



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

### Pesachim Daf Tes

#### MISHNA

- We are not concerned that a weasel may have dragged chametz from one house (which had chametz) to another (in which a bedika was already done), or from one place (which did not yet get a bedika) to another (which already had a bedika) in a house. If we would be so concerned, we would also have to be concerned that this would take place from the house of one chatzer to another, and from the house of one city to the house of another city. There would be no end to that concern.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** We are not concerned that maybe a weasel dragged over chametz. However, it would seem from the Mishna that if we saw a weasel drag chametz over, we would require another bedika. Why don't we assume that the weasel ate all the chametz? We find that a Mishna says, although we are concerned that goyim bury their stillborn babies (which give off tumah) in their houses, if pigs and weasels have access to those areas, we can assume the stillborn is gone (because the animals eat it). We should say the same thing regarding the chametz as well!? **A: R' Zeira** said, weasels will not leave over anything when they eat meat, but leave over when they eat bread. That is why a bedika is required. **A2: Rava** said, in the case of the stillborn, we are not certain a stillborn was even buried there. Therefore, since there is also the possibility that it was eaten, we can assume that it is not there. However, when we are certain that the weasel brought in chametz, we can't simply assume that it was eaten, because a "possibility" can't change the status of something that was certain.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that if a "chaver" dies and leaves over a storehouse of produce, the produce is considered to be ready to eat (i.e. all ma'aser is assumed to have been given). Now, the produce had a definite status of "tevel", and yet, the *possibility* that the chaver gave ma'aser is enough to remove that definite status!? **A:** We say like **R' Chanina Choza'ah**, that a chaver has *certainly* given ma'aser from anything in his possession. Therefore, it is a certainty that is changing the original, certain status. **A2:** It is only a possibility that it was tevel, because **R' Oshaya** says that a person can bring his produce into his house before the threshing and in that way circumvent the ma'aser obligation. Based on that, it is only a *possibility* that the produce is tevel, and therefore, the possibility that he gave ma'aser can change the status of the possible tevel.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, **R' Yehuda** said, there was a story where a woman threw a stillborn into a ditch, and a Kohen bent over the ditch (possibly making himself an "ohel" over the stillborn) to determine if the stillborn was a boy or a girl (because there are different halachos of tumah and tahara depending on the gender of the child). Although the Kohen should have become tamei by doing so, the **Chachomim** said he was tahor, because there were weasels in that ditch (and we assume that the stillborn was dragged away before the Kohen bent over the ditch). In this case the stillborn was *definitely* thrown into the ditch, and yet, the **Chachomim** said that the Kohen is tahor because of the *possibility* that the stillborn was dragged away!? **A:** The story was that the woman threw an afterbirth into the ditch, but it was not certain whether it had the status of a child (in which case it would give off tumah) or not. Therefore, it never had the status of being certainly tamei. **A2:** It was certainly tamei, but it is also a certainty that the weasel dragged it away, because it does so immediately. One certainty can change the status of another certainty.
    - **Q:** The Braisa says the kohen bent over to see whether it was a boy or a girl. That means it surely developed enough to have the status of a child!? **A:** The

Braisa means that the Kohen bent over to see whether the thing thrown in had the status of a child, and if it did, to see whether it was a male or a female.

- **Q:** From the Mishna it seems that we are not concerned that maybe a weasel dragged the chametz to another place. However, the next Mishna says, whatever chametz one wants to leave over after the bedika, he should be sure to leave it in a secure place, so that he does not have to do another bedika. Presumably this means, that if the chametz is not left in a secure place we must be concerned that it will get dragged by a weasel to another area!? **A: Abaye** said, our Mishna is discussing on the 13<sup>th</sup> of Nisson. At that time the weasel does not notice any shortage of bread and therefore will not store any. Whatever it takes, it eats completely. The next Mishna is discussing the 14<sup>th</sup> of Nisson. At that time the weasel knows that there will not be much bread, and it therefore stores some of the bread that it takes.
  - **Q: Rava** asks, is the weasel a prophet that it knows that there will be no bread on the 14<sup>th</sup>? **A: Rava** said, the reason the chametz left over on the 14<sup>th</sup> must be kept in a safe place is because we don't want a weasel to come in front of us and drag some away, which would require another bedika. However, we are not concerned that a weasel dragged something away unless we actually see it happen.
  - **A: R' Mari** said, the reason the chametz must be put in a safe place is so that he should not put away 10 pieces of bread and come back later to find only 9 pieces. In that case we would certainly have to be concerned that a piece was dragged away by a weasel.
- If one had 9 piles of matzah and one pile of chametz, and a mouse took a piece from one of the piles and brought it into a house that was already checked for chametz (we don't know from which pile the mouse took it), the halacha would be the same as the case when there are 9 kosher butcher shops and one non-kosher, and one took a piece of meat from one of them, but doesn't know from which store he took the meat. In that case the halacha is that the meat is assur because of the principle that "kol kavua k'mechtza ahl mechtza dami". Therefore, in the case of the mouse, the house would have to be checked again.
  - If there was a piece separated from the piles and a mouse took that piece into a house that was already checked for chametz, and we don't know which pile that piece came from, that would be the same halacha as the case of the 10 butcher shops, above, where a piece of meat was found outside of the stores. In that case the halacha is that the meat is mutar, because we follow the majority based on the principle of "kol d'parish m'rubah parish". Therefore, in this case of the mouse, the house would not have to be checked again.
- If there are 2 piles – one of matzah and one of chametz – which are in front of 2 houses – one which was already checked for chametz and one which had not yet been checked – and 2 mice came, one taking a piece from one pile and going into one of the houses and the other taking a piece from the other pile and going into the other house, without us knowing where the contents of each pile ended up, that would be the same halacha as the case of "2 boxes". A Braisa says, if there are 2 large boxes of produce – one of chullin and one of terumah – and in front of them are 2 containers of produce – one of chullin and one of terumah – and one container fell into one box, and the other container fell into the other box, the box of chullin produce remains mutar, because we say that the chullin fell into the chullin and the terumah fell into the terumah. Here too, we would say that the mouse with the chametz went into the house that was not yet checked, and the mouse with the matzah went into the house that was already checked.
  - **Q:** Maybe we are only lenient in this way by Terumah D'Rabanan (after the destruction of the Beis Hamikdash). However, regarding chametz, which is a D'Oraisa, maybe we are machmir!? **A:** Bedikas chametz is only D'Rabanan.