

It is similar to the sides of a רה"ר – מידי דהוה אצדי רשות הרבים

OVERVIEW

The precedent that the גמרא finds, to be דרך סטיו לרה"ר, is the case of רה"ר צדי דרך רה"ר. Our תוספות will explain 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 רה"ר צדי דרך רה"ר is חייב, should equally apply to דרך סטיו.

asks: תוספות

ואם תאמר מה פשוט לן יותר דרך צדי רשות הרבים מדרך סטיו –

And if you will say; why is it simpler for us to accept that one is חייב if one was מוציא via the sides of a רה"ר, than if one was מוציא via a סטיו. What is the basis that if you are רה"ר צדי דרך רה"ר, you are חייב, more than if you are דרך סטיו?

answers: תוספות

ויש לומר דדרך בית שיש לפניו צדין¹ וכן היה מסתמא במשכן²:

And one can say that it is usual for a house to have in front of it an area which is called רה"ר צדי, and presumably that is how it was in the משכן, that there were רה"ר צדי in front of their tents, and when they carried from their tents to the רה"ר, they invariably passed through the רה"ר צדי. That is the basis why carrying מרה"י לרה"ר, 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 רה"ר צדי, which teaches us that a רה"ר צדי דרך רה"ר. Once we know that רה"ר צדי דרך רה"ר is חייב, we can derive from it that דרך סטיו is also חייב.

THINKING IT OVER

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

¹ People do not generally build their homes flush to the property line of the רה"ר.

² The tents did not form a straight line, rather others protruded and others receded (in order that the pegs and ropes do not interfere with each other) making that space רה"ר צדי. See רמב"א, רשב"א, רמב"ן. See TosfosInEnglish.com