

## TRANSLATION PROCEDURES AND IDEOLOGY OF TWO DIFFERENT ENGLISH TRANSLATION VERSIONS OF *SURAH* AL-FATIAH: A CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS

Sukarno, Risyah Adilia, dan Riskia Setiarini  
Universitas Jember  
Email: msukarno08@gmail.com

### Abstract

English translation of the Holy Qur'an comes as solutions for *Muslims* and non-*Muslims* worldwide to be able to understand the message of the Holy Qur'an besides its authentic Arabic text. Two of the most famous versions are translated by Saheeh International SI (2004) and Abdel Haleem hereafter AH (2004). Since Arabic and English belong to different language families, the translations resulted in the variation of lexicons and grammatical structures to express the same meaning in English from the Holy Qur'an. This research attempts to reveal how lexical and grammatical differences happened in two different English translation versions of *surah* al-Fatihah by SI and AH. The data were analyzed using a contrastive analysis method with content analysis. The results showed that firstly, there are lexical and grammatical differences in the five *ayats*. Secondly, SI used procedures that are mostly oriented to the SLT such as transcription and componential analysis while AH used procedures that are mostly oriented to the TLT such as modulation and contraction. Lastly, the two translators applied different dominant ideologies on their translations. SI represents the foreignization ideology while AH represents domestication ideology.

**Keywords:** al-Fatihah, English translation, contrastive analysis, translation procedures, translation ideology

## PROSEDUR PENERJEMAHAN DAN IDEOLOGI DALAM DUA VERSI TERJEMAHAN BAHASA INGGRIS SURAT AL-FATIAH: SEBUAH ANALISIS KONTRASTIF

### Abstrak

Terjemahan bahasa Inggris dari kitab suci AlQur'an adalah sebuah solusi untuk orang-orang muslim dan nonmuslim di seluruh dunia untuk dapat memahami isi dari kitab suci AlQur'an di samping teks Arab aslinya. Di antara versi terjemahan-terjemahan kitab suci AlQur'an, dua yang paling terkenal diterjemahkan oleh Saheeh International yang disingkat SI (2004) dan Abdel Haleem (2004) yang disingkat AH. Karena bahasa Arab dan bahasa Inggris berasal dari keluarga bahasa yang berbeda,

terdapat beberapa perbedaan leksikal dan gramatikal dalam terjemahan dari kitab suci Al-Qur'an untuk menunjukkan makna yang sama di dalam bahasa Inggris. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengkaji bagaimana perbedaan leksikal dan gramatikal terjadi pada dua versi terjemahan *surah* al-Fatihah oleh SI dan AH. Data dianalisis menggunakan metode analisis kontrastif dengan analisis konten. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa pertama, terdapat perbedaan leksikal dan gramatikal yang dapat ditemukan di 5 *ayat*. Kedua, SI menggunakan prosedur yang kebanyakan berorientasi pada bahasa sumber seperti transkripsi dan analisis komponen, sedangkan AH menggunakan prosedur yang kebanyakan berorientasi pada bahasa sasaran seperti modulasi dan reduksi. Selain itu, SI cenderung menggunakan ideologi foreignisasi, sedangkan AH cenderung menggunakan ideologi domestikasi.

**Kata kunci:** Al-Fatihah, terjemahan bahasa Inggris, analisis kontrastif, prosedur penerjemahan, ideologi penerjemahan

## INTRODUCTION

The Holy Qur'an as the fundamental source of life for *Muslims* (ones who follow and practice Islam) has been translated into various languages all over the world. It is done to facilitate *Muslims* or non-*Muslims* to understand the messages of the Holy Qur'an for those who cannot read and understand Arabic text. One of the target languages is English as a recognized global language.

Translating the Holy Qur'an as a Holy Book is somehow so tricky because the source language text (SLT) is complex in all its linguistic aspects, unique, inimitable, and rich with cultural elements. Therefore, the biggest challenge of translating the Holy Qur'an is that the translation must be able to convey the meaning from Arabic to the target language text (TLT) without missing one piece of it that can cause misleading or misinterpreting by the readers. Translation as a language and cultural bridge should not reduce the essence, emotion, culture, and value of the sacred text.

However, since translation was human made, it cannot be denied that in the process of interpreting and transferring the SLT to TLT always involves the translators' subjective judgment, understanding, and background knowledge. It also resulted in various versions of Holy Qur'an translations. This might confuse the readers to choose one version to read and it also can cause the failure to transfer the important messages of the Holy Qur'an. In the context of the Holy Qur'an translation, the major factor that will define the way the readers perceive and understand the Holy Qur'an translation is how the messages of the SLT is presented to the readers through the TLT. Meanwhile, due to the various focuses and purposes, translators applied various translation procedures, techniques, and methods to produce the most appropriate meaning and the most natural form of the translation about the purposes and target readers they want to achieve. For that reason, an application of linguistics

to the translation of the Holy Qur'an helps to reveal the differences of the translations, the translation procedures, and the reason for the emergence of many translation versions of the Holy Qur'an.

Two of the most recognized and well-known English translation versions of the Holy Qur'an are written by Saheeh International hereafter SI (Saheeh International, 2004) and by Abdel Haleem hereafter AH (Haleem, 2004). One of the parts (*surah*) of the Holy Qur'an is entitled 'al-Fatihah' at the beginning of the Holy Book. Al-Fatihah which means "the opening" is regarded as the most important *surah* in the Holy Qur'an due to its urgency in the Islamic rituals. Al-Fatihah is regarded as the most important *surah* in the Holy Qur'an since it emphasizes the oneness of Allah (*Tawheed*) which becomes the basis of every *Muslim's* faith. It is a compulsory requirement for every *Muslim* to recite this *surah* during their five times in a day prayer in every *raka'ah* (the number of prayers). Therefore, this *surah* is the most recited in prayer and most *Muslims* are acquainted with this *surah*. As a result, they are able to memorize this *surah* well although they never read it in the Holy Qur'an. Moreover, this *surah* is recited not only in prayers, but also in every religious occasion such as *halaqah* or *majlis* (*Muslim's* gathering), praying for the death, opening for meetings and many other social events.

Some *Muslims* might read a *surah* periodically in daily life, such as: *surah* al-Kahfi or *surah* Yaseen once a week on every Friday, but the quantity never surpasses the quantity of al-Fatihah

recitation. These facts make this *surah* as the most remembered and easiest yet accessible to *Muslims* and easy to be understood by non-*Muslims* because it only consists of seven *ayat*. The strong reason for the usage of this *surah* in this research is that it is widely used and easily to understand.

In the academic atmosphere, several experts have done researches in relation to contrastive analysis, translation procedures, and translation ideology with the object of *surahs* in the Holy Qur'an. Firstly, Zadeh, Lashkarian, and Zadeh (2015) did a contrastive research by examining four translation versions of *surah* al-Fatihah. This study shows that there are different translation processes found in the four versions. The two of the translation versions produced by Pikhthal (1930) and by Ali (1983) were more formal correspondent in which their translations were faithful to the structure and to the word order of the source language while the other two version of the translations conducted by Arbery (1955) and Shakir (2003) were more dynamic equivalent in which their translations were adjusted based on the structure of the target language.

The second research were carried out by Amjad and Farahani (2013) who compared the English translations of Qur'anic Divine Names (DNs) by Shakir (1985), Qarai (2003), and Nikayin (2006). Besides finding the problems in translating the Qur'anic Divine Names (DNs), it was also found that the most frequent strategies adopted by each translator were varied. Shakir and Nikayin applied the "near-synonymy" strategy to deliberately save the poetical

spirit of the original text in the translated version while Qarai applied the “expansion” strategy to attain the semantic equivalence through asking the readers to follow the meaning of the Arabic text of the Quran.

The next study was done by Diwasasri (2015) who also contrasted the English and Arabic pair languages, but she only limited the verb forms of English and Arabic sentences derived from *surah* “al-Baqarah” and its translation by Saheeh International (Saheeh, 1997). The aim of this research was to investigate the similarities and differences in the morphological system of verb formation in the *surah*. It is found that the form of Arabic and English verbs was quite different in aspects, tenses, moods, and subject-verb agreement.

Finally, the research on translation was conducted by Al Farisi (2015). He analyzed the Holy Qur’an and its translation published by the Ministry of Religious Affairs of Indonesia to understand the translation procedures or techniques and ideology in dealing with *iltifat* (shifting) speech act in the Holy Qur’an and its Indonesia translation. The corpus of Quranic verses that contained *iltifat* speech act along with their translation showed that more than 60,16% of *iltifat* speech act was translated using the literal procedure. The domination of the literal procedure showed that the translator tended to be source language-oriented, therefore, indicated the tendency of foreignization ideology.

From the previous studies above, it is seen that the Holy Qur’an translations are very interesting to be analyzed

through various linguistic perspectives. Although some researches have compared the language of the Holy Qur’an and the English translation, most of them only deal with the translation of the Holy Qur’an into one version of translation. Nevertheless, this research aims to describe the translation procedures and the translators’ intention while doing the translation process that resulted to the linguistic properties differences (lexical and grammatical features) in two English translation versions by SI and AH which lead to ideological orientation.

## METHODS

This study is qualitative research with a case study approach. The sources of the data were the translation versions of the first *surah* of the Holy Quran, *surah al-Fatihah*, that consists of seven *ayat*. The two English translation versions of *surah al-Fatihah* are from SI (Saheeh, 2004) which was published by Al-Muntada Al-Islami and from AH (Haleem, 2004) which was published by Oxford University Press. The data were collected by reading the two English translation versions critically to find the different lexical choices and grammatical structures by contrasting them.

The data analyzed in this research are the lexical choices and grammatical arrangements from the SLT and the two TLTs collected through the critical reading. Analysis and discussions were done under contrastive analysis by Tarigan’s method (Tarigan, 1992) to find the lexical and grammatical differences (Haiguang, 2015) between both TLTs and from SLT to TLTs (if any). Newmark’s seventeen translation

procedures (Newmark, 1982) are also used to support the contrastive analysis by describing and interpreting the translation procedures chosen with the help of the context of the *ayah* from the *Tafseer*. Each difference in the English version (TL) is compared with its Arabic version (SL) to see the (possible) shifting process. Following Venuti's theory (Venuti, 1995) and Budianto (2019) the tendencies of translation procedure choices will lead to reveal the translation ideology, either foreignization or domestication, of each translator or whether the translation is culturally oriented to SLT or TLT.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Results

This research uses two translation texts as the source of the data. They are two English translation versions by SI and by AH. Because they are translated from one SLT, the linguistic elements should be contrasted to provide a better understanding of linguistic differences between the translation versions. To compare the two translation versions, the contrastive method proposed by Tarigan (1992) is applied. The linguistic features that are contrasted are the lexical choices and grammatical structures of the two English translation versions. The result

of the analysis shows that lexical and grammatical differences are only found in five *ayah* out of seven *ayah* of *surah* al-Fatihah (there are no lexical and grammatical differences in the third and sixth *ayah* either between the two TLTs or between the SLT and the two TLTs). Furthermore, the lexical differences are found in the five *ayah*, but the grammatical differences only happen in ayah 1 and ayah 6. The result of this research is presented in Table 1 below.

### Discussion

The lexical and grammatical differences were analyzed to reveal the translation procedures applied by SI and AH to translate *surah* al-Fatihah, in turn, they can be used to determine the translation orientation (ideology) for each translator (SI and AH). The analysis also shows that the more differences found in the translation, the more translation procedures are used. After classifying the translation procedures according to their translation orientation and counting the number of the translation procedures, the translation motivation behind the translation procedures is revealed. The translation motivation shows the translation ideologies of the translators.

**Table 1. The Representation of the Lexical and Grammatical Differences**

Number of Differences in	<i>Ayah</i> 1	<i>Ayah</i> 2	<i>Ayah</i> 3	<i>Ayah</i> 4	<i>Ayah</i> 5	<i>Ayah</i> 6	<i>Ayah</i> 7
	Lexicons	2	4	-	2	1	-
Grammar	1	-	-	-	1	-	1

**Translation Procedures in SI and AH  
Translation Versions**

The interpretation of the lexical and grammatical differences shows the translation procedures applied by each translator. The differences indicate that in the translation process, the translators used different strategies in the rendering process of meaning from SLT to TLT in the form of words, phrases, and sentences. The frequency of the appearance of the translation procedures in each *ayah* according to SI and AH is presented below. It is seen that SI applied eighteen procedures while AH applied twenty-two procedures.

The detail analysis and interpretations of the translation procedures in the five *ayah* is presented through the following tables (Table 3 to Table 7). The first column shows the *ayah*, then it is followed by the SLT to the word/phrase which is translated, the third column contains the differences: the lexical difference (LF), and the grammatical difference (GF), and finally the translation versions (TLT 1 and TLT 2) are presented.

Table 3 demonstrates that the lexical differences can be found in the translation of the word (*lafdzul Jalalah*) اللهُ (Allāh, /ʔallo:h/) where SI kept it as “Allah”, while AH translated it into “God”. The word

**Table 2: The Frequency of the Translation Procedures in each *Ayah***

Translation Versions	<i>Ayah</i> 1	<i>Ayah</i> 2	<i>Ayah</i> 3	<i>Ayah</i> 4	<i>Ayah</i> 5	<i>Ayah</i> 6	<i>Ayah</i> 7
SI	2	6	-	2	2	-	6
AH	4	6	-	2	3	-	7

**Table 3. The Lexical and Grammatical Differences in the First *Ayah***

<i>Ayah</i>	SLT	Differences	TLT 1 (SI)	TLT 2 (AH)
1	the word اللهُ (Allāh, /ʔallo:h/)	LF	“/ʔallo:h/” translated into “Allah”	“/ʔallo:h/” translated into “God”
			No additional subjects	Added subjects “Lord” and “Giver”
		GF	<i>Jumlah ismiyyah</i> in the SLT that is equal with a sentence translated into prepositional phrases.	<i>Jumlah ismiyyah</i> in the SLT that is equal with a sentence translated into prepositional phrases.

الله (Allāh, /ʔallɔ:h/) is a proper noun which is the one and the only God in Islam. The word الله (Allāh, /ʔallɔ:h/) did not have its literal equivalence in English. SI with his translation “Allah” or he applied the transcription procedure that the translation is adapted through its transliteration. SI tends to preserve the authentic meaning which he wanted the readers (specifically addressed to the *Muslims*) to only refers to the Almighty Allah *SWT*. Meanwhile, AH with his translation “God” or he applied the compensation procedure to replace the SLT aspect of *Allah* with another acceptable element in the TLT, and it refers to the word “God” as an English (TLT) cultural word. In addition, he also applied componential analysis procedure in which the translator comparing the SLT word with the TLT word that has similar meaning and properties. The word الله (Allāh, /ʔallɔ:h/) is rendered into the more general word “God” which shares the same properties of the “King” or “Lord” of the world. AH also added subjects in the phrases besides “God” which are “Lord” and “Giver” which SI

did not do. The capital letters of “Lord” and “Giver” indicate that they also refer to a proper noun and, in this context, they refer to the “God” mentioned before. It is done to define the properties of “God”.

The grammatical differences are found in the grammatical shift that happened in the two TLTs where a *jumlah* that should be equal with a sentence is rendered into phrases in both versions. Therefore, SI and AH are applying the transposition procedure.

The difference found in the translation version of this *ayah* occurs only in lexicons. There are four lexical differences. The first is the additional word in parenthesis “[all]” before the word “praise” by SI, while AH is not. The existence of “/al/” before “/hamdu/” in *lafdzul Hamdalah* (al-ḥamdulillāh, /alḥamdulil-la:h/) is the form of *istigraq*. *Istigraq* means the word “/al/” encompasses all types of thanks, grateful, and appreciation solely for *Allah* the Exalted. Therefore, SI writes “all praise” to render /alḥamdu/ as close as possible to the SLT. In this case, SI is applying the

**Table 4. The Lexical and Grammatical Differences in the Second *Ayah***

<i>Ayah</i>	SLT	Differences	TLT 1 (SI)	TLT 2 (AH)
2	al-ḥamdulillāh	LF	Additional word in parenthesis “[all]” before the word “praise” the verb is translated into “is [due]” Translate “/ʔallɔ:h/” into “Allah” the translation of “/alḥa:lami:na/” into “the worlds”	No additional word before the word “praise” the verb is translated into “belongs” Translate “/ʔallɔ:h/” into God the translation of “/alḥa:lami:na/” into “the Worlds”
		GF	-	-

transcription procedure, although it is written in a parenthesis in his translation. This is an insertion which is inserted by the translator to help the translation of the *ayah* make more sense in the TLT. Therefore, SI also applied the modulation procedure to conform to the grammatical arrangement of the TLT. In contrast, AH does not add the word “[all]” before the word “praise”. So, AH applies the contraction procedure since he reduces the element “all” that is equal with “/al/” in the SLT.

The second is the translation of the verb where SI translates it into “is [due]” while AH into “belongs”. Although both SI & AH translate the verb into finite verbs, SI gives a word in parenthesis “[due]”. The word in the parenthesis “[due]” after the finite verb “is” might be added to form the preposition “due to”, for achieving the equality of meaning from “/lil-la:hi/” which is “attributable to”. It indicates that the translation by SI is written by following the grammatical structure of the TLT without ignoring the semantic aspect of its translation. Thus, like the translation of the previous element which is “/alhamdu/”, SI applies the transcription and modulation

procedures, meanwhile, AH does not add the word in parenthesis “[due]”, therefore, AH applies the contraction procedure.

The third is the word **اللّٰه** (Allāh, /ʔallɔ:h/) which is still rendered as “Allāh” by SI and as “God” by AH like in the previous *ayah*. SI with its translation “Allah” is applying the procedure transcription. AH with his translation “God” is applying the procedure compensation, cultural equivalence, and componential analysis.

The fourth is the translation of “/alʕa:lami:na/” into phrases where SI writes it as “the worlds” and AH writes it as “the Worlds” with a capital “W”. The literal meaning of this word is “world” and, in this context, it refers to everything that Allah created in life and Hereafter. AH writes it as a proper noun so he writes it with a capital letter in the beginning. He seems to be very oriented to the TLT in which he follows the English grammar guide to writing proper noun with a capital letter in the beginning. He applies modulation procedure to reproduce the message in the SLT in conformity with the norms of the TLT, while SI with its translation applies the transcription procedure.

**Table 5. The Lexical and Grammatical Differences in the Fourth *Ayah***

<i>Ayah</i>	SLT	Differences	TLT 1 (SI)	TLT 2 (AH)
4	/ma:lik/ and /ad-di:n/	LF	“/ma:lik/” translated into “Sovereign” “/ad-di:n/” translated into “Recompense”	“/ma:lik/” translated into “Master” “/ad-di:n/” translated into “Judgement”
		GF	-	-



As mentioned before that there are no lexical and grammatical differences found in the third *ayah*. In the fourth *ayah*, there are only two lexical differences which are synonymous. SI and AH use different lexicons to translate the words “/ma:lik/” and “/ad-di:n/”. SI translates “/ma:lik/” into “Sovereign” while AH into “Master”. Both the words “sovereign” and “master” basically share the same properties which refer to “the rulers”. However, “sovereign” has a stronger meaning which is “someone who possesses the supreme power, supreme ruler, and the most exalted kind” rather than “master” which means “someone who has people work for them for instance slave or servant, someone who has authority”.

Next, SI translates the word “/ad-di:n/” into “recompense” while AH into “judgment”. The words “recompense” and “judgment” also share the same properties which refer to “the act to give something like the way of compensation and forming evaluation for what someone has done”. In the context of this *surah*, this process is the judgment done by Allah to humankind. Therefore, the two

translators also did componential analysis by translating “/ad-di:n/” into “recompense” and “judgment” which are also synonymous.

The lexical differences of the translation of this *ayah* are at the translation of the *huruf* ‘wa’ as a conjunction into “and” by SI, but it is not translated by AH. In the researcher’s opinion, the conjunction “and” from the *huruf* “/wa/” should not be omitted in the translations since it gives a significant contribution as a coordinate conjunction of the two clauses to form a coherent compound sentence. This coordinator is meaningful in the context of this *ayah* and its translations. SI translates the word using transcription procedure while AH using contraction procedure since he omits it. However, in the translation of this *ayah*, AH gave a semi-colon punctuation (;) after the word “worship” to join the two clauses in his translation version. AH uses semi-colon without a coordinate conjunction in a compound sentence to join the two related independent clauses which are equal while a semi-colon or a comma in a compound sentence is written before the

**Table 6. The Lexical and Grammatical Differences in the Fifth *Ayah***

<i>Ayah</i>	SLT	Differences	TLT 1 (SI)	TLT 2 (AH)
5	The <i>huruf</i> “/wa/”	LF	The <i>huruf</i> “/wa/” translated into “and”	The <i>huruf</i> “/wa/” not translated, But, given a semi-colon (;) after the word “worship”
		GF	In the second clause after the conjunction “and”, SI omitted the introductory it and the finite verb “is”	In the second clause after the the semi-colon mark (;), AH did the complete repetition of the clauses with the introductory it and the finite verb “is”

coordinator of the clause and the semi-colon is only functioned as a punctuation marker in a sentence, not as a coordinator of the clauses (Wekker and Haegeman, 1989:27). Therefore, AH applies a recasting sentence procedure by altering the sentence at a syntactic level by modifying the conjunction of the clauses.

The grammatical differences are in the second clause after the conjunction “and” in SI version and the semi-colon (;) in the AH version. Since AH joins the clauses in his translation using the semicolon mark (;), he did the complete repetition of the clauses with the introductory it and the finite verb “is” in the second clause. Unlike AH, SI omitted the introductory it and the finite verb “is”

in the second clause and replaced both the grammatical features with the conjunction ‘and’. The use of the conjunction “and” between the clauses is following the grammatical arrangement of the SLT. The deletion of the introductory “it” and the finite verb “is” is motivated to avoid redundancy. Furthermore, when the SLT and both TLTs are compared literally, the translation arrangement by AH is closer to the SLT. In the SLT, “/ij-ja:ka/” is repeated twice thus if it is translated literally, the introductory it and the finite verb “is” also written twice. From these grammatical differences, it is seen that SI applies the transcription procedure while AH applies the modulation procedure.

**Table 7. The Lexical and Grammatical Differences in the Seventh *Ayah***

<i>Ayah</i>	SLT	Differences	TLT 1 (SI)	TLT 2 (AH)
7	/anʃamta/	LF	“/anʃamta/”, rendered it into a phrase “bestowed favor”. Using the verb “bestow”.	“/anʃamta/”, rendered it into a word “bless”. Using the verb “bless”.
	/almaydʕu:bi/		/almaydʕu:bi/ translated into “evoke”	/almaydʕu:bi/ translated into “incur”
	/wa/		/wa/ translated into “or” There is additional word in parenthesis “[Your]” The additional phrase “upon whom”	/wa/ translated into “and” There is no additional word in parenthesis No additional phrase
		GF	The negation marker “not” is only written at the beginning of the clause	The negation marker “no” and “not” are written before the noun “anger” and before the phrase “gone astray”

As mentioned before that there are no lexical and grammatical differences found in the sixth *ayah*. There are five lexical differences and one grammatical difference found in the last *ayah*. The first lexical difference is found in the translation of /anṣamta/ into “You have bestowed favor” by SI and “You have blessed”. In translating “/anṣamta/”, SI rendered it into a phrase “bestowed favor” while AH into the word “bless”. Although the verb “bestow” is synonymous with the verb “bless”, the lexicon “bestow” has broader and more general meaning rather than “bless”. In the context of a religious text, the transitive verb “bless” is used more often since “bless” means God’s help and protection. The word “bestow” means to give something like honor or present, and in this *ayah*, it is followed by “favor”. Like the translation from the fourth *ayah*, the two translators also did componential analysis by translating “/anṣamta/” into “bestowed favor” and “bless”. “Bestowed favor” is a phrase, therefore, SI applied transposition procedure and “bless” is a word thus AH applied transcription procedure.

The second lexical difference occurs at the translation of “/almayd‘u:bi/” where SI uses the lexicon “evoke” while AH uses the word “incur”. Both the verbs “evoke” and “incur” basically share the basic idea of causing something as the consequence of something that someone has done. According to Sinclair (2015), the word “evoke” means to cause something to be remembered through memories, emotions, or sympathy.

Meanwhile, the word “incur” means to experience something, usually, something unpleasant as a result of action someone has taken, and the thing incurred is some self-inflicted negative consequence (such as a debt or somebody’s temper”. Like the previous translation of “/anṣamta/”, the two translators also applied componential analysis by translating “/almayd‘u:bi/” into verbs “evoke” and “incur” which is synonymous.

The third lexical difference happens in the translation of conjunction “/wa/” which SI translates into “or” while AH into “and”. The *huruf* “/wa/” literally means “and”. Thus, SI applies lexical synonymy, while AH applies the transcription procedure by translating “/wa/” into “and”, according to its literal meaning.

Next, the lexical differences take place in the form of additional words and phrases that exist in one version of the translation but does not exist on the other version. The additions of the word ‘you’ between brackets ‘[You]’ and the phrase ‘upon whom’ appear in SI version but they do not exist in AH version. As mentioned, and analyzed in the second *ayah*, a parenthesis in a Holy Qur’an translation is an insertion inserted by the translator to help the readers to get more sense about the *ayah* in the TLT. In this *ayah*, the parenthesis “[Your]” is added to give information to the readers about the subject upon whose anger refers. Therefore, SI adds “[Your]” that indicates the modulation procedure. The additional phrase “upon whom” by SI shows that he is trying to translate it with transcription

procedure. Like the other previous *ayah*, SI always paid attention to every smallest detail of the *ayah*. In this *ayah*, SI translates “/ʕalaihim/” as the object of “bestowed favor” and “bless”. On the other hand, AH did not translate it, therefore, he is applying the contraction procedure by deleting or preferring not to translate “/ʕalaihim/” in his version.

Finally, in this *ayah*, there are also grammatical differences. Each translator arranges their translations with different grammatical structures. The negative marker “not” by SI is only written at the beginning of the clause. Meanwhile, the negation markers “no” and “not” by AH are written before the noun “anger” and before the phrase “gone astray”. There are elements written as “ghairi” and *huruf nafi* in the SLT. “Ghairi” and *huruf nafi* presented by the *huruf* لا /la/ are negative particles to negate the following words, phrases, or clauses after it. If the translation is translated literally, this “ghairi” and *huruf nafi* should be mentioned in the translation, therefore, the negation marker “not” should also be written twice. In fact, in the translation of SI, the negation marker is only written at the beginning of the clause. The negation marker “not” is functioned for the following two noun clauses since it is not repeated. On the other hand, AH repeats the negation marker “no” and “not” to translate as literal as the SLT in terms of the structure. In short, SI applies contraction procedure while AH applies transcription procedure.

### ***Translation ideologies in SI and AH translations***

An ideology can be understood as the set of beliefs, notions, and principles believed and internalized in a society. In the translation context, the selection of procedures or techniques practiced by the translator indicates what ideology is adopted by the translator (Budianto, 2019). Consequently, the differences between dominant translation procedures in the translation version by SI and AH will lead to the different ideologies of the translators.

Theoretically, there are five translation procedures which are oriented to SLT (transcription, literal translation, translation couplet, componential analysis, and lexical synonymy) and twelve translation procedures which are oriented to TLT (through translation, transposition, modulation, compensation, cultural equivalence, translation label, definition, paraphrase, expansion, contraction, recasting sentences, and rearrangement). After observing the number of translation procedures used by SI and AH in each *ayah*, the translation procedures can be classified through its orientation whether they are oriented to SLT or to TLT. In this research, it is found that there are three translation procedures which are oriented to SLT (transcription, Componential analysis, and lexical synonymy), and six translation procedures which are oriented to TLT (transposition, modulation, compensation, cultural equivalence, contraction, and recasting sentences). The classification of translation procedures and their orientation for SI and AH are presented in Table 8 and Table 9.

**Table 8: The Translation Procedures and Their Orientation by SI**

Orientation	Translation Procedures	Frequency	Total
SLT Orientation	Transcription	8	13
	Componential Analysis	4	
	Lexical Synonymy	1	
TLT Orientation	Transposition	2	5
	Modulation	2	
	Contraction	1	

**Table 9. The Translation Procedures and Their Orientation by AH**

Orientation	Translation Procedures	Frequency	Total
SLT Orientation	Transcription	3	9
	Componential analysis	6	
TLT Orientation	Transposition	1	13
	Modulation	3	
	Compensation	2	
	Cultural Equivalence	2	
	Contraction	4	
	Recasting Sentences	1	

By comparing to the total (overall) translation procedures presented in Table 8 and 9 above, it is found that SI mostly oriented to SLT (13 out of 18), while AH to TLT (13 out of 22). Following to the overall procedures used by SI and AH in translating *surah* al-Fatihah in both the tables above, SI dominant translation procedures are SLT orientation with the most used translation procedure is the transcription procedure which appears eight times. Meanwhile, AH dominant translation procedures are TLT orientation with the most used translation procedure is the contraction procedure appearing four times and modulation appearing three times.

Finally, in relation the ideologies of the translators (SI and AH) on translating *surah* al-Fatihah in each ayah of the five ayat, it can be presented in Table 10.

**Table 10. The Translation Ideology by SI and AH**

<i>Ayah</i>	Ideology	
	SI	AH
<i>Ayah</i> 1	Foreignization	Domestication
<i>Ayah</i> 2	Foreignization	Domestication
<i>Ayah</i> 4	Foreignization	Foreignization
<i>Ayah</i> 5	Foreignization	Domestication
<i>Ayah</i> 7	Foreignization	Foreignization

It is shown that from the five *ayat*, SI dominant translation ideology is always foreignization. Meanwhile, AH dominant translation ideology is domestication even though there are two foreignization ideologies found in the fourth and seventh *ayah*. Therefore, the English translation of *surah* al-Fatihah by SI is oriented to the SLT while the translation by AH is oriented to the TLT.

## CONCLUSIONS

As a classic Islamic text, the Holy Qur'an is rich with cultural elements, specific norms, and values written in a unique Arabic language. When it is translated into other languages, including English, there is a great cultural shift between the two cultures and languages. Moreover, different translators rendered the Holy Qur'an with different purposes according to their subjective interpretation. Therefore, the translations of the Holy Qur'an are always filled with subjectivity.

The analysis of this research showed that the English translation versions of *surah* al-Fatihah by SI and AH are having lexical and grammatical differences. The lexical differences are always found in five *ayat* (1, 2, 4, 5, 7) and the grammatical differences only found in three *ayat* (1, 5, 7). The lexical differences are in the form of the different lexical choice to refer to one term in the SLT, additional words and phrases, the use of capital letters, the replacement of an element with other elements, and the translation of a lexicon into different classes (into a phrase or into a word) while the grammatical differences are in the form of grammatical shift and the repetition of the clauses that do not exist on the other version. Those

lexical and grammatical differences reflect the different translation procedures applied by each translator. SI applies eighteen translation procedures with the most used procedure is the transcription procedure while AH applies twenty-two translation procedures with the most used procedure is the contraction procedure and modulation. Finally, SI applies the foreignization ideology that is oriented to the SLT in its translation version because SI dominant translation ideology in the five *ayat* is always foreignization while AH applies the domestication ideology that is oriented to the TLT in his translation version with his dominant translation ideology in the five *ayat* is domestication.

It can be concluded that the differences of the translations happened due to the different target readers of the translation and related to the publishers' policy on what ideology they want to bring, therefore, the translators should adjust their works which include how to choose the styles and how to deliver the messages to the target readers.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study is a result of a research project conducted by the Center for Language Study (CLS) under the English Department of Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Jember. We would like to express our gratitude to Universitas Jember for funding this project. The writers feel deeply indebted to the blind reviewers who have given some valuable suggestions to revise the draft of this article. Our gratitude also goes to the students and colleagues who also contributed to realize this article.

## REFERENCES

- Al Farisi, Z. (2015). Speech Act of Iltifat and Its Indonesian Translation Problems. in *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*. Vol. 4 (2): 78-90. <https://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/IJAL/article/view/685/493>.
- Ali, A.Y. (1983). *The Holy Quran: Text, Translation and Commentary*. Brentwood, Md: Amana.
- Amjad, F. A. and M. Farahani. (2013). Problems and Strategies in English Translation of Quranic Divine Names. in *International Journal of Linguistics*. Vol. 5(1): 128 -142.
- Arbery, A. (1955). *The Qur'an Interpreted*. New York: Macmillan.
- Budianto, P. (2019). Foreignization and Domestication Strategies in Indonesian Translations of Tao Te Ching, *Litera Jurnal Penelitian Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya*, 18(2), 185-195. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21831/ltr.v18i2.25218>
- Diwasasri, G. (2015). A Contrastive Analysis on the Verb Forms of Arabic and Their English Translations in surah Al-Baqarah in "The Qur'an, Arabic Text with Corresponding English Meanings". *Postgraduate Thesis*. Jember: Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Jember.
- Haiguang, Y. (2015). Studi Kontrastif Kalimat Pasif Bahasa Indonesia dan Tionghoa. *Litera Jurnal Penelitian Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya*, 14(2), 347-360. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21831/ltr.v14i2.7209>
- Haleem, M. A. S. (2004). *The Qur'an: A New Translation*. UK: Oxford University Press.
- Newmark, P. (1982). *Approaches to Translation*. UK: Pergamon Press Ltd.
- Nikayin, F. (2006). *The Quran: The First Poetic Translation*. Skokie, Illinois: The Ultimate Book, Inc.
- Pickthal, M. (1930). *The Glorious Qur'an*. Tehran: Salehi.
- Qarai, A. (2003). *The Quran with an English Paraphrase*. Qom: The Center for Translation of Holy Quran.
- Saheeh International. (1997). *The Qur'an Arabic Text with Corresponding English Meanings*. Jeddah: Abul Qashim Publishing House.
- Saheeh International. (2004). *Translation of the Meaning of the Qur'an Translated by Saheeh International*. Jeddah: Al-Muntada Al-Islami.
- Shakir, M. H. (1985). *The Holy Qur'an*. Qom: Ansarian.
- Sinclair, J. (2015) (Ed). *Collins Cobuild Advanced Dictionary of English*. HerperCollins Publishers, (Printed and bound in Indonesia by PT Gramedia Printing).
- Tarigan, H. G. (1992). *Pengajaran Analisis Kontrastif Bahasa*. Bandung: Penerbit Angkasa.
- Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Wekker, H. and Haegeman, L. (1989). *A Modern Course in English Syntax*. New York: Routledge.
- Zadeh, H.M., A. Lashkarian, and S.M. Zadeh. (2015). Translating the Holy Quran: A Comparative Analysis of Al-Fatiha Verse from Arabic to English. *Iranian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research*. 3(2). [https://www.academia.edu/30455271/Translating\\_the\\_Holy\\_Quran\\_A\\_Comparative\\_Analysis\\_of\\_Al-Fatiha\\_Verse\\_from\\_Arabic\\_to\\_English](https://www.academia.edu/30455271/Translating_the_Holy_Quran_A_Comparative_Analysis_of_Al-Fatiha_Verse_from_Arabic_to_English).