

ISRG Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (ISRGJAHSS)



ISRG PUBLISHERS

Abbreviated Key Title: ISRG J Arts Humanit Soc Sci

ISSN: 2583-7672 (Online)

Journal homepage: <https://isrgpublishers.com/isrgjahss>

Volume – IV Issue - V (September-October) 2026

Frequency: Bimonthly



Women's Language in Surah Yusuf: Some Sacred Reported Speeches Featured by Language Politeness, Keeping Face and Telling the Truth

Ghufran Ahmed Saghir Ahmed Al-Dakinah

Assistant Professor of Applied Linguistics Department of English, Faculty of Education, Sciences, and Arts, Hajjah University, Yemen

| **Received:** 11.09.2026 | **Accepted:** 15.09.2026 | **Published:** 21.09.2026

***Corresponding author:** Ghufran Ahmed Saghir Ahmed Al-Dakinah

Abstract

Article 27 of the United Nations Charter empowers the permanent members of the Security Council to quash any non-procedural draft resolution through the use of their veto powers, though this "veto" power is not provided for in the Charter. Sequel to this provision, the Security Council has always depended on the permanent members for any resolution to succeed. This Article introduces the subject matter, analyses the history of the use of veto power by the permanent member states particularly between 1946 and 2013 and then 2014 and 2023. The Studies have shown that before 1991, the defunct USSR was the most frequent user of the veto but since 1992, the United States has become the most frequent user of the veto. This Article is to examine the enablement of the Veto by the permanent members of the Security Council to prevent an intended negative resolutions. It will also focus on those vital resolutions that would have brought peace that were vetoed. The Article will also consider the Organ of the United Nations as the General Assembly that has taken prompt actions when it foresaw that the Veto could bring disorder and undermine Article 39 of the UN Charter. In conclusion, this paper is of the view that if some changes can be effected on the Charter and there is an increase of the member, Security Council will become more effective in the exercise of its primary objective and the United Nations will effectively and easily achieve the desired global peace.

Keywords: politeness, face threatening, positive face, negative face, Yusuf PBUH, Zulaikha, women.

1. Introduction

Politeness theory relies on the assumption that speakers in any given language not only convey information through their language but they use it to do things, such as achieving self-esteem, approval and appreciation by others, gaining power via language, etc. Accordingly, participants construct and build personal

relationships through the dialogue they have with each other. In this vein, Brown and Levinson (1987) propose that there is an 'abstract underlying social principle' guiding and constraining the choice of language in everyday discourse. Hence, the term 'politeness' is not used in its conventional sense of having and showing good manners, displaying courtesy and correct social

behavior. It is rather intended to cover all aspects of language usage that serve to establish, maintain or modify interpersonal relationships.

The ultimate aim of politeness is to make all participants in a conversation as relaxed and as comfortable with each other as possible (Hei, 2008). At the same time, politeness plays a part in maintaining order in communication by adhering to the socio-cultural norms of relating communication to social order (Pillai, 2008). This goes hand in hand with "the concept of politeness as governed by socio-culturally specific norms of linguistic behavior" (Bharuthram, 2003).

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), politeness is the action, linguistic or otherwise, that redresses the speaker's and the hearer's 'face' in situations whereby 'face' is threatened. They further add that attending to 'face' will either minimize or avoid conflict during interaction. Yet, "politeness should also be regarded as being aggressive and enhancing power where domination and manipulation occur" (Ermida, 2006). Culpeper (1998) believes that both politeness and impoliteness constitute the continuum of social interaction. A real picture of verbal interaction necessitates the inclusion of the strategies of impoliteness in addition to those of politeness (Rudanko, 2006).

2. Brown and Levinson's Theory of Politeness

Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness builds on the Gricean model of the cooperative principle. They consider a Model Person (MP) whom has to charge the danger of threatening other participants face and to choose the appropriate strategies in order to diminish any face treats. The MP in Brown and Levinson's model refers to the speaker, and the only reason the addressee is brought into the representation is in order that the MP can judge the most appropriate politeness strategy to use in the circumstances. Brown and Levinson (1987) take for granted that every individual has two types of face: positive and negative. Positive face is defined as the individual's desire to be respected and accepted in social interaction, while negative face is the desire for freedom of action and freedom from obligation. On the other hand, Brown and Levinson classify politeness as "positive politeness" being addressed to the addressee's positive face and "negative politeness" being addressed to her/his negative face. In discussing Brown and Levinson's theory (1987), the central issues are the concept of 'face', and the strategies used to address face-threatening acts (FTAs).

3. Politeness Strategies

Brown and Levinson (1987) suggest five politeness strategies that can become the speakers' choice, namely, bald on record strategy, positive politeness, negative politeness, and going off record.

(I) Bald on Record

This strategy is a direct way of saying things, without any minimization to the imposition, in a direct, clear, and concise. It is commonly used by people who known each other. It is used when the speaker has no intension to lessen the threats to the hearer's face. The speaker uses bald on record strategy in order to get the maximum efficiency in communication. The strategy is in conformity with Grice's maxims¹¹ in which adhering to the maxim to quality by being non-spurious; adhering to maxim

quantity by saying as required; adhering to the maxim of relevance by being relevant; and adhering to the maxim of manner by avoiding ambiguity and obscurity.

Bald on record strategy is differentiated by two cases of uses, they are "the case of non-minimization of the face threat" where the intention is to gain maximum efficiency is the main importance. This case can be found in cases such as: (1) great urgency and desperation such as yelling for help in emergency situation; (2) cases of task oriented interaction as in ordering the hearer to help lifting a heavy material by asking one to hold the other end; (3) Interaction in noisy environment is also classified into this category, where the only importance is the hearer can hear what the speaker says. (4) Cases where the speaker's wants to satisfy the Hearer's face is small, either because the speaker is powerful or the speaker does not fear the non-cooperation of the hearer. Such cases can be found in such interaction between a person with his/her apprentice; (5) cases when the speaker wants to be rude without worrying the risk of offending; (6) cases when the speaker wants to give a sympathetic advice and warnings; (7) and cases when speaker is granting permission for something that the hearer requested. Another set uses of bald on record strategy is in the cases of FTA-oriented bald on record usage.

(II) Positive Politeness

Positive politeness strategy is used in interaction where the speaker wants sacrifice his/her positive face in order to express closeness and friendliness, by showing interest as if the hearer needs to be respected. This strategy is commonly found in a group of people who knows each other very well. There are 15 strategies of positive politeness:

1. Notice, attend to Hearer (his interests, wants, needs, goods).
2. Exaggerate (interest approval, sympathy with Hearer)
3. Intensify interest to Hearer
4. Use in-group identity markers
5. Seek agreement
6. Avoid disagreement
7. Presuppose/raise/assert common ground
8. Joke
9. Assert or presuppose Speaker's knowledge of and concern for Hearer's wants.
10. Offer, promise.
11. Be optimistic
12. Include both Speaker and Hearer in the activity
13. Give (or ask for) reasons
14. Assume or assert reciprocity
15. Give gifts to Hearer (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation)

(III) Negative politeness

This strategy is used in when the person wants to have his freedom of action unobstructed and his attention unrestricted. It is a redressive action addressed to the addressee's negative face. There are 10 strategies of negative politeness:

1. Be conventionally indirect.
2. Question, hedge.
3. Be pessimistic.
4. Minimize imposition
5. Give difference
6. Apologize

7. Impersonalize Speaker and Hearer
8. State the Face Threatening Act as general rule
9. Nominalize
10. Go on record as incurring debt, or as not indebted Hearer

(IV) Off the Record Strategy

This strategy is particularly done with an off-record communicative act "in such a way that it is not possible to attribute only one clear communicative intention to the act". This strategy enables the speaker to convey his/her intention by avoiding the responsibility of doing the FTA and leave to the hearer to decide the interpretation. There are 15 strategies:

1. Give hints
2. Give association clues
3. Presuppose
4. Understate
5. Overstate
6. Tautologies
7. Contradictions
8. Be ironic
9. Use metaphors
10. Use rhetorical questions
11. Be ambiguous
12. Be vague
13. Over-generalize
14. Displace H
15. Be incomplete, use ellipsis

4. Face

The concept of face can be discussed in relation to three points, namely face work, positive and negative face and face threatening acts (FTAs):

4.1 Face Work

The most central component to Brown and Levinson's theory (1987) is the concept of 'face'. It is derived from a term employed by Goffman (1967,) and from the English folk term which tied 'face' up with some notions of being embarrassed, humiliated or 'losing face'. Face is defined as "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself." It is something that is emotionally invested and can be lost, maintained or enhanced and must be constantly attended to in interaction in order to achieve social harmony. Moreover, each one of us has two aspects of 'face', i.e. positive face and negative face. Essentially, the actions by means of which people cooperate in maintaining face are called 'face-work' (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

Brown and Levinson's claim of the universality of 'face' has often been raised by many critics including Matsumoto (1988), Ide (1989), and Mao (1994). These scholars, while acknowledging the presence of 'face' in all cultures, doubt the universal applicability of it across diverse communities and cultures (Suleiman, 2004).

4.2 Positive and Negative Face

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), the 'public self-image' that a person wants to project is of two types: 'positive face' and 'negative face'. 'Positive face' usually refers to the positive 'self-image' a participant claims for himself including the desire to be liked, ratified, understood, admired, appreciated and approved of. 'Negative face', on the other hand, refers to the speaker's right not

to be imposed upon. In other words, it is the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-intrusion i.e., to freedom of action and freedom from imposition.

O'Driscoll (1996) reconstructs Brown and Levinson's 'face' by suggesting three kinds of 'face', namely positive face and negative face being universal and culture-specific face being a product of cultures. Watts, Ide and Ehlich (2005) have raised doubt about the presence of a positive face and a negative face, i.e., how the negative face is to be understood in a culture that considers an individual's possessions as the possessions of the community. In the same vein, Spencer-Oatey (2005) suggests the incorporation of a social identity component to remove the impression of the negative face being too individually focused.

4.3 Face Threatening Acts (FTAs)

In social interactions, some acts intrinsically threaten face and they, in Brown and Levinson's (1987) words, "run contrary to the face wants of the addressee and/or of the speaker". Such face-threatening acts (FTAs) can endanger either the hearer's or speaker's positive or negative face. For example, asking someone for a lift contains an imposition on the hearer, a threat to his 'negative face', i.e. his desire to be free from imposition. Insults, terms of abuse, criticism, disapproval and disagreement, and other similar acts usually pose a different threat, i.e. a threat to the 'positive face'.

Buck (1997) states that these acts that are inherently threatening to the speaker or hearer constitute the principal unit of analysis in Brown and Levinson's model, adding that Brown and Levinson's theory doesn't show "how FTAs ... interact sequentially with other acts in large segments of extended discourse." However, other studies have concluded that "acts listed as inherently threatening by Brown and Levinson are clearly not seen as such" by other cultures (O'Driscoll, 1996).

4.4 Strategies for Performing FTAs

Generally speaking, speakers who want to achieve their goals in interaction cannot do without FTAs. As human communication is awash with face-threatening situations, Brown and Levinson "postulate the existence of strategies to minimize them and, therefore, to protect the mutual vulnerability of face" (Ermiida, 2006). Bearing in mind the scope of this chapter, the researcher will provide a brief account of such strategies that can be found elaborated in detail in Brown and Levinson (1987). In the presence of face-threatening situations, speakers can, of course, refrain from doing the FTA (avoiding any FTA would ultimately honour face, but this by itself would severely inhibit the process of interaction). But in case they decide to go ahead and carry out the FTA, they have two options: (a) to do so off-record, i.e., to provide indirect hints for the hearer by using linguistic strategies such as metaphor and irony, rhetorical questions, understatement, tautologies and other kinds of indirect hints as to what a speaker wants or means to communicate or (b) to do so on record. When speakers opt to go on record, they have two choices: (1) doing the act "without redressive action, baldly", i.e., doing it in the most direct, clear and unambiguous way possible (for instance, an order would accordingly be carried out by means of a blunt imperative) or (2) doing the act with redressive action, through positive politeness strategies (e.g., using in-group identity markers, avoiding disagreement, exaggerating interest, joking, giving reasons, etc.) and negative politeness strategies (e.g., apologizing, being indirect, not coercing, impersonalizing, hedging, etc.).

When an act of verbal or non-verbal communication "run[s] contrary to the face wants of the addressee and/or the speaker" (Brown & Levinson 1978, p. 70), this is called a "face-threatening act" (FTA). An example of a speech act that threatens the hearer's (H's) negative face would be a request, because this means that the speaker (S) is impeding on H by asking H not to do what H wants, but rather to do what S wants. On the other hand, a speech act that threatens H's positive face would be "a contradiction or expression of disagreement, which means the speaker thinks there is something wrong with an opinion held by the hearer". As mentioned above, S's negative or positive face may also be threatened. This could happen in the case of an offer, which would threaten S's negative face because if she carries out the offer, she would be meeting H's wants and not necessarily her own wants. S's positive face would be threatened in the case of confessions, admissions of guilt, and apologies, where the speaker is admitting that she has done something that is not expected (or not done something that is expected) of her (Fasold, 1990).

5. The Application of Politeness Strategies and Face to Yusuf Chapter

Example (1)

(وَرَوَدَتْهُ الَّتِي هُوَ فِي بَيْتِهَا عَنْ نَفْسِهِ وَغَلَّقَتِ الْأَبْوَابَ وَقَالَتْ هَيْتَ لَكَ قَالَ مَعَاذَ اللَّهِ إِنَّهُ رَبِّي أَحْسَنَ مَثْوَايَ إِنَّهُ لَا يُفْلِحُ الظَّالِمُونَ)

And she [Zulaikha], in whose house he was, sought to seduce him. She closed the doors and said, "Come, you." He said, "[I seek] the refuge of Allah. Indeed, he is my master, who has made good my residence. Indeed, wrongdoers will not succeed.

The speech act that threatens the hearer's negative face would be a request or command because this means that the speaker is impeding on the hearer by asking him not to do what the hearer wants, but rather to do what the speaker wants (Fasold, 1990). The bald on record strategy is applied. When Zulaikha says: "come here", she uses an indirect form of the imperative that is the nominal verb of command. The directive function of the verb is understood by the nominal verb of command such as "come". She threatens Yusuf's face since she was impeding on Him, asking Him to do what she wants. The strategy of doing an act baldly, without regressive action involves doing it in the most direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way possible (Brown & Levinson 1978). Zulaikha does the FTA when she says: "come here, You". She acts in a direct, clear, and unambiguous way. Acts (complaints, criticisms, accusations, mention of taboo topics, interruption) that threaten an addressee's positive face include those acts in which a speaker demonstrates that he/she does not approve of or support the addressee's positive face or self-image. Zulaikha threatens Yusuf's positive face when she says: "come here, You".

On the other hand, a speech act that threatens the hearer's positive face would be "a contradiction or expression of disagreement, which means the speaker thinks there is something wrong with an opinion held by the hearer" (Fasold, 1990). The directive act threatens Yusuf's positive face since Zulaikha makes an assumption about his capacities and social condition. However, she thinks that He does not want to sleep with her and commit a sin. Yusuf threatens her negative face by refusing to have sex with her.

The phrase (هَيْتَ لَكَ) means ‘come here’. It emphasizes that the invitation was intended for the person across the room. The

conversation between Zulaikha and Yusuf indicates that the house was quiet or only both of them were in the house. Zulaikha aims at seducing Yusuf PBUH by closing all the doors and uttering those stimulating words because she has fallen for the handsome Yusuf PBUH. Moreover, the verse (وَرَوَدَتْهُ أَثَىٰ هُوَ) talks about Zulaikha who fell in his love Yusuf and tried to seduce him. It explains that the word *râwada* originated from the word *râda*, which means the ability to ask for something in a delicate or polite manner with the hope of obtaining it. The word *râwadathu* means ‘seduce to make the other succumb’. The use of “seduce” carries a hidden meaning of sexual intercourse. In this case, the seducer (Zulaikha) was an adult woman, while the seduced was an adult man (Yusuf), who just reached maturity. This shows the existence of the element of cajoling or seduction in her efforts. This element is further strengthened by the word ‘*an nafsîhi*’, which means to make Yusuf PBUH succumb.

In addition, Al-Aziz's wife, the lady who attempts to seduce Yusuf into sleeping with her, has no name in the story though her name, Zulaikha, is well-known to many of the Quran interpreters. This type of information that has not been released to the readers is likely intended to convey two messages: First, it intends to teach significant moral lessons about the incident itself; second, it intends to tell that there is no reason to publicize the issue or the name of the sinner. Upon reading a verse like this, a reader may communicatively receive the message by implicating that the sinner's name is not mentioned so as to communicate a message of morality.

The above verse explains that the word "râwada" originated from the word *râda*, which means the ability to ask for something in a direct manner with the hope of obtaining it. The word "râwadathu" means 'seduce to make the other succumb'. In this case, the seducer is an adult woman, Zulaikha, while the seduced is an adult man who just reached maturity, namely Yusuf PBUH. This shows the existence of the element of cajoling or seduction in her efforts. This element is further strengthened by the word "an nafsîhî", which means to make Yusuf PBUH succumb.

This verse does not show that Prophet Yusuf PBUH had bad intentions towards women (Zulaikha), *hamma biha* means a turbulent state of mind that has yet to be transformed into reality. This shows that Yusuf's PBUH feeling towards Zulaikha was in a tumultuous state but he managed to control himself by envisioning the power of Allah based on the education he received when small and the protection afforded by Almighty Allah right until he is safe

The efforts to make Yusuf PBUH succumb are evident in the words ‘wa ghallaqat al-abwâb’ and ‘wa qâlat haita laka’, which shows that the efforts were not just verbal pleadings but also included actions such as closing shut the door and ensuring it was locked. Use of the word ‘ghallaqat’, which results from the word ghalaqa (close), shows a repeated activity, whereas the word abwâb in plural form means doors. This shows that Zulaikha had repeatedly closed the doors, first by securely closing all the doors and again ensuring all the doors were properly closed. Besides that, the conversation between Zulaikha and Yusuf PBUH got clearer after Zulaikha said ‘haita laka’. The word haita means ‘come here’ while the word ‘laka’ emphasises that the invitation was intended for the person across the room. The conversation that took place between the two indicated that the house was quiet or only both of them were in the house. These were the efforts of Zulaikha aimed at seducing Yusuf PBUH, which was by closing all the doors and

uttering those stimulating words because she had fallen for the handsome Yusuf PBUH.

Example (2)

(وَأَسْتَبَقَا الْبَابَ وَقَدَّتْ قَمِيصَهُ مِنْ دُبُرٍ وَأَلْفَيَا سَيِّدَهَا لَدَى الْبَابِ قَالَتْ مَا جَزَاءُ مَنْ أَرَادَ بِأَهْلِكَ سُوءًا إِلَّا أَنْ يُسْجَنَ أَوْ عَذَابٌ أَلِيمٌ)

She said: what is the recompense (punishment) for him who intended an evil design against your wife, except that he be put in prison or a painful for men?

Yusuf PBUH does not want to do that bad act of sexual intercourse with her. While He tries to escape from her, they find Al-Aziz at the door. The negative politeness is applied where she after forcing Yusuf to make sex with her, she denies by saying that it is Yusuf who forces her to have sex with Him. She does not tell her husband the truth.

It is also a threat. Zulaikha threatens Yusuf that He will certainly be cast into prison, and will be one of those who are disgraced if He refuses to obey her order. When she asks her husband **مَا جَزَاءُ مَنْ** "أَرَادَ بِأَهْلِكَ سُوءًا", she uses the negative face to free herself of action imposition by.... Furthermore, the word "سوءًا" is used for anything that gets a person down and for In this everything hideous. It is not used in such a sense; it actually connotes the meaning of adultery.

Zulaikha had lied to her husband and defamed Yusuf PBUH, which caused him to be imprisoned. Yusuf PBUH heard the false report and accusations made by Zulaikha to her husband but could not do anything except give the actual account of what occurred. However, when Zulaikha's husband saw that Yusuf's PBUH shirt was torn from behind, he knew that his wife had lied to him, and Almighty Allah had protected Yusuf PBUH from those evil deeds and deception.

Example (3)

(وَقَالَ نِسْوَةٌ فِي الْمَدِينَةِ امْرَأَتُ الْعَزِيزِ تُرَاوِدُ فَتَاهَا عَنْ نَفْسِهِ قَدْ شَغَفَهَا حُبًّا إِنَّا لَنَرَاهَا فِي ضَلَالٍ مُبِينٍ)

The wife of Al-Aziz is seeking to seduce her (slave) young man, indeed she loves him violently, verily, and we see her in plain error.

The news of the incident between Yusuf and Zulaikha is spread in the city. Here the negative politeness is applied where rumours are spread by the wives of dignitaries about Zulaikha who seduced Yusuf. These women talk negative impressions and accusations towards Zulaikha who is of a high rank and who seeks to seduce a slave; she is a wrong doer woman. The exclamation 'shaghafahâ hubban' refers to a form of love that is specific, which is an intense burning love. This is the epitome of a person's loving feeling so much so that one is totally inclined to control the person so loved. This means that Zulaikha's love was so intense and over-bearing towards Yusuf PBUH so much so that she acted aggressively to do something that was prohibited by religion.

Zulaikha's action towards Yusuf PBUH becomes known to the town and the women in the palace in Egypt. After the news of the scandal spread, it becomes the talk of women in Egypt, especially among the rich and elite women as well as fellow dignitaries in Egypt. Zulaikha is defamed and ridiculed with mockery, which eventually degrade her because she seduces and fall in love with her step-son whom she brought up since he was a child; like a slave.

This shows how the elite society was portrayed during ancient Egypt, in which the wives of dignitaries often met and entertained themselves while in conversation about wealth, clothing, luxury, cosmetics, decoration etc. Hence, rumours about wives of dignitaries seducing young men had become a talking point among these women and raised issues about spite, negative impressions and accusations towards Zulaikha. The hypocrisy and insincerity raised by the dignitary's' wives were like as if they had done no wrong. Thus, the attitude of elite women in Egypt those days shows moral decay as they were inclined to be pessimistic, accuse falsely and easily become conceited.

Example (4)

Zulaikha was a clever woman as she did not distant herself or despises the women who criticised or disdained her good name, but rather she invited them to her beautiful palace to look at Yusuf PBUH. All the women were so enthralled and awed that they did not even realize that they had cut their fingers because they were so focused and in a trance-like state when they look at Yusuf PBUH and see his charm.

(فَلَمَّا سَمِعَتْ بِمَكْرِهِنَّ أَرْسَلَتْ إِلَيْهِنَّ وَأَعْتَدَتْ لَهُنَّ مُتَكَنًا وَءَاتَتْ كُلَّ وَاحِدَةٍ مِّنْهُنَّ سِكِّينًا وَقَالَتْ أَخْرِجْ عَلَيْهِنَّ فَلَمَّا رَأَيْنَهُ أَكْبَرْنَهُ وَقَطَّعْنَ أَيْدِيَهُنَّ وَقُلْنَ حَاشَ لِلَّهِ مَا هَذَا بَشَرًا إِنْ هَذَا إِلَّا مَلَكٌ كَرِيمٌ - قَالَتْ فَذَلِكُنَّ الَّذِي لُمْتُنَّنِي فِيهِ وَلَقَدْ رَاودْنَاهُ عَنْ نَفْسِهِ فاستعصم وَلَمْ يَفْعَلْ مَا ءَامُرُهُ لِيُسْجَنَ وَلِيَكُونَا مِنَ الصَّغِيرِينَ)

This is He, on whose account you blamed me. I attempted to seduce him, but he was unyielding. If he declines to obey my orders, he shall be thrown into prison.

The verb "أَرْسَلَتْ إِلَيْهِنَّ" here is not used in the sense of "sent", but rather it is used to mean "invite". Zulaikha invites the women of the city to a banquet to end their gossip. The strategy of bald on bald, without regressive action, involves doing the act in a direct way. Also, when Zulaikha says "أَخْرِجْ عَلَيْهِنَّ", does the FTA When, threatening Yusuf's.

When the women of the city see Yusuf, they unconsciously cut their fingers, saying, "حاش لله", which is regarded positive politeness. They were charmed by his good looking that He was not an ordinary man but a noble angel. The actions of women to seduce and usurp Yusuf PBUH proves that they were easily seduced by the good-looks of someone, easily lead astray when confronted with earthly pleasures and this signals the corrupted moral values of the Egyptian society at that time. This plot also shows the beauty of the language and the contents of the story regarding Yusuf PBUH. In addition, what they say assures their awareness that "Yusuf" is innocent of the accusations held against him by Zulaikha. "حاش لله" is defined as "God forbid" where God forbids it that Yusuf is to carry out such a sin.

The utterance "If he declines to obey my orders, he shall be thrown into prison" is a conditional threat that implicates a promise. She threatens to imprison Yusuf PBUH if he rejected her overtures. Besides, it is a promise where He will not be punished if He does what she wants. By saying that, Zulaikha assures the women of the city that she will be the one to punish Yusuf if he refuses to obey her. It should be the Aziz who carries out the punishment, but the subject of the verb "أمر" refers to his wife. This indicates that the case is not of the Aziz being the one to give orders, and this reveals facts about the social lives of people in the days of Yusuf. In the aristocracy households, the wife has great control over her husband and is able to influence him and make him do what she wants. The

verse carries within it the relation of power between two characters in the story, the wife and the Aziz (the husband).

Example (5)

(الآن حَصَّنَ الْحَقُّ)

And the king said: Bring him to me. And when the messenger came to him [Yusuf in prison], he said: Go back to your master and ask him how it is with the women who cut their hands. My master [or, my Lord] knows about their cunning. (51) He [the king] said to them [the women]: What happened to you when you sought to seduce Yusuf? They said: God forbid, we know of no evil against him. The Aziz's wife said: Now the truth has come to light. I sought to seduce him, and he is one of those who tell the truth.

Examples of FTAs to the speaker's positive face include confessions. Zulaikha herself confesses that she seduces Yusuf. The speaker's positive face would be threatened in the case of confessions and admissions of guilt, where he/she admits that he/she has done something that is not expected (Fasold, 1990). Roughly speaking, every single utterance is *co-extensive* with the realization of a speech act, and every realization of a speech act is *co-extensive* with a single utterance. As a whole, an utterance is a piece of evidence about the speaker's meaning, and comprehension is achieved by inferring this meaning from evidence provided not only by the utterance but also by the context (Sperber & Wilson, 2002). Moreover, utterances involve a complex variety of meanings, but all of them can be individually interpreted as the concrete realization of a single speech act, with its peculiar illocutionary force. By admitting that she seduces Yusuf, Zulaikha threatens her positive face.

After that incident, Zulaikha admits that she pleads and seduces Yusuf PBUH. She herself presumes that Yusuf's PBUH attractiveness is acceptable because other Egyptian women also have similar feeling and intentions. She benefits by this situation by allowing herself to condescend to Yusuf PBUH when she fell; in love and seduced him, so that she would not be blamed.

As a speaker, the declaration threatens Zulaikha's positive face since she admits that she herself seduces Yusuf. It also *intrinsically* threatens her negative face. She imposes herself to say that Yusuf is innocent. As a hearer, the declaration *intrinsically* threatens Yusuf's negative face. He is part of the institutional framework where the declaration is performed, and he must accept it.

6. Conclusion

This study is conducted to encompass the validity of politeness theory (Brown and Levinson 1987) by investigating the linguistic aspects of politeness in a new type of communication. It aims at investigating various aspects of politeness in the Holy Quran from a socio-pragmatic perspective. The study has examined some verses taken from Yusuf Chapter, consecrating on reported speeches of women. It has been observed that these verses communicate a great deal of theological and moral messages. Politeness strategies were found to be expressed through different channels of communication. The main approach that is used for communicating such messages is storytelling. It aims at conveying some information about the prophet Yusuf PBUH and bygone generations on the one hand, and directing people toward the good; criticizing and amending unsatisfactory behavior on the other. Based on the data analysis, it is noticed that there are three kinds of politeness strategy applied in the Holy Quran in Yusuf Chapter.

They are bald on record, positive politeness, and negative politeness.

References

1. Bharuthram, S. (2003). Politeness Phenomena in the Hindu Sector of the South African Indian English Speaking Community. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35, 1523-1544.
2. Brown, Penelope & Stephen Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Buck, R. A. (1997). Towards an extended theory of face action: Analyzing dialogue in E. M. Forster's A Passage to India. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 27, 83-106.
4. Culpeper, J. (1998). (Im)Politeness in Dramatic Dialogue. In J. Culpeper, M. Short & P. Verdonk (Eds.), *Exploring the Language of Drama: From Text to Context* (pp. 83-95). London and New York: Routledge.
5. Ermida, I. (2006). Linguistic Mechanism of Power in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: Applying Politeness Theory to Orwell's World. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38, 842-862.
6. Fasold, R. (1990). *The Sociolinguistics of Language*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.
7. Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction Ritual: Essays on face-face Behavior*. New York: Anchor Books.
8. Hei, K. C. (2008). Strategies of Politeness Used by Grandparents in Intergenerational
9. Talks In M. K. David & K. K. Cheng (Eds.), *Politeness in Malaysian Family Talk* (120- 168). Serdang: Penerbit Universiti Putra Malaysia.
10. O'Driscoll, J. (1996). About Face: A Defense and Elaboration on Universal Dualism. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25(1), 1-32.
11. Pillai, S. (2008). Politeness and Power in Family Discourse. In M. K. David & K. K. Cheng (Eds.), *Politeness in Malaysian Family Talk* (pp. 1-18). Serdang: Penerbit Universiti Putra Malaysia.
12. Rudanko, J. (2006). Aggravated Impoliteness and Two Types of Speaker Intention in an Episode in Shakespeare's *Timon of Athens*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38, 829-841.
13. Spencer-Oatey, H. (2005). (Im)Politeness, Face and Perception of Rapport: Unpackaging Their Bases and Interrelationships. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 1(1), 95-120.
14. Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. (2002). Pragmatics, Modularity and Mindreading. *Mind and Language* 17: 3-23.
15. Suleiman, R. R. (2004). *Face Considerations in Malay: An Examination of Offers and Requests in Malay Plays*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Malaya, Malaysia.
16. Watts, R., Ide, S. & Ehlich, K. (Eds.) (2005). *Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory and Practice* (2 ed.). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.