

If so, it is indeed a good question

אי הכי שפיר קשיא ליה –

OVERVIEW

After רבא finished interpreting the ברייתא of חזקיה דבי תנא it seems that from the כלל of גניבה (the כופו"כ), (פרטים) שור שה חמור, and חיים (the final כלל) we can derive everything, why therefore do we need תמצא תמצא. This is the current question. תוספות discusses the answer somewhat.

ומשני משום דאית ליה פירכא¹ –

And the גמרא answered this question;² because there is a refutation to this כופו"כ, which will not allow us to derive everything (without תמצא תמצא) –

תוספות responds to an anticipated difficulty:

אף על גב דהאי פירכא ליתא בברייתא³ היינו משום דלא חש⁴ לפרשה:

Even though this refutation is not mentioned in the ברייתא; nevertheless it should not concern us, for the reason it is not mentioned is because he did not care to mention it.

SUMMARY

Sometimes the תנא does not fully express himself and relies on us to make the correct conclusion.

THINKING IT OVER

Is תוספות response appropriate according to both explanations (the ר"י and the 'לכך' given in the previous יאמר ד"ה, תוספות ד"ה⁵ or only according to one explanation?⁶

¹ תוס' ד"ה מהיכא See following בע"ה. The answer is because the last כלל is חיים which limits it to כופו"כ.

² See 'Overview'.

³ Since the ברייתא, according to רבא, was discussing the need for תמצא תמצא; why after all was said, it did not explain the need for תמצא תמצא.

⁴ Perhaps the main goal of the תד"ה was to prove that we can derive everything from the פסוקים. However the manner he presented it was in a question and answer format, why we need (תמצא תמצא, and) this פרט, etc.; once we arrived at a (seemingly) valid כופו"כ to include everything (which was his main goal), he relied on us to figure out why תמצא תמצא is necessary (as the גמרא continues to explain). See # 44. אוצר מפרשי התלמוד.

⁵ See there TIE footnote # 36

⁶ See # 49. אוצר מפרשי התלמוד.