

## **מכלל דפליגי בהפסקה כדתניא - It can be inferred that they disagree regarding interruption as the ברייתא teaches**

### **Overview**

The גמרא stated that the הלכה is like ר' יהודה on ע"פ, and the הלכה is like ר' יוסי on ע"ש. The גמרא concluded that all we can infer from this is that they (ר"י ור"י) disagree (also) regarding interruption (הפסקה).<sup>1</sup> The גמרא then cites a ברייתא which states a dispute between the same ר"י ור"י whether we interrupt (a meal) when שבת arrives, אין מפסיקין. Our תוספות is troubled since the cited ברייתא makes no mention of a dispute regarding ע"פ.

לא גרס דתניא<sup>2</sup> דהא בברייתא לא פליגי בהפסקה דפסח אלא כדתניא<sup>3</sup> גרס -

The text does not read 'דתניא', since in the cited ברייתא they are not arguing regarding the הפסקה of פסח (but rather the הפסקה of ע"ש); rather the text reads, 'כדתניא' -

ומייתי כי היכי דפליגי בהפסקה דשבת הכי קים ליה דפליגי נמי בהפסקה דפסח -

And the גמרא cites the following ברייתא from which we can assume that just as they argue regarding הפסקה on שבת, so too it was assumed that they also argue regarding הפסקה of פסח.

תוספות offers an alternate view:

ומורי רבינו יחיאל אמר דגרס דתניא<sup>4</sup> ודייק מדקאמר רבי יוסי אין מפסיקין -

And my master ר"י maintains that the text reads 'דתניא' (כ"ף), and we can infer that ר' יוסי argues on בהפסקה, since ר"י stated אין מפסיקין -

והיינו אפילו בערב הפסח דאין מתחילין דבערב שבת שרי רבי יוסי אפילו להתחיל<sup>5</sup> -

<sup>1</sup> This means since it was necessary to say that the הלכה is like ר' יהודה on ע"פ, we can infer that ר' יוסי argues with ר"י even on ע"פ. The גמרא explains that we can say that all agree that on ע"פ one may not begin to eat; however their argument on ע"פ is whether one must interrupt his meal of ע"פ when night falls.

<sup>2</sup> The word 'דתניא' means 'for we learnt'; indicating that what follows next (the ברייתא) supports our contention that ר"י ור"י disagree regarding הפסקה on ע"פ. However the cited ברייתא is discussing ע"ש, not ע"פ, so the word 'דתניא' is inappropriate.

<sup>3</sup> The word 'כדתניא' (with a הדמיון כ"ף) means 'similar to what we learnt'; indicating that the from the following ברייתא (which discusses ע"ש) we can derive something similar that they also argue regarding ע"פ.

<sup>4</sup> The cited ברייתא indeed informs us that ר' יוסי maintains אין מפסיקין even on ע"פ.

<sup>5</sup> We assume that if one is permitted to begin eating (on ע"פ or ע"ש) in the afternoon, he is certainly not required to interrupt a meal which he already began. Therefore once we know (from the previous ברייתא) that ר' יוסי maintains that one may begin eating המנחה on ע"ש, why is there a need to teach us that אין מפסיקין. Therefore we must conclude two things, first that ר"י agrees that אין מתחילין, and secondly, if he did start, the rule is אין מפסיקין.

**And that means that מפסיקין אין even on ע"פ, where ר' יוסי agrees that one may not begin to eat in the afternoon, for regarding ע"ש it was not necessary for ר' יוסי to tell us מפסיקין אין on ע"ש, since ר"י permits even to begin eating on ע"ש –**

An additional comment:

**עוד נראה דאמר לקמן (דף קב,א) בני חבורה שהיו מסובין וקדש כולי -**

**Furthermore it appears that the גמרא later cites this ברייתא, 'members of a group that were reclining at a meal, and night fell and it became a holy day, etc.**

**וקתני פלוגתא דרבי יהודה ורבי יוסי והתם סתמא קתני וקידש בין שבת בין פסח:**

**And the ברייתא there teaches this very dispute between ר"י ור"י whether they have to interrupt their meal, but there, the word וקידש - 'and it was sanctified', is written without qualification, meaning in all cases, whether it was שבת or whether it was פסח; there is the מחלוקת between ר"י ור"י.**

### **Summary**

We can be גורס דתניא for it is an inferred proof, or דתניא for there is no need for ר' יוסי to inform us that מפסיקין אין on ע"ש, since we are even permitted to begin eating.

### **Thinking it over**

Is the 'ועוד נראה',<sup>8</sup> a proof to the first explanation of תוס' (that we are not 'דתניא'), or is it in support of רבינו יחיאל?<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> See 'Thinking it over'.

<sup>7</sup> We will assume that the גמרא here understands that these two statements are basically the same, and the latter one (סתם) clarifies the former.

<sup>8</sup> See footnote # 6. In other words is the ועוד נראה an inferred proof or a direct proof.

<sup>9</sup> See footnote # 9. תוס' הרא"ש (מכון אופק) and מהרש"ל.