

The Mark of Torah - Lust Chizuk

Posted by Markz - 02 Dec 2015 03:57

1. **TORAH TAVLIN:** a) Torah is not a blanket protection and can actually do the opposite [if not approached correctly](#). b) May not work for all forms of [Yetzer Hara](#)
 2. Gd wants our small [sacrifice](#) and [effort](#)
 3. **ODAAT:** [One Day at a Time](#). And a nice [source](#) for ODAAT.
 4. **DO SOMETHING:** When facing a personal challenge, We can't say "I tried, I cried, I prayed", No no no! [Do something positive!!](#)
 5. **BECHIRA:** The "main" bechira we have is to [avoid triggering situations in the first place](#)
 6. **THE 3 SECOND RULE:** [The pasuk is telling us - do not follow your heart to take that second look](#)
 7. **THE REAL PROBLEM:** To me it seems poshut that the problem is lusting [not shmiras eynayim](#)
 8. **WHITE KNUCLING:** Is not [the Torah way](#) so cut the [Confrontations](#). Which according to the Torah way [will not succeed](#)
 9. Is everyone in the world an [addict?](#)
 10. **WIFE:** Is she your [Pas Besalo?](#)
- Warning: Spoiler!**

11. **INTENT:** I'm a lustaholic and I want [Intimacy](#) leshem shamayim. Honest?
12. **TESHUVA:** Teshuva (the way we understand it) is [NOT recovery](#) but a ploy
13. in the Zohar, it is said the sin of wasted seed is the worst sin for which no recovery is possible. And that relations with non-Jews attaches to us even in Olam Haba. What are the [defenses against these charges?](#)

SCOURCES:

1. The prohibition of [V'NISHMARTA and V'LO SASURU](#)
2. including undressed unmarried [gentile women](#)
3. A wife is [like bread?](#)

HOLIDAYS

1. Chanuka - [ODAAT](#)
2. Thank Gd - [Al Hanissim](#)
3. The 3 Weeks - We are building the [Beis Hamikdash](#) with GYE

=====

=====

The Mark of Torah - Lust Chizuk
Posted by eslaasos - 15 Jan 2016 18:26

[cordnoy wrote:](#)

[markz wrote:](#)

[eslaasos wrote:](#)

Question for the weekend - why does mezonos and z'nus have the same shresh?

????????????? ????-?????-???? ????-???????? ????-???????? ????-???????? ????-????-
???????????? ????-???? ????-????

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

??? ??: ?? ?? ???? ?? ???? ?????.???? ??" ???? ???? , ??" ???? ???? ???? ???? ? ? ???? ????
?? ???? , ???? ???? ???? ???? ??
???? ???? ???? ???? , ???? ????
??? ????
???? , ???? ????
?.??) ?
????
????
????
????
????
????
????
????
????
????
???? ?

Nice vort.

Accordingly, es laasos's question is even stronger now.

I think you're referring to our previous discussion about this. To sum up, the similarity noted by the Kli Yakar is that both are Masbia. However, there is a difference because without food we would die, and without sex, we would not die.

I asked you then if perhaps the connection is that procreation is necessary for survival from a global and spiritual perspective, albeit not on the individual level.

If you meant something else, please share.

=====
=====

The Mark of Torah - Lust Chizuk

Posted by cordnoy - 15 Jan 2016 18:30

[eslaasos wrote:](#)

[cordnoy wrote:](#)

[eslaasos wrote:](#)

Posting on behalf of Stillgoing -

Maybe mezonos, which means sustenance, can be missused by overeating. Personally i find that when indulging in lust, i also do the same with food. When i was younger my body shrugged it off. Now im starting to feel the weight and it's calling attention to me, that eating (mezonos) and lusting (z'nos) often follow each other - at least for me.

Anything can be misused.

The shoresh of the word is probably it's definition when it is used properly.

At your convenience, can you please clarify.

It seems that you were implying the correlation of the words is that one can misuse eating or sustenance and therefore it is the same shoresh as zenus.

I am suggesting that the word zan, meaning sustenance has its meaning in its pure form, and that is not when one is overeating, but rather, when he is eating properly.

Accordingly, we would not have a connection between the two words.

=====

=====

The Mark of Torah - Lust Chizuk

Posted by cordnoy - 15 Jan 2016 18:37

[eslaasos wrote:](#)

[cordnoy wrote:](#)

[markz wrote:](#)

[eslaasos wrote:](#)

Question for the weekend - why does mezonos and z'nus have the same shresh?

???????????? ????-?????-???? ??????-???????? ?????-???????? ?????????? ????? ?????-
???????????? ??????-????? ?????????

?????: ?? ?? ????? ??? ??? ?????. ????????? ??? ?????:

??? ????: ?? ?? ????? ??? ??? ?????.????? ??" ???? ?????, ??" ???? ??? ????? ?????? ?? ?? ????? ?????
?? ?????, ????? ?????? ?????? ??? ?? ??? ?????? ?????? ??? ?? ????? ?? ?? ??? ???, ?? ??????? ??
????? ????????? ?????? ???, ????????? ????????? ?? ?????? ?????? ?????????, ??????" (???? ??:) ??? ??? ???????
??? ??????" (???????? ??.)????? ??? ?????? ?????? ??????? ??????, ?? ??? ?????? ?????? ?? ?? ?????
?????, ????? ????? ??" (???? ?:) ?? ??? ?? ??? ?????? ?????? ?????? ??? ??? ?????? ?????? (????
?.??) ?? ??? ??? ?????? ?? ??? ???, ?????? ??? ?????? ??? ??? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ??????
????? ?????? ?? ?? ????? ?????. ??? ??????, ??? ?? ??? ??? ???, ?? ?????? ????????? ?????? ??? ??
??????, ????? ?? ????? ?????? ?? ?????? ??? ??? ?????? ?????? ?? ????? ?? ??" ????? ?? ??? ?? ???
????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ??? ?????? ??? ??? ?????, ??" ?? ??? ?????? ???
????? ??? ?????? ??? ?? ?? ??????? ?" ?????? ??? ??? ?????, ?? ?????? ??? ??? ?????? ?? ?????, ???"
?? ?????? ?????? ??? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ??????

????? ?? ?????? ??? ?????? ????? ??? ?????? ?????? ?????? ??, ??? ?????????? ??? ???
??? ?????? ????? ??? ??? ??????? ??? ?? ???????

Nice vort.

Accordingly, es laasos's question is even stronger now.

I think you're referring to our previous discussion about this. To sum up, the similarity noted by the Kli Yakar is that both are Masbia. However, there is a difference because without food we would die, and without sex, we would not die.

I asked you then if perhaps the connection is that procreation is necessary for survival from a global and spiritual perspective, albeit not on the individual level.

If you meant something else, please share.

I try to focus on one topic at a time.

The keli yakar does not address the similarity of the two words. If anything, he contrasts them, for he equates the word lechem to be referring to eating and cohabitation, but only when performed with one's wife. Accordingly, when one cohabits with a woman who is forbidden to him, she is not lechem, and that is why there is no "zan" (unless you say that they are opposites).

=====

The Mark of Torah - Lust Chizuk
Posted by Workingguy - 15 Jan 2016 18:44

[eslaasos wrote:](#)

[cordnoy wrote:](#)

[markz wrote:](#)

[eslaasos wrote:](#)

Question for the weekend - why does mezonos and z'nus have the same shoresh?

???????????? ????-?????-???? ??????-???????? ?????-?????? ????????? ???? ????-
???????????? ??????-????? ?????????

?????: ?? ?? ????? ?? ???? ?????. ????????? ???? ????:

??? ????: ?? ?? ????? ?? ???? ?????.???? ??" ???? ???? , ??" ???? ???? ????? ???? ? ? ???? ????
?? ?????, ????? ????? ???? ???? ? ? ???? ????? ???? ? ? ???? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ?
???? ????????? ???? ???? , ????????? ????????? ? ? ???? ???? ?????????, ??????" (???? ??:) ???? ???? ??????
??? ??????" (???????? ??.)???? ???? ???? ????????? ????????? ???? , ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ?
??????, ????? ???? ??" (???? ??:) ?
?.??) ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? , ?????
???? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? . ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? , ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? , ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ?
??????, ?????
????
????
????
????
????
???? ?

Nice vort.

Accordingly, es laasos's question is even stronger now.

I think you're referring to our previous discussion about this. To sum up, the similarity noted by the Kli Yakar is that both are Masbia. However, there is a difference because without food we would die, and without sex, we would not die.

I asked you then if perhaps the connection is that procreation is necessary for survival from a global and spiritual perspective, albeit not on the individual level.

If you meant something else, please share.

Eslaasos, I've actually heard the answer that you gave many times in a similar context. Both of these Yetzer Haras- taavas achila and taavas tashmish- are necessary for people to survive. Food on an individual level, and reproduction on a global level. The same way that when they were ???? the Yetzer Hara they couldn't find chickens or eggs, I forget, if people wouldn't have a YH for food only smart people would remember to eat and others would die.

=====
=====

The Mark of Torah - Lust Chizuk
Posted by eslaasos - 15 Jan 2016 18:55

[cordnoy wrote:](#)

[eslaasos wrote:](#)

[cordnoy wrote:](#)

[markz wrote:](#)

[eslaasos wrote:](#)

Question for the weekend - why does mezonos and z'nus have the same shoresh?

???????????? ????-?????-???? ??????-???????? ?????-???????? ?????????? ?????-
???????????? ??????-????? ?????????

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

??? ??: ?? ?? ???? ???? ???? ?????.???? ??" ???? ???? , ??" ???? ???? ???? ???? ? ? ???? ????
?? ???? , ???? ???? ???? ???? ? ? ???? ???? ???? ? ? ???? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? , ? ? ???? ? ?
???? ???? ???? ???? ???? , ???? ???? ???? ? ? ???? ???? ???? ???? , ???? ?" (???? ??) ? ? ? ? ?
??? ???? ?" (???? ??) ???? ???? ???? ???? ???? , ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ?
???? , ???? ???? ?" ? (???? ?:) ? (????
?.??) ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? , ????
???? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? . ? ? ? ? ? ? , ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? , ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ?
???? , ????
???? , ?" ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ?
???? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ?" ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? , ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? , ??" ?
? , ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ,
???? , ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ?
??? ???? ???? ???? ???? ???? ? ? ? ? ? ?

Nice vort.

Accordingly, es laasos's question is even stronger now.

I think you're referring to our previous discussion about this. To sum up, the similarity noted by the Kli Yakar is that both are Masbia. However, there is a difference because without food we would die, and without sex, we would not die.

I asked you then if perhaps the connection is that procreation is necessary for survival from a global and spiritual perspective, albeit not on the individual level.

If you meant something else, please share.

I try to focus on one topic at a time.

The keli yakar does not address the similarity of the two words. If anything, he contrasts them, for he equates the word lechem to be referring to eating and cohabitation, but only when performed with one's wife. Accordingly, when one cohabits with a woman who is forbidden to him, she is not lechem, and that is why there is no "zan" (unless you say that they are opposites).

My understanding of the Kli Yakar is that he is indeed comparing the 2 terms in that tashmish in its proper form is masbia the eiver, the same way that lechem is masbia. However, if a person misuses tashmish and turns it into znus, then it is as you wrote and there is no satisfaction (it is not masbia) as he has corrupted the lechem.

I used to translate the word zan/mezonos as sustain/sustenance. According to this Kli Yakar, it appears satisfaction is more accurate.

Agav, I must thank Markz for this designated Torah of lust thread because otherwise you wouldn't philosophize with us.

=====

The Mark of Torah - Lust Chizuk
Posted by gibbor120 - 15 Jan 2016 19:48

Thanks Markz! Great Kli Yakar.

Not that he needs any haskama from modern science, but I indeed saw some physiological explanation of that same phenomenon. That the body actually reacts differently to intimacy with a wife vs masturbation. Hormones that are released or not released in each instance...

=====

====

The Mark of Torah - Lust Chizuk

Posted by cordnoy - 15 Jan 2016 20:13

[eslaasos wrote:](#)

[cordnoy wrote:](#)

[eslaasos wrote:](#)

[cordnoy wrote:](#)

[markz wrote:](#)

[eslaasos wrote:](#)

Question for the weekend - why does mezonos and z'nus have the same shoresh?

???????????? ????-?????-???? ??????-???????? ?????-???????? ????????? ????-????-
???????????? ??????-???? ????-????

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

??? ??: ?? ?? ???? ?? ???? ?????.???? ??" ???? ???? , ??" ???? ???? ???? ???? ? ? ???? ????
?? ???? , ???? ???? ???? ???? ?? ? ? ???? ???? ???? ? ? ???? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? , ? ? ???? ? ?
???? ???? ???? ???? ? ? , ???? ???? ???? ? ? ???? ???? ???? ???? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? , ???? ? ? (? ? ? ? ? ?) ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ?
??? ???? ? ? (? ? ? ? ? ? ? ?) ? , ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ?
???? , ???? ???? ? ? ? ? (? ? ? ? ? ?) ?
?.??) ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? , ????
???? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? . ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? , ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? , ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ?
???? , ?

12 / 23

I used to translate the word zan/mezonos as sustain/sustenance. According to this Kli Yakar, it appears satisfaction is more accurate.

Agav, I must thank Markz for this designated Torah of lust thread because otherwise you wouldn't philosophize with us.

He might be comparing the term seviah, but not zan.

My philosophizing is due to my interest in word meanings.

=====

The Mark of Torah - Lust Chizuk
Posted by cordnoy - 15 Jan 2016 20:15

[gibbor120 wrote:](#)

Thanks Markz! Great Kli Yakar.

Not that he needs any haskama from modern science, but I indeed saw some physiological explanation of that same phenomenon. That the body actually reacts differently to intimacy with a wife vs masturbation. Hormones that are released or not released in each instance...

Can you elaborate please, or provide a source?

I am not questioning; I am curious.

Is there a difference between intimacy with one's wife and cohabitation with a forbidden woman?

=====

The Mark of Torah - Lust Chizuk
Posted by kilochalu - 17 Jan 2016 00:13

He might be comparing the term seviah, but not zan.

My philosophizing is due to my interest in word meanings.

see tosfos gitin 6b zvuv about mazon and znus, its mistama not coincidental

=====

The Mark of Torah - Lust Chizuk
Posted by cordnoy - 17 Jan 2016 00:54

[kilochalu wrote:](#)

He might be comparing the term seviah, but not zan.

My philosophizing is due to my interest in word meanings.

see tosfos gitin 6b zvuv about mazon and znus, its mistama not coincidental

Now, that's a mareh makom!

=====

====

The Mark of Torah - Lust Chizuk
Posted by eslaasos - 17 Jan 2016 03:10

[kilochal wrote:](#)

He might be comparing the term seviah, but not zan.

My philosophizing is due to my interest in word meanings.

see tosfos gitin 6b zvuv about mazon and znus, its mistama not coincidental

Thank you.

Granted the Kli Yakar doesn't mention the word zan, but he does compare the two topics and I was understanding the Kli Yakar as providing the meaning behind the connection.

With the new maare makom it certainly seems to add up.

=====

====

The Mark of Torah - Lust Chizuk
Posted by markz - 17 Jan 2016 16:58

[the.guard wrote:](#)

[Briut wrote on 29 Jul 2010 14:49:](#)

1) I like lust. I'll be candid but politically incorrect here -- I find lust nourishing. (There. I said it. Whew.)

lo sassuru... asher atem **zonim** achareihem. The word "Zonim" comes from the word "zan" = "nourish"... Yes, the eye candy feels nourishing, but we are meant to one day 'lizon miziv hashchinah"... and eyes that were zan from lust won't be able to be zan from the ziv

hashchinah, which is a much higher and sublime delight. So it's worth holding back!

[Yosef Hatzadik wrote:](#)

In the beginning of Sefer Yehoshua, Rashi, The Radak, & The Metzudas, among others, state that Rachav HaZonah was not a prostitute, chas V'sholom. After all, she ended up marrying Yehoshua himself!!!

Rather they translate that she sold food. *Mocheres minei mezonos* is Rashi's words.

=====

====

The Mark of Torah - Lust Chizuk

Posted by cordnoy - 17 Jan 2016 17:44

[markz wrote:](#)

[the.guard wrote:](#)

[Briut wrote on 29 Jul 2010 14:49:](#)

1) I like lust. I'll be candid but politically incorrect here -- I find lust nourishing. (There. I said it. Whew.)

lo sassuru... asher atem **zonim** achareihem. The word "Zonim" comes from the word "zan" = "nourish"... Yes, the eye candy feels nourishing, but we are meant to one day 'lizon miziv hashchinah"... and eyes that were zan from lust won't be able to be zan from the ziv

[Yosef Hatzadik wrote:](#)

In the beginning of Sefer Yehoshua, Rashi, The Radak, & The Metzudas, among others, state that Rachav HaZonah was not a prostitute, chas V'sholom. After all, she ended up marrying Yehoshua himself!!!

Rather they translate that she sold food. *Mocheres minei mezonos* is Rashi's words.

Good stuff.

I was looking there last night but couldn't find anyone explaining the correlation. Nobody was even bothered by it.

=====

The Mark of Torah - Lust Chizuk
Posted by markz - 17 Jan 2016 19:14

TOPIC: A wife is like bread?

[neshamaincharge wrote:](#)

In ?????? ???:? the Torah refers to ??? ?????? as ???. Rashi says it is a ???? ???? for wife.

The ??? ??? says something that I always had trouble with:

???? ?????? ?????? ???, ?? ??? ?????? ?????? ??? ?? ????? ?? ?? ??? ???, ?? ?????? ?? ?????

???????? ???? ???- ?????? ?????? ?? ?????? ???? ????????, ?????"? ??? ??? ?????? ???

Loosely translated: a wife is referred to through the euphemism of "bread", because just as bread satisfies more than any other food, so too, permitted intimacy (with one's wife) satisfies a person. In contrast, with prohibited forms of sexual relations, the rule is-as our sages say- the more you feed it the more it goes hungry.

I had major trouble with this ??? ??? on many fronts:

1) is bread really the most satisfying food? What percentage of the trillion dollar food industry is bread?

2) is sex with one's wife really more satisfying than with anyone else? What percentage of the trillion dollar sex industry is intimacy between a man and his own wife?

My bigger question is:

3) how can the ??? ??? say that the rule of our sages that "the more you feed it, the more you need it" only applies to prohibited relationships? One of the places that the gemara mentions this rule is with reference to ??? ????, and it's clearly talking over there about intimacy with one wife! (I don't have a gemara in front of me, but I think it's Sanhedrin 107a- someone please correct me if I'm off)

The gemara there tells about how ??? knew that he was going to be tested in this area, so he slept with his wife in an attempt to minimize the ??????. The gemara says that ??? forgot the rule that "the more you feed it, the more you need it", so he actually made it harder on himself. According to the kli yakar, it should have worked like "bread"- it was permitted intimacy!

I would really like to hear your thoughts on this. I have an idea based on what I've learned on this forum, but I haven't seen a ????? for it. Feel free to comment!

I'm assuming that many of you had a similar approach to my question. That is that of course bread (and real kosher intimacy with one's wife) is more satisfying. It doesn't provide the fake "sugar high" that a donut has. It doesn't have the glitz and glamour of "sweet porn" (as Dov would say it).

Anyone who is on this site knows all too well how unsatisfying the junk fast- food fantasy is, as sweet and alluring as it seems at the time. We are often left with that same sick, sick feeling as

when we polished off a box of donuts.

Regarding ??? ??, and I say this with trepidation because I haven't seen a ???, but perhaps when the kli yakar says that permitted intimacy is satisfying, he doesn't mean all married sex. Maybe it's only if you're totally focused on giving to the other person, then it has that quality.

As pure as Dovid's motivations were, the gemara seems to say that he was trying to use this as a way of "filling himself" to try to minimize the impending nisayon. At Dovid's level, perhaps there was an element of taking rather than giving in intimacy, even though it was with his wife. Perhaps the ??? ?? would say -that's why it didn't work, and it fact it backfired.

Whether this is the accurate ??? or not, the lessons for me are profound. Many of us that are married are very much struggling with making sure not to lust -even after our own wives.

We read some of the bochurim writing about their having an expectation of having a "muttar outlet" once they get married. I'm not here to judge whether that's right or wrong. It just make me want to cry for all of the pain that that future couple might have to go through before he chaps what real intimacy is. It is only once I joined GYE that I began (still got long ways to go) to understand what it really means to be a giver in a relationship, which gave me a little taste of ?? ???

The following user(s) said Thank You: israel613120, cordnoy, lavi

[Shmeichel wrote:](#)

in my humble opinion i think that the kley yokor refers to non permitted relationship with your own wife, like when she is not o.k., or in forms how she does not appreciate it, these type of s*x does not satisfy your hunger it only makes it more hungry, in contrast to normal permitted relationship and in a way where she enjoys it, gives both sides great satisfaction

does that make any sense?

neshamaincharge wrote:

???? ???? ??"? ?? ??? ?? ??? ????? ????? ????? ???? ???? ???? ???? ???? ????
???. ????? ???? ???? ???? ???? ???? ???? ???? ???? ???? ???? ???? ???? ???? ???? ????.

I know that some of us have struggled with "putting bread on the table". Although nothing is so simple, I hear from this kli yakar that part of my Hishtadlus in earning more "bread", is to view and treat my wife as the only and most satisfying thing for me.

The paradox is, that the only way I will ever be really satisfied, is by not focusing at all on my own satisfaction, rather being totally focused on giving to her. If my giving is conditional - expecting something in return, I will go hungry.

kedusha wrote:

I also don't have the Gemarah in front of me, but my recollection is that, in the incident referred to, the Gemarah says that Dovid HaMelech had relations with one of his wives during the day. Maybe that was the Tzad issur she'bo (although, technically speaking, Dovid surely did no issur, considering that there are ways to have relations by day in a permissible manner).

The following user(s) said Thank You: neshamaincharge

[belmont4175 wrote:](#)

I had prepared a long reply for this one but it got lost somehow (my fault always).

In my small view, what the Kli Yakar means by ?? ?????? ?? ????? is real relationship and love, that husband and wife should have for each other that goes far beyond bodily connection, although it does have a physical touch, but the bonding reaches higher levels. (which some of us don't even know what it is at all).

To that some of us here can attest that: by giving in to our lust desires and fantasies elsewhere or even with our spouses if done in our selfish way just to fulfill our desires the way we viewed it in the dark world, "we will NEVER be satisfied enough".

I am sure there is a Mekor for this, although we don't need one (it's a fact) I will let the experts deal with that.

The following user(s) said Thank You: cordnoy, Shmeichel, neshamaincharge

[lavi wrote:](#)

since the experts haven't responded [they normally don't when called experts] i found a mekor that chasing after our desire will never satisfy us.

??? ????? ????????? ?? - ??? ????????? ?????? ???

(??) ????? ?????? ????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?? ??? ????????? ?? ??? ??? ??? ?????? ?????

From rabbi shlomo ben yehudah ibn gabirol circa 1020: [found on bar-ilan].

The following user(s) said Thank You: Shmeichel, neshamaincharge, belmont4175

=====

=====