



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Avodah Zarah Daf Chuf Aleph

MISHNA

- We may not rent houses to goyim in EY (as a gezeira that it may lead to selling them a house in EY, which is assur as giving them an ownership in EY), and certainly may not rent fields to them in EY. In Surya we may rent houses to them, but not fields. In chutz laaretz we may even sell houses to them and may rent fields to them. This is the view of **R' Meir**. **R' Yose** says, in EY we may rent houses to goyim, but may not rent fields to them. In Surya we may even sell houses to them, and may rent fields to them. In chutz laaretz we may sell houses and fields to them.
 - Even in a place where they said it is mutar to rent houses to goyim, that is not meant that we may rent them a house to live in, because a goy brings avoda zara into the house in which he lives, which would be assur for the Yid based on the pasuk of "lo savi so'eiva ehl beisecha".
- In all places it is assur to rent to them a bathhouse, because a bathhouse is always known as belonging to the Yid (even when it is rented to someone else).

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why is it that the issur of renting fields is more obvious than that of renting houses? You can't say it is because the selling of a field would involve two issurim – giving them ownership in land in EY, and removing the field from a maaser obligation – because selling a house also involves two issurim – giving them ownership in EY and removing the house from the mitzvah of mezuzah!? **A:** **R' Mesharshiya** said, the mezuzah obligation is on the one who lives in the house, not the owner of the house, and therefore the act of selling the house doesn't change the mezuzah obligation. Based on this, selling a house to them would involve one problem and selling a field would involve two. That is why the issur to sell a field to them, and the gezeira not to rent a field to them, is more obvious.

BESURYA MASKIRIN BATIM...

- **Q:** The reason we can't sell them a house in Surya is a gezeira that it may lead to selling a house to them in EY. If so, we should also not be allowed to rent a house to them in Surya as a gezeira that it may lead to renting a house to them in EY!? **A:** Renting to them in EY is itself a gezeira, so we will not make a gezeira to strengthen another gezeira.
 - **Q:** The issur of renting a field to them in Surya is a gezeira to a gezeira, and yet it is assur!? **A:** Selling a field in Surya is assur based on halacha, not based on a gezeira. This is because **R' Meir** holds that Dovid's conquering of Surya gave it the status of EY itself. Therefore, regarding fields, which involve two issurim, he is goizer that even renting to a goy is assur. Regarding houses, which only involve one issur, he does treat Surya more leniently than EY and allows for the renting of houses.

B'CHUTZ LAARETZ...

- **R' Meir** allows the sale of houses to them outside EY, but not the sale of fields to them outside EY. This is because the sale of fields in EY involve two issurim, so he is goizer even outside EY. The sale of houses in EY involves only one issur, so he is not goizer outside EY.

R' YOSE OMER B'ERETZ YISRAEL MASKIRIN LAHEM BATIM...

- **R' Yose** holds this way, because he is goizer regarding fields, whose sale involves two issurim, but is not goizer regarding houses, whose sale involves only one issur.

UBISURYA MOCHRIN...

- **R' Yose** holds that Surya does not have the status of EY. Therefore, he is goizer regarding the selling of fields, whose sale in EY involves two issurim, but is not goizer regarding the selling of houses, whose sale in EY involves only one issur.

UBICHUTZ LAARETZ MOCHRIN...

- **R' Yose** holds that since chutz laaretz is far away from EY, we don't have to be goizer against selling in chutz laaretz to prevent the selling in EY.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** paskened that the halacha follows **R' Yose**.
 - **R' Yosef** said, this is as long as he does not sell or rent houses to goyim in a way that he creates a neighborhood of goyim.
 - **Q:** What is considered to be a "neighborhood"? **A:** A Braisa says a neighborhood is a minimum of three people.
 - **Q:** We should be concerned that a Yid will sell his house to one goy, and the goy will then sell portions of his house to two other goyim, thereby making a neighborhood of three goyim!? **A: Abaye** said, we only need to be concerned for immediate possibilities, not eventual ones.

AHF BIMAKOM SHE'AMRU L'HASKIR

- The Mishna here implies that there are some places where it is assur to rent houses to goyim altogether. The Mishna is following the view of **R' Meir**, because according to **R' Yose** it is always mutar to rent houses to goyim.

UBICHOL MAKOM LO YISKOR...

- A Braisa says, **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, a person may not rent out his bathhouse to a goy, because it is always known as being owned by the Yid (the owner), and the goy will do melacha there on Shabbos and Yom Tov, and people will assume that the melacha is being done on behalf of the Yid.
 - **Q:** The Braisa seems to suggest that renting to a Kuti would be mutar. But, a Kuti does melacha on Chol Hamoed, and we should therefore have the same concern – that he will do melacha on Chol Hamoed in the bathhouse and people will assume that it is being done on behalf of the Yid!? **A:** The melacha that is needed to be done in a bathhouse are mutar for a Yid to do on Chol Hamoed as well. Therefore, there is no issue with renting to them.
 - **Q:** The Braisa seems to suggest that it would not be a problem to rent a field to a goy (assuming it did not run afoul of the gezeiros in the Mishna), because even if the goy does melacha there on Shabbos and Yom Tov, people know that a field is given to sharecroppers and will assume that the goy is a sharecropper, and is not doing the melacha on behalf of the Yid. Why don't we say that regarding a bathhouse as well, people will say that the goy is involved in some profit sharing arrangement, and therefore is doing the melacha on his own behalf? **A:** Such an arrangement is not typically done for bathhouses, and therefore people will assume that any melacha done is being done on behalf of the Yid.
- A Braisa says, **R' Shimon ben Elazar** said, a Yid may not rent his field to a Kuti because it remains to be known as the field of the owner, and this Kuti will do melacha in the field on Chol Hamoed.
 - **Q:** The Braisa suggests that renting a field to a goy would be mutar, because when people see the goy doing work, they will assume that the goy is a sharecropper in the field. Why don't we say that when a Kuti does work in the field they will also assume that he is a sharecropper and any work he does is on his own behalf? **A: R' Shimon ben Elazar** does not hold that people will assume that the goy is a sharecropper. Rather, the reason he allows renting to a goy is because he holds that if the Yid tells the goy not to do work on Shabbos, he will listen and will not do work. That is why we can rent a field to him. However, a Kuti will not listen when he is told not to work the field on Chol Hamoed, because he feels that he knows the halachos better than the Yid, and holds that working on Chol Hamoed is mutar.
 - **Q:** If so, why does he say that the reason it is assur is because it remains known as the field of the Yid? The reason it is assur is because of "lifnei iver" of having the Kuti work the field on Chol Hamoed!? **A:** Understand the Braisa as giving two reasons: one because of lifnei iver, and an additional reason, because it remains to be known as the field of the owner.