- 1מא גיררה הולדה אין שמא אין אין

We are not concerned that perhaps a הולדה dragged

OVERVIEW

Our משנה teaches that once (part of) the house was searched and found to be free of may have dragged חמץ there after the בדיקה there after the חמץ (thus requiring a new תוספות challenges the need for our משנה to teach this, for seemingly it is evident from the first משנה.

asks: תוספות

– ואם תאמר והא מרישא שמעינן

And if you will say; but we already know this from the דישא that there is no concern that perhaps a חולדה dragged חמץ to a place which was searched and found to have no -

דקתני² כל מקום שאין מכניסין בו חמץ אין צריך בדיקה –

For the משנה taught; 'any place into which אמן is not brought, there is no requirement to search' there for המץ. This proves that we are not concerned שמא גיררה הולדה; for if we were concerned, then בדיקה would be necessary even in a place where אין מכניסין בו חמץ, for perhaps a חולדה dragged some המץ there. Why is this משנה here necessary?!

תוספות answers:

תריץ דהוה מוקמינן בשאין חולדה וברדלס³ יכולין להלך שם:

You can answer, that without our משנה we may have thought that we are concerned for גרירת חולדה, however the reason the first מקום שאין taught us that מכניסין בו חמץ א"צ בדיקה, that is because we would have established that משנה to be discussing a situation where a הולדה and a ברדלם cannot go there⁴, therefore it does not require בדיקה. However in places where חולדה וברדלם frequent we are concerned for גרירת חולדה.

SUMMARY

We would have not known the principle that אין חוששין לגרירת חולדה from the ruling of כל מקום שאין מכניסין בו חמץ א"צ בדיקה, for we could have interpreted that ruling to be valid only in a place where there is no הולדה.

¹ A הולדה is usually translated as a weasel.

³ A ברדלם is translated as a marten.

⁴ There are no holes and crevices for them to enter.

THINKING IT OVER

If not for the reason of אין לדבר שי we are חולדה, why then is a מקום, why then is a מקום, we should be concerned for גרירת חולדה?

_

 $^{^{5}}$ See דבר שמואל