

ולא¹ חיישינן לחולדה – And are we not concerned for a weasel?!

OVERVIEW

The משנה taught that after one is בודק his house for חמץ, we are not concerned that perhaps a חולדה dragged חמץ from an unsearched place to a searched place.² The גמרא questions this assumption and argues that we seemingly find elsewhere that we are concerned for a weasel dragging חמץ away. תוספות discusses what חוששין לגרירת חולדה specifically we are concerned about if we would maintain



negates a possible explanation of the גמרא's question:

הא לא פריך³ דניחוש לחולדה אפילו מבית לבית⁴ –

The גמרא **is not asking** (when it states לחולדה), **that we should be concerned for גרירת חולדה even from a house to a house**. The concern is that a חולדה may have dragged the חמץ from a בית שאינו בדוק to a house that was בדוק. תוספות explains why we negate this concern:

דאם כן אין לדבר סוף⁵ דאי אפשר שלא יבדוק אחד קודם חבירו –

For if indeed this is the concern there will be no end to allay this concern, for it is impossible that one will not be בודק before his friends -

ואיכא למיחש שמא הביאה חולדה מבית שאין בדוק לבדוק –

And therefore there is always the concern perhaps a חולדה brought חמץ from a house which is not searched to a searched house and this would require בדיקה again (and again, etc.). Therefore we cannot assume that this is the concern.⁶

¹ In our גמרא the גמרא is; 'ומי אמרינן אין חוששין וכו'.

² The משנה reads that אין חוששין שמא גררה חולדה מבית לבית וממקום למקום וכו' indicating that if we were חושש we would (be capable and) have to take measures against this חשש. The reason why we do not take any measures to prevent this חשש is, as the משנה continues, because if we were חושש מבית לבית וממקום למקום then יש לדבר סוף. There is no way to prevent the חשש of these two latter cases. [It would seem however that it is possible to prevent the חשש of גרירת חולדה from מקום למקום and (even) from לבית לבית; see, however, this תוספות (and footnote # 5) who seemingly negates this preventive possibility by מבית לבית.]

³ See 'Thinking it over' # 1.

⁴ If this would be the question and concern of the גמרא, then this would require that (at least) all the neighbors should be בודק simultaneously, for otherwise a חולדה may drag חמץ from a house which is not בדוק to another house which is בדוק.

⁵ See תו"ח who asks that from the משנה it seems that מבית לבית (as well as ממקום למקום) there is יש לדבר סוף (it is only א"כ מחצר לחצר ומעיר לעיר אין חושש מבית לבית וממקום למקום then חושש מבית לבית וממקום למקום). See דבר שמואל who (on account of this question) suggests that חוששין לחולדה from מקום למקום and (even) from לבית לבית; see, however, this תוספות (and footnote # 5) who seemingly negates this preventive possibility by מבית לבית.]

⁶ There would seem to be no point in voicing a concern if the problem cannot be rectified in any event. Therefore we must assume that the concern is something which can be prevented (as תוספות concludes).

offers the correct interpretation:

אלא ממקום למקום פריך דהיינו באותו הבית עצמו⁷ –

But rather we must assume that the גמרא is asking concerning the dragging of a חולדה **from place to place, meaning from place to place in any specific house itself.** We must assume that the גמרא -

כלומר⁸ ולא חיישינן לחולדה באותו בית עצמו:

means to say, 'and are we not concerned for a חולדה in that house itself!' In a house precautions can be taken to prevent the concern of גרירת חולדה from one place to another in this house

SUMMARY

The question that we should be חושש for גרירת חולדה was only ממקום למקום in one house but not מבית לבית.

THINKING IT OVER

1. Why did תוספות find it necessary to establish that the גמרא is not asking concerning מבית לבית⁹; why would we have (even) thought that this is the intent of the question?!

2. Is the משנה negating the concern of (ממקום למקום ומבית לבית וכו') (only) גרירת חולדה in a case where no חולדה was observed at all, or is it negating the concern of גרירת חולדה even if we saw the חולדה elsewhere, nevertheless if it was not seen in the מקום הבדוק, we are not concerned that the חולדה dragged it there?¹⁰

⁷ In a בית itself it is considered כיון דלדבר סוף, for one can place sufficient people in the house that he is בודק to assure that a חולדה did not take any חמץ from a מקום which is not בדוק to a מקום which is בדוק.

⁸ The word כלומר indicates that we do not assume the simple meaning of the text. In this case the question of 'ולא' חולדה sounds universal; that in all cases there should be a חשש of גרירת חולדה. However תוספות limits it to a situation of (only) ממקום למקום and not (even) מבית לבית.

⁹ See footnote # 3.

¹⁰ See שפ"א on the משנה and the גמרא on ט, א. It would seem (from this שפ"א) that if a חולדה was seen (with חמץ in a מקום שאינו בדוק) we should be concerned and be בודק again (in the מקום הבדוק). It is only when no חולדה was seen that we are not חושש ממקום למקום. However if a חולדה was seen with חמץ in another house (which was not בדוק), the בית הבדוק requires no additional בדיקה.

[It is possible that when the משנה states that מבית לבית א"ח that is even when we saw the חולדה in the בדוק בית. (It may be considered כיון דלדבר סוף, for we can address this concern if everyone is בודק after we see a חולדה with חמץ in an adjacent בית. However the rule is that we are not חושש even if we see a חולדה in another בית, because א"לד"ס; there are always more בתים in different הצרות or עיריות). The question here חיישינן ולא is that we should be חושש even if we did not see a חולדה (as is the case of 'ויניחנו בצנעה כו'). In this type of concern then מבית לבית is considered א"לד"ס, since it is impossible for all to be בודק in the same time. However the חשש of ממקום למקום in one בית (even if we do not see a חולדה) is כיון דלדבר סוף (see footnote # 7). וצ"ע ג.]