

דף יומי • בכורות • דף ט"ו

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

THE SUGYA

We start off on our daf by continuing the shakla v'tarya regarding Rav's shitta on our Mishnah. The Gemara is bothered by how to establish the Mishnah's ruling that if consecrated animals died they must be buried, which points to the requirement of standing and valuation (ha'amadah v'ha'aracha). We explore whether this is because of Rabbi Shimon's shitta, or if we can even align it with the Rabbis according to Rabbi Yochanan. We also delve into the halachos of an animal whose consecration preceded its blemish, which is exempt from the firstborn (bechor) and the priestly gifts (matanos).

From there, the Gemara brings a Braisa that learns these exemptions from the hekesh comparing disqualified consecrated animals (kodashim she'nifslu) to a gazelle (tzvi) and a hart (ayal). The Gemara goes deep into the lomdus of this hekesh, asking why we need a special mi'ut of "ach" (however) to forbid the chelev (fat) of these animals, and how we know that the prohibition of "it and its offspring" (oto v'es bno) still applies. We also begin a discussion on the source for the Mishnah's ruling that these animals may not be sheared or worked.

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

עמוד א' DAF 15A

OBJECTION

”זו דברי רבי שמעון ומחלוקתו” מיבעיא ליה!

If so, then Rav **should have** formulated his statement as: **"This is the statement of Rabbi Shimon and his disputants"**, since both agree that an animal blemished before its consecration can be redeemed!

ANSWER

אמרי: רב כרבי שמעון בן לקיש, דאמר לרבנן: קדשי בדק הבית היו בכלל העמדה והערקה, קדשי מזבח לא היו בכלל העמדה והערקה,

The Sages say in response: Rav holds like Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish, who said that according to the Rabbis, consecrated property for Temple maintenance was included in the law of standing and valuation, but consecrated animals for the Altar were not included in the law of standing and valuation.

EXPLANATION

ולא מיתוקמא מתניתין כרבנן, דקתני סיפא: ואם מתו יקברו.

And therefore, **our Mishnah cannot be established** as agreeing with the Rabbis, as the latter clause teaches: **And if they died, they must be buried**, which shows that even Altar-consecrated animals require standing and valuation, which is only Rabbi Shimon's view.

QUESTION

אמר: ממאי דהא "מתו יקברו" משום דבעי העמדה והערכה הוא? דלמא משום דאין פודין את הקדשים להאכילן לכלבים הוא!

The Gemara asks: **From where** do we know **that this** ruling of "if they died they must be buried" is because they require standing and valuation? Perhaps it is because we do not redeem consecrated animals to feed them to dogs, and since they died, they are only fit for dogs!

ANSWER

אמרי: אם כן, ניתני: "אם נעשו טריפה יקברו".

The Sages say in response: **If so, let** the Mishnah teach: "If they became tereifah, they must be buried." Since a tereifah can be stood up, the only reason to bury it would be the rule against feeding holy things to dogs, yet the Mishnah did not rule so.

RESOLUTION

ואיפצית אימא: לעולם רב פרבי יוחנן סבירא ליה, ויתני: זו דברי רבי שמעון ומחלוקתו.

And if you want, say instead: **Actually, Rav holds like Rabbi Yochanan** that even the Rabbis require standing and valuation for Altar-consecrated animals, **and** indeed Rav taught the text of the Mishnah as: "This is the statement of Rabbi Shimon and his disputants."

QUESTION

אבל קדם הקדשן וכו'. מנא הני מילי?

The Mishnah taught: **But if their consecration preceded** their blemish, they are exempt from the firstborn and from the priestly gifts. The Gemara asks: **From where are these words** derived?

BRAISA

דתנו רבנן: "צבי", מה צבי פטור מן הבכורה, אף פסולי המוקדשין פטורין מן הבכורה.

For the Rabbis taught in a Braisa: The verse comparing disqualified consecrated animals to a "gazelle" teaches that just as a gazelle is exempt from the law of the firstborn, so too, disqualified consecrated animals are exempt from the law of the firstborn.

QUESTION

אוציא אני את הבכורה, ולא אוציא את המתנות?

The Braisa continues: **Shall I exclude** only the firstborn, and not exclude the priestly gifts?

BRAISA

תלמוד לומר: "איל", מה איל פטור מן הבכורה ומן המתנות, אף פסולי המוקדשין פטורין מן הבכורה ומן המתנות.

Therefore, the verse teaches: "and the hart"; just as a hart is exempt from the firstborn and from the priestly gifts, so too, disqualified consecrated animals are exempt from the firstborn and from the priestly gifts.

QUESTION

אי מה צבי ואיל חלפן מותר, אף פסולי המוקדשין חלפן מותר?

The Braisa asks: If so, just as the fat of a gazelle and a hart is permitted to be eaten, should the fat of disqualified consecrated animals also be permitted?

BRAISA

תלמוד לומר: "אך" — חלק.

Therefore, the verse teaches: "However", which divides and limits the comparison, teaching that their fat remains forbidden.

EXPLANATION

אמר מר: אוציא את הבכור, ולא אוציא את המתנות. מאי שנא אוציא את הבכור — שאין שוה בכל, ולא אוציא את המתנות — ששוות בכל. תלמוד לומר: "אך".

The Master said above: Shall I exclude the firstborn, and not exclude the priestly gifts? What is the difference that makes me exclude the firstborn? Because it is not equal for all animals, applying only to males. And why should I not exclude the priestly gifts? Because they are equal for all, applying to males and females. Therefore, the verse teaches: "and the hart" to exclude them as well.

QUESTION

אמר ליה רב פפא לאבאי: אי מה צבי ואיל, אין אותו ואת בנו נוהג בהן, אף פסולי המוקדשין אין אותו ואת בנו נוהג בו!

Rav Pappa said to Abaye: If we compare them, then just as a gazelle and a hart do not have the prohibition of slaughtering "it and its offspring" on the same day, so too, disqualified consecrated animals should not have the prohibition of "it and its offspring"!

ANSWER

אמר ליה: למאי מדמיית להו? אי לחולין — "אותו ואת בנו" נוהג בו, ואי לקדשים — "אותו ואת בנו" נוהג בו!

Abaye said to him: To what are you comparing them? If you compare them to non-sacred domesticated animals, the prohibition of "it and its offspring" applies to them; and if you compare them to consecrated animals, the prohibition of "it and its offspring" applies to them! Since it applies to both, there is no basis to exempt them.

OBJECTION

אמר ליה: אי הכי, גבי חלב נמי נימא הכי: למאי מדמיית להו? אי לחולין — חלבן אסור, ואי לקדשים — חלבן אסור!

Rav Pappa said to him: If so, regarding its fat as well, let us say this: To what are you comparing them? If you compare them to non-sacred animals, their fat is forbidden; and if you compare them to consecrated animals, their fat is forbidden! Why then did the Braisa need a verse to forbid their fat?

EXPLANATION

אלא, לאו מי אמרת "אך" ולא חלבן? אימר נמי "אך" ולא אותו ואת בנו.

Rather, is it not so that you said the word "However" comes to exclude and not its fat? Say also that "However" comes to exclude and not "it and its offspring"!

ANSWER

רַבָּא אָמַר: "אַךְ" לְאוֹתוֹ וְאֵת בְּנוֹ הוּא דְאֵתָא, וְחֵלְבוֹ מִ"דָּמוֹ" נִפְקָא, דְּכֵתִיב: "רַק אֶת דָּמוֹ לֹא תֹאכַל".

Rava said: The word "However" comes for "it and its offspring" to teach that this prohibition does apply, and its fat is derived from "its blood", as it is written: "Only its blood you shall not eat."

QUESTION

מַאי "דָּמוֹ"? אֵילִימָא דָּמוֹ מִמֶּשׁ, לֹא יְהֵא אֶלָּא דָּמֵן דְּעֵבִי וְאֵיל, אִטּוּ דָּמֵן דְּעֵבִי וְאֵיל מִי שְׂרִי?

The Gemara asks: What is "its blood" referring to? If we say it is actual blood, even if it were only like the blood of a gazelle and a hart, is the blood of a gazelle and a hart permitted that we would need a special verse to forbid it here?

ANSWER

אֶלָּא "דָּמוֹ" — חֵלְבוֹ.

Rather, "its blood" is a metaphor for its fat.

QUESTION

וְלִיכְתּוּב רַחֲמָנָא "חֵלְבוֹ"!

The Gemara asks: But let the Merciful One write "its fat" explicitly!

ANSWER

אִי כְּתִיב רַחֲמָנָא "חֵלְבוֹ", הֵוָּה אֲמִינָא: אֲהֲנִי הֵיכִיּוֹשָׁא וְאֲהֲנִי קָרָא. אֲהֲנִי הֵיכִיּוֹשָׁא לְמַעוּטֵי מִכֶּרֶת, דְּכִי כְּתִיב כָּרֶת — אֲאוּכַל חֵלֶב בְּהֵמָה הוּא דְּכֵתִיב, שְׁנַאֲמַר: "כִּי כָּל אוֹכֵל חֵלֶב מִן הַבְּהֵמָה". וְאֲהֲנִי קָרָא לְמִיָּקָם עָלֶיהָ בְּלֹא בְּעָלְמָא,

The Gemara answers: If the Merciful One had written "fat", I would have said: Both the comparison to the gazelle and the verse are effective. The comparison is effective to exclude it from kares, because the penalty of kares is only written for eating the fat of a domestic animal, as it says: "For whoever eats the fat of the animal..."; and the verse is effective to establish a standard negative prohibition against eating it.

EXPLANATION

לְהֵכִי אִפְקִיָּה רַחֲמָנָא בְּלִשׁוֹן "דָּמוֹ", לְוִמַר לָךְ: מָה דָּמוֹ בְּכֶרֶת — אֵף חֵלְבוֹ בְּכֶרֶת.

Therefore, the Merciful One expressed it in the language of "its blood", to tell you: Just as blood carries the penalty of kares, so too, its fat carries the penalty of kares.

QUESTION

וְהָא תַנָּא "אַךְ", וְלֹא חֵלְבוֹ, קֹאֲמַר!

The Gemara asks: But the Tanna of the Braisa says: "However" excludes and not its fat! How can Rava say "However" refers to "it and its offspring"?

ANSWER

הָכִי קֹאֲמַר: אֵילּוֹ לֹא נֶאֱמַר "דָּמוֹ", הִיִּיתִי אוֹמֵר "אַךְ" — וְלֹא חֵלְבוֹ, עֲכָשְׁיוֹ שְׁנַאֲמַר "דָּמוֹ", לְאוֹתוֹ וְאֵת בְּנוֹ הוּא דְאֵתָא.

The Gemara answers: **This is what** the Tanna is saying: Had "its blood" not been said, I would have said "However" excludes **and not its fat; now that "its blood" is said** to forbid the fat, the word "However" comes for "it and its offspring".

QUESTION

ואינן יוצאין לחולין. מנא הני מילי?

The Mishnah taught: **And they do not go out to non-sacred status** to be sheared and worked. The Gemara asks: **From where are these words derived?**

BRAISA

דתנו רבנן: "תזבח" — ולא גיזה, "בשר" — ולא חלב, "ואכלת" — ולא לכלביה, מפאן שאין פודין את הקדשים להאכילן לכלבים.

For the Rabbis taught in a Braisa: The verse says: "You shall slaughter" — and not shear its wool; "flesh" — and not milk; "and you shall eat" — and not for your dogs. From here we derive that we do not redeem consecrated animals to feed them to dogs.

עמוד ב' DAF 15B

STATEMENT

איכא דאמרי: "תזבח ואכלת" — אין לה בהן היתר אכילה אלא משעת זביחה ואילתה.

There are those who say a different version of this drasha: The verse says, "You may slaughter and eat" — this teaches that you have permission to eat them only from the time of slaughter onward, meaning that before shechita, they are forbidden to be eaten,

EXPLANATION

אבל פודין את הקדשים להאכילן לכלבים, הכי נמי דאמר.

but as for the ruling that one may redeem sacrificial animals to feed them to dogs, indeed, so too he says that this is permitted, because that halacha is not derived from the words "and you may eat."

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

וולדו וחלבן אסור לאחר פדיונן.

The Mishnah taught: **And their offspring and their milk are prohibited after their redemption.**

גמרא GEMARA

QUESTION

היכי דמי?

The Gemara asks: **What are the circumstances** of the offspring's birth?

OBJECTION

אֵילִימָא דְּאֵיעֵבֵר וְאֵיתִּילִיד לְאַחַר פְּדִיּוֹנָן — אֲמַאי?

If we say that the offspring was conceived and born after their redemption, why should it be prohibited?

EXPLANATION

וְלֵיד צָבִי וְאַיִל בִּינְהוּ!

After all, they are like the offspring of a gazelle and a hart, which are completely chullin!

ANSWER

אֶלָּא דְּאֵיעֵבֵר לְפָנֵי פְּדִיּוֹנָן וְאֵיתִּילִיד לְאַחַר פְּדִיּוֹנָן.

Rather, we must say that the offspring was conceived before their redemption and born after their redemption.

INFERENCE

הָא לְפָנֵי פְּדִיּוֹנָן — מִיִּקְדָּשׁ נִמְי קֻדְּשִׁי.

The Gemara infers: **But** if they were born before their redemption, they are also holy with inherent sanctity.

QUESTION

מִנָּא הֵנִי מִיִּלִּי?

The Gemara asks: **From where are these words** derived, that the offspring of a consecrated animal is holy?

PROOF

דְּתַנּוּ רַבָּנָן: "זָכָר" — לְרִבּוֹת אֶת הַזֶּלֶד, ו"נִקְבָּה" — לְרִבּוֹת אֶת הַתְּמוּרָה.

As the Rabbis taught in a Braisa: The verse regarding peace-offerings says "whether male or female." The word "male" comes to include the offspring of a peace-offering, and "female" comes to include the substitute of a peace-offering.

QUESTION

וְאֵין לִי אֶלָּא זֶלֶד תְּמִימִין וְתְּמוּרַת תְּמִימִים, וְלֹדִי בְּעָלִי מוּמִין וְתְּמוּרַת בְּעָלִי מוּמִין מִנִּין?

And I only have a source for the offspring of unblemished animals and the substitute of unblemished animals; from where do we derive the offspring of blemished animals and the substitute of blemished animals?

ANSWER

כִּשְׁהוּא אוֹמֵר "אִם זָכָר" — לְרִבּוֹת זֶלֶד בְּעָלִי מוּמִין, "אִם נִקְבָּה" — לְרִבּוֹת תְּמוּרַת בְּעָלִי מוּמִין.

When it says "if male," the extra word "if" comes to include the offspring of blemished animals; and when it says "if female," the extra "if" comes to include the substitute of blemished animals.

QUESTION

אוֹתָן וְלֹדוֹת שְׁלֹאֲחֵר פְּדִיּוֹנָן, מָה תָּהֵא עֲלֵיהֶן?

The Gemara asks: **Those offspring that** were born **after their redemption**, what shall be with them? Since they cannot be offered on the Mizbe'ach, nor can they be redeemed.

EXPLANATION

לפני פדיונו — מיפֿלג פֿליגי בָּחוּ, איפֿא לִמָּאן דָּאָמַר: קִדְּשִׁי לִיקָרְבַּ, וְאִיפֿא לִמָּאן דָּאָמַר: קִדְּשִׁי לְרַעְיָה.

The Gemara notes: If they were born **before their redemption**, they argue about them; there is one who says they are **holy to be offered** on the Mizbe'ach, and there is one who says they are **holy to graze** until they get a blemish and can be redeemed.

QUESTION

דלִאֲחֵר פֿדיונו, מָה תִּהְיֶה עָלֵיהֶן?

But as for those born **after their redemption**, what shall be with them?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַב הוּנָא: כּוֹנְסִין לְכִיפָּהּ, וְהֵן מֵתִין.

Rav Huna said: One puts them into a chamber and they die of starvation.

EXPLANATION

דְּהִיכִי לִיעֲבִיד? לִיקָרְבִּינָהוּ — מִכַּחַּ קְדוּשָׁה דְּחוּיָהּ קֶאֱתוּ, לִיפְרָקִינָהוּ — לֹא אֲלִימִי לְמִיתָפֶס פֿדיונו.

For what should we do? Should we offer them? They come from the power of a pushed-aside sanctity of the mother, so they are unfit for the Mizbe'ach. Should we redeem them? They are **not strong enough** in their sanctity to catch their redemption money.

STATEMENT

אָמְרִי בְּמַעֲרָבָא מִשְׁמִיָּה דְּרַבִּי חֲנִינָא: סָמוּךְ לְפִדְיוֹנָן מִתְּפִיסִין לְשֵׁם אוֹתוֹ זָבַח.

They said in the West, Eretz Yisrael, in the name of Rabbi Chanina: Close to their redemption, one consecrates them for the sake of that same sacrifice.

QUESTION

סָמוּךְ לְפִדְיוֹנָן? לְמִימָרָא דְּבָנֵי פְּדִיָּה נִינְהוּ?

The Gemara asks: Close to their redemption? Is that to say that they are subject to redemption? But we just said they cannot be redeemed!

ANSWER

אֵלָא אִימָא: סָמוּךְ לְפִדְיוֹן אֲמֵן מִתְּפִיסִין לְשֵׁם אוֹתוֹ זָבַח.

Rather, say: Close to the redemption of their mother, while they are still in the womb, one consecrates them for the sake of that same sacrifice.

QUESTION

טעמא מאי?

The Gemara asks: **What is the reason** that we must do this, rather than leaving them as they are?

ANSWER

אמר רבי לוי: גזירה שמה יגדל מהן עדרים עדרים.

Rabbi Levi said: It is a Rabbinic decree, lest one raise flocks and flocks from them and come to shear them or work them.

QUESTION

בעא מיניה רבינא מרב ששת: מהו שמתפיסין לכל זבח שירצה?

Ravina asked Rav Sheshet: What is the law as to whether one can consecrates them for any sacrifice that he wants?

ANSWER

אמר ליה: אין מתפיסין.

He said to him: One may not consecrate them for any other sacrifice.

QUESTION

מאי טעמא?

Ravina asked: **What is the reason?**

ANSWER

אמר ליה: גמר "בשעריך" "בשעריך" מבכור,

He said to him: We learn a gezeerah shavah of "within your gates" written by redeemed animals, from "within your gates" written by a firstborn.

EXPLANATION

מה בכור אין מתפיסין לכל זבח שירצה, דכתיב: "אך בכור אשר יבפר לה' בבהמה וגו' לא יקדיש איש אתו", אף הני אין מתפיסין לכל זבח שירצה.

Just as a firstborn, one cannot consecrate it for any sacrifice that he wants, as it is written: "However, a firstborn which is born as a firstborn to Hashem among animals, a man shall not sanctify it" for another offering, so too these, one cannot consecrate them for any sacrifice that he wants.

PROOF

תנא כוותיה דרב ששת:

The Gemara notes: **It is taught in a Braisa in accordance with Rav Sheshet:**

BRAISA

קדשים שקדם מום קבוע להקדישן ונפדו — חייבין בבכורה ובמתנות,

Sacrificial animals whose permanent blemish preceded their consecration and were redeemed, are obligated in the law of the firstborn and in the priestly gifts,

BRAISA

בין לפני פדיונם בין לאחר פדיונם — הגויז והעובד בהן אינו סופג את הארבעים,

whether before their redemption or after their redemption, one who shears them or works with them does not receive forty lashes,

BRAISA

בין לפני פדיונם בין לאחר פדיונם — אין עושין תמורה.

and whether before their redemption or after their redemption, they do not make a substitute holy.

BRAISA

ולפני פדיונם — מועלין בהן, ולאחר פדיונם — אין מועלין בהן.

And before their redemption, one can commit me'ilah with them, but after their redemption, one cannot commit me'ilah with them.

BRAISA

ונלדותיהן — חול, ונפדין תמימים, ומתפיסן לכל זבח שירצה.

And their offspring are chullin if born after redemption; and they may be redeemed even while unblemished if born before redemption; and one may consecrate them for any sacrifice that he wants.

BRAISA

כללו של דבר: הרי הן כחולין לכל דבריהם, אין להן בהם אלא מצות עלוי בלבד.

The general rule of the matter: Behold, they are like chullin for all their matters, and you only have in them the mitzvah of value alone to give their worth to Hekdesh.

BRAISA

אבל קדם הקדישן את מומן, או מום עובר להקדישן, ולאחר מכאן נולד מום קבוע ונפדו — פטורין מן הבכורה ומן המתנות,

But if their consecration preceded their blemish, or if a temporary blemish preceded their consecration and afterwards a permanent blemish occurred and they were redeemed, they are exempt from the law of the firstborn and from the priestly gifts,

BRAISA

בין לפני פדיונם בין לאחר פדיונם. הגויז והעובד בהן סופג את הארבעים,

whether before their redemption or after their redemption. And one who shears them or works with them receives forty lashes,

BRAISA

ובין לפני פדיונם בין לאחר פדיונם — עושין תמורה.

and whether before their redemption or after their redemption, they make a substitute holy.

BRAISA

לפני פדיונם — מועלין בהן, ולאחר פדיונם — אין מועלין בהן,

Before their redemption, one can commit me'ilah with them, but after their redemption, one cannot commit me'ilah with them.

BRAISA

וילדותיהן קודש, ואין ניפדין תמימין, ואין מתפיסן לכל זבח שירצה.

And their offspring are holy, and they cannot be redeemed while unblemished, and one cannot consecrate them for any sacrifice that he wants — which is exactly like Rav Sheshet's ruling.

BRAISA

כָּלֹּ שֶׁל דָּבָר: הָרִי הוּא כְּהֶקְדֵּשׁ לְכָל דְּבָרֵיהֶם, וְאִין לָהּ בָּהֶם אֶלָּא הֵיתֵר אֲכִילָה בְּלֶבֶד.

The general rule of the matter: Behold, they are like Hekdash for all their matters, and you only have in them permission of eating alone after they are slaughtered.

EXPLANATION

”כָּלֹ שֶׁל דָּבָר” דְּרִישָׁא — לְאַתּוּי שׁוּחָטֵן בְּחוּץ דְּפֶטוּר, ”כָּלֹ שֶׁל דָּבָר” דְּסִיפָּא —

The Gemara explains: The "general rule of the matter" of the first clause of the Braisa comes to include one who slaughters them outside the Beis HaMikdash, that he is exempt from the punishment of kares. The "general rule of the matter" of the second clause comes to include...

SUMMARY

The Gemara first resolves Rav's view of the Mishnah, showing that either the Mishnah follows Rabbi Shimon who requires standing and valuation for Altar-consecrated animals, or it can even follow the Rabbis if we hold like Rabbi Yochanan. Next, the Gemara analyzes the Braisa's derivation exempting disqualified consecrated animals from bechor and matanos based on the comparison to a tzvi and an ayal. Through a series of kashas and teretzim between Rav Pappa, Abaye, and Rava, the Gemara clarifies that while the hekesh exempts them from these gifts, a special limud of "ach" or "its blood" is needed to teach that their chelev remains forbidden under the penalty of kares, and that the prohibition of "oto v'es bno" still applies. Finally, the Gemara brings a Braisa deriving from the pesukim that one may not shear, work, or milk these redeemed animals, nor may we redeem consecrated animals solely to feed them to dogs.

The Gemara is bothered by a deep question: when an animal is consecrated to Hashem and then becomes blemished, it is redeemed and enters a strange, in-between state. It is no longer fit for the Altar, yet it is not completely regular chullin either. The Torah compares it to a gazelle and a hart, but Rava teaches us that we still apply the prohibition of "it and its offspring", we cannot slaughter the mother and its young on the same day. Even though this animal has lost its primary holy status, we must still treat its life and its relationships with a high level of sensitivity and care.

This teaches us a tremendous yesod in our own avodas Hashem. Sometimes, we feel like we have become "blemished." We had high aspirations, we made holy commitments, but then things broke down. We feel like we have been "redeemed" down to a lower, more mundane level of existence, far from the Altar we once dreamed of serving on. The yetzer hara whispers that since we are no longer in that pristine, holy state, it doesn't matter how we act anymore. We might as well throw away our sensitivity.

But the Torah is telling us: even "פסולי המוקדשין", disqualified holy things, retain a trace of their original sanctity. You are still a child of Hashem, and the holy moments of your past still define who you are today. Even if you cannot serve on the Altar right now, you are still expected to maintain your refinement, your sensitivity to mitzvos, and your care for others. A Yid is never truly "chullin."

Today, if you feel discouraged about a spiritual setback or a broken commitment, remind yourself that your past holiness still lives within you. Do one small, refined act of sensitivity, like speaking gently to a family member or taking extra care with a brachah, to show that you still carry that inner kedushah.