

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

- 1. If there were two piles, one of *matzah* and one of *chametz*, and in front of the piles were two houses, one searched for *chametz* and one not searched, and two mice came, one taking a piece of *matzah* and one *chametz*, and we do not know which house the mice entered, we assume the *chametz* was brought into the unsearched house.**

If there were two piles, one pile of *matzah* and one pile of *chametz*, and in front of the two piles were two houses, one house that was searched for *chametz* and one house that was not searched for *chametz*, and two mice came, one taking a piece of *matzah* and one *chametz*, and we do not know which house the mice entered, this is similar to a case of two boxes, one that has *chullin*, non-sacred produce inside and the other contains *terumah*. In front of those two boxes are two *se’ah* (volume measure between two and three gallons) boxes of produce, and one *se’ah* box contains *chullin* and one box contains *terumah*. The contents of the *se’ah* boxes fell into the other two boxes, and we know that each of the *se’ah* boxes fell into a different box, but we do not know which box each *se’ah* box fell into. We rule that the *chullin* is permitted before this occurred, as assume that the *chullin* produce fell into *chullin* and *terumah* fell into *terumah*. In the same vein, we assume that the *chametz* was brought into the unsearched house and that the *matzah* was brought into the house that was searched, and the house that was searched is not required to be searched again. (9b)

- 2. Searching for *chametz* is only required by rabbinical law.**

The *Gemora* wonders why we compare the case of *terumah* to the case of *chametz*, if the requirement to separate *terumah* nowadays is only a rabbinical requirement, whereas *chametz* is biblically prohibited. The *Gemora* answers that although the prohibition of retaining *chametz* on Pesach is biblical, the requirement to search for *chametz* prior to Pesach is of a rabbinic nature, because biblically it is sufficient for one to merely nullify the *chametz*. For this reason we allow the assumption that the *chametz* was brought by the mouse into the house that was not yet searched for *chametz*. (9b -10a)

- 3. If there was a pile of *chametz* and there were two searched houses in front of it, if a mouse came and took some *chametz*, and we do not know which house the mouse entered, the *halachah* regarding the requirement to search for *chametz* will depend on how the homeowners present their inquiry.**

If there was one pile of *chametz* and there were two searched houses in front of the pile, if a mouse came and took some *chametz*, and we do not know which house the mouse entered, this is similar to the case where there are two paths, one path is *tamei* because it has a grave and the other path is *tahor*. If a person walked down one of the paths and he then came into contact with food that was *tahor*, and then another person walked down the other path and the second person came into contact with other food that is *tahor*, there is a dispute regarding both

people's status. Rabbi Yehudah maintains that if each person queried regarding their status separately, then they are both rendered *tahor*. If, however, they queried regarding their status simultaneously, then they are both *tamei*. Rabbi Yosi disagrees and maintains that however they posed their query they will both be *tamei*. The *Gemora* qualifies this dispute as follows: if both people queried regarding their status simultaneously, then everyone agrees that they are both *tamei*. If they queried separately, then everyone agrees that they are both *tahor*. The only case where Rabbi Yehudah and Rabbi Yosi disagree is regarding a case where one person queried regarding the status of himself and his friend. Rabbi Yosi maintains that this akin to their both querying together, and since the Chacham has to render a ruling on both people simultaneously, he cannot declare both of them to be *tahor*. Rabbi Yehudah, however, maintains that since only one person is posing the query, the Chacham can rule that he is *tahor* and not rule regarding the other person. The one posing the query can assume on his own that his friend is *tahor*. If they both came together, however, the Chacham would not be able to rule for both of them that they are both *tahor*. In the same vein, with regard to *chametz*, if each homeowner queries separately, we can rule that both of them are not required to make a new search for *chametz*. If they query simultaneously, however, then they would both be required to search their house for *chametz* again. Regarding a case where one queries for himself and his friend, then the *halachah* would be the subject of the debate between Rabbi Yehudah and Rabbi Yosi. (10a)

- 4. If there was one pile of *chametz* in a courtyard and a mouse took a piece and ran off and we do not know if the mouse entered a house that was previously searched for *chametz*, everyone agrees that the house does not need to be searched again.**

If there was one pile of *chametz* in a courtyard and a mouse took a piece and ran off to a different area of the

courtyard and we do not know if the mouse entered a house that was previously searched for *chametz*, this is similar to a case where one enters open fields during the rainy season when one is forbidden to walk through other people's fields, and there is a grave in one of the fields. If one said, "I entered that area but I am uncertain if I entered that specific field," Rabbi Eliezer maintains that he is *tahor* and the Chachamim maintain that he is *tamei*. Rabbi Eliezer posits that a doubt regarding entering an area is rendered *tahor* even in a private domain and a doubt regarding coming into contact with *tumah* is rendered *tamei*. In this case there is an uncertainty whether the person even entered the field that contains that grave, so Rabbi Eliezer rules that he is *tahor*. This is because Rabbi Eliezer maintains that there are two doubts here. One doubt is if the person entered the field in question, and even if he entered that field, did he pass over the grave. The Chachamim, however, maintain that there is only one doubt, and that is whether the person who entered the area of the fields passed over the graves or not. Similarly, regarding the case where there is a doubt whether the mouse entered the house that was searched with *chametz* or not, Rabbi Eliezer would rule leniently, and even the Chachamim would agree that since the requirement to search for *chametz* is rabbinical, the houses are considered distinct from the courtyard where the mouse took the *chametz* from. (10a)

- 5. If a mouse entered into a searched house with *chametz*, and the owner searched his house and did not find *chametz*, everyone would agree that the house does not need to be searched again.**

If a mouse entered into a searched house with *chametz*, and the owner searched his house and did not find *chametz*, we can rule on this case based on a dispute between Rabbi Meir and the Chachamim. The case concerns a pile of stones that has in it a part of a corpse and those stone become mixed up with two other piles of stones that are *tahor*. The *halachah* is that if one pile of stones is searched and no *tumah* is found, that pile is *tahor*

and the other two piles are *tamei*. If one searches a second pile, those two are *tahor* and the third pile is considered *tamei*. If the third pile is searched and there is no *tumah* discovered, Rabbi Meir maintains that they are all considered to be *tamei*. Rabbi Meir maintains that anything that we assume is in a state of *tumah* will always be assumed to be in a state of *tumah*, until one ascertains where that *tumah* is. The Chachamim, however, maintain that one should search until he reaches a rock or untilled ground, and if he cannot find *tumah*, then we assume the *tumah* no longer exists, and a raven or a mouse came and removed the corpse. Regarding *chametz*, since searching for *chametz* is only of a rabbinic nature, even Rabbi Meir would agree that the house does not need to be searched again. (10a)

6. There is a dispute regarding a case where the mouse entered a searched house with *chametz* and the owner searched his house for *chametz* and found some *chametz*, but he does not know if it is the same *chametz* that the mouse brought in.

If a mouse entered a searched house with *chametz* and the owner searched his house for *chametz* and found some *chametz*, but he does not know if it is the same *chametz* that the mouse brought in, the *halachah* would be based on a dispute between Rabbi and Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel. We learn that a field where a grave has been lost, i.e. It was known that there was a grave here but its whereabouts are unknown, one who enters the field is *tamei*. If the grave is found later, Rebbe maintains that one who enters any other area of the field is *tahor*, because we say that the grave that was lost is the grave that was discovered. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, however, maintains that the whole field must be searched and then we can declare that the field does not contain *tumah*. In the same vein, regarding the case of *chametz* Rebbe would maintain that the *chametz* that was found is the same *chametz* that the mouse brought into the house. Rabban

Shimon ben Gamliel, however, would maintain that one must search the whole house. (10a)

7. There is a dispute regarding one who places nine pieces of *chametz* and finds ten.

If one placed nine pieces of *chametz* and found ten, the *halachah* would be based on the dispute between Rebbe and the Chachamim. We learn that if one placed a *manah* (one hundred zuz) of *ma'aser sheini* in a box and later he discovered two *manah* in the box, and he does not remember placing the additional *manah* there, Rebbe maintains that we assume that there is *chullin* and *ma'aser sheini* money mixed together, so he should take other coins that have the value of a *manah* and he should say, "wherever the *ma'aser sheini* money is, their *maser sheini* status should be transferred to these coins." The coins that were in doubt are no longer sacred coins and the newly designated coins are taken to Jerusalem to be used for food purchases. The Chachamim, however, maintain that we assume that all the money in the box is *chullin*. This is because people do not usually put their *ma'aser sheini* money with regular money, so we assume that he removed the original *manah* of *ma'aser sheini* and he then replaced it with two regular *manahs* and then he did not recall what he had done. Similarly, regarding the *chametz*, the Chachamim would maintain that one must search the whole house again because then we are concerned that the ten pieces that were found are a new bundle of *chametz* that just entered the house and the original nine pieces are still elsewhere in the house. Rebbe, however would maintain that we assume that these are the nine original pieces and one new piece was added on, so a new search of the house would not be required. (10a)

8. There is a dispute regarding one who places ten pieces of *chametz* and finds nine.

If one places ten pieces of *chametz* and only finds nine, the *halachah* will be based on a dispute between Rebbe and the Chachamim regarding a case where one placed two *manah* of *ma'aser sheini* money in a box, and then he only discovered one *manah* there. Rebbe maintains that we assume that a *manah* of the original two still is in the box and the other *manah* was taken. The Chachamim, however, maintain that all the money in the box is assumed to be *chullin* because people do not usually separate their *ma'aser sheini* money before taking it with them to Jerusalem. We therefore assume that if only one *manah* was found in the box, that he removed the two *manah* of *ma'aser sheini* and placed them elsewhere, then placed a regular *manah* in the box, and then he forgot what he did. Similarly, Rebbe would maintain that one is required to search the house for the one missing piece, whereas the Chachamim would maintain that he must search the house for all ten pieces. (10a)

9. There is a dispute regarding one who places *chametz* in one corner of the house and then he finds the *chametz* in another corner of the house.

If one places *chametz* in one corner of the house and then he finds the *chametz* in another corner of the house, the *halachah* will be based on the dispute between Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel and the Chachamim regarding the case of an ax that was lost in a house, where the Chachamim maintain that the house is *tamei*, because we say that one who was *tamei* entered the house and took the ax and at the same time he touched the other utensils in the house. If the owner left the ax in one corner and found the ax in another corner, the house is *tamei* because we say that one who was *tamei* entered the house and took the ax from one corner and placed the ax in another corner. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, however, maintains that the house is *tahor* in both cases, because we say that the owner lent his ax to someone else and forgot what he had done, or that he took the ax from one corner and placed it in another corner and forgot. In a similar vein, regarding *chametz* we say that according to Rabban

Shimon ben Gamliel, if one left *chametz* in one corner and then found the *chametz* in another corner we assume that the owner himself moved the *chametz* and forgot what he had done. The house would not have to be searched again. The Chachamim however, do not maintain that we can assume that the owner moved his items and then forgot. We would thus need to be concerned that a mouse entered the house and took the *chametz* from the corner where it was left and moved it elsewhere, and the house would need to be searched again. (10b)

10. If a mouse enters the house with a loaf of bread in its mouth and the owner entered after the mouse and found crumbs on the floor, a new search is now required.

Rava said: If a mouse enters the house with a loaf of bread in its mouth and the owner entered after the mouse and found crumbs on the floor, a new search is now required. The reason for this ruling is that it is not common for a mouse to crumble food. We therefore do not assume that the crumbs stem from the loaf that the mouse brought in. We maintain that the mouse took its loaf to a different area of the house and the crumbs that were discovered here were already there from before.

And Rava said: If a child entered with a loaf of bread in his hand and the owner followed the child and discovered crumbs on the floor, a new search for *chametz* is not necessary because a child is wont to crumble food. We can thus assume that the crumbs that were found are from the loaf that the child was holding. (10b)

Rava asked: What if a mouse enters with a loaf in its mouth, and a mouse goes out with a loaf in its mouth: do we say, the same which went in went out; or perhaps it is a different one? Should you answer, the same which went in went out, — what if a white mouse entered with a loaf in its mouth, and a black mouse went out with a loaf in its mouth? Now this is certainly a different one; or perhaps it

did indeed seize it from the other? And should you say, mice do not seize from each other, — what if a mouse enters with a loaf in its mouth and a weasel goes out with a loaf in its mouth? Now the weasel certainly does take from a mouse; or perhaps it is a different one, for had it snatched it from the mouse, the mouse would have [now] been found in its mouth? And should you say, had it snatched it from the mouse, the mouse would have been found in its mouth, what if a mouse enters with a loaf in its mouth, and then a weasel comes out with a loaf and a mouse in the weasel's mouth? Here it is certainly the same; or perhaps, if it were the same, the loaf should indeed have been found in the mouse's mouth; or perhaps it fell out [of the mouse's mouth] on account of [its] terror, and it [the weasel] took it? The question stands over. (10b)

Rava asked: If there is a loaf on the top rafters, need he [take] a ladder to fetch it down or not? Do we say, our Rabbis did not put him to all this trouble, [for] since it cannot descend of its own accord he will not come to eat it; or perhaps it may fall down and he will come to eat it? Now should you say, it may fall down and he will come to eat it, — if there is a loaf in a pit, does he need a ladder to fetch it up or not? Here it will certainly not happen that it will ascend of its own accord; or perhaps he may happen to go down to perform his requirements and come to eat it? Should you say that he may happen to go down for his purposes and come to eat it, — if a loaf is in a snake's mouth, does he need a snake-charmer to take it out or does he not need [one]? [Do we say,] our Rabbis put him to personal trouble, but they did not put him to trouble with his money; or perhaps there is no difference? The questions stand over. (10b)

11. Rabbi Yehudah maintains that we search for *chametz* three times and the Chachamim dispute this.

MISHNAH: Rabbi Yehudah says that we search for *chametz* on the night of the fourteenth of Nissan, on the morning of the fourteenth, and at the time when the *chametz* is

removed, which is during the sixth hour on the fourteenth. The Chachamim, however, maintain that if one did not search for *chametz* on the night of the fourteenth, he should search for *chametz* on the morning of the fourteenth. If he did not search on the morning of the fourteenth, he should search during the appointed time that one removes *chametz*, which is during the sixth hour of the fourteenth. If he did not search during that appointed time, he should search after the appointed time until dark. (10b)

12. Rabbi Yehudah does not allow one to search for *chametz* after the *chametz* prohibition goes into effect because he may find *chametz* and eat it.

Rav Chisda and Rabbah bar Rav Huna say that the reason why Rabbi Yehudah requires three searches of *chametz* is because they correspond to the three terms that the Torah uses regarding removing *chametz* from one's possession. It is said: *chametz shall not be seen to you and leaven shall not be seen to you*. It is also said: *for a seven-day period leaven shall not be found in your homes*. It is further said: *but on the first day you shall eliminate leaven from your homes*. These three terms teach us that if one did not discover *chametz* during the first search, he will discover *chametz* during the second or third search. This explanation is challenged by Rav Yosef, however, from a *braisa* that records Rabbi Yehudah's own statement that if one did not search for *chametz* in those three times, he does not search any more, and this indicates that Rabbi Yehudah only disagrees with the Chachamim regarding searching after the time of removing the *chametz*, but Rabbi Yehudah agrees with the Chachamim regarding the number of searches that are required.

Mar Zutra taught this (challenge) as follows: Rav Yosef asked that Rabbi Yehudah said that if one did not search for *chametz* in any one of those three times, he does not search any more. Evidently, they disagree regarding "one does not search any more"!?



The *Gemora* therefore explains that Rabbi Yehudah agrees with the Chachamim that only one search for *chametz* is required, and the dispute between Rabbi Yehudah and the Chachamim is that Rabbi Yehudah maintains one can only search for *chametz* while *chametz* is permitted, but once *chametz* is prohibited, one cannot search for *chametz*, because if he were to find *chametz*, he may come to eat it. The Chachamim, however, maintain that if one did not search for *chametz* before the *chametz* was prohibited, he must still search for *chametz* afterwards. This ruling only applies on the fourteenth of Nissan, when *chametz* is forbidden, but one is not liable the penalty of *kares*, excision. Regarding Pesach itself, however, the Chachamim agree that one cannot search for *chametz*, because on Pesach one is liable *kares* if he were to eat *chametz*. (10b)

DAILY MASHAL

Chametz and Matzah in a Deeper Sense

The *Gemora* discusses situations where one is required to search his house for *chametz* a second time.

The sefarim write that the word *matzah* is in numerical value 135, and this is equivalent to the word *kalah* which means light. This alludes to the idea that one should not take “lightly” the mitzvah of eating *matzah*.

According to the Arizal, one who is careful to not own even a crumb of *chametz* on Pesach is guaranteed that he will not sin the whole year. Great Torah scholars and pious ones would be meticulous to eat *matzah* until after Chanukah, as they wished to avoid the prohibition of eating

chametz that had been owned by a Jew on Pesach. The Arizal said that the difference between *matzah* and *chametz* is only a small line that distinguishes the letter *ches* in the word *chametz* and the letter *hey* in the word

matzah. This alludes to the *halachah* that even a minute amount of *chametz* is prohibited on Pesach.

The Radvaz said that of all prohibitions in the Torah, only *chametz* (and idolatry) is forbidden even in a minute amount, and this is because *chametz* alludes to the Evil Inclination, which one is forbidden to be tempted by even in the minutest amount.

Rabbi Shemelke of Nikolsburg said that there is an Evil Inclination for food and drink, and this is called *chametz*. There is also an Evil Inclination for anger and slander, which one cannot consume, and this is called *seor*, leaven, which causes the dough to rise. Then there is the Evil Inclination of humility, which is the real Evil Inclination, *chametz* that is visible, and one must dispose of all the inclinations so he does not see them or find them. The difference between the simple meaning of *chametz* and the exegesis provided throughout the generations is that as long as Pharaoh was just Pharaoh and Egypt was just Egypt, they were drowned in the sea and they were destroyed forever. Once the Zohar revealed that Pharaoh alludes to the Evil Inclination and Egypt is the Evil Inclination's helpers, then we can no longer absolve ourselves from them. When *chametz* is *chametz*, it can be burned easily, but the Evil Inclination is not so easy to be rid of.