



Writing Shem from Shmuel

One of the *melachot* we discussed this week was *kotev* - writing. In brief, the *melacha* involve writing a minimum of two letters in a normal fashion using a substance that will endure. We also learnt (12:3) about the opinion of *R' Yehuda* who maintains that if one intended to write a word, but stopped after two letters that spell a word, then he is liable as it is still considered *kotev*. The *Bartenura* explains that since the shorter word is complete in a different context, it is considered a complete *melacha*.

Interestingly however, one of the cases is where one intended to write the name *Shmuel* and stopped after writing the word *shem* (name). One will note that the second letter, *mem* in the name *Shmuel* (שמואל) is an "open" *mem*, while the *mem* in word *shem* (שם) is a "closed" *mem*. The *Gemara* (*Shabbat* 103a) notes this difference and asks how he could be liable for writing *shem* with an open *mem* (שמ) since it is not complete in any context. The *Gemara* concludes that, while this matter is debated, *R' Yehuda* maintains that if one wrote *tefillin* or a *mezuzah* and switched the closed *mem* with an open *mem* then it would be valid. Consequently, writing in this manner (שמ) would be considered complete according to *R' Yehuda*.

The *Avnei Nezer* (201:1-2) however asks, granted that *tefillin* would be *kosher*, people nevertheless do not write in this manner and on *Shabbat* one is only liable for *melechet machshevet* – loosely translated as creative or purposeful work. On *Shabbat* one is not liable if they perform a *melacha* in an unusual manner as it is not considered *melechet machshevet*. For example, while a *get* that is written with one's left hand is valid, one would not be liable for writing on *Shabbat* in that manner. Since writing שמ is unusual why is one liable?

The *Avnei Nezer* explains that it is true that if one intended to write שמ and wrote it in *Shabbat* it he would be exempt. In isolation, it is not considered *melechet machshevet*.

However, writing *shem* as required to write *Shimon* or *Shmuel* is. We combine what he wrote (the *melacha*) with the fact that it was a prerequisite to what he intended to write (the *machshevet*) to consider it a *melechet machshevet*. In other words since שמ is considered *melechet machshevet* when writing שמעון, it is considered *melechet machshevet* in this context.

When explaining why one would be liable even if they did not complete the entire word, the *Rambam* explains that we find that if one intended to weave twenty-five *amot* of fabric, would he only be *chayav* if he completed the entire length? Surely not. He is liable as soon as he weaves two weft threads – the minimum measure. Consequently it is also true by all *melachot*.

The *Tosfot R' Akiva Eiger* however find the need for this logic difficult. The *Gemara* cites a *Beraita* that explains that our law is learnt from the *pasuk* the discusses the *korban chatat* - "ve'asah me'achat me'hena" – "and he performs from one of them" (*Vayikra* 4:2).¹ Consequently, this law is not built on logic alone, but rather derived from *pesukim*.

The *Tifferet Yisrael* attempts to defend the *Rambam*. Firstly, he suggests that it is not clear that the *Rambam* is basing his explanation on logic alone. Perhaps when the *Rambam* explains that "it is falsehood" to suggest one would only be liable if they wove the entire twenty-five *amot* length, he means that it is false due to the *pasuk* of "me'achat me'hena". The *Tifferet Yisrael* however continues that even without this answer, one could suggest that logic was required to clarify which cases were covered by the "me'achat me'hena". For example, there is a debate whether one is liable in the case where one intended to throw an item eight *amot* but only threw it four *amot*. In other words we find that the scope of "me'achat me'hena" is debated.

Yisrael Bankier

¹ The difficulty raised by the *Chiddushei Mahariach* is that both our case and the case of weaving are cited together in the *Beraita*. That being the so,

the case of weaving is not more obvious than our case. He therefore asks why the *Rambam* brings the case of weaving as a proof.

Revision Questions

שבת י"א ד' – י"ג ה'

- Explain the case of *rekak mayim* and why does the *Mishnah* repeat itself? (י"א ד')
- Is one *chayav* for *hotza'ah* if they threw an object from: (י"א ה')
 - The sea to the land?
 - From a boat into the sea?
- When can one carry from one boat to another? (י"א ה')
- What are the four cases where one throws an object four amot in *reshut ha'rabim* yet is *patur*? (י"א ר')
- What is the minimum measure for one to be *chayav* for performing:
 - *Bo'ne*?
 - *Ma'ke be'patish*? (י"א א')
 - Ploughing?
 - Collecting wood? (NB: List both cases.) (י"א ב')
- Using which hand to write, would an ambidextrous person be *chayav* for writing? (י"א ג')
- Is one *chayav* for writing in Japanese? (י"א ג')
- Explain the debate regarding drawing symbols? (י"א ג')
- Is one *chayav* if they intended to write the name "שמעון" yet stopped after writing "שמ"? (י"א ג')
- Explain the debate regarding whether one is *chayav* from scratching letters into their skin? (י"א ד')
- Provide a definition of the *melacha* of *kotev* (writing). (י"א ד'-ה')
- Is one *chayav* if they wrote letters in sand? (י"א ה')
- Is one *chayav* if they wrote over existing letters? (י"א ה')
- Explain the debate regarding one who wrote one letter in the morning and another in the afternoon? (י"א ו')
- When would one be *chayav* for *oreg*? (י"א ז')
- How many stitches are performed before one is *chayav*? (י"א ח')
- Is one *chayav* if they tore something out of anger? (י"א ט')
- How much of a thread must one dye to perform the *melacha* of *tzove'ah*? (י"א י')
- Which other three *melachot* share the same *shiur* described in the previous question? (י"א י"א)
- Other than literally trapping a deer, when would one have transgressed the *melacha* of *tzad* (hunting)? (Include all three opinions.) (י"א י"ב)

Melbourne, Australia

Sunday -Thursday

10 minutes before *Mincha*
Mizrachi Shul
 Melbourne, Australia

Friday & Shabbat

10 minutes before *Mincha*
Mizrachi Shul
 Melbourne, Australia

Efrat, Israel

Shiur in English

Sunday -Thursday

Rabbi Mordechai Scharf
 9:00am
Kollel Magen Avraham
 Reemon Neighbourhood

ONLINE SHIURIM

Yisrael Bankier
mishnahyomit.com/shiurim

Rabbi Chaim Brown
www.shemayisrael.com/mishna/

Rabbi E. Kornfeld
Rabbi C. Brown
<http://www.dafyomi.co.il/calendars/myomi/myomi-thisweek.htm>

SHIUR ON KOL HALOSHON

Rabbi Moshe Meir Weiss
 In US dial: 718 906 6400
 Then select: 1 – 2 – 4

Next Week's Mishnayot...

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	שבת קודש
2 April ו' ניסן	3 April ז' ניסן	4 April ח' ניסן	5 April ט' ניסן	6 April י' ניסן	7 April י"א ניסן	8 April י"ב ניסן
Shabbat 13:6-7	Shabbat 14:1-2	Shabbat 14:3-4	Shabbat 15:1-2	Shabbat 15:3-16:1	Shabbat 16:2-3	Shabbat 16:4-5

