

Because of something else

מחמת דבר אחר –

OVERVIEW

ר"ש states that the **חמץ** of איסור teaches us that the **חמץ** is even if it became **חמץ** because of something else. תוספות defines what is meant by **מחמת** (which would seemingly be less likely to be prohibited as **חמץ**) **דבר אחר**.

פירש רבינו יצחק בן אשר מחמת דבר אחר דלאו מינו¹ -

The **ריב"א** explained that **מחמת דבר אחר** means something which is not its kind, but not merely becoming **חמץ** through an agent outside the dough -

דעל ידי שאור² מיקרי חמץ טפי משנתחמץ מאליו כדמוכח בפרק כל המנחות³ (מנחות נב, ב) -

For (on the contrary) a dough which became **חמץ** through sourdough (**שאור**) is considered 'more' **חמץ** than a dough which became **חמץ** by itself (without adding **שאור**), as is evident in **המנחות**.

אלא כגון שנתחמץ על ידי שמרי יין -

But rather the term **מחמת דבר אחר** refers to a case for instance where the dough became **חמץ** through wine sediment -

שמייבשין השמרים בתנור כאשר עושין בארץ אשכנז -

Where they dry the sediments in an oven, as they do in the land of אשכנז (presently Germany), and this is added to the dough as a leavening agent -

cautions: תוספות

ולא דמי לעיסה שנילושה ביין⁴ דלית ביה כרת ויש בה לאו:

And this dough (which is kneaded with water) is not similar to a dough which was kneaded with wine, where in that case there is no **כרת** for eating it but there is a **לאו** for eating it, however in our case, where it was kneaded with water and the **שמרים** were (merely) a leaving agent, it is **חמץ גמור** and there is a **כרת** for eating it.

SUMMARY

¹ The agent causing the **חימוץ** is not from grain, the 'kind' which the dough is made from.

² Dough which is left for a long period of time becomes sourdough (**שאור**), which is a good leavening agent. However dough can become **חמץ** on its own even without adding **שאור**.

³ ר"ש there states that in order to make a **מנחה חמץ** (the **שתי הלחם** which were brought on **שבועות** needed to be **חמץ**) it is better to make them **חמץ** through adding **שאור** from elsewhere than letting it become **חמץ** from its own **שאור**. This proves that **מחמת דבר אחר** cannot be referring to **שאור**, for on the contrary it is more **חמץ** than not **חמץ**.

⁴ See תוספות later ומי ד"ה לה, ב that we are discussing a dough which was kneaded with a mixture of **מי פירות** (wine) and water (where there is a **לאו** but no **כרת**), however if it was kneaded with **מי פירות** alone it is not **חמץ** altogether, עיי"ש.

There are four levels of חמץ (in ascending order); a dough kneaded with wine (no כרת, only a לאו), a dough (kneaded with water only and) leavened through שמרים, a dough leavened on its own, a dough leavened through שאור (there is a חיוב כרת for last three).

THINKING IT OVER

It seems we derive the נתחמץ מחמץ דבר אחר of איסור מחמצת. How do we know that the דבר אחר is referring to אינו מינו, perhaps it is referring only to שאור?⁵

⁵ אור חדש.