

Mishna

There are two primary cases of forbidden transfers for someone standing inside a *reshus hayachid* (the “*baal habayis*”), and two secondary cases. The primary cases are where the *baal habayis*, while standing in the *reshus hayachid*, (a) lifts an object in the *reshus hayachid* and transfers it to the *reshus harabim* or, (b) reaches into a *reshus harabim* and lifts an item that he then brings into the *reshus hayachid*. The secondary cases include (a) where he lifts an object while in the *reshus hayachid* and extends it into the *reshus harabim*, but someone else removes it from his hand, or (b) someone standing in the *reshus harabim* inserts his hand into the *reshus hayachid* and the *baal habayis* lifts an object and places it in his hand.

There are two primary cases of forbidden transfers for someone standing in a *reshus harabim* (the “*ani*”), and two secondary cases. The primary cases are where the *ani*, while standing in the *reshus harabim*, (a) lifts an object in the *reshus harabim* and transfers it to the *reshus hayachid* or, (b) reaches into a *reshus hayachid* and extracts an item that he then places in the *reshus harabim*. The secondary cases include (a) where he lifts the object while in the *reshus harabim* and extends it into the *reshus hayachid*, but someone else removes it from his hand, or (b) someone standing in the *reshus hayachid* inserts his hand into the *reshus harabim* and the *ani* lifts an object and places it in his hand.

Gemara

The *Gemara* cites a *Mishna* in *Shavuos* that describes a number of cases where there are two primary categories, with two accompanying secondary categories: oaths, inadvertent *tumah*, types of *tzaraas* and forbidden transfers on *Shabbos*. The *Gemara* is troubled why our *Mishna* lists eight categories of forbidden transfers (two primary cases for an *ani*, plus two secondary ones, as well as two primary cases for a *baal habayis*, plus two secondary ones), while the *Mishna* in *Shavuos* indicates that there are just four (two primary and two secondary).

After rejecting the idea that the *Mishna* in *Shavuos* is referring to both *Torah* and *Rabbinic* prohibitions (because it must be similar to *tzaraas*, where all four cases are *Torah* prohibitions), *Rav Pappa* posits that the *Mishna* in *Shavuos* lists only *Torah* prohibitions, but (despite usage of a word that ordinarily connotes only taking out) includes in its terminology two cases of bringing in, in addition to the two primary cases of taking out. Thus, it includes only the four primary cases listed above. The reason it only lists the *Torah* prohibitions is because *Shavuos* is not the primary place for discussion of taking out items on *Shabbos*. In *Maseches Shabbos*, which is the primary source for discussion of these laws, it includes four secondary *Rabbinic* prohibitions alongside the four primary cases of *Torah* prohibition. The structure and language of our *Mishna*, as well as another later in the *Mesechta* support this notion that the language of removal can also connote an act of bringing in.

Rava explains that when both *Mishnayos* state that there are two primary cases, they are actually referring to two *reshuyos* (i.e., the *reshus hayachid* and the *reshus harabim*). When the *Mishna* in *Shavuos* says there are four, it is a reference to the four *Torah* prohibitions. When our *Mishna* says *four*, for each of the *ani* and the *baal habayis*, it is listing both the primary (i.e., *Torah*) prohibitions, as well as the secondary (i.e., *Rabbinic*) prohibitions.

Inspiration

Sarah was distinguished by her candles (representing *kedusha*) going from before *Shabbos* through the entire week. So should it be for our exploration of *Maseches Shabbos*.

The *Talmidei Besh”t* explain that the *ani* outside is the *yetzer harah*. Sometimes the *ani* reaches into the house - the domain of *kedusha*. But that is somewhat beyond our control and the *baal habayis* in that case is exempt. But, if the *baal habayis* reaches outside to engage the *ani/yetzer harah*, then he is liable even if he doesn’t actively do the lifting, but just introduces into his home what was put into his hand.