

הא ליכא אוצר עביד - But if there is no storehouse he may make it

Overview

The גמרא inferred from the משנה that if there is no storehouse above, one may make a bakery, etc. (indicating that it is מותר לסמוך [not like רבא]). Our תוספות suggests an (alternate) answer.

הוי מצי לשנויי הוא הדין כי ליכא לא סמיך והא קא משמע לן דהבלא¹ קשיא² לאוצר:

The גמרא **could have also answered; the same rule** will apply even **if there is no** storehouse above, and nevertheless one **cannot be** סומך, and the reason he mentions the אוצר **is to inform us that the heat** produced by **these** (the bakery, dye store, etc.) **damage the** אוצר.

Summary

The גמרא could have answered (as it did previously); the משנה is merely teaching us that these items can damage the אוצר.

Thinking it over

אוצר writes that the גמרא could have answered that indeed even if there is no אוצר he is not permitted to be סומך, etc. How could the גמרא have said that, when in the ברייתא it clearly states 'אם היה רפת בקר קודמת לאוצר מותר', so it is obvious that if there is no אוצר one may be סומך (not like רבא)?!³

¹ The הגהות הב"ח amends this to read דהני קשה לאוצר (instead of דהני קשה לאוצר).

² This is the same (type of) answer the גמרא gave on the previous (four) challenges to רבא.

³ See פני שלמה and מהר"ם.