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 Rava says: “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.

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.

When these words were said before Rabbi Yishmael, he said to them: Do not read it as abirim. Rather, read it as eiwarin, 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 Pera with regard to the effect the manna had on the digestion of other foods.

Alternatively, “Man [ish] did eat the bread of the mighty” (Psalms 78:25); the verse is referring to Joshua, for whom manna fell corresponding to all the rest of the Jewish people, 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.

Furthermore, with regard to the manna: The students of Rabbi Shimon ben Yohai asked him: Why didn’t the manna fall for the Jewish people just once a year* 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.

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.

---

NOTES

Joshua, for whom manna fell corresponding to all the rest of the Jewish people – Joshua, for whom manna fell corresponding to all the rest of the Jewish people. 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 – ס짓: 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 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 (Tosfer Yom Hotripparim).

*It is unclear whether this reference to a king was meant to be literal or metaphorical.
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.

It is told: Rabbi Tarfon, and Rabbi Vishmael, 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: Moda’i, how long will you collect words and bring upon us teachings that have no basis?

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.”

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. 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 78:22–224).

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 verse statements: “He commanded the skies above, and opened the doors of heaven,” and 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.

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’); Abaye said: We learn from this that the cup of David in the next world holds 211 log, since it is stated: “My cup runs over,” and the word revaya has that numerical value.

The attribute of goodness is greater than the attribute of retribution.

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 — דף ח’ פ.’ 383
Some commentators explain 221 log in accordance with the Kabbala (Shiḥ 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).
**Greek Words**

**Anigron** – ἀνίγρων: From the Greek word αἰνίγρων, meaning wine mixed with oil.

**Akhsigron** – αἰχθησιγρῶν: From the Greek word αἰχθησιγρῶν, osugaron, which is a sauce made from vinegar, fish, and other foods.

**NOTES**

On the tenth, and: But on the tenth – Akhsigron

It seems in the Jerusalem Talmud that bathing is not included as one of the five affictions 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**

Intoxicated in the Temple – ἀσωρός ἀκαθάρτως

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 Hilchot Bat HaMikdash 1:2).

**HALAKHA**

The Gemara asks: Are these the only affictions? We learn in the mishna that there are six: Eating, drinking, bathing, smearing oil, anointing, and covering oil. As Rabbi Shmuel said: Anigron is a sauce made of oil, beet juice, and garum mixed with wine. As Rabbi bar Shmuel said: Anigron is meaty wine mixed with meat. Akhsigron 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.

The Gemara rejects this answer: 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 [tiros], and of your oil” (Deuteronomy 14:23). Tiros 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 proof: From where do you draw this conclusion? Perhaps the wine was eaten as anigron, a sauce made of oil, beet juice, and garum mixed with wine. As Rabbi bar Shmuel said: Anigron is meaty wine mixed with meat. Akhsigron 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 Yaakov 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 anigron! 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!...
is liable for violating the prohibition: “Drink no wine nor strong drink [sheikhar]” (Leviticus 10:9). Consequently, the term sheikhar in the text means wine rather than sweet dried figs.

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.

The Gemara returns to the meaning of the word tirosh: Is tirosh wine? Isn’t it taught in a baraita: One who vows not to benefit from tirosh 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 [yenovev]” (Zechariah 9:17). The word yenovev comes from the word shin, 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: If so, 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.

The Gemara challenges this: But isn’t it written: “And your vats shall overflow with tirosh” (Proverbs 3:10). This description implies that wine is tirosh 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 grapes. Perhaps wine is called tirosh only by extension because it is made from tirosh.

The Gemara objects: But it is written: “Harlotry, and wine, and tirosh take away the heart” (Hosea 6:11). 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.4 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.

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 to the world because drunkenness causes most sins. There is a phonetic resemblance between the yavin, wine, and tavaniya tavaniya, sorrow and howling, which Rashī (on Job 21:5) explains as lament. “Tirosh” shows that those who indulge in it become poor [rash].

Rav Kahana raised a contradiction: It is written as tirosh but we read it tirosh. This should be understood as follows: If one merits and drinks appropriately, he is made a head [rash]; 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 [yisamā] the heart of man’ (Psalms 104:15) with a shin, but we read it yisamā with a sin. This teaches: If one merits, wine makes him happy [same’āh]; if one does not merit, it makes him confounded [shame]. This is the same as what Rava said: Wine and good scents make me wise, meaning that wine benefits one who deserves it.

NOTES

1. Rash – שָׂרָשֶׁךָ: 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.

2. Wine and tirosh – שָׂרָשֶׁךָ: 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 Sia Yitzhak).

3. It brings lament – עֹזַב מְדִיבָר יְשַׁמֵּח: One opinion explains that wine brings lament since somebody who is often drunk becomes impoverished (Rabbi Eyakim).

4. Yisamah, yisamah – יִסְמַח, יִסְמַח: 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 tet or hey: Should it be read as yisamah or as yisamah, the latter from the word shamea, meaning desolation.
Judaean after the destruction of the First Temple.

Shaphan himself was a scribe of King Josiah and the Shaphan family was an ins
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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 I 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?” Rav Yehuda, son of Rav Shmuel bar Sheliat, 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, 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 10:11). “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 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, standing in the midst of them, each man with his censer in his hand, and a thick cloud of incense went up” (Ezekiel 8:15). 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

What is the meaning of...pleasant (hamudot) bread – ḥabytes hanumadot: The Bara noted the Gemara 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 – ḥabytes hanumadot: 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 amoraim explained the verse in the opposite way (Yosafat 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).