



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

Pesachim Daf Yud

- If there is a pile of chametz, and in front of it are 2 houses that were both already checked for chametz, and a mouse came and took something from the pile into one of the houses, but we don't know which one it went into, this would have the same halacha as the case of "2 roads". A Mishna says, if there are 2 roads, one of which has a meis buried under it in a way that one walking down that road will surely become tamei meis, and there are 2 people, each of which went down one of the roads, so that one of them must surely be tamei, but we don't know which one, the halacha is as follows. **R' Yehuda** says, if each of the people ask about their status separately, we can tell each of them that they are tahor. If they ask together, we must tell them that they are tamei. **R' Yose** says, in both cases we must tell them that they are tamei. **Rava** explained, that **R' Yehuda and R' Yose** agree that if they ask together we tell them they are tamei and if they ask separately we tell them that they are tahor. The machlokes is when one comes to ask, but he asks about himself and the other individual. In that case **R' Yehuda** says it is as if he is only asking about himself and he is told that he is tahor. **R' Yose** says that it is considered as if both have come to ask together, and they are told that they are tamei.
 - The same halacha would apply to the houses. If they ask separately, neither would need another bedika. If they ask together, they would. If one asks regarding both of them, that would be subject to the machlokes between **R' Yehuda and R' Yose**.
- If we saw a mouse with chametz running, and we are not sure whether or not it ran into a house that was already checked for chametz, the halacha would be subject to the machlokes between **R' Eliezer** and the **Rabanan** regarding the case of open fields. A Mishna says, when there are many adjacent, open fields, and one of them has a meis buried in it, and one enters the fields during the winter (when people are not allowed to enter other people's fields and it therefore has the status of a reshus hayachid), but is not sure whether he entered the field with the tumah in it, **R' Eliezer** says he is tahor, because when one is unsure whether he entered a place of tumah, he is tahor, and it is only when one is unsure whether he touched tumah that he is tamei. The **Rabanan** says he is tamei.
 - Here, we are unsure whether the mouse even went into the house, so he will not have to do another bedika (even the **Rabanan** would agree in this case because bedika is only D'Rabanan).
- If a mouse with chametz went into a house, and the homeowner did another bedika but found no chametz, the halacha would be subject to the machlokes between **R' Meir** and the **Rabanan**. A Mishna says, **R' Meir** says, anything that has a chazaka of tumah cannot break that status until we can determine the whereabouts of that tumah. The **Rabanan** say that we must dig down until we reach rock or virgin soil, and if we don't find the tumah at that point, we can assume that it was removed.
 - Similarly, if the house was searched for chametz and none was found we can assume that it was removed from the house even according to **R' Meir**, because bedikas chametz is only D'Rabanan.
- If a mouse with chametz went into a house, and the homeowner did another bedika and found chametz (but doesn't know for sure if it is the chametz brought in by the mouse), the halacha would be subject to the machlokes between **Rebbi** and **R' Shimon ben Gamliel**. A Braisa says, if a grave was "lost" in a field, one who enters the field is tamei. If a grave is then found in the field, **Rebbi** says that we assume it is the grave that was lost and one who walks into the field does not become tamei. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, we can't assume it is the same grave and must continue to search the entire field.
 - Similarly, whether we assume that the chametz found is the chametz that was brought in would be subject to this machlokes as well.

- If one left over 9 pieces of chametz and later found 10 pieces, the halacha would be subject to the machlokes between **Rebbi** and the **Rabanan**. A Braisa says, if one put a maneh of ma'aser money into a box and later found 2 maneh in the box, **Rebbi** says we assume one maneh is ma'aser and the other is chullin. The **Rabanan** say we assume the ma'aser was removed and that both maneh are chullin.
 - Similarly, in this case the **Rabanan** would say we assume the 9 pieces that he put down are somewhere else and these 10 are new ones. Therefore, he will need to search for the 9 pieces of chametz. **Rebbi** would say that his original 9 are here and someone added one piece, and no bedika needs to be done.
- If one left over 10 pieces of chametz and later found 9, the halacha would be subject to the machlokes between **Rebbi** and the **Rabanan**. The end of the previous Braisa says, if one put 2 maneh of ma'aser money into a box and later found only one maneh in the box, **Rebbi** says we assume one maneh was taken and the remaining maneh is ma'aser. The **Rabanan** say we assume all the ma'aser was removed and the maneh found in the box is chullin.
 - Similarly, the **Rabanan** would say the 9 pieces found are not from those originally left and he therefore needs to find the missing 10 pieces of chametz, and **Rebbi** would say that they are and he only needs to find the one missing piece.
- If one placed chametz in one corner and later found the chametz in another corner, the halacha would be subject to the machlokes between **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** and the **Rabanan**. A Braisa says that if one finds keilim in his house missing or moved around, the **Rabanan** say we must assume that someone came in and moved it. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says we assume the owner himself moved it and forgot that he did so.
 - Similarly, the **Rabanan** would say that we have to assume that a mouse moved the chametz, and the chametz found may not be the same chametz that was left. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says that we assume the owner moved it, and therefore no new bedika would be necessary.
- **Rava** said, if a mouse entered a house with bread in its mouth, and the owner searched after it for chametz and found crumbs, he still must do another bedika, because it is not normal for a mouse to crumble the bread, therefore the bread must still be somewhere in the house.
- **Rava** said, if a child walked into the house with bread in its hand, and the owner searched after it for chametz and found crumbs, no further bedika is necessary, because a child typically does crumble the bread, and we can assume that this is the bread that the child brought in.
- **Q: Rava** asked, if a mouse walks into a house with bread in its mouth, and a mouse walks out with bread in its mouth, can we assume it is the same mouse and piece of bread or not? **Q2:** If we assume that it is the same mouse and bread, what if it was a white mouse that went into the house and a black mouse that came out of the house, can we say that the black mouse grabbed it from the white mouse or do we say that it is a different piece of bread? **Q3:** If we say that one mouse would not take from another mouse, what if a mouse went in with bread and a weasel came out with bread, do we say that the weasel surely took it from the mouse, or do we say that if it took the bread from the mouse it would have killed the mouse and came out with the mouse in its mouth as well? **Q4:** If we say that the mouse would have to be in the weasel's mouth as well, what if a mouse entered with bread and a weasel came out with the mouse and the bread in the weasel's mouth? Do we say that the bread was surely that of the mouse, or do we say that if it was from the mouse it would still be in the mouse's mouth, or do we say that the mouse dropped it out of fright and it truly is the bread of the mouse? **A: TEIKU.**
- **Q: Rava** asked, if there is bread on a beam near the ceiling, does one have to get a ladder to bring it down or is a simple bitul enough? Do we say that since it will not fall down there is no concern that he will come to eat it on Pesach, or do we say that since there is a chance that it can fall down, he must take it down before Pesach? **Q2:** If we say he must take it down because of the chance that it will fall, what if there is chametz down in a "bor", does he need to get a ladder to remove it? Do we say that since it will not come up on its own there is no concern that he will eat it, or do we say that he may go down there on Pesach, so he must get rid of it now? **Q3:** What if there is bread in the mouth of a snake, does one need to hire a professional to get the bread from the snake, or do we say that the **Rabanan** only required things that a person can do on his own, not things that he must spend money to hire others to do for him? **A: TEIKU**

MISHNA

- **R' Yehuda** says one must do a bedika on the night going into the 14th, the morning of the 14th, and at the time that he destroys the chametz. The **Chachomim** say, if one did not do a bedika at night, he does it in the morning of the 14th. If he didn't do it then either, he does it at the time of destroying the chametz. If he didn't do it then, he does it later on the 14th before nightfall.
- Whatever chametz one leaves over after the bedika should be left in a secure place so that he should not be required to do another bedika.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why does **R' Yehuda** says that 3 bedikos must be done? **A: R' Chisda** and **Rabbah bar R' Huna** explain, it is because of the 3 words used in the Torah to refer to the destruction of the chametz – “yeira'eh”, “yimatzei”, “tashbisu”.
 - **Q: R' Yosef** asked, a Braisa says that **R' Yehuda** says, if one was not bodek during these 3 times, he can no longer do a bedika. It seems that he only argues about a bedika after these times, but agrees that only one bedika needs to be done!? **A:** All agree that only one bedika needs to be done. **R' Yehuda** says one may not do a bedika once the issur chametz has begun, because we are concerned that if he is searching for chametz he may eat the chametz that he finds. The **Rabanan** say that we are not concerned for that and therefore a bedika may be done after the issur chametz has begun.