Comparative Critical Discourse Analysis of Quranic Translations: A Study of Maulana Maududi and Javed Ghamidi's Interpretation of the Verse 256 of Surah Al-Baqarah

Dr. Jabreel Asghar*
Higher Colleges of Technology, United Arab Emirates

Abstract

This paper employs comparative discourse analysis to examine Maulana Maududi and Javed Ghamidi's interpretations of a part of the verse in Surah Al-Baqarah (2:256) in the Quran. Applying Fairclough's theory as the foundation, comparative CDA sheds light on linguistic variations, discourse structures, and ideological foundations for in depth exploration of the debate. The analysis encompasses textual, discursive, and social dimensions to uncover differences in lexical choices and rhetorical devices used by each author and reveals differing perspectives within the language construction of both translations influenced by historical, cultural, and intellectual factors. Specifically, it contrasts Maududi's assertive political language with Ghamidi's more rational and adaptable writing style. The power structures and ideological influences in society reflect Maududi's emphasis on an Islamic state compared to Ghamidi's contextual, rational Islam. Translations impact societal dynamics by reinforcing specific interpretations, such as Maududi's clarity on doctrine or Ghamidi's promotion of individual autonomy. This research expands our understanding of diverse viewpoints within the Islamic discourse on religious freedom and coercion in the translation of the verse.

Keywords: Comparative Critical Discourse Analysis; Surah Al-Baqarah (2:256); religious freedom; Maulana Maududi; Javed Ghamidi; Islamic discourse.

1. Introduction

This research paper analyses the two interpretations of verse 2:256 from the Qur'an to understand various perspectives influenced by language choices, ideologies, and cultural factors of respective translators i.e., Maulana Maududi and Javed Ghamidi. The study examines the linguistic construction of the verse within Surah Al-Baqarah through the lens of Comparative Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to understanding how these translations impact the religious meaning of 2:256.

For this study, CDA of translations of Quranic verses closely considered cultural sensitivity and reverence. With this perspective, the analysis aims at commenting on linguistic features and their representation of sociopolitical ideologies without prioritizing or commenting on any one scholar, their translations, quality of their interpretations or ideologies. Following such precautions allows for a comprehensive and respectful CDA of Quranic translations.

This research paper begins with outlining both its purpose and significance for study, followed by a narration of both scholars' background, emphasizing contributions by

---

* Email of corresponding author: jabreel@hotmail.co.uk

each scholar while outlining specific approaches they take in studying this verse. Then, we discuss the theoretical framework and methodology applied to the study. Through the lens of Comparative Discourse Analysis, the paper analyses Maududi and Ghamidi's discourse regarding religious freedom, coercion, and key concepts found in the selected verse (2:256), to reveal linguistic differences as and concept framing differences. The analysis extends beyond power relations to cover ideological perspectives influencing interpretations. The paper concludes with critical analysis of each scholar's discourse providing valuable insights into wider discussions regarding religious freedom and coercion. Such structured approach helps expand scholar understanding of Quranic interpretations as well as all their various interactions and influences on them.

2. Sociocultural background of both scholars

Understanding Abul Ala Maududi and Javed Ahmad Ghamidi's unique interpretations of Surah Al-Baqarah 2:256 requires understanding their respective sociocultural environments during translation efforts. Maududi was influenced by British Indian society at that time - particularly due to the Khilafat Movement and subsequent struggle for independence against colonial rule (Nisar 1996). As such, his worldview centered around creating an Islamic state (Maududi 1963; Adams 1983; Nisar 1994), while his translation efforts showcase his desire to establish one which combined Islamic principles into governance practices (Maududi 1979).

Maududi's approach is closely linked with his cultural and political context, where an Islamic state was seen as the only solution to the apparent loss of Islamic values. He believed in and strived for a political order which could allow Muslims live in a n Islamic society where morally corrupt influences are removed by the Islamic state. In the forthcoming sections we will discuss how his lexical choices reflect an interesting contrast to his religio-political creed.

Contrarily, Ghamidi was born in 1951 in Pakistan. At that time the Pakistani society was marked with post-colonialism, logical thinking and political changes across the globe which influenced his approach to interpreting Islam (Al Mawrid 2017). He emphasizes the importance of personal decisions, rational thought, and the separation of religion from forceful methods, clearly reflected in his approach to the changing circumstances (Iftikhar 2005 / Ghamidi 2018).

Considering social and political environment of both scholars lived, this paper will compare Maududi and Ghamidi's language choices when translating verse 2:256 to highlight how their language construction influenced by their individual history, culture, and viewpoints.

3. Theoretical Framework

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) serves as an analytical framework that goes far beyond language semantics, providing deep explorations into power dynamics, ideologies, and discourse structures in religious interpretations. According to Fairclough (2001), CDA serves as a tool which uncovers social structures, power relations and ideological perspectives within discursive practices. The study employs CDA techniques to explore various viewpoints regarding language power and ideology (Fairclough 2001).

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) explores how language is linked to broader sociocultural, historical, and political settings where religious interpretations occur. According to Van Dijk (2009), CDA seeks to uncover and question the improper use of social power and control in social and political situations. In religious interpretations, CDA reveals how power dynamics are expressed in language, aligning with Van Dijk's notion that ideology embedded in discourse influences meaning.

Furthermore, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) extensively investigates power dynamics in religious interpretations, recognizing the social, political, and historical aspects of power misuse (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). Through a careful analysis of linguistic choices, CDA identifies which voices are given importance or sidelined, revealing how power functions in discourse.

CDA uncovers ideological dimensions within religious interpretations, revealing "the ideological effects of texts" (Fairclough and Wodak 1997). Ideologies often embed themselves deeply in religious language discourse, making CDA an effective method for uncovering hidden or explicit belief systems that shape interpretations of sacred texts.

Additionally, CDA facilitates an in-depth examination of religious interpretations through discourse structures, enabling the exploration of social events through texts (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999). In religious settings, this involves investigating language organization patterns, metaphor use, and how these linguistic components contribute to framing concepts and shaping meaning-construction processes.

At the core of this research lies its adoption of Comparative Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), drawing heavily upon Fairclough (2001) and Van Dijk (2009)'s seminal works (Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999). CDA as articulated by Fairclough transcends traditional linguistic analysis by providing an effective lens to expose power relations, ideologies, discourse structures within religious interpretations as well as power relations in both interpretations of verse (2:256). This framework serves as methodological scaffold for investigating Maulana Maududi's and Javed Ghamidi's interpretations of Surah Al-Baqarah (2:256).

The Comparative CDA draws upon Fairclough's three-dimensional model for textual analysis, discursive practice, and social practice (Fairclough 2001; Van Dijk 2009). First dimension provides insight into linguistic elements; second dimension delves further into how language forms meaning within wider contexts; while last dimension uncovers power relations or ideological influences shaping scholar interpretations of what has been studied (Fairclough, 2001; Van Dijk 2009).

The use of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) in studying Quranic translation is grounded in its extensive literature within discourse analysis and linguistic studies. Scholars such as Jaworski & Coupland (1999) emphasized its importance in unravelling language complexities and revealing power relations and embedded ideologies in communication. Methodological frameworks provided by Wodak & Meyer (2009) and Fairclough (1995) enabled CDA to systematically analyse different interpretations, exposing power relations and discourse structures within religious discourses.

Blommaert and Bulcaen (2000a, 2000b) contribute to this framework by explaining CDA as a tool to dissect language use and unveil implicit power structures in societal discourse. Fowler (1991) explored language use in news reporting, highlighting the

significance of discourse analysis in understanding ideological aspects of language. Integrating these references strengthens the rationale, placing Quranic translation in a broader theoretical context that includes foundational works from discourse analysis and critical discourse studies. This approach allows for an insightful examination of power structures, ideologies, and discourse dynamics within interpretations of Quranic verses, enhancing academic insights into religious discourse.

Research methodology employs an impartial and objective examination of Maududi and Ghamidi's discourses presented via comparative discourse analysis, using its comparative framework as the starting point. First step involves an in-depth investigation of language elements like vocabulary choices, metaphors and rhetorical strategies (Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999; Fairclough 2001).

The second phase entails dissecting discursive practices by exploring how language constructs meaning within social, cultural, and political settings (Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999; Fairclough 2001; Van Dijk 2009). In so doing, historical and sociocultural factors that impact interpretation will also be taken into consideration (Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999; Fairclough 2001; Van Dijk 2009).

Simultaneously, the study investigates social practices by unpacking power relations and ideological influences shaping interpretations, exploring societal, political and cultural elements affecting scholars' perspectives (Wodak & Meyer 2009; Ghamidi 2002).

To sum up, the methodology effectively combines textual, discursive, and social analyses, through comparative Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) framework to discuss the interpretations of both scholars. The application of various analytical tools allows for a comprehensive examination of language choices by providing insights into the broader social dynamics at play.

4. The Verse

In Islamic scholarship, few Qur'anic verses provoke as much discussion and debate as this verse in Surah Al-Baqarah (2:256).

<div dir="rtl">

لَآ اِكۡرَاهَ فِى الدِّيۡنِ ۙ قَدۡ تَّبَيَّنَ الرُّشۡدُ مِنَ الۡغَيِّ ۚ (2:256)

دین کے معاملے میں کوئی زور زبر دستی نہیں ہے۔ صحیح بات غلط خیالات سے الگ چھانٹ کے رکھ دی گئی ہے۔ (مودودی، ۲۵۶:۲؛ ص:۱۹۵-۶)

</div>

"There is no compulsion in the matter of religion. The right thing has been sorted out from the wrong thoughts (Maududi: 2:256; p 195-6. Google translation)

<div dir="rtl">

(یہ جو رویہ چاہیں، اختیار کریں)، دین کے معاملے میں (اللہ کی طرف سے) کوئی جبر نہیں ہے۔ حقیقت یہ ہے کہ ہدایت (اس قرآن کے بعد اب) گم راہی سے بالکل الگ ہو چکی ہے۔ (غامدی، البیان: البقرہ: ۲۵۶:۲)

</div>

"(Take whatever attitude you want), there is no compulsion (from Allah) in the matter of religion. The fact is that guidance (after this Qur'an) is completely separated from misguidance." (Ghamidi 2:256. Google translation)

This verse, declaring, "There is no coercion in religion," provides guidance when discussing religious freedom, coercion and finding balance between faith and free will.

This chosen verse invites to discover its many layers of meaning. Primary aim to conduct an in-depth comparative Critical Discourse Analysis of Maududi and Ghamidi's interpretations is to investigate the linguistic variations, power dynamics, ideologies and discourse structures underlying each interpretation's perspectives on religious freedom within the verse (2:256). Particular attention will be paid to their choice of words and sentence structures without making comments about the quality and validity of both interpretations.

5. CDA of Maududi and Ghamidi's Discourse on the Verse (2:256) – Discourse Practice

Examination of Surah Al-Baqarah 2:256 as translated by Abul Ala Maududi and Javed Ahmad Ghamidi offers an interesting journey into discourse practice to explore lexical choices, rhetorical devices, pragmatic approaches, coherence and semantic nuances. The exploration offers insights into their distinct approaches and individual perspectives.

Lexical Choices

Maududi uses the word "صِّحَات" (righteousness), which conveys abstract ideals without probing into specific details. This technique allows for different interpretations in religious settings and encourages thinking about broader principles of righteousness. In contrast, Ghamidi chooses a more concrete term "بدایت" (guidance), which emphasizes that guidance is tangibly available as a reality and appeals more explicitly to audiences that prefer an empirical understanding of truth.

These choices reveal much about their respective translator's tendencies. While both terms truly convey the meaning of the actual Arabic word "الرُّشْدُ", both scholars translated the word reflecting their sociopolitical background. Maududi's use of abstract language allows for a more open and diverse interpretation of righteousness. It invites individuals to contemplate and interpret righteousness according to their understanding and context. Ghamidi's preference for concrete terms aligns with a more empirical and straightforward understanding of truth, catering to specific audience preferences. His lexical choices also appeal to an audience that values a more realistic and precise approach to religious teachings.

Rhetorical Devices

Maududi uses metaphorical language to highlight that no one should be forced to make imposed religious choices, reinforcing the voluntary nature of such decisions. On the other hand, Ghamidi uses repetition and antithesis to highlight the notion of free will in religious matters. Both translators strategically employ these devices to maximize rhetorical impact influencing how their audiences interpret the message in the verse.

Maududi's use of parallelism in the phrase, "The right thing has been separated from wrong thoughts," provides a balanced effect, drawing attention to his understanding of right and wrong and adding clarity to his translation of religious text. Ghamidi used antithesis with "Take whatever attitude you like" followed by "There is no compulsion" to emphasize religious freedom.

In summary, Maududi's metaphorical language and use of parallelism contribute to a clear and balanced expression of religious concepts, while Ghamidi's reliance on repetition and antithesis highlights the importance of free will in religion. The careful

deployment of these rhetorical devices by both translators shapes the audience's perception of the message within the verse.

Pragmatic approach

Maududi's emphasis on the freedom to choose in matters of faith reflects his practical approach. His translation addresses concerns about religious coercion and reflects his broader belief in individual agency in practicing Islam. While he emphasizes the freedom to choose in matters of faith, there's a paradox in the absence of an actor when he mentions "no compulsion." This paradox suggests a disappearance of individual agency, which seems to symbolize divine intervention and emphasize transcendence over directive control. The practicality of individual choice appears to generate a divine influence.

When addressing questions about divine guidance, Ghamidi employs the imperative structure along with the statement "guidance is completely separated from misguidance," offering a straightforward response. Nevertheless, the emphasis on individual responsibility, implicit in the imperative syntax, indicates a move away from relying solely on divine guidance. This approach implies a shared responsibility between individuals and divine influence, highlighting a subtle understanding of the dynamics between human agency and divine intervention.

Cohesion and Coherence

An examination of cohesion and coherence within translations reveals distinctive approaches for cohesion and coherence. Maududi uses a straightforward and direct structure, linking the concept of non-compulsion with distinguishing right from wrong. This approach ensures a cohesive understanding within his translation and helps in the seamless comprehension of the intended message for followers who seek a straightforward interpretation.

Ghamidi's translation, on the other hand, offers an interesting twist by simultaneously maintaining coherence while adding subtle perspectives. Using expressions like "Take whatever attitude you wish" before stating there is no religious compulsion reflects total individual freedom and establishes a smooth flow of ideas before declaring the absence of coercion within religion. This approach not only maintains a coherent structure but also adds depth to the interpretation for those seeking a subtle understanding of religious principles. The variations in these approaches highlight the diverse strategies employed in translating the verse, which influence readers' perception to interpret and internalize the message.

Semantic Analysis

An in-depth semantic analysis of verse 2:256 in Maududi and Ghamidi's translations exposes varied meanings assigned to specific terms. It also provides insight into cultural, historical, and contextual influences on specific terms. Maududi's emphasis on "no compulsion" and "right thing" reflects his view that freedom should come first before moral rightness (right thing). His choice aligns perfectly with his broad perspective on individual freedom and righteousness.

In contrast, Ghamidi's semantic selections highlight individual freedom, and the intentional distinction between guidance and misguidance addresses the evolving dynamics in postcolonial Pakistan. Expressions like 'Take whatever attitude you wish' in his translation emphasize individual autonomy, accommodating diverse

perspectives. Additionally, Ghamidi's choices are influenced by cultural, historical, and contextual factors, revealing how language nuances within his translation of verse 2:256 are shaped by these elements.

Also, Maududi's syntactical structure "there is no compulsion" carries implied tone that this is a declaration from God, which ironically contrasts with the freedom granted consequently. Whereas Ghamidi sentence construction prioritizes the freedom over the message giving it a tone of an announcement which is further softened with added explanation in parenthesis "(from Allah)".

To conclude, Maududi and Ghamidi's discourse on Surah Al-Baqarah (2:256) provides an exhaustive investigation of their individual approaches. From lexical choices, rhetorical devices, pragmatic approaches, cohesion/coherence issues and semantic nuances, their interpretations provide an expansive range of interpretations which demonstrate both depth of translation capabilities for various audience needs and how adaptable translation can be to suit them all.

6. Discourse Practice Dimension analysis

Maududi strategically tailors his interpretation of Surah Al-Baqarah 2:256 to match with his primary ideological stance of society and political organization based on his interpretation of Islamic principles. To do this, he utilizes language and framing techniques that demonstrate a firm opposition against religious coercion and forcefulness.

Maududi's Discourse

Maududi's discursive strategy becomes apparent upon closer consideration of his lexical choices and interpretation of key concepts within translations. Maududi places great stress on a lack of coercion by using the term "زورزبردستی", which means force or coercion in religious matters, to emphasize his staunch rejection. Maududi strategically employs this linguistic choice to clearly signal his opposition to coercion. Additionally, Maududi employs "غلط خیالات" (wrong thoughts) in his writing to establish an unmistakable distinction between correct and incorrect beliefs. It is meaningful that he hooses "صحیح بات" (righteousness) as an established reality, no matter how abstract it is, and places it next to "غلط خیالات" (wrong thoughts) which apparently sound an amalgamation of erratically gathered ideas. Maududi uses this strategy of juxtaposing semi abstract concept with a totally abstract notion to empower righteousness over wrong thoughts. This also confirms Maududi's implicit ideological stance in the discourse that anything other than righteousness is nothing but haphazard thoughts.

Maududi goes further than simply rejecting coercion as an isolated theological assertion. Instead, he positions it within an overall strategy to advocate for an Islamic-inspired societal and political order. First and foremost, he highlights non-compulsion as one of the fundamental values in Islamic teachings, thus setting forth his ideal of creating a society in which individuals are expected to adhere to Islamic values without coercion or force from outside sources. Maududi connects his opposition to force with the idea of an Islamic political system. He clarifies that the absence of coercion can create a setting where people are encouraged to willingly follow Islamic principles in political and social dealings. However, his political system seeks a set up where people are not only allowed to live purely in an Islamic way but also the state will ensure that

no Muslim acts otherwise. However, politically Maududi holds the belief that the state, in an Islamic context, has the authority to penalize Muslims who choose to adopt a different faith or deviate from Islam. According to his interpretation, apostasy (leaving Islam) is considered a crime in an Islamic state, and he argues for the imposition of legal consequences for such actions. We understand that the connotation of expectation is implied in the translation. This implied connotation emerges more explicitly when compared to Ghamidi's translation with his supportive phrase in parenthesis "یہ جو رویہ چاہیں،

اختیار کریں" (Take whatever attitude you want) which denotes sheer voluntary.

Maududi's strategy relied heavily on supposedly instinctive acceptance of Islamic values rather than forced compliance. By employing this technique as the central component in his discourse, he is linking religious principles with his political vision to persuade audiences of both its viability and desirability as part of an Islamic political order. In other words, Maududi establishes an Islamic political order founded upon voluntary compliance to Islamic ideals.

One may argue that Maududi's language construction betrays his intention that individuals freely adopt Islamic ideology; yet their acceptance often appears forced or forced upon them, leaving the only choice as that of accepting Islam itself. However, as Ghamidi also observes, all the heavenly religions convey the same message which is instinctively insinuated in human nature and in the absence of any guidance, purged human agrees on the same universal values and teachings (2007). Furthermore, language choices and framing techniques reinforce certain sociopolitical agendas. By rejecting coercion and purging away wrong thoughts Maududi subtly reinforces his vision of an Islamic state where religious principles play an integral part in shaping norms of behavior and society norms.

Maududi's discursive strategy goes well beyond interpretation of the verse, serving as an advocate and communicator of his broader sociopolitical vision, in line with his ideological framework. The depth and sophistication of Maududi's language choices show his strategic approach in producing discourse.

Ghamidi's Discourse

Javed Ahmad Ghamidi stands in stark contrast to Maududi. His translation of verse 2:256 provides an approachable yet subtle discursive strategy. A close examination reveals several elements which contribute to Ghamidi's unique discursive stance characterized by rationality and contextual understanding.

Ghamidi employs language that emphasizes rationality and contextual understanding, using phrases like "(یہ جو رویہ چاہیں،اختیار کریں)" (Take whatever attitude you like) to introduce flexibility into his interpretation and signal his openness toward differing perspectives and individual choices. This reflects Ghamidi's dedication towards adopting more adaptable, inclusive approaches to religious understanding.

Ghamidi's discursive strategy becomes evident through his emphasis on rationality and contextualization, positioning him as an engaged scholar who addresses contemporary challenges head on. Ghamidi's translation serves not just to interpret scripture theologically but rather provides tools to address and manage present day complexities - thus reflecting his larger ideological commitment towards contextualized yet rational Islam.

Ghamidi's discourse seeks to unmask traditional interpretations of verse from traditional religious discourse, through his selection of language and emphasis on individual choice. He challenges established power structures within religious discourse within his translation thereby questioning conventional norms while encouraging more sophisticated understandings of religious principles.

Ghamidi's translation conveys an ideological underpinning of contextual and rational Islam that shapes its interpretation, setting him as an activist voice against status quo interpretation of religious texts. Therefore, beyond translation Ghamidi uses his discursive strategy as an advocate for more inclusive, adaptable interpretation of religious texts that takes context into consideration.

Ghamidi's discursive strategy can be described by its emphasis on rationality, flexibility, and challenging traditional interpretations of religious texts. This aligns with his larger ideological stance while positioning his translation as an active means to tackle contemporary challenges. Ghamidi's discursive strategy goes even deeper by being capable of encouraging inclusivity while creating nuanced understanding within religious debates.

Maududi and Ghamidi agree on many principles regarding freedom from coercion and clarity of guidance in matters of faith; however, advanced discursive analysis reveals the diverse approaches they used when conveying these shared principles.

Maududi's discursive strategy can be defined by assertiveness and politically charged language, using phrases such as "زور زبردستی" (compulsion) and "غلط خیالات" (wrong thoughts) to demonstrate his strong rejection of forceful beliefs while drawing clear distinctions between right and wrong beliefs. Maududi's assertive language reinforces his wider ideological position of decisively interpretating religious doctrines with his language highlighting. This clarity in language helps establish a distinct sociopolitical agenda.

Ghamidi takes an elegantly subtle approach in his discursive strategy. His language choices, including expressions such as "یہ جو رویہ چاہیں، اختیار کریں" (Take whatever attitude you like) suggest flexibility and individual choice within religious beliefs framework. These statements show an openness toward diverse viewpoints while offering more adaptable interpretation of religious principles.

A discursive practice analysis shows that while both scholars share common principles, their differing discursive strategies create subtle variations in tone, emphasis and overall presentation of those principles. Maududi's assertive interpretation accentuates clear delineations between right and wrong while Ghamidi offers room for diversity within religious frameworks.

Overall, discursive practice analysis shows that Maududi and Ghamidi employed different discursive strategies despite sharing similar principles. Maududi used assertive and politically charged language that led to decisive interpretation while Ghamidi's nuanced approach allowed personal autonomy as well as more flexible interpretation of religious beliefs. Their differing discursive strategies reflect larger differences in approaches towards religious interpretation and communication.

Analyzing Abul Ala Maududi and Javed Ahmad Ghamidi's translations of verse 2:256 through Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) reveals complex power structures and ideological influences. CDA serves as a powerful analytical tool that exposes hidden

power structures as well as power relations within language use that reveal implicit power relations as well as specific ideologies within discourse.

Maududi's translation positions God as the ultimate authority, emphasizing an Islamic view of power that emphasizes hierarchies of power structures and subjugation to divine control. People are expected to submit to it; thus, emphasizing His superiority over humanity while further reinforcing a strict view of authority. Maududi suggests adherence to Allah is the sole path toward liberation thereby further reinforcing such views of authority and control.

Ghamidi's translation takes an open and inclusive approach. He emphasizes God's mercy and justice while suggesting an adaptable relationship between Him and us. His interpretation provides for complete freedom of choice while emphasizing individual rights more strongly. Unlike Maududi, Ghamidi implies enhanced personal liberties making this verse relatable for modern audiences.

Ghamidi holds that God's authority is supreme yet distant, providing humans maximum space in life. Maududi, however, holds to traditional perspectives which posit people cannot be left alone and must be closely regulated, perhaps by means of an earthly state representing His law to enforce at all costs. These distinct interpretations reflect these ideologies within the translation of the verse.

Also, these translations reveal wider sociopolitical realities. Maududi's interpretation mirrors British India and its challenges under colonial rule; Ghamidi responds to postcolonial Pakistan and its complex society while seeking balance between tradition and modernity, and serving as lenses through which these scholars interpret and position themselves within the discourse surrounding verse 2:256.

To conclude, Critical Discourse Analysis can reveal Maududi and Ghamidi's translations with respect to power structures, ideologies foundations and discursive strategies that they utilize. Their positions within discourse as well as sociopolitical contexts offer invaluable insight into interpreting Quranic verses amid changing religious and societal landscapes provide useful context and provide invaluable knowledge of this challenging endeavor.

Analysis From a Social Practices Perspective

Analyzing verse (2:256) of Surah Al-Baqarah through the lens of social practices means understanding how Maududi and Ghamidi's translations reflect, and shape social dynamics, cultural contexts and broader societal implications associated with the verse.

Maududi's translation highlights an Islamic state vision through the absence of coercion and clear separation of right from wrong thoughts, reflecting his social practice perspective rooted in Islamic law. Maududi used language such as "زورزبردستی", which resonates with British India where Islamic political power was being called for as an answer against colonial rule. His translation further serves the social practice goal of advocating for specific societal organization as well as reinforcing notions of religious authority within governance structures (Maududi, 1960 & 2002). His interpretation again may be viewed as self-contradictory when he presents the idea of "no compulsion" on one hand, on the other he advocates a political system where the state can force its citizens to assume a certain way of "Islamic" lifestyle completely defined by the state.

Conversely, Ghamidi's translation emphasizes rationality and individual choice, distinguishing guidance from misguidance to fit with his social practice viewpoint in postcolonial Pakistan. His adapted approach mirrors an engagement with societies undergoing transition while seeking balance between tradition and modernity. He encourages a more contextually aware interpretation of Islam that is reflective of contemporary Pakistani societal dynamics.

Both translations share similarities in their promotion of religious tolerance, emphasizing freedom of religion without coercion, and emphasizing clarity of guidance, social practices which contribute to Islamic discourse on individual freedom in matters of faith. While their language and focus differ significantly, both help create an atmosphere which stresses choice over coercion in religious matters.

Social practices demonstrate how Maududi and Ghamidi influence society through their translations, by shaping attitudes and beliefs through translation. Maududi may influence social dynamics by reinforcing rigid interpretations of religious doctrines that could shape governance practices. Ghamidi's unique approach may foster an atmosphere that emphasizes individual autonomy within religious belief systems while reflecting an adaptable and contextually aware Islam.

The Social Practices Perspective emphasizes that Maududi and Ghamidi, in their translations, played a significant role in shaping the sociocultural dynamics in their environments. They actively participated in processes like identity formation, contributing to and influencing these sociocultural aspects. Their interpretations also had an influence on everyday practices by shaping understandings about religious concepts, individual freedom and Islamic involvement within societies.

6. Social and Political Implications of the Analysis

Abul Ala Maududi and Javed Ahmad Ghamidi offer different perspectives in translating the verse, each carrying significant implications for contemporary Pakistani society marked by distinct cultural, political, and social dynamics. Maududi rejects coercion, distinguishes between right and wrong, and aligns closely with a more conservative interpretation of Islam while Ghamidi emphasizes the establishment of an Islamic state strictly guided by its principles, presenting challenges in Pakistan's diverse and pluralistic setting.

Maududi's perspective carries political implications that might resonate with those seeking a traditional Islamic governance. However, applying his vision in modern Pakistan requires careful consideration due to various social norms and cultural dynamics. While assertive language and hierarchical authority may find support among conservative circles, they pose challenges in accommodating developing societal norms and individual freedoms.

In contrast, Ghamidi offers a view characterized by rationality and flexibility, challenging traditional interpretations of Islam. Advocating for individual choice within contextualised interpretations, Ghamidi provides accessible and open approaches that better respond to contemporary challenges. His emphasis on adaptability resonates with those aspiring to build an inclusive and harmonious society, reflecting Pakistan's diverse cultural landscape and promoting tolerance among different groups.

In Pakistan, the way people receive Maududi and Ghamidi's ideas is influenced by the peaceful coexistence of various voices in society. Balancing diversity and shared values is challenging due to differing religious beliefs and cultural practices. Political affiliations also matter, as Maududi's vision aligns with certain movements, while Ghamidi's resonates with those advocating for moderate governance.

Ghamidi's focus on rationality might appeal to the younger, educated population dealing with modern complexities. Achieving a balance that respects diversity, tackles modern challenges, and promotes inclusivity is crucial for successful Pakistani citizenship. How these perspectives are received depends on ongoing discussions, societal changes, and the ability to address the diverse needs of the population.

8. Conclusion

This Comparative Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) analyses Maulana Maududi and Javed Ghamidi's interpretations of verse 2:256, making substantial contributions in religious studies, linguistics, and critical discourse analysis. Studying differences and beliefs in a chosen Quranic verse reveals the intricate connections between language, power dynamics, and ideology. This analysis shows how these elements influence religious discussions by highlighting either the freedom to worship or the coercion of worshippers. An analysis focusing on sociocultural contexts reveals historical and cultural influences on Maududi and Ghamidi's perspectives. Commonalities and differences emerge in how both emphasize non-compulsion, with Maududi using assertive discourse that furthers his political agenda, while Ghamidi using his subtle approach to test existing power structures. Critical Discourse Analysis uses language analysis to reveal power structures and ideological dimensions within Islamic thought, simultaneously showcasing scholars' unique contributions to ongoing interpretative dialogues in this realm of philosophy. This study contributes to our understanding of religious interpretation by examining its complex dynamics. It focuses on language, power, and ideology in cultural, historical, and sociological contexts, providing fresh perspectives for religious studies, linguistics, and critical discourse analysis.

References

1. Adams, Charles J. (1983). "Maududi and the Islamic State". In Esposito, John L. (ed.). *Voices of Resurgent Islam*. Oxford University Press

2. Al Mawrid Hind (2 July 2017) "Introduction to 'Meezan' at International Book Fair | New Delhi | Javed Ahmad Ghamidi". You Tube (in Urdu). Last retrieved on 13 January 2024 from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xxeOdD62FpY&t=910s

3. Al-Qur'ān, 2: 256.

4. Blommaert, J., & Bulcaen, C. (2000). Critical Discourse Analysis. Annual Review of Anthropology, 29, 447-466.

5. Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis. Edinburgh University Press.

6. Fairclough, N. (1995). Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language. Longman.

7. Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis: An Overview. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction (Vol. 2, pp. 258-284). SAGE Publications.

8. Fairclough, N. (2001). Language and Power (2nd ed.). Pearson.

9. Fowler, R. (1991). Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press. Routledge.

10. Ghamidi, J. A. (2007). Al-Bayaan. Retrieved on 12 January 2024 from https://www.javedahmedghamidi.org/#!/quran?chapter=2&paragraph=133&type=Ghamidi

11. Ghamidi, J. A. (2001). Official website of Ghamidi/Almawrid. Retrieved January 13, 2024, from https://www.javedahmedghamidi.org/#!/about-ghamidi?q=5a3584ab05ad589800bf7d32

12. Ghamidi, Javed (2018). *Mizan*. Lahore. Al-Mawrid.

13. Iftikhar, Asif (2005). *Jihad and the Establishment of Islamic Global Order: A Comparative Study of the Interpretative Approaches and Worldviews of Abu al-A'la Mawdudi and **Javed Ahmad Ghamidi***. (Master's Thesis). Montreal: McGill University.

14. Jaworski, A., & Coupland, N. (1999). The Discourse Reader. Routledge.

15. Nasr, Seyyed Vali Reza (1994). *The Vanguard of the Islamic Revolution: The Jamaʿat-i Islami of Pakistan*. University of California Press.

16. Nasr, Seyyed Vali Reza (1996). *Mawdudi and the Making of Islamic Revivalism*. Oxford University Press.

17. Masud, M.K. (2007). "Rethinking shari'a: Javed Ahmad Ghamidi on hudud". *Die Welt des Islams*. Brill Publishers. **47** (3–4): 356–375.

18. Maududi, S. A. A. (1963). A Short Hustory of the Revivalsit Movement in Islam. Lahore. Islamic Publications.

19. Maududi, S. A. A. (1960). *The Islamic Law and Constitution*. Islamic Publications (Pvt.) Limited.

20. Maududi, S. A. A. (1979). Tafhimul Quran, Vol. I, Lahore.

21. Maududi, A. A. (2000). *Tafhim-ul-Quran.* Islamic Publications.

22. Maududi, A. A. (1972). *Tafheem ul Quran.* (pp. 195-196). Available online in scanned PDF version: https://tafheemulquran.org/tafhim/al-baqarah/

23. Mawdudi, A. A. (2002). *Towards Understanding Islam*. Islamic Circle of North America.

24. Van Dijk, T. A. (2009). Society and Discourse: How Social Contexts Influence Text and Talk. Cambridge University Press.

25. Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis. SAGE Publications.

26. Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). Critical Discourse Analysis: History, Agenda, Theory, and Methodology. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis (2nd ed., pp. 1-33). Sage.