

TRANSLATION AS *TARJĪH*: Managing Juristic Pluralism in Indonesia's Official Qur'an Translation

Ade Yusuf Mujaddid

Universitas Islam Negeri (UIN) Walisongo Semarang, Indonesia

adeyusufm@walisongo.ac.id

Dede Rodin

Universitas Islam Negeri (UIN) Walisongo Semarang, Indonesia

dederodin@walisongo.ac.id

Corresponding Author: Dede Rodin

Article history: Received: March 25, 2026; Revised: May 15, 2026; Published: June 27, 2026.

Abstract

This article examines how Indonesia's official Qur'an translation negotiates juristic disagreement in legally indeterminate verses and argues that translating such verses necessarily entails an act of juristic preference (tarjih). Focusing on the 2019 revised edition of Al-Qur'an dan Terjemahannya (QT 2019), the study investigates how particular renderings determine, accommodate, or preserve competing mazhab interpretations and what broader legal logic emerges from these choices. Using qualitative library research, it combines comparative tafsir al-ahkām with uṣūl al-fiqh and paratextual analysis. Seven contested verses from two clusters—ritual purification and personal-status law—are examined against classical juristic sources and, where relevant, compared diachronically with the 2002 edition. The analysis identifies four strategies: decisive tarjih, tarjih with paratextual accommodation, double accommodation within the main text, and contextual explanation. The findings show that QT 2019 does not resolve ikhtilāf through a uniform mazhab preference. Although its renderings generally incline toward Shāfiʿī and majority positions, the translation calibrates legal determination and interpretive openness according to the nature of the ambiguity, the weight of competing opinions, and the practical



consequences of each ruling. This graded pattern is conceptualized as wasatiyyah fihiyyah, or managed juristic pluralism. The study thus develops “translation-as-tarjih” as an analytical framework. It demonstrates how an official Qur’an translation can function as a legal-textual mechanism through which juristic certainty and plurality are selectively mediated in public religious practice.

[Artikel ini mengkaji bagaimana terjemahan resmi Al-Qur’an di Indonesia menyikapi perbedaan pendapat hukum dalam ayat-ayat yang secara hukum tidak memiliki ketentuan tunggal yang pasti, serta berargumen bahwa penerjemahan ayat-ayat semacam itu niscaya melibatkan tindakan pemilihan pendapat hukum (tarjih). Dengan berfokus pada Al-Qur’an dan Terjemahannya edisi revisi tahun 2019 (QT 2019), studi ini meneliti bagaimana pilihan penerjemahan tertentu menentukan, mengakomodasi, atau mempertahankan interpretasi mazhab yang saling berkontestasi, serta logika hukum lebih luas dari pilihan tersebut. Melalui pendekatan kepustakaan yang dipadukan dengan perbandingan tafsir al-ahkām, uṣūl al-fiqh, dan analisis paratekstual, artikel ini memilih tujuh ayat pada dua kluster: taḥārah dan ahwāl shakhsīyyah. Dua kluster ini kemudian dikaji dengan merujuk pada sumber-sumber hukum klasik dan dibandingkan secara diakronis dengan Al-Qur’an dan Terjemahannya edisi tahun 2002 (QT 2002). Analisis ini mengidentifikasi empat strategi: tarjih yang menentukan, tarjih dengan akomodasi paratekstual, akomodasi ganda dalam teks utama, dan penjelasan kontekstual. Temuan menunjukkan bahwa QT 2019 tidak menyelesaikan ikhtilāf melalui preferensi mazhab yang seragam. Meskipun terjemahannya secara umum cenderung mengikuti pandangan mazhab Syafi’i dan pendapat mayoritas, terjemahan tersebut menyeimbangkan antara penetapan hukum dan keterbukaan penafsiran dengan mempertimbangkan sifat ambiguitas, bobot pendapat-pendapat yang bersaing, serta konsekuensi praktis dari setiap putusan hukum. Sehingga pola ini paling tepat dibaca sebagai wasatiyyah fihiyyah atau pluralisme hukum yang dikelola; tempat negara mendistribusikan kepastian dan keterbukaan hukum dalam praktik keberagamaan publik.]

Keywords: *Qur’an Translation, Tarjih, Ikhtilāf, Juristic Pluralism, Wasatiyyah Fiqhiyyah*

Introduction

A single pair of parentheses can settle the question of law that scholars have debated for centuries. When *Al-Qur'an dan Terjemahannya Edisi Penyempurnaan 2019* [The Qur'an and Its Translation, 2019 Revised Edition], the official Qur'an translation of the Indonesian Ministry of Religious Affairs (hereafter QT 2019), inserts the words “(*basuh*) kedua kakimu” [(wash) your feet] into the verse on ablution (Q al-Mā'idah [5]:6),¹ it fixes an obligation that some schools of law do not, in fact, require, and hundreds of millions of readers receive that choice as the incontrovertible word of God. On the surface, an official translation presents itself as a neutral transfer of meaning; in practice, a jurisprudential decision hides behind every word chosen for a legally ambiguous verse. This is the paradox from which the present study departs: the text held to be most neutral in fact harbours the least visible of legal rulings.

This study names that act translation as *tarjih*. The term designates the unavoidable move by which a translator of a legally indeterminate Qur'anic verse commits to one Indonesian rendering, privileging one juristic reading over its rivals in the act of linguistic transfer. The word is drawn from *uṣūl al-fiqh*, where, as Kamali explains, it names the jurist's disciplined preference for one piece of evidence over another when evidence yields conflicting conclusions.² Reading translation in these terms treats each rendering as a juristic act, not a matter of style, and it is this reframing the sections below test against QT 2019.

A state's official Qur'an translation is never merely a linguistic document. In Indonesian, spoken by nearly three hundred million Muslims, QT functions as an authoritative reference for everyday religious life. As Lukman shows, QT is a product of the state, born of political and institutional interests, so its standing as the official rendering lends it an authority far exceeding any rival.³ The difficulty

¹ Kementerian Agama, *Al-Qur'an dan Terjemahannya (Edisi Penyempurnaan 2019)* (Jakarta: Lajnah Pentashihan Mushaf Al-Qur'an Badan Litbang dan Diklat Kementerian Agama RI, 2019), 146.

² Kamali, *Principles of Islamic Jurisprudence*.

³ Fadhlī Lukman, “Conflicting Interests in the Creation of a State-Authorised Translation: Comparing the Saudi and Indonesian Editions of Al-Qur'an Dan Terjemahnya,” *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 26, no. 1 (2024): 38–62.

is that many legal verses are *ẓanni al-dilālah*, their signification is indeterminate, admitting more than one equally valid reading, and it is here that translation cannot remain neutral. Unlike the exegete, who may lay several possibilities side by side in a commentary, the translator is compelled by the target language to fix a single sense (*ta'yīn*) and close the others. The consequences are concrete: the words chosen for verses on ablution, touching the *muṣḥaf*, or the waiting period (*ʿiddah*) help determine whether an act of worship is valid and whether a woman's waiting period has ended. As Alwazna finds, expert translators tend toward explicitation when rendering Qur'anic legal verses on purity and prayer, linguistically superfluous, yet undertaken to make the legal sense accessible.⁴

Scholarship on QT has grown rapidly, yet it has viewed the translation chiefly through the lens of ideology and the politics of translation. Lukman demonstrates that the state translation is driven by political interest and reflects the concerns of those in power,⁵ while Pink maps the politics of scripture in multilingual Indonesia.⁶ QT's translation politics have likewise been examined by Rodin et al., foregrounding the power, knowledge relation between state and society.⁷ Reading QT 2002 through Molina and Hurtado Albir's translation techniques, Gunawan reaches a convergent conclusion: the Ministry's rendering reflects a moderate Islamic ideology, unlike unofficial renderings.⁸ This current illuminates translation's ideological dimension but stops at macro-ideology, without treating the rendering of legal verses as a juristic decision in its own right.

⁴ Rafat Y. Alwazna, "The Relation Between Explicitation and Translation Expertise in the Rendition of Nominalisation and Participles in Legal Qur'anic Verses Specific to Purification and Prayer into English: A Corpus-Based Study," *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law* 36, no. 4 (2023): 1717–47.

⁵ Fadhli Lukman, *The Official Indonesian Qur'ān Translation: The History and Politics of Al-Qur'an dan Terjemahnya* (Cambridge, United Kingdom: Open Book Publishers, 2022).

⁶ Johanna Pink, ed., *Qur'an Translation in Indonesia: Scriptural Politics in a Multilingual State* (New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2024).

⁷ Dede Rodin et al., "The State and the Holy Quran: Politics of the Quran Translation by the Ministry of Religious Affairs," *Ilmu Ushuluddin* 8, no. 1 (2021): 57–80.

⁸ Fahmi Gunawan, "The Ideology of Translators in Quranic Translation: Lessons Learned from Indonesia," *Cogent Arts & Humanities* 9, no. 1 (2022): 1–14.

Closest to the present concern is Mursyid's study of the state's exegetical politics regarding the legal verses in *Al-Qur'an dan Tafsirnya*.⁹ That study, however, examines the state's exegesis, not its translation, and frames it as politics rather than a systematic act of *tarjih*. Linguistic variation and law have long been linked: Shah shows how differences in the canonical readings (*qirā'āt*) and lexical homonymy entered classical legal discourse,¹⁰ Qurani et al. trace their implications for the legal norms governing women,¹¹ and Ushalli et al. highlight the uncertainty of translating juristic terms into Indonesian.¹² Within the archipelagic tradition, a vocabulary-based reading of the legal verses (*āyāt al-ahkām*) fused with a Shāfi'i juristic orientation has long been practised in classical Nusantara *fiqh* works; yet such scholarship stops at the classical text rather than the state's official translation. All of these studies, in short, halt at the classical commentary or at isolated cases, without reading the official translation as a systematic corpus of legal decisions.

On a broader plane, recent work on the jurisprudence of disagreement (*fiqh al-ikhtilāf*) affirms that inter-school divergence is an institutionalised form of legal pluralism rather than a source of division,¹³ while the moderationist content of QT has been shown at the level of key terms such as *ummatan*

⁹ Achmad Yafik Mursyid, "Kebijakan Politik dalam Tafsir Negara: Studi Atas Ayat-Ayat Fiqih dalam Tafsir Kemenag Al-Qur'an dan Tafsirnya," *Al-Bayan: Jurnal Studi Ilmu Al-Qur'an dan Tafsir* 6, no. 2 (2021): 217–33.

¹⁰ Mustafa Shah, "The Case of Variae Lectiones in Classical Islamic Jurisprudence: Grammar and the Interpretation of Law," *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law* 29, no. 2 (2016): 285–311.

¹¹ Hizbia Qurani, Solehudin, and Kahfi Ya Kahfi, "Between Linguistics and Jurisprudence: Qirā'āt Variation in Ibn 'Aṭīyyah and Al-Qurṭubī's Exegesis of Qur'an 33:33," *ṢUḤUF: Jurnal Pengkajian Al-Quran Dan Budaya* 19, no. 1 (2026): 1–25.

¹² Eskarni Ushalli et al., "Change in Religious Understanding and Language Shift of the Recitations of the Quran and Hadith in the Perspective of Islamic Jurisprudence," *International Journal of Science and Society* 6, no. 1 (2024): 835–49.

¹³ Abu Baedah, Musolin, and Nurlaelah, "Dialectics of Fiqh Al-Ikhtilāf: A Comparative Madhhab Analysis of Legal Pluralism in Contemporary Muslim Societies"; Maola, "Flexibility and Uncertainty: Ambiguity in Pre-Modern Islamic Law in Dialogue with Modern European Culture."

wasāṭan,¹⁴ in step with the discourse of *wasatīyyah* as a Qur’anic principle of the middle way.¹⁵ Yet neither current has met the study of translation: the first halts at the classical juristic text, the second at themes and terms rather than the mechanism of legal determination at the verse level. Research on translatorial intervention, moreover, shows that translators frequently perform an embedded explicitation that closes the plurality the classical tradition preserved; Almjlad argues that paratextual annotation can keep that openness intact.¹⁶

Previous studies have paid limited attention to the intersection of these three literatures. Translation scholarship illuminates QT’s ideological character but stops short of treating specific renderings as juristic decisions. Scholarship on the legal verses illuminates *ikhtilāf* in rich detail but rarely engages the official translation as its object. Scholarship on moderation illuminates lexical markers of *wasatīyyah* but not the mechanism of legal determination at the level of the individual verse. No study has yet read QT 2019’s legal verses as an act of *mazḥab tarjih*, mapped it into a typology, and linked it to the governance of legal pluralism. This study therefore maps how QT 2019’s legal-verse renderings relate to inter-school *ikhtilāf*, formulates its strategies of determination and accommodation across the main text (*matn*) and paratext, and exposes the ideological-legal logic behind them, joining *uṣūl al-fiqh* with paratextuality theory¹⁷ and the thesis of translation-as-interpretation,¹⁸ and treating the translator of

¹⁴ Naufal Cholily, “Moderation in Indonesian Tafsir: Critical Discourse Analysis of the Terms of Ummatan Wasatan in the Al-Qur’an Dan Terjemahannya By the Ministry of Religion of the Republic of Indonesia,” *MUSHAF: Jurnal Tafsir Bermawasan Keindonesiaan* 3, no. 2 (2023): 1–17.

¹⁵ Kamali, *The Middle Path of Moderation in Islam: The Qur’anic Principle of Wasatīyyah*. the actual number of HF hospitalizations remains >1 million annually. More than 80% of patients who are hospitalized are initially seen in the emergency department (ED

¹⁶ Sultan Samah A Almjlad, “Semantic Untranslatability in Quranic Discourse: Challenges and Contextual Remedies in English Translation,” *Cogent Arts & Humanities* 12, no. 1 (2025): 2542336.

¹⁷ Kathryn Batchelor, *Translation and Paratexts* (London: Routledge, 2018); Gérard Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

¹⁸ Najlaa Aldeeb, “From Polemics to Peacebuilding: Tracing Interfaith Ideologies in Premodern and Contemporary Qur’ān Translations,” *Religions* 17, no. 5 (2026): 512.

a *ẓanni* verse as compelled, like a *mufti*, to perform *tarjih*.

On that basis the study offers three contributions: theoretically, it introduces the concept of “translation-as-*tarjih*”; methodologically, it reads the state translation with the instruments of *uṣūl al-fiqh* rather than translation theory alone; and empirically, it produces a replicable typology of strategies. More broadly, it positions the official translation as a legal artefact that helps regulate public religious practice, a dimension hitherto overlooked. The remainder of this section sets out the method before the analysis proceeds through seven cases across the two clusters of *ṭahārah* and *aḥwāl shakḥiyyah*, and close by formulating the typology together with the *wasāṭiyyah fiqhīyyah* that underwrites it.

This is a qualitative study of library-research design that couples a comparative *tafsīr al-aḥkām* approach with *uṣūl al-fiqh*. Such a design is well established in text-based Islamic legal scholarship: inter-school *ikhtilāf* is examined by analysing the classical jurisprudential sources of the principal Sunni schools and interpreting them socio-legally to understand how legal reasoning is constructed, negotiated, and applied,¹⁹ typically supported by content analysis and textual hermeneutics of works of comparative law (*muqāranat al-madhāhib*).²⁰

The object of study, the 2019 edition of the Ministry of Religious Affairs translation (hereafter QT 2019), was selected for its standing as the official state translation which, as prior scholarship affirms, rests fundamentally on mainstream Sunni exegesis even when it occasionally diverges from government policy.²¹ The primary data source is QT 2019,²² with the 2002 edition²³ serving as a diachronic comparator that brings shifts in legal choice into view. Secondary

¹⁹ Abu Baedah, Musolin, and Nurlaelah, “Dialectics of Fiqh Al-Ikhtilāf.”

²⁰ Muṣṭafā Sa’id al-Khinn, *Athar al-Ikhtilāf fī al-Qawā’id al-Uṣūliyyah fī Ikhtilāf al-Fuqahā’*, 3rd ed. (Beirut: Mu’assasah al-Risālah, 1982); Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Abī Bakr ibn Farḥ al-Anṣārī al-Qurṭubī, *Al-Jāmi’ li Aḥkām al-Qur’an*, 2nd ed. (Kairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyyah, 1964).

²¹ Lukman, *The Official Indonesian Qur’an Translation: The History and Politics of Al-Qur’an dan Terjemahnya*; Rodin et al., “The State and the Holy Quran: Politics of the Quran Translation by the Ministry of Religious Affairs.”

²² Kementerian Agama, *Al-Qur’an dan Terjemahannya (Edisi Penyempurnaan 2019)*.

²³ Departemen Agama RI, *Al-Qur’an dan Terjemahnya (Juz 1-Juz 30)* (Surabaya: Karya Agung, 2006).

sources comprise works of *tafsīr al-aḥkām* and classical *fiqh-uṣūl*, among them al-Qurṭubī, al-Khinn, al-Ṣābūnī, and *al-Mansū'ah al-Fiqhiyyah al-Kumaitiyyah*, together with pertinent recent journal scholarship.

Case selection is purposive. From the legal verses, seven *ikhtilāf*-laden cases were chosen, distributed across two clusters: purification/worship (*ṭahārah/ʿibādah*) and personal-status law (*aḥwāl shakḥiyyah*). Three criteria were applied: (1) the verse is *ẓannī al-dilālāh*; (2) a documented inter-school disagreement exists; and (3) that disagreement is rooted in a linguistic matter, a difference of *qirā'āt* or a shared-sense lexeme (*mushtarak*), that forces the translator into a decision of meaning. The third criterion rests on the finding that differences in *qirā'āt* may carry semantic nuances that enter legal discourse, even where their bearing on legal disagreement is not always decisive,²⁴ consistent with recent work tracing the implications of *qirā'āt* for legal norms through library methods that draw on *al-Jāmi' li-Aḥkām al-Qur'ān* as a primary source.²⁵

Analysis proceeds through five sequential steps for each case: identifying the point of *ikhtilāf* and its *uṣūlī* cause; reading the QT 2019 rendering on two layers, the main text (*matn*) and the paratextual apparatus of footnotes and parenthetical insertions, following the paratextuality framework that treats such elements as a “threshold” steering the reader’s reception;²⁶ linking the choice to the *madhhab* position it reflects; classifying the strategy by the relation between determination (*matn*) and accommodation (paratext); and inferring the ideological-legal logic behind that pattern. This dual-layer procedure aligns with approaches used in contemporary Qur'an-translation studies of *ikhtilāf*-laden verses.²⁷

Validity is safeguarded through source triangulation: every conclusion about a *madhhab* position is cross-checked against references in *tafsīr al-aḥkām* and classical *fiqh-uṣūl*, rather than resting on the author’s reading alone. The findings are then distilled into a mapping table (Table

²⁴ Shah, “The Case of Variae Lectiones in Classical Islamic Jurisprudence.”

²⁵ Qurani, Solehudin, and Kahfi, “Between Linguistics and Jurisprudence.”

²⁶ Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*; Batchelor, *Translation and Paratexts*.

²⁷ Almjlād, “Semantic Untranslatability in Quranic Discourse.”

1) and elaborated narratively until the typology of translation-as-*tarjih* takes shape.

Legal Verses and the Translation of *Ẓannī* Meaning

The legal verses that give rise to *ikhtilāf* are, at bottom, *ẓannī al-dilālah*: texts whose signification is uncertain and therefore open to more than one equally valid reading. Unlike a *qaṭʿī al-dilālah* text, whose sense is single and closed, a *ẓannī* expression carries the possibility of other meanings, so that it may be construed or diverted from its initial import toward another sense.²⁸ This is the property the exegetical tradition calls *ḥammālat li al-wujūh*, capable of bearing many faces of understanding. It is precisely in this domain that inter-school disagreement acquires its legitimacy: *ikhtilāf* is an inherent and licit part of juristic reasoning, confined to speculative texts and never touching the *qaṭʿī*.²⁹ All seven cases analysed here stand within this *ẓannī* terrain, so that semantic openness is the point of departure.

The problem becomes distinctive once a *ẓannī* text is translated. An exegete can leave semantic openness intact by presenting several possibilities at once; a translator enjoys no such luxury. The target language demands a determinate form, so the translator is forced to fix one sense (*taʿyīn*) and close the rest. Qurʾan translation is therefore best understood not as a neutral transfer of meaning but as an interpretive act shaped by the translator's intellectual, theological, and historical framework.³⁰ With polysemous and homonymous expressions, features especially dense in legal and ritual diction, this interpretive character becomes unavoidable. Here the translation of a *ẓannī* verse intersects

²⁸ Sayyid Ziauddin Olyanasab, Sayyid Mohammad Olyanasab, and Sayyid Majid Nabavi, "A Review and Critique of the Theory of the Speculativeness of the Implication (Ẓannī Al-Dilāla) of the Qurʾān," *Religious Inquiries* 11, no. 1 (2022): 21–39.

²⁹ Olyanasab, Olyanasab, and Nabavi.

³⁰ Najlaa Ramadan Abdulaziz Aldeeb, "Traces of Ideologies in Four English Translations of the Qurʾān: A Comparative Study of Authorised and Unauthorised Versions" (Swansea University Wales, United Kingdom, 2023), <https://cronfa.swan.ac.uk/Record/cronfa65162>; Aldeeb, "From Polemics to Peacebuilding: Tracing Interfaith Ideologies in Premodern and Contemporary Qurʾān Translations"; Lukman, *The Official Indonesian Qurʾān Translation: The History and Politics of Al-Qurʾān dan Terjemahnya*.

directly with *tarjih*: to choose one sense over another is, in essence, to give preponderance to one legal opinion among competing ones.

That compulsion does not erase every space for openness: two layers must be distinguished. On the main text (*matn*) the translator must fix a single form, but on the paratextual layer, footnotes and parenthetical insertions, some plurality can be restored, since paratext functions as an interpretive threshold framing the reader's reception.³¹ Yet this apparatus is double-edged: when a parenthetical insertion fuses into the *matn*, translation privileges theological closure over the diversity of meaning.³² Erebiḥ and Almanna find that translators often opt for this embedded mode over the classical tradition's preserved plurality,³³ and Hassanein shows human translators favour more explicit explication than AI to preserve the legal register.³⁴ This two-layer framework, determination in the *matn*, accommodation in the paratext, is key to reading QT 2019.

In QT 2019, the tendency of determination has an identifiable direction. As the official state translation, it rests fundamentally on mainstream Sunni exegesis even where it occasionally diverges from government policy,³⁵ and, in the juristic domain, inclines toward the Shāfi'ī school and the *jumbūr* followed by most Indonesian Muslims,³⁶ consistent with the finding that contemporary exegesis is shaped by the interaction between tradition and modern forces

³¹ Batchelor, *Translation and Paratexts*; Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Almjāḍ, "Semantic Untranslatability in Quranic Discourse."

³² Aldeeb, "From Polemics to Peacebuilding."

³³ Mohamed Erebiḥ and Ali Almanna, "Between Text and Commentary: Translator Intervention and Semantic Openness in English Translations of the Qur'ān," *Cogent Arts and Humanities* 13, no. 1 (2026): 2662804.

³⁴ Hamada S. A. Hassanein, "Between Human and Machine: A Dual Translational Approach to Qur'anic Legal Terminologies and Semantics," *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law*, December 8, 2025.

³⁵ Lukman, *The Official Indonesian Qur'ān Translation: The History and Politics of Al-Qur'an Dan Terjemahnya*.

³⁶ Dede Rodin, "The Sunni Ideology in 'Al-Qur'an Dan Terjemahannya' by the Ministry of Religious Affairs," *Subuf: Jurnal Pengkajian Al-Qur'an Dan Budaya* 16, no. 2 (2023): 245–66.

such as nation-state politics and religious authority.³⁷ Even so, the tendency is neither uniform nor invariably exclusive. To map how determination and accommodation operate in each case, the seven verses are summarised in Table 1 according to the contested expression, the QT 2019 rendering on both layers, the *mazhab* position reflected, and the strategy type.

Table 1. Mapping of translation strategies for the legal verses in the 2019 edition of *Al-Qur'an dan Terjemahannya*

Verse	Contested lexeme & <i>usūlī</i> cause	QT 2019 rendering (<i>matn</i>)	Paratext	<i>Madbbab</i> reflected	Strategy
Q al-Mā'idah [5]:6	<i>arjulakum / arjulikum</i> Cause: <i>qirā'at</i> difference (accusative vs genitive) → governs "wash" or "wipe".	"...dan (<i>basuh</i>) kedua kakimu sampai kedua mata kaki." "...and (wash) your feet up to the ankles."	No note for the "wipe" opinion.	Shāfi'ī / <i>jumbūr</i> (washing).	(a) Decisive <i>tarjih</i>
Q an-Nisā' [4]:43; al-Mā'idah [5]:6	<i>lāmastum</i> Cause: <i>mushtarak</i> lexeme, <i>baqīqah</i> "touch skin" vs <i>kināyah</i> "intercourse".	"...atau kamu telah menyentuh perempuan." "...or you have touched women."	Footnote 156: <i>jumbūr</i> = skin contact; some exegetes = marital intercourse.	<i>Matr.</i> Shāfi'ī / <i>jumbūr</i> (literal). Note: accommodates Ḥanafī (<i>jimā'</i>).	(b) <i>Tarjih</i> + paratextual accommodation
Q an-Nisā' [4]:43	<i>'ābirī sabīl</i> Cause: semantic <i>ikebtilāf</i> , "merely passing" vs "traveller".	"...kecuali sekadar berlalu (saja)..." "...except merely passing by..."	No note for the "traveller" reading.	"Crossing the mosque" (<i>jumbūr</i>) over "traveller" (Abū Ḥanīfah).	(a) Decisive <i>tarjih</i>

³⁷ Johanna Pink, *Muslim Qur'anic Interpretation Today: Media, Genealogies and Interpretive Communities* (Shefeld & Bristol: Equinox Publishing Ltd., 2019).

Q an-Nisā' [4]:43; al-Mā'idah [5]:6	<i>ṣaṭḍan</i> Cause: semantic <i>ikhtilāf</i> , “dusty earth” vs “earth’s surface”.	“... bertayamumlah... dengan debu yang baik (suci)...” “...perform tayammum with clean (pure) dust...”	No note for the alternative position.	Shāfi‘ī, Ḥanbalī (dust) over Mālikī, Ḥanafī (earth’s surface).	(a) Decisive <i>tarjih</i>
Q al-Wāqī‘ah [56]:79	<i>al-muṭṭabarūn</i> Cause: “the purified” vs “the pure”; consequence: prohibition on touching the <i>muṣḥaf</i> .	“...kecuali para hamba (Allah) yang disucikan.” “...except the (servants of Allah) who are purified.”	Footnote 708: some = pure from major/ minor impurity; others = angels (pure from sin).	<i>Matn</i> leans “purified”; note accommodates both readings.	(b) <i>Tarjih</i> + paratextual accommodation
Q al-Baqarah [2]:222	<i>yaṭḥurnā /</i> <i>taṭabbarna</i> Cause: limit of “purity,” blood cessation vs bathing; + <i>sabab al-nuzūl</i> .	“... <i>jaubilah</i> <i>para istri (dari</i> <i>melakukan</i> <i>hubungan intim)</i> ... <i>Apabila mereka</i> <i>benar-benar</i> <i>suci (setelah</i> <i>mandi wajib),</i> <i>campurilah...</i> ” “...keep away from wives (from intercourse)... When they are truly pure (after the obligatory bath), then approach them...”	Parenthetical insertion via <i>sabab al-nuzūl</i> ; footnote 65. The 2019 edition removes the Ḥanafī accommodation present in earlier editions.	<i>Jumbūr</i> (Mālikī, Shāfi‘ī, Ḥanbalī: cessation + bath).	(d) Contextual explanation (+ <i>jumbūr</i> determination)
Q al-Baqarah [2]:228	<i>Qurū’</i> Cause: <i>mushtarak</i> lexeme, “purity” (Ḥijāz) vs “menstruation” (Kūfah).	“...(menunggu) tiga kali qurū’ (suci atau haid).” “...(awaiting) three qurū’ (purity or menstruation).”	Dual sense given in parentheses within the <i>matn</i> ; no <i>tarjih</i> .	Accommodates both opinions at once (purity & menstruation).	(c) Double accommodation within the <i>matn</i>

Table 1 reveals a pattern more intricate than the dominance of one *mazhab*: only some cases receive decisive determination without a note, the rest attended by paratextual accommodation, double accommodation within the *matn*, or contextual explanation. QT 2019, in other words, does not settle *ikhtilāf* through one mechanism but manages it by gradation, as the discussion below traces beginning with the *ṭabārah* cluster.

Legal Choice in the Verses of *Ṭabārah*

The *ṭabārah* cluster is the domain most densely packed with linguistic questions and most often taken as the classic illustration of how differences in *qirā'āt* and shared-sense lexemes generate differences in law. Five cases are analysed here, washing or wiping the feet, the sense of *lāmastum*, *‘ābirī sabīl*, *ṣa‘īdan*, and *al-muṭabharūn*, all standing within the *ẓannī al-dilālāh* terrain. Across the cluster QT 2019 displays a consistent leaning toward the *jumhūr* and the Shāfi‘ī, yet through differing modes of determination: some fixed decisively without a note, others accompanied by paratextual accommodation. This variation of mode reveals *mazhab* inclination and openness to *ikhtilāf* to be working in layers rather than uniformly.

The case of washing or wiping the feet (Q al-Mā'idah [5]:6) shows how *qirā'āt* triggers a legal branching. The word *arjul* is read either in the accusative (*arjulakum*), linked to *faghsilū wujūhakum wa aydiyakum* (“wash your faces and hands”), yielding *washed*, or the genitive (*arjulikum*), linked to *wamsaḥū bi ru'ūsikum* (“wipe your heads”), yielding *wiped*. The *jumhūr* require washing; the wiping reading is attributed to Companions such as Ibn ‘Abbās and Anas ibn Mālik and remains the Imāmī Shī‘ī position.³⁸ Al-Ṭabarī himself preferred the genitive reading on syntactic grounds, yet held that *maṣḥ* to be general enough to cover both.³⁹ QT 2019 renders “...dan (*basuh*) kedua kakimu sampai kedua mata kaki” [“...and (wash) your feet up to the ankles”], inserting “(*basuh*)” [“(wash)”]

³⁸ al-Khinn, *Ajar al-Ikhtilāf fī al-Qawā'id al-Uṣūliyyah fī Ikhtilāf al-Fuqahā'*, 38–41; al-Qurṭubī, *Al-Jāmi' li Ahkām al-Qur'ān*, vols. 6:91–92.

³⁹ Shah, “The Case of Variae Lectiones in Classical Islamic Jurisprudence.”

without any note on the wiping opinion, decisive *tarjih* (type a), closing a space even al-Ṭabarī left open.⁴⁰

The case of *lāmastum* (Q an-Nisā' [4]:43; al-Mā'idah [5]:6) rests not on *qirā'āt* but on the homonymy of *lams*, which literally means “touching the skin” and figuratively “sexual intercourse.” Three positions follow: the Shāfi'ī read it literally, so skin contact nullifies ablution; the Ḥanafī read it as *jimā'*, so ordinary contact does not; the Mālikī tie the effect to the presence of desire.⁴¹ Shah notes that most exegetes in fact converge on the sense of contact, so the disagreement traces to the homonymy of *lams* and its *ḥadīth* evidence rather than to reading variation.⁴² QT 2019 fixes the literal sense in the *matn*, “...atau kamu telah menyentuh perempuan” [“...or you have touched women”], reflecting the Shāfi'ī/*jumbūr* position, then accommodates the Ḥanafī reading in footnote 156: *tarjih* with paratextual accommodation (type b). The *matn* selects not the more common sense but the one with the heavier consequence, inclining toward Shāfi'ī caution over Ḥanafī leniency.⁴³

The next two cases exhibit the most “closing” mode, though classical ground runs deeper than Q'T 2019's silence suggests. For *'ābirī sabīl* (Qur'an-Nisā' [4]:43), Q'T 2019 renders “...kecuali sekedar berlalu (*saja*)” [“...except merely passing by”], conveying the *jumbūr* reading that a person in major ritual impurity may cross the mosque without lingering, based on a report that a Companion whose house opened onto the mosque was permitted to pass through it while *junub*.⁴⁴ A second reading, attributed to 'Alī, Ibn 'Abbās, and others, takes the phrase as the traveller (*musāfir*), Abū Ḥanīfah's position, since a traveller typically lacks water.⁴⁵ Q'T 2019's “*berlalu*” registers only the first reading; the second, despite its Companion and school pedigree, receives no footnote. The case of

⁴⁰ Shah.

⁴¹ Wizārah al-Awqāf wa al-Shu'ūn al-Islāmiyyah, *Al-Mausū'at al-Fiqhiyyah al-Kuwaitiyyah* (Kuwait: Dār al-Salāsīl, 1404), 35:331.

⁴² Abu Baedah, Musolin, and Nurlaelah, “Dialectics of Fiqh Al-Ikhtilāf.”

⁴³ Shah, “The Case of Variae Lectiones in Classical Islamic Jurisprudence.”

⁴⁴ Departemen Agama, *Al-Qur'an dan Tafsirnya (Jilid II) (Edisi yang Disempurnakan)*, 182.

⁴⁵ al-Qurṭubī, *Al-Jāmi' Li Ahkām Al-Qur'ān*, vols. 5:202, 206.

ṣa'idan (Q an-Nisā' [4]:43; al-Mā'idah [5]:6) shows the same structure. QT 2019 renders "...bertayammulah... dengan debu yang baik (*suci*)" ["...perform tayammum with clean (pure) dust"], privileging Shāfi'ī, Ḥanbalī over Mālikī, Ḥanafī, again without a note. Al-Mālikīyah and Abū Ḥanīfah read *ṣa'id* as "the surface of the earth," from *al-ṣu'ūd* ("to rise"), citing the Prophet's tradition that the earth was made for him "a place of prostration and a means of purification." Al-Shāfi'īyah and the Ḥanābilah read it instead as "dusty soil," citing hadith specifying tayammum with *turāb* rather than the earth at large.⁴⁶ Both cases are decisive *tarjih* (type a): QT 2019 settles tacitly, without disclosing that a rival opinion, resting on its own warrant, exists, the mode affording the least room for legal plurality.

The case of *al-muṭahharīn* (Q al-Wāqī'ah [56]:79) differs, since here one practical ruling hinges on the choice of meaning: "those purified," pure of ritual impurity, entailing a prohibition on touching the *muṣḥaf* without ablution, or angels pure of sin, with no juristic consequence. Zadeh shows that Mālik ibn Anas linked the verse to ritual purity, grounding the *jumbūr* prohibition.⁴⁷ QT 2019 renders "...kecuali para hamba (Allah) yang disucikan" ["...except the (servants of Allah) who are purified"], its passive phrasing leaving the referent suspended, then presents both readings in footnote 708, *tarjih* with paratextual accommodation (type b). Precisely where the consequence is most concrete, QT 2019 refrains from determining in the *matn* and preserves both readings in the paratext.⁴⁸ Weighed as a whole, the *ṭahārah* cluster leans consistently toward the *jumbūr* and the Shāfi'ī, but through graded modes, decisive where the position is dominant, accommodated where the minority opinion is substantial or the consequence heavy. As Shah shows, *qirā'āt* variation is classically often not the decisive factor, so every QT 2019 determination is in truth its own interpretive

⁴⁶ Wizārah al-Auqāf wa al-Syu'un al-Islāmiyyah, *Al-Mausū'ah Al-Fiqhiyyah Al-Kuwaitiyyah*, vols. 14:260–62.

⁴⁷ Travis Zadeh, "Touching and Ingesting: Early Debates over the Material Qur'an," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 129, no. 3 (2009): 443–66, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20789421>.

⁴⁸ Shah, "The Case of *Variae Lectiones* in Classical Islamic Jurisprudence."

act of *tarjih*.⁴⁹ The same pattern, with sharper dynamics, appears in the *ahwāl shakhsīyyah* cluster examined next.

Legal Choice in the Verses of Menstruation and ‘*Iddah*

The *ahwāl shakhsīyyah* cluster holds two cases, the limit at which a wife may be approached after menstruation (Qur’an al-Baqarah [2]:222) and the sense of *qurū’* that determines the end of the waiting period (Qur’an al-Baqarah [2]:228). Both touch the female body, bear directly on family law, and stand within the *ẓannī* terrain. Yet it is here that QT 2019 exhibits its two most widely separated poles of strategy: on 2:222 it moves toward a firmer determination, even removing an accommodation present in earlier editions, while on 2:228 it withholds *tarjih* entirely and lets two senses coexist within the *matn*. This contrast within a single cluster is the best site for testing whether QT 2019’s “moderation” is consistent or contingent on each case’s configuration.

In Qur’an 2:222, two consecutive words, *yaṭburna* (cessation of blood) and *taṭahharna* (bathing), yield three positions: the *jumbūr* require both; the Ḥanafī accept cessation alone once the ten-day maximum is reached; al-Ṣābūnī records a mediating third position, cleansing without a full bath.⁵⁰ A parallel *qirā’at* difference attends the dispute; al-Ṭabarī preferred the geminated reading, meaning purification with water.⁵¹ QT 2019 takes a decisive stance, rendering “*Apabila mereka benar-benar suci (setelah mandi wajib), campurilah*” [“When they are truly pure (after the obligatory bath), then approach them”], its insertion fixing the *jumbūr* position and setting aside both the Ḥanafī concession and al-Ṣābūnī’s middle way. Strikingly, the 2019 edition in fact *removed* an accommodation present in the 1971, 1990, and 2002 editions, which had noted that “others interpret it as [the time] after the bleeding has stopped.”⁵² This excision marks a determinative

⁴⁹ Aldeeb, “From Polemics to Peacebuilding.”

⁵⁰ Wizārah al-Awqāf wa al-Shu’ūn al-Islāmiyyah, *Al-Mausū‘at al-Fiqhiyyah al-Kuwaitiyyah*, vol. XVIII:325-326.

⁵¹ Muḥammad ‘Alī al-Ṣābūnī, *Rawā‘i‘ al-Bayān fī Tafsīr Āyāt al-Aḥkām min al-Qur’ān* (Damaskus: Maktabah al-Gazālī, 2001), vol. I:301.

⁵² Shah, “The Case of Variae Lectiones in Classical Islamic Jurisprudence.”

shift: QT 2019 narrows, rather than widens, the space of *ikhtilāf*, cutting against its own “moderation” by closing a plurality it had previously preserved.⁵³

Yet within the same verse, QT 2019 also loosens: the prohibition on approaching a menstruating wife is framed via an occasion-of-revelation (*sabab al-nuzūl*) insertion, “*jaubilah para istri (dari melakukan hubungan intim)*” [“keep away from wives (from intercourse)”], restricting the prohibition to intercourse alone, against communities that had ostracised menstruating women. Two movements thus coexist: a contextual loosening and a *madhhab* determination, so contextual explanation (type d) is never truly neutral.⁵⁴ The case of *qurū'* (Qur'an 2:228) moves to the opposite pole: the word bears two opposite senses at once, purity and menstruation.⁵⁵

The people of the *Ḥijāẓ* took it as purity, the people of Kūfah as menstruation; *madhhab*-wise, al-Shāfi'ī, Mālik, and Ibn Ḥanbal follow “purity,” Abū Ḥanīfah “menstruation,” affecting the waiting period and a divorced woman's status.⁵⁶ Facing a sense intrinsically double, QT 2019 chooses not to choose: “...(menunggu) tiga kali qurū' (suci atau haid)” [“...(awaiting) three qurū' (purity or menstruation)”], double accommodation within the *matn* (type c). Unlike 2:222, where the dispute concerns a legal condition attached to a clear-sensed word, here the dispute concerns the meaning of a lexeme with two opposite senses; selecting one would erase the other, equally valid. This restraint echoes al-Qurṭubī, who likewise accommodated both readings rather than choosing.⁵⁷ The two cases thus bracket the entire range of strategy: 2:222 the most determinative, 2:228 the most open, where *tarjih* is withheld altogether, when the disagreement concerns a condition, the translation determines; when it concerns a genuinely double meaning, it restrains itself, and because these

⁵³ Departemen Agama RI, *Al-Qur'an dan Terjemahnya* (Juz 1-Juz 30), 44.

⁵⁴ Aldeeb, “From Polemics to Peacebuilding.”

⁵⁵ Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-'Arab* (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1414).

⁵⁶ al-Khinn, *Ajar al-Ikhtilāf fī al-Qawā'id al-Uṣūliyyah fī Ikhtilāf al-Fuqahā'*, 72; al-Qurṭubī, *Al-Jāmi' li Ahkām al-Qur'an*, 3:113; Mohammad Hashim Kamali, *Shari'ah Law: An Introduction* (Oxford London: Oneworld Publications, 2008), 102.

⁵⁷ Abu Baedah, Musolin, and Nurlaelah, “Dialectics of Fiqh Al-Ikhtilāf”; Lailaturrohmah, “Legal Diversity in the Concept of 'Iddah: Comparative Analysis among Shafi'i, Maliki, Hanafi, and Hanbali Schools.”

decisions regulate a divorced woman's body and autonomy, the stakes are not small.⁵⁸⁵⁹

A Typology of Translation-as-*Tarjih* and the Governance of Legal Pluralism

The seven cases across the two clusters, weighed together, reveal not a single mechanism but four mappable strategies. The first is decisive *tarjih*: the *matn* fixes one opinion without a note, as with washing the feet, *'ābirī sabīl*, and *ša'īdan*, nearly half the corpus. The second, *tarjih* with paratextual accommodation, fixes the *jumbūr* position in the *matn* while preserving the minority opinion in a footnote, as with *lāmastum* and *al-muṭabharūn*. The third, double accommodation within the *matn*, holds two senses at once without preference, as with *qurū'*. The fourth, contextual explanation, inserts a *sabab al-nuzūl*-based gloss to restrict the scope of the law, as with the menstruation verse. Together the four form a spectrum running from full certainty to full openness.

This distribution responds to at least three variables: the type of ambiguity, a dispute over a *legal condition* invites determination, a dispute over the *meaning* of a double lexeme invites restraint; the weight of the minority opinion, since a substantial position outside the *jumbūr* is more likely accommodated than ignored; and the gravity of the practical consequence, since a sensitive ruling tends to keep both readings open. QT 2019, in short, weighs each case along the determination, accommodation spectrum.

This graded pattern is most aptly read as *wasatīyyah fiqhīyyah*, a moderation operating not as slogan but as translation technique at the level of the word, in keeping with *wasatīyyah*'s demand for balance between certainty and openness.⁶⁰ QT 2019 realises it by granting legal certainty to the Shāfi'ī majority through determination in the *matn*, while preserving inclusiveness through paratextual

⁵⁸ Qurani, Solehudin, and Kahfi, "Between Linguistics and Jurisprudence."

⁵⁹ Qurani, Solehudin, and Kahfi.

⁶⁰ Kamali, *The Middle Path of Moderation in Islam: The Qur'ānic Principle of Wasatīyyah*. the actual number of HF hospitalizations remains >1 million annually. More than 80% of patients who are hospitalized are initially seen in the emergency department (ED

accommodation and lexical openness. That the Ministry's translation carries a moderationist charge has been shown at the level of key terms such as *ummatan wasaṭan*,⁶¹ in its translation techniques generally,⁶² and in scholarship linking Indonesia's religious moderation to *maqāṣid al-sharī'ah*, particularly *ḥifẓ al-dīn*. The present study extends this into the legal verses, where moderation operates not on the selection of a single term but on the pattern of determination and accommodation, transposing the classical ethic of *ikhtilāf* as institutionalised pluralism⁶³ into the apparatus of *matn*-and-footnote.

Here lies the study's theoretical contribution. Because the target language compels the translator to fix a single form over a *ẓannī* text, translating a legal verse is at bottom an act of *tarjih*, so the translator occupies a position resembling a *muftī*. This bridges two traditions: it strengthens translation studies' thesis that Qur'an translation is ideologically laden, not a neutral transfer,⁶⁴ and it deploys *tarjih*, from *uṣūl* and *fiqh al-ikhtilāf*, as a mechanism for resolving evidence yielding different conclusions from the same source.⁶⁵ The result is a new way of reading the state translation: not merely a linguistic product but a corpus of legal decisions.

Reading QT 2019 as a corpus of legal decisions opens a governance dimension hitherto little examined: as the official state translation, it administers juristic diversity in public religious practice, distributing certainty and openness to the public who perform ablution, touch the *muṣḥaf*, and observe the waiting period, consistent with findings that exegesis is shaped by institutional forces

⁶¹ Cholily, "Moderation in Indonesian Tafsir."

⁶² Gunawan, "The Ideology of Translators in Quranic Translation: Lessons Learned from Indonesia."

⁶³ Abu Baedah, Musolin, and Nurlaelah, "Dialectics of Fiqh Al-Ikhtilāf"; Lailaturrohmah, "Legal Diversity in the Concept of 'Iddah'."

⁶⁴ Lukman, *The Official Indonesian Qur'an Translation: The History and Politics of Al-Qur'an dan Terjemahnya*; Aldeeb, "From Polemics to Peacebuilding: Tracing Interfaith Ideologies in Premodern and Contemporary Qur'an Translations."

⁶⁵ Abu Baedah, Musolin, and Nurlaelah, "Dialectics of Fiqh Al-Ikhtilāf."

such as religious authority and nation-state politics.⁶⁶⁷

This inference rests on QT 2019's institutional position, not merely on the choice itself. As Lukman documents, QT is the Ministry's own translation, reproduced by mosques and pesantren at a scale he estimates at seven to ten million copies a year, the dominant player in the Indonesian Qur'an translation market;⁶⁸ audience-side, a nine-city survey by Syatri and colleagues found 57.2 percent of readers naming it their most-used translation, though for the pre-2019 edition and a purposively selected readership.⁶⁹

As Rodin et al. observe, the Ministry's power over the text is not coercive, since alternatives may circulate, but decisive in effect, since QT is the version most readers encounter. It is *de facto* dominance, not the choice between readings, that converts a linguistic decision into an instrument of governance.⁷⁰

This pattern recurs elsewhere in Indonesia's Islamic legal institutions, from Aceh's *Qanun Jinayat* within the national criminal justice system to judicial discretion in construing "best interests of the child" in marriage-dispensation rulings.⁷¹ In each case, an ostensibly technical act turns out to be the site where the state adjudicates among competing versions of Islamic law.

This governance reading is an inference from the pattern of textual choices, not a claim about individual translators' intentions or the ministerial committee's deliberations, which lie beyond this study's sources. What the analysis establishes directly is the pattern of determination and accommodation

⁶⁶ Pink, *Muslim Qur'anic Interpretation Today: Media, Genealogies and Interpretive Communities*.

⁶⁷ Umar Kustiadi, Muhammad Ilham Sofyan, and Mufarrih Yazid, "Reframing the Role of the State in Religious Moderation: A Thematic Qur'anic Interpretation," *Shabih: Journal of Islamicate Multidisciplinary* 10, no. 2 (2025): 2503–4227.

⁶⁸ Lukman, *The Official Indonesian Qur'an Translation: The History and Politics of Al-Qur'an Dan Terjemahnya*.

⁶⁹ Jonni Syatri et al., "Sikap dan Pandangan Masyarakat terhadap Terjemahan Al-Qur'an Kementerian Agama," *SUHUF: Jurnal Pengkajian Al-Qur'an dan Budaya* 10, no. 2 (2017): 227–62.

⁷⁰ Rodin et al., "The State and the Holy Quran: Politics of the Quran Translation by the Ministry of Religious Affairs."

⁷¹ Afandi and Bagaskoro, "Islam and State's Legal Pluralism: The Intersection of Qanun Jinayat and Criminal Justice System in Indonesia."

in the text itself; the claim that this pattern functions as governance follows from QT 2019's institutional position rather than from documented evidence of a deliberate policy to govern through translation. Future work drawing on ministry archives or interviews with committee members could test this inferential step more directly.

This fact, however, must not be read celebratorily. QT 2019's moderation is not uniform, and the 2:222 case is its reminder: the 2019 edition removed the Ḥanafī accommodation still present in earlier editions, so the state there narrows rather than widens plurality. *Wasatiyyah* is thus more accurately a managed pluralism: the state opens and closes at once, calibrating openness to what is at stake in each case. As Syamsuni argues, *wasatiyyah* in Indonesia's state exegesis and translation is not a static concept but a contested discursive space that state actors strategically mobilise to build a moderation narrative aligned with institutional interests.⁷²

This study is limited to seven cases across two clusters, focuses on the Sunni *maṣḥab*, and is largely synchronic; its typology invites re-testing on other legal domains and other state translations, with fuller diachronic and reception studies to follow. What the findings affirm is that translating a legal verse is never a mere transfer of meaning; it decides the law, and in deciding, it manages diversity.

Conclusion

Translating the Qur'an's legal verses, this study has argued, is inescapably an act of juristic preference. Because these verses are *ḡannī al-dilālah* and the target language admits no plural form, the translator, like a *muftī*, must give preponderance to one reading, so every rendering encodes a legal decision. Reading QT 2019 across seven contested cases yields a four-strategy typology, decisive *tarjih*, *tarjih* softened by paratextual accommodation, double accommodation within the *matn*, and contextual

⁷² Syamsuni, "Negotiating Religious Moderation: Qur'anic Interpretation and the Construction of Wasatiyyah Discourse in Indonesia," *Interdisciplinary Explorations in Research Journal* 4, no. 1 (2026): 195–214.

explanation, forming a single spectrum along which QT 2019 calibrates each case, determining where a clear-sensed word's legal condition is at issue and restraining itself where a lexeme is intrinsically double.

The significance of this pattern reaches beyond translation technique. It shows that the official state translation functions as a corpus of legal decisions and, through it, as an instrument of governance in virtue of its singular institutional status rather than any documented intention to govern: the state distributes legal certainty and openness to the millions who perform ablution, touch the *muṣḥaf*, and observe the waiting period. The graded calibration is best named *wasatīyyah fiqhīyyah*, yet, as the 2:222 case shows, this is a managed pluralism rather than an unqualified openness, for there the 2019 edition withdrew an accommodation its predecessors had preserved. Determination and accommodation at the level of the word, in short, are never merely linguistic; they order the religious practice of a public, and the typology offered here invites re-testing on other legal domains and other state translations.

References

- Abu Baedah, Said Syarifuddin, Mukhamad Hadi Musolin, and Nurlaelah. "Dialectics of Fiqh Al-Ikhtilāf: A Comparative Madhhab Analysis of Legal Pluralism in Contemporary Muslim Societies." *Mazhabuna: Jurnal Perbandingan Mazhab* 8, no. 1 (2026): 19–38. <https://doi.org/10.24252/mazhabuna.vi.64995>.
- Afandi, Fachrizal, and Ladito Risang Bagaskoro. "Islam and State's Legal Pluralism: The Intersection of Qanun Jinayat and Criminal Justice System in Indonesia." *Epistemé: Jurnal Pengembangan Ilmu Keislaman* 19, no. 1 (2024): 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.21274/epis.2024.19.01.1-26>.
- al-Khinn, Muṣṭafā Saʿīd. *Asar Al-Ikhtilāf Fī Al-Qawāʿid Al-Uṣūliyyah Fī Ikhtilāf Al-Fuqahā*. 3rd ed. Beirut: Muʾassasah al-Risālah, 1982.
- al-Qurṭubī, Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Abī Bakr ibn Farḥ al-Anṣārī. *Al-Jāmiʿ Li Ahkām Al-Qurʾān*. 2nd ed. Kairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyyah, 1964.
- al-Ṣābūnī, Muḥammad ʿAlī. *Rawāʿi Al-Bayān Fī Tafsīr Āyāt Al-Aḥkām Min Al-Qurʾān*. Damaskus: Maktabah al-Gazālī, 2001.
- Aldeeb, Najlaa. "From Polemics to Peacebuilding: Tracing Interfaith Ideologies in Premodern and Contemporary Qurʾān Translations." *Religions* 17, no. 5 (2026): 512. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/rel17050512>.
- Aldeeb, Najlaa Ramadan Abdulaziz. "Traces of Ideologies in Four English Translations of the Qurʾān: A Comparative Study of Authorised and Unauthorised Versions." Swansea University Wales, United Kingdom, 2023. <https://cronfa.swan.ac.uk/Record/cronfa65162>.
- Almjlad, Sultan Samah A. "Semantic Untranslatability in Quranic Discourse: Challenges and Contextual Remedies in English Translation." *Cogent Arts & Humanities* 12, no. 1 (2025): 2542336. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2025.2542336>.
- Alwazna, Rafat Y. "The Relation Between Explication and Translation Expertise in the Rendition of Nominalisation and Participles in Legal Qurʾānic Verses Specific to Purification and Prayer into English: A Corpus-Based Study." *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law* 36, no. 4 (2023): 1717–47. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-023-10025-y>.

- Batchelor, Kathryn. *Translation and Paratexts*. 1st ed. London: Routledge, 2018.
- Cholily, Naufal. "Moderation in Indonesian Tafsir: Critical Discourse Analysis of the Terms of Ummatan Wasatan in the Al-Qur'an Dan Terjemahannya By the Ministry of Religion of the Republic of Indonesia." *MUSHAF: Jurnal Tafsir Berwawasan Keindonesiaan* 3, no. 2 (2023): 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.33650/mushaf.v3i2.6171>.
- Departemen Agama. *Al-Qur'an dan Tafsirnya (Jilid II) (Edisi yang Disempurnakan)*. Jakarta: Widya Cahaya, 2011.
- . *Al-Qur'an dan Terjemahnya (Juz 1-Juz 30)*. Surabaya: Karya Agung, 2006.
- Erebih, Mohamed, and Ali Almann. "Between Text and Commentary: Translator Intervention and Semantic Openness in English Translations of the Qur'ān." *Cogent Arts and Humanities* 13, no. 1 (2026): 2662804. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2026.2662804>.
- Genette, Gérard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Gunawan, Fahmi. "The Ideology of Translators in Quranic Translation: Lessons Learned from Indonesia." *Cogent Arts & Humanities* 9, no. 1 (2022): 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2022.2088438>.
- Hassanein, Hamada S. A. "Between Human and Machine: A Dual Translational Approach to Qur'anic Legal Terminologies and Semantics." *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law-Revue Internationale de Sémiotique Juridique*, December 8, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-025-10399-1>.
- Ibn Manẓūr. *Lisān Al-'Arab*. Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1414.
- Kamali, Mohammad Hashim. *Principles of Islamic Jurisprudence*. Cambridge: Islamic Texts Society, 2003.
- . *Shari'ah Law: An Introduction*. Oxford London: Oneworld Publications, 2008.
- . *The Middle Path of Moderation in Islam: The Qur'anic Principle of Wasatiyyah*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.

- Kementerian Agama. *Al-Qur'an dan Terjemahannya (Edisi Penyempurnaan 2019)*. Jakarta: Lajnah Pentashihan Mushaf Al-Qur'an Badan Litbang dan Diklat Kementerian Agama RI, 2019.
- Kustiadi, Umar, Muhammad Ilham Sofyan, and Mufarrih Yazid. "Reframing the Role of the State in Religious Moderation: A Thematic Qur'anic Interpretation." *Shabih: Journal of Islamicate Multidisciplinary* 10, no. 2 (2025): 2503–4227. <https://doi.org/10.22515/shahih.v10i2.12021>.
- Lailaturrohmah, Kummil. "Legal Diversity in the Concept of 'Iddah: Comparative Analysis among Shafi'i, Maliki, Hanafi, and Hanbali Schools." *El-Aqwal: Journal of Sharia and Comparative Law* 5, no. 1 (2026): 49–66. <https://doi.org/10.24090/el-aqwal.v5i1.14946>.
- Lukman, Fadhli. "Conflicting Interests in the Creation of a State-Authorised Translation: Comparing the Saudi and Indonesian Editions of Al-Qur'an Dan Terjemahnya." *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 26, no. 1 (2024): 38–62. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3366/jqs.2024.0568>.
- . *The Official Indonesian Qur'an Translation: The History and Politics of Al-Qur'an dan Terjemahnya*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Open Book Publishers, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.11647/OBP.0289>.
- Maola, Mochammad. "Flexibility and Uncertainty: Ambiguity in Pre-Modern Islamic Law in Dialogue with Modern European Culture." *Epistemé: Jurnal Pengembangan Ilmu Keislaman* 20, no. 1 (June 20, 2025): 55–83. <https://doi.org/10.21274/epis.2025.20.01.55-83>.
- Mursyid, Achmad Yafik. "Kebijakan Politik dalam Tafsir Negara: Studi atas Ayat-Ayat Fiqih dalam Tafsir Kemenag Al-Qur'an dan Tafsirnya." *Al-Bayan: Jurnal Studi Ilmu Al-Qur'an dan Tafsir* 6, no. 2 (December 31, 2021): 217–233. <https://doi.org/10.15575/al-bayan.v6i2.13601>.
- Olyanasab, Sayyed Ziaoddin, Sayyid Mohammad Olyanasab, and Sayyid Majid Nabavi. "A Review and Critique of the Theory of the Speculativeness of the Implication (*Zannī Al-Dilāla*) of the Qur'ān." *Religious Inquiries* 11, no. 1 (2022): 21–39. <https://doi.org/10.22034/RI.2022.248925.1437>.

- Pink, Johanna. *Muslim Qur'ānic Interpretation Today: Media, Genealogies and Interpretive Communities*. 1st ed. Shefeld & Bristol: Equinox Publishing Ltd., 2019.
- , ed. *Qur'an Translation in Indonesia: Scriptural Politics in a Multilingual State*. 1st ed. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2024.
- Qurani, Hizbia, Solehudin, and Kahfi Ya Kahfi. "Between Linguistics and Jurisprudence: Qirā'āt Variation in Ibn 'Aṭīyyah and Al-Qurṭubiy's Exegesis of Qur'an 33:33." *Ṣuḥuf: Jurnal Pengkajian Al-Quran Dan Budaya* 19, no. 1 (2026): 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.22548/shf.v19i1.1359>.
- Rodin, Dede. "The Sunni Ideology in 'Al-Qur'an dan Terjemahannya' by the Ministry of Religious Affairs." *Ṣuḥuf: Jurnal Pengkajian Al-Qur'an dan Budaya* 16, no. 2 (2023): 245–66. <https://doi.org/10.22548/shf.v16i2.885>.
- Rodin, Dede, Rosihon Anwar, Dody S Truna, and Wahyudin Darmalaksana. "The State and the Holy Quran: Politics of the Quran Translation by the Ministry of Religious Affairs." *Ilmu Ushuluddin* 8, no. 1 (August 18, 2021): 57–80. <https://doi.org/10.15408/IU.V8I1.18344>.
- Shah, Mustafa. "The Case of Variiae Lectiones in Classical Islamic Jurisprudence: Grammar and the Interpretation of Law." *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law* 29, no. 2 (2016): 285–311. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-016-9461-1>.
- Syamsuni. "Negotiating Religious Moderation: Qur'anic Interpretation and the Construction of Wasatiyyah Discourse in Indonesia." *Interdisciplinary Explorations in Research Journal* 4, no. 1 (2026): 195–214. <https://doi.org/10.62976/ierj.v4i1.1771>.
- Syatri, Jonni, Ali Akbar, Abdul Hakim, Zarkasi, Mustopa, Ahmad Jaeni, and Muhammad Musadad. "Sikap dan Pandangan Masyarakat Terhadap Terjemahan Al-Qur'an Kementerian Agama." *Ṣuḥuf: Jurnal Pengkajian Al-Qur'an dan Budaya* 10, no. 2 (2017): 227–62. <https://doi.org/10.22548/shf.v10i2.260>.
- Taufik, Ahmad, Hamdani Anwar, Kusmana, Wan Fariza Alyati Wan Zakaria, and Mohd Kailani. "Countering Radicalism Through Tafsir: State and Jihad in Indonesia's Thematic Quranic Interpretation."

Ulul Albab: Jurnal Studi Islam 26, no. 1 (2025): 143–63. <https://doi.org/10.18860/ua.v26i1.32141>.

Ushalli, Eskarni, Salma, Naila Hayati, Neni Yuherlis, and Arwansyah Kirin. “Change in Religious Understanding and Language Shift of the Recitations of the Quran and Hadith in the Perspective of Islamic Jurisprudence.” *International Journal of Science and Society* 6, no. 1 (February 9, 2024): 835–49. <https://doi.org/10.54783/ijssoc.v6i1.1070>.

Wizārah al-Auqāf wa al-Syu’ūn al-Islāmiyyah. *Al-Mausū‘ah Al-Fiqhiyyah Al-Kuwaitiyyah*. Kuwait: Dār al-Salāsil, 1404.

Zadeh, Travis. “Touching and Ingesting: Early Debates over the Material Qur’an.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 129, no. 3 (2009): 443–66. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20789421>.