

Friday 25<sup>th</sup> April 2025

**Subject: Exposing the deceptive Arabic to English translation in [Section e4.3 of the Sharia Law Manual of The Reliance of the Traveller](#) in regard to female circumcision. Which in turn, alludes as an example to the key overall Islamic concept of [Taqiyyah](#).**

**“In their own Arabic and English words.”**

[PDF COPY](#)

Back on the 12<sup>th</sup> February 2025, I listened to the 100 minute YouTube video titled [The Truth about Shariah Law – Q&A](#) on the [Channel of Lloyd De Jongh](#) in an extended discussion with the [Egyptian-American Baptist pastor Usama Dakdok](#), born and raised a [Christian in Egypt, but migrating to America in 1992](#). Usama also studied for a [university degree in Egypt which included the study of Sharia, Islamic law](#).

Lloyd, a South African, now based in Warsaw Poland, describes himself as a National Security and Technology professional, with 11 years Middle East experience, and a History buff and pro-Israel Christian. His X account is at [@lloyddejongh](#).

Focusing on History, Religion, Ideology and Philosophy, but in particular Islam, he uses sophisticated technology to perform detailed research and analysis. His livestreams combat confusion, offer facts and historical truths, makes sense of the world, promoting Judeo-Christian morals and cultural values. He defends the West and recognises Christianity as a pillar of Western civilisation, which compels us to uphold what’s right in a society chronically adrift.

From about 1 hour and 21 minutes, the discussion turned to the topic of circumcision for men and women in Islam. Before too long, Lloyd brought up on his screen [Section e4.3 of the Sharia Law Manual of The Reliance of the Traveller](#), which in the English translation states:

“Circumcision is obligatory (O: for both men and women. For men it consists of removing the prepuce from the penis, and for women, removing the prepuce (Ar. bazr) of the clitoris (n: not the clitoris itself, as some mistakenly assert). (A: Hanbalis hold that circumcision of women is not obligatory but sunna, while Hanafis consider it a mere courtesy to the husband.)”

However, Usama then asked Lloyd to move to the right of the document with the original Arabic, to which, not all that surprising it seemed to Usama, ***he discovered that the English translation was NOT a true translation of the original Arabic!***

***In short, Usama stated that in the original Arabic, the complete removal of the woman’s clitoris was MANDATORY!***

To which Usama added; the reason for this barbaric practice was to remove the woman’s ability to experience pleasure during sex. To which one can only conclude, implies a chronic insecurity for male adherents and proponents of Sharia Law.

Weeks later, on the website of [Answering Islam](#), I discovered the following statement in regard to [Section e4.3 of the Sharia Law Manual of The Reliance of the Traveller](#):

**QUOTE:**

“The following quotation is taken from *Reliance of the Traveller*, Revised edition, amana publications, Beltsville, 1997. The title page informs us that this book is

The Classic Manual of Islamic Sacred Law ‘Umdat al-Salik  
by Ahmad ibn Naqib al-Misri (d. 769/1368) in Arabic with  
Facing English Text, Commentary, and Appendices  
Edited and Translated by Nuh Ha Mim Keller

In this book, in the section titled “THE BODY”, we find on page 59 the following entry [*As already quoted above.*]:

e4.3 Circumcision is obligatory (O: for both men and women. For men it consists of removing the prepuce from the penis, and for women, removing the prepuce (Ar. Bazr) of the clitoris (n: not the clitoris itself, as some mistakenly assert). (A: Hanbalis hold that circumcision of women is not obligatory but sunna, while Hanafis consider it a mere courtesy to the husband.)”

[With the original Arabic as follows:]

e4.3 وَيَجِبُ (على كل من الذكر  
والأنثى) الختانُ (وهو قطع الجلدِ التي  
على حشفة الذكر وأما ختان الأنثى فهو  
قطع البظر [ويسمى خفاضاً]).

The above used abbreviations mean:

A: ... comment by Sheikh ‘Abd al-Wakil Durubi

Ar. Arabic

n: ... remark by the translator

O: ... excerpt from the commentary of Sheikh ‘Umar Barakat

However what the Arabic actually says is:

**Circumcision is obligatory (for every male and female)** by cutting off the piece of skin on the glans of the penis of the male, **but circumcision of the female is by cutting out the clitoris** (this is called HufaaD). {bold emphasis ours}

[See also pages 63 to 64 of *The third choice : Islam, dhimmitude and freedom* by [Mark Durie](#), published in 2010, ISBN: 9780980722307, 0980722306, 9781926800004, 1926800001, Durie uses “**this is called khifad ‘female circumcision’**” at the end rather than “**this is called HufaaD**”. Durie also gives five detailed footnotes at the bottom of page 64, and likewise at the foot of page 63.]

The Arabic word *bazr* does not mean “prepuce of the clitoris”, it means the clitoris itself (cf. the entry in the [Arabic-English Dictionary](#)). [This [LINK is now dead](#). [However, see HERE.](#)]

The deceptive translation by Nuh Hah Mim Keller, made for Western consumption, obscures the Shafi'i law, given by 'Umdat al-Salik, **that circumcision of girls by excision of the clitoris is mandatory**. This particular form of female circumcision is widely practiced in Egypt, where the Shafi'i school of Sunni law is followed.

#### UNQUOTE

To which, just below the above extended quote there is the following most poignant link:

Further Reading: [Islam and Lying](#)

... where the key Islamic concept of [Taqiyyah](#), embodying the justification of lying in furtherance of Islam, is discussed in detail. Which moreover confirms what Usama Dakdok implied in his [online discussion with Lloyd](#); ***that lying is inherently essential in propagating and infiltrating Islam into a naive non-Muslim world.***

To which, as stated from [section o9.1 of the Reliance of the Traveller](#), most poignantly segues in regard to **hijra [emigration]** only being justified to the end of performing jihad:

“If none of those concerned perform jihad, and it does not happen at all, then everyone who is aware that it is obligatory is guilty of sin, if there was a possibility of having performed it. In the time of the Prophet (Allah bless him and give him peace) jihad was a communal obligation after his emigration (hijra) to Medina. **As for subsequent times, there are two possible states in respect to non-Muslims.**

The **FIRST** is when they [non-Muslims] are in their own countries, in which case jihad (def: o9.8) is a communal obligation, [OK – *Certainly NOT Fair Enough! As is the case today with “Great” Britain under WOKE Cultural neo-Marxist useful idiot two-tiered-Stasi-Starmer, as he sanctions its descent into the proverbial Sharia Hell-Hole Abyss!*] and this is what our author is speaking of when he says, “Jihad is a communal obligation,” meaning upon the Muslims each year. [*Jihad here being in the sense of [covert 5<sup>th</sup> generational warfare](#), or as the [famous Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci \[1891-1937\]](#) put it: [“The long march through the institutions”](#).]*

The **SECOND** [OK – *Fair Enough*] is when non-Muslims invade a Muslim country or near to one, in which case jihad is personally obligatory (def: c3.2) upon the inhabitants of that country, who must repel the non-Muslims with whatever they can.”

And even more explicitly from [Sahih al-Bukhari 2825 : Book 56, Hadith 41](#):

“On the day of the Conquest (of Mecca) the Prophet () said, ‘There is no emigration after the Conquest but Jihad and intentions. When you are called (by the Muslim ruler) for fighting, go forth immediately.’” [[See also this X post by Lloyd](#).]

Hence, does this excerpt from section o9.1 of the [Reliance of The Traveller Sharia Manual](#) and [Sahih al-Bukhari 2825 : Book 56, Hadith 41](#) then not both imply, that if a Muslim emigrates from say the Middle East to a Western country, he or she is thus compelled to participate in Jihad in the Western country? And indeed, has this been the very essence of Great Britain's descent into the abyss of the Sharia Hell-Hole? Moreover, from section o9.16 dealing with TRUCES:

“So do not be fainthearted and call for peace, when it is you who are the uppermost” (Koran 47:35). [*And indeed today in [Stasi-Starmer's Two-Tiered-Sharia-Hell-Hole Britain](#), the jihadists could hardly be more emboldened to gleefully comply with Koran 47:35.*]

As such, does this not then imply, that when Islam in a Western country is far too small in number, with **most strategic and deceitful prudence and wisdom**, they proclaim Islam as “[the religion of peace?](#)” Whilst on the other hand, as is the case in the undeniably Sharia Hell-Hole that defines Two-Tiered-[Stasi](#)-Starmer’s “Great” Britain today, they, **in their state of excess-populous-critical-mass**, aggressively push for the implementation and invocation of Sharia Law?

Hence, in conclusion:

“God [*not Allah and not Muhammad*] [is not a man that he should lie](#). [*Numbers 23:19*] It is impossible for God to lie. Jesus said; “I am the way, the truth, and the life.” Truth, [*as is allowed by Islamic [Taqiyyah](#)*] is NOT optional in the Christian faith. It’s the foundation. If a belief system requires deception to protect itself or spread, what does that say about its origin? God does not need lies [*nor the synonymous coercion of death embodied in [Sharia o8.1 – o8.2](#)*] to defend truth, but falsehood [*as embodied in [Taqiyyah](#)*], always does.”