

If a man left nine [pieces of leaven] and found ten, there is a controversy of Rabbi and the Rabbis. For it was taught: If he left a *maneh*¹ and found two-hundred [zuz],² *hullin* and second tithe are intermingled,³ this is Rabbi's view. But the Sages maintain: It is all *hullin*.⁴ If he left ten and found nine, that is [analogous to] the second clause. For it was taught: If he deposited two-hundred and found one *maneh*, [he assumes], one *maneh* was left lying and one *maneh* was taken away;⁵ this is Rabbi's view. But the Sages maintain: It is all *hullin*. [10b] If a man left [leaven] in this corner and finds [leaven] in another corner, there is a controversy of R. Simeon b. Gamaliel and the Rabbis. For it was taught: If an axe is lost in a house, the house is unclean, for I assume: An unclean person entered there and removed it. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: The house is clean, for I assume, He lent it to another and forgot, or he took it from one corner and placed it in another corner and forgot. Who mentioned anything about a corner?⁶ The text is defective, and is thus taught: If an axe is lost in a house, the house is unclean, for I say: An unclean person entered there and took it. Or if he leaves it in one corner and finds it in another corner the house is unclean, for I assume, An unclean person entered there and took it from one corner and placed it in another corner. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: The house is clean, for I say, He lent it to another and forgot, or he took it from one corner and placed it in another corner and forgot.⁷

Raba said: If a mouse enters [a room] with a loaf in its mouth and he [the owner] enters after him and finds crumbs, a [fresh] search is necessary,⁸ because it is not a mouse's nature to make

(1) Of second tithe. (2) I.e., two *manehs*. (3) We assume that the original *maneh* was left and an unknown person added another. It will therefore be necessary to redeem one *maneh* by exchanging it for another. (4) For the original *manehs* may have been taken away. The Rabbis will make a similar assumption here and therefore the house must be searched for the nine pieces. (5) Hence the present *maneh* is treated as second tithe. (6) We are discussing the case where it is lost. (7) Thus here too, according to the Rabbis we fear that mice have been about, and consequently we also fear that the leaven he now finds is not the same which he left, so that a re-search is required. But on R. Simeon b. Gamaliel's view we do not fear this. (8) To find leaven with which the mouse was seen to enter.

crumbs.¹ Raba also said: If a child enters [a room] with a loaf in his hand, and he [the owner] enters after him and finds crumbs, a [fresh] search is not necessary, because it is a child's nature to make crumbs.

Raba asked: What if a mouse enters with a loaf in its mouth, and a mouse goes out with a loaf in its mouth: do we say, the same which went in went out; or perhaps it is a different one? Should you answer, the same which went in went out, — what if a white mouse entered with a loaf in its mouth, and a black mouse went out with a loaf in its mouth? now this is certainly a different one; or perhaps it did indeed seize² it from the other? And should you say, Mice do not seize from each other, — what if a mouse enters with a loaf in its mouth and a weasel goes out with a loaf in its mouth? now the weasel certainly does take from a mouse; or perhaps it is a different one, for had it snatched it from the mouse, the *mouse* would have [now] been found in its mouth? And should you say, had it snatched it from the mouse, the *mouse* would have been found in its mouth, what if a mouse enters with a loaf in its mouth, and then a weasel comes out with a loaf and a mouse in the weasel's mouth? Here it is certainly the same; or perhaps, if it were the same, the loaf should indeed have been found in the *mouse's* mouth; or perhaps it fell out [of the mouse's mouth] on account of [its] terror, and it [the weasel] took it? The question stands over.

Raba asked: If there is a loaf on the top rafters, need he [take] a ladder to fetch it down or not? Do we say, our Rabbis did not put him to all this trouble, [for] since it cannot descend of its own accord he will not come to eat it;³ or perhaps it may fall down and he will come to eat it? Now should you say, it may fall down and he will come to eat it, — if there is a loaf in a pit, does he need a ladder to fetch it up or not? Here it will certainly not happen that it will ascend of its own accord; or perhaps he may happen to go down to perform his requirements and come to eat it? Should

(1) Therefore these are not merely the loaf crumbled up. (2) Lit., 'throw'. (3) Therefore he may leave it there, and merely annul it.