صریرخامہ
SAREER A KHAMA
TAFHEEM RESEARCH CENTRE
Category Y
ISSN Online: 3005-947X
ISSN Print: 3005-9461
Vol: 05, Issue 02 (April-June 2026)

Islamic Communication Ethics and Online Religious Disagreement: A Discourse Analysis of Respect, Authority, and Verbal Aggression

Dr. Imran Hayat
Lecturer, Department of Islamic Studies
Division of Islamic and Oriental Learning
University of Education, Lower Mall Campus, Lahore, Pakistan
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0647-0989
Email: imran.hayat@ue.edu.pk; imranhayatmalik@gmail.com

Asif Ali
PhD Scholar, English Linguistics
University of Central Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan
Email: asifalinaseer@gmail.com

Dr. Nabeel Ahmed Nabeel
Associate Professor, Department of Urdu, Division of Islamic and Oriental Learning
University of Education, Lower Mall Campus, Lahore, Pakistan
Email: nabeel.ahmed@ue.edu.pk

Abstract

Online religious disagreement raises questions about both the interpretation of religious teachings and the treatment of those who understand them differently. This conceptual article examines how respect, authority, and verbal aggression are expressed in such exchanges. It brings selected Qur'anic passages and authentic hadith into dialogue with scholarship on ethical disagreement, religious authority, and relational work. Five constructed exchanges illustrate the distinction between challenging an argument and discrediting its speaker. The analysis considers the reasons offered, the representation of interlocutors, the use of authority, and opportunities for clarification and correction. It argues that responsible disagreement requires fair representation, claims proportionate to the evidence, restraint in judging motives, and willingness to correct errors. Courteous language alone does not meet these requirements, while a direct objection need not constitute aggression. The article proposes a framework for evaluating these features without treating disagreement as misconduct or respect as unquestioning acceptance. As the examples are illustrative rather than drawn from an empirical corpus, the framework requires further examination through actual online exchanges and participants' interpretations.

Keywords: Islamic communication ethics; online religious disagreement; adab al-ikhtilāf; relational work; religious authority; verbal aggression

Introduction

There are two dimensions of religious disagreement: disagreement on (1) how to understand the teachings, and (2) how to respond to those who interpret differently. The challenge can take place in a social media exchange, where the person questioned can point out an argument, question a source, call a person into question or dub the competence of an expert, or give someone a religious label in a briefer exchange. These actions are correlated but have different ethical aspects. The interpretation of a text and not the sincerity of its reader is the issue at stake in a disagreement. The same applies to the treatment of a person: all interpretations are not acceptable. The main question is how religious communication can continue to survive and avoid personal degradation and unsupported exclusion and yet remain serious criticisms.

This problem is mainly an applied Islamic studies because the standards being studied are ones related to responsibility, justice and disagreement. Applied Linguistics brings techniques for the discovery of the responsibility in the language. A position of an exchange can be swapped using labels, pronouns, questions, quotations, and certain markers. This interpretation is not enough, this interpretation does not take account; people like you cannot understand religion is addressing the standing of the speaker. This second formulation may leave the original disagreement completely unresolved. This is where the ethical analysis of a message becomes useful: a look at what the message does, rather than what it may seem to be doing.

These digital-religion scholarship challenges the notions of authority. Campbell identifies the authority of roles, structures, beliefs and texts, and demonstrates how the Internet is not solely about the removal of traditional authority.[i] The relationships between online communication and situated religious leadership are also explored in Whyte's study of Muslim religious actors in Australia.[ii] These findings are enough to warrant an examination of the use of authority, but cannot be used to extend a generalization to all Muslim communities. A claim to authority that could be established by visibility of an account or by a religious title or by an extensive quotation might not be sufficient to establish the correctness of the particular conclusion to be defended. Bunt's study of cyber-Islamic environments further situates these questions within the changing relationship between digital communication and Muslim religious authority.[iii]

There is also a need for an ethical system of protection from the misuse of respect. Harmonious discussion can keep inquiry going, but can also seem inappropriate, before the reasons for objection, are examined. The difference is important when a less influential questioner poses a question to a more powerful informant. Just assessing the tone of the questioner will leave the substantive issue and response of the authority untreated. In keeping with this, this article understands respect as a responsibility shared with others throughout a communication; one responsibility is to represent an objection fairly, and to allow appropriate clarification. It does not presume that it is a bad thing to disagree when it is uncomfortable.

The inquiry is structured around four questions. What principles of respectful disagreement can be identified in the sources of Islam chosen? What is the effect of linguistic choices in building authority and differentiate criticism from personal attack? When can there be a call to respect evidence that is not compelling? When may one be allowed to narrow down the participation and/or the evidential weaknesses? How can a practical structure facilitate ethical differences in the online world? The contribution becomes a process of linking these questions by following a clear assessment process. The article does not provide an observed corpus, but five constructed exchanges. These claims are about conceptual differences and their use and do not make a statement about the prevalence of aggression, beliefs of users, or the impact of platform design.

Literature Review

Ethical Disagreement and Relational Work

Adab al-ikhtilāf is in this instance an expression of the ethical behavior of disagreement. Adab is about proper, cultured behavior and ikhtilāf denotes difference or disagreement. These are not intended to suggest that all of the positions for each are equally valid. The treatment of Al-Alwani distinguishes disagreements based on the grounds and behavior of disagreements, and constructive differences and destructive conflict.[iv] His remarks are not an exhaustive list of the traditions of Islam, but rather a contemporary scholarly source. Its importance lies in the fact that it can be disagreed upon in a way that is grounded in evidence and is ethically responsible, rather than in the need to squelch difference in order to conform. A classical point of reference is Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr's chapter on debate and establishing proof, which opens with Qur'anic demands for evidence.[v]

Recent research, however, reveals a similar correlation between disagreement and learning. Abdul-Jabbar introduces a notion of ethical disagreement as a dialogical tool in Islamic education, focusing on elements of humility, argumentativeness and recognition.[vi] That is not an intervention he has tried with social media, it is religious education. Its applicability here is thus conceptual: the processes of locating evidence and voicing a defensible point can be used as techniques to disagree without agreeing totally. The study at hand is adding to this concern with the depiction of interlocutors in short exchanges. What makes a contribution answerable, and how the right to ask questions is linguistically negotiated?

The main (linguistic) lens is relational work. Locher and Watts, however, situate politeness in the broader context of negotiation of interpersonal relations in such terms as appropriate behavior, impolite behavior, and polite behavior.[vii] This point of view excludes any ability to view a courteous expression as an adequate moral cue. An accusation can be preceded by a greeting; an honorific can be part of the consequence of exclusion. However, confrontational disagreement may be appropriate in a context where everyone is subject to a close examination. The task is to investigate the relationship being built and the relevant

interactional context; as well as maintaining the evaluations of the participants separate from the moral judgment of the researcher.

Culpeper provides an accompanying worry with language used in interpersonal attack and with the contextual interpretations of impoliteness.[viii] This article relies on that concern, but does not assume that insulting language is evidence of an intention to harm. Verbal aggression is defined as discourse that is degrading, threatening or replaces engagement with an identifiable proposition with degradation of a person or group. Communicative positioning is defined as this. In addition to evidence must be provided to establish actual intention, emotional experience and consequences. In this way, familiar teasing, quotations and criticism of an abusive statement may impact the assessment of the wording as if it would be aggressive when used alone.

That can be a significant idea for cautious online interaction, and it has been demonstrated in a research program. Graham's work on an email community focuses on how disagreement is negotiated as a means of establishing group identity and expectations for politeness.[ix] It is about that community not a general online norm. At the same time, they demonstrate the need for the researcher to study what they call the "rules of the game" which are attached to an exchange, rather than bringing in a set of pre-established truths about expressions. Similarly, Herring sees computer-mediated discourse analysis as a flexible method based on observable discourse.[x] This analytical genre has not been operationalized in a way that can be used as evidence of the interactional field, but it is not accepted as an evidence of it: the present analysis is still conceptual and poses questions for actual exchanges.

It is also important to note the difference between the nature of deliberation and politeness. However, Papacharissi who researched political newsgroups challenges the idea of equating civility with a simple level of politeness.[xi] The implication for religious discussion is limited and useful: disagreement is not necessarily heated and may be substantive; a nice tone may not allow for scrutiny. It is not necessarily constructive to be harsh. It is important to note that tone, evidence, and participation are assessed independently. Marwick and boyd also explain the concept of context collapse and the imagined audience of Twitter messages, and propose some reasons why the audience for a message should not always be taken for granted to possess the same interpretive context as the original message.[xii]

Online conditions are relevant, but do not influence behavior. Suler points to some of the elements that might lead to less control when using the Internet, such as anonymity and asynchronicity.[xiii] There is no evidence to back up those factors to account for any specific exchange. An aggressive named religious voice and a careful anonymous voice. These two literatures, then, do not argue that ethical disagreement scholarship and interpersonal pragmatics are somehow a lost cause, but rather that there is a need for a clear connection between the religious responsibilities and the ways in which religious arguments are actually presented in the world. This is provided provisionally below in the form of a framework.

Research Methodology

This article uses a qualitative conceptual approach, combining a focused reading of selected Islamic sources with discourse-oriented analysis. The Qur'anic passages were selected for their direct relevance to ridicule, suspicion, justice, and the manner of disagreement; the two hadith were selected from Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī and Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim for their relevance to responsible speech and gentleness. The English renderings of the cited Arabic passages are provided for this article, and excerpts are identified as such. Five constructed exchanges illustrate specific analytical problems rather than represent collected social-media data. Each exchange is examined for the target of criticism, the reasons offered, claims to authority and certainty, attributions of motive, opportunities to participate, and possibilities for correction. The discussion also considers alternative readings and circumstances that might justify restricting participation. Its conclusions concern the coherence and possible use of the proposed framework, rather than the frequency of particular behaviours or their effects on actual users. Any subsequent study of identifiable online participants would also require attention to consent, context, and the risk of harm, as emphasised in the Association of Internet Researchers' ethical guidelines.[xiv]

Islamic Principles of Constructive Dissent

The Qur'an establishes a clear boundary between disagreement and the humiliation of others. In Sūrat al-Ḥujurāt, Allah states:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا لَا يَسْخَرْ قَوْمٌ مِنْ قَوْمٍ عَسَىٰ أَنْ يَكُونُوا خَيْرًا مِنْهُمْ

"Believers, let no group mock another group; those mocked may be better than those who mock them."[xv]

The same verse also prohibits mutual defamation and offensive name-calling. Ibn Kathīr explains ridicule here in terms of humiliating and belittling others.[xvi]Applied to online disagreement, the principle directs attention to whether a reply addresses an interpretation or demeans its advocate. A claim may be rejected with reasons; contempt for its speaker supplies no such reason. Context remains essential: quoting an insult to criticise it differs from endorsing the insult.

Restraint is also required when interpreting another person's motives. The following verse states:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اجْتَنِبُوا كَثِيرًا مِنَ الظَّنِّ إِنَّ بَعْضَ الظَّنِّ إِثْمٌ وَلَا تَجَسَّسُوا وَلَا يَغْتَبْ بَعْضُكُمْ بَعْضًا

"Believers, avoid much suspicion, for some suspicion is sinful. Do not spy, and do not backbite one another."[xvii]

Disagreement with a conclusion does not, by itself, establish dishonesty, hostility, or rejection of religious truth. In online discussion, the relevant distinction is between identifying conduct supported by evidence and asserting knowledge of an unseen intention. A demonstrably inaccurate quotation may be corrected without declaring that its author deliberately distorted the

text. The verse also cautions against exposing private information or circulating disparaging claims. Its application should preserve accountability for documented wrongdoing while restraining speculation about inward motives. Al-Nawawī qualifies the prohibition of backbiting by recognising a legitimate legal purpose that cannot otherwise be achieved, beginning with a wronged person's complaint to someone able to provide redress.[xviii]

Justice provides a standard that applies even when an interlocutor belongs to an opposing group. Allah commands:

وَلَا يَجْرِمَنَّكُمْ شَنَآنُ قَوْمٍ عَلَىٰ أَلَّا تَعْدِلُوا اعْدِلُوا هُوَ أَقْرَبُ لِلتَّقْوَىٰ

"Do not let hatred of a people lead you to act unjustly. Be just; that is nearer to God-consciousness."[xix]

For religious disagreement, this requires a fair account of an opponent's position and consistent standards of evidence. An argument should not be dismissed merely because of the speaker's affiliation, nor accepted merely because it comes from a favoured authority. Fairness does not require treating every interpretation as equally sound. It requires identifying the actual claim, retaining relevant qualifications, and explaining the grounds for accepting or rejecting it. A mistake by one participant also does not justify condemning an entire community.

The Qur'an combines reasoned engagement with responsibility for the manner of speaking. Allah states:

ادْعُ إِلَىٰ سَبِيلِ رَبِّكَ بِالْحِكْمَةِ وَالْمَوْعِظَةِ الْحَسَنَةِ وَجَادِلْهُمْ بِالَّتِي هِيَ أَحْسَنُ

"Invite to the way of your Lord with wisdom and good counsel, and debate with them in the best manner."[xx]

The instruction recognises argument as part of engagement with difference, while directing how it should be conducted. Applied here, wisdom involves attending to the question, the evidence, and the circumstances of the exchange. Good counsel cannot be reduced to pleasant wording if the reply misrepresents an objection or humiliates its author.

A related instruction states:

وَقُلْ لِعِبَادِي يَقُولُوا الَّتِي هِيَ أَحْسَنُ إِنَّ الشَّيْطَانَ يَنْزَغُ بَيْنَهُمْ

"Tell My servants to say what is best, for Satan stirs discord between them."[xxi]

The warning draws attention to speech that aggravates division. In an online exchange, a responsible response may involve clarification, careful correction, referral to a qualified scholar, or withdrawal when useful discussion is no longer possible. These are contextual applications of the verses, rather than platform rules expressly stated in them.

Two authentic reports further illuminate responsibility in speech. ʿĀʾishah reports that the Prophet ﷺ said:

إِنَّ الرِّفْقَ لَا يَكُونُ فِي شَيْءٍ إِلَّا زَانَهُ وَلَا يُنْزَعُ مِنْ شَيْءٍ إِلَّا شَانَهُ

"Gentleness adorns whatever it accompanies, and whatever loses it is marred."[xxii]

Here, rifq (الرِّفْقُ) means gentleness. Its relevance lies in exercising restraint while addressing an error, rather than avoiding correction altogether. Abū Hurayrah also reports the following instruction of the Prophet ﷺ:

وَمَنْ كَانَ يُؤْمِنُ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ فَلْيَقُلْ خَيْرًا أَوْ لِيَصْمُتْ

"Whoever believes in Allah and the Last Day should speak good or remain silent."[xxiii]

This instruction makes speaking a matter of moral responsibility. It supports truthful correction and restraint from harmful or pointless speech; it does not grant an influential participant immunity from questions. Together, the reports support self-control without making every firm objection a breach of religious etiquette. Ibn Ḥajar explains rifq as gentleness in speech and action, contrasting it with violence or harshness.[xxiv]

Ethical criteria are not focused on the access for an analyst of inward piety, but on behavior. Persons are answerable interlocutors, claims to knowledge matched, claims to persons fair, and needless humiliation avoided. There is no need for theological relativism needed in any of them. The participant may hold a stance, defend the validity of another stance and determine a documented harmful action. Whereas the shift from criticism to personal accusations, to broad condemnations of communities, or to blanket statements about another person's faith is justifiable, it is not at this point. Ruling on individual cases is not part of the process of assessing those transitions. Within the specific category of matters open to juristic reasoning, Ibn Taymiyyah states that a person following a scholarly position should not be censured or shunned for doing so.[xxv]

Analysis of Constructed Exchanges

Substituting a Person's Degradation for an Argument

Constructed exchange: A says, "This is a statement that I understand differently, because the verses surrounding it qualify the statement." B replies, "Only an ignoramus would say that: Religion should not be taught by someone like you. This is because the original objection cited context as a reason. That is not the reason that the response engages. TARGET is moving away from the meaning of the interpretation and towards competence and identity, and "only" and "people like you" create a generalized category of disqualified speakers. ACCESS does not close because they are requested to look at the text, but by an instruction to stop teaching.

The wording allows for a defensible conclusion for the constructed reply, it is a substitution of personal discrediting in place of an answer to the stated argument. It is neither

proof of the correctness of A's interpretation nor proof that A teaches religion. An alternative that's charitable is that B is trying to stop a "leaky" interpretation from spreading.An alternative is more charitable, that B is trying to block the spread of an unsupported interpretation. That concern may be good enough to be represented in the text with the appropriate textual error or to explain competence requirements, but it does not make the insult evidentially useful. The problem of degradation in the context of 49:11 is that there is an unresolved substantive matter of the dispute. A proportionate response would recognise the claim of mistake in the context and ask comparisons to the passage.

Calling out without Answering the Objection

Constructed exchange: A asks, “Which source would be supportive of this ruling being applied to these situations?” B answers, “Our teacher has explained it, there is no serious Muslim who will ask him. AUTHORITY is presented by the teacher’s authority (but not explained). The words CERTAINTY and MOTIVE link two things: firstly, acceptance of a certain authority and secondly, sincerity. The reply shifts from the question (based on an application) to the question of whether it is acceptable to ask the question from a religious point of view. Only access to ACCESS can be denied if it is proven that the question is disrupting or out of the setting's boundaries.

There is value in expertise that is not lost: ordinary users don't have to re-construct all of the scholarly arguments themselves. The question is of the use of the authority. When someone asks for a helpful explanation, giving such an explanation will settle the matter; when sincerity requires unconditional acceptance, it will not prove the conclusion. Another way to read it is that B takes for granted a common source that participants are aware of. A clarified response should include the source and an explanation as to why this source is relevant to the situation. The constructed exchange is not the basis for an evaluation of the teacher’s qualifications, but rather an evaluation of an unjustified closure. It is necessary to distinguish respect for learning from immunity to proper enquiries regarding a claim if there is to be justice and restraint. Ibn Jamāʿah similarly instructs the teacher to hear a question fairly, help clarify its wording when necessary, and acknowledge what he does not know.[xxvi]

Attributing Motives to Others

A states, “I accept that the report is genuine but I do not agree with your conclusion, based on that report.” B responds, “You're just saying that because you don't like it when the truth is said," It is a disagreement about inference due to the inability of the parties to agree on the actual transmission. B's formulation ignores the internal motivation and does not explain how it came about. TARGET hones in on character, MOTIVE and CERTAINTY replace the actual question. The answer also assumes that if one does not accept one application, one rejects the truth in general, which means that the disputed inferential step gets ignored.

No exchange is available which can prove the motivation of both participants or fix the application. None of the above are shown; A may be reasoning carefully, not understanding the argument, or wanting attention. There would be no automatic rebuttal to the objection even if independent evidence of attention seeking were provided. Ethical relevance of 49:12 is restraint with regard to suspicion, analytical relevance is separation of the proposition and speaker. A better response will explain how report and conclusion are related and will make an inference about what step A refutes. This allows for a firm disagreement without presuming hostility within. The case highlights the fact that not all arguments in the modern day are authenticated by a religious source.

Ruling out the possibility of being examined

Constructed exchange: A asks “Respectfully, why is the alternate reading not included?” B responds, “Dear brother, we appreciate your concern, for the sake of unity, we will not ask questions in this regard with regard to our interpretation. The greeting and acknowledgment is courteous form. ACCESS nevertheless is closed and AUTHORITY is assumed by the ownership and control of the interpretation and control of the setting. The wording does not set out to determine if a published discussion rule or a previous disruption or if there is a relevant boundary to justify that closure. It is not well assessed with politeness markers.

An educational announcement can logically guide detailed discussions from another location and a moderator can also safeguard users from repetitive provocation. Such alternatives matter. The moral issue is whether or not a restriction is proportionate, explicable and leaves a reasonable path of clarification. The produced answer provides cohesion without any evidence/explanatory or procedural grounds, which can lead to an understanding of respect being a requirement for conformity. A good answer will define the discussion and give a source, another forum or a short answer. This would allow for the preservation of the legitimate boundary, while at the same time allowing the question to be understood. The case can be used to explore the issues of courtesy and participation separately from the issues of moderation being unethical.

Identifying Immediate Correction and Constructive Improvement

Rewrite: A writes, “The qualification following the second sentence is missing from your quotation, and the conclusion is misleading.” B responds, “You're correct about the omission; I've been able to restore the qualification, but I still don't agree with what you're saying.” A's turn is straightforward and is a negative evaluation of the quotation. TARGET is about a presentation that is actually observed and the argumentative impact rather than about a personal identity. REPAIR is used to respond to a specific point, but maintaining disagreement. The exchange needs to be more accountable, which means that both parties must not turn away from a position.

In an actual case of empirical research the accusation of omission would need to be justified by a comparison with a source, which is not provided in this fabricated case. Its function is to present

a conditional judgment (the imputation of which is allowed because the omission is substantiated and material). A's words alone do not establish a deceptive intent and B's admission does not put the interpretation to rest. There is a balance between deference and clear correction which can be achieved through truthful responsibility both in terms of a clear concession and clear correction without an excess of deference. The case is a negative one for the framework: even if a strong objection is raised, it is not necessarily a verbal attack if it does not cause discomfort or challenge an authority statement.

As a group, the examples can help them find a common thread that could be explored in future research in relation to an analytical transition that moves from reasons to the position of the reasoner. They also demonstrate the reverse of that, i.e., transition from defensiveness to a proposition to which they can respond. These are not actual frequencies, but concepts. Classifications are based on the context that is needed in order to understand the immediate words. The examples do not represent harm to the audience and do not give any authority to make judgments about the culpability of any particular religion. These are valuable because they force the analyst to be explicit about the aspect of a communication that is being criticized and on which evidence they are willing to base a change in assessment.

Set of Principles to Follow to be in Disagreement in an Ethical Manner

The framework proposed considers exchanges on four different aspects: support for the proposition, representation of persons, use of authority and opportunity for response/repair. Content can be supported, disputed, unsupported or unresolved. The positioning of the person can be respectful, degrading, or it may simply not be known within the context. Authority can be applicable and clarifying, inappropriate or confusing. Participation can be open, closed due to legitimate reasons or closed due to inadequate reasons. These dimensions render a proper quotation immune to abuse, and make an insult not disprove the speaker's whole argument.

The first practical requirement is to find out what the real disagreement is. The participant must identify the issue(s) of the dispute as it relates to wording, authentication, interpretation, application or conduct. Examples of such indicators that can be observed are quotations, source references, and inferential expressions like “therefore.” Verification should focus on the relevant material, should compare with this material and should maintain the qualifications. Referral is appropriate for a dispute that would benefit from the expertise of a specialist, but should be explained. By stating the question, criticism is also answerable and diminishes the chances of a generalized criticism being made about an individual or community. It also provides a more accurate basis for the moderator's judgment of whether or not an exchange is still relevant.

Fair Representation is the second criteria. What should be discussed is the best possible version of the objection, and participants should try to differentiate a statement from a description of the speaker. The indicators that warrant careful consideration are identity labels, collective pronouns and attributed motives. Quranic justice allows for the exercise of the same

expectations of evidence in favor and in disfavor. Practical conduct: verification of retention of qualification and verification of a correction in response to the claim made. A group affiliation can be relevant to understanding an argument, but cannot replace a consideration of the reasons. Fair representation also allows expressing the opinion that there is an absence of information.

Proportional authority and certainty is the third requirement. Expertise and textual references can help with reasoning when explained in relation to the text. The expression of "all scholars agree" or "no sincere believer questions this" needs to be handled differently – the first relates to the agreement of scholars, the second to the conditionality of the sincerity. When communicating responsibly, it is clear what is being referred to, and there is recognition of material disagreement. This does not mean that all online opinions have to be taken equally. It requires an explanation of the relevance of a source and only a conclusion based upon the evidence. Credentials should be used to help inquire, not to end an inquiry with an assertion.

The fourth requirement has to do with participation. Criticism is not forbidden in a discussion; it can be properly contained within the topic, and protected from harassment. A restriction should describe the rule, the conduct and/or the practical limitation dealt with and, if possible, include a way to get clarification. Moderators should look at the objection and the response of the Authority, not at the direction to be taken. Respect is also about saying no when asked to do something again, but it is also about not being ridiculed for saying "no" when a request to contribute is turned down. An account can respond that it is not able to answer the complex question right away rather than implying that a lack of faith is evidenced by the question.

The fifth is the restraining of motives and identities. Participants should be able to differentiate between evidence of a wrongful behavior and speculation about its motives, sincerity or religious affiliation. Examples of observable indicators are accusations of hidden hostility, and categorical labeling of a person. The framework does not call for a tolerance that is endless, there has to be a documented threat or repeated targeted insult for this form of behavior. The key to its advice is specificity – name the action, state the boundary, and refrain from making unsupported comments about the in-wards action. Theological conversation should be kept separate from mere allegations and platform moderation should be presented in terms of own rules and not in the guise of a religious judgment.

The last step is meaningful repair. Correction needs to identify the mistake, provide the context that has been missing, or retract the accusation and leave a clearly marked explanation if possible. An apology that does not correct the allegation provides little apparent evidence to show the repair. Similarly, it does not have to be taken as giving up on an entire interpretation to accept one criticism. These can be taught in communities and in educational institutions, by comparing exact corrections with personal attacks. It is an empirical question if such teaching actually leads to improvement in discussion. A focus on evaluation should be on the quality of reasons, opportunity to respond and accuracy of representation, not just on polite expressions.

Al-Ghazālī describes the seeker of truth as one searching for a lost possession and urges gratitude toward a partner who reveals an error: «وَيَشْكُرُهُ إِذَا عَرَّفَهُ الْخَطَأَ وَأَظْهَرَ لَهُ الْحَقَّ» ("and thanks him when he identifies the error and makes the truth clear to him").[xxvii]

There are points in the framework which are limited. An address term in Urdu, Arabic or any other language can have varying meanings and may be a different kind of address word, depending on the context of the language; religious formulas and institutional relationships can vary, and constructed English exchanges cannot establish norms. The sources chosen are from the Sunni tradition, but do not encompass all interpretations, and some disagreement is still possible as to their applications. Empirical studies should leave sequences and context of the participants' actions intact, include participant interpretations as appropriate, and should analyze power without assuming it from roles. Negative cases as well as cases in which restrictions are justifiable should also be tested. Whether a proposal is useful in enhancing discriminating analysis will be determined by the proposal's usefulness, not by conceptual coherence alone.

Conclusion

There is a need to allow for substantive criticism and to restrict the degrading of people in an ethically correct religious disagreement. In this article, the interplay between certain principles of Islam and the linguistic production of authority and identity and participation has been linked. The sources stand for justice, moderation with regard to suspicion, shyness from ridicule, good dissension, and responsible speech. Their use on social networking platforms must involve reasoning in context, so it cannot be simply boiled down to a demand for things to be pleasant or that the authorities are to be obeyed without question. The cases can be constructed in such a way that they demonstrate the need to evaluate linguistic form and ethical justification before. An unanswered argument, a well-worded question that cannot be addressed and a sincere appeal that closes a legitimate one, can all leave an argument unanswered. In contrast, criticism can be given directly and specific recognition can be provided to maintain disagreement but enhance accountability. The practical structure delineates the disagreement, fairly presents opposing positions, establishes the limits of authority and certainty, explains the boundaries of participation, mitigates unsupported judgments of motive, and allows for repair.

The contribution is an operational link between the fields of Applied Islamic Studies and Applied Linguistics. Religious ethics provides principles for responsibility and relational analysis is the analysis of responsibility in communication. The proposed procedure does not solve all theological problems nor does it define what users want. It serves as a foundation for further empirical, multilingual studies and teaching. The point at the heart of this is that respecting an interlocutor demands that disagreement is accountable: Appraise and respond to the given reasons, discuss the scope of the conclusion, maintain reasonable prospects for improvement or correction. These duties are applicable to any teacher who has influence and any teacher who participated as a contributor in common discussions.

References

[i] Heidi Campbell, "Who's Got the Power? Religious Authority and the Internet," *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 12, no. 3 (2007): 1043–62, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00362.x.

[ii] Shaheen Amid Whyte, "Islamic Religious Authority in Cyberspace: A Qualitative Study of Muslim Religious Actors in Australia," *Religions* 13, no. 1 (2022): 69, https://doi.org/10.3390/rel13010069.

[iii] Gary R. Bunt, *Hashtag Islam: How Cyber-Islamic Environments Are Transforming Religious Authority* (University of North Carolina Press, 2018), introduction, https://doi.org/10.5149/northcarolina/9781469643168.001.0001.

[iv] Taha Jabir al-Alwani, *Bridging the Divide: Beyond the Ethics of Disagreement* (International Institute of Islamic Thought, 2024), https://iiit.org/wp-content/uploads/Bridging-the-Divide-_-Beyond-the-Ethics-of-Disagreement.pdf.

[v] Abū ʿUmar Yūsuf ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *Jāmiʿ bayān al-ʿilm wa-faḍlihi*, ed. Abū al-Ashbāl al-Zuhayrī (Dār Ibn al-Jawzī, 1994), 2:953, "Bāb ityān al-munāẓarah wa-al-mujādalah wa-iqāmat al-ḥujjah," Shamela, https://shamela.ws/book/22367/1209.

[vi] Wisam Kh. Abdul-Jabbar, "The Ethics of Disagreement (Adab al-Ikhtilaf): Religious Education for Intercultural Competence in Arabo-Islamic Pedagogy," *British Journal of Religious Education* 48, no. 3 (2026): 344–59, https://doi.org/10.1080/01416200.2026.2619036.

[vii] Miriam A. Locher and Richard J. Watts, "Politeness Theory and Relational Work," *Journal of Politeness Research* 1, no. 1 (2005): 9–33, https://doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2005.1.1.9.

[viii] Jonathan Culpeper, "Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness," *Journal of Pragmatics* 25, no. 3 (1996): 349–67, https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00014-3.

[ix] Sage Lambert Graham, "Disagreeing to Agree: Conflict, (Im)politeness and Identity in a Computer-Mediated Community," *Journal of Pragmatics* 39, no. 4 (2007): 742–59, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.11.017.

[x] Susan C. Herring, "Computer-Mediated Discourse Analysis: An Approach to Researching Online Behavior," in *Designing for Virtual Communities in the Service of Learning*, ed. Sasha A. Barab, Rob Kling, and James H. Gray (Cambridge University Press, 2004), 338–76, https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511805080.016.

[xi] Zizi Papacharissi, "Democracy Online: Civility, Politeness, and the Democratic Potential of Online Political Discussion Groups," *New Media & Society* 6, no. 2 (2004): 259–83, https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444804041444.

[xii] Alice E. Marwick and danah boyd, "I Tweet Honestly, I Tweet Passionately: Twitter Users, Context Collapse, and the Imagined Audience," *New Media & Society* 13, no. 1 (2011): 114–33, https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444810365313.

[xiii] John Suler, "The Online Disinhibition Effect," *CyberPsychology & Behavior* 7, no. 3 (2004): 321–26, https://doi.org/10.1089/1094931041291295.

[xiv] aline shakti franzke, Anja Bechmann, Michael Zimmer, Charles Ess, and the Association of Internet Researchers, *Internet Research: Ethical Guidelines 3.0* (Association of Internet Researchers, 2020), 4, 9–10, https://aoir.org/reports/ethics3.pdf.

[xv] Qur'an 49:11 (excerpt), Arabic text, Quran.com, https://quran.com/49/11. The English rendering is provided in this article.

[xvi] Ismāʿīl ibn ʿUmar ibn Kathīr, *Tafsīr al-Qurʾān al-ʿaẓīm*, ed. Sāmī ibn Muḥammad al-Salāmah, 2nd ed. (Dār Ṭaybah, 1999), 7:376, commentary on Qur'an 49:11, Shamela, https://shamela.ws/book/8473/3874.

[xvii] Qur'an 49:12 (excerpt), Arabic text, Quran.com, https://quran.com/49/12. The English rendering is provided in this article.

[xviii] Yaḥyā ibn Sharaf al-Nawawī, *Riyāḍ al-ṣāliḥīn*, ed. Māhir Yāsīn al-Faḥl (Dār Ibn Kathīr, 2007), 425, chap. 256, "Bāb mā yubāḥ min al-ghībah," Shamela, https://shamela.ws/book/2348/1688.

[xix] Qur'an 5:8 (excerpt), Arabic text, Quran.com, https://quran.com/5/8. The English rendering is provided in this article.

[xx] Qur'an 16:125 (excerpt), Arabic text, Quran.com, https://quran.com/16/125. The English rendering is provided in this article.

[xxi] Qur'an 17:53 (excerpt), Arabic text, Quran.com, https://quran.com/17/53. The English rendering is provided in this article.

[xxii] Muslim ibn al-Ḥajjāj, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Kitāb al-birr wa-al-ṣilah wa-al-ādāb, "Bāb faḍl al-rifq," hadith 2594a, Arabic text, Sunnah.com, https://sunnah.com/muslim:2594a. The English rendering in the article is provided for this study.

[xxiii] Muḥammad ibn Ismāʿīl al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, Kitāb al-adab, "Bāb man kāna yuʾminu bi-Allāh wa-al-yawm al-ākhir fa-lā yuʾdhi jārahu," hadith 6018, Arabic text, Sunnah.com, https://sunnah.com/bukhari:6018. The article quotes the closing clause and provides its English rendering.

[xxiv] Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Fatḥ al-bārī bi-sharḥ al-Bukhārī*, ed. Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb, hadith numbering by Muḥammad Fuʾād ʿAbd al-Bāqī (al-Maktabah al-Salafiyyah, 1380–90 AH), 10:449, "Bāb al-rifq fī al-amr kullihi," Shamela, https://shamela.ws/book/1673/6210.

[xxv] Aḥmad ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥalīm Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmūʿ al-fatāwā*, collected and arranged by ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad ibn Qāsim and Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Qāsim (King Fahd Complex for the Printing of the Holy Qur'an, 2004), 20:207, Shamela, https://shamela.ws/book/7289/10031.

[xxvi] Badr al-Dīn Ibn Jamāʿah, *Tadhkirat al-sāmiʿ wa-al-mutakallim fī adab al-ʿālim wa-al-mutaʿallim*, ed. Muḥammad Hāshim al-Nadwī (Dāʾirat al-Maʿārif, 1354 AH), 42, Shamela, https://shamela.ws/book/151180/43.

[xxvii] Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad al-Ghazālī, *Iḥyāʾ ʿulūm al-dīn* (Dār al-Maʿrifah, n.d.), 1:44, discussion of the conditions of debate, Shamela, https://shamela.ws/book/9472/44.