י. מים שלפני הנפח אף על פי שלא נשתנו מראיהם פסולים, מפני שבידוע שנעשה בהם מלאכה דהיינו שכיבה בהם הברזל. [ש"ע סי' קס ס"ג]

יא. מים שלפני הספר, וידוע שטבל בהם הספר את ידיו, פסולים לנטילת ידים. אבל אם לא ידוע הדבר אם טבל בהם הספר ידיו, כשרים. [הליכו"ע ח"א עמ' שלח]

Blacksmith's water

10) The water in a container in a smithy is disqualified for *netillat yadayim* since the blacksmith almost certainly has used it to douse his hot metal in his work. Even if the water has a normal appearance it may not be used.

Barber's water

11) The water in a basin in a barber shop may be used for *netillat yadayim* as long as the barber has not used the water, dipping his hands in it. If it is known that he used it, the water is disqualified. If it is not known whether or not he used it, we may assume that he did not and the water is fit for *netillat yadayim*.[83]

to cool them off, the water is disqualified, just like when someone places a warm bottle of wine into the water to cool it off.

Harav Zalman (160:5) explained that Rama ruled that the water is still fit for the mitzvah since rinsing hands is not considered an act to disqualify water for the mitzvah. If the reasoning for disqualifying used water would be that the water is considered sewage after it is used, then there would be a basis to disqualify the water in this case as well. Rama, however, followed the reasoning offered by Rabbenu Shimshon [cited in the preface to this *Siman*], that used water is no longer considered water. The act of performing *netillat yadayim* is itself the act of rinsing hands in water. Therefore, the act of rinsing hands cannot change the water's status or our conception of it being water.

83. The *Shulhan Arukh* ruled that as long as the water's appearance has not changed it is fit for the mitzvah. The *Ben Ish Hai* (*parashat Kedoshim* halakha 6) cited Harav Zalman (160:7) explaining that when a barber dips his hands in the water in order to smooth out his client's hair, it is similar to the case of a baker dipping his hands in water and patting the surface of his dough. In both cases, the water remaining in the container is not considered "used water."

Maran the Rishon Letziyon (*Halikhot Olam* Vol. I, page 338) pointed out that the source of this reasoning is the *Nahalat Tzevi*. According to him, even if we know that the barber has dipped his hands in the water, it remains fit for the mitzvah. The *Levush*, however, explained that the reason why the barber's water is fit for the mitzvah is because we may assume that he did not dip his hands into it. Since we do not know for a fact that he did, this case becomes a doubt about a institution of our Sages, and the rule is *safek derabanan lekula*. This is the rule laid down below in halakha 23. It appears from this that if we know for a fact that the barber did dip his hands in the water, it is disqualified.

The *Eliya Rabba* (160:8) challenged the position of the *Nahalat Tzevi*, citing the Rashba in his *Torat Habayit Hakatzer*, who explained this halakha exactly as the *Levush* did. Likewise, this appears to be the meaning of the *Tosefta* cited by Rabbenu Shimshon (comment to *Yadayim*, chapter 1). Therefore, if we know for a fact that the barber dipped his hands in the water, it is disqualified for the mitzvah.

Why is this case different than that of the baker dipping his hands in water? The *Kaf Hahayim* Sofer (160:25) explained that when a barber dips his hands in the water he has dual intentions - to smooth his client's hair and also to clean his hand from the perspiration on his client's head. This makes the entire container "used water."

The *Mishna Berura* (*Sha'ar Hatziyun* 160:25) cited Harav Eliyahu of Vilna who likewise ruled that the water in a barbershop is fit for the mitzvah because we do not know for a fact that the barber dipped his hands in it, but if we know that this happened the water is disqualified. This likewise runs contrary to the ruling of Harav Zalman and the *Ben Ish Hai*, who followed the *Nahalat Tzevi*.

Conclusion of the *Halikhot Olam*

At the end of his discussion of this halakha, Maran the Rishon Letziyon suggested that the barber's water would become disqualified only if he rinsed his tools in it. The *Mishna Berura* (160:19) likewise mentioned this as a possibility. When the barber dips his hands in the water, however, the container of water remains fit for the mitzvah, for it is no different than a baker dipping his hands in water in order to pat down the surface of his dough. This fits in

יב. מים שהניחו בתוך "בקבוק גומי חם", שמניחים על הבטן וכיו"ב לשיכוך כאבים, פסולים לנטילת ידים. [מנחת יצחק ח"ב סי' נא, נצח יוסף ח"א סי' טו]. והוא הדין אם שלק ביצים קשות במים, שאסור ליטול ידיו במים אלו, דהוו מים שנעשתה בהם מלאכה. [נצח יוסף שם]. והוא הדין שאין ליטול ידיו ממים חמים הנכנסים למכשירי חימום והסקה "רדיאטורים". [פסקי תשובות עמ' שעב]

יג. והוא הדין אם עשה במים שאר מלאכות, כגון שנתן בהם כלים שנתבקעו בימות החמה כדי שיתכווצו, או שמדד בהן מדות, וכן אם היו עומדין המים בכלים שיש בהם שנתות בשביל משקל, שיש בהן חריצין לסמן לליטרא ולשני ליטראות, דכשנותנין בתוכן הדבר שרוצין לשקל עולה המים עד החריצין, ושקלו בתוכן איזה דבר, חשיב נמי מלאכה ופסולין. [משנ"ב ס"ק יב ואחרו']

Boiled water

12) If someone filled a hot-water bottle for medicinal purposes, that water cannot be used afterward for *netillat yadayim*. Likewise, if someone boiled eggs on the stove, the water in the pot is disqualified for this mitzvah as "used water." For the same reason, the water in home radiators is disqualified for this mitzvah.[84]

Measuring with water

13) Any use of water disqualifies it for the mitzvah of *netillat yadayim*. Even simply using it to measure a container makes it "used water." If wooden items have cracked from the dry heat of the summer and they are placed in water to rejuvenate them, the water is disqualified.

---

with the explanation given by the *Nahalat Tzevi*, Harav Zalman and the *Ben Ish Hai*.

It appears from this that Maran the Rishon Letziyon retracted his original position, for he now explained that even if it is known that the barber dipped his hands in the water it is not disqualified unless it is known that he rinsed his tools in the water. According to this, when the Rashba wrote that "when we are unsure, the water is still fit," he meant that we are unsure whether or not the barber dipped his tools. Even if it is known that he dipped his hands, the water would still be fit for the mitzvah.

This reasoning rejects the suggestion of the *Kaf Hahayim* that the barber intends to clean his hands from his client's perspiration when he dips his hands in the water. If this is really the conclusion of Maran the Rishon Letziyon, it contradicts the ruling printed in the *Halikhot Olam* above his discussion of the halakha. Indeed, the *Halakha Berura* (page 182) ruled leniently based on this concluding argument and he ignored the halakha written above the discussion.

Nevertheless, it is possible that Maran the Rishon Letziyon did not retract his position at all. He still maintains that the water is disqualified if it is known that the barber dipped his hands in the water, since the barber does this in order to clean off his client's perspiration beside the obvious purpose of smoothing the client's hair. His closing argument is only a suggestion to support the position of the *Nahalat Tzevi*, but he himself did not subscribe to it.

84. The *Peri Megadim* (555:19) wrote that he is unsure of the rule regarding the water in a hot-water bottle. Several *Aharonim* (*Keren LeDavid*, *Minhat Yitzhak*, *Netzah Yosef* and others) ruled stringently in this matter, explaining that is it highly unusual for people to reuse the water from a hot-water bottle for any other purpose. The *Piske Teshuvot* ruled that the water in radiators is disqualified although it might be possible to argue that it is similar to the rule about melted ice, explained below in the footnote to halakha 18. Besides, no one would consider drinking the water that had been used for these purposes in normal circumstances.

אמנם אם היה יודע משקל המים, ושקל הבשר כנגדם, כשרים, כיון שלא נעשה המלאכה בגופן. [הגר"ז ס"ד. ובילקו"י ח"ג עמ' סז פסל המים]. והוא הדין אם שקלו המים בעצמו לראות כמה הם, כשרים. [כה"ח ס"ק יט]

יד. מים שנתן בהם דבר שמריח, יש מי שכתב לאסור המים דהוי כשרה בהן פיתו. אבל האחרונים הסכימו דאין בו איסור כלל, דאינו עושה מלאכה במים אלא בא להשביחן. [משנ"ב ס"ק יב]. וכן עיקר שיכול ליטול ממים אלו אף בברכה. ואם יש לו מים אחרים נכון שיטול מהם ולא יכניס עצמו לספק, ראה לקמן הלכה כ"ג.

If a container is marked at the points where its contents are one cup, two cups and so on, and someone fills it partially with water and places an item in the container to determine the item's volume by measuring the water's level, the water is now disqualified.

If someone uses water as a counterbalance to weigh meat on the other side of the scale, the water is still fit for the mitzvah of *netillat yadayim*. Being a counterbalance does not make it "used water" since nothing was done to the water itself.[85] Likewise, if someone weighs a container of water, the water remains fit for this mitzvah.

Perfumed water

14) Some *Poskim* ruled that if a fragrance was added to water it is disqualified for *netillat yadayim*. They equated this case to that of soaking bread in water. Nevertheless, the *Aḥaronim* rejected this view and ruled that perfumed water is perfectly fit for the mitzvah. Adding a fragrance to the water is not an example of using the water; it is an act of improving the water's quality.[86] It is therefore permissible to use perfumed water and to recite the blessing of *al netillat yadayim*. If other, plain water is available, however, it is recommended to use the plain water rather than use perfumed water since some *Poskim* disqualified it. See below in halakha 23.

85. This is the ruling of Harav Zalman (cited in the *Kaf Haḥayim* Sofer 160:19). The *Mishmerot Kehuna* ruled stringently in this case, however, and the *Yalkut Yosef* (Vol. III, page 67) stated that Maran the Rishon Letziyon concurred with this stringent ruling. Nevertheless, there is no hint to such a ruling in any of the published works of Maran the Rishon Letziyon. The *Piske Teshuvot* (page 373) cited only the ruling of Harav Zalman, while the *Halakha Berura* (footnote on page 180) cites both opinions without making any decision. Following the principles of the rules regarding *netillat yadayim*, it seems that the halakha should follow the lenient opinion.

86. The *Shene Luḥot Haberit* states that his mentors taught him that if a fragrance is added to the water it is disqualified just like water in which bread was soaked. The *Magen Avraham* (160:5) challenged this ruling, arguing that if this is so then adding a coloring to the water would likewise disqualify it even without the reason of changing the water's appearance. Furthermore, he argued that this cannot be called "using the water" since his intention is to improve it. Used water is ruined; it has become sewage, and that is not the case in this instance. Nevertheless, the *Eliya Rabba* upheld the opinion of the *Shene Luḥot Haberit*, and the *Ḥesed La'alafim* likewise ruled stringently.

The *Kaf Haḥayim* Sofer (160:20) ruled that since the *Poskim* debated this halakha, if someone used perfumed water he must not recite the blessing. The *Halakha Berura* (page 181), however, ruled that one may recite the blessing as well. Since we are in doubt whether this water has become "used water" we can revert to the general rule stating that whenever we are in doubt whether water has become "used" we may be lenient. This rule applies, not only when we are in doubt regarding what has happened to the water, but also to a case like this when the doubt is based on a debate of the *Poskim*. Since the halakha permits using this water for the mitzvah, one must also recite the blessing.

All this applies if no plain water is available. If plain water is available, it is recommended to use it rather than the perfumed water in order to avoid any doubt in one's mitzvah as explained below in halakha 23. See the *Halikhot Olam* (Vol. I, page 341).