

דף יומי • חזקוני • דף קכ"ב

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

THE SUGYA

In this daf, the Gemara continues its deep dive into the shakla v'tarya surrounding Rav Huna's ruling about whether hide nullifies the flesh attached to it. We analyze the machlokes between Rabbi Yishmael and Rabbi Akiva, clarifying whether the manner of flaying—whether the hide was severed by a knife or torn by an animal—makes a difference in the halachos of tumah. This discussion brings us to a clear understanding of how the Sages viewed the connection between the hide and the meat.

We then move into a new Mishnah that lists the specific creatures whose skins are considered soft enough to have the same halachic status as their flesh, meaning they can convey tumah. This includes human skin, the skin of a domesticated pig, and various other tender skins. The Gemara begins analyzing these cases, starting with Ulla's famous teaching regarding the Rabbinic decree on human skin, and a discussion on the exact definition of a "young camel" whose hump skin is still considered tender.

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

עמוד א' DAF 122A

QUESTION

אליבא דמאן?

The Gemara asks: **In accordance with whose** opinion is this ruling of Rav Huna?

OBJECTION

אי אליבא דרבבי ישמעאל – האמר לא מבטל עור.

If you say it is **in accordance with** the opinion of **Rabbi Yishmael**, didn't he say that **hide does not nullify** the flesh attached to it, and therefore the one who carries it becomes tamei?

OBJECTION

ואי אליבא דרבבי עקיבא – פשיטא, האמר מבטל עור.

And if you say it is **in accordance with** the opinion of **Rabbi Akiva**, then Rav Huna's ruling is **obvious**, for didn't he say that **hide does nullify** the flesh, and therefore one who carries it is tahor?

ANSWER

לעולם אליבא דרבבי ישמעאל, וכי אמר רבי ישמעאל לא מבטל עור – הני מילי שפלטתו חיה, אבל פלטתו סבין – בטייל.

The Gemara answers: **Actually**, Rav Huna's ruling is **in accordance with** the opinion of **Rabbi Yishmael**, and when **Rabbi Yishmael** said that **hide does not nullify** the flesh, **this applies only** to a case **where an animal severed** the hide, leaving the

flesh attached naturally; **but** where **a knife severed** and flayed the hide, the hide **nullifies** the attached flesh.

OBJECTION

תא שמע, רבי יהודה אומר: האלל המכונס, אם יש כזית במקום אחד – חייבין עליו, ואמר רב הונא: והוא שפנסו.

The Gemara challenges: **Come and hear** a refutation from a Mishnah: **Rabbi Yehuda says**: With regard to **the meat residue** attached to the hide after flaying **that was collected**, if **there is an olive-bulk** of it **in one place**, one who enters the Beis HaMikdash after touching it is **liable** to kares for it. **And Rav Huna said** in explanation: **And this is only where** a halachically competent person **collected it**.

EXPLANATION

אי אמרת בשלמא פלטתו ספין, לרבי ישמעאל לא כטיל, רב הונא דאמר פרבי ישמעאל.

Granted, if you say that even where **a knife severed** the hide, according to **Rabbi Yishmael** also the hide **does not** nullify the flesh, then we can say that **Rav Huna said** his ruling in accordance with **Rabbi Yishmael**.

OBJECTION

אלא אי אמרת פלטתו ספין, לרבי ישמעאל כטיל, רב הונא דאמר כמאן?

But if you say that where **a knife severed** the hide, according to **Rabbi Yishmael** the hide **nullifies** the flesh, then in accordance with **whose** opinion did **Rav Huna say** his ruling that the collected pieces of flesh still convey tumah?

RESOLUTION

אלא לעולם פלטתו ספין, לרבי ישמעאל לא כטיל, ורב הונא דאמר פרבי עקיבא!

Rather, we must say that **actually**, even where **a knife severed** the hide, according to **Rabbi Yishmael** the hide **does not** nullify the flesh; **and** as for the ruling of **Rav Huna**, he **said** it in accordance with **Rabbi Akiva**!

QUESTION

פשיטא!

The Gemara asks: But according to **Rabbi Akiva**, isn't it **obvious** that the hide nullifies the flesh? Why did **Rav Huna** need to state his ruling?

ANSWER

מהו דתימא, כי קאמר רבי עקיבא – הני מילי פלטתו ספין, אבל פלטתו חיה – לא כטיל.

The Gemara answers: **Rav Huna's** ruling is necessary, **lest you say** that **when Rabbi Akiva says** the hide nullifies the flesh, **this applies only** where **a knife severed** the hide, **but** where **an animal severed** the hide, the hide **does not** nullify the flesh.

EXPLANATION

קא משמע לן טעמא דרבי עקיבא מפני שהעור מבטלן, לא שנא (פלט) [פלטתו] חיה, ולא שנא (פלט) [פלטתו] ספין,

Therefore, **Rav Huna comes to teach us** that **the reason** of **Rabbi Akiva** is because the hide nullifies them, and it makes **no difference** whether **an animal severed** the hide, and it makes **no difference** whether **a knife severed** the hide.

PROOF

בְּדִקְתָּנִי סִיפָא: מִפְּנֵי מָה רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא מְטַהֵר בְּעוֹר? מִפְּנֵי שֶׁהָעוֹר מְבַטֵּלָן.

This is just as the latter clause of that Mishnah teaches: For what reason does Rabbi Akiva deem one pure when carrying the flesh with the hide? Because the hide nullifies them.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִתְּנֵי אֵלּוּ שְׁעוֹרוֹתֵיהֶן כְּבָשָׂרוֹן:

MISHNAH: These are the creatures whose skins have the same halachic status as their flesh to convey tumah:

MISHNAH

עוֹר הָאָדָם, וְעוֹר חֲזִיר שֶׁל יֵשׁוּב.

The skin of a human, and the skin of a domesticated pig.

MISHNAH

רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אֹמֵר: אֵף עוֹר חֲזִיר הַבֵּר.

Rabbi Yehuda says: Even the skin of a wild boar has the same status as its flesh.

MISHNAH

וְעוֹר חֲטָרֶת שֶׁל גִּמְל הַרְפָּה, וְעוֹר הָרֹאשׁ שֶׁל יֶעֱגֹל הָרֶה, וְעוֹר הַפָּרְסוֹת, וְעוֹר בֵּית הַבּוֹשֶׁת, וְעוֹר הַשְּׁלִיל, וְעוֹר שֶׁל תַּחַת הָאֵלֶּיהָ,

And the skin of the hump of a young camel that is still tender, and the skin of the head of a tender calf, and the skin of the hooves, and the skin of the womb, and the skin of the fetus found inside a slaughtered animal, and the skin of the area under the fat tail of a sheep,

MISHNAH

וְעוֹר הָאֲנָקָה וְהַכֶּחַ וְהַלְטָאָה וְהַחוּמָט.

and the skin of the gecko, and the desert monitor, and the lizard, and the skink, which are four of the eight creeping animals.

MISHNAH

רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אֹמֵר: הַלְטָאָה כְּחוּלְדָּה.

Rabbi Yehuda says: The lizard is like the weasel and its skin is not considered flesh.

MISHNAH

וְכוּלָן שְׁעָבְדוּן, אוֹ שֶׁהִילֵךְ בָּהֶן כְּדֵי עֲבוֹדָה – טְהוֹרִין, חוּץ מֵעוֹר הָאָדָם.

And regarding all of these skins, if one tanned them, or if he trod upon them for the equivalent time required for tanning, they are pure and no longer considered flesh, except for the skin of a human which remains tamei.

MISHNAH

רבי יוחנן בן נורי אומר: שמונה שרצים יש להן עורות.

Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri says: All eight creeping animals have skins that are distinct from their flesh.

גמרא GEMARA

GEMARA

גמ' אמר עולא: דבר תורה עור אדם טהור, ומה טעם אמרו טמא? גזירה שמא יעשה אדם עורות אביו ואמו שטיחין.

GEMARA: Ulla said: By Torah law, the skin of a human is pure; and what is the reason the Sages said it is tamei? It is a Rabbinic decree, lest a person make the skins of his father and mother into mats.

GEMARA

ואיכא דמתני לה אסיפא, וכולן שעבדו או שהילך בהן כדי עבודה טהורין, חוץ מעור אדם.

And there are those who teach this statement of Ulla on the latter clause of our Mishnah: And all of them that he tanned or trod upon them for the equivalent of tanning are pure, except for the skin of a human.

GEMARA

אמר עולא: דבר תורה עור אדם שעבדו טהור, ומה טעם אמרו טמא? גזירה שמא יעשה אדם עורות אביו ואמו שטיחין.

On this clause, Ulla said: By Torah law, the skin of a human that one tanned is pure; and what is the reason the Sages said it remains tamei? It is a Rabbinic decree, lest a person make the skins of his father and mother into mats.

EXPLANATION

מאן דמתני לה ארישא, כל שפן אסיפא, ומאן דמתני אסיפא, אבל ארישא – טומאה דאורייתא.

The Gemara notes: The one who teaches it on the first clause, all the more so applies it to the latter clause; but the one who teaches it on the latter clause holds that only after tanning is it Rabbinic, but on the first clause, before tanning, its tumah is from the Torah.

QUESTION

ועור חזיר [וכו']. במאי קמיפלגי?

The Mishnah taught: And the skin of a pig, etc. The Gemara asks: In what principle do the Tanna Kamma and Rabbi Yehuda disagree regarding a wild boar?

ANSWER

מר סבר: האי אשון והאי רכיה, ומר סבר: האי נמי רכיה.

The Gemara answers: One Master holds: This wild boar skin is tough and this domesticated pig skin is tender; and the other Master holds: This wild boar skin is also tender.

QUESTION

עור חטרת של גמל הרכה, וכמה גמל הרכה?

The Mishnah taught: The skin of the hump of a young camel that is still **tender**. The Gemara asks: And how much is considered a **young camel**?

ANSWER

אמר עולא, אמר רבי יחושע בן לוי: כל זמן שלא טענה.

Ulla said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: Any time that it has not yet carried a load.

QUESTION

בעי רבי ירמיה: הגיע זמנה לטעון ולא טענה, מהו?

Rabbi Yirmeyah raised a query: If its time to carry a load arrived, but it did not actually carry a load, what is the halacha?

QUESTION

בעי אביי: לא הגיע זמנה לטעון וטענה, מהו?

Abaye raised a query: If its time to carry a load did not arrive, but it prematurely carried a load, what is the halacha?

RESOLUTION

תיקו.

The Gemara concludes: The questions **stand** unresolved.

STATEMENT

יתיב ריש לקיש וקמיבעיא ליה: כמה גמל הרכה?

The Gemara relates: Resh Lakish sat and raised a query: How much is considered a young camel?

ANSWER

אמר ליה רבי ישמעאל בר אבא: הכי אמר רבי יחושע בן לוי: כל זמן שלא טענה.

Rabbi Yishmael bar Abba said to him: This is what Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: Any time that it has not yet carried a load.

STATEMENT

אמר ליה: תיב לקבלי.

Resh Lakish said to him: Sit before me in honor of this teaching.

STATEMENT

יתיב רבי זירא וקמיבעיא ליה: כמה גמל הרכה?

Similarly, Rabbi Zeira sat and raised a query: How much is considered a young camel?

ANSWER

אמר ליה רבין בר חיננא: הכי אמר עולא, אמר רבי יחושע בן לוי: כל זמן שלא טענה.

Ravin bar Chinana said to him: This is what Ulla said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: Any time that it has not yet carried a load.

STATEMENT

הָיָה קֹתְנִי לָהּ. אָמַר לִיה: חָדָא הָוִיא לָךְ אֲמַרְתָּ.

Ravin bar Chinana **was repeating it** over and over. Rabbi Zeira **said to him: You have said one** teaching, and there is no need to keep repeating it.

STATEMENT

תָּא חֲזִי, מָה בֵּין תַּקִּיפֵי אֶרֶץ דִּישְׁרָאֵל, לַחֲסִידֵי דְבָבֶל.

The Gemara notes: **Come and see the difference between the strong** scholars of the Land of Israel, like Resh Lakish who honored his informant, **and the pious of Babylonia**, like Rabbi Zeira who was sharp with him.

QUESTION

וְעוֹר הָרֹאשׁ וְכוּ'. וְכַמָּה עֲגָל הָרֶךְ?

The Mishnah taught: **And the skin of the head** of a tender calf, etc. The Gemara asks: **And how much** is considered a tender calf?

ANSWER

עוֹלָא אָמַר: בְּן שָׁנָתוֹ, רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן אָמַר: כָּל זְמַן שְׂיוֹנָק.

Ulla said: **Within its first year**. Rabbi Yochanan said: **Any time** that it still nurses.

QUESTION

אִיבָעִיא לְהוֹ: הִיכִי קָאָמַר עוֹלָא? בְּן שָׁנָתוֹ וְהוּא שְׂיוֹנָק,

A query was raised by them: How did Ulla mean to rule? Did he mean **within its year**, provided that it still nurses,

עמוד ב' DAF 122 B

EXPLANATION

וְאָמַר לִיה רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: כָּל זְמַן שְׂיוֹנָק.

And Rabbi Yochanan said to him, to Ulla, that a calf is considered young **as long as it is** still suckling, even if it is already past its first year.

QUESTION

אוּ דְלָמָּא, עוֹלָא בְּן שָׁנָתוֹ קָאָמַר, בֵּין יוֹנָק וּבֵין שְׂאִינּוּ יוֹנָק, וְאָמַר לִיה רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: בְּן שָׁנָתוֹ וְהוּא שְׂיוֹנָק?

Or perhaps, we should explain the machlokes the other way around: Ulla **says** a calf is considered young if it is **within its first year**, whether it is suckling or whether it is not suckling, and Rabbi Yochanan **said to him** that it is only considered young if it is **within its first year** and it is also suckling?

PROOF

תא שמע, רבי יוחנן אמר: כל זמן שיונק,

Come and hear a proof from what Rabbi Yochanan said in a statement: A calf is considered young as long as it is suckling.

PROOF

ואם איתה – "והוא שיונק" מיבעי ליה!

And if it were so that Rabbi Yochanan requires both conditions, he should have said: "And provided that it is suckling," which would imply that suckling is an additional requirement on top of being in its first year.

RESOLUTION

שמע מינה.

We must indeed learn from this that Rabbi Yochanan considers any suckling calf to be young, even after its first year.

QUESTION

בַּעַל מִינִיחַ רִישׁ לְקִישׁ מֵרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: עוֹר הָרֹאשׁ שֶׁל עֵגֶל הָרֶה, מֵהוּ שְׂיֻטְמָא?

Reish Lakish asked of Rabbi Yochanan: Regarding the skin of the head of a tender calf which is still soft enough to be eaten, what is the halacha as to whether it imparts impurity as flesh?

ANSWER

אמר ליה: אינו מטמא.

Rabbi Yochanan said to him: It does not impart impurity as flesh, because its status is like ordinary hide.

OBJECTION

אמר ליה, לימדתנו רבינו: אלו שעורותיהן כבשרן, ועור הראש של עגל הרך!

Reish Lakish said to him: But didn't you teach us, our teacher, in our Mishnah: These are the ones whose skins are like their flesh to impart impurity, and the list includes the skin of the head of a tender calf?

ANSWER

אמר ליה: אל תקניטני, בלשון יחיד אני שונה אותה.

Rabbi Yochanan said to him: Do not provoke me with this kasha, for I teach that Mishnah as representing a singular opinion of an individual Tanna, and the halacha does not follow him.

BRAISA

דַּתְנָא: הַשּׁוֹחֵט אֶת הָעוֹלָה לְהַקְטִיר כְּזֵית מֵעוֹר שֶׁתַּחַת הָאֵלֶּיָּה, חוּץ לְמָקוֹמוֹ – פָּסוּל, וְאֵין בּוֹ פֶּרֶת; חוּץ לְזִמְנוֹ – פִּיגּוּל, וְחַיִּיבִין עָלָיו פֶּרֶת.

As it is taught in a Braisa: One who slaughters a burnt-offering with the intention to burn an olive-bulk of the skin that is under the tail on the Mizbe'ach outside its proper place, the offering is unfit, but there is no liability of kareth for eating it; if he had this intention for outside its proper time, the offering is piggul, and one is liable to kareth for eating it, because this skin is soft and has the status of flesh. This is the view of the Rabbis.

BRAISA

אֶלְעָזָר בֶּן יְהוּדָה אִישׁ אֶבְלִים אוֹמֵר מִשּׁוֹם רַבִּי יַעֲקֹב, וְכֵן הָיָה רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן יְהוּדָה אִישׁ כְּפַר עֵיכוֹם
אוֹמֵר מִשּׁוֹם רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן:

Elazar ben Yehuda of Aveilim says in the name of Rabbi Yaakov, and so Rabbi Shimon ben Yehuda of Kefar Ikum
would say in the name of Rabbi Shimon:

BRAISA

אֶחָד עוֹר הַפָּרִסוֹת, וְאֶחָד עוֹר הָרֹאשׁ שֶׁל עֵגֶל הָרֶה, וְאֶחָד עוֹר שֶׁל תַּחַת הָאֵלֶיהָ, וְכָל שְׁמָנוּ חֲכָמִים גָּבִי
טוֹמְאָה שְׁעוּרוֹתֶיהֶן כְּבָשָׂרוֹ, לְהִבְיָא עוֹר שֶׁל בֵּית הַבּוֹשֶׁת.

Whether it is the skin of the hooves, or whether it is the skin of the head of a tender calf, or whether it is the skin
under the tail, and indeed all those that the Sages enumerated regarding impurity whose skins are like their flesh,
which comes to include the skin of the womb—

BRAISA

חוץ למקומו – פסול, ואין בו פרת. חוץ לזמנו – פיגול, וחיביבין עליו פרת.

if one slaughtered the offering with intention to burn them **outside its proper place**, the offering is **unfit, but there is no kareth**; if **outside its proper time**, it is **piggul, and one is liable to kareth** for eating it. Thus, our Mishnah which equates
these skins to flesh follows this individual opinion, whereas the Rabbis hold only the skin under the tail is like flesh.

QUESTION

ועור בית הפרסות. מאי בית הפרסות?

Our Mishnah taught: **And the skin of the hooves** is like flesh. The Gemara asks: **What is** meant by **the hooves** in this context?

ANSWER

רב אומר: בית הפרסות ממש,

Rav said: It means **the actual hooves**, the skin covering the lowest part of the leg.

ANSWER

רבי חנינא אומר: רכובה הנמכרת עם הראש.

Rabbi Chanina said: It refers to the skin of the knee-joint **that is sold with the head**, which is higher up on the leg.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

ועור האנקה,

Our Mishnah taught: **And the skin of the gecko**, the desert monitor, the lizard, and the skink are like their flesh.

BRAISA

תְּנוּ רַבָּנָן: "הַטְּמֵאִים" – לְרַבּוֹת עוֹרוֹתֵיהֶן כְּבָשָׂרוֹן.

The Rabbis taught in a Braisa: The verse says, "the impure ones" among the creeping animals, which comes to include their skins as being like their flesh to convey impurity.

BRAISA

כָּוֹל אָפִילוּ כּוֹלָן, תִּלְמוּד לומר "אלה".

One might have thought this applies even to all eight sheratzim; therefore the verse states: "These," to exclude some of them.

QUESTION

וְהָא "אלה" אֲפֻלָּהוּ כְּתִיבִי!

The Gemara asks: But isn't "these" written regarding all of them, referring to all eight sheratzim?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַב: "לְמִינֵהוּ" הִפְסִיק הָעֲנִין.

Rav said: The word "according to its kind" written after the first three sheratzim interrupted the subject, so the inclusion of the skin only applies to the last five mentioned after it.

QUESTION

וְלִיחֲשׁוֹב נָמִי תִנְשָׁמֶת?

The Gemara asks: But if so, let us also count the chameleon, which is the last of the five listed in the second group?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַב שְׁמוּאֵל בַּר יִצְחָק: רַב תַּנָּא הוּא, וְתַנִּי תִנְשָׁמֶת.

Rav Shmuel bar Yitzchak said: Rav is a Tanna and has the right to dispute our Mishnah, and indeed he teaches that the skin of the chameleon is also included.

QUESTION

וְהָא תַנָּא דִּידָן לֹא תַנִּי תִנְשָׁמֶת?

The Gemara asks: But the Tanna of our Mishnah does not teach the halacha regarding the chameleon! Why does he exclude it?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַב שֶׁשֶׁת בְּרִיהַ דְּרַב אִידִי: תַנָּא דִּידָן סָבַר לֵה כְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה, דְּאָזִיל בְּתַר גִּישָׁתָא.

Rav Sheshet the son of Rav Idi said: The Tanna of our Mishnah holds like Rabbi Yehuda, who goes after the feel of the skin to see if it is soft like flesh, rather than relying on the verse.

EXPLANATION

ובגישתא דה'קטא'ה קמיפלגי.

And they argue about the feel of the lizard's skin, whether it is soft enough to be considered like flesh.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

וכולן שעיקרן [וכו].

Our Mishnah taught: **And all of them that one tanned**, or walked on, are pure.

גמרא GEMARA

QUESTION

הילך אין, לא הילך? לא?

The Gemara asks: If he **walked on** it, **yes**, it is pure, but if he **did not walk on** it, **no**, it is not pure?

OBJECTION

והא תני רבי חייא: אוזן חמור שטלאה לקופתו טהורה, טלאה – אף על גב דלא הילך!

But didn't Rabbi Chiyya teach in a Braisa: **The ear of a donkey that one patched onto his basket is pure** from impurity of nevelah, which shows that once he **patched it, even though he did not walk on** it, it is already considered processed hide!

ANSWER

לא: טלאה, הילך – אין, לא הילך – לא.

The Gemara answers: **No**, even if he **patched it**, if he also **walked on** the basket, **yes**, it is pure, but if he **did not walk on** it, **no**, it is not pure.

QUESTION

כמה כדי עבוד?

The Gemara asks: **How much** walking on it is required to be equivalent to tanning?

ANSWER

אמר רב הונא אמר רבי ינאי: ארבעת מילין.

Rav Huna said in the name of Rabbi Yannai: Walking on it for the time it takes to walk **four mil**.

ANSWER

רבי אבהו משום דריש לקיש אמר: לגבל.

Rabbi Abbahu said in the name of Reish Lakish: The time it takes for a baker to **knead** a dough.

STATEMENT

ולתפלה ולנטילת ידים – ארבעת מילין.

And regarding walking **for Tefillah** to a shul, **and for washing hands** before eating, one must travel up to **four mil**.

EXPLANATION

אמר רב נחמן בר יצחק:

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said to clarify this rule:

SUMMARY

The Gemara resolves that Rav Huna's ruling aligns with Rabbi Akiva, who holds that the hide nullifies the attached flesh regardless of whether it was severed by a knife or an animal. The new Mishnah lists various skins that are halachically treated as flesh for tumah purposes, noting that tanning them makes them tahor, except for human skin. The Gemara explains that human skin is Rabbinically tamei even after tanning to prevent people from turning the skins of their parents into mats. Finally, the Gemara discusses the dispute over wild boar skin and explores the precise definition of a young camel whose hump skin is still tender, leaving several queries by Rabbi Yirmeyah and Abaye unresolved.

למעשה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

The Mishnah teaches us a fascinating halachic reality: there are certain soft skins, like that of a tender calf or a young camel, that are so soft they are halachically treated as actual meat. But the moment a person tans them, or even just treads on them for the amount of time it takes to tan them, they lose their status as meat and become pure, tough leather.

Lichoira, we have to look at the one exception the Mishnah makes: "except for the skin of a human." Ulla explains in the Gemara that by Torah law, even human skin would become pure through tanning. Why did the Rabbis step in and decree that it remains tamei? "Lest a person make the skins of his father and mother into mats." The Sages understood that if we treat human skin like any other material, we will eventually lose our basic sense of human dignity and respect for our parents.

This is a tremendous yesod for our daily avodah. In the physical world, anything can be processed, flattened, and turned into a utilitarian object. We can get so used to "tanning" and hardening our lives that we begin to treat the most sacred things, our parents, our families, our own neshamos, as mere tools or mats to be stepped on. The Torah demands that we maintain a boundary of absolute respect and sensitivity. We cannot allow the cold, practical world to desensitize us to the holiness of a human being.

Today, make a conscious effort to show extra respect to a parent, a spouse, or a teacher. When speaking to them or doing something for them, pause for a second to realize their inherent holiness, ensuring you never treat them as just another practical part of your daily routine.