

Jerusalem for the Three Monotheistic Religions A Theological Synthesis

Alviero Niccacci

This presentation is divided into three points: 1) A brief historical-theological background concerning the attitudes of the three religions toward the sacred space in Jerusalem; 2) Some theological guidelines to set the relations among the three religions in a correct perspective; and 3) A synthesis and evaluation of the results of our symposium.

1. Historical-Theological Background

A Muslim text (attributed to Abū Khālid Thawr Ibn Yazīd al-Kalā'ī, probably AD 770/AH 153) reads as follows:¹

The most holy spot [*al-quds*] on earth is Syria; the most holy spot in Syria is Palestine; the most holy spot in Palestine is Jerusalem [*Bayt al-maqdis*]; the most holy spot in Jerusalem is the Mountain; the most holy spot in Jerusalem is the place of worship [*al-masjid*], and the most holy spot in the place of worship is the Dome.

Clearly Abū Khālid adopted a Jewish phrase, transmitted in Midrash Tanhūma (*Qedoshim*, Ch. 10):

The land of Israel is situated in the middle of the world, Jerusalem in the middle of the land of Israel, the sanctuary (*bēt ha-miqdash*) in the middle of Jerusalem, the Holy of the Holies (*ha-hēkal*) in the middle of the Sanctuary, the Ark of the Covenant in the middle of the Holy of the Holies, and the foundation rock from which the world was founded in front of the Holy of the Holies.²

For Christianity, Golgotha (or Calvary) is the middle of the earth because “God... worked salvation in the midst of the earth” (Psa. 73/74:12).³ Alternatively, the Sepulcher of the Lord is in the middle of the Temple (i.e. the

¹ Quoted from J. van Ess, “‘Abd al-Malik and the Dome of the Rock. An Analysis of Some Texts,” in: J. Raby - J. Johns (eds.), *Bayt Al-Maqdis*, Part One, Oxford 1992, 89-103, esp. 89.

² Quoted from the same work of van Ess (previous note).

³ B. Bagatti - E. Testa, *Corpus scriptorum de Ecclesia Matre, IV: Gerusalemme. La redenzione secondo la tradizione biblica dei Padri*, Jerusalem 1982, Nos. 102-106 (pp. 67-69). All the texts quoted hereafter by their number are taken from this book.

Basilica of the Holy Sepulcher), the Temple is in the middle of the city, and the middle of the earth is in front of the Holy Sepulcher as we read in the following text (No. 107):

The Sepulcher of the Lord... is built in the middle of the Temple; the Temple is in the middle of the city toward the north, not far from the gate of David. Behind the Resurrection [i.e. the *Anastasis*] is the garden in which Saint Mary spoke with the Lord. Outside the church, on its back, is the middle of the earth. Of this place David says: "He worked salvation in the middle of the earth." Another prophet says: "Thus says the Lord, This is Jerusalem; I placed it in the middle of the nations."

These expressions epitomize the faith of the three monotheistic religions concerning the most precious and sacred spot on earth: the Temple on Mount Zion for the Jews; the Dome of the Rock at the same place as the Jewish Temple for the Muslims; Mount Calvary and the Holy Sepulcher for the Christians. All these holy places are located in Jerusalem – the City of the one God, creator and sovereign of the earth, the Holy City of the three religions.

The early Jewish-Christian community prayed in the Temple together with their fellow Jews (see Acts 2:46), but with the Roman destruction in AD 70 a great process of theological reflection began to develop inside the small community of Jewish believers. The Roman destruction affected the Temple and half of Jerusalem inside the walls (No. 155). It did not affect a small section outside the walls on the hill West of the Temple Mount around the Upper Room where Jesus held the Last Supper with his disciples and where the small Jewish-Christian community continued to gather after the Ascension of the Lord (No. 82).

This place inspired a series of theological speculations by the early Christian community of Jewish origin. First, the gathering there of a great crowd of "Jews dwelling in Jerusalem, devout men from every nation under heaven" on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:5) was interpreted as the fulfillment of the prophecy of the gathering of the peoples on Mount Zion to learn the Law of the Lord according to Isa. 2:2-4 (and the parallel passage in Mic. 4:1-4). This Law according to the Jewish-Christians was the new Law of Jesus (No. 77-78, 80, 83). Second, of the seven synagogues that (according to one tradition) existed on the hill, only that of the Jewish-Christian community was left because it was insignificant (Nos. 79, 82).⁴ This synagogue, believed to be on the place of the Lord's Last Supper, of the gift of the Holy Spirit, and of the

⁴ See brief presentation and bibliography by R. Riesner, "Der christliche Zion: vor oder nachkonstantinisch?," in: F. Manns - E. Alliata (eds.), *Early Christianity in Context. Monuments and Documents* (Fs. E. Testa), Jerusalem 1993, 85-90, esp. 88.

beginning of the Christian community, was called “the Upper Church of the Apostles” (No. 344). It became the seat of the Mother Church under the leadership of fourteen bishops of Jewish stock from the beginning until the reign of Constantine.⁵ Third, the Jewish-Christians who lived in this place were convinced of being the “survivors” graciously left by the Lord according to Isa. 1:9 (Nos. 83, 85). Thus, in the course of time the hill inherited the name of Zion – the Christian Zion. It was a second transfer of the name after that from the City of David to the Temple Mount.

After the destruction of the Temple, a new place of worship was found by the Jewish-Christians at Getsemane where the Lord prayed the night before his death. In connection with this place, Origen quoted, although polemically, a certain “Jewish man” (*vir... Judaicus*) who explained this choice with the necessity of finding a suitable place for prayer according to the text which gives the tone of our symposium, “My house shall be called a house of prayer” (Isa. 56:7) – and also according to Psa. 18:7, “From his Temple he heard my voice” (No. 76).⁶

In AD 117, the Roman emperor Aelius Hadrian wanted to restore Jerusalem as a Hellenistic city (No. 159) and gave permission to the Jews to rebuild the Temple (No. 157). However, because the Jews resisted his impious initiative and rebelled (Nos. 158, 166, 171-172), the emperor radically destroyed what remained of the city, plowed it under and rebuilt it as a new entity with the name of Aelia Capitolina. He also sold many Jews as slaves, used the stones of the Temple for his new buildings and established a sanctuary of Jupiter and his own statues in its place (Nos. 161-171). Further, he expelled the Jews from the city and forbade them to re-enter (Nos. 204, 207-212). Christian sacred places were also defiled with the superimposition of pagan cults in order to divert Jewish-Christian worship. Hadrian established the cult of Venus on Calvary and put a statue of Jupiter on the Holy Sepulcher (Nos. 301-307).

This complete transformation signaled the end of the Jewish city and the beginning of the “Roman” city. It also meant the end of the Jewish hierarchy in the Mother Church of Jerusalem and the emergence of a new leadership of Gentile origin (No. 164). However, it did not put an end to the Jewish-Christian presence on Zion, which according to Epiphanius remained until the time of bishop Maximus during the reign of Constantine. At this time, a large

⁵ See E. Testa, *Il simbolismo dei giudeo-cristiani*, Jerusalem 1962, 543-547; F. Manns, “La liste des premiers évêques de Jérusalem,” in: Manns - Alliata (eds.), *Early Christianity*, 419-431.

⁶ Origen polemically objects to a physical interpretation of these biblical passages by those “who adhere to the Jewish fables” (No. 76).

church was built by the Gentile-Christians, called “the Holy Zion.” It took to itself all the memories that were earlier kept by the Jewish-Christian synagogue on the spot (No. 347).

Of the old Jewish city only a few remains were left as the so-called ‘pinnacle of the Temple’ (No. 179), the corner stone (the *’eben š’etiyâ*, No. 180; cf. No. 63), the palace of Solomon, etc. (Nos. 181-189). These remains were shown by the local guides to the visitors (No. 189).

Around 363, the Roman emperor Julian the Apostate urged the Jews to rebuild the Temple, encouraged their return to the city and incited them against the Christians. These Christians are to be understood as the Gentile-Christians who had taken over the city under Constantine while the Jewish-Christians, as Jews, could not live in the city – although they did not disappear but survived in different ways (No. 200). Indeed, the Jewish-Christians shared the messianic hopes of their brethren, among them being the idea of rebuilding the Temple and the city. However, differently from their brethren, they seemed to expect this rebuilding to happen in a marvelous way, according to the celestial prototype of Jerusalem, as the place of the millennialist reign of God (Nos. 86, 227-231).

The attempt to rebuild the Temple, however, failed for mysterious reasons (Nos. 193-198). As a consequence the Temple Mount became more or less a dump until the Muslims took over. The hopes of the Jewish-Christians concerning the rebuilding of the Temple and their millennialism were not shared by non-Jewish Christians. According to the latter, the Temple was to remain in ruins until the end of times (No. 202), when it was to be restored for the Antichrist (No. 221). As St. Jerome put it, “the Jews as well as those among us who live like the Jews (*Judaei... et nostri iudaizantes*) ... say that in that place is to be built the sanctuary of the Lord, that is the Temple, which has to last for ever” (No. 231); and he comments, “Although we do not follow these hopes, we cannot condemn them because many ecclesiastics and martyrs said such things, so that each one may think as he wishes and everything must be left to the Lord to judge” (No. 230).

The new branch of Christianity established under Constantine in the Holy Land, the Gentile-Christians, by the emperor’s will took over from the hands of the Jewish-Christians most of the places sacred to the memories of Jesus. They re-interpreted their significance according to their views and built basilicas and chapels over them. Specifically, in order to purify the area of the Holy Sepulcher from the pagan buildings, Constantine completely excavated it and built a wonderful complex (335). The rock around the tomb of Jesus was isolated for preservation and honor and a huge round mausoleum was built over it, called *Anastasis* or Resurrection. To the East, an open-air court-

yard followed, which ended in a magnificent basilica built for liturgy, called the *Martyrium* or Testimony, whose narthex overlooked the *cardo*, the main street of the city. The rock of Calvary was left in open air.

For our purpose, it is important to note that the idea behind this majestic complex was to rebuild the “new Jerusalem in antagonism to the old and famous city, which after the bloody assassination of our Lord, was swept away to the point of total devastation”; and, “the new Jerusalem foretold by the prophets” (Eusebius, *The Life of Constantine* III,33). In other words, the basilica was intended to replace the Jewish Temple.⁷

Understandably, the Holy Sepulcher became the center of the Gentile Church while the Jewish-Christian community continued its separate life on Mount Zion. To the Holy Sepulcher all the prerogatives of the ancient Temple were transferred. As the place where the Lord accomplished the work of salvation, it became the center of the world.⁸

This fact meant a shift as far as the location of the main cult place was concerned, but Jerusalem remained the Holy City. Its significance in the eyes of the Christian writers ranged from symbolic to material. It became a “*locus theologicus*” but never lost its factual reference.⁹ This is confirmed by the phenomenon of pilgrimage, which began well before the Byzantine period.¹⁰

According to some scholars there is indirect evidence to suggest that emperor Heraclius became interested in the Temple area when he regained the control of Jerusalem from the Persians. The construction of the Golden Gate, or “the Beautiful Gate,” may date around 628/630 when the emperor returned to the city bringing back the relic of the Holy Cross which had been taken away by the Persians in 614.¹¹ The gate may have been built for his triumphal entry into Jerusalem in that occasion.¹² The emperor’s interest in the area may

⁷ See H. Busse - G. Kretschmar, *Jerusalem Heiligtumstraditionen in altkirchlicher und frühislamischer Zeit*, Wiesbaden 1987, esp. the excursus “Tempel und Golgota,” 81-111.

⁸ The Jewish-Christians had already transferred the characteristics of the Temple to the area of Golgotha; see E. Testa, “Golgota, porto della quiete,” in: *Studia Hierosolymitana in onore di P. Bellarmino Bagatti*, I: *Studi archeologici*, Jerusalem 1975, 179-244. In Islam, a transfer took place of the traditions of the Şakhra to the Ka’ba; see van Ess, “‘Abd al-Malik,” 100; H. Busse, “The Sanctity of Jerusalem in Islam,” *Judaism* 17 (1968) 441-468.

⁹ On the Patristic view of Jerusalem, see M.C. Paczkowski’s paper in this volume.

¹⁰ See B. Bagatti, *The Church from the Gentiles in Palestine. History and Archaeology*, transl. by E. Hoade, Jerusalem 1971, 18-22.

¹¹ See C. Mango, “The Temple Mount AD 614-638,” in: Raby - Johns (eds.), *Bayt Al-Maqdis*, 1-16; F. E. Peters, *The Distant Shrine. The Islamic Centuries in Jerusalem*, New York 1993, 55-56.

¹² The memory of this event seems reflected in a legend related by Rabanus Maurus (856) concerning the emperor’s humble entry in Jerusalem through the eastern gate, which was thought to be the one through which the Lord went in for his passion; see D. Baldi,

be seen as a consequence of some Jewish activity in the area during the short Persian occupation. It seems, in fact, that the Jews were given permission to rebuild the Temple. Although short-lived, this attempt may have caused a counter-action by Heraclius.¹³ Finally, the fact that the emperor apparently did not carry out any construction in the Temple area may be reflected in the following words addressed by the Patriarch Sophronius to Umar Ibn al-Khattab according to Eutychius:

I will give the Commander of the Faithful a spot to build a place of worship where *the Kings of Rome* [i.e. the Byzantines] *were unable to build one*.¹⁴

We come now to the Islamic take-over of the Temple Mount in 638. There is no agreement among scholars about the reason why the Dome of the Rock was built and, more generally, about the process of sacralization of Jerusalem which happened in the Umayyad period.¹⁵ Some scholars propose a political motivation, to divert the pilgrimage (*ḥajj*) from Mecca – which was in the hands of Ibn al-Zubayr, an enemy of ‘Abd al-Malik – to Jerusalem. Others disagree and propose different religious motivations. Among these are the nocturnal journey of the Prophet (*isrā’*) and his Ascension (*mi‘rāj*) from the Holy Rock (the *Ṣakhra*); the creation of humanity on the Holy Rock, which also was to be the place of gathering for humanity in the Last Days; and the fact that the ancient Temple of Solomon stood on the same spot. This variety of opinions, the experts say, depends on the complexity of the Islamic sources.¹⁶

Enchiridion Locorum Sanctorum, 2 ed., Jerusalem 1955, No. 659, p. 431, and recently H. Busse, “*Bāb Ḥiṭṭa*: Qur’ān 2:58 and the Entry into Jerusalem,” *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 22 (1998) 1-17. Heraclius’ entry through the Golden Gate is also known to Crusader sources. Further, in the Latin liturgy of this period the Golden Gate was opened twice a year, on the feast of the Exaltation of the Cross and on Psalm Sunday; see G. Ligato’s paper in this volume.

¹³ Peters, *The Distant Shrine*, 56, mentions the parallel counter-action by emperor Zeno in 484, when he drove off the Samaritans who had attempted to reconstruct their Temple and built the church of the Theotokos in its place. He also put a relic of the rock of Golgotha in the church. See also Y. Magen, “Mount Garizim and the Samaritans,” in: Manns - Alliata (eds.), *Early Christianity*, 91-147, esp. 92.

¹⁴ Peters, *The Distant Shrine*, 51; Baldi, *Enchiridion*, No. 680, p. 447.

¹⁵ See, e.g., I. Hasson (ed.), *Faḍā’il al-Bayt al-Muqaddas d’ Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Wāsiṭī*, Jerusalem 1979, 15-21; F.E. Peters, *Jerusalem the Holy City in the Eyes of Chronicles, Visitors, Pilgrims, and Prophets from the Days of Abraham to the Beginning of Modern Times*, Princeton, New Jersey, 1985, 199-201; 213-214; M. Gil, *A History of Palestine, 634-1099, Translated from the Hebrew by E. Broido*, Cambridge etc. 1992, 90-104.

¹⁶ The texts are collected, e.g., in Peters, *Jerusalem*, 197-198. Also see A. Elad, “Why Did ‘Abd al-Malik Build the Dome of the Rock? A Re-Examination of the Muslim Sources,” in: Raby - Johns (eds.), *Bayt Al-Maqdis*, 33-58; van Ess, “‘Abd al-Malik,” *ibid.*, 89-103; H. Busse, “The Destruction of the Temple and Its Reconstruction in the Light of Muslim Ex-

One fact that has attracted considerable attention is the similarity of the architectural plan of the *Ḥaram al-Sharīf* and the Constantinian complex of the Holy Sepulcher. A major similarity is the axial alignment of the Dome of the Rock (*Qubbat al-Ṣakhra*) and the al-Aqsa mosque (*Masjid al-Aqsa*), on the one side, and the *Anastasis* and the *Martyrium*, on the other. Architecturally, the Dome of the Rock is a memorial monument exactly as the *Anastasis* (and also the dome of the Ascension on the Mount of Olives), while the al-Aqsa and the *Martyrium* are the place of gathering and worship.¹⁷ In this connection, it is most noteworthy that the inscriptions of the Dome of the Rock grant an important place to Jesus – while the *mi'rāj* is not mentioned – especially in the famous paraphrase of Surah 19:33 found on the inner face of the octagonal arcade (N-NW):

God! Bless your messenger and your servant Jesus, the son of Mary! Blessed be he on the day of his birth, on the day of his death, and on the day on which he will be raised from his death!¹⁸

This inscription is in line with the Muslim belief that Jesus did not die on the cross and therefore did not rise from the dead. It seems to oppose intentionally the meaning of its Christian counterpart, the *Anastasis* or resurrection.

On the whole, the Dome of the Rock is interpreted by some scholars as a Muslim revival of the Jewish Temple and of the right cult of God in counterbalance to the Christian main monument, the Holy Sepulcher. Of course, it was intended to surpass both and establish the right of the new religion.

Finally the Crusaders, after the violent period of the conquest, carried out a complete Christianization of the Temple Esplanade. The Dome of the Rock was converted into the *Templum Domini* – the true *domus Domini* besides the Holy Sepulcher – and the al-Aqsa mosque into the *Templum Salomonis* – the seat of the Latin king and later of the Templars. Thus the Esplanade became the center of the new Latin institutions. A theo-political ideology was cre-

egesis of Sūra 17:2-8," *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 20 (1996) 1-17; and a special issue of *Dédale* 1996, Nos. 3-4, esp. O. Grabar, "Pourquoi avoir construit la coupole du Rocher," 299-306.

¹⁷ See references in the previous note. A stylistic study of the mosaics of the Dome of the Rock has also revealed striking similarities with the original program of the Basilica of the Nativity. The same mosaicists may have worked in Bethlehem (680-681), then in the Dome of the Rock (ca. 690) and finally in the Great Mosque of Damascus (706); see S.S. Blair, "What is the Date of the Dome of the Rock?," in: Raby - Johns (eds.), *Bayt Al-Maqdis*, 59-87. Further, the church of the Theotokos on Mount Garizim (see note 13 above) is very similar in plan to that of the Holy Sepulcher and that of the Dome of the Rock; see Peters, *The Distant Shrine*, 55, and Magen, "Mount Garizim," 133.

¹⁸ See Blair, "What is the Date," 87.

ated, which connected the Crusades with the wars of the Maccabees and of the heroes of ancient Israel. In comparison with the attitude of Constantine and Eusebius, the Crusaders represent of course a remarkable shift.¹⁹

Rather than stress the polemic side, I would like to accent the high significance of this situation as a testimony of a conscious continuity as well as distinction of the three monotheistic religions. One could say that the history of the three religions concerning Jerusalem is a paradoxical history of love and hatred.

2. Theological Guidelines

Since they believe in the one and same God, the three monotheistic religions share the most important article of faith. On this basis alone, they have a place and a function in the plan of God for humanity.

A remarkable passage from Maimonides's *Mishneh Torah* attributes a positive function to both Christianity and Islam. After refuting Jesus' messianic claim, he remarks as follows:

But it is beyond the human mind to fathom the designs of the Creator, for our ways are not His ways, neither are our thoughts His thoughts. All these matters relating to Jesus of Nazareth and the Ishmaelite [that is, Muhammad] who came after him, only served to clear the way for the King Messiah, to prepare the whole world to worship God with one accord, as it is written, "For then will I turn to the peoples a pure language, that they may call upon the name of the Lord to serve Him with one consent" (Zeph. 3:9). Thus, the Messianic hope, the Torah, and the commandments have become familiar topics, topics of conversation (among the inhabitants) of the far isles and many peoples, uncircumcised of heart and flesh.²⁰

As is well known, the Koran sees the Scriptures of both the Jews and the Christians as different forms of the same Heavenly Book, called "the Mother of the Book." For instance, in Surah 5 we read as follows:

Surely We revealed the Torah, wherein there is guidance and light. Thereby did the Prophets – who had submitted themselves (to Allah) – judge for the Judaized folk...

And We sent Jesus, the son of Mary, after those Prophets, *confirming the truth* of whatever there still remained of the Torah.²¹ And We gave him the Gospel, wherein

¹⁹ See Ligato's paper in this volume.

²⁰ Quoted from F.E. Peters, *Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. The Classical Texts and Their Interpretation*, Princeton, NJ, 1990, 116-117.

²¹ Or, "... daß er bestätige, was von der Thora vor ihm war," with the note: "Oder: was vor ihm da war, nämlich die Thora(?)": R. Paret, *Der Koran*, Stuttgart etc. 1962, 93.

is guidance and light, and which *confirms the truth* of whatever there still remained of the Torah, and a guidance and admonition for the God-fearing...

Then We revealed the Book to you (O Mu'ammad) with Truth, *confirming* whatever of the Book was revealed before, and protecting and guarding over it... (Surah 5:44, 46, 48).²²

We shall come back to this text by the end of this presentation. For the moment, let's note the similarity of the conception expressed here with a passage from the Gospel of Matthew 5:17:

Think not that I have come to abolish the law and the prophets; I have come not to abolish but to fulfill.²³

The relationship between Christianity and Judaism is to be seen in the framework of the relationship between what is called Old Testament and New Testament. As we heard from the last quotation, the relationship is one of fulfillment, not substitution nor removal. This idea is not an innovation of the NT writings; it is already found in the OT.

The terms used to indicate this relationship are, in the OT, *ri'shôn* "first" and *ḥādāš* "new." We find the following expressions: "new things" (with feminine singular or plural in Hebrew: Isa. 42:9; 43:19; Jer. 31:22); "new heavens and earth" (Isa. 65:17; 66:22); "new covenant" (Jer. 31:31); "new spirit and heart" (Ezek. 11:19; 18:31; 36:26). In each case, the adjective "new" indicates a reality produced by God's intervention in the history of his chosen people. We can qualify this intervention as "eschatological," although it takes place in history, because it is always presented as producing a better and lasting reality. Sometimes it is said that the first realities will not be mentioned any more (e.g. Jer. 3:16). The correspondent terms in the NT are *prōtos* "first" and *kainos* "new." The term *palaios* "old" occurs together with *neos* in a passage from Mat. 13:52:

Therefore every scribe who has been trained for ('who has been made a disciple of') the kingdom of heaven is like a householder who brings out of his treasure what is new and what is old (*kaina kai palaia*).

Further, instead of *prōtos* one finds *archaios* in 2Cor. 5:17:

Therefore, if any one is in Christ, he is a new (*kainē*) creation; the old (*ta archaia*) has passed away, behold, the new (*kaina*) has come.

²² Sayyid Abul A'lā Mawdūdī, *Towards Understanding the Qur'ān*, II, *Sūrah*s 4-6, *English Version of Tafhīm al-Qurān*, transl. & ed. by Zafar Ishaq Ansari, London 1989, 165-168.

²³ As noted by Sayyid Abul A'lā Mawdūdī, *Towards Understanding the Qur'ān*, I, *Sūrah*s 1-3, *English Version of Tafhīm al-Qurān*, transl. & ed. by Zafar Ishaq Ansari, London 1988, 254, note 46.

Instead of *neos* one finds *deuteros* in Heb. 8:7:

For if that first (*hē prōtē ekeinē*) covenant had been faultless, there would have been no occasion for a second (*deuteras*).

Other terms used are “made with hands” (*cheiropoiētos*) versus “not made with hands” (*acheiropoiētos*: Mark 14:58; Acts 7:48; cf. 17:24), and “the present” (*hē nyn*) versus “the above” (*hē anō*, said of Jerusalem: Gal. 4:25-26).

It is likely that the relationship between the “first” and the “new” realities is to be understood in the light of the principle of correspondence between the heavenly model and its earthly execution as expressed in Ex. 25:9:

According to all that I am going to show you, that is the model (*tabnît*) of the tabernacle, and the model (*tabnît*) of all its furniture, so you shall make it (cf. 25:40).

In sum, the meaning is that, in the future, God is going to make a better reality than the previous one – better in the sense of a closer resemblance to the heavenly model. Sometimes, the heavenly model is said even to come down to the earth to become one with the earthly reality and to regenerate it, as we have in Revelation 21:2, 10 for Jerusalem. In this case, the reality on earth is made new, as totally corresponding to the will of God and guaranteed by him until it remains on earth, i.e. during the eschatological period before the final consummation. (Incidentally, this conception does not devoid the earthly Jerusalem of its value, and this is why I am against a “spiritualistic,” or a “spiritualizing” understanding of Jerusalem for the Christians.)²⁴

This view does not involve any depreciation of the “first” realities vis-à-vis the “new” ones; both are the work of God although the new ones are superior and final. Let us recall that the idea of a heavenly model vis-à-vis the earthly reality is also present in Islam. It underlies the conception of the Heavenly Book. The holy Ka‘ba in Mecca is also said to have a heavenly model.²⁵

Theological reflection went a step further as Christians realized that, historically and therefore in the plan of God, the “first” realities continue to exist side by side with the “new” ones. Specifically, Judaism continues to exist along with Christianity not as a negative reality but as a divinely established way to salvation. *Mutatis mutandis*, this understanding also applies to Islam.

²⁴ See my paper, “La grande prostituta e la sposa dell’Agnello”, in: L. Padovese (ed.), *VI Simposio di Efeso su S. Giovanni Apostolo*, Roma 1996, 137-154.

²⁵ H. Busse, “Geschichte und Bedeutung der Kaaba in Licht der Bibel,” in: F. Hahn *et al.* (eds.), *Zion – Ort der Begegnung. Festschrift für Laurentius Klein zur Vollendung des 65. Lebensjahres*, Bodenheim 1993, 169-185.

This nuanced understanding of God's plan of salvation for humanity is already attested in the NT and in the early Church but has been most clearly spelled out by the Catholic Church in the declaration of the Second Vatican Council entitled "Nostra Aetate" published in 1965, and in later pronouncements.²⁶

This understanding of Judaism goes hand in hand with the specific Christian belief that with Jesus the Reign of God has been inaugurated and the eschatological era has begun. In other words, the fact that the final stage has arrived does not mean that the one preceding has been abolished; Judaism, with its values and religious system, still preserves its function in God's plan.

This understanding does not fail to provoke deep contrasts among Christian theologians as in the early Church.²⁷ Some think that the Jewish religious system has lost its meaning while others speak of parallel ways to salvation, one through Moses for the Jews and one through Jesus for the Christians. Others would also admit an Islamic way to salvation.²⁸

A middle way seems preferable. Admittedly, no religion can be asked to renounce its specific tenets, but each religion is asked to take into account the tenets of the other religions. Above all, God's plan of salvation must be taken into account. This plan surpasses our understanding and develops in its own way, in different stages and with different means. Ultimately, the three religions must remain open to the ways of the Lord and to His sovereign will.

In the present symposium, it was important for us to hear competent expositions of the sacred books and traditions by scholars who are also members of the three religions. However, since we are scholars and not religious leaders, in the exposition we have to carefully distinguish creed, on one side, from, say, history, geography, hermeneutics and other human sciences, on the other. Each domain must be dealt with according to its own methodology and proofs. Admittedly, creed need not be in opposition to science; however, it is not appropriate to simply apply creedal methodology and proofs to science and vice versa. Of course, while speaking of God a place must be found for faith, but faith cannot be the only criterion simply because we have different faiths.

²⁶ A more recent document is "Christianity and the Religions" prepared by the International Theological Commission of the Catholic Church, published in 1997.

²⁷ On this very delicate issue see, e.g., N. Casalini, "Per un commento a Ebrei (II). Eb 7,1-10,18," *LA* 44 (1994) 111-214, esp. 140-144; E. Main, "Ancienne et Nouvelle Alliances dans le dessein de Dieu," *NRT* 118 (1996) 34-58; V. Martin, "L'ancien et le nouveau," *ibid.*, 59-65; M.R. Macina, "L'«antijudaïsme» néotestamentaire: entre doctrine et polémique," *ibid.*, 410-416; also see issue No. 4 of *TQ* 176 (1996).

²⁸ A particularly sympathetic view of Islam in the framework of the history of salvation is presented by G. Basetti-Sani, *The Koran in the Light of Christ. A Christian Interpretation of the Sacred Book of Islam*, Chicago 1977.

The issue of the place of prayer is complicated and sensitive under many aspects. First, the Jewish Temple Mount has become the Ḥaram al-Sharīf for more than thirteen centuries. Except for the Crusader period, it always remained a Muslim holy place under the different political powers until today. This situation has again become a problem when the Jewish people came back to the Promised Land and established a State which declares itself Jewish. Second, there seems to be no full agreement among experts of the Jewish *Halachah* on the religious duty or even feasibility of rebuilding the Temple and re-establishing the ancient cult system. Third, on the Christian side there is no competition on the physical sacred area, but on the theological level some controversy exists as far as the validity of the Jewish cult system is concerned.

To put it very succinctly, the discussion about the Jewish Temple developed along similar lines as the more general issue of the relationships between Judaism and Christianity outlined above. In the early Church, it became gradually clear that the Temple and the ancient cult system was transcended by the salvific death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. For the believers, the person of Jesus serves all the functions of the old Temple and cult system. He is the place where the believers meet God, offer prayers and sacrifices perfectly pleasing to God. This point is manifest in the so-called “cleansing of the Temple” by Jesus as found in the Gospel of John:

Jesus answered them [i.e. the Jews], “Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up.” The Jews then said, “It has taken forty-six years to build this Temple, and will you raise it up in three days?” But he spoke of the Temple of his body. When therefore he was raised from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this; and they believed the scripture and the word which Jesus had spoken (John 2:19-22).

Note that by this highly theological statement Jesus is not saying that he was going to destroy the Temple; on the contrary, he says that others were going to do it, i.e. his opponent Jews because of their unbelief as announced by the ancient prophets. Jesus, on the contrary, was going to raise the Temple up again although these words, with their *double entendre*, alluded to his own resurrection. Thus, Jesus’ resurrection meant the raising up of the Temple. The Temple received a new, fuller meaning but did not necessarily lose its first meaning.

In any case, even now that the Jewish holy place is destroyed and a magnificent mosque exists on its site, the vocation of the Temple as God’s house and the house of prayer for all peoples remains for both Jews and Christians. Can we say that this conception is also shared by Islam?

I like to quote some expressions found in the Koran which struck me in connection with the topic under discussion:

(Allah) said: Lo! I have appointed thee a leader for mankind [*li-l-nās*] ... And when We made the House (at Mecca) a resort for mankind [*li-l-nās*] and a sanctuary, (saying): Take as your place of worship [*muṣallā*] the place where Abraham stood (to pray) [*maqām Ibrāhīm*]. And We imposed a duty upon Abraham and Ishmael, (saying): Purify My house for those who go around and those who meditate therein and those who bow down and prostrate themselves (in worship) (Surah 2:124, 125).

Lo! those who disbelieve and bar (men) from the way of Allah and from the Inviolable Place of Worship [*maṣjid al-ḥarām*], which We have appointed for mankind [*li-l-nās*] ... And (remember) when We prepared for Abraham the place of the (holy) House [*makān al-bayt*], saying: Ascribe thou no things as partner unto Me, and purify My House for those who make the round (thereof) and those who stand and those who bow and make prostration (Surah 22:25, 26).

Lo! the first Sanctuary [*bayt*] appointed for mankind [*li-l-nās*] was that at Becca [i.e. Mecca], a blessed place, a guidance to the peoples [*al-‘ālamīn*] (Surah 3:96).²⁹

One would like to know, first: In which sense is the mosque of Mecca, besides being the first House of God, also the house of humanity and the house of prayer for all peoples? At face value at least, the phrases just quoted resemble that of the prophet Isaiah which constitutes the tone of our symposium. And, second, are these phrases, which are said of Mecca, also valid for Jerusalem?

3. Synthesis and Evaluation

This long detour seemed necessary before collecting and evaluating what we have learned from the lecturers and the respondents in this symposium. Professor Greenberg gave a beneficial impulse to our discussion with his lucid exegesis of Isa. 56:2-8. According to his presentation, two categories of people will be included in the new community of worshippers of the God of Israel. They are the “alien who joined himself to the Lord,” that is who converted to him, and the “eunuch.” The peculiarity of this prophetic pronouncement lies in the fact that these two categories, who were not entitled to join the worshipping community, after the restoration of Israel from exile would be brought by God himself to the Temple in Jerusalem, “for – God says – my house will be called a house of prayer for all the peoples.” It is significant that the term used for “alien” is not *gēr*, the “alien resident,” but *ben-hannēkār*,

²⁹ *The Meaning of the Glorious Coran*, Translation by M. Pickthall, Beirut n.d.

that is simply “the alien, the foreigner.” Further, as Professor Greenberg noted, the prophet speaks of “joining oneself to the Lord,” not “to the Jews.” Conditions for the admission are, first, keeping the Sabbath, which for Professor Greenberg epitomizes celebrating the sacred festivals during the year, and second, “doing no evil,” which is explained as “holding fast to the Lord’s covenant.” What is striking, then, is the fact that the role of Israel is secondary. On the one hand, the rights and duties imposed on the joiners are the same as those imposed on Israel but, on the other hand, the joiners remain a group distinct from Israel. In other words, they will be a group enjoying equal status with Israel, yet distinct from Israel.³⁰

Can we say that the joiners are equal to the chosen people from the religious point of view, that is before God, while they are distinct from that people from the social or ethnic point of view? If so, a similar tension between unity and diversity was felt in the early Church as soon as non-Jews believed in Jesus. Some Jewish-Christians claimed that the non-Jews had to undergo circumcision and observe the Law of Moses in order to be saved, while others maintained that faith in Jesus had superseded the Jewish religious system. A council of “the apostles and the elders” of the Mother Church convened in Jerusalem for this purpose around AD 50 declared as follows:

We believe that we [i.e. the Jews] shall be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus, just as they [i.e. the non-Jews] will (Acts 15:11).

Having declared this basic unity, however, the council established some conditions in order not to offend Jewish sensitivity. In a letter sent to the Christians of Antioch they said:

It has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things: that you abstain from what has been sacrificed to idols and from blood and from what is strangled and from unchastity. If you keep yourselves from these, you will do well. Farewell (Acts 15:28-29).

The problem of unity versus diversity has always posed a challenge to the Church. It is much debated today under the name of “inculturation of the faith.”³¹ In different ways, it may have been felt also by the rabbis. As Profes-

³⁰ The historical-critical problems connected with this prophetic passage are discussed in J. Loza Vera’s response.

³¹ See A. Mattam, “Christianity and Inculturation,” *Ephrem’s Theological Journal* 1 (1997) 43-68. Bishop Mar A. Mattam refers to several official documents of the Holy See, i.e. *Evangelii Nuntiandi* of Pope Paul VI, 1975; *Catechesi Tradendae* of Pope John Paul II, 1979; *Redemptoris Missio* of John Paul II, 1990; *Ecclesia in Africa*, Post-Synodal Exhortation of John Paul II; *Inculturation of the Roman Liturgy* of the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of Sacraments, 1994.

sor Shinan has shown, it seems that the rabbis living in Israel tried to avoid what seems to be the literal meaning (*pshat*) of Is 56:7. They understood the word *'ammîm* as referring to the Israelites rather than to all human beings. Only the Aramaic Targum of Isaiah – a Babylonian text – is close to the *pshat*. More than one explanation can be offered for this fact. The most likely one is that the Rabbinic literature reflects a Jewish-Christian polemic while the Targum is simply a literal translation of the original word by word.

The exclusiveness of the Rabbinic writers contrasts the inclusiveness of later Jewish exegetes such as al-Qirqisānī, Saadia Gaon, and Yefet ben 'Alī in the 10th century, who interpreted Is 56:7 as referring to all the nations. It seems that the competitive encounter with Islam, which claimed to be an universal religion, was a decisive factor for the change.³²

The issue of diversity, in the sense of ethnicity, reminds us of the problems felt by minority groups such as Palestinians, both Muslim and Christian, in this land. In sympathy with their Muslim brothers, the Palestinian Christians also struggle for their identity. In this respect, insightful inspiration comes from the large corpus of the Arab-Christian literature of the 10th-13th century. This was a golden period when the Arab culture was formed due to the fruitful cooperation of Muslims, Christians and Jews.³³ That is why it was important for us to hear the lecture of Professor Wadi, who illustrated the centrality of Jerusalem in the Arabic-Christian literature. After presenting a series of texts both historical and apocalyptic, Wadi surveyed the movement of pilgrimage to Jerusalem throughout the ages with special emphasis on the Copts and on the writings of the 13th century Coptic authors. He underlined the strong connections of the Coptic Church with Jerusalem and hoped for a better political situation in the region.

From the fine analysis of Professor Sevrin we learned that Jesus does not actually proclaim the destruction of the Jewish Temple in Mark 11:15-19. Jesus enters Jerusalem as the Messiah and purifies the Temple by reopening it as the house of prayer for all peoples. Indeed, the context shows that, because he is rejected, Jesus symbolically announces the sterility of the Temple, which at that time was closed to the universality of the nations. According to Mark, the material destruction of the Jewish Temple is linked to the second coming of the Messiah at the end of time. According to Professor Sevrin, in the period between the first and the second coming of the Messiah, the Jewish Temple, though surpassed, was to remain. Actually, the early Christians continued to attend the Temple service while on the same time “breaking bread from house

³² See B. Chiesa's essay in this volume.

³³ As underlined by Msgr. G.B. Marcuzzo in his comment on Wadi's paper in this volume.

to house” (Acts 2:46). Apparently, the Temple service continued to have a meaning for them as members of the worshipping Israel. At the same time, as believers in Jesus they were aware of having a new identity, of being a community assembled by the risen Lord, who was the new Temple.³⁴

Can we see, also here, a double identity – one Jewish, preserving the Jewish way of worship, and one specifically Christian, shaping a new worship modeled on the Lord’s supper? If so, we discover a remarkable parallelism with what we learned from Professor Greenberg. Two levels are envisioned in both texts – one religious in Isaiah, specifically Christian in Mark; the other, say, ethnic. The first establishes a common identity for a group of believers, the second allows for a certain distinction among the members of the group. Can we call this unity and diversity? This binomial view may eventually provide a useful key to at least a partial solution to our problem.

From Professor Abbad we learned about strong and ancient connections of the Muslims with Jerusalem. These connections are said to link today’s Palestinians to the pre-Israelite population of Canaan. He also underlined the Islamic conception of one God and one religion. In the Muslim view, the prophets complement each other; their mission is to call humanity back to God and to the true religion of Abraham. The sanctity of Jerusalem for Islam is another point illustrated by Professor Abbad. He described the Islamic occupation of Jerusalem as an imperative duty of liberating the Holy City from the impious Byzantines (Romans). Finally, Professor Abbad pleaded the case of a tolerant behavior of the Islamic rulers towards both Jews and Christians throughout history.³⁵

From the historical point of view, one can object that the attempt by modern Palestinians to trace their origin back to the pre-Israelite, even Canaanite population of this land may be counterproductive.³⁶ It may amount to negating the Abrahamic descent of the Arabs through Ishmael. In other words, if the Palestinians are descendants of the pre-Israelite Canaanites, then they do not belong to the progeny of Abraham as outlined in the Bible (Gen. 10-11) because Canaan was of the descent of Ham, not of Shem as Abraham was.³⁷

³⁴ In his response to Professor Sevrin’s lecture in this volume, T. Masvie emphasizes the importance of Jer. 7:11 for the interpretation of the Marcan text. He also takes the fig-symbol to refer to the people in charge of the Temple rather than to the Temple itself.

³⁵ See critical remarks by H. Noujaim in this volume.

³⁶ Admittedly, a certain criticism is being voiced even in academic circles concerning a “Israelitic” interpretation of the archaeological findings and a pro-Israeli, or Zionist, reconstruction of Biblical history. See Editor’s note to Abbad’s paper in this volume.

³⁷ See E. Cortese, “Patriarchal genealogies: Literary, Historical and Theologico-Political Criticism,” in: A. Niccacci (ed.), *Divine Promises to the Fathers in the Three Monotheistic Religions. Proceedings of a Symposium Held in Jerusalem March 24-25, 1993*, Jerusalem 1995, 11-27.

One could imagine, however, that the situation of modern Palestinians is not much different from that of the ancient Israelites who established themselves in the Promised Land. In fact, according to a fairly accepted view, the ancient Israelites were a mixed population. They consisted of a group of tribes come from Egypt under the leadership of Moses, and of a group of tribes which always remained in the country and lived among the Canaanites. In a similar way, one could argue, today's Palestinians are a mixed population, consisting of descendants of the local Canaanite peoples, and of the occupants from Arabia. If so, an historical argument of this kind seems inconclusive for either party.

I do not intend to pursue this very sensitive point any longer. I only wish to say, together with moderate individuals of both sides, that it is not permitted to jump back in history. Our God is the sovereign of history and of peoples, as the ancient prophets remind us. The destiny of all the nations is in his hands. Can we redress the course of history? This is not, I suppose, a fatalistic way of seeing things but rather a believing way that may be shared by many of us. Besides, I agree with Professor Cortese that the presence of Muslim and Jewish worshippers around the same sacred area, and of Christian worshippers in a nearby sacred area, as well as the coming of pilgrims of the three religions are, in the eyes of faith, a realization, at least partial, of the prophecy of the gathering of many peoples on the Holy Mountain to learn the ways of the Lord and walk in his paths.

In any case, from the perspective of our symposium we are left without an answer concerning what I see as the main problem, that is the relationship between unity and diversity. We saw how this problem has been illustrated from a Biblical point of view, both in the OT and in the NT. I would like to understand better the Islamic position. Here I will quote some of texts that seem relevant to me.

The Islamic ideal of one God, one Heavenly Book, one community, and one Prophet is expressed in a forcible way in Surah 2:

Mankind [*al-nās*] were one community [*umma wāhida*], and Allah sent (unto them) prophets as bearers of good tidings and as warners, and revealed therewith the Scripture [*al-kitāb*] with the truth that it might judge between mankind concerning that wherein they differed. And only those unto whom (the Scripture) was given differed concerning it, after clear proofs had come unto them, through hatred one of another. And Allah by His Will guided those who believe unto the truth of that concerning which they differed. Allah guideth whom He will unto a straight path (Surah 2:213).

What I understand from this passage is that, sometimes in the past, humanity was one community around one revelation. Later, probably with the split-

ting of humanity in different peoples, prophets were sent to them in different times and languages to bring good news and to warn. With the prophets God sent the Scripture containing the truth for the different peoples. This truth had the purpose of being the judge and settling disputes among the peoples. On the contrary, precisely those who received “the clear proofs,” both the Jews and the Christians, became divided among themselves because of hatred for one another. But God rightly guides those whom he wills.

In Surah 3 we read as follows about Jews and Christians:

Lo! religion with Allah (is) the Surrender (to His Will and Guidance) [*al-islām*]. Those who (formerly) received the Scripture differed only after knowledge came unto them, through transgression among themselves. Whoso disbelieveth the revelations of Allah (will find that) lo! Allah is swift at reckoning. And if they argue with thee, (O Muhammad), say: I have surrendered my purpose to Allah and (so have) those who follow me. And say to those who have received the Scriptures and those who read not [i.e. the pagan Arabs, who had no knowledge of the Scriptures]: Have ye (too) surrendered? If they surrender, then truly they are rightly guided, and if they turn away, then it is thy duty only to convey the message (unto them). Allah is Seer of (His) bondmen (Surah 3:19-20).

In Surah 5, after a passage quoted above in which the Koran lists the subsequent revelations to Moses, to Jesus and finally to Muhammad, we read as follows:

For each We have appointed a divine law [*šir’a*] and a traced-out way [*minhāj*]. Had Allah willed He could have made you one community [*umma*]. But that He may try you by that which He hath given you (He hath made you as ye are). So vie one with another in good works. Unto Allah ye will all return, and He will then inform you of that wherein ye differ (Surah 5:48).

We can learn important points from this passage. First, religion is one; the differences come from God himself, who altered the prescriptions to suit the different nations at different times and in different circumstances. Second, God wanted the differences to put peoples to a test, and the test seems to consist in the readiness to accept the will of God whenever it is revealed to them. As one commentator puts it, “The proper mode of conduct for people who keep their eyes fixed on this true purpose is to strive for God’s good pleasure rather than quarrel about differences in the legal prescriptions of the various Prophets.”³⁸ Finally, Surah 98:

And they [i.e. the People of the Book] are ordered naught else than to serve Allah, keeping religion pure for Him, as men by nature upright [*ḥunafā’*], and to estab-

³⁸ Mawdūdī, *Towards Understanding the Qur’ān*, II, 170.

lish worship [*ṣalāt*] and to pay the poor-due [*zakāt*]. That is the true religion [*dīn al-qayyima*] (Surah 98:5).

In these, and maybe other, passages the Koran seems to be tackling the problem mentioned above – the relationship between unity and diversity. Now the question is, how far is diversity acceptable in Islam? What makes the unity in the diversity? How is the answer to this question precisely with regard to our topic – Jerusalem, a house of prayer for all peoples? Until unity is achieved under the right guidance of God, what is the duty and the function of the monotheistic religions according to Islam?

One thing is clear at this point – that I proposed more questions than answers. However, you might agree that an important task of our symposium is to ask questions, each religion of itself and then of the others, and try to find answers in the light of God and in the light of an honest, respectful, and humble position one toward the other.

The religion of Abraham is one important point that is common to Islam and to Christianity, especially St. Paul (e.g. Rom. 4 and Gal. 3). To a certain extent, this going back to the sources opened up the possibility for non-Jews to become part of the people of God. However, the Jewish way remains open. The task for everybody is faithfulness to God and to his plan in history.

I would like to make one last point before concluding these random considerations. Besides the many things that the three religions have in common – God, the Scripture, most of the prophets – one cannot forget the faith in the Last Days and the coming of the Messiah. It is common faith that after a final battle, all humanity will be gathered in the Valley of the Judgment in Jerusalem, between the Temple Mount or the Ḥaram al-Sharif and the Mount of Olives. We are all heading toward this goal. In the meantime, it is our task to unite forces and bring our God to humanity in our time.

4. Conclusion

I would conclude with three words: faithfulness, dialogue, and sharing. *First, faithfulness towards God and his guidance in history. We need to be men and women of faith in order to perceive God's guidance in history and follow it in obedience.*³⁹

³⁹ At least in two cases, Muslims, Christians and Jews prayed together – in 903 in Egypt to ask for rain: see B. Pirone (ed.), *Eutichio, Patriarca di Alessandria (877-940). Gli annali*, Cairo 1987, 424; and in 1348 in Damascus on the occasion of a severe plague: see Ibn Battûta, *Voyages, I. De l'Afrique du Nord à la Mecque*, eds. C. Defremery - B.R. Sanguinetti - S. Yerasimos, Paris 1990, 234-235.

Second, dialogue around the Scriptures with open-mindedness and without mistrust. From the past centuries, we have remarkable examples of discussions among Jews, Christians and Muslims about the Scriptures. These examples can provide inspiration for today. We have to learn much more one of the other, and we have to learn from God by letting the Scriptures be our judge.⁴⁰

Third, sharing is the solution. If the three religions share so much, and have a place and a function in God's plan for humanity, then sharing is imperative. Again, looking at the past centuries we find examples of sharing places of worship.⁴¹ Sharing without hegemony but with respect and pluralism and without interference of political considerations.

With the help of God, faithfulness, dialogue, and sharing can bring us closer to a better understanding, which alone makes a solution possible. This proposal may seem irenic and simplistic. To me, it is highly demanding. It obliges us to look beyond our own outlook, toward the Reign of God, which is not bound to any religion. It also obliges us to look at the consummation of human history and to evaluate our present divergences in that light.

⁴⁰ A very rich "ecumenical" literature was produced in Arabic between the 9th and 13th centuries with the contribution of authors pertaining to the three monotheistic religions; see, e.g., S. Khalil, "La tradition arabe chrétienne et la chrétienté de Terre Sainte," in: D.-M.A. Jaeger (ed.), *Papers Read at the 1979 Tantur Conference on Christianity in the Holy Land*, Jerusalem 1981, 343-432, esp. 354-358.

⁴¹ A remarkable example was the Basilica of the Nativity in Bethlehem in the 10th-14th centuries; see A.-S. Marmardji, *Textes géographiques arabes sur la Palestine*, Paris 1951, 24-26. An anonymous booklet edited by the Franciscans of the Holy Land entitled *Cenacolo (Appunti)*, Gerusalemme 1921, lists the following cases: the Church of the Holy Cross near Jerusalem, a section of the Basilica of the Nativity in Bethlehem, the Church of the Monastery of St. Elias between Jerusalem and Bethlehem, and the Church of St. Ann in Jerusalem (pp. 10-11). One can add the case of the Tomb of the Virgin at Gethsemane; see D. Baldi, *Enchiridion locorum sanctorum*, Jerusalem 1982 (repr.), no. 1085 and 1086.