Politeness Strategies and Maxims in English for Islamic texts: A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Quran

Hamid Gittan Jewad
English Language and Literature, Faculty of Letters and Humanities
Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran

Zargham Ghabanchi
English Language and Literature, Faculty of Letters and Humanities
Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran

Mohammad Ghazanfari
English Language and Literature, Faculty of Letters and Humanities
Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran

Abstract
This research tackles two chapters from the Holy Quran, the sura of Prophet Yusuf, and the sura of the Cave (al-Kahf) to find out whether the theories of Leech (1983) and Brown and Levinson (1987) can be applied to find out the positive and negative politeness strategies and the politeness maxims. The Leech's model (1983) consists of six maxims, and for Brown and Levinson (1987), consists of two major politeness strategies. It consists of two principles of politeness, where one of them is positive, and the other is negative politeness. This study aims at investigating politeness strategies, and politeness principle linguistically in two Suras from the Holy Quran, how politeness strategies and politeness maxims used within the Holy Quran. This study tries to investigate the image of the main characters in the most sacred book. A qualitative approach is employed to provide interpretations of selected verses. In this paper, we will discuss the politeness strategies, positive and negative politeness strategies, and politeness maxims. The study falls into two parts. It begins briefly to overview the theoretical framework underlying politeness, in particular discussing some definitions of politeness and politeness principle and its maxims, exploring the face theory and its strategies by Brown and Levinson, and how far these strategies affect polite style then, dealing with politeness maxims by Leech. The other part displays a practical application of what has presented theoretically. Also, the researcher examined the politeness strategies, and politeness maxims of two Suras (Yusuf and Al-Kahf). Moreover, the study observed that approximately the majority of negative politeness in two suras then positive politeness, and the last one is politeness maxims.
Keywords: negative politeness. politeness, positive politeness, politeness maxims, the Holy Quran

1. Introduction
This research motivated a general concern for the study of the politeness strategies, and politeness maxim in two Suras from the Holy Quran. The concept of face, as in losing or saving face, can be seen as a positive social value that one can claim during a particular social interaction (Goffman, 1967). Also, this study inspired the work of Brown and Levinson (1978), and Leech (1983) exploring mainly their distinction between 'positive' and 'negative' politeness and politeness maxims

According to Brown and Levinson's (1978) theory of politeness, a face can distinguish two components: positive face and negative face. Positive face occurs when the individual desires to be liked, approved of, respected, and appreciated by others. In contrast, negative face is the individual's desire not to be impeded, and to have the freedom to behave as one chooses (Brown& Levinson, 1978).

Lakoff (1975) proposes that "politeness is developed by societies to reduce friction in personal interaction"(p. 64). Similarly, Leech (1980) defines "tact" as "strategic conflict avoidance," adding that it "can be measured in terms of the degree of effort put into the avoidance of a conflict situation"(p.19). For Holmes (1995), linguistic politeness means "recognizing the autonomy of others and avoiding intrusion (negative politeness), as well as emphasizing connectedness and appreciation (positive politeness)" (p. 24).

Several researchers in the 1970s and 1980s argued that "politeness" was a particular driving force in how people determine language choice and negotiate relational meaning. The previous researchers count the approaches by Lakoff (1973), Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987), and Leech (1983) among the early and influential contributions to the study of politeness. Working within a framework of pragmatics in the broad sense—the study of language in use—these researchers argued that there are not only syntactic rules in establishing grammaticality of sentences but also pragmatic rules that determine the appropriateness of language use (Locher, 2012).

Politeness is a commonsense phenomenon that has been dealt with by many scholars, the first of whom is Lakoff. Lakoff (1973) and Eelen (2001) describe Lakoff, is the mother of modern politeness theory because she is the first who has tackled it from a decidedly pragmatic angle. For Lakoff, politeness is "a system of interpersonal relations designed to facilitate interaction by minimizing the potential for conflict and confrontation inherent in all human interchange" (Lakoff, 1977, p. 88). Watts (2003)   comments that Lakoff's view of politeness is developed by societies to reduce friction in personal interaction, which leads one to conclude that conflict in personal communication is undesirable. As such, communities develop strategies, that is, politeness, to reduce that friction. Courtesy, thus, ends up as being a set of norms for a cooperative behavior (Mirza, 2017).

1   What is Politeness?
Different definitions are offered for politeness by linguistic researchers. Lakoff (1990, p.34), and Leech (1983, p.82) had defined politeness as "the forms of behavior which facilities personal and social interaction to obtain an atmosphere of harmony between interlocutors via minimizing the inherent inner conflict in all human interactions." The linguistic modal of

politeness had been set forward by Brown and Levinson (1987). They had defined politeness as "forms of behavior used to maintain and develop communication between potentially aggressive partners" (p.61). They maintain that positive and negative strategies are employed to minimize threat and to accomplish linguistic politeness (Kadhem, 2008). Mills (2003) hardens the previous definition to define politeness as "the employing of a certain behavior to lessen the imposition between the parties in social interaction" (p. 6). Moreover, Holtgraves and Yang (1992) define politeness as "phrasing one's remarks to minimize face threat" (p. 246). It can say that Mills and Holtgraves and Yang's definitions differ from Spencer-Oatey ones in that they concentrate on the negative face rather than on the positive one. Fraser (1990, p. 232) and Watts (2003, p. 20) have a similar viewpoint about politeness. Fraser (1990) claims some obligations and rights, which are considered by the addresser, and the addressee of any conversational contract. These obligations and rights govern the negotiation of that contract. Also, there is always a possibility to renegotiate during the course of time as regards the situational context progressing.

1.2 Research Questions

1) What have positive politeness strategies used in the Suras (Yusuf and Al-Kahf) under investigation based on Brown and Levinson's theory?
2) What have negative politeness strategies used in the Suras under investigation based on Brown and Levinson's theory?
3) What have politeness maxims have used in the Suras under investigation based on the Leech's' model?
4) What are politeness strategies used in the discourse of the Holy Qur'an when the Holy prophet is addressed, based on Brown and Levinson's theory?
5) What are politeness maxims used in the speech of the Holy Qur'an when the Holy prophet is addressed, based on leech's Model?
6) What are politeness strategies used in the discussion of the Holy Qur'an when humanity, in general, is addressed, based on Brown and Levinson's theory?
7) What are politeness maxims used in the speech of the Holy Qur'an when humanity, in general, is addressed, based on leech's Model?
8) What are politeness strategies used in the discussion of the Holy Qur'an when men discussed other, based on the Brown and Levinson' Model?
     9)What are politeness maxims used in the discourse of the Holy Qur'an.

2. Literature Review
2.1 Introduction
As a research object in linguistic pragmatics, politeness has stated a rather short history. The desire for the study of courtesy has come from H.P. Grice's seminal paper 'Logic and conversation' (1975), in which he had suggested a Cooperative Principle, and four maxims underlying transactional discourse ("maximally efficient information exchange"). Grice observed that to account for other aspects of language use, and additional, maxims may be needed, such as a politeness maxim. This suggestion was taken up and elaborated in early reports of linguistic politeness by Lakoff (1973, 1979), Leech (1977, 1983), and Edmondson (1979, 1981). The common denominator of these proposals is that they view politeness in terms of maxims or rules, thus underscoring their conceptual link to the Gricean maxims.

A different approach to politeness was proposed by Brown and Levinson (1978/87), who derive politeness from Goffman's (1971) notion of face. According to Thomas' view (1995, p.149), impoliteness is the opposite of courtesy in orientation to Brown and Levinson's politeness theory (1987). To date, this has proven to be the most essential proposal, extremely powerful in its generation of research and controversy. Most theoretical contributions and empirical studies adopt Brown and Levinson's work as a reference point, debating, in particular, the universality of their theory(Östman & Verschueren, 2009, p. 157).

It is having specific worth reminding that the greatest interlanguage pragmatic studies have been used in understanding and inspecting the various speech acts. Consequently, studies on speech acts seemed to be justifiable. A majority of recent studies have been carried out across languages to examine various speech acts: such as complaints by (e.g., Farnia, Buchheit & Binti Salim, 2010), congratulations (e.g., Gomez, 2016), compliment (e.g., Sharifian, 2008), apologies (e.g., Chang, 2018), corrections (e.g., Pishghadam & Norouz Kermanshahi, 2011), suggestions (e.g., Pishghadam & Sharafadinin, 2011), and requests (e.g., Abdolrezapour, & Eslami-Rasekh, 2010).

Regarding the studies on speech acts, Eslami and Fatahi (2004) compared Persian speakers' use of face-saving strategies in reaction to complaints with American English speakers' performance .They discussed them in terms of different cultural concepts.

The study by(Zakaria & Syukri, 2016) is concerned with politeness strategies that were used by male students and male teachers at Pondok Pesantren Salaf Al-Qur'an Sholahul Huda Al-Mujahidin Malang. Male students gave the politeness strategies responses, and male teachers based on the hypothetical situation provided. The sample, five teachers, "male teachers" of Pesantren Salaf Al-Qur'an Sholahul Huda Al-Mujahidin, and 20 students selected as the participants. Additionally, a qualitative approach by giving a questionnaire used as the method of the study. To know the phenomenon, Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of politeness strategies employed in analyzing the data. From the analysis, it figured out that all types of politeness strategies were realized both in students' and teachers' answers. In a formal situation, students 'male students' had been tended to use negative politeness strategy with 40, 58%, whereas male teachers tended to use the off-record politeness strategy with 44, 00%. In an informal situation, still, male students managed to use a negative politeness strategy with 60,14%, while male teachers tended to use a positive politeness strategy with 48,00%. It recognized that there were three social factors of power, social distance, and ranking of imposition that triggered the students and teachers to perform such strategies. Brown and Levinson (1987) proposed the theory of these social factors.

In another study on speech acts, Hill, Ide, Ikuta, Kawasaki, and Ongino (1986) examined cross-cultural evidence for a common factor, Discernment, systems of politeness. The authors also propose a complementary operates, volition, differences in the weighting of the two factors afford one way to characterize the sociolinguistic study of requests, for a pen in Japanese and American English provides observed, which they hypothesize factor, in all sociolinguistic speculating that systems of politeness in different languages. The results of the further study suggested practical support for Brown and Levinson's theory and Leech's theory. The review was an empirical investigation of certain aspects of linguistic politeness in Japanese and American English. The

study aimed to find quantitative evidence as a basis for comparing the systems of sociolinguistic courtesy in making requests in the two languages. This study examines the overall policies of courtesy in the two different cultures and identifies the common elements and strategies, as well as to characterize the essential differences.

2.2. Politeness Strategies

According to Brown and Levinson (1978), individual acts may damage or threaten another person's face. Brown and Levinson view politeness primarily as a complex system for softening face-threatening acts (FTAs). However, a "Face-Threatening-Act" (FTA, for short) is one that would make someone possibly loses face, or damages it in some way (Erbert & Floyd, 2004, pp. 325-327). Elen (2001, p.45) argues that politeness and impoliteness are two sides of a coin. Face threatening acts include acts of criticizing, disagreement, interrupting, imposing, asking a favor, requesting information or goods, etc. (Sandberg, 2010, p. 345). Thus, "communication is seen as a fundamentally dangerous and antagonistic endeavor" (Kasper, 1990, p. 194). FTAs can come with four strategies: 1. Do the FTA without redressive action: badly on record. 2. Do the FTA with redressive work: positive politeness. 3. Do the FTA with redressive work: negative politeness. 4. Do the (FTA) off-record. 5. Do not do the FTA "On- record" means directly 'saying something unambiguously,' while "off-record" means expressing it indirectly. It can be interpreted ambiguously as a way to minimize the extent to which the addressee's face would threaten.

On- record FTAs can be committed with redressive action, which is an action that 'gives face' to the addressee, that is, the attempts to counteract the potential face damage of the FTA. According to Khattab (2010) in her thesis mentioned that Brown and Levinson (1976, pp. 106-30) list fifteen positive politeness strategies, which appeal to the hearer's (H's) desire to be liked and approved. Positive Face: "the consistent positive self-image or 'personality' (crucially including the hope that this self-image be appreciated and accepted of) claimed by interactants"(Fraser, 2005). The wants of every member that to be desirable to at least some others". This strategy, in contrast with the bald on-record policy, looks for minimizing the FTAs via viewing the addressee some respect. This strategy tries to reduce the social distance between those who know each other very well like, friends. They involve the following:

Strategy 1: Notice, attend, to H (his interests, wants, needs, goods)
      Strategy 2: Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with H)
Strategy 3: Intensify interest to H.
Strategy 4: Use in-group identity markers
Strategy 5: Seek agreement
Strategy 6: Avoid disagreement

For Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 66), disputes are positive-face threatening acts because the speaker conveys to the addressee that he or she is wrong, misguided, or unreasonable about an issue, thus revealing a lack of concern for that person's feelings and, or wants. To redress such threat, Brown and Levinson (1987, pp. 112-113) propose the positive politeness strategy "avoid disagreement." Likewise, Leech (1983) identifies "a tendency to exaggerate agreement with other people, and to mitigate disagreement."
plan 7: Presuppose / raise / assert common ground

The common ground includes shared or mutual knowledge, assumptions, and beliefs (Stalnaker, 1978).

Plan 8: Joke

Plan 9: Assert or Pre-suppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants

Plan 10: Offer, Promise

      Plan 11: Be optimistic

      Plan 12: Include both S and H in the activity

Plan 13: Give (or ask for) reasons

Plan 14: Assume or assert reciprocity

Plan 15: Give gifts to the H (goods, sympathy, and understanding cooperation).

In negative politeness strategies, "the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, right to non-distraction – i.e., to freedom of action and freedom from imposition." The want of every competent adult member that his action is unimpeded by others". Speaker (S) shows that he respects H's territory and that he does not want to hinder his freedom of action. This strategy displays some social distance between the addresser and the addressee. Like relations between teachers and students, boss and employees, father and son, etc., there is an imposition on the addressee. Brown and Levinson (1978, pp. 106-30) list ten negative politeness strategies:

Strategy 1: Be conventionally indirect

The notions of indirectness and politeness show a crucial role in the negotiation of the face during the realization of speech acts, such as requests. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), and Leech (1983), higher levels of indirectness may result in higher levels of politeness.

Strategy 2: Questions, hedge

Strategy 3: Be pessimistic (assume H is unlikely to be willingly/able to do any acts predicated of him)

By being pessimistic, or modest (Gu, 1992) about his expertise, he tried to lower his power and authority over the hearer and reduce the negative face threat to the hearer.

Strategy4: Minimize the imposition. Brown and Levinson (1987) defined the degree of imposition as "a culturally and situationally defined ranking of impositions by the degree to which they considered to interfere with an agent's wants of self-determination or of approval (negative and positive face wants)" (p. 77). Holtgraves and Yang (1992) demonstrated a clear and positive relationship between the degree of imposition, and overall politeness of language used.

Strategy5: Give deference.

According to Scollon and Scollon (1983), deference is in line with negative face, and doing respect is a politeness strategy commonly adopted by interlocutors with asymmetrical power relationships. Usually, people with relatively lower power status are significantly most polite, showing respect for the face of the higher status person.

Strategy 6: Apologies
By apologizing for doing an FTA, the speaker can indicate his reluctance to intrude on H's negative face and thereby partially redress that impingement.
Meier (1995b), concerned about whether a speech act works as an FTA or a politeness strategy and, if the latter, is a negative or positive strategy, writes: Apologies were categorized by Brown and Levinson as negative politeness strategies, could be seen as requests for exoneration (e.g., please forgive me, please excuse me), and as requests, would threaten H's face, which would bring their status as politeness strategies into question. Additionally, although the appeal is considered to be FTAs, one could well imagine a context in which they could be a sign of solidarity, this would then qualify them for positive politeness status (Meier, 1995b, p.385).

 Strategy 7: Impersonalize S and H Strategy 8: State the FTA as a general rule.

Strategy 9: Nominalize

Strategy 10: Go on record as incurring debt, or as not indebting H A politeness strategy is employed by assessing the 'weightiness' of FTA. The weightiness will calculate by speakers (Ss) from the social variables such as power difference between S and H (P), the perceived social distance between speaker and hearer (D), and ranking of imposition (R). Mainly, the selection of strategy will base on the speaker's evaluation of the size of the FTA. Thus, weightiness can calculate as follows: $Wx = D (S, H) + P (S, H) + Rx$. Where Wx represents the "weightiness" of FTAx, which estimates the risk of face loss. Wx, in turn, determines the degree of politeness the speaker needs to attend in performing x. The three variables determine the degree of weightiness (W) are: D (S, H), the social distance between the speaker, and the hearer; P (H, S), the relative power of the speaker concerning the hearer, and Rx, the absolute ranking of imposition of an act x in the particular culture in which x performed. Brown and Levinson's D, P, and R factors are comparable to Leech's social distance, authority, and cost-benefit scales, respectively, which determine the type and degree of politeness. Because people tend to act more politely when they have less power and less politely when they have more power, they may make the inference that people whom they observe are also following similar rules. It is possible that the relationships that have found to exist between power and politeness also extend to the relationships between power and interpersonal justice, because politeness and interpersonal justice appear to be overlapping constructs.so, these social variables, distance, power, and ranking of imposition affect the degree of politeness between the interactants.

2.3. Geoffrey Leech's model of politeness
 Research on linguistic politeness came into its own with the publication of Brown and Levinson's study in 1987. Since then, this phenomenon has received widespread scholarly attention. Researchers have approached politeness from different viewpoints, showing it as a means to conflict-avoidance (Leech, 1983), as a distancing and solidarity-building practice (Holmes, 1995; Scollon & Scollon, 1995), or as behavior that expresses positive concern for others (Holmes, 1995). These conceptualizations agree with Brown and Levinson's (1979,1987) notion of politeness as a rational behavior aiming to reduce an imposition or threaten an interlocutor's face(Geyer, 2008).

Brown and Levinson (1987) stated that "all competent adult members of a society" have "face," which is a public self-image. Face comprises two related aspects: negative face (the claim to freedom from imposition) and positive face (an interactant's positive self-image, including the desire to be appreciated). According to the authors, a speaker's face is subject to threats at every point of interaction.

Leech's (1983) approach to politeness also bases on Grice's maxims. His work locates politeness within the broader framework of interpersonal rhetoric, which has tied to social goals (what social position a speaker assumes) rather than illocutionary goals (what a speaker tries to convey through a speech act). Within the domain of interpersonal rhetoric, Leech (1983) founds three groups of maxims, which associated with three principles: (1) the cooperative principle (CP), (2) the politeness principle (PP), and (3) the irony principle (IP).

Next, Leech's cooperative principle bases on and corresponds to Grice's. He states that the general function of the politeness principle is to "minimize the expression of impolite belief (Leech, 1983, p. 81). Later Leech limits six maxims associated with the politeness principle that is used to explain the relationship between sense and force in daily conversations.

2.3. 1. Politeness Principles

According to Geoffrey Leech (1983), there is a politeness principle with conversational maxims alike to those formulated by (Grice, 1975). He lists six maxims: tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, and sympathy. The first and second form a pair, as do the third and the fourth. These maxims differ from culture to culture: what may be considered polite in one culture may be strange or downright rude in another. As the politeness principles mention below:

The six maxims; Tact maxim, Generosity maxim, Approbation maxim, Modesty maxim, Agreement maxim, and Sympathy maxim, diverge of their value concerning the considerable effect on the situation at hand (Terkourafi, 2001,p. 56).

2.3.1.1. The tact maxim states: "Minimize the expression of beliefs which imply cost to others; maximize the expression of beliefs which imply benefit to others." This maxim found in utterances that express the speaker's intention in future action. Then, they are expressions that influence the hearer to do an activity. The first part of this maxim fits in with Brown and Levinson's negative politeness strategy of minimizing the imposition, and the second part reflects the positive politeness strategy of attending to the hearer's interests, wants, and needs. For example:

Could I interrupt you for a second?

If I could clarify this, then.

Would you hand me that screwdriver? (G. N. Leech, 1980).

2.3.1.2. Generosity maxim states: 'Minimize the expression of beliefs that express or imply benefit to self; maximize the expression of beliefs that express or imply cost to self' (Leech, 1983, p.132). Unlike the tact maxim, the maxim of generosity focuses on the speaker and says that others should be put first instead of the self. For example:

You relax and let me do the dishes.

You must come and have dinner with us.

2.3.1.3. The approbation maxim states: 'Minimize the expression of beliefs which express dispraise of others; maximize the expression of beliefs which express approval of others.' It is preferred to praise others and if this is impossible, to sidestep the issue, to give some minimal response (possibly through the use of euphemisms), or to remain silent. The first part of the maxim avoids disagreement; the second part intends to make other people feel good by showing solidarity. For example:

I heard you singing at the karaoke last night. It sounded like you were enjoying yourself!
    Gideon, I know you're a genius – would you know how to solve this math problem here?

2.3.1.4. Maxim of modesty is one of the six maxims proposed by Leech (1983) in his PP (politeness principle) meaning to minimize praise or to maximize the dispraise of self. In the modesty maxim, the participants must reduce appreciation of themselves and maximize the dispraise of themselves. This maxim is similar to the approbation maxim. The approbation maxim, and the modesty maxim concern with the degree of good, or bad evaluation of others, or self, which is uttered by the speaker. The approbation maxim exampled in courtesy of congratulation. On the other hand, the modesty maxim usually occurs in apologies. The sample of the modesty maxim is below. "Please accept this small gift as a prize for your achievement." In this case, the utterance above is categorized as the modesty maxim because the speaker maximizes dispraise of himself. The speaker notices his pronouncement by using a "small gift." The modesty maxim states:

"Minimize the expression of praise of self; maximize the expression of the dispraise of self" **(**Leech, 1983, p. 132). For example:

Oh, I'm so stupid – I didn't make a note of our lecture! Did you?

2.3.1.5. The agreement maxim runs as follows: 'Minimize the expression of disagreement between self and others; maximize the expression of the agreement between self and others.' It is in line with Brown and Levinson's positive politeness strategies of 'seek agreement' and 'avoid disagreement,' to which they attach great importance. However, it doesn't claim that people avoid disagreement. It observed that they are much more direct in agreeing, rather than argument. For example:

  I don't want my daughter to do this; I want her to do that.
  Yes, but ma'am, I thought we resolved this already on your last visit.

Consider the following answer for this tag question:
 (a)No, they are straightforward topics. (b)Yes, they are. (c)Yes, but pragmatics is very interesting. (a) Displays obvious and direct disagreement with the addresser. While (b) Exhibits agreement with the addresser. The third answer (c) Reflects a partial argument with the addresser. So (b and c) are more polite than (a)

2.3.1.6. The sympathy maxim states: 'minimize antipathy between self and others; maximize sympathy between the self and others (Leech, 1983, pp. 134). The sympathy maxim includes a small group of speech acts such as congratulation, commiseration, and expressing condolences –

all of which is following Brown and Levinson's positive politeness strategy of attending to the hearer's interests, wants, and needs. For example, I am sorry to hear about your father. Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Politeness_maxims.

Leech (1983) proposes several scales involved in determining the type and degree of politeness: cost-benefit, optionality, indirectness, authority, and social distance. The complex interrelation between maxims and scales creates the nuances in politeness style and level (G. Brown & Yule, 1983).

Also, Leech (1983) worked on the distinction between relative and absolute politeness. The former means courtesy within a particular setting or culture; the latter discusses to politeness inextricably linked to specific speaker actions**.** The perfect courtesy indicates that speech acts are intrinsically polite or impolite based on their illocutionary force. Leech stresses the importance of ideal courtesy, affirming that "general pragmatics may reasonably confine its attention to politeness in the absolute sense."

Leech lists four main illocutionary functions, which are competitive, convivial, collaborative, and conflictive, and links them with the types of politeness. For instance, competitive illocution (e.g., ordering), which is undoubtedly impolite, requires mitigation. On the other hand, convivial illocution (e.g., thanking), which is naturally polite, calls for politeness to enhance the positive impact.

The conversational-maxim view of politeness, which is dependent on the Gricean notion of the cooperative principle and its maxims (El-Samir, 2014), offers a frugal (i.e., Lakoff's) and a comprehensive (i.e., Leech's) model of politeness, and gives rules, strategies, maxims, and scales of courtesy. Politeness, never explicitly defined, is treated within the domain of Interpersonal Rhetoric, which contains at least three sets of aphorisms: those falling under the terms of Grice's Cooperative Principle (CP), those associated with a Politeness Principle (PP), and those associated with an Irony Principle (IP). Each of the interpersonal principles has the same status in his pragmatic theory, and associate maxims with the cooperative principles used to explain how an utterance may interpret to convey indirect messages. The politeness principle (PP) with its maxims used to explain why such indirectness might be used (Fraser, 1990).

3. Methodology
3.1 *Material*
The Glorious Qur'an, which is translated from Arabic to English by Arberry (1955), was chosen to be analyzed. The researcher explains two Suras (Yusuf and Cave).

3.2 *Instrumentation*
Two models were employed in this study, i.e., Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness and Leech's maxims of courtesy. The researcher in this study was required to read these suras carefully.

3.2.1 *Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness*
According to (Levinson, Brown, Levinson, & Levinson, 1987), they state their Politeness theory accounts for the redressing of affronts to a person's 'face' by face-threatening acts. The

concept of the face was derivative from Chinese into English in the 19th century. Erving Goffman would then continue to introduce his theories of 'face' and 'facework.' Though politeness studied in a variety of cultures for many years, Brown and Levinson's politeness theory has come to be very influential. In 1987, Brown and Levinson offered and stated that politeness was a universal concept, which has had some disagreement within academia. Courtesy, in its nature, is the expression of the speakers' intention to mitigate face threats carried by firm face-threatening acts toward the listener, or another definition of politeness that Foley (1997) defined it as "a battery of social skills whose goal is to ensure everyone feels affirmed in social interaction" (p.270). So, politeness is the speaker's attempt to save his/her face or the face of the person he or she is talking to.

Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness (1978, 1987) is a detailed and large scale work that endeavors to explain and predict polite language behavior in all languages and cultures. It is, therefore, a theory with great importance not only for pragmatics but also for other areas of language study such as cross-cultural understanding, communication, and language education. It has, inevitably, been the subject of considerable controversy amongst international scholars(Brown, 2007).

3.3 *Procedures*

English data gathered from the Holy Quran, which was translated by Arberry as the representative sample. The selection of verses based on their availability to the researcher, and also, because these suras have different politeness strategies, and maxims. The researcher will read these suras carefully more than one time and begin to extract the verses which contain the politeness strategies, positive and negative strategies based on Brown and Levinson's theory and extract the politeness maxims based on Leech's theory. English data gathered from the Holy Quran, which was translated by Arberry and the online Arabic version, which was available on the website. The data collected from two suras (Yusuf and Cave) in the English language and analyzed in qualitative and quantitative methods. The texts were selected and transformed into tables displaying the frequency, percentage, and the tables were analyzed qualitatively.

3.4 *Data Analysis*

The first procedure for analyzing the data in this study was comparative. The politeness strategies and politeness maxims of the two suras from the Holy Quran, which was translated by Arberry. The frequency and percentage of each strategy, and maxim calculated, and "Maxqda 2018.2" was run to analyze the data, and "endnote X8" was used in citation and references, and the APA style was applied. In the next stage, qualitative and quantitative analyses provided.

Taylor-Powell (2003) asserts that "good analysis depends on understanding the data"(p. 2). The content analysis method was used to analyze the data extracted from the Suras. Data were analyzed in terms of both Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness, and Leech's maxims of politeness. For qualitative analysis, this means the researcher must read and re-read the text more one time. The materials in this study constitute a considerable number of verses (Ayahs) presented in narrative form in the Yusuf's Surah and Cave Surah. As pointed out earlier in this investigation, the focus is on the politeness strategies, and maxims politeness and their co-occurrence with the selected expressions in written texts, either in a clear, or idiomatic manner. Although the present

study's results based on a careful investigation of all politeness strategies and politeness maxims in Yusuf, and Cave Suras of the Glorious Qur'an, extracts will be analyzed, discussed, and presented here for illustration.

It is essential to mention that we tried from the very beginning to select our sample in the best possible way from as many texts as possible. Thus, the extracts upon which this study based on collected texts from Yusuf Surah and Cave Surah. These texts organized in such a way as to provide a comprehensive view of both types of relationships (i.e., man-man relationship and God-man relationship).

They selected for the following reasons: (a) they have as many politeness strategies as possible, (b) the two types of relationships contain self-identified strategies of politeness, and (d) they are thought to serve the purposes of this study against the theoretical frameworks chosen for investigation.

Data analysis is a process in which several phases would distinguish, such as working with the data, coding, organizing data, and breaking data into manageable units (in review, see Singh & Jones, 2007). This work consists of two main steps. Step one represents an underlying case, namely an inspection of all politeness formulas that used in the selected Yusuf, and Cave Suras. This process served as a screening phase to identify and select the appropriate verses of the study. It also provided a descriptive account of the contexts in which the politeness strategies and politeness maxims had used. Step two was a detailed analysis of politeness strategies and politeness maxims as used in two types of communications, namely God-man communication, and man-man communication in Yusuf, and Cave Suras. In doing this, we introduce, identify, and interpret the text-building mechanisms about the set.

3.6 *Materials:*
The data consists of two suras that have taken from the Holy Quran translated by Arberry. The sura of Yusuf contains 111 verses, and the Cave -Al-Kahf consists of 110 Quranic verses. Arberry translated these suras from Arabic (original version) to the English text.

4. Results and Discussion
Thus, drawing on the model proposed by Brown and Levinson (1978), and Leech's model (1983), the current study analyzed two suras (Yusuf and Cave) from the Holy Quran, which translated by Arberry (1955) in terms of politeness strategies, and politeness maxims. The results revealed that positive politeness strategy (offer, promise) is the dominant one with about 22.2 % occurrence in the Sura of Cave, in contrast, the dominant one in the Yusuf Sura is the negative politeness (give deference or respect with 21.25% of all texts as showing in Table 1.

Table 1

Frequency and Percentage of Politeness Strategies and Politeness Maxims in Yusuf and Cave Suras

Suras	Yusuf Sura		Cave Sura	
Strategies/maxims	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Notice of admiration	4	5%	0	0%
Claim common view or ground with the hearer or give something wanted or desired and gifts	6	7.5%	2	7.4%
Seek agreement	3	3.75%	4	14.8%
A Hedge of opinion to avoid disagreement	4	5%	1	3.7%
Assert or presuppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants	3	3.75%	1	3.7%
Be optimistic	5	6.25%	0	0%
Offer, promise	8	10%	6	22.2%
Be pessimistic by doing indirect request	0	0%	0	0%
Give deference or respect	17	21.25%	2	7.4%
Apologize for doing FTA	1	1.25%	1	3.7%
Minimize the imposition, Rx	3	3.75%	3	11.11%
Go on record as incurring debt, or as not indebting H	3	3.75%	1	3.7%
The tact maxim	6	7.5%	1	3.7%
generosity maxim	0	0%	0	0%
The approbation maxim	5	6.25%	1	3.7%
Maxim of modesty	5	6.25%	0	0%
The agreement maxim	5	6.25%	4	14.8%
The sympathy maxim	2	2.5%	0	0%
total	80	100%	27	100%

4.1 *Politeness strategies*
4.1.1 *Positive politeness*
1. Notice, attend to hearer's interests, needs, wants
As indicated earlier, positive politeness is redress directed to the hearer's positive face, his or her continual desire that his/her wants or actions should be acceptable and desirable. Insofar as this study is concerned, redress here involves in partially satisfying that desire by communicating the message that the addresser's own wants or desires are, in some respects, similar to the addressee's wants and desires (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

اذْهَبُواْ بِقَمِيصِي هَذَا فَأَلْقُوهُ عَلَى وَجْهِ أَبِي يَأْتِ بَصِيرًا وَأْتُونِي بِأَهْلِكُمْ أَجْمَعِينَ ﴿93﴾

₉₃ Go, take this shirt, and do you cast it on my father´s face, and he shall recover his sight; then bring me your family all together. (Translation of the Holy Quran by Arberry).
This text reveals that Allah gave Yusuf the miracle and sign that he then gave their brother his shirt and said to them took it and put on my father's face. The conversation represents positive politeness strategies that Yusuf used it to redress the face-threatening act of his brothers by giving them his shirt.

وَإِذِ اعْتَزَلْتُمُوهُمْ وَمَا يَعْبُدُونَ إِلَّا اللَّهَ فَأْوُوا إِلَى الْكَهْفِ يَنشُرْ لَكُمْ رَبُّكُم مِّن رَّحمته ويُهَيِّئْ لَكُم مِّنْ أَمْرِكُم مِّرْفَقًا ﴿16﴾

₁₆ So, when you have gone apart from them and that they serve, excepting God, take refuge in the Cave, and your Lord will unfold to you of His mercy and will furnish -- you with a gentle issue of your affair. ´ (Translation of the Holy Quran by Arberry).
Here in this verse, Allah told his worshipers if you leave them and from what they worship, other than Allah, find refuge in the Cave. Allah will extend His Mercy to you and will furnish you with a gentle issue of your affair.so this text explains the positive politeness strategy used by Allah to award his honest believers.

3. Seek agreement
قَالَ مَا خَطْبُكُنَّ إِذْ رَاوَدتُّنَّ يُوسُفَ عَن نَّفْسِهِ قُلْنَ حَاشَ لِلّهِ مَا عَلِمْنَا عَلَيْهِ مِن سُوءٍ قَالَتِ امْرَأَةُ الْعَزِيزِ الآنَ حَصْحَصَ الْحَقُّ أَنَاْ رَاوَدتُّهُ عَن نَّفْسِهِ وَإِنَّهُ لَمِنَ الصَّادِقِينَ ﴿51﴾

₅₁ ´What was your business, women, ´ he said, 'when you solicited Joseph?´ ´God save us!´ they said. ´We know no evil against him. ´ The Governor´s wife said, ´Now the truth is at last discovered; I solicited him; he is a truthful man.
Zulekha, the wife of Egypt governor, agreed with the speech of king of Egypt when ' he asked, 'when you solicited Joseph? She said, "the truth revealed at last; I requested him; he is among the truthful." She used the positive politeness strategy.

قَالَ لَهُ مُوسَى هَلْ أَتَّبِعُكَ عَلَى أَن تُعَلِّمَنِ مِمَّا عُلِّمْتَ رُشْدًا ﴿66﴾

₆₆ Moses said to him, "Shall I follow thee so that thou teachest me, of what thou hast
taught, right judgment." (Translation of the Holy Quran by Arberry, cave 18:66).
Here Moses used the strategy (seek agreement) to avoid the imposition of disagree because his request may be accepted or not.

4 A hedge of opinion to avoid disagreement

وَقَالَ الْمَلِكُ ائْتُونِي بِهِ فَلَمَّا جَاءهُ الرَّسُولُ قَالَ ارْجِعْ إِلَى رَبِّكَ فَاسْأَلْهُ مَا بَالُ النِّسْوَةِ اللاَّتِي قَطَّعْنَ أَيْدِيَهُنَّ إِنَّ رَبِّي بِكَيْدِهِنَّ عَلِيمٌ ﴿50﴾

₅₀ The king said, ´Bring him to me! ´ And when the messenger came to him, he said, ´Return unto thy lord, and ask of him, "What of the women who cut their hands?" Surely, my Lord knows their guile. ´ (Translation of the Holy Quran by Arberry, Yusuf 12:50).
In this verse, when the messenger came to Yusuf to take him to the king. Yusuf said, tell the king to ask, "What about the women who cut their hands. Indeed, my Lord knows their guile." Yusuf used the strategy of hedge of opinion to avoid disagreement with the order of the king. So, he used a positive politeness strategy.

قَالَ إِنَّكَ لَن تَسْتَطِيعَ مَعِيَ صَبْرًا ﴿67﴾ وَكَيْفَ تَصْبِرُ عَلَى مَا لَمْ تُحِطْ بِهِ خُبْرًا ﴿68﴾

₆₇ Said he, ´Assuredly thou wilt not be able to bear with me patiently. 68 And how shouldst thou patiently bear that thou hast never encompassed in thy knowledge? ´ (Translation of the Holy Quran by Arberry, cave 18:68).

The Prophet Ilyas (PBUH) said to Moses (PBUH) how you could bear patiently with that which you have never comprehended in your knowledge? '

5 Assert or presuppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants

نَحْنُ نَقُصُّ عَلَيْكَ أَحْسَنَ الْقَصَصِ بِمَا أَوْحَيْنَا إِلَيْكَ هَذَا الْقُرْآنَ وَإِن كُنتَ مِن قَبْلِهِ لَمِنَ الْغَافِلِينَ ﴿3﴾

2   We will relate to thee the fairest of stories in We have revealed to thee this Koran, though before it thou wast one of the heedless. (Translation of the Holy Quran by Arberry, Yusuf 12:3).

In this verse, Allah declares to his prophet the stories that he didn't know before. Allah asserts this knowledge related to the prophet.

قَالَ أَلَمْ أَقُلْ إِنَّكَ لَن تَسْتَطِيعَ مَعِيَ صَبْرًا ﴿72﴾

₇₂ Said he, ´Did I not say that thou couldst never bear with me patiently? ´ (Translation of the Holy Quran by Arberry, cave 18:72). Here in this text, the Ilyas said: Did I not I tell you, 'that you would not bear patiently with me? '. He knows and asserts the fact about Moses. So, he used a positive politeness strategy.

6. Offer or promise
Searle (1969: 58, reported in Bretag 2006) contends that a promise "is a pledge to do something for you, not to you." Offer and promise can indicate that the speaker and hearer are cooperators. Given the situational context of our data as representing a dialogue between God and His servants, it was no surprise that the speech acts of promise and offer were commonly used here as positive politeness strategies.

7. Offer, promise

قَالُواْ يَا أَبَانَا مَا لَكَ لاَ تَأْمَنَّا عَلَى يُوسُفَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَنَاصِحُونَ ﴿11﴾

11 They said, "Father, what ails thee, that thou trustest us not with Joseph? Surely, we are his sincere well-wishers." (Translation of the Holy Quran by Arberry, Yusuf 12:11).
Yusuf' brothers said: Indeed, we are sincere advisors. That they gave their father promise to advise Yusuf. They used positive politeness when they used to promise.

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ إِنَّا لَا نُضِيعُ أَجْرَ مَنْ أَحْسَنَ عَمَلًا ﴿30﴾

30 Surely, those who believe, and do deeds of righteousness -- surely, we leave not to waste the wage of him who does good works. (Translation of the Holy Quran by Arberry, cave 12:30). Here, Allah promises believers who do good works; he does not waste the wage of whosoever does good works.

4.1.2 *Negative politeness*
1. Give deference or respect

يَا صَاحِبَيِ السِّجْنِ أَأَرْبَابٌ مُتَفَرِّقُونَ خَيْرٌ أَمِ اللَّهُ الْوَاحِدُ الْقَهَّارُ ﴿39﴾

39 Say, which is better, my fellow-prisoners --many gods at variance, or God the One, the Omnipotent? (Translation of the Holy Quran by Arberry, Yusuf 12:11).
The verse reveals the strategy of deference and respect, which used by the Prophet Yusuf when called the two persons in prison, my fellow-prisoners in spite of they are common men, and he is the prophet, and they are lower rank from him.

إِذْ أَوَى الْفِتْيَةُ إِلَى الْكَهْفِ فَقَالُوا رَبَّنَا آتِنَا مِن لَّدُنكَ رَحْمَةً وَهَيِّئْ لَنَا مِنْ أَمْرِنَا رَشَدًا ﴿10﴾

10 When the youths took refuge in the Cave, saying, ´Our Lord, give us mercy from Thee, and furnish us with rectitude in our affair. ´ (Translation of the Holy Quran by Arberry, cave 18:10). Here, the youths believed in Allah and explained their deference, and respect to Allah when they called him

2. Apologize for doing FTA

قَالُواْ يَا أَبَانَا اسْتَغْفِرْ لَنَا ذُنُوبَنَا إِنَّا كُنَّا خَاطِئِينَ ﴿97﴾

97 They said, ´Our father, ask forgiveness of our crimes for us, for, indeed we are sinful. ´ (Translation of the Holy Quran by Arberry, Yusuf 12:97). Yaqub prophet sons said: 'Father, ask forgiveness for our sins. We have, indeed been sinners. They apologize to their father because they commit crimes

قَالَ لَا تُؤَاخِذْنِي بِمَا نَسِيتُ وَلَا تُرْهِقْنِي مِنْ أَمْرِي عُسْرًا ﴿73﴾

73 He said, ´Do not take me to a task that I forgot, neither constrain me to do a thing too difficult. ´ (Translation of the Holy Quran by Arberry, cave 18:73). Here the Prophet Moses apologizes to the prophet Ilyas to take him to the task that he forgot.

3. Minimize the imposition

قَالَ إِنِّي لَيَحْزُنُنِي أَن تَذْهَبُواْ بِهِ وَأَخَافُ أَن يَأْكُلَهُ الذِّئْبُ وَأَنتُمْ عَنْهُ غَافِلُونَ ﴿13﴾

₁₃ He said, ´It grieves me that you should go with him, and I fear the wolf may eat him, while you are heedless of him. ´ (Translation of the Holy Quran by Arberry, Yusuf 12:13).

The Prophet Yaqub (P.B.U.H) used here negative politeness to express his refusal. Politeness resides here in the way the Prophet said: 'It grieves me to let him go with you, for I fear the wolf should consume him when you are not paying attention to him. 'Used negative politeness strategy to avoid imposition on his sons.

قَالَ فَإِنِ اتَّبَعْتَنِي فَلَا تَسْأَلْنِي عَن شَيْءٍ حَتَّى أُحْدِثَ لَكَ مِنْهُ ذِكْرًا ﴿70﴾

₇₀ Said he, ´Then if thou followest me, question me not on anything until I introduce the mention of it to thee.´. (Translation of the Holy Quran by Arberry, Cave 18:70).

The verse reveals that the prophet used the negative politesse strategies 'minimize the imposition' when he told the prophet Moses don't ask him about something, Still, he added that he explains to reduce and smooth the cost.

4. Go on record as incurring debt, or as not indebting H

قَالُواْ يَا أَيُّهَا الْعَزِيزُ إِنَّ لَهُ أَبًا شَيْخًا كَبِيرًا فَخُذْ أَحَدَنَا مَكَانَهُ إِنَّا نَرَاكَ مِنَ الْمُحْسِنِينَ ﴿78﴾

₇₈ They said, ´Mighty prince, he has a father, aged and great with years; so, take one of us in his place; we see that thou art one of the good-doers. (Translation of the Holy Quran by Arberry, Yusuf 12:78). The brothers of Yusuf when they met the mighty prince (their brother, Yusuf) Without knowing that he was their brother, and they praised him and thanked him because he was an optimist with them.so they utilize negative politeness to express their indebtedness to him

الْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ الَّذِي أَنزَلَ عَلَى عَبْدِهِ الْكِتَابَ وَلَمْ يَجْعَل لَّهُ عِوَجَا ﴿1﴾

₁ Praise belongs to God who has sent down upon His Servant the Book and has not assigned unto it any crookedness. (Translation of the Holy Quran by Arberry, Cave 18:1).

Here in this text, the Prophet praises Allah because he has sent down the Book (Holy Quran) to His worshiper (Prophet Muhammad), and has not made any crookedness in it. So, the Prophet (PBUH) used negative politeness strategy to show his indebtedness to God.

4.2 Politeness *maxims*
1. Modesty maxims

Modesty had been defined by having or indicating a moderate or humble estimate of one's merits, importance, etc.; free from vanity, egotism, boastfulness, or great pretensions (Dictionary.com, 2012). Modesty can be seen as a critical aspect of politeness, especially when dealing with others. Insofar as Islam is concerned, Zohery (2011) asserts that Islam teaches humans, men, and women, equally, how to overpower the desires of the ego. It makes modesty part of faith, a fact that is stressed in several traditions as well as in several places of the Quran. Prophet Muhammad is the most excellent example of a modest man in the full sense of the word (Zohery, 2011). Modesty maxim, according to Leech, minimizes praise of self, and maximizes the dispraise of self.

وَمَا أُبَرِّىءُ نَفْسِي إِنَّ النَّفْسَ لأَمَّارَةٌ بِالسُّوءِ إلاَّ مَا رَحِمَ رَبِّيَ إِنَّ رَبِّي غَفُورٌ رَّحِيمٌ ﴿53﴾

53 Yet I claim not that my soul was innocent. Undoubtedly, the soul of man incites to evil – except since as my Lord had mercy, truly, my Lord is All-forgiving, All-compassionate. ´ (Translation of the Holy Quran by Arberry, Yusuf 12: 53). In this verse, the wife of governor in Egypt said, "Yet I do not consider my soul was guiltless," the soul incites to evil except to whom my Lord has mercy; indeed, my Lord is Forgiving, the Most Merciful explains. She used maxim of modesty to dispraise herself. They chiefly call for minimizing the expression of praise of self and maximizing the expression of dispraise of self. They also call for reducing the expression of beliefs, which express the dispraise of others and maximizing the expression of opinions that express the approval of others.

2. The approbation maxim

وَدَخَلَ مَعَهُ السِّجْنَ فَتَيَانَ قَالَ أَحَدُهُمَا إِنِّي أَرَانِي أَعْصِرُ خَمْرًا وَقَالَ الآخَرُ إِنِّي أَرَانِي أَحْمِلُ فَوْقَ رَأْسِي خُبْزًا تَأْكُلُ الطَّيْرُ مِنْهُ نَبِّئْنَا بِتَأْوِيلِهِ إِنَّا نَرَاكَ مِنَ الْمُحْسِنِينَ ﴿36﴾

36 And two youths entered the prison with him. Said one of them, "I dreamed that I was pressing grapes. Said the other, ´I dreamed that I was carrying on my head bread, that birds were eating of it." Tell us its interpretation; we see that thou art of the good-doers.' (Translation of the Holy Quran by Arberry, Yusuf 12:36). ´ This verse revealed that the two prisoners they use the maxim of approbation to praise Yusuf when they said: 'we can see you are among the good.'

3. The agreement maxim

قَالَ مَا خَطْبُكُنَّ إِذْ رَاوَدتُّنَّ يُوسُفَ عَن نَّفْسِهِ قُلْنَ حَاشَ لِلّهِ مَا عَلِمْنَا عَلَيْهِ مِن سُوءٍ قَالَتِ امْرَأَةُ الْعَزِيزِ الآنَ حَصْحَصَ الْحَقُّ أَنَاْ رَاوَدتُّهُ عَن نَّفْسِهِ وَإِنَّهُ لَمِنَ الصَّادِقِينَ ﴿51﴾

51 ´What was your business, women, ´ he said, 'when you solicited Joseph? ´ ´God save us! ´they said. ´We know no evil against him. ´ The Governor´s wife said, ´Now the truth is at last discovered; I solicited him; he is a truthful man. (Translation of the Holy Quran by Arberry, Yusuf 12:51).

Here the wife of Egypt (Zulekha) used the politeness agreement maxim to agree with the king of Egypt when he said when you solicited joseph.

قَالَ سَتَجِدُنِي إِن شَاء اللَّهُ صَابِرًا وَلَا أَعْصِي لَكَ أَمْرًا ﴿69﴾

69 He said, ´Yet thou shalt find me, if God will, patient, and I shall not rebel against thee in anything. ´ (Translation of the Holy Quran by Arberry, Cave 18:69). In this verse, Moses expresses his agreement to Ilyas prophet. So, he used the agreement maxims of politeness.

4. The sympathy maxim

وَجَاؤُواْ أَبَاهُمْ عِشَاء يَبْكُونَ ﴿16﴾

16And, they came to their father in the evening. (Translation of the Holy Quran by Arberry, Yusuf 12:16). This text states that the Yagup's sons used polite sympathy maxim to express his compassion to their father.

5. Conclusion

This study conducted to analyze the use of politeness strategies, and politeness maxims by Allah, Prophets, and Humans in Yusuf, and Cave Suras. The researcher has applied two theories, Brown and Levison, and Leech's Model. From the discussion above, also from my observation toward the Holy Quran, and read the Suras more than one time to extract the politeness strategies, and politeness maxims correctly. Even, this study aimed to answer all the questions above. The conclusion can draw that politeness does exist in these Suras but differently. The most frequent strategy used is negative politeness (Give deference or respect), which takes the percentage 16% in Yusuf Sura, this explains that there is a large number of conversations, which contain the mutual deference and respects. Notably, in Yusuf Sura, there are different conversations among Allah and the Prophet Yusuf, and also between the prophet Yusuf, his father, brothers, and other characters. The second strategy, which took the frequency (8), and the percentage 7%, is the positive politeness strategy (offer and promise) in Yusuf Sura. So, the research also reveals that the highest positive politeness strategy and negative politeness strategy used in Yusuf Sura. According to Leech (1983), the tact maxim represents the highest percentage among the politeness maxims strategies in Yusuf Sura, which is 7 percent. The humans used the negative politeness strategy in Yusuf Sura (give deference or respect) more than others is 12.5% and is higher than other negative politeness strategies. Also, the positive politeness strategy (promise and offer) in Yusuf Sura is used by humans more than others because the texts (ayahs) contained conversations expressed promise and offer, which is 8.75%. This study reveals that humans used the politeness adage (maxim of modesty) in Yusuf Sura more than others (Allah and Prophets, which is nearly 6.25%. This study explains that humans use the maxim of modesty more than God and the prophets because human beings have made mistakes. They try to vilify themselves and praise God, and the prophets to express their remorse. In Cave Sura, the results revealed that positive politeness strategy (promise and offer) is the dominant one with about 22 % occurrence.

The study's calculations revealed that the agreement maxim has occurred in 17 % of the politeness strategies and politeness maxims of Cave Sura. Also, the positive politeness strategy (seek agreement), used by the prophets, occurred in14.8 %, the positive politeness strategy (offer, promise), which is used by God, had 14,8. And also, in Cave Sura, the prophets had used the politeness maxim (the agreement maxim) in occurrence 14.8%.

About the Authors:

HAMID GITTAN JEWAD has a Bachelor's degree in Human Sciences (English language and literature) from the University of Kufa, Iraq. and Master's degree in English Language from Sam Higginbottom Institute of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, India. and he is a PhD Student at Ferdowsi University of Mashhad in Teaching English Language.
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0688-1000

ZARGHAM GHABANCHI received his BA in English language and literature from Mashhad University. Then he received his MA in TEFL from Tehran Tarbiayyet Moderres University.He started his Ph.D. at the University of Liverpool, the UK in 1993 and Ph.D. was conferred to him in 1998. https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8941-5277

MOHAMMAD GHAZANFARI is associate professor of applied linguistics at Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad. He has published articles in the field of applied linguistics (TEFL, translation studies, and discourse analysis) in both Persian and English.
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6160-7928

References

Arberry, A. J. (1955). *The Koran interpreted: A translation*. New York, Macmillan: Simon and Schuster.

Bretag, T. (2006). Developing 'third space' interculturality using computer-mediated communication. *Journal of computer-mediated communication, 11*, 981–1011.

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis* (pp. 415). New York: Cambridge university press.

Brown, I. B. (2007). *The applicability of Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness to Japanese: a review of the English literature*. *41*.

El-Samir, S. F. (2014). Politeness: A Socio-Pragmatic Study. *Journal of the College of Languages*(28), 1-37.

Elen, G. (2001). *A critique of politeness theories*. Manchester: St. JeromePublishing.

Erbert, L. A., & Floyd, K. (2004). Affectionate expressions as face-threatening acts: Receiver assessments. *Communication studies, 55*(2), 254-270.

Eslami-Rasekh, Z., Eslami-Rasekh, A., & Fatahi, A. (2004). The Effect of explicit metapragmatic instruction on the speech act awareness of advanced EFL students. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language, 8*(2), 9.

Farnia, M., Buchheit, L., & binti Salim, S. B. (2010). "I need to talk to you"–A contrastive pragmatic study of speech act of complaint in American English and Malaysian. *The International Journal of Language Society and Culture, 30*, 11-23.

Foley, W. A. (1997). *Anthropological linguistics: An Introduction*: Blackwell.

Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of pragmatics, 14*(2), 219-236.

Fraser, B. (2005). Whither politeness. *PRAGMATICS AND BEYOND NEW SERIES, 139*, 65.

Geyer, N. (2008). *Discourse and politeness: Ambivalent face in Japanese* (1 ed.). New York: A&C Black.

Goffman, E. (1967). On face-work. *Interaction ritual*, 5-45.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. *1975*, 41-58.

Holmes, J. (1995). *Women, Men, and Politeness*. London: Longman.

Holmes, J. (2013). *Women, men, and politeness*: Routledge.

Holtgraves, T., & Yang, J. (1992). Interpersonal underpinnings of request strategies: General principles and differences due to culture and gender. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62*(2), 246– 256.

Holtgraves, T. (2005). Social psychology, cognitive psychology, and linguistic politeness. *Journal of Politeness Research. Language, Behaviour, Culture, 1*(1), 73-93.

Kadhem, A. A. (2008). Politeness Theories in Conversations with Special Reference to Cather's Short Story" On the Gulls' Road": A Pragmatic Analysis. *Journal of Al-qadisiya in arts and educational science, 7*(1-2), 37-68.

Khattab, M. k. (2010). Politeness Strategies Used by The Interviewer of BBC World's "Hard Talk" Programme. *Journal Of AL-Turath University College*(7), 322-332.

Lakoff, R. T. (1973). *The logic of politeness: Minding your p's and q's* (Vol. 9). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Lakoff, R. (1977). *What you can do with words: Politeness, pragmatics and performatives.* Paper presented at the Proceedings of the Texas conference on performatives, presuppositions and implicatures.

Lakoff, R. (1990). *Talking Power*. New York: Basic Books.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Leech, G. (2007). Politeness: Is there an East-West Divide? ①. *Journal of Politeness Research. Language, Behaviour, Culture, 3*(2), 167-206. doi: 10.1515/PR.2007.009

Leech, G. N. (1980). *Explorations in semantics and pragmatics*: John Benjamins Publishing.

Levinson, P., Brown, P., Levinson, S. C., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4): Cambridge university press.

Locher, M. A. (2012). *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.

Meier, A. J. (1995). Passages of politeness. *Journal of pragmatics, 24*(4), 381-392.

Meier, A. J. (1995a). Defining politeness: Universality in appropriateness

Mills, S. (2003). *Gender and politeness* (Vol. 17): Cambridge University Press.

Mirza, R. F. A. (2017). Politeness in Imam Ali's Letter to Malik Al-Ashtar *Adab Al-Kufa, 2*(33), 55-68.

Östman, J.-O., & Verschueren, J. (2009). *The pragmatics of interaction* (Vol. 4): John Benjamins Publishing.

Pishghadam, R., & Kermanshahi, P. N. (2011). Speech act of correction: The way Iranian EFL learners correct their teachers. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 1*(4), 342-348.

Renner, M., & Taylor-Powell, E. (2003). Analyzing qualitative data. *Programme Development & Evaluation, University of Wisconsin-Extension Cooperative Extension*.

Saffarzadeh, T. (2012). *The Holy Qur'an*
 Qum: Osveh

Sandberg, S. (2010). "The Role Of Advertising on Facebook.Sheryl facebook's Chief operating officer". 338- 376.

Searle, J. R., & Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language* (Vol. 626): Cambridge university press.

Stalnaker, R. (1978). Assertion.

Terkourafi, M. (2001). *Politeness in Cypriot Greek: A frame-based approach.* Citeseer.

Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

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

Wikipedia. (2007). Encyclopedia

Britannica: Online.http://en.wkipedia.org/wiki/politeness.

Zakaria, B. N. A., & Syukri, M. A. (2016). Politeness Strategies Used by Santri (Male Student) and Ustadz (Male Teacher) In Their Interaction At Pesantren Salaf Al Quran Sholahul Huda Al-Mujahidin Malang. *Journal Universitas Airlangga, 5*(2), 132 - 137.

Zohery, A. (2011). Encyclopedia of ethics from an Islamic perspective *http://www.scribd.com/doc/22621852/Encyclopedia-of-Ethics-From-an-Islamic-Perspective*