Whether standing, etc.— The language of this baraita suggests that there are not meticulous halakhot with regard to the positions of the yavam and the yevamah during halitza. In contrast, Ameinir’s statements in the continuation of the passage imply that the yavam must stand during halitza ab initio. Many halakhic authorities relied upon the opinion of the Sifer that the yavam should be standing while reciting the verses of halitza, based on the simple meaning of the verse: “He should be standing while reciting the verses of halitza” (Deuteronomy 22:5). They applied the same halakha to the yevamah, maintaining that she should also stand while reciting her passages from the Torah (see Tosafot, Rashba, and Riva).

A woman who performs halitza on a blind yavam— The Gemara does not explicitly state why one would have thought to disqualify a person who is blind for halitza. The Riva explains that one might have thought to disqualify a blind person based on similarity to the case of the deaf-mute, as initially there is a concern that he will not be able to fully identify the yevamah. The Gemara, however, concludes that there is no reason to disqualify a blind man, as he is capable of recognizing the yevamah based on her voice; consequently, the halitza would certainly be valid after the fact.

Whether the yavam is standing1 or sitting2 or leaning; and a woman who performs halitza on a blind yavam;3 in all of these cases her halitza is valid. But if she performs halitza when he is wearing a shoe that is so torn that it does not cover most of the foot; or using a broken sandal that does not hold most of the foot; or using a hand blanket that the amputee wears on his hand, similar to a leather shoe, in order to drag himself using them; or using a soft sole [anipleya] made of cloth; or a woman who performs halitza with a yavam who is a minor;4 in all these cases her halitza is disqualified.

The Gemara comments: Who is the tanna who holds that an amputee’s prosthetic is considered a shoe? It is Rabbi Meir, as we learned in a mishna (Shabbat 65b): One with an amputated leg may go out on Shabbat with his wooden leg,5 as it has the legal status of a shoe; this is the statement of Rabbi Meir. He reasons that the prosthetic functions like the shoe of any other person, indicating that Rabbi Meir is not especially concerned about the material from which the shoe is made. And Rabbi Yosei, on the other hand, prohibits the amputee from going out on Shabbat with his wooden leg, as he does not consider it a shoe that is being worn, but rather a wooden object that is being carried.

The Gemara asks how Rabbi Meir can be the tanna of the baraita, as the continuation of the baraita states halitza is disqualified if performed with an anipleya made of cloth, as this cloth shoe is not to be considered a shoe. If so, have we come to the opinion of the Rabbis, who rule in accordance with Rabbi Yosei, and render it prohibited to use any shoes for halitza that are not made of leather?

In an attempt to resolve the contradiction Abaye said: Since the latter clause of the baraita is in accordance with the Rabbis, who rule like Rabbi Yosei, the first clause is also in accordance with the Rabbis. And therefore the first clause, which permits the amputee’s prosthesis, is referring to a prosthetic foot covered in leather,6 as it constitutes a shoe due to its leather exterior.

Rava said to him: But according to your explanation, if the prosthesis is not covered in leather, what would its status be? It would be unfit. If so, rather than teaching in the latter clause: Anipleya made of cloth is invalid for halitza, let it distinguish within the matter itself and say: In what case is this statement that a wooden prosthesis is fit said? It is in the case of a prosthetic leg covered in leather, but if it is not covered in leather, it is unfit.

---

Removing the shoe from a minor— The yevamah and yevam stand for all elements of the halitza ab initio, including the recitation and the sitting. Although the baraita also permits sitting, this is only after the fact (Tosafot; Rosh; Rambam Sefer Nashim, Hilkhot Yibbum 4:6; Shulhan Arukh, Even HaEzer 169:46).

A woman who performs halitza on a blind yavam— The yavam’s walking— A blind man may not perform halitza ab initio, but if he did perform halitza, it is valid after the fact. This ruling is implied from the wording of the baraita. The Rambam holds that if the blind man is the only yavam; then he may perform halitza even ab initio (Rambam Sefer Nashim, Hilkhot Yibbum 4:8; Shulhan Arukh, Even HaEzer 169:46 and Seder Halitza 17).

A shoe that is torn— Dve ani ha’asak: If a woman performed halitza using a shoe so torn that it does not cover most of the foot, the halitza is invalid (Rambam Sefer Nashim, Hilkhot Yibbum 4:18; Shulhan Arukh, Even HaEzer 169:22).

Covered in leather— Dve ani ha’asak: If the shoe used for halitza was made of wood or another material and covered with leather, or if a linen lining was sewn into a leather shoe or a shoe made of any material from within, the halitza is valid. This ruling is in accordance with Abaye’s statement, as although his statements were rejected as the proper interpretation, they are nevertheless accepted as halakha (Rambam Sefer Nashim, Hilkhot Yibbum 4:19; Shulhan Arukh, Even HaEzer 169:22).
Must press his foot – עָלָיו מִיְּתִירֵי מָדֵרָה רִבְּהוֹ מְנַיְּאִי
Ameimar’s reasoning is not explained in the Gemara, and therefore, the early commentaries offer several explanations for it. Some explain that the need to press one’s foot in the ground is to ensure that it is evident that it was the yevamah who removed the shoe. The concern is that otherwise, the shoe may be too big for the foot and fall off by itself, and therefore, if the yevamah presses his foot to the ground the shoe should not fall off by itself, but must be removed by the yevamah (Nimnukye Yosef).

The Rambam (Sefer HaZekhut) offers an alternative explanation of Ameimar’s reasoning: By pressing his foot to the ground the yevamah ensures that it rests on the ground in a normal manner. The later commentaries debated whether Ameimar intended to completely invalidate a halitza not performed in this fashion, possibly due to a tradition from Sinai that halitza must be performed while pressing one’s foot to the ground, or whether he is merely teaching the preferred way to perform halitza.

Walks on the backs of his feet – עָלָיו מִיְּתִירֵי מָדֵרָה רִבְּהוֹ מְנַיְּאִי
This teaching of Ameimar that prohibits a clubfooted individual from performing halitza would seem to contradict Rashī’s understanding of a teaching in the mishna. The mishna states that halitza from the knee down is valid, which Rashī understands to refer to a halitza performed on one whose leg has been amputated from the knee down. If one need not have a foot at all to perform halitza, on one whose leg has been amputated from the knee down it is valid, since he cannot lean and press his foot on the ground. However, he asserts that this does not contradict Ameimar’s opinion and that Ameimar’s halitza is invalid (Rav Nissim Gaon).

Rabbinenu Mananel interprets the mishna in a manner that is similar to Rashī, explaining that the phrase: From the knee down it is valid halitza, does refer to one whose knee is amputated. However, he asserts that this does not contradict Ameimar’s opinion and that Ameimar’s two halakhot relate to one another, as they indicate that one who leans must also press his foot on the ground. Only one who cannot simultaneously lean and press his foot to the ground is disqualified for halitza. An amputee is capable of leaning and pressing his calf on the ground, which is not true for someone who is clubfooted, as he cannot lean and press his foot on the ground at all.

HALAKHAI

He must press his foot to the ground – עָלָיו מִיְּתִירֵי מָדֵרָה רִבְּהוֹ מְנַיְּאִי
The yevamah must stand or lean against a wall or a pillar, and press his foot to the ground, in accordance with the opinion of Ameimar (Rambam Sefer Nashim, Hilkhot Yibbum 4:17; Shulhan Arukh, Even HaZer 169:30 and Seder Halitza 63).

Someone who walks on the backs of his feet – עָלָיו מִיְּתִירֵי מָדֵרָה רִבְּהוֹ מְנַיְּאִי
If one’s foot is twisted upward or the sides of his feet or on his ankles. In some cases the heel is so inverted so the bearer of this defect is forced to walk on the tops of his feet, with the soles facing upward.

Rather, the fact that the baraita was not taught in that manner indicates that Abaye’s explanation is incorrect. Therefore, Rava said that the contradiction should be reconciled in another way: Since the first clause of the baraita is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir, that the shoes need not be made of leather, the latter clause is also taught in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir, and the distinction between a wooden prosthetic and an amputa is: This prosthesis protects the foot, and that soft shoe does not protect the foot, as it does not have a hard sole. Rabbi Meir does not require that the shoe be of leather, but he does require that it be protective footwear.

With regard to the statement in the baraita that indicates that halitza may be performed even if the yevamah is not standing, Ameimar said: The one who performs halitza by having his yevamah remove his shoe must press his foot to the ground, and while in this position the yevamah will remove his shoe.

Rav Ashi said to Ameimar: But isn’t it taught in the baraita above: She may perform halitza whether he was standing or sitting or leaning? One who is leaning cannot easily press his foot into the ground. He answered him: Say that the man may perform halitza while in any of these positions, but that actually this is true only if he presses his foot to the ground, which is admittedly more difficult to do while leaning.

And Ameimar also said about this issue: Someone who walks on the backs of his feet, meaning he is clubfooted and his foot is twisted upside down, cannot perform halitza. Rav Ashi said to Ameimar: But isn’t it taught in a baraita: Leg supports can be used for halitza. Does this not mean that this lame individual performs halitza using these supports on his knees? This would indicate that even one with twisted feet can perform halitza. The Gemara answers: No, the intention is that if he gave these supports to another whose foot is shaped normally and he wore them while performing halitza, it is valid. That other one is allowed to perform halitza while wearing these supports because they are also considered shoes, but one whose foot is misshapen may not perform halitza with them, as it functions for him as a foot, not a shoe.

Rav Ashi said: According to what Ameimar said, bar Uva cannot perform halitza and bar Kipof cannot perform halitza, as these two, who were famous eulogizers in Rav Ashi’s generation, had feet that became so crooked that they were unable to walk normally.
It was taught in the mishna that if one’s leg was amputated from the knee down and his yeimum performed halitza with him, the halitza is valid. The Gemara raises a contradiction from a baraita that comments on the pilgrimage one makes to Jerusalem during a Festival. The Torah states: “Three Festivals [regalim] you shall celebrate for Me in the year” (Exodus 23:14). The baraita comments on the verse: Festivals are referred to in the verse as regalim, which literally means feet, indicating that one must actually make the pilgrimage to Jerusalem by foot [regel] during the Festival, which comes to exclude people who have protheses.” This indicates that a prosthetic foot is not called a regel, which seems to contradict the mishna that allows halitza on a prosthetic from the knee down.

The Gemara answers: It is different here, with respect to halitza, as it is written: “She removes the shoes from on his foot [me’al raglo]” (Deuteronomy 25:9), which indicates that not only can his actual foot be used for performing halitza, but also the part above it, i.e., the calf. The Gemara objects: If that is so, that one may use a part of his leg above his foot to perform halitza, then if one’s leg was amputated from above the knee, he should also be eligible for halitza; and yet, the same mishna taught that only one with a leg amputated from below the knee is eligible for halitza. The Gemara answers that the verse states: “From on his foot,” meaning above his foot, but not: “From on which it is on his foot; the wording indicates that it can be above his foot until the knee, but not any further up that.

Rav Pappa said: Learn from here that the heel bone [istavira] reaches to the ground where it connects to the foot, for if it enters your mind to say that it is separate and divided, and there is another bone in between, then that ankle bone is “from on the foot” and the calf would be prohibited for halitza, as it would be considered: “From on which that is on his foot.” Rav Ashi said: Even if you say that it is separate and divided from the calf, because anything that is connected with the sole of the foot is considered like the foot, then the ankle is certainly part of the foot, making the calf the area that is “from on the foot.”

It was taught in the mishna that if one’s legs were amputated from the knee above and below, the halitza is invalid. This implies that the regel includes the calf but not the thigh. Rav Kahana raised an objection from the verse: “And against her afterbirth that emerges from between her legs [raglha]” (Deuteronomy 25:17), implying that regel includes even the thighs. Abaye said: The verse actually means between her feet, as when a woman crouches to give birth, she pushes her heels into her thighs and she gives birth, so it appears as if the fetus emerges from between her feet.

The Gemara continues its challenge. Come and hear another verse: “He had neither dressed his feet [reglav], nor trimmed his beard” (11 Samuel 19:25). The phrase “dressed his feet [reglav]” is referring to treating his pubic hair, implying that even the area around the thigh is referred to as regel. The Gemara answers: This is a euphemism. The Gemara attempts another challenge: Come and hear from another verse: “And Saul went in to cover his feet [raglav]” (1 Samuel 24:3), meaning: To urinate, implying that regel refers even to the thighs. The Gemara answers: This is also a euphemism.

Come and hear the meaning of: His feet, from the following verse regarding the Moabite king, Eglon, which states: “Surely he is covering his feet [raglav] in the cabinet of the cool chamber” (Judges 3:24). The Gemara answers: This is a euphemism. The Gemara attempts another proof from a verse regarding Sisera’s encounter with Yael: “At her feet [raglha] he sunk, he fell” (Judges 5:27), which indicates that they had sexual intercourse, and implies that regel includes the thigh. The Gemara answers: This is also an euphemism.

---

**NOTES**

Euphemism – אפיח בדיק בדיק. Apparently it does not make sense that the Gemara seems to ask the same type of question several times, providing the same answer. Furthermore, one would expect the challenges to be arranged according to the order of verses in the Bible. One explanation is that the questions of the Gemara are arranged in a logical order based on how reasonable it is to assume that the verses are being euphemistic. The first question concerning “dressed his feet” can most readily be understood as a euphemism and therefore is placed first. With regard to Saul there is less reason to interpret the verse euphemistically, as the text is describing him urinating, which could be written more explicitly. Furthermore, even if with regard to Saul it is possible to say that in his honor as the king of Israel a euphemistic term was chosen, this should not be so for a foreign king like Eglon. Consequently, the Gemara explains that even here a euphemism is preferred when possible (Arukh Lali'i).

**BACKGROUND**

The heel bone reaches to the ground – אפרתק בדיק בדיק דרי. The anatomical drawing shows that the ankle bone, or talus, between the heel bone and the tibia and fibula, or so-called shank bones, does not continue down to the ground. Regardless, since there are no skeletal muscles, also called voluntary muscles, between the talus and the heel, both may be considered as one bone. In the first chapter of tractate Cholot there is a mishna in which the Sages enumerated the ten bones in the ankle.

**LANGUAGE**

Heel bone [istavira] – אפרתק בדיק בדיק דרי. Possibly derived from the Greek ἄρτιβια ἀνάτριξις, stauros, meaning an upright pole with a sharp point, generally intersected by another pole, forming a shape like a cross, similar to the shape of the tarsal bone group in the heel. Others assert that the word is derived from the Iranian ast-bara, meaning bone carrier.

**HALAKHA**

Festivals, comes to exclude people who have protheses – אפרתק בדיק בדיק דרי. A crippled individual is exempt from the mitzva of bringing an offering when he appears at the Temple during the three pilgrim Festivals and is also not obligated to make the pilgrimage, in accordance with the Gemara (Rambam Sefer Korbanot, Hilchos Aggados 2:1).
The Gemara elaborates on what happened when Sisera was in Yael’s tent. Rabbi Yoḥanan said: That wicked man, Sisera, had sexual intercourse with Yael seven times that day, as it is stated: “At her feet he sunk, he fell, at her feet he sunk, he fell; where he sunk, there he fell down and died” (Judges 5:27). Each instance of the terms “sunk,” “fell,” or “lay” in the verse indicates an act of intercourse, as Yael sought to tire and weaken Sisera to enable her to kill him. The Gemara asks: But how could Yael do this even for the noble purpose of killing the wicked Sisera, as she derive pleasure from the transgression of licentious sexual relations with a gentle? Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai: Every act that is a benefit for the wicked is a disadvantage for the righteous, as a righteous individual gains no pleasure from this so-called beneficial act. As it is stated by God to Laban: “Take heed to yourself that you speak not to Jacob either good or bad” (Genesis 31:24). Granted, speak no bad; this is rightly so, i.e., understandable. But speak no good? Why not? Rather, learn from here that even something that would be a good benefit to the wicked like Laban, is a disadvantage for the righteous.

The Gemara asks: Granted, there, in Laban’s words to Jacob, it is understandable that there could be a certain repulsive aspect to a wicked man speaking nicely to a righteous individual, as perhaps he will mention to him the name of the idol he worships and even though he means well, it still would repulse Jacob. But here, what disadvantage is there if she derives benefit from licentious relations with a wicked man?

The Gemara answers: He implants filth in her and contaminates her, as her body accepts his semen. As Rabbi Yoḥanan also said, based on his understanding that the serpent seduced Eve into having sexual relations with him: When the serpent came upon Eve, he infected her with moral contamination, and this contamination remained in all human beings. When the Jewish people stood at Mount Sinai their contamination ceased, whereas with regard to gentiles, who did not stand at Mount Sinai, their contamination never ceased. Therefore, Yael was repulsed by the contamination that she allowed into her body, and she did not benefit from relations with Sisera.

**NOTES**

Perhaps he will mention to him, etc. – This interpretable as meaning that the serpent’s interest in Eve was so great that to seduce her he went to Mount Sinai.

When the serpent came upon Eve, etc. – This interpretation is based on the view that the serpent acted with the connivance of God, and that this action was a test for Eve. According to some commentators, the serpent’s purpose was to show Eve that she could not achieve immortality through the Tree of Knowledge, and that she must rely on the Tree of Life for that. The serpent’s action was thus a test for Eve, and she passed it.

Rashi explains that Laban’s accusing Jacob of taking his idols (see Genesis 31:30) may lead him to mention the idols by name. A number of commentaries prefer Rashi’s explanation elsewhere (Nahalot 36a), where he explains that the concern was that perhaps with good intentions Laban would come to bless Jacob in the name of a false deity.

He implants filth in her – The primary element of the filth is the disgrace in having relations with one whose pleasure-seeking nature has not been purified through the experience at Sinai (Rashi). Others explain that a sexual relationship between people creates a certain connection between them, and therefore, when having relations with one who is wicked a righteous person cannot completely preserve himself from the negative influence of that connection.
רבçı חופה דייrelude Granted, say that the Sages said after the fact, etc. –

אתי Hilkhot Yibbum תנו דייrelude אוemer דייrelude הกายיט, etc. The Sages taught: From the verse “And remove his shoe from on his foot” (Deuteronomy 25:9), I have derived only that the yavam may wear “his shoe,” i.e., a shoe that belongs to him, from where do I derive that he may wear any person’s shoe? The verse states the words “shoe” and “shoe” twice: “And remove his shoe” (Deuteronomy 25:9), and “The house of he who had his shoe removed” (Deuteronomy 25:10), to teach us that in any case it is acceptable, i.e., the shoes of another person may also be worn for halitza.

But if so, what is the meaning when the verse states: “His shoe,” which seems to indicate that he must own the shoe that he is wearing? It teaches that one must wear “his shoe,” i.e., a shoe that is fitting for him, excluding a shoe so large that he is unable to walk in it, and excluding a shoe so small it does not cover most of his foot, and also excluding a heless sandal [sandal hamesuyam], a sandal that has only a sole but does not have a heel and is not fit for walking.

The Gemara relates: Abaye was standing before Rav Yosef and a yevama came to perform halitza. Rav Yosef said to Abaye: Give the yavam your sandal so that the halitza may begin. He gave him his left sandal. Rav Yosef said to him: Granted, one can say that the Sages said that it is permitted to perform halitza with the left shoe after the fact, but did they say that it is also permitted ab initio?

He said to him: If so, then also with regard to a sandal that does not belong to him, say that the Sages said that it is permitted after the fact; however, did they say it is permitted as well to perform halitza using another’s shoe ab initio? Rav Yosef said to Abaye: This is what I was saying to you: Give him your sandal and transfer ownership to him by giving it to him as a temporary gift so that it will be his, and therefore the halitza will be performed in an ideal manner, without any question as to its validity.

The mishna taught that if the yevama performed halitza while the yavam was wearing a wooden sandal the halitza is valid. The Gemara asks: Who is the tanna who taught that it is permitted to use a wooden sandal? Shmuel said: It is the opinion of Rabbi Meir, as we learned in a mishna (Shabbat 65b): One with an amputated leg may go out on Shabbat with his wooden leg, as it has the legal status of a shoe; this is the statement of Rabbi Meir. And Rabbi Yosei prohibits it, since he does not consider it to have the legal status of a shoe. Alternatively, the father of Shmuel says: Here the mishna is referring to a wooden sandal that is covered in leather, and all agree. This halakha was taught in accordance with all opinions, as even Rabbi Yosei agrees that the leather covering makes it a shoe.

His shoe...excluding a shoe so large – The shoe used for halitza must not be so large that the yavam cannot walk in it, nor so small that it does not cover most of his foot (Rambam Sefer Nashim, Hilkhot Yibbum 4:18; Shulhan Arukh, Even HaEzer 169:22).

Granted, say that the Sages said after the fact, etc. – give him and transfer ownership to him – The sandal used for halitza should belong to the yavam ab initio, but since nowadays the practice is to use the court’s sandal, the court gives it to the yavam as a gift before halitza so that it will belong to him during the halitza. After the halitza the yavam returns the shoe to the court. This ruling is in accordance with Rav Yosef. Some add that the yavam must walk for a short time in the court’s shoe so that it will appear as if it is his shoe (Rambam Sefer Nashim, Hilkhot Yibbum 4:19; Shulhan Arukh, Even HaEzer 169:14 and Seder halitza 54).

NOTES
I have derived only that the yavam may wear his shoe – Tosafot comment that it seems as though two separate teachings are expounded from one verse. One explanation is that the Gemara here is not deriving a Torah obligation, but merely introducing a rabbinic decree. One should not use another’s shoe lest it not fit properly and be either too large or too small in a way that will invalidate the halitza (Rashba).

A sandal that does not have a heel – In a halitza the shoe is a sandal without a sole is disqualified. Others question this interpretation, as it is obvious that a shoe without a sole is unfit, and therefore they explain that the heel here is referring to the back part of the sandal, which holds the heel of the foot. Any shoe that doesn’t have this back portion may not be used for halitza as the hamesula of halitza involves removing the yavam’s heel from the shoe, thereby obligating the use of a shoe with a section for the heel of the foot (Tosafot Yeshanim; see Meiri).

LANGUAGE
Heelless sandal [sandal hamesuyam] – It seems that the correct version of the text is that of the Arukh and the ge'onim, who read it as sandal hamesulas, or sulas. The source of this word is apparently the Latin sola, a kind of sandal that has no heel, meaning there is no fixture on the back to hold the heel, similar to modern flip-flops.

Ancient Egyptian heelless sandals.
A quarantined sandal and a confirmed sandal – מְטַמְּאִין סַנְדָּלי מְטַמְּאִין. According to the Gemara’s conclusion, there is no prohibition after the fact for one who performs ḥalitza using a sandal with leprosy, and therefore the commentators offer explanations as to why use of a sandal with confirmed leprosy cannot be used ab initio. The Rashba and the Ritva explain that the Sages were worried that if people saw that one could use a sandal with leprosy for ḥalitza, even though it is to be burned, they might mistakenly assume that one could also use other shoes destined for burning, such as a shoe used for idol worship. Since it is prohibited to use a shoe used for idd worship for ḥalitza even after the fact, they decreed as a preventive measure that one should not use a shoe with confirmed leprosy ab initio.

Halakha

Quarantined sandal and confirmed sandal – מְטַמְּאִין סַנְדָּלי מְטַמְּאִין. A quarantined sandal and a confirmed sandal, and likewise a sandal placed on the feet of an idol, should not be used for ḥalitza ab initio, but if one did so, the ḥalitza is valid after the fact (Rambam Sefer Nashim, Hilkhot Yibbum 4:20).

A quarantined house and a confirmed house – הַמּוּסְגָּר הַבּוֹ. A quarantined house imparts ritual impurity to one who touches it from the inside, and a house with confirmed leprosy causes ritual impurity by touching it on the inside or the outside. They both cause ritual impurity if one enters the house, even if he did not touch anything, in accordance with the mishna (Rambam Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tumot Tzaara‘at 16:2–3).

Notes

A quarantined house, a house with confirmed leprosy – יָא קְלָקָא מְשַׁמְּשָה יָא קְלָקָא. By Torah law (see Leviticus 14:33–57), if leprous spots appear in a house, all of the objects in the house must be removed in order to prevent them from becoming ritually impure, after which a priest is brought to examine the house. If the priest confirms that there is evidence of leprosy, the house is quarantined and left uninhabited for a week, after which it is reexamined by the priest. If the leprous spots darkened or disappeared, the priest scraps away the blemished area and the house is declared ritually pure. If the spots are unchanged in color and size, the house is quarantined for a second week and inspected at the end of the week. If the spots have faded or disappeared, the priest scraps away the place of the blemish and purifies the house with the purification process involving birds, cedarwood, and red thread, parallel to the purification process by which a leper is purified.

If, at the end of the second week, the priest discovers that the blemish has spread or retained its color, the affected stones are removed, and the mortar that had supported them is scraped off and deposited outside the city. The house is then replastered and quarantined for a third week. If the spots reappear, the entire house must be destroyed, and its stones are disposed of in a ritually impure place. If the blemish did not reappear, then the priest purifies the house with the purification process. Both a quarantined house and a confirmed house render objects inside them ritually impure, with the exception of objects in hermetically sealed earthenware containers. Additionally, a confirmed house also renders objects that contact its exterior ritually impure.

Rav Pappi said in the name of Rava: One should not perform ḥalitza on a woman wearing a quarantined sandal, i.e., a sandal examined by a priest who found its signs of leprosy to be inconclusive, and places the sandal in isolation for a waiting period of up to two weeks to see if clear indications of leprosy develop. But if she did perform ḥalitza while the yarum was wearing it, her ḥalitza is nevertheless valid after the fact. On the other hand, if the sandal with leprosy is a confirmed sandal, i.e., a sandal that was definitively ruled to have leprosy, one may not perform ḥalitza with it, and if she did perform ḥalitza while the man was wearing it, her ḥalitza is disqualified. As an object with confirmed leprosy must be burned, it is considered halakhically as if it were already burnt, and is consequently considered to lack the qualities of a shoe necessary for ḥalitza.

In contrast, Rav Pappa said in the name of Rava: With regard to both a quarantined sandal and a confirmed sandal the same halakha applies: She may not perform ḥalitza with it ab initio, but if she did perform ḥalitza with it, her ḥalitza is valid.

The Gemara raises an objection to Rav Pappi’s version, from a mishna (Nega‘im 13:4): A quarantined house, i.e., one in which a discoloration appeared and was then quarantined by a priest until it could be determined whether it would be deemed a confirmed house of leprosy or not, renders one who touches it ritually impure from within, i.e., if one touches the inside of the house he becomes ritually impure; a house with confirmed leprosy renders one impure not only from touching it inside from within, but additionally from touching it behind, by touching it on the outside; and both this and that, i.e., both a quarantined house and a confirmed house, impart ritual impurity through entering it, as one who enters into either house becomes ritually impure, even if he does not touch the walls.

The Gemara elaborates: And if it enters your mind to say that an item with confirmed leprosy is considered as if it were crushed and not intact due to the requirement to burn it, then in order to contract ritual impurity through entering a house with leprosy, we require that there be a house, as the verse states: “Moreover, one who enters the house . . . shall be ritually impure” (Leviticus 14:46)? And this requirement is not satisfied here, as the house confirmed with leprosy must be burned and consequently should be considered as if it is crushed and not intact.
The Gemara answers: There it is different, as the verse states: “And he shall break down the house” (Leviticus 14:45), which teaches that while even if it is being broken down it is still called a house, until it is totally destroyed. Therefore, although for other purposes, objects that are required to be burnt are considered crushed, the verse explicitly teaches that a house confirmed with leprosy is considered intact with regard to its ability to transmit ritual impurity to those who enter it.

Come and hear a proof from the Tosefta (Nega’im 7:3): If a rag that is three fingerbreadths by three fingerbreadths has a spot of leprosy, then even if it does not contain the minimum volume of an olive-bulk, once most of the rag enters a pure house it renders the house ritually impure. What, is it not referring to a rag with confirmed leprosy, implying that one should calculate its measurements even when its leprosy is confirmed and it is destined to be burned? The Gemara rejects this assumption: No, this is referring to a quarantined rag, which does not have to be burned and is consequently considered intact. It can be measured to determine if it has the minimum measurements required for imparting ritual impurity.

The Gemara challenges: If you interpret it so, say the latter clause: If the rag was the volume of several olives, i.e., it was very thick and even a small section of the cloth was equal to an olive-bulk, when one olivé-bulk of the rag enters a ritually pure house, even if it is a small portion of the rag, it renders the house ritually impure.

Granted, if you say that the entire baraita is referring to a rag with confirmed leprosy, this is so because a confirmed leper is juxtaposed with and thereby compared to a dead person (Numbers 12:12), and therefore an olivé-bulk of the rag causes ritual impurity just as an olivé-bulk of a corpse does. But if you say it is speaking about a quarantined rag, why should it be juxtaposed to a dead person? There is no biblical source comparing a quarantined leper to a corpse, and therefore, there is no reason to think that an olive-bulk of a rag transmits ritual impurity. Only if the rag is of the minimum dimensions and the entire rag enters the airspace does it transmit ritual impurity.

The Gemara answers: That is correct; the baraita is referring to a rag with confirmed leprosy, but nevertheless it is not difficult for Rav Pappi. Although generally objects that are required to be burnt are considered crushed even before they are burnt, this is not true with regard to a garment with leprosy. There the halakha for a garment that has confirmed leprosy is different, as the verse states: “And he shall burn the garment” (Leviticus 13:52), which indicates that even when it is being burned, it is still called a garment.

HALAKHA

A rag that is three fingerbreadths by three fingerbreadths – מַטְלִית שָׁלֹשׁ בָּהּ שָׁלֹשׁ. A rag afflicted with leprosy that is three fingerbreadths by three fingerbreadths transmits ritual impurity to a ritually pure house when most of the rag enters the house, even if it does not have the minimum measure of an olive-bulk (Rambam Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tumat Tzara’at 13:14).

If the rag was the volume of several olives – fi נגברית, fi נגב♡. If a large rag is afflicted with leprosy, as long as at least a portion of the rag that is equal in size to one olive-bulk enters a house, it renders the house ritually impure (Rambam Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tumat Tzara’at 13:14). This ruling does not differentiate between a quarantined or confirmed case of leprosy, as opposed to the simple understanding of the Gemara.
The Gemara asks: If your interpretation above is correct, that a garment with confirmed leprosy can still transmit ritual impurity even though the object is to be burned and should be considered crushed, let us learn from this concerning a sandal that even after it has been definitively determined to have leprosy, it is still considered a shoe and should be eligible for halitza, at least after the fact, in accordance with Rav Pappa’s opinion. The Gemara answers: We cannot derive a halakha of a prohibition from a halakha of ritual impurity, as these different areas of halakha cannot be compared. Therefore, although a garment with leprosy is considered intact with regard to the transmission of ritual impurity, that status cannot act as a source to teach that it is intact for the purpose of ruling that halitza performed with a shoe with confirmed leprosy is valid.

The Gemara cites Rava’s final ruling: Rava said that the halakha is the same for a quarantined sandal, a confirmed sandal, and a sandal of idolatrous worship, i.e., a sandal that was placed on a statue of idolatrous worship; one should not perform halitza with it, and if she did perform halitza with it, her halitza is valid. If, however, he was wearing a sandal that functioned as an offering of idolatrous worship, in that it was brought as a gift to an idol;