



1804 P/E

## Summary of 201 + 33)

1) The Consensus of the Poskim is that there is no source whatsoever to prohibit 53) from Davening, Touching a 201 200 etc.

2) The Rama quotes the 201 that women don't daven or say 53) or go to shul whilst they are menstruating. He also mentions that the custom only applied during the time the woman was actually menstruating and did not take effect when it would cause 20) 53)

3) The Poskim challenge the custom of not davening and saying 53) on the grounds that this 201 which has no halachic 310' can by no means free her from biblical or rabbinic obligations.

4) The 201 201 mention that our women go to shul though they mention the custom of not looking at the writing of the 510 when raised for 201. This latter custom too seems no longer in effect.

5) Thus the custom only affected those women who were actually menstruating and seems to be totally detached from the concept of 53) 53) which continues until a woman goes to 201.

Thus there is of course no prohibition ~~from~~ even according to the P'21NND 201 for a woman who is not actually menstruating from touching a 510, 180 etc.

did like to note that Harav Ovadyah Joseph (50 1N'0 20 201K 8'P') - says that it is perfectly

all right for a  $\text{עֲשֵׂה}$  to approach to  $\text{מִיָּד עָלָה}$  and that this has been the custom for generations

When we approach the question of whether a woman can put on  $\text{יָרֵךְ} + \text{עֲרֵב}$  - it should be not surprising that <sup>almost</sup> ~~not~~ one source raises the question of  $\text{עֲשֵׂה}$  anywhere! Nor have I ever heard of a woman refraining from kissing <sup>through</sup>  $\text{עֲרֵב}$  when she's a  $\text{עֲשֵׂה}$ !

Before we discuss the problem of  $\text{יָרֵךְ}$  it should be noted that originally  $\text{יָרֵךְ}$  were worn all the time. There are two basic requirements when wearing  $\text{יָרֵךְ}$  1)  $\text{יָרֵךְ}$  - a chamber pot and that includes not passing gas while wearing them

2)  $\text{יָרֵךְ}$  - That he should not forget that he's wearing  $\text{יָרֵךְ}$  nor should he be distracted by sexual or <sup>worldly</sup> secular thoughts.

Eventually the custom resulted only to wear  $\text{יָרֵךְ}$  while one is <sup>performing</sup>  $\text{עֲשֵׂה}$ , though legitimately it can be put on later.

( $\text{יָרֵךְ} \text{ עֲרֵב} \text{ עֲשֵׂה} \text{ כִּי} \text{ עָלָה}$ )

Comment on Tanchum - For sources 3' - 5' perception of  $\text{עֲשֵׂה} \text{ עֲרֵב} \text{ עֲשֵׂה} \text{ עֲרֵב}$  who taken very literally; with  $\text{עֲשֵׂה} \text{ עֲרֵב}$  and  $\text{עֲשֵׂה}$  situation changes and they perceive the problem as one of  $\text{עֲשֵׂה}$  but that's certainly not  $\text{עֲשֵׂה}$  of the words in  $\text{עֲשֵׂה}, \text{עֲרֵב}, \text{עֲשֵׂה}$ .

Regarding note 5"ג - ע"ד gives two reasons why ש"ב  
is ק"ד"י 1) not י"ד פ"ד ק"ד (found in ק"ד)  
2) is ~~not~~ ש"ב'נ"ד ע"ב" (not found in any other  
source)

According to reason (1) obvious why י"ד פ"ד is not  
problem of ק"ד"י for ק"ד; see however פ"ד פ"ד