

THE BAIS HAVAAD

HALACHA JOURNAL

Family, Business, and Jewish Life through the Prism of Halacha



A PUBLICATION OF THE
BAIS HAVAAD HALACHA CENTER
105 River Ave. #301, Lakewood NJ 08701
1.888.485.VAAD (8223)
www.baishavaad.org
info@baishavaad.org
Lakewood • Midwest • Brooklyn • South Florida

לע"נ הרב יוסף ישראל
ב"ר משה גרוסמן זצ"ל

Dedicated in loving memory of
HaRav Yosef Grossman zt"l

VOLUME 5783 • ISSUE XXIX • PARSHAS BEHAR-BECHUKOSAI



LEAVE NO STONE UNRETURNED: SHOULD THE STAR OF AFRICA GO HOME?

Adapted from the writings of Dayan Yitzhak Grossman

Reuters reports:

Some South Africans are calling for Britain to return the world's largest diamond, known as the Star of Africa, which is set in the royal scepter that King Charles III will hold at his coronation on Saturday.

The diamond, which weighs 530 carats, was discovered in South Africa in 1905 and presented to the British monarchy by the colonial government in the country, which was then under British rule.

Now, amid a global conversation about returning artwork and artifacts that were pillaged during colonial times, some South Africans are calling for the diamond to be brought back.

"The diamond needs to come to South Africa.

It needs to be a sign of our pride, our heritage and our culture," said Mothusi Kamanga, a lawyer and activist in Johannesburg who has promoted an online petition, which has gathered about 8,000 signatures, for the diamond to be returned.

"I think generally the African people are starting to realize that to decolonize is not just to let people have certain freedoms, but it's also to take back what has been expropriated from us."

Returning stolen property is one of the *taryag mitzvos*:

Whoever steals is obligated to return the stolen object itself, as it is written: "And he

(continued on page 2)

1 Reuters. South Africans call for UK to return diamonds set in crown jewels. <https://www.reuters.com/world/africa/south-africans-call-uk-return-diamonds-set-crown-jewels-2023-05-04/>



PARSHAS BEHAR-BECHUKOSAI

LOSS OF SMELL

Excerpted and adapted from a shiur by
HaRav Chaim Weg

I will put your cities to ruin and I will make your sanctuaries desolate; I will not smell your satisfying aromas.

Vayikra 26:31

According to Rashi, "*velo ariach bereiach nichochachem* (I will not smell your satisfying aromas)" means the *korbanos* will cease with the destruction of the *Bais Hamikdash*. But the Ramban says it means that Hashem's acceptance of *korbanos* with favor will end with the *churban* until *Mashiach* comes—so there was no *reiach nicho'ach* from any *korbanos* brought in the *Bayis Sheini*. He holds that although *reiach nicho'ach* is certainly an important part of *avodas hakorbanos*, not having it does not invalidate a *korban*, so all the *korbanos* brought during *Bayis Sheini* were valid. This adheres to the simple meaning of the Mishnah in *Zvachim* (46b), which says that although a *korban* must be *shechted* for *reiach nicho'ach*, if one had contrary intentions, the *korban* remains valid.

The Netziv takes a different approach, that this *pasuk* invalidates *korbanos* at a time

(continued on page 2)

Reading and Righting

Q Should I correct a *ba'al korei's* mistake?

A The Rambam (*Hilchos Tfilah* 12:6) writes that a *ba'al korei* should be corrected. Other *Rishonim* say to refrain, to avoid embarrassing him (Tur O.C. 142 quoting Sefer Hamanhig). The Shulchan Aruch (O.C. 142:1) codifies the Rambam's ruling. The Rama mostly agrees but sets a limit: One should send the *ba'al korei* back (i.e., even if he has moved on—Teshuvos Vehanhagos 1:147) only for a mistake that changes the meaning, not for an error in *trop* (cantillation) or *nikud* (vowels); but even in those cases, the correction should be shouted (only if the error is caught before he continued reading—*ibid.*).

(continued on page 2)

O&A from the
BAIS HAVAAD
HALACHA HOTLINE
1.888.485.VAAD(8223)
ask@baishavaad.org

(continued from page 1)

shall return the stolen item that he stole." If this article was lost or underwent a change, the thief must pay its value.²

Though Reuters refers to "artifacts that were pillaged during colonial times," as a matter of halacha, the diamond in question would likely be the legitimate property of the United Kingdom. As we have previously discussed,³ sovereign governments, including those who seize power by conquest, have the legal right to appropriate the property of their subjects, provided that, per the Rambam's formulation, such appropriation is "in accordance with the laws that they enacted."⁴ Accordingly, assuming the colonial government of South Africa acted in accordance with its own laws, it had the right to the diamond, and thus the right to gift it to the British monarchy.

If the colonial government did not act in accordance with its own laws, however, there might indeed be a valid claim for the repatriation of the diamond, as the Rambam rules:

If, however, a king confiscates a courtyard or a field from one of the subjects of his country in a manner that is not in accordance with the laws that he enacted, he is considered a thief, and the owners may expropriate the property from the person who purchased it from the king.⁵

Although more than a century has passed since the transfer of the diamond to the United Kingdom, halacha has no statute of limitations on a claim of theft. Even if the original owner has given up hope (*yeiush*) of recovering his property, if the stolen item is still intact, it must be returned to its owner.

If the item underwent a physical transformation (*shinui ma'aseh*) in the hands of the thief, he has the right to keep it and pay the owner its value.⁶ In our case, Reuters reports that

Officially known as Cullinan I, the diamond in the scepter was cut from the Cullinan diamond, a 3,100-carat stone that was mined near Pretoria.

If we were to view the diamond as stolen, then the obligation to return the diamond itself

rather than its value would depend on whether the cutting occurred subsequent to the theft, in which case it would qualify as a *shinui*, or prior to the theft, in which case it would not. (The setting of the diamond into the scepter would probably not qualify as a *shinui*, because a reversible transformation, like the nailing together of pieces of wood, is not considered a *shinui*.)

Even in the absence of a physical transformation that would qualify as a *shinui ma'aseh*, there is a rabbinic enactment exempting a thief from returning the stolen object itself in certain cases:

Even if a person stole a beam and used it in building a house, Torah law requires that he tear down the entire building and return the beam to its owner, for the beam remains unchanged. Nevertheless, to encourage robbers to repent, our Chachamim ordained that the robber pay the worth of the beam and did not require him to destroy his building. The same applies in all similar situations.⁷

The Erech Shai extends this to any case where the thief would incur a loss by returning the actual stolen item.⁸ Accordingly, if dismantling the scepter would entail financial loss, it might suffice to return the value of the diamond rather than the diamond itself.

In addition to a physical transformation, a transfer of ownership (*shinui reshus*) coupled with *yeiush* also eliminates the requirement to return the actual object, but a pious and scrupulous individual should still do so.⁹ Some require that the *shinui reshus* occur after the *yeiush*; others do not. In a situation of *yeiush* and *shinui reshus*, while the purchaser of the stolen property is not obligated to return the item itself, there are various opinions as to whether he is obligated to compensate the victim for its value.¹⁰

Accordingly, if the colonial government of South Africa and the British monarchy are viewed as separate entities, the transfer of the diamond between the two would constitute a *shinui reshus*, so the British monarchy might not be obligated to return the stone itself, and perhaps

(continued from page 1)

The Mishnah Brurah (ibid. 4) points out that even *nikud* mistakes sometimes change the meaning, e.g., from future tense to past; for those, the *ba'al korei* should be sent back. And in certain



RAV ARVEH
FINKEL

cases, even the wrong *trop* can change the meaning (ibid.). Conversely, if a letter is omitted (or added) and the meaning is not affected, one need not go back (ibid.).

If an entire word was omitted, even one that does not affect the meaning, the *ba'al korei* must be sent back (Biur Halacha ibid. s.v. *Aval*).

Some *poskim* are more lenient, like the Derech Hachaim (cited in Biur Halacha ibid. s.v. *Ein*), who says that even mistakes that change the meaning don't need to be corrected. Ask your *rav* or *gabbai* which view your shul follows. The practice in many shuls, from what I've observed, is to correct all mistakes when caught immediately, except those of *trop*.

not even its value, depending on the above considerations. As noted, however, a scrupulous person should return stolen property even in a situation of *yeiush* and *shinui reshus*, and various authorities maintain (in other contexts) that a public entity is obligated to adhere to such standards of meticulous conduct.¹¹

(As usual, in this article we are discussing the halachos primarily as they would apply to Jews.)

2 Rambam Hilchos Gzeilah Va'veidah 1:4; Sefer Hamitzvos asef 194; Sefer Hachinuch mitzvah 130; Smag asef 73.

3 All Hail Seizure: May Government Expropriate Property? Bais HaVaad Halacha Journal, Aug. 12, 2021.

4 Rambam Hilchos Gzeilah Va'veidah 5:13.

5 Rambam Hilchos Gzeilah Va'veidah ibid.

6 Shulchan Aruch C.M. 360:5. Cf. Pis'chei Choshen Hilchos Gneivah Ve'on'ah perek 2 se'if 2 and n. 4.

7 Rambam Hilchos Gzeilah Va'veidah 1:4. Cf. Shulchan Aruch ibid. se'if 1; Pis'chei Choshen ibid. se'if 9.

8 Erech Shai ibid. Cf. Pis'chei Choshen ibid. n. 32.

9 Shulchan Aruch ibid. 369:5. Cf. Ketzos Hachoshen siman 259 s.k. 3, R' Zalman Nechemia Goldberg, Ha'atakas Kalates LeLo Reshus Habe'alim, Techumin 6, os 14:1.

10 Shulchan Aruch ibid. 353:3, 356:3, and 361:4. Cf. Pis'chei Choshen ibid. se'ipim 14-15 and perek 3 se'ipim 18-20.

11 See Shu"t Machzei Avraham cheilek 2 C.M. siman 1; Shu"t Pe'as Sadecha siman 155 (pp. 323 and 328-29).

(continued from page 1)



of *galus* due to the lack of *reiach nicho'ach*.

The purpose of *korbanos* is for Klal Yisrael to find favor in Hashem's eyes, and during *galus*, *reiach nicho'ach* is not available, so *korbanos* are *pasul*.

This would accord with the Brisker Rav's understanding of the Mishnah, as he explains that the reason a *korban shechted* for a purpose other than *reiach nicho'ach* is valid is not because *reiach nicho'ach* is not *me'akeiv* the mitzvah, but rather because it is *stama lishmah*, meaning that

reiach nicho'ach is built into the *korban*, so intending otherwise will not remove it. According to the Netziv, *reiach nicho'ach* was restored when the second *Bais Hamikdash* was built.

ALLURE
HEALTHCARE SERVICES
Mr. and Mrs. Michael Nudell

BHHJ SPONSORS
Mr. Baruch Abittan

To become a corporate sponsor of the BHHJ or disseminate in memory/zechus of a loved one, email info@baishavaad.org

Elevate your Inbox.

Scan here to receive the weekly email version of the Halacha Journal or sign up at www.baishavaad.org/subscribe

