

An Examination on Edip Yuksel's Interpretation of Q.4:34

By: Nadya Utari Boru Sitanggang

Q.4:34 is frequently used to justify men's domination over women. There are some keywords in this verse that Edip Yuksel thought have been mistranslated and misunderstood by many scholars, then he reinterpreted them. The authors employed five principles to establish their work, "Quran: A Reformist Translation". Those five principles are what shaped the work and what influenced the final result of the interpretation. This article uses their principles as tool to criticize the interpretation, so it is called internal criticism. Finally, this work concludes that Edip Yuksel's interpretation valuated by the five principles is relatively implemented well, the lack is located in the author's attitude to decide the meaning rashly without explaining the reason they finally chose the meaning after criticizing other's work.

Keywords: 4:34, mistranslated, misunderstood, internal criticism.

Introduction

Here is a verse that usually used to justify men's domination over women¹, reads as follows:

الرِّجَالُ قَوَّامُونَ عَلَى النِّسَاءِ بِمَا فَضَّلَ اللَّهُ بَعْضَهُمْ عَلَى بَعْضٍ وَبِمَا أَنْفَقُوا مِنْ أَمْوَالِهِمْ فَالصَّالِحَاتُ قَانِتَاتٌ حَافِظَاتٌ لِّلْغَيْبِ بِمَا حَفِظَ اللَّهُ وَاللَّاتِي تَخَافُونَ نُشُوزَهُنَّ فَعِظُوهُنَّ وَاهْجُرُوهُنَّ فِي الْمَضَاجِعِ وَاصْرَبُوهُنَّ فَإِنِ أَطَعْنَكُمْ فَلَا تَبْغُوا عَلَيْهِنَّ سَبِيلًا إِنَّ اللَّهَ كَانَ عَلِيمًا كَبِيرًا (النساء : 34)

"Men are in charge of women because Allah hath-made one of them to excel the other and because they spend of their property for the support of women. So, good women are the obedient, guarding in secret that which Allah hath guarded. As for those from whom ye fear rebellion, admonish them and banish them to beds apart, and scourge them. Then if they obey you, seek not away against them. Lo! Allah is ever high Exalted, Great." (Al-Nisa (4) : 34)²

In the contemporary discourse, the interpretations of this verse become a hard endless debate. Appearance of a movement called feminism³ increased the complication

¹Manuela Marin, "Disciplining Wives: A Historical Reading of Quran 4:34", in *Studia Islamica* No. 97, 2003, p. 6.

²I quote this English translation from, Muhammad Marmaduke Pickthall, *The English Translation of The Glorious Quran (The Final Revelation)*, (Kuala Lumpur: Al-Ameen Printers), p. 83. His English translation is quite popular in Shi'ie Muslim. His treatise was claimed as first English Quran translation that made by Englishman Muslim. He believed that Quran can't be translated, every effort that translators do is in order to try presenting the meaning of Quran, but Quran in Arabic will never be irreplaceable (see, Hartmut Bobzin, "Translation of Quran", in Jane Dammen McAuliffe (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of The Quran*, vol. 4, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2004, P. 343).

³Feminism is a mode of analysis which including the recognition of gender equality and women's right which is withheld in socio-political life and looking for ways to protect and struggle the withholding equality and right. See Margot Badran, "Feminism and The Quran" in Jane Dammen McAuliffe (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Quran*, vol. 2, p.200.

in the discussion of the interpretation of 4:34. There are many aspects of this verse that produces various interpretations of it. Shannon Dunn and Rosemary B. Kellison noticed some challenges given by 4:34, first there are some flexible-meaning words in it that carry into a blur view and emerge various understanding, they are *qawwamuna*, *nushuz*, and *idribuhunna*. Then, it is debatable whether the recommendations to deal with *nushuz* doers will be done consecutively or simultaneously. The last, the word *takhafuna* 's meaning is also debated, whether it is 'know' or 'fear', which implied to the recommendations implementation, whether it will be done when the husband supposes that the wife has committed *nushuz* or after it actually have committed.⁴ Yet, the most important thing of all is that the interpretations of 4:34 are always implied objections (to the meaning of *qawwamuna*, *nushuz*, and *idribuhunna*). Then, the reality that the interpretations of 4:34 are characterized by ambivalence and disagreement (even since the time of Prophet Muhammad)⁵ becomes more obvious.

Mohamed Mahmoud gave another view to the foundations that construct 4:34. According to him there are five foundations built 4:34, affirmation, exhortation, crisis, discipline, and reconciliation. The first phrase "*Al-Rijaku qawwamuna 'ala>al-Nisa>*" is affirmation for men's domination over women because they get God's preference and hold responsibility in family finance. For that reason, women are exhorted to be "*al-Salihah*", they are "*qanitatun hafizhatun li al-Ghaibi bima>hafizh Allahu*". A crisis happens if a woman commit *nushuz* (remember the word using here is "*takhafuna*" which is unclear whether implies supposing or knowing). Then, to discipline them, men must "*fa'izhuhunna wa uhjuruhunna fi al-Madhji'i wa idribuhunna*". The reconciliation step is made if women repent and stop committing *nushuz*.⁶

The discussion towards 4:34 interpretations are crowd in every aspects of those five foundations, especially in theme of discipline, which conveying the steps to deal with a *nushuz* woman. The idea of beating women has invited scholars' attention in the past and in the present time. This paper concerns to discuss about one of the

⁴Shannon Dunn and Rosemary B. Kellison, "An Intersection of Scripture and Law: Quran 4:34 and Violence Against Women", in *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion*, Vol. 26, No.2 (fall 2010), p.13.

⁵Shannon Dunn and Rosemary B. Kellison, "An Intersection of Scripture and Law: Quran 4:34 and Violence Against Women", p.13.

⁶Mohamed Mahmoud, "To Beat or Not to Beat: On The Exegetical Dilemmas over Quran 4:34", in *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 126, No.4 (Oct.- Dec., 2006), p. 537-538.

contemporary Islamic scholars who also gives his attention deeply to the interpretation of 4:34, Edip Yuksel. He bounded up his thoughts towards the interpretation of 4:34 in his book “Quran: A Reformist Translation”, a book that he wrote with his two colleagues.

Concerning Edip Yuksel and Quran: A Reformist Translation

Edip Yuksel is a changing paradigm Sunni Muslim to reformist and rational monotheist on 1986. He was born on July 1, 1957 in Turkey, his father is Sadredin Yuksel (Islamic scholar in Turkey) and his brother is Metin Yuksel (who killed by a nationalist). He is founder of 19.org, it is a website contained his thoughts about Islam and the reformation. His youth was spent as an activist of politics and Islamic revolution in Turkey, so that he had prisoned on 1980's for 4 years.

A book by Rashad Khalifa, titled *Quran, Hadith, and Islam* influenced him and his thought, so that he adopted Quran alone philosophy.⁷ It happened around 1986. On 1989, his teacher and partner, Rashad Khalifa sponsored his departure to Tucson, America. It is a place where Rashad Khalifa spread his knowledges and being praised by many followers. Since then, he worked with Rashad Khalifa. Unfortunately, his partner was murdered on 1990.

He received his Bachelor degree and also law degree from University of Arizona in Philosophy major and Near Eastern Studies. Now, he works as an adjunct Philosophy Professor in Pima Community College. He speaks in several languages, such as Turkish, English, Classic Arabic, and also Kurdish, his mother tongue. He writes in those languages, mostly in English and Turkish.

He has written over twenty books, hundred articles, a bunch of booklets on religion, politics, philosophy and law. Here are some of his publishing works: Quran: A Reformist Translation, Nineteen: God's Signature in Nature, Running Like Zebras, Muhammad: A Messenger of Peace and Freedom, In The Name Of Allah: My Journey From Radicalism to Reform, 19 Questions For Muslims, Christians and Atheists, Test Your Quranic Knowledge, Purple Letters, etc.

⁷Aisha Y. Musa called the adopter Quran Alone philosophy as Quranist, it is “advocates of the concept of the Quran as the sole of the legitimate scriptural source of religious law and guidance in Islam.” See Edip Yuksel (et.al.), *Quran: A Reformist Translation*, p.2.

As an Islamic reformation scholar, Edip Yuksel organizes many international conferences in many countries such as in Atlanta, Oxford, Los Angeles, Almaty and Istanbul. He leads many organizations. A source of his own website, www.yuksel.org, said that he leads around 114 organizations which move in Islamic reformation realm. He also shares his thought via internet in www.islamicreform.org, www.free-minds.org, and www.progressivemuslims.org. Other informations about him, his thoughts, and activities are definitely reachable in Youtube, he makes many videos in his channel.

Rashad Khalifa was seemingly influenced him not only about Quran Alone philosophy, but also about the miracle of number 19. This theory shows how Quran predicts many things, also about the discovery of the theory itself. It, in the end, is kind of the emphasizing the Quran Alone philosophy, for it shows that Quran itself has a lot of informations, that is not discovered yet until this time.⁸

The book that I use for this research titled *Quran: A Reformist Translation* is one of his most wellknown book. The book is result of the collaboration of three writers which have their own responsibilities for this work. While I have deep attention to the comparison sample of Q.4:34, translation and endnotes.⁹ The translation of Quran is made by Edip Yuksel and Layth Shalih al-Shaiban, but Martha Schulte Nafeh is also mixed up with them in this job, because her responsibility is as linguistic consultant, while talking about translation means talking about the linguistic. The endnotes are totally written by EdipYuksel, so the discussion below is describing Edip Yuksel's thought which spread in the translation, comparison sample part, and endnotes of Q. 4: 34.

⁸The short biography of Edip Yuksel in this paper is taken from some sources, see Edip Yuksel (et.al.), *Quran: A Reformist Translation*, p. 4 and 520, Fazlul Rahman, "Otoritas Pemaknaan Kitab Suci: problematika Pemikiran Edip Yuksel dalam Qur'an: A Reformist Translation", in *Jurnal Studi Ilmu-Ilmu Al-Qur'an dan Hadis*, Vol. 15, No.2 juli 2014, and www.19.org.

⁹QRT is not kind of exegetical book in common, it is a Quran translation in English version. So that, the most essential part of this book is the translation itself, actually. Though, we must not forget that it is not the final and absolute translation of Quran, it is however is a human-made. So, for this reason the endnote (the explanation of the translation that wrote by Edip Yuksel) is demanded. to inform the readers of the endnote function, Edip Yuksel wrote the reasons in detail: 1) to avoid the loss of meaning and ambiguity that usuallly happen in translation, 2) to inform the reader the reason why they (the authors) translate the verse so, 3) to alert the reader to orthodox and sectarian distortions, 4) to accommodate the differences among the three auhors who had different background, 5) to provide some cross-references to the Bible. See, Edip Yuksel (et.al.), *Quran: A Reformist Translation*, p. 12-13.

In establishing this book, its authors employed 5 main principle directing them to write the book as what they intended to, those are following¹⁰:

1. The Reformist Translation of the Qur`an offers a non-sexist understanding of a divine text; it is the result of the collaboration between three translators, two men and a woman.
2. It explicitly rejects the right of the clergy to determine the likely meaning of disputed passages.
3. It uses logic and the language of Quran itself as the ultimate authority in determining likely meanings, rather than ancient scholarly interpretations rooted in patriarchal and hierarchies.
4. It offers extensive cross-referencing to the Bible and provides arguments on numerous philosophical and scientific issues.
5. It is God's message for those who prefer reason over blind faith, for those who seek peace and ultimate freedom by submitting themselves to the truth alone.¹¹

The involvement of Martha Sculthe Nafeh itself in this establishment is also as the representation of balancy between men and women in this work. Besides, it also in order to omit the biases that currently happens in gender issues. Their rejection of clergy's rules anyway based of they are often originated from the classical scholars' interpretations on Quran or hadis which are influenced by patriarchal culture prevailed extremely in that time as well as political agendas. For that reason, they prefer to rely on logic and the language of Quran itself. On contrary, they choose to employ the cross-referencing to the Bible, simply mentioned as intertextualism method, as well as philosophical and scientific issues.¹² Those five principles are the standard that I use to measure the consistency of the application to their work, using internal criticism method.

The Debates Towards Interpretation of 4:34

The challenges that Dunn and Kellison found from 4:34 are sufficient to attest that the interpretation of 4:34 is far from unanimous voice. Long explanation is always

¹⁰Edip Yuksel (et.al.), *Quran: A Reformist Translation*, p.5

¹¹Edip Yuksel (et.al.), *Quran: A Reformist Translation*, p.5

¹²Edip Yuksel (et.al.), *Quran: A Reformist Translation*, p.11.

demanding to project the interpreters' opinion towards the verse. If Dunn and Kellison ordained ambivalence and disagreement as the character of interpretation of 4:34, Manuela Marin characterized it by variety and diversity, which are the evidence of the conflict that occurs among the interpreters by this discourse.¹³ Vast expanse of geographical, periodical, and science are involved in the effort of finding the truest meaning for 4:34.

Let's start from the most frequently quoted and followed interpretation of 4:34 from classical period, al-T̤abari. What makes his interpretation quoted very often is because he gave very huge contribution to the explanation of the verse, they are the insert of occasion of revelation and his explanation to term *qawwamunna*.¹⁴ The tradition he quoted told that a woman whom has been slapped by her husband complaining to Prophet, and he asked her to do retaliation, then this verse was revealed.¹⁵ While the concept of *qawwamunna* in this verse is all financial-speaking. Men spend their money to pay the dowries and to provide women, so they become *qaim*.¹⁶ Al-T̤abari was seemingly did not question the meaning of *nushuz*, it is simply means disobedient. So, if the wives are disobedient to them (by not giving their right and disobeying the rule), they will accept three recommendations that 4:34 suggested to do with disobedient wives. They should be advised firstly, then, separated in bed, and last beaten (this recommendations are done sequentially, I mean, when first step is failed so the husbands can go to next step).¹⁷ Thing that need to be noticed here is that al-T̤abari restricted beating women by explanation that beating must be unseverely one and done by small stick like *siwak*.¹⁸ Besides, he did not intervene too much to the interpretation of 4:34, he followed the traditions he quoted.¹⁹

A similar approach comes from al-Suyut̤i, but Manuela Marin caught that there is an effort to bound up his own opinion to the interpretation of 4:34²⁰, not only following traditions as al-T̤abari did. I found a very interesting thing of his interpretation in the

¹³Manuela Marin, "Disciplining Wives: A Historical Reading of Quran 4:34", p. 39.

¹⁴Shannon Dunn and Rosemary B. Kellison, "At The Intersection of Scripture and Law", p.16.

¹⁵Abu Ja'far Al-T̤abari, *Jami' Al-Bayan fi Taiwil Al-Qur'an*, (Beirut: Mu'assasah Al-Risalah: 2000), Vol. 8, p. 291.

¹⁶Abu Ja'far Al-T̤abari, *Jami' Al-Bayan fi Taiwil Al-Qur'an*, vol. 8, p. 293.

¹⁷Abu Ja'far Al-T̤abari, *Jami' Al-Bayan fi Taiwil Al-Qur'an*, vol. 8, p. 293-311.

¹⁸Abu Ja'far Al-T̤abari, *Jami' Al-Bayan fi Taiwil Al-Qur'an*, vol. 8, p. 311.

¹⁹The intervention that I mean here is the interpreter's own opinion without referring to traditions.

²⁰Manuela Marin, "Disciplining Wives: A Historical Reading of Quran 4:34", p.28.

way he explained word “*fā al-Shāhīhātu qanītatun*”, it is not only telling the meaning of the word, obedient, but also mentioning some traditions about the good and bad thing that would happen for obedient and disobedient wife. For example, a tradition of Ibn Abi Syaibah which telling that a good woman for her husband is like a golden crown on her husband head, while a bad woman is like heavy load in her husband leg.²¹ Marin saw that as al-Suyutī’s effort to emphasize his opinion, in which is women are inferior to men. The ploy is by collecting every traditions that precisely support his argument, he did not even refer to previous scholars.²²

Now let’s see another model of interpretation of 4:34, I pick al-Qurtūbī’s interpretation as sample of classical exegetes using juridical approach in interpreting Quran. Differed from al-Tābarī and al-Suyutī who used traditions as main source in their works, al-Qurtūbī preferred following and extending the previous scholars’ interpretations.²³ The way he explained was not based on the verse establishment. He broke down the discussion in the verse into 11 points, starting by the discussion of affirmation part (using Mohamed Mahmoud’s theory) in point 1, 2, and 3. In point 1, he found three cases related to the sentence “*al-Rijālū qawwamūna ‘ala>al-Nisā*”, that women are under men protection, judgement, and leadership, women can not retaliate to their husband since the law was abrogated by the revelation of 4:34, and husband’s right on more legacy for they have paid dowries and provide women. In the next point, he emphasized that the concept of *qawwamūna* in this verse also means men’s responsibilities to women, that they must provide, manage, and educate, so women must obey them as long as they do not ask to do the wickedness. In point 3, I found that there is an effort to show a mutual system prevailed in marriage, that ability to provide women is requirement to be *qawwamūna* in marriage, if this requirement is unfulfilled the marriage covenant is damaged. This notion is conveyed by relying on three Islamic law schools, Shafi’ite, Malikite, and Hanafite.²⁴

²¹Jalāluddin Abdurrahman bin Abi Bakr Al-Suyutī, *Al-Duʿā Al-Manthūr fi Tafsīr bi Al-Maʿthūr*, p. 272.

²²Manuela Marin, “Disciplining Wives: A Historical Reading of Quran 4:34”, p.28.

²³Manuela Marin, “Disciplining Wives: A Historical Reading of Quran 4:34”, p.26.

²⁴Abi Abdillah Muḥammad bin Ahmad Al-Anṣārī Al-Qurtūbī, *Al-Jāmi’ Al-Aḥkām Al-Qurān*, (Beirut: Dar Al-Kutub Al-‘Ilmiyyah, 1993), p.110-111.

The explanation to crisis happening in this verse is accepted simply as rebellion like common understanding in that era, and also the way to discipline women's rebellion, that they must be admonish, separate in bed, and be beaten.²⁵ Manuela Marin indicated that al-Qurtūbī's explanation on disciplining wives involves social rank, that women from high social position must be subjected differently to the lower. Reprimanding is enough for the former, but the latter need to be beaten. This attests that the interpretation is also result of social life influences.²⁶

Now, I'd like to review the interpretation of three exegetes above. I found Jane Dammen McAuliffe's examination on al-Tābarī's work, "Jāmi'ul Bayan", that she said even in a *tafsir bi al-Ma`thur* works like al-Tābarī's or al-Suyutī's an effort to bound up the exegetes' own opinion is obvious. Theirs are not only the establishment of traditions, there are emphasizing of the exegetes' insights and judgements there.²⁷ The statement that disobedient women must be subjected as 4:34 recommended (to admonish, to separate in bed, and to beat) , even the insertion of occasion of revelation itself, are their way to convey that the contents of the verse are like what the traditions told. Moreover, to show their understanding towards the verse. In al-Suyutī's work, the notion that men are superior to women is being convinced by many traditions he quoted that speak and evince about women's inferiority. Again, their works are not just the list of hadith or traditions as what we can see in glimpse, they are the statements of their authors's understanding towards Quran. On contrary to *tafsir bil ra`yi* like al-Qurtūbī's work, the opinions of the author are briefly stated. Finally, every exegetical treatises are not free from the authors' intervention.

The new trends of Quranic interpretation in contemporary era shows a braver ploy in interpreting Quran, moreover, in rejecting the notions that are unavailable to be applied in this era. I will take some samples to show the tendencies in interpreting 4:34 in contemporary era. Riffat Hassan emphasized an idea of reciprocal relationship between men and women, men are providers for women, providing women is their

²⁵Abi Abdillah Muḥammad bin Aḥmad Al-Anṣārī Al-Qurtūbī, *Al-Jāmi' Al-Aḥkām Al-Qurān*, p.112-113.

²⁶Manuela Marin, "Disciplining Wives: A Historical Reading of Quran 4:34", p.26 and 34.

²⁷Jane Dammen McAuliffe, "Quranic Hermeneutics: The views of al-Tābarī and Ibn Kathīr", in Andrew Rippin (ed.), *Approaches to the History of the Interpretation of the Quran*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), p. 48.

obligatory in marriage. Yet, it does not mean that women can not provide themselves if they are able to. Women are permitted to provide themselves, but that is not their obligatory, that is the husbands', since they have other things to do in marriage, such as being pregnant, giving birth, and taking care of their children, which biologically only women can do.²⁸ The tool that she used to analyze *qawwamuna* in 4:34 is linguistics, and she found that the meaning of it is not directed to all men in this world, but to whom fulfilled the requirement. It is having ability to provide women, so *qawwamuna* are those who able to provide their wives, since in the reality there are many men can not accomplish this obligatory.²⁹ Mohamed Mahmoud thought that Hassan took a chance from her division on biological-social labor to reconstruct the meaning of *nushuz* which usually understood as wife's rebellion to husband, and it prevailed for a pair, she thought that *nushuz* in this verse is a women mass rebellion to do their obligatory.³⁰ Since it is a mass movement of women who rebell to pregnant, give birth, and take care of children, the ways to deal with it also directed to the mass or community, not a single wife.³¹ The steps are: first, they have to be adviced, if they still mutiny, the second is followed. It is isolating them. The last step is limiting their space in public society.³²

The next sample comes from Asghar Ali Engineer, a Syi'ie Indian scholar. The main idea of the methodology that Engineer used for interpreting 4:34 that I can catch is separation between normative value and contextual value of a verse. The former is closer to divinity (*ilahiyyah*) and the latter to humanity. So, the best approach to read this verse is socio-historical approach.³³ Using this approach the interpreter will reflect how the social situation of the time when the verse revealed (not only when the moment when a verse revealed, but the longer period). Besides, he also showed a hermeneutics view in his discussion about the interpretation of 4:34, as Ahmad baidhwi said that every readings and understandings of Quran (or every texts) are based on the interpreter

²⁸Riffat Hassan, "The Issue of Woman-mab Equality in Islamic Tradition", translated by Team LSPPA, in *Setara di Hadapan Allah*, (Yogyakarta: LSPPA, 1995), p.91-92.

²⁹Riffat Hassan, "The Issue of Woman-mab Equality in Islamic Tradition", p.91.

³⁰Mohamed Mahmoud, "To Beat or Not to Beat: On The Exegetical Dillemmas over Quran 4:34", p.547.

³¹Riffat Hassan, "The Issue of Woman-mab Equality in Islamic Tradition", p.91-92.

³²Riffat Hassan, "Muslim Women and Post-Patriarchal Islam", p.91-92.

³³Asghar Ali Engineer, *The Quran Women and Modern Society*, translated by Agus Nuryanto, (Yogyakarta: LkiS, 2007), p.84.

social, political, or economical background.³⁴ Related to this view, he displayed some interpretations of 4:34 from various interpreters with different period and place. Each of them gave diverse reading towards 4:34, and Engineer concludes that the interpretations of the verse are depended on the tendency of the interpreters. For those who incline the egalitarianism will reject all the interpretation that discriminate women and give the opposite interpretation towards it, and for those who prefer men's superiority will interpret the verse as what they prefer to.³⁵ But, how about his own interpretation?

Using socio-historical approach, Engineer found that beating women, the theme that frequently questioned of this verse, is an ordinary course in the time of revelation, even Prophet's companions kept practicing beating women. Prophet Muhammad tried to bring the equality between men and women, but it is a very huge work. So, even he did not like the practice he let it going for that time.³⁶ Engineer considered that Prophet Muhammad's act of beating women permission as concession for the practice in that time.³⁷ His main goal of interpreting 4:34 is to found the divinity value and contextual value of the verse, that by using socio-historical approach and reading Quran as a unity he found that Quran means an equality among of all human in this world and it supports who are weak.³⁸ Yet, Quran reveals without ignoring the system of values that society of the time of revelation held, so, sometimes in Quran we will find it speaks specifically but in other times it does generally.³⁹

The beating women is one of the verse that Quran mentions specifically what it means, but the value of it is contextual, it is for respect the value prevailed of that time. In other hands, when it speaks about men and women are equal, it speaks in general way, which contained the divine means. This value what actually should be used for all of time. Finally, Engineer concludes that beating women is clearly reject in this contemporary era, because the divinity means the equality between men and women,

³⁴Ahmad Baidhawi, "Asghar Ali Engineer dan Penafsiran Al-Quran" in M. Yusron (et.al), *Studi Kitab Tafsir Kontemporer*, (Yogyakarta: Teras, 2006), p.115. In Gadamer's hermeneutics's view, it is called effective history and pre-understanding. For further discussion see Sahiron Syamsuddin, *Hermeneutika dan Pengembangan Ulumul Quran*, (Yogyakarta: Nawasea Press, 2009).

³⁵Asghar Ali Engineer, *The Quran Women and Modern Society*, p.97-98.

³⁶Showing in many traditions that recount Prophet Muhammad said "I want a thing, but Allah wants something else", which usually considered as his objection on beating women.

³⁷Asghar Ali Engineer, *The Quran Women and Modern Society*, p.98-99.

³⁸Asghar Ali Engineer, *The Quran Women and Modern Society*, p.102.

³⁹Asghar Ali Engineer, *The Quran Women and Modern Society*, p.101.

oppositely, the beating women is only the concession for the practice on the time of revelation.⁴⁰

The next interpretations of 4:34 in this article comes from Amina Wadud, an African-American Muslim Feminist. She wrote about *nushuz* in one of the chapter of her book “Quran and Woman”. *Nushuz* discussion in the book is read by these following perspectives:

“1. There is no inherent value placed on man or woman. In fact, there is no arbitrary, pre-ordained and eternal system of hierarchy. 2. The Quran does not strictly delineate the roles of woman and the roles of man to such an extent as to propose only a single possibility for each gender (that is, women must fulfil this role, and only this one, while men must fulfil that role and only men can fulfil it).”⁴¹

In this part, she tried to explain that there were two words of this verse that often translated falsely, they are *qanita* and *nushuz*. As many modern scholars, she discovered that *Qanita* usually translated as obedient and assumed as obedient to husband. While in Quran this word also used to male, not only female. So, obedient to husband is not fit to it for that reason. The right translation is obedient to God. She wrote: “it describes a characteristic or personality trait of believers towards Allah. They are inclined towards being co-operative with one another and subservient before Allah. This is clearly distinguished from mere obedience between created beings which word *ta'a* indicates.”⁴²

She quoted the interpretation of Sayyid Qutb to explain the second word, *nushuz*. Quran uses word *nushuz* for male in 4:128 and female 4:34, the meaning of both ought to be equal. Yet, what frequently found in many exegetical treatises is both of them translated or interpreted differently. In case of woman, *nushuz* is disobedient to husband, but in man case, it is the carelessness of husband to his wife. So, to make both of them equal Sayyid Qutb decided that the meaning of *nushuz* is disruption in marriage. Amina Wadud was seemingly agreed to his comment since she chose his interpretation in this book. The same reason is used here, that because Quran uses the

⁴⁰Asghar Ali Engineer, *The Quran Women and Modern Society*, p.102.

⁴¹Amina Wadud, *Quran and Woman*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), p.63.

⁴²Amina Wadud, *Quran and Woman*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), p.74.

word for male and female, so the right meaning must be appropriate for both, it is disorder in married couple.⁴³

Quran gives three steps to regain the disharmony in marital. Wadud construed those steps as same as other scholars, including the third one. Yet, because she referred to 4:128, the best solution to solve disharmony problems is by reconciliation between them. Reconciliation is the best solution to solve this problem because it is in line with Quran's spirit. Peace is reached by consultation between two parties, husband and wife. This step is the first step that Quran gives and the best one.⁴⁴

The second solution is bed apart. There are some points that must be watched in this steps, such as that bed apart is only prevailed in monogamy, because the spouses share one bed continually. Though in polygamy the situation is different. Besides, the period of bed apart will be continued indefinitely before the resolution is found. This steps is kind of the chance to both parties to reflect on themselves and the problems. The reflection result may be the reconciliation or 'continued separation-divorce'.⁴⁵

The third is *ḍhraba*, she translated it as scourge. In her other book, she admitted that she tried many methods to find solution of this word which she thought contradicts to spirit of Quran. She said: "There is no getting around this one, even though I have tried through different methods for two decades. I simply do not and cannot condone permission for a man to 'scourge' or apply any kind of strike to a woman."⁴⁶ This statement showed that Wadud explicitly rejected beating woman, but she did not find the way yet (in "Quran and Woman"). Finally, likely similar to Asghar Ali Engineer, she thought that "beat" in this verse "not permission, but a severe restriction of existing practices."⁴⁷

After the review of her comment on those two common mistranslated words, Wadud related the remnant of the verse which usually ignore by many scholars (I mean their focus are not as big as the focus to previous part of 4:34), it is *fā in aṭh'nakum fā la> tabghu>'alaihinna sabika>*(if they obey you do not seek a way against them). As I have

⁴³Amina Wadud, *Quran and Woman*, p.75.

⁴⁴Amina Wadud, *Quran and Woman*, p.75.

⁴⁵Amina Wadud, *Quran and Woman*, p.76.

⁴⁶Amina Wadud, *Inside The Gender Jihad*, (Oxford: One World,2006), p.200.

⁴⁷Amina Wadud, *Quran and Woman*, p.76. Engineer said that beating women is kind of concession of the practices on the time of Quran revealed, when the misogynistic is extremely accepted.

reviewed before that *nushuz* in Wadud's thought is neutral for men and women-the steps of resolving its problem are prevailed for both too and beating in this verse is only as restriction on practices in the time of revelation, Wadud then connect the rest of the verse with all things that I have mentioned above, that word *th'a* needs to be contextualized. For women in the time of revelation were prosecuted to be obedient to their husbands, so, men were demanded to bear their attitude on the women. As she said: "In the case of marriages of subjugation-the norm for Muslims and non-Muslims at the time of revelation-wives were obedient to husbands. The husbands are commanded "not to seek a way against" wives who are obedient. The emphasis is on the male's treatment of the female."⁴⁸ The explanation above is what Wadud called as "contextual consideration".⁴⁹ There is adjustment for both parties, when women are being good so do men.

Finally, Wadud concluded that women's obedience to husbands are caused by men and women's belief. Men believe that they should be obeyed, while women believe that they should obey their husband for they maintain their life. This belief is brought by the tradition of Muslim.⁵⁰ She said: "This belief in the need to obey the husband is a remnant of marriage of subjugation". Yet, this kind of marriage is only one of marriage type, which is practiced in the early Islam period, even the belief is still joined in Muslim nowadays practice. In Amina Wadud's thought, if only Quran just available to that one kind, "it would be fail to present a compatible model to the changing needs and requirements of developing civilizations worldwide".⁵¹ Her statement implied that she wished that understanding of Quranic verses must produce new meaning, so that the understanding of Quran can be applied for every generations, depended on how the situation changed.⁵²

⁴⁸Amina Wadud, *Quran and Woman*, p.76-77.

⁴⁹Amina Wadud, *Quran and Woman*, p.76.

⁵⁰As cited by Abdul Mustaqim that according to Amina Wadud "prior text" is very important in shaping understanding. Muslim understanding of women's obedience to husband produced from the text they read (see Abdul Mustaqim, "Penafsiran Al-Quran Yang Sensitif Gender (Telaah Kritis Atas Pemikiran Amina Wadud Muhsin), in M. Yusron (et.al), *Studi Kitab Tafsir Kontemporer*, (Yogyakarta: Teras, 2006), p.82-83).

⁵¹Amina Wadud, *Quran and Woman*, p.77-78.

⁵²Abdul Mustaqim, "Penafsiran Al-Quran Yang Sensitif Gender (Telaah Kritis Atas Pemikiran Amina Wadud Muhsin), p.83.

Three samples of modern exegeses above are enough to represent that the tendency of modernists is contextualizing the meaning of the verse. Trying to contextualize the verse means trying to reject the notion of violence against women, that in 4:34 is pointed by *idfibukunna* (beat them), which they think is unavailable for contemporary practices. Their efforts are marked by using various approach. Riffat Hassan used social and gender approach, then she found that 4:34 implied a reciprocal relationship between men and women and it is not pointed to women only, but also men. Asghar Ali Engineer used socio-historical approach considering that beating women is only concession for existing practices in the time of revelation, but, it can not implement for contemporary life. The last, Amina Wadud used hermeneutics view uncovering some terms in the verse and found that the using of the terms in Quran are not only pointed to women, but also to men. Simply, they all tried to find the equality between both gender.

Edip Yuksel's Interpretation

Here is the translation of Edip Yuksel in "Quran: A Reformist Translation":

The men are **to support** the women by what God has gifted them over one another and for what they spend of their money. **The reformed women are devotees** and protectors of privacy what God has protected. As for those women from whom you fear **disloyalty**, then you shall advise them, abandon them in the bedchamber, and **separate them**; if they obey you, then do not seek a way over them; God is High, Great.⁵³

The translation of Edip Yuksel's to 4:34 above is quite different to some conventional translations like Pickthall's⁵⁴, Yusuf Ali's⁵⁵, and Tahereh Saffarzadeh's⁵⁶. The

⁵³Edip Yuksel (et.al.), *Quran: A Reformist Translation*, p.93.

⁵⁴"Men are **in charge of** women, because Allah hath made the one of them to excel the other, and because they spend their property (for the support of women). So, **good women are obedient**, guarding in secret that which Allah hath guarded. As for those from whom ye fear **rebellion**, admonish them and banish them to beds apart, and **scourge** them. Then if they obey you, seek not away against them. Lo! Allah is ever High Exalted, Great." See Muhammad Marmaduke Pickthall, *The English Translation of The Glorious Quran(The Final Revelation)*, (Malaysia: A.S. Noordeen,), p. 83.

⁵⁵"Men are **protectors and maintainers** of women, because God has given the one more (strength) than the other, and because they support them from their means. Therefore **the righteous** women are devoutly **obedient** and guard in (the husband's) absence, what God would have them guard. As to those women who ye fear **disloyalty and ill-conduct**, admonish them (first), (next), refuse to share their beds, and (last) **beat them (lightly)**; but if they return to obedience, seek not against them, means (of annoyance), for God is most High, Great (above you all)." See Abdullah Yusuf Ali, *The Holy Quran (Text, Translation and Commentary)*, (Kuala Lumpur: Islamic Book Trust, 1996), p. 190-191.

⁵⁶"Men are **overseers and maintainers** of women because Allah has made one of them excel to the other, and because they (the husband) provide the livelihood of the family. Therefore, **righteous**

differences particularly come from *Qawwamunna*, *Shahihah*, *Qanita*, *Nushuz*, and *Idfibuhunna*.⁵⁷ Edip Yuksel's translation chooses uncommon meanings for the words with some reasons that explained in the endnote of 4:34 in QRT.

The endnote is the explanation and emphasizing of the translations. The way he explained the verse is not like other conventional exegeses, especially, the traditional one. He mentioned the words that he thought have been mistranslated in other English version translations, then rendered the proper meaning for them completed with short explanation on why he rendered so. The words that he mentioned are not systematically based on the verse, but depended on how frequent the words have been mistranslated. If it is based on the verse, it will be *Qawwamunna* → *Qanita* → *Nushuzahunna* → *Idfibuhunna*. Yet, for it based on the critiques on translations, so it is *Qawwamunna* → *Idfibuhunna* → *Nushuzahunna* → *Qanita*.

The first word that he discovered mistranslated is “*Qawwamunna*”, he found that most of translations translated the word to “in charge of”, while in other verses which contained the derivation of the same word translated “maintain/observe”. Here are the verses that contained the same verb mentioned by Yuksel:

فَإِنْ خِفْتُمْ أَلَّا يُقِيمَا حُدُودَ اللَّهِ فَلَا جُنَاحَ عَلَيْهِمَا (البقرة: 229)

*And if ye fear that they may not be able (maintain) to keep the limits of Allah, in that case it is no sin for either of them...*⁵⁸

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا كُونُوا قَوَّامِينَ بِالْقِسْطِ شُهَدَاءَ لِلَّهِ (النساء : 135)

*O ye who believe! Be ye staunch (maintain) in justice, witnesses for Allah...*⁵⁹

يُؤَقِّمِ الصَّلَاةَ لِذِكْرِي (طه : 14)

women are obedient and guard in husband's absence what Allah orders them to guard. As to those women on whose part you see **ill-conduct**, admonish them (first), (next), refuse to share their beds, (and last) **beat them lightly**, but if they return to obedience, do not seek against them means annoyance, verily Allah is Sublime, Great.” See Tahereh Saffarzadeh, *The Holy Quran (Translation with Commentary)*, (Iran: Alhoda, 2007), p.142-143.

⁵⁷The differences come from those words are typed in bold for each translations.

⁵⁸Muhammad Marmaduke Pickthall, *The English Translation of The Glorious Quran(The Final Revelation)*,p.54.

⁵⁹Muhammad Marmaduke Pickthall, *The English Translation of The Glorious Quran(The Final Revelation)*,91.

...And establish (observe) worship for my remembrance.⁶⁰

According to Yuksel, the translation of *Qawwamun* into “in charge of” is in order to justify the misogynistic and patriarchal practices. He thought that it was strange for other derivations of this word in other verses were translated as “observe/maintain”. He wrote, “when the same verb is used to depict a relationship between man and woman, it somehow magically transforms into a prescription of hierarchy and authority.”⁶¹

The second word that he found frequently mistranslated is “*idfibuinna*”, the bare form of it is *dharaba-yadhibu-dharban*. The word used in Q.4:34 is from *fi'il amr* (command) to second person’s pronoun in plural usage. Yuksel discovered that *dharaba* has multiple meanings. This word and its derivation is used in Quran in many times and in many contexts. The meaning of the word is not always same in each verses, it depends on the context of the verse. Here are some verses that use the derivation of *dharaba* and its meaning which found by Yuksel:

a. To travel or to get out(3:156, 4:101, 38:44, 73:20, 2:273)

وَقَالُوا لِإِخْوَانِهِمْ إِذَا ضَرَبُوا فِي الْأَرْضِ أَوْ كَانُوا غُزًى (آل عمران : 156)

...who say of their brethren, when they are **travelling** or engaged in fighting...⁶²

b. To strike (2:60,73, 7:160, 8:12, 20:77, 24:31, 26:63, 37:93, 47:4)

فَقُلْنَا اضْرِبْ بِعَصَاكَ الْحَجَرَ فَانفَجَرَتْ مِنْهُ اثْنَتَا عَشْرَةَ عَيْنًا (البقرة : 60)

...we said: “**Strike** the rock with thy staff.” Then gushed forth therefrom twelve springs.⁶³

c. To beat (8:50)

يَضْرِبُونَ وُجُوهَهُمْ وَأَدْبَارَهُمْ وَذُوقُوا عَذَابَ الْحَرِيقِ (الأنفال : 50)

... (How) they **smite (beat)** their faces and their backs, (saying): “taste the penalty of the blazing fire.”⁶⁴

d. To set up (43:58, 47:4)

⁶⁰Muhammad Marmaduke Pickthall, *The English Translation of The Glorious Quran(The Final Revelation)*, p.228.

⁶¹See Edip Yuksel (et.al.), *Quran: A Reformist Translation*, p. 104.

⁶²Abdullah Yusuf Ali, *The Holy Quran (Text, Translation and Commentary)*, p. 163.

⁶³Abdullah Yusuf Ali, *The Holy Quran (Text, Translation and Commentary)*, p.31-32.

⁶⁴Abdullah Yusuf Ali, *The Holy Quran (Text, Translation and Commentary)*, p.428.

مَا ضَرَبُوهُ لَكَ إِلَّا جَدَلًا بَلْ هُمْ قَوْمٌ خَصِمُونَ (الزحرف : 58)

... *this they set forth (set up) to thee only by way of disputation: yea, they are a contentious people.*⁶⁵

e. To give (example) (14:24,25, 16:75,76, 112, 18:32,45, 24:35, 30:28,58, 36:78, 39:27,29, 43:17, 59:21, 66:10,11)

ضَرَبَ اللَّهُ مَثَلًا عَبْدًا مَمْلُوكًا لَا يَقْدِرُ عَلَى شَيْءٍ (النحل : 75)

*Allah makes this comparison (give example) on the one hand there is a helpless slave...*⁶⁶

f. To take away (to ignore) (43:5)

أَفَنضِرُبُ عَنْكُمْ الدُّكْرَ صَفْحًا أَنْ كُنْتُمْ قَوْمًا مُسْرِفِينَ (الزحرف : 5)

*Shall we then take away the message from you and repel you for that ye are a people transgressing beyond bounds?*⁶⁷

g. To condemn (2:61)

وَضُرِبَتْ عَلَيْهِمُ الذِّلَّةُ وَالْمَسْكَنَةُ وَبَاءُوا بِغَضَبٍ مِّنَ اللَّهِ (البقرة : 61)

*Shame and misery were stamped upon (condemn) them and they incurred the wrath of Allah.*⁶⁸

h. To seal or to draw over (18:11)

فَضْرَبْنَا عَلَى آذَانِهِمْ فِي الْكَهْفِ سِنِينَ عَدَدًا (الكهف : 11)

*Then we draw (a veil) over their ears, for a number of years...*⁶⁹

i. To cover (24:31)

وَلِيَضْرِبْنَ بِخُمُرِهِنَّ عَلَى جُيُوبِهِنَّ وَلَا يُبْدِينَ زِينَتَهُنَّ إِلَّا لِبُعُولَتِهِنَّ (النور : 31)

...and to draw their veils over (cover) their bosoms, and not to reveal their adornment save to their own husband's father...⁷⁰

j. To explain (13:17)

كَذَلِكَ يَضْرِبُ اللَّهُ الْحَقَّ وَالْبَاطِلَ (الرعد : 17)

⁶⁵Abdullah Yusuf Ali, *The Holy Quran (Text, Translation and Commentary)*, p.1336.

⁶⁶N.J. Dawood, *The Koran*, (Great Britain: Penguin Book, 1979), p. 309.

⁶⁷Abdullah Yusuf Ali, *The Holy Quran (Text, Translation and Commentary)*, p.1324.

⁶⁸N.J. Dawood, *The Koran*, (Great Britain: Penguin Book, 1979), p. 338.

⁶⁹Abdullah Yusuf Ali, *The Holy Quran (Text, Translation and Commentary)*, p.731.

⁷⁰Muhammad Marmaduke Pickthall, *The English Translation of The Glorious Quran(The Final Revelation)*, p.255.

Thus doth God (by parables) *show forth (explain) truth and vanity.*⁷¹

Yuksel found that *d̥araba* and its derivations usage in Quran have ten meanings, as I have mentioned above. Besides that 10 meanings, there are other meanings of *d̥araba* that used in Arabic which are not used in Quran, such as break in *d̥araba al-Watida* means *daqqahu* (break it), or print in *d̥araba al-Dirhama* means *t̥aba'ahu* (print it), or move in *d̥araba al-Syai'u* means *taharraka* (move), etc.⁷²

Yuksel thought that it was strange that commonly translators chose “beat” or “scourge” as meaning of *d̥araba* for this verse, while it has multiple meanings. Choosing “beat” or “scourge” as the meaning of *d̥araba* for this verse is seemingly contrasted with message that Quran brought from other verses, one of it is from Q. 30:21.

(وَمِنْ آيَاتِهِ أَنْ خَلَقَ لَكُمْ مِنْ أَنْفُسِكُمْ أَزْوَاجًا لِتَسْكُنُوا إِلَيْهَا وَجَعَلَ بَيْنَكُمْ مَوَدَّةً وَرَحْمَةً إِنَّ فِي ذَلِكَ لَآيَاتٍ لِقَوْمٍ يَعْتَكِرُونَ)
(الروم : 21)

*From His signs is that He created for you mates from yourselves that you may reside with them, and he placed between you affection and compassion. In that are signs for people who reflect. (Q. Al-Ruum:21)*⁷³

This verse talked about marital life that should be full of mutual love and care.⁷⁴ Again, it is interesting that most of translators chose “beat” or “scourge” as the meaning of that word, not only for Yuksel, but also for me too. In the previous part, Yusuf Ali and Saffarzadeh added “lightly” after “beat” as the adverb, while in the quranic word itself there is no word that could be translated as “lightly”. This case, also happened in the traditional interpretation. When the traditional exegeses explain “*id̥ribukunna*” they gave “*ghairu mubarrih*” as the official statement. It can be understood that the translators who added “lightly” in their translations even there is no word that can be translated directly from the verse as their interpretation on it, for the translation is the simplest kind of interpretation.⁷⁵ For Edip Yuksel, the addition for meaning of *id̥ribukunna* is kind of apology. He wrote, “to avoid moral and intellectual problems, they try to soften the word ‘beat’ when they translate the verse 4:34. For instance, Yusuf Ali uses a merciful parenthesis after ‘beat’, adding the word ‘(lightly)’. This insertion

⁷¹Abdullah Yusuf Ali, *The Holy Quran (Text, Translation and Commentary)*, p.609.

⁷²Muhammad bin Mukarram bin Mandhur, *Lisan Al-'Arab*, (Beirut: Dar Shadir,t.t), Vol. 1, p.543.

⁷³Translation from QRT, see Edip Yuksel (et.al.), *Quran: A Reformist Translation*, p. 267.

⁷⁴See Edip Yuksel (et.al.), *Quran: A Reformist Translation*, p. 104.

⁷⁵See, Hartmut Bobzin, “Translation of Quran”, in Jane Dammen McAuliffe (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of The Quran*, vol. 4, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2004, p. 343.

does not appear in Arabic text, it serves as a kind of apology for his translation of the surrounding material.”⁷⁶

For Edip Yuksel, the main problem of the mistranslation of this verse is located on the translation of *idhibukunna*, which has multiple meanings. In the comparison sample part of QRT, he wrote steps that a translator must do if he/she faces a multiple-meaning word in translating Quran, it is depended on:

- a. Given the context
- b. The Arabic forms
- c. The usage of the same word in Quran in other verses
- d. A certain amount of common sense⁷⁷

Before rendering his translation to *idhibukunna*, he showed another sample translation from Yusuf Ali on Q. 38:44.

وَأَخَذَ بِيَدِكَ ضِعْفًا فَاصْرِبْ بِهِ وَلَا تَحْنُثْ إِنَّا وَجَدْنَاهُ صَابِرًا نِعْمَ الْعَبْدُ إِنَّهُ أَوَّابٌ (44)

*And take in thy hand a little grass, and **strike** therewith: and break not (thy oath)...(Yusuf Ali).*

*Take in your hand a bundle and **travel** with it, and do not break your oath...(QRT)*

He thought that the usage of that word is the same case as what happened on Q.4:34, so, he decided that the appropriate meaning of it is “to leave the wife” or “separate with them”. He wrote “we translate the controversial ‘beating’ portion of 4:34 as ‘leave her’ (literally, the phrase might also be rendered ‘strike them out’ meaning, in essence, ‘separate yourselves from such wives’).”⁷⁸

The third translating word that has been criticized by Yuksel is *nushuz*. This word comes from *nashaza-yanshuzu-nushuzan*, means being high. This word and its derivation have been used in Quran for several times. As in Q.S. 4:34 and 4:128, both verses speak about marital. In 2:259, the verb used is *nunshizuha*>the verse talked about the story of Ibrahim and a man who challenged his faith on God. In this verse, the word means rebuild. In 58:11, the verb used is *inshuzu*>means get up from the seat. In arabic

⁷⁶Edip Yuksel (et.al.), *Quran: A Reformist Translation*, p. 18.

⁷⁷Edip Yuksel (et.al.), *Quran: A Reformist Translation*, p. 19.

⁷⁸I took the explanation above from the comparison sample part of QRT, because Yuksel only explained it shortly in the endnotes, it was by showing the multiple meaning of the word and his anxiety of the common translation, see Edip Yuksel (et.al.), *Quran: A Reformist Translation*, p. 18-20 and 104.

context itself, *nashaza-yanshuzu-nushuzan* means *irtafa'a* (being high), such as from sitting position to stand, example: *nashaza al-Rajulu* means a man get up from his seat. While *nushuz* in marital case as Ibn Mandzur in his “Lisan Al-Mizan” quoted from Abu Ishaq that it is one of two spouses hatred to other.⁷⁹

Edip Yuksel thought this word has been mistranslated in 4:34 in many translations and misinterpreted in exegetical works, he thought that there is a clue in 4:34 that directs the translators and interpreters to render the meaning of the word to the proper one. He cited:

If we study 4:34 carefully we will find a clue that leads us to translate that word as embracing a range of related ideas, from ‘flirting’ to ‘engaging in an extramarital affair’ – indeed, any word or words that reflects the range of disloyalty in marriage. The clue is the phrase before *nushuz*, which reads: ‘...they honor them according to God’s commandments, even when alone in their privacy.’⁸⁰

Yuksel decided that the meaning of *nushuz* in this verse is disloyalty because he relied to the phrase before it, it is *hāfizātun li al-Ghaibi bima>hāfizā Allahu*. It is contrasted to scholars who construed *nushuz* as “rebellion”. I think, that their interpretation for that word is based on *qanītaʿ*, because they interpret it as “obey”, so *nushuz* is “disobey” or “rebel”.

The second reason of why Yuksel understand *nushuz* as disloyalty is because he thought that the message of this verse is harmony in marital life and loyalty is one of the most important aspect to create it. This message is in line with Quran’s message in 30:21.

The third reason is to balance the meaning of 4:34 and 4:128, where both verses used the same word in the same shape and in the same context, it is marital life.⁸¹ Yuksel thought that many exegeses and translators have mistaken in understanding one of the those verses. For they have the similarities, both in context and grammar, they must treat in the same way too. I mean, both verses, for *nushuz* word, must have the same result.

⁷⁹Muhammad bin Mukarram bin Mandhur, *Lisan Al-‘Arab*, (Beirut: Dar Shadir,t.t), Vol. 5, p.417.

⁸⁰Edip Yuksel (et.al.), *Quran: A Reformist Translation*, p. 104.

⁸¹See Edip Yuksel (et.al.), *Quran: A Reformist Translation*, p. 104

Now, let's observe how Edip Yuksel's treatment to 4:128 is⁸². Firstly, here is the verse that will be observed, reads as follows:

وَإِنْ امْرَأَةٌ خَافَتْ مِنْ بَعْلِهَا نُشُوزًا أَوْ إِعْرَاضًا فَلَا جُنَاحَ عَلَيْهِمَا أَنْ يُصْلِحَا بَيْنَهُمَا صُلْحًا وَالصُّلْحُ خَيْرٌ وَأُحْضِرَتِ الْأَنْفُسُ الشُّحَّ وَإِنْ تُحْسِنُوا وَتَتَّقُوا فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ كَانَ بِمَا تَعْمَلُونَ خَبِيرًا (النساء : 128)

“if a woman fears from her husband disloyalty, or estrangement, then there is no sin for them to reconcile between themselves, and reconciliation is good. The persons are brought by need. If you are kind and aware, then God is Expert over what you do.”⁸³

Q.4:34 is far more frequently debated than this verse. Its interpretation and translation is not too much variant and controversy as much as the first verse. Though, at least there are two terms of the verse that translated differently from Edip Yuksel's. Word *nushuz* in it has been translated as “ill-treatment” by Pickthall⁸⁴ and “cruelty” by Yusuf Ali⁸⁵ and Saffarzadeh⁸⁶. I assumed that ill-treatment and cruelty implied resemble meaning, even Pickthall's translation seemingly has broader meaning than cruelty. Violence and abandonment are including into its meaning. While QRT offered another contrast sense, it is “disloyalty” the same meaning as found in Q.4:34.

The last is the phrase *wa uhjirati al-Anfusu Al-Shuhhi*. Ibnu Mandzur in his book construed *al-Shuhhi* as “*ashaddu al-Bukhli*” (very greedy).⁸⁷ All samples⁸⁸ except

⁸²I have to inform that in the endnote of QRT we will never found any explanation of Q.4:128 in the endnote part as we found in other verses like in Q.4:34. Only the translated verse with asterisk sign (*) will be given the endnote. While Q.4:128 does not have sign, I think, it is because the explanation of it is discussed in Q.4:34 concurrently.

⁸³Edip Yuksel (et.al.), *Quran: A Reformist Translation*, p. 98.

⁸⁴“If a woman feareth ill-treatment from her husband, or desertion, it is no sin for them twain if they make terms of peace between themselves. Peace is better. But greed hath been made present in the minds (of men). If ye do good and keep from evil, lo! Allah is ever informed of what ye do.” See Muhammad Marmaduke Pickthall, *The English Translation of The Glorious Quran(The Final Revelation)*, p.91.

⁸⁵“If a wife fears cruelty or desertion on her husband's part, there is no blame on them if they arrange an amicable settlement between themselves and such settlement is best even though men's souls are swayed by greed. But if ye do good and practice self restraint, God is well-acquainted with all that ye do.” See Abdullah Yusuf Ali, *The Holy Quran (Text, Translation and Commentary)*, p. 221.

⁸⁶“And if a wife fears cruelty or desertion from her husband, there is no sin on them (both) if they decide upon friendly settlement between themselves (by overlooking some of their rights), since making peace is better. Human mind is captured by greed, but you (Muslims) should do good and keep away from evil. Verily, Allah is the Well-aware of what you do.” See Tahereh Saffarzadeh, *The Holy Quran (Translation with Commentary)*, p. 167.

⁸⁷Muhammad bin Mukarram bin Mandhur, *Lisan Al-‘Arab*, vol. 2, p. 295.

⁸⁸Samples that I mean here are Muhammad Marmaduke Pickthall's, Abdullah Yusuf Ali's, and Tahereh Saffarzadeh's translations which are cited in footnote 81-83. Those samples are functioned as comparisons to Edip Yuksel's translation.

QRT cite “greed” in the meaning of it, in the complete phrase it is every human has greed as their character. Again, QRT showed very different meaning, it is “The persons are brought by need”.

Some samples that I displayed above seemingly are able to show that *nushuz* in the former and the latter are treated differently, only QRT rendered the same treatment for both, it is “disloyalty”. Yet, the hypothesis above only comes from the translations. Now, I am going to pick some samples of exegeses of Q.4:128, to see whether it has different meaning or the same.

I have surveyed randomly in some exegetical treatises and I found that all of them implied that *nushuz* in 4:128 is cruelty and ill-treatment as Yusuf Ali, Pickthall, and Saffarzadeh did. Al-Zamakhshari wrote: أن يتجافى عنها بأن يمنعها نفسه و نفقته و المودة و الرحمة التي ⁸⁹بين الرجل و المرأة-⁸⁹ means being rude. Al-Razi also gave the resemble explanation in the short sentence, it is being rude in word, action, or both.⁹⁰ While Al-Samarqandi rendered the same word for *nushuz* in this verse as Al-Thabari rendered to Q.4:34, it is *al-‘Isyan*.⁹¹ And Al-Alusi gave the same explanation for this verse as Al-Suyuthi gave to Q.4:34, it is being arrogant.⁹² I think, all of explanations above to *nushuz* in Q.4:128 direct to same meaning as its common translation showed, it is ill-treatment and cruelty. Being rude, arrogant, and rebelling are kind of ill-treatment and cruelty. There is none of it implied the meaning as QRT gave.

Discrepancy in interpreting 4:34 and 4:128, which have the same context, leads Edip Yuksel to balance both verse. Finally, to balance both he considered that “disloyalty” is the fit sense for both. He wrote: “However, the understanding of *nushuz* as marital disloyalty, in a variety of forms, is clearly appropriate for both 4:34 and 4:128.”⁹³ The implication of balancing meaning to both verses is that *nushuz*, which means disloyalty is prevailed for both men and women, and so are the recommendations

⁸⁹Abu al-Qasim Mahmud bin ‘Amr bin Ahmad, *Al-Kassyaaf*, vol.1, p.469.

⁹⁰Abu Abdullah Muhammad bin Umar bin Al-Hasan Al-Taimi Al-Razi, *Mafatih Al-Ghaib*, Vol.5, p.401.

⁹¹Al-Samarqandi, *Bahr Al-‘Ulum*, Vol.1, hlm.429.

⁹²Syihabuddin Al-Husaini Al-Alusi, *Ruh Al-Ma’ani Fi Tasir Al-Quran Al-‘Adhim Wa Sab’u Al-Matsani*, vol.4, hlm.254.

⁹³Edip Yuksel (et.al.), *Quran: A Reformist Translation*, p. 104.

to deal with. I mean, if a man/woman has an extramarital affair in marriage, so the spouse must do the recommendations as suggested in 4:34.

The next word Edip Yuksel criticized is *Qanita*, it is from *qanata-yaqnutu-qunukan*. Ibn Mandzur in his book wrote that it means *al-Th'ah* (obedient). He wrote:

قَنَّتَ اللَّهُ يَفْتُنُّهُ أَطَاعَهُ وَقَوْلُهُ تَعَالَى كُلُّ لَه قَانَتُونَ أَي مُطِيعُونَ وَمَعْنَى الطَّاعَةِ هَهُنَا أَنْ مَنْ فِي السَّمَوَاتِ مَخْلُوقُونَ كِبَرَادَةِ اللَّهِ تَعَالَى لَا يَقْدِرُ أَحَدٌ عَلَى تَغْيِيرِ الْخَلْقَةِ⁹⁴

Qanata Allah yaqnutuhu means obey Him and as His word "kullun lahu qanitatun" means people who obey Him. Obedient in this context means every creatures follow God's willing and no one is able to change the other creatures.

Simply, according to Ibn Mandzur *qanita* means obedient. Yet, in QRT, the authors chose "devotion to God" as the meaning of it. Yuksel showed some verses that used this word and its usages are not directed to women only, but also to men. He mentioned 11 verses that used this word, such as 2:116, 238; 3:17,43; 16:120; 30:26; 33:31,35; 39:9; 66:5,12. Yuksel admitted that mostly translation of this word in other verses are correct, but, the translation of *qanita* as obedient for 3:34, for him is unacceptable, because that brought understanding as if women must obey their husbands for their inferiority. Besides, this kind of translation is not fair, because it is prevailed only to women who have husband, while for they who have not husband is not, included Mary.⁹⁵

The rest of endnote for 4:34 is the providing of cross-referencing to the Bible, it is based on the principle that the author of QRT made in composing the book, "it offers extensive cross-referencing to the Bible and provides arguments on numerous philosophical and scientific issues". In this part, he inserted some references of Old and New-Testament. He thought that patriarchal culture and practice are not only happened in Islamic world, but also in the Western culture which influenced by the Church teaching. As he wrote in the comparison sample, "Though wife-beating is not Muslim specialty, and domestic violence is an endemic problem in the West as well as the East".⁹⁶ He quoted some samples to show the truth of his statement, such as:

⁹⁴Muhammad bin Mukarram bin Mandhur, *Lisan Al-'Arab*, vol.2, p. 73.

⁹⁵Edip Yuksel (et.al.), *Quran: A Reformist Translation*, p. 104.

⁹⁶Edip Yuksel (et.al.), *Quran: A Reformist Translation*, p. 18.

For a woman is not covered, let her also be shorn. But if it is shameful for a woman to be shorn or shaved, let her be covered. For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, since he is the image and glory of God; but woman is glory of man. For man is not from woman, but woman from man. Nor was man created for the woman, but woman for the man (I Corinthians 11:6-9).⁹⁷

Besides the quotation mentioned above, there are other 7 cross-referencings that he mentioned. All of those depicted the misogynistic tradition in the Christianity, which implied what Yuksel said that patriarchy⁹⁸ is not Muslim specialty.

He argued that the Muslim scholars, deliberately or not, attempted to take back the rights of women that promoted by Quran. Their interpretation on Quran based on the Jewish and Christian who converted to Islam, while they did not experience the paradigm change. The converts who did not experience it certainly were still extremely influenced by their religious background. While then, the Muslim scholars cooperated with them, the result of their interpretation was surely close by-what Yuksel called-the culture of ignorance, which is fully patriarchy.⁹⁹

An Internal Criticism On 5 Principles

Main mission of Edip Yuksel in writing QRT is to produce a translation of Quran in English version which making Quran as the main source of interpretation, abandoning pre-conceptions of all-male scholarly, and resonating contemporary notions of gender equality, progressivism, and intellectual independence.¹⁰⁰ Simply, to make a contrast translation of Quran from other many translations that, according to him, do not have adequate requirement to be a modern Quran translation. In other word, as a critic to conventional translation. So, not to be surprised that we will find a very different idea in this treatise. Eventhough, this book is not free of critic and error, it must contain stain in some spots of the pages of the book.

The first¹⁰¹ principle which said that they offer a non-sexist understanding of Quran. One of the purpose this treatise written is to produce a work that free from

⁹⁷Edip Yuksel (et.al.), *Quran: A Reformist Translation*, p. 104.

⁹⁸Patriarchy is the politics of transforming biological sex into politicised gender, which making priorities the male while making the woman different (unequal), less than, or other, see Asma Barlas, "The Quran and Hermeneutics: Reading The Quran's Opposition To Patriarchy", in *Journal of Quranic Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 2, 2001.

⁹⁹See Edip Yuksel (et.al.), *Quran: A Reformist Translation*, p. 104.

¹⁰⁰Edip Yuksel (et.al.), *Quran: A Reformist Translation*, p.10.

¹⁰¹The bold numbers are to show that the number of principle.

gender bias, so they employ a woman's thought in this work, Martha Schulte Nafeh's. They expected that the employment will reduce the bias. I consider that this treatise, valuated from interpretation of 4:34, is relatively egaliter since they minded some notions which discriminate women's rights, such as their interpretation to word *Qawwamun*, *qaaita*, *nushuz*, and *idfibukunna* and the way they related 4:128, which commonly understood as verse about a treatment to man who commits *nushuz*.

The second, rejecting the right of clergy to determine the likely meaning of the passage, is done, as we see in his interpretation that he does not even mention a hadis or other scholars argument.

The third, the usage of logic and language of the Quran itself, is complied. In the interpretation of 4:34 a meaning of word is determining by seeing a whole verses in Quran which have the same word. It's mean that language of the Quran itself takes a big role in interpreting this verse.

Now, let's re-observe point two and three by seeing the endnote and comparison sample. I will begin with his statement about his opinion on scholars' demeanor of this verse, he said: "Many orthodox translators have tried to **beat around the bush** when it comes to explaining this passage, and perhaps just as many have **beaten a hasty retreat** from those inquiring after the author's intention—but all have found themselves, in the end, **beaten** by 4:34."¹⁰² In his opinion, many orthodox translators chose to avoid to discuss this passage deeper and clearer, they rushed into deciding that the meaning of *idfibukunna* in this verse is "beat", without considering that the word is a multiple-meaning word. He moreover, deliberately use "beat" three times in that sentence (the bold words) just to show that "beat" even in English has multiple-meaning.

By criticizing many scholars that avoiding the discussion of this passage, it means Edip Yuksel offered a more complete discussion and explanation of it. Now, let's evaluate how complete and visceral his explanation is. I have checked his interpretation in the endnote. As I said in the previous chapter that in the endnote he criticized the words that he thought have been mistranslated and showed his translation on it, and I think in this part he only stopped in conveying his astonishment to the conventional translation and interpretation. He also mentioned other verses that have the same word

¹⁰²Edip Yuksel (et.al.), *Quran: A Reformist Translation*, p.10.

as the 4:34. The explanation of *qawwamun* is stopped there, without any further explanation of why he chose the translation so. In *idjibukunna*, he made addition by mentioning verse that implied an ideal marriage. The third word *nushuz*, is seemingly as the only criticizing word that completed by his argument of why he thought that the appropriate meaning so. While the explanation model of the last criticizing word, *qanita* is same as *qawwamun*.

His explanation in the comparison sample of this verse located on the first order, showing that it gets his attention more than other verses in the comparison sample. Yet, the explanation of this part on the verse is seemingly heavier on the discussion of word *idjibukunna*, while other words get akin explanation as in the endnote. It's no wonder, because the thing that interested him most is the word *idjibukunna*. As he said: "The main problem comes from the word *idjibukunna*, which has traditionally been translated as 'beat them'".¹⁰³ That is a part that showed how he could not accept idea of beating a woman, he explicitly rejected it by reinterpreting it, by other alternative meaning on it. His rejection on beating women is also showed that he is a feminist, a man who struggle for equality and right of women.¹⁰⁴

The conclusion of my recheck above on how deep the discussion and explanation that Edip Yuksel delivered in his book is that his main goal of interpreting this verse is to abrogate the idea of beating women in the verse. His effort even in looking for other verses that have the same word as in the verse, finally, direct to a result, that man must not beat woman. Problem solving in marriage problem is not by violence, because it is contradictive as marriage goal. His explanation on other keyword like *nushuz* and *qanita*, in the end, is to show that he disagreed with the notion of violence against women. So, he looked for a way to make the realization of his thought which ended by conclusion that *nushuz* is prevailed for man and woman, and the way to deal with it is not by violence.

I think he is successful in conveying what he meant explicitly by showing that it is a multiple meaning word. Unfortunately, for me, his critic to orthodox scholars whom

¹⁰³Edip Yuksel (et.al.), *Quran: A Reformist Translation*, p.19.

¹⁰⁴See Margot Badran, "Feminism and The Quran" in Jane Dammen McAuliffe (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Quran*, vol. 2, p.200.

he said “beat around the bush when it comes to explaining this passage”, is also happened to him. His decision to take “leave her” or “separate with her” is not along with the explanation of why he decide so. Other keywords that he criticized also treated in the same way, there is no further explanation why he chose it finally. I think, he also did the same as what he conveyed to many orthodox scholars.

Now, let’s see the other side of the interpretation of 4:34 in Edip Yuksel’s thought. In the short biography of Edip Yuksel, I wrote that he is a Quran alone philosophy holder, he rejected any other claimed religious sources, because its notions make as if Quran is incomplete, unintelligible, and insufficient.¹⁰⁵ This idea is also obtained in his interpretation of 4:34. I found that the samples from the traditionalist cluster used hadis in it, while no one of the reformist samples did. However, out of this research, many reformist also used hadis in their interpretation of this verse. The recently hadis used is the *asbab al-Nuzul* of the verse which telling that Prophet ask the woman to do the retaliation and this verse revealed as the abrogation of that command. Mohamed Mahmoud, in his article, wrote that in interpretation of 4:34 comes to an anomalous situation, where Quran and hadis are contradictive to each other. The usage of hadis in this situation is in order to support the idea of rejecting beating woman, especially for those who oppose the beating woman. This hadis convinced them, that even Prophet Muhammad, God’s messenger disagreed with idea of beating woman which Quran recommended, so, it’s mean man must not beat their woman.¹⁰⁶

It is clear that Edip Yuksel, a reformist and feminist, who explicitly rejects beating woman, does not use hadis in his interpretation since the philosophy that he hold, Quran alone. Edip Yuksel finds other way to show his rejection on that idea, not by using hadis. He relies mostly on the “logic and the language of the Quran itself as the ultimate authority in determining likely meanings”¹⁰⁷ Yet, the source that he used to interpret the verse is impacted to the result of it. Scholars who used “retaliation” hadis used it to show Prophet objection on beating woman, directly, showed that they construed *idribuhunna* in this verse as “beat”, as the *asbab al-Nuzul* of the verse told.

¹⁰⁵Edip Yuksel (et.al.), *Quran: A Reformist Translation*, p.439.

¹⁰⁶Mohamed Mahmoud, “To Beat or Not To Beat: On The Exegetical Dilemmas Over Quran 4:34” in *Journal Of The American Oriental Society* , Vol. 126, No. 4, 2006.

¹⁰⁷Edip Yuksel (et.al.), *Quran: A Reformist Translation*, p.5.

Even *dharaba* has multiple-meanings, but they got the context from the story, that *dharaba* in this verse is “beat”. Edip Yuksel who relies on the language of the Quran, without using, even mentioning a bit part of hadis, will never reach the conclusion that *idribukunna* is beat, as many scholars did. He has showed that it has many meanings, so it means the translators have many choices to translate the word. Edip Yuksel seeked a logic way that would be fit with his mission to establish “a non-sexist understanding of the divine text” and a translation of Quran for “those who seek peace and ultimate freedom”¹⁰⁸ In this case, “separate” or “leave” is the appropriate meaning that he choose to avoid violence against women. I think, the tension between this kind of discussion will be fallen calm if we understand that the result of the interpretation is depended on the source used, that the scholars interpret *idribukunna* as “beat” because they rely on hadis, and for Edip Yuksel who said it as “leave” because he relied on the language.

The concept of *nushuz* which has rebuilt by Edip Yuksel simply means “disloyalty”. He found a clue that leads him to interpretation that *nushuz* is disloyalty in 4:34, it is *hāfizātun li al-Ghaibi bima>hāfizah Allahu*. Yet, I find two peculiarities between his translation and interpretation and the concept of *nushuz* that he constructed for 4:34 and 4:128, two verses which talking about a same context. First, I found that in the translation he wrote “protectors of **privacy** what God has protected” as the meaning of the fore-mentioned phrase, but, in the endnote he wrote “**they honor them according to God’s commandments**, even when alone in their privacy”. I think, these two sentences have two different meanings. I wonder what is the privacy that God has protected? There is no explanation about this phrase at all either in the comparison sample or in the endnote. The translation of the phrase is changed in the endnote. My question to its changing is who are “them” in this sentence. Now, let’s say that “them” is husband, so the translation is “they honor the husband according to God’s commandment”. It is women honor the men as what Allah has commanded them to. I think, his translation in the endnote as if implied that he undeliberately ascribed that even Allah commands women to honor their men. Honoring in marriage between spouses is not only done by one side, but by each to another, the principle of justice as Edip Yuksel wanted. Yet, by writing that translation of the phrase, I think that Edip Yuksel is also perplexed and not sure with his interpretation.

¹⁰⁸Edip Yuksel (et.al.), *Quran: A Reformist Translation*, p.5.

The second, the concept of *nushuz* that he has constructed from 4:34 and 4:128 ended with “disloyalty” as the conclusion. Yet, I think his decision of it is not ripe enough yet. His decision comes from only one verse, it is 4:34, as I have written that he found a clue that led the translators to give the appropriate meaning for *nushuz*. Apart from my astonishment on the first point, I can accept his idea that *nushuz* is disloyalty since he argued that there is clue that directs us to that meaning. Though, if that idea prevailed as the concept of *nushuz* for the whole Quran, I think, it is not right if the decision is only made from one verse. To built a concept of a thing in the Quran, an interpreter must see for whole verses in Quran that talk about that thing. He knows that *nushuz* in 4:128 usually translated and interpreted as “misbehaviour” or “ill-estrangement” from a husband, but, he rendered “disloyalty” as the meaning of the *nushuz* in this verse following a verse that have the same word as it and the context, it is 4:34. He did not even explain anything about his rendering to the meaning of it in 4:128, he made it go round only by endnote in 4:34. I think, his decision to say that *nushuz* is disloyalty is not fit yet, he rushed in deciding. The better way to decide to an entire meaning of concept must engage every verses involving.

The fourth is the providing of extensive cross-reference to the Bible, the last point that I discussed in this part. If we read directly the endnote of 4:34, we will see that the quotations from the Bible takes a half part of the explanation of the verse, which mean that the author of the book has provided it well as they intended in their principle.

He mentioned Ephesians 5:22-33, Collosians 3:18-19, Peter 3:1-7, Corinthians 14:34, Timothy 2:11-15, Leviticus 12:1-5 and 15:19-33. All of this quotation he mentioned is implied a thing, that patriarchal culture is not Muslim’s specialty, it happened in a whole world, either in Western or Eastern. If we see this quotations we will think that for Edip Yuksel the main issue of this verse is men domination over women as the beginning of this verse said *al-Rijahu qawwamunha ‘ala>al-Nisa>* In my opinion, what interested him most about this verse is the beating issue, not men domination, so then the quotations are perplexing me. When I read the fourth point in the principle of establishing this book, I think that the providing of cross-reference is to emphasize the interpretation, as the usage of hadis in many conventional exegeses. Yet, what I find in the endnote of 4:34 is something different. These quotations are in order

to compare Muslim and non-Muslim tradition, not as appositio or sidelight. He moreover added his comment on that quotations as following: “The Old Testament contains hyperbolic exaggerations and bizarre practices.”¹⁰⁹

The fifth is the conclusion of all the principle that have been mentioned above that “It is God’s message for those who prefer reason over blind faith, for those who seek peace and ultimate freedom by submitting themselves to the Truth alone.” Since all of the principles above are done well, so, this last point so. Apart of my critics to QRT, the author of this book have made efforts to run their principles well even there are still some inevitable lacks of it.

Conclusion

The Interpretation of Q.4:34 by Edip Yuksel in *Quran: A Reformist Translation* is not really a new kind of its interpretation as it is one of the most controversial and debated verse in exegesis realm and as it is always characterized with ambivalence and objections that many exegetes have tried to reproduce meanings of it from time to time using various methods and approaches. However, Edip Yuksel and his colleagues have shown an effort to fight the mainstream interpretation of the verse by employing five principles to express the equality between men and women to have the same right in marital.

Based on my examination to Edip Yuksel’s interpretation of 4:34 using those five principles as a tool to criticize, I found that the first principle is to produce a masterpiece that free from gender bias, is reached since the main ideas of the the interpretation of 4:34 is to equalize men and women’s right. 4:34 is really a proper verse to show this principle employment and they have ran it well. The second, third, and fourth principle shows the source of interpretation that they use, they reject any right of clergy and rely on logic and language of Quran. Unfortunately, I found that the interpretation seems rush in deciding the meaning of the words which they criticized. The author did not explain further why they finally decide the meaning so. Nonetheless, the effort to employ the principle deserves appreciation as they clearly reject hadis to support their interpretation while common exegetes do, instead they provide cross-referencing to Bible. The providing indirectly supports their interpretation as it convey

¹⁰⁹Edip Yuksel (et.al.), *Quran: A Reformist Translation*, p.105.

the same culture to treat women discriminatively in Christian and Jewish culture. The last principle is the foundation of all principles which stated that QRT is established for whom seek peace and ultimate freedom. The spirit of freedom portrays in interpretation that women have right to be leader as well as men, that the problem must not solve by violence, and that both men and women must be treated equally if they make mistake in marriage by cheating to each other.