

*Theophany* 1 (2018) 9-15.

## JERUSALEM, AS ARCHETYPICAL “HOUSE” OF BEING RELIGIOUS\*

By

Dr., Dr. **Spyridon K. Tsitsigkos**, MA, DD, PhD

*Associate Professor of the Psychology of Religion*

School of Religious Studies & Social Theology, University of Athens

*“All nations and all kingdoms  
will in time to come gather  
together in the midst of Jerusalem”  
(Rabbi Simeon b. Gamaliel)*

All Holiness, Beatitude, respected Hierarchs, Eminences Rabbis, representatives of the political authorities, honorable professors, ladies, and gentlemen.

In this presentation I will try briefly to refer semantically to the archetypal spirituality of Jerusalem<sup>1</sup> (videlicet as a sign of Transcendence) or Zion<sup>2</sup> [deriving from *Zedek* (compare with Melchi-zedek)], which as names represent the entire Judaism, researching particular Jewish and Greek Orthodox Patristic sources. Origen<sup>3</sup>, Gregory of Nyssa<sup>4</sup> and all Hesych Fathers<sup>5</sup> provide rich, psychological and allegorical interpretation of Jerusalem as every human religious soul.

The psycho-historic religiosity and spirituality are being investigated, basically, throw the etymology of the name, the semantics of specific events or sites and cultural and social human-geography and Psychology. Agreeing to a common denominator among psychologists of Religion, being religious consists of six parameters: Belief, faith, worship, coming together (viz. assembling), experience and ethos.

Officially, among seventy names in the Aggadah tradition, Jerusalem (*wšmm*) was called *Jebus* or *Salem*, which is interpreted in *Genesis* either as

---

\* Presentation in the framework of the interreligious dialogue between Christianity and Judaism, as representative of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, in the presence of the Patriarchs, Ecumenical Bartholomew and Jerusalem Theophilus III (Jerusalem, 5-7/12/2017).

perfection<sup>6</sup> or as reverence<sup>7</sup>. In the Greek writing of the noun, Jerusalem emphasis is given to the geographic sacredness of the city by adding the adjective *Holy* as a prefix: Holy-Salem equal mark *Hiero-solyma*. From the letters of Tell-el-Amarna we know the Canaanitic city Urus Halim, that means God's Foundation.

In conformity with the distinction, which Emmanuel Levinas rightly makes, here it is the ancient-Greek concept of *sacred* and not the spiritual of Judeo-Christian *holy*. Indeed, for many years a great number of scholars — everyone from his point of view — have pointed out the distinct direction of thinking between Athens and Jerusalem. Hence, the ancient Greek way corresponds more to the analytical thinking (quod vide ventral system of the human cerebral cortex, which is associated with object features and a causal relation between them), while the Judeo-Christian way corresponds to the holistic thinking (quod vide dorsal system, which is associated with the visuospatial information<sup>8</sup>).

*Shalim* or *Shulman* was a West Semitic god, who is considered the patron of the city. Forsooth, the deeper meaning of the root *sem* indicates the special relationship between the one who gives the name and the one who gains it<sup>9</sup>. Therein lies the power of true faith. Thus, the etymology of Jerusalem from the Shalom (equal mark peace) comes out to be a later poetic appellation.

God elected Jerusalem for the construction of His own House of worship. Thus, Jerusalem is called the City of the true God and Holy City. He declared to Solomon: “*In this house, and in Jerusalem, which I have chosen out of all the tribes of Israel, I will put My name forever*”<sup>10</sup>. According to Greek and Latin historians and religious writers<sup>11</sup>, an unexplained fire (Mana-dynamic energy?) appears to have occurred at the point where he had built the first temple. Just as the ancient Greeks considered the first man sprang from the stones, and the Oracle of Delphi was the navel of the Earth (comparable with *axis Mundi*), so the Jews (especially in the *Aggadah* tradition) believed that the city of stones was the navel of the earth<sup>12</sup>, and Adam was created from a pure and holy place, the site of the Temple<sup>13</sup>, or that all the world was created from Zion<sup>14</sup>. Similarly, merely in a spiritual sense, Cyril of Jerusalem considered the Golgotha as the center of the world<sup>15</sup>. Therein lies the archetypically authentic worship of true God.

Then, in a period of prosperity, Jerusalem was undoubtedly the cultural, ethical and spiritual Centre of the whole area. According to Midrash, just as ancient Athens was beautiful, wise and polytheistic, Jerusalem was gracious, wise and multi-faith, in width and in depth. And this is reflected both in the archaeological discoveries and partly to the frequent wars, government,

philosophy, artistic creation, and so on. A number of Judaic Schools in Jerusalem coexisted with heretical centers at all times. According to R. Hoshaiah, there were forty hundred eighty synagogues in Jerusalem, each including a school for the study of the Bible and another for the study of the Mishnah<sup>16</sup>, and addition, there were three hundred ninety-four *battei din*<sup>17</sup>. By this the concept of the synagogue, videlicet the Hebrew qahal, we bear the coming together.

And this *qahal* was expanding and experiencing in every Jewish family (*kindred*)<sup>18</sup>. Therein lie the individual and community ethos. The *Bayit* (namely "house") was a branch of the *mishpahah* (clan and family)<sup>19</sup>. The household was a religious as well as a societal unit. "House" (Arabic "*Bayt al-Maqdis*" equal mark saint House) or "house of a father" (*bet AV*)<sup>20</sup> corresponds in Christianity with *Eden*. Besides, according to Ezekiel<sup>21</sup> and Philo, Jerusalem "*situated in the center of the world*"<sup>22</sup>. The Israelite family as reflected in all genealogical and narrative sources was patriarchal, with the first patriarch Abraham, the father of Belief. According to Aggadah, all the above-mentioned Weltanschauung carries the implication of firstly having the Israel feminine image of the clean, but then of the harlot "*daughter Zion*"<sup>23</sup>, which nevertheless YHWH married and she became a mother, according to mainly the apocalyptic literature<sup>24</sup>, as well as in Midrashim by the name of *Tanh*<sup>25</sup>. The term "mother" had a special significance for the Hellenistic Jewry: in referring to Jerusalem as the "metropolis", they expressed the idea that the Diaspora communities were settlements founded on the initiative of the mother city, Jerusalem<sup>26</sup>. But in the *Aggadah*, the term "metropolis" had the meaning of the navel of the earth and the light of the world<sup>27</sup>, and the metropolis of all countries<sup>28</sup>.

This mother, therefore regenerates and fashions spiritually (from the holy soil of Jerusalem<sup>29</sup>) the new man through the Divine seed, which now constitutes the sperm of the Divine Word. Hence, Jacob is interpreted by the Greek Fathers of the Church as the practical Theology and Israel as the theoretical mind<sup>30</sup>, which has three gates. The material gates of Jerusalem are allegorized respectively as the silence (id est the sabbathism of thought), the fasting and the study of death<sup>31</sup>. All this high Theology<sup>32</sup> is symbolized again by the towers of Jerusalem that Ozia raised<sup>33</sup>. Finally, the psalm verse "*he that dwells in Jerusalem shall never be moved*"<sup>34</sup> indicates the mental-spiritual stability<sup>35</sup>. Therein also lies the personal experience.

An integral part of Theology, after creation, is the suffering, the temptations, the afflictions, the cross and the death, in order to follow the redemption and the resurrecting glory of Jerusalem, as Isaias and Jeremias had prophesied. In the past three thousand years, Jerusalem has experienced more sorrow than

any city in the world<sup>36</sup>. Granting to the story of Kamza and Bar Kamza given by R. Johanan, which we can say is a Theology of History, "*Jerusalem was only destroyed... because they based their judgments [strictly] on the letter of the law and did not go beyond its requirements*"<sup>37</sup>. Merely, a favorite standpoint (akin to a Jewish teaching about the Diaspora) was that Jerusalem had to be demolished (as Christ is dismembered in every Divine Eucharist) so that Jews and Christians alike might be spread throughout the world as witnesses to the fulfillment of prophecy in the Christian Church. In Jerusalem, the Spirit of God will descend again on the twelve Apostles, who, fulfilling the twelve tribes of Israel, as the figure declares the ecumenical character of God in Christ. It is, ultimately, for the cross-resurrecting dialectics of Jerusalem as situation, or of each of the human soul, that is to say about each authentically spiritual person. This inner or spiritual being, who rests in slumber within us, can, cultivated, be transformed into an "upper" (overtime/eternal) Jerusalem, personally and collectively.

In the times of Jewish Patriarchs and Prophets, this god-panhuman archetype of universal "being religious" is brought out by a shading, modeling, and prescribed form, while in the times of the Apostles and the Christian Church it is brought out clearly and unequivocally. Hither, the 'family' is not natural, such as of the ancient Greeks, neither biological, like the circumcised Jews, but spiritual<sup>38</sup>. Place-names in the Gospel of Mark are to be interpreted theologically rather than geographically<sup>39</sup>. In addition to, all this alteration has gradually been reached by the martyrs' deaths of the righteous and the saints. The authentic spiritual man, namely saint and great (see E. Fromm), is not the ethnic-racial Greek, so we as Greek Orthodox Christians do not identify the Hellenization with spirituality, as has been argued in the past. For us, a spiritual person is ecumenical like a global womb, such as the Apostle Paul<sup>40</sup>. Likewise, the Jewish synagogue of "holy land" has become a universal mother of three monotheistic religious beliefs. Of path, at this stage we should be careful, because a) in the past, Eusebius of Caesarea and other Christian writers later had called Istanbul under the name of "*new*" or "*second Jerusalem*", and b) under the name "*mother Jerusalem*", a para-Christian Movement, the so-called Elochists, has come out in South Korea today.

Consequently, by the deification of a natural father (according to S. Freud) we were guided to the religious belief of the spiritual taking as God's father and, therefore, of our spiritual adoption. As known, according to Jacques Lacan, a father (whose an ellipsis occurs psychologically in every person) can be *realistic*, *symbolic* or *fancied*. This triple psychological understanding of the father also can function for the God Father in every religion. If now we want to

parallelize the three monotheistic Religions to these three versions of the *father* respectively, we will observe psychologically that Judaism —through the Moses— perceives YHWH as its *real* father (see emphasis to Man collectively: '*chosen people*'); Islam —through the Muhammad— assumes Allah as its *symbolic*<sup>41</sup> father (see emphasis specifically on juristic God); and Christianity —based on the theology of "*imago Dei*", which is Christ— perceives God as its *fancied*<sup>42</sup> (without the "*fancied*" to coincide with the "*fantastic*" or "*imaginative*" one) father, who is consubstantial with the other two hypostases (see emphasis to God-Humanism in *Synergism*). It is not accidental that the number three, after Jerusalem was built on three hills (Accra, Moriah and the highest one, Zion). Furthermore, the sacredness of Jerusalem stemmed from the p r o p h e t i c (Moses), the r o y a l (David) and the p r i e s t l y (Aaron) attributes of Jerusalem<sup>43</sup>. The same triple figure, under the Roman occupation, is expressed in the three gods' protectors of Jerusalem (Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva). Minerva, who is Athena, the goddess of wisdom, was replaced by Venus later; under her Temple, the tomb of Christ was found. In the euphoric civilization of the Romans, the "above wisdom", that is, the Divine Logos were replaced by the lust of the flesh. Love and death: the two main urges are met, buried and resurrected transformed into the most spiritual situations. Withal, the triple this schema brought, and the following religious-psychological consequences respectively: the legal heritage in Judaism, the phobic submission in Islam, and the God-human passion to every man in Christianity. Notwithstanding, let's not be misled that all these three forms of religiousness operate evenly; they work individually, either on an external or on an internal psychological level.

Accordingly, the earthly Jerusalem (priestly, prophetic and royal City) indicates, according to the Apostle Paul<sup>44</sup>, the type of mental "mother Jerusalem", that is the Church<sup>45</sup>, and "*celestial Jerusalem*"<sup>46</sup>, *id est Kingdom of heaven*<sup>47</sup>, an idea that came from the Isaiah's vision<sup>48</sup>; because tangible things are images and symbols of the invisible ones. All spiritual inhabitants of the celestial Jerusalem become priests, prophets, and kings. So, the type of the *sacred* becomes *holy*, without the first (the earthly, human and created) to remove<sup>49</sup>, but synergistically to be sanctified<sup>50</sup>, whence, according to the Christian Revelation, the historicity merges distinctly with the transcendent.

Yet, in practice, this operation needs constant exercise of discernment, *videlicet* the nuclear concept of *qôdèš* [equal mark discreteness (from all other surrounding nations, such as Jerusalem was distinct from all other pagan cities naturally, aesthetically and spiritually); it also requires, according to Levinas, a pure, sincere, candid, straight and direct look, because to achieve an accurate

judgment, a full eyesight is necessary. Verily, everyone overlooks the city from the Mount of Olives, like bird's eye (E. D. Clarke). Thus, the true 'over' Jerusalem has become the symbol of *Justice*<sup>51</sup> and the eschatological "vision of peace" (*yera'eh*), in the Old Testament<sup>52</sup>, as well as in Greek Fathers of the Church<sup>53</sup>.

## REFERENCES

---

<sup>1</sup> For a full bibliography of Holy City, see J. D. Purvis, *Jerusalem, the Holy City, A Bibliography*, vol. II., ATLA Bibliography Series, 20, The American Theological Library Association and the Scarecrow Press, Metuchen, 1991.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. D. Caemakis, *Zion and Jerusalem in Second-Isaias*, Thessaloniki 1990.

<sup>3</sup> Or., *In Jo*, hom. 21, 2, p. 431, 19, MPG 87, 1033C.

<sup>4</sup> *In Cant.*, hom. 15, MPG 44, 1097C.

<sup>5</sup> Calistos Patriarch, "Chapters about prayer", *Philocaly*, vol. IV, p. 339.

<sup>6</sup> Gen. 14, 18.

<sup>7</sup> Gen. 22, 14.

<sup>8</sup> L. G. Ungerleider & M. Mishkin, "Two cortical visual systems", in: D. J. Ingle, M. A. Goodale & R. J. W. Mansfield (Eds.), *The analysis of visual behavior*, pp. 549-586, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1982, A. D. Milner & M. A. Goodale, *The visual brain in action*, Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 1995, M. A. Goodale, "Action without perception in human vision", *Cognitive Neuropsychology* 25 (2008) 891-919, G. Borst, W. L. Thompson & S. M. Kosslyn, "Understanding the Dorsal and Ventral Systems of the Human Cerebral Cortex", *American Psychologist* 66/7 (2011) 624-632.

<sup>9</sup> N. Caldusch-Benages, "The Name of the Beloved City in Baruch 4:5 – 5:9", *Biblische Notizen* 164 (2015).

<sup>10</sup> II Chronicles 33, 7.

<sup>11</sup> See historians Ammianus Marcellinus, Zosimus, Gregory Nazianzen, John Chrysostom, Ambrose, Rufinus, Theodoret, Sozomen, Socrates, Gibbon.

<sup>12</sup> B.A. M. Chyutin, *The New Jerusalem Scroll from Qumran. A Comprehensive Reconstruction*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1997, M. Evans, *Jerusalem*, TimeWorthy Books, 2013, pp. 187ff.

<sup>13</sup> PdRE 12; Gen. R. 14:8. TJ, Naz. 7: 2, 56b.

<sup>14</sup> Yoma 54b.

<sup>15</sup> Cat. 13, 28.

<sup>16</sup> TJ, Meg. 3: 1, 73d.

<sup>17</sup> Ket. 105a.

<sup>18</sup> Exod. 12, 3, Eph. 3, 15.

<sup>19</sup> Josh. 7: 14.

<sup>20</sup> Gen. 24: 38; 46: 31.

<sup>21</sup> 38, 12.

<sup>22</sup> *Legatio ad Gaium*, 294.

<sup>23</sup> Is. 1, 21.

<sup>24</sup> IV Ezra 10: 7; I Bar. 4: 9; II Bar. 3: 1.

<sup>25</sup> PR 26: 131b; Yal. Mak. On Ps. 147: 2, no. 4.

<sup>26</sup> Philo, *In Flaccum*, 45–46; *Legatio ad Gaium*, 281.

- 
- <sup>27</sup> Gen. R. 59: 5.
- <sup>28</sup> Ex. R. 23: 10.
- <sup>29</sup> Ezek. 4, 1. See Neilos Ascetic, "Ascetic Homily", *Philocaly*, vol. I, p. 211.
- <sup>30</sup> Gregory of Sinai, "About quiet", *Philocaly*, vol. IV, p. 71.
- <sup>31</sup> Philotheos of Sinai, "Sobering chapters", *Philocaly*, vol. II, 6, 275.
- <sup>32</sup> Maximus the Confessor, "About Theology, 4<sup>th</sup> hundred", *Philocaly*, vol. II, p. 119.
- <sup>33</sup> II Chronicles 26, 9.
- <sup>34</sup> Ps. CXXIV, 1.
- <sup>35</sup> Isaias the Anchorite, "About observance of mind", *Philocaly*, vol. I, p. 35, Maximus the Confessor, "About Theology, 4<sup>th</sup> hundred", *Philocaly*, vol. II, p. 120.
- <sup>36</sup> M. Evans, *Jerusalem*, TimeWorthy Books, 2013, p. 228.
- <sup>37</sup> Git. 55b.
- <sup>38</sup> Cf. P. Christos, "The significance of Holy Land for Orthodoxy", in: *Holy Bread spiritual* (honorary book G. J. Conidares), Athens 1981, pp. 543-547.
- <sup>39</sup> Bl. J. Schreiber, *Die Markusp passion. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1993.
- <sup>40</sup> Gal. 4, 19.
- <sup>41</sup> *Symbolic* is a network that in its function is nothing but the law, namely the presence and request of the Other, denoting the subject as the basis of a symbolic order, which makes sense by naming the terms of kinship. Thus, *Symbolic* means finally what the ancient Greeks called fate (destiny) or predestination (cf. *Kismet*).
- <sup>42</sup> *Fancied* is a system of representations, which are narcissistically invested in the body image; it is the composition of the Ego based on the image of its own (cf. "in his own image"), viz. an imagery Ego. Thus, *phantasm* is a supernatural discarnate being or conscious representations, while *fantasm* is the unconscious formation of the idea of representation (*imago*) of a thing that belongs to the category of the Fancied, and that is not identical to the image that the subject has for himself (cf. non-mirror image). As known, in Christianity is forbidden any kind of visual representation of God, since any imaginary representation of the Divine is idolatry.
- <sup>43</sup> *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Thomson – Gale, second edition, vol. 11, p. 208.
- <sup>44</sup> Gal. 4, 24-31, Heb. 12, 21.
- <sup>45</sup> Jo. 13, 13, p. 238, 8, MPG 14, 420A, Gr. Nyss., *Eun.* 10, 2, p. 233, 25, MPG 45, 836A., Nil., epp. 1, 258, MPG 79, 177D, Cyr., *Is.* 1, 2, p. 2, 34D, 35D, Chrys., *Comm. In Gal.* 4, 26 (10, 710E).
- <sup>46</sup> Apoc. 21, 18ff.
- <sup>47</sup> Orig., Hom. 34, Luc, p. 201, 19, Calistos and Ignatios Xanthopouloi, *Philocaly*, vol. IV, p. 256.
- <sup>48</sup> Isa. 6. 49, 16.
- <sup>49</sup> Bl. P. W. L. Walker, *Holy City, Holy Places? Christian attitudes to Jerusalem and the Holy Land in the IVth century*, Oxford Clarendon Press, 1990, Archim. Aristarchos, "Holy Land in the work of the saint Gregory of Nyssa", *Ecclesia* 1-15/1/1996, pp. 36 εξ.
- <sup>50</sup> Bl. M. E. Isaacs, *Sacred Space. An Approach to the Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
- <sup>51</sup> Ps. 89, 15, Jer. 33, 16, Isa. 1, 26.
- <sup>52</sup> Gen. 22, 14.
- <sup>53</sup> Clem., *Str.* 1, 5, MPG 8, 720B, Cyr., *Glaph.* Gen. 2.3, 1. 49B.