

דף יומי • הקלין • דף קי"ח

Daf Yomi • The Full Daf • Elucidated Talmud • Navy & Gold Edition • with Rashi

THE SUGYA

We start off on our daf with a kasha on a Baraisa regarding the tumah of a hide that has meat attached to it. The Gemara is bothered by an apparent contradiction between the reisha and the seifa of the Baraisa, and Rava brings a teretz that the Baraisa is actually missing some words. Through this, we learn a major yesod that a hide cannot join together with the meat to make up the minimum shiur of a kezayis, but it can act as a "yad" (a handle) to transmit the tumah of the nevelah.

This leads the Gemara into a deep sugya in Hilchos Tumah, analyzing the classic Mishnah in Maseches Uktzin about the definitions of a "yad" (a handle) and a "shomer" (a protector) for food. We delve into the limudim from the pesukim to find the sources for these halachos, asking where the Torah reveals that a handle can transmit tumah and that a protector can actually join together with the food to make up the required shiur.

All introductions, summaries, and contextual notes are the editor's commentary and are not part of the original text.

עמוד א' DAF 118A

INFERENCE

כול הנוגע בנגד בשר מאחוריו לא יהא טמא?

Lichoira, we would have thought that **one who touches** the hide **opposite the flesh from its back**, meaning on the outside of the hide directly over where the meat is attached, **should not be tamei** because he did not touch the actual meat?

PROOF

תלמוד לומר: "יטמא".

Therefore **the verse teaches: "He shall be tamei,"** which comes to include this case.

QUESTION

מאי קאמר?

The Gemara is bothered: **What is** this Baraisa **saying?** The reisha says the hide is not tamei, but the seifa says touching the hide makes you tamei!

STATEMENT

אמר רבא, ואמרי לה כדן:

Rava said, and some say it as a stam statement, **unattributed:**

EXPLANATION

חסורי מיחסרה והכי קתני:

The Baraisa **is indeed missing** some words, **and this is what it is teaching:**

EXPLANATION

”בְּנֶבֶלָתָהּ” – וְלֹא בְּעוֹר שֶׁאֵין עָלָיו כְּזַיִת בָּשָׂר, וְעוֹר מִשְׁלִימוֹ לְכֻזָּית.

When the Torah says “**in its carcass**,” it means to exclude, and teach **and not in a hide that does not have on it a kezayis of meat, and** where the **hide completes it to a kezayis**. The hide cannot join together with the meat to make up the shiur.

INFERENCE

יְכוּל שֶׁאֲנִי מוֹצִיא אֹף עוֹר שֶׁיֵּשׁ עָלָיו כְּזַיִת בָּשָׂר, הַנוֹגֵעַ כְּנֶגֶד בָּשָׂר מֵאַחֲרָיו יְכוּל לֹא יִהְיֶה טָמֵא,
וְאִפְּלוּ מַעֲשֵׂה יָד נִמְי לֹא עֲבִיד.

But you might have thought that I should exclude even a hide that has on it a kezayis of meat, so that one who touches opposite the meat from its back, you might have thought should not be tamei, and we would say even the function of a handle it also does not perform to transmit tumah.

PROOF

תְּלִמוּד לֹמֵד ”יִטָּמֵא”.

Therefore **the verse teaches: “He shall be tamei,”** showing that the hide does act as a handle to transmit tumah.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

תֵּנוּ הֵתָם:

We learned in a Mishnah there in Maseches Uktzin:

MISHNAH

כָּל שֶׁהוּא יָד וְלֹא שׁוּמֵר – טָמֵא וּמְטַמֵּא, וְאֵינוֹ מִצְטָרֵף.

Anything that is a handle but not a protector for food, becomes tamei and brings tumah to the food, and makes other things tamei by transmitting tumah from the food, but it does not join together with the food to make up the minimum shiur.

MISHNAH

שׁוּמֵר, וְאֵף עַל פִּי שֶׁאֵינוֹ יָד – טָמֵא וּמְטַמֵּא וּמִצְטָרֵף;

If it is a protector, even though it is not a handle, it becomes tamei and makes tamei and joins together with the food to make up the shiur.

MISHNAH

לֹא יָד וְלֹא שׁוּמֵר – לֹא טָמֵא וְלֹא מְטַמֵּא.

But if it is neither a handle nor a protector, it does not become tamei and does not make tamei.

QUESTION

ידות היכא כתיבי?

The Gemara asks: **Where are handles written** in the Torah as being effective for tumah?

ANSWER

דכתיב "וכי יתן מים על זרע ונפל מנבלתם עליו טמא הוא לכם",

As it is written regarding food tumah: "And if water is put on seed, and any of their carcass falls on it, it is tamei to you."

EXPLANATION

"לכם" – לכל שבצרכיכם, לרבות את הידות.

The word "to you" means for everything that is for your needs, which comes to include the handles which you use to hold the food.

ANSWER

ובתיב: "וכי ימות מן הבהמה אשר היא לכם",

And it is written regarding nevelah: "And if there dies of the animals which is to you for food..."

EXPLANATION

"לכם" – לכל שבצרכיכם, לרבות את הידות,

Here too, "to you" means for everything that is for your needs, which comes to include the handles of nevelah,

EXPLANATION

יד להכניס ולהוציא.

so we have one handle to bring in tumah to the food, and one to take out and transmit tumah from the food.

PROOF

שומר להכניס ולהוציא – לא צריך קרא, קל וחומר מיד אתי:

But that a protector should be able to bring in and take out tumah, does not need a verse, because it comes from a kal vachomer from a handle:

PROOF

ומה יד, שאינה מגינה – מכנסת ומוציאה, שומר – לא כל שכן?

If a handle, which does not protect the food, still brings in and takes out tumah, then a protector, which is more important because it guards the food, is it not all the more so able to bring in and take out tumah?

QUESTION

שומר דכתב רחמנא, למה לי?

If so, **why do I need** the verse that **the Merciful One wrote** regarding a protector?

ANSWER

שָׁמַע מִיָּנָה לְצָרָה.

We must **learn from it** that a protector is so connected that it can **join together** with the food to make up the shiur.

OBJECTION

וְאִמָּא: יָד לְהַכְנִיס וְלֹא לְהוֹצִיא, שׁוֹמֵר לְהַכְנִיס וְלְהוֹצִיא, אֲבָל יָד לְהוֹצִיא וְשׁוֹמֵר לְצָרָה – לֹא.

The Gemara challenges: **But** say instead that a **handle** only works to **bring in** tumah but **not to take out** and transmit tumah, and a **protector** works to **bring in and take out**, but a **handle to take out** and a **protector to join together**, no, we do not have a source for that!

RESOLUTION

יָד לְהַכְנִיס וְלֹא לְהוֹצִיא, לֹא מְצִית אֶמְרָתָהּ, הַשְׁתָּא עֵיּוּלֵי מְעִיָּלָא, אַפּוֹקֵי מִיבְעָא!?!

The Gemara answers: That a **handle** should only **bring in and not take out**, you cannot say. Now, if it can **bring in** tumah to the pure food, **is it necessary** to say **it can take out** and transmit tumah from the food? That is obvious!

OBJECTION

וְאִמָּא: יָד לְהוֹצִיא וְלֹא לְהַכְנִיס, שׁוֹמֵר לְהוֹצִיא וְלְהַכְנִיס, אֲבָל יָד לְהַכְנִיס וְשׁוֹמֵר לְצָרָה – לֹא.

The Gemara asks: **But** say instead that a **handle** only works to **take out** but **not to bring in**, and a **protector** works to **take out and bring in**, but a **handle to bring in** and a **protector to join together**, no, we do not have a source!

RESOLUTION

יָד יִתִּירָא כְּתִיב, "תַּנּוּר וְכִירִים יוֹתֵץ וְגוֹ'".

The Gemara answers: **An extra handle is written** in a third verse, regarding earthenware vessels: "**An oven and stove shall be smashed...**"

EXPLANATION

לָכֶם" – לְכֹל שֶׁבְּצָרְכֵיכֶם, לְרַבּוֹת אֶת הַיָּדוֹת.

where the Torah says "**to you**," which means **for everything that is for your needs**, coming to **include the handles**. So we have three verses for handles.

QUESTION

הֵי מִינֵיהוּ מֵייתֵר?

The Gemara asks: **Which of them is extra?** Lichoira, we need all three because we cannot derive one from the other!

EXPLANATION

לְכַתּוּב רַחֲמָנָא בְּזֵרְעִים, וְלִיתּוּ הֵנָּה מִינֵיהוּ – מָה לְזֵרְעִים, שֶׁפֶן טוּמְאָתָן מְרֻפָּה.

If the Merciful One had only written it by seeds, and we would derive these others from it, we would ask: **What is unique to seeds?** That their tumah is **frequent** and easy to contract.

EXPLANATION

לכתוב רחמנא בתנור, וליתי הנה מיניה – מה לתנור, שכן מטמא מאוירו.

If the Merciful One had only written it by an oven, and we would derive these others from it, we would ask: What is unique to an oven? That it makes tamei through its airspace.

EXPLANATION

לכתוב רחמנא בנבלה, וליתי הנה מיניה – מה לנבלה שכן מטמאה אדם, ומטמאה במשא, וטומאה יוצאה מגופה.

If the Merciful One had only written it by nevelah, and we would derive these others from it, we would ask: What is unique to nevelah? That it makes a person tamei, and makes tamei through carrying, and its tumah comes from its own body.

RESOLUTION

חדא מחדא לא אתיא, תיתי חדא מתרת.

So indeed, one from one cannot be derived, but let one be derived from two of the others!

QUESTION

הי תיתי?

The Gemara asks: Which one should be derived?

EXPLANATION

לא לכתוב רחמנא בזרעים, ותיתי מהנה!

Let the Merciful One not write it by seeds, and let it be derived from these other two, oven and nevelah!

REFUTATION

מה להנה – שכן מטמאין שלא בהכשר, תאמר בזרעים – שאינן מטמאין אלא בהכשר!

We can refute this: What is unique to those? That they become tamei without hechsher with water, can you say the same for seeds, which do not become tamei except with hechsher?

STATEMENT

אמר רב הונא בריה דרב יהושע: פירות שלא הוכשרו, כתנור שלא נגמרה מלאכתו דמי.

Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua said: Fruits that were not yet enabled to receive tumah are like an oven whose work is not finished, so this is not a real refutation.

REFUTATION

אלא פריה הכי: מה להנה, שכן מטמאין שלא בנגיעה, תאמר בזרעים, שאינן מטמאין אלא בנגיעה!

Rather, refute it like this: What is unique to those? That they can become tamei without direct touch (an oven by airspace, nevelah by carrying), can you say the same for seeds, which only become tamei through direct touch? Therefore seeds must be written.

REFUTATION

לא לכתוב רחמנא בתנור, ותיתי מהנה, מה להנה שכן אוכל.

What if the Merciful One did not write it by an oven, and let it be derived from these others? We would refute: What is unique to those? That they are food. An oven is a vessel, so it must be written.

QUESTION

לֹא לְכַתּוּב רַחֲמָנָא בְּנֵבֵלָהּ, וְתִיתִי מֵהֶנָּה?

What if the Merciful One did not write it by nevelah, and let it be derived from these others, seeds and oven?

ANSWER

אִין הָכִי נָמִי.

The Gemara answers: **Yes, indeed, it is so** that we could have derived it.

QUESTION

אֵלָא יָד דְּנֵבֵלָה לְמָה לִּי?

But if so, **why do I need** the verse for the handle of nevelah?

ANSWER

אִם אֵינוּ עֲנִין לְיָד נֵבֵלָה, תְּנִינָהוּ עֲנִין לְיָד דְּעֻלָּמָא.

We apply the rule: **If it is not needed for the subject of the handle of nevelah, apply its teaching to the subject of handles in general,**

EXPLANATION

יָד לְהַכְנִיס, יָד לְהוֹצִיא, שׁוֹמֵר לְצָרָה.

so we have one **handle to bring in** tumah, one **handle to take out** tumah, and a **protector to join together**.

OBJECTION

וְאִפְתִּי, יָד דְּנֵבֵלָה אֶצְטְרִיךְ, דָּאִי לֹא כְּתִב רַחֲמָנָא בְּנֵבֵלָהּ, הָיָה אֲמִינָא: דִּי לִפְא מִן הַדִּין לְהִיּוֹת כְּנִדּוֹן, מָה הֵנָּה לֹא מְטַמּוּ אָדָם, אִף נֵבֵלָה לֹא מְטַמְּאָה אָדָם.

But still, the handle of nevelah was indeed needed in its own place! Because if the Merciful One had not written it by nevelah, I would have said: It is enough for that which is derived by logical inference to be like the source from which it is derived; just as those sources (seeds and oven) **do not make a person tamei** when he touches their handles, so too nevelah should not make a person tamei when he touches its handle. Therefore it had to be written by nevelah.

RESOLUTION

אֵלָא, יָד דְּנֵבֵלָה מִיִּצְרָה צְרִיכָה, וְשׁוֹמֵר דְּנֵבֵלָה הוּא דְּלֹא צְרִיכָה.

Rather, the handle of nevelah is indeed needed, and it is the protector of nevelah that is not needed to be written, because it is derived by a kal vachomer.

QUESTION

לְמַאי הִלְכְּתָא פְּתִיבִיה רַחֲמָנָא?

For what halachah did the Merciful One write it?

EXPLANATION

אי לאיצטרופי – אמרת לא מצטרף, ולהוציא – קל וחומר מיד אתי.

If for joining together, you already said that by nevelah a protector does not join together! And to take out tumah, it comes from a kal vachomer from a handle!

RESOLUTION

אָלָא, אַם אַיִן עֲנָן לְשׁוֹמֵר דִּנְבִּלָּה, תִּנְהוּ עֲנָן לְיָד דִּנְבִּלָּה, וְאִם אֵינּוּ עֲנָן לְיָד דִּנְבִּלָּה, תִּנְהוּ עֲנָן לְיָד דְּעֶלְמָא:

Rather, if it is not needed for the subject of the protector of nevelah, apply its teaching to the subject of the handle of nevelah, and if it is not needed for the subject of the handle of nevelah, apply its teaching to the subject of handles in general:

EXPLANATION

יָד לְהוֹצִיא, יָד לְהַכְנִיס, וְשׁוֹמֵר לְצִרְיָה.

to have one **handle to take out** tumah, one **handle to bring in** tumah, and a **protector to join together**.

עמוד ב' DAF 118B

QUESTION

וַאֲמָא: אִם אֵינּוּ עֲנָן לְשׁוֹמֵר דִּנְבִּלָּה, תִּנְהוּ עֲנָן לְשׁוֹמֵר דְּעֶלְמָא,

The Gemara asks: **And say** instead: **If** the verse **is not** needed for the **matter of protection of a carcass**, then **apply it** to the **matter of protection in general** regarding food,

QUESTION

שׁוֹמֵר לְהַכְנִיס וְשׁוֹמֵר לְצִרְיָה, אֲבָל יָד לְהַכְנִיס לֹא!

to teach that **protection** can **import** impurity and **protection** can **join together** with the food to make up the minimum shiur, **but** we would say that a **handle** does **not import** impurity at all, since there is no source for it! Why apply the extra verse to handles?

ANSWER

אָלָא, מַעֲיָקְרָא כִּי פְתִיבָא יָד, אַהֲכִנְסָה פְתִיבָא.

Rather, the Gemara returns to its earlier explanation: **From the outset**, when the halakha of a **handle is written** in the Torah, it **is written in the context of importing** impurity, as derived from the words "it is impure for you."

QUESTION

אָלָא שׁוֹמֵר דִּנְבִּלָּה, לָמָּה לִּי?

The Gemara asks: **But** if so, the verse regarding **protection of a carcass**, **why do I need it**?

ANSWER

לְגוּפִיהָ.

The Gemara answers: It is needed **for itself**, to teach that the concept of protection applies to a carcass.

QUESTION

וּלְמַאי? אִי לְאַצְטְרוּפִי – אֶמְרֵת לָא מְצִטְרֵי!

The Gemara asks: **And for what** halachic purpose is it needed? If it is **to join together** with the carcass to make up the shiur of a kezayis, **you** already **said** in our Mishnah that protection **does not join together** with a carcass!

QUESTION

אִי לְהַכְנִיס וּלְהוֹצִיא – קַל נְחוֹמֵר מִיָּד אֶתְיָא!

If it is **to import and export** impurity, this is not needed because it **comes from a kal vachomer** from a handle!

ANSWER

מִיֵּלְתָא דְּאֶתְיָא בְּקַל וְחוֹמֵר – טָרַח וְכָתַב לָהּ קָרָא.

The Gemara answers: Sometimes a **matter that can be derived** through a kal vachomer, the verse takes the trouble and **writes it** explicitly.

OBJECTION

אִי הָכִי, שׁוֹמֵר דְּעֵלְמָא, אֵימָא לָהּ: לְהַכְנִיס, וּמִיֵּלְתָא דְּאֶתְיָא בְּקַל וְחוֹמֵר – טָרַח וְכָתַב לָהּ קָרָא.

The Gemara objects: **If so**, regarding **protection in general** (by food), **I can say to you** that the verse is only needed **to import** impurity, **and** even though this is a **matter that can be derived** through a kal vachomer from a handle, the Torah **takes the trouble and writes it** explicitly! If so, we would have no source that protection joins together with food!

RESOLUTION

הִיכָא דְּאֵיכָא לְמִידְרַשׁ, דְּרִשְׁיָנָא.

The Gemara answers: **Wherever there is** an opportunity **to expound** a verse to teach a new halakha (like joining together), **we expound** it, and we do not say the Torah merely repeated something that could be derived through a kal vachomer.

ANSWER

רַב חֲבִיבָא אָמַר: שְׂאֵנִי שׁוֹמֵר דִּנְבָלָה, כִּיּוֹן דְּמַעֲשָׂה יָד קָא עֲבִיד, אִיד שְׂדִינָא לִיהָ.

Rav Chaviva said a different teretz to the original question: **The protection of a carcass is different**; since it performs the **function of a handle** (by only importing and exporting impurity, but not joining), **we cast it onto** the halachos of a handle, and use it to teach that a handle imports impurity.

OBJECTION

מִתְקִיף לָהּ רַב יְהוּדָה בַּר יִשְׁמָעֵאל, הָא דְּתַנּוּ: הִפְיִטְמָא שֶׁל רִמּוֹן מְצִטְרֶפֶת, וְהַנִּץ שֶׁלּוֹ אֵין מְצִטְרֵי.

Rav Yehuda bar Yishmael challenged this derivation that protection joins together from the words "upon any sowing seed": **Behold, that which we learned in a Mishnah: The protrusion of a pomegranate joins together** with the fruit to make up the shiur, **but its flower does not join together**.

OBJECTION

וְאֵמָי? קָרִי כָּאן "עַל כָּל זֶרַע זָרוּעַ", וְלִיכָא!

And why does the protrusion join? Read [here](#) the verse: "upon any sowing seed", which implies things that are sown, and this is not the case here, since pomegranates are planted as saplings, not sown as seeds!

OBJECTION

ותו, הא דתנן: העור והרוטב והקיפה וכו'. מצטרף לטמא טומאת אכלים – מנלן?

And furthermore, that which we learned in a Mishnah: The hide, and the gravy, and the spices, etc., join together to impart the impurity of foods—from where do we derive this? These are not sown at all!

ANSWER

אלא תלתא קראי בתיבי: "על כל זרע", "זרוע", "אשר יזרע",

Rather, we must say that three verses are written using the root of sowing: "upon any seed", "sowing", and "that is sown".

ANSWER

חד לשומר דזרעים, וחד לשומר דאילנות, אידה לשומר פשר וביצים ודגים.

One is for the protection of seeds, and one is for the protection of trees (like pomegranates), and the other is for the protection of meat, eggs, and fish.

STATEMENT

אמר רב חייא בר אשי, אמר רב: יש יד לטומאה, ואין יד להכשר.

Rav Chiyya bar Ashi said that Rav said: There is a handle for impurity to import it, but there is no handle for hechsher (to make the food susceptible to impurity when liquid touches only the handle).

STATEMENT

ורבי יוחנן אמר: יש יד לטומאה ולהכשר.

And Rabbi Yochanan said: There is a handle for both impurity and for hechsher.

EXPLANATION

במאי קמיפלגי? איבעית אימא סברא, איבעית אימא קרא.

The Gemara asks: In what principle do they argue? If you want, say they argue in a logical reasoning; if you want, say they argue in the interpretation of a verse.

EXPLANATION

איבעית אימא קרא, מר סבר: מקרא נדרש לפניו, ולא לפני פניו.

If you want, say they argue in a verse: One Master, Rav, holds that a verse is expounded to apply to the phrase immediately before it, but not to the phrase before the before it (and "it is impure" only refers to impurity, not to the wetting of the seed mentioned earlier).

EXPLANATION

ומר סבר: מקרא נדרש לפניו, ולפני פניו.

And the other Master, Rabbi Yochanan, holds that a verse is expounded to apply both before it and before the before it.

EXPLANATION

איבעצית אימא סבא, מר סבר: הכשר תחלת טומאה הוא, ומר סבר: הכשר לא תחלת טומאה הוא.

If you want, say they argue in logical reasoning: One Master, Rabbi Yochanan, holds that hechsher is the beginning of impurity, so whatever applies to impurity applies to hechsher; and the other Master, Rav, holds that hechsher is not the beginning of impurity.

PROOF

תנא פוּתִיָּה דְּרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: כִּשֶׁם שֶׁיֵּשׁ יָד לְטוּמְאָה, כֵּן יֵשׁ יָד לְהֶכְשֵׁר,

The Gemara notes: It was taught in a Braisa like Rabbi Yochanan: Just as there is a handle for impurity, so there is a handle for hechsher;

PROOF

וְכִשֶּׁם שֶׁאֵין מְקַבְּלִין טוּמְאָה אֶלָּא לְכַשְׁיָתָּהּ, כֵּן אֵין מְקַבְּלִין הֶכְשֵׁר אֶלָּא עַד שִׁתְּלָשׁוּ.

and just as they do not receive impurity except when they are detached from the ground, so they do not receive hechsher except when they are detached.

STATEMENT

אמר רב: אין יד לפחות מכוזת, ואין שומר לפחות מכפול.

Rav said: There is no handle for less than a kezayis of food, and there is no protection for less than a bean-sized piece of food.

STATEMENT

ורבי יוחנן אמר: יש יד לפחות מכוזת, ויש שומר לפחות מכפול.

And Rabbi Yochanan said: There is a handle for less than a kezayis, and there is protection for less than a bean-sized piece of food.

OBJECTION

מיתיבי: שתי עצמות, ועליהן שני חצאי זיתים, והכניס ראשיהן [השנים] לבית, והבית מאהיל עליהן – הבית טמא.

The Gemara challenges Rav's view from a Braisa: If there are two bones, and upon them are two half-kezayis pieces of meat, and one brought their two ends into a house, and the house overhangs them, the house is tamei because the bones act as handles to bring the impurity inside.

OBJECTION

יהודה בן נקוסא אומר משום רבי יעקב: היאך שני עצמות מצטרפין לכוזת?

Yehuda ben Nakosa says in the name of Rabbi Yaakov: How can two bones join together to make a kezayis? This implies that the first Tanna holds there is a handle for less than a kezayis, which is a kasha on Rav!

SUMMARY

The Gemara resolves the contradiction in the Baraisa by explaining that while a hide does not join together with meat to make up a kezayis, it does function as a handle to transmit tumah. We then analyze the rules of handles and protectors, establishing that a protector is even more important than a handle and can join the food's shiur. The Gemara searches for the

biblical sources for these concepts, pointing to the words "to you" written by seeds, nevelah, and earthenware vessels (an oven), and engages in a detailed shakla v'tarya to determine why all three verses are necessary and how we can derive the halachos of handles and protectors from them.

למעשה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

The Gemara on our daf is busy with the concept of a "yad", a handle. We learn that a handle, like the stem of a fruit or the bone of a piece of meat, is not the food itself, but because it serves the food by allowing you to hold it and carry it, the Torah considers it completely connected. It brings tumah in, and it transmits tumah out. The Tanna is telling us a deep yesod: what you use to hold and carry something becomes an inseparable part of the thing itself.

Think about this in your own avodas Hashem. We all have the "main body" of our spiritual lives, our davening, our learning, our mitzvos. But what are the "handles" we use to carry them? The way you prepare for Shabbos, the way you set up your learning space, the physical effort you put into driving a friend to the doctor, or even the way you manage your physical health so you have the strength to serve Hashem. You might think these are just external, secondary actions, not the "real" mitzvah.

But the Torah is mechadesh that a yad is completely connected. The effort, the preparation, and the physical vessels you use to hold your ruchniyus are not separate from the mitzvah, they are part of it. When you put heart and care into the "handles" of your life, you elevate the entire thing, making it a vessel that holds and transmits the kedushah of Hashem.

Today, pick one mitzvah or spiritual goal and focus on its "handle." Whether it is taking two minutes to prepare your mind before davening, or setting up your learning area nicely before you start, treat the preparation with the same respect and focus as the mitzvah itself.