

## Logically, it is the opposite

## איפכא מסתברא –

### OVERVIEW

rules that regarding ע"ז, which is thrown into the המלה, it does not require שחיקה, however regarding חמץ, which is thrown into other rivers, it does require פירור. רב argued that logic dictates the opposite; ע"ז which does not dissolve requires שחיקה, but חמץ which dissolves should not require פירור. Our תוספות is somewhat puzzled by the expression איפכא מסתברא.

לשון איפכא אינו מיושב דמה שייך איפכא<sup>1</sup> כיון שרבה משוה אותם:

The expression איפכא מסתברא does not fit well; for how is the term איפכא applicable since רבה equates חמץ וע"ז to each other.

### SUMMARY

חמץ וע"ז (regarding פירור) and רבה are not assuming opposite views.

### THINKING IT OVER

Can we perhaps answer תוספות question in the following manner. רבה assumes that one משנה requires פירור (by חמץ) and the other does not require שחיקה (by ע"ז). רב (ימים) is asking why make this assumption (that they are discussing different) and therefore חמץ בעי פירור, when the simple logic dictates (that if one requires שחיקה/פירור and the other does not); it is the ע"ז that requires the שחיקה (לא since), but חמץ does not require פירור (ממס since), which is the opposite of the way רבה interpreted the משניות (as to which requires פירור/שחיקה).

---

<sup>1</sup> רב argues that ע"ז needs שחיקה more than חמץ needs פירור. How is this the opposite of רבה. The opposite would mean that רבה maintains that חמץ needs פירור more than ע"ז needs שחיקה, but רבה says that חמץ וע"ז (intrinsically) are the same, the only difference depends on where they are thrown into (however if they were both thrown into the same place [whether המלה or נהרות] the rule would be the same, both for חמץ and ע"ז).