Overview

The גמרא is attempting to establish the ברייתא ווא בריית, and explains that he agrees with אמר לי that a קנס does not receive קנס. The גמרא challenged this assumption by citing a statement from רב יהודה אמר רב, saying; 'this (ruling) is the opinion of ר"מ (מוֹ ברי ר"מ ברי ר"מ ור"מ, and if ר"מ agrees with ר"מ, he should have said, 'זו דברי ר"מ ור"מ ווייב' רבי הודה אמר רב referring to.

: אמתניתין דלקמן $(regarding\ the\ average this\ statement (זו דברי ר"מ) regarding the משנה later, which stated, that whenever there can be a sale, there is no קנס.$

Summary

ר"י אמר רב was referencing the משנה later, which maintains that a קנס has no קנס.

Thinking it over

It is not clear what תוספות is teaching us here. The גמרא just stated that regarding a ר"י, קטנה מדיא agrees with ר"מ (that אין לה קנס) and the גמרא immediately asks that ר"י tannot agree with ר"מ (regarding a קטנה) since ר"י אמר רב stated ר"י אמר רב, which is an explicit גמרא later; what else could it mean?! 3

_

¹ This is referring to the sale of a קטנה for an אמה העבריה. This משנה rules that if the girt can be sold as an אמה העבריה (which means that she is still a קטנה [for only a קטנה be sold as an אמה העבריה), this girl will not receive קטנה. This follows the opinion of ר"מ that a קטנה has no קנס has no משנה that משנה that משנה that ב"י אמר רב stated that this קנס maintain that (even) קנס קטנה קטנה.

בד"ה זו cites this also רש"י. ²!

³ See (also) מהרש"א and ש"מ.