

MUHAMMAD AND THE FEMALE CAPTIVES

by [Silas](#)

INTRODUCTION

Muhammad and his followers fought many battles. Some were offensive some were defensive. Following a victory the Muslims would take captives, or prisoners of war. Muhammad would usually distribute the captives, both male and female, as slaves to his soldiers. Islam provides some basic rights to its slaves but these rights are limited. Naturally, the rights or demands of the slave owner were greater than those of the slaves.

Female slaves were used for primarily for work. But they also provided another service to their male masters.....

The material I present is detailed but it needs to be provided to document support from all Islamic sources.

Here is the source material I use.

- 1) The Quran - N.J. Dawood's translation.
- 2) The Hadith collection of Bukhari. This collection of stories / traditions is the second most important set of books in Islam. It follows the Quran.
- 3) The Hadith collection of Muslim, (third most important set of writings).
- 4) The Hadith collection of Abu Dawud.

5) The biography of Muhammad, known as "Sirat Rasulallah", written by Ibn Ishaq, and translated by A. Guillaume as "The Life of Muhammad", (the most authentic biography of Muhammad's life).

6) The biographical material found in Ibn Sa'd's "Kitab al-Tabaqat al-Kabir" (Book of the Major Classes). This was translated by S. Moinul Haq.

7) The History of Tabari. This 39 volume set is almost finished being translated by a collection of both Muslim and non-Muslim scholars.

FROM THE QURAN - 70:22-30

"Not so the worshippers, who are steadfast in prayer, who set aside a due portion of their wealth for the beggar and for the deprived, who truly believe in the Day of Reckoning and dread the punishment of their Lord (for none is secure from the punishment of their Lord); who restrain their carnal desire (save with their wives and their slave girls, for these are lawful to them: he that lusts after other than these is a transgressor..."

This verse shows that Muslim men were allowed to have sex with their wives (of course) and their slave girls.

FROM THE QURAN - 23:5,6

"...who restrain their carnal desires (except with their wives and slave girls, for these are lawful to them..."

Again, Muslim men were allowed to have sexual relations with their wives and slave girls.

FROM THE QURAN - 4:24

"And all married women are forbidden unto you save those captives whom your right hand possess. It is a decree of Allah for you. (Muhammad Pickthall's English translation of the Quran).

This verse is one verse out of a long passage dealing with who Muslim men can marry or have sexual relations with. The phrase "captives whom your right hand possess", means the slave girls Muslim men own.

Note also that this passage deals with more than just marriage. In [Sahih Muslim volume 2, #3432](#), the background context for this Quranic verse is given. It relates to the events at Autus, and it permitted the Muslim men to have sex with their female slaves.

FROM THE QURAN - 33:50

"Prophet, We have made lawful to you the wives whom you have granted dowries and the slave girls whom God has given you as booty;..."

This verse is for Muhammad. Supposedly, God allows Muhammad to have sex with his slave girls.

These verses establish that it was permissible for Muslim men to have sex with female slaves.

ISLAMIC EXAMPLES OF MUSLIM MEN HAVING SEX WITH THEIR FEMALE SLAVES.

Muhammad had sex with a slave girl named Mariyam. He probably also had sex with another slave girl of his - Rayhana.

Mariyam was a Christian slave girl and she was given to Muhammad as a gift by the governor of Egypt. Muhammad got her pregnant and she gave birth to a son. Afterwards Muhammad married her. The son died 18 months later.

Here is the reference. NOTE: Words in [] type brackets are mine

In the "**Kitab al-Tabaqat al-Kabir**", mention is made of Mariyah. On page 151, it says

"He [the Lord of Alexandria] presented to the prophet Mariyah, her sister Sirin, a donkey and a mule which was white....The apostle of Allah liked Mariyah who was of white complexion and curly hair and pretty....The he cohabited with Mariyah as a handmaid and sent her to his property which he had acquired from Banu al-Nadir."

The note for the word "handmaid" says "Handmaids gained the status of wedded wives if they bore children. They were called "umm walad" and became free.

This story is also supported by **Tabari's History, volume 39, page 194**. Here is the quote: (my words are in () parenthesis).

"He (Muhammad) used to visit her (Mariyam) there and ordered her to veil herself, [but] he had intercourse with her by virtue of her being his property."

The note (845) on this says, "That is, Mariyah was ordered to veil herself as did the Prophet's wives, but he did not marry her."

We see that Muhammad had sex with his female slave without marrying her, that it was legal in Islam for Muslim men to have sex with their female slaves. They were after all, the Muslim man's property. Although the slave girls had some human rights, when it came to satisfying their master's desires they had to comply.

Let's examine some background material found in the Hadith's of Bukhari, Muslim, and Abu Dawud, and in the Sirat literature of Ibn Ishaq's - "Sirat Rasulallah", and Ibn Sa'd's "Kitab al-Tabaqat al-Kabir". Note that both Sirat works were written BEFORE the Hadith, but they do not supersede the Hadith or Quran in authenticity according to Muslim scholars.

FROM SAHIH BUKHARI - VOLUME 3, #432:

Narrated Abu Said Al-Khudri that while he was sitting with Allah's messenger we said, "Oh Allah's messenger, we got female captives as our booty, and we are interested in their prices, what is your opinion about coitus interruptus?" The prophet said, "Do you really do that? It is better for you not to do it. No soul that which Allah has destined to exist, but will surely come into existence."

(also refer to Bukhari Vol. 3, #718)

FROM SAHIH BUKHARI - VOLUME 9, #506:

Narrated Abu Said Al-Khudri that during the battle with Bani Al-Mustaliq they (Muslims) captured some females and intended to have sexual relations with them without impregnating them. So they asked the prophet about coitus interruptus. The prophet said, "It is better that you should not do it, for Allah has written whom He is going to create till the Day of Resurrection".

Qaza'a said, "I heard Abu Said saying that the prophet said, "No soul is ordained to be created but Allah will create it.""

(also ref. Bukhari 5:459).

FROM SAHIH BUKHARI - VOLUME 5, #637:

Narrated Buraida: The prophet sent Ali to Khalid to bring the Khumus (part of the war booty) and I hated Ali, and Ali had taken a bath (after a sexual act with a slave girl from the Khumus). I said to Khalid, "Don't you see this (i.e. Ali)? When we reached the prophet I mentioned that to him. He said, "O Buraida! Do you hate Ali?" I said, "Yes." He said, "Do you hate him for he deserves more than that from the Khumus."

The note for 637 explains that Buraida hated Ali for taking from the Khumus, and Buraida thought that was not good.

FROM SAHIH MUSLIM, VOLUME 2, #3371

Abu Sirma said to Abu Said al Khudri: "O Abu Said, did you hear Allah's messenger mentioning about al-azl (coitus interrupts)?" He said, "Yes", and added: "We went out with Allah's messenger on the expedition to the Mustaliq and took captive some excellent Arab women; and we desired them for we were suffering from the absence of our wives, (but at the same time) we also desired ransom for them. So we decided to have sexual intercourse with them but by observing azl" (withdrawing the male sexual organ before emission of semen to avoid conception). But we said: "We are doing an act whereas Allah's messenger is amongst us; why not ask him?" So we asked Allah's messenger and he said: "It does not matter if you do not do it, for every soul that is to be born up to the Day of Resurrection will be born".

FROM SAHIH MUSLIM, VOLUME 2, #3432

Abu Said al-Khudri reported that at the Battle of Hunain Allah's messenger sent an army to Autas and encountered the enemy and fought with them. Having overcome them and taken them captives, the Companions of Allah's messenger seemed to refrain from having intercourse with captive women because of their husbands being polytheists. Then Allah, Most High, sent down regarding that: "And women already married, except those whom your right hands possess (Quran - 4:24), (i.e. they were lawful for them when their Idda (menstrual) period came to and end).

FROM THE HADITH OF THE SUNAN OF ABU DAWUD, VOLUME 2, # 2150:

Abu Said al-Khudri said: "The apostle of Allah sent a military expedition to Awtas on the occasion of the battle of Hunain. They met their enemy and fought with them. They defeated them and took them captives. Some of the Companions of the apostle of Allah were reluctant to have intercourse with the female captives in the presence of their husbands who were unbelievers. So Allah, the Exalted, sent down the Quranic verse, "And all married women (are forbidden) unto you save those (captives) whom your right hand possesses". That is to say, they are lawful for them when they complete their waiting period."" [The Quran verse is 4:24].

The note on this Hadith says that "After the distribution of the spoils of war a man may have intercourse with the female slave after passing one menstrual period, if she is not pregnant. If she is pregnant one should wait till she delivers the child. This is the view held by Malik, al-Shafi and Abu Thawr. Abu Hanifah holds that if both the husband and wife are captivated together, their marriage tie still continues; they will not be separated. According to the majority of scholars, they will be separated. Al-Awzai maintains that their marriage tie will continue till they remain part of the spoils of war. If a man buys them, he may separate them if he desires, and cohabit with the female slave after one menstrual period.

FROM THE HADITH OF THE SUNAN OF ABU DAWUD, VOLUME 2, #2167:

Muhaririz said: "I entered the mosque and saw Abu Said al-Khudri. I sat with him and asked about withdrawing the penis (while having intercourse), Abu Said said: We went out with the Apostle of Allah on the expedition to Banu al-Mustaliq, and took some Arab women captive, and we desired the women, for we were suffering from the absence of our wives, and we wanted ransom; so we intended to withdraw the penis (while having intercourse with the slave-women). But we asked ourselves: "Can we draw the penis when the apostle of Allah is among us before asking him about it?" So we asked him about it. He said, "It does not matter if you do not do it, for every soul that is to be born up to the Day of Resurrection will be born.""

The note on 2167 says: "This means that the Companions wanted to have intercourse with the slave girls, but they were afraid of conception. In case they were pregnant and gave birth to a child they could not be sold as it was prohibited that a slave mother should be sold. So they withdrew the penis while having intercourse with them. By this they meant to sell the slave girls and obtain the ransom."

COMMENT ON HADITH

All of these Hadith relate to Muslim soldiers having sexual relations with newly captured female slaves. In some cases the women's husbands were still alive. After a battle, the captured women and children were divided between the Muslim soldiers as "booty", or spoils of war.

In Bukhari Volume 5 #637, it is shown that Ali had sex with one of the females before the distribution of "Khumus" occurred. This "Khumus" was 1/5 of the war booty to be used by Muhammad and his family, (Ali was Muhammad's son-in-law), and be used and distributed to the poor and needy. Here, Khalid, himself a member of

Muhammad's family, took part of the Khumus prior to the distribution. That is why Buraida hated him in this case. Note that Muhammad supported Ali in this. There was no reproof at all. If anything, Muhammad thought Ali deserved more!

Here is the point: Muslim men were allowed to use female slaves for sex. If the slave was not pregnant she could be sold at a slave market. This is what Muhammad's soldiers intended to do.

CORROBORATING MATERIAL FROM THE SIRAT LITERATURE

Ibn Ishaq's biography of Muhammad, "Sirat Rasulallah", is the most reliable extent biography of Muhammad available today. It corroborates the events with the Mustaliq on pages 490 and 493. This event took place just before Aisha was accused of having sexual relations with another man.

It also corroborates the events at Autas on pages 574-576. This event took place just after the initial battle of Hunain.

Ibn Sa'd corroborates the events at Autas (Awtus) on pages 187, 188. He notes that 6000 slaves were taken.

ANALYSIS

The Hadith I quoted show that:

- 1) The Muslim men were out in the field, and took female captives following a battle.
- 2) They were divided up between the men and the men were very horny. They were without their wives who were back home.
- 3) So, the men prepared to have sex with the females, out on the field, away from home, and asked Muhammad about coitus interruptus. They didn't want to get the females pregnant because they wanted to later sell the female slaves for money. Had they gotten them pregnant the Muslim men would be forced to be responsible for the children.
- 4) **Marriage wasn't required to have sex with the females.** Listen to the men's own words.... "we were interested in their prices", i.e., they wanted to sell them. No Muslim man would marry a woman intending to sell her later. That is not what "nikah" - marriage was all about. These men wanted to have sex with their slaves, enjoy them, and they later sell them.
- 5) And if you note what Ali did, - had sex with a female before the "human booty" was divided up between the Muslim soldiers. Muhammad allowed him to do this.

What does all of this boil down to? Muslim men were allowed to have intercourse with their female slaves after the slaves had had one menstrual period. The

reason for waiting one menstrual cycle was to insure that the female slaves were not already pregnant prior to being captured.

In some cases, the female slave's husbands were also captives and it was still legal for the Muslim men to have sex with the female captives. Muhammad received a "revelation" allowing the Muslim men to have sex with the female slaves while there were still married to their captive husbands. A note on the Hadith says that according to Islam, when the married couple is captured, their marriage is automatically annulled!

Muslims did not need to marry the female slave or give her any type of dowry in order to have sex with her.

Muslims did not need to have the female slave's permission to have intercourse with her. She was his property, (as was noted by Tabari), and thus, as property, the Muslim owner had an Allah-given right to have intercourse with her if he desired. I have yet to find one Quranic verse or Hadith that says that the female's slave's permission was required. All Hadith and Quranic verses that pertain to Muslim men having intercourse with female slaves always put the option on the slave-owning man, whether he wants it or not. The slaves were not given a choice.

THE MUSLIM MEN WERE RAPING THEIR FEMALE SLAVES AND MUHAMMAD ALLOWED IT!

Think about it from the women's point of view. A battle is fought and her side lost. Many of the husbands, fathers, and sons are now dead. Some have been captured. The women and children are also taken as captives. Imagine the horror of the females.

Family members dead, homes and possessions are now gone, they are in the total power of their captors.

The captives are distributed amongst the Muslim men as slaves, husband and wife captives are separated. As soon as a female has her menstrual cycle her owner appears. He has been separated from his wife for a while out on the field of battle, sexually hungry, and he proceeds to have sex with his female slave.

Do you think that this female slave willingly has intercourse with him? Is that her wish? She has just experienced one of the most horrible events in her life, - the destruction of her tribe and family, the taking of her possessions, and being made someone's slave, and now she willingly consents to have sex with the very men who brought this disaster upon her!? Of course not! What women would look upon with loving eyes the men that brought destruction upon her family and tribe!

Would Jesus Christ allow soldiers to rape female slaves?

What would the world say if Israel allowed its soldiers to take Palestinian females prisoner and rape with them? There would be a horrible outcry!

Examine the events in Kosovo and Bosnia. Here the same situation occurred. The Muslims were defeated by the Serbs and some Serbs raped Muslims. It is a horrible crime and we all condemn it. But if we examine what Muhammad allowed his soldiers to

do we see that their actions are identical. Muhammad's standards were little better than Serbs who raped Muslim women.

The Japanese did this to the Chinese, Korean and Filipino women during WWII. The Germans did likewise to the Russian women. In a similar way the Muslim soldiers only waited a few weeks to do likewise to their female captives.

Muhammad and his soldiers treated these female slaves just like the Japanese did to their female captives. Much has been written condemning the treatment of black slaves in the West: how much more should a man who claimed to be a prophet of God be condemned for these acts?

DISCUSSION

Some attention needs to be paid to the Quranic term used here for slave. I'm told that the Quranic classical Arabic reads 'ma malakat aymanukum'.

Let's examine a fuller definition of this term. [Starting with the Encyclopedia of Islam, Published by E.J. Brill, Vol. 1, page 24 under the word 'abd', it says:](#)

"Abd is the ordinary word for 'slave' in Arabic of all periods, more particularly for "male slave", "female slave" being ama. On the other hand, the Quran frequently uses the term "rakaba", literally "neck, nape of the neck", and still more frequently, the periphrasis "ma malakat aymanukum - "that which your (their) right hand possesses".

So, the Quran uses the phrase "that which your right hand possesses" as a term for slave.

Moving to the [Shorter Encyclopedia of Islam](#), we find similar. Under "mamluk" it says:

"The term (mamluk) owes its origin probably to the current phrase of the Quran ma malakat aimanukum - "what your right hand possesses", a general designation of slaves without specialization of gender."

Referencing [Hughes Dictionary of Islam, page 596 on slavery](#), it says:

"The term generally used in the Quran for slaves is "ma malakat aimanukum", - "that which your right hand possesses."

There is no doubt that 'right hand possesses' is a phrase used to describe a slave, whether newly captured or not.

Some Muslims may feel that I have taken the Quran and Hadith out of context. Here is supporting material from famous Islamic scholars.

SUPPORT >FROM ISLAMIC SCHOLARS ALLOWING MUSLIM MEN TO HAVE SEX WITH FEMALE SLAVES

1) Dr. Abdul Latif, from Al-Azhar writes "The second reason (to take slaves) is the sexual propagation of slaves which would generate more slaves for the owner." [Taken from "You Ask, Islam Answers, page 51,52].

2) **The great Islamic scholar Ibn Timmiya wrote:**

"The one who owns the mother also owns her children. Being the master of the mother makes him the owner of her children whether they were born to a husband or they were illegitimate children. Therefore, the master has the right to have sexual intercourse with the daughters of his maid slave because they are the daughters of his property, provided he does not sleep with the mother at the same time" ...Vol. 35, page 54.

3) I also want to note that Umar, the 2nd Caliph also committed what seems to be rape of a female slave. From Ibn Sa'd, volume 2, Page 438 "A slave girl passed by me who attracted me, and I cohabited with her while I was fasting".

In effect, during his fast, he noticed an attractive slave girl. He used her sexually. There is no mention of her being his "wife". There is no mention that he ever "married" her. She looked good, and he took her.

QUESTIONS

1) Do Muslims really understand how brutal a man Muhammad was? He willingly allowed those women to be raped! Why do Muslims follow such a man if they know he did such evil actions?

2) Do Muslims in this day and age adhere to this barbaric act? Would they allow the rape non-Muslim slaves in the Muslim world today? Even in Mecca in 1960 there were black slave markets in operation.

3) Why do non-Muslim standards exceed those of a man who claimed to be God's final messenger? If Muhammad were really the final prophet, why were his standards so poor? Why did he allow, even support such, abusive actions? Wouldn't we call a man who did this a criminal today?

SUMMARY

So, all three main sources of Islam - the Quran, the Hadith, and the Sirat all support Muslim men, including Muhammad, having sex with female slaves. Also, both prior and present Islamic scholars also declare that Muslim men can have sex with female slaves.

These verses from the Quran and Hadith prove that Muhammad allowed his men to do to female slaves what essentially amounts to as RAPE. No true prophet of God would willingly allow this. The icing on the cake is that Muhammad claimed to receive "revelations" from Allah permitting this. One has to ask what kind of god Muhammad really worshipped.

APPENDIX 1: A MUSLIM'S ATTEMPT TO JUSTIFY THE RAPE BASED UPON DEUTERONOMY

A Muslim seeking to justify Muhammad's evil actions implies that God allowed the rape of female slaves in the Old Testament. He asks the following question:

"So what do you think the God of the Bible is telling you here.....and since you believe Jesus to be God he is also telling you this:" [Deut 21:10 – 14]

Deuteronomy 21:10-14: "When thou goest forth to war against thine enemies, and the LORD thy God hath delivered them into thine hands, and thou hast taken them captive, And seest among the captives a beautiful woman, and hast a desire unto her, that thou wouldest have her to thy wife; Then thou shalt bring her home to thine house; and she shall shave her head, and pare her nails; And she shall put the raiment of her captivity from off her, and shall remain in thine house, and bewail her father and her mother a full month: and after that thou shalt go in unto her and be her husband, and she shall be thy wife. And it shall be, if thou have no delight in her, then thou shalt let her go whither she will; but thou shalt not sell her at all for money, thou shalt not make merchandise of her, because thou hast humbled her."

Here is the same passage from the NIV.

DT 21:10 When you go to war against your enemies and the LORD your God delivers them into your hands and you take captives, 11 if you notice among the captives a beautiful woman and are attracted to her, you may take her as your wife. 12 Bring her into your home and have her shave her head, trim her nails 13 and put aside the clothes she was wearing when captured. After she has lived in your house and mourned her father and mother for a full month, then you may go to her and be her husband and she shall be your wife. 14 If you are not pleased with her, let her go wherever she wishes. You must not sell her or treat her as a slave, since you have dishonored her.

RESPONSE

The answer to the question: "What is God telling His people to do?"

It is obvious that God is speaking to His people about marriage to a woman who was captured as a slave. And kindness, protection and marriage is the context of the passage.

Looking at the passage there is not even the hint of a rape. In fact, just the opposite is given. When a woman who is not a Jew is made a captive, and the Israelite falls in love with her because of her beauty, he is not allowed to touch her for those 30 days so that she may mourn the loss of her family and country. The intention of this law is to protect her against any rude passion on the part of the man (i.e., rape), and give her time to get used to the Jewish culture and begin to learn an affection for the man. This law provided protection from her against rape. This is not to be simply a thing of passion, but of true love and care. It is a compassionate law for this foreign woman taken in war. Remember this woman was a Gentile, and as such was not expected to have the covenant protection as a Jewish woman would have been. But this law is giving her that protection. She is to be given the status of a woman in Israel and is not to be regarded as a slave, or simply as contraband from the battle. She was to be treated with dignity.

Now the question comes at verse 13 where at the end of the 30 days the man is then allowed to go into her (i.e., have intercourse)...but as a wife. Is this verse suggesting rape? Not at all. It is upholding the normal sexual union permitted a man and a wife.

M.G. Kline (perhaps one of the leading Old Testament theologians of the last century) commented on Deut. 21:10-14:

This first of three stipulations concerned with the authority of the head of the household (cf. vv. 15-21) deals with the limits of the husband's authority over his wife. The case of a captive woman (vv. 10,11; cf. 20:14; contrast 7:3) is used as a case in point for establishing the rights of the wife, perhaps because the principle would obviously apply, a fortiori in the case of an Israelite wife. On the purificatory acts of verses 12b, 13a, which signified removal from captive-slave status, compare Lev. 14:8; Num. 8:7.

On the month's mourning, see Num 20:29 and Deut 34:8. this period would provide for the achieving of inward composure for beginning a new life, as well as for an appropriate expression of filial piety. 14. Thou shalt not sell her. A wife might not be reduced to slave status, not even the wife who had been raised from slave status. ...then thou shalt let her go whither she will. The severance of the marriage relationship is mention here only incidentally to the statement of the main principle that a man's authority did not extend to the right of reducing his wife to a slave. This dissolution of the marriage would have

to be accomplished according to the laws of divorce in the theocracy (cf. Deut. 24:1-4). Not the divorce was mandatory, but the granting of freedom in case the man should determine to divorce his wife according to the permission granted by Moses because of the hardness of their hearts (cf. Matt 19:8). [Wycliff Bible Commentary (London: Oliphants, Ltd., 1963), p. 184].

Then Chief Rabbi J. H. Hertz (late chief rabbi of the British Empire) has said this: "A female war-captive was not to be made a concubine till after an interval of a month. The bitter moments of the captive's first grief had to be respected. She must not subsequently be sold or treated as a slave. 12. bring her home. This law inculcates thoughtfulness and forbearance under circumstances in which the warrior, elated by victory, might deem himself at liberty to act as he pleased (Driver). 'After the countless rapes of conquered women with which recent history has made us so painfully familiar, it is like hearing soft music to read of the warrior's duty to the enemy woman, of the necessary marriage with its set ritual and its due delay. And the Legislator proceeds to trace the course of the husband's duty in the event of the conquered alien woman failing to bring him the expected delight. 'Then thou shalt let her go whither she will; but thou shalt not sell her at all for money, thou shalt not deal with her as a slave, because thou hast humbled her'" (Zangwill)...13. she shall be thy wife. And enjoy the full rights and duties of a Jewish wife; Exodus xxi, 10.14. no delight in her, i.e. no longer any delight in her. The Rabbis deemed such a marriage a concession to human weakness, as a preventive against worse manifestations of the unbridled passions of man...humbled her. Dishonored her." [Pentateuch & Haftorahs, edited by Dr. J H Hertz (London: The Soncino Press Limited, 1960), p. 840.]

The question of allowed rape seems to me is not what the traditional Jewish understanding. You have to comprehend what the Heb. text says. The Hebrew for the verb "dishonor" (NIV) in v. 14 is `inah, which can mean sexual abuse. But it is used in v. 14 to describe a subsequent time, as seen in Hebrew wehayah ("and when it will happen"), which begins v. 14, when he refuses to continue to be her husband but to send her away. In that case, he can no longer treat her as a captive. The act "going into her" (v. 13) after 30 days was to become her husband.

Additional Judaistic references are found in these:

Deuteronomy [Devarim] the traditional Hebrew text with the new JPS translation / commentary by Jeffrey H. Tigay.

Studies in Devarim (Deuteronomy) by Nehama Leibowitz ; translated and adapted from the Hebrew by Aryeh Newman.

Sifre:a Tannaitic commentary on the book of Deuteronomy translated from the Hebrew with introduction and notes by Reuven Hammer.

The main point of this text is the compassion the Lord has on the foreign woman taken in battle. The man is not allowed to rape her, but to treat her with all the respect a wife of the covenant is due. If a Muslim reads this as rape, then he must be reading his own cultural bias into it. But that is not the Biblical understanding of a woman. What this text is saying is that even in battle, a woman was not to be raped by a Jew. If he really wanted her --- he had to marry her. And even then, he had to wait a month to let the passion wear off, and for her to get used to the new culture she was about to be committed to, and to mourn for her own father. The context of the passage is very clear,

it is very easy. How has he dishonored her if he sends her away? Not because he raped her, but because she has been cast away, discarded as unwanted. Divorce was an embarrassing thing (even as it was in this country 50 years ago).

COMPARISON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT VS. ISLAM'S TREATMENT OF FEMALE SLAVES

Let's compare the two cases. This will show clearly Islam's brutal system. Below are two Hadith – one with provides the context of a Quranic verse.

FROM SAHIH MUSLIM, VOLUME 2, #3371

Abu Sirma said to Abu Said al Khudri: "O Abu Said, did you hear Allah's messenger mentioning about al-azl (coitus interrupts)?" He said, "Yes", and added: "We went out with Allah's messenger on the expedition to the Mustaliq and took captive some excellent Arab women; and we desired them for we were suffering from the absence of our wives, (but at the same time) we also desired ransom for them. So we decided to have sexual intercourse with them but by observing azl" (withdrawing the male sexual organ before emission of semen to avoid conception). But we said: "We are doing an act whereas Allah's messenger is amongst us; why not ask him?" So we asked Allah's messenger and he said: "It does not matter if you do not do it, for every soul that is to be born up to the Day of Resurrection will be born".

FROM SAHIH MUSLIM, VOLUME 2, #3432

Abu Said al-Khudri reported that at the Battle of Hunain Allah's messenger sent an army to Autas and encountered the enemy and fought with them. Having overcome them and taken them captives, the Companions of Allah's messenger seemed to refrain from having intercourse with captive women because of their husbands being polytheists. Then Allah, Most High, sent down regarding that: "And women already married, except those whom your right hands possess (Quran - 4:24), (i.e. they were lawful for them when their Idda (menstrual) period came to and end).