

A LESSON FROM THE PARASHA

Seeing is Not Believing

[Korach] dressed [his followers] in shawls that were all *t'cheiless* (blue wool)... They said to [Moshe], "Is a *tallis* that's totally *t'cheiless* subject to the requirement to [put strings of *t'cheiless* on its] fringes?

He told them, "It's required."

They started laughing at him... (Rashi, commentary to 16:1)

The Torah testifies that this protest was insincere. Korach really meant to challenge Moshe's authority.

However, this confrontation does call to mind another question, which does deserve an answer: The Talmud (Sotah 17a) explains that the blue string on a *tallis* is meant to make us think of Hashem, but only through a series of associations. Why doesn't Hashem want to remind us of Himself directly?

In *Darash Moshe*, Rabbi Moshe Feinstein explains that our people's Greatest Generation had an intimate knowledge of Hashem. The Children of Israel knew that they could rely on Hashem because they had seen His hand, openly.

However (and if Reb Moshe hadn't written this, I'd be afraid to), that generation's faith in Hashem was incomplete. They had never learned, in a deeper, intellectual way, to trust that He would *always* be at their side, even if they didn't see it.

In times of stress, because they were insecure, the Children of Israel would express these doubts—usually to bad effect. The Torah describes these many troubles as "tests," because the people were experimenting, in a way, subjecting the "theory" of Divine Providence to challenges and trials.

This happened repeatedly over the course of the forty years in the Wilderness. The Spies weren't sure that the G-d Who had overpowered Pharaoh and Egypt would be able to vanquish the nation-states of Canaan. The *Assafsuf* (the "crowd," in Parashas B'ha'alos'cha) weren't convinced that the Provider of manna and quail could also supply them with red meat. Korach and his followers didn't trust that Moshe, Hashem's interlocutor on Mount Sinai, had given out positions of leadership in accordance with Hashem's wishes.

Korach's *"T'cheiless* Protest" was a metaphor for Korach's claim (16:3) that "the whole congregation is entirely holy," but it also symbolized the notion that relating directly to Hashem, based on what we see before us, is good enough, that there's no need to have faith in Divine supervision when it isn't obvious.

The problem is that this idea isn't true.

The only way to achieve genuine, deep faith in Hashem is to take it slowly and work on it, step by step, until one is able to identify Hashem's hand by its fingerprints alone—to borrow the Torah's metaphor, to associate a little blue string on the corner of one's *tzitzis* with the color of the sea, which is like the color of the sky, and in turn remember

A TIMELY HALACHA

RABBI CHAIM HEINEMANN

Another issue that comes up in citywide eruvin is how to deal with the with a karpef located within their confines.

A karpef refers to an uninhabited area larger than a beis sasayim (5000 sq amos), even if it is surrounded by partitions. The Mishna Berurah explains (O.C. 346:17) that a karpef is different than a typical private domain, which usually has a smaller dimension and is inhabited. Consequently, an area which is both large and uninhabited is similar in some degree to a reshus harabim and is therefore classified as karmelis, even it is enclosed. This would mean that one cannot carry in an area which is not easily transverable even if it is surrounded by mechitzos.

Many citywide *eruvin* include areas such as swampland, overgrown areas, streams, or bodies of water. These areas are difficult to walk through and pose a serious issue to the *eruv*.

One possible justification which some towns rely upon is the Dvar Shmuel

--- CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE -----

G-d's Throne of Glory. Then we'll be capable of following both instinct and intellect, and find faith in times of doubt.

Korach and his rebellion were ultimately consumed by earth and fire. They needed a whole shawl of blue wool to remind them of Hashem; in the end, even that wasn't good enough.





A TIMELY HALACHA

CONTINUED

(Siman 296), who states that the above restriction does not apply to a *karpef* located within a city. He reasons that any natural uninhabited place situated within the city is vital to the city, or those establishing the city would not have left it there. Rav Moshe Feinstein, ztz"l, as well as Rav Elyashiv, ztz"l, did not feel that this rationale applies to modern cities.

The Shulchan Aruch clearly states that streams of water negate the residential status of an area if they are more than ten *tefachim* deep and are not fit for drinking. R' Moshe Feinstein told R' Moshe Heinemann that, at present, people do not walk through water even if it is less than ten tefachim and we must treat even shallow water as a karpef. However, R' Moshe Feinstein did agree that recreational parks and the ponds within them are not *karpifos*, as they enhance the appearance of the park. Similarly, water hazards of a golf course are considered "used" and pose no problem being a karpef. He also maintained that the streams which are used for swimming, wading, or catching wild life during the summer are not categorized as karpifos even in the winter.

Here in Cincinnati, all the above is extremely relevant when dealing with the Losantiville Golf Course and the creek that runs from Reading Road to Ridge Road. However, in regard to Amberley Green's lakes, (which are no longer used for a golf course, but instead as a scenery for a walking trail), R' Moshe Heinemann instructed us to "use" the water either via canoe or by operating a remote-control boat in that water (or a remote-control truck when iced over) at least once a month!

TIDBITS OF CINCINNATI JEWISH HISTORY

GREAT ACTS OF ORDINARY PEOPLE

DANNY WAS LOOKING FOR PARKING IN THE area of Meiron on Lag Ba'omer and, after much time searching, found a spot. As he pulled in he felt a small bump, and after getting out of the car to look, found that he had nicked the car next to him. It was not at all a serious scratch and did not leave any dent whatsoever, but nonetheless Danny left a note with his name, number, and hotel where he was staying, writing that the owner should be in touch about paying for fixing the scratch. Later that night there was a knock on his door and sure enough there was the owner of the car. But he was not looking for money. He just wanted a picture to keep with him. He was moved by the honesty shown by Danny when it was so easy to dismiss it and walk away that he had resolved to be more honest in his own life and wanted a picture of his role model to keep with him. Seeing that Danny was a religious person

A RIDDLE FOR YOU

For what *halachah* regarding Chanukah do Sephardim follow the opinion of Tosafos (an Ashkenazi) and Ashkenazim follow the opinion of the Rambam (a Sephardi)?

Look for the answer in two weeks!

PREVIOUS RIDDLE:

- **Q** Where do we find that someone ignorant of the law is the one to give the verdict, while one who knows the law cannot render a verdict?
- A kohein that is ignorant of the laws of Tzora'as is still able to give the verdict on a suspected case, with the help of a Yisrael who is knowledgeable. The Yisrael, on the other hand, even though he is knowledgeable of the law, may not render a judgement. (Sifrah on Leviticus 13:2,3)

also inspired the man to learn more about his own Judaism, eventually becoming fully observant. \square



RABBI MOSHE TZVI CRYSTAL

On the 29th of Sivan, 5734 (1974), the *Seattle Times* reported the first life saved by the Heimlich maneuver which had been developed by Dr. Henry Heimlich, a thoracic surgeon and Head of Surgery for Jewish Hospital and later professor at Xavier University. Heimlich had only recently published his new procedure in that month's *Journal of Emergency Medicine*. A woman in Washington state had been choking and a man, who only the night before had read Heimlich's article, performed the procedure, saving the woman's life. Within a month of the first report, another forty people were reported to have been saved by the Heimlich maneuver. Estimates are given that 100,000 people have been saved since then. Heimlich later claimed that his procedure could also save drowning victims and be helpful for asthma attacks. These claims were not so well received. The Red Cross argued that doing the Heimlich maneuver could potentially make things worse for a drowning victim. Other researchers regarded his claims regarding asthma attacks as unfounded. At the age of 96, Heimlich saved an 87-year-old woman in the nursing home he resided in who had been choking on her dinner. Sources: "HEIMLICH MANEUVER BORN: JUNE 1, 1974." HEALTH CENTRAL, 30 MAY 2013. RETRIEVED FROM HTTPS://WWW.HEALTHCENTRAL.COM/ARTICLE/MCFADDEN, ROBERT D. "DR. HENRY J. HEIMLICH, FAMOUS FOR ANTICHOKING TECHNIQUE, DIES AT 96." THE NEW YORK TIMES, 17 DEC 2016. "THE HEIMLICH MANEUVER." THE CINCINNATI ENQUIRER, 30 JULY 1974. RETRIEVED FROM PROQUEST.

2241 Losantiville Avenue, Cincinnati OH 45237 • 513-631-1118 • kollel@shul.net • cincykollel.org

