

דיקא נמי דקתני כולי - This can also be inferred, for it was taught, etc.

Overview

The גמרא stated that we can infer that דירה שאני (in a דירה, one may be סומך initially [even according to רבא], as opposed to other situations), since regarding a דירה, the ברייתא ruled that if the רפת בקר was there first, it is permitted.¹

ולאביי לא קשיא האי דיקא דלא משמע ליה שיהא חידוש בשאר טפי² מבדירה:

And this inference does not present a difficulty for אביי, for to him it does not seem to be a greater novelty by the other cases that it is מותר לסמוך any more than by דירה.

Summary

According to אביי if one may be סומך by דירה, he may be סומך anywhere else.

Thinking it over

1. Why did not תוספות say that there is no difficulty for אביי, for he can maintain the reason the ברייתא spoke about אוצר is (not because דירה שאני, but rather) because there is a greater חידוש by אוצר, that even though it is גירי דיליה, it is still לסמוך (as argued previously³)?!

2. According to אביי that it is מותר לסמוך in all cases, why indeed did the ברייתא only mention אוצר?!⁴

¹ The answer of the גמרא that דירה שאני assumes *a priori* that by a דירה there should be less restrictions on his use of the דירה than in other cases (see רש"י ד"ה דירה).. Therefore since the ברייתא makes the exception only by דירה, it is understood that in the other cases it is לסמוך. This seemingly presents a difficulty for אביי who maintains מותר לסמוך; why does the ברייתא state this rule only by a דירה if (according to אביי) it applies in all cases..

² אביי disagrees with the *a priori* assumption (in footnote # 1) that there is more reason to allow לסמוך by דירה than in other cases; rather אביי maintains if you are permitted by דירה you are permitted just the same in other cases.

³ בד"ה דיקא (הא').

⁴ See נחלת משה.