

שאני בית הכסא דנפיש¹ זוהמא –

A bathroom is different; for there is much filth there

OVERVIEW

The גמרא explained that when רב אדא said that one may *daven* in a bathhouse he was referring to new bathhouse that was never used; it was merely designated as a מרחץ. The גמרא challenges this ruling by citing an unresolved query by רבינא whether an unused designated bathroom is considered a בית הכסא or not, and presumably the same query should apply to a designated מרחץ. The גמרא answered that the query is limited only to a בית הכסא since it is disgusting, but not to a מרחץ in which one may *daven* if it was never used. גמרא reconciles our גמרא with a seemingly contradictory גמרא.

asks: תוספות

תימה בסוף פרק קמא דנדרים (דף יא, א') גרס –

It is astounding! For in (the end of) the first פרק of נדרים, the text reads -

בעי רבינא³ הזמינו לבית הכסא והזמינו לבית המרחץ מהו –
queried; if he designated a place for a הכסא, or he designated a place for a מרחץ what is its status; is it considered a ביהכ"ס or a מרחץ, or not?

אלמא במרחץ נמי מיבעי ליה –

It is evident from that גמרא that רבינא posed his query by a מרחץ as well, how can our גמרא answer that the query of רבינא as only regarding a ביהכ"ס and not a מרחץ?!

comments: תוספות

ויש שמוחקין אותו שם מן הספרים משום הך דהכא –

And there are those who erase the query regarding a מרחץ from the texts there in נדרים because of this גמרא here which indicates that there is no query regarding a מרחץ.

reconciles the two גמרות: תוספות

ומיהו יש לקיים שם הגירסא –

¹ In our גמרא the text reads דמאיס (not דנפיש זוהמא). It would seem that regarding an unused designated ביהכ"ס one may assume that it is מאיס, but not that it is נפיש זוהמא since it was never used.

² This should be amended to read זא (and therefore the word 'בסוף' should be omitted)

³ The same רבינא which the גמרא cites here (presumably regarding a ביהכ"ס [only])

However it is possible to sustain the texts there in נדרים (that the query was also regarding a מרחץ), -

והכא הכי פירושא מאי לאו כי היכי דלא איפשיטא ליה מבית הכסא –

And this is the explanation here in our גמרא; the גמרא asked, ‘isn’t it so that just as the query regarding a ביהכ"ס was not resolved -

הכי נמי לא איפשיטא ליה מבית המרחץ⁴ –

So too did רבינא not resolve the query regarding a מרחץ, so how can רב rule that one may *daven* in a מרחץ -

ומשני שאני בית הכסא דנפיש זוהמיה להכי לא איפשיטא ליה –

And the גמרא answered, a מרחץ for it is different from a ביהכ"ס **is different** from a מרחץ **therefore רבינא did not resolve his query** regarding a ביהכ"ס -

אבל מרחץ בתר דבעיא דדר פשטא –

However regarding a מרחץ (which is not זוהמיה) we may assume **that after רבינא posed his query he resolved it** that merely designating it for a מרחץ does not give it the status of a מרחץ (and therefore one may *daven* there).

Tosfos offers an alternate solution to resolve the contradiction:

אי נמי הזמינו לבית המרחץ אינו מדברי רבינא⁵ –

Or you may also say that the words (in נדרים) of לבית המרחץ **are not part of רבינא's query** -

אלא הש"ס הוא דמסיק שאינו רוצה לחלק⁶ וכן יש בכמה מקומות:

But rather the גמרא concluded and added this additional query, for the גמרא there **did not see to differentiate** between a מרחץ and a ביהכ"ס; **and this is found in many places** that the גמרא on its own adds to the words of an אמורא.

SUMMARY

The query of רבינא regarding a ביהכ"ס was not resolved however the query regarding a מרחץ was resolved that it does not have the status of a מרחץ.

THINKING IT OVER

1. The גמרא initially assumed that the query of מרחץ was not resolved just as the query of ביהכ"ס was not resolved. The גמרא concludes that the query of

⁴ When the גמרא asked למרחץ it did not mean that presumably there was a query for מרחץ as well (and the answer is that there never was a query for מרחץ), but rather the question was (on the words לא and לא איפשיטא that is mentioned immediately before כו' that just as the query regarding a ביהכ"ס was לא similarly the query regarding a מרחץ was also לא איפשיטא. See 'Thinking it over' # 1.

⁵ According to this answer רבינא never posed a query regarding מרחץ as תוס' initially understood the גמרא.

⁶ See 'Thinking it over' # 2.

מרחץ was resolved.⁷ Why did the גמרא initially assume that the query of ביהכ"ס was certainly not resolved and presumably the query of מרחץ was also not resolved; for in the גמרא in נדרים both queries are equally left unresolved? (And if the reason we assume that ביהכ"ס was certainly unresolved because רב אדא only permitted *davening* in a מרחץ then why did the גמרא assume that מרחץ was unresolved as well.)⁸

2. second answer was that the query regarding מרחץ was posed by the גמרא (and not רבינא).⁹ Why then did the queries remain unresolved since רב אדא ruled that one may *daven* in a מרחץ and the גמרא maintains that there is no difference between a מרחץ and a ביהכ"ס? And if we can assume that the גמרא argues with רב אדא, then we can just as easily assume that רב אדא argues with רבינא and there is no need for any answer!¹⁰

⁷ See footnote # 4.

⁸ See ענף יהושע חי' מהרי"ט.

⁹ See footnote # 6

¹⁰ See חי' מהרי"ט.