

It is similar to one who carries an object outside by way of the sides of the רה"ר – מידי דהוה אצדי רשות הרבים

Overview

The precedent that the גמרא finds, to be סטיו דרך לרה"ר, is the case of מוציא מרה"י לרה"ר דרך צדי רה"ר. The difficulty here is; why we are assuming that the latter case is חייב, more than the former. They seem to be identical. Whatever reason compels us to assume that דרך צדי רה"ר is חייב, should equally apply to סטיו דרך.

asks: תוספות

you may ask: why is it simpler for us to accept – **ואם תאמר מה פשוט לן יותר** – מוציא if one was חייב that one is חייב

via the sides of a רה"ר, than if one was – **דרך צדי רשות הרבים מדרך סטיו** **via a סטיו**. What is the basis that if you are דרך צדי רה"ר, you are חייב, more than if you are סטיו דרך?

answers: תוספות

We can say that it is usual for a house to have in front of it – **ויש לומר דדרך בית שיש לפניו צדדין** an area which is called צדי רה"ר, since people do not generally build their homes flush to the property line of the רה"ר.

and presumably that is how it was in the משכן, that there were צדי רה"ר in front of their tents, and when they carried from their tents to the רה"ר, they invariably passed through the צדי רה"ר. That is the basis why carrying מרה"י חייב, because that is the way it was in the משכן.

Summary:

In the משכן the access to the רה"ר from the individual tents, presumably passed through צדי רה"ר, which teaches us that a דרך צדי רה"ר. Once we know that דרך צדי רה"ר is חייב, we can derive from it that סטיו דרך is also חייב.

Thinking it over

Can we differentiate between the status of a סטיו and צדי רה"ר? Or: can we derive סטיו directly from the משכן, as opposed to deriving it from צדי רה"ר, which in turn is derived from the משכן?