**Shevuoth, Chapter Four, Mishnah Seven**

**Introduction**

Mishnah seven lists cases where although the person falsely testifies, since the case did not concern money, he is not guilty of a false oath of testimony.

**Mishnah Seven**

1. “I adjure you that you come and bear testimony for me that I am a priest, or, that I am a levite, or, that I am not the son of a divorced woman, or, that I am not the son of a *halutzah*;
2. That so-and-so is a priest, or, that so-and-so is a levite, or, that he is not the son of a divorced woman, or, that he is not the son of a *halutzah*;
3. That so-and-so violated his daughter, or seduced his daughter;
4. That my son injured me;
5. That my neighbor injured me, or set fire to my haystack on the Sabbath”:
   1. [And they deny knowledge of testimony] they are exempt.

***Explanation***

This mishnah is a contrast to mishnah six. In it a person adjures witnesses to testify in non-monetary cases, or at least in cases in which the one adjuring does not stand to gain money by the testimony.

**Section one**: In all of these cases the testimony is about the status of either the person who adjures the witnesses or about a third party. There is no monetary suit. The son of priest and divorcee or a priest and a *halutzah* (one rejected by the levir) are considered disqualified priests and they do not retain their priestly status.

**Section three**: A person who rapes or seduces his own daughter is liable for the death penalty and not for a fine, as is one who rapes or seduces another person’s daughter.

**Section four**: A child who strikes his parent and inflicts a wound is liable for the death penalty. Since he will be executed he is exempt from paying a financial penalty, and therefore this case is not a monetary suit.

**Section five**: One who injures another person on the Sabbath or burns a haystack is liable for the death penalty. Although these cases also involve financial damage, since a person cannot be obligated for death and payment for the same act, the criminal would be liable for death and not payment. This is not, therefore, a monetary suit.

**Questions for Further Thought:**

* **Sections one and two**: Why might you have thought that these cases were monetary suits?