

**הניחא למאן דאמר קרשים מלמטה עוביין אמה וכלין והולכין עד כאצבע –**

**It is properly understood according to the one who maintains that the boards were one אמה thick at their bottom and would continually narrow down until an אצבע.**

## **OVERVIEW**

The גמרא says that we can understand that underneath the עגלות it was not a covered רה"ר if we assume that the קרשים were wide (one אמה) at the base and their width narrowed towards the top, which was only one אצבע wide. If we placed four קרשים on the five-אמה-wide wagon, so on top there will be more than three טפחים between each board.<sup>1</sup> Underneath these empty spaces is an uncovered רה"ר.

asks: תוספות

**הקשה הרב פור"ת<sup>2</sup> ולדידיה מי ניחא והלא כיון שהולכין וכלין עד כאצבע -**

**(כלין והולכין עד כאצבע) מ"ד (that asked; and according to this is it understood, but since they continually narrow until they are an אצבע wide -**

**יכולין לסדר ששה סדרים או יותר שיתנו חודו של זה כנגד עביו של זה<sup>3</sup> -**

**It is possible to arrange six sets of boards or more, for they will place this narrow side of one board opposite the thick side of the other board**

**ויחזיקו ששה סדרים שלש אמות ושלוש אצבעות וישארו י"א טפחים לאויר<sup>4</sup> -**

**And these six sets will occupy a total of three אמות and three אצבעות so there will remain eleven טפחים of air space**

**וכי שדית להו ביני וביני כלבוד דמי<sup>5</sup> -**

**And if you will place these eleven טפחים between the קרשים it will be לבוד.**

answers: תוספות

<sup>1</sup> There are four אצבעות to a טפה. At the very top the total width of the four קרשים (each an אצבע wide) will be one טפה. This leaves four אמות and five טפחים (which is 29 טפחים) of empty space between the three spaces that separate the four (sets of) קרשים. There is therefore almost ten טפחים of empty space between the קרשים (at the very top where they are one אצבע wide).

<sup>2</sup> See TIE footnote # 1. תוס' צו,ב ד"ה למימרא

<sup>3</sup> The קרשים according to this view were like a (right [90 degree]) triangle. They can be set up on the wagons where the (narrow) apex of one lies next to the (broad) base of the other. [Together they will form a rectangle one אמה and one אצבע wide by ten אמות long. However it is apparent from the question that they were not actually next to each other, but rather there was always a separation between the 6 sets of קרשים.] See 'Thinking it over'.

<sup>4</sup> Five אמות are thirty טפחים. Three אמות and three אצבעות are (almost) 19 טפחים; which leaves us with eleven טפחים of airspace. Divide 11 by the five spaces between the six sets, the width of each one is slightly more than 2 טפחים, which makes it לבוד, so the רה"ר underneath is מכוסה.

<sup>5</sup> Any separation less than three טפחים is considered לבוד (as if they are attached) and there is no space.

**ותירץ דגנאי הוא להשים צד העב העומד סמוך לקרקע אצל הקצר שהיה למעלה -**  
**And answered that it is shameful to place the thick side, which**  
**stands near the ground, next to the narrow side which was higher, by -**  
**מקום שהיריעות פרוסות עליהן ודמי להא דאמרינן<sup>7</sup> מעלין בקדש ואין מורידין<sup>7</sup> -**  
**The place where the curtains were spread over them, and it is similar to this**  
**which we say, 'we elevate in holiness but we do not diminish'.**

תוספות offers an alternate solution:

**ורבינו תם תירץ דכמו שהיו פורקין אותן מן המשכן כך היו מניחים על העגלה -**  
**And the ר"ת answered that in the same manner as the קרשים were taken apart**  
**from the משכן (the wide on the bottom and the narrow on the top), in the same**  
**manner they were placed on the wagon -**  
**שהיתה אצל דופן המשכן כי כך היו עושין בלא טורח אבל להפכן היה טורח גדול<sup>8</sup> -**  
**Which was adjacent to the wall, for in this manner they could do it**  
**without difficulty, however to turn the קרשים upside down, that would be a**  
**great difficulty.**

תוספות offers a final answer:

**ורבינו יצחק אומר דשמא מחציין ולמעלה היו כלין והולכין<sup>9</sup> והשתא אי אפשר לסדר יותר -**  
**And the ר"י answered that perhaps they became continually narrower from**  
**their midpoint and upwards, so now it would be impossible to arrange more**  
**than four sets of קרשים side by side.**

תוספות asks:

**ואם תאמר מנלן דילפינן ממה שאינו מקורה -**  
**And if you will say; from where do we know that we derive the status of a רה"ר**  
**from the underneath of the עגלות which were uncovered -**  
**נילף מן המקורה שבו ויהא המעביר ד' אמות ברשות הרבים מקורה חייב -**  
**Let us derive the status of a רה"ר from the covered parts of the עגלות and the rule**

<sup>6</sup> לעיל כא, ב.

<sup>7</sup> The narrow part which was the top of the קרשים were in contact with the יריעות; they are deemed to be more holy than the bottom of the קרשים which were near the ground, therefore it is a גנאי to place the more holy adjacent to the less holy.

<sup>8</sup> The wagon was adjacent to the משכן wall, when they finished dismantling each קרש (from the adjoining קרש) they tilted it on to the wagon. The wide bottom side of the קרש was next to the משכן wall and the top narrow side was far from the משכן wall. If they would want to place the top narrow side near the משכן wall they would need to turn the entire ten אמה קרש upside down, that would be much more difficult.

<sup>9</sup> Each קרש was an אמה wide up to half their height (they only started become narrower after their midpoint), so they could not nestle into each other as הרב פור"ת suggested.

**should be that one who carries four אמות in a מקורה רה"ר should be חייב?!<sup>10</sup>**

answers: תוספות

**ויש לומר דמן האויר יש לנו ללמוד שדומה יותר רשות הרבים<sup>11</sup> -**

**And one can say that we should learn the status of a רה"ר from the air space for that is similar to a רה"ר.**

offers an alternate answer: תוספות

**ורבינו יצחק אומר דמהכא לא ילפינן רשות הרבים אלא ממחנה לוויה<sup>12</sup> כדאמר לעיל<sup>13</sup> -**

**And the ר"י answers that we do not derive the status of a רה"ר from here (the עגלות), rather we derive it from מחנה לוויה as the גמרא stated previously -**

**ומהכא לא ילפינן אלא שיעור רשות הרבים דהוי י"ו אמות<sup>14</sup> -**

**And from the עגלות we only derive the size of a רה"ר that it is sixteen אמות wide (at least) -**

**ומכל מקום<sup>15</sup> אי לאו דתחתיהן וביניהן רשות הרבים -**

**But nevertheless if not for the fact that underneath the עגלות and between the עגלות and the sides of the עגלות are a רה"ר -**

**לא הוה ילפינן מינייהו<sup>16</sup> שיעור רשות הרבים:**

**We could not have derived from the עגלות the minimum size of a רה"ר.**

## **SUMMARY**

They could not place the narrow side of the קרשים next to the wide side because a) it is a גנאי, b) it was too difficult, and c) it narrowed after the midpoint. We derive the status of a רה"ר (not מקורה) from מחנה לוויה, we derive from the עגלות, who were in a רה"ר (underneath, etc.) merely the size of a רה"ר (sixteen אמות).

<sup>10</sup> רב stated in the name of רב חייא that underneath the עגלות was a רה"ר; why did not רב accept this at face value that the entire underside of the עגלות was a רה"ר including the covered parts. Why was it said in the name of רב that a רה"ר must be uncovered.

<sup>11</sup> A public place (רה"ר) is generally uncovered. It seems that (according to this answer) the statement in the name of רב is axiomatic (that a רה"ר must be uncovered), however we need to reconcile it with the statement made by רב in the name of ר"ה that underneath the עגלות was (also) a רה"ר.

<sup>12</sup> The מחנה לוויה was uncovered.

<sup>13</sup> צו, ב.

<sup>14</sup> See later א, צט.

<sup>15</sup> עגלות is responding to an anticipated difficulty; if we derive the laws of a רה"ר from מחנה לוויה, and from the עגלות we merely derive its width, why is it necessary to state that רה"ר וכו' רה"ר; תחתיהן וביניהן וכו' רה"ר; even if תחתיהן is not a רה"ר, but since the עגלות were in a רה"ר and they occupied 16 אמות, that should be sufficient proof that a רה"ר requires a width of 16 אמות.

<sup>16</sup> We would say that it is only a 'happenstance' that the עגלות were 16 אמות wide, but it has nothing to do with the legal width of a רה"ר (which may be more or less), since the עגלות were not actually in a רה"ר. However now that תחתיהן is a רה"ר therefore we can derive the legal width of a רה"ר from the עגלות.

### **THINKING IT OVER**

Why cannot we answer s't' פור"ר question<sup>17</sup> that they nestled the wide and narrow parts adjacent to each other, so there was three sets of two adjoining קרשים, and there was only two spaces between them, each more than three טפחים?<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> See footnote # 3.

<sup>18</sup> See אור החמה and מהרש"א.