

historical continuity is portrayed as ephemeral and transient.

A lyrical and personal note runs through Yehuda Fichmann's poems on Jerusalem whose wistful mood expresses an undefined longing. The poet, like a prowler, stealthily surprises the city in its most intimate moments. Onto these he projects his own moods. In the sonnet *Jerusalem*, Fichmann captures Jerusalem in a moment in which all of time is gathered, and in which "Dead splendor rests on furrows of new life."

Jerusalem is central to a number of Shmuel Yosef Agnon's works, especially to his major novels: *Ore'ah Natah Lalun* (1940; *A Guest for the Night*, 1968), *Temol Shilshom* ("The Days Before," 1946), and *Shirah* (1971), each of which treats the Jerusalem motif differently. The action in *Ore'ah Natah Lalun* is set in a small Galician town to which a traveler from Jerusalem, drawn by childhood nostalgia, has come to spend the night. The two main symbols in the work, the town's *bet ha-midrash* and Jerusalem, interact on a level beyond the immediate realistic scene. They are also interwoven into the surrealist images often producing a sense of eeriness and unreality. On every level of the story Jerusalem functions both as a real place in time and space and as a symbol. The surrealist atmosphere of the town and the town itself have reality by virtue of the fact that Jerusalem in *Ore'ah Natah Lalun* has real existence. In *Temol Shilshom* Jerusalem also functions on several different levels; most of the action takes place in the city during the period of the Second Aliyah. *Shirah* is set in the Jerusalem of the 1930s and describes, often satirically, the life of German-Jewish and other intellectuals at the Hebrew University. Other works of Agnon in which Jerusalem is either the setting, theme, or functions as a symbol are: "Tehillah," *Sefer ha-Ma'asim* ("The Book of Deeds"), "Ha-Mikh'm" ("The Letter"), "Iddo ve-Inam," "Ad Olam" ("Forevermore"), and *Sefer ha-Medinah* ("The Book of the State"). The particular Yemienite milieu of Jerusalem has been dealt with by H. Hazaz.

ISRAEL PERIOD. Uri Zvi Greenberg's Jerusalem poetry belongs as much to the Mandatory period as to the period of statehood. The prophetic thunder and woeful liturgical laments are a consistent theme in his poetry. The poet, however, not only exhorts—he also dreams; and in *Mi-Sifrei Tur Malka* ("From the Books of Tur Malka") he sees the *Shekhinah* which has returned to Jerusalem and the celestial Jerusalem which comes down to the earthly city. In *Kelev Bayit* ("House Dog," 1928) Greenberg sees at the gates of Jerusalem a "miraculous horse" waiting for its rider. "Jerusalem the Dismembered," a dirge from the greater work *Yerushalayim shel Mattah*, bemoans the shame and desecration of the holy city. Despite its despair and sense of infinite loss and infinite horror, his Holocaust poetry is characterized by a leap of faith rather than a loss of faith in God. Out of the ashes he sees salvation and imagines the host of the martyred dead gathered in Jerusalem.

The theme of Jerusalem recurs less frequently in the literature of the 1950s which is concerned with the more immediate problems of the decade. At most it is a realistic landscape. Amos Ayalon's *Yerushalayim Lo Natehah* ("Jerusalem Did Not Fall," 1948) is a novel about the siege of Jerusalem in 1948 written by an eye witness. Yet in the late 1950s a change occurred and the canvas of the dramatist as well as of the poet and prose writer extended.

Among the younger poets Yehuda Amichai is probably the most representative. He used the Jerusalem motif in different time settings, contexts, and even mythical landscapes. The city seems to have a strong hold on him, a hold

which he wants to break but cannot. In "Ha-Kerav ha'Gdoli" ("Battle for the Hill") he says he is going to fight that battle and then "I shall never return to Jerusalem" but he does in "Jerusalem 1967." The "sea" of Jerusalem, a symbol found already in very early Hebrew poetry, is a recurring image in "Battle for the Hill"—"the sea of Jerusalem is the most terrible sea of all." Amichai's tendency to fuse historical and mythical landscapes with the present can perhaps best be seen in "If I forget thee Jerusalem" where he uses ancient themes to create new myths. His novel *Lo mi-Kan ve-Lo me-Akhsav* ("Not of This Time, Not of This Place," 1963) contains vivid descriptions of Jerusalem.

A. B. Yehoshua's Jerusalem in "Sheloshah Yamim ve-Yeled" ("Three Days and a Child"; in *Tishah Sipurim*, 1970) is an impressionistic yet realistic portrait of the city marked by a note of nostalgia which endows it with a personality as well as a landscape. The play *Laylah be-Mai* ("A Night in May," 1969) dramatizes the effect of the tension of May 1967 on a Jerusalem family; Jerusalem however is only incidental to the play. Another writer who has made Jerusalem the setting of many of his works is David Shahar: *Moto shel ha-Elohim ha-Katan* ("Death of the Little God," 1970), *Al ha-Halomot* ("On Dreams," 1955), *Heikkal ha-Kelun ha-Shevirin* (1962), and *Maggid ha-Atidot* ("Fortune-teller," 1966), four collections of short stories.

Other authors who have written on Jerusalem or used it as a setting include: Dov Kimhri, *Emesh* ("Last Night, 1927) and *Beit Hefej* (1951), novels; *Ezra Ha-Menahem, bein ha-Homot* ("Between the Walls, 1941); Y. D. Kamson, *Yerushalayim* (1950); Aaron Reuveni, *Ad Yerushalayim* (1954) and *Leylot Yerushalayim* (1957); El'raim and Menahem Talmi, *Sefer Yerushalayim* (1956), a miscellany; H. Brandwein, *Ba-Hazerot Yerushalayim* (1958); Pinhas Sadeh, *Ha-Hayyim ke-Matshal* (1968); "Life as a Parable") and *Al Mazzavot shel ha-Adam* ("On the Condition of Man," 1967), novels. *Mikha'el Sheli* ("My Michael," 1968), a novel by Amos Oz, is set in the Jerusalem of the period following the establishment of the State of Israel. Yizhak Navon's play *Bustan Sefaradi* (1970), a dramatization of the author's childhood reminiscences, vividly portrays the Sephardi community in Jerusalem 40 years earlier. Several authors have written historical novels in which Jerusalem is a central feature, such as Moshe Shamir's *Melekh Basar va-Dam* (1954; *King of Flesh and Blood*, 1958) and Aaron A. Kabak's *Ba-Mishol ha-Zar* (1937; *The Narrow Path*, 1968). For translations, see Goell, Bibliography. [Av. Go.]

IN OTHER RELIGIONS

In Christianity, Christian concern with Jerusalem involves the ancient concept of the city as a shrine of preeminent holiness, marking the physical and spiritual center of the cosmos, the spot at which history began and at which it will reach its apocalyptic consummation. The idea of an *umbilicus mundi*, a scale model, as it were, of the universe itself, at which a nation or tribe would gather periodically to renew its corporate life by the observance of the now familiar year-rites was familiar to many ancient peoples, and the nations converted to Christianity had no difficulty accepting the supreme eschatological significance of Jerusalem and its Temple. The city's unique status, however, raised certain questions that have never ceased to puzzle and divide Christian theologians, namely: Just how literally are Jerusalem's claims and promises to be taken? How can the prized continuity (back to Adam) of the city's long history be maintained if Christianity is a completely new, spiritualized, beginning? How can Jerusalem be the Holy City par excellence without also being the headquarters of the

Church? How can the city's prestige be exploited in the interests of a particular church or nation? These issues have all come to the fore in each of the main periods of Christian preoccupation with Jerusalem, namely: the "Golden Age" of the second and third centuries; the Imperial age from Constantine to Justinian; the Carolingian revival; the Crusades; the period of intrigues and grand designs; the time of patronage by the great powers; and the rise of Israel.

IN THE SECOND AND THIRD CENTURIES. The question of literalism was paramount in the second and third centuries: the early Christians had been Jews of the apocalyptic-chiliasitic persuasion with lively visions of a literal New Jerusalem, while an educated and growing minority (also among the Jews) favored a more spiritual interpretation of the biblical promises and accused the old-school Christians of superstition and "Judaizing." The banning of Jews from the city by Hadrian gave an advantage to the gentile party, and the "Doctors of the Church" made the Hellenized or "spiritualized" image of Jerusalem the official one (e.g., St. Jerome). Still, the millennialist teachings survived beneath the surface, occasionally bursting out in sectarian enthusiasm or becoming general in times of crisis, while the "Doctors" themselves repeatedly succumbed to the temptations of a real and earthly Holy City. Hence the ambiguities of literalism versus allegory might have been minimized were it not that the continued presence and preachings of the Jews forced the Christians in self-defense to appeal to the doctrine of a purely spiritual Jerusalem.

From Origen's time, churchmen of all sects have been one in insisting that the New Jerusalem is for Christians only, since the Jewish city can never rise again. In the absence of scriptural support for this claim, various stock arguments are used, namely, Josephus' description of the destruction of 70 C.E. with its atmosphere of gloom and finality (B.J. IV, v, 3); the argument of silence in that the New Testament says nothing about a restitution of the city after Vespasian; the ominously lengthening period of time since the expulsion of the Jews; various tortured allegorical and numerical demonstrations; and the appeal to history with the ringing rhetorical challenge: "Where is your city now . . .?"

A favorite argument (akin to a Jewish teaching about the Diaspora) was that Jerusalem had to be destroyed so that Jews and Christians alike might be scattered throughout the world as witnesses to the fulfillment of prophecy in the new religion. Against these were arguments that never ceased to annoy: Why did the city and Temple continue to flourish for 42 years after the final pronouncement of doom, and why during that time did the Christians show every mark of reverence and respect for both? Why did Jesus weep for the destruction if it was in every sense necessary and desirable? Why do the Doctors insist that the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans was a great crime, and yet hail it as a blessed event, saluting its perpetrators as the builders of the New Jerusalem, even though they were the chief persecutors of the Christians? If expulsion from Jerusalem is proof of divine rejection of the Jews, does the principle not also hold good for their Christian successors? How can the antichrist sit in the Temple unless the city and Temple are built again by the Jews? The standard argument, that only a total and final dissolution would be fit punishment for the supreme crime of deicide, was frustrated by the time schedule, which suggested to many that the city was destroyed to avenge the death not of Jesus but of James the Just.

But if Jerusalem was to be permanently obliterated, the Christians could only inherit it in a spiritual sense. The Church was the New Jerusalem in which all prophecy was fulfilled, the Millennium attained, and all things became

new. This raised a serious question of continuity, however: Has God chosen another people? Can one preserve the meaning of the eschatological drama while changing all the characters? Can a people (the Christians) be gathered that was never scattered? And what of the Heavenly Jerusalem? The approved school solution with its inevitable rhetorical antithesis was to depict the Heavenly and the Earthly Jerusalems as opposites in all things, the one spiritual, the other carnal. Yet none of the fathers is able to rid himself of "corporeal" complications in the picture, and the two Jerusalems remain hopelessly confused, for in the end the two are actually to meet and fuse into one. Palestine was the scene of busy theological controversy on these and related mysteries when the "Golden Age" of Christian Jerusalem came to an end with the persecutions of 250.

THE IMPERIAL AGE. After the storm had passed, Constantine the Great at Rome, Nicaea, Constantinople, and elsewhere celebrated his victories over the temporal and spiritual enemies of mankind with brilliant festivals and imposing monuments. But his greatest victory trophy was "the New Jerusalem," a sacral complex of buildings presenting the old hierocentric concepts in the Imperial pagan form, with the Holy Sepulcher as the center and chief shrine of the world. Jerusalem was treated as the legitimate spoils of Christian-Roman victory over the Jews, whose entire heritage—including the Temple—accordingly passed intact into the hands of the Christians. Henceforth, there remained no objections to giving Jerusalem its full meed of honor. Continuity back to Adam was established with suspicious ease by the rapid and miraculous discovery of every relic and artifact mentioned in the Bible, and a flood of pilgrims, came to rehearse, Bible in hand (the earliest pilgrims, Silvia (383) and the Bordeaux Pilgrim (333), are markedly partial to Old Testament remains), the events of each holy place and undertake weary walks and vigils in a cult strangely preoccupied with caves and rites of the dead. The patriarch Macarius, who may have contrived the convenient discoveries of holy objects with an eye to restoring Jerusalem to its former preeminence, promoted a building boom that reached a peak of great activity in the sixth and seventh centuries.

Financed at first by Imperial bounty, the building program was later supported by wealthy individuals, and especially by a line of illustrious matrons whose concern for the holy city goes back to Queen *Helena of Adiabene and whose number includes *Helena, the mother of Constantine; his mother-in-law, Eutropia; Eudocia, the wife of Theodosius II; Verina, the wife of Leo II; Sophia, the mother of St. Sabas; Paula; Flavia, Domitilla, and Melania, rich Roman ladies and friends of St. Jerome. By the end of the fourth century, Jerusalem had more than 300 religious foundations sustained by generous infusions of outside capital, until the economic decline of the fifth century forced the government to take the initiative, culminating in Justinian's ambitious but fruitless building program. The period was one of specious brilliance in which, as J. Hubert notes, everything had to be *splendens, nitens, nitens, nitens, nitens, nitens, nitens, nitens*—i.e., brilliantly surfaced, while the actual remains of the buildings show slipshod and superficial workmanship.

Spared the barbarian depredations suffered by most of the world in the fifth and sixth centuries, Jerusalem was an island of security and easy money, where the population of all ranks was free to indulge in those factional feuds that were the blight of the Late Empire. Points of doctrine furnished stimulation and pretext for violent contests involving ambitious churchmen and their congregations, hordes of desert monks, government and military officials and their forces local and national, the ever-meddling great

ladies, members of the Imperial family and their followings, and the riotous and ubiquitous factions of the games in confused and shifting combinations. The Jews of Alexandria became associated with one of these factions, which in that notoriously fickle city found itself opposed to the faction of the Emperor Phocas, who ordered his general, Bonossus, to suppress the corresponding faction in Jerusalem by converting all Jews by force. While pitched battles raged in the streets, a Persian army appeared at the gates, sent by Chosroes, the pro-Christian monarch seeking vengeance on the treacherous Phocas for the murder of his friend Mauritius. The Jews regarded this as a timely deliverance by a nation that had succored them before and sided with the Persians—an act not of treachery (as Christian writers would have it) but of war, since Phocas had already called for their extermination as a people. The Christian world was stunned when Chosroes took the cross from Jerusalem in 614 and elated when the victorious Heraclius brought it back, in 628. Under the vehement urging of the monk Modestus, whom he had made patriarch and who aspired to rebuild Jerusalem as a new Macarius, Heraclius, against his better judgment, took savage reprisals on the Jews. But within ten years the city fell to Omar, who allowed the pilgrimages to continue, while making Jerusalem a great Muslim shrine by the revival of the Temple complex, which the Christians, after long and studied neglect, also now claimed as their own.

Though Christians, originally as Jews and later on church business, had always made pilgrimages to Jerusalem, the great surge of popular interest beginning in the fourth century alarmed some churchmen, who denounced the pilgrimage as wasteful of time and means, dangerous to life and morals, and a disruptive influence in the Church. Along with monasticism, with which it was closely associated, the pilgrimage to Jerusalem was an attempt to get back to the first order of the Church, retrieve the lost world of visions, martyrs, prophets, and miracles, and this implied dissatisfaction with the present order. The writings of the Church Fathers furnish abundant evidence for the basic motivation of the pilgrims, which was the desire to reassure oneself of the truth of Christianity by seeing and touching the very things the Bible told of and experiencing contact with the other world by some overt demonstration of supernatural power (healing was the most popular). Only at Jerusalem could one receive this historical and miraculous reassurance in its fullness; only there did one have a right to expect a miracle.

The earliest holy place visited was not, as might have been supposed, the Holy Sepulcher, but the footprint of Jesus on the Mount of Olives, the spot where he was last seen by men as he passed to heaven and would first be seen on his return (Cabrol and Leclercq, Dic. 7, 231). Contact was the basic idea—contact with the biblical past and with heaven itself, of which Jerusalem was believed to be a physical fragment. Tangible pieces of the Holy City, carried to distant parts of the world, gave rise to other holy centers, which in turn sent out their tangible relics like sparks from a central fire. The Christian world was soon covered by a net of holy shrines, built in imitation of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher or the Temple and often designated by the names of Jerusalem, the Temple, or the Sepulcher. Each became a pilgrimage center in its own right, and there was a graded system of holiness measured on a scale of distance in time from Jesus and in space from Jerusalem, which remained "as far above all the other cities in the world in renown and holiness as the sun is above the stars."

THE CAROLINGIAN REVIVAL. In 800, after being fought over for two centuries by Muslim dynasties, Jerusalem was

placed under the protection of Charlemagne, who was doing Hārūn al-Rashīd the service of annoying his Umayyad enemies in Spain. Although Rome had come under his protection five years earlier in the same way—by the presentation of holy keys and a banner from the bishop—it was the prestige of ruling Jerusalem that warranted the change in Charlemagne's title from king to emperor. Like Constantine, Charlemagne stimulated a revival of large-scale pilgrimage to Jerusalem and a tradition of royal generosity, endowing a church, school, monastery, and library. The Jerusalem hospitals for pilgrims were a tradition going back to pre-Christian times. From Darius to Augustus and the Emperors of the West, great rulers had courted the favor of heaven by pious donations to the holy city, and this tradition of royal bounty was continued through the Middle Ages, when kings imposed Jerusalem-taxes on their subjects and monks from Jerusalem made regular fund-raising trips to Europe.

During the years of the "quasi-protectorate of the Western Emperors" over Jerusalem and the revived Byzantine control (made possible by Muslim disunity), a steadily mounting stream of pilgrims even from the remotest regions of northwestern and Slavic Europe came to bathe in the Jordan, pray at the Holy Sepulcher, and endow pious foundations. Stimulated by the end-of-the-world excitement of the year 1000, this stream "multiplied tenfold" in the 11th century, culminating in great mass pilgrimages of thousands led by eminent lords and churchmen. When the Seljuks, having defeated the Byzantine army in 1071 and occupied Jerusalem in 1075, became oppressive in their fees and controls of the holy places, Christian leadership felt obliged to "take up again the part of Charlemagne," and the armed pilgrimage led by Robert le Frison (1085-90) was hailed enthusiastically throughout Europe and viewed by pope and Byzantine emperor alike as advance reconnaissance for a crusade.

THE CRUSADES. The Crusades were the expression of a popular religious revival in which Jerusalem, restored to its full apocalyptic status (the Crusading literature has a strongly Old Testament flavor), offered a welcome door of escape to all classes from economic and social conditions that had become intolerable in Europe. The Crusades have also been described as the complete feudalization of Christianity by an ancient chivalric tradition, with Jesus as a liege lord whose injuries must be avenged and whose stronghold must be liberated. The language of the Crusading literature bears this out, as does its conscious affinity with older epic literature (reflected later in Tasso), the significant exchange of embassies, and the close resemblance of Asiatic to European arms and accoutrements, suggesting an older common "Epic Milieu," and the nature of the Crusades as a *Volkerwanderung*.

From the fourth century the Western Church had accepted, with the Roman victory cult, the concept of world polarity, dividing the human race into the blessed (Jerusalem, Church, *ager pacatus*) and the damned (Babylon, unbelievers, *ager hostilis*), reflected in the *jihad* concept of the Muslim counter-crusade. Such a concept assumed papal leadership of all crusades, giving rise to baffling questions of imperial, papal, and royal prerogative. These came to a head in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, whose assizes, though the most perfect expression of a model feudal society, remained but an ideal, "a lawyers' paradise," where royalty, exploiting the city's propinquity to heaven, dramatized its own claims to divine authority with pageantry of unsurpassed splendor. This motif was developed by the military religious orders of the Hospitaliers (founded by the Amalfi merchants in 1048 and open only to the nobility) and the Templars, each claiming a monopoly of the unique

traditional power and glory of Jerusalem and the Temple and hence displaying an independence of action that in the end was its undoing.

INTRIGUES AND GRAND DESIGNS. The Crusades challenged the infidel to a formal trial-of-arms at Jerusalem to prove which side was chosen of God. The great scandal of the Crusades is accordingly not the cynical self-interest, betrayal, and compromise with the enemy that blights them from the beginning, but simply their clear-cut and humiliating failure, which dealt a mortal blow to medieval ideas of feudal and ecclesiastical dominion. With the loss of all the East, "Operation Jerusalem" adopted a new strategy of indirection, approaching its goal variously and deviously by wars against European heretics, preaching missions (through which the Franciscans held a permanent Roman bridgehead in Jerusalem), and local crusades against Jews and Muslims as steps in grand designs of global strategy. The grandiose plans of Charles VIII, Alfonso of Castile, João II, Albuquerque, and Don Sebastian all had as their ultimate objective the liberation of the Holy Sepulcher, as indeed did all of Columbus' projects (S. Madariaga, *Christopher Columbus*). A marked kabbalistic influence has been detected in these plans, and indeed the ever-living hopes of the Jews, fired by new prophecies and new messiahs, were not without effect in Catholic and Protestant circles, as appears in the career of the humanist Guillaume *Postel, who, acclaimed at the court of France for his philological researches in Jerusalem, urged the transfer of the papacy to that city and finally declared himself to be the *Shekhinah*.

Christians in the post-Crusader period continued their dream of Jerusalem but those who did manage to obtain a foothold there were largely engaged in unseemly squabbles over minute rights in the Holy Places. The great reformers, while mildly condemning pilgrimages, placed strong emphasis on the purely spiritual nature of the New Jerusalem and the utter impossibility of the Jews ever returning to build an earthly city. This was necessary to counteract the tendency to apocalyptic excitement and renewed deference to the Jews attendant upon the Reformation's intensive preoccupation with the Bible, as various groups of enthusiasts took to building their own local New Jerusalems or preparing to migrate to Palestine for the task. Such groups flourished down through the 19th century. Protestant pilgrims to Jerusalem from the 16th to the 20th centuries have consistently condemned the "mummery" of the older pilgrimages while indulging in their own brand of ecstatic dramatizations. Whereas the Catholic practice has been to identify archaeological remains as the very objects mentioned in the Bible, the Protestants have been no less zealous in detecting proof for the Scriptures in every type of object observed in the Holy Land. Chateaubriand's much publicized visit to Jerusalem in 1806 combined religious, literary, and intellectual interest and established a romantic appeal of the Holy Land that lasted through the century.

When Jerusalem was thrown open to the West in the 1830s by Muhammad Ali, European and American missionaries hastened to the spot with ambitious projects of converting the Jews with an eye to the fulfillment of prophecy in the ultimate restoration of the Holy City. Even the ill-starred Anglo-Lutheran bishopric of 1841 had that in view, and Newman's denunciation of the plan as a base concession to the Jews and Protestants indicated the stand of the Roman Catholic Church, which in 1847 appointed a resident patriarch for Jerusalem. In the mounting rivalry of missions and foundations that followed, France used her offices as protector of Roman Catholics and holy places in the East (under Capitulations of Francis I, 1535, renewed in 1740) to advance her interests in the Orient, e.g., in the Damascus

flood libel of 1840. When Louis Napoleon was obliged by his Catholic constituents to reactivate French claims to holy places that France had long neglected and the Russians long cherished, "the foolish affair of the Holy Places" (as he called it) led to the Crimean War and its portentous chain of consequences.

PATRONAGE BY THE POWERS. In the second half of the 19th century, the major powers and churches were stimulated by mutual rivalry to seek commanding positions in Jerusalem through the founding of eleemosynary institutions over which they retained control. Beyond the hard facts of geography and economics, the religious significance of the city continued to exert steady pressure on the policies of all Great Powers, as when the German kaiser gratified his Catholic subjects with the gift of the "Dormition," proclaimed Protestant unity by the dedication of the great Jerusalem Church and sought personal fulfillment in a state pilgrimage to Jerusalem and the patronage of Zionism (thwarted by his advisers). The taking of Jerusalem by Allenby in 1917 was hailed through the Christian world as the fulfillment of prophecy and deplored by the Muslims as a typical Crusade against their holy city. World War II was followed by increasing interest in Jerusalem as a center of ecumenical Christianity, though old religious and national rivalries of long standing and great variety continued to flourish. The 20th-century pilgrimages acquired a touristic air in keeping with the times, interest in Jerusalem having a more sophisticated and intellectual tone. Even the old and vexing problem of the priority of Jerusalem, "mother of Churches," over other Christian bishoprics is now approached in a spirit of mutual concession and with respect for the autonomy of the various bishoprics of Jerusalem. This liberalized attitude may be a response to what is regarded in some Christian circles as the Jewish challenge to the basic Christian thesis that only Christians can possess a New Jerusalem. While the Great Powers for over a century cautiously sought to exploit the energies of Zionism and its sympathizers, it is now openly conceded that the Jews might indeed rebuild their city—though only as potential Christians. Though some Christians are even willing to waive that proviso, the fundamental thesis is so firmly rooted that the progress of Israel is commonly viewed not as a refutation of it but as a baffling and disturbing paradox.

A NEW IMAGE OF ISRAEL. With the Israel military victories of 1948, 1956, and 1967, the Christian world was confronted by a new image of a heroic Israel. The picture was agreeable or disturbing to Christians depending on which of two main positions one chose to take, and the years of tension following the Six-Day War of June 1967 were marked by an increasing tendency among Christians everywhere to choose sides. On the one hand, the tradition of the Church Fathers and Reformers, emphasized anew by Arnold Toynbee, looked upon a Jewish Jerusalem as a hopeless anachronism, and deplored any inclination to identify ancient with modern Israel. This attitude rested on the theory, developed by generations of theologians, that only Christians could be rightful heirs to the true Covenant and the Holy City. Roman Catholics continued to hold the position, propounded by Pope Pius X to Herzl in 1904, that the return of the Jews to Jerusalem was a demonstration of messianic expectations which that church considered discredited and outmoded. Those suspicious of the progress of Israel naturally chose to minimize the moral and world-historical significance of Jerusalem, and to treat the problems of modern Israel as purely political. On the other hand were Bible-oriented Christians of all denominations in whom the successes of the Israelis inspired to a greater or lesser extent renewed hope and interest in the literal fulfillment of biblical promises. To such persons in