

SICHA POEM

Likkutei Sichos, Vol. 27

Kedoshim, Sicha 1

— By Mrs. Chanie Gourarie, Chabad Toms River

“Before a blind person,” the Torah does say,
“You shall not place a stumbling block,” in his way.
Rashi explains that to someone who is blind in a particular manner,
You shall not give advice that for him is improper.”

To explain the simple interpretation is Rashi's goal,
So why does he deviate from his role?
The Mizrachi says that this explanation is a continuation,
Of Rashi's previous explanation on the words “You shall not curse a deaf person.”

The deaf and the blind the Mizrachi does compare,
Just like the deaf includes any person who is alive, not just people that can't hear,
So too the blind includes anyone who is blind to something,
However, only the blind phrase is completely stripped of its literal meaning.

Even if we accepted the Mizrachi's view it wouldn't suffice,
To explain why Rashi explains putting a stumbling block as saying bad advice.
With the simple explanation it would better align,
If Rashi would explain it as, not placing in a Nazir's hand, a cup of wine.

The Gur Aryeh has a different explanation,
Which stems from the verse's conclusion,
Which states that we must fear Hashem which only Hashem can see,
So placing a stumbling block before the blind must be in the same category.

However it is difficult to accept this view,
Because if it was the reason then Rashi would have connected the two.
But since not placing an obstacle before the blind has an independent heading,
The reason for deviating from the simple translation comes from its own wording.

Additionally, there are a few difficulties about the example given,
Which is used to describe “advice that is improper for him.”
“Do not say to him, ‘Sell your field and buy yourself a donkey,
While you are manipulating him and taking the field from him,” says Rashi.

Why is it necessary to give an example at all, of advice that is improper?
If an example is needed, why not use an example that is simpler and easier?
Why does Rashi use the example of the donkey specifically,
When in Toras Kohanim, it is the last of three?

Within this example we have another question,
Why does Rashi tell us about the advisor's motivation?
Why introduce something completely new?
A possible answer is that selling a field for a donkey can be good advice too.

The advantage of a donkey over a field, one can argue,
Is that in a field work is done by day but a donkey works day and night too.
A field requires a person's toil and exertion,
While a donkey carries the heavy burden.

The work and transport of merchandise with a donkey,
Brings profit after a short time or immediately,
While with a field only after a lengthy period of time is there a gain,
After the time of reaping and gathering the grain.

Under normal circumstances it can be,
That selling a field for a donkey is proper actually,
Therefore in this case Rashi must clarify,
That we are discussing a case where the advisor is selfish and sly.

However, this explanation doesn't work because the opposite we also see,
There are advantages that a field has over a donkey.
A donkey can die while a field does stay,
And the field's owner doesn't have the hardship of traveling far away.

Rashi could have stated simply that in every situation,
You must assess what is good for the person,

Why is it relevant to mention,
The advisor's gain from the transaction?

There is a rule in the Torah that we must explore,
When the Torah repeats a law that we know from before,
There is a new ruling in store,
We don't say that the repetition is to make us transgress more.

From the Torah it has already been transmitted,
That to damage another is prohibited,
As it says in Parshas Mishpatim,
You need to pay if you dig a pit and an ox or donkey falls in.

Based on this principle,
That a repeated law must contain something novel,
It is understood why Rashi didn't choose,
The earlier two examples that the Toras Kohanim did use.

The first example is not to advise someone to go out in the morning early,
So that robbers will ambush him and take his money.
The second example is not to advise someone that at noon he should go,
So that from the intense heat he should suffer a blow.

Such improper advice is already included in, "if a pit a man does open,"
Because his advice caused damage to a person.
Causing a person to sin spiritually,
Is included and even worse than damaging physical property.

We find this when the snake convinced Chava to eat from the tree,
The snake was punished severely.
Someone who causes others to sin,
Doesn't need to be judged favorably by the Beis Din.

Now we can understand why from Toras Kohanim Rashi brings example three,
About giving advice to sell your field and buy a donkey,
And concludes with the advisor's motivation,
Because specifically here is the innovation.

The new law is that when giving advice to another,
One must have in mind that the advice for the person should be proper.
About himself he should not think simultaneously,
He shouldn't say, "What is in it for me?"

Even when the person who is “blind in the matter,”
Will incur no loss whatsoever,
It is forbidden for the advisor to think about his profit,
Because the “blind” person thinks that the advice is only for his own benefit.

The advisor's intention is not clear,
Therefore the Passuk ends by saying that Hashem we must fear.
Hashem knows exactly what we are thinking,
When advice we are giving.

From here we learn a wondrous lesson,
About our Ahavas Yisrael obligation.
When doing a favor for a person,
We must focus exclusively on their situation.

Invest yourself completely,
And let go of your ego entirely.
With such love and dedication,
We will merit the final redemption!
