ליטול ידים עם טבעת זו. ואם מנהג רוב הנשים שיש להם טבעת כזו להסיר הטבעת קודם לישה או מלאכה, אף אם היא עצמה אינה מקפדת בזה, יש לה להסיר הטבעת מעל ידה קודם נטילה. [ראה באו"ח סו"פ קדושים, אול"צ ח"ב עמ' צג]

טו. והוא הדין לאיש שיש לו טבעת על ידו, אם מסיר את הטבעת בעת שמתעסק במלאכות שונות, הרי שהטבעת חוצצת ויש לו להסירה קודם נטילה. אבל איש שמלאכתו נקייה ואין דרכו להסיר הטבעת מאצבעו, מותר לו ליטול עם הטבעת, אפילו היא מהודקת לאצבע. אמנם אם יש בה אבן טובה, יש להסירה מעל ידו, כיון שגם איש דרכו להקפיד להסיר בשעת נטילה שלא יתלכלך מהמים. [ראה משנ"ב ס"ק יט, באו"ח סו"פ קדושים ועוד]

removes it regardless of the activity in which she engages, she may leave it on her finger when performing *netillat yadayim* as well. If most other women in the community do remove such a ring when engaging in certain activities, each individual woman must take it off for *netillat yadayim*, even those who never remove their rings.[122]

Men's rings

15) All these rules apply to a man who wear rings as well. If he removes it when engaging in certain activities, he must remove it to perform *netillat yadayim* as well. If, however, he is a man who never engages in any dirty activity and therefore never removes his ring from his finger, he may perform *netillat yadayim* while wearing his ring also, even if it fits snugly on his finger. If the ring has a gemstone set in it, however, he must remove it for *netillat yadayim* since he certainly would not want the gem to get wet.[123]

122. The *Ben Ish Hai* (*parashat Kedoshim* halakha 26) ruled that a woman must remove a ring with a gemstone when performing *netillat yadayim*. He explained that since women are careful not to allow such a ring to become soiled it is a *hatzitza*. The *Mishna Berura* (161:19) wrote likewise.

The *Or Letziyon* (Vol. II, page 93) wrote that nowadays nobody bothers to remove his or her ring, even if it has a gemstone, and therefore it is not necessary to take it off for *netillat yadayim*. Even according to this ruling, if an individual woman does care to remove her ring sometimes, she must remove it for *netillat yadayim* as well.

As we see in our societies, most women do remove their rings at times in order to perform household chores. Assuming that this is the case, it is necessary for all women to remove their rings for *netillat yadayim*, even an individual who performs all household chores with her rings on her fingers, as explained above in halakha 3.

123. As explained in the previous footnote, if a person never kneads dough his ring does not constitute a *hatzitza*, following the ruling of Harav Shelomo Luria and the *Gan Hamelekh*. If the ring has a gemstone, however, he must remove it for *netillat yadayim* since most people are careful not to allow such a ring to get wet. This appears to be the opinion of the *Ben Ish Hai* (*parashat Kedoshim* halakha 26) and the *Mishna Berura* 161:19.

The *Or Letziyon* (Vol. II, page 93) wrote that the attitudes in today's society are not the same as they once were, and today nobody bothers to remove his ring even if it has a gemstone. Therefore, he ruled that it is permissible to perform *netillat yadayim* even while wearing the ring. As explained above, the *Halakha Berura* took issue with this ruling, insisting that even today the common practice is to remove a ring when engaging in an activity that soils the hands. This is not a halakhic dispute, they only debate the status of today's society. Therefore, we must investigate the practice of each community. If it is found that a community practices as the *Or Letziyon* described, then it is not necessary to remove a ring for *netillat yadayim*, even if the ring is set with a gemstone. An individual who cares to remove his ring when working must remove it for *netillat yadayim* despite the fact that everybody else does not bother to remove their rings at those times, as explained above in halakha 11.

If the ring is set with a gemstone, it may be that most people would take off the ring when performing chores even though they would not take off another ring at those times. If someone establishes the fact that in his commu-

טז. אשה שהיה לה טבעת על ידה, והיתה צריכה להסיר הטבעת קודם הנטילה (ובאופנים שהדין כן, וכפי שנתבאר לעיל), ועברה ונטלה את ידיה כשטבעתה על אצבעה. אם היתה הטבעת מהודקת לא עלתה לה נטילה אף בדיעבד.

יז. אפילו טבעת רפויה שאינה מהודקת על האצבע, יש להסיר קודם נטילת ידים (באופנים הנ"ל שמקפדת). ובדיעבד אם לא הסירה הטבעת הרפויה מעל ידה, עלתה לה נטילה, ובלבד ששפכה על היד רביעית מים בבת אחת. [משנ"ב ס"ק יח, באו"ח פ' קדושים הכ"ו, כה"ח ס"ק לג]

Forgot to remove ring

16) If a woman has a tight-fitting ring on her finger and she forgot to remove it when she performed the mitzvah of *netillat yadayim*, the washing is invalid and she must dry her hands, remove the ring and start over again. [She must not repeat the blessing, however.]

Loose-fitting ring

17) As mentioned above, even if the ring is loose-fitting, it must be removed in order to perform *netillat yadayim*.[124] If the person did not remove the ring and he poured *revi'it* of water on his hand all at once, he has fulfilled the mitzvah of *netillat yadayim*.

---

nity no one bothers to take off his or her ring at any time, he does not have to take it off for *netillat yadayim* either. If he himself does bother to take it off at those times, he must take it off for *netillat yadayim* as well, regardless of the practice common in his community, as explained above in halakha 11.

124. Maran ruled in the *Bet Yosef* that it is necessary to remove even a loose-fitting ring for *netillat yadayim* for two reasons. First, not everyone understands what is considered loose-fitting. Second, if it will not be necessary to remove loose-fitting rings, people will get the idea that it is not necessary to remove any rings. The Rama (gloss to 161:3) likewise ruled that it is necessary to remove a loose-fitting ring, but he testified that many people are lenient about this. He concluded that it is best to remove all rings since we do not know the exact parameters categorizing loose rings vs. those that are not.

The *Sidre Tahora* pointed out that the *Shulhan Arukh* (*Y.D.* 198:23) ruled that a loose-fitting ring is not a *hatzitza* regarding a woman immersing in a mikveh. He commented that this is not a contradiction; that ruling applies to a woman who failed to remove her ring when immersing. She does not have to repeat the mitzvah. Before immersing, she is certainly obligated to remove her rings and avoid problems. Likewise regarding *netillat yadayim*, we are supposed to remove the ring before performing the mitzvah, but if someone failed to and his ring is loose-fitting, he does not have to repeat the mitzvah. The *Magen Avraham* (161:10) likewise ruled that if someone failed to remove a loosely-fitting ring and he performed *netillat yadayim* he has fulfilled the mitzvah.

The *Ru'ah Hayim* Palachi, however, wrote that when a woman immerses in a mikveh we can be reasonably certain that the water reached all the surface of her skin since the ring is loose. When someone performs *netillat yadayim*, simply spilling water momentarily over his hand, we must suspect that the water did not penetrate to the skin of the finger wearing the ring. Therefore, he must repeat the mitzvah. Nevertheless, most *Aharonim* agreed that it is not necessary to repeat it.

The *Mishna Berura* (161:18) added that this halakha applies only when the person poured *revi'it* of water on his hand all at once, so that the water itself remains *tehorim*. If he poured less than *revi'it* and then poured water on the hand a second time, then it is possible that after pouring the first time, a drop of water that is *teme'im* will drip from the ring onto the finger, rendering the hand *teme'a* all over again. See the *Shulhan Arukh* (162:9).

Definition of a loosely-fitting ring

Rabbenu Menahem Hame'iri (*Mikva'ot* 9:1) defined "loosely-fitting" as a ring that can be twisted around the finger effortlessly. Mahar"i Bruna (#108) defined it as a ring that is liable to fly off the finger if the wearer waves his hand with force.