There are three hides

שלש עורות הן –

Overview

The גמרא here mentions three types of hides (and the amount needed to be הייב for carrying each one on גמרא). However the גמרא does not mention (a hide which was completely processed to be) parchment. תוספות and חוספות offer differing explanations.

פירש בקונטרס¹ דקלף גמור לא חשיב בהדייהו דלא שמיה עור -

רש"" explained that he does not include finished parchment among these three, because parchment is not called hide -

ועוד אומר רבינו יצחק דלא מני בהדייהו קלף -

And additionally, says the ר"י, that he does not count קלף among the three -

משום דבהדיא תנן² ששיעורו כדי לכתוב פרשה קטנה שבתפילין³

Because its amount to be liable for משנה on שבת is explicitly stated in the משנה, namely there should be sufficient קלף in order to write a small הפילין –

חוספות anticipates a difficulty with his explanation:

אף על גב דשיעור חיפה דהוי כדי לעשות קמיע שנוי במשנה⁴ - And even though that the amount of היבה hide needed to be הוצאה, which is a sufficient amount to make an amulet, is also taught in the משנה, so why is it mentioned here again −

responds:

מכל מקום לא הזכיר חיפה בהדיא⁵ במתניתין:

Nevertheless there is a difference, for היפה is not mentioned explicitly in the משנה, however קלף is mentioned explicitly.

<u>Summary</u>

קלף is not mentioned either because it is not considered 'hide' anymore (רש"י), or because its שיעור was already explicitly mentioned in a משנה elsewhere (תוס').

_

¹ בד"ה לכתוב.

 $^{^2}$ שבת עח,ב "שבת אייי, שבת הרש"י, שבת שיעור here also mentions this שיעור, however this is not the reason he gives why קלף is not included with the others.

 $^{^3}$ See שבת שמע in שבת עט,ב ד"ה שבתפילין that this refers to פרשת.

⁵ Therefore he mentions חיפה here to clarify that the 'עור' in that משנה means חיפה. There is no need to mention קלף again since the משנה was explicit.

Thinking it over

Why was תוספות dissatisfied with פירש"י?