

Likkutei Sichos

On the weekly Torah readings and holidays

From the Talks of

**The Lubavitcher Rebbe
Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson**

Volume 27 | Chag HaPesach

The Compromise Cup

General Editor: Rabbi Eliezer Robbins | **Senior Editor:** Rabbi Lazer Danzinger

Content Editor: Rabbi Zalmy Avtzon

Translated by Mendel Greenbaum



© Copyright by Sichos In English 2025 ◦5785

A note on the translation: Rounded and square brackets reflect their use in the original *sichah*; curly brackets are interpolations of the translator or editors. The footnotes in curly brackets are those of the translator or editors and do not correspond to the footnotes in the original. Words in bold type are italicized in the original text.

Considerable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the translation while maintaining its clarity. However, as in all translations, inadvertent errors may occur.

Your feedback is appreciated — please share your thoughts at info@projectlikkuteisichos.org

1.

OBLIGATION OR PERMISSION

Rambam writes that after one fulfills “all the described obligatory mitzvos at the Pesach seder on the night of the fifteenth of Nissan,”¹ after drinking the fourth cup:²

One then has the prerogative³ to fill a fifth cup and recite over it the Great Hallel,⁴ that is, from “Give thanks to Hashem, for He is good”⁵ to “On the rivers of Babylon.” Unlike the {other} four cups, this cup is not obligatory.

The source for the fifth cup⁶ is from the version of a *beraisa*⁷ cited by the Geonim:⁸ “Over the fifth cup, he recites the Great Hallel.’ These are the words of Rabbi Tarfon.”⁹

Rabbeinu Manoach,¹⁰ in his gloss to *Mishneh Torah*, states:

From this, we can infer that drinking more wine after the four cups is forbidden. If one were to surmise that it was permitted, why would we require the recitation of the Great Hallel over {this fifth cup}? Instead, this implies that one may not drink after the fourth cup. But if one desires to drink {more}, he must recite songs of praise and something related to the subject of the exodus from Egypt, as one does over the fourth cup. Otherwise, drinking more is forbidden.

From this statement of Rabbeinu Manoach, it is understood that he construes *Rambam’s* words to mean that the fifth cup is optional.¹¹ The statement, “One then has the prerogative to

¹ *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Chametz Umatzah*,” ch. 8. {The quoted phrase appears in par. 1 of this section.}

² *Ibid*, par. 10.

³ {A literal reading of the original would be, “there is for him to fill...,” an ambiguous phrase that is generally intended to be understood contextually as either an obligation, desired course of action, or dispensation, hence the discussion below.}

⁴ {An addition to the “Regular” Hallel, *Tehillim*, chs. 113-118.}

⁵ *Tehillim* ch. 136.

⁶ For assorted opinions and discussion regarding the fifth cup — see *Tur*, “*Or HaChaim*,” sec. 481, and *Beis Yosef*, ad loc; *Encyclopedia Talmudis*, entry “Four Cups”; end of *Hagaddah Sheleimah* (by Rabbi Menachem Kasher), at length; *Torah Sheleimah*, Addenda to vol. 9, sec. 1.

⁷ *Pesachim* 118a. {A *beraisa* is a Tannaic teaching not included in the Mishnah.}

⁸ {The Geonim were Jewish scholarly leaders who headed Babylonian academies during the post-Talmudic era from approximately the 6th to 11th centuries, serving as the supreme authorities on Jewish law and religious practice throughout the diaspora.}

See sources cited above fn. 6. {The prevalent version of the *beraisa* reads: “Over the **fourth** cup...”}

⁹ Beginning of *Beis Yosef*, loc cit.: The **Rif** and **Rambam** have the version of the *beraisa* “over the fifth cup, he recites the Great Hallel.” In *Haggadah shel Pesach* by *Maharal*, near the end (“*Leshon Limudim*” — “*Din Kos Hei*”): “This is the version used by all the commentaries. Only *Rashbam* has the version, “fourth cup” instead of the “fifth cup,” and his opinion is inconsequential in the face of all other commentaries.” Note, however, that this version used by *Rashbam* also appears in *Rashi*, ad loc, and *Tosafos*, s.v., “*revii*” (on *Pesachim* 117b).

¹⁰ {A late 13th century scholar in Provence, he is most known for his *important* commentary on *Rambam’s Mishneh Torah*.}

¹¹ The same can be found in *Shiltei Giborim* on *Pesachim*, loc cit.: *Rambam*, *Semag*, and *Tur* write that it is optional. *Maaseh Rokeach* on *Mishneh Torah*, loc cit., quotes the testimony of *Rambam’s* son, Rabbi

fill” is intended as a dispensation — “**if one does desire** to drink {more}, he must recite over that cup....” This accords with the opinions held by many of the Geonim¹² that the fifth cup is optional and contingent entirely on the person’s interest.

However, this interpretation does not align smoothly with *Rambam’s* exact wording, as *Rambam* concludes (as cited above), “This cup is not obligatory **like the four cups**.” If we were to surmise that *Rambam’s* opinion is that the fifth cup is not at all obligatory, then we would expect *Rambam* to have said concisely, “This cup is not obligatory.” *Rambam’s* expanded formulation implies that this fifth cup, too, is “obligatory,” but “not obligatory **like the four cups**” — it’s not “obligatory” to the same degree **as** that of the four cups.

The same can be inferred from Rabbeinu Nissim’s commentary¹³ on *Pesachim*. He writes the following concerning Rabbi Tarfon’s words:

The four cups are obligatory, while the fifth is optional. If one wishes to drink {an additional cup}, he should recite over it the Great Hallel. Alternatively, drinking a fifth cup and reciting the “Great Hallel” over it fulfills the mitzvah in its most ideal way.¹⁴ This second *explanation* conforms with the wording “he recites over it the Great Hallel”. From his words in the last chapter of “*Hilchos Chametz Umatzah*,” *Rambam* seems to concur with this {latter} explanation.

Namely, Rabbeinu Nissim learns that, according to *Rambam*, the fifth cup is the ideal way of fulfilling the mitzvah.¹⁵ Therefore, *Rambam* writes, “this cup is not obligatory like the four cups.” In other words, although “one then has the **prerogative** to fill” (to fulfil the mitzvah in its most ideal way), “this cup is not obligatory like the four cups”

However, it is also difficult to reconcile this interpretation with *Rambam’s* wording, for {if this were *Rambam’s* opinion} then he should have written so explicitly (employing the familiar expression): “to fulfil the mitzvah in its most ideal way, one should fill a fifth cup and recite over it the Great Hallel” (or some similar expression).

Rambam’s wording implies that while it does indeed carry some level of obligation, it is still not actually the fulfillment of **a mitzvah** (or even just as a mitzvah) in its most ideal way (and therefore, *Rambam* says simply, “One then has the prerogative...”).

Avraham, that the *Rambam* himself was not accustomed to fill a fifth cup. {See further in fns. 8-10 in the original.}

¹² See sources cited above fn. 6.

¹³ Cited (partly) in the *Beis Yosef*, loc cit.

¹⁴ See as well *Raavad’s* gloss on the *Rif* on *Pesachim*, loc cit.: It is a mitzvah to act in accordance with his (Rabbi Tarfon’s) words... even the Tanna of the mishnah only means that one should not have less than four cups, but it is praiseworthy to add a fifth. See also *Haggadah Sheleimah*, loc cit., at length.

¹⁵ However, we may posit that *Ran’s* statement “*Rambam’s* words... concurs” only refers to the general gist of his explanation of the Gemara, that Rabbi Tarfon does not disagree with the Tanna in the mishnah, unlike the opinion held by the *Baal HaMaor*, ad loc.

2.

TO DRINK OR NOT TO DRINK

Rambam's real intent may be understood by examining the *Rambam's* precise wording:

Concerning the four cups, *Rambam* rules:¹⁶ “One recites a blessing on every one of these four cups individually.” (This is followed by his description of the respective passages to be recited over each of the four cups.) Afterwards, when delineating how to fulfill “all the obligatory mitzvos at the Pesach seder on the night of the fifteenth of Nissan,”¹⁷ *Rambam* **specifies** in each case that the person should “drink” it: For the first cup — “He recites the blessing of בּוֹרֵא פְּרִי הַגָּפֶן, and recites over it the *kiddush* of the day and the blessing of וְשֵׁהֲתַיְבוּ, and then drinks {it}.”¹⁸ For the second cup — “He recites the blessing of בּוֹרֵא פְּרִי הַגָּפֶן, and drinks the second cup.”¹⁹ For the third cup — “He recites the Grace after Meals over the third cup and drinks it.”²⁰ For the fourth cup — “He recites the blessing of בּוֹרֵא פְּרִי הַגָּפֶן, and he may not taste **anything**²¹ afterwards.”²²

However, concerning the fifth cup, *Rambam* simply states (as quoted above), “one then has the prerogative to fill a fifth cup and recite over it the Great Hallel” without concluding “he recites the blessing of בּוֹרֵא פְּרִי הַגָּפֶן and drinks it.”

Considering that *Rambam* is famous for his meticulous phrasing, it becomes clear that this was his intended point: to convey that we do **not** drink the fifth cup but simply fill it and recite the Great Hallel over it.

This can also be inferred from his words immediately prior: “Afterwards, he fills a fourth cup and completes the Hallel over it... He recites the blessing of בּוֹרֵא פְּרִי הַגָּפֶן, and he may not taste **anything afterwards** throughout the entire night **except for water.**” In the following sentence, *Rambam* would obviously not **contradict** himself and say that we *should* drink a cup of wine immediately following the fourth cup.

¹⁶ *Mishneh Torah* “*Hilchos Chametz Umatzah*,” ch. 7, par. 10.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, ch. 8.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, par. 1.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, par. 5.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, par. 10.

²¹ {Intimating that this cup is drunk.}

²² *Ibid.*

3.

FIRST EXPLANATION: FULFILLING BOTH OPINIONS

We may posit that the following is the explanation:

Rambam agrees with those opinions²³ who understand Rabbi Tarfon as arguing with the Tanna²⁴ of the mishnah on whether the obligation is to have four or five cups. Accordingly, it would seem that the halachah should follow the view of the first {anonymous} Tanna of the mishnah, and one is only obligated to drink four cups. Yet, we find that the Gemara engages in a back-and-forth about what passages to recite over the fifth cup (“From where does the Great Hallel begin?”) following Rabbi Tarfon’s opinion.²⁵ This seemingly implies that the Gemarah actually accepts Rabbi Tarfon’s opinion as the halachah.

How, then, should someone conduct himself practically? Ostensibly, we could say that in light of this doubt, we should be stringent and drink a fifth cup in accord with the opinion of Rabbi Tarfon.²⁶ However, we cannot do so, as according to the opinion that we are only obligated in four cups, **we would not be permitted** to drink a fifth cup (as *Rambam* states that after fulfilling the mitzvah of the four cups, “**he may not taste** anything afterwards ... except water”).

Rambam, therefore, resolves: “One has the prerogative to fill a fifth cup,” **but nothing more** — {meaning, the cup should be filled, but} it should **not** be drunk,

Consequently, the person accomplishes both things: he drinks **only** four cups and fills a fifth cup to account for Rabbi Tarfon’s opinion.

What purpose is there in **filling** a (fifth) cup if it is not drunk?

We find a parallel situation in Jewish law where a cup is filled for the sake of a recitation despite **not** being drunk:

{That is, the case of} a meal that was eaten on Friday and continued until the start of Shabbos. According to many opinions, one {should still} recite the Grace after Meals over a cup {of wine}, despite not being able to drink (until after Kiddush).²⁷ A similar principle can be applied to the cups on Pesach night.

²³ *Baal HaMaor*, loc cit.; see also *Rosh*, loc cit., sec. 33.

²⁴ {The title given to the Sages of the Mishnah.}

²⁵ See *Milchamos Hashem* and *Ran*, ad loc. However, they opine that since the Amaraïm discuss Rabbi Tarfon’s opinion, we should conclude that his opinion is adopted as the accepted halachah. See below Section 4.

²⁶ See *Baal HaMaor*, loc cit.

²⁷ See *Tur* and *Shulchan Aruch* (and Alter Rebbe’s *Shulchan Aruch*), “*Orach Chaim*,” sec. 271, par. 6 (and par. 12). See also *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Shabbos*,” ch. 29, par. 13.

Generally, {the mitzvah concerning these cups can be said to} have two parts:²⁸ (a) imbibing the contents of the cup and (b) **reciting** the designated passages instituted by our Sages over each of these (four) cups,

Therefore, *Rambam* rules that in the case of the fifth cup, one should fill the cup “and recite over it the Great Hallel” (despite being unable to drink it), to account for Rabbi Tarfon’s opinion, at least in respect to one part of the mitzvah.

4.

SECOND EXPLANATION: NO MITZVAH TO DRINK

An alternative explanation:

Rambam learns (as do many other commentaries) that Rabbi Tarfon agrees with the Tanna of the mishnah (that the mitzvah is to drink only four cups),

The meaning, then, of Rabbi Tarfon’s words (in the version maintained by *Rambam*) “Over the fifth cup, he recites the Great Hallel” is that he should (only) **fill** this cup “and recite over it the Great Hallel,”²⁹ but **not** drink it.

The reasoning for this opinion is self-evident: The fifth cup is distinct and different from the other four cups regarding the parameters defining the mitzvah observance and certainly in the defining parameters of the mitzvah object.³⁰

Regarding the four cups, the Gemara states,³¹ “The Rabbis instituted that the four cups {be drunk} in a way that shows freedom. With the drinking of each cup, a mitzvah is performed.” As *Rambam* stated earlier,³² “One recites a blessing on each of these four cups individually. The person recites the Kiddush for the day over the first cup. Over the second cup, he reads the Haggadah. Over the third, he recites the Grace after Meals. Over the fourth, he concludes the Hallel and recites the blessing associated with the song {of Hallel}.”

This means that even if we say that according to *Rambam* “every one (of these four cups) is an **independent expression of freedom and a mitzvah in its own right**” (as the Alter Rebbe puts it in his *Shulchan Aruch*),³³ nevertheless, the defining parameters of all four cups are identical: (a) they share the **same** obligatory element — each must be drunk as an expression of freedom, (b) each has a distinct mitzvah in the recitation and blessing over it.

²⁸ Examine Alter Rebbe’s *Shulchan Aruch*, “*Orach Chaim*,” sec. 190, par. 4.

²⁹ See *Milchamos Hashem; Ran; Raavad*; et al.

³⁰ {In the original, “*chefza shel mitzvah*.”}

³¹ *Pesachim* 117b.

³² *Hilchos Chametz Umatzah*, ch. 7, par. 10.

³³ Sec. 474, par. 2.

However, the fifth cup does fall under the same class of mitzvah as the other four: The fifth cup (a) is not drunk; (b) the recitation over it is not in the same category as the recitations over the four — *Rambam* believes³⁴ that we do **not** conclude the recitation over the fifth cup with a blessing,³⁵ unlike the recitations over each of the four cups which do conclude with **blessings**.³⁶

[Perhaps, we may posit that the fifth cup over which we recite the Great Hallel, from “Give thanks to Hashem, for He is good,” until ‘On the rivers of Babylon,” is praise and expression of gratitude for the opportunity to have fulfilled the mitzvah of the previous four cups and more generally — a thanksgiving for all the mitzvahs and actions which we have performed on this night. Further elucidation of this point is beyond the scope of this work.]

5.

A MITZVAH IN THE IDEAL

On this basis, we can understand the import of *Rambam’s* wording, “One then has the prerogative to fill a fifth cup” (instead of stating that “to fulfil the mitzvah in its most ideal way one should fill a fifth cup,” or some similar phrase):

The expression “the mitzvah in its most *ideal* way” (generally) connotes that the perfection of the mitzvah fulfillment itself is enhanced.³⁷ Moreover, it means that not only is a person’s fulfillment of the mitzvah more ideal, but the **mitzvah object** itself is also considered more ideal. Namely, the quality of being “ideal” is ascribed to the mitzvah object.

[This idea is analogous to *Rambam’s* wording³⁸ concerning the Chanukah candles: “The mitzvah is for a single candle to be lit in every house... A person who is conscientious in his performance of **the mitzvah**... A person who is even more conscientious in his performance of the mitzvah than this and **observes the mitzvah in its most ideal way**, lights one candle for each individual on the first night and adds one candle on each subsequent night.” The enhancement is the improvement in the mitzvah of the Chanukah candles themselves; in the mitzvah object of the Chanukah candles (as explained elsewhere).³⁹]

³⁴ Unlike the opinions of other Geonim etc. — see *Tur*, op cit. (sec. 481; see also end of sec. 486) and the citations in *Haggadah Sheleimah* (cited above in fn. 6) ch. 5.

³⁵ See *Shiltei Giborim on Rif on Pesachim*, loc cit.: From *Rif’s* words as well as those of *Rambam*, it is evident that we do not conclude with a blessing when having a fifth cup.

³⁶ As stated by *Rambam*, regarding the first cup of kiddush — beginning of ch. 8, regarding the second cup — ch. 8, par. 5, regarding the third and fourth cups — ch. 8, par. 10.

³⁷ See also *Likkutei Sichos*, vol. 16, p. 187, ff. — regarding the phrase “a mitzvah in its most ideal way” in the Alter Rebbe’s *Shulchan Aruch*, “*Orach Chaim*,” sec. 527, par. 1.

³⁸ *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Chanukah*,” ch. 4, par. 1.

³⁹ See *Likkutei Sichos*, vol. 20, p. 209, 209. In fn. 14 there, it’s suggested that this explains the distinction between the term “*mehadrin*” {those who are conscientious in their observance of mitzvot} and the phrase “the mitzvah in its most ideal way” (as *Rambam* phrases it in that source).

And since it is *Rambam's* opinion that the fifth cup does not fall under the same category as the mitzvah of the four cups, it would not be possible to say that the **fifth cup** constitutes the “ideal way of fulfilling” the mitzvah of **(four) cups**.

Rambam, therefore, states that “one then has the prerogative to fill a fifth cup” — as a separate instruction and obligation, using a different phrase: “one has the prerogative.”

Therefore, *Rambam* elaborates, “This cup is not obligatory like **the four cups**” — he emphasises that the fifth cup is not obligatory as the other cups but one simply “has the prerogative,” as explained above.

6.

A FIFTH CUP OR ELIJAHU'S CUP

Now, there are those⁴⁰ who associate this fifth cup with the cup filled for Eliyahu. They understand that since there is an argument in the Gemara as to the requirement of a fifth cup and there has been no conclusive halachic ruling, we should, therefore, fill a fifth cup on account of this doubt but not drink it. For this reason, we refer to this cup as the Cup of Eliyahu, intimating that when Eliyahu comes and clarifies all doubts, he will then clarify the doubt regarding **this** cup.

However, it is evident from the *Chok Yaakov* and the Alter Rebbe's *Shulchan Aruch* that these are two separate ideas: The Alter Rebbe, in his *Shulchan Aruch*,⁴¹ cites (the ruling of *Rema*)⁴² “It has become a universal Jewish custom from the early generations {onward} to refrain from drinking wine... after {drinking} the fourth cup... unless there is a great need, such as {in the instance of} a squeamish person or someone desperately thirsty... If the person has no other beverages, only wine, he may drink a fifth cup and recite the Great Hallel, *Nishmas*, and *Yishtabach* including its conclusion.”

And in the previous Section, the Alter Rebbe states⁴³ (citing from *Chok Yaakov*)⁴⁴ “**It is customary in these regions** to fill one cup in addition to {the cups filled for all} those participating in the Seder. This cup is called the Cup of Eliyahu the Prophet.”

It is clear from this that these are two completely separate rites — and to the extent that

a) They appear in individual and separate Sections of *Shulchan Aruch*;

⁴⁰ Such is brought in *Sefer Taamei HaMinhagim* (vol. 1, “matters of Pesach”) ch. 551, citing the *Gra*. See also fn. 40 in the original.

⁴¹ Sec. 481, par. 1.

⁴² *Shulchan Aruch*, “*Orach Chaim*,” sec. 481, par. 1.

⁴³ Sec. 480, par. 5.

⁴⁴ Ad loc, subpar. 6.

- b) They are referred to by different names (the “Cup of Eliyahu” and the “Fifth Cup”) and their laws and specifics differ: It is permitted for one “to drink a fifth cup” if there is great need, etc. and in such an instance he is required to recite the Great Hallel over it. In contrast, the cup of Eliyahu “is **customary** in these regions” (not only **permitted**).
- c) The most significant distinction is that we collectively fill “**one** cup, in addition to {the cups filled for all} those participating in the Seder.” It is a part of the Seder of all participants. There is no separate cup for each individual, unlike the fifth cup, which is permitted for **each** individual (who wants it).

Based on this, we can also clarify *Rambam’s* position on the fifth cup. (As mentioned above, he maintains that it is not simply permitted or optional, but “**one has the prerogative**” — an obligation). This is not an obligation to fill **one** cup for **all** participants collectively but a cup for each individual who fulfills the mitzvah of the four cups. This is evident in his precise wording “**one** has the prerogative,” and not even {the slight variation of} stating “there is a prerogative to fill a fifth cup.”⁴⁵

7.

A DIFFERENCE OF CUPS

{From the above discussion, two points emerge:}

- a) The fifth cup and the cup of Eliyahu are two distinct things, in their content and laws as mentioned above;
- b) We find that they comprise **contradictory** elements. Though *Rambam* rules regarding the fifth cup: “One has the prerogative to fill a fifth cup,” we do not do so in practice. The ruling in *Shulchan Aruch*⁴⁶ is that it is only a dispensation for a highly sensitive person or for one who “desires... to drink.” The opposite is true regarding the Cup of Eliyahu: No mention of **this** cup is made in the Gemara or by the *Rishonim*;⁴⁷ only by the *Acharonim*.⁴⁸ Nevertheless, filling this cup has become customary throughout the Jewish community.

A deeper explanation of these two points is as follows: We find a common denominator regarding these two cups (as discussed above): Neither cup is drunk, and both are only filled. From this, it is understood that both cups are associated with an *avodah*⁴⁹ and spiritual level beyond the *avodah* expressed in practical action (in drinking).

⁴⁵ In the original Hebrew, *Rambam* writes “אֵין לְהַמְלִיךְ” (literally, “there is **for him** to fill”) rather than the impersonal “אֵין לְמַלֵּא” (“there is to fill”).

⁴⁶ In fact, *Beis Yosef* in his *Shulchan Aruch* makes no mention of it.

⁴⁷ {Lit., “the first ones;” the *Rishonim* are Torah sages who lived during the 11th to 15th centuries.}

⁴⁸ {Lit., “the latter ones;” the *Acharonim* are Torah sages who lived during the 16th century until the present day.}

⁴⁹ {Divine service.}

This is the (deeper) meaning of *Rambam's* conclusion: “This cup **is not obligatory** like **the {other} four cups.**” This cup is associated with the level beyond obligation (similar to the well-known explanation⁵⁰ about the evening prayer being voluntary).⁵¹ The same is true of the cup of Eliyahu, which is associated with redemption and transcends a person’s service.

8.

IN ADDITION BUT AS ONE

Nevertheless, there is a distinction between these two cups. The name “the **fifth** cup” emphasizes that it is **a continuation** (the fifth) of the person’s *avodah*. Conversely, the Cup of Eliyahu is distinct. It is not the fifth in relation or continuation to the four cups, representing the preceding *avodah*.

We may posit the following explanation for this:

The efflux elicited by the **fifth** cup comes specifically (through and) following a person’s **prior** *avodah* reaching a state of perfection. This is **similar** to what is explained regarding the third form of “arousal from Above,” which is only elicited when the person prepares himself to be a fitting receptacle.⁵²

For this reason, the fifth cup is mentioned in the Gemara and by the Geonim and *Rambam*. It explains why in those eras, some conducted themselves personally (and such was their *avodah*) to fill the fifth cup. For⁵³ **their** *avodah* on the Seder night and when drinking of the four cups was loftier, and one of perfection. {Our observance, however, is on a far lower level, as the following two sayings indicate:} “These earlier ones are considered like angels...,”⁵⁴ and “Can the present generation be deemed worthy {in comparison}?!”⁵⁵ It follows then that their *avodah* was such that it could be a proper receptacle to elicit the spiritual effluence from the (fifth) level associated with the fifth cup.

However, nowadays, when Mashiach is approaching, our *avodah* is not on the same level of perfection. It cannot be a fitting receptacle (“a perfect place”) to receive such a lofty level. Therefore, in our generation, filling a fifth cup is unconventional.

However, the Cup of Eliyahu symbolizes the Jewish people’s unshakable faith in his arrival. [This linkage between the two is understood from the continuity of the Alter Rebbe’s

⁵⁰ See *Likkutei Torah*, “*Sukkos*,” 80c; “*Shir HaShirim*,” 24b; *Biurei HaZohar* by the Mitteler Rebbe (13d, ff.) and by the Tzemach Tzedek (vol. 1, p. 88, ff.).

⁵¹ See *Or HaTorah*, “*VaEira*” (vol. 7), end of p. 2588; *Or HaTorah*, “*Lech Lecha*” (vol. 4), 674a; see also *Maharal's Haggadah Shel Pesach* on this section.

⁵² See *Likkutei Torah*, “*Shir HaShirim*,” 24a, ff. {In the the original Aramaic, “אַתָּר שְׁלִים”; lit. “an ideal place.”}

⁵³ See in a similar vein *Kuntres Inyanah shel Toras HaChassidus*, marginal notes to fn. 78.

⁵⁴ {*Shabbos* 112b.}

⁵⁵ *Yevamos* 39b, and Rashi, ad. loc.

words. Namely, the Alter Rebbe mentions the custom of the Cup of Eliyahu following his statement at the beginning of the same paragraph:⁵⁶ “In some places, it is customary not to lock the bedrooms on Pesach night, since it is a night of “protection for the Children of Israel for generations,” {i.e., an auspicious time for G-d} to redeem the Jewish people from exile. Should Eliyahu come, he will find an open door, and we will speedily greet him. We fervently believe in this promise, and this faith brings a great reward... It is customary in these regions....” From this, it is understood that this Cup of Eliyahu is linked with and germane to the belief in the Future Redemption.]

Every Jew has this faith. Jews are **all** “believers, the children of believers.”⁵⁷ Notwithstanding the sort of *avodah* a person engages in with his revealed faculties, a Jew constantly has (in a revealed sense — or at the very least in the innermost aspect of his soul)⁵⁸ faith in the coming of Mashiach. (He not only “believes in him,” but “**awaits** his coming.”)⁵⁹ This belief is a **Divine commandment** found in the Written and Oral Torah;⁶⁰ And if anything,⁶¹ the later the person finds himself in the process of Mashiach’s approach, the closer the person is to the redemption, and the more intensely does this belief illuminate him

For this reason, specifically in the latter generations the custom was publicized, and it has become common practice “to fill one cup in addition to {the cups filled for all} those at the Seder. This cup is called the Cup of Eliyahu the Prophet,” despite this custom not being recorded (explicitly) as practiced in previous generations.

And it is (a) “**one** cup” (b) in **addition** to {the cups filled for} all those at the seder.

On this basis, we can explain the precise wording employed by the Alter Rebbe, “to fill one cup in addition **to those participating in the Seder.**” The Alter Rebbe thereby alludes to Eliyahu HaNavi arriving and participating with those **reclining at the Seder table.**

For the faith of the Jewish people on this night — the night on which the King of kings, the Holy One, in His essence, revealed Himself to them⁶² — which is openly expressed in a physical form ({through} a cup with wine) — invites Prophet Eliyahu and prompts his presence at every Seder. His appearance is an **addition** to those participating in the Seder. Still, his cup is placed on the table with the cups of those participating in the Seder, indicating that he is **one** of the participants.

From the talks delivered on Shabbos *parshas Korach*, 5744 (1984) and Second Seder Night, 5729 (1969)

⁵⁶ And similarly in *Chok Yaakov*, *ibid.*

⁵⁷ {*Shabbos* 97a.}

⁵⁸ See *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Geirushin*,” ch. 2, par. 20.

⁵⁹ *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Melachim*,” ch. 11, par. 1; ch. 12, par. 2.

⁶⁰ *Mishneh Torah*, *ibid.*

⁶¹ See also *Kuntres Inyanah shel Toras HaChassidus*, {in English, “On the Essence of Chassidus”} marginal notes to fn. 78.

⁶² From the Haggadah, the paragraph beginning “This matzah...,” and the earlier paragraph of “And He took us out...”