

## שמעון from שם

## שם משמעון -

### OVERVIEW

explains that ר' יוסי interprets the word מאחת to mean that if one intended to write one (large) word שמעון (this refers to אחת) and instead he wrote a small word שם (this refers to מאחת), nevertheless he is חייב. Our תוספות explains that according to ר' יוסי there is even a greater novelty.

-----

anticipates a difficulty

האי לישנא לא הוה צריך למימר כיון דאליבא דרבי יוסי קאי –

**It was not necessary for ר' יוסי בר חנינא to use the expression שם משמעון, since the גמרא is expounding the view of ר' יוסי -**

דסבר בפרק הבונה (לקמן דף קג, ב) דאפילו שריטה אחת על שני נסרים –

**Who maintains in פרק הבונה that even if one made one mark on two boards -**

**או שני שריטות על נסר אחד חייב<sup>1</sup> –**

**Or he made two marks on one board; he is liable** for writing on שבת. Why therefore did ריב"ה state that he wrote שמעון instead of that he made two marks?!

responds.

אלא ניחא ליה למנקט לישנא דמתניתין דהבונה (שם, עמוד א') –

**However the reason ריב"ה states that he wrote שמעון is because it was preferable for him to use the expression of the משנה in פרק הבונה which states -**

**אמר רבי יהודה מצינו שם קטן משם גדול שם משמעון<sup>2</sup>:**

**‘said we find that one is liable for writing a small name from a big name, i.e., שם משמעון’. Therefore ריב"ה chose to ‘paraphrase’ ר"י.**

### SUMMARY

(even שמעון that he wrote ר' יהודה chose to use the expression of ריב"ה

<sup>1</sup> ר' יוסי is of the opinion that it is not necessary to write two letters to be חייב for כתיבה, it is sufficient if one makes two marks. The writing in the משכן (according to ר' יוסי) took the form of marking the boards so they would be set up in the proper order. If one had the intention of making a number of marks and then made only two marks he is חייב; this is what מאחת teaches us according to ר' יוסי (see מהר"ם). The question is why did ריב"ה state that he wrote שמעון (which is a complete word), when he could have said he made only two marks instead of whatever.

<sup>2</sup> See ‘Thinking it over’.

though one would be liable for just marking [according to ר' יוסי]), since that expression is clearly written in the משנה

### **THINKING IT OVER**

שתי explains that ריב"ז used the expression שם משמעון (instead of שתי) since that is written explicitly in the משנה.<sup>3</sup> However the משנה there also writes the view of ר' יוסי that marking is sufficient to be חייב for כתיבה; why choose ר' יוסי especially since we are discussing ר' יהודה?<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> See footnote # 2.

<sup>4</sup> See פני אברהם and מהר"ם. [The מהר"ם writes that the view of ר' יוסי is mentioned in the משנה that אפילו לא שרט אלא שריטה אחת וכו'. However in our משנה it only states משום רשם אלא חייבו וכו'; however in the ברייתא it does state שרט שריטה אחת וכו'.]