

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying the Mishnah (cont.)

Abaye rules that those that ride on camels are unfit to eat terumah.

A related Beraisa is cited and clarified.

R' Yehoshua ben Levi warns against sleeping in certain positions.

This ruling is unsuccessfully challenged.

2) **MISHNAH:** The examinations necessary to prepare taha-ros are recorded. The consequence of finding blood after relations is discussed.

3) Clarifying the Mishnah

Two reasons are given why when blood is found on the man we are not concerned that it is from a louse.

The difference between the two explanations is explained.

4) Stains

There is a disagreement between Rav and others regarding a woman who examined herself with a pre-inspected cloth, pressed it against her leg and the next day discovers blood on it. According to Rav she is *temei'ah* whereas according to others we are suspect that she is *temei'ah*.

Regarding a woman who examined herself with a cloth that was not pre-inspected, put away the cloth and later found blood on it, it is reported that when R' Chiya was young he ruled that she is *temei'ah* but when he was older he declared her *tehorah*.

The Gemara seeks clarification of R' Chiya's position.

The Gemara clarifies R' Chiya's ruling.

A related incident is cited.

The sources of Rabbi's and R' Yosi's positions are identified.

R' Zeira aligns the disagreement between Rabbi and R' Yosi with the dispute between R' Meir and R' Yosi.

This connection is unsuccessfully challenged.

5) Time frames for exams

A Beraisa clarifies the time of "immediately."

A Beraisa rules that if blood is found beyond the "immediate" time period an *asham talui* must be offered.

The reason our Mishnah does not mention bringing a *korban* is explained.

A Beraisa records a different way of measuring "after a time."

R' Chisda resolves the contradiction.

This resolution is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Ashi offers an alternative resolution.

The Gemara begins to challenge this explanation. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

Using a cloth which was not checked beforehand

אתמר בדקה בעד שאינו בדוק לה והניחתו בקופסא ולמחר מצאה עליו
דם

The Gemara presents an inquiry regarding a cloth used for a *bedikah*. A woman used a cloth which was not previously inspected to determine if it was clean. After checking herself, she did not look at the cloth, but she placed it into a box. The next day, she inspected the cloth and found it to be stained. The question is whether we must assume the blood on the cloth came from her, or can we say that perhaps the discoloration was on the cloth before she checked herself?

Rav Yosef answered and informs us that during his entire life, R' Chiya had ruled that under these circumstances, a woman would be *temei'ah*. However, near the end of his life, R' Chiya changed his mind and ruled that a woman would be *tehorah*. The Gemara inquires regarding the meaning of R' Chiya's life-long ruling that the woman would be *temei'ah*, and what the change in his ruling was later. Rebbe, however, rules in this case that the woman is definitely *temei'ah* due to being a *niddah*.

In terms of the original inquiry itself, the commentators ask why the question was posed in regard to a cloth which was put away for a day and only then inspected. The cloth was placed in a secure and clean place in the meantime, so no new element of doubt or uncertainty develops as a result of the delay, so why did the question have to include this time delay? It could have simply asked if a cloth which was not previously checked was used, do we attribute the blood to the woman herself, or can we assume it might have been on the cloth from beforehand?

Sefer Beis Meir (To Y.D. 190: #36), and Aruch LaNer explain that if the cloth was checked immediately, it would have been clear whether the blood was moist and fresh, thus indicating that it came from her, and if it was dry it would mean that it had been on the cloth from earlier. However, because the cloth was only checked the next day and it was found to have dried blood upon it, we now have a dilemma if it was there from before or if the blood came from the woman's inspection the day before.

The Rishonim offer various explanations regarding the definition of "a cloth which was not checked." Tosafos explains that this cloth was previously checked several days earlier, but at the moment the woman took it to use it she did not verify that it was still spotless. This is why we now have a doubt. However, if the cloth had never been pre-checked, even Rebbe agrees that she is only *temei'ah* due to a doubt. Ramban holds that if the woman used a cloth which had never been inspected that she is now *tehorah*, and we do not assume the blood came from her now.

Ra'aved explains that even if the woman uses a cloth which was never checked, we still must assume that the blood came from her, because "blood is often found from her." ■

HALACHA Highlight

Lying on one's back

Cursed one who sleeps on his back

R' Yehoshua ben Levi cursed one who sleeps on his back. The Gemara challenges his strong opposition to this practice from R' Yosef's teaching that one may not recite krias shema while lying on one's back which implies that when not saying krias shema there is no issue to lay on one's back. The Gemara answers that as far as sleeping is concerned it is sufficient if one leans on his side but when it comes to reading krias shema leaning on one's side is not sufficient. Rashi¹ indicates that the restriction applies only while one is sleeping which leads Aruch LaNer² to wonder why the Gemara challenged R' Yehoshua ben Levi from one's body position during krias shema when one is obviously not sleeping during krias shema. He leaves this question unresolved.

Mishnah Berurah³ writes that one may not lie down on his back and emphasizes the severity of this prohibition. Sefer Shoneh Halachos⁴ deduces from the Gemara based on Aruch LaNer's question that the Gemara maintains that lying down on one's back even when one is not sleeping is also prohibited and for that reason Mishnah Berurah used words that refer to lying down rather than words that refer specifically to sleep. He also confirmed that this was the position of Chazon Ish. Sefer Beirur Halacha⁴ quoted many Rishonim about this matter and concluded that according to halacha one should not deviate from Shulchan Aruch's ruling⁵ that it is only while sleeping that the re-

לייט אמאן דגני אפרקיד

REVIEW and Remember

1. Why was R' Yochanan permitted to recite shema while leaning slightly?
2. What is a מאכולת?
3. Why did R' Chama bar Bisa assume that Rebbi's rulings were more authoritative?
4. Why does the Tanna of our Mishnah exempt the couple who found blood "after a time" from bringing an asham talui?

striction applies. He goes on to prove that even for Torah scholars there is no restriction against laying on one's back if one is not sleeping from a letter the Rambam wrote in which he describes his exhaustion at the end of the day. He writes that he is so tired that he doesn't even have the strength to talk and must lay down on his back to rest. This self description is revealing since Rambam rules that one may not sleep while on his back. This proves that resting on one's back as long as one is not sleeping is permitted. ■

¹ רש"י ד"ה אפרקיד.
² ערוך לנר ד"ה הא מגנא.
³ מ"ב סי' רל"ט סק"ו.
⁴ ספר ביורור הלכה או"ח ח"ב סי' רל"ט למשנ"ב סק"ו.
⁵ שו"ע אהע"ז סי' כ"ג סעי' ג. ■

STORIES off the Daf

The Pretender

"לייט אמאן דגני אפרקיד..."

On today's daf we find that it is forbidden for one to sleep on his back or stomach.¹

Someone asked Rav Chaim Kanievsky, shlit"a, how to explain this prohibition to his teenage sons. He could not just tell them not to lie on their backs, and explaining the reasoning behind this prohibition can be counterproductive.

"When you see them lying on their stomachs or backs, explain that lying in

this manner is prohibited because it is not a nice way to sleep," the gadol replied.²

When Rav Wolbe, zt"l, would discuss sanctity, he would bring up the halachah not to sleep on one's back and recount a famous story regarding this halachah:

When Shabtai Tzvi first became famous, many gedolei Yisrael were unsure whether he was actually Moshiach. He was learned, he prayed with great devotion, and he was known to perform acts of kindness. Perhaps he was the redeemer after all?

The Taz, zt"l, sent his son-in-law to investigate his claim. Since he was the son-in-law of the gadol hador, Shabtai Tzvi received him with great honor and

spent many long hours discussing Torah matters with him and sending princely gifts back to Poland for the Taz.

When he returned home, the first thing the Taz asked his son-in-law was if he had determined whether or not Shabtai Tzvi was Moshiach.

"He is a false Moshiach," replied his son-in-law decisively.

"How can you tell?" asked the Taz.

"Upon my arrival, when I first went into the room, he was lying on his back on a couch. Moshiach would never do this—contradict an explicit halachah!" ■

¹ כן הוא דעת החזו"א, כמובא בשונה הלכות רל"ט, שאיסור גם בשכיבה לבד.

² שאילת רב ■

