

Aurangzaib Yousufzai – October 2017

Thematic Quranic Translation Series - Installment 25
(IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE)

AL-ZINA AND FOHOSH (الزنا و فحش)

Rebuttal of Fictitious Traditional Interpretations

All Relevant Verses Academically and
Rationally re-translated

PART 1: AL-ZINA

The prevalent traditional translation and/or interpretation of Quranic word “Al-Zina” appears to be neither thematically substantiated nor fits in or supported by its respective context in the key Verse 24/3. It can be described, in the least, as a totally illogical statement that cannot be attributed to the exalted Author of Quran.

The key Verse on this Quranic Theme is presented as follows (24/3) :-

3/24: الزَّانِي لَا يَنْكِحُ إِلَّا زَانِيَةً أَوْ مُشْرِكَةً وَالزَّانِيَةُ لَا يَنْكِحُهَا إِلَّا
الْمُؤْمِنِينَ. زَانٍ أَوْ مُشْرِكٍ وَحُرْمٌ ذَلِكَ عَلَى

The traditionally accepted translations of this Verse, based on blatant contempt of human intellect and wisdom, stipulate as under :-

Moududi: “A man guilty of adultery (or fornication) shall not marry any but the woman guilty of the same or a mushrik woman, and none shall marry a woman guilty of adultery (or fornication) but the man guilty of the same or a mushrik man: such marriages are forbidden to true believers.”

Shakir: "The fornicator shall not marry any but a fornicatress or idolatress, and (as for) the fornicatress, none shall marry her but a fornicator or an idolater; and it is forbidden to the believers."

Yousuf Ali: "Let no man guilty of adultery or fornication marry and but a woman similarly guilty, or an Unbeliever: nor let any but such a man or an Unbeliever marry such a woman: to the Believers such a thing is forbidden."

Asad:" [Both are equally guilty:] the adulterer couples with none other than an adulteress - that is, a woman who accords [to her own lust] a place side by side with God; and with the adulteress couples none other than an adulterer - that is, a man who accords [to his own lust] a place side by side with God: and this is forbidden unto the believers."

DISCUSSION:

As you will clearly visualize, the categorical statement made in the above translations *does not correspond with the physical realities of our human world*. It is a fictitious statement, and can't be proved as a generally applicable rule upon humans. Let us discuss this issue exhaustively.

- 1) In different social classes of Muslims (as well as non-Muslims) we can observe adulterous men who have fully chaste, loyal wives in their homes. Rather a vast majority presently consists of such married men who spend their energies in the pursuit of sex adventures outside their homes; their wives still do not transgress the limits of loyalty to their husbands.
- 2) We also do observe a smaller number of such adventurous women whose men are chaste, do not establish sexual relationship with other women, while the wives are secretly keeping permanent relationship with one or the other male sex partners.
- 3) Even the worst sexually disloyal husband would not choose for his wife an adulteress. He would always go for a chaste and loyal wife.
- 4) No woman having whatever sexual drives would ever agree to share her husband with another woman willingly. It's against the psychology of a woman. Therefore, an adulteress would never knowingly marry an adulterer.

Hence, due to the logically unacceptable traditional translations quoted above, we cannot agree with the categorical statement of Quran which proves to be against the circumstantial evidence, and therefore stands unsubstantiated. However, we can easily surmise that it is not the statement of the divine Book which is wrong; it is rather the traditional translation of it which is false and totally illogical. It does not coincide with ground realities. It is to be discarded into a waste bin. Neither the given translation of Al-Zani is authentic, nor of Al-Zaniah is appropriate; neither the word ZAAN is defined properly, nor the word NIKAAH. Hence the need for exploring a plausible version of the Verse crops up before us.

Let us also check :-

5) As to what kind of correlation or common value is found between both, an adulterer and a Polytheist, which has driven God to declare them mutually equal or identical in their conduct? There seems to be none.

6) As to how noticeable is the fact that some of the monogamous men and women can also be adulterers? And, can't a Polytheist as well be a very chaste person in terms of his sexual tendency? It is not necessary that an adulterer must always be a polytheist. And it is not at all necessary that all polytheists must essentially and invariably be adulterers!

It goes without saying that ZINA or sexual intercourse is an instinctual urge of man's physical organism; whereas, being monogamous or polytheist is an ideological need of man's conscious self! Both factors have no values common between each other. Both have their own quite different spheres of functioning. An instinctual act of man's physical organism can be held equivalent to only another instinctual act of his! Just as the matter of faith is man's ideological need or mindset which relates to his conscious self, and can be compared with only another identical need pertaining to his conscious and intellectual thinking, not with some physical instinctual urge!

Therefore, it should be evident from this discussion that the Root Z N Y (fornication/adultery) just cannot apply in this particular context as the act understood from it is not comparable to polytheism or the ideals of a polytheist. It is so because polytheism is not an instinctive act of our physical organism. It is an ideological concept. It goes without saying that a monogamous person and a polytheist both, on the level of their animal organism, under the instinctual pressure, can commit the act of illicit sexual intercourse in a conducive situation.

They can both also remain chaste by resisting this temptation when an opportunity to do so becomes available to them!

An overview of the above translations, with subsequent Discussion, would easily confirm that the word ZINA has been misconceived as a derivative from the Root :

Zay-Nun-Ya (ز ن ي) = to mount, the mounting upon a thing, to commit fornication/adultery, fornication/adultery, fornicator/adulterer (Lane's);

and, as a result thereof, taken as adultery or fornication by our worthy translators collectively! This implies that ZINA, lexically, is an immoral act that can be taken as a violation or transgression of the moral code – a sin. However, the above discussion proves that this is a wrong and wishful deduction from a wrong Root. We will come later to the right Root of ZINA in this context, and to the accurate definition of this word. But over and above this misconception of theirs, this human slip from the righteous path, or a behavioral immodesty, which might have taken place once or twice, or say, on some rare occasions, has been blindly equated by all interpreters with an ideological deviation from the discipline of monogamy, and the sinner is declared non-Muslim, viz., a Polytheist (Mushrik)! Is that possible?

The act of ZINA or adultery can be committed by any devout Muslim too when forced by his innate emotions and when an opportunity conducive to such act may arise in a certain situation. He can subsequently ask forgiveness of God and be repentant too. Would the act of a moral slip suddenly make him lose his ideological faith and turn him into a Polytheist? Obviously not. It certainly looks like a farfetched conclusion.

It goes without saying that an act of moral slip or sin by a Muslim, which occurs because of the “inherent attraction” he is bestowed with in his inner self towards his opposite sex, cannot be drawn or dragged into a comparison with a big ideological deviation like polytheism. It cannot make him a polytheist while he still believes in one God, feels sorry and is repentant!

At the same time, how can a real Polytheist be blamed, as a rule, to become sex or marriage partner with only the one involved in the sin of adultery! Polytheism is a matter of faith,,, and it has got nothing to do with the act of adultery. Hinduism is fundamentally based on polytheism, but we do not find any Hindu male looking mandatorily for a wife who is an adulteress – or vice versa! A Polytheist cannot

always be an adulterer, just as an adulterer cannot always be misconstrued as a Polytheist! It is a mere idiocy and a preposterous tendency to try to draw a comparison between a moral physical sin and a conscious ideological disposition! There is no visible compatibility between the two!

Therefore, by all accounts, it sounds ludicrous to declare that “an adulterer would marry only an adulteress or a polytheist woman, and vice versa”. It is an unsubstantiated and unauthentic claim. As elaborated above, an adulterer, though conscious of his own moral depravity, would still always look for a woman who is chaste and loyal. It is the nature of a male not to tolerate disloyalty from his female mate. And again, by her nature and psychology, a woman would never happily allow her man to indulge with other women sexually!

Once again, we utterly fail to find a correlation or a common value between an adulterer and a Polytheist! Then, the question arises automatically in our minds as to why God has, by equating the two in conduct or status, issued an utterly wrong, illogical and irrational statement in Verse 24/3? Well now, it is deemed impossible that the Scripture may contain anything that can go substantially against human psychology, knowledge and experience! So, finally we come to the inevitable conclusion that it is the wrong interpretation of the word ZINA that has created a big puzzle – the source of a phenomenal misguidance.

A deeper investigation and academic research into this illogical and inconsistent traditional translation brings into light a new revelation that the basic word “ZINA” actually describes the act of

“corruption or distortion of a doctrine or ideology for spoiling its purity”,

which is actually what is discussed in Quran as an important issue. It DOES NOT SUGGEST a human act of illicit sexual indulgence regarded as a vice or an evil act which is declared a major sin and unforgivable transgression by our predecessors, by exercising religious extremism under a pre-determined agenda. By now we have known that due to gross authoritative mutilation of Quran by despotic Arab regimes, these terms are purposefully misrepresented in the form of a moral crime and a major sin.

We would still be prepared to accept the traditional work as authentic if it would only make sense to our faculties of intellect and imagination; and if they would

testify the academic and practical justification of the statement made therein; if they could only re-investigate the veracity of their outdated translation and redraft it in the light of its context and try to make us understand the correlation between adultery and polytheism! But we find that it is not possible and it leaves us with no alternative but to reject their work altogether. Quran is a book free from doubts and ambiguity and we have to prove its veracity for us as well as for the modern intellectual world out there.

Another big distortion found in this translation is another misconception derived from the word NIKAAH (ينكح، نكاح). It is unilaterally taken to mean MARRIAGE against the lexical authority. The latest research into the definition of this word has revealed that it does not offer the meaning of Marriage unless there's some particular situation or a particular word in its context leading us to draw the meaning of a MARRIAGE AGREEMENT. (Please see this link for a fully detailed research on the Theme of Nikaah in Quran : <http://ebooks.rahnuma.org/cgi-bin/shbkpage.pl?bkid=1503151421>) . Nikaah in itself is defined like this :-

Nun-Kaf-Ha = to tie, make a knot, to enter into a contract/agreement, to take into possession, to enter into a marriage contract; and some say, it is also coitus. Nevertheless, the world's most comprehensive Arabic-English Lexican of Lane clarifies the definition of this word as follows :-

“...it is said to be from نكح الدوى , or from تناكحت الاشجار , or from نكح المطر الارض ; and if so, it is tropical in both the above senses; and the opinion that it is so is confirmed by this, that the signification of marriage is not understood unless by a word or phrase in connexion with it, as when you say نكح فى بنى فلان (he took a wife from among the sons of such a one); nor is that of coitus unless by the same means, as when you say نكح زوجته (inivit conjugem suam); and this is one of the signs of a tropical expression. نكحت She married, or took a husband. نكح المطر الارض The rain became commingled with the soil; or, rested upon the ground so as to soak it. As also نكح الدوى The disease infected him, and overcame him; نكح النعاس عينه Drowsiness overcame his eye; as also ناكها: and in like manner استنكح النوم عينه sleep overcame his eye.”

Hence, the situation boils down to **three important points.**

Firstly, what is the real Root of ZINA, which should be followed in all the relevant verses so that the divine narrative of 24/3 reverts to its original rational or plausible form, and it becomes logically possible to compare or correlate it with Polytheism? Moreover, it should not exhibit the controversial statement about who WILL marry whom! This can be achieved only by radically changing its erroneously applied Root to the presently discovered Root “ZAAN”.

Secondly, as the prevalent traditional meaning of NIKAAH cannot be acknowledged here to mean a MARRIAGE AGREEMENT, therefore, legitimate applicable meaning of this word must be applied here instead of MARRIAGE or COITUS.

Thirdly, the big hoax which Muslim nation is confronted with is the general tendency of misconstruing the word ZANIAH in terms of a FEMALE, to make women a general target of condemnation. The feminine ta (ة) in Arabic language is not used for females alone but the plural of a group, party or community is also denoted with the feminine “ta”. So it is well known that Al-Zaniah can also be used for a group (Taaifah) or community of Zanis (males). Still by virtue of the general tendency of playing a constant blame game with women, this word was directed towards the female sex. And it is done in the same way as the word MOMINAAT is always wrongly defined as female Momins rather than Momin Groups/parties, AZWAAJ in Quran was always turned to mean “wives” instead of different groups of people/companions/comrades, ,, , and Al-Nisaa was always misconstrued as “Women” instead of its greater definition of “forgotten/neglected poor masses!

Therefore, before we present the ultimate rational translations of all ZINA related Verses from Quran, let us elaborate the real Root of this word from the world’s most comprehensive and authentic lexicons :-

Z a n (زان) : A noxious weed, that grows among wheat; (app. Darnel-grass; the “lolium temulentum of Linn.; so in the present day;) a certain grain, the bitter grain, that mingles with wheat, and gives a bad quality to it. Yazni, azani, yazani; zwan.

Lane’s Lexicon, Page 1213

Lisanul Arab, Page 1801

THIS IS THE ROOT whose idiomatic and metaphoric usage, when applied to Verse under discussion, gives us the real rational and plausible concept of

“distortion or making impure or spoiling the essence of an ideology/doctrine”. And in the context of ZINA in Quran, this seems to be the ROOT which makes perfect sense by drawing a rational comparison with Polytheism (Shirk). It removes the ambiguity and confusion created by using the derivatives from the wrong Root ZNY (زنى).

It may also be made clear here that this new revolutionary change has not been incorporated into Quran from any outer source. It is ever present in the Verse under discussion (Zaan in 24/3). And as we have found out, its right application seems to have been fully ignored in the past without any regard to the ambiguity this distortion created in the text. And to cover up the crime, it was replaced very craftily with another Root in order to paint a false picture of the respective interpretation. ZAAN in itself is a quite distinct Root and according to this research, it is this Root whose derivatives are used in all the Verses which contain the word ZINA in different forms. The Readers would soon notice how beautifully it fits in.

This has been a quite lengthy and repetitive kind of discussion. I beg your pardon for being so excessively expressive. So now, without wasting more time of the Readers, the most rational translations of relevant Verses are presented hereunder.

Verse: 24/3:

آيت 3/24: الزَّانِي لَا يَنْكِحُ إِلَّا زَانِيَةً أَوْ مُشْرِكَةً وَالزَّانِيَةُ لَا يَنْكِحُهَا إِلَّا زَانٍ أَوْ مُشْرِكٌ وَحُرِّمَ ذَلِكَ عَلَى الْمُؤْمِنِينَ (٣)

“The spoiler of the true essence of Divine doctrine – Deen - (الزَّانِي) would not have a close association with (لَا يَنْكِحُ) anyone but a group/party/organization engaged in the same distortion (زَانِيَةً) or with a polytheist group (مُشْرِكَةً); and the party working to spoil the essence of Deen (الزَّانِيَةُ) would not be joined with except by a spoiling element (زَانٍ) or a polytheist. And such conduct is prohibited to the peace providers.”

And now let us apply this Root, Zaan, which has beautifully removed the ambiguity faced by us in all the old traditional translations, and which is highly consistent with the context, to all the relevant Verses for making the theme of ZINA crystal clear. You will agree with me that after a lengthy discussion gone

through above, we no longer need to repeat the old outdated translations of these Verses.

Verse 24/2:

آيت 2/24: الزَّانِيَةُ وَالزَّانِي فَاجْلِدُوا كُلَّ وَاحِدٍ مِّنْهُمَا مِائَةَ جَلْدَةٍ وَلَا تَأْخُذْكُمْ بِهِمَا رَأْفَةٌ فِي دِينِ اللَّهِ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ تُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ وَلَيْشَهِدَ عَدَابَهُمَا طَائِفَةٌ مِّنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ .

“As for the party found intent on spoiling the essence of Deen (الزَّانِيَةُ) and the individual committing the same crime (الزَّانِي), each one of them must be restrained and bound (اجْلِدُوا) with a hundred bindings (مِائَةَ جَلْدَةٍ). And if you have faith in Allah and the Hereafter, you should not entertain in your heart any thought of concessions in their favor in this crucial issue which relates to Divine Discipline (فِي دِينِ اللَّهِ). And a contingent of responsible peace keepers must be made to witness their punishment.”

Verse 25/68:

آيت 68/25: وَالَّذِينَ لَا يَدْعُونَ مَعَ اللَّهِ إِلَهًا آخَرَ وَلَا يَقْتُلُونَ النَّفْسَ الَّتِي حَرَّمَ اللَّهُ إِلَّا بِالْحَقِّ وَلَا يَزْنُونَ وَمَنْ يَفْعَلْ ذَلِكَ يَلْقَ أَثَامًا ﴿٦٨﴾

“It is those who do not call upon another God with Allah and do not humiliate the one Allah has declared respected except where it becomes legitimate to do so, and do not spoil the essence of Deen (وَلَا يَزْنُونَ). And whoever would act in this way would see his self-evolution hindered.”

Verse 60/12:

آيت 12/60: يَا أَيُّهَا النَّبِيُّ إِذَا جَاءَكَ الْمُؤْمِنَاتُ يُبَايِعْنَكَ عَلَى أَنْ لَا يُشْرِكْنَ بِاللَّهِ شَيْئًا وَلَا يَسْرِقْنَ وَلَا يَزْنِينَ وَلَا يَقْتُلْنَ أَوْلَادَهُنَّ وَلَا يَأْتِينَ بِبُهْتَانٍ يَفْتَرِينَهُ بَيْنَ أَيْدِيهِنَّ وَأَرْجُلِهِنَّ وَلَا يَعْصِيَنَّكَ فِي مَعْرُوفٍ فَبَايِعْنَهُنَّ وَاسْتَغْفِرْ لَهُنَّ اللَّهُ.

“O Messenger, when such faithful communities come to you giving you pledge that they will not associate anyone with Allah; will not steal, will not distort the essence of Deen (وَلَا يَزْنِينَ), will not leave their new generations humiliated for being uneducated (وَلَا يَقْتُلْنَ أَوْلَادَهُنَّ); will not falsely incriminate one openly or secretly; and will not resent your obedience in known situations, you must accept their pledge and beg Allah’s protection for them.”

Verse 17/32:

وَلَا تَقْرَبُوا الزَّيْنَىٰ إِنَّهُ كَانَ فَاحِشَةً وَسَاءَ سَبِيلًا (۳۲) وَلَا تَقْتُلُوا النَّفْسَ الَّتِي حَرَّمَ اللَّهُ إِلَّا بِالْحَقِّ ۗ

“And do not go near the act of spoiling the essence of Deen (وَلَا تَقْرَبُوا الزَّيْنَىٰ). Indeed that is an excess and a transgression (فَاحِشَةً) and an evil way to adopt (وَسَاءَ سَبِيلًا). And do not humiliate a person (وَلَا تَقْتُلُوا النَّفْسَ) whom Allah has given respect except when it becomes legitimate to do so”.

SECOND PART

FOHOSH – OBSCENITY (فحش)

Wherever this word “Fohosh” has occurred in the text of Quran, our so-called earlier times ‘pious scholars’ have given it a lone meaning,,,,,, that of the sexual intercourse.

As a matter of fact, the definition of this word has a much wider scope as you would kindly note from below. AND, as you have already noted from the above writing, the word ZINA has also been defined in terms of SEX, by viciously changing its legitimate Root.

It is not a matter of surprise for those who happen to know the history as to how the monopolists of our Doctrine have misplaced the foundations of our Ideology on SEX through their wishful interpretations. They talk of 11 wives in this life, slave women from war spoils, temporary marriages, and repeated new marriages after divorcing the older wives; and then in the Hereafter, rewards of numerous Hoories as free sex workers. To cope with such a tremendous sex activity, every Paradise dweller is to be given a sexual capacity equal to 100 males!

Let us investigate to check what is the truthful concept of the pure and rational Word of God, as against the interpretations propagated by our evil religious monopolists :-

Fa-Ha-Shin (فحش) = became excessive/immoderate/enormous/
exorbitant/ overmuch/beyond measure, foul/bad/evil/unseemly/

indecent/abominable, lewd/gross/obscene, committing excess which is forbidden, transgress the bounds/limits, avaricious, adultery/fornication.

On this Quranic Theme too we have a key Verse whose latest Rational Translation would bring forth Quran's pure and clean face by doing away with the old hoax and fiction. Moreover, this new translation would pave the way for a rational translation of all the Verses related to this theme.

We have chosen this Verse only because this is made to relate closely with our main theme of ZINA, and a stand point is adopted, with an evil intention, that from here *four witnesses* are ordained to be produced as a mandatory requirement for awarding punishment for the sin of ZINA. BUT, we will soon observe that the word Fohosh has got no direct relationship with ZINA in view of the fact that Fohosh is just a general term for all kinds of immodest behavior. At the same time it is an acknowledged fact that a sexual act is always performed in complete privacy which makes it impossible for four eye witnesses to be present during the act. As elaborated earlier, the term FAHISHAH does not signify ZINA but defines a host of obscenities, immodesty, uncivil behavior, etc. Therefore, Fohosh is a general conduct in public or social level upon which four eye witnesses can be easily produced, so it can't be the sexual intercourse they call ZINA. For example, making obscene gestures towards opposite sex, tempting for sex in public, exposing body parts in public, loose sexual talk in public which might arouse sexual emotions, and above all, *to exercise excess and transgression in matters of faith, etc. etc.*

We must be curious to know as to what was the intended design of our earlier "Pious Imams" behind dragging ZINA into the parameters of Fohosh and then devising the pre-condition of four witnesses for the proof of a violation of this Shariah code? We fail to draw any other conclusion than their open intention of making the punishment for ZINA totally inapplicable! They actually wanted for themselves and for their masters, the Royalty, an open license for ZINA without ever having been exposed to prosecution. Nobody could enter their premises to see this elite class freely committing the acts of ZINA, hence no eye witnesses could testify to the act. It goes without saying that all later generations of Muslims kept benefitting from this big loop hole in the law to this date.

Let us first have a glance on the wishful translations of these old religious monopolists :-

Verse 4/15:

آيت 15/4: وَاللّٰتِي يَأْتِيْنَ الْفَاحِشَةَ مِنْ نِّسَائِكُمْ فَاَسْتَشْهِدُوْنَ عَلَيْهِنَّ اَرْبَعَةً مِّنْكُمْ فَاِنْ شَهِدُوْا فَاَمْسِكُوْهُنَّ فِي الْبُيُوْتِ حَتّٰى يَتَوَفَّاهُنَّ الْمَوْتُ اَوْ يَجْعَلَ اللّٰهُ لَهُنَّ سَبِيْلًا ﴿١٥﴾ وَاللَّذَانَ يَأْتِيَانِهَا مِنْكُمْ فَاَذُوهُمَا فَاِنْ تَابَا وَاَصْلَحَا فَاَعْرِضُوْا عَنْهُمَا ۗ اِنَّ اللّٰهَ كَانَ تَوَّابًا رَّحِيْمًا .

Moududi: “As for those of your women who are guilty of immoral conduct, call upon four from amongst you to bear witness against them. And if four men do bear witness, confine those women to their houses until either death takes them away or Allah opens some way for them.”

Yousuf Ali: “If any of your women are guilty of lewdness, Take the evidence of four (Reliable) witnesses from amongst you against them; and if they testify, confine them to houses until death do claim them, or Allah ordain for them some (other) way.”

Asad: “AND AS FOR those of your women who become guilty of immoral conduct, call upon four from among you who have witnessed their guilt; and if these bear witness thereto, confine the guilty women to their houses until death takes them away or God opens for them a way [through repentance].”

Shakir: “And as for those who are guilty of an indecency from among your women, call to witnesses against them four (witnesses) from among you; then if they bear witness confine them to the houses until death takes them away or Allah opens some way for them.”

DISCUSSION:

All the three words used for Fohosh in English here are: *Lewdness, indecency and immoral conduct*. All of these are actually misconstrued as ZINA as is evident from the capital punishment of death prescribed for them. HOWEVER, we don't find any suggestion here towards ZINA as no involvement of a male is inferred here. They emphasized “*your women who commit indecency*”. As no sexual act is usually committed without the involvement of a male partner, therefore, had it been ZINA, only women would not be mentioned; rather men and women both would be indicted and both had been sentenced! Again, the same perennial question : How and wherefrom FOUR WITNESSES could be provided for a very private act??? Obviously, no egghead would be able to answer this question! Therefore, it is evident that FOHOSH is some other kind of act! Then we have

here another word “ALLAZAAN”, which is translated by one as “a man and a woman”, by another one as “two males”, and by another one as “the entire male gender”!!!

Although in some progressive modern translations the word Fohosh has duly been limited to only “immodest acts”, but you will kindly note the degree of extremism that just for the punishment of some “immodest acts” a most severe and cruel punishment of “*solitary confinement until death*” has been recommended! Can any sane person think of such a barbaric punishment for this crime? And then suddenly, coming down from that extreme, it is also added : “*God might open some way for them*”!!! “For example, if they are not married, they should be married with each other” (G.A.Pervaiz). For God’s sake, **WHY WAS THE LIGHTER PUNISHMENT NOT PRESCRIBED IN THE FIRST INSTANCE?** First of all, you have immediately condemned the women to an ultimate death in solitary confinement; how would you, as a subsequent step, impose the softer sentence of “Sabeel” upon her. And which Momin male would come forward to marry a woman on the death row, who is a sinner of ZINA or INVITATION TO ZINA? Would this society let them live honorably after such a marriage? Is there any substance of sanity in these self styled laws? The Readers can easily come to their own conclusions!

This issue, in fact, was very simple and our great Creator had resolved it in His classical style as follows :-

Verse 4/15:

آيت 15/4: وَاللّٰتِي يٰٓاْتَيْنَ الْفٰحِشَةَ مِنْ نِّسٰنِكُمْ فَاَسْتَشْهَدُوْا عَلَيْهِنَّ اَرْبَعَةً مِّنْكُمْ فَاِنْ شَهِدُوْا فَاَمْسِكُوْهُنَّ فِي الْبُيُوْتِ حَتّٰى يَتَّوَفَّاهُنَّ الْمَوْتُ اَوْ يَجْعَلَ اللّٰهُ لِهُنَّ سَبِيْلًا ﴿١٥﴾ وَاللَّذٰنِ يٰٓاْتِيٰنَهَا مِنْكُمْ فَاَدُوْهُمَا فَاِنْ تَابَا وَاَصْلَحَا فَاَعْرِضُوْا عَنْهُمَا ۗ اِنَّ اللّٰهَ كَانَ تَوّٰبًا رَّحِيْمًا .

“Those of your women who are seen transgressing the limits of modesty (يٰٓاْتَيْنَ) (الْفٰحِشَةَ), arrange to produce four witnesses against them. If they attest to their crime, hand them over to the relevant governmental institutions (فِي الْبُيُوْتِ) so that this degrading life of captivity (الْمَوْتُ) may strengthen their character by removing their weaknesses (يَتَّوَفَّاهُنَّ), or the divine Government may create for them a way out from this impasse (لِهُنَّ سَبِيْلًا). Then if you find two of your males committing transgression from the moral limits, sentence them too to

some kind of punishment. If they repent and improve their conduct, let them go. Indeed Allah or Divine Government always reverts to its people with mercy.”

Important words defined from authentic lexicons

Bayit: (Buyoot): Household, Nobility, Respected house/institution/Centre; deliberations; a place to pass the night, overnight deliberations, etc. Bayitul Maal = the department which has authority on finances.

Miim-Waw-Ta = To die, to pass away from the earthly life, to be destitute or deprived of life, deprived of sensation, deprived of the intellectual faculty, to be still/quiet/motionless, to be calm/still, to sleep, lifeless, to be assuaged, dried up by the earth, to cease, wear out/be worn out, to be poor/reduced to poverty, abject/base/despicable/vile, disobedient or rebellious, lowly/humble/submissive, to be soft/loose/flabby/relaxed, lack spirit or life.

Waw-Fa-Ya = to reach the end, keep ones promise, fulfil ones engagement, pay a debt, perform a promise. tawaffa - to die. wafaat - death. To pay in full, to fulfill. To remove weakness, infirmity and want. To recover, recoup.