For if he would want he could take it out

- דאי בעי מפקע ליה

Overview

The אמר is trying to prove that אגד כלי לא שמיה אגד, for if שמיה אגד, why is the ruling that in a case where one stole a purse on שבת and dragged it from the "רה" to the הוצאה from paying since he is חייב מיתה for חיילול שבת of היילול שבת simultaneously with the איסור גניבה. The איסור ממרא asks even if we are discussing that he dragged it by the bottom of the purse (so he cannot take out the money from the opening), nevertheless he can tear the seam and take out the money, so the איסור גניבה precedes the חוספות Clarifies this question.

נראה לרבינו יצחק שכיסין שלהם לא היו תפורות בחוזק כמו שלנו -It is the view of the ר"י that their purses in those days were not sewn as strongly as our purses are -

ולהכי פריך ממקום התפירה ולא ממקום אחר:

So therefore the גמרא asks that he tear the purse from the place of the seam (which is not so strong), but not from any other place, which is more difficult to tear.

Summary

It is easier to tear the seam than to tear the purse (especially in those days).

Thinking it over

Is תוספות explaining that the ממקום תפירה and not from anywhere else, because practically it is very difficult to do so (however the real question is that he can tear the purse from anyplace), or is תוספות telling us that if it is that difficult, then there would be no question (for he is certainly not קונה)?

¹