prescribed, but not return. Raba said: It follows from the essential meaning of the verse, He shall surely die: his blood shall be upon him; thus those who lend upon usury are compared to shedders of blood: just as those who shed blood can make no restitution, so those who lend upon interest can make no restitution.

R. Nahman b. Isaac said: What is R. Eleazar's reason? Scripture saith, [62a] [Take thou no usury of him, or increase: but fear thy God;] that thy brother may live with thee; [implying] return it to him, that he may be able to live with thee.

Now how does R. Johanan interpret, 'that thy brother may live with thee?'—He utilises it for that which was taught: If two are (travelling on a journey [far from civilisation], and one has a pitcher of water, if both drink, they will [both] die, but if one only drinks, he can reach civilisation,—The Son of Patura taught: It is better that both should drink and die, rather than that one should behold his companion's death. Until R. Akiba came and taught: 'that thy brother may live with thee:' thy life takes precedence over his life.4

An objection was raised: If their father left them usury money, though they know it to be usury, they are not bound to return it. [This implies.] But their father is bound to return it!! — In truth, their father too is not bound to return it: but because the second clause desires to state, 'If their father left them a cow, or a garment, or any distinguishable object [received as interest], they must return it for the sake of their father's honour,' the first clause too is taught with reference to them. But are they then bound to make restitution for the sake of their father's honour? [Why not] apply here, Thou shalt not curse a ruler of thy people, 7 [which means], only

production of the state of the

⁽¹⁾ Ezek, ibid. (2) Translating the last phrase: 'his blood', i.e., the blood shed by taking usury, shall be upon him. (3) That direct interest can be recovered in court. (4) With the implies that thy life takes first place, but that he too has a right to life after thine is assured. [For an excellent exposition of R. Akiba's dictum, v. Simon, Leon, Etrays on Zionism and Judaism by Achad Ha-am (1922), Pp. 236ff.] (5) Thus contradicting R. Johanan's ruling. (6) But the father himself cannot be compelled to make restitution. (7) Ex. XXII, 27: this is interpreted as a general injunction to safeguard another Jew's honour.