

Chizzuk NeededPosted by simchastorah - 04 Nov 2024 10:39

Shalom to all the courageous members of GYE, who deal with this nisayon that so many struggle with, bravely admitting to their issues and doing everything that they can to overcome it. I had a different thread in the past, but have not been active on it for a long time. I have been struggling recently and what I have tried has not helped. I have a filter, accountability with HHM, and have delved deeply into my inner life to try and understand the roots of my struggle. I daven passionately to Hashem in every way I know how to help me, but alas I find myself falling again and again.

My hisbonenus for today is to be mischazek in the emuna that Hashem has infinite koach and He can overcome my yetzer no problem. And ??? ?????? ???????. And that any voice in my head that tells me I'm bound to fail, ????? ??? ?????. As some explain the the ??? ????? is this thought itself, that I don't have the power to overcome the yetzer.

Yesterday I fell three times and by the end of the day I felt like I was living in hell. I finished a productive and meaningful morning seder and walked home davening to Hashem to help me not to fall. By the time I got home I felt that I had the chizzuk I needed to not fall. Even with being mchuzak I fell and wasted much precious time throughout the day trying to find cracks in my filter to squeeze out whatever filthy content I could.

But ????? ?????? and I am absolutely committed to not being ??????.

I am committing bli neder to posting here every day until I have 30 days clean from porn and masturbation.

=====

Re: Chizzuk NeededPosted by simchastorah - 16 Jan 2025 18:40

I certainly can't say what it says about it in kabbala, and you are right that it's not recommended (though the shulchan aruch doesnt mention any lack of recommendation about it so I feel comfortable saying it's mutar).

Anyway my original point mistama has been lost in all this back and forth about a point that had no real relevance. And as usual, I regret sharing anything more than a "?? on GYE.

=====

Re: Chizzuk Needed

Posted by BenHashemBH - 16 Jan 2025 18:49

[simchastorah wrote on 16 Jan 2025 18:40:](#)

Anyway my original point mistama has been lost in all this back and forth about a point that had no real relevance. And as usual, I regret sharing anything more than a "?? on GYE.

My Brother,

I appreciated your deep point and the valuable discussion surrounding it.

=====

Re: Chizzuk Needed

Posted by cande - 16 Jan 2025 19:13

[simchastorah wrote on 16 Jan 2025 11:40:](#)

I want to share a thought that I find very powerful which I recently shared with someone here in the chat and realized I had never shared here.

According to halacha we are required to be in darkness when we engage in intimacy. **This tells us that the true nature of the intimate act *can not* be perceived using the sense of sight. If we are seeing it, we are seeing a lie.** Only when we're not seeing it can we possibly perceive it correctly.

Ichora,

the fact that the gemara says 2 different reasons then you,

is ???? that it ???? its totally fine when those reason dont apply,

in fact it actually may be allowed if it will enhance the sexual experience ect..

anyway how by having lights on and looking @ your lovely wife will that make you
"perceive" the sex action as a lie??

cande

=====
=====

Re: Chizzuk Needed

Posted by simchastorah - 16 Jan 2025 19:36

Who says there's such a thing as the reasons ???? not applying? I understood the opposite - there is a ???? ????? inherent to the seeing of it, or doing it in a ??? of ????? even if you're not seeing it.

As far as the main point - I am not saying it will make you perceive the sex action as a lie. I am saying that every sensual perception brings with it a certain message. Meaning for example - if you hear a sad song the perception of it as being sad is something **within** the experience of hearing. So you could say your ears perceive a sadness in the music. With this ???? the ????? of it which is ???? when it's ?????, and especially in sight, contains a message about it which is false. What is that message? I don't know. But whatever that message is is false.

But when you perceive it with ?????? which requires not seeing, then you can perceive what is is ?????.

Regarding what it is - @yosefms suggested, and this idea does ring true to me, that just as we need to cover our eyes when we say ??? in order to block out the ????? of the world which will get in the way of focusing on or perceiving the ???, so too the ikkar of intimacy is the becoming ???, and when it's done ????? you're seeing the act without the ???, which is a ?? ????? of what it is (meant to be)

=====

Re: Chizzuk Needed

Posted by iyh2023 - 16 Jan 2025 19:44

[simchastorah wrote on 16 Jan 2025 19:36:](#)

Who says there's such a thing as the reasons ????? not applying? I understood the opposite - there is a ????? ????? inherent to the seeing of it, or doing it in a ??? of ????? even if you're not seeing it.

As far as the main point - I am not saying it will make you perceive the sex action as a lie. I am saying that every sensual perception brings with it a certain message. Meaning for example - if you hear a sad song the perception of it as being sad is something **within** the experience of hearing. So you could say your ears perceive a sadness in the music. With this ????? the ????? of it which is ????? when it's ?????, and especially in sight, contains a message about it which is false. What is that message? I don't know. But whatever that message is is false.

But when you perceive it with ?????? which requires not seeing, then you can perceive what is is ?????.

Regarding what it is - @yosefms suggested, and this idea does ring true to me, that just as we need to cover our eyes when we say ??? in order to block out the ????? of the world which will get in the way of focusing on or perceiving the ???, so too the ikkar of intimacy is the becoming ???, and when it's done ????? you're seeing the act without the ???, which is a ?? ????? of what it is (meant to be)

Is this the same guy that said, " I cant say what it says in Kabbalah"?!?

=====

=====

Posted by chosemysheM - 16 Jan 2025 19:48

But more than that. It's not just that we're trying to fill a real-life desire with a fake digital substitute. Follow along as I take this mashal too far. Deep down we have a genuine need for love (cake). We have a superficial desire for lust (icing). Sex can be done as cake or icing, but looking at digital things has a resemblance to lust* but no resemblance to love. It's like we're hungry for cake, but we think we want icing so we go eat icing-colored plastic. We're not just trying to fill a hole with a fake thing or a wrong thing. We're trying to fill a hole with a fake copy of

the wrong thing. And that leaves you eeeeeeeemptyyyyy.

Although I just said looking at things has no resemblance to love, it's not true that it has no place in love. This point is relevant to the lingerie discussion too. Undoubtably, looking is a powerfully stimulating thing. And using looking as a warm-up chelek of love might very well be a very enjoyable and beautiful thing. But, as ST is pointing out, it's not the thing itself. It's only a prelude or way to come to the thing itself. Hence, you can have all the lights in the world on - until you start that moment of connection, that moment of love.

Very speculative. And I think there's more to the point you're making. But yasher koach for sharing something that got me thinking. I appreciate it.

*I think there is some small drive to just see beautiful things, including women. And that drive is maybe, *maybe*, filled. But that's a tiny part of picture.

=====

Re: Chizzuk Needed

Posted by cande - 16 Jan 2025 19:55

[simchastorah wrote on 16 Jan 2025 19:36:](#)

Who says there's such a thing as the reasons ???? not applying? I understood the opposite - there is a ???? ????? inherent to the seeing of it, or doing it in a ??? of ????? even if you're not seeing it.

there are times were doing it by day or seeing is actually ?????? ??????

with love

cande

=====

Re: Chizzuk Needed

Posted by iyh2023 - 16 Jan 2025 19:57

there are times were doing it by day or seeing is actually ?????? ??????

with love

candePlease refer to R' COs post.

=====

Re: Chizzuk Needed

Posted by simchastorah - 16 Jan 2025 19:58

Man I was in the middle of an edit after better understanding candes point and then i closed my browser!

?So now I'm typing in notepad in the hope that i won't accidentally close that.

The ?? never says things like this. If we just parrot gemaros we won't have too much interesting things to say, and it certainly won't be us saying it.

One of the ????? the ?? gives is ??????. What is ?????? Yes ?????? ??????. But that's not the only ?? of ??????. The ?????? ?????? says that ?????? is a ?????? where even the ?????? ??????? are ?????? and the ??? himself becomes like the ????? ??????. That the ??? itself becomes something ??????.

And ?????? ????? the ?????? of all the existence is to become a ?????? of something ??????.

??? ????? ??????? ??? ??????? ??? ??? ??????? ??????? ???????.

To say that ????? ?????? jews refrain from doing this in the day is to say that doing this act in the day is ????? ??????, meaning taking something which should be a place where there is ????? a ?????? of how what's ????? is to bring out what's ????? and being ?????? that. ????? ?? ??? ?????? ???.

I hope I dont get in trouble for this point but clearly the perception of day is a perception which has in it a ?????? to the perception of light even when the light is off.

=====

Re: Chizzuk Needed

Posted by cande - 16 Jan 2025 19:58

[simchastorah wrote on 16 Jan 2025 19:36:](#)

But when you perceive it with ?????? which **requires not seeing**, then you can perceive what is is ?????.

the reason that the gemara gives because of ??????

has nothing to do do with **YOU not seeeeeing**, it has to do with dark.

see ????? ??? there

cande'

=====

Re: Chizzuk Needed

Posted by iyh2023 - 16 Jan 2025 19:59

[cande wrote on 16 Jan 2025 19:55:](#)

[simchastorah wrote on 16 Jan 2025 19:36:](#)

Who says there's such a thing as the reasons ??? not applying? I understood the opposite - there is a ??? inherent to the seeing of it, or doing it in a ??? of ????? even if you're not seeing it.

there are times were doing it by day or seeing is actually ??????

with love

cande

Please refer to R' chaimoigens post.

=====

Re: Chizzuk Needed

Posted by cande - 16 Jan 2025 20:02

[simchastorah wrote on 16 Jan 2025 19:36:](#)

so why did they open the "?" show us the ?????? embracing?

=====

Re: Chizzuk Needed

Posted by simchastorah - 16 Jan 2025 20:03

[cande wrote on 16 Jan 2025 19:55:](#)

[simchastorah wrote on 16 Jan 2025 19:36:](#)

Who says there's such a thing as the reasons ???? not applying? I understood the opposite - there is a ???? ????? inherent to the seeing of it, or doing it in a ??? of ????? even if you're not seeing it.

there are times were doing it by day or seeing is actually ?????? ??????

with love

cande

Really? When?

=====

Re: Chizzuk Needed

Posted by simchastorah - 16 Jan 2025 20:06

[cande wrote on 16 Jan 2025 19:58:](#)

[simchastorah wrote on 16 Jan 2025 19:36:](#)

But when you perceive it with ?????? which **requires not seeing**, then you can perceive what is is ????.

the reason that the gemara gives because of ??????

has nothing to do do with **YOU not seeeeeing**, it has to do with dark.

see ?????? ??? there

cande'

Thank you I will see the ?????? ??? ???"

I am trying to say that *you* seeing is a ????? of what's there in perception of ????? in general and therefore not a separate thing from ????? ?????

=====