

**Nedarim 8a****Making a Shevuah to Fulfill a Mitzvah**

The daf starts with another statement from Rav Gidel in the name of Rav.

How do we know	מִיָּנִי
that we (can) make a shevuah (i.e. swear)	שְׁנִשְׁבַּעְיִן
to fulfill a mitzvah	לְקַיִם אֶת הַמִּצְוָה
(Tehillim	שְׁנִאָמַר 119:106
as it says	
”I swore and I will fulfill	נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי וְאֶקְיְמָהּ
to keep your righteous laws”	לְשֹׁמֵר מִשְׁפָּטֵי צְדָקָה

The Ran explains that the Gemara understands that Rav Gidel was trying to say that the shevuah that a person makes to do a mitzvah is the same as any other shevuah that he makes (i.e., and if the person will break this shevuah, he will have to bring a korban chatas).

And on this the Gemara asks that:

But he is sworn and ‘standing’	וְהֵלֵא מוֹשְׁבֵעַ וְעוֹמֵד
from Har Sinai	מִהַר סִינַי הוּא

The Gemara in meseches Shevuos (27a) tells us that since a person is already obligated to do a mitzvah (as the entire Klal Yisroel stood by Har Sinai and accepted the Torah), if he makes a shevuah to do a mitzvah, he will not have to bring a korban if he violates this shevuah (see footnote). That is, since he already made a shevuah at Har Sinai, the shevuah that he now makes cannot be chal as a complete shevuah. If so, how could Rav Gidel say that he will be chayiv in a korban chatas if he violates this shevuah that was made to fulfill a mitzvah?

**<sup>46</sup> What is and What is Not the Chiddush of Rav Gidel According to the Ran?**

The way the Ran understands the Gemara there are only two possibilities to explain the chiddush of Rav Gidel. Either he is coming to tell us that one who violates this shevuah is chayiv a korban, or the chiddush is that it is a proper thing to make this type of shevuah despite the fact that normally we try to stay away from making shevuos.

But why does the Gemara not simply hold that the chiddush of Rav Gidel is that the shevuah is ‘chal’ at all? That is, the chiddush could be, that despite the fact that the shevuah is not ‘chal’ with regard to bringing a korban it is ‘chal’ with regard to malkus.

The Ran answers that this could not be the chiddush of Rav Gidel because if it was, why did he not say so. That is, Rav Gidel should have said that despite the fact that a shevuah on a mitzvah does not obligate one in a korban, he will get malkus if he violates it? Why does he need to quote the posuk in Tehillim?

The Ran explains that initially the Gemara thought to say that the chiddush of Rav Gidel is that the shevuah is a complete shevuah, and the proof is from the posuk, as we see in the posuk that the shevuah is chal.

And the Gemara then says that the chiddush of Rav Gidel is not to say that this shevuah is a complete shevuah even with regard to bringing a korban but rather the chiddush is that it is a proper thing to make this type of shevuos, as this is seen from the fact that Dovid Hamelech made such a type of shevuah.

The Gemara answers:

Rather	אַלֵּא
this comes to teach us	הָא קָא מְשַׁמַּע לָן
that it is permitted for people (to make this type	דְּשָׂרִי לִיה לְאִינִישׁ
of shevuah)	לְרוּזֵי נַפְשֵׁיהּ
to ‘encourage’ himself	

The Ran explains that the Gemara always understood that a shevuah on a mitzvah is ‘chal’ (and if the person transgresses this shevuah, he will receive malkus). The change of the Gemara is that initially the Gemara thought that the chiddush of Rav Gidel was to say that the shevuah is chal even with regard to bringing a korban, and now the Gemara is saying that the chiddush is with regard to this that it is a good thing to make this type of shevuah (and even in the Gemara’s answer, the shevuah is chal).

That is, although typically the righteous people would not make shevuos (as it is better to avoid making shevuos), if the reason that he is making a shevuah is in order to be מְרַר himself, then it is considered a good thing.

As to why the chiddush of R' Gidel can't be simply that the shevuah is ‘chal’ in the first place, see footnote. Also see footnote regarding the shitos that holds that this shevuah is indeed not ‘chal’ at all.<sup>46</sup>

The Gemara continues:

And Rav Gidel said	וְאָמַר רַב גִּידֵל
that Rav said	אָמַר רַב
one who says	הָאוֹמֵר
“I will get up and learn	אֶשְׁכֵּם וְאֶשְׁנָה
this perek” <sup>47</sup>	פָּרָק זֶה

**The Shita of the Rosh in the Understanding of the Gemara**

The Rosh explains the Gemara differently than the Ran. He explains that at first the Gemara thought that the chiddush of Rav Gidel was to say that one is allowed to make shevuah on a mitzvah and we don't say that it is assur to do so as he is running the risk of violating it.

And on this the Gemara asks that how we can say that the shevuah is ‘chal’ if the Gemara tells us that since Klal Yisroel already accepted all the mitzvohs at Har Sinai, one cannot make a shevuah on a mitzvah.

To which the Gemara answers that this is true, that this shevuah will not be ‘chal’ at all (i.e., not like the shita of the Ran), but a person is allowed to make it anyway. That is, the fact that the shevuah is not ‘chal’ does not make it as if he said Hashem's name in vain, as the reason why he said Hashem's name was for a constructive purpose (he is using Hashem's name to make this shevuah in order to encourage him to do the mitzvohs).

**<sup>47</sup> A Person's Obligation to Learn**

The Ran points out that although the Gemara says that a person can be yotzie his chiyuv to learn by saying Shema during Shacharis and Maariv, what he adds to this is considered something that he is not obligated in and that is why the shevuah is ‘chal’.

”I will learn this meshecta”  
 he has made a great neder  
 to the G-d of Yisroel

אֶשְׁנֶה מִסְּחֶתָּא זֶה  
 נְדָר גְּדוֹל נְדָר<sup>48</sup>  
 לֵאלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל

But on this the Gemara asks as it did before:

But he is sworn and ‘standing’  
 and a shevuah is not ‘chal’  
 on a shevuah’  
 (and if you are going to say) what  
 is it coming to teach us  
 that even for  
 just motivation (one can make this shevuah)  
 (but) this is  
 the first (statement) of R’ Gidel

וְהִלָּא מוֹשְׁבֵעַ וְעוֹמֵד הוּא  
 וְאִינוּ שְׂבוּעָה חֲלָה  
 עַל שְׂבוּעָה  
 מֵאֵי  
 קָא מְשַׁמַּע לֵן  
 דְּאִפִּילוּ  
 זְרוּזֵי בְעֻלְמָא  
 הֵינּוּ  
 דְּרַב גִּידֵל קְמִיתָּא

Rav Gidel already taught us that one can make a shevuah to motivated himself to do a mitzvah. If is, why would he have to repeat this idea and say that it is good to make a shevuah to learn?

The Gemara answers:

This comes to teach us  
 (that) since  
 if he would want  
 to patur (exempt) himself  
 with Krias Shema  
 (of) Shacharis and Maariv  
 because of this  
 the shevuah is ‘chal’ on it

הָא קָא מְשַׁמַּע לֵן  
 כִּיֵּן  
 דְּאֵי בְּעֵי  
 פְטוּר נִפְשֵׁיהּ  
 בְּקִרְיַת שְׁמַע  
 שְׁחָרִית וְעֶרְבִית  
 מִשּׁוּם הַכִּי  
 חֵייל שְׂבוּעָה עָלֶיהָ

That Gemara had asked that since a person is obligated to learn, how can a person make a shevuah to finish a meshecta? This person is already obligated to learn, and if so, this new shevuah should not be ‘chal’.

To which the Gemara answers that while it is true that a person is obligated to learn, he can fulfill this chiyuv by just saying Shema twice a day. Therefore, if this person goes ahead a makes a shevuah, he is adding to that which he is already obligated in, and as such, this is why the shevuah is ‘chal’.

But the Ran says that this cannot be the minimum amount of learning that one needs to do. The Gemara in meseches Kiddushin tells us that a person has to know his learning so well, to the point that he can answer questions on his learning with the same clarity that he can answer if a person is mutur to marry his sister or not. To achieve this level of learning obviously takes a tremendous amount of time, and if so, how can the Gemara say that you can by yotzie your chiyuv with just saying Krias Shema?

The Ran answers, that the intent of the Gemara is to just say that this is the minimum amount of learning that is written explicitly in the Torah. And although with regard to bringing a korban, a person cannot make a shevuah on a mitzvah, this only refers to a mitzvah that is written explicitly in the Torah. Therefore, if a

Once again, the Ran points out that when the Gemara refers to the shevuah being ‘chal’ or not, this is not referring to the shevuah being ‘chal’ at all, but rather it refers to whether the shevuah will be ‘chal’ completely with regard to even bringing a korban if the person violates it. The Gemara was asking that since Rav Gidel says that this is a ‘Great Neder’ this implies that it is ‘chal’ completely, even with regard to bring a korban. And on this the Gemara asks how this could be true if the person is already obligated to learn.

To which the Gemara answers that since one can be yotzie his chiyuv to learn with saying Shema during Shacharis and Maariv, the shevuah that he makes on the ‘added learning’ is ‘chal’ completely, even with regard to bringing a korban.

**The Halachos of One Who Suggests to His Friend that They Get Up Early to Learn**

Rav Gidel said	אָמַר רַב גִּידֵל
that Rav said	אָמַר רַב
one who says to his friend	הָאוֹמֵר לְחֵבֵירוֹ
let us get up and learn	נִשְׁכֵּם וְנִשְׁנֶה
this perek	פָּרָק זֶה
(there is a chiyuv) upon him	עָלָיו
to get up (first)	לְהִשְׁכֵּם
as it says (Yechezkel 3:22-23)	שְׁנֹאֲמַר
“And He said to me	וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלַי
get up and go out	(בֵּן אָדָם) קוּם צֵא
to the valley	אֶל הַבְּקָעָה
and there I will talk to you	וְשָׁם אֲדַבֵּר אִתְּךָ
And I went out to the valley	וָאֵצֶא אֶל הַבְּקָעָה
and behold	וְהִנֵּה
there	שָׁם
the honor of Hashem was standing”	כְּבוֹד ה' עֹמֵד

person makes a shevuah to learn less than the amount that is explicit in the Torah, it will be ‘chal’.

**48 How Can One Make a Neder to do an Action?**

The Ran points out that although the Gemara calls this a great neder, in reality what this person did was to make a shevuah and not a neder. The Ran explains that this has to be the case as a neder is always with regard to forbidding an object and never about obligating yourself to do an action. The Ran explains that this is a common practice to call a shevuah with the term neder.

In these pesukim, Yechezkel describes his meeting with Hashem. Yechezkel relates how Hashem told him to go out to the valley and Hashem would meet him there. And when Yechezkel went out to the valley, Hashem was already there to greet him.

From this posuk we see what Rav Gidel taught us. That if you are the one who tells your friend that you would like to meet with him, it is on you to be the first one there. And this is what we find in this posuk. That it was Hashem who suggested the meeting and that is why it was Hashem who arrived at the valley first.

matir him, as when there are ten people gathered in one place, the Shechina resides among them.

In the best-case scenario, he should get ten people who have learned Gemara to be the ones that are matir his nidui. And if he cannot find ten people who learn Gemara, then he can rely on ten people who learn Mishnayos to be matir this nidui. And if he cannot find even that, then he should go to the crossroads and greet everyone with the word ‘Shalom’. By doing so, the people who pass by will respond with their greeting of shalom and this will protect him from harm until he is able to find ten people to be matir his nidui.

**The Halachos of One Who Was Put into Nidui While Dreaming**

Reb Yosef said	אמר רב יוסף
if a person was put into nidui	נידוהו
in a dream	בחלום
he needs ten people	צריך עשרה בני אדם
to be matir it for him	להתיר לו
and this referring	והוא
to people who learn	דתנו
halacha (i.e. the Gemara, see the Ran) <sup>49</sup>	הלכתא
but those who learn (Mishnayos)	אבל מתנו
and do not learn (Gemara)	ולא תנו
no (they cannot be matir his nidui)	לא
and if there are not	ואי ליכא
people who learn halacha	דתנו הלכתא
(then) even people who learn (Mishnayos)	אפילו מתנו
but don't learn (Gemara) can be matir the nidui	ולא תנו
and if there aren't (even these people)	ואי ליכא
he should go and sit	ליזיל וליתב
on the crossroads	אפרשת דרכים
and give shalom (i.e. greet)	ויהיב שלמא
to ten people	לבי עשרה
until it chances upon him	עד דמקלעי ליה
ten people who learn halacha	עשרה דגמרי הלכתא

Ravina said to Rav Ashi	אמר ליה רבינא לרב אשי
if he knows	נדע
who put him into nidui	מאן שמתיה
what is the halacha	מהו
regarding this person being matir him	דלישרי ליה

Normally a person that puts a person into nidui has the power to take him out of nidui. What is the halacha in our case? If a man dreams of a particular person putting him into nidui, is that person allowed to be matir him without the need for ten people?

He said (back) to him	אמר ליה
to put him into nidui	לשמותיה
he (this person in the dream) was made into	שויוה
a shliach	שליח
(but) to be matir him	למישרי ליה
he was not made into a shliach	לא שיוה שליח

We previously learned that the reason you need ten people to be matir a nidui that was made during a dream is because we are concerned the nidui was made at the request of Hashem.

Therefore, even if this person had a dream that a particular person put him into nidui, we will need ten people to be matir it. This is because although it was a person who put him into nidui, since this happened during a dream, we are concerned that perhaps that person was the shliach of Hashem.

Although one could have argued and said that if it is really true that this person is the shliach of Hashem, then the same way this person was able to make the nidui, he should be able to take it off as well, the Gemara says not this way.

The Gemara explains that it could be that the person in the dream who made the nidui was only the shliach of Hashem with

<sup>49</sup> The Ran's Girsa in the Gemara

According to our girsa (version) of the Gemara, the Gemara differentiates between a person who learns halacha and one who learns just Mishnayos. This

is the second girsa that the Ran has. In the Ran's first girsa, the Gemara differentiates between those who teach Gemara to others and those that just learn it themselves.

regard to the putting on the nidui but not with regard to taking it off.

Therefore, since it could be that the person who made the nidui was the shliach of Hashem, you would need Hashem (so to speak) to be matir, and as such, we would need a minyan of people to do so.

Rav Acha said  
to Rav Ashi  
(if in the dream) he was put into nidui  
and they were matir him

אָמַר לִיה רַב אַחָא  
לְרַב אֲשִׁי  
שְׁמַתִּיהָ  
וְשָׂרוּ לִיה

in the dream

בְּחֻלְמִיהָ

What (is the halacha)

מֵאֵי

Can we say that the same way he was put in nidui, he was taken out of nidui, and as such, there would be no problem?

The Gemara answers:

They said to him  
the same way it is impossible  
(to have) grain without straw

אָמַר לִיה  
כְּשֵׁם שְׂאִי אֶפְשָׁר  
לְבָר בְּלֹא תִבֵּן

<sup>50</sup> The 'Consolation for One Who Makes Typos

As with any written work, there are bound to be typos in this edition of the Gemara. And although every author would like if there were no mistakes in his

work, many bring this Gemara as a consolation for those who might feel bad at the 'imperfect work'. They say that the same way there is no grain without straw, so too there is no sefer without mistakes!

## Nedarim 8b

So too it is impossible  
for a dream  
not to have meaningless things

כִּדְאִי אֶפְשָׁר

לְחֵלוֹם

בְּלֹא דְבָרִים בְּטָלִים

The Gemara is telling us that just because they were matir him in his dream, this is not a reason to say that he is not still in nidui, as in every dream there are meaningless things. Therefore, we have to be concerned that perhaps what he dreamt with regard to being put into nidui was real, and this that they were matir him was only part of the devorim bataylim (meaningless things) that are included in every dream.

### When and How Can a Husband be a Shliach to be Matir His Wife's Nedarim?

Ravina's wife had a neder<sup>51</sup>  
(so) he (Ravina) came before Rav Ashi  
(and) he said (asked) him  
"A husband  
what is the halacha  
with regard to him becoming  
a shliach  
for the 'regret' of his wife"

רַבִּינָא הָוָה לֵה נִדְרָא לְדַבֵּיתָהּ

אֶתָּא לְקַמֵּיהּ דְּרַב אֲשִׁי

אָמַר לֵיהּ

בַּעַל

מַהוּ

שְׂעִיָּשָׁה

שְׁלִיחַ

לְחֵרֶטֶת אִשְׁתּוֹ

If a person makes a neder and then at a later point he has charatah (regret) that he made the neder, he can go before a Bais Din of three people, explain to them why he has charatah, and ask them to be matir his neder. But about a woman that makes a neder, does she have to go herself to the Bais din, or can her husband go as her shliach?

The Ran in the name of the Rambam says that the Gemara is assuming that normally a person cannot make a shliach and the Gemara is asking that perhaps a wife is different as אִשְׁתּוֹ כְּגוֹפֵר "A wife is body", that is, in many aspects a man and his wife are considered as one, and if so, even though the wife would not be able to make a 'regular' shliach, her husband would be able to go for her.

The Ran then brings Tosefos who explain the Gemara in the opposite manner. The Gemara assumes that a regular person (this women included) could make a shliach and the Gemara is asking that perhaps a husband should be worse. That is, perhaps we should say that since the wife's nedarim affect him, this will lead him to add on to his wife's reasons why she no longer wants the neder, and as such, the Chachamim will end up being matir her nedarim based on inaccurate information.

He said to him  
if they (the three people who form the Bais Din) are  
already gathered

אָמַר לֵיהּ

אִי מְכַנְּפִין

אֵינ

yes (he could be her shliach)

אֵינ

but if not (i.e. they are not yet gathered)

אֵי לֹא

no (he cannot become a shliach)

לֹא

The Ran explains the Gemara as follows. According to the Rambam that the Gemara was asking if the husband is better than a regular shliach, the Gemara says that it depends on if the Bais Din is already gathered or not. If the Bais Din is already there, then we allow the husband to be maykil and to be his wife's shliach. But if there is no Bais Din in place, then he will not be allowed to gather them together.

In other words, this this halacha that a husband is allowed to be his wife's' shliach is only a kula, we only allow the kula if not that much has to be done, i.e., there is no need to now gather the Bais din together. But to extend the kula to allow him to now put the Bais Din together, this is something the Chachamim were not willing to permit.

The Ran continues and explains that according to Tosefos, that explains that the Gemara was asking that perhaps the husband is worse than a regular shliach, the Gemara's answer is as follows. If the Bais Din is already in place and he does not have to go through the trouble of gathering them together, then we are not concerned that the husband will exaggerate the wife's reason to be matir her neder (despite the fact that he suffers from them).

husband can only be mayfer those nedarim that would cause him pain or discomfort).

The second possibility they say is that it could be that he was already מְקַיֵּים the neder. If a husband hears about his wife's neder and is not mayfer it, this is considered as if he 'approved' of it and as such, he would no longer be able to be mafir it. If that was the case, then the only option left in order to revoke the neder would be to go before a Bais Din and to express regret for making the neder.

<sup>51</sup> Why Wasn't Ravina Just Mayfer His Wife's Neder?

The Gemara describes how Ravina wanted to be a shliach to be matir his wife's neder. But seemingly there was another option that he could have done. He could have just been mayfer (uproot) his wife's neder. As we previously learned, a husband/father has the right to be mayfer his wife's/daughter's neder, and if so, why didn't he just do that? Tosefos and the Rosh both answer that it could be that this neder was not one of נִפְשׁ עֵינֵי, a neder that would cause him pain, and as such, he would not have the right to be mayfer it (a

But if he does go through the trouble of getting together a Bais Din, then the desire to make sure he didn't waste his time by getting the Bais Din together, combined with his discomfit from his wife's nedarim will motivate him to make sure the Bais Din is matir her nedarim, i.e., he will exaggerate what she said.<sup>52</sup>

From this psak (Rabbinical ruling) the Gemara says:

We learn three things	שָׁמַע מִיָּנָה תָּלֵת
we see	שָׁמַע מִיָּנָה
a husband can become a shliach	בְּעַל נִעְשָׂה שְׁלִיחַ
for the 'regret' of his wife	לְחֻרְטוֹת אִשְׁתּוֹ
and see	וְשָׁמַע מִיָּנָה
one is not permitted	לֹא שָׂרִי
to be matir a neder	לְמִשְׁרֵי נִדְרָא
in the place of his Rebbe (teacher)	בְּאַתְרָא דְּרַבֵּיהּ
and we see from here	וְשָׁמַע מִיָּנָה
when they are gathered together	כִּי מְכַנְּפִין
it is good (i.e., a husband can be his wife's shliach).	שְׁפִיר דָּמִי

Although the Gemara is discussing gathering together a Bais Din of three people in order to be matir the neder, in reality even a single talmid chacham has the ability to be matir it. But if so, why didn't Ravina just be matir his wife's neder? The Gemara concludes that it must be that although Ravina certainly had the ability to be matir nedarim, he could not do so as he was in the town of Rav Ashi. And as such, from the previous story we learn three things. We learn that husband can be his wife's shliach to be matir her nedarim, but only if the Bais Din is already gathered together, and that a talmid chacham cannot be matir nedarim in the town of his Rebbe.<sup>53</sup>

**Who and How Can Someone Put Someone else in Nidui?**

<sup>52</sup> The Shita of R' Shimshon that Bais Din Can Be Matir a Neder Without the Person's Knowledge

The Ran brought the machlokes between the Rambam and Tosefos if a person can make a shliach to go to Bais Din and to have them be matir his nedarim, the Rambam holds that he cannot and Tosefos hold he could. The Ran brings a third shita of R' Shimshon that holds that a person does not even need to make a shliach to go to Bais Din in order for the Bais Din to have the ability to be matir the neder. That is, even if the person would write his reasons for his charatah on a piece of paper and then sent it to the Bais Din, this would be good enough. This is because Bais Din has the ability to be matir a person's nedarim without his knowledge. That is, as long as the Bais Din knows that the person has charatah, this would be good enough, similar to a husband that is mayfer his wife's nedarim without her knowledge.

<sup>53</sup> Why Could Ravina be Matir His Wife's Nedarim if the Mishna in Meseches Negaim Says the A Husband Can Not Be Matir His Wife's Neder?

The Mishna in meseches Negaim brings the shita of R' Yehuda that a person cannot be matir his wife's nedarim. If so, what is the proof that one

And with regard to Nidui	וְשָׁמַעְתָּ
even in the place of his Rebbe	אֲפִילוּ בְּאַתְרָא דְּרַבֵּיהּ
an individual who is an expert	וְיַחֲיד מוֹמְחָה
	שָׂרִי
can permit nidui	שָׁמַעְתָּ

Even though with regard to nedarim we said that a person cannot be matir someone's nedarim in the place of his Rebbe, with regard to nidui he could.

Tosefos explains that we want to remove nidui from a person as quickly as possible and therefore we always allow the talmid chacham to be matir it (i.e., we can't wait for his Rebbe because perhaps he will be busy or unavailable). With regard to nedarim however there is no such concern as there is no problem if a person remains with his neder for an extra amount of time.

Although the Gemara says that to be matir nidui a Bais Din of three people is not needed and a Talmid Chacham would suffice, the Rishonim point out that this is not to the exclusion of being matir nedarim. With regard to being matir nedarim as well, a single talmid Chachamim would be enough.

**The Power of the Sun to Heal Those Who are Careful Not to Say the Name of Hashem in Vain**

R' Shimon bar Z'vid said	אָמַר רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן בַּר זְבִיד
(that) R' Yitzchok bar Tavla	אָמַר רַבִּי יִצְחָק בַּר טַבְלָא
said	סָאֵד
(that) R' Chiya Aricha said	אָמַר רַבִּי חִיָּא אַרִיכָא
of the Yeshiva of R' Acha	דְּבֵי רַבִּי אַחָא
(that) R' Zayra said	אָמַר רַבִּי זֵירָא
(that) R' Elazar said	אָמַר רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר

cannot be matir nedarim in the place of his Rebbe? Maybe Ravina would have been matir nedarim there despite the fact that his Rebbe lived there, but the reason why he did not do so was because a husband cannot be matir his wife's nedarim.

The Ran answers that although this is true that we hold like the shita of R' Yehuda that one cannot be matir his wife's nedarim, but this is only true if he is being matir them himself. But if he joins up with others, he would be allowed to do so. If so, why did he gather together three other people? Why didn't he just join up with two other people? The Gemara concludes that it must be that one cannot be matir nedarim in the town of his Rebbe.

The Ran continues and says that even if one would want to say that in this case there would be no possibility of Ravina being matir his wife's nedarim (as אַשְׁתּוֹ כּוּפּוֹ). The question was, why didn't Ravina just get three of his talmidim to be matir his wife's nedarim. And the conclusion of the Gemara is that it must be that he didn't do so as one should not be matir nedarim in the location of his Rebbe.



burning like an oven” etc.

בער כתנור וגו

The pesukim there describe how the tzaddikim will not only be healed through the sun, but they will enjoy it as well. And with regard to the reshayim, they will be burned with this very same sun, i.e., the same sun that is used to reward the tzaddikim will be used to punish the reshayim.<sup>56 57</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> **The Complete Pesukim in Sefer Malachi**

To better understand the drashos of the Gemara, we bring the complete pesukim that the Gemara quotes.

יט כי הנה היום בא בער כתנור והיו כל יידיים וכל עשה וישעה קש ולהט אתם היום הבא אמר ה' צבקות אשר לא יעזוב להם שורש ופגף: כ ונרחה לכם יראי שמי שמש צדקה ומרפא בכתפיה ויצאתם ופשתם כעגלי כרובק:

<sup>57</sup> **How Can One Thing Bring Both Reward and Punishment**

The Mefarshim give many different explanations into how the sun will both reward the tzaddikim and punish the reshayim.

The Maharsha (Avodah Zora 3:) explains that the same way heat affects different things differently, for example, salt congeals and wax melts, to too with regard to the tzaddikim and reshayim. The sun will affect them differently; the tzaddikim will be enjoy it and the reshayim will suffer from it. The Maharsha explains that this is the comparison to an oven. The same way the 'main job' of the oven is to benefit mankind, i.e., to bake bread, it can also burn the straw that is in it, so too it will be with Hashem's taking out of the sun. The main objective will be to benefit the tzaddikim, but a side result of Hashem's action will be the punishment of the reshayim.