

בממוניה לא אטרחוהו רבנן –

The רבנן **did not trouble him** to spend **his money**

OVERVIEW

רבא posed a query; what is the ruling if there is a loaf in a snake's mouth, is one required to hire a professional to remove it or not. The reason not to remove is because perhaps the חכמים require of a person only to exert personal effort in the search for חמץ, but they do require that one spend money for חמץ (or perhaps there is no difference and one is obligated even to spend money). תוספתא will qualify this position



פירוש¹ הכא דוקא דשמא יוציאנה או יאכלנה –

The explanation of this idea that בממוניה לא אטרחוהו רבנן is limited **specifically** to case under discussion **here**, for there is the possibility **that perhaps** the snake will **remove** the ככר from the premises **or** perhaps the snake **will eat** the ככר, therefore we can entertain the concept that in such an instance where it is possible that the removal of חמץ may not be necessary, that בממוניה לא אטרחוהו רבנן -

אבל היכא דאיכא חמץ אמר לעיל (דף ד, ב) דניחא ליה לאינש דליעבד מצוה בממוניה²:

However wherever there is חמץ and one is obligated to rid his house from חמץ, then the גמרא **stated previously that a person is pleased that he should fulfill a מצוה** by spending **his money**.

SUMMARY

A person definitely is pleased (and required) to spend money for a מצוה which he is required to perform, however where there is uncertainty, if the performance of the מצוה is necessary one may not be obligated to spend money.

THINKING IT OVER

תוספתא distinguishes between our case where it is a ספק (since the נהש may remove it) and the case of ודאי where it is a ניהא לאינש וכו'.

¹ The term פירוש is used to qualify the meaning of a term. Here too תוספתא limits this idea of לא אטרחוהו רבנן to situations where there is a ספק if the מצוה is necessary.

² This indicates that there is an obligation to spend money for חמץ, בדיקת חמץ, for otherwise why should we assume that a person is pleased to spend money if there is no obligation. Alternately; that גמרא indicates that a person is pleased to spend money for a מצוה and it is not a טרחה (as opposed to here where spending money is considered a טרחה). See 'Thinking it over'.

חיוב (שמא יוציאנו וכו') is not necessary. In the case of ניהא לאיניש where there is a חיוב בדיקה, then obviously one has to perform it even if it cost money³; however here we are discussing whether the חכמים were מחייב בדיקה in a [farfetched] case⁴ if it would cost money.⁵

³ Whenever there is a חיוב (whether מדאורייתא or מדרבנן) one must perform it even if it cost money. There is no doubt in the case of בית המשכיר that בדיקה is required.

⁴ It seems that the main issue by a ככר בפי נחש is that it is highly unlikely that he will come to eat it since it is נחש בפי [just like בבור] (but not that he will not come to eat it because הנחש או יאכלנו הנחש, this seems to be an addition of תוספות to distinguish it from בית משכיר but not to diminish the וצ"ע (חשש אכילה, וצ"ע).

⁵ The query of נחש בפי ככר comes as a continuation of previous queries (ואת"ל [see however ככר ואת"ל] who is not negligible). The שמא יבא לאכלו of חשש (where the בדיקה is in farfetched situations (where the חשש is negligible). The גמרא therefore rightfully argues that even if in certain farfetched situations there is a חיוב בדיקה; however this may not apply where there is a monetary cost. See footnote # 2 (Alternately...).