

Vertlach

Posted by obormottel - 28 Oct 2011 06:33

Inspired by Yosef Hatzaddik (from the forum, not my favorite Bible hero, but who is also my recent hero) I would like to start a thread of more or less meaningful divrei Toiro that I have collected and that I will come accross in the future. Feel free to add on, criticize, or quote.

=====

Re: Vertlach

Posted by gibbor120 - 07 Nov 2011 16:00

I actually once heard a pshat that "Ish kol hayoshor b'aynov ya'ase" was a leshevach, not legnai. The did what they really felt was right. (not the standard pshat)

=====

Re: Vertlach

Posted by JackAbbey - 07 Nov 2011 16:54

everyone at the time he sins, he thinks he is doing right, as he is actually blindfolded

=====

Re: Vertlach

Posted by obormottel - 07 Nov 2011 17:07

[gibbor120 wrote on 07 Nov 2011 16:00:](#)

I actually once heard a pshat that "Ish kol hayoshor b'aynov ya'ase" was a leshevach, not legnai. The did what they really felt was right. (not the standard pshat)

Exactly! They may have been doing wrong things, but they "felt" it was the right thing to do.

[Shmeichel wrote on 07 Nov 2011 16:54:](#)

everyone at the time he sins, he thinks he is doing right, as he is actually blindfolded

I think the point is, that an addict even when he knows he's doing the wrong thing, does it anyways.

ANd that is the difference between then and now.

=====
=====

Re: Vertlach

Posted by JackAbbey - 07 Nov 2011 17:08

true

=====
=====

Re: Vertlach

Posted by gibbor120 - 07 Nov 2011 17:15

What you are both saying is true. the pshat though was that it WAS ACTUALLY a good thing. Like i said, it's not the standard pshat.

=====
=====

Re: Vertlach

Posted by obormottel - 14 Nov 2011 17:59

Someone posted an idea taken from a censored part of some holy book, reinforced by a "frum

psychotherapist woman", that Arizal held masturbation in a very high esteem for it's "potential power and good" etc.

To quote: "He references R. Isaac Luria (the great kabbalist known as the ?Ari?)

who writes that the souls contained within the ejaculate from masturbation or nocturnal emissions are on a higher level than those that result from sexual intercourse. This is because with masturbation the man is aroused by himself whereas in intercourse he is aroused by woman, and there is a certain energy and power in the self being the source of arousal". Ad kan divrei mee-oos.

Perhaps, R. Tzadok was reading a different Arizal, or perhaps, he was misquoted. Even so, this supposition shmeks to high heaven. Does anyone here beleives for one second that "with masturbation the man is aroused by himself whereas in intercourse he is aroused by woman"? Even if you leave out the issue of porn (external stimulant), a masturbating man is certainly having a woman-related fantasy, and is not merely aroused by himself.

To bring it back to Arizal, here is a shtickle Tanya (end of p. 7 of Likutei Amorim) that addresses this issue and Arizal's take on it:

?? ????? ?????? ??? ?????? ?????? ?? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ??? ?? ?????? ???
 ?????? ?????? ?????????? ?????? ??????? ?? ?? ?? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ??????
 ?????? ??? ?? ?????? ?????? ?????? ??? ?? ?? ?????? ??' ?????? ?????? ?????????? ?????? ?????? ??????
 ??????? ?????? ?????? ??? ?????? ??". ?????? ?? ?????? ??? ??? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ??
 ?????? ??? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ??????
 ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?? ?????????? ??????? ?????? ?? ?????? ??????? ?????? ?????? ?? ?????? ??????
 ??????? ??? ?????? ???????:

???? (???? ??????? ?????? ??????? ??????? ??????? ??????? ??????? ??????? ??????? ?????? ?????? ??????
 ?? ???' ?????? ??????? ?? ?????????? ?????????? ?????????? ?????? ??????? ?????? ??")? ?????? ??????
 ?????? ??? ?? ?? ?????????? ?????? ?? ??????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ??????
 ??? ?? ?????? ??????? ?????? ??? ?? ?? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?? ?? ?? ?????? ?? ??????? ?????? ??????
 ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ??????? ?????? ??? ???:

In short, zera l'vatolo adds life-force to klipois, and even though there is no woman present (and this fact makes tshuvo easier for hz"l than for biyos asurois), since the woman is present "in thought" it gives "koichois", powers, to the klipo.

In another place he explains, that since this chayus, life-force, is not limited by a woman who absorbs it, the klipois run wild and unlimited (as above, ?????????? ??????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ???????), and that is the reason why this sin is even more "chomur" than aroyos.

And in Iggeres Hatshuvo (Tanya) he quotes Arizal as recommending 84 fasts to anyone who was nichshal in this sin.

There is no doubt, that if someone is looking for an excuse, one can always find chapter and verse to justify his behavior.

However, I strongly feel, that we shouldn't be perverting traditional Toiro-musogim in order to fit a modern "syko" theory that is against Toiras Emes.

Shabsai Tzvi (may his memory be erased) was once found in a sodomic act with a young boy while wearing talles and tfilin. He explained (and brought Arizal to prove it) that in order to elevate those sparks of holiness that fell the lowest, one has to lower himself to the level of klipois. This is similar to what the article quoted above brings allegedly from R. Zadok that masturbation brings forth neshomois and thereby hastens the coming of Moshiach.

Malarkey is the name of this.

Just because it says something about masturbation and creation of the neshomois in Kisvei HoArizal doesn't mean anyone is free to make an illogical conclusion from this that not only it's ok to be moitzi zera levatolo, it actually brings the world closer to it's intended completion: the Days of Moshiach, may he come immediately and remove all doubt and impurity.

=====
=====

Re: Vertlach

Posted by obormottel - 04 Dec 2011 23:01

Man should ponder thoughtfully how great are the kindnesses of the Creator: Such a puny insignificant being, Man, can bring great delight to the "Greatest of all great" of Whom it is written, "There is no delving into His greatness."¹ Man ought therefore always be inspired, and perform his *avoda* with an eager heart and spirit.

Compiled and arranged by the [Lubavitcher Rebbe, Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson](#), of righteous memory, in 5703 (1943) from the talks and letters of the sixth Chabad Rebbe, [Rabbi Yosef Yitzchak Schneersohn](#), of righteous memory

=====
=====

Re: Vertlach

Posted by obormottel - 06 Aug 2012 15:14

[Think wrote on 27 May 2009 13:24:](#)

Here is a letter from the Lubavitcher Rebbe, Rabbi Menachem M. Schneerson, of righteous memory.

The core of Jewish vitality and indestructibility is in its pure faith in G-d; not in some kind of an abstract Deity, hidden somewhere in the heavenly spheres, who regards this world from a distance; but absolute faith in a very personal G-d, who is the very life and existence of everybody; who permeates where one is, or what one does. Where there is such faith, there is no room for fear or anxiety, as the Psalmist says, 'I fear no evil, for Thou art with me,' with me, indeed, at all times, not only on Shabbos or Yom Tov, or during prayer or meditation on G-d. And when one puts his trust in G-d, unconditionally and unreservedly, one realizes what it means to be really free and full of vigor, for all one's energy is released in the most constructive way, not only in one's own behalf, but also in behalf of the environment at large.

The road is not free from obstacles and obstructions, for in the Divine order of things we are expected to attain our goal by effort; but if we make a determined effort success is Divinely assured, and the obstacles and obstructions which at first loom large, dissolve and disappear.

I wish you to tread this road of pure faith in G-d, without over [unclear in original] introspection and self-searching, as in the simple illustration of a man walking: he will walk most steadily and assuredly if he will not be conscious of his walk and not seek to consciously coordinate the hundreds of muscles operative in locomotion, or he would be unable to make his first step.

Wishing you success in all above, and hoping to hear good news from you and yours,

With the blessing of a happy Yom Tov of Receiving the Torah with inner joy,

The content on this page is copyrighted by the author, publisher and/or Chabad.org, and is produced by Chabad.org. If you enjoyed this article, we encourage you to distribute it further, provided that you comply with the copyright policy.

=====

=====

Re: Vertlach

Posted by tehillimzugger - 07 Aug 2012 08:49

A.

[obormottel wrote on 04 Nov 2011 06:52:](#)

This is not exactly a vertel, but for the benefit of the public that likes tuna wraps: The question of whether it is mezonos or hamotzi only comes up if you figure that the tortilla is not lechem gomur, because if it is, you wash and bentch on any amount over a kezais. In my humble layman's opinion, flour tortillas are lechem gomur. It seems so from the Shulchan Oruch HaRav, Seder Hilchos Hanehenin, Perek 2. There are two types of tortillas, pressed and cut, but the dough they are made out of starts off as thick as your wife's chala dough, so it is not b'lila racho (runny batter), so essentially it is a soft matzo, which we know is hamotzi. The tortilla's primary function is to be a main part of the meal (k'vius pseudo) and it is not eaten for pleasure. These reasons compel that flour tortillas are lechem gomur. But even if we say for argument sake, that they are lechem sh'eino gomur, as long as you eat more than 230gr (4 kabeitzas acc. To Rav A.C. Noe) and going to be full, you say hamotzi. (If you going to be full from the amount lesser than 229, you should wash on kezais lechem gomur). The size 4 kabeitzas includes the "lipton", the stuffing of tuna or whatever, in the wrap, because the "lipton" is secondary to the bread and is therefore included in shiur sviyo. If you're not gonna be full, and going to eat less than 335gr (upto 6 beitzim), then you say mezonos, but if eating 336gr or more, you should wash on kezais of lechem gomur, and only then eat your wrap. So thinking it's lechem sh'eino gomur is confusing, and should therefore be avoided in favor of washing and bentching on tuna wraps. And here is a vertel: A frum Jew has three ta'avois: to be o-gedavente, o-gebenchte, and pareve. (Heard from rav Reisman). Sorry if I ruined it for you.

???? ?????? ????? ????? ?????? ?????? ??? ????? ???

????? ????' [?"?] ?????? ?? ??? ?????? ?????? ?????? ???? ???? ??"? ??????"? ???????
 ??????"? ?????? ?????? ??? ?? ?????' ?????? ??????"? ??? ??? ?????? ?????? ??????"?
 ??"? ?????? ?" ???? ?? ????? ?????? ??? ?? ?????? ?????? ??"? ?????? ?' ?????? ?????? ?????? ???? ??"?
 ??????? ??? ?????? ????' ?????? ??? ??"? ?????? ??"? ??????? ?????? ?????? ???? ?????? ??????"? ???
 ????? ??? ?????? ?????? ??????? ??????"? ?????? ?????????? ??? ?????? ??? ??????? ??????"? ????? ??????
 ??"? ?????? ?????? ??? ??? ??? ??????? ??????? ?????? ??????? ??????"? ??"?;

[illegible]

obormottel wrote on 14 Nov 2011 17:59:

Perhaps, R. Tzadok was reading a different Arizal, or perhaps, he was misquoted. Even so, this supposition shmeks to high heaven. Does anyone here beleives for one second that "with

To bring it back to Arizal, here is a shtickle Tanya (end of p. 7 of Likutei Amorim) that addresses this issue and Arizal's take on it:

Just because it says something about masturbation and creation of the neshomois in Kisvei HoArizal doesn't mean anyone is free to make an illogical conclusion from this that not only it's ok to be moitzi zera levatolo, it actually brings the world closer to it's intended completion: the Days of Moshiach, may he come immediately and remove all doubt and impurity.

8 / 14

activities of all kind, there was once a party where they named a certain Rebbetzin the Mezuza and everyone took turns kissing the Mezuza...

In the book "Chassidim U'Mitnaggdim" [two volume set] the "gilyon" of a shulchan aruch belonging to a certain melamed is printed [the melamed was thought to be a chassid, and later found to be a frankist] over there he goes into great detail explaining why Hz"l is actually the highest form of Avodah etc. For instance in O.C. 64, 4 [???? ???? ?? ???? ?? ?????? ??????, ??? ??????. ??" ???? ???? ?????? ?????? ?? ?????, ??? ?????? ???? ?????? ??? ?????? ?????? ?????, ?????? ?????? ?????? ??????. ??? : ?????? ??? ?? ?????? ?????? ??????] the melamed goes into a whole rage, how the ReM"A knew absolutely nothing and that the highest form of deveikus during Kriyas Shema is bringing oneself to erection and even ejaculation during davening....

When people say things like this, **THERE'S NO POINT IN ANSWERING.**

C.

o-gedavente

get the davening over with quickly

I thought he meant "oop-gedavent" which means "finished davening" same with benching.

=====

Re: Vertlach

Posted by tehillimzugger - 07 Aug 2012 09:52

[obormottel wrote on 28 Oct 2011 06:35:](#)

Below is my free translation from the original Hebrew:

It says in Chullin 58a: Every creature that has no bones doesn't exist for more than 12 months, and Talmud Yerushalmi adds, that it doesn't even stay alive for more than 6 months, and then within the next six months it disintegrates totally. (Yerushalmi Shabbos 83, h. 5).

This, then, raises the question: Being that the mabul lasted 1 year and eleven days, how did all the boneless creatures survived?

The Talmud in Sanhedrin , 108b, learns out from the posuk "I'mishpochoiseichem yotz'u min hateivo" (they left the teivo according to their families) that the animals left the teivo by their families but not those same animals who entered. As a proof, the gemoro in Chullin 58a, is brought: Every creature that has no bones doesn't exist (eino miskayem) for more than 12 months.

So if we are to understand the gemoro in Chullin without the clarification from Yerushalmi, that these creatures do not live for more than 12 months, we have a good answer: The original boneless creatures (insect etc) came into teivo pregnant, gave birth to offspring, and died. And it were their children who left the teivo after the mabul was over (by their families but not themselves).

However, if you take into account Yerushalmi's opinion that they didn't even live for more than 6 months (and 12 months mentioned in Chullin refers merely to their body's existence), then their offspring would also be dead by the end of the second 6-month period.

And since procreation was prohibited in the teivo (and only three creatures transgressed this prohibition as in Sanhedrin 108b), we are back to the original question: where do boneless creatures come from if there was no way they could have survived the mabul, even in the teivo?

This question is asked by the Lubavitcher Rebbe, ZTz"l, in his Reshimot that were printed for Parshas Noyach in 1997.

The Rebbe says, that we cannot answer this question by supposing that all boneless creatures come to be by spontaneous generation, and therefore, since they don't need a father and a mother to generate offspring, they came to life spontaneously after the mabul. This idea is not mentioned anywhere in Talmudic literature, and even though there is a concept of spontaneous generation, it is never said to include all creatures with no bones.

Additionally, the proof that even boneless creatures rely on male/female procreation is from Chullin 58b, where the gemoro brings down a male name and a female name for a particular boneless creature, suggesting that there is gender division within these species.

So the Rebbe offers the following explanation:

The supposition that all boneless creatures do not live for more than 6 months, and their bodies disintegrate after 12 months, relies on the movement of celestial bodies and on the pronouncements of new months. The proof of it is this: there is a halocho psuko (a known Rabbinical verdict) in Yore De'ot 124, that during a leap year even a boneless creature survives for 13 months. This is learnt out from Yerushalmi Ksuba, and brought down by Pri Magodim regarding checking of dried fruit for to'olaim (bugs).

The Shulchan Aruch says, that those fruits which become infested while on the tree, need checking for bugs up to twelve months from harvest, but could be eaten without checking after

that time because “kolberiyō sh’ein bo etzem eino miskaym 12 choidesh” (boneless creatures do not exist for more than twelve months). Adds the Pri Magodim, that during the leap year you must check for 13 months.

If this is the case, and the life-span of boneless (or perhaps all) creature is dependent on the movement of celestial bodies and the Beis Din’s pronouncements of leap year (as in the case in above Yerushalmi), the answer is clear:

During the year of the Flood, stars and planets did not move (see Yerushalmi Psochim P. 1, H. 1; Breishis Rabbo 25 and 33; you can also deduce from Sanhedrin 108b, that this is also the opinion of Talmud Bavli), so much so that even when figuring out the years since Creation, the year of the Flood is not counted (according to Rabbi Yehuda in Breishis Rabbo, and Rabbi Nechemya seems to agree). Therefore, this year didn’t count towards the life-span of the boneless creatures, and they survived the year in the teivo.

Nice! Though I wouldn't exactly refer to it as a "vertel" just a small excerpt from my writings:

??? ??????

??' ??????? ?????? ("? ??? ?") ?? ?' ????? ????? ??, ????? ????"? ????? ??, ?????? ??????.
 ???' ??????"? ("? ??) ????? ?????? ?????? ?? ????? ?? ?????? ?????? ?????? ??????

=====
 =====

Re: Vertlach

Posted by Pidaini - 06 Feb 2013 01:39

Just one Day at a Time!

The Pasuk in Parshas Yisro says "on this day they came to the Sinai Desert" Rashi explains that "on this day" means to tell us that "it should be as if it [the torah] was given on this day.

The Yismach Moshe explains that the entire Torah is advice in how to fight the YH, and here the Torah is telling us that we are supposed to tell ourselves that the whole coming to Har Sinai was only for TODAY, so how can i give it up until tomorrow when the Torah hasn't been given to me for tomorrow yet?

It's one day at a time!!

=====
 =====

Re: Vertlach

Posted by Pidaini - 29 Jun 2014 22:59

Dovid Hamelech writes in Tehillim 116;3 "?????? ???? ??? ?????? ???? ?????? ??? ?????? ?????"

"The sorrows of death compassed me, and the pains of hell found me: I found distress and sorrow."

The Radak observes that in the beginning Dovid Hamelech says "they found me" and right afterwards he writes "I found", he goes on to explain it in one way.

The first thought that came to me though was that the first two things, of being on the verge of death, are facts of what situation Dovid Hamelech was in, facts that he wasn't in control of, they had found him.

But his attitude, the way he perceived what was happening, that he looked at it with a negative attitude, *that* was of his own doing, those things he brought upon himself, therefore "I found them".

Whatever our situation, we can choose what our attitude will be towards them!!

=====

Re: Vertlach

Posted by shivisi - 30 Jun 2014 11:27

[Pidaini wrote:](#)

Dovid Hamelech writes in Tehillim 116;3 "?????? ???? ??? ?????? ???? ?????? ??? ?????? ?????"

...But his attitude, the way he perceived what was happening, that he looked at it with a negative attitude, *that* was of his own doing, those things he brought upon himself, therefore "I found them".

Whatever our situation, we can choose what our attitude will be towards them!!

I'm sorry Reb Pidaini- I don't think that Dovid Hamelech A"H was saying something negative about himself - that he [chas vesholom] - "looked at it with a negative attitude" when he said that ??? ????? ????

And the proof is, because the continuation of the posuk is "???? ???"? ?????".

ADARBA! Only a **clear realization** that "??? ??? ????? ????? ????? ??? ?? ????????? ????? ??????" brings a reaction of "???? ???"? ?????"

Thinking further, I think we can explain the change in the wording of the possuk to like this:

AT first ??????...????? ????? ??????? - Before I was ??????, Hashem sent me a "wakeup call" of tzoro veyagon & yesurim.

I then took advantage of that call and **I UTILIZED it positively** - to be "??? ???"? ?????"- Thus, now they have become **MY metziah** - thus the change to ?????.

Anyway, whether we learn your pshat or mine, your yesod is surely correct, and the lesson that we must look for the positive tachlis in our challenges, and utilize them in a positive way, is learned from this posuk.

Yashekoach!

=====

=====

Re: Vertlach

Posted by Pidaini - 30 Jun 2014 15:39

Thank You shivisi, it's good to know that there is someone who actually reads through all the

I think the natural, instinctive way that a human views such situations is in a negative light, once we realize that, we can try and change it.
Torah's that I write, and thoroughly enough to comment on each one!!

Actually, and I don't remember why I didn't like this part, the end of the thought was also "???? ?' ????" that when I find myself with the wrong attitude I call out to Hashem to help me view it the right way. (oh!! right!! the end of that pasuk doesn't flow so well with that, although there is some way to farenfer that as well)

=====
=====