

Sutras codified about full dress in Islamic jurisprudence

Somayeh Abedini(M.A)¹, Mahdi Khodaei (PhD)²

¹Department of Religious Jurisprudence and Islamic law, Karaj branch, Islamic Azad University, Karaj, Iran
Email: Somayeh.abedini@yahoo.com

²Department of Religious Jurisprudence and Islamic law, Karaj branch, Islamic Azad University, Karaj, Iran

Abstract: Sutras codified about full dress which has been recommended by the Omnipotent as a blessing, bestowed upon the incumbency of full dress in mort and masculine with regulations and disciplines to the society. The start-up of full dress is considered the most overriding exclusives of humans which have been regarded as a requisite and sine qua non of life respectively. The full dress is considered an indigenous and piece de resistance which has been entitled “the resolver of his/her requirements to full dress”. According to the aforesaid need, humans enjoy a propensity to avoid bundling up even in solitude as well. If he/she deviates, it would cause bezel in society and individual.

[Somayeh Abedini, Mahdi Khodaei. **Sutras codified about full dress in Islamic jurisprudence.** *N Y Sci J* 2014;7(1):52-59]. (ISSN: 1554-0200). <http://www.sciencepub.net/newyork>. 7

Keywords: sutras, veil, dress, quintuplet of religion

1. Introduction

The whole universe enjoys the pomposity of the theophany of God, who is the omnificent of concinnity and grace and the evolution is recapitulated to grace, theologizing the grace which obliterates the indecency. Decorous wearing is considered a benison endowed by God as a means to prettify besides His paradigms when orders:

We bestowed thee velvet habiliments to dress thyself. (Verse 26, Araaf paradigm).

In the modern world you consider new horizons along with the up-throw of sciences besides the flash of calamities and threats with the astonishing progression of axiology as well, qua it sophisticates the realities, immuring the spirituality of beings organized with otherworldly beatitude respectively.

Insomuch the moralizing of this contretemps is nothing but waning the cultures and the spiritusosity of life, prepossess the way of dressing of males and females as well in modern communities.

Henceforth, the crux considering the dress and its characteristics clarifies the reality of humans' need to catechesis of scriptures despite the floruit, neither during the following era, nor the past epoch, inaccessible to repentance and euthenics as well.

Ergo, the religion is considered the just way to reconversion from reprobation with no hyperbolizes.

Lexical meaning of dress

It means the “cover” and “robe”, interpreted variously in paradigms e.g. the clobber is viewed the cover and veil. (Ibn-e-Manzour, 1408).

The etymon of “لباس” is “لبس” which means “habit” and “wearable”.

We bid them to wear “damask” and “brocades”. (Verse 31, Kahf paradigm).

Dress in Dehkhoda's word-hoard means “cover”. (Dehkhoda, 1364).

Dr. Moeen says that cover means ‘veil’, “dress” and “clothing”. (Moeen, 1376).

“Cover” is an action noun (gerund) derived from covering, locus classicus that they covered themselves by the foliage of guaiacum. (Dehkhoda, 1364).

The following illustrations have been derived from “Ameed Persian Lexicon”: (Ameed, 1379).

1- ستر (س ت) means raiment, cover and clothe.

2- ستر (س ت) means raiment, cover and clothe.

3- Cover (پ ش) means habit.

Technically clothing means what thou wear to cover thy nudity. (Ibn-e-Manzour, 1408).

Semantics and broadly usage of word “dress” in general

a) Dress and Clothe mean the covering of limbs e.g. consider the following verse:

We bestowed thee habiliments to cover thy limbs. (Araf verse, paradigm 26).

Consider that the word “یواری” or “وری” means covering derived by the gerund “Mofaeleeh”.

Pay attention to the word “سوات” which means abomination, privy parts and limbs which should be covered and unveiling them is considered petulant. (Tabatabaee, 1374).

The Omnipotent applies to covering of limbs and privy parts in the aforesaid verse.

b) Covering is considered the resolving of needs for humans' prinking up as God orders that:

O! The agonies of Adam! We blessed thou a veil to cover thy privy parts. (Araaf paradigm, verse 26).

c) Covering is blessed as a gift to safeguard thee during various feuds as God says we prepared thee shades to cover thee from heat by growers, covertures, rockeries and ghauts. (Nahl paradigm, verse 81).

Semantics and broadly usage of word “dress” in labels

Undoubtedly the exact and precise objective of dressing is veil, howbeit the aforesaid realm encompasses the females but according to the strict of Koran and traditions and cabalas, the rhetorical question of veil (Hijab) must be considered by both.

We order them to veil their covers and not make their passementerie and adornments visible. (Nour paradigm, verse 31).

In verse 59, Ahzab paradigm, God orders to consider the veil when He says:

O! The prophet! Order thy associates, Mesdemoiselles and female Methodists to put their veil up to clarify that they are Saracens, whereupon nobody can pester them and God is merciful.

In lexicon, the word “جلباب” means braided clothes larger than kerchief and smaller than cloak in which females cover their tops by it, unfastening the leftover to their breasts. (Farahidi, 1405).

Commandments about dressing

Covering of privy parts is derived by intrinsic considered in Islamic views.

O! The agonies of Adam! Pursue their adornments by any mosque. (Araaf paradigm, verse 31).

The above-mentioned verse applies to males and females.

Imam Razi and Ibn-e-Arabi entitled the word “زينت” as dress in which humans cover them by it.

Regardless to Islamic commandments, the gumption orders to cover the privy parts thereafter.

As we mentioned the covering of privy parts is derived by human intrinsic. (Roum paradigm, verse 30).

Imam Tabari says that it is inadmissible to females to cover and dress-up to converse the natural cosmogony, neither for the sake of husbands, nor anybody else.

Sutras codified about dress

Incumbency: covering of privy parts is indispensable.

O! The agonies of Adam! We blessed thou clothes to cover thy privy parts. (Araaf paradigm, verse 26).

The aforesaid verse interprets the requisiteness, connoting the exigency of covering privy parts.

O! The agonies of Adam! Pursue their adornments by any mosque. (Araaf paradigm, verse, 31).

Recommendation: it is recommended to Saracens to rosary the title “In the name of Allah” when dressing and doffing, teeing off the right-side when dressing and left-side when doffing respectively. (Baqareh paradigm, verse 42).

Impunity: dressing of postiche is recommended e.g. swash-buckles during New Years Eve and commemorations which is conventional to our predecessors.

Abomination: it means the prudery of masquerade and rehashing of dissentions.

Taboos: dressing of silk for males and transvestism. (Jamalzehi, Bita).

Materials considered in producing of clothes

Clothes are made up of plants e.g. flax, cotton, beasts` hides and wool and plastics which are voidable for males and females.

Mohammad (peace be upon Him) wore wooly, cotton and flax sometimes, interdicting Saracens to wear silk but it is allowable for females.

Abu-Moses-Ashari narrates by Prophet. (Jamalzehi, Bita).

Wearing of silk is absolutely forbidden for men but it is allowable for women as well.

Ibn-e-Majedeh narrates by Imam Ali that the Prophet held silk and gulden in His right and left hands respectively, saying that both are taboos for males but licit foe females.

Rites considered in dressing

Wearing of dolmans and streaking the sleeves and pulling it on the beneath is considered incommensurate.

Imam Kazim quotes by the Prophet that God ordered Him to purify thy dress. (Modasser paradigm, verse 4).

He said the clothes of Him were pure but the oracle is to clipping the clothes to avoid smutch which means ingathering to avoid pulling out.

Blessing in the hour of doll up

It is quoted by Imam Baqer that He was consecrating the following blessing when dolling up:

O! God! Superpose the cloth as mirthfulness, pietism and felicity, bestowing me sustenance to follow wellness of worship, down to submission and eucharisting of thy blessings. Thanks to God who dressed me to cover my privy parts and dolling up myself amongst the folks as well. (Jamalzehi, Bita).

The efficacy of clothes` tint in Islam

The efficacy of tint upon any bystander is undeniable and various traditions have overemphasized to the selection of clothes` tint since the divertimento of tints announces the theonomous but lack of colors makes the life drab and drippy.

In Islam the following exceptions are considered in case of dressing of colored clothes regarding the paradigms related to the existence about the nature and descriptive verses in Koran respectively:

1- Colored covers featuring the emblems and mottos cried by the antagonists is forbidden

2- Colored covers impressing on humans` psych, soul and his/her meditates.

3- Colored covers which are considered athwart to Islamic social status and revivalisms.

Imam Sadeq addressed Ubeyd-Ibn-e-Ziyad ordering that: do not preen yourself but matched with your germane. (Horr Ameli, 1412).

4- Colored covers of females in the period during which a widowed may not be married to another man.

5- Colored covers which are voluptuous to non-intimates.

6- Transvestism for both females and males. (Hosseinian, 1373).

Scrutiny of certain tint covers

a) Hoary color

The above-said color is regarded the best one amongst all paradigms for clothes. Holy Prophet says that dress hoary clothes which are considered seely and pure.

Imam Sadiq says that: Ali (peace be upon Him) wore hoary covers. (Horr Ameli, 1412).

Some scholars avouch and aphorize that the hoary clothes act as the hypo upon individuals like blaze and asterism, bringing about effervescence, being brace and delightful.

b) Caramel

Imam Baqer says that we wear caramel and rose-colored clothes. (Horr Ameli, 1412).

The word “معصفرات” means hoary dresses or clothes of sparrows’ pinna and feathers.

The word “مضرجات” means caramel and rosily colored clothes.

The hoary color is entitled “guidwille” in Koran e.g. that hoary ox whose hoary color raptures thee. (Baqareh, verse 69).

The fresh hoary color is considered an exciter, bringing about mirth and vivacity, withal it is a psychodynamic and recreation. (Sabour Ardoubadi, 1368).

c) Verdure

In Islamic paradigm the verdure is glorified and some jurisconsults name it the best covers pro-white, exempli gratia wearing verdure dresses is considered the Methodism of House.

The verdure categorizes itself as a so-so amongst septet-colors, having a soothing hank.

The aforesaid color is named “elysian’s dress” in Koran e.g. thou have bolstered on verdure fulcrums. (Al-Rahman, 1379).

They wore verdure damasks. (Kahf paradigm, verse 31).

d) Ponceau (rosy color)

Imam Sadiq quotes by His ancestors that the Prophet abominated wearing of rosy-color dresses. (Majlesi, 1337).

He says in another tradition that beware of rosy-color since it is considered the most favorite passementerie by Satan. (Majlesi, 1337).

Imam Baqir orders that do not pray whilst wearing rosy-colored dresses. (Horr Ameli, 1412).

Scholars believe that individuals are susceptible against rosy-colored tints, thereupon they use it to lionize, signal and froth something promptly in amplitudes to get by mishaps. (Sabour Ardoubadi, 1368).

e) Smut (black-color)

Imam Ali orders that beware of black-color dresses which is considered the hue of pharaoh. (Majlesi, 1337).

It is realized in chromatometry that the smut and white colors show optimistic and pessimistic reactions vis-à-vis addresses respectively.

Black-color is a surd and passive tint; neither steams up the seer, nor hanks his/her usual efficiencies. (Rahmani, page 3).

Sutras codified about covers (veil)

Verses 32-33, Ahzab paradigm orders to Prophet’s helpmates that:

O! The helpmates of the Prophet! Thou differ from unwashed fellows, hence thou must be abstemious, not being lambency to wile those who suffer from megalomania, dogmatizing and stay indoors, acting like a materfamilias and overwhelm thy beauty homogeneous to the pagan state of the Arabs before Mohammad.

Verse 59, Ahzab paradigm clarifies that:

O! Prophet! Order thy helpmates and Saracens to put their veil up to avoid being teased and pestered.

According to the aforesaid verses, imps must avoid ogling, eluding from reprobation and wicked acts as well.

Carlins likewise are obliged to esteem the aforesaid affairs but different commandments must be regarded in the case. (Modoudi, 1369).

The cover of any individual features his/her reality ensign, an ensign being waved upon his/her intra-psychic, proclaiming his/her channel.

Likewise any state, evincing daresay to popularity with flag-waving and respecting, thereafter; any utilitarian believing in axioms, will not put the value symmetric with those percipience away. (Haddad Adel, 1385).

Covering for non-intimates

Highbrows have dissention about delimiting of privy parts of which is voidable to show in for non-intimates since the exact glimmering of the word “privy parts” is complicated. (Nour paradigm, verse 31).

In this verse the objective of not looking through and through is to looking at intimates, and making the privy parts unhandy means looking out of touching and sexual intercourse except the husband who is allowable to do it.

The Omnipotent says that they do not show their privy parts excluding their ordinary limbs. So Sunnite scholars are not consensus in delimiting the carline's privy parts:

Followers of Shafei and Hanabali religions believe that the whole limbs of a woman is considered her privy parts and it is a foul play to show them for non-intimates, except when she is incoercible videlicet suffering from a disease, for physician, wooer, chief justice in venue and dealings respectively. But they excluded the physiognomy and thenars since showing them is as occasion arises, but showing of limbs is not expeditious, hence; whether or not it includes privy parts as well. So, there is a parallelism saying that limbs include the privy parts of women.

But the regard of Hanifa, Shafeis' second side-glance and Maliki adjudication say that the whole limbs of women is her privy parts except her physiognomy and thenar, hence she is allowed to show them for non-intimates on their quartering haunt by the sutra codified to being secured from devilry.

If showing of limbs for the sake of intrinsic beauty and gauds foiling devilry, then she is obliged to cover them, reckoned as privy parts to pull up reprobation, foiling devilry, edification and prevention of ravishment respectively.

Verily a lascivious look is considered fornication inducement, vice and a venomous bull's eye being the plant seed of the filthiest tree. (Jaziri, 1413).

Mohammad Javad Moqniyeh says that the consensus of all jurisconsults of quintuplet of religion is that carlines must cover their privy parts for non-intimates and the whole limbs of her is regarded as privy parts except that of physiognomy and hands from the upper part of the wrist, the cause of which is clean-cut by the verse 31, Nour paradigm:

Thou are not allowed to show their dress-up for non-intimates, covering their breasts and shoulders by veil.

The word "ارخم" means covering the tops but not that of physiognomy and the word "جيب" means thorax. Women have been bidden to cover their tops and impend it over the breast.

O! The prophet! Bid your helpmates, daughters and pious carlines to cover them by braided clothes. (Ahzab paradigm, verse 59).

The word "جلباب" remarked in the aforesaid verse means sack.

Dressing for intimates

Jurisconsults have dissention in delimiting the carlines privy parts for their intimates. Mohammad Javad Moqniyeh has scrutinized the imbroglio in his book titled "jurisprudence regarded in quintuplet of religions".

They have dissention in determining the amount of cover in women for masculine intimates and vice

versa, to wit; what is the limitation of showing of carlines privy parts towards their peers, consanguineous intimates and affinities?

Shafei and Hanafi jurisconsults believe that carlines should cover the umbilical down to buskin.

Maliki and Hanbali jurisconsults believe that carlines are obliged to cover their umbilical down to buskin and whole limbs for intimate masculine except that of tops, physiognomy and hands.

Many Imamiyeh jurisconsults say that carlines are behooved to cover their privy parts for peers and intimates as well but covering of limbs is considered better but not behoove, except that the scruple of foiling hurly-burly bechances. (Moqniyeh, Bita).

Covering of males' privy parts

There is no consensus amongst the jurisconsults of quintuplet of religions about the limitation of masculine privy parts being covered e.g. not looking at the peers genitalia.

Hanbali and Hanafi jurisconsults believe that males are behooved to cover their umbilical down to buskin for non-intimate females, whether females or males, intimates or non-intimates and it is kosher to look at the limbs of peers while being irrefrangibly from sedition.

Shafei and Maliki jurisconsults believe that there are twain postures about females' privy parts, imprimis for cognates and intimate females, sec; for non-intimate females respectively.

In the first case, men are behooved to cover the umbilical down to buskin but in the second case, the whole limbs are regarded as privy parts and non-intimate females are forbidden to look at his limbs.

Maliki religious scholars have excluded physiognomy and hands if titillation would not be visualized.

Imamiyeh jurisconsults have differentiated between the peeper and peeped saying that men should cover their "قبل" or penis and "دبر" or anus, and female intimates are behooved not to look at the limbs of male intimates respectively.

Imamiyeh scholars daresay that it is voidable for males to look at their cognates, limbs of intimate females except that of anus and pudendum with no libido and vice versa. (Moqniyeh, Bita).

Covering of privy parts of minor girls and lads

Mohammad Javad Moqniyeh has run on the assessments of scholars of various religions:

Hanbali religious scholars: minor girls and lads under the age of 7 have no privy parts, ergo; touching his/her whole limbs is allowable. The privy parts of lads up to 7-9-year-old are regarded as anus and penis but the same ages considered for minor girls are regarded as privy parts thereupon.

Hanafi scholars say that there are no privy parts for lads till the age of 14 and up to it, the anus and

penis are regarded as privy parts, if being sexiness, the sutra is likewise individuals attained the pubescence and there is no variation between males and females.

Maliki jurisconsults daresay that carlines are allowed to look at their lads till the age of 8-12 but lads up to the age 12 are not allowed to be touched. Males are allowed to touch 2-year-old and 2-month-old minor girls, being allowed to look at 4-year-old girls but not touching them as well.

Shafei scholars say that the privy parts of a lad who attains pubescence is likewise the mature peer but a lad who has not attained pubescence, if would not be able to delineate concupiscence, hence he has no privy part and contrariwise. Looking at the pudendum of a minor girl is not allowable except that of her wardens.

Imamiyeh jurisconsults say that covering of limbs for a discerning lad is obligatory and vice versa since he is regarded as a zoid.

Sheikh Jafar says in his book titled "Kashf-Al-Qeta" that it is allowable to look at the privy parts of lads under 5-year-old but if they lust, then it is considered a taboo, as respects; referring to the cabalas traditionalized by Households clarified that looking at the privy parts of a 6-year-old lad is allowable.

Sunnite jurisconsults have dissension in delimiting the privy parts of minor girls and lads e.g. Hanabeleh, Hanifa and Shafei and etc.

Hanifeh scholars say that minor lads have no privy parts when they are under the age of 4 respectively, thereupon; looking at them and touching is allowable but at the age of 10, ass and penis are privy parts.

Characteristics of the full dress

Shafiees believe that the dress must cover the limbs but Maliki jurisconsults say that limbs must not be seen under the cover, if so; it means that he/she have wore no cover. The purpose is that the dress must not be gossamer.

Shafei and Hanbali scholars say that the clothes must cover the limbs, neither being gossamer, nor tight, covering the privy parts as well.

Quadruple religions of Sunnites believe that the privy parts mean whatever nether the navel to buskin, hence; popliteal under the ham is considered privy parts as well.

Sunnite religions believe that pubes of pedundum, except that of physiognomy and rump and metatarsus standing by them are considered as privy parts and they imputed to verses 24 and 31, Nour paradigm.

Word *passemeterie* in this verse means everything turning up, thereafter; Ibn-e-Abbas quotes by the Prophet that when carlines show their privy parts, then Demon would overshadow them.

(Narration of Tarmazi quoted by Abd-Allah-Ibn-e-Masoud).

Characteristics of females` dress

Carlines are considered as Aphrodite in primordial cultures and folktales. Carlines are personified in Islam, thereto; their social and civil rights have been considered and the gloss which has been franked respectively.

There is a particular ingratiation to females preen, sanitation of limbs and their etiquettes in Islam and it orders that they are obliged to doll up, wearing clothes by the following exclusivities:

1. Cover the privy parts

The clothes must cover her whole limbs except that of excluded by Holy Koran which has been pointed in verse 30, Nour paradigm. The principal logion is considered physiognomy, hands down to wrist which means that females are allowed to show their hands and physiognomy as well. (Hanafi, Shafei citation, Sabouni, 1407 and Abu Shaqeh, 1416).

2. Anomalous to males` dress

Carlines dress must differ from males`. If males get by wearing a peculiar dress, qua; being rampant amongst hoi polloi, thereafter it is forbidden for females.

The prophet maledicts and anathematizes transvestite females and says that:

Transvestite females would have been excommunicated. (Beiaghgi, Bita).

Being a transvestite brings about odium, ergo; the Omnipotent has created masculine and mort, contradistinguishing them by peculiar limbs and it is regarded theosophy of which nobody could controvert as well. It is very meritorious that males and females esteem bounds slated by God. (Ibn-e-Aljouzi, 1425 and Abu-Shaqeh, 1416).

3. Lain in the masquerade of pride and emprise

Masquerade of emprise means deviancy from the backbones of society, becoming a by-word thereafter, the reason of which is the way of its sewing up or his/her superego. (Hossienian, 1373).

Man jacks wear jackanapes clothes off and on and the psychological cause of which are inferiority complexes harrowing their psych, hence they make an exhibition of themselves to remedy their foible and it is considered megalomania, standing with paltriness and nadir in the Day of Judgment. (Hosseinian, 1373).

Imam Sadiq says that curmudgeons show off themselves by lain in the masquerade or riding on an animal to be celebrated. (Hosseinian, 1373).

Imam Sadiq assumes that the masquerade will catch God`s scourge. (Hosseinian, 1373).

It is not allowable for a Saracen to dress up as becoming the by-word or being dandyism to swagger with egotism, haply her dress should be alike Saracens` to avoid being a gazing-stock.

The Holy Prophet orders that man-jacks who lain in masquerade of pride in the earth, God, the merciful togs him/her with the cover of ignominy before one can say Jack Robinson. (Sajistani, 1423).

4. Eschewing of clothes exciting the lust

The Omnipotent has codified the statutes of veil and full dress, hent to cover females adornment, ergo it is not plausible to consider the dress as adornment as well.

Insomuch if a carline dresses with big-ticket adornments, the motto of kashruth is lost.

The Almighty orders that thou either are not allowed to show thy adornments, or similar to booboisie. (Ahzab paradigm, verse 33).

5. Eschewing of peelings and nudes

Females dress must be squatty, owing to full dress accredits with peeling-woven clothes. Females in peelings, howsoever are considered habilitate, but actually they are nude.

The Holy Prophet says some infernal are those who have dressed outwardly but actually they are nudes and corrupters. Indeed they are not Elysian, een not savoring the whiff of Eden. (Moslem, Bita).

The aforesaid tradition bodes to the salience of nudes which is considered a deadly sin, drawing on self-annihilation thereupon.

6. Wearing slip-ons

The grail of putting on clothes is bridling of devilry and tights show the limits and dimensions of the limbs, portraying them for males, foiling dry-rots. (Ifnikher, 1425, Ghazali, 1381).

Ibn-e-Zeyd says that the Prophet (peace be upon Him) donated a tight alb to me woven by lingerie and I gave it to my helpmate. He ordered me to my mate to wear petticoat to cover her pubis and iliac. (Beyhaqi, Bita).

Therefore the female dress should not make her privy parts and breasts, albeit not being nude as well.

Tights which have been imported to Islamic countries by the West make the privy parts and suasive limbs visible.

7. Dissimilar to pagans` dress

It is voidable for Islamite women to wear the clothes of demimondes. (Bahiri, Bita).

It means that wearing of any dress bringing about turgescence and ruff, apostasy, converting to heathenism or without free-lance is illicit, but dressing with regard to the aforementioned qualifications is licit even for unbelievers respectively.

8. Eschew of fragrant clothes

It is considered sine qua non to eschew aromatizing for females in outdoor since it is a drawing-card for reps, predisposing the perpetration of misdemeanor. The Prophet says that any signora

aromatizing herself is forbidden to pray the evensong. (Beyhaqi, Bita).

Properties of males` dress

Saracens are plebeians with various half-castes and ethos, owning heresy to wear clothes. Islam has bounded them limitations in wearing, whilst it accepts the aforementioned variegation.

They are obliged to consider the ethics by prevention of becoming a by-word or becoming a smart-aleck by dressing rakish clothes as well.

Their dress must cover the privy parts wholly, being slip-on, being a shelter against chill and heat respectively.

Males are not allowed being a transvestite. (Sabeq, 1397).

They are not allowed to wear silken, tabbies, signet ring, wristwatch and bracelet which have been filled with gold thereafter.

Sutras codified about the cover of grimalkins

Mohammad Javad Moqniyeh says that God orders in verse 60, Nour paradigm that:

Senile carlines on the wane, unpromising to hand-fast have excluded.

They are allowed to doff and show their adornments for non-intimates, providing that they call piety and chastity and God is conversant of what people do.

The verse exemplifies that senile carlines who enjoy no covet for matrimony due to senescence are allowed to show their physiognomy and some parts of hands and hair down to funny-bone e.g. what is considered normal amongst beldams. But it is allowable providing that of showing limbs with no trimming thereupon.

It is averred that showing of the aforesaid limbs, in the event that; it is to be feared of wasting, is not allowable, since by the virtue of age, carlines are subject to eroticism, thereto; leniency is regarded for them because they, like minor girls, are not subjected to libido but if vice versa, thereupon; the sutra is similar to wenches` respectively.

Islam is lenient for beldams but presses hard upon wenches. In the modern society the karmas of carlines are jarred of what has considered in Koran, since they show their trimmings and do not observe the veil, but beldams cover themselves unbelievably, ergo; carlines act negligently where God presses hard upon them and vice versa. (Moqniyeh, Bita).

Full dress before uncommon individuals

Inasmuch as; looking at the privy parts of non-intimates is forbidden, here we scrutinize the subject of "considering the full dress before uncommon individuals" e.g. stone-blinds, peewees and bedlamites.

Full dress before stone-blinds

It is narrated by Salameh that she was about Mohammad (peace be upon Him) with Meymouneh. A stone-blind named "Maktoum" entered promulgation of veil by us. The prophet said: observe thy limbs for her. We asked whether or not she was a blind fellow.

"Thou are not blind", the prophet said. (Sajistani, 1423, Tarmazi, 1411).

Dr. Yousef Qarzavi says about the authenticity of the aforesaid cabala that:

It has been considered a back-handed verbiage de rigueur by exegetists and we deduce by referring to other traditions that carlines are not obliged to cover their limbs and observe veil before blinds. (Abdu-Allah-Al-Aziz, 1425).

Imam Moslem iterates the exemplum of Fatimah, daughter of Qeys:

When her husband put her away, the prophet ordered her to stay by the mater of Ansari during which she was a divorcee, then he said:

My companions pother his domicile. He is a blind man and thou can take your clothes off there.

Some scholars believe that observing the full dress is obligatory before blinds, relying on what Tarmazi and Abu-Davoud have transliterated.

Two aforesaid traditions reveal that observing the full dress before blinds is not obligatory, uncovering their adornments for them since blinds cannot sensate their trimmings and they are not libidinous as well, except that of tits' swanks respectively.

Carlines are obliged to circumspect, avoiding of cathecting blinds since the Omnipotent orders in verse 32, Ahzab paradigm:

Talk up to males, absit omen; the concupiscent covets.

Full dress before peewees

The Glorious God says that:

O! The prophet! Order the abstemious carlines to cover their privy parts but for their husbands and peewees who are incognizant of sexuality and females' pubes. (Verse 31, Nour paradigm).

Hierophants have dissention in defining the word "الطفل" and some believe that it means a bloomer unable to copulate. (Qartabi, 1423).

Others believe that it means a bloomer who is not titillated by looking at females' limbs, privy parts and gestures. (Ibn-e-Kasir, 1425, Alousi, 1405, Zamakhshari, Bita, Naseri, 1328).

Moudodi says that the aforesaid definition is not an abstract but the antitype of striplings at the age of 10-12, henceforth; juveniles up to the aforesaid age, howbeit; have not attained puberty but eroticism is impassioned on them. (Modoudi, 1369).

Shafei followers believe that looking at non-intimate carlines by an adolescent attaining puberty is tantamount to looking at the same woman by a bloomer coming of age. (Nouvi, 1328).

Followers of Hanifa believe that it is voidable for carlines to show their adornments before peewees who cannot espy privy parts and have not a nocturnal pollution never & eless. (Kasani, 1409).

Textual epigraphs reveal that females are voidable to show their adornments before bantlings who have not impassioned by eroticism but the opposite satisfy the condition.

Conclusions

Islam considers full dress and covering of privy parts an innate actuality.

Irrespective of what Islam's order, humans' gumption considers it respectively. Sunnites have dissentions in delimiting of carlines privy parts for non-intimates. Shafei and Hanabeleh followers have iterated in one of their traditions out of two that the whole limbs of a carline are considered her privy parts and it is not voidable to show them for non-intimate males, otherwise an exclusion comes up to happen e.g. falling sick, for medicos, wooers, chief justice for oyez and dealings respectively and they have excluded physiognomy and thenar, since showing them is as occasion arises. But showing of limbs is voidable when the question arises whether or not limbs are included in privy parts.

Hanifeh side glance, Shafei sec standpoint and Maliki indults are that the whole limbs of a carline are regarded as her privy parts except physiognomy and thenar, ergo; she is voidable to show them for non-intimates on the condition that, no devilry would arise.

Jurisconsults are not consensus in delimiting females' privy parts for intimates in which Mohammad Javad Moqniyeh has scrutinized it on his book titled "jurisprudence in quintuplet of religions".

Scholars of quintuplet of religions have dissention about the limitation of cover for non-intimate males, to wit; what is the delimitation of females' privy parts for peers, relatives-in-law and consanguineous intimates?

Hanafi and Shafei religious scholars believe that females are obliged to cover their umbilicus down to buskin.

Hanbali and Maliki jurisconsults say that females are obliged to cover their umbilicus down to buskin for intimates, except that of tops and physiognomy as well.

Certain Imamiyeh jurisconsults daresay that carlines are obliged to cover their privy parts for peers and intimates, thereupon; covering of other limbs is better, unless the act of devilry would occasion.

Corresponding Author:

Somayeh Abedini

Department of Religious Jurisprudence and Islamic law, Karaj branch, Islamic Azad University, Karaj, Iran

Email: Somayeh.abedini@yahoo.com**References**

1. Holy Koran
2. Alousi, Seyyed Mahmoud Shokri, fourth edition, Beirut, Lebanon, volume 18, p.145.
3. Afnikher, Hamed, first edition, Damascus, p.21.
4. Ibn-e-Al-Jouzi, Abu-Al-Faraj, Jamal-Al-Din, Abdu-Al-Rahman, and sutras codified about carlines, Halab, Syria, p.124.
5. Ibn-e-Kasir, Abu-Al-Fada, interpretation, Halab, Syria, volume 3, p.292.
6. Ibn-e-Manzour, Abu-Al-Fazl Jamal-Al-Din, Beirut, volume 6, p.202.
7. Abu Shaqeh, Abdu-Al-Halim Mohammad, fourth edition, Kuwait, volume 4, p.276.
8. Al-Tarmazi, Mohammad-Ibn-e-Jesus, Beirut, volume 5, p.102.
9. Beihaqi, first edition, Beirut, Lebanon, Bitā, volume 2, 5, p.199-200.
10. Boheiri, Mohammad Abdu-Al-Assi, Cairo, Egypt, Bitā, p.260.
11. Jamalzehi, Mohammad, sutras codified about females' dress-up and cover, Avaye-Islam, Bija, Bitā, pp.52,41,38,60.
12. Jaziri, Abdu-Al-Rahman, Mohammad, Households religion, first edition, Beirut, volume 5, p.75.
13. Hurr Ameli, Mohammad-Ibn-e-Hasan, Beirut, Lebanon, volume 3, pp.359, 356,346.
14. Hadda Adel, Gholamali, Occidentalism of nudism and cultural nudism, Tehran, Soroush publication, pp.6, 40.
15. Hosseinian, Ruh-Allah, limits of chastity (veil and whim-wham), published by Islamic Propagation Organization, Bija, pp.108-116, 110-117.
16. Dehkhoda, Aliakbar, lexicon written by Dehkhoda, Tehran, institution of Dehkhoda, volume 3, p.107.
17. Rahmani, Hojjat-Allah, marvels of smut (why carlines use veil), Feyziyeh publication, and p.3.
18. Zamakhshari, Jar-Allah, Beirut, Lebanon, Bitā, volume 3, p.232.
19. Sabiq, Seyyed, Sunnites Jurisprudence, third edition, Beirut, volume 3, p.253.
20. Sajistani, Suleiman-Ibn-e-Ashas, traditions of Abu-Davoud, first edition, Beirut, Lebanon, volume 4, pp.361, 72-73.
21. Sabouni, Mohammad Ali, fifth edition, Beirut, Lebanon, institute of Ez-Al-Din, volume 2, p.386.
22. Sabour Ardoubadi, Ahmad, better-shacking ethics in Islam, volumes 1-2-3-4; Tehran, Islamic Propagation Organization, volume 2, pp. 47, 40.
23. Tabatabaee, Mohammad Hussein, translated by Mohammad Baqir Hamedani, Islami publication, Qom, volume 8, p.69.
24. Abd-Allah Abdu-Al-Aziz and et al, second edition, Beirut, Lebanon, p.203.
25. Amid, Abdu-Al-Hamid, Amid lexicon, Tehran, Amir Kabir publication, p.1172.
26. Ghazali Mesri, Mohammad, translated by Majid Ahmadi, Tehran, Ehsan publication, p.22.
27. Farahidi, Khalil-Ibn-e-Ahmad, Qom, volume 6, p.132.
28. Qartabi, Abu Abdu-Allah, fourth edition, Beirut, volume12.
29. Majlisi, Mohammad Baqir, Behar-Al-Anvar, Tehran, Islamic sect, volume 80, p.7.
30. Moslem, Abu-Al-Hussein, Damascus, Bitā, volume 2, 10, 14.
31. Moeen, Mohammad, Moeen lexicon, Tehran, Amir Kabir publication, volume 1, p.836.
32. Moqniyeh, Mohammad Javad, jurisprudence on quintuplet of religions, institute of Alssadeq-Al-Matlab, Bitā, pp.86-89.
33. Modoudi, Abu-Ali, veil, translated by Nemat-Allah Shahrani, Tehran, Ehsan publication, pp.156-157.
34. Nouvi, Abu-Zakariya, Beirut, Lebanon, volume 3, p.130.
35. Naseri, Mohammad Baqir, first edition, Beirut, Lebanon, Dar-Al-Zahra, volume 2, pp.2, 407.

12/30/2013