

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Cases that require a second bedikah (cont.)

An additional seven cases are presented that concern situations that may require a second bedikah:

One pile of chometz taken by a mouse into one of two houses.

A mouse took some chometz and we do not know whether he entered a previously searched house.

A mouse with chometz entered a searched house and the house was searched again and no chometz was found.

A mouse with chometz entered a searched house and the house was searched again and chometz was found.

One placed down nine pieces of chometz and found ten.

One placed down ten pieces of chometz and found nine.

One placed chometz in one corner and found chometz in a second corner.

### 2) Teachings and inquiries presented by Rava

Rava ruled that if one saw a mouse enter a house and then found crumbs a new bedikah is required since mice don't crumble their food. If the same case involved a child a new bedikah is not required since children crumble their food.

Rava presents a series of inquiries related to these rulings which are left unresolved.

Three more inquiries presented by Rava are cited that deal with the general topic of the extent of the obligation to remove chometz from one's home.

3) **MISHNAH:** A dispute is recorded regarding how many times a person must search for chometz. The Mishnah also rules that after the bedikah the chometz should be placed in a secure place to avoid having to do a second bedikah.

### 4) Clarifying R' Yehudah's opinion

After R' Yosef rejects R' Chisda's and Rabbah bar R' Huna's explanation of R' Yehudah's ruling in the Mishnah he explains that the dispute revolves around whether one who did not search for chometz should search even after the prohibition began. According to R' Yehudah, it is prohibited because of the fear one may eat the chometz whereas according to Rabanan it is not only permitted but obligatory.

The Gemara begins to question whether R' Yehudah is concerned with the possibility one may inadvertently eat chometz. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated

לעילוי נשמת

כ"ק אדמו"ר רב אברהם אייכענשטיין זצוק"ל

בן כ"ק אדמו"ר רב יהושע העשיל

אייכענשטיין זצוק"ל

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by Mr. and Mrs. George Saks  
 in memory of their uncle Samuel C. Gluck  
 Shmuel ben Zev z'l

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*Ten pieces were placed and nine were found. What to do?*  
 הניח עשר ומצא תשע היינו סיפא, דתניא הניח מאתים ומצא מנה—מנה מונח ומנה מוטל דברי רבי, וחכמים אומרים הכל חולין.

The Gemara describes a case where a person placed ten pieces of chometz around his house for the bedikah, but then he only found nine. What should he do? The Gemara teaches us that this hinges upon a מחלוקת between Rebbe and the Chachamim in a parallel case. A person left two packages of ma'aser money in a pile, and when he returned, he found only one pile. Rebbe says this pile is one of the two that was originally placed, while the Chachamim assume that this is a new package of money, which we can assume to be non-ma'aser, and both packages of ma'aser money are still at large. Similarly, Rebbe would hold that the nine pieces of chometz found are from the original ten, and only one remains to be found. Chachamim hold that since we did not find ten, even the nine are not from the original set. We must now set out to find the ten.

The Shulchan Aruch (O.C. 439:3) rules according to the Chachamim, and if only nine are found, it is necessary to search for ten more pieces. The Acharonim explain this ruling to be true in a case where the original ten were tied together, and the fact that we now find only nine tied together clearly indicates that this is not the grouping of ten which was originally placed. If the original ten were separate pieces, we can be lenient and now search only for one. We may rely upon this leniency particularly in a case where the ביטול was already done, or if there is still time to do the ביטול. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. How does Rava explain the dispute between R' Yehudah and R' Yosi concerning the case of two paths?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
2. Explain the dispute regarding one who put down ten pieces of bread and only found nine.  
 \_\_\_\_\_
3. Who or what is careful not to leave behind crumbs?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
4. According to Chachamim, why is it necessary to search for chometz after Peasch?  
 \_\_\_\_\_

# HALACHAH Highlight

## The obligation to search for chometz on Yom Tov and after Pesach

וחכמים אומרים לא בדק אור י"ד יבדוק ב"ד, לא בדק ב"ד יבדוק בתוך המועד לא בדק בתוך המועד לאחר המועד ...

And the Sages say; if one did not search on the night of the 14th he should search on the morning of the 14th. If one did not search on the morning of the 14th he should search during the moed (appointed time). If one did not search during the moed he should search after the moed.

The Rishonim differ over the understanding of the word 'moed' (appointed time). Rashi explains that it refers to the sixth hour which is the appointed time for the elimination of all chometz from the person's domain. Tosafos<sup>1</sup> and Ritva comment that Rashi explains this way because he maintains<sup>2</sup> that the requirement for the bedikah is in order that one will not transgress the Torah prohibitions of **בל ימצא** and **בל יראה** (no chometz should be seen or found in his possession). Therefore 'moed' cannot be referring to the festival of Pesach. This is because<sup>3</sup> the latter requirement of the Mishnah (to search after the moed) would be unnecessary since there are no prohibitions of **בל יראה** and **בל ימצא** after Pesach has finished.

Others<sup>4</sup> deduce another halachic implication from Rashi's explanation. Since the reason for the search is in order to find chometz and to eliminate it in order not to transgress the Torah prohibitions of **בל יראה** and **בל ימצא**, Rashi understands that the cases discussed in the Mishnayos are when a person has not performed **ביטול חמץ** (annulment of chometz). Had he made the declaration of **ביטול חמץ** he would no longer be liable for any chometz in his possession. Based on this, on Yom Tov itself, Rashi

would maintain that there would be no reason to do a bedikah. Even if he found chometz he could not eliminate it on Yom Tov and he would transgress the prohibitions of **בל יראה** and **בל ימצא**. According to Tosafos, however, (who maintains that the reason for the bedikah is to prevent a person from coming to eat chometz on Pesach) even on Yom Tov a person would be required to search for chometz in order to locate potential chometz and cover it with a vessel in order to prevent him from eating it<sup>5</sup>.

The Shulchan Aruch<sup>6</sup> follows the view of Tosafos that one is obligated to perform the bedikah even after the festival of Pesach. The Mishna Brura<sup>7</sup> cites a dispute regarding whether a person should search for chometz on Yom Tov (even if he did the bedikah but forgot to check a particular area e.g. his car, basement etc). There are those<sup>8</sup> that write that nowadays since people clean their houses thoroughly prior to Pesach one should not search for chometz on Yom Tov but only on Chol HaMoed.

The above-stated halachos are relevant for one someone who did a bedikah but forgot to check a particular area e.g. a car, basement etc.<sup>9</sup> ■

1. בסתד"ה ואם והריטב"א בסוגריים

2. לעיל ב' ע"א

3. וכן הוא ברמב"ם בפיהמ"ש וכן בהלכות חמץ ומצה פ"ג הלכה ה'

4. כ"כ כאן המהרש"א וע"ע בזה בב"ח ומ"א ופר"ח בריש סימן תל"ה.

וע"ע כאן בחדושי חתם סופר, וברש"י במנחות ס"ז ב'

5. כן סתימת השו"ע בסימן תמ"ו ס"א, וכ"כ שם המשנה ברורה בס"ק ו' ועע"ש

6. בסימן תל"ה

7. בסימן תל"ה ס"ק ג'. ועי"ש בשע"צ ס"ק ו' שלהכרעת הפר"ח דין זה תלוא במ"ב תמ"ומס"ק י' הנ"ל

8. כ"כ בפס"ת תל"ה בשם אורחות חיים. ויש להוסיף קצת סמך לדבריו עפ"י שעת"ת סוף סימן תל"ג ודו"ק וכ"ה למ"ב הנ"ל שנוהגין ביו"ט לכפות כלי ואפילו כשלא ביטל ולפי"ז גם אין בודקין ביו"ט כמפורש בשעמ"צ תל"ה ס"ק ו' וכנ"ל

9. במקום שמכניסו בו חמץ ולא מכרוהו במכירת חמץ ■

# STORIES off the Daf

## To exercise the utmost care

ומה שמשיר יניחנו בצינעא

This seemingly simple piece of advice that the mishnah gives also has a much deeper meaning to it. Bedikas Chometz by the Klausenberger Rebbe zt"l was one of the biggest nights of the year. The Rebbe would personally inspect all areas, getting down on his hands and knees

where necessary. After finally collecting the Chometz, he would spend an inordinate amount of time tying it up and hanging it in a place where no mice should reach it. He even appointed a shomer to guard it when he was not present. When questioned about the necessity of all these precautions, he related the following:

In the times of R' Mendel of Rimanov zt"l, a mouse once chewed off a part of the sack holding his shmurah wheat. Angry at the audacity of the

mouse, R' Mendel wished to banish all mice from Rimanov and its surroundings, only being appeased by the entreaties of the Malach appointed over all mice that the culprit would be punished. From this we see that mice represent a **כח** of tum'ah which doesn't want to let Jews fulfill the mitzvah of Pesach. That's why the **ירושלמי** refers to them as **רשעים** and why the Gemara constantly uses mice as the example of the animal that we worry will take the chometz. ■

