

BANANA PEELS ON THE SIDEWALK

“לִפְנֵי עֵוֶר לֹא תִתֵּן מִכְשָׁל”

Often times when we read verses in the Chumash, we’re surprised to find much more profound and interesting interpretations provided by the Talmud and the great Jewish commentators throughout the millennia. “*Don’t place a stumbling block before the blind*” is certainly an example of this, for, as the Talmud explains, this verse may not only be simply referring to literally stumbling a blind person, but, rather, to causing another to do something wrong, or even for offering improper advice!

With these expanded definitions of the verse in mind, “*Don’t place a stumbling block before the blind*” takes on a broad range of practical applications to our daily living. It urges us to be cognizant of not only ourselves, but those around us as well with whom we have influence – our co-workers, friends, and family: we have to take caution not to trip others up.

In this study session, we’ll explore the following issues:

- **What are all the various interpretations of the verse “*Don’t place a stumbling block before the blind*”?**
- **Why don’t we read the verse literally??**
- **What does bad advice have to do with stumbling-blocks?**
- **What does “causing another to make a mistake” mean exactly??**

לעיני שמואל משה בן יונה ע"ה
נלביע ו' אדר תשע"ח
ת.נ.צ.ב.ה.

1 – BAD ADVICE AND BANANA PEELS

Source 1. Vayikra 19:14

<p><i>“You shall not curse the deaf, and before the blind you shall not place a stumbling block, and you shall fear your God: I am Hashem”</i></p>	<p>לֹא-תִקְלַל חֵרֵשׁ וְלִפְנֵי עִוֵּר לֹא תִתֵּן מְכַשֵּׁל וַיִּרְאֵתָ מֵאַלְהֵיךָ אֲנִי יְהוָה</p>
--	--

The Talmud teaches us: “אין מקרא יוצא מידי פשוטו” - we do not abandon the most basic-level understanding of a verse in the Torah.¹ With this concept in mind, what is the most basic understanding of the verse “before the blind you shall not place a stumbling block”?

Rashi, whose job it is to explain to us the most basic-level understanding of the text of the Chumash² (as he himself attests to in many places), explains this verse in a way which is slightly surprising:

Source 2. Rashi

<p><i>“Before the blind do not place a stumbling block”</i> – This implies: Do not give a person who is ‘blind in a matter’ advice which is improper for him. Do not say to him: "Sell your field and buy from the proceeds of the sale a donkey", the fact being that you are endeavouring to circumvent him and to take it (the field) from him!</p> <p><i>“You shall have fear from your God”</i> — Because in this case it is not given to human beings to know whether the intention of this man (the offender) was for the advantage or the disadvantage of the person whom he advised, and he thus might be able to evade the responsibility by saying: "I meant it for the best", the verse therefore states with reference to him: <i>“But you shall be afraid of your God”</i> Who is cognizant of ones secret thoughts. Similarly in all actions where it is given only to the heart of he himself who does it to know the motive that prompts him and where other people have no insight into it, the verses state, "But be afraid of your God!" (Sifra, Kedoshim, Section 2 14; Bava Metzia 58b).</p>	<p>וּלְפָנַי עוֹר לֹא תִתֵּן מְכַשׁוּל. לִפְנֵי הַסּוּמָא בְּדָבָר לֹא תִתֵּן עֵצָה שְׂאִינָהּ הוֹגֵגֶת לוֹ, אֵל תֹּאמֶר מְכוֹר שְׂדֵדָה וְקַח לָךְ תְּמוֹר, וְאַתָּה עוֹקֵף עָלָיו וְנוֹטְלָהּ הַיָּמִינוּ</p> <p>וַיִּרְאֵתָ מֵאַלְהֵיךָ. לְפִי שֶׁהִדְבָּר הַזֶּה אֵינוֹ מְסוּר לְבְרִיּוֹת לִידַע אִם דַּעְתּוֹ שָׁל זֶה לְטוֹבָה אוֹ לְרָעָה, וְיָכוֹל לְהַשְׁמִיט וְלוֹמֵר לְטוֹבָה נִתְכַּוְּנָתִי, לְפִיכֵן נֹאמַר בּוֹ וַיִּרְאֵתָ מֵאַלְהֵיךָ הַמְּפִיר מִחֻשְׁבוֹתֶיךָ; וְכֵן כָּל דְּבָר הַמְּסוּר לְלִבּוֹ שֶׁל אָדָם הָעוֹשֶׂהוּ וְאֵין שָׂאֵר הַבְּרִיּוֹת מְכִירוֹת בּוֹ, נֹאמַר בּוֹ וַיִּרְאֵתָ מֵאַלְהֵיךָ:</p>
--	--

¹ This does not mean that we necessarily read the verse literally; on the contrary, the Oral Torah in many instances will come to illustrate that the literal understanding of a verse is entirely incorrect. For example, see Bava Kama 83 on the verse “*Eye for an eye*” [שמות כא:כד]. Rather, it means that we always interpret the verse most simply.

² There are many levels of understanding in every verse in the Torah. In general terms, our Sages divide these levels in to 4 categories of depth, summarized by the acronym of “פרדס”:

- פּשׁט – The simplest meaning of the text
- רמז – Deeper wisdom alluded within the text
- דרוש – Even deeper wisdom, expounded by way of various Talmudic-derivations
- סוד – Secrets.

Whereas many of the other classic commentators, such as the Ramban and Ohr Chaim, often delve in to the deeper meanings of the texts, Rashi’s mission is singular: “פשוט פשוט” - the simplest meaning of the text.

Fascinating! Rashi explains that “*Before the blind don’t place a stumbling block*” means **don’t give bad advice!** The other person is ‘blind’ in so far as he is uninformed, and the ‘stumbling block’ is bad advice!!

Now this certainly may be an innovative and interesting explanation of this verse, however, given that Rashi is here to provide us with the most basic-level understanding of the text, why would Rashi say that this is the פשוט? Isn’t the simplest understanding to read it as it is: “*In front of a blind person (i.e. literally blind!), do not place a stumbling block (i.e. a banana peel!)*”??

What do you think?

The famed Maharal from Prague, in his classic commentary on Rashi (“גור אריה”), explains:

Source 3. Maharal (Gur Aryeh)

<p>Blind in a matter – This is challenging, for let us say that the verse is literal!? Perhaps we can answer based on the end of the verse “<i>and you shall fear your God</i>”: it’s only relevant to say “you shall fear God” about something which is only known in ones own heart, whereas the literal translation of the verse (i.e. don’t put a banana-peel in front of a blind person) is not concealed to the person himself, for its conceivable that the blind-person may indeed know about the stumbling-block, or others may be aware of it, or they could’ve heard about it, etc...</p>	<p>לפני הסומא בדבר – וקשיא שמא הוא כפשוטו ויש לומר משום סיפא דקרא ויראת מהלקיך שלא נאמר ויראת מאלקיך אלא על דבר המסור ללב אבל זה אין דבר המסור ללב שהרי לפעמים הסומא יודע מי שנתן לפניו מכשול או אחרים ראו או מכיר אותו בקול וכיוצא בזה.</p>
--	--

If the verse was only addressing the most literal application (i.e. banana peel), there’d be no need to say “and you shall fear your God” at the end, for this implies that only **He** (with a capital “H”) ‘sees’ what’s really going on, but, if it’s a banana peel, **everyone** can see it!

Rather, explains the Maharal, because the verse says “you shall fear your God”, by force we’re talking about a stumbling-block that no one can see. And what’s that? Bad advice.

This is why Rashi had to say this explanation, and it is for this reason that this is indeed the simplest meaning of the verse (פשוטיה דקרא³).

Notwithstanding this, many of the great commentators⁴ add that the *literal* reading of the text (i.e. banana peel) is certainly *also* true.

³ לשון הרמב"ם בשה"מ ל"ת רצ"ט

⁴ כ"פ האג"מ או"ח ח"ה סי"ג ס"ט, משך חכמה, ותורה תמימה, ע"ע במנ"ח מצוה רל"ב דמפקפק בזה ובסוף דעתו נוטה להסכים.

2 – CAUSING OTHERS TO SIN

In addition to the 2 explanations of the verse thus far discussed, the Talmud provides for us an additional explanation of “Before a blind,” (henceforth abbreviated as “לפני ע”) which has a multitude of far-reaching applications:

Source 4. Avodah Zara 6b

<p>It was taught in a baraisa that Rabbi Nasan says: From where is it derived that a person may not offer a cup of wine to a <i>nazirite</i>, (one who is prohibited from drinking wine), and that he may not offer a limb cut from a living animal to a descendant of Noah, (who is prohibited by Noahide law from eating a limb from a living animal)? The verse states: “<i>Before the blind do not place a stumbling block</i>”</p>	<p>תניא רבי נתן אומר מנין שלא יושיט אדם כוס יין לנזיר שמא יבא לשתותו ואבר מן החי לבני נח לפי שנאסר להן דכתיב אך בשר וגו' (בראשית ט:) ת"ל ולפני עור לא תתן מכשול</p>
---	---

Lest we think that this expanded definition of “Before the blind” – don’t cause another to sin – is limited to the specific examples listed in this Gemara, Tosafos explains that what is being taught here is actually a great over-arching principle:

Source 5. Tosafos on Avoda Zara 6b [ד"ה מנין]

<p>From where is it derived that a person may not offer a cup of wine to a <i>nazir</i> – It appears to me that the same rule applies to all prohibitions, only, that for the following reason specifically the scenario of a cup of wine to a <i>nazir</i> was chosen: because, most likely, he’s asking for the cup in order to drink it (since that’s what most people do with wine!), and, perhaps he’s forgotten about his <i>nazir</i>-status. In contrast, if a Jew would ask to be passed non-kosher meat, or pig, or any other type of forbidden object, we needn’t suspect him of any wrong intentions, and could give it to him. However, if it’s known that he wants it in order to eat it, it’s certainly forbidden to give it to him, even if it belongs to him...</p>	<p>מנין שלא יושיט אדם כוס יין לנזיר - נראה דה"ה בכל שאר איסורין אלא להכי נקט כוס יין לנזיר משום דמסתמא למישתי קא בעי ליה כיון דכ"ע חמרא שתו ושמא שכח נזירתו אבל ישראל שאמר הושיט לי נבלה או חזיר או שום איסור אין לחושדו מלהושיט לו אבל אם ידוע לו שרוצה לאכלו אסור להושיט לו ואפי' הוא שלו</p>
---	---

Tosafos points out that this teaching is applicable to the entire Torah: “*Before the blind do not place a stumbling block*” teaches us that one is not allowed to cause another person to violate any part of the Torah. Another example:

Source 6. Moed Katan 17a

<p>The maidservant in Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi’s house saw a certain man who was striking his adult son. She said: Let that man be excommunicated, due to the fact that he has transgressed the injunction: “You shall not place a stumbling block before the blind” (FOR, SINCE HE’S AN ADULT, HE MAY REBEL AGAINST HIS FATHER AND TRANSGRESS THE PROHIBITION OF HITTING ONES PARENT, AND IT WILL EMERGE THAT HIS FATHER HAD CAUSED HIM TO STUMBLE. RASHI)</p>	<p>אמתא דבי רבי חזיתיה להווא גברא דהוה מחי לבנו גדול אמרה ליהויה הווא גברא בשמתא דקעבר משום ולפני עור לא תתן מכשול דכיון דגדול הוא שמא מבעט באביו והוה ליה איהו מכשילו</p>
--	--

Now, the general principle is pretty black & white: one may not cause another to do something wrong. However, like any other axiomatic principle, the specific practical parameters involve a spectrum of grey: what is called ‘causing’ him to sin, exactly?

B”H, the great Jewish sages did not leave us hanging here. The Gemara in Avoda Zara elaborates:

Source 7. Avoda Zara 2a, 6a-b

Mishna: On the three days before the festivals of idol-worshippers the following actions are prohibited: It is prohibited to engage in business with them; to lend items to them or to borrow items from them; to lend money to them or to borrow money from them; and to repay debts owed to them or to collect repayment of debts from them.

Gemara: A dilemma was raised before the Sages: Is the reason for the prohibition against conducting business with idol-worshippers in the days preceding their festivals because they might profit, (which will bring him joy, and he will subsequently give thanks to his idol on his festival)? Or perhaps it is because this is a violation of the prohibition: “*And you shall not put a stumbling block before the blind*” (as one who sells an animal to an idol-worshiper thereby aids his idol worship)?

What is the practical difference between the two options? The practical difference is in a situation where the idol-worshiper already has an animal of his own: If you say that the reason for the prohibition is because he might profit, here too the Jew causes him to profit; But if you say that the reason for the prohibition is due to “*You shall not put a stumbling block before the blind,*” since he has his own animal, the Jew is not helping him sin.

(The Gemara challenges): And even if he already has his own animal, does not one who assists him transgress due to the command: “*You shall not put a stumbling block before the blind*”? But isn’t it taught in a baraisa that RABBI NATAN SAID: FROM WHERE IS IT DERIVED THAT A PERSON MAY NOT EXTEND A CUP OF WINE TO A NAZIRITE, AND THAT HE MAY NOT EXTEND A LIMB SEVERED FROM A LIVING ANIMAL TO DESCENDANTS OF NOAH? THE VERSE STATES: “*AND YOU SHALL NOT PUT A STUMBLING BLOCK BEFORE THE BLIND*”. But here, in both cases, if one does not give it to him, he can take it himself, and yet the one who provides it to him transgresses due to the prohibition: “*You shall not put a stumbling block before the blind.*”

(The Gemara answers): Here we are dealing with a case where they are standing on the two sides of a river, [and therefore the recipient could *not* have taken it himself. Since his help was instrumental, the one who conveyed the item has violated the prohibition of putting a stumbling block before the blind].

מתני' לפני אידיהן של עובדי כוכבים שלשה ימים אסור לשאת ולתת עמהם להשאילן ולשאול מהן להלוותן וללוות מהן לפורען ולפרוע מהן

גמ' איבעיא להו משום הרווחה דרווח ואזיל ומודה לעבודת כוכבים ועבר ישראל משום לא ישמע על פיך (שמות כג) או דלמא משום (ויקרא יט, יד) ולפני עור לא תתן מכשול דמזבין ליה בהמה ומקריבה לעבודת כוכבים ובני נח נצטוו עליה דהיא אחת משבע מצות

למאי נפקא מינה דאית ליה בהמה לדידיה אי אמרת משום הרווחה הא קא מרווח ליה אי אמרת משום עור לא תתן מכשול הא אית ליה לדידיה

וכי אית ליה לא עבר משום עור לא תתן מכשול והתניא אמר רבי נתן מנין שלא יושיט אדם כוס של יין לנזיר ואבר מן החי לבני נח ת"ל (ויקרא יט, יד) ולפני עור לא תתן מכשול והא הכא דכי לא יהיבין ליה שקלי איהו וקעבר משום לפני עור לא תתן מכשול

הב"ע דקאי בתרי עברי נהרא עובד כוכבים מצד זה וישראל מצד זה דאי לא יהיב ליה לא מצי שקיל

(The Gemara adds): The language of the baraisa is also precise, as it teaches: “A person may not *extend*”, and it does not teach: “One may not *give*.” [Learn from the usage of the term “extend” that the baraisa is referring to one located on one side of a river, who *extends* the item to the one on the other side].

דיקא נמי דקתני לא יושיט ולא קתני
לא יתן ש"מ

The Gemara teaches us a clear distinction:

- ➔ לפנ"ע applies only in a situation similar to ‘2 sides of the river’ (i.e. where the *Nazir* could not get the wine without help), that is, where person A is incapable of transgressing without the help of person B.
- ➔ However, in scenarios of “same side of the river” (i.e. he could get it himself), לפנ"ע does not apply, since person A is capable of transgressing without the help of person B.⁵

Pretty good. But let’s take it a step deeper: What if person B is not the only one on the other side of the river? What if someone else is going to (or could) give the wine to him anyways? Does לפנ"ע apply in this case?

On the one hand, the Nazir can’t get the wine by himself, and, therefore by person B passing it to him, he’s certainly facilitating his sin.

On the other hand, if someone else is going to pass it to him anyways (i.e. he can get it without me), then, perhaps this is more analogous to the scenario of “1 side of the river”.

How shall we look at this scenario?

What do you think?

This scenario is actually a matter of major debate amongst some the great later-day Halachic authorities (see footnote below⁶), but is slightly beyond the scope of this particular learning session ☺

⁵ There may still be a Rabbinic prohibition of “Before the blind” in these scenario’s, called “מסייע”, but this is beyond the scope of this particular learning session. [עיינן שו"ע יו"ד קנ"א ס"א]

⁶ עיינן משנה למלך פ"ד מלוה ולוה ה"ב, דנחלקו שם אם הפני משה

3 – OPEN YOUR EYES!

There's another subtle, but delightful point in our exploration of לפני"ע which requires elaboration.

The verse says: “*Before a blind person do not place a stumbling block*” – clearly, we're speaking about someone who is, at least in some capacity, “blind.”

Now, according to the first 2 applications of לפני"ע (i.e. banana peel & bad advice) it's quite simple to understand how the other is 'blind': he's either unaware of the physical stumbling block being placed in front of him, or he's uninformed regarding the negative nature of the advice. But, according to the 3rd application of לפני"ע (i.e. causing another to sin), in what way is the other 'blind'? He's asking for the wine!!

What do you think?

This thought-provoking question was dealt with by many of the classic, medieval sources:

Answer #1 – Tosafos

Tosafos (quoted earlier, source 5) actually pre-empted this question, and said that the verse is actually only speaking about someone who forgot that they are doing something wrong (like the Nazir who forgot that he's not allowed to drink wine)

- According to Tosafos, then, לפני"ע would in fact not apply if the receiver was aware/intentional, since he couldn't be considered 'blind'; it's his own fault!

Answer #2 - Rambam

There is, however, another phenomenal approach to this question, taken by the Rambam, as elaborated by the great Steipler Gaon, R' Yaakov Yisroel Kanievsky zt"l:

Source 8. Kehilos Yaakov, Avoda Zara #3

Clearly, the Torah only prohibited placing a stumbling block in front of another who is 'blind' in some capacity, as it says in the Sifra: “to one who is blind in a matter.” Now, if that's so, we can understand that if the Nazir is unintentional, לפני"ע would apply. But if he *is* sinning intentionally, there is no “blind person”, for he sees and is aware of the stumbling block, and nevertheless is choosing to transgress! It would seem quite obvious that in this scenario לפני"ע would not apply.

In truth, this matter was bothersome to no less than the Rambam himself, and he addressed the issue in the Laws of Murder, 12:14, as follows: “*Anyone who falters another who is blind in a matter, by either giving him inappropriate advice, or strengthening one who is committing a sin, who*

הרי לא אסרה תורה נתינת מכשול אלא למי שהוא עור וכדמפרש הספרא למי שהוא סומא בדבר, וא"כ התינח אם הנזיר שוגג בדבר שפיר איכא מכשול לפני עור אבל כשחוטא הזה הוא מזיד אין כאן לפני עור כלל שהרי רואה ויודע את המכשול אלא שרוצה להכשל בו, ולכאורה כל כה"ג לית בי' משום לפני עור...

ובאמת דבר זה הוקשה גם להרמב"ם ז"ל דאם החוטא הוא מזיד הא אין כאן עור וכתב בפ"ב מהלכות רוצח הי"ד וז"ל וכן כל המכשיל עור בדבר והשיאו עצה

is blind and does not see the path of truth because of the desires of his heart, behold he's violating a negative commandment, as it says in the verse 'In front of a blind person...'"

The Rambam explains, with his classically eloquent language, that even if one is intentional and aware that this is a prohibited action, even still he's considered 'blind', because a person does not commit an *aveira* unless a spirit of insanity enters in to him, and he fails to recognize the path of truth.

שאינה הוגנת או שחזק ידי עוברי עבירה
שהוא עור ואינו רואה דרך אמת מפני
תאות לבו ה"ז עובר בל"ת שנא' ולפנ"ע
לא תתן מכשול עכ"ל הרי ביאר במתק
לשונו שאע"פ שהוא מזיד ויודע שזה חטא
מ"מ קרינן בי' עור משום שאין אדם עובר
עבירה אא"כ נכנס בו רוח שטות ואינו
מכיר דרך האמת

To Summarize the Steipler's amazing approach:

- The Rambam says explicitly that "Before the blind" is violated even if the receiver is intentional and aware ("מזיד"). So, in what way is he 'blind'?
- Chazal [סוטה ג.] teach us a profound lesson in human nature: "אין אדם חוטא אלא אם כן נכנס בו רוח שטות" – "A person does not make a mistake unless he's overcome by a spirit of insanity"
 - o A person is pre-programmed to do the right thing; he cannot consciously do something wrong, or evil...unless he justifies it (and there's no shortage of creative justifications that people are capable of coming up with!).

Therefore,

- When a person does something wrong, he is in a state of temporary insanity! In this respect, explains the Steipler, he certainly fits the bill of a 'blind' person.

4 – INTRIGUING INQUIRIES

The topic of לפני"ע has a very rich and engaging literature. There are a number of fascinating and thought-provoking talmudic-inquiries (“הקירות”) on this topic. We’ll present a few of them. Enjoy!

Note: Much, much ‘ink has been spilled’ over the generations, regarding each one of these inquiries, so take your time to consider each one thoughtfully!

הקירה #1

When is לפני"ע violated: right away, or only once he’s transgressed?

In other words: do we say that the prohibition is *causing* the other to sin, or even the mere *placing* of the stumbling block?⁷

→ Practical Difference (נפקא מינה): What if the *Nazir* does not end up drinking the wine?

What do you think?

הקירה #2

Does לפני"ע apply by a Rabbinic prohibition?

In other words: perhaps לפני"ע only applies when the prohibition which one is causing the other to transgress is Biblical in nature?

On the one hand, causing another to stumble even in something which is only Rabbinically prohibited should be no less severe than giving him bad advice (which is of course an explicit violation of לפני"ע)!⁸

On the other hand, perhaps bad advice is prohibited since it’s intrinsically bad, whereas a Rabbinic prohibition is merely a ‘fence’ of sorts.⁹

What do you think?

⁷ יד מלאכי כללי למ"ד אות שס"ז, ע"ע משמרת חיים ח"א ענינים שונים ס"א

⁸ מנ"ח מצוה רל"ב

⁹ משמרת חיים ח"א ענינים שונים ס"ב ע"פ שיטת הנתיות הידוע דאכילת איסור דרבנן בשוגג לא בעינן כפרה

חקירה #3

Is לפני"ע a sub-category or every other prohibition, or an independent prohibition in and of itself?

In other words, one way of framing this inquiry is as follows¹⁰: there are 2 general categories of mitvochs – “Man-2-Man” (בין אדם לחבירו), and “Man-2-God” (בין אדם למקום). ***Under which category does the prohibition of causing another to sin fall?***¹¹

If לפני"ע is M2M, then it is its' own separate prohibition, that is; not to cause another to stumble.

If, however, לפני"ע is a M2G, it could very well be a sub-category of each other *aveirah*, meaning: G-d doesn't want aveira “X” to be done by this other guy, therefore, if I am a guy who cares about what G-d wants, I certainly can't facilitate “X” being done!

Said in another way: לפני"ע doesn't have to do with him, but, rather, with Him.

→ **Practical difference (נפקא מינה)**: “The Big-3 Cardinal Sins” – “ג' עבירות חמורות” – What must a person do if faced with the following situation: either cause another to transgress one of the Big-3¹², or forfeit his own life?

Think about it ☺

What do you think?

¹⁰ אמת ליעקב פ' קדושים

¹¹ The component of לפני"ע of not giving bad advice is most certainly man-2-man

¹² There are 3 ‘cardinal sins’ for which one must forfeit his own life rather than violate: illicit-relations, idol-worship, and murder. Regarding the other 362 Biblical prohibitions, the Torah commands us “וחי בהם” – “Live!”, that is, even at the expense of transgressing. [See Sanhedrin 74a]

EXAMPLES:

1. Jeremy is performing at this year's "Jewish Comedy Festival" and has invited his buddies out for his debut comedy routine. Eric is a bit reluctant to go, since he's pretty sure that Jeremy's performance is going to be littered with a significant degree of *loshon hara* (derogatory speech about others), but on the other hand, he certainly doesn't want to make his friend feel bad. "I'll just go, stuff my ears with ear plugs, and smile while he's talking", Eric figures. *Is this a legitimate option, in lieu of לפני"ע??*
2. "How will I ever get rid of this last refrigerator from this stock?" Mr. Rosen, the appliance store proprietor, wondered to himself? "It was never a very successful model, and I've gotten plenty of complaints, but I must make room for the new ones."
Just then a young couple speaking in a foreign accent walked in. "We're looking for a good refrigerator, and we want your advice. These are the measurements..."
"I have just the item for you – an excellent appliance at an excellent price," Mr. Rosen said, smiling in satisfaction at the instant solution that had just presented itself. *They'll swallow anything I tell them – this is going to be an easy sell*, he thought to himself. Has Mr. Robin violated לפני"ע?
3. May an adult purchase marijuana or alcohol for a teenager, in lieu of the prohibition of לפני"ע?
4. Are there any potential לפני"ע issues involved in giving one's teenage child a 'smartphone'?
5. Dr. Warensteinberg, a family practitioner, has an arrangement with the drug store that any time he calls in a prescription he receives a substantial kick-back when he recommends the generic products, as opposed to brand-names. In one case, Dr. Warensteinberg feels that a certain patient would best benefit from a particular brand-name drug, but, on the other hand, feels an internal conflict of interest due to the loss of kickbacks. *How would לפני"ע help guide his decision?*
6. John is sitting with his accountant and is describing a complicated tax-related problem he's facing. "That's a question for a lawyer," his accountant says. "Can you recommend someone good?" John asks innocently. "Mr. Steincloud is perfect for this sort of thing" John's accountant blurts out instinctively, forgetting to realize that every referral he provides for Mr. Steincloud results in free Maple Leaf tickets...*how does לפני"ע play a role in this situation?*