

בס"ד

הלכה ברורה

Halacha Berurah

צעירי
אגודת
ישראל



Volume 7. Issue 9.
• Email Edition •

The Prohibition of לא ילבש

Reviewed by Horav Shlomo Miller

The Torah states in *Parshas Ki Seitzei*: לא יהיה כלי גבר על אשה — *Male articles should not be on a woman and a man should not wear a feminine garment.* The *posuk* concludes by saying that anyone who does so has performed a *תועבה*—an abomination. These are two individual prohibitions, one concerning men and one concerning women. Although there is a difference in the terminology used for each gender, in practice there is no practical difference between them.¹

The Reason for the Prohibition

There are two reasons offered by the *Rishonim* why the Torah forbids this, and why *Chazal* viewed this prohibition as being extremely important in maintaining proper *kedushas Yisroel*. One reason offered is that the purpose of the prohibition is to maintain the sanctity of the Jewish nation, and prevent any conduct which might lead to immoral behavior. If dressing as the other gender was permitted, it would inevitably demoralize our society, and promiscuity would be widespread. Moreover, the *Rishonim* write that this was the practice of some idol worshippers, and the Torah requires us to distance ourselves from their shameful activity.²

Categories of the Prohibition

Activities forbidden by this prohibition fall under one of three categories.

The three categories are as follows:

1. Wearing articles of clothing of the other gender.
2. Embellishing oneself in ways that are unique to the other gender.
3. Removing body hair that is normally only removed by the other gender.

We will discuss each of these categories separately.

Wearing Articles of Clothing of the Opposite Gender

The *Gemara* presents a *machlokes* in defining the exact parameters of this *issur*.

The opinion of the *Tanna Kamma* is that a person transgresses this prohibition only if he or she completely changes their garments, thereby concealing their true identity, and then mingles with the opposite gender. Such licentious activity qualifies as the abomination expressed by the *posuk*.

Rav Eliezer ben Yaakov disagrees and maintains that the Torah unconditionally forbade any acts of embellish-

ment performed by the opposite gender. Even if one does not mingle with the opposite gender, it is still forbidden. Moreover, this prohibition is transgressed even by performing a single act of beautification that is unique to the other gender.³ *Rav Eliezer ben Yaakov* may have held that even such an act qualifies as an abomination. Alternatively, he may have held that any activity which might ultimately lead to promiscuous behavior is forbidden by the Torah.⁴

The *poskim* rule in accordance with the opinion of *Rav Eliezer ben Yaakov*. The *Smag* maintains that although *Rav Eliezer ben Yaakov* extends the Torah prohibition to include acts of beautification, he agrees with the *Tanna Kamma* that interchanging garments violates the prohibition, as is implied by the simple translation of the *posuk*.⁵

There is a *machlokes* amongst the early *Acharonim* as to what extent *Rav Eliezer ben Yaakov* subscribes to the opinion of the *Tanna Kamma*. The *Bach* maintains that any garments belonging to the opposite gender which are not classified as *בגדי נוי וקישוט* — *garments which add beauty*, but are ordinary garments, are only forbidden to be worn if one changes their garments completely, thereby concealing their identity, and then mingles with the opposite gender (i.e. precisely as the *Tanna Kamma* maintained). The *Beis Yosef* disagrees and maintains that although *Rav Eliezer ben Yaakov* subscribes to the opinion of the *Tanna Kamma*, it is only to a certain extent. *Rav Eliezer ben Yaakov* agrees

Please Note: Due to the intricacy of the material discussed in each issue, and the brevity of its treatment, a *Rov* should be consulted for a final *psak halacha*. In addition, this publication does not intend to be מכריע on issues that are *machlokes haposkim*. Although we have usually brought the dissenting views in the footnotes, we have selected for simplicity sake to incorporate into the main text the views of the *Mishnah Berurah*, R' Moshe Feinstein, R' Shlomo Zalmen Auerbach and several other preeminent *poskim*. Please send all questions and comments to 1341 E. 23rd Street, Brooklyn, NY 11210 or email to hbinfo@thekosher.net

that interchanging garments is also forbidden by the *Torah*, just as the *Tanna Kamma* opines, but he does not agree that there is an additional criterion of mingling.⁶ Some *poskim* maintain that according to the *Beis Yosef*, *Rav Eliezer ben Yaakov* prohibits interchanging a single ordinary garment as well.⁷ The *Shach* offers a third opinion on this matter, which offers a bit of a compromise. He maintains that interchanging ordinary garments is only prohibited if one's garments are completely interchanged. Doing so violates the *Torah* prohibition even if no mingling is involved. However, with regard to **בגדי נוי וקישוט** — *garments which add beauty*, it is forbidden to wear even a single garment that is unique to the other gender.⁸

Since we are dealing with a *Torah* prohibition, the *poskim* rule stringently regarding the above dispute, and maintain that there is no difference between **בגדי נוי וקישוט** and ordinary conventional types of clothing. Hence, *all* clothing unique to the other gender is forbidden to be worn, even if one does not mingle with the opposite gender. Furthermore, even wearing a single garment where one's gender is apparent is forbidden.⁹

Intention

The *Bach* maintains that a person only transgresses the above prohibition if they dress or embellish themselves like the opposite gender, *with the intention of imitating the opposite gender*. If, however, one has an ulterior motive in doing so, it is permitted. For example, if a woman feels cold and wants to wear her husband's jacket to warm herself, it is permitted according to the *Bach*, since the jacket is not being worn in order for her to appear as a man. The *Bach's* rationale is that such an act does not qualify as the abomination described by the *posuk*. In essence, two people can do the same exact act, and for one it would be forbidden and for the other it would be completely permissible, since intention plays a role in determining whether the act qualifies as an abomination forbidden by the *Torah*.¹⁰ There are other *poskim* who disagree with the *Bach's* principle, and maintain that the act itself is forbidden by the *Torah*, and intention is not a determining factor.¹¹ Some contemporary *poskim* rely on the *Bach*, while others are stringent.¹²

Unless there is a pressing need, one should preferably be stringent in this regard. For example, if it is chilly outside and a woman is cold, she should try to obtain a woman's jacket. This is far more preferable than relying on the *Bach* for the mere convenience of putting on her husband's jacket. If, however, she is very cold and there is no other woman's jacket available nearby, she may rely on the *Bach* and wear her husband's jacket.¹³

Additionally, some *poskim* maintain that in situations where suspicion may arise from onlookers, then even if one does not intend to appear like the other gender, it should be avoided. For example, if a woman has trouble reading and there are only men's reading glasses available nearby, she may wear them to read. After she is done reading, she must remove them to avoid suspicion. Some *poskim* forbid a woman to wear a man's watch even if she needs the watch and has no other one available. This is because when she is not looking at the watch, onlookers may suspect her of wearing it to appear as a man. If she needs the watch to keep track of time, she should place the watch in her pocket or purse.¹⁴

Effect of Present-Day Style

The entire prohibition of *lo yilbash* is limited to wearing garments that are worn exclusively by the other gender. Garments that are worn by both men and women are permitted to be worn by either gender. If a person of one gender has already worn a particular garment (i.e. a garment that is generally worn by either gender), it is still permitted for a person of the opposite gender to wear the garment.¹⁵

When describing the poverty of *Rav Yehuda*, the *Gemara* comments that he and his wife only possessed one coat which they had to share. During the winter when *Rav Yehudah* went to the *Beis Medrash* to learn, his wife stayed at home. When his wife needed to go to the market, he had to stay at home. The *meforshim* explain that since the coat was not designed exclusively for any particular gender, this prohibition did not apply.¹⁶

If there are noticeable differences between a garment normally worn by men and a garment normally worn by women, the prohibition applies even though the general type of garment is worn by both. If there are no noticeable

differences in the design or shape of the garment, then even if the manufacturer intended for this particular garment to be used exclusively by one gender, it is permissible for the other gender to use it. In such a case, for example, even if the inside label reads 'Men's Size 6' or 'Woman's Size 6', it is permitted to be worn by either gender.¹⁷

The *poskim* also maintain that the dress of every generation must be assessed on its own. A garment that is currently normally worn by both genders is permitted to be used by either gender, even if at one time in a previous generation, the garment was generally only worn by one gender.¹⁸ There is a discussion amongst the *poskim* whether the conduct or style of dress of non-Jews or irreligious Jews who don't abide by the moral standards put in place by *Chazal*, are to be taken into account.¹⁹

Distinguishing Features Between Men's and Women's Garments

Obviously, if a certain type of garment is unique to one gender, it is regarded as a garment of that gender, and the other gender is forbidden to wear it. Even if both men and women wear the same general *type* of garment, but the men's and women's garments differ in the specificity of their design (e.g. they differ in shape, material, color, or stitching pattern) or by the accessories or ornaments that are attached to the garment (e.g. buttons, ribbons, or insignias), it is forbidden to wear the type of garment that is designed for the other gender.²⁰ For example, men's hats are used exclusively by men, and women's hats are used exclusively by women. Toupees are worn by men, while *shaitels* (wigs) are worn by women. (Below we will discuss toupees in further detail.) A woman's blouse and skirt are additional articles that are worn exclusively by women. Other articles which may be exclusive to a particular gender are ties, shoes, slippers, glasses, gloves, coats, sweaters, shirts, belts, and socks. Some of these items may be designed for both men and women, in which case they are permitted to either gender. Most scarves, for example, can be worn by both men and women.²¹

Wearing These Garments in Private

The *poskim* maintain that it is forbidden to wear garments designated for the opposite gender, whether it is in public or in the privacy of one's own home, and even if no one else is around.²²

Garments Worn Under Other Articles of Clothing

There is a *machlokes* amongst the *poskim* whether garments worn under other clothing are subject to this prohibition. If it is not customary for the other gender to wear that particular garment under other clothing, all agree that it is permitted.²³

Women Wearing Pants

We mentioned above that the *poskim* maintain that a garment which was normally worn by one gender in a previous generation and is now worn by both genders, is not subject to the prohibition of *lo yilbash*. We also mentioned that many *poskim* maintain that the current mode of dress of non-Jews and irreligious Jews are not taken into account when determining the individuality of a particular garment. A contemporary example is the issue of women wearing pants. *Chazal* consider it to be a lack of *tznius* for women to wear pants. Additionally, for centuries, women never wore pants. Therefore, although it is unfortunately quite prevalent nowadays for irreligious women and non-Jewish women to wear pants, this would not necessarily affect the *halacha*.

Nevertheless, the *poskim* do discuss the fact that in more recent times there are styles of pants that are designed solely for women, and the fitting and stitching of those pants differ from the male variety. According to some *poskim*, if a particular garment is inherently designed for one gender (e.g. due to modesty standards)²⁴, then even if those of the other gender begin to wear that type of garment, it is not permitted to be worn by the second gender even if its fitting and stitching differ slightly. According to these *poskim*, pants are still considered to be a male garment. Consequently, women who wear pants transgress the *Torah* prohibition of *lo yilbash*, in addition to not abiding by

the laws of *tznius*.²⁵ Other *poskim* disagree, and maintain that since the pants are designed differently for women, the prohibition of *lo yilbash* does not apply, but the pants are still forbidden to be worn by women since they are considered an immodest mode of dress for women.²⁶

Skiing

In a case where a woman is cold, many *poskim* maintain that she may wear pants if she wears a skirt on top of the pants. For example, a woman who wishes to go skiing, would be permitted to wear pants underneath a skirt. Wearing the pants underneath a skirt avoids concerns of *tznius*. Even according to the *poskim* who maintain that for a woman to wear pants is a violation of *lo yilbash*, in such an instance it would not be forbidden, since men don't wear pants in such a manner (i.e. under a skirt). Therefore, even if the pants are going to be covered by a long outer coat, it is still preferable to wear a skirt on top of the pants.²⁷

Exercising

It is quite typical in the world at large for women to wear pants and other athletic clothing while exercising. In many instances, pants are not a necessity, but are merely more convenient and comfortable and give a person the most versatility, and allow a person to exercise with the greatest ease. An additional reason why people wear tight fitting athletic clothing while exercising is because it stimulates them psychologically, and makes them feel more muscular, thinner, and flexible, while wearing them. However, for the added comfort and for this psychological edge, *hilchos tznius* may not be compromised.²⁸

Hilchos tznius requires modest dress and conduct even in places where there are no other people around. Additionally, according to the *poskim* who maintain that for a woman to wear pants is a direct violation of the *Torah* prohibition of *lo yilbash*, it would still remain forbidden even when worn in private.²⁹ There are some *poskim* who suggest that even according to those who ordinarily forbid women to wear pants due to the prohibition of *lo yilbash*, it is nevertheless permitted for women to wear pants while exercising.³⁰ Still, many *poskim* suggest that a loose

skirt should be worn over the pants while exercising, even though it might hinder one's versatility slightly. Even when worn in his manner, the pants still provide the comfort desired while exercising. In many instances, *hilchos tznius* would require that pants be worn under a skirt while exercising.³¹

If wearing a skirt greatly hinders one's ability to perform the exercises (e.g. one is doing gymnastics), there are many *poskim* who permit women to wear pants without the covering of a skirt, only if there are no men around. As an aside, it need not be mentioned that men and women should not exercise together.³²

Pajama Pants

According to many *poskim*, women are permitted to wear pajama pants when going to sleep. Pajama pants are designed specifically for each gender and have been worn by women for many years. Pajama pants are therefore not considered a male garment. Additionally, since pajama pants are only worn in the privacy of one's own home, there is no concern that it is considered a male garment due to the *tznius* issues involved in women wearing them.³³ Nonetheless, these *poskim* write that women should not walk freely around the house wearing these pants, and that a robe should be worn on top of the pants. (It is understood that if outsiders frequently enter one's home, the previous discussion is not relevant, and pajama pants should not be worn.)³⁴

Some *poskim* are more stringent in this regard and maintain that even pajama pants should not be worn by women. They maintain that women should wear nightgowns when going to sleep. They stress that it is praiseworthy to follow this practice, as it adds to the *tzinisdike* conduct which women should strive to excel in.³⁵

Articles Which Are Not Worn

There is a *machlokes Rishonim* whether the prohibition of *lo yilbash* is limited to wearing an article exclusive to the other gender, or if it also includes carrying an article that is normally carried by the other gender (e.g. a cane, umbrella, or a pocketbook that has a

handle). The consensus of the *poskim* is to be stringent in this regard.³⁶

At the beginning of this article, we mentioned a dispute amongst the *poskim* whether one gender may wear garments unique to the other gender if there is no intention to appear like the other gender, and there is a different reason for wearing the garment (e.g. a person is cold and that garment is the only one available). With regard to articles that are not worn, all *poskim* mentioned at the beginning of the article would agree that it depends on the intention of the person carrying the item. Therefore, if the person carries the item with no intention of mimicking the other gender, it is permitted.³⁷ For example, a woman is permitted to walk with a man's cane in order to prevent herself from falling. Similarly, a man is permitted to carry a woman's pocketbook by its handle (with the intention of merely transporting it) according to all *poskim*. If a man would wear the pocketbook (i.e. placing the strap over his shoulders) without the intention of mimicking the behavior of a woman, it would be subject to the *machlokes* discussed at the beginning of the article.³⁸

Nowadays, umbrellas are generally used interchangeably between men and women, and therefore, the prohibition of *lo yilbash* does not apply. In earlier times, there were umbrellas that were designed for each gender, and the permissibility at that time for a man to carry a woman's umbrella was dependent on this discussion.³⁹

The same discussion applies to using something that is generally used only by the other gender. For example, many bicycles are designed for men and have a horizontal cross bar, whereas woman's bicycles have crossbars that slant downwards. The question of whether it is permitted for a man to ride a woman's bicycle or vice versa, is dependent on this discussion. In most circumstances, a person who rides a bike of the other gender does so for convenience purposes, which is permitted according to all *poskim* as we explained.⁴⁰

Chazal state that it is not the practice of women to fight in battle. Indeed, some *Rishonim* maintain that a woman who joins the army transgresses the *issur* of *lo yilbash*.⁴¹ (It is beyond the scope of this discussion to discuss the

additional problems involved in Jewish girls joining the military, which all *gedolim* have unanimously vehemently opposed.)⁴²

The *Gemara* considers weaponry to be masculine articles. Rav Moshe Feinstein maintains that since large weapons are items that are generally only used by male soldiers, it is forbidden for women to carry them even if they have no intention of mimicking the actions of male soldiers. It is only with regard to clothing which are articles that are generally used to prettify oneself, that some *poskim* maintain that it depends on the intention of the wearer. With regard to weapons which are used for an act that is considered masculine, intention would not play a role. However, Rav Moshe writes that if a woman lives in a neighborhood where it is unsafe for her to walk around unarmed, she may carry a weapon to protect herself. This is surely so if she bears smaller weapons which are not normally used by soldiers.⁴³

Jewelry

Jewelry is something inherently made for women.⁴⁴ There have been many times in history where men have also worn certain types of jewelry. In the times of *Chazal*, for example, it was quite common for men to wear signet rings on their fingers.⁴⁵ Nowadays, it is common for men to wear fancy tie clips, men's watches, and cufflinks. Women who wear these types of items which are designed for men, transgress the prohibition of *lo yilbash*.⁴⁶

In this day and age, most types of jewelry are designed for women, and only men with drastically deteriorated moral values wear such jewelry (e.g. earrings, necklaces, bracelets, etc). Even the types of jewelry worn by these men differ in design from regular women's jewelry.⁴⁷ Therefore, men who wear jewelry designed for women transgress the *Torah* prohibition of *lo yilbash*. An exception to this is regarding men's rings, which are worn by many married men to show their married status. Still, Rav Moshe Feinstein and many other *poskim* oppose the practice of men wearing rings altogether, even if they were designed to be worn by men and are not subject to the *issur* of *lo yilbash*.⁴⁸

Children

Starting at a certain age, children are required to be trained in the observance of *mitzvos* and adherence to the laws of modesty. Some *poskim* maintain that *chinuch* for modesty begins at the age of three, while others are bit more lenient and maintain that *chinuch* for modesty begins at the age of six or seven.⁴⁹ Even prior to this age, it is forbidden for a parent to give their child something that is forbidden according to *halacha*. Therefore, a young girl may not be dressed in pants or other garments that are considered men's garments. Likewise, a young boy may not be dressed in types of clothing solely worn by women. Clothes manufactured for children under the age of three generally don't have any individuality to any particular gender. For example, it is quite common for children's outfits worn by girls to be designed with pants. Therefore, the *poskim* maintain that such young children may be dressed in these clothes.⁵⁰

Some *poskim* maintain that the *issur* of *lo yilbash* does not restrict children from wearing garments that are worn only by adults of the other gender. Therefore, a young boy would be permitted, according to these *poskim*, to wear a *shaitel* when dressing up.⁵¹

Purim Costumes, Weddings, Plays, etc.

There are some earlier *poskim* who permitted dressing up like the other gender on *Purim*, since it is done only for amusement, and there is no intention for any promiscuous activity.⁵² However, most earlier and later *poskim*, including the *Mishna Berurah*, maintain that such a practice is improper, and wearing even just one garment of the other gender should be avoided.⁵³

In a letter written by the *Rambam*, he vehemently chastises those who have the practice of dressing up as the other gender for amusement during the *Simchas Chosson V'kallah* at weddings. The *Rambam* writes that aside from the *Torah* prohibition involved, it often leads to mingling between the genders, and should be avoided completely. Many *poskim* rule accordingly.⁵⁴

Dressing up during plays is also disapproved of by the *poskim*. Even the *poskim* who permit doing so on *Purim*, only rule that way on account of several reasons that apply uniquely to *Purim*.⁵⁵ Some *poskim* suggest that it is permitted to dress up in a way that would resemble the other gender, if the clothes are battered to the extent that the clothes would not ordinarily be wearable by the other gender. For example, a man may wear a worn out or scruffy *shaitel* while acting in a play, since no woman would wear such a *shaitel* in public. Additionally, one can cut out a significant portion of the garment, thereby rendering it unusable by the other gender. Moreover, it is permitted to use items not uniquely associated with any particular gender and to decorate these items to give an intended appearance. For example, women may bear imitation weapons that are noticeably fake. Men may wrap themselves with a sheet or towel to mimic the appearance of a skirt.⁵⁶

Embellishing Oneself In Ways That Are Unique To The Other Gender

Chazal view acts of beautification to be a feminine activity. Conversely, what makes a man distinguished is having an older and dignified look. Consequently, men are forbidden to beautify themselves, or to alter their appearance to make themselves appear younger.⁵⁷

We mentioned above that when determining the individuality of men's and women's clothing, we take into account the present-day custom. There is a discussion amongst the *poskim* whether acts of beautification are also measured based upon the present day custom. The difference between wearing clothing and performing acts of beautification is that beautifying oneself is essentially a feminine activity. Thus, even if in a certain era men embellish themselves, the act of beautification is still considered a feminine activity, and since they are all in essence performing a feminine activity, it is forbidden.⁵⁸

Removing and Dying White Hairs

Chazal forbid a man to remove any white hairs from amongst the darker

hairs on his head or beard. It is also forbidden to dye the hairs black, brown, or any other dark color.⁵⁹ Even a temporary dye that fades away on its own is forbidden to be used, for dying hair is considered a feminine activity.⁶⁰ Rav Moshe Feinstein writes that even if the dying is performed via internal medication, it is still forbidden.⁶¹ It is permitted, however, for a man to take a short haircut, and as a result, make the white hairs less noticeable. Similarly, if one removes the white and dark hairs together, as opposed to just removing the white hairs, it is permitted. Even if one completely removes the portion of his hair containing the white hairs, it is permitted.⁶²

As we mentioned, what makes a man distinguished is having an older and dignified look. Therefore, many *poskim* permit a man to dye his hair white.⁶³ Some *poskim* maintain that once a man's hair has been dyed white, it is forbidden for him to re-dye it black.⁶⁴ However, it would be permitted to remove the white dye by cleaning the hair with certain chemicals, and thereby returning the hair to its original color.⁶⁵

Acts of Embellishment to avoid Embarrassment, Earn a Livelihood, or Find a Shidduch

There is a *machlokes haposkim* whether acts of beautification are only forbidden for men when done to create a more striking and attractive appearance. It is clearly a feminine trait to be conscious of always appearing as attractive as possible. However, if a man performs acts of beautification in order to cover up blemishes, it might not be considered acts of embellishment, but a way of hiding imperfections, even though the same act of beautification was performed.

For example, if a younger person grows a few white hairs on his head which causes him embarrassment or may hinder his ability to find a *shidduch*, his purpose in dying his hair is to remove the discoloration and not to beautify himself. Similarly, if a person fears that he may not be hired for a certain job due to his older appearance, his purpose in dying his hair is not to beautify himself, but to make sure that it

won't hamper his chances of getting a job. (This discussion obviously only applies where by doing so, there is no deception with regard to one's working abilities, and the act is done merely to improve one's appearance.)⁶⁶

During the last century, there was a *chazzan* whose hair and beard turned completely white on one side of his head, while the other side remained dark. This was obviously a great source of embarrassment and put his job in jeopardy due to the repugnance people had when looking at him. The major *halachic* authorities of that era dealt with this issue, and many of them were hesitant to permit him to dye his hair.⁶⁷ Some suggested that he dye all his hair white, while others suggested that he dye his hair red, as these colors are generally not used by women.⁶⁸ There were some *poskim* who permitted dying the hair its original color.⁶⁹

Clearly, since this is a dispute amongst the *poskim* concerning a *Torah* prohibition, it is correct to be stringent in this regard. Some *poskim* maintain that in cases of great need, one may be lenient.⁷⁰ This is especially true nowadays when it is quite common for men to dye their hair, and there are exclusive dyes available for use by men, whose colors are slightly different from the dyes used by women. Although we mentioned above that taking the current custom into account is itself a *machlokes* amongst the *poskim*, nevertheless, in combination with this *machlokes* regarding acts of beautification, there are grounds to be lenient if a pressing need arises.⁷¹ It is nevertheless vital that a *rov* be consulted to assess each particular situation and whether there are grounds to be lenient.

Toupees, Re-growing or Implanting Hair, Preventing Hair Loss

The *poskim* permit men who have experienced hair loss to wear a toupee (designed for men) or to perform some other act to conceal this deficiency.⁷² It is therefore permitted to take pills or use shampoos which stimulate the re-growth of hair. Moreover, it is permissible to have hair implanted as well. It goes without saying that it is permissible to take steps to prevent hair loss. These

activities are not considered feminine practices.⁷³

It should be noted that some *poskim* prohibit an older person who has white hair to wear a black toupee in order to appear younger.⁷⁴

Manicures

Manicuring is an act of beautification that is considered a feminine practice, and is forbidden for a male. Included in this is the removal of one's cuticles. If a man's cuticles are irritating him, they may be removed, but an excessive amount of time should not be spent beautifying his nails, for that is clearly a feminine act.⁷⁵

Cosmetics and Plastic Surgery

Skin cleansers are permitted to be used by men and are not considered a feminine practice. In fact, *Chazal* stress that it is incumbent on men to appear clean and presentable.⁷⁶

Creams used to cure cuts, blisters, or chapped skin, are permitted to be used by men. Any solutions or creams used for medical purposes are likewise permitted.⁷⁷

Some *poskim* permit men who experience outbreaks of freckles when exposed to the sun to use ointments that aid in the disappearance of the freckles.⁷⁸

The *poskim* discuss the permissibility of performing plastic surgery to correct facial imperfections. Aside for the issue of *lo yilbash*, there are several other *halachic* issues involved, including injuring oneself in the process, and the use of anesthesia which involves a certain element of *sakana*, albeit minor. A *Rov* should be consulted to assess each particular situation.⁷⁹

Perfumes and Colognes

The *poskim* consider the use of strong scented perfumes and colognes to be a feminine practice, and men should therefore refrain from using them. Men are permitted to use colognes designed for men, which counteract odors and give off a pleasant scent.⁸⁰

Chazal also consider it inappropriate for women to draw extra attention to

themselves by applying strong scented fragrances.⁸¹

Looking Into a Mirror

At one time, using a mirror was a practice unique to women. Looking into a mirror is obviously not in and of itself an act of beautification, but aids people in beautifying themselves. Having said that, the *poskim* still consider it to be a feminine practice. In earlier times, the *poskim* only permitted men to use a mirror in order to appear presentable and respectable, or to aid in applying a medicine. Nowadays, the *poskim* write that looking into a mirror is a practice that is common among men as well, and its use is therefore more permissible than in earlier times. Nevertheless, the *poskim* encourage men to refrain from excessive use of a mirror.⁸²

Curling Hair, Tweezing Eye Brows, Blow Drying hair

A man is forbidden to curl his eyelashes or tweeze his eyebrows, as these are considered feminine practices. A man is permitted to rub his eyebrows without the intention of removing any hair. Curling hair on one's head is considered a feminine activity. Nevertheless, *chassidim* who have long *payos* may curl their *payos* since it is obviously not an act performed by women.⁸³

The *poskim* permit a man to use a blow dryer in order to speed up the drying process of his hair.⁸⁴

Men Removing Body Hair Commonly Removed by Women

We mentioned above that a third category of activities forbidden is the removal of body hair that is normally only removed by the other gender. According to many *poskim*, the removal of hair that is normally not exposed is only a *Rabbinic* extension of the *Torah* prohibition.⁸⁵ The *poskim* forbid the use of a razor by a man to remove any hair on the body normally removed by women (e.g. arms, legs, etc.). Tweezing the hairs or using any cream to facilitate the complete destruction of such hairs is also forbidden, but a close cut using scissors is permitted.⁸⁶ (The use of electric shavers by men to remove facial hair

is dependent on other issues that were discussed in *Halacha Berurah's* article: *Electric Shavers in Halacha*). Hair found on the underarms and the private areas are forbidden to be cut closely even with scissors. The *poskim* permit a man who shaves his entire body (i.e. not necessarily including the hair on his head, of which parts are anyway forbidden to be shaved) to even shave the hair on the underarms and the private areas, since it is not considered an act of beautification. Therefore, professional swimmers are permitted to remove all their body hair, which allows them to swim with much more ease.⁸⁷

It is permitted for a man to remove body hairs if the intention is not for beautification, but for other purposes such as medical reasons. For example, one who is having surgery is permitted to have the area shaved with a razor.⁸⁸ Additionally, if only a small portion of hair is removed (e.g. when receiving an EKG, stitches, etc.) it is not considered an act of beautification, and no prohibition applies.⁸⁹

There are various ways of checking electric shavers to determine whether they are kosher and can be used by men to shave their facial hair. Often, *Rabbonim* test the sharpness of the blades of an electric shaver by running the shaver along their forearms. Although some hair might be removed in the process, this is permitted since it is not an act of beautification.⁹⁰

It is permitted for men to remove hair from areas where women don't normally remove their hair. For example, after taking a haircut many men have the back portion of their necks shaved with a razor. This is permitted since women don't normally remove the hair from that area.⁹¹

Short Hair Cuts for Women

Women are forbidden to cut their hair very short in a manner that resembles men's haircuts. However, the *poskim* do permit women to take short haircuts if they also remove the hair that is considered *payos* by men. Indeed, this is the practice of many *chassidische* married women, who, in addition to covering their heads, take extra measures to ensure that none of their hair will become exposed.⁹²

- דברים כבה, ועי' חכמ"א כלל צ' ששינה הקרא לשונו ולא כתב לא תלבש לשמענין שאפילו דבר שאינו מלבש בכלל, ועי' שו"ת ערוגת הבשם יו"ד סי' קל"ח שמחדש חילוקי דינים בין איש ואשה מדוני קרא לשונו, מ"מ משאר פוסקים לא משמע כותיה, ועי' ספר מלבושי כבוד ותפארת בלח העיון סי' ב' ד"ה עוד יש לדייק, ועי"ש מה שהביא מגמ' בכורות דף כה, ומשם משמע שריים שוה.
- עי' בספר החינוך מצוה תקמ"ב וז"ל: להרחיק מאומתנו הקדושה דבר ערוה וכל ענין צד שיהיה הכשלון באותו דבר מצוי מתוכו... ואין ספק כי אם יהיו מלבושי האנשים והנשים שויים יתערבו אלו עם אלו תמיד ומלאה הארץ זמה. ועוד להרחיק כל ענין גמ' שדרכק של עובדי עז"ה היה בכך, עכ"ל ועי' רמב"ם בסנה' לאוויר מ', ובמורה נבוכים ח"ג פל"ז, ועי' בספרי שקרוי חמשה שימות חרם, תועבה, שנואי, משוקל, ועול.
- עי' מס' נוזר דף נט ע"א.
- עי' ב"י ביו"ד סי' קפ"ב שהאריך בזה בשיטת הרמב"ם והסמ"ג, והנ"מ אם העברת שיער בית השחי ובית הערוה אסור מן התורה לשיטת רמב"ם, עי"ש.
- עי' שו"ע שם סי' ה', ועי' ב"י ובה"ש.
- עי' ב"ח שם, ועי' ב"י בשיטת הרמב"ם שכתב וכל שכן דהיבא ההלכו' שמלותיהם דהוא מביא טפי לידי תועבה דאסור אע"פ שאינו יושב בין הנשים, עי"ש ויל"ע אם דוקא מחליף כל שמלותיהם או אפילו נגד אחד, ועי' משי"כ בציון בשם שו"ת שבת הלוי. ועי' ב"י שם בשם הסמ"ג שמורה ראב"י לת"ק דאין מקרא יוצא מידו פשוט, ולכאורה לפי הסמ"ג שדברים אלו יוצא תועבה ואינו תלוי אם מביא לידי תועבה י"ל לפי הבנת ב"י שאסור אפילו בהחלף אחר מהבגדים.
- עי' שו"ת שבת הלוי ח"ב סי' ס"ג, ויל"ע בדבריו דמשי"כ ב"י, שו"ע, ורמ"א שאפילו באחד מהבגדים אסור אולי זה דוקא בבגדי נוי וקישוט דהוי תיקוני דאיתתא, אבל בסתם בגדים אפשר לא, וצ"ע.
- עי' שו"ע שם סק"י, ועי"ש שהולך בשיטת הב"ח רק פליג עליו, עי"ש. אכן עי' שו"ת שבת הלוי שם שפסק אע"פ שה"ך לדבריו של הב"ח קאמר וליה לא סבירא ליה בהכי, מ"מ עי"ש בחו"י סי' קמ"ב שאם בייש שפשוט שאין לומר כן בשיטת הב"ח אלא דהכי הוא שיטת הש"ך.
- עי' שו"ת שבת הלוי שם.
- עי' ב"ח שם, ועי' בחי"ך שם משמע שמקל כוותיה עכ"פ היבא שלא החליף כל שמלותיו, וכן נקט המנח"י ח"ב סי' קיח, ושו"ת אבני צדק סי' ע"ב בדעת הש"ך. ועי' בט"ז שם סק"ד שמקל כוותיה, ועי' שו"ת חסד לאברהם סי' ע"ב שהביא ראה להב"ח מתוס' במס' קידושין דף ל"ו: שכתב אשה יכולה ללבוש בגדי כוונה, אכן עי' בגליוני הש"ס שם שלמד תוס' באופן אחר.
- עי' יד הקטנה הל' עז"ז אות ל', ועי' מעשה רוקח על הרמב"ם פ"ב ה"י, ועי' שו"ת דברי חיים יו"ד ח"ב סי' ס"ב שרק במילוי דרבנן יש להקל, ועי"ש שהביא שזה שיטת הרשב"א בשו"ת ח"ה סי' רע"א, ואף שמשמע שני שם שאין זה נחשב תיקוני איתתא לכאורה משמע שאף בדאורייתא יש להקל, מ"מ מטעם ראשון שם משמע שרק בדרבנן התיר, ועי' בשו"ת שו"מ סי' ר"י דאף לטעם שני אין להקל באיסור דאורייתא, עי"ש. ומה שמשמע מתוס' ומדרכי במס' שבת דף נ' ע"ב שמותר, עי' בדברי חיים שזה רק אליבא דבריתא שם שלא פסקינן כמוהו, עי"ש, ועי' בשו"ת שבת הלוי ח"ו ק"הג' בענין שיטת תוס', ועי' שו"ת אבני צדק סי' ע"ב שמתמיה על הדברי חיים מדוע לא הביא שיטת הב"ח שמקל, ועי' בשו"ת מהר"ם שייק יו"ד סי' קע"ג שהקשה דהוי פסקי רישא, ועי' חכמ"א כלל צ' ובינת אדם שם שהחמיר.
- עי' שו"ת אבני צדק סי' ע"ב שמקל כהב"ח הגם שצירף שם עוד טעם להיתר, ועי' שו"ת אג"מ או"ח ח"ד סי' ע"הג' משמע שמקל, ועי' שם שייק יו"ד ח"ב סי' ס"א שמקל, ועי' שו"ת יביע אומר ח"ו יו"ד סי' י"ד שיש להחמיר לכתחילה. ועי' שו"ת שבת הלוי ח"ב סי' ס"ג וח"ו סי' ק"ח, ומנח"י ח"ב סי' ק"ח שלא הכריע.
- כך שמעתי ממכמה פוסקי זמננו, ועי' גם בב"ח שם ובשו"ת מהרש"ם ח"ב סי' רמ"ג דאם אפשר בענין אחר אין להקל. ועי' שו"ת יביע אומר שם בס' ידו' שבמקום צורך יש להקל.
- עי' מהרש"ם שם. ועי' בספר מלבושי כבוד ותפארת ו'ה' בשם הגאב"ד דעברעצין זצ"ל.
- עי' גליוני הש"ס במס' קידושין דף ל"ו ע"ב, ועי' הגהות יעב"ץ במס' שבת שף י"ב ע"א, ועי' מהרש"א במס' נדרים דף מט ע"ב, ועי' ברכי יוסף פ"ב ידו'.
- עי' גמ' נדרים דף מט ע"ב, ועי' במהרש"א שם.
- עי' שו"ת אהלי יעקב יו"ד סי' ע'.
- עי' שו"ע ורמ"א שם סי' ה'.
- עי' פירוש שם סק"ה שהביא שתי לשונות בזה, ועי' שו"ת ערוגת הבשם סי' קל"ח בענין אם התחילו באיסור, ועי' שו"ת דברי יהושע ח"ה סי' ל"ד שרן שאלה כיוצ"ב לפני החפץ חיים זצ"ל ולא נתבררה אז הלכה לפניו. ועי' בשו"ת הרשב"א ח"ד סי' צ"ג שלא נחת לו התיר בזה, ועי' שו"ת יביע אומר ח"ו יו"ד סי' ידו' שהרשב"א החמיר רק בהבאת שיעור הבית השחי וזה הערה, אבל במלבושים יורה להיתר שאין זו מטעם הנשים, ועי' שו"ת מהרש"ם ח"ב סי' רמ"ג שהחמיר בזה וכתב שהפרישה חזר בו מההיתר בלשון שני.
- עי' חכמ"א ריש כלל צ'.
- עי' בספר מלבושי כבוד ותפארת שהאריך בזה.
- עי' שו"ת מנח"י ח"ב סי' ק"ג, ועי' שו"ת בצל החכמה ח"ה סי' קכ"ו, ועי' במס' ברכות דף ט"ב ע"א שאין קורין צנועה אלא למי שצנועה בה"כ. ועי' שו"ע או"ח סי' ב' ומ"ב שם.
- עי' מנח"י שם שאפילו תחת בגדיו אסור, והביא ראה משיעור בית השחי ובית הערוה שאף שאין הכל רואין אותו מ"מ אסור להעבירו. אכן עי' בספר מלבושי כבוד ותפארת א"ט'ו בשם הגר"ש אלישיב שליט"א שמוטר, ועי"ש שהעברת שיער הוי בגדר קישוט משא"כ במלבושים האיסור להחליף שייך רק אם יבוא לידי תועבה, ועי' בשו"ת אבני צדק סי' ע"ב שמתיר לנשים ללבוש מכנסים תחת בגדיהם וליכא חסרון צניעות בזה, ועי' שו"ת שבת הלוי ח"ב סי' ס"ג דאם אין דרך אנשים בכך מותר. אכן מהמנ"י הג"ל משמע שאפילו באופן זה אסור.
- עי' גמ' פסחים דף ג' ע"ב שפוסק רגלים באשה פריצותא. ועי' אורחות רבינו ח"א סי' רכ"ט שבזמן חז"ל היה סוקל אשה שלושת מכנסים.
- עי' שו"ת שבת הלוי ח"ב סי' ס"ג שלא מועיל שינוי הבגד, ועי' ספר מלבושי כבוד ותפארת פ"ג שלמד בדעתו דאף שינוי בכונה לא יועיל להתירו שס"ס שייך לאנשים, ולכן אף אם יאמר ששינוי בצורה מועיל להחשיבו לבגד אחר מ"מ בגד שנראה פסיק רגליה שייך לאנשים. ונלע"ז שאין זה סברת בעל שבת הלוי שהזכר שם אלא שאוסר רק מטעם שבגד זה מיוחד לאנשים ולכן קצת שינוי בצורתו לא יועיל להתירו, ואף שבימינו מצוינו שמכנסים אינם מיוחדים רק לאנשים י"ל כסברת הפרישה שאינם לומדים ממנה הגוים. ועי' בשו"ת מנח"י ח"ב סי' ק"ח, ושו"ת דבר יהושע ח"ה סי' ל"ד, ובצ"ע אליעזר ח"א סי' ט"ב שאוסר.
- עי' שו"ת אבני צדק סי' ע"ב שהתיר מכנסו חורף שניכרם שם משונים ממכנס אינשים, ואף שכתב שכובע אנשים שהתחילו נשים ללבוש אסור שס"ס שם בגד איש עליהם, ועי' שו"ת יביע אומר ח"ו יו"ד סי' י"ד שמפרש דבכובע היה ניכר שלא עשו כן הנשים אלא כדי להדמות לאנשים ולכן לא היה מועיל בו מה שהיה צורתו משונה קצת משל אנשים, עי"ש. ומשי"כ בשו"ת שבת הלוי שם בענין אבני צדק, עי"ש בהמהודורא ג' מש"כ בעד הגליון שחזר מזה, ועי' ספר הליכות בת ישראל פ"ז סעי' ו' בהערה שם שהביא מהגר"ש אלישיב שליט"א, ומהגר"ח"פ שייבוער"ג שליט"א שאין בו איסור לא ילבש, וכך שמעתי מהגר"י בעלסקי שליט"א, וכך



Halacha Berurah is a bi-weekly publication affiliated with Zeirei Agudath Israel of Brooklyn, NY

Ephraim Elli Bohm
 Publisher; Author
Rabbi Meier Saslow
 Administrative Assistant
Avrohom Goldberg
 Technical Manager
Tzvi Geller
 Zeirei Liaison

This Project is Dedicated
 לז"נ פנחס בן ר' זאב
 חיה שרה בת ר' יצחק הלוי



Halacha Berurah goes monthly, increases in size, and will now be published all year round

For the past six years, Halacha Berurah has been published every other week during the months of October thru June. We would like to inform our readership that Halacha Berurah will now be published monthly instead, and will be published during the summer months of July thru September as well. In addition, many of the new monthly issues will be double in length. *Be'ezras Hashem*, Halacha Berurah will be able to continue publishing thought provoking issues, aimed at driving one to delve deeper into the sugyos relevant to the halachos discussed.

Please note that due to the increase in size of many of our issues and the fact that we will be publishing during the summer months as well, the end date of all annual subscriptions will remain the same. We welcome your comments or inquiries. Please feel free to call: 718-851-5259, or email to hbinfo@thekosher.net.

We appreciate the support and input of all our readers, and encourage you to continue to look for the new monthly issues of Halacha Berurah.

תורה בהלכה ח"ו עוג שבמבושם הרבה יש גירוי היצר.

- 81. עי מדרש תנחומא פ"ר וישלח דלא נתנו תכשטיין לאשה אלא כדי שתהא מתקשטת בתוך ביתה, ועי גמ' שבת דף סב ע"ב, ועי' שו"ת אז נדברו הח.
- 82. עי שו"ע יו"ד סעי' ב', ועי' נ"ר"כ שם, ועי' שו"ת אג"מ ח"ב סי' ס"א, ועי' שו"ת יביע אומר ח"ג א"ח א.ב, ושו"ת יחוה דעת ח"ו סי' מ"ט.
- 83. עי ספר מלבושי כבוד ותפארת פ"ד סעי' כ"ג וכ"ד.
- 84. עי"ש בשם בעל שו"ת באר משה.
- 85. עי מס' נזיר נח. ונט. ועי' ב"ר"ד שם בב"י שהאריך בזה.
- 86. עי שיטה מקובצת בנזיר נח. ועי' שו"ת גינת ורדים כלל ו' סי' יב.
- 87. עי שו"ע שם ונ"כ.
- 88. עי שו"ת הרשב"א בח"ה סי' רע"א אדבריו מובא בב"י שם, ועי' תוס' בנזיר נט.
- 89. עי הגהות הט"ז שם בענין מקצת גופו, ושמעתי מכמה פוסקי זמנינו יותר מזה שכבחה' אינו נחשב אפ' תיקון.
- 90. עי"פ הנ"ל.
- 91. עי ט"ז שם בסק"ה, וכך שמעתי מהגר"ד פיינשטיין בנ"ד.
- 92. עי שו"ע שם, ועי' דרכי תשובה שם שהאריך בזה, ועי' שו"ת שבת הלוי ח"ו סי' קצ"ט.

- ומקורו משו"ת דברי חיים ח"ב סי' ס"ב, ועי' בשו"ת מחנה חיים יו"ד ח"ב סי' ל' בר"ה ועי' בב"ק, דכתב תירוץ לתרץ הגמ' בב"ק דף ס ע"א, עי"ש.
- 63. עי ב"י סוף סי' קפ"ב, ועי' ט"ז שם סק"ז, ועי' בשו"ת דברי חיים שם.
- 64. עי שבת הקהתי ח"ב סי' רנ"ז.
- 65. כך שמעתי מכמה פוסקי זמננו.
- 66. עי תוס' במס' שבת דף נ ע"ב ד"ה בשביל צערו. עי' ע"ע בתוס' בנזיר דף נט ע"א ד"ה גבול דמשמע שמותר, אכן עי' שו"ת הרשב"א בח"ה סי' רע"א שמשמע שמותר רק במידי דאסור מדרבנן, ועי' ציון זו הנ"ל שהאריך בדברי האחרונים שפרשו דברי הראשונים אלו, ועי' בציון הבא.
- 67. עי שו"ת מחנה חיים ח"ב יו"ד סי' ל', שו"ת דברי חיים ח"ב סי' ס"ב, שו"ת מהר"ם ש"ק סי' קע"ג, שו"ת שו"מ סי' רי, שו"ת מחנה פתים סי' קפ"ב.
- 68. עי שו"ת דברי חיים שנתן עצה לצבוע לבן, ועי' מהר"ם ש"ק שם שנתן עצה לצבוע אדום.
- 69. עי שו"ת מחנה פתים שם שהתיר בכל אופן, ועי' מחנה חיים שם שהתיר רק בצניור מיוחד, ועי' שו"מ שם שמידי דרבנן יש להקל.
- 70. עי לבושי מרדכי סי' כ"ד, שו"ת באר משה ח"ח, ועי' בשו"ת אג"מ ב"ר"ד ח"ב סי' ס"א שמקל, ועי"ש שהביא שכן הורה הגר" משה מרדכי עפשטיין אב"ד בסלאבאדקא, ועי' שו"ת תשובות והנהגות סי' תס"א.
- 71. כך שמעתי מכמה פוסקי זמננו.
- 72. עי לבושי מרדכי באר"ח סי' ק"ח שאין נחשב שמלת אשה, וכן משמע מדברי הפוסקים בסי' ב' באר"ח לענין פאה נכרית לתפילה, ועי' שו"ת יביע אומר ח"ה אב"ע סי' ה', ועי"ש בח"ד אב"ע גג, ובח"ו סי' יג.
- 73. עי שו"ת אג"מ אר"ח ח"ד סי' מ"ח.
- 74. עי כרם שלמה סי' קפ"ב סעי' כבג.
- 75. עי ספר מלבושי כבוד ותפארת פ"ד סעי' כה.
- 76. עי גמ' שבת דף ק"ד ע"א, ועי' רמב"ם הל' דעות פ"ה ה"ט וז"ל: מלבושי ת"ח מלבושי נאה ונקי, ואסור לו שימצא בבגדו חתם או שמנונית וכיוצא בהן, עי"ש. ועי' לבושי מרדכי יו"ד סי' ק' שמחיר אם אינה משנה טבעות אלא חוזר למצב קודם. ועי' גמ' שבת דף נ ע"ב שרוחץ פנים לשחרית ואין בו משום לא ילבש. ועי' שו"ת אז נדברו ח"ד סי' ל"ז שכל דבר שצריך לנקיון או רפואה אין בזה משום לא ילבש.
- 77. עי שו"ת אז נדברו שם.
- 78. עי שו"ת לבושי מרדכי ח"א יו"ד סי' ק'.
- 79. עי שו"ת מנח"י ח"ו סי' ק"ה, שו"ת חלקי' ח"ג סי' מ"א, שו"ת שבת הלוי ח"ו קצ"ח, ושו"ת באר משה ד"קב.
- 80. עי גמ' ברכות שף מב ע"ב שרק לת"ח גנאי הוא לו ליוצא בשוק כשהוא מבושם, ועי' שו"ת באר משה ד"קט, ושו"ת אז נדברו ח"ד סי' ל"ז, ועי' מה שחזר בח"ח סי' ס"ח. ועי' שו"ת קנין

- 49. עי בה"ל באר"ח סי' עה ט"ו. אכן עי' חזו"א א"ח ט"ז, ח.ו, ושמעתי בשם הגר"מ פיינשטיין וצ"ל שיש מקום להקל בזה.
- 50. עי מעשה רוקח בהק' שהביא תשו' מהרמב"ם בזה, ועי' מנח"י ב"ק, שבת הלוי ויח, ומה שמקיל האג"מ בח"ד סי' סב לכא' הוא בצניור שכתוב בפנים.
- 51. עי עם התורה חוברת י"ג מהדו"ב שנת תשמ"ז בתשו' מהרב פסח אליהו פאלק שליט"א, ושמעתי מהגר" שלמה מילר שליט"א שלכאורה נחשב לבישה באופן כלאחר יד, ועי' בשו"ת מהר"ם מינץ סי' ק"ט בר"ה סבלונות בענין לבישת טבעת שלא כדרכה, ועי' שו"ת בצל החכמה ח"ה סי' קכ"ו סק"א.
- 52. עי שו"ת מהר"י מינץ סי' י"ז, והובא ברמ"א באר"ח סי' תרצ"ו סעי' ח'. ועי"ש שהתיר בצניור ג' טעמים.
- 53. עי מ"ב שם, ועי' בב"ח יו"ד סי' קע"ב שהאריך בזה, ועי"ש שהביא מספר יראים סי' צ"ו, ועי"ש בש"ך וט"ז, ועי' חיד"א בשו"ת ברכה שם סק"ג, ועי' בהגהת רעק"א וחתם סופר לאר"ח שמשמע שאסור, ועי' שו"ת באר משה ח"ח סי' ח', שו"ת יביע אומר ח"ה יו"ד סי' י"ז, ועי"ש בח"ו סי' י"ה, ועי' ספר הליכות בת ישראל פ"ז שכך הורה הגר"ש אלישיב שליט"א, ועי" משה ברורה שם שאף אם החליף רק מלבוש אחד אפשר דאין למחות, עי"ש אבל לכתחילה יש להרחיק מכל זה.
- 54. עי בהקדמה למעשה רוקח על הרמב"ם, ועי' ספר יראים סי' צ"ז שמובא בב"ח שם, ועי' שו"ת יחוה דעת ח"ג סי' ס"ח.
- 55. עי שו"ת שבת הקהתי ח"ב סי' רנ"ח, ועי' חיד"א בשו"ת ברכה שם, ועי' בספר מלבושי כבוד ותפארת פ"ד סעי' י"ד בשם בעל היביע אומר.
- 56. עי עם התורה שם, וכך שמעתי מכמה פוסקי זמנינו, ועי"ש בשו"ת מהר"י שטייף סי' צ"ז.
- 57. עי ב"י בסוף סי' קפ"ב, ועי' ט"ז שם סק"ז.
- 58. עי שו"ת שבת הלוי ח"ג סי' ק"א, ועי' שו"ת להורות נתן ח"ב סי' ע', ועי' ביאור הגר"א יו"ד סי' קנ"ז, ועי"ש שאף פליג על הסתכלות במראה, ואף שנוהגים להקל בזה, מ"מ תיקון יופי ממש שייך יותר לטבע של נשים.
- 59. עי גמ' שבת דף צד ע"ב, ובגמ' מכות דף כ ע"ב, ועי' רמב"ם בסוף הלכות עו"ב, ועי' טור וב"ב סי' קפ"ב. ועי' שו"ת שו"מ סי' ר' שצביעת שערות אסור רק מדרבנן, אכן עי' שו"ת מהר"ם ש"ק סי' ע"ב שפליג עליו, וכן משמע משאר פוסקים שהוא איסור דאורייתא, ועי' ערוך לנר דף כ ע"ב, ושו"ת צפנת פענח ח"ד סי' רנ"ח אם יש חילוק בין הראש והזקן.
- 60. עי צפנת פענח ח"ב סי' ט"ו.
- 61. עי שו"ת אג"מ יו"ד ח"א סי' פ"ב, ועי' שו"ת חלקי' ח"ב סי' ע"ז, ועי' שו"ת בצל החכמה ח"ה סי' קכ"ז.
- 62. עי שו"ת שבת הלוי ח"ג סי' ק"א, ועי' שו"ת שבת הקהתי ח"א סי' רל"א,

זכר נשמת
 ר' משה בן
 ר' שלמה זלמן
 כ"ד אדר

לעילוי נשמת
 שמריהו בן ר' דוד
 ז' סיון
 ר' משה בן ר' יוסף אריה

This issue has been sponsored by the Greenwood Family of Toronto, Canada