חוּמָּשׁ עִם רַשִׁ"י · וישלח · שְׁלִישִׁי

Complete Word-for-Word Interlinear · Navy & Gold Edition

VAYISHLACH · 3RD ALIYAH

📖 CHAPTER PREVIEW

In this aliyah, Yaakov Avinu names the place of his holy struggle Peniel, acknowledging Hashem's chasdim in saving his life after wrestling with the angel. As the sun rises to heal him, Yaakov moves forward limping from his injury, establishing the eternal mitzvah for Klal Yisrael to abstain from eating the gid hanasheh.

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

פָּסוּק א

Pasuk 1

וַיִּקְרָא יַעֲקֹב שֵׁם הַמָּקוֹם פְּנִיאֵל כִּי רָאִיתִי אֱלֹהִים פָּנִים אֶל פָּנִים

And he called Yaakov the name of the place Peniel for I saw an angel face to face

וַתִּנָּצֵל נַפְשִׁי׃

and was saved my soul

פָּסוּק ב

Pasuk 2

וַיִּזְרַח לוֹ הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ כַּאֲשֶׁר עָבַר אֶת פְּנוּאֵל וְהוּא צֹלֵעַ עַל יְרֵכוֹ׃

And shone for him the sun as he passed — Penuel and he was limping on his hip

רַשִׁ"י

ויזרח לו השמש. לְשׁוֹן בְּנֵי אָדָם הוּא כְּשֶׁהִגַּעְנוּ לְמָקוֹם פְּלוֹנִי הֵאִיר לָנוּ

And shone upon him the sun. an idiom of sons of man it is when we reached to a place such and such shone for us

הַשַּׁחַר, זֶהוּ פְּשׁוּטוֹ; וּמִ"אַ וַיִּזְרַח לוֹ לְצָרְכּוֹ – לְרַפְּאוֹת אֶת צָלַעְתּוֹ,

the dawn this is its plain sense and the Midrash Aggadah and shone for him for his needs — to heal his lameness —

כְּמָה דְתֵימָא שֶׁמֶשׁ צְדָקָה וּמַרְפֵּא בִּכְנָפֶיהָ מלאכי ג' ; וְאוֹתָן שָׁעוֹת שֶׁמִּהֲרָה

as you say a sun of righteousness with healing in its wings Malachi 3 and those hours that it hastened

לִשְׁקֹעַ בִּשְׁבִילוֹ כְּשֶׁיָּצָא מִבְּאֵר שֶׁבַע מִהֲרָה לִזְרֹחַ בִּשְׁבִילוֹ׃

to set for his sake when he left from Be'er Sheva it hastened to rise for his sake

רַשִׁ"י

והוא צלע. הָיָה צוֹלֵעַ כְּשֶׁזָּרְחָה הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ׃

And he limped he was limping when shone the sun

Pasuk 3

עַל כֵּן לֹא יֹאכְלוּ בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת גִּיד הַנָּשֶׁה אֲשֶׁר עַל

is upon which the displaced the sinew of — Yisrael the children of do eat not · therefore

כַּף הַיָּרֵךְ עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה כִּי נָגַע בְּכַף יֶרֶךְ יַעֲקֹב בְּגִיד

at the sinew of Yaakov the hip of the socket of he touched because this the day until the hip the socket of

הַנָּשֶׁה׃

the displaced

רַשִׁ"י

גיד הנשה. לָמָּה נִקְרָא שְׁמוֹ גִּיד הַנָּשֶׁה? לְפִי שֶׁנָּשָׁה מִמְּקוֹמוֹ וְעָלָה,

and rose from its place that it sprang because the thigh-vein the sinew of its name is called why the thigh-vein the sinew of

וְהוּא לְשׁוֹן קְפִיצָה, וְכֵן נָשְׁתָה גְּבוּרָתָם ירמיהו נ"א , וְכֵן כִּי

for and similarly 51:30 Yirmiyahu their strength sprang away and similarly springing an expression of and it is

נַשַּׁנִי אֱלֹהִים אֶת כָּל עָמָלִי בראשית מ"א :

41:51 Bereshis my trouble all — God made spring away

פָּסוּק ד

Pasuk 4

וַיִּשָּׂא יַעֲקֹב עֵינָיו וַיַּרְא וְהִנֵּה עֵשָׂו בָּא וְעִמּוֹ אַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת אִישׁ

men hundred four and with him was coming Esav and behold and he saw his eyes Yaakov And he lifted

וַיַּחַץ אֶת הַיְלָדִים עַל לֵאָה וְעַל רָחֵל וְעַל שְׁתֵּי הַשְּׁפָחוֹת׃

handmaids the two and among Rachel and among Leah among the children — and he divided

פָּסוּק ה

Pasuk 5

וַיָּשֶׂם אֶת הַשְּׁפָחוֹת וְאֶת יַלְדֵיהֶן רִאשֹׁנָה וְאֶת לֵאָה וְיַלְדֶיהָ אַחֲרֹנִים

next and her children Leah and — first their children and — the maidservants — and he placed

וְאֶת רָחֵל וְאֶת יוֹסֵף אַחֲרֹנִים׃

last Yosef and — Rachel and —

רַשִׁ"י

ואת לאה וילדיה אחרנים. אַחֲרוֹן אַחֲרוֹן חָבִיב׃

more beloved latter latter last and her children Leah and —

פָּסוּק ו

Pasuk 6

וְהוּא עָבַר לִפְנֵיהֶם וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ אַרְצָה שֶׁבַע פְּעָמִים עַד גִּשְׁתּוֹ עַד אָחִיו׃

his brother unto his approaching until times seven to the ground and bowed before them passed and he

רַשִׁ"י

עבר לפניהם. אָמַר אִם יָבֹא אוֹתוֹ רָשָׁע לְהִלָּחֵם יִלָּחֵם בִּי תְּחִלָּה׃

first with me let him fight to fight wicked man that comes if he said before them passed

פָּסוּק ז

Pasuk 7

וַיָּרָץ עֵשָׂו לִקְרָאתוֹ וַיְחַבְּקֵהוּ וַיִּפֹּל עַל צַוָּארָו וַיִּשָּׁקֵהוּ וַיִּבְכּוּ׃

and they wept and kissed him his neck upon and fell and embraced him toward him Esav and ran

רַשִּׁ"י

ויחבקהו. נִתְגַּלְגְּלוּ רַחֲמָיו, כְּשֶׁרָאָהוּ מִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה כָּל הִשְׁתַּחֲוָאוֹת הַלָּלוּ׃

these prostrations all prostrating himself when he saw him his mercies were aroused and he embraced him

רַשִּׁ"י

וישקהו. נָקוּד עָלָיו; וְיֵשׁ חוֹלְקִין בַּדָּבָר הַזֶּה בַּבָּרַיְתָא דְּסִפְרֵי, יֵשׁ שֶׁדָּרְשׁוּ נְקֻדָּה זוֹ שֶׁלֹּא נְשָׁקוֹ בְּכָל לִבּוֹ, אָמַר רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן בֶּן יוֹחַאי, הֲלָכָה הִיא

it is a law Yochai son of Shimon Rabbi said his heart with all he kissed him that not this dotting who expounded there are of Sifrei in the Braisa this in the matter those who disagree and there are upon it it is dotted And he kissed him

בְּיָדוּעַ שֶׁעֵשָׂו שׂוֹנֵא לְיַעֲקֹב, אֶלָּא שֶׁנִּכְמְרוּ רַחֲמָיו בְּאוֹתָהּ שָׁעָה וּנְשָׁקוֹ בְּכָל לִבּוֹ

his heart with all and he kissed him hour at that his mercies were aroused but Yaakov hates that Esav it is known

ספרי במדבר׃

Bamidbar Sifrei

פָּסוּק ח

Pasuk 8

וַיִּשָּׂא אֶת עֵינָיו וַיַּרְא אֶת הַנָּשִׁים וְאֶת הַיְלָדִים וַיֹּאמֶר מִי אֵלֶּה לָךְ׃

to you are these who and he said the children and — the women — and he saw his eyes — And he lifted

וַיֹּאמַר הַיְלָדִים אֲשֶׁר חָנַן אֱלֹהִים אֶת עַבְדֶּךָ׃

your servant — God graced whom the children and he said

רַשִּׁ"י

מי אלה לך. מִי אֵלֶּה לִהְיוֹת שֶׁלְּךָ׃

yours to be are these Who to you are these Who

CHAPTER SUMMARY

Yaakov prepares for the long-awaited encounter with Eisav by dividing his family strategically and advancing first to bow before his brother. Eisav runs toward Yaakov, embraces him, and falls on his neck in a emotional moment where both weep, leading to Eisav inquiring about the family Hashem graciously bestowed upon Yaakov.

לְמַעֲשֶׂה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

Look at what happens here in the psuokim. Yaakov Avinu just came out of a whole night of struggling with the malach, he is limping on his hip, and Esav is walking right toward him with four hundred armed men. Lichoira, we would think Yaakov should stay safely in the back behind his family. But what does the pasuk say? V'hu ovar lifneihem. Yaakov puts himself right in front. He steps out first to protect his family and face the nisayon head on.

This is a major chiddush in how a Yid faces a difficult situation. In our own lives, when a hard moment comes, whether it is a difficult conversation, a parnassah worry, or a shalom bayis challenge, the yetzer hara whispers that we should pull back, dodge the issue, or let someone else deal with the mess. But Yaakov Avinu teaches us the true דרך of Avodas Hashem. When Hashem puts a challenge in front of you, you do not hide behind others. You stand up, step to the front with emunah, and rely on Hashem to bring you through it.

Today, when you encounter a difficult or uncomfortable situation that you would usually try to avoid, do not push it away or hide from it. Step up right away, face it directly with emunah, and handle it with menuchas hanefesh.

דַּף יוֹמִי · עֲרָכִין · דַּף ז׳

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

📖 THE SUGYA

This daf continues exploring the halachic implications of a person who is being taken out to his execution, specifically regarding financial obligations and korbanos. The Gemara discusses whether claims against a person can be collected from his heirs after his death, delving into the machlokes whether an unwritten oral loan or a Torah-mandated liability carries a lien on a person's estate. We then analyze whether we delay an execution to allow a person's korban to be completed, establishing the important principle of avoiding afflictions or prolonged anxiety for the condemned.

We then learn a new Mishnah regarding a pregnant woman who is sentenced to death by the court. The Tanna clarifies the exact stage of labor at which the fetus is considered an independent entity rather than just a part of the mother's body, and the Gemara examines why we do not delay her execution for the sake of the husband's potential monetary rights in the fetus.

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

עמוד א׳ DAF 7A

QUESTION

מִכְּלָל דְּתַנָּא קַמָּא סָבַר: נִיתַּן לַחֲזָרַת עֲמִידַת בֵּית דִּין?!

Can we infer **from this**, from Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar's reason, **that the first Tanna holds** that a person who is already sentenced to death **can be returned for standing before the court again** if new financial obligations arise?! That cannot be, for we do not delay a person's execution once sentence is passed!

ANSWER

אָמַר רַב יוֹסֵף: בִּמְלָוָה עַל פֶּה גּוֹבֶה מִן הַיּוֹרְשִׁין קָמִיפַּלְגִי,

Rav Yosef said: They differ regarding whether **an oral loan can be collected from heirs** after the borrower's death.

EXPLANATION

תַּנָּא קַמָּא סָבַר: מִלְוָה עַל פֶּה גּוֹבֶה מִן הַיּוֹרְשִׁין,

The first Tanna holds that **an oral loan can be collected from heirs**, so the victim can collect the damage claim from the person's estate after he is executed.

EXPLANATION

וְרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן בֶּן אֶלְעָזָר סָבַר: אֵינוֹ גּוֹבֶה מִן הַיּוֹרְשִׁין.

And Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar holds that an unwritten, **oral loan cannot be collected from heirs**, and therefore once he is executed, the victim has no recourse against the heirs.

ANSWER

רַבָּה אָמַר: דְּכוּלֵּי עָלְמָא מִלְוָה עַל פֶּה אֵינוֹ גּוֹבֶה מִן הַיּוֹרְשִׁין,

Rabba said: Everyone agrees that an oral loan cannot be collected from heirs,

EXPLANATION

וְהָכָא בִּמִלְוָה הַכְּתוּבָה בַּתּוֹרָה כִּכְתוּבָה בִּשְׁטָר קָמִיפַּלְגִי,

and here, they differ regarding whether **a loan written in the Torah,** such as a Torah-mandated obligation to pay damages, **is like an obligation written in a contract** or document.

EXPLANATION

תַּנָּא קַמָּא סָבַר: כִּכְתוּבָה בִּשְׁטָר דָּמְיָא,

The first Tanna holds that a Torah-ordained liability **is considered like an obligation written in a contract**, creating a lien on the estate that can be collected from heirs.

EXPLANATION

וְרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן בֶּן אֶלְעָזָר סָבַר: לָאו כִּכְתוּבָה בִּשְׁטָר דָּמְיָא.

And Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar holds that it **is not considered like an obligation written in a contract**, so it cannot be collected from heirs.

OBJECTION

מֵיתִיבִי:

The Gemara **raises an objection** against Rabba's view that a Torah obligation cannot be collected from heirs according to Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar:

BRAISA

הַחוֹפֵר בּוֹר בִּרְשׁוּת הָרַבִּים, וְנָפַל עָלָיו שׁוֹר וַהֲרָגוֹ — פָּטוּר,

We learned in a Braisa: If **one digs a pit in a public domain, and an ox falls on him** into the pit **and kills him,** the owner of the ox **is exempt** from paying for the digger's death because the digger acted unlawfully by creating a public hazard.

BRAISA

וְלֹא עוֹד, אֶלָּא שֶׁאִם מֵת הַשּׁוֹר — יוֹרְשֵׁי בַּעַל הַבּוֹר חַיָּיבִין לְשַׁלֵּם דְּמֵי שׁוֹר לִבְעָלָיו!

And not only that, but if the ox died from falling into the pit, **the heirs of the owner of the pit are liable to pay the value of the ox to its owner!** We see clearly that a Torah obligation to pay damages is collected from heirs, which contradicts the opinion that a Torah-written obligation is not collected from heirs!

RESOLUTION

אָמַר רַבִּי אִילָא אָמַר רַב: כְּשֶׁעָמַד בַּדִּין,

Rabbi Ila said in the name of Rav: This Braisa is speaking of a case **where he stood trial** and was sentenced by the court for the damages before he died, turning it into a rendered judgment which binds the heirs.

OBJECTION

וְהָא "וַהֲרָגוֹ" קָתָנֵי!

The Gemara asks: **But doesn't it teach, "and** the ox **killed him"** immediately when it fell upon him? How could he have stood trial first?

RESOLUTION

אָמַר רַב אַדָּא בַּר אַהֲבָה: כְּשֶׁעָשָׂאוֹ טְרֵיפָה.

Rav Adda bar Ahava said: It means the fall **made him a treifah,** fatally injuring him so that he died later, allowing time for him to stand trial before his death.

OBJECTION

וְהָאָמַר רַב נַחְמָן, תָּנֵי חַגָּא: מֵת וּקְבָרוֹ!

The Gemara challenges: **But didn't Rav Nachman say that Chagga taught** a explicit version of this Braisa: The ox **died and buried him** right there at the bottom of the pit! If he was killed and buried instantaneously, how could he have stood trial?

RESOLUTION

וְהֵילְכְתָא דְּיָתְבִי דַּיָּינֵי אַפּוּמָּא דְּבֵירָא.

The Gemara answers: **And the case here is that judges sat at the mouth of the pit** immediately after the incident and tried him before he actually expired under the rubble.

BRAISA

תָּנוּ רַבָּנַן: הַיּוֹצֵא לֵיהָרֵג — מַזִּין עָלָיו מִדַּם חַטָּאתוֹ וּמִדַּם אֲשָׁמוֹ,

The Rabbis taught in a Braisa: **One who is being taken out to be executed, they sprinkle on** the altar **on his behalf from the blood of his sin-offering or from the blood of his guilt-offering** if he had already consecrated and slaughtered it.

BRAISA

חָטָא בְּאוֹתָהּ שָׁעָה — אֵין נִזְקָקִין לוֹ.

However, if **he sinned at that time,** while being led to execution, **we do not attend to him** to delay his execution so he can bring an offering.

QUESTION

מַאי טַעְמָא?

What is the reason for this distinction?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַב יוֹסֵף: מִפְּנֵי שֶׁאֵין מְעַנִּין אֶת דִּינוֹ.

Rav Yosef said: Because we do not afflict his judgment by delaying his execution and causing him prolonged anxiety once his sentence has been finalized.

OBJECTION

אֲמַר לֵיהּ אַבָּיֵי: אִי הָכִי, אַפִּילּוּ רֵישָׁא נָמֵי!

Abaye said to him: If so, even in the first clause where he had already brought his offering, we should **also** not delay his execution to sprinkle the blood on his behalf, to avoid afflicting him!

RESOLUTION

כְּגוֹן שֶׁהָיָה זִבְחוֹ זָבוּחַ בְּאוֹתָהּ שָׁעָה.

Rav Yosef answered: The first clause is speaking of a case **where his sacrifice was already slaughtered at that time,** so only the sprinkling remains, which takes no noticeable time and does not cause affliction.

QUESTION

אֲבָל אֵין זִבְחוֹ זָבוּחַ, מַאי? לָא?

Abaye asked further: **But** if **his sacrifice was not yet slaughtered, what** is the halacha? Is it true that we do **not** wait for him?

OBJECTION

אַדְּתָנֵי ״חָטָא בְּאוֹתָהּ שָׁעָה אֵין נִזְקָקִין לוֹ״, לִיפְלוֹג וְלִיתְנֵי בְּדִידַהּ:

If so, **instead of teaching, "If he sinned at that time, we do not attend to him," let** the Tanna **qualify and teach within that very case** of one who brought a sacrifice prior:

EXPLANATION

בַּמֶּה דְּבָרִים אֲמוּרִים — שֶׁהָיָה זִבְחוֹ זָבוּחַ בְּאוֹתָהּ שָׁעָה, אֲבָל אֵין זִבְחוֹ זָבוּחַ — לֹא!

In what cases is this said? When his sacrifice was already slaughtered at that time; but if his sacrifice was not yet slaughtered, we do not wait to perform the slaughtering!

RESOLUTION

הָכִי נָמֵי קָאָמַר: בַּמֶּה דְּבָרִים אֲמוּרִים — שֶׁהָיָה זִבְחוֹ זָבוּחַ בְּאוֹתָהּ שָׁעָה, אֲבָל אֵין זִבְחוֹ זָבוּחַ — נַעֲשָׂה כְּמִי שֶׁחָטָא בְּאוֹתָהּ שָׁעָה, וְאֵין נִזְקָקִין לוֹ.

The Gemara answers: **This is indeed what he is saying: In what cases is this said? When his sacrifice was already slaughtered at that time; but if his sacrifice was not slaughtered, he is treated like one who sinned at that time, and we do not attend to him.**

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

הָאִשָּׁה שֶׁיָּצְאָה לֵיהָרֵג, אֵין מַמְתִּינִין לָהּ עַד שֶׁתֵּלֵד.

MISHNAH: A woman who is being taken out to be executed, we do not wait for her until she gives birth if she is pregnant; she is executed immediately.

MISHNAH

הָאִשָּׁה שֶׁיָּשְׁבָה עַל הַמַּשְׁבֵּר, מַמְתִּינִין לָהּ עַד שֶׁתֵּלֵד.

However, **a woman who has already sat on the birthing stool** and active labor has begun, **we wait for her until she gives birth,** because the child is now considered an independent entity.

MISHNAH

הָאִשָּׁה שֶׁנֶּהֶרְגָה, נֶהֱנִין בִּשְׁעָרָהּ.

In the case of **a woman who was executed, one may derive benefit from her hair,** as hair is not forbidden as part of a corpse's forbidden benefit if detached or prepared.

MISHNAH

בְּהֵמָה שֶׁנֶּהֶרְגָה, אֲסוּרָה בַּהֲנָאָה.

Whereas in the case of **an animal that was executed** by the court, it is completely **forbidden for benefit.**

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

QUESTION

פְּשִׁיטָא, גּוּפַהּ הִיא!

GEMARA: Isn't it obvious that we do not delay the execution of a pregnant woman? **It is part of her body!** Why should we hold up her sentence for a limb of her body?

ANSWER

אִיצְטְרִיךְ, סָלְקָא דַּעְתָּךְ אָמֵינָא: הוֹאִיל וּכְתִיב "כַּאֲשֶׁר יָשִׁית עָלָיו בַּעַל הָאִשָּׁה", מָמוֹנָא דְּבַעַל הוּא, וְלָא לֵיפְסְדֵיהּ מִינֵּיהּ, קָא מַשְׁמַע לַן.

It was necessary to state this, for **it might enter your mind to say: Since it is written** regarding an assault that causes a miscarriage, **"As the husband of the woman shall lay upon him,"** this implies that the fetus **is the monetary property of the husband, and** the court **should not cause a monetary loss to him** by executing her while pregnant; therefore, the Mishnah **comes to teach us** that we do not delay her execution for the husband's monetary claim.

QUESTION

וְאֵימָא הָכִי נָמֵי!

The Gemara asks: **And why not say so indeed,** that we should preserve the fetus for the husband's sake?

PROOF

אָמַר רַבִּי אַבָּהוּ אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: אָמַר קְרָא "וּמֵתוּ גַּם שְׁנֵיהֶם" — לְרַבּוֹת אֶת הַוָּולָד.

Rabbi Abbahu said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: The verse states regarding an adulterous woman, **"Then they shall both of them die,"** and the word **"both" comes to include the unborn child** with her in her execution.

QUESTION

וְהַאי מִיבְּעֵי לֵיהּ, עַד שֶׁיִּהוּ שְׁנֵיהֶן שָׁוִין, דִּבְרֵי רַבִּי יֹאשִׁיָּה!

The Gemara asks: **But this verse is required for** the teaching: The punishment applies **only when both of them are equal** in age and liability, **which is the opinion of Rabbi Yoshiyah!**

ANSWER

כִּי קָאָמְרִינַן מִ"גַּם".

The Gemara answers: **When we derive** our teaching, it is specifically **from** the extra word **"gam" (also),** not from "both".

QUESTION

יָשְׁבָה עַל הַמַּשְׁבֵּר וְכוּ׳. מַאי טַעְמָא?

We learned in the Mishnah: If **she sat on the birthing stool,** we wait for her until she gives birth. **What is the reason?**

ANSWER

כֵּיוָן דְּעָקַר, גּוּפָא אַחֲרִינָא הוּא.

Once the fetus **has uprooted** itself from the womb to be born, **it is a separate body** and not merely part of the mother.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל: הָאִשָּׁה הַיּוֹצְאָה לֵיהָרֵג, מַכִּין אוֹתָהּ כְּנֶגֶד בֵּית הָרֶיוֹן, כְּדֵי שֶׁיָּמוּת הַוָּולָד תְּחִילָּה, כְּדֵי שֶׁלֹּא תָּבֹא לִידֵי נִיוּול.

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: A pregnant woman who is being taken out to be executed, they strike her opposite her womb so that the fetus dies first, so that she will not come to disgraceful disfigurement if the fetus were to attempt to emerge after her death.

QUESTION

לְמֵימְרָא דְּהִיא קָדְמָה וּמֵתָה בְּרִישָׁא?

The Gemara asks: Is this **to say that** without striking her, **she would die first?**

OBJECTION

וְהָא קַיְימָא לַן דְּוָולָד מָיֵית בְּרִישָׁא!

But don't we hold that the fetus dies first when the mother dies naturally?

PROOF

דְּתָנַן: תִּינוֹק בֶּן יוֹמוֹ נוֹחֵל וּמַנְחִיל,

For as we learned in a Mishnah: **A child one day old inherits and transmits inheritance;**

STATEMENT

וְאָמַר רַב שֵׁשֶׁת: נוֹחֵל בִּנְכָסֵי הָאֵם לְהַנְחִיל לָאַחִין מִן הָאָב.

and Rav Sheshet explained: He inherits his mother's property if she dies first, **to transmit it to his paternal brothers** if he dies immediately afterward.

INFERENCE

דַּוְקָא בֶּן יוֹם אֶחָד, אֲבָל עוּבָּר — לָא, דְּהוּא מָיֵית בְּרִישָׁא, וְאֵין הַבֵּן יוֹרֵשׁ אֶת אִמּוֹ בְּקֶבֶר לְהַנְחִיל לָאַחִין מִן הָאָב!

This implies that **specifically a child one day old** can inherit, **but a fetus cannot, because it dies first** in the womb when the mother dies, **and a son in the grave does not inherit from his mother to transmit to his paternal brothers!** Why then did Shmuel worry that the mother would die first?

RESOLUTION

הָנֵי מִילֵּי לְגַבֵּי מִיתָה, אֲיִדֵּי דְּוָולָד זוּטָרָא חַיּוּתֵיהּ, עָיְילָא טִיפָּה דְּמַלְואַךְ הַמָּוֶת וּמְחַתֵּךְ לְהוּ לְסִימָנִין, אֲבָל נֶהֱרָגָה — הִיא מֵתָה בְּרִישָׁא.

The Gemara answers: **This applies only regarding natural death, since the vitality of a fetus is fragile, the drop of the Angel of Death enters** the mother **and severs its vital organs first; but where she is executed, she dies first,** and the fetus might remain alive briefly and try to emerge.

OBJECTION

וְהָא הֲוָה עוֹבָדָא, וּפַרְכֵּיס עַד תְּלָת פַּרְכוּסֵי!

The Gemara challenges: **But there was an incident** where a mother died naturally **and the fetus twitched up to three times** after her death!

RESOLUTION

מִידֵּי דְּהָוֵי אַזְנַב הַלְטָאָה דְּמִפַּרְכְּסָא.

The Gemara answers: That is not actual life; **it is like the tail of a lizard that twitches** reflexively even after it is severed.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַב נַחְמָן אָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל: הָאִשָּׁה שֶׁיָּשְׁבָה עַל הַמַּשְׁבֵּר וּמֵתָה בְּשַׁבָּת, מְבִיאִין סַכִּין וּמְקָרְעִים אֶת כְּרֵיסָהּ, וּמוֹצִיאִין אֶת הַוָּולָד.

Rav Nachman said in the name of Shmuel: A woman who sat on the birthing stool and died on Shabbos, they bring a knife and cut open her belly, and extract the fetus to save its life.

QUESTION

פְּשִׁיטָא, מַאי עֲבִיד?

The Gemara asks: Isn't this **obvious? What is** one doing that would be forbidden on Shabbos?

עמוד ב׳ DAF 7B

QUESTION

מְחַתֵּךְ בְּבָשָׂר הוּא!

Why would cutting open her abdomen to retrieve the fetus be forbidden on Shabbos? After all, cutting into a dead body **is merely cutting flesh!** Since a corpse is no longer alive, no prohibition of taking a life is involved, so why does Shmuel need to state that we do so?

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַבָּה:

To answer this, **Rabba said:**

ANSWER

לֹא נִצְרְכָה לְהָבִיא סַכִּין דֶּרֶךְ רְשׁוּת הָרַבִּים.

The ruling of Shmuel **is necessary only** to permit one **to bring a knife** to perform the operation **by way of a public thoroughfare** on Shabbos, which involves a melacha d'Oraisa of carrying in a public domain.

QUESTION

וּמַאי קָמַשְׁמַע לַן, דְּמִסְפֵּיקָא מְחַלְּלִינַן שַׁבְּתָא?

The Gemara asks: **And what does this come to teach us? Is it** coming to teach us **that even out of doubt we desecrate Shabbos** to save a life, since we do not know if the fetus is still alive?

OBJECTION

תְּנֵינָא:

We already **learned** this explicitly in a Mishnah in Maseches Yoma:

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִי שֶׁנָּפְלָה עָלָיו מַפּוֹלֶת,

Regarding **one upon whom a debris-pile collapsed** on Shabbos,

MISHNAH

סָפֵק הוּא שָׁם, סָפֵק אֵינוֹ שָׁם,

and there is a **doubt whether he is there** under the rubble, or **a doubt whether he is not there;**

MISHNAH

סָפֵק חַי, סָפֵק מֵת,

and even if he is there, there is a **doubt whether he is alive** or **a doubt whether he is dead;**

MISHNAH

סָפֵק נָכְרִי, סָפֵק יִשְׂרָאֵל —

and even if he is alive, there is a **doubt whether he is a non-Jew** or **a doubt whether he is a Yid**—

MISHNAH

מְפַקְּחִין עָלָיו אֶת הַגַּל!

in all these doubtful cases, **we clear the pile from atop him** on Shabbos! So we already know that safek pikuach nefesh overrides Shabbos!

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

ANSWER

מַהוּ דְּתֵימָא:

The Gemara answers: **What might you have said?**

EXPLANATION

הָתָם הוּא דַּהֲוָה לֵיהּ חֲזָקָה דְּחַיְּיתָא,

You might have said that **there,** in the case of the debris, **it is because he had a chazakah of life** before the wall fell on him, so we assume he might still be alive;

EXPLANATION

אֲבָל הָכָא דְּלָא הֲוָה לֵיהּ חֲזָקָה דְּחַיְּיתָא מֵעִיקָּרָא — אֵימָא לָא,

but here regarding an unborn fetus, **where it never had an independent chazakah of life from the beginning** as a viable person, **say** that we should **not** desecrate Shabbos for its sake.

RESOLUTION

קָא מַשְׁמַע לַן.

Therefore, Shmuel's statement **comes to teach us** that we desecrate Shabbos even to attempt to save a fetus.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

הָאִשָּׁה שֶׁנֶּהֶרְגָה וְכוּ'.

The Mishnah had taught: **A woman who was executed** by the Beis Din, the court may **derive benefit from her hair, etc.**

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

QUESTION

וְאַמַּאי? אִיסּוּרֵי הֲנָאָה נִינְהוּ!

The Gemara asks: **And why** is it permitted to use her hair? After all, a human corpse and its attached body parts **are items from which benefit is forbidden!**

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַב:

Rav said:

ANSWER

בְּאוֹמֶרֶת "תְּנוּ שְׂעָרִי לְבִתִּי".

The Mishnah is speaking of a case **where she says** before her execution, **"Give my hair to my daughter."**

OBJECTION

אִילּוּ אָמְרָה ״תְּנוּ יָדִי לְבִתִּי״, מִי יָהֲבִינַן לַהּ?!

The Gemara challenges: **If she had said, "Give my hand to my daughter," would we give it to her?!** Can a person's verbal instruction undo the prohibition against deriving benefit from a dead body?!

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַב:

Rather, **Rav said:**

ANSWER

בְּפֵאָה נָכְרִית,

The Mishnah is dealing **with a wig** worn on her head, which is not an actual part of her body.

INFERENCE

טַעְמָא דְּאָמְרָה ״תְּנוּ״, הָא לֹא אָמְרָה ״תְּנוּ״ — גּוּפַהּ הוּא וּמִיתְּסַר.

The Gemara infers: The **reason** it is permitted is **that she said "Give** it to my daughter," demonstrating that she viewed it as property and not as part of herself; **but if she did not say "Give** it," then it is considered as **her body itself and is forbidden!**

OBJECTION

וְהָא מִיבַּעְיָא לֵיהּ לְרַבִּי יוֹסֵי בְּרַבִּי חֲנִינָא,

The Gemara raises an objection: **But didn't Rabbi Yosei b'Rabbi Chanina raise a dilemma** on this point?

QUESTION

דְּבָעֵי רַבִּי יוֹסֵי בְּרַבִּי חֲנִינָא:

For Rabbi Yosei b'Rabbi Chanina asked:

QUESTION

שְׂעַר נָשִׁים צִדְקָנִיּוֹת מַהוּ?

Regarding **the hair of righteous women** in an Ir HaNidachas (an apostate city whose property must be burned), **what is** the halacha?

STATEMENT

וְאָמַר רָבָא:

And Rava said in explaining that dilemma:

EXPLANATION

בְּפֵאָה נָכְרִית לָא קָמִיבַּעְיָא לֵיהּ,

Regarding a wig, he had no dilemma, as a wig is certainly property;

OBJECTION

כִּי קָמִיבַּעְיָא לֵיהּ לְרַבִּי יוֹסֵי בְּרַבִּי חֲנִינָא דְּתָלֵי בְּסִיכְתָּא.

when Rabbi Yosei b'Rabbi Chanina had a dilemma, it was where the wig was **hanging on a peg,** whether it is considered part of her garments or regular property. But when attached to her, it is clearly part of her body! This contradicts Rav, who says that an attached wig is NOT automatically part of her body unless she omits saying "give it."

RESOLUTION

הָכָא דִּמְחַבַּר בַּהּ, טַעְמָא דְּאָמְרָה "תְּנוּ", הָא לֹא אָמְרָה "תְּנוּ" — גּוּפַהּ הוּא וּמִיתְסַר.

The Gemara clarifies Rav's view: **Here, where it is attached to her, the reason** it is permitted is davka **that she said "Give** it," revealing that she does not treat it as part of her body; **but if she did not say "Give** it," then because it is attached, **it is** considered like **her body itself and is forbidden.**

OBJECTION

קַשְׁיָא לֵיהּ לְרַב נַחְמָן בַּר יִצְחָק,

This explanation of Rav **was difficult to Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak:**

QUESTION

וְהָא דּוּמְיָא דִּבְהֵמָה קָתָנֵי,

Doesn't the Mishnah teach the case of the woman's hair as **similar to the case of the animal?**

OBJECTION

מָה הָתָם גּוּפַיהּ — אַף הָכָא נָמֵי גּוּפַיהּ!

Just as there, regarding the animal, it refers to **its own body, so too here,** regarding the woman, it must refer to **her own body** and her real hair, not a wig!

ANSWER

אֶלָּא אָמַר רַב נַחְמָן:

Rather, Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak **said:** The Mishnah is indeed talking about her natural hair, and the reason for the difference is:

EXPLANATION

זוֹ מִיתָתָהּ אוֹסַרְתָּהּ, וְזוֹ גְּמַר דִּינָהּ אוֹסַרְתָּהּ.

Regarding **this one** (the woman), **it is her death that renders her forbidden,** so her hair—which does not change upon death—remains permitted; **whereas that one** (the animal), **its final verdict renders it forbidden,** so attached hair becomes forbidden at the time of the verdict.

STATEMENT

תָּנֵי לֵוִי כְּוָותֵיהּ דְּרַב, תָּנֵי לֵוִי כְּוָותֵיהּ דְּרַב נַחְמָן בַּר יִצְחָק.

The Gemara notes: **Levi taught a Braisa in accordance with Rav, and Levi** also **taught a Braisa in accordance with Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak.**

BRAISA

תָּנֵי לֵוִי כְּוָותֵיהּ דְּרַב:

The Gemara details: **Levi taught a Braisa in accordance with Rav:**

BRAISA

הָאִשָּׁה שֶׁיּוֹצְאָה לֵיהָרֵג וְאָמְרָה: ״תְּנוּ שְׂעָרִי לְבִתִּי״ — נוֹתְנִין,

A woman who is taken out to be executed and said, "Give my hair to my daughter," we give it to her daughter;

BRAISA

מֵתָה — אֵין נוֹתְנִין,

if **she died** without making this instruction, **we do not give** it to her daughter,

BRAISA

מִפְּנֵי שֶׁהַמֵּת אָסוּר בַּהֲנָאָה.

because benefit from a corpse is forbidden.

QUESTION

פְּשִׁיטָא!

The Gemara asks: Is it not **obvious** that benefit from a corpse is forbidden?

ANSWER

אֶלָּא שֶׁנּוֹיֵי הַמֵּת אָסוּר בַּהֲנָאָה.

Rather, it means **that the adornments of the corpse are forbidden to derive benefit from,** referring to a wig, exactly like Rav taught.

BRAISA

תַּנְיָא כְּוָותֵיהּ דְּרַב נַחְמָן בַּר יִצְחָק:

It was taught in a Braisa in accordance with Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak:

BRAISA

הָאִשָּׁה שֶׁמֵּתָה — נֶהֱנִין בִּשְׂעָרָהּ,

In the case of **a woman who died, one may derive benefit from her hair;**

BRAISA

בְּהֵמָה שֶׁנֶּהֶרְגָה — אֲסוּרָה בַּהֲנָאָה;

whereas regarding **an animal that was executed, it is forbidden to derive benefit from it.**

BRAISA

וּמָה הֶפְרֵשׁ בֵּין זֶה לָזֶה?

And what is the difference between this case **and that** case?

BRAISA

זוֹ — מִיתָתָהּ אוֹסַרְתָּהּ, וְזוֹ — גְּמַר דִּינָהּ אוֹסַרְתָּהּ.

For **this one, her death renders her forbidden; and for that one, its final verdict renders it forbidden.**

STATEMENT

הֲדַרַן עֲלָךְ הַכֹּל מַעֲרִיכִין.

May we return to you, "HaKol Ma'arichin"!

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מַתְנִי׳

MISHNAH:

MISHNAH

אֵין נֶעֱרָכִין פָּחוֹת מִסֶּלַע, וְלֹא יָתֵר עַל חֲמִשִּׁים סֶלַע.

One is not evaluated for less than a sela, nor for **more than fifty sela.**

MISHNAH

כֵּיצַד?

How so?

MISHNAH

נָתַן סֶלַע וְהֶעֱשִׁיר — אֵינוֹ נוֹתֵן כְּלוּם,

If a poor person **gave a sela and** then **became wealthy, he does not give anything** more, because he fulfilled his obligation according to his standing at the time;

MISHNAH

פָּחוֹת מִסֶּלַע וְהֶעֱשִׁיר — נוֹתֵן חֲמִשִּׁים סֶלַע.

if he gave **less than a sela and** then **became wealthy, he must give fifty sela,** since his initial payment was invalid.

MISHNAH

הָיוּ בְיָדָיו חָמֵשׁ סְלָעִים,

If **there were five sela'im in his possession,** and the standard valuation would be fifty sela'im:

MISHNAH

רַבִּי מֵאִיר אוֹמֵר: אֵינוֹ נוֹתֵן אֶלָּא אַחַת,

Rabbi Meir says: He gives only one sela, and keeps the rest for his living needs;

MISHNAH

וַחֲכָמִים אוֹמְרִים: נוֹתֵן אֶת כּוּלָּן.

and the Sages say: He must give all of them.

MISHNAH

אֵין נֶעֱרָכִין פָּחוֹת מִסֶּלַע, וְלֹא יָתֵר עַל חֲמִשִּׁים סֶלַע.

The Mishnah repeats the rule: **One is not evaluated for less than a sela, nor more than fifty sela.**

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

GEMARA

גמ׳

GEMARA:

QUESTION

אֵין נֶעֱרָכִין פָּחוֹת מִסֶּלַע. מְנָלַן?

The Gemara asks: That **one is not evaluated for less than a sela, from where do we know it?**

PROOF

דִּכְתִיב: ״וְכָל עֶרְכְּךָ יִהְיֶה בְּשֶׁקֶל הַקֹּדֶשׁ״,

For it is written: "And all your valuations shall be in the shekel of the Sanctuary,"

EXPLANATION

כָּל עֶרְכִּין שֶׁאַתָּה מַעֲרִיךְ לֹא יְהוּ פְּחוּתִין מִשְּׁקָל.

meaning **all valuations that you evaluate shall not be less than a shekel** (which is a sela).

QUESTION

וְלֹא יָתֵר עַל חֲמִשִּׁים סְלָעִים.

And that one is **not** evaluated for **more than fifty sela'im,** from where do we know it?

PROOF

דִּכְתִיב: ״חֲמִשִּׁים״.

For it is written: "Fifty" shekels as the maximum valuation in the pasuk.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

הָיוּ בְיָדָיו חֲמִשָּׁה כּוּ׳.

We learned in the Mishnah: If **there were five** sela'im **in his possession, etc.,** Rabbi Meir says he gives only one.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

QUESTION

מַאי טַעְמָא דְּרַבִּי מֵאִיר?

The Gemara asks: **What is the reasoning of Rabbi Meir?**

ANSWER

כְּתִיב "חֲמִשִּׁים" וּכְתִיב "שֶׁקֶל",

It is written "fifty" shekels for a wealthy person, **and it is written "shekel"** as a minimum for a poor person;

EXPLANATION

אוֹ חֲמִשִּׁים אוֹ שֶׁקֶל.

this teaches that one gives **either fifty** if he can afford the full valuation, **or one shekel** if he is poor, but never an intermediate amount!

QUESTION

וְרַבָּנַן?

And how do **the Rabbanan** respond to this?

ANSWER

הַהוּא, לְכָל עֲרָכִין שֶׁאַתָּה מַעֲרִיךְ לֹא יִהְיוּ פְּחוּתִים מִשְּׁקָל הוּא דַּאֲתָא,

They hold: **That** pasuk mentioning a shekel **comes for** the rule **that all valuations you evaluate shall not be less than a shekel;**

PROOF

הֵיכָא דְּאִית לֵיהּ — אָמַר קְרָא: "אֲשֶׁר תַּשִּׂיג יַד הַנּוֹדֵר",

but **where he has** more money, **the verse says: "According to what the hand of the vow-maker can afford,"**

EXPLANATION

וְהָרֵי יָדוֹ מַשֶּׂגֶת.

and behold, his hand can afford all five sela'im!

QUESTION

וְרַבִּי מֵאִיר?

And how does **Rabbi Meir** learn this verse?

ANSWER

הָהוּא ״יַד הַנּוֹדֵר וְלֹא יַד הַנִּידָּר״ הוּא דַּאֲתָא,

That verse **comes** to teach: **The hand of the vow-maker, and not the hand of the subject of the vow,** determining that affordability depends on the one making the pledge.

OBJECTION

וְרַבָּנַן, לָאו מִמֵּילָא שָׁמְעַתְּ מִינַּהּ דְּהֵיכָא דְּיָדוֹ מַשֶּׂגֶת שְׁקוֹל מִינֵּיהּ?

And the Rabbanan answer: **Do you not automatically hear from it that wherever his hand can afford, we take it from him?**

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַב אַדָּא בַּר אַהֲבָה:

Rav Adda bar Ahavah said:

STATEMENT

הָיוּ בְּיָדָיו חָמֵשׁ סְלָעִים, וְאָמַר ״עֶרְכִּי עָלַי״,

If **there were five sela'im in his hands, and he said, "My valuation is upon me,"** creating a first obligation,

STATEMENT

וְחָזַר וְאָמַר ״עֶרְכִּי עָלַי״,

and he then repeated and said, "My valuation is upon me," creating a second obligation,

STATEMENT

וְנָתַן אַרְבַּע לַשְּׁנִיָּה וְאֶחָד לָרִאשׁוֹנָה —

and he gave four sela'im **for the second** vow **and one** sela **for the first** vow—

RULING

יָצָא יְדֵי שְׁתֵּיהֶן.

he has fulfilled his obligation for both of them!

QUESTION

מַאי טַעְמָא?

What is the reason?

ANSWER

בַּעַל חוֹב מְאוּחָר שֶׁקִּדֵּם וְגָבָה — מַה שֶּׁגָּבָה גָּבָה.

Because of the rule: **A later creditor who collected first, what he collected he has collected!**

EXPLANATION

בְּעִידָּנָא דְּיָהֵיב לַשְּׁנִיָּה, מְשַׁעְבַּד לְרִאשׁוֹנָה.

At the time that he gives four sela'im **to the second** vow, those funds were technically **encumbered to the first** vow;

EXPLANATION

בְּעִידָּנָא דְּיָהֵיב לָרִאשׁוֹנָה, תּוּ לֵית לֵיהּ.

yet since he paid them to the second, it stands, and **at the time that he gives** the remaining one sela **to the first, he no longer has** any more money, so paying one sela discharges his obligation as a poor person!

SUMMARY

The Gemara first resolves a machlokes between the first Tanna and Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar regarding collecting damages from heirs, explaining their dispute around oral loans and Torah-mandated liabilities. It defends the view that a Torah obligation creates a lien by bringing a case of a pit digger who stood trial right before dying. Next, the Gemara analyzes the Braisa regarding a condemned person's korbanos, explaining that we do not hold up an execution to slaughter an offering because of the affliction of delaying sentence, though sprinkling blood from an already-slaughtered korban is permitted since it takes no time. Finally, the Mishnah and Gemara discuss the execution of a pregnant woman, teaching that she is executed immediately unless she has already sat on the birthing stool, and rejecting the idea that we should delay execution to protect the husband's financial interest in the fetus.

לְמַעֲשֶׂה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

The sugya brings a fascinating halocha regarding pikuach nefesh on Shabbos. If a pregnant woman sitting on the birthing stool passes away on Shabbos, the Gemara tells us we bring a knife through reshus harabim, slice her womb, and extract the fetus. The Gemara asks: isn't it a doubt whether the child is actually alive? How do we mechalel Shabbos on a sefeik-sefeika with no chazaka of life? The Gemara answers with a powerful Yesod: when it comes to saving a life, even a flickering, uncertain spark of potential life, we break every barrier.

Think about what the Torah is telling us here. In the eyes of the world, a faint possibility, an unproven chance, or someone with no track record of success isn't worth setting aside the holy Shabbos for. But the Torah views a neshama completely differently. Hashem looks at a Yid who seems distant, broken, or completely lacking a "chazaka" of spirituality, and He says: there is a spark there. Move mountains, break the normal rules, do whatever it takes to reach that life and bring it out into the world.

We often look at ourselves or others and think, "What's the point? There's no baseline here, no chazaka of growth, no real track record." The sugya teaches us never to write off a single Yid or a single spiritual spark. Every tiny possibility of life is a whole world worth fighting for.

Today, look for one subtle spark of goodness in yourself or in another Yid, a small mitzvah, a quick kapitel Tehillim, or a kind word, and treat it like a precious life worth moving heaven and earth to save.

תְּהִלִּים · חֲמִשָּׁה קַאפִּיטְלָעך

The Five Daily Kapitlach

📖 **CHAPTER PREVIEW**

These are the five kapitlach of Tehillim said every single day: 32, 43, 83, 121, and 130, each set word for word with its English meaning. They are gathered here as one section so the whole daily Tehillim can be said and downloaded together.

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

פֶּרֶק ל״ב CHAPTER 32

לְדָוִד מַשְׂכִּיל אַשְׁרֵי נְשׂוּי פֶּשַׁע כְּסוּי חֲטָאָה׃

אַשְׁרֵי אָדָם לֹא יַחְשֹׁב יְהוָה לוֹ עָוֹן וְאֵין בְּרוּחוֹ רְמִיָּה׃

כִּי הֶחֱרַשְׁתִּי בָלוּ עַצְמָי בְּשַׁאֲגָתִי כָּל הַיּוֹם׃

כִּי יוֹמָם וָלַיְלָה תִּכְבַּד עָלַי יָדֶךָ נֶהְפַּךְ לְשַׁדִּי בְּחַרְבֹנֵי קַיִץ סֶלָה׃

חַטָּאתִי אוֹדִיעֲךָ וַעֲוֹנִי לֹא כִסִּיתִי אָמַרְתִּי אוֹדֶה עֲלֵי פְשָׁעַי לַיהוָה וְאַתָּה נָשָׂאתָ עֲוֹן חַטָּאתִי סֶלָה׃

עַל זֹאת יִתְפַּלֵּל כָּל חָסִיד אֵלֶיךָ לְעֵת מְצֹא רַק לְשֵׁטֶף מַיִם רַבִּים אֵלָיו לֹא יַגִּיעוּ׃

אַתָּה סֵתֶר לִי מִצַּר תִּצְּרֵנִי רָנֵּי פַלֵּט תְּסוֹבְבֵנִי סֶלָה׃

אַשְׂכִּילְךָ וְאוֹרְךָ בְּדֶרֶךְ זוּ תֵּלֵךְ אִיעֲצָה עָלֶיךָ עֵינִי׃

אַל תִּהְיוּ כְּסוּס כְּפֶרֶד אֵין הָבִין בְּמֶתֶג וָרֶסֶן עֶדְיוֹ לִבְלוֹם בַּל קְרֹב אֵלֶיךָ׃

רַבִּים מַכְאוֹבִים לָרָשָׁע וְהַבּוֹטֵחַ בַּיהוָה חֶסֶד יְסוֹבְבֶנּוּ׃

שִׂמְחוּ בַיהוָה וְגִילוּ צַדִּיקִים וְהַרְנִינוּ כָּל יִשְׁרֵי לֵב׃

פֶּרֶק מ״ג CHAPTER 43

שָׁפְטֵנִי אֱלֹהִים וְרִיבָה רִיבִי מִגּוֹי לֹא חָסִיד מֵאִישׁ מִרְמָה וְעַוְלָה תְּפַלְּטֵנִי׃

כִּי אַתָּה אֱלֹהֵי מָעוּזִּי לָמָּה זְנַחְתָּנִי לָמָּה קֹדֵר אֶתְהַלֵּךְ בְּלַחַץ אוֹיֵב׃

שְׁלַח אוֹרְךָ וַאֲמִתְּךָ הֵמָּה יַנְחוּנִי יְבִיאוּנִי אֶל הַר קָדְשְׁךָ וְאֶל מִשְׁכְּנוֹתֶיךָ׃

וְאָבוֹאָה אֶל מִזְבַּח אֱלֹהִים אֶל אֵל שִׂמְחַת גִּילִי וְאוֹדְךָ בְכִנּוֹר אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהָי׃

מַה תִּשְׁתּוֹחֲחִי נַפְשִׁי וּמַה תֶּהֱמִי עָלָי הוֹחִילִי לֵאלֹהִים כִּי עוֹד אוֹדֶנּוּ יְשׁוּעֹת פָּנַי וֵאלֹהָי׃

פֶּרֶק פ״ג CHAPTER 83

שִׁיר מִזְמוֹר לְאָסָף׃

אֱלֹהִים אַל דֳּמִי לָךְ אַל תֶּחֱרַשׁ וְאַל תִּשְׁקֹט אֵל׃

כִּי הִנֵּה אוֹיְבֶיךָ יֶהֱמָיוּן וּמְשַׂנְאֶיךָ נָשְׂאוּ רֹאשׁ׃

עַל עַמְּךָ יַעֲרִימוּ סוֹד וְיִתְיָעֲצוּ עַל צְפוּנֶיךָ׃

אָמְרוּ לְכוּ וְנַכְחִידֵם מִגּוֹי וְלֹא יִזָּכֵר שֵׁם יִשְׂרָאֵל עוֹד׃

כִּי נוֹעֲצוּ לֵב יַחְדָּו עָלֶיךָ בְּרִית יִכְרֹתוּ׃

אָהֳלֵי אֱדוֹם וְיִשְׁמְעֵאלִים מוֹאָב וְהַגְרִים׃

גְּבָל וְעַמּוֹן וַעֲמָלֵק פְּלֶשֶׁת עִם יֹשְׁבֵי צוֹר׃

גַּם אַשּׁוּר נִלְוָה עִמָּם הָיוּ זְרוֹעַ לִבְנֵי לוֹט סֶלָה׃

עֲשֵׂה לָהֶם כְּמִדְיָן כְּסִיסְרָא כְיָבִין בְּנַחַל קִישׁוֹן׃

נִשְׁמְדוּ בְעֵין דֹּאר הָיוּ דֹמֶן לָאֲדָמָה׃

שִׁיתֵמוֹ נְדִיבֵמוֹ כְּעֹרֵב וְכִזְאֵב וּכְזֶבַח וּכְצַלְמֻנָּע כָּל נְסִיכֵמוֹ׃

אֲשֶׁר אָמְרוּ נִירָשָׁה לָּנוּ אֵת נְאוֹת אֱלֹהִים׃

אֱלֹהַי שִׁיתֵמוֹ כַגַּלְגַּל כְּקַשׁ לִפְנֵי רוּחַ׃

כְּאֵשׁ תִּבְעַר יָעַר וּכְלֶהָבָה תְּלַהֵט הָרִים׃

כֵּן תִּרְדְּפֵם בְּסַעֲרֶךָ וּבְסוּפָתְךָ תְבַהֲלֵם׃

מַלֵּא פְנֵיהֶם קָלוֹן וִיבַקְשׁוּ שִׁמְךָ יְהוָה׃

יֵבֹשׁוּ וְיִבָּהֲלוּ עֲדֵי עַד וְיַחְפְּרוּ וְיֹאבֵדוּ׃

וְיֵדְעוּ כִּי אַתָּה שִׁמְךָ יְהוָה לְבַדֶּךָ עֶלְיוֹן עַל כָּל הָאָרֶץ׃

פֶּרֶק קכ״א CHAPTER 121

שִׁיר לַמַּעֲלוֹת אֶשָּׂא עֵינַי אֶל הֶהָרִים מֵאַיִן יָבֹא עֶזְרִי׃

עֶזְרִי מֵעִם יְהוָה עֹשֵׂה שָׁמַיִם וָאָרֶץ׃

אַל יִתֵּן לַמּוֹט רַגְלֶךָ אַל יָנוּם שֹׁמְרֶךָ׃

הִנֵּה לֹא יָנוּם וְלֹא יִישָׁן שׁוֹמֵר יִשְׂרָאֵל׃

יְהוָה שֹׁמְרֶךָ יְהוָה צִלְּךָ עַל יַד יְמִינֶךָ׃

יוֹמָם הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ לֹא יַכֶּכָּה וְיָרֵחַ בַּלָּיְלָה׃

יְהוָה יִשְׁמָרְךָ מִכָּל רָע יִשְׁמֹר אֶת נַפְשֶׁךָ׃

יְהוָה יִשְׁמָר צֵאתְךָ וּבוֹאֶךָ מֵעַתָּה וְעַד עוֹלָם׃

פֶּרֶק ק״ל CHAPTER 130

שִׁיר הַמַּעֲלוֹת מִמַּעֲמַקִּים קְרָאתִיךָ יְהוָה׃

אֲדֹנָי שִׁמְעָה בְקוֹלִי תִּהְיֶינָה אָזְנֶיךָ קַשֻּׁבוֹת לְקוֹל תַּחֲנוּנָי׃

אִם עֲוֹנוֹת תִּשְׁמָר יָהּ אֲדֹנָי מִי יַעֲמֹד׃

כִּי עִמְּךָ הַסְּלִיחָה לְמַעַן תִּוָּרֵא׃

קִוִּיתִי יְהוָה קִוְּתָה נַפְשִׁי וְלִדְבָרוֹ הוֹחָלְתִּי׃

נַפְשִׁי לַאדֹנָי מִשֹּׁמְרִים לַבֹּקֶר שֹׁמְרִים לַבֹּקֶר׃

יַחֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל יְהוָה כִּי עִם יְהוָה הַחֶסֶד וְהַרְבֵּה עִמּוֹ פְּדוּת׃

וְהוּא יִפְדֶּה אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל מִכֹּל עֲוֹנֹתָיו׃

לְמַעֲשֶׂה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

When you feel weighed down by your mistakes, do not keep silent or try to hide them. Open your heart to Hashem in honest confession, and then immediately shift your focus to absolute trust in His forgiveness and constant protection, knowing that He never slumbers and is always guarding your steps.

Today, the moment you feel a heavy heart or a sense of spiritual distance, stop what you are doing, speak to Hashem in your own words to acknowledge your mistake, and then say out loud: 'My help is from Hashem, who forgives and guards my soul.'