

**For instance; *Moso Mechasyoh***

**כגון מתא מחסיא –**

## OVERVIEW

said in the name of רב חסדא that this leniency (that we allow the wedding to precede the אבילות) is only if water was already poured over the wedding meat (so if it is not used now it cannot be sold and there will be a monetary loss), however if the water was not poured over the meat, the wedding is postponed (because the meat can be sold [easily]). רבא qualified this ruling that in a large city it can be sold even if the water was poured (so the wedding is always delayed). רב פפא (also) qualified this ruling (in the opposite manner) that in a village even if no water was poured it cannot be sold (so the wedding is never delayed). The גמרא asked so when is the ruling of רב חסדא (that there is a difference whether the water was poured or not) applicable (neither in a כרך nor a כפר [for in those types of cities it makes no difference whether the water was poured or not]). The גמרא answered it is applicable in a city like מתא מחסיא (which is smaller than a כרך and larger than a כפר). תוספות discusses the need of ר"ה to seemingly narrow the scope of the ברייתא.

תוספות asks:

**תימה רב חסדא מאי דוחקיה לאוקומי בנתן מים על גבי בשר -**

**It is astounding! What forced רב חסדא to establish the ברייתא in a case where he poured the water over the meat** (and then have the difficulty to explain in what type of city the ruling of the ברייתא is effective) -

**נוקמה בכפר<sup>1</sup> אף על פי שלא נתן מים על גבי בשר<sup>2</sup> -**

**Let רב חסדא establish the ברייתא in a village, and it applies in all cases even when he did not pour the water over the meat?<sup>3</sup>**

תוספות answers:

**ויש לומר משום דניחא ליה לרב חסדא לאוקמה ברוב עיירות שהן בינוניות -**

<sup>1</sup> We could not establish it by a כרך, for indeed by a כרך the ruling of this ברייתא does not apply since he can always sell the meat (and the wedding is always delayed). However, we can establish it by a כפר, where the rule of the ברייתא (that the wedding is not delayed) is always valid regardless whether על גבי בשר or not (as רב פפא ruled).

<sup>2</sup> There will be two advantages if we establish it by a כפר and על גבי בשר. Firstly the ברייתא does not mention that he was already על הבשר, and secondly why narrow the ברייתא to only one city (מתא מחסיא) when it can apply to all the כפרים.

<sup>3</sup> We cannot answer that ר"ה established this ברייתא by נתן מים (and מתא מחסיא) because of the upcoming ברייתא which mentions מים, because if he knew of the ברייתא he should have cited the ברייתא (see תוספות הרא"ש).

And one can say; because רב חסדא prefers to establish the ברייתא by the majority of cities which are of average<sup>4</sup> size; neither very large like a כרך, nor very small like a כרך –

והכי קאמר<sup>5</sup> כגון מתא מחסיא ורוב עיירות -

And this is what רב אשי answered; for instance מתא מחסיא and the majority of cities, which are similar in size to מתא מחסיא -

ומשום הכי נקט נמי בברייתא דמייתי ונתן מים על גבי בשר<sup>6</sup> משום דאיירי ברוב עיירות:

And that also explains why the newly cited ברייתא mentions בשר על גבי מים, because that ברייתא is discussing a majority of cities (which are of average size).

### SUMMARY

It is preferable to establish a ברייתא where it covers a majority of cases rather than a limited amount of cases.

### THINKING IT OVER

Is the question<sup>7</sup> on the (second) ברייתא the same as the question on רב חסדא (or is one stronger than the other)?<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> There are more (people in) cities like מתא מחסיא (which are עיירות בינוניות) than there are (in) כפרים.

<sup>5</sup> מתא מחסיא is not a singular exception to a כפר or a כרך; rather it is representative of a majority of the average size cities that are neither a כפר nor a כרך.

<sup>6</sup> Seemingly the same question (and answer) that applies to רב חסדא applies to this ברייתא as well; why mention נתן בשר מים על גבי when it can be discussing כפרים. See 'Thinking it over'.

<sup>7</sup> See footnote # 6.

<sup>8</sup> See פרדס יצחק אות עד.