26.1.17; 20b (משנה חב) → 22a (סיום הפרק)

1. **ולא תָבִיא תוֹעֵבָה אֶל בֵּיתָד** וְהָיִיתָ חֵרֶם כְּמֹהוּ שַׁקֵּץ תְּשַׁקְצֶנוּ וְתַעֵב תְּתַעֲבֶנּוּ כִּי חֵרֶם הוּא: *דברים ז:כו* 2. לא תְקַלֵּל חֵרֵשׁ **וְלִפְנֵי עָוַּר לֹא תִתַּן מִרְשׁל** וְיָרֵאתִ מֵּאֱלֹהֶיךּ אֲנִי ה': *ויקרא יט:יד*

- I משנה משנה renting/selling houses/fields in חו"ל and מוריא א"י arting/selling houses/fields in
 - a סוריא → כיבוש יחיד שמיה כיבוש is considered to have 'קדושת א"ו: (maintains that סוריא
 - i In א"י: may not rent either
 - ii In סוריא: may rent houses, but not fields, may not sell either
 - *Comment*: we don't sell houses as precaution against selling in א"י,
 - (a) Challenge: why not make same precaution and disallow renting out houses
 - (b) Answer: renting in א"י is itself a הזירה and we don't make a "doubled"
 - (i) Challenge: then why disallow renting fields?
 - (ii) Answer: it isn't the same הזוה since he holds כיבוש יחיד ש"כ, a field has 2 issues (חניה, מעשרות,
 - iii In המ"ל: may rent fields and sell houses may not sell fields
 - 1 Explanation: since a house has one isuse in אורה no גזרה; since a field has 2 גזרה
 - b "סוריא ווייש (maintains that סוריא \leftarrow כיבוש יחיד לאו שמיה כיבוש is not considered to have קדושת א"י
 - i In א"י: may rent houses, not fields may not sell either
 - 1 Explanation: since a house has only one issue no מזרה against renting; as distinct from a field, which has 2
 - ii In סוריא: may rent fields, sell houses may not sell fields
 - 1 Explanation: since he holds גזרה on fields (in "ל c'בוש יחיד לש"כ, it is simply א"ל but neighboring only גזרה on fields (in גזרה)
 - iii In חו"ל: may sell either
 - 1 Explanation: since it is far away, no reason for a גזרה
 - 2 Ruling (שמואל): follows ר' יוסי
 - (a) Limitation (עבר"ם: as long as he doesn't establish a neighborhood of עבר"ם) (three people together)
 - (i) *Challenge*: what if he sells to one and he sells to two others (and subdivides with them)
 - (ii) Answer (אביי): we aren't commanded regarding indirect enabling (לפני עוור of לפני עוור)
 - c Analysis of severity of fields over houses
 - i Fields: allows them חנייה בקרקע as well as uprooting land from חיוב מעשרות (holds) מיי לגוי להפקיע
 - i Houses: only provides them with חיוב; "uprooting" of מצוות מזוזה not considered as there is no essential מצוות מזוזה
 - 1 Explanation: חובת הדר" is מזוזה on the resident, not the house
- II ששנה even in those places where it is permissible to rent (implying there are places it is משנה יס, סתם כר"מ אסור
 - a *may not*: rent a living quarters, as they bring ע"ז (violation of v. 1)
 - b *nor*: may he rent out a bathhouse in any place, since it is referred to as the owner's (and the workers are heating up the water on שבת)
 - i related רשב"ג ברייתא disallows renting גוי to גוי, but (by implication) allows to כותי
 - 1 Challenge: just as the תוה"מ will heat up water on כותי, שבת will work there on חוה"מ
 - 2 Answer: we also heat up on חוה"מ (it is permissible)
 - 3 Alternative inference: may rent a field to גוי (in those places where it is otherwise מותר
 - (a) Challenge: won't it be considered the ישראל's field which is being worked on שבת?
 - (b) Answer: all assume that the vis is working as a sharecropper for himself
 - (i) If so: why not say the same about a bathhouse?
 - (ii) Answer: there is no such arrangement for a bathhouse
 - ii Related רשב"א :ברייתא may not rent a field to מותי a it considered 'ישראל's and כותי will work there on חוה"מ
 - 1 However: permissible to rent to גוי
 - 2 Explanation: cannot be אריסות, as the כותי could also be assumed to be his sharecropper
 - 3 Rather: ישראל will heed the ישראל's dicatates; כותי will assume he knows better and violate
 - (a) Challenge: רשב"א stated reason is נקראת על שמו
 - (i) Answer: both reasons are used נקראת על שמו and he won't heed instructions
 - iii Story: ישראל and non-Jewish farmhands made an arrangement to divide יים א' and and יים א'
 - 1 Ruling (דבא): permissible arrangement
 - 2 Challenge (עכי"ם and עכר"ם may not divide in that manner unless they set it up in advance
 - (a) אבא. was embarrassed; but it turned out that they had set it up that way from the start
 - (i) Alternate version of story: split was ערלה-post-ארלה
 - (ii) Note: no way to tell what default case is, since both explicated circumstances are used