



## A Linguistic Study of Facial Expressions in Selected Quranic Verses

Itimad Munam Neama (MA candidate)

Dep. of English, College of Education for Humanities, Wasit University

[itimadmunem56@gmail.com](mailto:itimadmunem56@gmail.com)

Asst. Prof. Hashim Aliwy Mohammed Al-Husseini (Ph.D.)

College of Education for Humanities, Wasit University

[alhili.usm@gmail.com](mailto:alhili.usm@gmail.com)

### ABSTRACT

The current study investigates the linguistic features of facial expressions in the Holy Quran. The language of the Holy Quran is considered as a symbolic language that refers to meaning beyond itself. The symbolism of this form of language is increased by the use of some expressions that represent paralinguistic elements including the phenomenon of facial expressions which have different meanings and interpretations that need to be explored. It is believed that facial expressions have various linguistic explicit and implicit meanings. Thus, this study attempts to identify two levels of meaning, i.e., pragmatic and semiotic, to explain the meaning of these forms of facial expressions and clarify their implied meaning. It also aims to identify the types of speech acts, implicature, and forms of politeness in addition to the semiotic meaning that is implemented in these forms of facial expressions. These facial expressions are analysed from the pragmatic and semiotic points of view by employing a qualitative linguistic investigation. The analysis is carried out through an eclectic model which includes Barthes' (1968) theory of semiotics, Searle's (1969) classification of speech acts, Grice's (1975) theory of implicature, and Leech's (1983) politeness theory. Four representative Quranic texts are chosen to analyse these types of facial expressions. The findings of the pragmatic analysis show that facial expressions in the Quranic texts encompass different types of speech acts, many implicatures, and various forms of politeness. The semiotic analysis, on the other hand, shows that these forms of facial expressions have denotative and connotative levels of meaning.

**Keywords:** facial expressions, paralinguistics, linguistics, pragmatics, semiotics

## المستخلص

تسعى الدراسة الحالية الى البحث عن الخصائص اللغوية الموجودة في تعابير الوجه المذكورة في القرآن الكريم. تعتبر لغة القرآن الكريم لغة رمزية تشير إلى معنى يتجاوز حدود المعنى الظاهري. تزداد رمزية هذا الشكل من اللغة من خلال استخدام بعض التعبيرات من العناصر غير اللغوية بما في ذلك تعبيرات الوجه التي لها معاني وتفسيرات مختلفة والتي تحتاج الى الدراسة والبحث . من المعروف أن تعبيرات الوجه لها معاني لغوية ظاهرية وباطنية. وبالتالي ، تحاول هذه الدراسة الى دراسة هذين المستويين من المعنى وهما المعنى التداولي والسميائي لشرح معنى هذه الأشكال من تعبيرات الوجه وتوضيح معانيها الضمنية. وتهدف الدراسة ايضا إلى التعرف على أنواع أفعال الكلام وأنواع التلميحات الموجودة في هذه التعبيرات وأشكال التأدب بالإضافة إلى المعنى السيميائي الموجود في هذه الأشكال من تعابير الوجه. لإتمام إجراء التحليل اللغوي لعينات هذه الدراسة، فقد تم انتقاء نموذج انتقائي من خلال توظيف نموذج البحث اللغوي النوعي والذي يتضمن نظرية بارت (1968) للسيميائية ، وتصنيف سيرل (1969) لأفعال الكلام ، ونظرية جرابس (1975) للتضمنين ، ونظرية ليتش (1983) للتأدب. تم اختيار اربعة نصوص قرآنية ممثلة لعينة الدراسة لتحليل هذه الأنواع من تعابير الوجه. اظهرت نتائج التحليل التداولي أن تعبيرات الوجه في النصوص القرآنية تحوت على أنواعا مختلفة من الأفعال الكلامية ، والعديد من المعاني الضمنية ، وأشكال مختلفة من التأدب. ومن ناحية أخرى ، فقد اظهر التحليل السيميائي أن هذه الأشكال من تعبيرات الوجه لها مستويات دلالية ظاهرية ودلالة تضمينية.

## 1. Introduction

The religious language is said to have a sort of ambiguity that makes it a bit difficult to be understood by the majority of ordinary readers. This issue comes from the belief that this form of language comes from a divine source and is generally described as an infinite, timeless, and incorporeal (Robert, 2002). The religious language is said to be prior to the language of everyday life that is simply because the language of religion is associated with divine teaches and instructions (Alston, 1996). This form of language is said to be full of expressions that are related to facial expressions and which make its structure somehow difficult to be interpreted appropriately by

ordinary readers that lack of knowledge of such form of language (Alston, 1989).

The language of the Holy Quran is considered as a symbolic language that refers to meaning beyond itself (Brian, 2004). What increase the symbolism of the language of the Holy Quran is that this language composes many expressions that are related to paralinguistic features and particularly to facial expressions and which have different levels of meaning and different interpretations.

This study investigates the linguistic meaning of the expressions of facial expressions that are found in the Holy Quran from the pragmatic and semiotic aspects. It aims at identifying the different forms of pragmatic aspects that are implemented in the expressions of facial expressions including speech acts, implicature, and politeness. It, additionally, attempts to investigate the semiotic meaning of such form of language. Facial expressions are stated directly or indirectly in the Holy Quran as seen in the following verse:

{ { { 8 } } } (الغاشية:8).

{ { (8) (Other) faces that Day will be joyful } } (Ali, trans., 2004, p.1640).

## 2. Literature Review

Language is a means by which it is possible to infer the existence and behaviour of beings. It is the means of contact between the people of specific societies or between societies by which the norms, traditions, opinions, ideas, and codes of life are transmitted. Language reflects the culture, faith and social norms of a society or even of a register in question (Herman, 2008).

The Holy Quran is the central religious text of Islam (Jones, 1994). The language of Holy Quran is a register that reflects the difference in language from the ordinary language and other configurations used in the setting of religion. The language of the Holy Quran varies entirely from the language of daily life. It is the vocabulary that changes or even suspends

those elements of everyday language. The language of the Holy Quran is taken into consideration prior to everyday language (Toropove, 2002).

### 2.1. Facial Expressions in the Holy Quran

Facial expressions are one of the main forms of nonverbal behaviour in which communication can occur. That is to say, humans may use their facial expressions as non-compulsory practice that is used to communicate feelings. Although speech is linked to emotion, the communicator typically shows it indirectly (Walters, 2009). A facial expression derives from one or more facial muscle movements or positions. These gestures express the individual's state of emotion to observers. A type of non-verbal communication is facial expressions. This indicates that one of the characteristics of facial expressions arises from the action of the muscles in the face (Traunmuller, 2005; Walters, 2009). For instance, in the Holy Quran, we may find several verses that refer to the faces of men in the afterlife, whether they are the faces of believers or disbelievers.

In the Holy Quran, it is said that there are different forms of facial expressions. The following text proves the existence of facial expressions:

{ { وَجُوهٌ يَوْمَئِذٍ نَّاصِرَةٌ (22) } } (القيامة:22).

{ { (22) Some faces, that Day, will beam (in brightness And beauty) } } (Ali, trans., 2004, p.1567).

### 3. Methodology

To understand a particular linguistic or a social concept, it has to be investigated according to the contexts in which it is appears, and all the other aspects to which this linguistic concept might be related (Nakhilawi, 2016). Eye language, for instance, cannot be studied in isolation from the social context since it represents an important type of communication which is the non-verbal one (Traunmuller, 2005).

The current study conducts a qualitative research analysis and as Shank (2002) states that a qualitative research can be defined as “a form of

systematic empirical inquiry into meaning” (p. 5). In this definition, the word *systematic* means organised and follows certain rules that are accepted by the community of qualitative researchers. The word *empirical*, on the other hand, means that this form of research approach is proved by certain knowledge and experience, in a way, that the researchers can make sense of their own experience. Denzin and Lincoln (2011) claim that “qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or to interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them” (p. 3). In addition to qualitative research analysis, the present study combines between the pragmatic theories that include Searle’s (1969) classification of speech acts, Grice’s (1975) theory of implicature, Leech’s (1983) theory of politeness, and one of the main theories of semiotics represented by Barthes’ (1968) theory of semiotics. This qualitative research aims at identifying the expressions of eye language that are found in the Holy Quran and analysing them pragmatically and semiotically. The purpose of such analysis is to find out the types of speech acts that are included in the use of such form of language in the Quranic verses, the types of implicatures, types of politeness, and the different interpretations of signs that are found in these verses.

The adopted model is clarified as follow:

### 3.1 Pragmatic Features

Leech (1983) states that pragmatics is the study of the expression of contextual meanings. Yule (1996) claims that pragmatics deals with the interpretation of meaning as expressed by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader) (Yule, 1996).

Richards (2006) shows that the relationship between language and meaning is particularly concerned with pragmatics. It involves how language comprehension is dependent on the expertise of the speaker. How speakers use and interpret utterances, and how the interactions between speakers and listeners affect the form of sentences.

### 3.1.1 Speech Acts

Speech act refers to a theory that analyses the role of expressions in the interpersonal communication behaviour of speakers and listeners (Crystal, 2003). The historical tracers of this theory claim that Wittgenstein, the German philosopher, first generated it, but Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) later gave it some linguistic tint. Austin (1962) starts his widely cited work by distinguishing between statements which he prefers to call constatives and another type of utterances which he calls performatives.

Since the classifying scheme of speech acts in Austin (1962) is not perfect, there have been several attempts to improve his classification. One of those attempts is the taxonomy of Searle (1969) which is considered the most influential research method.

Searle (1969) has reclassified more systematically speech acts into two types: direct and indirect. A direct speech act, as Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, & Svartvik, (1985) define it, is one where the structure corresponds to the function, that is, a sentence, an interrogative, an imperative, and an exclamative topic, a statement, a question, an order, and an exclamation, syntactically speaking, respectively. "On the other hand, indirect speech acts are obtained, as Searle (1975) elaborates them, if "a sentence containing the illocutionary indications for one type of illocutionary act may be uttered to perform another type of illocutionary act also. As such, two-illocutionary force utterances are indirect speech acts; one is literal (direct), the other non-literal (indirect).

Searle's requirements for building his classification of speech acts are illocutionary point, the direct-fit between words and the environment, psychological condition articulated and propositional substance (Haug, 2006). Searle (1979) classifies the following speech acts:

1. Representatives are actions that are judged in the course of truth. Examples are to assume, to deduce... etc.

2. Directives are actions that the speaker executes to make something happen to the audience. Command, order, pray, allow, advise, etc. are the verbs belonging to this form of speech act.
3. Commissives are actions in which the speaker is committed to doing something in the future. This class contains pledges, threats, proposals, rejections... etc. ( Haung, 2006).
4. Expressives are actions that express the speaker's psychological condition. Thanking, condoling, congratulating... etc. are paradigmatic situations (Searle, 1979).
5. Declaratives are actions through which the speaker communicates between fact and speech (Searle, 1979). Nominating a candidate, firing from jobs and declaring war, for instance, are among the cases that belong to this category of speech acts ( Haung, 2006).

### 3.1.2 Implicature

As the founder of the implicature, Grice (1975) States that what a speaker requires can be divided into what the speaker "says" and what the speaker "implies" by a phrase. This creates what is called conversational implicature by Grice (1975). To suggest something, according to him, is to imply something that may go beyond what one says. Implicature is defined as what can be inferred, suggested or intended by the speaker as distinct from what the speaker speaks (Levinson, 1983). In other words, some explicit interpretation of how it is possible to mean more than what is said is generated by implication. The speaker of an utterance can explicitly or implicitly convey the intended message.

Charles (2002) claims that an implicature is a bridge built by the listener (or reader) to link one utterance to some previous utterance, and this relation is always unconsciously created by the listener or reader. Grice (1975) discusses two main categories of implicature:

**1. Conventional implicature:** It emerges from the standard meaning of words and the discourse in which they take place in. The example of "She was poor but she was honest," is given by Grice, which suggests some distinction between poverty and honesty. He believes that the word "but" has the same truth-conditional content as the word "and" with an additional conventional implication that the conjuncts are somewhat contrasting.

**2. Conversational implicature:** It occurs by consequence of general concepts regulating the actions of expression. Grice (1975) introduces the conversational implication phenomenon and sets out the rules that make it possible for speakers to consistently mean more than they say. Conversational implicature, according to Griffiths (2006), is inferences that rely on the presence of language use requirements, such as universal consensus that communicators should seek to say the truth. Grice (1975) classifies conversational implicature into three types; generalised, scalar, and particularised:

**a. Generalised implicatures:** When no specific information is required to quantify the additional expressed meaning in the context. In other words, for making necessary inferences, it occurs without any specific context. As an instance of generalised conversational meaning, one day I was sitting in a garden. The garden is not the speaker's one in this case, because if it's his garden, he's going to tell (I was sitting in my garden ) (Haung, 2006).

**b. Scalar implicatures:** By selecting a word that expresses one value from a continuum of values, such content is still transmitted. As seen in the scales, where terms are described from the highest to the lowest value, this is especially evident in terms of expressing quantity, e.g., <All, most, many, some, few> (Zainurrahman, 2010).

**c. Particularised implicature:** In very specific contexts in which inferences are needed, most conversations take place. In order to recognise the conveyed meanings, certain inferences are needed. This particularised conversational implication occurs, according to Yule (1996), when the speaker says something and the listener answers indirectly. The speaker must therefore be

able to draw inferences from the argument of the hearer based on the particular context, for instance:

Rick: Hey, coming to the wild party tonight?

Tom: My parents are visiting.

Here, he's not going to come to the party, according to Tom's response, because he's going to stay with his parents.

### 3.1.3 The Co-Operative Principle

It appears in most of conversational conversations that, in fact, the participants cooperate with each other. This idea was first set out by Grice, along with four maxims that we expect to be obeyed (1975). The fact that the cooperative theory is in place is common knowledge, thus helps speakers to engage and interpreters to recognise consequences (Simons, 2009). In the following manner, the cooperative theory is stated: "Make your Conversational contribution, as necessary, by the established intent or direction of the discussion exchange in which you are engaged, at the stage at which it occurs.(Birner, 2013, p. 41)". The four maxims endorse this principle:

1. Quantity: Make your contribution as comprehensive as possible, but no more or less than necessary.
2. Quality: Do not claim what you think is wrong or for which you do not have proof.
3. Relation: Be pertinent.
4. Manner: Be concise, quick and orderly (Yule, 1997).

### 3.1.4 Politeness

Politeness is 'a set of constraints', i.e., normative and perspective rules on how to interact with others, and its creditable goals are the establishment of mutual comfort and the promotion of rapport. Even stating

these goals implies that there are others with other goals (Watts, 2003). Suzila and Yusri (2012) indicate that politeness is essential for communication because it considers the face needs of others. They also believe that "social distance, the formality of topic, and power difference may be affecting adherence to politeness expectations as it may mould behaviours in several ways" (p. 128).

The Politeness theory consists of maxims, in which Leech (1983) explains how in conversational interactions politeness operates. Jiang (2010) clarifies the significance of the role of politeness for linguistic communication and, in particular, the principle of politeness and the principle of cooperation; suggested by H.P Grice as the two fundamental principles through which communication should be centred.

The Politeness theory proposed that, along with its less essential equivalent, minimise the expression of impolite beliefs to enhance the representation of polite beliefs (Leech, 1983). As a consequence, negative politeness has reduced the impoliteness of impolite illocutions (avoidance of discord), according to Leech (1983), whereas positive politeness resides in optimising the politeness of polite illocutions (seeking concord). The politeness theory is divided into six maxims, all of which are composed of two sub-maxims.

Leech (2014) states six maxims, summed up as follows in the imperative mood:

1. Tact Maxim: (a) Minimise others' costs and maximise others' benefits.  
(b) Maximise other's cost and minimise other's benefit
2. Generosity Maxim: (a) Minimise self-benefit and maximise self-cost.  
(b) Maximise self-benefit and minimise self-cost
3. Approbation maxim: (a) Minimise the dispraise of others and maximise the praise of others.

(b) Maximise the dispraise of others and minimise the praise of others (Ran, 2006).

4. Modesty maxim: (a) Minimise self-praising and maximise self-dispraise.

(b) Maximise self-praising and minimise self-dispraise.

5. Agreement Maxim: (a) Minimise disagreement between oneself and others and maximise agreement between oneself and others.

(b) Maximise disagreement between oneself and others and minimise agreement between oneself and others (Leech, 1983).

6. Sympathy Maxim: (a) Minimise antipathy between oneself and others and maximise sympathy between others and oneself.

(b) Maximise antipathy between oneself and others and minimise sympathy between oneself and others (Almusallam, 2018).

To assess the quantity and sort of politeness, Leech (1983) considers several pragmatic scales to the maxims. First, the cost-benefit scale tests the cost to the speaker or addressee or the benefit. The higher the hearer's expense, the less polite the act of illocution is, and vice versa. Second, the scale of alternatives, which assesses the degree of choice with which the speaker permits the suggested action to be taken by the listener. Third, the scale of indirectness tests the amount of work performed in understanding the suggested act by the listener. According to Leech (1983), since they increase the degree of optionality and minimise the impositive force of the illocution, indirect illocutions tend to be more polite than direct ones. Fourth, the scale of authority is used to calculate the degree to which the speaker is entitled to enforce on the hearer. Finally, the scale of social distance measures the degree to which the speaker and the hearer are familiar.

### 3.2 Semiotic Features

According to Prior (2014), semiotics is a general field that is mainly concerned with the investigation of different types of signs expressed utilising different forms of media. Eco (1976) argues that semiotics is all

about signs. It deals with symbols, gestures, pictures, sounds, words, and anything that can be considered as a sign. Those types of signs can be understood as referring to or symbolising something. Eco (1976) says that it is difficult to consider something as a sign if it cannot be understood as a sign an if it does not symbolise anything.

According to Tsotra, Janson, and Kecmanovic (2004), comprehending a sign happens only through relating the sign to a common systems of conventions so that it comes to be a distinctive part of these conventions and have no use or function outside such systems. Copley and Jansz (2000) state that the function of signs is to create some kind of code between the perceivers and their prior knowledge and experience. That simply means, people act as meaning-makers by utilising different forms of signs to comprehend, perceive, and communicate knowledge and information. Copley and Jansz (2000) believe that perceiving and comprehending a sign require some knowledge that is based on norms and conventions that are socially accepted.

### 3.2.1 Barthes' Theory of Semiotics

Roland Barthes (1915-1980) is a French philosopher, literary theorist, and semiotician. He has made a significant contribution to the field of linguistics in general, and in the semiotics in particular. Barthes' (1968) theory of semiotic is one of the main theories that are used in analysing and understanding the systems of signs. This theory is proved to be practical and convenient in the study of signs, analysing their structure, and expressing their meaning (Barthes, 2005).

Barthes (1968), in his study of semiotics, wants to have some kind of semiology that takes into consideration all cultural objects that have a metaphorical meaning. Barthes (2005) says that, in the study of semeiotics, one can deal with different forms of signs and objects that have meaning even if they do not have any communicative intention such as furniture, clothes, dishes...etc. Barthes (2005) suggests that each object or sign has a connotative meaning that goes beyond its denotation. Barthes (1990) says that no object can be meaningless. For example, the colour of a telephone

suggests different interpretation, pink coloured telephone refers to feminineness or womanhood, while white telephone stands for luxury. Barthes (1968) says that any object is considered as part of a particular discourse on the basis of its connotation including, beverages, food, wine...etc.

According to Barthes (1968), there are two levels of interpretation for each sign these are; denotation which is considered as the primary level and connotation which represents the secondary one.

### 1. Denotation

As Barthes (1968) states, denotation stands for the literal and direct relationship between a sign and the reference. This kind of relationship appears between the signifier and the signified and which expresses the explicit meaning of the sign. The denotative meaning of a sign refers to the common meaning that is known and accepted in society. Sobur (2009) states that “ the denotative meaning involves referential meaning it tends to be described as the definitional, or literal, common sense meaning of a sign” (p.263). Panofsky (1970) believes that the denotative meaning of a sign refers to the explicit and obvious image that is recognised by all the members of any culture or society. “It represents the dictionary meaning of a word or terminology of object” (Panofsky, 1970, p.51).

### 2. Connotation

Barthes (1967) defines connotation as the second level of interpretation which includes signifiers and signified. Connotation stands for the sign that can be deduced from the signifier of any denotative sign. That simply means, for each denotation there is a number of connotative meanings. Barthes (1968) gives the primary concern to the connotative meaning of a sign. Fiske (2010) argues that the connotative meaning of a sign refers to the “cultural meaning which is attached to a term, it refers to the interaction that occurs when then sign meets the emotions and cultural values of the reader” (p.54). Barthes (1968) refuses the idea that regards the sign as

having one level of meaning and says that we have to deeply read and focus on the sign in order to figure out its unlimited number of connotations.

#### 4. Data Analysis

The Analysis of the selected data is presented according to the model stated in the previous section. The researchers analyse four Quranic texts that include different forms of facial expressions and as follows:

##### 4.1. Analysis of Text (1)

{إِذَا بُشِّرَ أَحَدُهُمْ بِمَا ضَرَبَ لِلرَّحْمَنِ مَثَلًا ظَلَّ وَجْهُهُ مُسْوَدًّا وَهُوَ كَظِيمٌ (17) (الزخرف: 17)}

{{(17) When news is brought to one of them of (the birth of) what he sets up as a likeness to (Allah) most gracious. his face darkens, and he is filled with inward grief! }}(Ali, trans., 2004, p.1267).

##### 4.1.1. The Context of Text (1)

Al Tabatabai (1996) states that this verse is about the disbelievers. When one of them is told that his wife has given birth to a daughter which they attributed to Almighty Allah and claimed that the angels are the daughters of Almighty Allah, their faces become darkened and filled of anguish and grief. Those disbelievers deem having a daughter as a shame and dishonour.

The message is communicated in the form of speech from Almighty Allah to the Prophet Mohammed (ﷺ) in which He warns the disbelievers to leave polytheism, worship other than Almighty Allah, and leave any ghastly habit such as pessimism of girls.

##### 4.1.2. The Pragmatic Analysis of Text (1)

From the pragmatic point of view, this text comprises some pragmatic concepts. The linguistic structure of this text includes speech act, implicature, and politeness. The expression (his face darkens) (وَجْهُهُ مُسْوَدًّا) has a kind of expressive speech act. It shows the disbelievers' sadness.

Concerning implicature, the expression (his face darkens) (وَجْهَهُ مُسَوِّدًا) has a form of implicature. It conversationally implies the disbelievers' state. When they are informed that the female is born their faces become black and sad since their hearts are full of anger and hypocrisy. Because of their disbelief they give what is bad to Almighty Allah and they consider having a daughter as a scandal.

Referring to politeness in this verse, the expression (his face darkens) (وَجْهَهُ مُسَوِّدًا) represents a form of negative politeness. The negative politeness in this verse results from the maxim of approbation in which the speaker minimises others' praise and maximises others' dispraise.

#### 4.1.3. The Semiotic Analysis of Text (1)

As far as the semiotic analysis of this text is concerned, the expression (his face darkens) (وَجْهَهُ مُسَوِّدًا) has both denotation and connotation. The denotation of this expression refers to the darkness of the disbelievers' faces. Its connotation, on the other hand, is that it refers to the disbelievers' disbelief, blasphemy, and stubbornness.

Sign	Denotation	Connotation
(his face darkens) (وَجْهَهُ مُسَوِّدًا)	Darkness and blackness of the disbelievers' faces.	The disbelievers' disbelief, blasphemy, and stubbornness.

#### 4.2. Analysis of Text (2)

كَأَنَّمَا أَغَشِيَتْ وَجُوهُهُمْ قِطْعًا مِّنَ اللَّيْلِ مُظْلِمًا أُولَئِكَ أَصْحَابُ النَّارِ هُمْ فِيهَا خَالِدُونَ (يونس: 27))

{{(27)... Their faces will be covered, as it were, with pieces from the depth of the darkness of night: they are companions of the fire: they will abide therein ( for aye) ! }} (Ali, trans., 2004, p.487).

#### 4.2.1. The Context of Text (2)

According to Al Tabrasee (1992), this verse talks about the darkness of faces of the disbelievers on the Day of Judgement. Almighty Allah says that those who earn evil deeds and sins and then disbelieve and disobey Him they will be covered by humiliation as if their faces have been clothed in pieces during the night. These are the people of the fire, they will stay there forever.

In the text above, the message is communicated in the form of speech from Almighty Allah as a speaker to the Prophet Mohammed (ﷺ) as the addressee. This verse describes the disbelievers who have committed sins and neglected the Hereafter on the Day of Resurrection.

#### 4.2.2 The Pragmatic Analysis of Text (2)

From the pragmatic point of view, this text consists of some concepts like speech act, implicature, and politeness. In this text, the expression (Their faces will be covered) (أُعْشِيَتْ وُجُوهُهُمْ) includes a form of representative speech act. In uttering these words Almighty Allah assures disbelievers' sins.

Regarding implicature, the expression (Their faces will be covered) (أُعْشِيَتْ وُجُوهُهُمْ) has a form of conversational implicature. It implies the disbelievers' state on the Day of Judgement. They do sins and their hearts are full of hypocrisy as well as they disbelieve in Almighty Allah. It also implies sorrow and sadness which appear on the faces of the disbelievers that result from their bad deeds.

In terms of politeness, the words (Their faces will be covered) (أُعْشِيَتْ وُجُوهُهُمْ) include a form of negative politeness. This form of politeness results from the tact maxim in which the speaker maximises others' cost and minimises others' benefit.

#### 4.2.3 The Semiotic Analysis of Text (2)

From the semiotic point of view, the words (Their faces will be covered) (أَغْشَيْتَ وُجُوهُهُمْ) include both denotative meaning and connotative one. The denotative meaning of this word is that it refers to the disbelievers' dark faces . Its connotative meaning, on the other hand, is that it signifies how the hypocrites will take their retribution as a result of their evil deeds and there is no escape from Almighty Allah's punishment.

Sign	Denotation	Connotation
(Their faces will be covered) (أَغْشَيْتَ وُجُوهُهُمْ)	The disbelievers' dark faces.	signifies how the hypocrites will take their retribution as a result of their evil deeds and there is no escape from Almighty Allah's punishment.

#### 4.3. Analysis of Text (3)

[ فَلَمَّا رَأَوْهُ زُلْفَةً سَيِّئَتْ وُجُوهُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا وَقِيلَ هَذَا الَّذِي كُنْتُمْ بِهٖ تَدْعُونَ ] (27) (الملك: 27).

{{(27) At length, when they see it close at hand, grieved will be the faces of the unbelievers, and it will be said (To them): “ this is (the promise fulfilled), which ye where calling for!” (Ali, trans., 2004, p.1503).

##### 4.3.1. The Context of Text (3)

Qutb (2013) says that when the polytheists see the penalty very close to them, their faces become unpleasant, ugly and black. They are said by the Hell's Angels this is the day which you are questioning in doubt and answering with certainty, the day you are waiting for has come, so taste your penalty. Those who doubt the prophet's message, when they see the torment and they faced what they promised , all these things are reflected in their faces which become black and upset as a result of their bad fate.

The message is directed from Almighty Allah to the Prophet Mohammed (ﷺ) telling him about the destiny of the disbelievers on the Day of Judgment. Almighty Allah describes what happens to the disbelievers in the afterlife as a result of their bad deeds and disobedience in their lives.

#### 4.3.2. The Pragmatic Analysis of Text (3)

As far as the pragmatic Analysis is concerned, this text comprises speech acts, implicature, and politeness. In this text, the expression (grieved will be the faces of the unbelievers) (سَيِّئَتْ وُجُوهُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا) is considered as a representative speech act. In uttering these words Almighty Allah describes the disbelievers' faces on the Day of Judgement.

In terms of implicature, the expression (grieved will be the faces of the unbelievers) (سَيِّئَتْ وُجُوهُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا) includes a form of conversational implicature. It implies misery, unhappiness, shame, disgrace and humiliate. All these things are indicated in their faces which become sad and dark because their evil deeds.

Concerning politeness, the expression (grieved will be the faces of the unbelievers) (سَيِّئَتْ وُجُوهُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا) is a kind of negative politeness. This kind of politeness results from the appropriation maxim in which the speaker maximises the dispraise of others and minimises the praise of others.

#### 4.3.3. The Semiotic Analysis of Text (3)

From the semiotic point of view, the expression (grieved will be the faces of the unbelievers) (سَيِّئَتْ وُجُوهُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا) has denotative and connotative meanings. The denotative meaning of this expression is that it signifies their dark and black faces. Its connotative meaning, on the other hand, is that it signifies the disbelievers' dishonour, abasement, grief and depression and each one who observes them knows their bad destiny.

Sign	Denotation	Connotation
(grieved will be the faces of the unbelievers) (سَيِّئَتْ وُجُوهُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا)	Grief of disbelievers' faces.	The disbelievers' dishonour, abasement, grief and depression and each one who observes them knows their bad destiny.

#### 4.4. Analysis of Text (4)

{ { تَعْرِفُ فِي وُجُوهِهِمْ نَضْرَةَ النَّعِيمِ (24) } } (المطففين:24).

{ { (24) Thou wilt recognise in their faces the beaming brightness of bliss } }  
(Ali, trans., 2004, p.1618).

##### 4.4.1. The Context of Text (4)

In this verse Almighty Allah describes a joyful and blissful state of living for the devout who are in pleasure and bliss. The expressions of bliss, happiness and delight are appeared on the faces of the believers on the Day of Judgement as a result of their good deeds that cause extreme joy and rejoice. Thus, happiness and brightness can be observed on their faces as a result of their faith.

##### 4.4.2. The Pragmatic Analysis of Text (4)

From the pragmatic point of view, this text comprises some aspects like speech acts, implicature, and politeness. Concerning speech acts, in this text, the expression (their faces the beaming brightness of bliss) (وَجُوهِهِمْ نَضْرَةَ النَّعِيمِ) includes a representative type of speech acts. In saying these words, Almighty Allah asserts the believers' state on the Day of Resurrection .

Concerning implicature, the expression (their faces the beaming brightness of bliss) (وَجُوهِهِمْ نَضْرَةَ النَّعِيمِ) has a form of implicature that is a conversational one. It conversationally implies happiness, rejoice, and deep faith in Almighty Allah.

In terms of politeness, the expression (their faces the beaming brightness of bliss) (وَجُوهِهِمْ نَضْرَةَ النَّعِيمِ) has positive politeness. This form of politeness results from the approbation maxim in which Almighty Allah maximises the believers' praise and minimises their dispraise.

##### 4.4.3. The Semiotic Analysis of Text (4)

From the semiotic point of view, the expression (وَجُوهِهِمْ نَضْرَةَ النَّعِيمِ) (their faces the beaming brightness of bliss) has both a denotative and connotative meanings. The denotative meaning of this expression is that it

refers to the blissful faces of the believers. Its connotative meaning, on the other hand, is that it signifies the believer's belief in the prophet Mohammad's message, their good deeds, rejoice and delight.

Sign	Denotation	Connotation
(their faces the beaming brightness of bliss) (وَجُوهَهُمْ نُضْرَةٌ أَلْوَجِيم)	The blissful faces of the believers.	The believer's belief in the prophet Mohammad's message, their good deeds, rejoice and delight.

### Conclusion

The study investigates facial expressions in the Holy Quran through adopting an eclectic model which includes Barthes' (1968) theory of semiotics, Searle's (1969) theory of speech acts, Grice's (1975) theory of implicature, and Leech's (1983) theory of politeness. After analysing the selected data, the research has achieved the following conclusions:

There are different ways of conveying and expressing meanings in the Holy Quran. Thus, the Holy Quran is not restricted to the spoken words but also consists of situations utilising facial expressions. Several Quranic verses confirmed the significance of this type of communication. In this study, three different kinds of usages for facial expressions are recognised. Allegory is one of the evidences that proves the importance of using body language in the Quranic texts as well as in the communicative process among people. Through analysing the selected verses, it is deduced that facial expressions which are used in the Holy Quran have both pragmatic and semiotic levels of meaning.

Thus, this paper concludes that human communication does not only include the spoken words but also includes facial expressions which are considered to be a very effective means to express emotions. Identifying these linguistic meanings of facial expressions from the pragmatic and semiotic perspectives helps, to some extent, in understanding facial expressions that are used in the Quranic texts. Thinking of such expressions as having different levels of interpretation and signification helps the readers of the Holy Quran to understand that such expressions are not used physically but have deep and figurative meanings.

## References

### The Holy Quran.

- Al Tabatabai, S. M. H. (1996). *Al-mizan fi tafsir al-Quran*. Qom. Iran. Islamic Publication office.
- Al Tabrasee, A. A. (1992). *Majma'a Al Bayan Fi Tafseer Al Qur'an*. Dar Ihya'a Al Turath Al Arabee. Beirut- Lebanon.
- Ali, A. Y. (2004). *The meaning of the holy Qur'an*. USA. Beltsville. Maryland. Amana Publications.
- Almusallam, I. (2018). *A discursive approach to politeness: Negotiating offers in women's talk by Saudi Arabic and British English speakers*. The University of Leeds School of Languages, Cultures, and Societies.
- Alston, W. (1989). *Divine nature and human language: Essays in philosophical theology Ithaca*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Alston, W. (1996). Belief, acceptance, and religious faith. In D. Howard-Snyder and J. Jordan (eds.) *Faith, freedom, and rationality*. Lanham. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Austin, J. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Clarendon, Oxford.
- Barthes, R. (1968). *Elements of semiology*. New York. Hilland Wang.
- Barthes, R. (1990). *Mythologies*. İstanbul, Turkey: Hürriyet Yayınları.
- Barthes, R. (2005). *Semiological adventure*. İstanbul, Turkey: YKY.
- Birner, J. (2013). *Introduction to pragmatics*. Malden, MA.: Wiley-Blackwel.
- Brian, D.(2004). *An introduction to the philosophy of religious language*. Oxford. Oxford University press.
- Buck, R. And VanLear, A. (2002). Verbal and nonverbal communication: Distinguishing symbolic, spontaneous, and pseudo-spontaneous nonverbal behavior. *Journal of Communication*, 52(3), pp. 522-539.
- Charles W. (2002). *Introducing English semantics*. London and New York.
- Cobley, P. and Jansz, L. (2001). *Introducing semiotics*. Icon Books. Cambridge.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. London: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (2011). *The sage handbook of qualitative research*. USA. University of Illinois.
- Eco, U. (1976). *A theory of semiotics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Fiske, J. (2010). *Introduction to communication studies*. Routledge.
- Grice, P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
- Griffiths, P. (2006). *An introduction to English semantics and pragmatics*. Edinburg: Edinburg University Press Ltd.
- Haug, V. (2006). *Pragmatics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Herman, J. (2008). The language problem. *Language & Communication* 28 (2), pp. 93-99.
- Jiang, Y. (2010). On linguistic phenomenon. *Philosophical Investigation*, 1 (6), pp. 73-78.

- Jones, S. L. (1994). A constructive relationship for religion with the science and profession of psychology: Perhaps the boldest model yet. *American Psychologist*, 49 (3), 184-199. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.49.3.184>.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London. Longman.
- Leech, G. (2014). *The pragmatics of politeness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nakhilawi, H. A. (2016). Ethnosemantic, pragmatic, and textual analysis of kinship terms in Arabic and English discourse. Doctorate Thesis. University of Sains Malaysia.
- Panofsky, E. (1970). *Meaning in the visual arts*. Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Prior, P. (2014). *Semiotics*. In L. Constant, and S. Brian (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to English studies* (pp. 160-173). London, UK: Routledge.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London. Longman.
- Qutb. S. (2013). *Fī-Zilāl al-Qur'an* (A. Yasin, Trans.). Jakarta: Gema Insani.
- Ran, Y. P. (2006). *Pragmatics: Phenomena and analysis*. Beijing: Peking University Press.
- Richards, J. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Robert, R. (2002). *Philosophy of Religion & Religious Ethics: Study*. Nelson Thornes.
- Robert, R. (2002). *Philosophy of Religion & Religious Ethics: Study*. Nelson Thornes.
- Searle, J. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Shank, G. (2002). *Qualitative research. A personal skills approach*. New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Simons, M. (2009). *Implicature*. Carnegie Mellon University: Department of Philosophy.
- Sobur, A. (2009). *Semiotika komunikasi*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Suzila, T. and Yusri, M. (2012). Politeness: Adolescents in disagreements. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*. 2 (2), p. 127.
- Toropove, B. (2002). *World religions*. A person education company.
- Traunmuller, H. (2005). *Paralinguale phänomene [Paralinguistic phenomena]*. In Ammon, U., Dittmar, N., Mattheier, K. & Trudgill, P. (Eds.), *An international handbook of the science of language and society*. (pp. 653-665). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Tsotra, D. Janson, M., & Cecez-Kecmanovic, D. (2004). *Marketing on the Internet: A semiotic analysis*. In D. Tsotra, M. Janson, & D. Cecez-Kecmanovic; *Proceedings of the Tenth Conference on Information Systems* (pp. 4210-4220). New York: Association for Information Systems.
- Walters, S. (2009). *Practical kinesic interview and interrogation: Level 1 and 2 Course*. Indianapolis, IN: Stan Walter and Associates.
- Watts, R. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zainurrahman, A. (2010). Pragmatics: How people use language. *Stkipkieraha Ternate. Indonesia Free Access Journal of the Philosophy of Language and Education*.