Laws of Chametz and Matzah, Chapter 2 - Elimination and Search for Chametz (Auto Translated)

English

Auto Translated

Shiur Overview

Summary of the Learning Session: Laws of Chametz and Matzah – Rambam

---

A. Nullification of Chametz – "And Consider It as Dust"

Language of the Rambam: "And consider it as dust, and place in his heart that there is no chametz in his possession at all, and that all chametz in his possession is like dust, and is worth nothing."

Simple Meaning: The nullification of chametz consists of thinking that the chametz is like dust, and holding in one's heart that one has no chametz at all.

Novel Points:

1. **The Metaphor of "Like Dust":** What does the Rambam mean by "like dust"? The joke is mentioned (from Minhag Sofrim) that people say "dust is not chametz, but chametz is dust" – but the true meaning is the opposite: one must make chametz like dust. The application: everyone knows there is dust in their house, but no one cares about the dust. That's how one should relate to chametz – one may know it's there, but one doesn't reckon with it at all.

2. **"Like Dust" – Not Ownerless, Rather Mindset:** The reason for "like dust" is **not** like Tosafot who understands it as ownerless, rather it means that he doesn't reckon with the chametz – he has in his mind that it's not his, it doesn't exist for him. This is "and place in his heart that he has no chametz."

3. **Tashbitu and Mindset:** If the reason for the commandment of "tashbitu" (from the Torah) is that your mind shouldn't be involved in business with chametz, then if someone goes into a business and his mind is involved in business – how is this tashbitu? The answer: "Tashbitu" essentially has to do with **mindset** – everything in the human world revolves around mindset. As the verse says: "For the earth shall be full of the knowledge of God as the waters cover the sea."

B. Searching for Chametz from Rabbinic Law – The Obligation, the Time, and Candlelight

Language of the Rambam: From rabbinic law there is a commandment to search for chametz in hiding places and to check and remove it everywhere, and this must be at night, on the evening of the fourteenth, because at night everyone is found in their homes, and candlelight is good for searching.

Simple Meaning: The Sages enacted that one should actively search for chametz, and this must be on the night of the 14th of Nissan, because then one is at home and a candle is good for checking.

Novel Points:

1. **Three Elements of the Rabbinic Enactment:** (a) One should do actual work – searching and removing, not just nullification in the heart; (b) It must be at a specific time – the evening of the 14th; (c) It must be at night specifically.

2. **Candlelight is Good for Searching – A Deeper Meaning:** The advantage of a candle at night is not just because one sees – during the day one also sees. The novelty is that a candle (like a flashlight) has an **extra power** to illuminate specific corners and places that during the day with natural light one actually **doesn't see as well**. The light is **focused** – it shines into holes and cracks, which the sun and moon cannot do because they are "too big."

3. **Moon, Sun, Torch – Why Not: "One does not search by moonlight, by sunlight, or by torchlight, but only by candlelight"** – the verse "The candle of God is the soul of man" is mentioned. The advantage of a candle is that it can enter into holes and cracks, while the sun and moon cannot penetrate into narrow places.

4. **Sunlight After the Fact:** Rava's position – **"Even though its light is great, one does not search by sunlight."** The Yerushalmi says **"It shows disrespect to the sun in the upper story"** – there is an aspect of dishonor, not just a practical matter. It is discussed whether after the fact one can search during the day – Shmuel's position is mentioned that there are certain after-the-fact situations, such as when one didn't search at night.

C. Not Learning Before Searching for Chametz

Language of the Rambam: "A person is obligated to review his studies with concentration, lest he be drawn after his learning and be prevented from searching at its proper time."

Simple Meaning: One may not begin learning before searching for chametz, because one can get caught up and miss the time.

Novel Points:

1. **Rabbeinu Manoach's Interpretation:** Even **reading Scripture** (not just in-depth study) is forbidden before searching, because even when reading one gets caught up. This is a novelty – one would have thought that only in-depth study is a problem, but Rabbeinu Manoach says that even simple reading can cause one to forget.

2. **The Connection to Candlelight:** The prohibition to learn before searching has to do with the candle. In those times, when a person came home from work and lit a candle, his first instinct was to sit and learn by the candle. The Sages come and say: The candle of the night of the 14th you should use for searching for chametz, not for study.

3. **Rabbeinu Yonah's Explanation: "The Sages required the Rabbis to use candlelight at the time of**

evening" – and the reason is **"Great is study that one sacrifices oneself for the commandment"** – a great scholar can sacrifice himself for his study and forget the commandment.

4. **Simple Jews Don't Have This Problem:** The entire concern is only for scholars – simple Jews who don't study in depth don't have the concern that they will get caught up.

5. **[Digression: Searching for Chametz as Torah Study]:** The process of searching for chametz itself is also a type of Torah study – one deals with laws, one asks questions (what is kitniyot? what are fruits?), one states practical halachic rulings.

D. Searching Up to Where His Hand Reaches – Holes and Cracks

Language of the Rambam: "Therefore one must search the holes and cracks up to where his hand reaches."

Simple Meaning: One must search in holes and cracks up to where the hand reaches.

Novel Points:

1. **Why Only Up to Where His Hand Reaches?** Seemingly this is simple – if one cannot reach, one cannot search. The novelty: Chametz that lies deeper than where the hand reaches is in any case not chametz that one can reach – it's as if it doesn't exist for the person.

2. **Holes and Cracks – Not a Space:** "Holes and cracks" are not proper places/spaces – they are holes, not a piece of space where one normally brings in chametz. Therefore there is a question why one must search there at all.

E. A Place Where His Hand Does Not Reach – Nullification in His Heart

Simple Meaning: A place where one cannot reach with the hand, one must nullify in one's heart.

Novel Points:

1. **The Binyan Olam's Question:** If a place where his hand does not reach doesn't require searching (as stated in a Mishnah), why should one include this in chametz? One shouldn't have responsibility for it – nullification in the heart is not a leniency regarding searching for chametz, but a separate obligation.

2. **The Definition of the Obligation to Search for Chametz:** If one knows a place where there is chametz, one should not rely on nullification in the heart – one must go search. If one knows a place where there **might be** chametz, one must also search. But if not, one goes back to nullification in the heart. The question remains: What is the novelty regarding a place where his hand does not reach, if one is certain there is nothing there? Why is one not fulfilled with the general nullification that one makes on all chametz?

F. A Courtyard That Does Not Require Searching

Language of the Rambam: A courtyard that does not require searching, because birds are commonly found there and eat all chametz that falls – but one must make sure not to bring chametz there, because if one brings it in one will forget to remove it.

Simple Meaning: A yard where birds eat the chametz doesn't require searching, but one must make sure not to bring in new chametz.

G. Places Where One Does Not Bring In Chametz – List from the Mishnah

Language of the Mishnah: Upper rooms and lower rooms, the roof, the balcony, cattle pen, chicken coops, slaughterhouses, wine and oil storehouses, salt house, snow house, large fish house, wood house, olive press house.

Simple Meaning: These are places where one doesn't usually bring in chametz, and therefore they don't require searching.

Novel Points:

1. **Why Do We Need the List?** We already have the general rules (places where one brings in/doesn't bring in). The answer: The list comes to teach that one shouldn't think that only where one knows **for certain** that one brought in chametz must one search. On the contrary – one is only **exempt** when one knows **for certain** that one **did not** bring in. The list gives examples of places where one can be certain that not.

2. **Reasoning from the Gemara for Each Place:**

- **Chicken coops** – According to the Rabbis, a place where animals come, one can reckon that they will do their job (eat the chametz).

- **Wine and oil storehouses** – It is not customary to place bread there.

- **Large fish** – One prepares them **before** the meal (not in the middle), therefore one doesn't go there with bread. **Small fish** – On the contrary, one goes to take them in the middle of the meal, but this has no connection to chametz.

3. **[Digression – A Jew's Life:]** A Jew's house had a lower level, upper level, balcony, cattle pen, fish house, storehouses – not a small apartment.

H. Weasel – "Too Broad"

Question: If weasels (mice) drag chametz from one place to another, doesn't the entire world become a "place where one brings in chametz"? This is "too broad" – when a concern is too wide, it falls through.

Dispute Between Rashi and Ramban:

- **Rashi** learns: "Too broad" speaks **during** or **after** the search. The question is: After one has already searched, perhaps a weasel will come and drag chametz to a place that is already searched. To this one says: You will have to turn around all night, it will never end – this is the "too broad".

- **Ramban** learns: The question is about **a place where one brings in chametz** itself – the novelty is that not all places where one doesn't bring in chametz become places where one brings in chametz because of weasels. According to this it's difficult to understand the "too broad" – one can learn the entire thing from the clear sugya of biblical doubt.

Novelty Regarding Biblical Doubt: "Biblical doubt" doesn't mean that perhaps once a dog flew in with a challah – that doesn't create a doubt. Biblical doubt means an **equal doubt**. A mere concern that something **can** happen is not a

doubt – nothing begins. The entire matter of searching in places where one doesn't bring in is a rabbinic law, not from the Torah.

Another Novelty: The Rambam learns regarding searching the law of **fasting** (guards) – but this is not carried out.

I. After Searching – Concern That One Left Over / Mice Dragged Away

The matter of **requiring a second search** – if after the search there is a concern that mice dragged away chametz. **Tosafot** writes "unless mice definitely distributed it" – once one dragged around there, there is a fear that one left it over.

J. Witchcraft in Searching for Chametz

Novelty: The Rambam brings the law of **"lest the gentile say I performed witchcraft on him"** – that one should not search in a gentile's house because of witchcraft. Perhaps the Rambam held that this is only a law that is relevant when the gentile actually fears witchcraft – in the Rambam's times perhaps the gentiles didn't have such fear, but in the time of the Sages yes.

K. A Mouse That Entered a Searched House – Like a Mouse in Its Mouth, Crumbs

A Mouse That Took Chametz — Like a Mouse in Its Mouth

Novelty: A baby (small child) is like a mouse in his hand, not in his mouth — he is born and doesn't carry in his mouth. But a mouse is like a mouse in its mouth, because it carries it simply to transport (it drags it). The difference between a baby and a mouse is that with a baby it means "in his hand" — he has the privilege to hold things, because it's a light burden.

The Rema rules that a mouse that is more involved with children/crumbs, one must follow carefully — that is, one must pay attention to how one eats. **The Magen Avraham** says that one must make sure there are enough crumbs from the entire thing.

Entered a Searched House — If He Finds Crumbs

The Law: If a mouse entered a searched house (a house that was already searched), and one finds crumbs — one doesn't need to search. **Crumbs** is a hint that it may also contain chametz, but it's not enough to obligate a new search.

L. Two Piles — One Chametz and One Matzah, and a Mouse Came and Took

Language of the Rambam: If there are two piles, one of matzah and one of chametz, and a mouse took and one doesn't know whether it took chametz or matzah, and it entered a searched house — **one must search**, because **anything fixed is like half and half**.

Novelty — Where is the "Fixed"? The question is not on the house (where it entered), but on the **place from where it took** — that is, the piles are the fixed place. Because the rule of "fixed" always goes according to where one took it from. Therefore, even though there is a majority of matzah (two piles of matzah against one of chametz), one views it as half and half, because fixed is like half and half.

Hasagat HaRaavad — Requires Searching or Requires Nullification?

The Raavad disputes the Rambam. The Rambam says **"requires searching"**, but the Raavad says **"requires nullification"**. It is asked: Nullification is a matter from the Torah, and searching is rabbinic — both positions are rabbinic, what is the difference?

The Difference Between Searching and Removal: There are two separate things: (1) One should search places where one knows there is chametz and not rely on nullification — this is **removal**; (2) Even where one doesn't know there is chametz, one must search for it — this is **searching**. Tosafot makes this distinction regularly. The Ramban is mentioned: Even if there were no nullification from the Torah, there would be a commandment of removal. The Divrei Yosef says there are two things as the Ramban says.

An Approach: One can learn that **a place where one brought in chametz** has a **presumption of chametz**, and the presumption says that it's not nullified by majority from the Torah, therefore you must search in order to remove the presumption of chametz. (This is recognized as a new reasoning.)

M. Two Piles and Two Houses — One Searched and One Not Searched

Language of the Rambam: If there are **two piles** (one chametz, one matzah) **and two houses** (one searched, one not searched), and one searched the searched one and found chametz — **one is concerned**, because perhaps the chametz that one found is the same chametz from the pile, and if so the other (unsearched) house has returned to its chametz, **and requires a second search** — because **there is no fixed here**.

Novelty — Why Is There No Fixed? If the question is on the **house** (which house did the mouse bring into), there is no fixed — because the mouse moved, it's "separated" (anything that separates, separates from the majority). But if the question is from **which pile** it took, it is indeed fixed.

The Gemara's Foundation — "I Can Say": The Gemara says **"I can say"** — one can say (attribute) that the chametz mouse entered the chametz house. This is a rule in rabbinic law — **rabbinic doubt is lenient**, and one says "I can say" to be lenient.

Dispute Between Rambam and Raavad — Whether It's Fixed

The Rambam's Position: It **is fixed** (from which pile it took), but it's **attributing leniently** because there is an **additional doubt** — which house it entered. The Rambam holds that fixed exists, but one can attribute leniently because there is a doubt in our hands.

The Raavad's Position: The Raavad says that it's **not fixed** at all. He doesn't say "two piles", he doesn't say "anything that separates", he doesn't say that one makes "upon settling". His claim is that it's not fixed with us.

Novelty — A New Way in the Rambam: The Rambam's position is a new approach — he says that it **is fixed**, but he says **not** that one must execute (as with nine shops). Because even though it's fixed (half and half), there is a **new doubt** — which house it entered. This makes a **double doubt**: (1) Doubt from which pile it took (fixed = half and half), (2) Doubt which house it entered.

Question: Why is this a double doubt? One only has a doubt of which house it entered — that's the only doubt that's

relevant. The doubt of which pile is already "fixed" (half and half), and the second doubt (which house) is a separate doubt. In a normal situation one speaks of a group, but here — where it's fixed with another doubt — one doesn't view it as a simple fixed half and half, but it's a double doubt for leniency.

N. One Who Rents a House to Another

Language of the Rambam: "One who rents a house without specification to another – the landlord must search. If before he gave him the key the fourteenth arrived – the landlord must search. Once he gave him the key – the renter must search. One who rents a house with the presumption it's searched and it's found not searched – the renter must search."

Simple Meaning: When one gives away an apartment to rent, the obligation to search depends on who has the responsibility when the obligation to search comes in. "Without specification" means without stating what the status of the house is.

Novel Points:

1. **"Without Specification" – Presumption of Chametz:** A house without specification has a presumption that it's chametz-filled, therefore it's on the landlord to search. There is a position that Jews perform commandments in their time, but the main point is that a house without specification – the landlord must search.

2. **Giving the Key = Law of Acquisition:** When the landlord has already given over the key, it's a law of acquisition – that is, it's no longer his, and the obligation to search falls on the renter.

3. **With Presumption It's Searched and Found Not Searched – Why Not a Mistaken Purchase?** The renter must search, and one doesn't say it's a mistaken purchase (which would exempt the renter). The reasoning is: Searching for chametz is not so difficult, a person is not angry about it – on the contrary, he has gratitude because it's a commandment. Therefore he is presumably forgiving about it, because he wants to fulfill the commandment.

O. One Who Goes Out on a Ship and One Who Goes Out in a Caravan

Language of the Rambam: "One who goes out on a ship and one who goes out in a caravan – within thirty days is obligated to search, before thirty days doesn't need to search."

Simple Meaning: Someone who goes away on a journey – if he goes away within thirty days before Pesach, he must search before leaving.

Novel Points:

1. **Thirty Days – An Obligation to Search, Not Just a Time Frame:** The distinction is: within thirty days the obligation to search begins. Before thirty days there is not yet any obligation.

2. **When He Returns:** If he will return before Pesach eve, he must search when he returns – "a person doesn't leave his house empty." He must leave the house prepared for Pesach.

3. **Force Majeure – When He Cannot Return:** If someone is forced and cannot return, he is exempt. The **Gilyon Maharsha** is brought: If there is chametz in the house, it will become nullified, and this is the reason why he is not obligated.

4. **[Digression: Enactments of the Sages and the Life Ladder:]** The enactments of the Sages were made for people who had servants and maids who take care of everything – not for people who wander around. The main thing is peace of mind, not money – "money is nothing."

P. Nine Piles of Matzah and One of Chametz

Simple Meaning: Nine piles of matzah and one pile of chametz, when something fell in.

Novel Points:

1. **Dispute in Interpretation:** Three of the Maggidei Mishnah want to say it means a majority of chametz, not like the simple meaning that it's a majority of matzah.

2. **A Mouse Entered a House with a Loaf in Its Mouth:** When a mouse comes into a house with a piece of bread in its mouth – despair of the owner (the homeowner gives up) doesn't help, because "since it entered with permission" – it entered with permission (into the house).

3. **A Snake Entered a Pit – Not Obligated to Bring an Expert:** An "expert" means a snake-catcher. One is not obligated to bring one. **Tosafot** says: It's a rabbinic burden, not a danger. Others mean: It's a danger, and it costs money – one must pay the expert.

Q. Dough in the Cracks of the Kneading Trough / A Thread of Dough

Novel Points:

1. **A Thread of Dough Between Them – Connects the Matter:** When there is a thread of dough between pieces, it connects them together and one must remove it.

2. **Receives Impurity:** If the thread of dough connects, it receives impurity like one vessel.

3. **Far from Each Other:** If the pieces are far from each other (not "the amount of a swallow"), it doesn't receive impurity and is not connected.

4. **Less Than an Olive's Bulk:** If it's less than an olive's bulk and one will never use it, he is not always obligated to remove it.

Full Transcript

Laws of Chametz and Matzah – Nullification of Chametz and Search for Chametz

Law 2: Nullification of Chametz – "And Consider It as Dust"

Speaker 1:

The Rambam begins, **"And consider it as dust, and place in his heart that there is no chametz in his possession**

at all, and that all chametz in his possession is like dust and is worth nothing".

The Question on the Language "It is Like Dust"

The question is the language, "it is like dust." I always say, there's a joke in the custom of scribes that people say that dust is not chametz, but chametz is dust, like dust. It's not chametz, one needs to do the opposite, one needs to make chametz like dust. That's the meaning of the Rambam.

For whom does it not become chametz? Because you don't have any chametz. He said that there shouldn't be any chametz, and he shouldn't have any fear.

The Reason for "Like Dust" – Not Hefker, Rather Daas

I saw that the reason for "it should be like dust" is not according to Tosafos that he had from hefker (ownerless property), but rather what? That he doesn't reckon with it, he's absolutely certain that this is not... "lo yera'eh" (it shall not be seen), it wasn't seen, but there's something in the head.

Just as everyone knows that in his house there is dust, but no one cares about the dust. There are people who ask about streets and all dust, I also have chametz, where do I have dust? I know that I have dust, but I don't care about it. Because I saw it, and it can even be that one might go with the chain, one should have in mind a bit of dust under his house, the lower part is a building of his house.

A level up, a level down. You say the same thing, he doesn't think that it's chametz, he doesn't have any chametz. That is "in his heart that he has no chametz."

Tashbitu and Daas

Why does it make sense? Because if the reason for the mitzvah is "tashbitu" (you shall remove), which is from the Torah, that the removal should be through your mind not being in business, and you went into the store and your mind is in business, then how is tashbitu fulfilled? But tashbitu should mean by definition that the word tashbitu has more to do with daas (knowledge/awareness) than not. Everything in the world has to do with daas at the end of the day. I mean to say, everything in the human world. **"They shall not hurt nor destroy in all My holy mountain, for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of Hashem, as the waters cover the sea"**. As if from daas, I mean. Yes?

Law 3: Search for Chametz from the Rabbis

Speaker 1:

Okay, from the Rabbis there is a mitzvah, not just, uh, one must die rather than transgress, but one should do actual work, **to search for the chametz in hiding places and to check and remove in every place**. That's one thing from the Rabbis.

Another thing from the Rabbis, what is there? That it has a specific time. It's like a positive commandment, like something that one does. Not just that one should be exempt from all this, but one should do it at a specific time, in a specific manner. One should actually search for it, and not search to actually remove it. It's not enough that one shouldn't rely on the nullification in the heart, when one removes it one shouldn't be actually exempt.

Time of the Search – Specifically at Night

Another thing is that it must be at night, and it must be specifically at night. It must be on the night of the fourteenth. Why? Because then the person is at home. It is **at night all people are found in their homes**. **The light of the candle is good for searching**.

This is a very interesting law, because the light of the candle is good for searching, one must do it at night, but one could do it during the day. But then one is not at home.

The Advantage of Candlelight – A Deeper Explanation

But I think there's another aspect, that is the light of the candle is good for searching, that I think I learned a year ago, that during the day one sees everything, but there's such an extra power of shining a light on certain places, and during the day you don't see as well as when you look with a flashlight in the corners. One clearly sees that there's an aspect to learn from this. There is such a thing, that one can, yes, if there's enough sun one can light. There's such a piece of Pesach lechatchilah (ideally).

Why must one do this during the day? Yes, so no, that's how I understand it. There's something to investigate, it says differently, but I suspect it's simpler and more powerful to say it this way. One must certainly think about it, because one sees that it's very true.

Not Learning Before Searching for Chametz

There's one difficulty in the Midrash at the end of Yonah the Prophet, it's very... no, no, it's very correct. What does a Jew do? What does it mean to say that when one says that a Jew must remove chametz, one must remove chametz? What does it mean? To say that one shouldn't go to the study hall? What's different? What's different here? There are people at that time. Does one go to the study hall, and what's the rest of the night? One goes to the study hall to learn. Establishing a study session, that's also an answer. I'll say it again. Ah, a very good expression, yes. Not to give such a lecture. A Jew doesn't give lectures. He makes a study hall, we learn. A study hall. He says the language like this: **"They gather little by little by candlelight in the study hall"**.

"A person is obligated to refrain from his studies at that time, lest he be drawn after his learning and be prevented from the search at its proper time". He gives a sermon, he brings... ah, by the way, here is Rabbeinu Manoach with his powerful explanations, I've already forgotten the name. That it says in the Gemara, he has a fixed practice that every night he learns at home, he should learn after the search, not before the search. Why? Because he says that even to read, to read which means Scripture, because even when he learns Scripture, he finishes and becomes absorbed.

A fool may go to the study hall, hear the lecture, hear the sermon. Perhaps he may... he doesn't give a sermon, he has nothing to learn, but perhaps he may read. Because reading doesn't take time, he has anyway a... He says that he must read. Okay, it's the same question. If he's alone, is a scholar, even a chapter of Psalms he shouldn't learn, because he won't finish. It's a question.

The Connection to Candlelight

I think perhaps that the learning has to do with the candle. We know that one learns by candlelight, yes? What question? One learns by candlelight. So obviously when a person comes home from work, he goes to sleep. If there's a candle, he sits down to learn, yes? If he decided that he can spend the money, he has a candle, he sits down to learn. That's the Gemara. The first thing he does with a candle is to think, "I'll sit down to learn a page of Gemara, a Mishnah, a law." The Gemara comes and

says, "No. The candlelight of the search, use it for learning for searching for chametz."

Rabbeinu Yonah says, he says **"The Sages required the Rabbis for candlelight at the time of Torah"**. He says further, why? **"Great is Torah study that one gives his life for the mitzvah"**. What is the source of protecting? What does such language say here? "Lest he be drawn"? No, that remains for Torah, challenge. One cannot read the Megillah at all because it's nullification of Torah. But I think no, one sees that the Sages always had concerns about not doing mitzvos which cause punishment. They make you do other types of decrees. He brings here a law. Simple Jews don't have this problem. That one has already not forgotten any mitzvah.

Searching for Chametz as Torah Study

So, one searches. In laws, in Megillah people ask, wasn't this Torah study? So Rabbi Elazar, how he deals with stolen chametz, how he deals with his children, and one asks further, what is kitniyos? What are fruits? And he says the halachic rulings, practical law. It's not the decrees of the Gemara.

But I say, today's is also a certain Torah study. One deals with it, one learns it as Torah study, that one goes around the house and fulfills a mitzvah. Yes. True.

Law 4: The Light of the Search

Speaker 1:

One does not search by moonlight, nor by sunlight, nor by torchlight, but by candlelight. Nu, how does it say there in that verse? **"The candle of Hashem is the soul of man"**. No, no, first... yes. The candle of Hashem is the soul of man. Yes. Here there doesn't need to be any evil tongue. Yes, here there doesn't need to be. But there, candle. One doesn't search with the moon, not the sun, not the torch, not the candle. But by candlelight. Yes, one must have a candle.

The Advantage of a Candle – Focused on Specific Places

The holes and cracks. One says, the candle doesn't reach. The moon and sun don't reach, because they're too large. One must have a candle that gives light into the... The advantage of a candle is that it's focused on the place where you need to focus. The holes... It goes in. It goes in.

Sunlight Bedieved

Even though its light is abundant, one does not search by sunlight. Here there is reasoning bedieved (after the fact). One means to say bedieved, but not necessarily. It could be lechatchilah also at night, when there's no sun, but... but he's speaking... One can also make me a father, he can make me... a father. No, no. That says... says... a courtyard that doesn't require searching... the opinion of Rav, Rava said, even though its light is abundant, one does not search... The Yerushalmi says, **"Concerned about sun in the upper room"**. Aha. In the explanation of the difficulty. Because the Yerushalmi held that on one hand there's disgrace of honor. That also says, the Gemara... Everything here is such a kind... One had established a time.

Shmuel says, the answer is that there are certain bedieveds, like when one doesn't search at night. Or, whoever doesn't search at night, it could be that he can no longer check properly. Because the moon... I don't know. There is a law that one had established a time. That's an important thing, that one shouldn't forget, no? Right?

A Courtyard That Doesn't Require Searching

Speaker 1:

Yes, but **a courtyard that doesn't require searching, because birds are commonly found there and they eat all chametz that falls**, one needs to ensure that they don't bring chametz there, and perhaps it's a place where they don't bring chametz, and if they bring it there they'll forget to remove it. I think it's a place that... it's a concern. Yes. Yes. Okay. "Concerned lest he find a house burned by his fellow." Aha.

Law 5: Searching to Where His Hand Reaches

Speaker 1:

"And the searcher searches to where his hand reaches". Why does the searcher search to where his hand reaches? "Lest he nullify it in his heart." Ah, no. The practical difference is why. What's the point? What's the point here of this? Why must one only search to where his hand reaches? To where his hand reaches.

I remember that the Rambam said somewhere why one must search. One did say it with the Baraisa even. I don't remember the place. I don't want to say because perhaps one will come late. No, he didn't say it. Right. He said it with the Baraisa even, and there's who asks. It's not a plan.

Such a difficulty exists, the Rambam isn't particular to always say the reason. It doesn't say in the Gemara, and he has the Rambam's formula which is in parentheses, which aren't typical. Yes? Yes. No. Oh, I'm in... concerned lest he find a house... yes.

Discussion: Why to Where His Hand Reaches?

So what did you say, you know why one doesn't need to check in between? Because one can't reach with the hand. That's apparently chametz that has no feeling.

And here he searches apparently in the place where his hand reaches. The Rambam says the word "to where his hand reaches." Yes. And that's the language he says here, **"Therefore one needs to search the holes and cracks to where his hand reaches"**. Apparently it would be simpler to understand that apparently there's a place where he says this word. Holes and cracks. That's simply so. One can only search to where his hand reaches. But that's the question, what's the question when he says "to"? It's better for me, I'll look at the chart.

Witchcraft in Searching for Chametz

So, in the Mishnah it says as a preparation for the law that if it's a non-Jew one shouldn't because of witchcraft. So, it could be that this is the entire law. Why should the Rambam bring not the end? Why should we even know this part? The part is apparently not so important to bring a novelty. And the words he says, "to such an extent." The second Rambam that he says under witchcraft, because it's a law. No, the word is **"lest the non-Jew say I performed witchcraft on him"**. Yes, yes, fine.

I hold that perhaps the Rambam held that it's only a law that's relevant if one knows that a non-Jew is afraid. Today, the non-Jews in the Rambam's times weren't afraid of witchcraft. But one was afraid of witchcraft in the names. Ah, I know, one must know.

It's a good question, because it's obvious that all the entire Torah is only to where his hand reaches. No, no, no, all the entire Torah is not only to where his hand reaches. To where

his hand reaches is searching, and the essence of searching. What's the one way is there a concept to bring this word? That's the Rambam's novelty. But what you're saying is better than mine, that it's a good question. What could be the novelty here? I don't know.

But, that perhaps in essence that a hole in the middle of the house has a certain area, why should it be a place where they bring holes and cracks? Again, all holes, holes and cracks, that's not an area. All holes and cracks are indeed a work reason, holes and cracks. A hole means it, but not such a piece of place that makes

Searching for Chametz – Places Where They Don't Bring Chametz, Mouse, and Concerns After Searching

The Rambam's Novelty – A Place Where His Hand Doesn't Reach and Nullification in His Heart

That's the novelty of the Rambam.

But that's by the neighbor, everyone's lenient. You don't need to have responsibility for the neighbor, and each one has responsibility for his own invalid stuff. What could be the novelty there? I don't know.

Or perhaps in essence, that a hole in the middle of the house, that a person thinks, why would it be a place where they bring chametz? Again, all holes, holes and cracks, that's not a question, all holes and cracks have hundreds of answers why holes and cracks. But a wall means that there's such a piece of place that makes it so I shouldn't be free from chametz. Okay.

The Binyan Olam's Difficulty

What does the Binyan Olam say? That he says, he says it like you, that a place where his hand doesn't reach is in one Mishnah it says that one doesn't need searching, once one needs to nullify, why should I include that? I should divide chametz. I don't need to have responsibility for that. Nullifying in his heart is not a permission for searching for chametz.

He says that one needs to nullify in his heart, because if it's a place where they bring chametz, the question is about bringing chametz there. And if he nullifies in his heart and he doesn't have enough of a comprehensive nullification in his heart, this looks like all prohibitions in the Torah. No, on the contrary, according to what he says nullifying in his heart, that's a comprehensive nullification that he makes on his house.

The Definition of the Obligation to Search for Chametz

Therefore, the explanation of searching for chametz here, the definition of the obligation to search for chametz, one said that if you know a place where there is chametz, you shouldn't rely on the nullification in the heart. If you know a place where there could be chametz, you must go search. But if not, one returns to the nullification in the heart.

If so, what novelty is here? I don't understand what the novelty is. If so, because one must search in holes and cracks, and the novelty here is that a place where his hand doesn't reach one must also nullify in his heart.

But he says that it's certain that it's not there at all. One will say, why aren't you fulfilled with the comprehensive nullification in the heart that you're going to make on all your chametz? Why does one need another thing?

I don't know, the question of the non-Jew once made sense, because one can say that there's a life concern, a question of guarding the mitzvah, the entire topic. But the Rambam, who doesn't have that part in his text, is indeed unclear what he says simply.

List of Places Where They Don't Bring Chametz (Mishnah)

Okay, let's go further. In practice, the next thing one will speak clearly, apparently the upper and lower ones, yes? Holes of the house and the upper and lower ones. Apparently the upper houses are the upper floors, and the lower ones are the lower floors, and the middle is Rabbi Moshe Rambam, Laws of Chametz and Matzah, let's go back to the Mishnah.

Apparently the lower and upper houses, it's relevant to be abundant in fear and vow, there's a dangerous place not to make chametz. The roof and the balcony, what's a balcony? A balcony is the storage that's next to the house where one puts things. Okay, the roof thereof. The roof. And the cattle barn and chicken coops and slaughterhouses. There's a list of places where they don't bring chametz.

Why Does One Need the List?

Why do I need the list? I want to understand myself why one needs to bring the list. There are already the principles, I want to understand myself.

He brings here a few explanations from the Gemara

He brings here a few explanations from the Gemara. That there is a concept of a chicken coop. A chicken coop is the same idea as we had before, that by "onsa d'rabbanan" (circumstances beyond one's control according to the Rabbis), a place where the birds will come or the chickens will come, you can reckon that the animals will do their work.

"Otzarot yayin v'shemen, she'ein darech l'haniach sham pat" (storehouses of wine and oil, where it is not customary to place bread there). The Gemara says that the shamash (sexton) should leave over his bread, because one doesn't go in the middle of the meal. Here he says large fish, it's also the same thing, that one doesn't go in the middle of the meal. For a small fish one goes to take in the middle of the meal, but large fish one prepares before the meal. It has no connection to chametz. If you know that chametz was placed there, then yes, one must.

But storehouses, yes, storehouses of wine and oil, storehouses of wine and oil in general is not relevant. Storehouses of wine and oil in general. Yes, beer he means regular beer from grain, because beer is not relevant to place there. Storehouses of wine and oil in general, the salt house, the snow house, the house of small fish, the wood house, the house of muries. What is muries? Muries is the food that one gives to animals, right? Ah, yes, fish sauce. Tzir muries that we see in halachot, that in the laws of insects we had this.

The Definition of Places Where One Doesn't Bring In

Apparently the common houses, where one does come in, "v'yotzei bazeh" (and goes out with this), require checking. And generally there is no bringing chametz into them. I mean, one can even extract a side thing, which is a Jew's life. A Jew's life is a house that has a cellar, with an upper story, with a balcony, with a cattle shed, with a house of large fish, with storehouses. Not a small apartment. Okay. When a Jew checks, that he shouldn't bring chametz there, one thing is certain. There is no law that one must check when one knows that one hasn't, but when one is not sure one must be concerned.

As always, the halachot, the list that stands here in the Gemara, it's certain topics. You don't know, he tells you that these things make sense as "machnisim" (places where one brings in). I mean, there was back then a halachic rule, that you shouldn't think that only where you know for certain, but where you know for certain that not, you are exempt. There is a statement from an Amora who says this, that it's not enough that you know for certain that you didn't carry chametz, you are exempt. You are only exempt when you know for certain that not.

However, either way, generally, like every other place in the world. If you know certainly that yes, you must check. If you know certainly that not, you are exempt. If you don't know, I look at you. You are a certain type, you are a place that is customary, you place there, you don't place there. So I go generally. And this is the place that you don't place there.

The Gemara goes into the law, what here what, that the wine house wasn't one of the places, and you didn't think about the shamash going in carrying bread. It wasn't thought about with the shamash.

So, in other words... So, now comes the whole Gemara discussion of the advice. So, when it's better clear. But the Talmud which is not clear, there is better... This is a place that is checking. So, there shouldn't be any definition. We should only make a list. So, this one sees from when he is better places that he makes himself. So, because one can already make oneself. So, you won't make a list of every house with all the types and varieties. So, can you already a mikveh? So, because bringing in will start to rule, saying, how I don't think, because what fits with your names? So, you'll still come a good thing. So, occasionally. So, but only therefore occasionally.

Chuldah – "Yedei Basar"

So, a child has dragged away, out, all the types of things that come to you. But one is already after... And the tractate makes this foundations, if people already say then a chuldah (weasel) has perhaps taken. So, it's already not. It's already not! So, I say the chuldah comes very well in right after this. So, you said that one perhaps has the names once brought in. No, no, the chuldah is still a whole text. So, righteous, righteous.

Okay. Rabbi Yehuda, shows the war needs checking. So, there is concern after searching for chametz. After checking for chametz. Right. Why does one need all these places? Because perhaps one has made there chametz. If so, will any person think to bring in? No, no, no. So will he be concerned? Always your generation. But because of what is now... Still, so, now one has finished checking for chametz. No, one has finished checking for chametz. One has checked above, finished, "machnisim bo chametz" (one brings chametz into it).

The Concern of Chuldah

That there are chuldot (weasels) that they make everything into a place where one brings chametz into it. That is, they don't take it here, they don't take it here, they don't take it here, they don't take it here, they don't take it here, they don't take it here. They take it from one place to a second. That is, the whole world is called a place where one brings chametz into it, and this is already too much. And "yedei basar" (human hands) is a great principle in halacha, that when there is "yedei basar" it's fallen through.

This is not such a good argument practically. Why can't one say that not? Where it's reasonable, it's reasonable. Where not, not. It's not such a good argument. The halacha one will see, one can make logical calculations, instead of a majority, a chazakah (presumption), how strong a minority is the chuldah.

Dispute Between Rashi and Ramban

Now let's come today to the sort of feelings, what has become here simply "yedei basar"? It's a simple thing. What does the Gemara say in Eruvin? When I eat in challah close to nine, that is the difference from house to house is from house to city. No, it's very difficult. Why? Because it's not clear cut. It's very clear cut, sorry. Why? Because it's in my eyes this. He does here a precious thing. What does "davar she'ein machnisim bo chametz" (a thing where one doesn't bring chametz into it) mean? It's not a clear thing. It tells you that it's perhaps something that you must think, something a thing that can happen. It's only something day-to-day. Day-to-day I can't say that I'll leave over my bread, because perhaps will come a chuldah from far away.

Okay, it's certainly to the other reasoning, the different reasoning. It's something the frequent minority. I have a... There is also the Gemara... Ah, you have a phone? I want to see that there is a dispute. All the foolishness one can see there, not for my Gemara. In my Gemara he brings that this is actually a dispute, and it was never a dispute. It's actually a dispute between Ramban and Rashi.

Rashi learns that "yedei chashiv" is this, because of the public matter, the public matter, you must go... you must turn a whole night. And this makes sense the "yedei basar".

No, according to Rashi it's speaking in the middle of the checking or after the checking. Therefore, you must be in corners. Therefore, you must be in corners. The question... according to Rashi is not the question that there is a place where one brings chametz into it. According to Rashi the question is that after checking, perhaps will come a chuldah and take to a place that is not checked. Therefore he says, come here, you must turn a whole night, it's never finished.

But the **Ramban** learns that the question is about a place where one brings chametz into it. The novelty of the one explanation is that it won't all places where one doesn't bring chametz into them become places where one brings chametz into them because of chuldot.

Doubt of Torah Law and Concern

And according to this it's difficult to understand the concept of "yedei basar". One can learn the whole thing with the clear topic of doubt of Torah law. "A place where one brings chametz into it" is simply that there is a presumption. This has become for the Rabbis, the whole thing is for the Rabbis. And afterwards he said with the Rabbis so, what are the Rabbis now? The Rabbis that one spoke about in the Torah law. He says so: Here is a place where one brings chametz into it, is simply a presumption. It's like a lazar. A place that is not a place where one brings chametz into it, is perhaps a concern of doubt of chametz, doubt of Torah law. You say that even there is perhaps there a minority, or... No, no, no.

But the truth is that with Torah law by doubt of Torah law doesn't mean everyone can review. But because one has brought this in, is not because one has given us any knowledge. One learns the halacha from this, is also because the Rambam learns regarding checking is the halacha from

fast watchers, which is very interesting. This is still a side thing.

But in any case, when there is... No, doubt of Torah law doesn't mean perhaps there has flown in once a dog, or a dog has brought a challah. This doesn't make any doubt of Torah law. Doubt of Torah law means when there is an equal doubt, and you can't... whatever it is, it's equal. The halacha of a concern is a law in doubt, that the doubt doesn't begin at all. But it's not any concept of doubt, because the whole thing is for the Rabbis that one should make sure. You say that it's a concept of checking? Checking means that it's already going into doubt. Checking is perhaps a new commandment. Soon it will go into doubt, but it's not now our standing.

Concerns After Checking for Chametz – Mice and Differences

Let's go further. **"And obligation to smear after them, chametz that was checked after checking, they need to check a second time"**. Let's see. "That I didn't hear who checks, and perhaps that he relies on what checks the whole house entirely". Yes, there is a Rambam. To interpret, he is very concerned to one must check the first time. Because you see the Tosafot writes **"but that mice divided it certainly"**. So once you have dragged around there, there is a fear that one has left it over. Why shouldn't one say that the Gemara there speaks about the guests, no question, there is a checking. Because there is a majority of bread.

"And obligation to smear after him that chametz shouldn't come after checking, they need to check a second time. Even if one finds crumbs in the middle of the house, we don't pay attention that mice shouldn't come to a place of garbage, and they are not crumbs, and we rule that it's not sold at all. But the crumbs close to dough, he returns and checks. If he didn't find anything, behold this one checks the whole house, he found them in the place where he places them, he doesn't need checking". He is afraid actually that there is a concern that one has left over. Look, I won't tell you that I didn't have the first hand of the harmony, because I have the specific upstate.

The Topic of a Mouse That Entered a Checked House — Laws of Fixed and Majority

A Mouse Before — Like a Mouse in Its Mouth

Speaker 1: The Rema ruled that a mouse before, a mouse that is more reached with the children, him one must well lead. What does lead mean? Is the question how one eats.

By the way, a child is like a mouse in his hand, not in his mouth. He is born, and the Gemara stands yes on like a mouse in his mouth, it's very interesting. No, the Gemara stands yes on like a mouse in his mouth. But a mouse is like a mouse in his mouth, actually therefore because we know that to come in a mouse, what it is, one must search only. A child is like a mouse in his mouth, a mouse is like a mouse in his mouth, because he carries it actually generally so before.

He brings the Magen Avraham who says that one must make sure that there are enough crumbs from the whole thing. The question is what does before mean? The Rema learns before during eating. It's I leave crumbs.

Speaker 2: No, no, no, sugar. What is the mouse that the same thing, but away?

Speaker 1: I'm not like that. But it's interesting, I see bringing in that you exchange the child for the in his hand, because he doesn't go from the mouth, and disgusted from this has his hand.

Speaker 2: By the Shulchan Aruch, yes, a child from the honor sits.

Speaker 1: But it means that in his hand means the privilege to hold something.

Speaker 2: Yes, yes. Because it's a hacker easily such. More because it's not any inseli from the nkala.

Speaker 1: Okay, you're not red to bring it to a checked house.

Entered a Checked House — Law of Fixed

Speaker 1: Entered a checked house, the children entered into a house house checked, and he is entered a checked house. We have learned it. Or so, that if he found crumbs, he doesn't need to check.

Speaker 2: I don't catch what the crumbs is, is it pieces? What does it mean, he saw that someone has eaten there? Or perhaps he entered into a place that is easy to become chametz?

Speaker 1: If you see that there are crumbs, crumbs is a hint that it can also hold in itself. This is the point.

Two Piles — One Chametz and One Matzah

Speaker 1: And if you have two piles of matzah and one of chametz, and a mouse came and took, and we don't know if chametz he took or matzah he took, and he entered a checked house, **he needs to check, because everything fixed is like half and half**.

Although there is a majority of matzah, but in the place where he entered, the question is on the fixed place. The question is not on the piles, the question is on the house, whether there is there. Therefore one looks at the house, and the house is the fixedness, and it's half and half.

If you go plain with the majority, it should have been that it's a majority, that it's kosher, that it's a majority of matzah. But since the question is on the house, and the house is the fixed place, no, this is not true.

Speaker 2: Entered a checked house, this is not what concerns me. The fixed place is the piles. I mean that the fixedness is always from where one has taken it. You go with the question.

Speaker 1: Right, right, right, right. Therefore the fixed place is the piles, therefore one looks as it would have been half and half.

Dispute of Raavad and Rambam — Needs Checking or Nullification

Speaker 1: Here there is a great point, that the Raavad argues and he says that the Rambam says "needs checking", but the Raavad says "needs nullification". It can be that the Rabbis are strict on all these doubts. Because the Rabbis, the whole concept of checking, I don't know if it's relevant that the Raavad should say "needs nullification". Nullification is a concept from the Torah, and checking is from the Rabbis. Both opinions are from the Rabbis.

The Rebbe's Approach — Checking for Chametz Is About Doubt

Speaker 1: The Rebbe's approach is like the Rishonim and other commentators. He wants the simple meaning, that actually because checking for chametz is the main doubt, one must say that the whole idea of checking for chametz is not about the doubts. It's only on the chametz that you have regularly bound up. The checking means that you will remove the doubts. The doubts is actual, and this is the reason for the checking.

This is exactly true, because once you do checking for chametz everything is a doubt, because you don't think that there is chametz. You search for chametz that perhaps is there.

Speaker 2: Right, but the doubt that the Torah speaks is not chametz that you say that it's certainly there. It speaks of all chametz that you think that it's perhaps there.

Speaker 1: But once the Sages added the concept of, the concept of checking, they made something that it's not only, even not, here he speaks of the certainties, but it's a different thing, that you are saying.

Speaker 2: I don't understand what you're saying here. The Gemara has a doubt, the Gemara says that one shouldn't rely on nullification, there is a doubt. So, what is the question?

Speaker 1: You are right that there is a doubt, because I don't know if there is actually bread at all.

Speaker 2: Right. A place where one brought chametz into it, what means a place that everything is chametz?

Speaker 1: No, there is certainly chametz.

Speaker 2: It's also, that is, here are apparently two other things, one is, there are two things, but there is, one should check places where one knows that there is chametz and not rely on the nullification.

Speaker 1: No, one should remove, and not rely on nullification. Afterwards there is still another thing, that even one doesn't know that there is chametz one must search for it. There are two other halachot that you see the Tosafot here the whole time.

Discussion — Obligation of Removal and Obligation of Checking

Speaker 2: I don't know how it doesn't stand here the obligation of removal from the Ramban. It stands, even if there wouldn't have been any nullification from Torah law, there would have been a commandment of nullification. There would have been a commandment of removal.

Speaker 1: The Divrei Yosef says that there are two things, as the Ramban says, Divrei Yosef says that there are two things, as the Ramban says, there is the removal, there are two extra things. It's, if there is Torah there wouldn't have been the permission of nullification at all.

It's, one can learn two ways, it can be that the Torah says only, this is like, this is not any obligation of checking. It's not any obligation of checking, it can be that it's yes, there would have been an obligation of checking, because all this and perhaps chametz is an obligation from Torah law, therefore one must check, as it stands in the Rishonim.

Translation

One could learn from all this that it would be something like a chazakah, that a place where chametz was brought in has a chazakat chametz (presumption of chametz), therefore the chazakah says that it's not nullified by majority on a Torah level, therefore you need to check so there shouldn't be the chazakat chametz.

I don't know, I'm saying novel ideas. I'm telling you that there are two things, it could be that it says here, if there wouldn't be bitul (nullification) one would have to destroy it. Bedikah (checking) is still a third thing.

The Rambam means to say that the Ramban distinguishes between the two things. If there wouldn't be bedikat chametz (checking for chametz) one would have to destroy everything, one wouldn't have to search. They're different things.

In any case, the halachah is that if a mouse came and it took from the place, right? It took and we don't know, it went into a house that we know is checked, there we say it's kavu'a (fixed), and therefore it's a mechtzah al mechtzah safek (equal doubt), that what? That there's chametz in the house, one needs to check it again.

Two Piles and Two Houses — There Is No Kavu'a Here

Speaker 1: What if there are "two piles and two houses"? That not only is there a doubt about which pile, but also about the houses.

Speaker 2: No, **"one checked and one not checked", "and two piles, one chametz and one matzah", "he checked the checked one and found chametz in it", "he must be concerned", "perhaps this chametz is that chametz which was in the pile", "and if so, the checked one has returned to its chametz state", "and he needs to check a second time", "because there is no kavu'a here".**

Discussion — Why Is There No Kavu'a Here?

Speaker 1: Right, if the question is about the house, there's no kavu'a. If the question is from which pile he took, even according to Rav against this, it's all "davar she'yesh lo matir" (something that has a permitting factor), "nine of chametz and one of matzah", "this is kavu'a", "this is like mechtzah al mechtzah". Yes?

Speaker 2: No. Did it go according to majority, or should one go according to majority? Because what didn't go is the "kol kavu'a", we'll go according to majority.

Speaker 1: Ah, it's a safek hashakul (equal doubt), and you have another new doubt in the house, which house yes has. There's a new doubt here. This is the only doubt that exists. Do you understand the doubt? Here actually, if it's a doubt from which pile he took, it's called kavu'a, one needs to have "majority and needs to check". If it's a doubt which house he went into...

Speaker 2: Right, what's the difference? Is it "safek sefeika" (double doubt)?

Speaker 1: No, it's not a safek sefeika. It doesn't say here that it's a safek sefeika. It says that Rav is here, and there's no kavu'a, one needs to go according to majority.

Speaker 2: But there's a majority that I have chametz in my house?

Speaker 1: Here it's not kavu'a, there's no majority.

The Gemara's Foundation — "Shani Omer"

Speaker 2: But it seems that he... it actually comes... he explains that the Gemara says that the yes itself fell into the yes, and there's no kavu'a.

Speaker 1: No no no, but he says that the chametz-ish chametz came to the chametz-ish house. He already asks, no, the Rambam already says here, the Mechaber already says here the difference, actually. The Rambam says, the commentators give me, one can't... The Rambam says at this moment, one can't, the Rambam says that... two piles... **"shani omer"**, yes! The Gemara actually says it.

The Gemara says, **"two piles, one chametz and one matzah", "and they told him two mice", "one took chametz and one took matzah", "and it's not known which of them entered the checked house", "this is like one who didn't check". "Shani omer", "shani omer", "shani omer", "kavu'a", "shani omer"**, yes, exactly. This is all built on "shani omer". The Almighty loves the Jews, and He makes a case, the Gemara says "derabbanan", one says "shani omer". It turns out that the Rabbis, what are they relying on this thing.

But the Rambam doesn't say this. The Rambam says it's completely kavu'a. I don't know, it's very funny. I'm trying to cut with the bottom, and also with the teacher. The first, the first case is different.

Speaker 2: Yes, it's understandable. But what's the second case? It's forbidden, there's a doubt here.

Speaker 1: True, the second case is, let's say, he left you with eleven two pieces. Further, one hangs the leniency, I don't know. One needs to kill the nine, even if it was nine, explain this to me.

Speaker 2: True, does it say to kill nine in the Rambam? It says right in the old Rambam simple halachah.

Speaker 1: Ah, he shows there, you know what's the simple explanation there? He says that the Ra'avad's position is that kavu'a is certainly so, and one hangs leniently. The Rambam says that there's no kavu'a. The Rambam says that it is kavu'a, it comes from one place, and the Rambam has kavu'a. It's only hanging leniently, because he has a doubt in our hands whether specifically and hangs this with that. It's not such two piles, it's a new chiddush, a new explanation.

Discussion — The Ra'avad's Position

Speaker 2: So what does the Ra'avad say that it's completely kavu'a? In the midrash it's that he should say that it's completely kavu'a, he wouldn't have said this two piles. He would have said that one makes it easy, he doesn't say any two piles. He would have said that there's no kavu'a, so yes there is kavu'a, this means the Ra'avad that there's no kavu'a. But there's no kavu'a by us, because what is there...

Speaker 1: My thing is this thing, he doesn't say any two piles, he doesn't say any kol defarish. He doesn't say that one makes it easy.

Speaker 2: He argues, it is kavu'a.

Speaker 1: Yes, one has a doubt in the law, from which pile did he take. The doubt is also again, it's still another thing. Because the two piles says that you have a doubt from which pile it came, how does one rule? One says mechtzah al mechtzah, because you have a way you should have a rabbinic doubt.

But the question is, from the pile it came from one of the two places, but one of the two places isn't kavu'a. It's already a new doubt, safek sefeika. It's completely a new way in the Rambam, that he says that it is kavu'a, he says that there isn't the law that one needs to kill nine. Yes, there is kavu'a.

Speaker 2: The question is a wonder, this doesn't make a safek sefeika, because why do I have a safek sefeika? One has here a doubt from which pile, one only has a doubt from which mouse it went in. But fine, it's kavu'a and one has another doubt.

Speaker 1: Hey, in the normal one speaks of a group, but here what is kavu'a and one has another doubt, doesn't one look at it like a kavu'a which is mechtzah al mechtzah? But yes, there's a safek sefeika, it's innocent. Yes, the Rambam has such two laws.

Every house, let's learn further, we'll see what the black text says. And the standards are going down.

Conclusion

Speaker 1: Another point I wanted to add, which I saw a chiddush that I didn't think this word is. Afterwards we'll come to the questions that we received. But the sugya is difficult and important.

One Who Rents a House to His Friend and One Who Goes Out on a Ship

One Who Rents a House to His Friend

Speaker 1: What's the reasoning? Actually a kevi'ut (fixedness) can't be, normal one's own group. But here where you say a kevi'ut that there you depend on it, they don't look at it like a kevi'ut, so this is easy upon easy. But, yes, here you have many answers, I know. Yes, they have such two laws.

Yoreh De'ah, let's learn further, in natural, I understand what's going on here.

The Rambam's Language

"One who rents a house without specification to his friend – the renter must check. If before he gave him the key the fourteenth arrived – the renter must check. Once he gave him the key – the tenant must check. One who rents a house with the presumption of being checked and it's found that it's not checked – the tenant must check."

Simple Meaning: Giving the Key Is Like a Kinyan (Acquisition)

Speaker 1: After the sugya in Pesachim to understand what they said then, because one couldn't answer me. Yes, I said the sugya is difficult, but sometimes also.

"One who rents a house without specification to his friend" – what is this? "If before he gave him the key" – why do you need that giving the key should make this kevi'ut?

Again, ah, giving the key one looks. He didn't take from that one... He didn't take from a... And another piece. According to this a mouse came and took chametz, and you don't know if it went in at all. All these troubles one learns there, in man until terl.

Speaker 2: So what was there the real difference between Yoreh De'ah aleph and Yoreh De'ah beit? What is there... I don't know.

Chezkat Checked and Found Not Checked – Why Not a Mistaken Purchase?

Speaker 1: But this also, what you say a holy... This is a holy... This is a dispute. That three of the Maggidei Mishneh want to tell, and he says that it means mostly chametz. One

needs simple understanding, not transk, been mostly matzah, but it means mostly chametz.

Speaker 2: What's practical? I don't know.

Speaker 1: Okay, "One who rents a house with the presumption of being checked and it's found that it's not checked – the tenant must check, and it's not a mistaken purchase."

In practice it can't be. How long does one let in to see? There's a sugya in Bava Metzia. It stands there. You know, thirty days, or the chapter of HaMafkid, yes, one lets in to see in that chapter.

Chiddush: Checking Is a Mitzvah – Therefore One Forgives

Speaker 1: Okay, "One who rents a house with the presumption of being checked and it's found that it's not checked" – the despair of the owner is presumably a loaf in his mouth. They said, since he entered with permission, the owner's despair doesn't help him. You say, he entered with permission. How do you say he entered with permission?

Okay, this is a dependent, you made the correct comment earlier, which you said. Okay, this is the result of... Don't go make a new mouse. This is the same, you know, there's a question, the Almighty, what does He lack one mouse more or less? I don't know. I think that there's a matter of the owner's despair doesn't help him. I think that there's a measure, a dependent.

But what's the reason not to make a new chiddush at all? This is the same story. Since he entered with permission, the owner's despair doesn't help him. A mouse entered, yes, a mouse entered with a loaf in its mouth, the owner's despair no longer helps him, and a loaf in its mouth doesn't help him. So the loaf is already, yes, mouse.

A Snake Entered a Pit – One Is Not Obligated to Bring a Friend

Speaker 1: A snake entered a pit, one is not obligated to bring a friend, someone who is a good friend with the snake who can drag it out? Because, why? Because it's a danger, or because this is already a dangerous place, it's a war?

A snake entered a pit, one is not obligated to bring a friend. You don't need to bring someone who is a friend who will drag it. A friend means a snake bringer.

Speaker 2: Ah, it's a danger? Am I obligated even when he's not a snake bringer?

Speaker 1: Yes, he said that he's not talking about a snake bringer. Yes, something one doesn't do. He's not obligated.

Speaker 2: What does it say here? Yes, what's the danger? Just like before, what's the difference by a house to a non-Jew one doesn't need... not obligated, it's a burden.

Speaker 1: Tosafot says, the rabbinic burden, it's not a danger. I think that the Sages rabbinically, it's a danger, it costs you money for it, because you'll need to pay for the friends. I don't know, I haven't seen such an implication.

Dough in the Cracks of the Kneading Trough – A Thread of Dough Between Them

Speaker 1: Okay, in short, here is back another law. Actually, there's another law. Actually, the Rambam, the Rambam has another definition with this law. The law according to him should have been, the explained, that it fell on Pesach and he came to eat. The Rambam didn't say the thing that one fears lest he come to eat it.

Gravity – It Can Fall Down, But Going Up It Doesn't Go

Speaker 1: Let's see, I say sit in my spices the reader, because say gravity, it can fall down, but going up it doesn't go. Also what should enter took the upper, and nullifies from below and from its sides, because we believe very strongly in gravity.

For it is simple the yeshiva's position, that an apple seed participates with the bite. It became nullified. It became a backfall, one needs to check, and we have those who say Lezburg made a connected thing without? It becomes another what to strengthen with seven the Rav great customs nullified and canceled.

Connected Thing – A Thread of Dough Between Them

Speaker 1: Because aha, what rings there, aha, and one plans to take out, connected thing. Oh, sending the command, be it two places and a thread of dough between them, the Sages said one doesn't take out loaves with the student, connected thing. What becomes when it's said a large olive's worth, because one leaves one connected thing.

From our words we learn with proof from a top, above and from its sides, even if from it took the thread one student, connected thing. We hear from this receives impurity.

Speaker 2: Thank you.

Speaker 1: Yes, sometimes a person takes himself goes into a wall, and scratches out a piece of sore, and makes from this connected thing. Be enough poor.

The Amount of Swallowing – When Does It Receive Impurity

Speaker 1: Also be it be it between them, if it's, if it's, if it's one can't not sa... this one can say for a starter. Also if it's be it between them, if be it when it's between like a thread. If they are far one from the second, this won't receive impurity.

So between them if they are the amount of swallowing. Or... well, always, one speaks of course from squeezed. Squeezed which is close, even it until take that Eve needs to be with a thread, and an evil with a thread. But squeezed that it's far a two-hundred piece... ah... not quite, it's not so by.

What Chametz Is Obligated in Checking – Less Than an Olive's Worth

Speaker 1: These are new laws, not from Michumesht also sprout a chametz, but he can say just like what chametz is obligated. A chametz... what chametz. Right?

Speaker 2: Interesting. It's as if when they didn't answer the basic question. It means here places that one needs to check, but... let's say, I know that there's chametz.

Speaker 1: Interesting. Actual chametz three quarters after one at night. Huh?

Speaker 2: The question isn't if you know that there's chametz.

Speaker 1: Yes yes, I know that there's chametz in my spices the reader, the question is whether one needs to check for this, means to take out. The second thing that one needs to say here. Yes, the enactment of the Sages says that one needs to check. And he'll nullify it and he'll take out the chametz, it's not always he's obligated.

When Is One Obligated in Checking

Speaker 1: When is he obligated? When it's something that will fall down, or if it's something that one will sometimes use, and so on. If one will never use it, and it's less than an olive's worth... yes?

Speaker 2: Right that one will learn? Right that one will learn?

Speaker 1: Why are you so happy? You're tired, you want to go in that it's right? Good. It's always not a good ring.

One Who Goes Out on a Ship and One Who Goes Out in a Caravan

The Rambam's Language

Speaker 1: "One who rents a house without specification to his friend, without specification," it means without saying what the status of the house is, **"the renter must check,"** because yes, Jews... there are those who say that Jews do the mitzvah in its time, but actually every house has a presumption that it's chametz-ish. But there are those who say that an honest Jew, this is the Gemara, this is without specification, and I don't know the language. But I agree that but if there's a minor in the house, certainly, it has the presumption of being clean. But a house without specification, the renter must check. From the ends, the without specification is rabbinic, and the Rabbis believe the minor, terrible rabbinically, there's a minor who doesn't intend to check. Yes, not a baby of two years old, one speaks of a small boy, or a big boy.

"One who rents a house to his friend, if before he gave him the key his work arrived, the renter must check." Because it's still his time, the obligation of checking happened, and even though he no longer lives in the house, **"the tenant must check."** Giving the key means a law of acquisition, that is, it's no longer his.

"One who rents a house with the presumption of being checked and it's found that it's not checked, the tenant must check, because of a mistaken purchase." Even by law he's obligated, what's the mistaken purchase that he'll now have to pay money? No, what would there have been a mistaken purchase? Here there's no mistaken purchase, it's a mitzvah. Because it's not so difficult, a person isn't so angry that he needs to check, he has gratitude because it's a mitzvah. There he's presumably forgiving, he wants to do the mitzvah.

Within Thirty Days – Before Thirty Days

Speaker 1: Okay, **"One who goes out on a ship and one who goes out in a caravan,"** interesting, as if one grabs them together, as if what? It's not the same thing. Okay. **"One who goes out on a ship and one who goes out in a caravan, within thirty days,"** he should learn well, because the obligation of checking begins within thirty days. **"Before thirty days,"** he needs to check the house, because he'll be on Pesach back on Pesach eve. Why? **"Because a person doesn't leave his house empty, lest something happen to him."** Therefore he needs to leave the house prepared.

Question: Why Doesn't the Thirty Days Help?

Speaker 1: It's interesting that he must leave the house prepared for Pesach, the thirty days doesn't help. The simple explanation is, the thirty days is an obligation. This is an obligation because it's from the time when one has an obligation of bedikah (searching for chametz). But you know, there is a way to return, so there is an obligation of bedikah.

Speaker 2: Right, first of all there is an obligation of bedikah. Exactly. Why? Because someone is going to return and search there. He returned the same night.

Speaker 1: Right. But someone has a circumstance, he's planning to travel to a place where he knows he'll return at the last minute. He's under duress, he's under duress. He's under duress.

Speaker 2: If there is duress. Yes.

Gilyon Maharsha: Duress – Nullified and Voided

Speaker 1: If someone has a circumstance, someone remained behind, and consequently there is duress, it's simple that if there is chametz somewhere it will become nullified and it will be used as wood, and there is no circumstance, says the Gilyon Maharsha, that this is the reason why he is not obligated. All the more so here, that someone has a circumstance, he doesn't want to go for Pesach to his wife and children, because perhaps he won't be able to get rid of the chametz.

Seemingly in any case, someone has a circumstance, he doesn't want to go for Pesach, so he didn't go, so he's under duress, he can't search, so everything is just like before.

Digression: The Enactments of the Sages and the Life Situation

Speaker 2: Ah listen. You know, there's a whole world with this. It depends on how the person lives. Yes. It's a matter. The enactments were made for people who have servants and maids who take care of everything, who are not people who toil. As they are the great travelers, so they are. Yes.

Speaker 1: You're saying a good thing. Did they see this? That's a good thing. A Jew must have, not that he must work from Pesach to Pesach. They saw, ah, they were in a corner, they had greater responsibilities which is not toiling. Heaven have mercy. Foolishness. Once someone had those desires.

Speaker 2: Huh? Another type?

Speaker 1: On the contrary, I'm learning with the grandchildren. But the main thing is the yishuv hadaas (settled mind), it's not the money. Money is nothing.