INTRODUCTION

Historians have developed several ways of measuring the Jewish adjustment to modern culture in the nineteenth century. Typically, they have focused on changes in social behavior, religious practice, and political ideology. A neglected but valuable gauge of Jews' accommodation to modernity is their attitude toward the restoration of sacrificial worship in Judaism.

There are three advantages of utilizing the attitude toward the restoration of sacrificial worship. First, this attitude can highlight levels of accommodation to the Exile from the time of the destruction of the Second Temple. Since that time most religious authorities sought to adjust to the absence of sacrificial worship by teaching that prayer, study, and the performance of other mitzvot were efficacious substitutes for the cult. However, sacrifice was the focus of almost one-third of the commandments, and God had clearly indicated in the Torah that it was the preferred mode of worship and expiation of sins. The prominence of sacrifice in the Torah and the centrality of the Torah in Jewish life has kept alive the conviction that there is no satisfactory replacement of sacrificial worship. Thus, there have always been and will always be Jews who want to revive it; political or other reasons may also motivate them, but behind these lies a firm religious basis for their claims.

Second, the attitude toward the sacrifice renewal can clarify how the messianic idea can be utilized either on behalf of accommodation to the status quo or as a rebellion against it. Jewish messianism is generally a
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concept of restoration: the Messianic Age is conceived as the Jews’ return to the conditions of their pre-exilic existence, including an ingathering of all Jews to the Land of Israel, a Davidic kingship under the full reign of Jewish law, and worship at the Temple with its sacrificial cult. Until the Messianic Age, then, Jewish life is incomplete and in limbo. There have been two ways of reacting to this condition. Passive messianism has been the dominant response, teaching that only God can reverse the exiled status; all human activities designed to hasten the Redemption (except for moderate prayer and repentance) are a rebellion against him. In direct contrast has been an active messianic response, positing that until the Jews take concrete measures to hasten the end God will not end the Exile and redeem the world. Active messianism has had as long a history as its counterpart and is also represented in the classic Jewish literary and legal sources. However, while passive messianism encourages an adjustment to the exilic status quo, active messianism is an expression of rebellion by Jews against their own pragmatic adjustment to the demands of the Exile. In the nineteenth century, when adjustment became so widespread and so potentially destructive to traditional Jewish life, active messianism revived in force, and one manifestation of it was an attempt to renew the sacrificial cult. Those forces determined to adjust to modernity reasserted the principles of passive messianism.

Third, in the modern period the desire to restore sacrificial worship is a very accurate barometer for gauging degrees of accommodation within the orthodox world. During the first half of the nineteenth century great debates were staged by reformers and traditionalists over the modernization of the prayerbook, particularly the prayers that called for the restoration of sacrificial worship. Sacrificial worship was anything but modern. It was one lost aspect of the ancient world that most people regarded as irretrievable. Sacrificial worship was so foreign to the religious sensibilities of the host European culture and so tied to Jewish national life in Palestine that reverence for it and desire for its resumption had to be inversely related to the desire for cultural assimilation. Reform-minded Jews, citing the support of the ancient prophets, called for the omission of these prayers from the liturgy. Traditional Jews, among whom were those who may also have felt distaste toward sacrificial worship, would not allow their religion to change so considerably: the Torah was immutable and its laws eternal. They would not conclude that this had changed with the destruction of the Temple. To them, Judaism was still in theory a sacrificial religion. This theoretical conviction was disturbed, however, when Rabbis Zevi Hirsch Kalischer and Elijah Guttmacher, motivated by their active messianic convictions, actually attempted to restore sacrificial worship. The divisions within traditional Jewry, between the old Orthodox and neo-Orthodox, became highlighted; the reactions reveal just who among the traditionalists were
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resolutely anti-accommodationist and anti-modern, and who among them were determined to adjust Jewish thought to the modern world.

SACRIFICE RENEWAL AND PRAYER

There are many indications that for centuries after the destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E. Jews believed that the Temple could be rebuilt and its sacrificial service restored prior to the Messianic Age. The Mishnaic and Talmudic sages admitted that many of their rulings on levitical purity and holiday observance were made in order to enable the quick resumption of the Temple service. This same concern also underlay the priestly class's guard and recordkeeping of their priestly lineage for centuries after the Destruction. Construction of a new Temple was actually begun during the reign of Emperor Julian in the fourth century, but the work was interrupted and was abandoned completely upon Julian's death. At some point over the next few centuries, though, the rebuilding of the Temple was regarded as bound up with the messianic process and not to be attempted prior to the Messianic Age. The restoration of a sovereign Davidic kingdom and the Sanhedrin were also, for the most part, restricted to the Messianic Age. Any attempt to revive these pre-exilic institutions was considered by the dominant religious authorities as an illegitimate means of hastening the Redemption. We may conjecture that this development was a way of excusing the continued failure of Jews to rebuild the Temple, or a source of comfort in the face of that failure; at any rate, it was a mode of accommodation to reality.

Offering sacrifices without the Temple structure, however, was not generally regarded as a messianic provocation. Some sacrifices required merely an altar on the sanctified ground of the Temple Mount. After the Destruction of the Temple the sanctity of the Temple Mount was a relevant concern of halakhic scholars, and halakhic literature preserves their discussions. Some rabbis, like the Tanna Eliezer and the twelfth century Abraham ben David of Posquieres (known as the Rabad), argued that after the Temple structure was destroyed the Temple Mount was no longer sanctified ground, and therefore offering sacrifices there was forbidden. For them, the resumption of sacrificial worship required a re-sanctification of the Temple Mount that would occur at the next rebuilding of the Temple. (For Rabad, both events could occur only in the Messianic Age.) However, these rabbis' opinions did not prevail. The consensus followed the opinion of the Tanna Rabbi Joshua, and centuries later Maimonides confirmed his opinion that the Temple Mount was eternally sanctified and thus fit for those sacrifices that did not require the existence of the Temple walls. The sixteenth century author of the Shulhan Arukh, Joseph Karo, rejecting the opinion that the ground had to
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be resanctified, explained, "lest in the time of the destruction [of the Temple] we are given permission to sacrifice [and would be prevented by this requirement alone]." In other words, if not for the foreign possession of the Temple Mount, the Jews would be obligated to rebuild the altar and offer sacrifices. Rabbinic authorities throughout the Middle Ages were able to show that some sacrifices—e.g., at least the pesah (Passover) sacrifice, which could be performed without the shekel tax and without the Temple walls—could be restored. Because of this consensus, halakhic discussions of the sacrifice renewal usually dealt with how to comply with the requirements of Jewish law rather than whether the renewal was permissible in principle. It is important to point out that these discussions appeared in a theoretical context and usually as a tangent to a related and more immediate halakhic problem; they were not perceived as a preliminary to an attempt to restore the cult.

On the practical level, there is evidence that individuals actually offered sacrifices after the destruction of the Temple. According to Mishnaic sources, some individuals performed the pesah offering until 135 C.E., when the presence of Jews in Jerusalem was banned by Hadrian. Subsequent rulers, except for Julian, continued to guard against the renewal of sacrifices. Jews were aware of this and during times of loosened vigilence or eased relations with the ruling powers pressed for the cult's renewal. One account of the temporary Jewish rule of Jerusalem after the Persian invasion in the seventh century tells of the resumption of sacrificial offerings then. While Jerusalem was under crusader rule, according to an account from the following century, Rabbi Yehiel of Paris emigrated to Palestine intending to offer sacrifices. Apparently he did not succeed. (It should be noted that the author of this account, a topographer quite familiar with Jerusalem, did not mention the presence of the Islamic mosques on the Temple Mount as an obstacle to renewing sacrificial worship.)

On the theoretical level, sacrifice was generally regarded as superior in value to verbal prayer. Supplementing the Biblical appreciation of sacrificial worship, the Midrash stressed the superiority of sacrifice through several themes, for example, the notion of a heavenly Temple parallel to the earthly one; the idea that at the time of creation the earthly Temple was conceived as an element necessary for the sustenance of the world; and the belief that the divine presence accompanied the performance of the Temple ritual and was bereft at its cessation. The Kabbalists built upon these themes and described the powerful effect of sacrifices on the divine realm. In Kabbalistic writings, the savory smell of the sacrifice is an activating mechanism for the sefirot, moving them together to produce unity in the divine realm and bringing the sacrificer and the sacrificed object closer to their source there as well.

Alongside this quite positive attitude toward the sacrifices was a strain in prophetic and rabbinic literature that toned down the abundant
praise of the Temple service. These compared prayer and good deeds favorably to sacrifices, or expressed the hope that God would consider prayer equivalent to sacrifice, but they contain no serious criticism of the Temple and its service. Pre-modern Jews did not regard the prophetic criticisms of sacrifice as a rejection of sacrifice per se, but only a rejection of mindless ritual or ritual unaccompanied by religious behavior. Some medieval rationalist philosophers showed their discomfort with the sacrifices; Maimonides, for example, regarded them as a means of weaning the ancient Israelites from idolatry—but despite this, unequivocally maintained that the sacrificial commandments were still binding. Rabbinic authorities generally regarded his opinion with disapproval. This is because a functionalist approach to the commandments is an affront to all those, Kabbalists and others, who believe in the intrinsic meaning of the laws; for many Jews, the commandments constituted a reality independent of the human realm.

MODERN POLEMICS

By the eighteenth century, however, the desirability and permissibility of restoring sacrificial worship had acquired a heightened polemical function. Rabbis sensitive to the weakening of Jewish belief and the desire to accommodate Judaism to modern culture used the sacrifice renewal issue in defense of tradition. Jacob Emden, for example, who frequently complained about the Jews' satisfaction with their home in the Diaspora, reviewed the earlier halakhic sources and concluded that a resumption of the pesah offering was permitted. A century later, in opposition to Reform Jews who proposed omitting prayers for the restoration of the Temple from the prayerbook, traditional rabbis turned their attention to the inadequacy of non-sacrificial worship. Jacob Lorbeerbaum of Lissa, in opposition to the use of instrumental music on the Sabbath, characterized Jewish prayer after the destruction of the Temple as a somber, sorrowful affair. While the Temple stood, he wrote, the sacrificial offerings cleansed the Jews of their sins, and they were enjoined to be happy. But now, without the sacrifices, he wrote, "we have nothing by which to be forgiven," and must plead tearfully to God through prayer. Moses Sofer (HATAM SOFER) discussed the inadequacy of prayer in his opposition to substitutes for the traditional Hebrew liturgy. He argued that the composers of the Eighteen Benedictions, the Men of the Great Assembly, must have known from the Lord Himself that there cannot be any arbitrary substitutes for the sacrificial cult. If substitutes could so easily be found, why have a Temple and a sacrificial cult in the first place? It follows, he argued, that nothing can be a complete substitute for the Temple cult, although the prayer they composed comes close.

It was only a matter of time until someone asked whether the sacri-
ficial cult could be renewed. Rabbi Zevi Hirsch Kalischer of the Posen district addressed this question in 1836 to his teacher, Akiba Eger, who eventually turned the matter over to Hatam Sofer. The whole question was academic, Sofer pointed out, since the Muslims would never permit it. However, if the Muslims did permit it, there was no problem with the pre-messianic restoration of sacrifices, but he had to agree with Emden that only the pesah sacrifice could be offered according to the letter of the law.

Sofer’s opinion was not publicized for several years. He sent a copy of his opinion on the sacrifice renewal to his young protegee, Zevi Hirsch Chajes, who published it in 1842 in his book on halakhic methodology, Darkhei ha-Hora’ah. In the same volume Chajes included evidence from Talmudic sources showing that sacrificial worship had continued for about eighty years after the destruction of the Temple. He showed that the rabbis who lived immediately after the destruction of the Temple continued to offer sacrifices as long as they were able, and stopped only when the authorities prohibited Jewish worship on the Temple Mount. In effect, Chajes was presenting historical proof to support the orthodox opposition to reforms. His book appeared in the midst of heated debate between traditionalists and reformers brought on by the 1841 publication of the Hamburg reform prayerbook and heightened by the first conference of Reform rabbis in 1844.

Chajes’ publication encouraged other historians to comment on the continuation of the sacrificial cult and, indirectly, to express their views on Judaism as a progressive religion. The most notable response was an 1848 article by Bernhard Friedmann and Heinrich Graetz attacking the “alleged continuation of the Jewish sacrificial cult” after the destruction of the Temple. The authors emphasized that with the cessation of the sacrifices, prayer emerged, not as a substitute or continuation of the sacrifices, but as “a higher progression” of religious form. They wrote that the rabbis had recognized the march of progress within Judaism, and in the Talmud explicitly opposed any continuation of the sacrificial cult. Present-day suggestions to restore the sacrificial cult, they insinuated, are romantic and foolish yearnings that encourage the violation of Jewish law. In other words, Judaism is an evolving religion, and its adaptation to modern culture is proper and fitting.

Various scholars reacted to the Friedmann-Graetz article with their own calculations of the end of sacrificial worship, but the underlying issue addressed was the historical development of Jewish worship. A pattern emerged: those who held that the sacrifices ceased with the destruction of the Temple were also in favor of religious reform, while those who emphasized the continuation of the cult were more conservative. The only exception to this rule came from a rabbi prominent in anti-Reform efforts in Western Europe, Jacob Ettlinger. In 1847 he published an objection to Chajes’ point of view, arguing that the Torah itself taught that sacri-
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ficial worship was meant to cease at the destruction of the Temple and not to resume again until the Messianic Age. For this he was harshly rebuked by Rabbi Jacob Koppel ha-Levi Bamberger, a rabbinic scholar from Prague, and the matter ostensibly concluded. 24 This lone protest, though, indicates that the appearance of unanimity on this issue within the traditional community was deceptive—and this disagreement on the sacrifice issue implied differing views of the Jews' role and future in modern European society. The appearance of solidarity would last for another ten years.

All these approving statements from the traditionalists were made in a polemical anti-Reform context. By arguing that sacrificial worship was still necessary, desirable, and halakhically permissible these rabbis were saying that present-day Jewish life was truncated and in need of redemption. They were saying this in rebuttal to Jews who asserted that present-day Jewish life was becoming normal and whole through enlightenment and civic emancipation. To the truly orthodox, Judaism had been and would always be a sacrificial religion. The impossibility of rebuilding the altar on the Temple Mount made this a wonderful and safe argument.

The established pattern of discussion of the sacrifice renewal was changed, oddly enough, by the rabbi whose question had initiated the above debate. Unlike the other rabbis, Zevi Hirsch Kalischer actually had no polemical motives when he questioned Eger about the restoration of sacrificial worship in 1836. The primary source of his desire to resume sacrificial worship was messianic. He intensely longed for the Messianic Age and developed an ideology of active messianism: he was convinced that the Jewish tradition, correctly understood, taught that the Jew's duty was to participate in the coming of the Redemption. The vehicle for this would be the renewal of sacrificial offerings. When the Jews prepared for the Redemption by renewing the cult and offering a sacrifice, he believed, God's compassion would be restored and He would bring the miraculous features of the Messianic Age. 25 Why was sacrificial worship so decisive?

First, Kalischer took to heart the rabbinic teachings that sacrificial offerings mediated between the divine and human realms and had the power to awaken God's compassion for humanity and bring the Redemption. Second, he had studied and matured under the guidance of Jacob Lorbeerbaum and Akiba Eger, who had both actively opposed prayer-book reform, and the former had emphasized the inadequacy of prayer. Kalischer, too, felt that the absence of sacrificial worship left a profound gap in Jewish life, and he argued that only the sacrifices were powerful enough to convince God to bring the Redemption. Third, there was but minimal halakhic literature concerning sacrifice renewal, and the consensus pointed toward its permissibility. It was a matter which an exemplary halakhic scholar like Kalischer could resolve positively and feel that he was following the footsteps of his teachers. 26

When we consider Kalischer's involvement in the chain of halakhic
responsa described above, we see an intertwining of polemical and messianic motives not fully comprehended by all the participants. By the 1830s Kalischer had concluded that the new regime of Muhammed Ali in Palestine, the movement toward civic emancipation in Europe, and the Christian interest in the Jews' return to Zion, were manifestations of pro-Jewish attitude instilled by God as signs that the Messianic Age was potentially at hand. It was very likely, Kalischer felt, that permission could be obtained to rebuild the altar. He studied the halakhic issues of the sacrifice renewal and became convinced it was feasible. In 1836 he sent his messianic theory, halakhic review of the sacrifice renewal, and a request for funding to Amschel Mayer Rothschild, who did not respond. In the same year he sent his halakhic review to Akiba Eger, his former teacher, and asked for an opinion of it. Sensing and disapproving the messianic impulse behind it, Eger responded negatively and tried to discourage Kalischer. Failing this, and pleading health too ill to continue the correspondence, Eger wrote Kalischer that he would defer to the opinion of his son-in-law, Hatam Sofer, to whom he had sent the halakhic question. Hatam Sofer, knowing nothing of the background of the question, treated it as an issue in the anti-Reform offensive, responded positively, and sent a copy of his response to Zevi Hirsch Chajes. Eger sent a modified and less positive version of Sofer's letter to Kalischer. This and the deaths shortly afterwards of both Eger and Hatam Sofer (in 1837) seem to have discouraged Kalischer, and he dropped the matter for a while. In the early 1850s, when Kalischer read the original Sofer letter and Chajes' own research on the sacrifice renewal, he renewed his attempt to build up a movement of support among rabbinic scholars. He tried to engage Chajes in a correspondence, but Chajes did not respond, and he died shortly thereafter in 1855. Despite the positive conclusions of Chajes' responsa, all other literary evidence indicates that he regarded the sacrifice renewal as a purely anti-Reform issue. The same can be said of Rabbi Nathan Marcus Adler of London, to whom Kalischer next wrote and persuaded that a pre-messianic resumption of sacrificial worship was halakhically feasible.

The situation changed dramatically in the late 1850s when Kalischer began to collaborate on the matter with Rabbi Elijah Guttmacher. Guttmacher, also a resident of the Posen district, had studied with Kalischer in the yeshivah of Akiba Eger and had become deeply absorbed in the study of Kabbalah. He was widely known as a holy man, and many Jews flocked to him to receive his blessing; he even had a following among the Hasidim in Jerusalem. Guttmacher shared Kalischer's acceptance of active messianism and contributed Kabbalistic prooftexts to Kalischer's
theories. Together they studied the halakhic issues of the sacrifice renewal. Then, somehow, in 1857, a rumor spread throughout the Posen district that the Jews in Jerusalem wanted to offer sacrifices. This is how it was reported in a March edition of Ha-Maggid:

An honorable correspondent from the newspaper mentioned above [Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums] has written: "On the Posen district. Rabbi Elias Guttmacher was appointed a nasi from Erez-Israel. Not long ago the rabbis in Jerusalem sent him some halakhic questions, and one question—in the form of pilpul—on the laws of sacrifice. Before the rabbi sent them his answer, he wrote to two great rabbis, friends of his, in this district. And who knows how the matter became widely known among the masses and also among non-Jews. Some newspapers heard of it and announced that in Jerusalem people want to offer sacrifices."34

This report represents an effort to dispel the rumor that had spread in the Posen district and to squelch the open enthusiasm with which the rumor was received. However, the rumor would not die. Between then and 1862, when Kalischer’s messianic theory and his entire sacrifice responsa were published in his book Derishat Ziyyon, enthusiasm spread throughout different groups of Jews in Jerusalem as well.

RABBINIC RESPONSES

At this point, the consensus on the sacrifice issue fell apart. Staunchly traditional rabbis, alarmed at the appearance of active messianism in their midst, began strongly criticizing the pre-messianic resumption of sacrifice on practical, halakhic, and even theoretical grounds. Suddenly, a pre-messianic attempt to restore sacrificial worship was regarded as an act of great impiety or as an act that could not be accomplished in any form in accordance with halakhic requirements. The previous correspondence had caused little or no excitement among the traditional rabbinate. Eger had been the only scholar who had been aware of Kalischer’s messianic motives, and he failed to communicate them to others. We can therefore state a general rule about the position of the traditionalists: as long as the discussion of resuming sacrificial worship took place only among rabbinic scholars and not among the Jewish masses, as long as it was a purely theoretical issue in defense of the status quo against Reform and not a vehicle for actual change, it met with the approval of the traditional rabbinate. Eger had been the only scholar who had been aware of Kalischer’s messianic motives, and he failed to communicate them to others. We can therefore state a general rule about the position of the traditionalists: as long as the discussion of resuming sacrificial worship took place only among rabbinic scholars and not among the Jewish masses, as long as it was a purely theoretical issue in defense of the status quo against Reform and not a vehicle for actual change, it met with the approval of the traditional rabbinate. Since active messianism was usually discouraged by the rabbinate—the rabbinate traditionally has assigned itself the responsibility to tame the masses’ messianic impulse,35 and, from the time of its origins, has benefitted from the absence of a strong priestly authority—the anti-Reform benefits of embracing sacrifice renewal were cancelled out by its active messianic context. Had Kalischer’s halakhic arguments for the sacrifice renewal appeared in another context,
the rabbis would have lauded them as a defense of tradition, or they would have simply ignored them.

The rabbis who objected expressed their disapproval on halakhic, not theoretical grounds; after all, in the traditional mind this question could only be decided in reference to halakhic precedents. However, an examination of the written reactions reveals a variety of underlying non-halakhic reservations. The different reactions highlight the distinctions within and varying concerns of the nineteenth century traditional rabbinate.

Of these negative responses, the first I will address are those motivated primarily by a rejection of active messianism.

The non-Hasidic Ashkenazic community of Jerusalem at an early date recognized Kalischer and Guttmacher’s messianic motives, and for several years chose to react with silence. Despite the 1857 rumors, the community leaders refused to make any public statement about the matter until Derishat Ziyyon appeared in 1863 along with new rumors. They then preferred to comment only indirectly, through the editorials of Yehiel Brill, the editor of Ha-Levanon. Brill published a responsum against sacrifice renewal submitted by a Lithuanian rabbi, David Friedmann of Mohilev, and in response to Friedmann’s remark that he had written in reaction to a rumor about the sacrifice renewal, Brill wrote the following footnote:

Whoever told his honor the rabbi this story lied when he said that the Jerusalemites are considering making “gaily patched altars” [Ezekiel 16:6] in order to sacrifice zevahim and olot without a divine altar as God’s law teaches. When the book Derishat Ziyyon by Rabbi Zevi Hirsch Kalischer, may God protect and preserve him, arrived here, the masses heard and concluded wrongly that the law had been decided according to him and that the pesah sacrifice had been permitted here in our state of impurity, but God forbid that anyone should think this . . .

Brill was comparing the proposed altar and the popular enthusiasm for it with the prophet Ezekiel’s struggle with the errant Jews’ building of many illegitimate altars outside of Jerusalem. Out of respect for Kalischer and a consideration of his reputation as a great halakhic authority, Brill differentiated between Kalischer’s intention and the rumor, and in a continuation of these comments claimed that Kalischer never intended to suggest the actual restoration of the cult; according to the rabbis, Kalischer studied the possibility only as an act of piety and not for its practical application. That this dismissal of Kalischer’s messianic intent did not reflect what the rabbis really knew is clear from another Ha-Levanon statement, this one by Moses Auerbach, the leader of the non-Hasidic Ashkenazic rabbis, in an open letter to Guttmacher the same year:
We felt no obligation then to explain to our brothers in the Diaspora to what extent we agree or disagree [with Kalischer]. Through the force of his love for Zion and Jerusalem and his trembling before the holy, this rabbi’s honorable reputation has become exaggerated in the hearts of our brothers in Israel who say, “The coming of the Redemption is dependent upon him.” Scriptures says, “There is a time to be silent” [Ecclesiastes 3:7], and we do not argue with that.39

The rabbis recognized Derishat Ziyyon exactly for what it purported to be: a treatise in favor of active messianism aimed at the traditional Jewish community. These Ha-Levanon statements were designed to dispel the enthusiasm and mold public opinion against the sacrifice renewal without directly addressing the issues.

One reason why the rabbis did not acknowledge Kalischer’s active messianism and denounce it outright was their fear that in so doing they might be fanning the flames of a particularly dangerous fire. Enthusiasm for active messianism was not limited to a narrow group that could easily be censored. Guttmacher had loyal followers in the city among the Hasidim who must have supported him, and the Chief Rabbi of the Sefardic community in Palestine, Rabbi Hayyim David Ḥazan, had months earlier openly endorsed Derishat Ziyyon and its central idea that the Jews could eventually rebuild the altar and help bring the Messianic Age.40

It is not inconceivable that other members of the Yishuv community sympathized with Kalischer as well. Kalischer’s messianism was actually symptomatic of a larger movement of sympathy for active messianism in the nineteenth century. The disciples of the Vilna Gaon in Lithuania years before had developed a rationale for active messianism similar to Kalischer’s. Rather than focus on the sacrifices as the activating mechanism for the Redemption, they emphasized the importance of emigration to the Land of Israel, farming the land, and several other activities preparatory to the Messianic Age. These men had built up a base of support in Lithuania and, upon the aliyah of many during the first third of the century, within Jerusalem as well. During the 1830s and 1840s the Jerusalem community experienced intense messianic excitement and then disappointment when the Messianic Age failed to materialize.41 Kalischer had developed his messianic theory independently; he was never aware that the disciples of the Vilna Gaon had developed a similar theory, and throughout his life he believed that Derishat Ziyyon’s enthusiastic reception in Lithuania was due merely to that region’s greater piety.42 Apparently, in both Palestine and Lithuania his book and his organization promoting agricultural settlement (Hevrat Yishuv Erez-Israel) had stimulated underlying sympathies for messianic activism and created new followers. In both places the rabbinate was split into supporters and
opponents. The opposition rabbis in Palestine apparently preferred silence or denial rather than stir up tensions within the community and, indirectly, between the entire Yishuv and the Muslims. The matter was less sensitive in Lithuania, and therefore David Friedmann did not hesitate to trumpet his opposition.43

The revival of messianism and the enthusiasm for the return of sacrificial worship can be explained, in part,44 as a reaction to the vast changes taking place in Jewish life. A segment of the traditional community was refusing to accommodate itself to modernity and embraced practices reminiscent of an earlier period. In the mid-nineteenth century these types emerged from strongholds of traditional Judaism like Lithuania, Jerusalem, or Posen (in this more Western center, though, it is significant that the proponents were old men). Despite their apparent insularity, they were deeply conscious that their traditional world was being threatened. In reaction, they clamored for the return of ancient, pre-exilic institutions while the other, larger group of Jews (including those committed to traditional Jewish life) focused on adjusting to modernity.

An interesting example of this adjustment by traditionalists can be seen in Moses Auerbach's eventual direct response to Kalischer. He could not agree with Kalischer that the present age was the dawn of the Redemption; he observed that the civic emancipation that Kalischer felt was a portent of the new era affected a tiny number of Jews, while most Jews still lived in dire straits. The present age was auspicious only for its anarchy. He admitted that the halakhic problems posed by the sacrifice renewal could be solved, but should not be:

... a great rabbi, of blessed memory, of Zolkiev told me that the holy gaon Tevu'at Shor [Alexander ben Ephraim Schorr], of blessed memory, wrote a great and awesome composition on the sacrificial service with all the legally required details, much like his book *Tevu'at Shor* which has been so widely acclaimed by all scholars of Israel. In it he made decisive and convincing judgments on all the doubtful halakhic matters. But before his death he commanded that this composition be buried with him and not remain in the world. For without a doubt it was his intention that the answers not be found and he knew there was no use for his judgments, since when the time came for Israel to bring sacrifices a prophet would clarify the halakha.

The prophet has already scolded, "I did not speak to your fathers or command them concerning burnt offerings and sacrifices, but this command I gave them, 'Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and you shall be my people ...'" [Jeremiah 7:14], and also, "Oh, that there were one among you who would shut the doors, that you might not kindle fire upon my altar in vain!" [Malachi 1:10]. And he also said, "Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice" [I Samuel 15:22] through the commandments of obedience that derive from our tradition, and would that we
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observed with all strength those that we can now do. . . . We believe that God was just with his people in establishing a strong barrier that prohibits our presence on the Temple Mount from the wall and inward, because, due to our many sins, who among this orphaned generation of ours will close the doors before those who desire to walk there in their impurity?45

According to Auerbach, the Muslim possession of the Temple Mount was an appropriate one. The Jews were factionalized and self-control was on the wane, and if they were permitted access to the Temple Mount they would not properly observe the commandments. Since they were ignoring many commandments that were presently possible, he saw no reason to add more that would go unheeded. This would result in the behavior denounced by the prophets during the late First Temple period, in which the Jews were punctilious about sacrificial offerings while openly violating all other commandments. Aside from all that, Auerbach repeated throughout his letter, the Muslims would never allow it. Greater benefit would be derived from the purchase of land and an influx of pious Jews.46 Two attitudes dominate this letter: Auerbach’s resignation at the present state of affairs, and his lack of enthusiasm for the sacrifice renewal. His negativity toward the sacrifice renewal must be evaluated in the context of his pietistic Jewish observance, his decision to leave Europe several years earlier for residence in the Holy Land, his negative perception of modernity, and the memory of messianic agitation several decades earlier in Jerusalem. His disinterest in the renewal of the cult was, therefore, the result of an unenthusiastic but pragmatic adjustment to the status quo, and he was aided in this by citing the tradition of passive messianism.

In contrast to this motive is the negative response toward the renewal of sacrificial worship that stemmed from a discomfort with the image of Judaism as a sacrificial religion. Among the many difficulties presented by the sacrifice renewal, a more significant yet unspoken obstacle was the adjustment that Jews and Judaism had made to life without the Temple and sacrifices. Kalischer’s sacrifice renewal plan had highlighted the ambivalence some Jews felt toward the embarrassingly archaic features of their religion and forced them to resolve the contradictions in their conception of Judaism. To these Jews, passive messianism was also useful. They could hide their discomfort by arguing that the sacrifice renewal was such an impossibly difficult halakhic problem that it was ipso facto only a messianic event, or they could simply rely on passive messianism and denounce the sacrifice renewal as illegitimate. An additional dilemma is evident in their writings: these rabbis wanted to deny the possibility of sacrifice renewal but did not want to aid the Reform party in doing so.

This problem was acutely felt in the neo-Orthodox community in Western Europe, which drew much of its identity from its opposition to
Reform Judaism. Like their Reform opponents, though, the neo-Orthodox had difficulty with the prospect of sacrifice renewal; they were concerned that their attachment to Zion did not appear as an attachment to a homeland, and they were concerned that their formulation of traditional Judaism did not appear irrational or old fashioned. Jacob Ettlinger, who had been the lone traditionalist to speak out against Chajes in 1847, illustrates their quandary. Ettlinger (1798-1891) was raised in southwestern Germany, where he received an intensive traditional education and for a brief period attended university classes. He officiated as a rabbi in Mannheim and then Altona, and in both cities he founded yeshivahs. Among his students were Samson Raphael Hirsch and Azrial Hildesheimer, who, with Ettlinger, laid the foundations of German neo-Orthodoxy. Ettlinger’s influence and prominence grew in the 1840s when he rallied and presided over a protest meeting of traditional rabbis against Reform Jews and established the first official mouthpiece of Orthodox Judaism, Der treue Zionswächter with the Hebrew supplement Shomer Ziyyon ha-Ne’eman. It was in the supplement that Ettlinger first published his opposition to the sacrifice renewal in 1847.

Soon after the publication of Derishat Ziyyon, Ettlinger wrote a letter to Kalischer critical of his messianic theory, particularly his sacrifice renewal plan. Kalischer wrote him a rebuttal and never heard from him again. In 1868 Ettlinger published his collected responsa, and prominently situated as the first entry in the book was his letter to Kalischer, unrevised and without references to Kalischer’s rebuttal. Ettlinger’s letter was virtually identical to the one he had written in reaction to Chajes in 1847 and which had been faulted then by Jacob Koppel ha-Levi Bamberger and in 1862 by Kalischer. Ettlinger’s contention was that the Jews had been enjoined not to offer sacrifices until the Messianic Age, even if they had permission from the ruling authorities and could solve all the halakhic problems. He based this on the divine warning in Leviticus 26:31 against building illegitimate altars, “... and I will make your sanctuaries desolate, and I will not smell your savory odors.” Ettlinger explained that when the Tannaim used this prooftext in another context, “sanctuaries” meant the Temple. Thus, the passage should actually be read, “Once I make your Temple desolate, I will not smell your savory odors.” He pointed out that since the First Temple had not been completely destroyed by the Babylonians, the principle of Leviticus 26:31 did not apply, but when the Romans destroyed the Second Temple in 70 C.E. the site was truly made desolate. Then the sages realized that the prophecy of Leviticus had been fulfilled, and it would have been pointless, and disobedient, to offer sacrifices.

There were many problems with this viewpoint; its lack of precedent was its primary weakness. For our purposes, the most important feature
of this argument is its similarity to Reform Jews' criticism of sacrificial worship. Both depicted the sacrificial commandments as obligations that were never meant to be eternal, but were restricted to an early stage of Israel's religious development. Both tried to legitimize this opinion by rooting it in the Bible; for Ettlinger, the priestly code foretold its own demise, while the Reformers regarded the prophets as the agents of spiritual maturation. Both Ettlinger and the Reformers depicted the Tannaim welcoming the start of a new era, despite proof to the contrary in Talmudic sources. Unlike the Reformers, for whom the end of the Temple cult was irreversible, Ettlinger anticipated its restoration in the Messianic Age. The most significant similarity between Ettlinger and the Reformers was methodological: his opinion was not based on a legal precedent, but on a principle derived from his own exegesis. This distinguished Ettlinger from all of Kalischer's other critics among the rabbinate; even those whose objections were primarily based on their opposition to active messianism found a halakhic difficulty on which to hang their opinion. In 1847 Ettlinger's thesis was swiftly attacked; twenty years later—twenty more years more of adjustment to modern society—Ettlinger was criticized only by Kalischer, and that did not seem to detract from Ettlinger's reputation or credibility in the least.

Kalischer did not seem to realize the difficulties his proposals raised for this different breed of traditional rabbi, one concerned with encouraging a form of traditional belief and practice suitable for the modern world. Confronted with opposition, he responded to the surface claims and did not perceive the concerns that may have underlaid them. Only in his exchange with Ettlinger, whose comments on the sacrifices were so far removed from the traditional approach, did Kalischer explicitly remark that he was fighting against modernity disguised as tradition.53

Kalischer and Guttmacher's sacrifice renewal attempt touched so many sensitive nerves within the traditional community that a literature of opposition developed that has virtually discredited the sacrifice renewal as an halakhic possibility.54 Most religious Jews disavow any interest in the imminent resumption of the cult, citing the serious halakhic and practical difficulties and the tradition of passive messianism for support. Even active messianists, whose ideology dominates present-day religious Zionism, generally disavow attempts to restore the sacrificial cult.55 The vast majority of Jews have suppressed the challenges inherent in Judaism's sacrificial foundation. Still, we must expect that some Jews, distressed by what they perceive as the truncated life of the Exile, will continue to suggest that it is time to resume sacrificial worship. They will certainly be admonished by a worried and defensive rabbinate.
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