

וקאי עליה בבל יראה – בל יראה And he will transgress for it

Overview

The גמרא states that if the משנה would not have taught us that it is permitted to feed a בהמה בשעה החמישית, we may have thought that it is forbidden, for since occasionally the בהמה leaves over some of the food in the open; the owner may be distracted and will transgress the איסור of בל יראה. The apparent difficulty here is that since the person presumably was מבטל his חמץ the previous night when he was בודק there should be no concern of ב"י. Our תוספות resolves this issue and (also) offers an alternate explanation.

פירוש¹ אם לא ביטלו –

This explanation, that the concern is that he will transgress the prohibition of ב"י, is valid in a case **if he was not מבטל** the חמץ. In that case if the בהמה would leave over חמץ in the open the owner would be עובר on וב"י.

(משיירא offers an alternate concern of feeding a בהמה (since it is תוספות

והוא הדין² דהוה מצי למימר דילמא אתי למיכל מיניה:

And it would be just as valid if the גמרא would have said that the concern is that **perhaps he will come to eat from** the food which the בהמה leaves over.

Summary

There is a concern of קאי עליה בב"י when he was not מבטל as well as the concern of יבא לאכלו (even if he was מבטל).

Thinking it over

Why indeed did the גמרא not choose the concern of יבא לאכלו?!

¹ The term פירוש is used when there is a seeming difficulty in the understanding of the גמרא. See 'Overview' for the (seemingly) apparent difficulty which תוספות resolves.

² The advantage in תוספות choice of concern is that it is applicable even if the owner was מבטל. There still remains the concern of יבא לאכלו. See 'Thinking it over'.