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הסגת גבול (1)

a. "הסָגָת גְּבוּל," a concept which originally had specific reference to the unlawful taking of another’s land; later it was extended to embrace encroachment on various economic, commercial, and incorporeal rights of others.

b. The term ḥasagat gevul was the moving (cf. nasogu aḥor, Isa. 42:17) of boundary stones or other landmarks from their resting places into the bounds of another’s adjoining area of land, for the purpose of annexing a portion of the latter to one’s own land. Naḥmanides' comment on the passage, "Thou shalt not remove thy neighbor’s landmark, which they of old time have set, in thine inheritance which thou shalt inherit in the land that the Lord thy God giveth thee to possess it" (Deut. 19:14)

c. Removal of the landmark is exhorted against and castigated in the books of the prophets and the hagiographa (Hos. 5:10; Prov. 22:28, 23:10)

d. The widening in the doctrine of ḥassagat gevul are traceable back to talmudic times, when various halakhot were derived from the doctrine by way of *asmakhta*. Thus the doctrine was cited in support of the prohibition against withholding from the poor (all or anyone of them) their gleanings from the produce of the field (Pe’ah 5:6; on the meaning of the term olim and al tasseg gevul olim

e. Recognition in Jewish law of the ownership of incorporeal property were given as early as tannaitic times. Thus it was stated, "a person who eavesdrops on his neighbor to reproduce his teachings, even though he is called a thief, acquires for himself" (Tosef., BK 7:13), and support for the prohibition against interchanging one scholar’s statements with another’s was found (Sif. Deut. 188) in the passage, "Thou shalt not remove thy neighbor’s landmark." i.e. committing plagerism.


גניבת דעת (2)

a. "thieft of the mind", from "stealing" of דעות "understanding") is a concept in Jewish law and ethics that refers to a kind of dishonest misrepresentation or deception.

b. For example if a seller is selling a chariot, in Jewish law the seller must tell the potential buyer if the chariot wheels don’t work. The buyer could be killed if they bought the vehicle without being told this defect. However in Roman law the responsibility is on the buyer to have the vehicle certified first if it is safe i.e. CAVEAT SEMPTER

גניבת שינה (3)

a. In Jewish law, gezel sheina (גניבת שינה, theft of sleep) refers to waking up another person against their wishes.
b. The Agadata is told of a righteous gentile ben Dama who refused to wake up his father even though the Kohanim approached him with an offer to buy a Jewel for the Hosheh Misphat that was under the pillow of ben Dama’s sleeping father. Because the son refused to wake his father but suffered the immediate financial loss, the son’s family was rewarded a year later by having in its flock a para adamah (red heifer) born to its flock which the Kohenim bought for the potential tekes (ceremony) of purifying persons from contact from the dead.

(5) מיסקנ סעיגת
a. Selling damaged goods without buyer being aware they are damaged
(6) "overreaching"), the act of wronging another by selling him an article for more than its real worth or by purchasing from him an article for less than its real worth
a. עונס ממון Overcharge, prix fixing by overreaching
b. ona'ah applies to undercharging as well as overcharging (Sh. Ar., HM 227:2).
c. In the case where a person has overreached by one-sixth, the transaction is valid, but he must make good the discrepancy to the injured party (BM 50b). The discrepancy of one-sixth is calculated on the market value. If the discrepancy amounts to less than one-sixth, the transaction is valid and the difference need not be made good (Yad, loc. cit. 12:3).
d. Concerning consecrated property in the Temple period, it was decided that 'if hekdesh worth a maneh had been redeemed for the equivalent of a perutah, the redemption was valid' – hence, in the sale of consecrated property also there is no law of overreaching, even though the Temple treasury be wronged, so that the buyer cannot retract since ‘a verbal undertaking in favor of the Temple treasury is as a delivery to the common man’” (Arukh ha-Shulhan, HM 227:34). In the Temple period the law of overreaching did not apply to consecrated property (BM 56b; Yad, Mekhirah 13:8), but "in these times" the law of over-reaching does apply in respect of consecrated property and property dedicated to the poor (HM 227, n. 48).
e. accepted opinion is that, with regard to land, slaves, and deeds, the law of overreaching never applies nor does it ever serve to invalidate the transaction (Sh. Ar., HM 227:29; Siftei Kohen, HM 66, n. 122).
f. The law of overreaching does not apply to the sale of apparel because the owner would not sell such articles except if he received the price he demanded (BM 51a), and this is so even when he is known to have sold these items on account of financial hardship (Resp. Rosh, no. 105:3).
g. Conflict of Interest: he law of ona'ah does not operate in respect of property sold through an agent. If the agent is overreached in any manner, the sale is void since his principal may say, "I delegated you to act to my advantage and not to my detriment" (Kid. 42b; Yad, Mekhirah 13:9).
h. Buy Outs: The law of overreaching applies to the division of inherited property by brothers or partners, since their position is assimilated to that of purchasers. This rule applies to partners in respect of the partnership property only and not to a mere profit-sharing or business partnership (Arukh ha-Shulhan, HM 8, 227:338)
i. Statute of limitations, time sensitive: A purchaser who wishes to claim restitution or to invalidate a transaction on the grounds of overreaching must do so within the time it
would take for him to show the article to a merchant or other person from whom he may ascertain its market price (Sh. Ar., HM 227:7)

j. עונס דיבריןliterally torturing words or lying or distorting in speech

(7) sanctification of G-d’s name vs. desecration of G-d’s name

a. See mikrotot on Jewish Ethics library guides

b. When God decided to visit destruction indiscriminately on both the righteous and the wicked of Sodom, Abraham protested that this would be ḥillul ha-Shem (Gen. R. 49:9). Were God to have permitted Absalom to slay his father David, His Name would have been publicly profaned (Sanh. 107a). The punishment of the righteous for their sins, relative to their own high standards, is divine kiddush ha-Shem (Sifra to Shemini 45d; Zev. 115b).

c. When Simean ben Shetah bought an ass from an Arab and his servants were delighted at finding a jewel hanging from its neck, he at once returned the gem to its owner, who cried out, "Blessed be the God of the Jews Who renders His people so scrupulous in their dealings with other men" (TJ, BM., 2:5, 8c).

d. Moral acts such as Joseph’s restraint in the face of temptation and Judah’s public confession of his relations with Tamar are also considered kiddush ha-Shem (Sot. 10b).