

## RULING ON HAVING TO SPEAK FALSEHOOD

### حكم الاضطرار إلى قول الباطل

Abul Firdaus Bayinat Basha Al Bajali\*

\*Ass. Professor, Faculty of Arabic and Islamic Studies, College of Islamic Sciences, International Islamic University for Sharia and Humanitarian Studies

أبو الفردوس بينات باشا البجالي

مؤخرة. أستاذ قسم علوم القرآن والتفسير كلية العلوم الإسلامية الجامعة الإسلامية العالمية للدراسات الشرعية والإنسانية

\*Corresponding Author:

abulfaradeesatnet@yahoo.com, abulfaradees11@gmail.com

### Abstract

Worship includes every human movement in life, and accordingly a person's quest to take care of himself and his society is an obligatory matter, and he is rewarded for it as long as he adheres to what he must do in it. Because the meaning of compulsion is a comprehensive meaning that touches on many matters, and a person must be characterized by reconciliation with himself and with others. I have dealt with in this research some of the provisions of necessity in a number of the following issues:

- Pronouncing the word disbelief when necessary.
- Permissibility of lying and swearing against it when necessary
- Taqiyyah Permissibility
- Eating prohibited vaccinations
- Drinking wine because of thirst

Then I interpreted the verses and explained the hadiths, criticism and deduction, and listed the opinions of the scholars and tried to explain the most correct one. Using the analytical method, then it showed the teachings to which the verses guide us, which must be applied in dealing with people through the applied approach.

**Keywords:** judgment, compulsion, saying, falsehood.

### ملخص البحث

إن العبادة تشمل على كل حركة من حركات الإنسان في الحياة، وعلى هذا فإن سعي الإنسان إلى العناية بنفسه ومجتمعه أمر واجب، وهو مأجور عليها ما دام يلتزم بما يجب عليه فيها، وقد سميت البحث بـ **حكم الاضطرار إلى قول الباطل**؛ لأن معنى الاضطرار معنى شامل يتطرق إلى أمور كثيرة، والإنسان يجب أن يتصرف بالإصلاح مع نفسه ومع غيره، ولقد تناولت في هذا البحث بعضاً من أحكام الاضطرار في عدد من المسائل الآتية،

- النطق بكلمة الكفر عند الضرورة.
- جواز الكذب والحلف عليه للضرورة
- جواز التقيّة
- تناول المحظور من المطاعم
- شرب الخمر لضرورة العطش

ثم قمت بتفسير الآيات وشرح الأحاديث والنقد والاستنباط وصرّد آراء العلماء ومحاولة بيان الراجح منه. مستخدماً المنهج التحليلي، ثم بينت ما ترشد إليه الآيات من تعاليم يجب العمل بها في التعامل مع الناس من خلال المنهج التطبيقي. الكلمات الافتتاحية: الحكم، الاضطرار، القول، الباطل.

### **The first requirement: Pronouncing the word disbelief when necessary:**

Saying infidelity is the most obscene and ugliest types of false speech. With it, a Muslim becomes an apostate, his blood becomes permissible, and his wife becomes clear from him, and he does not inherit or be inherited from Muslims, and other rulings. That is if he was chosen in this apostasy. But if a Muslim is compelled to utter the word of disbelief on his tongue without his heart, and that is because he is under compulsion and fears that he will perish or damage one of the organs, then he is in this case compelled, i.e., he is in a state of necessity. In order to survive the state of necessity in which he fell. The basis for that is the saying of the Lord, the Blessed and the Most High: He was reassured by him that he was angry with him for their knowledge of faith and then turned them away from him, and that they will have a great torment in the home of the hereafter, because they preferred the life of this world over the hereafter, so they proceeded with what they had done of apostasy for the sake of the world, and God did not guide their hearts and make them firm on the true religion, so He sealed their hearts. They do not comprehend anything of benefit to them. As for the Almighty's saying: (قَدْ أَفْوَاحًا) He is an exception to the one who disbelieves with his tongue and agrees with the polytheists with his wording under duress, because of the beating and harm he suffered, and his heart refuses what he says, and he is reassured with faith in God and His Messenger. So he agreed to that under duress, and he came apologizing to the Prophet, may God bless him and grant him peace, so God revealed this verse. Ibn Jarir said: The polytheists took Ammar bin Yasir and tortured him severely until he approached them in some of what they wanted, so he complained about this to the Prophet, peace and blessings be upon him, and he said to him: How do you find your heart? He said: He is assured of faith. The Prophet, may God's prayers and peace be upon him, said: If they return, he should count, and in it he insulted the Prophet, may God's prayers and peace be upon him, and mentioned their gods with goodness. For this reason, the jurists agreed that the one who is compelled to commit infidelity is permissible for him to continue keeping his tone. Three narrations were mentioned in the reason for the revelation of this verse.

The first: what Ibn Abi Hatim narrated on the authority of Ibn Abbas, he said: When the Prophet, may God bless him and grant him peace, wanted to migrate to Medina, the polytheists took Bilal, Khabab, and Ammar. Was your heart happy with what you said? He said: No, so I went down.

The second: what he also narrated on the authority of Mujahid, who said: This verse was revealed about people from the people of Mecca who believed. So the Companions in Madinah wrote to them that they emigrated, so they set out seeking Madinah, and the Quraysh caught up with them on the road, so they seduced them, so they disbelieved under compulsion, for it was on them that this verse was revealed.

The third: Ibn Saad narrated in al-Tabaqat on the authority of Omar Ibn Al-Hakam that he said: Ammar Ibn Yasir was tormented until he did not realize what he was saying, Bilal, Aamir Ibn Fuhaira and a group of Muslims in whom the verse was revealed.

Hence, the jurists said: If compulsion is imposed on a person to say or do something that is contrary to religion, and he cannot bear the possibility of this compulsion in any case. God Almighty does not punish him for what he says or for what he does. The jurists said: Whoever is compelled to disbelief until he fears that he will be killed or that one of his organs will be damaged, and the coercion is a resort, there is no sin on him if he disbelieves with his tongue, and his heart is reassured by faith, and his wife does not speak out of him, and he is not judged to be a disbeliever. And it was mentioned in the honorable hadith: "My nation has been removed from error and forgetfulness and what they were coerced into." With regard to the sayings of the jurists, the jurists have unanimously agreed on that. On himself or on a member of his body.. and the ability to reveal what they ordered him to do and to be seen, if he shows that and his heart is at peace with faith, there is no sin on him." And the same is true in the Maliki school... While he is imprisoned or tied up, he was not judged as a disbeliever, because the restriction and imprisonment is a compulsion in appearance." Ibn Qudamah said in al-Mughni: "And whoever was forced to disbelieve and came up with the word disbelief did not become an unbeliever." This is what Malik, Abu Hanifa and al-Shafi'i said... Imprisoned by the infidels and tied to them in a state of fear, he was not judged to be apostasy, because that is apparent in coercion.

### **Resolve when forced to disbelief is better:**

And if uttering a word when under duress is a concession, then it is preferable to the majority of scholars to adopt determination and patience in the face of torture, even if that leads to killing out of respect for religion, as Yasir and Sumaya did. This is not from throwing oneself to death, rather it is like killing in an invasion, as stated by the jurists. Ibn Qudamah said: "And whoever is forced to accept a word of disbelief, it is better for him to be patient and not say it, even if it comes to himself." When Khabab narrated from the Messenger of God, may God's prayers and peace be upon him, he said: On the cleft of his head, and he slit two pieces of what prevents him from his religion, and he combs with iron combs what is below his bone of flesh so that this distracts him from his religion. Some of the kings of the infidels took a group of believers and dug for them a groove in the ground and kindled a fire in it, then whoever did not return from his religion, then they threw him into the fire, and they began to throw them in it one by one, until a woman came on her hand with a boy for her, and she failed for the sake of the boy, so the boy said: O mother Be patient, for you are on the truth, so God Almighty mentioned them in his book. The Prophet, peace and blessings be upon him, mentioned the previous patient believers as a way of warning and appreciation." Accordingly, the jurists agreed that whoever was forced to utter disbelief did not commit disbelief, and chose murder and was killed, then he is a martyr and has a greater reward for God is the one who chose the concession and the argument to prefer the adoption of

determination over the concession. Musaylimah the Liar, they took two Muslim men and took them to Musaylimah. One of them forced him to respond to what he demanded of disbelief, so he let him go, and the second did not answer him, so he killed him. So the one who survived came to the Messenger of God, may God bless him and grant him peace, and told him about the matter He passed, and the Messenger (may God bless him and grant him peace) said: As for you, you took the license, and as for your friend, he continued his faith, and he is my companion in Paradise. To sum up: whoever is subjected to coercion or compulsion cannot stand it and cannot tolerate it, and because of that he commits an illegal act. He will not be held accountable for it, and the guilt will be on the one who hates him or compels him, and if he is patient and counts the reward with God and does not utter the word of unbelief, then he is better and he is in the highest ranks.

### **The second requirement: the permissibility of lying and swearing against it when necessary**

The liar is forbidden in the Sharia of Islam, so if he is sworn about, it is more severe in the prohibition, but with this it is permissible to lie and swear against him for the necessity of ridding an innocent soul from perdition, or a woman from adultery with her, or money infallible from anger, so if an oppressor chases an innocent who wants to kill him or a woman He wants to commit adultery with it, so he hides from someone. It is permissible for him to deny their presence with him and swear on that. Likewise, it is permissible for the custodian to deny the trust and swear an oath if it is requested by an oppressor, an oppressor, an oppressor, as this is a necessity and necessities allow prohibitions, and the evil of lying is less harmful than the evil of murder, adultery and usurpation of money. We have said before that there is a jurisprudential rule that requires: "The greater harm is induced by bearing the lesser harm, and this includes lying between people for the purpose of reform, or between a woman and her husband to reconcile them, or in matters of war. Imam al-Izz ibn Abd al-Salam: "And if he was truthful in this situation - which we mentioned - then the sin of the one who caused this corruption to be realized." This is also what Imam al-Qurtubi narrated in his interpretation of the Tabi'een jurists about the permissibility of lying and swearing against him in order to save the soul of the one who swears, his money, or the soul Others or their money from the aggression of the aggressors or the transgressor, and these statements are ancient and important jurisprudence precedents that reveal a delicate aspect of the great Islamic jurisprudence in confronting the reality of life, and how it is the aspect of intentions and the consequences of actions. He, may God have mercy on him, was asked about someone who has sworn an unjust ruler over himself, or to guide him to a man in order to oppress him unjustly, or the money of a man to seize him by force. Al-Hassan replied: If he fears him or his money or the money of others, let him swear and do not expiate his oath. Abdul Malik bin Habib was mentioned among the Maliki jurists. He said: Ma'bad told me on the authority of Al-Musayyab bin Sharik on the authority of Abu Shaybah q Al: I asked Anas bin Malik about a man being taken by a man, do you think he should take an oath to protect him with his oath? He said, "Yes, because I swear seventy oaths and oaths are dearer to me than to lead a Muslim." Al-Waleed bin Abdul Malik Rajaa bin Haywa, who is a Tabi'i jurist, took an oath to tell him about whom he spoke ill of in his assembly. This actually happened, and his news of this reached Al-Walid from his eyes, so Raja' bin Haywah swore that nothing of that happened in his assembly. my back, and he says please: Seventy lashes in your back are better for you than for a Muslim to be killed. Among the most important situations in which lying is permissible and must, is lying and deception to mislead the enemy as long as that does not involve breaking a covenant or breaching security. It is deceit that the commander deceives the enemies by deluding them that the number of his soldiers is many, and his equipment is an indomitable force, and in the hadith narrated by Al-Bukhari on the authority of Jaber That the Prophet, may God's prayers and peace be upon him, said: "War is a deception." Muslim brought out the hadith of Umm Kulthum bint Uqbah, may God be pleased with her, who said: "I have not heard the Prophet, may God bless him and grant him peace, allow something of the lies that people say except in war and reconciliation between people. And the hadeeth of a man is his wife, and a woman's speech is her husband." The same happened before the Prophet, may God's prayers and peace be upon him, and he did not deny it. Al-Bukhari reported under the title "Chapter of Lying in War" a hadith on the authority of Jabir bin Abdullah, may God be pleased with them, that the Prophet, may God's prayers and peace be upon him, said: Who is Ka'ab al-Ashraf, for he has harmed God and His Messenger... Muhammad ibn Maslamah said: Would you like me to kill him, Messenger of God? He said: Yes. He said, so he came to him and said: This – meaning the Prophet, may God's prayers and peace be upon him – has afflicted us and we asked for charity. By God, you will tire him. He said: We followed him, and we hate to leave him until we see what will happen to him. He said: He kept talking to him until he was able to kill him, and he entered this hadith. Th under the section on Lying in War, because Muhammad bin Maslama said to the Prophet, may God's prayers and peace be upon him, first: "Permit me to say. Lying is not permitted except in three cases: a man's updating his wife in order to please her, lying in war, and in reconciliation between people." Al-Nawawi said: It appears that the truth of lying is permissible in the three matters, but exposure is first. And the mind has no room in it, and if it were forbidden to lie by reason, it would not have turned into lawful. Al-Malhab said: The place of the witness to the translation from the hadith of the chapter is the saying of Muhammad bin Maslamah: "He has afflicted us, so we asked for charity." Because this speech is likely to be understood that their following of the Prophet, may God bless him and grant him peace, is only for the world, so it is a sheer lie, and it is possible that he wants to mean that he tired us with what he knows for us. From fighting the Arabs, it is one of the objections of speech, and there is nothing in it from the true lie that is to tell about something other than what it is...."

We conclude from all of this that lying is one of the prohibitions in Islamic Sharia, which is forbidden in the Qur'an, the Sunnah and the consensus of the nation, but if it is necessary, if it is for reconciliation between a man and his wife for fear of separation, or in reconciliation between quarreling people, or to ward off harm or killing on behalf of a Muslim.



do not rush me, I was a person attached to the Quraish, and I was not among themselves, and those with you of the immigrants had relatives in Mecca to protect their families and their money, so I loved if I missed that from the lineage among them to take with them a hand with which to protect my relatives, and what I did is blasphemy There is neither apostasy nor consent to infidelity after Islam. The Messenger of God (may God bless him and grant him peace) said: He has spoken the truth. Omar said: O Messenger of God, let me strike the neck of this hypocrite. He said: He witnessed Badr, and you do not know, perhaps God has seen the people of Badr and said: Do whatever you want, for I have forgiven you.” Such a spy was supposed to be killed by this illegal courtship of the infidels, but it is exclusive for those who witnessed Badr.

Having to take a prohibited vaccine or drink

#### **Fourth Requirement: Consuming prohibited foods:**

Islamic law forbids certain foods and drinks . This prohibition was mentioned in the Book of God Almighty and the Sunnah of His Messenger, may God’s prayers and peace be upon him, such as: carcasses, blood, pork, alcohol, and so on. It is not permissible for a Muslim to take up these taboos in the case of capacity and choice. But in case of necessity, all these taboos were allowed. If a person is forced to eat any of these things that God Almighty has forbidden him, it is permissible for him to eat what he finds of them to save himself from destruction. Likewise, if the compelled find food for others. The compelled may also take what saves himself from destruction, even by force, and fight its owner when he refrains from doing it in a reasonable manner. Even if he abstained from eating the dead animal or eating the food of others - unless the other person was not obligated to it - then he died then he was a sinner. The basis for that is the many verses that were mentioned in the Book of God Almighty stating that. Including the Almighty saying: (كُلْ مِمَّا رَزَقْنَاكَ مِنْ حَيْثُ كُنْتَ) and the Almighty’s saying: (ثُمَّ لَمْ يَكُنْ لَكَ كَلِمَةٌ تَنْتَهِزُ) and compulsion, as Al-Qurtubi says: “It is not without coercion from an oppressor or with hunger in a quencher.” Al-Qurtubi said in his interpretation: “So God Almighty permitted in a state of necessity all prohibitions due to his inability to do all permissible things.” Ibn Katheer said Then God Almighty permitted all of that when necessary and needed when other permissible foods were missing... Rather, a person is compelled if hunger reaches the point of death or a disease that leads to him. For this reason, Ibn Hazm said: “The limit of necessity is to stay for a day and a night in which he does not find anything to eat or drink. It is permissible for him to eat and drink what will ward off death by hunger or thirst.. Whoever is forced to do something of what we mentioned before and does not find the money of a Muslim or a dhimmi, he may eat until he is satisfied and supply himself until he finds what is permissible, and if he finds it, what is permissible returns from that forbidden. ...”. The jurists unanimously agreed that the one who is compelled to eat from the forbidden, in order to ward off the danger of death or damage, but they differed in the quantity that should be consumed. Is it enough to stop the life and ward off death from oneself, or does the matter reach the degree of satiety and extravagance in eating dead meat and the like when necessary? With the will of God Almighty, we will briefly explain the opinions of the jurists on this until we arrive at the most correct opinion.

#### **Hanifa Doctrine:**

The proponents of this doctrine state that: It is obligatory on a person to eat - even from forbidden or dead meat - as much as he can ward off destruction from himself. As there is no survival of the structure without it.

#### **Maliki school of thought:**

It came in the explanation of Manah Al-Jaleel: What is adopted in the madhhab is to eat dead meat and its likeness is permissible until one is full, and to provide food until he finds something else. The text of al-Muwatta’: Malik, may God have mercy on him, said: One of the best things I have heard about a man being forced to eat dead meat is that he eats from it until he is satisfied, and supplies himself with it. And in your message, there is nothing wrong with the compelled to eat the dead and be satisfied and supplied. The dispensed put it. Ibn Rushd, the grandson, said: “As for the amount of dead meat and other things that can be eaten, Malik said: Limit that satiety and provision of it until he finds something else.”

#### **Shafi'i school of thought:**

It came in al-Majmoo’ by al-Nawawi: “And whoever is forced to eat carrion or pork meat, he may eat from them whatever fills his stomach, because of the Almighty’s saying: (كُلْ مِمَّا رَزَقْنَاكَ مِنْ حَيْثُ كُنْتَ) and is it permissible for him to be satiated with it? And it is the choice of Al-Muzni, because after filling the stomach, he is not obliged. The second: It is permissible because every food it is permissible to eat from it is as much as it is necessary to fill it, as it is permissible for him to be satiated with it, just as it is permissible for him to eat it.

And at the end of the needy: one who does not find halal food, and finds haraam food. He is forced to eat it to ward off hunger. The expectation of halal food will soon find it. And he did not fear a warning before his arrival, he was only allowed to stop the breath [i.e., the remnant of the soul], and if he did not expect, then he could be satisfied with his speech. So that he is not called hungry, as for anything beyond that, it is definitely forbidden, and if he is full in the event of abstinence, then he is able to eat what is permissible, he must - like anyone who eats a forbidden food - vomit if he can. That he did not get him hardship usually bear. And he showed bridging the eye only to avoid having to after him. Except that he fears damage if he confines himself to blocking the air. It fulfills an obligation. That is, by breaking Surat Al-Fajr for sure, because the survival of the soul is attached to it.

### **The Hanbali school of thought:**

It is forbidden to eat from dead meat when choosing, because of the Almighty's verse: (كُلْ مِمَّا رَزَقْنَاكَ... the verse) And whoever is forced to die, he should not eat from it except what he is safe with death, so it is permissible for him to eat what fills his stomach, and what exceeds his satiety is forbidden. This is not necessary for the travel of disobedience to eat from the dead. Ibn Qudamah mentioned in *Al-Mughni* that there are two narrations regarding the issue of satiety: the most obvious one is: it is not permissible because necessity is estimated according to its value. The second is permissible for him to be full. Abu Bakr chose it when he narrated on the authority of Jabir bin Samra: that a man went down to the free woman, and a she-camel died with him, and his wife told him to skin it so that we could burn its fat and flesh and eat it. He said: Until I ask the Messenger of God, may God bless him and grant him peace. He asked him and said: Do you have wealth that sings you? he said no. He said: Eat it." He did not make any difference, and because it is permissible to fill one's breath, it is permissible to satiate it as is permissible.

### **Virtual Doctrine:**

It came in *Al-Muhalla* by Ibn Hazm: "It is not permissible to eat pork, forbidden hunting, dead animals, blood, the meat of a seven-bird, a four-legged bird, an insect, wine, or anything else that God Almighty has prohibited of food and drink, except in cases of necessity. Adam and what kills the one who eats it - none of that is permissible at all, neither by necessity nor otherwise. Whoever is forced to do something of what was mentioned before. And he does not find the money of a Muslim or a dhimmi, he may eat until he is satisfied. He supplies himself until he finds what is permissible. The limit of necessity is that he stays for a day and a night without finding anything to eat or drink, for if he fears weakness that leads to death, or cuts him off from his way and preoccupies him, it is permissible for him to eat and drink, as he defends himself. Die of hunger or thirst.

### **Zaydism**

It came in *al-Bahr al-Zakhkhar*: "It is not permissible for the compelled to do what he himself forbids more than filling the breath, because the damage is removed with a dam, because of the Almighty's saying: "unwanted," meaning not taking pleasure and not going beyond the need to ward off necessity.

### **Imamate doctrine:**

It came in *Al-Rawdah Al-Bahiya*: "It is permissible when compelling to take a forbidden thing from dead meat, wine and other things when there is a fear of spoilage without eating, or the occurrence of disease or its increase, or weakness that leads to the failure of companionship.

Marat damage to the estimation of underdevelopment. This is in wine the place of concord. As for alcohol, it was said to be absolutely prohibited. Whether the shrine of other taboos or not. It was said passport with no other place. Rather, it is permissible for the one who is haraam to eat what preserves the breath - which is the rest of the soul - and it is obligatory to limit himself to protecting himself from spoilage, and it is not permissible to go beyond satiation while being self-sufficient." For companionship, with the appearance of signs of failure, or a weak ride leading to fear of damage, it is permissible for him to take what removes that necessity, and this is not specific to any kind of taboo, except for alcohol, which is different in it... What is permitted is what is in it, and transgression is forbidden, because The intent is to save oneself. Is it necessary to eat for preservation? It was said yes, and it is true...

### **The most correct opinion:**

This and the opinion that we prefer and incline to, is the opinion that states that necessity is measured in proportion to the meaning of taking from the forbidden as much as stopping the breath only, because what is meant is to keep the soul away from destruction by taking the forbidden. And the distance from perdition is achieved by what drives this perdition, which is the forbidden amount that fills the eye without exceeding it, because the excess of necessity falls within the scope of permissibility and is forbidden, especially since the Almighty, the Blessed and Most High, has been mentioned in more than one place to say "Neither transgressor nor transgression" i.e. transgressing the limit.

### **The fifth requirement: Drinking wine because of thirst**

As for the one who drinks wine for thirst, his condition is not free from one of two things: either his thirst is destructive, or he is not destructive.

If it is non-destructive, i.e. it does not cause death or fatal weakness to its owner, then it is not permissible to drink it in any case. But if his thirst is destructive and deadly, and he finds something that removes his thirst other than alcohol - such as water, for example, or one of the permissible liquids - then it is not permissible to drink it at all either, and in drinking it the limit must also be imposed to not have to. And the disagreement is as to whether his thirst was destructive and fatal, and he could not find anything to quench it with it except alcohol. Is alcohol permissible here because of the necessity of mortal thirst, or not?. There are many opinions on the matter, the most important of which are:

- 1- It is permissible for him to drink wine for this deadly thirst, as much as necessary, and he does not have to have the punishment. The Hanafis, the Zahiriyya and some of the jurists of the Shafi'i school went to this view, and they cited the Almighty's saying: The one who has suffered harm and pain as a result of compulsion - for him the prohibitions and prohibitions are charity and a kindness from him to his weak servants. And because God, the Most High, has permitted the pig and called it an abomination out of necessity, and He made the compelled to eat from it as much as to ward off destruction, neither unjustly nor transgressively. Likewise, wine is permitted in cases of fatal necessity to

ward off thirst, by analogy with pigs. In addition to that, all are agreed that its drinking is permitted in the case of forced compulsion, as it is permissible for the compulsion to drink wine, just as it is permissible for him to eat dead meat, pork, and other forbidden things. fatal.

- 2- Imam Malik, may God have mercy on him, did not allow Imam Shafi'i to drink wine because of thirst, arguing that it only increases human thirst. It came in Al-Umm to Al-Shafi'i: "It is not for him - that is for the compelled - to drink wine because she is thirsty and hungry...." Imam Malik said, justifying that wine is not permissible for the compelled: "Wine does not increase him except in thirst" because her character is hot and dry, and that is why her drinker is keen on cold water. , does not achieve the intended drink. Therefore it is not resolved. Despite this, some jurists of the Maliki madhhab have issued a fatwa that it is permissible to drink it if there is a necessity, saying by analogy with eating dead meat for the compelled, and this is exactly what the Hanafis, Zahiriyyah and some jurists of the Shafi'i madhhab held.

### The most correct opinion:

In fact, the justification for not solving and drinking wine in the necessity of thirst is that it does not quench and does not quench thirst, makes the matter - the hope of a solution - contingent on quenching thirst with it or not. It is apparent - as Ibn al-Arabi al-Maliki said - that alcohol motivates thirst, so it should be permitted for this necessity, because the necessity of thirst, which the compelled sees that it will destroy him, is greater than the necessity of hunger, and there is no difference in that between necessity and necessity. Imam Ibn Hazm al-Zahiri said, in support of his doctrine, in which he says that it is permissible to drink alcohol for one who is compelled to use it in the event of debilitating thirst: So, it is not specific, so it is not permissible to allocate anything from something, so the one who is compelled to drink alcohol and get provisions until he finds what is lawful, and if he finds it, the lawful becomes forbidden as it was at the height of necessity. Those who are addicted to it do not drink water at all even though they drink wine. Also, drinking it to relieve choking is permissible for everyone because of the necessity of suffocation, and there is no difference between the necessity of suffocation and the necessity of thirst, just as saying that it is forbidden due to the necessity of fatal thirst commands a person to kill himself, and that if he does not drink alcohol, then he dies, he is a self-killer. Which God has forbidden to kill except by right...".

Based on that, the opinion that we interpret and tend to is that it is permissible to drink wine because of the necessity of fatal thirst, so there is no difference between necessity and necessity, and God knows best.

### The most important results:

If a Muslim is compelled to utter the word of disbelief on his tongue without his heart, and that is because he is forced by compulsion and fears that he will perish or damage one of the organs, then in this case he is compelled, i.e. in a state of necessity, then it is permissible for him to utter the word of disbelief and go along with them with his tongue without his heart. In order to survive the state of necessity in which he fell.

- If uttering a word when under duress is a concession, then it is best for the majority of scholars to adopt determination and patience with torture, even if that leads to killing out of respect for religion, as Yasir and Sumaya did. This is not from throwing oneself to death, rather it is like killing in an invasion, as stated by the jurists. It is permissible to lie and swear against it because of the necessity of ridding an innocent soul of sin to perish, or a woman from fornication, or money infallible from anger, so if an unjust oppressor pursues an innocent person who wants to kill him, or a woman with whom he wants to commit adultery, then they hide from one of the people. It is permissible for him to deny their presence with him and swear on that. Likewise, it is permissible for the custodian to deny the trust and to swear an oath on it if the oppressor, the oppressor, the oppressor asks for it.
- There is no objection to a person protecting himself from damage and harm by what appears, even if he conceals the opposite.
- In case of necessity, all these taboos are permitted. If a person is forced to eat any of these things that God Almighty has forbidden him, it is permissible for him to eat what he finds of them to save himself from destruction. The justification for not solving and drinking wine in the necessity of thirst is that it does not quench and does not quench thirst, makes the matter – the hope of a solution – dependent on whether or not it quenches thirst with it

### Margins:

Brief interpretation of Ibn Kathir. Abbreviation and achievement of Muhammad Ali al-Sabouni. The second volume, p. 348, House of the Noble Qur'an - Beirut.

( ) Al-Majmoo' Sharh Al-Muhadhab - the second supplement by Professor Muhammad Husayn Al-Anabi, volume 18, pg.4, Imam Press.

( ) It was narrated by al-Tabarani in al-Kabeer on the authority of Thawban and Abu al-Darda' and it was narrated by Ibn Majah, Ibn Hayyan and al-Hakim on the authority of Ibn Abbas, and it was mentioned by others. Subul al-Salam by al-Sanaani, Volume 3, p. 232, The Book of Divorce.

( ) Al-Hedaya Explanation of the Beginning of Al-Mubtada by Al-Marginani, Volume 3, p. 277.

( ) However, the Malikis stipulate in this that the threat of death be.

( ) Al-Majmoo' Sharh Al-Muhadhab - previous reference, p. 7.

( ) Al-Mughni by Ibn Qudamah, volume 8, p. 146.

( ) Verses 4, 5, 6, 7 of Surat Al-Buruj.

- ( ) Dr. Ahmad Al-Sharbasi in They Ask You about Religion and Life - Dar Al-Jeel - Beirut, Volume 2, p. 621.
- ( ) Tafsir al-Qurtubi, volume 10, p. 182, the provisions of the Qur'an by Ibn al-Arabi, volume 3, p. 1167.
- ( ) Ishabah and Al-Nazaer by Ibn Najim pg. 89, and Ishabah Al-Suyuti pg. 87.
- ( ) Rules of Judgments in the Interests of People by Ezz bin Abd al-Salam, Volume 1, p. 107.
- ( ) Tafsir Al-Qurtubi Volume 10 p. 189.
- ( ) For details, see Rules of Judgments by Al-Izz bin Abd al-Salam, volume 1, p. 107.
- ( ) Fiqh of the Sunnah by Sheikh Sayed Sabiq. Volume Three, p. 162.
- ( ) Narrated by Al-Bukhari on the authority of Jabir. Fath al-Bari, Sharh Sahih al-Bukhari by Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, Volume 6, p. 194, and Muslim narrated it with this professor and on the authority of Abu Huraira. The Sahih Mosque of Imam Muslim Volume 3 p. 143.
- ( ) The Sahih Mosque of Imam Muslim Volume 3 p. 142.
- ( ) Narrated by Al-Bukhari on the authority of Jabir bin Abdullah. Fath al-Bari, Sharh Sahih al-Bukhari, Volume 6, p. 195.
- ( ) Previous reference p. 196.
- ( ) Fath al-Bari, Sharh Sahih al-Bukhari by Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, Volume 6, p. 196.
- ( ) Rules of Judgments by Al-Ezz bin Abd al-Salam, volume 1, p. 107.
- ( ) Verse 28 Surat Al Imran.
- ( ) Tafsir Ibn Katheer - Al Mukhtasar Volume I p. 276 Abbreviation and verification of Muhammad Ali al-Sabouni.
- ( ) Tafsir Al-Qurtubi, volume 4, p. 57.
- ( ) Al-Mabsoot by Sarakhsi Al-Hanafi, Volume 24, pg. 46.
- ( ) Interpretation of Al-Qurtubi - previous reference.
- ( ) Provisions of the Qur'an by Ibn al-Arabi, Volume 1, p. 268.
- ( ) Provisions of the Qur'an for Jassas, Volume 2, p. 9, edition of the year 1325 AH, Islamic Endowments Press - Astana.
- ( ) Verse 106 of Surat An-Nahl.
- ( ) Al-Mabsout Al-Sarakhsi, Volume 24, p. 47, Al-Saada Press, Egypt, in the year 1314 AH.
- ( ) Verse 145 of Surat An-Nisa.
- ( ) Tafsir Al-Qurtubi, volume 4, p. 57.
- ( ) Fath al-Bari with the explanation of Sahih al-Bukhari by Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, volume 10, p. 578.
- ( ) From verse 1 of Surat Al-Mumtahinah.
- ( ) Fath al-Bari with an explanation of Sahih al-Bukhari by al-Asqalani, Volume 6, p. 176.
- ( ) Verse No. 173 of Surat Al-Baqarah.
- ( ) Verse 119 of Surat Al-An'am.
- ( ) Tafsir Al-Qurtubi vol.3, p. 275.
- ( ) Ibid. p. 2 p. 232.
- ( ) Mukhtasar Ibn Kathir, volume 1, p. 150, abbreviated and verified by Muhammad Ali al-Sabouni.
- ( ) Al-Muhalla by Ibn Hazm Al-Dhahiri, Volume 7, pg. 426.
- ( ) A complex of rivers, explaining the confluence of the sailors. Abd al-Rahman Damar, nicknamed Sheikhi Zadeh and Hamish, Dar al-Muntaqa, in Sharh al-Multaqa by Alaa al-Din al-Hasfaki, volume 2, p. 524, printed by the Ottoman edition of Dar Saadat in 1328 AH.
- ( ) Explanation of Manah Al-Jaleel on the Mukhtasar Al-Allamah Khalil by Muhammad Ayeshe, printed by the great printing press in Egypt in the year 1294 AH (1st pg. 596).
- ( ) The Beginning of the Mujtahid and the End of the Moqtada by Muhammad bin Ahmed bin Rushd Al-Qurtubi, Volume 1, p. 555, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Islamiyyah.
- ( ) Verse 173 Surat Al-Baqarah.
- ( ) Al-Majmoo' by Imam Al-Nawawi, volume 9, p. 39, p. 40, The Arab Press in Egypt in the year 1344 AH.
- ( ) End of the Needy Explanation of the Minhaj by Ibn Hamza al-Ramli, edition of the year 1357 AH, edition of al-Halabi, volume 8, p. 151.
- ( ) The previous reference, as well as the footnotes of Al-Sharwani and Ibn Qasim Al-Abadi on Tuhfat Al-Muhtaj explaining the curriculum by Ibn Hajar Al-Haythami, volume 9, p. 390 - Dar Sader.
- ( ) From verse 173 of Surat Al-Baqarah.
- ( ) Narrated by Abu Dawood on the authority of Jaber bin Samra. Sunan Abi Dawood, Volume 2, p. 146, Dar Al-Kitab Al-Arabi.
- ( ) Al-Mughni by Ibn Qudamah al-Hanbali, volume 8, p. 595 - and the singer, followed by the great explanation, the commentary of Sayyid Muhammad Rashid Rida, volume 11, p. 73 - first edition - Al-Manar Press in Egypt in the year 1347 AH.
- ( ) Al-Muhalla by Ibn Hazm Al-Zahiri, volume 7, p. 436 - first edition in 1347, Al-Nahda Press in Egypt.
- ( ) Al-Bahr Al-Zakhkhar, the Collective School of the Ansar Scholars, by Ahmad bin Al-Murtada, Volume 2, Pg. 322, i
- (1) Al-Sa'ada Press in Egypt.
- ( ) Al-Rawdah Al-Bahiya, Sharh Al-Lama' Al-Damashqiah, by Zain Al-Din Al-Amili, Volume 2, p. 290, Dar Al-Kitab Al-Arabi, year 1378 AH.
- ( ) The Laws of Islam, by Jaafar bin Al Hussein bin Abi Zakaria Al Hudhali, nicknamed Al Muhaqqiq Al Hilli, Volume 2, p. 148 and beyond - Al Hayat Library Press - Beirut.
- ( ) Dr. Faraj Zahran in intoxicants, its harms and provisions, p. 159 and what follows.



- ( ) Verse 173 Surat Al-Baqarah.
- ( ) Badaa' al-Sana'i by al-Kasani al-Hanafi, vol.6, p.2935, and al-Muhalla by Ibn Hazm, vol.7, p. 246.
- ( ) Al-Mabsoot Sarakhsi, Volume 24, p. 39.
- ( ) Al-Sharh al-Kabeer al-Dardir and Hashiyat al-Desouki, volume 4, p. 313.
- ( ) The Imam of Muhammad bin Idris Al-Shafi'i, Volume 2, p. 253.
- ( ) Provisions of the Qur'an by Ibn al-Arabi al-Maliki, volume 1, p. 56.
- ( ) Al-Desouki's footnote on the great explanation of Al-Dardir volume 4, p. 313 and beyond.
- ( ) The provisions of the Qur'an by Ibn al-Arabi, volume 1, p. 57.
- ( ) Collection of Fatwas of Sheikh Al-Islam Ahmed bin Taymiyyah, volume 14, p. 471.
- ( ) Verse 119 of Surat Al-An'am.
- ( ) Al-Muhalla by Ibn Hazm Al-Dhahiri, Volume 7, pg. 426 and beyond.

### Resources and References

- [1]. Brief interpretation of Ibn Kathir. Abbreviation and achievement of Muhammad Ali al-Sabouni. The second volume, p. 348, House of the Noble Qur'an - Beirut.
- [2]. Al-Majmoo' Sharh Al-Muhadhab - the second supplement A poem by Professor Muhammad Husayn Al-Anabi, volume 18, p. 4, Imam Press.
- [3]. Al-Hedaya Explanation of the Beginning of Al-Mubtada by Al-Marginani, Volume 3, p. 277.
- [4]. Al-Mughni by Ibn Qudamah, volume 8, p. 146.
- [5]. Dr. Ahmad Al-Sharbasi in They Ask You about Religion and Life - Dar Al-Jeel - Beirut, Volume 2, p. 621.
- [6]. Rules of Judgments by Al-Ezz bin Abd al-Salam, volume 1, p. 107.
- [7]. Tafsir Ibn Katheer - Al Mukhtasar Volume I p. 276 Abbreviation and verification of Muhammad Ali al-Sabouni.
- [8]. Tafsir Al-Qurtubi, volume 4, p. 57.
- [9]. Al-Mabsoot by Sarakhsi Al-Hanafi, Volume 24, pg. 46.
- [10]. Interpretation of Al-Qurtubi - previous reference.
- [11]. Provisions of the Qur'an by Ibn al-Arabi, Volume 1, p. 268.
- [12]. Provisions of the Qur'an for Jassas, Volume 2, p. 9, edition of the year 1325 AH, Islamic Endowments Press - Astana.
- [13]. Al-Mabsout Al-Sarakhsi, Volume 24, p. 47, Al-Saada Press, Egypt, in the year 1314 AH.
- [14]. Tafsir Al-Qurtubi, volume 4, p. 57.
- [15]. Mukhtasar Ibn Kathir, volume 1, p. 150, abbreviated and verified by Muhammad Ali al-Sabouni.
- [16]. Al-Muhalla by Ibn Hazm Al-Dhahiri, Volume 7, pg. 426.
- [17]. A complex of rivers, explaining the confluence of the sailors. Abd al-Rahman Damar, nicknamed Sheikhi Zadeh and Hamish, Dar al-Muntaqa, in Sharh al-Multaqa by Alaa al-Din al-Hasfaki, volume 2, p. 524, printed by the Ottoman edition of Dar Saadat in 1328 AH.
- [18]. Explanation of Manah Al-Jaleel on the Mukhtasar Al-Allamah Khalil by Muhammad Ayesha, printed by the great printing press in Egypt in the year 1294 AH (1st pg. 596).
- [19]. The Beginning of the Mujtahid and the End of the Moqtada by Muhammad bin Ahmed bin Rushd Al-Qurtubi, Volume 1, p. 555, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Islamiyyah.
- [20]. Verse 173 Surat Al-Baqarah.
- [21]. Al-Majmoo' by Imam Al-Nawawi, volume 9, p. 39, p. 40, The Arab Press in Egypt in the year 1344 AH.
- [22]. End of the Needy Explanation of the Minhaj by Ibn Hamza al-Ramli, edition of the year 1357 AH, edition of al-Halabi, volume 8, p. 151.
- [23]. Al-Mughni by Ibn Qudamah al-Hanbali, volume 8, p. 595 - and the singer, followed by the great explanation, the commentary of Sayyid Muhammad Rashid Rida, volume 11, p. 73 - first edition - Al-Manar Press in Egypt in the year 1347 AH.
- [24]. Al-Muhalla by Ibn Hazm Al-Zahiri, volume 7, p. 436 - first edition in 1347, Al-Nahda Press in Egypt.
- [25]. Dr. Faraj Zahran in intoxicants, its harms and provisions, p. 159 and what follows.
- [26]. Badaa' al-Sana'i by al-Kasani al-Hanafi, vol.6, p.2935, and al-Muhalla by Ibn Hazm, vol.7, p. 246.
- [27]. Al-Mabsoot Sarakhsi, Volume 24, p. 39.