A Desire against all Odds and Difficulties?
The Presence of Christian Pilgrims in Early Muslim Jerusalem, Seventh to Tenth Century

This contribution attempts to investigate Christian pilgrimage activity to Jerusalem during the first 400 years of Arab-Muslim rule over the city\(^1\). The pilgrims’ progress to Jerusalem was neither stable nor invariable; indeed, it was affected by various temporal factors. Two factors are generally accepted as key:

1) the political relations between the place of origin or point of departure of the pilgrims and the Muslim authorities controlling Jerusalem.
2) the Palestinian Melkite Christians’ relationship with the Muslim authorities, which changed frequently from cordial to hostile and vice-versa.

In order to determine the relationship between these two factors, we have to analyse in how far pilgrimages to Jerusalem depended on these two factors, and which of the factors had a larger influence on the pilgrims’ endeavours.

To this purpose, I will study both Byzantine and Latin pilgrimage activities, since the Muslim authorities in Jerusalem generally perceived all pilgrims from the Christian states of the Mediterranean basin as one group, whom they called ḥākim’s demolition of the Holy Sepulchre, not so much because this is perceived as a major rupture in Jerusalem pilgrimage (the event is certainly exaggerated in retrospective: a matter discussed on p. 27), but because the most relevant developments in pilgrimage appeared during this period.

Sources and Methodology

Before we delve further into the subject, it is worthwhile to define the term pilgrim in detail. It is common knowledge that there was no defined image or nomenclature for pilgrims when the share of Western and Central European pilgrims was neither stable nor invariable; indeed, it was affected by various temporal factors. Two factors are generally accepted as key:

1) the political relations between the place of origin or point of departure of the pilgrims and the Muslim authorities controlling Jerusalem.
2) the Palestinian Melkite Christians’ relationship with the Muslim authorities, which changed frequently from cordial to hostile and vice-versa.

In order to determine the relationship between these two factors, we have to analyse in how far pilgrimages to Jerusalem depended on these two factors, and which of the factors had a larger influence on the pilgrims’ endeavours.

To this purpose, I will study both Byzantine and Latin pilgrimage activities, since the Muslim authorities in Jerusalem generally perceived all pilgrims from the Christian states of the Mediterranean basin as one group, whom they called ar-Rūm (»Romans«). It was only in the eleventh century – when the share of Western and Central European pilgrims substantially increased in comparison to those coming from Byzantium – that the former were usually perceived as a group of their own, al-Jfiran (»Franks«).

This study evolved from my Ph.D. thesis on the economy of Byzantine pilgrimage at the Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, which was supervised by Johannes Pahlitzsch and Claudia Sode and funded by the Leibniz-Gemeinschaft at the Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum Mainz, see Ritter, Zwischen Glaube und Geld. – The paper covers the period up to al-Hākim’s demolition of the Holy Sepulchre, not so much because this is perceived as a major rupture in Jerusalem pilgrimage (the event is certainly exaggerated in retrospective: a matter discussed on p. 27), but because the most relevant developments in pilgrimage appeared during this period.

Most scholars take for granted what a pilgrim is supposed to be, although the category was floating in medieval languages, and even nowadays the exact definition of a pilgrim remains unclear.

I will therefore use Jas Elsner’s theorem as a point of departure\(^2\), though I would like to specify some points that are important for the period under discussion. In my opinion, a traveller in the Middle Ages had to fulfil four main prerequisites to be coined as a pilgrim: first, his main motivation to travel had to lie in his belief or religion and the journey had to be a physical one. His destination had to be a sacred site outside of his everyday reach and at the same time accepted as a common religious site. Moreover, he had to make the journey on his own initiative and without a clear professional obligation. Finally, he performed no rituals on the way, but he did so at the destination.

Due to the biased source transmission on pilgrimage activity, we have a strong preponderance of Latin reports in regard to Jerusalem pilgrims in comparison to pilgrims speaking other languages. Consequently, we are confronted with a huge distortion of medieval realities, because it is evident that Latin pilgrims were in fact a small minority in Palestine before the eleventh century.

This fact can be highlighted by a look at the Commemoration de casis Dei vel monasteris compiled in the year 808 on behalf of Charlemagne. According to this inventory list of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, only five of the 35 hermits in Jerusalem at the time used Latin as language of prayer (ca. 14 % share)\(^3\). These hermits had certainly come as pilgrims to the Holy Land and had stayed there, just like many pilgrims in the Middle Ages.

\(^1\) This study evolved from my Ph.D. thesis on the economy of Byzantine pilgrimage at the Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, which was supervised by Johannes Pahlitzsch and Claudia Sode and funded by the Leibniz-Gemeinschaft at the Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum Mainz, see Ritter, Zwischen Glaube und Geld.

\(^2\) Dietz, Wandering Monks 27-35, ignores the Greek component when defining pilgrimage.

\(^3\) Elsner, Introduction, passim.

\(^4\) Commemoration de casis Dei 19-21 (207 McCormick); McCormick, Charlemagne’s Survey 56-58.
During Easter 1047, Nāṣer-e Khoshraw, a Persian visitor to Jerusalem, noted the huge mass of religious travellers (ziyāra) in Jerusalem who came from ar-Rūm (i.e., the Byzantine empire). He even claims that the emperor himself had accomplished a Jerusalem pilgrimage in disguise. There can be no doubt that apart from pilgrims from within the Caliphate, more than half of the foreign pilgrims in Jerusalem came from Byzantium. Some reached the Holy Land from the South Caucasus and only a tangible minority from Latin Europe. Moshe Gil and David Jacoby have calculated the latter at about 10% of all pilgrims in the eleventh century. Yet, the Latin pilgrims boasted of their accomplished pilgrimages that took much more effort than their eastern counterparts. Furthermore, the ways of transmission and the preservation of many monastic archives in the West lead to the distorted impression that Jerusalem pilgrimage was a rather Western and Central European phenomenon. We need to keep in mind, though, that the information on many Jerusalem pilgrims covers only their name, approximate date and place of origin. Elaborate reports about the route or the political conditions in Palestine are scarce. Nonetheless, the mere enumeration of pilgrims reveals at what times pilgrimage activities became less or more intense. This information can then be correlated with political events in the Levant.

One way to balance the picture is to draw more attention to the known Byzantine pilgrims. Alice-Mary Talbot has presented 30 religious travellers to Jerusalem, of which only 14 lived in the seventh to tenth centuries. Elisabeth Malamut partly studied the same individuals in more depth, but she did not focus on the topic of Jerusalem pilgrimage in her study of saints’ itineraries. Taking a closer look at the Byzantine evidence, Andreas Küzler worked on one of the texts, the itinerary of Epiphanius Hagiolopolites. For certain periods, there are no recorded Byzantine pilgrims at all, a fact which led Joseph Patrich to assume an entire disruption of pilgrimage activity from Byzantium. However, it is not possible to redraw the outlines of Byzantine pilgrimage to Jerusalem on the basis of the very few testimonies we actually have of genuine Byzantine pilgrims.

To overcome this deficit, different paths may be pursued. One might include indirect evidence of Jerusalem pilgrimage activity like the circulation of manuscripts, relic collections assembled in Palestine, or church architecture modelled after the Holy Sepulchre. However, there is also another way to tackle the problem which I want to follow here. Instead of relying on the very scarce evidence of Byzantine pilgrims in the seventh to tenth centuries, the patterns of Latin pilgrims of the period should be accounted for, since they resembled Byzantine pilgrimage patterns as soon as they reached the Byzantine orbit during their travel. There are two main deliberations for pursuing such a venture.

Firstly, almost all the Latin pilgrims up to the eleventh century had to cross Byzantine territory and waters. As a consequence, they received information about travel conditions and the prevalent political situation in Palestine from Byzantine subjects who were much more familiar with the region. The Jerusalem pilgrimage from Western Europe therefore developed using Byzantine perceptions. Experiences gathered by either Byzantine pilgrims or by the Byzantine populace in the border area affected both the travel time and the routes the Latin pilgrims took. Jerusalem pilgrimages could be deterred because Byzantines considered travels or border crossings too dangerous; this is also reflected in some pilgrimage reports. For instance, the Burggrave Meginfred of Waldeck (in 1040) and the Abbot Thierry of Saint-Évroult (in 1058) changed their routes and travel plans on Byzantine territory because Byzantines advised them not to cross overland to Palestine due to the conditions at the frontier.

There is another good reason to consider Latin and Byzantine pilgrims jointly for the issue raised here. Western European pilgrims entering Palestine came under the supervision of the Patriarch of Jerusalem who had the responsibility from the Muslim authorities to administrate and adjudicate all Chalcedonian Christians. The Latins possessed some monasteries (especially the one on the Mount of Olives), yet they did not have a Church organisation of their own in Palestine up to the First Crusade (1099).

At the same time, the Jerusalemite clergy were received at the Byzantine court not as envoys, but as subjects. Steven Runciman put it this way: »The Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem might head the Orthodox community in practical dealings with the Caliph; but above them was the Emperor, whose representatives they were in partibus infidelium.« This relationship should not be conflated with political ideology but was borne out of late antique tradition. In fact, the Jerusalemite patriarchs were usually very loyal to the Patriarchate of Constantinople in matters of Christian doctrine. This is relevant considering that Jerusalem stuck with Constantinople in the Filioque controversy that arose in Bethlehem in 807, and in the controversy about the azymes at a later date.

As a consequence of this situation, Latin pilgrims were under the juridical supervision of the Patriarch of Jerusalem who in turn usually entertained close relations to Byzantium.

5 Nāṣer-e Khoshraw, Itinerarium (106-107 and 13 Thackston).
7 Talbot, Pilgrimage 97-110.
8 Malamut, Route.
9 Küzler, Peregrinatio graeca 14-17.
11 Vita Haimeradi, cap. 32 (606 Koepeke).
12 Orderic Vitalis Historia ecclesiastica III (2, 68-74 Chibnall); Gazeau, Normannia II 243-244, 42.

13 For the crucial role of Jerusalem in forming the Melkite Church, see Griffith, Church of Jerusalem 175-204.
15 Runciman, Protectorate 212-213.
16 Runciman, Protectorate 207-215.
17 For a list of patriarchs of Jerusalem, see Fedalto, Hierarchia II 1001-1003.
18 Grumel, Jerusalem 104-117; McCormick, Charlemagne’s Survey 59.
The precedence of the Byzantine Church for Jerusalem was also acknowledged in vague terms by a Western source very much occupied with Jerusalem pilgrimage, Rodulfus Glaber, who writes: »Just as Rome bears the primacy over all the Latin lands, so Constantinople is the head not only of the Greeks, but of all the other peoples who live in the Eastern lands beyond the sea.« 19

Consequently, the treatment of the Melkite Church 20 by the Muslim authorities and by the populace in Palestine depended indirectly on the Caliphate’s political relations to the Byzantine empire.

The topic of Jerusalem pilgrimage is of paramount importance for the study of the Melkite Church of Palestine, not least because it effected the Jerusalem Patriarchate’s inner organisation. Church organisation completely changed in the early Muslim period, at least since the ninth century, insofar as the late antique bishoprics overwhelmingly turned into titular bishoprics and a new order of autocephalous archbishoprics was established from scratch. The pattern investigated by Levy-Rubin shows that at least four of the 25 dioceses of the Jerusalemite patriarchate were in fact centred on pilgrimage shrines without any considerable flock: Mount Tabor, Mount Sinai, Nazareth, and the archbishopric of the »Holy river Jordan«. She rightly coinched those dioceses »the archbishoprics of the holy places« and assigns them the protection of the assets and the shrine as their main function 21. One might surmise that the reception and care for pilgrims was another task of these bishoprics.

Pilgrims to Umayyad Jerusalem (661-750)

Between the Arab conquest of Jerusalem (638) and Mu‘awiya’s rise to the Caliphate (661), we have no recorded pilgrims from either Byzantium or the West. Yet, in 667/668, in other words, simultaneously with the first siege of Constantinople 22, Mu‘awiya approved John IV as ordained Patriarch of Jerusalem, the first such recognition after the Arab conquest. We know of only three pilgrims from this period:

The first is rather a legendary figure: Abbot Cathal of Lismore in Ireland, who went on pilgrimage to Jerusalem in the years around 670. On his return journey, he was shipwrecked off the Apulian coast and ended up as bishop of Taranto, still revered in the city as Saint Cataldo 24.

Another pilgrim is the Gallic Bishop Arculf whose well-known pilgrimage was written down by Abbot Adomnán of Iona. He entered the Caliphate in 679. Having sojourned in Bethlehem, Hebron, Jericho and some Galilean sites, he also turned towards Damascus and Tyre. He visited Alexandria in order to head for Constantinople, entering the empire by sea via Crete 25. His travelogue is not arranged according to the route taken, but according to exegetical considerations. Consequently, he may also have first visited Constantinople and entered the Caliphate in Alexandria. At any rate, the author Adomnán did not pay attention to the practical conduct of the pilgrimage.

The last pilgrimage to be mentioned is virtually absent in the scholarly discourse on Jerusalem pilgrimages. It is the travel of the then priest and future abbot of the Farfa abbey to the north of Rome, Thomas of Maurienne 26, which took place in around 675 to 682. This native of Savoy travelled to Rome and turned towards Fermo (Firmium) on the Adriatic Sea in order to embark on a ship to Jerusalem and the »ala loca sancta« which usually imply Bethlehem and the Jordan river. He stayed in the region for three years until he supposedly received a vision of the Mother of God, urging him to turn home. Interestingly, he returned via Ephesus, where he venerated John the Evangelist, and then sailed to Sabinium (Savinense, i.e. Latium), until he finally reached Rome 27. This return journey took three years according to the report transmitted by an anonymous mid-ninth century chronicler monk of Farfa abbey.

These pilgrims had left the Caliphate in the early 680s. There was a period of relative peace between the Caliphate and the empire in the years of Emperor Constantine IV (668-685), which came to an abrupt end with the accession of his son Justinian II, who immediately attacked the Caliphate in Armenia and launched navy operations against Acre and Caesarea in 686 28. Pilgrimage traffic halted. Only after around 705 did relations improve again, attested also by the then-approved nomination of John V as Patriarch of Jerusalem. The eminent presbyter, theologian and author John of Damascus served that very patriarch 29. Although the war between the empire and the Caliphate continued also after 705, small-scale pilgrimage activity can be detected in the period:

First of all, the monk Stephen of Chonolakkon travelled to Jerusalem, the Jordan river and the monasteries of the Judean desert in the period between 700 and 720 30. He returned to Constantinople.

The famous pilgrimage of the Anglo-Saxon Willibald, later bishop of Eichstätt, took place from 721 to 729. He entered the Caliphate at Tortosa in 723 after traversing the empire by

---

19 Radulphi Glabri Historia I 16 (France 30): »Constat igitur ab anterioibus illud principale totius orbis imperium fuisse diuium, sicelit ut quernadmodum universae Latinitatis Roma gerere debebat principatum, ita Constantinopolis tam Greccorum speciale caput in transmarinis orientis partibus quam ceterorum«.

20 The Melkites (*Syriac malka; literally, the ones adhering to the emperor of Constantinople) were those Christians of the Near East who followed the Chalcedonian doctrine. They fell under Muslim rule in the conquest period and would eventually adopt Arabic as their language of discourse. This and other cultural characteristics differentiated them from other Chalcedonian Christians.

21 Levy-Rubin, Reorganisation 203-206.

22 Levy-Rubin, Reorganisation 214.

23 Jankowiak, Arab Siege 237-320.

24 Iorio, Itinerari 179-181.

25 Adamnan De locis sanctis (Bieler). The main study for our purpose is Hoyland/Waidler, Adomnán 787-807.

26 Constructio monasterii Farsensis, cap. 1-3 (Balzani 3-5); about him with refs. McCormick, Origins 172 n. 70.

27 Gil, Palestine 80-81.

28 New study: Kontouma, John of Damascus.

29 Vita Stephani Chonolaccensi (AASS Nov. prop. 392-394).

---
sea from Naples via Reggio, Syracuse, Monemvasia, Ephesus, Attaleia and Cyprus. When he had concluded an exhausting pilgrimage journey in Palestine and Syria, he left the Caliphate from Tyre in 726, and returned via Constantinople. By the same time, in approximately 725, the Gallic monk Silvinus crossed the Mediterranean Sea (transmare) in order to go on pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and visited also the Jordan river. He returned to the Merovingian kingdom.

Another much more peculiar pilgrimage is supposed to have taken place in the year 723/724. The 70 Byzantine lay pilgrims are said to have travelled to Jerusalem, Bethlehem and the Jordan river when there was a truce between the empire and the Caliphate. According to the hagiographic text known as Passio of the Sixty Martyrs of Jerusalem composed in Syriac in the mid-eighth century (translated into Greek in the same century by a monk John 32 and again in the tenth century by a priest Symeon 33), those pilgrims were arrested by a Muslim authority when war broke out and were forced to convert to Islam under threat of death. Seven of them succumbed, three more died before execution and the remaining 60 are supposed to have been executed as martyrs in Jerusalem. The story resembles a hagiographic text about the martyrdom of 60 soldiers which took place in Gaza in 639. Therefore, George Huxley out-rightly rejects the authenticity of the story of the pilgrim-martyrs. It is quite clear that the eighth-century pro-Byzantine author wanted to entice the empire to attack the Muslims by reflecting on Arab atrocities. Nonetheless, the narrative mirrors historical realities of the eighth to the ninth century. He went via Italy and made his entry into the Caliphate at Alexandria in a larger group of laymen and clergymen. After a visit to Fustat, they headed towards Mount Sinai before going to Jerusalem.

The Irish monk Fidelis, who is mentioned by the geographer Dicuil, took the opposite direction. Fidelis served as an eye-witness for Dicuil’s description of Egypt because he had conducted a pilgrimage that took place at the turn of the eighth to the ninth century. He went via Italy and made his pilgrimage in the 780s and left Palestine around 792.

A first and very serious insurrection against the Melkites of Palestine by local Arab tribes occurred in 786. The Arabs attacked both the monasteries of Mar Saba and Chariton. In 787, a presbyter called John joined the council of Nicaea as acknowledged representative of Patriarch Elias II of Jerusalem who had been taken into exile to Iraq; he reported on the events. Elias would return later, dying in about 797. We have four kontakia ascribed to a Patriarch Elias who is most likely the same person.

Pilgrims to the `Abbāsids Caliphate (750-868)

At first, Abbasid rule over Palestine did not herald significant changes for the Melkite Christians. The Caliphs now visited Jerusalem more rarely and therefore each visit was recorded in the sources (758 and 771 al-Manṣūr; 780 al-Mahdi). Palestine faded into a backwater province, although the prominence of Jerusalem as an Islamic pilgrimage destination increased at the same time.

One pilgrim of this period was John of Gotthia, who later became bishop on the Crimea. In 755, John travelled from Anatolia to Jerusalem, where he stayed for three years and became a monk. He left around 758 and returned via Iberia (i.e. Georgia), where he received ordination as bishop by the Catholikos of Mcʿḥet’a, after which he arrived at his see.

Second to be mentioned is the later Bishop Maldeveus of Verdun. Maldeveus visited Rome and continued his journey via an Apulian port to Constantinople in 772-773. From there, he passed by Ephesus, reached Jaffa and then completed his journey to Jerusalem.

Gregory Acritas from Crete travelled by sea to Seleucia Pieria, where he dwelled as a hermit until around 780, when he departed to Jerusalem. He stayed there for twelve years. According to his Life, he suffered terribly on the hands of both Jews and Muslims, though the source gives no further specifications. We may conclude that Gregory began his pilgrimage in the 780s and left Palestine around 792.

The Irish monk Fidelis, who is mentioned by the geographer Dicuil, took the opposite direction. Fidelis served as an eye-witness for Dicuil’s description of Egypt because he had conducted a pilgrimage that took place at the turn of the eighth to the ninth century. He went via Italy and made his entry into the Caliphate at Alexandria in a larger group of laymen and clergymen. After a visit to Fustat, they headed towards Mount Sinai before going to Jerusalem.

A first and very serious insurrection against the Melkites of Palestine by local Arab tribes occurred in 786. The Arabs attacked both the monasteries of Mar Saba and Chariton. In 787, a presbyter called John joined the council of Nicaea as acknowledged representative of Patriarch Elias II of Jerusalem who had been taken into exile to Iraq; he reported on the events. Elias would return later, dying in about 797. We have four kontakia ascribed to a Patriarch Elias who is most likely the same person.
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During the years 792-793, a tribal war affected the area\(^{47}\). In March 797, Mar Saba was attacked a second time, allegedly producing 20 martyr monks including Theoctistus\(^{48}\). These events, which are also reflected in the repressions described in the Vita of Stephen Sabaites\(^{49}\), enticed Christianized Europe into paying more attention to the pilgrimage sites of Palestine.

In the years 796 to 811, Charlemagne supported the Patriarchate of Jerusalem by donating a lot of money both for the reconstruction of damaged buildings and for the erection of new buildings for the benefit of both monks and pilgrims\(^{50}\), activities that were overseen by Patriarch George (797-807). In 807, the Abbot George and the monk Felix from the Mount of Olives travelled as envoys to Pope Leo III on behalf of Patriarch Thomas (807-819), although by this time the main objective was to report on the outbreak of the Filioque controversy\(^{51}\). In order to attract support for the patriarchate, an inventory list of the religious houses in Jerusalem was drawn up in 808 by another embassy. From then on, the list formed the basis of the subsidies that flowed into the Holy Land\(^{52}\). Although there is no mention of Charlemagne's activities in Oriental sources, Byzantine sources register his support\(^{53}\), and overall there is no doubt about the impact of his interference in recent scholarship\(^{54}\). Since maritime connections in this period were slow, Patriarch Thomas I sent two more envoys to Charlemagne, called Agamus and Rocalphus. Both were Frankish subjects who happened to be in Jerusalem, most probably for religious reasons (pilgrimage, as Michael Borgolte plausibly assumed)\(^{55}\). However, there are no other pilgrims recorded in this period and immediately thereafter, which is surprising considering the fact that the conditions should have improved or at least remained the same as before 796.

This lack of pilgrimage activity may be explained by the civil war which had erupted after Hūrūn ar-Rašīd's death, which lasted from 809-813 and resulted in security issues, highway-robbery\(^{56}\), and numerous attacks on Christians in Palestine. Byzantine sources record a mass flight of monks to Byzantium\(^{57}\). Laymen also escaped, e. g. the later Saint Anthony the Younger who settled in Attaleia, then still a young man\(^{58}\). Another case is Leontius, who was a Jerusalem pilgrim from Athens. His Life – preserved only in Karamanlica – reports that he travelled by ship to Palestine and lived as a monk in the monastery of Theodosius. Due to repressions by the infidels he fled to Byzantium with his mentor Barnabas, and disembarked at Patara (Parassam)\(^{59}\). Soon after, he founded a monastery on Mount Kontobakion close to Attaleia\(^{60}\).

The written sources reflect the official requests for help from Palestine. The Jerusalemite Syncellus Michael went to secure help in Constantinople in 813\(^{61}\), and was ordered to proceed to Rome for the same reason, but was not able to realise the journey\(^{62}\). According to his Life, he travelled to Constantinople via Diospolis and a certain Seleucia. Another traveller from around 818 to ca. 820 was the Studite monk Dionysius who delivered letters from the Abbot Theodore Studites to various recipients around Jerusalem: the patriarch, and the abbots of Mar Saba and Chariton\(^{63}\). By the same time, the eventually successful pretender al-Ma'mūn (813-833) allowed the reconstruction of the damaged churches\(^{64}\) which apparently also included the dome of the Holy Sepulchre since it was repaired under Patriarch Thomas I (807-819)\(^{65}\).

In summer 826, the Abbot Domenicus of the monastery on the Mount of Olives appealed for help to Emperor Louis II the Pious in Ingelheim\(^{66}\). Only one counter-embassy is recorded from Louis II to Jerusalem in the 830s. It was conducted by the monk Raganarius\(^{67}\). Another monk called

---

\(^{47}\) Gil, Palestine 283-284; literally in the Passio 20 martyrum Iuriae Sabae, cap. 2 (Papadopoulos-Kerameus 2): «(...) synagkefísthése ën tê twn Palaistinwn xhýwra múnoi émbhloi pòlaros twn Spatharistwv fólwv».

\(^{48}\) Passio 20 martyrum Iuriae Sabae (Papadopolous-Kerameus and Blake); Grabois, Pèlerin 178; Gil, Palestine 284. 474; Kennedy, Melkite Church 332; CMR I 393-396 (D. H. Vila); Auzépy, Palestine à Constantinople 223-231.
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\(^{52}\) McCormick, Charlemagne’s Survey 165-176.

\(^{53}\) Constantinri Porphyrogeniti imperatoris De administrando imperio, cap. 26 (108 Moxavičk/ Jenkins), McCormick, Charlemagne’s Survey 79.

\(^{54}\) For this, see Borgolte, Filiqo-Süret 403-427.

\(^{55}\) Borgolte, Filiqo-Süret 417.

\(^{56}\) Abā’ī Fath, Kitāb al-tārikh 219-221 (68-71 Levy-Rubin).

\(^{57}\) Theophanis Chronographia, sub an. 6305 (484 de Boor; 665 Mango/Scotton); Gil, Palestine 292-294. 474-475; Todt/Vest, Syria 39 (flight of monks to Byzantium); McCormick, Charlemagne’s Survey 161-162; Griffith, Anthony David 16; for the district of the Palestinians in Constantinople see Guillon, Quartier 73-76. The newest, valuable study that gives also a wider context of migration is Azépy, Rôle 475-503, esp. 494; Galadza, Liturgy 108. For the monastery, see Galadza, Liturgy 151-152.

\(^{58}\) Vita Antonii iunioris, cap. 3 (188 Papadopoulos-Kerameus).

\(^{59}\) Vita Leontii in monte Contobacio (Jacob). Hild/Hellenkemper, Lykien und Palmyren 2, 651-652 (without my suggested identification with Patara); for the historical context, see Hild/Hellenkemper, Lykien und Palmyren 1, 300-302; Janin, Centres 335-336. With seventy monks, the Theodosius monastery was still flourishing in the first decade of the 9th c.: Commemoratorium de casis Dei 27-29 (259 McCormick); Patrich, Impact 272.

\(^{60}\) The Theodosius monastery was attacked several times in the years 809-14 and was finally abandoned, see Theophanis Chronographia, sub an. 6301 (484 de Boor; 665 Mango/Scotton); Gil, Palestine 474-475. Only sometime before the 11th c., a new community formed there again: Pringle, Churches 271.

\(^{61}\) Vita Michaelis synclii, cap. 6 (54 Cunningham). Sode, Michael Synkellos 161-162. 299; at 201-207, Sode proposes that Michael was a mere pilgrim to Constantinople (and Rome), although we have evidence for extractions from the Jerusalemite Church which may have instigated the need for external subsidies. Azépy, Palestine à Constantinople 248-252.

\(^{62}\) Mango, Palestine 154-157.

\(^{63}\) For letters to the patriarchs and to the abbots of Chariton and Choziba, see Theodori Studitae epistolae 276-278 (409-418 Fatouros). Their names were not known to Theodore who sought support for his ecclesiastical policy in the area and was not familiar with the actual office holders. Further studies: Talbot, Pilgrimage 102; PmbZ 1346; Todt/Vest, Syria 336.

\(^{64}\) Fattal, Statut 188.

\(^{65}\) Gil, Palestine 459; Galadza, Liturgy 106.

\(^{66}\) Borgolte, Gesandtenaustausch 108.

\(^{67}\) McCormick, Origins 903; Borgolte, Gesandtenaustausch 110-111.
Domenicus from Comacchio/Venice also belongs to this period. After having completed his pilgrimage to Jerusalem, he happened to be in Alexandria in 827 or 828\(^6\), where he waited for a vessel to take him home\(^6\). Domenicus embarked on one of the ten Venetian merchant ships that took St Mark’s relics to Venice, via a stop on the Aegean island of Astypalaia (Stroalia insula)\(^7\). A further, though improbable pilgrimage mentioned in relation with these events is the future Doge John I of Venice, who is said to have visited Jerusalem, where he received the inspiration for the building scheme of the church of San Marco which was built to house the relics of St Mark\(^1\).

The rebel chieftain Abū Harb (”father of war”, revolt 842-847\(^7\)) brought Jerusalem under his control in the years 842-844 and blackmailed the patriarch to release Church properties\(^7\). As a consequence, Patriarch John VI (838-852) fled into exile\(^7\). The Sabaita monk George was sent to Ifrīqiyā in order to raise funds for the Jerusalemite patriarchate, but unable to do so due to the lack of resources in the region, he went to al-Andalus to complete his objective (in vain, though, as he was martyred in Córdoba in 852)\(^7\).

In those troubling years, a resurgent Byzantine empire went on the offensive, with a surprise naval attack on Damietta in 853\(^7\). It was the time of Abbasid decline, especially after the death of al-Mutawakkil (861) which led to widespread anarchy in the Caliphate\(^7\), and an imminent threat of Byzantine conquest was tangible in the Levant. The situation of the Melkite Church was apparently uneasy in these times, and we can supplement this impression with the fact that those who sought to achieve sainthood, they should have travelled to Jerusalem, but they did not.

To give some examples: a certain Ioannicus, who deserted the army in battle against the Bulgars in 807 and wanted to become a monk\(^6\), visited Ephesus and maybe Myra instead of going to Palestine\(^7\). Stephen of Sugdaia on the Crimea in turn stemmed from Cappadocia but visited Athens and Constantinople instead of crossing the border in approx. 810\(^6\). Thirdly, Peter of Atroa sojourned within Anatolia instead of going to Palestine at around 820\(^1\). Furthermore, Gregory Decapolites, although born and raised in Cilicia, and therefore in the border zone to the Caliphate, pursued his wandering ascetism within the Balkans and the Anatolian and Italian parts of the empire in the years 829-831\(^8\). The same pattern is observable with Constantine the Jew from central Anatolia who, according to his Life, travelled through the entire empire in the years around 850, even to Cyprus, but did not cross over to Palestine\(^8\). Lastly, the pilgrimage of Euthymius the Younger stretched from Galatia across Anatolia and the Balkans in the years around 860\(^4\).

In summary, the hagiographic testimonies indicate that Byzantine pilgrims between 810/820 and 850/860 by and large avoided travels to Palestine altogether and instead chose to circulate within the empire and Italy. This lack of Greek influx to Palestine led to an alienation between the Palestinian monastic communities and the Byzantine world. For the communities in Palestine, Arabic became the standard language during that time and as a result, Greek-speaking Byzantines could no longer integrate as easily into those monastic communities. Nevertheless, the desert monasteries remained a point of reference for Byzantine pilgrims. Sidney Griffith states that Byzantine pilgrims did not visit these monasteries up to the Crusader period anymore but turned to the Holy sites instead\(^9\). However, pilgrims started visiting Palestine again after about 860:

**Hilarion the Iberian** from Kakheti travelled to Jerusalem, the Jordan river, Mount Tabor, and Mar Saba in approx. 850\(^6\). **Frod mound of Coutance** started his pilgrimage in 855 in Lothringia via Rome and turned towards Alexandria in order to reach Jerusalem, Mount Sinai, and Galilee\(^8\). He left Palestine in around 860 and after a sojourn in Armenia was back in Francia in approx. 863. **Bernard** the Monk took the same route in 867, though at this time, the Arabs had advanced
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into Apulia. After visiting Rome, Bernard turned towards Monte Gargano and Bari, where he had to pay for a letter of safe-conduct in order to embark on a ship to Alexandria in Taranto. On entering the Caliphate, and again in Fustat, he had to obtain new documents. In the latter town, he also met the Melkite Patriarch Michael I of Alexandria (859-870)\(^88\). In Jerusalem, Bernard was received by Patriarch Theodosius (ca. 865-878)\(^89\), and visited the surrounding shrines, but neither Galilee nor Mount Sinai. Although Bernard's report does not hint at the reasons for his rather short journey, it may be explained by the political situation prevalent in Palestine in the years 866 to 868. Bedouins had taken over control in large parts of the country and security had deteriorated.

**Elías the Younger** (of Enna) was taken captive by Saracen conquerors of his Sicilian hometown in 859 and brought to Tunis. After his manumission, he headed to Jerusalem, where he visited the surrounding shrines, and Galilee and Mount Sinai\(^90\). He met Patriarch Elías III and adopted a homonymous monastic name. He returned to Sicily before Syracuse fell to the Muslims (878).

In the light of these testimonies, we may newly evaluate two spurious pilgrimages that are usually connected to the period in question. The first account is of a certain **Giovanni Arbanese**, who is mentioned in a 17th-century Ragusan chronicle that reports him travelling from Ragusa to Jerusalem via Alexandria in 843 aboard a Venetian galley\(^91\). Although this journey is not entirely impossible, it appears to be anachronistic. Considering the pilgrimages of the period, it is very unlikely to have happened. The second account is by one **Iacintus** from Léon in Castile, who left a description of the Holy Sepulchre and Bethlehem in an Old-Castilian manuscript written sometime between 800 and 1100. His pilgrimage must be placed sometime between the eighth and eleventh centuries. The only textual indication that allows to narrow down this time span is Iacinthus’ notice of the Nativity church in Bethlehem lying in ruins (without giving the reason for that condition)\(^92\). Wilkinson's date of around 750\(^93\) is too early on linguistic and historical grounds. Due to the churches' and aedicula's measurements given in the account, Michael McCormick and Martin Biddle assign it to the period in question. The first account is of a certain Rainardus sent to Emperor Charles III the Fat in 881, with a letter to Patriarch Ignatius of Constantinople on the occasion of the Anti-Phiotian Council of Constantinople, in which he praised his ruler (ἀμφότερος, scil. ibn al-Shaykh)\(^97\).

Ahmad ibn Tülün entered Ramla only in June 878. The Abbasid regent al-Muwaqqaf tried to overthrow him, but failed, and Ahmad was able to establish firm control over the area by 880\(^98\). After a successful battle against the Abbasids in 885, his successor Abū’l-Jaysh Khumārāwāy (884-896) finally extended his dominion even to northern Syria, and to the frontier zone adjacent to the Byzantine empire (Tarsus 885-890).

It is generally supposed in modern scholarship that Tulunid Syria enjoyed a period of prosperity and peace that facilitated travelling\(^99\). Even though this assumption may be unfounded\(^100\), we can detect an increase in trade and pilgrimage traffic, not least because the Syrian ports were opened for merchants from the west. Immediately after seizing control in Syria (878), Ahmad fortified Akko\(^101\) and Tyre\(^102\) and improved both ports.

The Tulunids entertained cordial relations with the Copts\(^103\) and apparently also with the Melkites. This is suggested by events that took place under the Theodosiuses’ successor, Patriarch Elías III (878-907). Elías III sent the two monks Gispertus and Martin Biddle assign it to the mid-eleventh century, after the destruction of al-Ḥākim\(^94\). The above-mentioned context of pilgrimage traffic confirms the later dating.
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and Charlemagne's hostel. Another embassy consisting of the three Palestinian monks named Theodosius, David and Sabas personally appealed to Pope John VIII (872-882) for funding for the restoration of churches in 878/879, and indicated pilgrimage as the reason for their stay in Rome.

As Jonathan Harris has convincingly shown, Elias III had also exchanged letters with King Alfred I the Great. Although there is no detailed information, we may safely assume that this was most likely for the same purpose and based on the same circular letter which Emperor Charles III had answered. Harris surmises that Alfred responded favourably by sending alms. Later, in about 900/903, Elias III sent yet a further letter of request to the pope, this time in order to raise funds for ransoming monks from Turkish captivity in the diocese of the Iberian (i.e. East-Georgian) Bishop Malacenus. Malacenus even travelled to Rome himself and received the support of Pope Benedict IV for this venture.

According to the evidence presented, we may infer increased contacts between the Churches of the Holy Land and Rome and an improvement of conditions for Chalcedonian pilgrims. The evidence on pilgrimage activity confirms this impression. The first pilgrim to be mentioned is Peter the Miracle-Worker from Galatia. A former officer under Emperor Theophillus, he settled as a monk on the Bithynian Olympus after his retirement and decided to go to Jerusalem in the early 880s. According to his Life, his pilgrimage included various destinations in Palestine, that are, however, not individually mentioned. He is said to have suffered from unspecified Muslim maltreatment. After his stay, he returned via Cyprus and Attaleia to Constantinople.

Meingold of Hui in present-day Belgium accomplished a penitential pilgrimage most probably to Jerusalem in the 880s. The journey took him seven years. After his return, he died in 892. Further pilgrimage activity is reflected in the so-called proskynetarion of Epiphanius Hagiopolites which most likely belongs to the same period. Epiphanius apparently was a Byzantine pilgrim who had become familiar with the region and was bestowed with the cognomen of Jerusalemite. His description lists Near Eastern pilgrimage shrines that attracted pilgrims who came from the Byzantine empire (Ῥωμανία), was a Byzantine pilgrim who had become familiar with the area, possibly because Epiphanius wanted to begin his treatise with Jerusalem. Thereafter, the reader is introduced to Diospolis, the Levantine coastline and taken further to Trebizond: according to the 14th-century miracle collection of Saint Eugenius, a certain monk and a group of elderly men passed by that city on their pilgrimage to Jerusalem in around 900.

Finally, the monk Theodore went on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem that is mentioned in the legend of the miracle-working icon of the Mother of God in the Melkite convent of Saydnāýa close to Damascus. The legend records that when Theodore was taking a rest in Saydnāýa, a certain nun Marina ordered him to purchase an icon for the monastery in Jerusalem. After the completion of his pilgrimage in 900/901, Theodore wanted to return directly to Byzantium by ship from Acre because he wanted to keep the icon for himself, since it had saved him from bandits and lions. However, after a sea storm, he changed his mind and handed over the icon to the Saydnāýa convent. It might be noted in passing that this was certainly not the only icon which left Jerusalem for Byzantium in those years. During the reign of Emperor Leo VI (886-912), the miraculous icon of the Mother of God from the Holy Sepulchre (known as »The Icon Who Spoke to Saint..."
Mary of Egypt) was brought to Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, under unknown circumstances.

Renewed Direct Control by the ‘Abbāsid Caliphate (905-936)

‘Abbāsid control of Palestine and Egypt was re-established in the years 905-936. In 905-906, the Qarmaṭī movement spread to Palestine and led to widespread disturbances there. We have no pilgrim’s reports belonging to this period, which probably does not come as a surprise, if we consider the chaotic situation in Palestine at the time.

However, in about 920-922, probably the Metropolitan Archbishop Arethas of Caesarea wrote a letter that, according to its title, was addressed to a certain Qarmatian emir of Damascus. Arethas wrote in response to a letter which is now lost but may have been compiled in ca. 919 in Emesa/Hims by Takin, who ruled Damascus from 915-919, or in about 905 by another Qarmatian emir. In fact, both the exact date and the addressee of Arethas’ letters are unclear, and even its character as a letter designed for an addressee in Emesa may be contested; it may have been written solely for a Byzantine audience. Although it is essentially a polemic matter, it contains a passage of relevance for our purpose. Arethas mentions the Holy Fire miracle at the Holy Sepulchre that occurred on the Great Sunday of Easter as a matter of fact, without any concern for its occurrence, tradition, and connection to pilgrimage activity. Consequently, the Holy Fire was already a well-established institution in this period, well-known also to Byzantine pilgrims.

In autumn 923, the local Muslim populace destroyed churches in various Palestinian cities such as Ascalon, Ramla, and Caesarea, but apparently not in Jerusalem. Caliph al-Muqtadir allowed the rebuilding of the respective churches in Jerusalem making use of news gathered in Constantinople, where Emperor Romanus I had received an envoy from the Jerusalemite patriarchate. The doge reported that with Arab permission, the Jews had converted the Holy Sepulchre into a synagogue. Although this was fake news, forced conversions of Jews promptly occurred in Byzantium in 932.

Ikhshid Regime (936-969)

Muhammad ibn Tughj al-Ikhshid was appointed governor of Egypt in 936 and exerted authority on an autonomous scale just as the Tulunids had done before. From 936 on, Jerusalem was under his control. The Ikhshidids are usually regarded as being much more favourable towards the Melkites than the former ‘Abbāsid administrators. Steven Runciman expressed it thus: «In the east [in the tenth century, MR] the ‘Abbāsid caliphate was declining. Its viceroy in Palestine was ready to welcome visitors who brought money into the country and who could be taxed; and when the Ikhshidids, and after them the Fatimids, succeeded to the possession of Palestine, the appearance of good-will increased».

However, there are some significant differences between the two regimes. Only at the very beginning of their rule, the Ikhshidids had the frontier districts to Byzantium (=al-thughūr) under their control, while the Fatimids always shared a border with Byzantium. In autumn 937, Muhammad responded to an embassy (936/937) from Emperor Romanus I with a letter that is transmitted by ibn Sa’īd. Although the letter deals mainly with an exchange of prisoners-of-war, Canard surmised that it led to the establishment of an effective peaceful neutrality between the empire and the Ikhshidid ruler for the years to come. In contrast to the Tulunids, the Ikhshidids did not gain permanent control over northern Syria, because the competing Hamdānids repelled them finally between 943-945. Thereafter, they shared no border with the Byzantine empire and entertained cordial relations with Byzantium out of common hostility towards the Hamdānids and Fatimids. For these reasons, incoming pilgrims from the Byzantine empire predominantly chose a route heading directly to Ikhshidid territory in order to circumvent northern Syria, that is they traversed the sea via Cyprus.

However, the situation for the Melkites on the ground may have been less easy. On 26 March 937, the Holy Sepulchre was attacked and burnt during Patriarch Christophorus’ term of office (who is recorded under this name in Arabic, but

118 Lidov, Leo the Wise 1-30, esp. 6-9.
119 Gil, Palestine 312-313.
120 Identification by Karlin-Hayter, Arethas’ letter 281-302; Förstel, Schriften 11.
121 For the context, without a ruler’s name, see Bianquis, Damascus 16.
125 This is also recorded by Hebrew and Arabic sources: Holo, Jewry 48-49; Starr, Jews 151-154; Rotman, Converts in Byzantine Italy 914. For the political back-ground, see Bonfil, Continuity 94-95.
126 Canard, Lettre 190.
127 Felix, Byzanz 45.
128 Gil, Palestine 469-470; Behhammer, König 13, 29; Pmbz 25443.
129 Gil, Palestine 475-476.

The Presence of Christian Pilgrims in Early Muslim Jerusalem | Max Ritter 95
under the name of Christodulus in Greek sources, in office 937-950). Emperor Constantine VII sent an embassy loaded with money to the Patriarchate of Jerusalem in 947. A report, written on this occasion by his envoy Nicetas, a cleric of the churches in the palace, contains an interesting piece of information on pilgrimage activity, although Nicetas was certainly not a pilgrim. He gives the reason for why the local emir wanted to forbid the Holy fire miracle at Easter:

»Through this evil magic, this fabled miracle has made Syria toppling our values«

the life and passion of Christ, complemented by sites of the prospect to travel also to Egypt, but he was arrested in Galilee, and died in prison.

fill up with Christians and turned it into a little Romanía, written by the Melkite Patriarch Eutychius of Alexandria (ibn Baṭrīq) in the 930s. Eutychius mainly refers to the sites of the life and passion of Christ, complemented by sites of the early Church, interestingly including Tyre and Justinian's Jerusalem.

The pilgrim accounts of that period are the following: The later Abbot John from Parma was a layman at the start of his voyage but became a monk during his stay in Jerusalem at around 940. His travel route is unknown. The Mozarab nobleman Dunale from Cadiz travelled to Rome with his entourage of fifty servants. Having been received by Pope Agapetus II, he continued his travels to Constantinople accompanied by only five servants and was received at the imperial court. From there, he headed to Jerusalem, was received by Patriarch Christodulus (937-951), and visited Galilee with the prospect to travel also to Egypt, but he was arrested in Galilee, and died in prison. His journey took place between ca. 945 and 951.

Another likely pilgrim from the Iberian Peninsula was Abbot Jaufred/Laufred of Besalú who departed on a pilgrimage in 955. His destination is unstated, but in later sources it is always identified as Jerusalem. He did not return. Abbot Gausmarus of Savigny near Lyons accomplished a rather concise pilgrimage to Jerusalem in order to acquire relics. His journey must have taken place in the years around 960. The monk and custodian Adalpertus of St Emmeram in Regensburg went on a pilgrimage in around 965. Arnold of St Emmeram gives no details of his journey. Additionally, a Byzantine pilgrim is recorded for this period, the monk Paul, who has a short entry in the synaxarion of Constantine. From an unknown place in the empire, he travelled to Jerusalem via Cyprus and returned by the very same route to Constantinople. Unfortunately, the date of this journey can only be inferred from his very entry into the synaxarion which points to the either the ninth or the tenth century. His travel route via Cyprus points to the desire to avoid travelling overland through northern Syria. This most likely fits into the time frame presented here.

Three further testimonies highlight the increased pilgrimage traffic from Byzantium. The tenth-century Life of the fictive Theodore of Edessa reports that the protagonist had conducted a pilgrimage to Jerusalem and Mar Saba in his youth before becoming bishop of Edessa. Although the story is unreliable regarding the time it is supposed to have taken place (early ninth century), it mirrors the pilgrimage activities of the time of its compilation (tenth century). The same observation holds true for a certain Gregory who is mentioned in the spiritually beneficial tales of Paul of Monemvasia (second half of tenth century) as having undertaken a journey from the empire to Jerusalem. The Anti-Bogomilian treatise of Kozma Presviter admonishes Bulgarian monks not to go to either Jerusalem or Rome because it would deter them from their spiritual duties. Apparently, this had become a common habit in the time of its compilation in the last third of the tenth century.

Towards the end of the Ikshidid regime, the Egyptian-based navy attacked the Byzantine empire and was defeated in 960. Next, in 961 the Byzantine forces were able to conquer Antioch, and in 962 even the city of Aleppo (but not its citadel). During this period of imminent threat of a Byzantine conquest of Syria, tensions were high and so were sentiments instigated by parts of the Muslim populace against the Melkites. In May 966, the governor of Jerusalem, Muhammad bin Ismāʾil al-Ṣinājī, attempted to seize Church property in Jerusalem forcefully. The Christian resistance to this measure led to anti-Christian riots that culminated in the partial destruction of the Holy Sepulchre and the Sion church on 28 May 966. During the riots, Patriarch John VII was killed, either due to his collaboration with Emperor Nicephorus II
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though, and went to Constantinople instead, where they the Ikhshidid ruler offered to rebuild the churches, Emperor (as Scylitzes reports) was deterred from continuing his journey on to Cyprus be as Thietmar of Merseburg reports, as »if they would have unnamed usually flew sufficiently fast to the west via merchants and urlate causes. However, her entourage returned immediately, Romanus II rejected the gesture of goodwill and threatened holy church« and the burning of the patriarch, who remains unnamed. The source clearly refers to the events of 966.

Countess Iudita of Bavaria, sister-in-law of Emperor Otto I and mother of Henry II, left Bavaria in 966 when her son reached adulthood and went on pilgrimage to Jerusalem – apparently not yet informed about the 966 riots. She must have returned by 973, the year she signed documents in Lower Bavaria, and she brought back relics which she donated to Niedermünster in Regensburg. It is said that she had seen warfare with many victims, most likely the Fatimid onslaught.

Hidda of Ostfalia (mother of Markgrave Gero, widow of Markgrave Christian I) went to Jerusalem in the early 960s but died there sometime between 965 and 970 from natural causes. However, her entourage returned immediately, as Thietmar of Merseburg reports, as »if they would have known that the invaders will leave nothing to the defeated ones«. This description also fits the Fatimid advance into Palestine very well.

It seems as if those pilgrims who came from the West received news about a deterioration of safety for Christians in Palestine only when they had already arrived in the Eastern Mediterranean, and were no longer able to postpone their pilgrimage altogether. This is somewhat surprising, as news usually flew sufficiently fast to the west via merchants and returning pilgrims in the Early Middle Ages, since sailing ships (like the one on which Bernard the Monk travelled) usually accomplished the journey from Palestine to Italy within two months.

Interregnum in Palestine (968-979)

In August 969, the Fatimid Caliph al-Mu’izz finally subdued Egypt after his general Ja’far ibn al-Fallāh had launched a successful attack. Palestine was his next objective, in order to have a buffer zone against an eventual attack from the east. He took over Ramla in May 970, but in the end, the Fatimids were not able to gain firm control of Palestine and central Syria until 978, because they were repelled repeatedly. As a consequence, the area suffered from unceasing warfare. The Melkites and the Patriarchate of Jerusalem were rather hostile to the Fatimid expansion and supported the Bedouin adversaries in Palestine instead; the Bedouins were also on good terms with Byzantium. In this time of insecurity, Patriarch Thomas II rebuilt the Holy Sepulchre with the help of Jacobite and presumably also Byzantine funding. The Georgians strengthened their presence in Jerusalem in the same period, as the Monastery of the Cross was re(founded in 968.

Emperor John I Tzimiskes conducted anti-Fatimid offensives in 972 and 975. The emperor presented them as a religious war to liberate Palestine, at least towards the Byzantine client king Ašot III of Armenia (952-977). Actually, the scope of these campaigns was limited to central Syria, with no effective effort in directing the army towards Jerusalem. Most probably Tzimiskes used this propaganda in order to secure the continuing support of Ašot's troops by exhorting him to fight »for a common Christian purpose«.

This decade represents a period rather favourable for the Melkites in Palestine although it was characterised by politically unstable conditions on the ground. How did it affect pilgrimage activity?

Bishop Conrad of Constance travelled to Jerusalem three times according to his Life, which is likely to be an exaggeration. Possibly, the source implies that he had had to abandon his journey two times before he accomplished his pilgrimage. At any rate, we do not know the route he chose. He died at his see in 976. The priest Evrigeus/Erovigius of the Church of Barcelona and his companion Seniofred travelled to Jerusalem in 971. The former died there. The abbot of Cuxà, Guarin de Lézat, conducted two pilgrimages to Jerusalem. His first voyage took place in 978. At first, conditions were
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That year constitutes a watershed for pilgrimage activity. Apparently, Guarin had to cut his pilgrimage short. This would explain his second pilgrimage, this time via Italy, where he received a donation on behalf of the Jerusalemite patriarchate from Marquis Hugh of Tuscany. He presumably landed in Egypt in 993 and stayed in the Near East for three years until 996.

Fatimid Domination (979-1009)

After Fatimid power over Palestine was firmly established in 979, pilgrims from the west travelling to Jerusalem now preferably used the route via Alexandria and Egypt to reach their destination. This is evident not only from Guarin’s journeys, but also from other pilgrimages of the period until 995. That year constitutes a watershed for pilgrimage activity. The reason for seaborne travel is easy to understand: the almost uninterrupted warfare between Byzantium and the Fatimids in northern Syria made travels on land a risky matter, especially in the early 990s.

To this period belongs the future Abbot John III of Monte Cassino, who was only an ordinary monk when he began his travels. John departed from Campania in 987, arrived in Jerusalem in about 988 and stayed at the Mount Sinai monastery for six years. He departed from there in around 995, which is certainly no coincidence, and went to Mount Athos, to the monastery of the Amalfitans. Another pilgrim, Abbot Adso of Montier-en-Der, travelled between ca. 985-987. He departed the Champagne and reached Alexandria (Babylon, i.e. Egypt) by sea voyage. After the completion of his pilgrimage to Jerusalem, he returned from Alexandria by ship via the passage of Karpathos since he passed by the islet of Astypalaia (Astilla), in other words, he sailed through the southern Sporades in the Aegean Sea.

Abbot Gunterius of St Aubin in Angers left in 988, and went first to Rome, and then to Jerusalem. In March 989, the priest Vives of Barcelona left for a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, from which he never returned, as he died soon after his arrival. The nobleman Hugo from Aquitaine conducted a pilgrimage at the end of the tenth century. He first visited Rome and Monte Gargano before heading to Jerusalem.

Bononius of Bologna undertook a pilgrimage to Jerusalem via Alexandria sometime between 980 and 990 according to his Life. After his departure from the Caliphate, he returned to Italy via Constantinople. It is uncertain whether Adalpertus, the so-called apostle of the Slavs, was able to fulfil his desire to undertake a Jerusalem pilgrimage while he was staying at Monte Cassino in 989/990.

Moreover, two Byzantine pilgrims are supposed to have travelled around 980-995. Saint Paraskeue of Epibatai visited Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Jericho, and the Jordan river during her pilgrimage and returned from Jaffa to Thrace by ship, as she twelfth-century Life reports. The other pilgrim is the Athonite monk Gerasimus who travelled to Jerusalem at the end of the tenth century.

The relations between the Byzantine empire and the Fatimid Caliphate were usually hostile because of their intense struggle over Syria and Sicily. In around 995, the Fatimid navy was burned in Cairo. Due to suspicions of a Christian sabotage act, there were anti-Christian riots, and relations remained tense. The empire's armies reached the environs of Beirut, and Byzantium exercised tangible influence on the Christians of Palestine. However, due to other objectives, the Fatimids concluded a ten-year-truce with Byzantium and repairs on the Melkite churches of Jerusalem were conducted under Byzantine supervision. This truce had been mediated by Patriarch Orestes of Jerusalem (uncle of the Caliph's daughter) in the spring of 1001 who had travelled to Constantinople and stayed there, deceasing in 1005/1006, and Byzantine-Fatimid relations improved. During his absence and after his death, the patriarchate was administered by his natural brother Patriarch Arsenius of Alexandria (1000-1010) in commendam. Only in 1012, a new patriarch, Theophilos, was ordained and approved.

As the political situation improved, we should expect an increase of pilgrimage activity by the turn of the millennium. This is indeed the case: the period saw many pilgrims. The priest Centullo from Manresa in Catalonia, for example, first headed to Rome in 1002 planning to travel thereafter to Jerusalem, as he had declared in his testament. The Deacon Alderd of Troyes had gone to Salerno via Rome in order to take a ship to Egypt or Palestine in around 1000. According to his Life, he was taken captive by Saracen pirates but was
eventually able to conclude his pilgrimage to Jerusalem and Bethlehem. Roughly at the same time in 999, roundabout 40 Norman pilgrims returning from Jerusalem were passing by Salerno when the city was threatened by a Saracen attack. The pilgrims helped to counter the attack, and Count Guaimar III of Salerno (ca. 983-1027) asked them to stay in the city thereafter. Whether these episodes are related is uncertain.

Countess Hademund of Ebersberg, widow of Markgrave Markwart III of Carinthia, went on pilgrimage to Jerusalem at the turn of the eleventh century. No details are known to us. A similar case is the ministerial Makko who donated money to the monastery of Petershausen near Constance when departing to Jerusalem in ca. 1000. Count Fulco III of Anjou is said to have accomplished multiple pilgrimages. His first voyage had a penitential character and led him via Rome and Bari to Constantinople where he received an escort and finally reached Jerusalem in 1004. A second pilgrimage conducted by a sea route is said to have led him to Myra where he was forced to land because of a storm in 1008. He may serve as an example for a pilgrim who profited from the new cordial relations between Byzantium and the Fatimid Caliphate since he was able to cross the borders twice.

Pilgrimage in this period originated not only in Anjou, but also in the Périgord, in the Limousin and in Loiret. Bishop Radulf/Raoul of Périgueux travelled to Jerusalem sometime between 1000 and 1010 and returned to his see. Bishop Alduin/Hilduin of Limoges headed to Jerusalem with his brother, Viscount Wido of Limoges, in around 1000, and definitely returned before 1009. Abbot Gaizlin of Fleury, the later archbishop of Bourges, undertook a pilgrimage to Jerusalem in 1004. Unfortunately, the pilgrimage of Poppo of Stavelot cannot be as well dated. From the Brabantian abbey, he reached Jerusalem at the very beginning of the eleventh century and visited Rome on his return journey.

In 1003, Count Ottwin of Lurr and the Pusterthal (Carinthia) began his voyage to Jerusalem, and most likely went aboard ship in Venice. He stayed in Jerusalem for some time and returned most probably via the Byzantine empire, since he was accompanied by a Greek priest when he came back home.

At the order of Caliph al-Hākim (996-1021), the demolition of the Holy Sepulchre began on 27 September 1000. However, the destruction was less complete than imagined in former scholarship. In contrast to the very few mentions in Byzantine sources, Latin chroniclers elaborate on these events and stress their impact. These actions did not lead to open hostilities between Byzantium and the Caliphate. However, we may surmise that this event and the policy relating to it may have inclined pilgrims to leave Palestine and those on their way to interrupt their voyage to Jerusalem. Evidence for this is very slight, though. We have only three candidates for supporting this assumption.

The first, Guido of Anderlecht, had begun his pilgrimage in Brabant and travelled to Jerusalem where he stayed at least until 1009/1010. This is evident because he died during his return journey in Rome in 1012. Then there is Stephen from Agde (Languedoc). He was ordained as Bishop Stephen II of Apt (1010-1046) on his return from a journey to Jerusalem during which he had learned basic Greek. We may assume that he had been unable to finish his pilgrimage, because he headed again to Jerusalem during his tenure in 1032-1038.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periods</th>
<th>Reported Latin pilgrims</th>
<th>Reported Byzantine pilgrims</th>
<th>Total ratio years/pilgrims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Umayyad (661-750)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’Abbāsid I (750-810)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’Abbāsid II (810-860)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’Abbāsid III (860-878)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulunid (878-905)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’Abbāsid IV (905-936)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikhshid (936-969)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregnum (968-979)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatimid (979-1009)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Statistics of Jerusalem pilgrimage reports recorded for the respective periods.

The dating is not clear, see the discussion in Gil, Palestine 373-374; Canard, V. Gauzlini abbatis Stabulensis, cap. 3-4 (295-296 Wattenbach).
Another, much more well-known case is the Byzantine monk Lazarus Galesiotes. He came to Jerusalem via Chonai, Attaleia and Antioch in around 991/993 and became a monk at Mar Saba. Lazarus left the Caliphate by a wide itinerary through Galilee and coastal Syria in 1009 after he had witnessed the Holy Sepulchre’s destruction and the killing of many Christians, as the Life states. He then visited some pilgrimage shrines within the Byzantine empire and finally settled near Ephesus as a stylite monk (table 1).

Concluding Remarks

The scarcity and the bias of the sources limit our possibilities to present a coherent picture of pilgrimage activity to Jerusalem, and detailed statistics would be ill-judged; therefore, we may reach only tentative conclusions. The table reflects the steadily improving stock of source material; however, it also reveals complete gaps for certain periods.

At the beginning of this paper, I considered two factors as having a large impact on pilgrimage activity to Muslim-ruled Jerusalem:

1) the situation of the Melkite community in Palestine in regard to their Arab masters;
2) the diplomatic relations between Byzantium and its Muslim counterpart.

Regarding the first factor, there may have been a correlation of pilgrimage activity and the situation of the Melkites in Palestine in the early Muslim period of Jerusalem. In times of persecutions, turmoil and disorder, pilgrimage traffic from both the Byzantine empire and the West decreased noticeably, while in periods of convivencia it ran rather smoothly. These periods were usually also times of peace between Byzantium and the Muslim overlords of Palestine.

The survey has shown that the second factor had a much larger impact on the number and scale of pilgrimages, than the first. When Byzantium and the Muslim masters of Palestine were at war, crossing the frontier became very difficult and dangerous because pilgrims were suspected of espionage, and hostility flared up against foreign Christians. We have proof of pilgrims leaving Palestine when diplomatic relations with Byzantium collapsed. Pilgrims from the West received information about the prevailing conditions from Byzantine subjects and used the same routes as Byzantine pilgrims when they entered the Eastern Mediterranean orbit. This enabled them to either cut their journey short, by stopping at the frontier and returning home, or to bypass hostile territory like e.g. the Hamdanid emirate.

Steven Runciman was certainly right to assume an easing of pilgrimage traffic in the Tulunid and Ikhshidid periods. It has to be stressed, however, that an unprecedented general upsurge of pilgrimage can also be detected in the Qarmatian and Early Fatimid periods (969-1009). It can be explained by following the pattern of peace and war with Byzantium. Apocalyptic considerations are a less convincing explanation, especially as these could only have been prominent immediately before the turn of the millennium. Johannes Fried has rightly cast doubt on their alleged significance for other reasons.

A surprising find of this survey is that pilgrimage activity halted between ca. 810 and 860. In an important article, Cyril Mango has remarked on the sharp decline of Palestinian Christian culture and scholarship during the ninth century, for reasons which rather elude us so far. Recently, Sidney Griffith has expressed the same observation. Turmoil and Byzantine-Arab warfare led to the internalization and the isolation of Christian communities in Palestine, and in turn promoted their adoption of Arabic. This process eventually gave rise to the development of a distinct Melkite Christian identity. One component of this development may have been a decreasing recruitment of foreign monks into the Palestine monastic communities. At any rate, pilgrimage activity clearly had a strong impact on Christianity in Palestine in all periods and needs to be accounted for as one of the cultural developments in the Levant, as well.
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Zusammenfassung / Summary / Résumé

Eine Sehnsucht allen Widrigkeiten und Schwierigkeiten zum Trotz? Die Anwesenheit christlicher Pilger im frühmuslimischen Jerusalem, 7. bis 10. Jahrhundert


Un désir intense malgré toutes les adversités et difficultés? La présence de pèlerins chrétiens à Jérusalem au début de l’époque musulmane du 7e-10e siècle

La ville de Jérusalem est dès l’Antiquité étroitement liée aux pèlerinages. Au 6e siècle, les pèlerinages chrétiens de tout le bassin méditerranéen vers Jérusalem étaient devenus un phénomène de masse. Même si les témoignages de pèlerins diminuent nettement après la conquête arabe (638) et durant les siècles suivants, la ville resta sans aucun doute la destination la plus importante pour toute la chrétienté aux haut Moyen Âge et Moyen Âge central.

Cette étude réunit des témoignages de pèlerins et analyse les dates et les routes des différents pèlerinages pour livrer des éléments d’interprétation sur le caractère et la fréquence des activités des pèlerins au cours des siècles. A ceci s’ajoute une contextualisation des voyages documentés avec les relations politiques entre Byzance et les seigneurs musulmans de la Palestine. On aborde ainsi également la question des conditions politiques considérées comme décisives par les pèlerins pour le choix de la route et de la date de leur pèlerinage.

A Desire against all Odds and Difficulties?
The Presence of Christian Pilgrims in Early Muslim Jerusalem, Seventh to Tenth Century

The city of Jerusalem has been associated with Christian pilgrimage since antiquity. By the sixth century, Christian pilgrimage from all over the Mediterranean toward the city had become a mass-phenomenon. However, testimonies for pilgrims become sparser after the Arab conquest in 638 and in the centuries of Muslim rule over Palestine. Yet there can be no doubt that Jerusalem remained the most desired pilgrimage destination of the entire Christendom in the Early and High Middle Ages.

The paper gathers pilgrimage testimonies and analyses the dates and travel routes of individual pilgrims in order to draw a picture of Jerusalem pilgrimage activity and its frequency over the centuries. A contextualisation of the reported travels within the political situation between Byzantium and the Muslim potentates ruling over Palestine accompanies the analysis. It raises the question which of the political conditions we can consider as critical for the pilgrims’ decisions regarding their travel route and the date of departure.