

HALOCHOSCOPE ^{TOI}

A group of young girls are having a birthday party on Sukos. They planning on eating snacks and will not be eating bread, cakes or cookies. Should one encourage them to eat cake and the like, and to say *Laishaiv Basukah*? May they say it even if they only eat snacks, such as chips or pretzels?

The issues:

- (A) What requires the *Brocha, Laishaiv Basukah*?
 - (B) Which foods require a *Sukah*?
 - (C) Being *Koveia*, fixing a “meal” and its *Shiur*, amount
 - (D) Women reciting a *Brocha* on a time-bound Mitzvah; *Chinuch*, training children for this Mitzvah of *Sukah*, especially girls
- (A) *Laishaiv Basukah*

This is a Brocha on the Mitzvah of *Yeshivas Sukah*, literally, dwelling in the Sukah. A Brocha on a Mitzvah is usually recited before the performance of the Mitzvah. In our case, once we define the Mitzvah, the Brocha should be recited immediately before the act. The Poskim debate the exact definition of the Mitzvah, based on interpreting the Talmud’s definition. The Talmud defines the Mitzvah as “*Taishvu Keain Taduru*” live there the way you live permanently in your home. This entails taking one’s best furnishings into the Sukah. In deed it involves eating, sleeping, spending leisure time and studying Torah there.

This leads to a debate by the Poskim on what the entire Mitzvah is. One view maintains that it is the act of sitting down to do one of these activities. This is the literal translation of *Taishvu*, you shall sit. The addition of *Keain Taduru* tells us what we should sit down to do. According to this view, one must recite the Brocha *Laishaiv Basukah* before sitting down to do anything in the Sukah. For example, on Yomtov night, one must recite the Brocha before beginning to eat. Thus one would recite *Kiddush* standing, then say *Laishaiv Basukah*, then sit down. On other days he would stand and say the Brocha before sitting down.

The other view contends, if the entire Mitzvah is to be viewed in this way, it would be better to recite the Brocha before entering the Sukah. *Taishvu* can also mean to stay there and not to move on. Anyone spending an extended time in the Sukah fulfills this Mitzvah. If he sits down to eat, he has not yet started the main part of the Mitzvah because he has not yet spent the time. Therefore, before he spends the

time, i.e., after sitting down, he may still recite the Brocha. There is a further debate on how this should be fulfilled at a mealtime. Some say one should recite it before the Brocha *Hamotzie*, so it does not interrupt between the Hamotzie Brocha and eating the bread. Others maintain that, in light of the opinion cited here later that the Brocha is always recited at a meal, one should show that he means to relate the two. Accordingly, reciting it after Hamotzie is no interruption. It is necessary for the meal, and one may even speak at this juncture if necessary for the meal.

The Talmud records a debate on how often the Brocha should be said. In one view it is said once at the beginning of Sukos. This view seems to consider it one protracted Mitzvah, beginning on the first day and continuing for the seven days. The other view considers it a new Mitzvah each day. A new Brocha is recited every day. If one interrupts his performance of the Mitzvah, for example he left his Sukah for a while, he recites it again when he returns. This is based on the practice of Talmudic sages who wore *Teflin* all day. If they had to remove them for a while, during which they could not perform the Mitzvah, they recited a new Brocha when putting them back on.

One should be able to recite the Brocha on any of the activities listed as Yeshivas Sukah. The early Poskim maintain that one should do so. An opinion is cited requiring the Brocha to be said on each activity even if the person performing them stayed in his Sukah all the time from his very first Brocha. However, the *Minhag*, prevailing practice, is to recite it only when eating. This is strange, since sleeping is considered in some ways more stringent than eating. While snacking outside the Sukah is permitted, napping is not. One resolution is that one could not recite it on sleeping in case he does not sleep. This is difficult to understand, since even spending the time is a fulfillment of Yeshivas Sukah. Presumably, the concern is that he will leave before he can spend sufficient time for this. The better known answer is that eating is considered the main activity. Sleeping, spending time, Torah study and the like are all considered secondary. The idea of a primary and secondary item with the Brocha being made on the primary item and exempting a secondary item, comes from the laws of *Birchos Hanehenin*, Brochos on food. If one has a dish with two foods of different Brochos, he recites the Brocho on the main food. He need not recite any Brocho on the secondary food. It is encompassed by the main food.

Since people consider eating a meal the main activity of Taduru, living in a house, the Brocha is recited on this activity. This is the type of activity that one would go into his home to do, then the other activities would also be done there. One would not, apparently, specially enter his home to do the other activities alone, if he would be eating later. In fact, the Poskim cite a Minhag is to recite it many times a day, even if one did not leave his Sukah between the first and second meal. Others reject this opin-

ion, maintaining that as long as one has not stepped out of his Sukah he need not repeat the Brocha. [See Sukah 28b 35b-36a, Poskim. Tur Shulchan Aruch Orach Chaim 639:1 2 8, 643:1-3, commentaries.]

(B) Foods which require a Sukah

As mentioned, eating is one activity which must be done in the Sukah, and regarding the Brocha, is the main activity. However, not all eating is included in this central activity. The Talmud says that one need not eat *Achilas Arai*, snacks, in the Sukah. The Talmud presumes this to be the same food that can be eaten as a formal meal, but less of it. The Talmud debates how much this is, concluding that it is up to and including the size of a egg. At this point the Talmud assumes that all reference is to bread. Yet, the Talmud says that one who eats even less than this in the Sukah, and even drinks water in the Sukah, is commendable. We learn from here that water does not require a Sukah.

The Talmud discusses the basic obligation to eat in the Sukah. On the first night all agree that there is an obligation to eat in the Sukah. On all other days it is optional, because if one wishes he may eat foods that do not require a Sukah. Here too we learn that not all foods require a Sukah. There is a view that if one could not eat his piece of bread on the first night he may make it up on subsequent days. The problem is that if he eats a bread meal on a subsequent day in his Sukah he could be eating the meal of that day. There is nothing to show that it is a make up for the original Mitzvah. Therefore, he must eat more than the usual. Some commentaries point out that the ideal would be to eat a second bread meal, similar to the third meal eaten on Shabbos.

The Talmud says that one may satisfy this requirement with *Minei Targima*. Often this means a desert type of food brought in as a treat at the end of a meal. It is not just a snack. The question is, what exactly is it? One commentary says it means anything from fruit to cakes. Others maintain that it can not refer to fruit. The Talmud in a different passage, records a debate on whether fruit is included in the requirement for Sukah. Evidently, the aforementioned view rules strictly, or at least wishes to include this view in his reasoning. The others maintain that fruit is exempt. Since they rule leniently, one could not fulfil his obligation to make up for his obligation of the first night with fruit. Accordingly, they maintain that Minei Targima means meat fish and eggs, or anything that one would use as a supplementary dish to bread in a meal. A third view maintains that it seems to mean foods made of the five bread grains, but are not bread. This would include baked foods such as cakes and cookies or pies, and cooked dishes such as oatmeal or pudding, or in modern terms, pasta.

In keeping with our earlier discussion, one could only recite the Brocha Laishaiv Basukah on foods that definitely require a Sukah. Though one should certainly not

take the stricter opinions lightly, the consensus is to rule with the lenient opinions, at least with regard to fruit. One may practice stringency personally, but he could not recite Laishaiv Basukah on fruit.

The second view poses more of a problem. It appears that the consensus is to rule leniently here too, only requiring a Sukah for "Mezonos" foods or real bread. Nonetheless, the initial objections to this view are made in speculative form. Thus, this opinion is not rejected outright. Therefore, meat and the like should require a Sukah, and when eating them one should be able to recite Laishaiv Basukah. The reason it is not said on these foods could be due to it not being used as the main dish of a meal. We mentioned the prevailing practice to only recite it on eating because this is the main activity done in the Sukah. The main activity is usually a bread meal, with these added as supplementary dishes. One could not rightfully recite the Brocha on a supplementary dish if he plans to eat bread. Therefore, one does not recite it at all on a dish whose main purpose is as a supplement to bread. 'Mezonos' is not eaten as a supplement to bread. In fact, it can sometimes be eaten in place of bread, with other foods supplementing it. [This will be discussed in the next section.] Therefore, one could recite Laishaiv Basukah on cakes, but not on meat.

Wine is the subject of debate. It is not a regular drink like water, and is not usually drunk to satisfy a thirst. Often wine is taken as part of a meal. It is also drunk separately in a meal-like manner, such as seated or reclining while devoting an extended period of time to it. It is also eaten with a group, which is the true meaning of the word "party". Accordingly, some maintain that it requires a Sukah, and one may recite Laishaiv Basukah when drinking it. Others disagree, maintaining that it is not a meal, and can be treated as a snack. Alternatively, any drinking is not the type of activity that requires a Sukah. The Poskim rule that one should not drink wine outside the Sukah, and should always have it during a meal or with something that definitely requires the Brocha Laishaiv Basukah. [See Sukah 26a, 26b-27a, Yuma 79a-b, Poskim. Tur Sh. Ar. O.C. 639:2-3, commentaries.]

(C) Being Koveia

Formalizing eating is called being *Koveia Seuda*, fixing it as a meal. This involves making the eating into an official meal, with a setting and time devoted to it. When using bread, a meal is automatically considered a fixed meal for the individual. In order to be considered a group meal, such as when wishing to combine for a Mezuman, quorum of three, the group must be *Koveia* together. With regard to Sukah, bread also requires a measure of *Kva*, fixing. Thus, while for one olive sized piece of bread one must wash (without the Brocha, *Netilas Yadayim*) and recite *Birchas Hamazon* (Rabbinically, or if one is satisfied, Scripturally) for

Sukah a Kebeitza, egg sized piece is required. This is twice the size of an olive.

For "Mezonos" foods the Poskim debate the amount of Kvius for Sukah. As a bread substitute they must either form the staple of a meal, which includes all regular side dishes and supplementary dishes, and with clear intent to be used as a substitute for bread. In this case they become considered a bread and require *Netilas Yadayim*, *Hamotzie* and *Birchas Hamazon*. Or they can be eaten in an amount that anyone normal would consider a full meal of bread. The Talmud uses the amount of half a standard sized loaf. The Poskim consider this to be the volume of four eggs. [A minority view considers three eggs sufficient for this.] Accordingly, for a Sukah, some Poskim maintain that the amount of Kvius is the same as for Kvius Seuda, four eggs' volume. Others maintain that it is the same as for bread itself, for even bread requires a different Shiur for Sukah as for a meal. Thus, according to these Poskim one egg's volume of "Mezonos" is enough to recite Laishaiv Basukah.

Regarding the aforementioned debate on fruit, the Poskim discuss the stringent view, and maintain that it too requires a Kvius in order to be obligated in Sukah. This might seem obvious, but it leads to a number of heated discussions on practical application. The passage in the Talmud on fruit cites a few different sources recording instances of eating fruit in or out of a Sukah. In the first, three instances are cited, one sage refused to taste food outside a Sukah, another refused to eat two dates outside the Sukah, and both asked that water be taken into the Sukah. However, the third ate less than the volume of an egg outside the Sukah. The clear implication is that the three instances are all cases of exemption from Sukah. Some practiced personal stringency.

The Talmud then discusses whether the volume of a date, which is the minimum one is held liable for eating on Yom Kippur, is more or less than that of an egg. [It is forbidden to eat even less than this, but liability requires a *Shiur*.] Three answers are proposed. The first is that the volume of two dates without their pits can be less than a Kebeitza. This implies that the only reason that the sage eating the dates in the Sukah was really exempt was due to their size. Had they been the right volume, he would have been obligated. Fruit must, therefore, be included in the requirement for Sukah, and its Shiur is a Kebeitza. However, it is possible, that even at this size, it might not be considered a worthwhile stringency if it is not being eaten in a manner of Kvius of some sort. This is another issue to be discussed shortly.

The second view states clearly that the dates could easily add up to the volume of an egg, but that fruit is always exempt from a Sukah. In this view, the stringency was due to the food, but might still only be considered worthwhile if eaten with Kvius.

At this juncture the Talmud cites its second source. A group of students were offered figs and grapes during their studies and ate them outside the Sukah, in an Arai

manner. Clearly, the emphasis is on the formality of the eating. This could however, refer to the Shiur or the manner of eating them. Note that they were eating them as a group. In any event, had they eaten them in a Kva manner, they would have presumably been required to take them into the Sukah. This is problematic for the view that fruits do not require a Sukah. One answer offered in his defense is that they meant that fruit is always considered Arai by comparison to bread, presumably regardless of both the Shiur eaten and of the manner in which it is eaten. The second answer is that they mean that they ate them with bread and would have had to go to the Sukah had they eaten the bread with Kvius.

Then the third opinion on the original source says that the fruit would indeed require a Sukah had it been eaten in the requisite volume, but that one can show from other sources that two dates can be less volume than a Kebeitza.

Ruling on this passage depends on a number of issues, including how one views the conclusion on the size of a date without its pit, how one determines the volume of what is considered Kvius for fruit, how one considers the manner of eating for fruit, the number of opinions cited on each side, the most simple assumptions before questions and defenses, or which of the opinions is most authoritative. Accordingly, a number of prominent Poskim rule that fruit does require a Suka. One Posek says that it does not but one should always take the stringent view into consideration. This could either mean that he considers the lenient ruling more authoritative, or that he rules inconclusively and maintains that one must tend to stringency. The third view, which is the one followed by most of our communities, rules that one is exempt for fruit. At the same time the third Posek seems to question the second on why he felt that one should always eat fruit in the Sukah, even if it is not with Kvius. How did he know that the first view considered it obligatory without Kvius? Some say that he meant simply that it was evident that he was eating all types of fruit in all volumes in his Sukah. This might be laudatory, but could not be done to satisfy an obligation in any way, even according to an opinion requiring Sukah for fruit. Others say he meant that even in the amount that could be eaten with Kvius, one could eat it in an informal manner. This would never be considered obligatory. An interesting example of this is cited from the first source itself, where one sage refused to even taste something being cooked outside the Sukah. This could not be considered Kvius. This was done to practice personal stringency. Accordingly, may we assume that the other instance (the two dates) was also done in a similar manner. Thus, even if it had been a Kebeitza it would have been done informally, yet the Talmud would imply that this would have required a Sukah. This would mean that fruit is treated like bread, according to the stringent view.

We find other situations where the Talmud considers less than a formal meal as though there is a Kvius. This includes gathering as a group to drink wine, as mentioned. The Poskim also consider making Kiddush with a small amount of "Mezonos" a Seuda. This satisfies the requirement of making Kiddush where one is eating his Seuda. Accordingly, in such cases the amount for Kvius is certainly a Kebeitza. Thus, the laws of Kidush overlap with and are applied to Sukah.

Another way to consider Kvius for Sukah is when one plans to spend an extended period of time in the Sukah doing other things. Since the Brocha is on the performance of the Mitzvah anyhow, but must be said on the main activity, by eating even a minimal amount before he spends time there one is being Koveia himself. He must still eat the amount of Kvius for bread. There is also a possibility that if one eats a snack at a particular time of day, such as a small amount right after Shacharis with coffee, before spending time on Torah study and an hour or so before eating a full breakfast, this is also considered Kvius.

In practice we follow the view that one must eat some "Mezonos" food to recite the Brocha, but there is no clear ruling on the amount. Accordingly, if one spends time there or eats in a group ("party") he may say Laishaiv Basukah on a Kebeitza. If he only plans to eat a quick snack, he should not say it. However, due to the existence of all the views requiring Sukah for other foods, one may not eat four Kebeitzim of meat and the like outside the Sukah. Similarly, if one eats in a group even less than volume but more than a Kebeitza, they should eat it in a Sukah. Fruit, however, is not considered meal-worthy for any of this. One may practice stringency, but should be Koveia with both the volume and manner of eating.

In our case, the children are planning a formal party. If they eat "Mezonos", including pretzels, they may recite the Brocha. [See refs. for section C.]

(D) Women and children for the Brocha

Women are exempt from the obligation of time-bound Mitzvos. This is derived from the juxtapositioning of the Mitzvos of Tefilin and of Torah study. The Torah specifically exempts women from Torah study. Tefilin is a time-bound Mitzvah. It does not apply on Shabbos or at night. Nonetheless, they may perform the Mitzvah, and are rewarded for their performance. This means that the act they did was not just going through the motions, but has the sanctity of a Mitzvah. The Poskim debate whether they may recite a Brocha on this performance. A Brocha includes uttering the Name of Hashem, which may not be done in vain, such as when there is no obligation for a Brocha. The terminology of the Brocha includes language saying 'commanded us'. How could one not commanded recite it? Some say that she is included in the Jewish people who were commanded it as a whole. She accepted it at Mt. Sinai, and was

exempted from it as a second step. Others say that since after the fact the act is a Mitzvah, reciting a Brocha before it is truthful. The prevailing practice of Ashkenazi women is to recite the Brocha. [See Kidushin 34a-35a, Eruvin 96a-b Tos. Poskim.]

A second issue arising in our case is whether there is a need to show the children that one should try to fulfill a Mitzvah of eating in a Sukah, even if one does not need to. If children are interested in eating foods that require a Sukah, one should teach them about the Mitzvah and train them in its performance. Sukah is one of the Mitzvos about which the Talmud discusses *Chinuch*. The youngest age for Chinuch in positive Mitzvos varies according to the Mitzvah. If the child is old enough to comprehend the idea of the Mitzvah, and/or is physically able to perform it, he is old enough for Chinuch. If a child, upon awakening, does not call for his mother, he is obliged to go into the Sukah. Brochos are also Mitzvos, and children old enough to understand what they mean must be trained to recite the Brocha on a Mitzvah.

Normally, one would not need to train a child in a Mitzvah which he or she is not obliged to perform as an adult. Thus, girls would not be included in the obligation of Chinuch for Sukah. However, since women do eat in the Sukah as adults, albeit voluntarily, there is nothing wrong with training them as children, even if this means that they will recite a Brocha.

In our case, the children are happy to eat things that do not require a Sukah. They are not obliged to eat in the Sukah. The practice of eating there anyhow, though laudable, is voluntary. Is there a point in Chinuch on this aspect of the Mitzvah?

If staying in the Sukah when one is exempt due to rain is considered foolish and unworthy of reward (see Rema O.C. 639:7), why is eating Arai there highly praised? The Poskim determine from this that eating Arai in the Sukah might be exempt, but is in the spirit of the performance of the Mitzvah. Therefore, one should train a child in this aspect as well. Coupled with this is the fact that eating enough for Kvius Seuda of meat and the like requires a Sukah, due to the view that this is Minei Targima. This would also include eating as a group. Then there is the view that even fruit requires Sukah with Kvius, such as with a party.

Thus, though there is no obligation to, there is nothing wrong with trying to get the girls to eat food which requires it, in the Sukah, and to recite the Brocha Laishav Basukah.

Good Yomtov!