

## עיבוד<sup>1</sup> לשמן בעי כתיבה לשמן לא בעי –

**Processing *Lishmon* is required; writing *Lishmon* is not required?!**

### OVERVIEW

The גמרא cited a contradiction between two rulings of רשב"ג. In one ברייתא he rules that one may buy a ס"ת which a נכרי wrote (indicating that we do not need כתיבה לשמה [for presumably the נכרי is not writing לשמה]), while in another ברייתא we find that רשב"ג requires that the עיבוד העורות must be לשמה. The גמרא asks if רשב"ג requires the עיבוד לשמה, he should certainly require that the כתיבה be לשמה. Our תוספות has a difficulty with this question.

-----  
תוספות asks:

קשה דלמא כתיבה לשמן ודאי לא בעי דמסתמא לשמן קאי<sup>2</sup> -

**There is a difficulty; perhaps we do not require that the כתיבה be explicitly לשמה, for presumably a ס"ת is written לשמה -**

**אבל סתם עיבוד עורות לאו לתפילין קיימי -**

**However curing hides generally are not intended to be used for תפילין, therefore – לשמה requires that the עיבוד be specifically לשמה** –

anticipates and rejects a possible solution to his question:

**ולא מסתבר דפריך מעיבוד לעיבוד<sup>3</sup> דמדקאמר כתיבה לשמן לא בעי משמע דמכתיבה פריך:**

**And it is not logical to assume that the גמרא is asking a contradiction from one rule regarding עיבוד (that לשמה is not required) to the other ruling regarding עיבוד (where לשמה is required); we cannot assume that, since the גמרא states ‘do we not require לשמה כתיבה’; this indicates that he is asking from the ruling regarding כתיבה on the ruling of עיבוד (but not from לעיבוד), so the question remains that by כתיבה we perhaps do not require an explicit לשמה!**

### SUMMARY

There is seemingly no contradiction for כתיבה is לשמה, however by עיבוד עורות

---

<sup>1</sup> A marginal note indicates that this תוספות should be inserted earlier (before עד ד"ה).

<sup>2</sup> When the נכרי is writing the ס"ת (even without a specific לשמה כוונה), he is writing it for a ס"ת, that כוונה is sufficient to render it לשמה.

<sup>3</sup> Perhaps the contradiction was as follows; from the ruling of רשב"ג that we can buy a ס"ת from a נכרי, we can infer that we do not require עיבוד לשמה (for it is hardly likely that this parchment, which was found by the נכרי was נעבד [and as תוספות just said לתפילין קיימי]), and in the other ברייתא we find that רשב"ג requires עיבוד לשמה. Our תוספות rejects this interpretation of the גמרא's question. See ‘Thinking it over’.

עיבוד לשמה, therefore we require it is לא לשמה.

### **THINKING IT OVER**

Why indeed did the גמרא not ask מעיבוד לעיבוד as suggested?!<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> See (footnote # 3 and) פני יהושע.