

מכלל דרישא מין אחד ותמחוי אחד כולי –

It can be inferred that the first case is one species and one dish, etc.

OVERVIEW

The גמרא asked, since we established the סיפא (of מין אחד) in a case of מין אחד and two תמחויין, it follows that the רישא (of מין אחד) is by מין אחד ותמחוי, so what is the novelty; obviously they are מצטרף. Our תוספות explains why was not a similar inference and question asked by the initial explanation that we are referencing the רישא (of מין אחד מצטרפין)

לעיל¹ לא בעי למיפרך מכלל דסיפא משני מינין ושני תמחויין צריכא למימר² -

Previously the גמרא did not want to ask, the inference from the רישא is that the סיפא is by מין אחד ותמחויין ושני מינין, is it necessary to teach that they are not מצטרף?! The reason the גמרא did not ask this question there as well, is -

שלא חש להאריך כיון דלא קאי הכי:

Because it did not want to elaborate unnecessarily, since that initial explanation **does not remain**, it was replaced by the final explanation that ר"ל was referencing the סיפא (but not the רישא).

SUMMARY

The גמרא does not care to discuss at length a view that is not ultimately accepted.

THINKING IT OVER

Had the גמרא asked תוספות proposed question; is there a way to answer it;⁴ if not why did the גמרא merely say, 'מר ארישא וכו' און אסיפא וכו'; the גמרא could have proven that ר"ל cannot be referencing the רישא because of תוספות question!

¹ Initially (on the עמוד א') the גמרא assumed that the statement of ר"ל (regarding תמחויין ב') was to explain the חידוש of the רישא that מין אחד is מצטרף even though it was תמחויין בב'. The inference being that the סיפא which states that בב' they are not מצטרף is where it is מינין ב' and תמחויין ב'. The same question can be asked on this inference; if it is ב' it is obvious that מין אחד מצטרפין; what is the חידוש of the סיפא?

² If it is ב' and תמחויין ב', there can be no reason why they should be מצטרף!

³ In the מסקנא the רישא is מין אחד ותמחוי אחד (the חידוש is that שיעור like רבן גמליאל אין ידיעה לחצי שיעור).

⁴ See מתק שפתים and מהרש"א.