How Poskim Come to Know Reality 1 - Drisha Fall 2025

Rabbi Jonathan Ziring: jziring@migdalhatorah.org

1. On Gizzards and the Making of Rabbis, by Rabbi Ezra Y. Schwartz,

https://thelehrhaus.com/commentary/on-gizzards-and-the-making-of-rabbis/

There is a well-known story, variously retold as having occurred with Rav Boruch Ber Leibowitz, the *Rosh Yeshiva* of Kaminetz and with the Mitteler Rebbe of Chabad. Whomever it was, he happened to be in an abattoir and asked what a particular animal organ was. He was told that it was a gizzard, a *kurkevan*. Overtaken with emotion, the *gadol* blurted out, "The *Heiliger Kurkevan* (the holy gizzard)!" This rabbi had delivered many *shiurim* involving the intricacies of *hilkhot treifot* and had spoken often of a pin found in a *kurkevan*. Now, for the first time, he saw an actual *kurkevan*

Outsourcing

2. יומא פייב א:חי

ַ מַתְנִי׳ עוּבָּרָה שֶׁהֵרִיחָה — מַאֲכִילִין אוֹתָהּ עַד שֶׁתָּשִׁיב נַפְשָׁהּ. חוֹלֶה — מַאֲכִילִין אוֹתוֹ עַל פִּי בְּקּיאִין, וְאָם אֵין שֶׁם בְּקּיאִין — מַאַכִילִין אוֹתוֹ עַל פִּי עַצָמוֹ עַד שֵׁיאׁמֵר דַּי.

Yoma 82a:8

MISHNA: With regard to a pregnant woman who smelled food and was overcome by a craving to eat it, one feeds her until she recovers, as failure to do so could lead to a life-threatening situation. If a person is ill and requires food due to potential danger, one feeds him according to the advice of medical experts who determine that he indeed requires food. And if there are no experts there, one feeds him according to his own instructions, until he says that he has eaten enough and needs no more.

Not Part of Pesak

3. יבמות פ"ז ב:ר"ד-ט"ו

וְאָם נִיסַת שֶׁלֹא בִּרְשׁוּת — מוּתֶּרֶת לַחְזוֹר לוֹ. נִיסֵת עַל פִּי בֵּית דִּין — תַּצֵא, וּפְטוּרָה מִן הַקְּרְבָּן. לֹא נִיסֵת עַל פִּי בֵּית דִּין — תַּצֵא, וְסָלְכָה וְקלְקְלָה — טַיֶּיבֶת בְּקַרְבָּן, שֶׁלֹּא הָתִּירוּהָ אֶלָּא וְסַיֶּיבֶת בְּקַרְבָּן. יִפָּה כֹּט בֵּית דִּין, שֶׁפּוֹטְרָה מִן הַקְּרְבָּן. הוֹרוּהָ בֵּית דִּין לִינָּשֵׂא, וְהָלְכָה וְקלְקְלָה — טַיֶּיבֶת בְּקַרְבָּן, שֶׁלֹּא הָתִּירוּהָ אֶלָּא לִינַשֵׂא.

Yevamot 87b:14-15

All these *halakhot* refer to a situation when she married with the permission of the court, after hearing that her husband had died. **But if she married without** the **consent** of the court, basing herself entirely on the testimony she heard, and her husband returned, it is **permitted** for her **to return to** her first husband. The mishna adds another difference between these two scenarios: If **she married by** permission of **the court, she must leave** both of them **and she is exempt from** bringing **the offering,** i.e., the sin-offering for her unwitting adultery, as she had the authorization of the court and is therefore considered to have acted under duress. If, however, **she did not marry by** permission of **the court, she must leave** her second husband **and is liable to** bring **an offering** for mistakenly having relations with a man forbidden to her. In this regard, the **power of the court is greater, as she is exempt from** bringing **an offering.** If the **court instructed her to marry** on the basis of inaccurate testimony, **and she went and ruined** herself by engaging in licentious relations outside matrimony, **she is liable to** bring **an offering, as they permitted her only to marry,** and not to engage in licentious relations.

נִיסֶת עַל פִּי בֵּית דִּין תַּצֵא וְכוּי. אָמֵר זְעֵירִי: לֵיתָה לְמַתְנִיתִין, מִדְּתְנַן בֵּי מִדְרְשָׁא. דְּתָנֵי בֵּי מִדְרְשָׁא: הוֹרוּ בֵּית דִּין שֶׁשֶּׁקְעָה חַמָּה, וּלְבַסּוֹף זָרְחָה — אֵין זוֹ הוֹרָאָה, אֶלָא טָעוּת. וְרַב נַחָמֶן אָמֵר: הוֹרָאָה הִיא. אָמֵר רַב נַחְמֶן: תַּדַע דְּהוֹרָאָה הִיא, דְּבְכָל הַתּוֹרָה פּוּלְּה עֵד אֶחָד לָא מְהֵימֵן וְהָכָא מְהֵימֵן, מֵאי טַעְמָא? לָאו מִשׁוּם דְּהוֹרָאָה הִיא. אָמֵר רָבָא: תַּדַע דְּטָעוּת הוּא...

§ The mishna further taught that if **she married by** permission of **the court she must leave** him, but she is exempt from bringing a sin-offering. On this issue, **Ze'eiri said:** The **mishna is not** accepted, and this is derived **from what was taught** in **the study hall, as it was taught** in a *baraita* in **the study hall:** If **the court ruled that the sun had set** at the conclusion of Shabbat, which means it is permitted to perform labor, **and later** the sun **shone, this is not a ruling** for which the court is to blame, **but an error.** Consequently, the court does not have to bring an offering for the unwitting communal sin. Rather, each individual is liable to bring a separate offering. Here too, although the woman married with the consent of the court, they did not issue a mistaken ruling of *halakha* but simply erred with regard to the facts. She is therefore an unwitting sinner and is liable to bring an offering. **And** conversely, **Rav Naḥman said** that the court's permission **is** considered **a ruling** that renders them liable to bring an offering for an unwitting communal sin. **Rav Naḥman said:** You can **know that** her permission to marry **is a ruling,** as **in the entire Torah one witness is not deemed credible, and** yet **here he is deemed credible. What is the reason** for this? Is it **not because it is** considered **a ruling,** i.e., she does not rely on the witness but on the decision of the court? By contrast, **Rava said** that we can **know that** her permission to marry **is an error...**

Responsibility of Poskim

4. משנה תורה, הלכות סנהדרין והעונשין המסורין להם ב':אי

אֵין מעֲמִידִין בְּסנְהֶדְרִין בֵּין בָּגְדוֹלָה בֵּין בִּקְטנָה אֶלָּא אָנָשִׁים חָכָמִים וּנְבוֹנִים. מֻפְלָגִין בְּחָכָמִת הַתּוֹרָה בַּעֲלִי דֵּעָה מְרֵבָּה. יוֹדְעִים קְצָת מִשְּאָר חָכְמוֹת כְּגוֹן רְפוּאוֹת וְחֶשְׁבּוֹן וּתְקוּפוֹת וּמַזָּלוֹת וְאִצְטַגְנִינוּת וְדַרְכֵי הַמְעוֹנְנִים וְהַקּוֹסְמִים וְהַמְכַשְׁכִּי עֲבוֹדָה זָרָה וְכִיוֹצֵא בָּאֵלוּ כְּדֵי שֶׁיִהְיוּ יוֹדְעִים לָדוּן אוֹתָם. וְאֵין מַעֲמִידִין בְּסַנְהֶדְרִין אֶלָּא פֹהָנִים לְוִיִּם לְנִיִּים וְיִשְׂרְאֵלִים הַמְיֻחָסִים הָרְאוּיִים לְהַשִּׁיא לֹכְהֻנָּה. שָׁנֵּאֵמֵר (במדבר יא טז) "וְהָתִיצָבוּ שֵׁם עִּפֵּדְ" בָּדוֹמִין לְךְּ בָּחַכְמָה וּבִיִרָאֵה וּבְיַחַס:

Mishneh Torah, The Sanhedrin and the Penalties within Their Jurisdiction 2:1

We appoint to a *Sanhedrin* - both to the Supreme *Sanhedrin* and to a minor *Sanhedrin* - only men of wisdom and understanding, of unique distinction in their knowledge of the Torah and who possess a broad intellectual potential. They should also have some knowledge concerning other intellectual disciplines, e.g., medicine, mathematics, the fixation of the calendar, astronomy, astrology, and also the practices of fortune-telling, magic, sorcery, and the hollow teachings of idolatry, so that they will know how to judge them.

We appoint to the *Sanhedrin* only priests, Levites, and Israelites of lineage of fine repute who can marry into the priesthood. This is derived from Number 11:16: "And they shall stand there with you." Implied is that they should resemble you, Moses in wisdom, the fear of heaven, and in lineage.

Dangers of Translation

5. מכות ו' ב:ב'

ַרַבִּי יוֹסֵי אוֹמֵר: לְעוֹלָם אֵין נֶהֶרָגִין עַד שֶׁיְּהוּ שְׁנֵי עַדִיו מַתְרִין בּוֹ, שֶׁנֶּאֱמֵר ״עַל פִּי שְׁנַיִם עֵדִים״. דָּבָר אַחֵר: ״עַל פִּי שְׁנַיִם עֵדִים״ – שָׁלֹא תִּהָא סָנָהֶדְרִין שׁוֹמֵעַת מָפִּי הַתּוּרִגִּמַן....

דָּבֶר אַחַר: ״עַל פִּי שְׁנַיִם עֵדִים״ – שֶׁלֹּא תְּהָא סַנְהֶדְרִין שׁוֹמַעַת מִפִּי הַתּוּרְגָּמָן. הָנְהוּ לָעוֹזֵי דַּאֲתוֹ לְקַמֵּיה דְּרָבָא, אוֹקִי רָבָא תּוּרְגָּמָן בַּרָר אַחַר: יְעַל פִּי שְׁנִיִם עֵדִיד הָכִי? וָהָתָן: שֶׁלֹא תָהָא סַנָהָדְרִין שׁוֹמַעַת מִפִּי הַתּוּרְגָּמָן! רָבָא מִידַּע הַוּה יָדַע מָה דַּהָווֹ אָמְרִי, וְאַהְדּוֹרֵי הוּא דְּלָא

Makkot 6b

Rabbi Yosei says: Transgressors are never executed unless his two witnesses are the ones forewarning him, as it is stated: "At the mouth of two witnesses...he who is to be put to death shall die" (Deuteronomy 17:6), from which it is derived that it is from the mouths of the two witnesses that the accused must be forewarned, and forewarning issued by someone else is insufficient. Alternatively, from the phrase "at the mouth of two witnesses" one derives that the judges must hear the testimony directly from the witnesses, and the Sanhedrin will not hear testimony from the mouth of an interpreter.

§ The mishna teaches: Alternatively, from the phrase in the verse "at the mouth of two witnesses" one derives that the Sanhedrin will not hear testimony from the mouth of an interpreter. The Gemara relates: There were certain people who spoke a foreign language who came before Rava for judgment. Rava installed an interpreter between them and heard the testimony through the interpreter. The Gemara asks: And how did he do so? But didn't we learn in the mishna that the Sanhedrin will not hear testimony from the mouth of an interpreter? The Gemara answers: Rava knew what they were saying, as he understood their language, but he did not know how to respond to them in their language. He posed questions through the interpreter but understood the answers on his own, as required by the mishna.