face "wants to be respected and appreciated".

As for Alkhidr, he adopted a more polite way when he refused prophet Moses' request at first paying tribute to prophet Moses' negative face "wants not to be impeded", "Verily thou wilt not be able to have patience with me!". He also was considerate to prophet Moses' positive face wants to be appreciated and cared for when he agrees to his request in the end. On the other hand, Alkhidr keeps the social distance that is between him and prophet Moses that is why he, in his higher position as a knowledgeable man, is direct in his agreement to let prophet Moses follow him and in putting a condition for his agreement: "If then thou wouldst follow me, ask me no questions about anything until I myself speak to thee concerning it". This is what Brown and Levinson's formula of weightiness of politeness (1987) says: namely that politeness increases with

distance and so if the speaker is in a higher position, the hearer will be more polite and he is as seen above during the analysis.

Thus, as was elaborated during the analysis, both the speaker and the hearer were considerate to each other's positive and negative face wants to be appreciated and not to be imposed upon. Moreover, their employment of different politeness strategies as seen above helped them produce a decent and polite dialogue which sets a wonderful and great example for the dialogue between a knowledgeable man and a knowledge seeker. In addition, prophet Moses sets a great example for how should be the knowledge seeker when he wants to talk to his tutor as he showed great politeness and deference to his tutor. Likewise, Alkhidr was decent to the student who asked to follow him in a more polite way.

3. Conclusion

The present study has attempted to test Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness (1987) on a certain Quranic dialogue which focuses on the social relationship between a knowledgeable man and a knowledge seeker. It has focused mainly on the dialogue between prophet Moses and the righteous servant in the chapter of "The Cave" in the English translation of the Holy Qur'an by Yusuf Ali (2007). Throughout the analysis of the dialogue, it has been clear how the social variables which are the social distance between the participants, the power relation between them and the degree of imposition of an FTA affected the participants' choice of the suitable politeness strategies during the social interaction, in order to make a polite request.

By analyzing the Qur'anic dialogue between prophet Moses and Alkhidr in the chapter of "The Cave", the present study found that the participants have made use of a range of different politeness strategies resulting in a polite dialogue, which sets a wonderful example for how should be the dialogue between a knowledgeable man and a knowledge seeker. A desire from the speaker to behave politely, to save his own and the hearer's face and avoid hurting the hearer's feelings and imposing on him has been the urging motivation for producing a successful polite dialogue keeping the social distance between the interlocutors and achieving the social

comity between them. According to the previous analysis of the selected dialogue, the present study proves Brown and Levinson's model of politeness (1987) namely that the increased weightiness of an FTA is accompanied by increased politeness on the part of the speaker and hearer. This appears during the analysis of the dialogue on the part of both the speaker and hearer. For example, as seen during the analysis, prophet Moses adopted a more decent and polite way in making his request to learn using the negatively politeness strategy of being indirect, "May I follow thee, on the footing that thou teach me something of the (Higher) Truth which thou hast been taught?,no:66".

On the other hand, when Alkhidr refused prophet Moses' request in the beginning, he was considerate to his negative face "wants not to be impeded" that is why he chose to be indirect giving a reason for his refusal avoiding hurting Moses as the face threat of the act of refusal was so great. So, Alkhidr spoke off-record giving an association clue for the act of refusal, "Verily thou wilt not be able to have patience with me, no:67". This proves what Brown and Levinson (1987) theory of politeness proposes, as the authors note that off record strategies are used when the degree of imposition of an FTA is great, because off record strategies help the speaker say indirectly what he cannot say directly such as Alkhidr's use of the off-record strategy of giving an association clue for refusing Moses' request.

Thus, it has been verified that the findings of the present study have answered the research questions mentioned previously in the introduction, as the analysis of the corpus of the study has reviewed the politeness strategies used in the selected dialogue and it has been mentioned why they are used. The findings have also shown how the relationship between the interlocutors including relative social power and relative social distance and the degree of imposition of an FTA affect the directness and the indirectness of the dialogues concerned. For example, the bold-on record strategy of being direct was used on the part of Alkhidr when he agreed at the end to prophet Moses' request putting a condition for his agreement, "If then thou wouldst follow me, ask me no questions about anything until I myself speak to thee concerning it,no:70". This directness is

out of the asymmetrical relationship between prophet Moses and Alkhidr and the high power Alkhidr holds over prophet Moses. So, by going on record, as Brown and Levinson (1987) note, Alkhidr declares his credit for outspokenness, his right to make a condition and thus he avoids the danger of being misunderstood as imposing on the hearer.

As for positive politeness strategies, they were used on the part of the speaker (prophet Moses) such as promising Alkhidr to be patient, "Thou wilt find me, if Allah so will, (truly) patient, no:67". He also intensifies his interest in the hearer showing his complete obedience to his teacher, "nor shall I disobey thee in aught". The speaker thus satisfies the hearer's positive face wants to be respected and appreciated. Negative politeness strategies were used on the part of prophet Moses due to the high social distance between him and Al khidr. This is what Brown and Levinson (1987) suggest in their model of politeness as they note that negative politeness is mostly used when the social distance between the speaker and hearer is high, which means that the relationship between them is characterized by "formality and effacement", and this is the case here between the participants of this dialogue. For example, the use of the negative politeness strategy of being indirect helped prophet Moses make a polite request, "May I follow thee, on the footing that thou teach me something of the (Higher) Truth which thou hast been taught?,no:66". He also minimizes the imposition of his request by asking the teacher to teach him only something of the knowledge that Allah has granted him. In addition, prophet Moses went on-record explicitly claiming his indebtness to the hearer "Thou wilt find me, if Allah so will, (truly) patient: nor shall I disobey thee in aught". Thus, prophet Moses succeeded in satisfying Alkhidr's negative face wants not to be imposed upon.

On the other hand, off-record strategies were used on the part of Alkhidr because the threat of his refusal is high. That is why he spoke off-record giving an association clue for refusing Moses' request, "Verily thou wilt not be able to have patience with me". Moreover, Alkhidr's justified refusal is followed by a rhetorical question sympathizing with Moses and giving him an excuse for his

inability to forbear because the matter is too difficult for his mind to comprehend, "And how canst thou have patience about things about which thy understanding is not complete?, no: 68" Thus, Alkhidr's use of these off-record strategies helped him avoid hurting Moses' negative face wants not be impeded. As such, because of the high degree of imposition of the act of refusing, Alkhidr chose to be indirect since indirectness helps the speaker convey his message in a more polite way achieving a balance between the hearer's needs not to be impeded and his own needs not to be imposed upon. This is what Brown and Levinson (1987) suggest as they note that a higher degree of indirectness shows more politeness.

In addition, House and Kasper's modality markers (1981) were used during the analysis to support Brown and Levinson's model of politeness (1987). For example, the use of the upgraders was most evident such as the use of intensifiers as in the following example: ((The other) said: "Verily thou wilt not be able to have patience with me, no: **67**). Alkhidr's stand of refusing to let Moses follow him is emphasized by the intensifier adverb "verily" which increases the impact of his refusal and asserts his great interest in the hearer. Likewise, during the analysis of the corpus of the present study, there were instances of the downgraders which help mitigate the impact of the speaker's utterance such as the use of plus-committer devices such as: "And how canst thou have patience about things about which thy understanding is not complete?, no: 68". The question here is a non-committal expression used by the speaker to distance himself from being the cause of the refusal and asserts to prophet Moses that he wishes to help him but the matter will be difficult for him. He thus mitigates his refusal saving his positive face wants to be respected and the hearer's negative face wants not to be imposed upon as well.

4. Suggestions:

This paper has contributed to the discussion of human-human communication in relation to politeness in the Holy Qur'an. The findings of this research highlight the importance of studying politeness as a socio-pragmatic phenomenon especially in research about the English translation of the Holy Qur'an from a pragmatic view. In fact, the Holy Qur'an is abundant in different Quranic dialogues that deal with different social human relationships such as the relation between sons and parents or the human relationship between prophets and their people when they call them to believe in Allah. Research conducted on these dialogues help researchers prove upon how these dialogues are done politely form a linguistic and pragmatic viewpoint.

End note

1. [1] Yusuf Ali is an Indian scholar Muslim who translated the Holy Qur'an into English. He (1872-1953) was born in Bombay, in British India. He received a religious education and was a fluent speaker of Arabic and English. Ali studied at the University of Bombay, Cambridge and Lincoln's Inn, London. He worked as a lecturer at the Royal Society of Arts in London in1906 and also at the University of London in 1917. He studied English literature and concentrated his efforts on the Qur'an. His best-known work is his book is *The Holy Qur'an*: *Text, Translation and Commentary* (*http*:// www. masud. Co.uk/ISLAM/bmh/BMH-IRO-famous_muslims.htm).

2. [2] Pragmatics is the "study of language from the view point of its users, especially the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effect their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication" (Crystal, 1992, p. 57).

3. [3] The use of the modal verbs shall and will and may during the analysis of the selected dialogue is according to Palmer's classification (1979) of these modal verbs as he notes that 'shall' can be used for giving a sense of promise and obligation or undertaking, 'will' can be used for futurity and volition or determination and 'may' for expressing possibility.

References

1-Primary Sources:

Ali, A.Y. (2007). *Tajweed Qur'an with meaning translation in English*.Dar- Al-Maarifah, Damascus.

Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1987) *Politeness: Some universals in Language Usage.* Cambridge University Press.

2-Secondary Sources:

Austin, J. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words.* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Crystal, D. (1992). *Introducing Linguistics.* Penguin English.

Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on Politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 14,219-236.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In Peter Cole and Jerry Morgan, (Eds.),Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts, New York: *Academic Press*, pp, 41-58.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-face Behavior.* Garden City:New York: Anchor Books.

Hill, B., Ide,S. ,Ikuta,S., Kawasaki,A. & Ogino,T. (1986). Universal of Linguistic Politeness: Quantitative Evidence from Japanese and American English. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 10,347-371.

Holmes, J. (2012). Politeness in Intercultural Discourse and Communication. In Paulston,C. B., keisling, S. F. and Rangel,E. *The Hand Book of Intercultural Discourse and Communication.* Wiley-Blackwell.pp.205-228.

House, J. and Kasper,G. (1981). Politeness Markers in English and German. In Florian Coulmas, (Ed.), *Conversational Routine.* The House: Mouton, pp.157-185.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principle of Pragmatics*. London/New York: Longman.

Reiter, R. M. (2000). *Linguistic Politeness in Britain and Uruguay.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins publishing Company.

Palmer,F,R.(1979). *Modality and English Modals*. London/ New York: Longman.

Searle, J.(1995). *Speech Acts. An Essay in the Philosophy of Language.* Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. (1979). *Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts.* Cambridge University Press.

Sherif, M. A. (1994).*Searching for Solace:A Biography of Abdullah Yusuf Ali, Interpreter of the Qur'an.* Islamic Book Trust, Selangor,

Malaysia.

Sifianou, M. (1992). *Politeness Phenomena in England and Greece; A Cross- Cultural Perspective*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Terkourafi, M. (2005). An Argument for a frame-based approach to politeness: Evidence from the use of imperative in Cypriot Greek. In Lakoff, R. and Ide, S.*Broadening the Horizon of Linguistic Politeness,*(eds.), pp.99-117.Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Watts,R., Ide,S. & Ehlich,K.(eds)(1992). *Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory and Practice.*Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness.* Cambridge University Press.

3- Websites:

Ali, A.Y. (2012). Retrieved August, 13, 2012. from http:// www. masud.Co.uk/ISLAM/bmh/BMH-IRO-famous_muslims.htm.

Ali, A.Y. (2012). Retrieved August, 15, 2012. from http://al-quran.info/Translation/Yusuf=ali.aspx#PREFACE_TO_FIRST_EDITION online Quran Project.

Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (2012).Retrieved March 5, 2012 from http://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary/polite.

مراجع عربية

ابن كثير،اسماعيل (2005).تفسير القران العظيم.القاهرة.دار ابن الهيثم للنشر و التوزيع.