

And Reish Lokish said, etc.

וריש לקיש אמר כולי –

Overview

The גמרא cites the answer of ר"ל why it is not a שאינה ראויה. It would seem that ר"ל is part of the series of answers to explain the view of ר"ש, after the גמרא concluded that ר"ש אמילתא אחריתי קאי, namely by a case where he stole someone's קרבן. Our תוספות explains that ר"ל is not part of the series.

ריש לקיש לא קאי אסוגיא דידן דלדידיה לא צריך למימר דרבי שמעון קאי אמילתא אחריתי -
The answer of ר"ל is not addressing our סוגיא, where we are explaining the מילתא אחריתי, that the גנב stole a קרבן, since according to ר"ל, it is not necessary to say that ר"ש is referring another case (where the גנב stole a קרבן), as תוספות will shortly explain -
אלא לפי דבריו דמוקי מתניתין לעיל¹ (דף סח,ב) כשהקדישו בעלים ביד גנב² -

Rather the reason ר"ל also gives an answer here, is that since according to his explanation, where he previously established our משנה in a case where the owner was מקדיש the animal while it was in the possession of the גנב, so to avoid the question of שחיטה שאינה ראויה -

מוקי לה בשוחט בעלי מומין בחוץ:

He established the ruling of ר"ש where he was שוחט blemished animals outside the ביהמ"ק.

Summary

שחוטי חוץ ר"ל is only addressing the issue of

Thinking it over

Seemingly the answers of רב דימי, and רבין were not addressing the issue of איפכא מבעי ליה (for that issue was resolved); they were responding to the question of שחיטה שאינה ראויה, which applies to ר"ל as well, so why does תוספות write ר"ל לא קאי אסוגיא דידן?!

¹ ר"ל said there (on סח,ב) that our משנה of מקדיש (on ע"ב) means that the owner was מקדיש it while it was in the possession of the גנב. According to this interpretation, there is no question of איפכא מבעי ליה, which the גמרא asked here (on the א' עמוד), and which forced the גמרא to say ר"ש אמילתא אחריתי קאי, but rather he is discussing our משנה of גנב והקדיש. Why then was it necessary for ר"ל to offer an answer.

² Even according to the interpretation of ר"ל that גנב בעלים ביד גנב, the question still remains why is the גנב חייב בד' שחיטה שאינה ראויה, since it is a שוחט בחוץ, if he was שוחט בחוץ.

³ Once a קרבן received a מום there is no longer the prohibition of שחוט חוץ, and it is a שחיטה ראויה as the גמרא explains.