

ואם התחילו אין מפסיקין –

And if they began, they are not required to interrupt

OVERVIEW

The משנה rules that if they began any of the activities mentioned in the משנה which is prohibited from למנחה onwards they may continue this activity and are not required to interrupt it. תוספות explains that this leniency applies even if they began this activity at such time when they were not permitted to begin¹ (and not only if they began when they were permitted to begin²).

applies - ואם התחילו אין מפסיקין that this leniency of תוספות explains [and proves]

אפילו התחילו באיסור –

Even if they began doing this activity when it was prohibited -

כדמוכח בסוכה (דף לח,א) גבי מי שבא בדרך ואין בידו לולב נוטלו על שולחנו³ –

As is evident in משנה מסכת סוכה regarding the משנה which states, **if someone came from a trip and he was not in possession of a לולב** (while he was traveling), **he observes מצות לולב** while he is eating **by his table**; this concludes the משנה -

ופריך למימרא דמפסיקין והא תנן⁴ אם התחילו אין מפסיקין –

And the גמרא asks; **'do you mean to say that he interrupts his meal in order to be מצות לולב, but we learnt in a משנה, if they began eating, they are not required to interrupt'**; this concludes the citation from the גמרא -

ולא משני דהכא בהתחילו בהיתר וגבי לולב התחילו באיסור דמצפרא זמניה הוא⁵ –

But the גמרא **did not answer** this contradiction, by saying, **here** (in the משנה of שבת) we are discussing a case **where they began eating legally** (before the time of מנחה (ל) (סמוך ל), **and regarding לולב they began eating illegally, for the time of מצות לולב is from the morning**. This would reconcile the two משניות. The fact that the גמרא did not give this answer indicates that the גמרא assumes that our משנה which states מפסיקין אין התחילו אם applies even when they began eating באיסור.

התחילו באיסור אין מפסיקין that תוספות offer an additional proof

¹ This would be (even) after the proper זמן of מנחה began.

² This would (seem to) be before מנחה when there is no איסור to begin. See however מהרש"א.

³ The expression על שולחנו indicates (as is evident from the following question) that he must interrupt his meal for מצות לולב as soon as the לולב becomes available to him. See ד"ה יטול there רש"י.

⁴ The גמרא there is referencing our משנה.

⁵ The time of לולב is right in the morning; one should not eat until he is נוטל the לולב.

והכי נמי משמע בגמרא דקאמר כיון דשרי המיינה לא מטרחינן ליה –

And this is also what is indicated in the גמרא⁶ which states, ‘as soon as he unties his belt to eat, we do not trouble him’ to stop and *daven*.⁷

התחילו באיסור אין מפסיקין applies even if תוספות offers a final proof that

ויתיישב נמי הא דקשה⁸ בגמרא גבי לימא תהוי תיובתא דרבי יהושע בן לוי⁹:

And, by assuming that מפסיקין אין means באיסור התחילו, this will also resolve the difficulty in our גמרא regarding the question, ‘shall we say that there is a refutation of ל'ריב' from our משנה.

SUMMARY

The ruling of התחילו באיסור אם applies even if מפסיקין אין.

THINKING IT OVER

התחילו באיסור אין מפסיקין applies even if תוספות offers three proofs that the main proof is from סוכה¹⁰ מס' and the other two from the גמרא here. [How] is the proof from סוכה stronger than the proofs from the גמרא here, that תוספות offers it as his main proof?!

⁶ At the bottom of this עמוד.

⁷ אביי there states that if we maintain תפלת ערבית רשות (that מעריב is not an obligatory prayer) then if one untied his belt (at night) in preparation for a meal (before he was מעריב מתפלל) he is not required to interrupt and may continue until he finishes his meal (and then מעריב *daven*). The גמרא asks that this indicates that according to the מ"ד that תפלת ערבית חובה, he is required to interrupt, and first מעריב *daven* (before he continues with his meal); but תפלת מנחה is definitely a חובה and yet the משנה states מפסיקין אין. The גמרא could have seemingly answered that by תפלת מנחה the משנה is discussing where התחילו בהיתר (before the therefore מפסיקין אין מפסיקין, however אביי was discussing that he was שרי המיינה after the זמן of זמן (for there is certainly no איסור to begin a meal before nightfall), and therefore if we maintain תפלת ערבית חובה, the rule would be that התחילו מפסיקין אין. Since the גמרא does not offer this answer this proves that the התחילו אין מפסיקין of our משנה is even in a case where התחילו באיסור (see מהרש"א).

⁸ See תוס' ד"ה לימא (footnote # 9).

⁹ מנחה states that a person may not taste anything once the time of מנחה begins unless he first *davens* מנחה. It is assumed that ריב"ל means even if they began to eat they must stop and *daven* מנחה (see לימא). This seems to contradict our משנה which states מפסיקין אין. The גמרא could have resolved this contradiction by saying that our משנה is discussing where they began eating בהיתר (as opposed to the case of where ריב"ל [for he says וכו' התחילו באיסור]). The fact that the גמרא did not give this answer proves (again) that מפסיקין אין means באיסור התחילו.

¹⁰ תוספות uses the term 'כדמוכה' regarding the proof from סוכה, and the terms 'משמע' and 'ויתיישב' regarding the other two proofs.