מ. רביעית שאמרו בין לידיו של גדול בין לידיו של קטן. [ש"ע סי' קס סט"ו]

מא. שנים שבאים ליטול ידיהן, ואין להם אלא שיעור רביעית, יש להם להניח ידיהם זה מתחת לזה בסמיכות ממש [משנ"ב ס"ק עב], ויתכוונו שניהם מתחילה ליטול ביחד [משנ"ב ס"ק סח], ואדם אחר יצוק מים על ידי שניהם, באופן שיבואו המים על ידי הראשון, וירדו מידי הראשון על ידי השני, הכל בקלוח אחד. ויזהרו שיגיעו המים על ידיהם סביב כל שעור הנטילה שבידו. [משנ"ב ס"ק סט]. ובזה יהיו ידי שניהם טהורות אע"פ שפיחת שיעור הרביעית כשהם מגיעים לידיו של שני ידיו טהורות מפני שהם באים משיורי טהרה. [ש"ע סי' קס ס"ג]. וכשנוטלים בדרך זו יכולים אף לברך על נטילת ידים.

Small hands

40) Whether one has large hands or small hands[107] he must use a container holding *revi'it* of water to perform *netillat yadayim*.

Two people, one *revi'it*

41) If two people need to perform *netillat yadayim* but they have only *revi'it* of water, it is possible for them to use it together. One person should hold his two hands directly underneath those of his friend with very little space between them,[108] both intending to fulfill this mitzvah.[109] A third[110] person then pours the water on their hands so that the water runs over the fingers of the top hand and cascades onto the fingers of the bottom hand. Each of them must make sure that the entire surface area of his fingers has been wetted by the stream of water, so that he will have fulfilled the mitzvah. Although less than *revi'it* of water reaches the hands of the second person, being that some remains on the hands of the first person, he nevertheless fulfills the mitzvah since this water was poured from a container that was originally holding *revi'it* of water. Both people must recite the blessing of *al netillat yadayim*.

107. The *Mishna Berura* (160:82) interpreted this as an adult with small hands. The *Kaf Hahayim* Sofer (160:84) argued that if this is what the halakha means, it need not have been written. We already know that even if someone needs to pour the water on one hand only, he still needs an entire *revi'it* of water for the mitzvah. Therefore, it is self-understood that one needs an entire *revi'it* of water regardless of the area on which it needs to be poured. The *Kaf Hahayim* offered an alternative explanation for this halakha – that it means "a large person or a small person" – an adult or a child, that a father must train his child to perform this mitzvah using *revi'it* of water.

Despite his argument, the interpretation of the *Mishna Berura* seems more plausible.

108. The *Mishna Berura* (160:72) explained that if there is a noticeable distance between one person's hands and the other's, it will be as if the water reaching the lower hands is already "used water" and is disqualified for the mitzvah. See above in halakha 20.

109. The *Mishna Berura* (160:68) explained that if one person pours the water on his hands, and a second person notices this and thrusts his hands underneath those of the first person so that the water falls on his hands as well, the second person has not fulfilled the mitzvah of *netillat yadayim*. Since they did not have this in mind at the moment that the water was being poured, the second person has performed the mitzvah with "used water" and his *netillat yadayim* is not valid. He must dry his hands and perform the mitzvah a second time.

110. When a third person is not available

If two people are alone and they have only *revi'it* of water, it is still possible for both of them to perform *netillat yadayim*. One person should perform the mitzvah using approximately half the water, and then the second person can perform the mitzvah with the remaining water. Even though there is less than *revi'it* in the container when the second person uses it, it is a valid act of *netillat yadayim* since there originally was *revi'it* of water in it and the two

מב. אם אחר שנטל ידיו במים נתעורר לו ספק אם היה במים כשיעור, אין צריך לחזור וליטול ידיו. אבל לכתחלה אם יש לו ספק אם יש במים כשיעור לא יטול ידיו בהם, דהוה ליה ספק חסרון ידיעה מה שאינו יכול לברר אם יש בהם כשיעור. [הליכו"ע ח"א עמ' שמ]

When in doubt

42) If someone performed the mitzvah of *netillat yadayim* and afterward began to wonder whether he had used sufficient water, he is not obligated to repeat the mitzvah. [Since it is only a doubt, one may assume the lenient position regarding *netillat yadayim*.] If he is in doubt whether there is enough water in his container before he performs the mitzvah, he must not attempt to perform it with this water. This is not considered a genuine doubt since it is possible to measure the water. The fact that he does not know how to measure it or is missing the means with which to measure it does not make this the kind of doubt where the halakha allows one to assume the lenient position.

people intended to perform the mitzvah in this manner. Thus, the second person's act is a continuation of the first person's *netillat yadayim* and the one *revi'it* can suffice for both of them.

Since each person is using less than *revi'it* of the water, each one must pour the water two times on his hands, once to purify the hands and once to purify the water on the hands. When a third person is available, he simply pours the entire *revi'it* of water on all four hands at one time and the water does not become *teme'im*. See the comment of the *Mishna Berura* (160:74).

The *Mishna Berura* added (160:73) that the second person must perform *netillat yadayim* immediately after the first person does, so that their two acts will be connected as one. If the second person postpones his act of *netillat yadayim*, he can no longer use the leftover water in the container. He must find an entire *revi'it* of water.

When there is no third person and the two people perform the mitzvah one after the other, the second person is not to recite the blessing for the mitzvah. This is because the *Rishonim* debated whether or not this is a valid method of performing *netillat yadayim*. The Ramban ruled that the only way two people can use one *revi'it* of water is by having a third person pour the water on their hands at one time, but Rashi (comment to *Hullin* 107a) ruled that it is possible for the two people to use the water one after the other. The *Shulhan Arukh* cited both opinions, but it is obvious from the manner in which he cited them that in practice he ruled according to Ramban's opinion. In fact, Maran definitely ruled according to the Ramban's opinion in the *Bet Yosef* (*Bedek Habayit*). Therefore, when performing *netillat yadayim* in the manner described here, relying on Rashi's opinion, the second person must not recite the blessing.

According to Rambam and Rabbenu Yona, there must be *revi'it* of water for each individual and it is not possible to pour *revi'it* on two people's hands. The *Kaf Hahayim* Sofer (160:78) added that according to the Kabbalah each person must use *revi'it* of water. Despite this dissenting opinion, we may rely on the ruling of the *Shulhan Arukh* to perform the mitzvah in this manner and to recite the blessing. This is the ruling of the *Halakha Berura* (page 211) as well.

Preface *Hatzitza*

Whenever a person is *tame* and needs to immerse in a mikveh to become *tahor*, he or she must make sure that there is no *hatzitza*, something that would block the mikveh's water from coming into contact with any part of the person's body. If there is a *hatzitza*, the act of immersing in the mikveh is not valid and the person does not become *tahor*. Our Sages (*Pesahim* 109a) derived this halakha from the verse (*Vayikra* 15:16), "He shall bathe all his flesh in water." This means that "all his flesh" must be able to come into contact with the water of the mikveh and there is no substance on the flesh that prevents the water from making contact.

According to Torah law, a *hatzitza* does not invalidate the act of immersing in a mikveh unless it covers the majority of the person's body and the person does not wish that substance to remain on his body permanently. Our Sages instituted a rule that even a *hatzitza* covering a small portion of the body invalidates the act of immersing, but only if the person would not want the *hatzitza* substance to remain permanently on his body. Likewise, they instituted a rule that if the *hatzitza* covers a majority of the person's body, it invalidates the act of immersing even if he would not mind it remaining there permanently. If someone has a *hatzitza* covering less than half his body and he would not mind it remaining on his body permanently, the *hatzitza* does not invalidate the act of immersing at all.

In summary, there are three halakhic categories of *hatzitza*:

a) A *hatzitza* that covers a majority of the person's body and the person would not want it to remain on his body permanently. According to Torah law, this *hatzitza* invalidates the act of immersing.

b) A *hatzitza* that covers only a minor portion of the person's body but he would not want it to remain there permanently, or a *hatzitza* that covers a majority of the person's body but he does not mind it remaining there permanently. According to Torah law, these *hatzitzot* do not disqualify the act of immersing, but our Sages' instituted a rule that they do.

c) A *hatzitza* that covers only a minor portion of the person's body does not disqualify the act of immersing at all if he does not mind it remaining there permanently.

When our Sages instituted the mitzvah of *netillat yadayim*, they applied the same rules regarding *hatzitza*. If a *hatzitza* covers most of the area of the hand on which the water must be poured, it invalidates the act of *netillat yadayim* whether or not the person minds having the *hatzitza* remain on his hands permanently. If a *hatzitza* covers only a small portion of that area of the hand and the person would not want it to remain on his hand permanently, it likewise invalidates the *netillat yadayim*. If it covers only a small portion and he does not mind it remaining there permanently, it does not invalidate the *netillat yadayim*.

Even though the mitzvah of *netillat yadayim* is an institution of our Sages, they nevertheless enjoined that we observe all the stringencies of *hatzitza* as if it was a mitzvah of the Torah. This is not considered one injunction imposed on another, as explained by the *Levush* and the *Peri Megadim* (*Eshel Avraham* 161:3).