

דכתיב: "ויחנו על הירדן מבית הישימות עד אבל השטים". ואמר רבה בר בר חנה: לדידי חזי לי ההוא אתרא והויא תלתא פריסי והנא: בשנפנין – אין נפנין לא לפניהו, ולא לצדדיהו, אלא לאחוריהו.

How do we know that the Israelite camp was three parasangs? As it is written: "And they camped by the Jordan from Beth-Jeshimoth to Abel-shittim" (Numbers 33:49), and Rabba bar bar Hana said: I saw that site and it was three parasangs in length. And a *baraita* taught: When the Jews relieved themselves in the desert, they did not relieve themselves ahead of themselves, i.e., in the direction of their travel, nor to the side of the camp, but behind the camp, in a place that they had already traveled. Consequently, those near the front of the camp had to walk a distance of three parasangs from their homes to leave the camp.

"ועתה נפשנו יבשה אין כל" אמרו: עתיד מן זה שתפח במיעיהם, כלום יש ילוד אשה שמכניס ואינו מוציא?

Furthermore, with regard to the manna, the verse states Israel's complaint: "But now our soul is dry, there is nothing at all; we have nothing beside this manna to look to" (Numbers 11:6). They said: This manna will eventually swell in our stomachs and kill us; is there anyone born of a woman who ingests food but does not expel waste? This supports the Gemara's claim that the manna did not create waste.

וכשנאמרו דברים לפני רבי ישמעאל אמר להם: אל תקרי "אבירים" אלא "אבירים" – דבר שנבלע במאתים וארבעים ושמונה אבירים. אלא מה אני מקיים "ויתד תהיה לך על אוניך" – בדברים שבאין להם ממדינת הים.

When these words were said before Rabbi Yishmael, he said to them: Do not read it as *abirim*. Rather, read it as *eivarim*, limbs. The manna was something that was absorbed by 248 limbs. But, how do I establish "And you shall have a spade among your weapons"? From the food items that came to them from overseas lands. Rabbi Yishmael disagrees with Rabbi Elazar ben Perata with regard to the effect the manna had on the digestion of other foods.

דבר אחר: "לחם אבירים אכל איש"

Alternatively, "Man [*ish*] did eat the bread of the mighty" (Psalms 78:25);

Perek VIII
Daf 76 Amud a

NOTES

Joshua, for whom manna fell corresponding to all the rest of the Jewish people – יהושע שירד לו מן כנגד כל – שראל: Perhaps the Gemara is basing this on the verse that describes Joshua as "a man in whom there is spirit" (Numbers 27:18). The Sages understood that this verse means that Joshua was able to understand the spirit of each individual within the nation. Joshua's spirit therefore corresponded to the spirits of all the Jewish people. The Gemara here alludes to this with the manna, which was a gift from heaven. It was therefore given to Joshua, corresponding to all the Jewish people (*Tal Orot*).

Once a year – פעם אחת בשנה: The Gemara suggests that the manna could have been given once a year, rather than once a week or once a month, since that would be parallel to the blessing that God bestows on the crops of the field once a year, when they are harvested. The Gemara is asking why the manna was not like that (*Tosefet Yom HaKippurim*).

זה יהושע שירד לו מן כנגד כל ישראל, כתיב הכא: "איש" וכתיב התם: "קח לך את יהושע בן נון איש אשר רוח בו". ואימא משה, דכתיב: "והאיש משה ענו מאד". דנין איש מאיש, ואין דנין "איש" מ"האיש".

the verse is referring to Joshua, for whom manna fell corresponding to all the rest of the Jewish people,^N when he waited for Moses at Mount Sinai during the forty days Moses was on the mountain. The verses allude to this: "Man" is written here, and "man" is written there: "Take to you Joshua, the son of Nun, a man in whom there is spirit, and lay your hand upon him" (Numbers 27:18). From here, the Gemara learns that the "man" is Joshua. The Gemara asks: Say that the verse is referring to Moses, about whom it is written: "Now the man Moses was very humble" (Numbers 12:3). The Gemara answers: We can learn a verbal analogy to the word "man" from the word "man," but we cannot learn a verbal analogy to the word "man" from the phrase "the man," which is used to refer to Moses.

שאלו תלמידיו את רבי שמעון בן יוחי: מפני מה לא ירד להם לישראל מן פעם אחת בשנה? אמר להם: אמשול לכם משל: למה הדבר דומה – למלך בשר ודם שיש לו בן אחד. פסק לו מזונותיו פעם אחת בשנה, ולא היה מקביל פני אביו אלא פעם אחת בשנה. עמד ופסק מזונותיו בכל יום, והיה מקביל פני אביו כל יום.

Furthermore, with regard to the manna: The students of Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai asked him: Why didn't the manna fall for the Jewish people just once a year^N to take care of all their needs, instead of coming down every day? He said to them: I will give you a parable: To what does this matter compare? To a king of flesh and blood who has only one son. He granted him an allowance for food once a year and the son greeted his father only once a year, when it was time for him to receive his allowance. So he arose and granted him his food every day, and his son visited him every day.

אף ישראל, מי שיש לו ארבעה וחמשה בנים היה דואג ואומר: שמא לא ירד מן למחר ונמצאו בולן מתים ברעב, נמצאו בולן מכוונים את לבם לאביהו שבשמים.

So too, in the case of the Jewish people, someone who had four or five children would be worried and say: Perhaps the manna will not fall tomorrow and we will all die of starvation. Consequently, everyone directed their hearts to their Father in heaven every day. The manna that fell each day was sufficient only for that day, so that all of the Jewish people would pray to God for food for the next day.

רבי אלעזר המודעי – Rabbi Elazar HaModa'i was a Sage who lived after the destruction of the Temple and was apparently a young student of Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai. Most of the quotations cited in his name are midrash. Rabban Gamliel often remarked: We still need HaModa'i. As his name indicates, this scholar was from the city of Modi'in. Rabbi Elazar HaModa'i was bar Kokheva's uncle, his mother's brother, and he died during the siege of Beitar.

NOTES

The attribute of goodness is greater than the attribute of retribution – **מדה טובה מפרעת פורענות**: Rashi writes that the attribute of goodness is five hundred times greater than that of retribution. He bases this on the verse that states, with regard to the wicked: "For I the Lord your God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children until the third and fourth generation of those that hate Me, and showing mercy until the thousandth generation of those that love Me and keep My mitzvot" (Exodus 20:5). Consequently, retribution lasts four generations while God "shows mercy to thousands of generations" (Exodus 20:6). God extends favor to those who love Him for at least two thousand years, which is four times five hundred.

My cup runs over – **כוס רויח**: Some commentaries explain 221 *log* in accordance with the Kabbala (*Siah Yitzhak*). Others link it to the four cups of retribution from which God will force the world's nations to drink (see Jeremiah 25:15). Since blessing is always significantly more than punishment, the Jewish people will drink many cups of blessing (see *Ateret Rosh*).

דבר אחר: שהיו אוכלין אותו כשהוא חם.
דבר אחר: מפני משאו הדרך.

Alternatively, they received manna daily so that they would be able to eat it while it was hot and fresh. Alternatively, they received manna daily due to the hardship of carrying on the journey. They did not stay in the same place all those years, and it would have been difficult for them to carry the manna from one place to another. Therefore, the manna fell wherever they went.

וכבר היה רבי טרפון ורבי ישמעאל וקנים יושבין ועוסקין בפרשת המן והיה רבי אלעזר המודעי יושב ביניהן. נענה רבי אלעזר המודעי ואמר: מן שירד להן לישראל היה גבוה ששים אמה. אמר לו רבי טרפון: מודעי! עד מתי אתה מגבב דברים ומביא עלינו?

It is told: Rabbi Tarfon, and Rabbi Yishmael, and the Elders were sitting and discussing the passage about the manna and Rabbi Elazar HaModa'i was sitting among them. Rabbi Elazar HaModa'i responded and said: The manna that fell for the Jewish people was sixty cubits high. Rabbi Tarfon said to him: Modai, how long will you collect words and bring upon us teachings that have no basis?

אמר לו: רבי, מקרא אני דורש: "חמש עשרה אמה מלמעלה גברו המים וכספו ההרים" וכי חמש עשרה אמה בעמק (חמש עשרה בשפלה) חמש עשרה בהרים? וכי מים שורי שורי קיימי? ועוד: תיבד היכי סגיא? אלא "נבקעו כל מעינות תהום רבה" עד דאשווי מים בהדי טורי, והדר "חמש עשרה אמה מלמעלה גברו המים".

He said to him: Rabbi, I am interpreting a verse. How so? It states about the Flood: "Fifteen cubits above did the waters prevail; and the mountains were covered" (Genesis 7:20). Is it possible that it would be fifteen cubits high from a valley, fifteen cubits from the plain, and fifteen cubits from the mountains? Did the water stand as though in layers, conforming to the height of the land below it? Furthermore, how could the Ark travel over water that was at different levels? Rather: "On the same day were all the fountains of the great deep broken up" (Genesis 7:11), until the water rose and was level with the mountains. Afterward, the verse states that "fifteen cubits above did the waters prevail."

וכי אי זה מדה מרובה, מדה טובה או מדה פורענות? הוי אומר: מדה טובה ממדת פורענות. במדת פורענות הוא אומר: "וארובות השמים נפתחו", במדה טובה הוא אומר: "ויצו שחקים ממעל ודלתי שמים פתח וימטר עליהם מן לאכול ודגן שמים נתן למו".

Rabbi Elazar HaModa'i continues: But which attribute is greater, the attribute of goodness or the attribute of retribution? One must say the attribute of goodness is greater than the attribute of retribution.^N With regard to the attribute of retribution, in the case of the Flood, the verse states: "And the windows of heaven were opened" (Genesis 7:11), which indicates that there were only windows. Whereas, with regard to the attribute of goodness, in the case of the manna, the verse states: "He commanded the skies above, and opened the doors of heaven, and rained down manna upon them to eat and gave them heavenly grain" (Psalms 78:23–24).

כמה ארובות יש בדלת – ארבע, ארבע, הרי כאן שמונה, ונמצא מן שירד להם לישראל גבוה ששים אמה.

Based on this, the Gemara calculates: The area of how many windows are in a door? Four. A door is equivalent to four windows in size. One adds another four for the second door, as the verse uses the plural "doors," which implies that there were two doors. This equals the area of eight windows. If the depth of water in the Flood is based on the phrase "windows of heaven," implying two windows, then the manna fell at a rate four times that of the water of the Flood. Since the water of the Flood reached a depth of fifteen cubits, it turns out that the manna that fell for the Jewish people was sixty cubits high, i.e., four times as high.

תניא, איסי בן יהודה אומר: מן שירד להם לישראל היה מתגבר ועולה, עד שראו אותו כל מלכי מרח ומערב, שנאמר: "תערוך לפני שלחן נגד צוררי [וגו] כוסי רויח" אמר אביי: שמע מינה – כסא דוד לעלמא דאתי מאתן ועשרין וחד לוגא מחזיק, שנאמר: "כוסי רויח" – רויח בגימטריא הכי הוי.

Similarly, it was taught in a *baraita* that Isi ben Yehuda said: The manna that fell for the Jewish people would accumulate and ascend until all the kings of the East and West could see it, as it is stated: "You prepared a table before me in the presence of my enemies; you anointed my head with oil; my cup runs over" (Psalms 23:5). God prepared food for the Jewish people, so that their enemies would see their greatness over the world. "My cup runs over [*revaya*];"^N Abaye said: We learn from this that the cup of David in the next world holds 221 *log*, since it is stated: "My cup runs over," and the word *revaya* has that numerical value.

NOTES

On the tenth, and: But on the tenth – וּבַעֲשׂוֹר וְאֵךְ – וּבַעֲשׂוֹר בְּעֵשׂוֹר. Tosafot ask why the verses are not cited in order of appearance. Some commentaries suggest that the lack of sequence indicates that this is not a true interpretation of verses but merely an asmakhta, a scriptural support (Derekh HaMelekh).

Five and six afflictions – חֲמִשָּׁה וְשֵׁשׁ עֲנּוּיִן: It seems in the Jerusalem Talmud that bathing is not included as one of the five afflictions because it is not prohibited in every circumstance. For example, it is permitted to cross a river to fulfill a mitzva or to immerse in a ritual bath for the sake of a mitzva, as is discussed later in this tractate (Yoma 88a).

LANGUAGE

Anigrion – אַנִּיגְרוֹן: From the Greek word οἰνόγαρον, oynogaron, meaning wine mixed with oil.

Akhsigrion – אַחְסִיגְרוֹן: From the Greek word ὄξυγαρον, oxugaron, which is a sauce made from vinegar, fish, and other foods.

HALAKHA

Intoxicated in the Temple – שִׁיבוֹר בְּבֵית הַמִּקְדָּשׁ: A priest who is intoxicated is not permitted to enter the Temple for service, even if his intoxication stems from substances other than wine, e.g., other drinks, sweet dried figs, or milk. If he does serve, he is punished with lashes, although his service is valid nevertheless. However, one who is drunk on wine is liable to receive death at the hand of Heaven, and his service is invalid (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Biat HaMikdash 1:2).

הָא לֹא דְמִיָּא. הָתֵם – בְּאַרְבַּעִין יוֹמִין, הֵכָא – חֲדָא שְׁעָתָא, הָתֵם לְכוּלֵי עֲלִמָּא, הֵכָא – לְיִשְׂרָאֵל לְחוּדֵיהּ, וְנִפְיֵשׁ לְהוּ טְפִי רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר הַמּוֹדְעֵי פְתִיחָה פְתִיחָה גַּמְר.

”אָסוֹר בְּאֵכִילָה.” הֲנִי חֲמִשָּׁה עֲנּוּיִן בְּנֶגֶד מִי? אָמַר רַב חֲסִדָּא: בְּנֶגֶד חֲמִשָּׁה עֲנּוּיִן שְׁבִתוֹרָה וּבְעֵשׂוֹר – ”וְאֵךְ בְּעֵשׂוֹר” שְׁבִת שְׁבִתוֹן” וְשְׁבִת שְׁבִתוֹן” וְהִיתָה לָכֶם.

הֲנִי חֲמִשָּׁה הוּוּ? וְאַנְּן שִׁיתָא תַּנְּן! שְׁתִּיָּה בְּכֻלָּא אֵכִילָהּ הִיא. דְּאָמַר רִישׁ לְקִישׁ: מִנֵּין לְשְׁתִּיָּה שְׁהִיא בְּכֻלָּא אֵכִילָה – שְׁנֵאמַר: ”וְאֵכִילְתָּ לִפְנֵי ה’ אֱלֹהֶיךָ מֵעֵשֶׂר דְּנֶגֶד תִּירוּשָׁן וְיִצְהַרְךָ”, תִּירוּשׁ חֲמָרָא הוּא וְקָרִי לִיהּ ”וְאֵכִילְתָּ”.

מִמַּאי? וְדִילְמָא דְּאֵכִילָהּ עַל יְדֵי אַנִּיגְרוֹן? דְּאָמַר רַבָּה בַר שְׁמוּאֵל: אַנִּיגְרוֹן – מִיָּא דְּסִילְקָא, אַכְסִיגְרוֹן – מִיָּא דְּכוּלֵּיהּוּ שְׁלֵקִי!

אָלָא אָמַר רַב אַחָא בַר יַעֲקֹב: מֵהֵכָא: ”וְנָתַתָּה הַכֶּסֶף בְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר תֹּאמֶר נִמְשָׁךְ בְּבִקְרָה וּבִצְאֹן בֵּינִי וּבִשְׂכָר” שְׂכָר שְׁתִּיָּה הוּא, וְקָרִיָּיהּ רַחֲמֵנָא ”וְאֵכִילְתָּ”.

מִמַּאי? וְדִילְמָא הֵכָא נִמִּי דְּאֵכִילָהּ עַל יְדֵי אַנִּיגְרוֹן? שְׂכָר כְּתֹב, מִיָּדֵי דְּמִשְׁכַּר. וְדִילְמָא דְּבִילָהּ קַעֲוִילִית? דְּתַנְּנָא: אֵכִיל דְּבִילָהּ קַעֲוִילִית וְשְׁתִּיָּה דְּבִשׁ וְחֵלֶב וְנִכְנֵס לְמִקְדָּשׁ

The Gemara asks how Rabbi Elazar HaModa'i can compare the depth of the Flood waters with the amount of manna that fell in the desert: **This is not similar**, and the calculation is inaccurate. **There**, in the case of the Flood, the water rose fifteen cubits in **forty days**; but **here**, in the case of the manna, it took only **one hour** every day to fall. Conversely, **there** the Flood was **for everyone** and covered the whole world; whereas **here** the manna was **for the Jewish people alone**. **And there** would be **much more** manna **for them** than sixty cubits, which is the measurement put forth by Rabbi Elazar HaModa'i. The Gemara answers: **Rabbi Elazar HaModa'i derived “opening”** in the verse: “He commanded the skies above, and opened the doors of heaven” (Psalms 78:23), from **“opening”** in the verse: “And the windows of heaven were opened” (Genesis 7:11). He used a verbal analogy that teaches that the skies opened in both instances in the same way.

§ The mishna taught that as per the five prohibited activities on Yom Kippur it is **prohibited** to engage in **eating** and in drinking, and in bathing, and in smearing the body with oil, and in wearing shoes, and in conjugal relations. The Gemara asks: **These five afflictions** of Yom Kippur, to **what** do they **correspond**? Where is the Torah source or allusion to them? Rav H̄isda said: They are based on the **five times** that the afflictions of Yom Kippur are mentioned in the Torah. It is stated: (1) **“And on the tenth** of this seventh month you shall have a holy convocation, and you shall afflict your souls” (Numbers 29:7); (2) **“But on the tenthⁿ** of this seventh month is the day of atonement, it shall be a holy convocation for you and you shall afflict your souls” (Leviticus 23:27); (3) **“It shall be for you a Shabbat of solemn rest**, and you shall afflict your souls (Leviticus 23:32); (4) **“It is a Shabbat of solemn rest [shabbaton]** for you, and you shall afflict your souls” (Leviticus 16:31); (5) **“And it shall be a statute for you forever**, in the seventh month on the tenth of the month, you shall afflict your souls” (Leviticus 16:29).

The Gemara asks: **Are these five** the only afflictions? **We learn** in the mishna that there are **six**:ⁿ Eating, drinking, bathing, smearing oil, conjugal relations, and wearing shoes. The Gemara answers: **Drinking is included** in the prohibition of **eating**; both together are considered a single affliction. As Reish Lakish said: **From where do we derive that drinking is included** in the concept of eating? As it is stated: **“And you shall eat before the Lord your God**, in the place where He shall choose to cause His name to dwell there, **the tithe of your grain, of your wine [tiroshi], and of your oil”** (Deuteronomy 14:23). **Tiroshi is wine**, yet the verse **calls** the drinking of wine eating with the phrase **“and you shall eat,”** meaning that eating also refers to drinking.

The Gemara rejects this answer: **From where** do you draw this conclusion? **Perhaps** the wine **was eaten as anigrion**,^l a sauce made of oil, beet juice, and garum mixed with wine. As Rabba bar Shmuel said: **Anigrion is beet juice** and wine mixed together. **Akhsigrionⁿ** is **water that comes from boiled vegetables** that have wine mixed into them. The vegetables are mixed with the wine and eaten. It is possible for wine to literally be eaten. Therefore, the verse does not prove that drinking is included in eating.

Rather, Rav Aha bar Ya'akov said: **From here** there is a proof as the verse states: **“And you shall spend that money on all that your soul desires, on oxen, or on sheep, or on wine, or on strong drink [sheikhar]** or whatever your soul desires, and you shall eat” (Deuteronomy 14:26). **Strong drink is a drink, but the Merciful One** calls its consumption eating, in the phrase **“and you shall eat.”**

The Gemara rejects this proof: **From where** do you draw this conclusion? **Perhaps here too it was eaten as anigrion?** The Gemara rejects this: Here that answer is insufficient because the verse **writes “strong drink [sheikhar],”** meaning **something that intoxicates**. Beverages that generally intoxicate do not do so when they are in a mixture. The Gemara asks: **Perhaps sheikhar** does not refer to wine but to a food that causes intoxication, such as a **sweet dried fig from Keilah**. **As it was taught** in a *baraita*: A priest who ate a sweet dried fig from Keilah or drank honey or milk, thereby becoming intoxicated, and entered the Temple to serve^h

(תיב) is liable for violating the prohibition: “Drink no wine nor strong drink [*sheikhar*]” (Leviticus 10:9). Consequently, the term *sheikhar* in the text can be understood here as the sweet dried fig.

אֵלֶּא יִלְיֵי שְׂכָר שְׂכָר מְנֹרֵי, מֵה לְהֵלֵן
יִין – אֵף כָּאֵן יִין.

Rather, the Gemara rejects this and states: **It is derived** through a verbal analogy of “*sheikhar*” and “*sheikhar*” stated in the verses of the nazirite (Numbers 6:3). **Just as there**, in the case of the nazirite, *sheikhar* means strong wine, so too, here, it means strong wine and not sweet dried figs.

וְתִירוֹשׁ חֲמָרָא הוּא? וְהִתְנַיָּא: הַנּוֹדֵר מִן
הַתִּירוֹשׁ – אָסוּר בְּכֹל מִיַּיִן מִתִּיקָה, וּמוֹתֵר
בִּיַּיִן! וְלֹא חֲמָרָא הוּא? וְהִתְנַיָּב: “וְתִירוֹשׁ
יִנּוּבֵב בְּתוֹלוֹת!” דְּבָר הַבָּא מִן הַתִּירוֹשׁ
יִנּוּבֵב בְּתוֹלוֹת.

The Gemara returns to the meaning of the word *tirosh*: **Is *tirosh*^N wine? Isn't it taught in a *baraita*: One who vows not to benefit from *tirosh*^H is not allowed sweet foods, e.g., sweet fruits, but is allowed wine.** Therefore, *tirosh* is not wine but sweet food. The Gemara rejects this: **And is *tirosh* not wine? But isn't it written: “*Tirosh* shall make the young women flourish [*yenovev*]” (Zechariah 9:17).** The word *yenovev* comes from the word *niv*, speech. Consequently, *tirosh* is a food that tempts the heart and mouth of the drinker, even of virgins, who are modest and reticent. Since sweet foods do not have this effect, *tirosh* must be wine. The Gemara replies: This is not a proof, since we could explain it otherwise: **Something that comes from *tirosh***, such as wine, **causes virgins to come forth**; *tirosh* itself means sweet grapes. Perhaps wine is called *tirosh* only by extension because it is made from *tirosh*.

וְהִתְנַיָּב: “וְתִירוֹשׁ יִקְבֵּיךָ יִפְרוּצוּ” – דְּבָר
הַבָּא: מִן הַתִּירוֹשׁ יִקְבֵּיךָ יִפְרוּצוּ.

The Gemara challenges this: **But isn't it written: “And your vats shall overflow with *tirosh*” (Proverbs 3:10).** This description implies that *tirosh* is wine rather than sweet grapes. The Gemara answers: This too is not a proof that *tirosh* means wine. We could say that **the vats shall burst with something that comes from *tirosh***, i.e., wine; yet *tirosh* itself means sweet fruits.

וְהָא כְּתִיב: “זִנוּת וַיִּזֶן וְתִירוֹשׁ יִקַּח לֵב!”
אֵלֶּא, דְּכֹלֵי עֲלֵמָא תִירוֹשׁ חֲמָרָא הוּא,
וּבְנֵדְרִים הֵלֵךְ אַחֵר לְשׁוֹן בְּנֵי אָדָם.

The Gemara objects: **But it is written: “Harlotry, and wine, and *tirosh*^N take away the heart” (Hosea 4:11).** Since *tirosh* leads the heart astray, it is clear that it is wine. Therefore, the Gemara accepts that *tirosh* means wine. **Rather, according to everyone**, the word *tirosh* in the Bible refers to wine, but vows follow colloquial language.^H During the time of the Mishna, *tirosh* meant sweet fruits; the term included grapes but not wine. When dealing with vows, the intention of the speaker is what must be determined, but no inference can be drawn from colloquial language to the biblical definition of the word.

וְאִמַּאי קָרִי לִיָּה יִין וְאִמַּאי קָרִי לִיָּה
תִירוֹשׁ? יִין – שְׂמִיבִיא יִלְלָה לְעוֹלָם,
תִירוֹשׁ – שְׂבֵל הַמִּתְגַּדָּה בּו נַעֲשֶׂה רָשׁ.

The Gemara asks: **And if so, why does the Bible call it wine and why does it call it *tirosh*?** The Gemara explains: “**Wine**” suggests that **it brings lament^N to the world** because drunkenness causes most sins. There is a phonetic resemblance between the *yayin*, wine, and *ta'aniya va'aniya*, sorrow and howling, which Rashi (on Job 2:5) explains as lament. “***Tirosh***” shows that **those who indulge in it become poor [*rash*]**.

רַב כְּהֵנָא רָמִי: כְּתִיב תִירוֹשׁ וְקָרִינַן תִירוֹשׁ,
זְכָה – נַעֲשֶׂה רָשׁ, לֹא זְכָה – נַעֲשֶׂה רָשׁ.
(וְהִינּוּ דְרָבָא, דְרָבָא) רָמִי: כְּתִיב יִשְׂמַח
וְקָרִינַן יִשְׂמַח, זְכָה – מִשְׂמַחוּ, לֹא זְכָה –
מִשְׂמָמוּ. וְהִינּוּ דְאָמַר רָבָא: חֲמָרָא וְרִיחָנִי
פְּקַחִין.

Rav Kahana raised a contradiction: **It is written as *tirash* but we read it *tirosh*.** This should be understood as follows: If one merits and drinks appropriately, **he is made a head [*rosh*]**; if one does not merit and does not drink appropriately, **he is made poor [*rash*]**. The Gemara comments: **This is the same as what Rava said, as Rava raised a contradiction: It is written: “And wine that makes glad [*yishamah*] the heart of man” (Psalms 104:15) with a *shin*, but we read it *yisamah*^N with a *sin*.** This teaches: **If one merits, wine makes him happy [*same'ah*]**; if one does not merit, it makes him confounded [*shamem*]. **This is the same as what Rava said: Wine and good scents make me wise**, meaning that wine benefits one who deserves it.

NOTES

Tirosh – תִירוֹשׁ: *Tirosh* and wine are not synonymous. Rather, grape juice is called *tirosh* from the point it leaves the winery until it finishes fermenting, which is approximately forty days later. The discussion in the Gemara is whether the term *tirosh* is referring to grapes and other fruit or just to wine that has not yet finished fermenting.

Wine and *tirosh* – יַיִן וְתִירוֹשׁ: Since these are listed together, it is difficult to say that the word *tirosh* means something that comes from *tirosh*. Rather, it is clear that *tirosh* here is referring to actual wine (Rid). The distinction between wine and *tirosh* is as follows: Wine is referring to the stage after fermentation; *tirosh* is referring to wine that is still fermenting (see *Siah Yitzhak*).

It brings lament – שְׂמִיבִיא יִלְלָה: One opinion explains that wine brings lament since somebody who is often drunk becomes impoverished (Rabbi Elyakim).

Yishamah, yisamah – יִשְׂמַח, יִשְׂמָח – According to the standard text of the Gemara, the analysis here distinguishes between whether the word is read with a *shin* or a *sin*. In other manuscripts, the focus is on whether the word ends with the letter *het* or *heh*: Should it be read as *yishmah* or as *yishma*, the latter from the word *shemama*, meaning desolation.

HALAKHA

One who vows not to benefit from *tirosh* – הַנּוֹדֵר מִן הַתִּירוֹשׁ: One who vows not to drink *tirosh* is not allowed to drink wine, but may drink sweet beverages, since *tirosh* refers only to wine, based on the biblical meaning of the word. Although at the time of the Gemara the word *tirosh* referred to sweet fruits and did not include wine, over the generations, the meaning of the word *tirosh* changed back again. Nowadays, it is synonymous with wine (*Taz, Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a 217:16*).

Vows follow colloquial language – בְּנֵדְרִים הֵלֵךְ אַחֵר לְשׁוֹן: Terms appearing in one's vow are understood according to their local and current usage, in accordance with the ruling of the Gemara (*Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a 217:1*).

BACKGROUND

Jaazaniah son of Shaphan – יַאֲזַנְיָהוּ בֶן שָׁפָן: The Shaphan family was an influential Judean family in the last generations of the First Temple period. Shaphan himself was a scribe of King Josiah and of Jeremiah. His grandson Gedaliah governed Judea after the destruction of the First Temple. It is not certain that the Jaazaniah mentioned in the Gemara was related to the same Shaphan. However, some scholars surmise that he was the son of Shaphan and consequently the brother of Gemariah. The image below depicts a bulla found in the City of David bearing the inscription *leGemaryahu ben Shaphan*: For Gemariah, son of Shaphan.



Bulla found in the City of David

רְחִיצָה וְסִיכָה מִנָּא לֵן דְּאִיקְרִי עֵינוּ?
דְּכֵתִיב: "לֶחֶם חֲמוּדוֹת לֹא אֶכְלְתִי וּבִשָּׁר
וַיֵּין לֹא בָא אֵלַי פִּי וְסוּדָךְ לֹא סִכְתִּי." מֵאֵי
"לֶחֶם חֲמוּדוֹת לֹא אֶכְלְתִי"? אָמַר רַב
יְהוּדָה בְּרִיה דְּרַב שְׁמוּאֵל בַּר שֵׁילַת:
אֶפְלוּ נִהְמָא דְחִטִּי דְכֵיִתָּא לָא אֶכַּל.

וּמִנָּא לֵן דְּחָשִׁיב בְּעֵינוּ – דְּכֵתִיב: "וַיֹּאמֶר
אֵלַי אֱלֹהֵי תִירָא דְנִיֵּאל כִּי מִן הַיּוֹם הָרִאשׁוֹן
אֲשֶׁר נָתַתְּ אֶת לִבְךָ לְהִבִּין וּלְהִתְעַנּוֹת
לִפְנֵי אֱלֹהֶיךָ נִשְׁמַעוּ דְבָרֶיךָ וְאָנִי בָאתִי
בְּדָבְרֶיךָ" ("כִּי חֲמוּדוֹת אָתָּה").

אֲשַׁכְּחֵן סִיכָה, רְחִיצָה מִנָּא לֵן? אָמַר רַב
זוּטְרָא בְּרַבִּי טוֹבִיָּה: אָמַר קָרָא: "וַתְּבֹא
כַּמִּים בְּקִרְבוֹ וְכִשְׁמֹן בְּעֲצְמוֹתָיו."
וַאיֵמָא כְּשִׁתְּיָה? דּוּמְיָא דְשִׁמּוֹן, מַה שִׁמּוֹן
מֵאֶבְרָא – אִף מִים מֵאֶבְרָא.

וְהָא תִנָּא אֵיפְכָא קָא נָסִיב לֵה, דְתַנּוּ: מִיָּן
לְסִיכָה שְׁהִיא כְּשִׁתְּיָה בְיוֹם הַכַּפּוּרִים?
אִף עַל פִּי שְׁאִין רְאִיָּה לְדָבָר – זְכַר לְדָבָר,
שְׁנַאֲמַר "וַתְּבֹא כַּמִּים בְּקִרְבוֹ וְכִשְׁמֹן
בְּעֲצְמוֹתָיו"! אֵלָּא אָמַר רַב אֲשִׁי: רְחִיצָה
מִגּוֹפִיָּה דְקָרָא שְׁמִיעַ לֵיה, דְּכֵתִיב: "וְסוּדָךְ
לֹא סִכְתִּי."

מֵאֵי "וְאָנִי בָאתִי בְּדָבְרֶיךָ"? הֵינּוּ דְכֵתִיב:
"וְשִׁבְעִים אִישׁ מִזְקֵנֵי [בֵּית] יִשְׂרָאֵל
וַיֹּאזְנִיחוּ בֶן שָׁפָן עוֹמֵד בְּתוֹכָם עוֹמְדִים
לְפָנֵיהֶם וְאִישׁ מִקְטֹרֶתוֹ בְּיָדוֹ וְעֵתֵר עֲנַן
הַקְטֹרֶת עָלָה וַיִּשְׁלַח תַּבְּנִית יָד וַיִּקְחֵנִי
בְּצִיצֵת רֹאשִׁי וַתִּשָּׂא אוֹתִי רוּחַ בֵּין הָאָרֶץ
וּבֵין הַשָּׁמַיִם וַתְּבֹא אוֹתִי יְרוּשָׁלַיִם
בְּמַרְאוֹת אֱלֹהִים אֶל פֶּתַח שַׁעַר הַפְּנִמִּית
הַפּוֹנֶה צְפוֹנָה אֲשֶׁר

The Gemara asks: From where do we derive that abstaining from bathing and smearing oil on oneself is called affliction? The Gemara answers: As it is written "I ate no pleasant bread, neither did meat nor wine enter my mouth, neither did I anoint myself at all" (Daniel 10:3). The Gemara explains the verse: What is the meaning of "I ate no pleasant bread"?^N Rav Yehuda, son of Rav Shmuel bar Sheilat, said: He did not eat even bread made from refined wheat; he ate only wheat mixed with bran.

The Gemara continues to show that abstaining from smearing oil on oneself is considered an affliction: And from where do we derive that abstaining from the activities that Daniel describes is considered affliction? As it is written: "Then he said to me: Fear not, Daniel, for from the first day that you set your heart to understand and to afflict yourself before your God, your words were heard, and I have come due to your words" (Daniel 10:12). "For you are greatly loved" (Daniel 9:23).

We have found proof that abstaining from smearing oil on oneself is considered affliction; from where do we derive that abstaining from bathing is also called affliction? Rav Zutra, son of Rabbi Toviya, said: The verse states: "And it came into his innards like water, and like oil into his bones" (Psalms 109:18). This means that the water with which one bathes and the oil with which one smears himself are absorbed into the body. Just as abstaining from smearing oil is considered an affliction, so too, abstaining from bathing is considered an affliction. The Gemara objects: But say that "came into his innards like water" is referring to drinking rather than smearing oil. The Gemara rejects this: It is similar to oil. Just as the oil described in the verse is smeared from outside the body and not drunk, so too, the water mentioned in the verse is used for bathing from the outside. It is not drunk.

The Gemara asks: But the *tanna* took the opposite meaning, as we learned in a mishna: From where do we derive that smearing oil is like drinking on Yom Kippur? Although there is no explicit proof of the matter from the Bible, there is an allusion to the matter^N from the verse, as it is stated: "And it came into his innards like water, and like oil into his bones" (Psalms 109:18), meaning that oil on the body is like water within it. Therefore, the phrase "and it came into his innards like water" is referring to the act of drinking water. Rather, Rav Ashi said: Bathing is derived from the same verse cited above, as it is written: "Neither did I anoint myself at all" (Daniel 10:3). This teaches that Daniel did not do any anointing, including bathing. Consequently, the same source prohibits both of these activities.

Apropos the verses from Daniel, the Gemara asks: What did the angel mean when he said to Daniel: "And I have come due to your words" (Daniel 10:12)? From this, it seems that the angel was able to come only because of Daniel. The Gemara answers: This is as it is written: "And there stood before them seventy men of the Elders of the house of Israel, and Jaazaniah, son of Shaphan,^B standing in the midst of them, each man with his censer in his hand, and a thick cloud of incense went up" (Ezekiel 8:11). Ezekiel saw the Elders of the house of Israel worshipping foreign gods. "And the form of a hand was put forth, and I was taken by a lock of my head; and a spirit lifted me up between the earth and the heaven, and brought me in the visions of God to Jerusalem, to the door of the gate of the inner court that faces northward where

NOTES

מֵאֵי לָחֶם – What is the meaning of...pleasant [*hamudot*] bread – חֲמוּדוֹת: The *Ba'al Halakhot Gedolot* links *hamudot* with the word *hom*, meaning hot. He similarly explains the phrase: The innards were burned [*nehmedu*], in *Hullin* 56a. Some explain why this verse is cited here, with a possible suggestion that it is an attempt to explain the meaning of the word *hamudot*. Since it might have been understood that not eating pleasant bread is an actual affliction, the Gemara explains that although regular bread is not as tasty, eating it is not considered an affliction (see Rabbi Yoshiya Pinto).

Allusion to the matter – זְכַר לְדָבָר: The medieval commentators asked

why this proof is considered merely an allusion. One suggestion is that the argument cannot serve as a solid proof, since the *amora'im* explained the verse in the opposite way (*Tosafot Yeshanim*). Another explanation is that the verse is using bathing and anointing as a metaphor. The previous verse states: "He loved cursing, and it came into him; and he did not delight in blessing and it is far from him. He clothed himself also with cursing as with his garments, and it came into his innards like water, and like oil into his bones" (Psalms 109:17–18). An actual proof cannot be derived from a passage that is metaphorical (Ritva).