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ABSTRACT

Saewulf’s pilgrimage account is the first to survive after the Crusaders’ conquest of Jerusalem. Little is known of the author beyond his name and the dates of his pilgrimage; he commonly has been associated with the merchant and monk Saewulf described by William of Malmesbury. The evidence of the Saewulf’s account, though, suggests that the text was composed in Latin by an ecclesiastic, probably a monk or abbot, who wrote an account of his travels to the Holy Land, inserting an independent description of Jerusalem. Saewulf describes the experience of pilgrimage to the Holy Land, with all its accompanying dangers, and the guidebook he incorporates highlights the most important sites within Jerusalem for the pilgrim, while its descriptions of the holy places help to shape their greater religious significance. Through comparisons of Saewulf’s pilgrimage account and guidebook to contemporary pilgrimage accounts and guidebooks, as well as pilgrimage narratives from hagiography and sagas, this thesis describes the nature and intent of early twelfth-century pilgrimage, as well as the place and significance of the Holy Land within the wider context of contemporary religious belief and practice.
INTRODUCTION

Shortly after the capture of Jerusalem by the Crusaders, an Anglo-Saxon pilgrim, Saewulf, traveled to the Holy Land and later recorded his experiences. His account, dating from July 1102 to September 1103, is now the first surviving from the time of the Crusaders’ Kingdom. While it is of value for this fact alone, its content is also interesting and informative: Saewulf combines lively and personal tales of his adventures during the journey with an independent guidebook describing Jerusalem and the surrounding holy places. His account preserves a detailed record of pilgrimage to and within the Holy Land at this time.

Saewulf is unusual in providing both his name and precise dates for his journey, information which most pilgrimage guidebooks and travel accounts lack wholly or in part. His account breaks off abruptly after his departure from Jerusalem, though with no clear reason; any further direct information as to his homeland or identity has been lost. The few historians who have studied Saewulf’s account have assumed that Saewulf the pilgrim is identical to Saewulf the British merchant who late in life became a monk, according to William of Malmesbury’s *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*. This identification is based largely on the identical names and compatible dates, but it is probably incorrect. While Saewulf was most likely Anglo-Saxon, it is more probable that he was a monk, or even an abbot, who traveled to the Holy Land with a small group of companions from his home community.

Saewulf’s account, while interesting in its own right, is of most value when placed in comparison to contemporary pilgrimage accounts and guidebooks. The longest, most detailed, and arguably most important of these is the travel account of Daniel, a
Russian abbot who visited the Holy Land shortly after Saewulf. Several pilgrimage accounts also survive from later in the century, including those of John of Würzburg, Theoderic, and John Phocas, although their later date and lack of detail on subjects other than the pilgrimage sites make them less comparable to Saewulf. Reginald of Durham, in his hagiographic biography of St. Godric of Finchale, has preserved the highlights of Godric’s final pilgrimage to Jerusalem. King Sigurðr of Norway was a crusader and thus, in the twelfth century, the equivalent of a pilgrim; the saga which tells of his deeds preserves two incidents that resemble purely religious pilgrimage. Numerous guidebooks to the Holy Land also survive, all anonymously, of which only a selection of those closest in date to Saewulf’s journey is considered here. They present a wide variation of detail, with some describing all of the Holy Land at considerable length, and others only briefly stating the sites to be found within Jerusalem.

The stories within Saewulf’s narrative of his travels are particularly valuable, but his rather detailed guidebook also provides considerable information on the pilgrimage sites of Jerusalem and the surrounding Holy Land. Altogether, the pilgrimage accounts and Holy Land guidebooks are an important resource for the study of religion as well as pilgrimage in the early twelfth century. Stories of bandits, pirates, and storms within the pilgrimage accounts reveal the dangers which pilgrims were willing to face in order to reach the newly “liberated” Holy Land. Once there, the descriptions of the guidebooks illustrate what was typical and most important for a pilgrim within Jerusalem and the larger Holy Land, as well as the way in which Jerusalem and its holy places were viewed in the twelfth-century Church.
CHAPTER 1
SAEWULF AND HIS ACCOUNT

The Text of Saewulf's Account

The narrative of the British pilgrim Saewulf, dating from about 1102-1103, is the earliest extant from the period immediately after the First Crusade and the establishment of the Latin Kingdom. The only manuscript of Saewulf’s account is held at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, as MS 111; it was formerly in the library of Matthew Parker, archbishop of Canterbury from 1559 to 1575.¹ The manuscript is comprised mainly of charters copied in hands varying from the eleventh to the sixteenth centuries; Saewulf’s pilgrimage account is found near the beginning, copied in a hand of the late twelfth century.² The first edition of the Latin text, that of M.A.P. d’Avezac, was published at Paris in 1838 and reprinted the next year. The second edition, prepared by A. Rogers, was published by the Palestinian Pilgrims’ Text Society in 1896. The third and most current edition is that edited by R. B. C. Huygens in 1994.³ English translations were published by Thomas Wright in 1848, and by W. Brownlow for the Palestinian Pilgrims’ Text Society in 1892. John Wilkinson reprints the 1892 translation and notes as part of an anthology of Jerusalem pilgrimage texts from the time of the First Crusade.

Among modern historians, A. Graboïs devotes approximately two pages to

³ Huygens, introduction to Peregrinationes tres, 7.
Saewulf in his article on “Anglo-Norman England and the Holy Land.” He places it in the context of the First Crusade and other pilgrimages of the time to the Holy Land, but in his relatively brief article he has space only to summarize the text and briefly describe and explain certain portions. The only significant article based on Saewulf’s account is that of John H. Pryor, whose interest stems from the evidence about medieval sea travel found in Saewulf’s recollections. Other historians rely on Saewulf largely to confirm or describe aspects of the material they are covering: a typical case is that of F. E. Peters, who, in a work that is primarily a well-organized collection of sources, quotes Saewulf fairly extensively for his descriptions of the journey from Joppa to Jerusalem, and of the area of the Holy Sepulcher.

The Identification of Saewulf

The author of the pilgrimage account in Manuscript 111 identifies himself simply at the beginning: “I, Saewulf, although unworthy and a sinner.” Historians have been largely willing to accept the traditional identification of Saewulf as an Anglo-Saxon merchant. A. Grabois, author of an article on the relationship between England and the Holy Land during the Norman period, does so without question, quoting from William of Malmesbury’s Gesta Pontificum Anglorum, which contains a short passage telling of a

---

Saewulf. John Wilkinson says that “It is quite probable that he was from Britain,” citing Saewulf’s Anglo-Saxon name, the provenance of the manuscript, and Saewulf’s quotations of Bede, whom Wilkinson considers a uniquely British source. Unusually, Wilkinson ignores William of Malmesbury. Thomas Wright, the earliest translator of Saewulf’s account, calls Saewulf an “Anglo-Saxon” in his introduction and refers to William of Malmesbury’s account as “our only other information relating to this personage.” The romanticized version of William Boulting describes Saewulf as “an Englishman” with no reservations, liberally recounting William of Malmesbury’s story. Huygens refers to Saewulf as “Anglo-Saxon” in one place and as “British” in another, citing no reason, although he notes the English provenance of the manuscript.

Saewulf nowhere refers to his origins. He almost certainly composed his account himself: chroniclers and hagiographers described their subjects in the third person, and indeed the narrative opens with a clear self-identification: “I, Saewulf.” His account commences at his departure from Monopoli; given the brief introduction bearing his name and intent, this is clearly where he intended it to begin. The text as it survives ends abruptly as Saewulf is journeying from Jerusalem to Constantinople. There is no way of knowing whether Saewulf simply never completed the account, or whether the end portion was somehow lost in copying. Perhaps the original manuscript went on to describe how – and where – he returned home; unless this original should be found, though, this is idle speculation.

---

9 Wilkinson, introduction to Jerusalem Pilgrimage, 6.
12 Huygens, introduction to Peregrinationes tres, 5, 7.
13 Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 59: “Ego, Saewulf.”
Saewulf's account is not without clues as to his identity. He was familiar with recent history, including the deeds and conquests of the Crusaders, as well as ancient and biblical history and writings. Upon the arrival of his ship at an island he renders as Caphalania, he writes, "there Robert Gwiscard died and there [some of] ours died."\textsuperscript{14} William of Malmesbury describes Robert Gwiscard as one "born of middling parentage in Normandy, that is, neither low nor very high, [who] had gone, a few years before William [the Conqueror]'s arrival in England, with fifteen knights, into Apulia, to remedy the narrowness of his own circumstances."\textsuperscript{15} Having become duke of Apulia and Calabria, Gwiscard died (William of Malmesbury claims he was poisoned by his wife) on the island of Cephalonia on July 17, 1085, while campaigning against the Byzantine Empire.\textsuperscript{16} This is clearly whom Saewulf means, and it is an historical detail that would have been most notable in this context for someone educated and knowledgeable of recent Norman history, such as a member of the Norman nobility or, like William of Malmesbury, the clergy of Anglo-Norman Britain.

On the whole, the evidence supports the conclusion that Saewulf was an Anglo-Saxon, but the identification of Saewulf the pilgrim with William of Malmesbury's Saewulf the merchant is erroneous. William of Malmesbury's \textit{Gesta Pontificum Anglorum} briefly describes the career of this merchant also named Saewulf:

A certain merchant Saewulf was accustomed to come to him [Bishop Wulfstan of Worcester] every year, so that by his [the bishop's] counsel he [Saewulf] would be healed of the disease of his soul. To whom once after absolution had been made he [the bishop] said: "Often you repeat the sins

\textsuperscript{14} Saewulf, \textit{[Peregrinatio]}, 59, ll. 20-21: "ibi Rodbertus Gwiscardus obiit ibique nostri obierunt."
that you confessed, because, as it is said: ‘Opportunity makes the bandit.’ Wherefore I advise that you become a monk. Because if you will have done [that], you will lack the opportunity of these sins.” When that man had answered that he was not able to become a monk on account of the strictness of the way of life, the angry bishop: “Go,” he said, “you will become a monk [whether] you wish [it or] not, but when the materials of vice will have grown old in you.” Which afterwards we saw, because he became a lay brother in our monastery, now weakened by old age, with disease urging [him]. But, although he repented many times, as often as one of the bishop’s [men] had the said man [Saewulf] to him [the bishop], nonetheless he kept summoning back the impulse, he weakened [his] soul again.\(^{17}\)

William of Malmesbury composed the *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*, like his better-known *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, between 1118 and 1125.\(^ {18}\) It appears that the Saewulf of whom he writes was dead by the time this passage was written, although William seems to have known him personally. It is quite possible, then, that this Saewulf was alive and had not yet entered the monastery during the first years of the twelfth century.

Still, the link between this Saewulf of William of Malmesbury’s Chronicle and the Saewulf who wrote an account of his pilgrimage to Jerusalem in the years just after the First Crusade is tenuous. Jonathan Sumption, in his book on pilgrimage in the High Middle Ages, writes, “For pilgrims … the normal method of renouncing the world was to enter a monastery on their return.”\(^ {19}\) This comment somewhat bolsters the idea that Saewulf the merchant was also Saewulf the pilgrim and, newly penitent, entered the


monastery upon his return from Jerusalem. William of Malmesbury specifies that his
Saewulf was ill and feeble when he entered the monastery, though, and Saewulf the
pilgrim was clearly in excellent health during the journey, and well enough to write or
dictate his account afterwards. While a sudden lapse into illness or a delay in entering
the monastery is possible, the difference in physical condition between the two is
somewhat suspicious.

While a pious merchant certainly would have had the means and motivation to go
on pilgrimage, and his familiarity with the sea and trade would doubtless have made such
a journey somewhat easier, the only concrete connections between the two Saewulfs are
the same names and roughly coincident dates. The evidence of the names is not overly
convincing. Saewulf was not a particularly common name in Anglo-Norman England,
but it was not unusual. Both “Sae-” or “Sæ-” and “-wulf” were common components of
Anglo-Saxon names.20 For “Saewulf” or, more accurately, “Sæwulf,” the Onomasticon
Anglo-Saxonicum finds several specific incidences, beyond defining it simply as the
“name of a man.” In addition to William of Malmesbury’s merchant-monk, there was a
monk of Bath by that name in 1077, as well as a Saewulf who was in Cornwall c. 970.21
Several entries also turn up under the orthographical variants “Saulf” and “Seulf.”22
Since the name “Saewulf” is clearly not unique, no firm judgement of identity can be
made from this coincidence; this leaves the dates as the most important link between the
two Saewulfs.

Saewulf begins his account with the day of his departure from Italy: “we,

20 See William George Searle, Onomasticon Anglo-Saxonicum: A List of Anglo-Saxon Proper Names from
the Time of Beda to that of King John, (Cambridge: University Press, 1897, reprinted Hildesheim: Georg
Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1969), xiii, xvii-xix, 406-08, 574.
21 Searle, Onomasticon, 408, 574.
22 Searle, Onomasticon, 409, 415, 574.
however, ascended a ship at Monopoli, one day distant from Varo, on Sunday, the feast
of Saint Mildred the Virgin, Third Ides of July.”23 The date is the thirteenth of July, a
day which fell on a Sunday in 1102.24 Evidence within the narrative serves to place it
within the first years of the twelfth century, allowing the determination of this exact date.
Saewulf often comments on the threat posed by “Saracens,” who once directly attack the
ship on which he is travelling, but his only direct references to the Crusades come after
he has left Jerusalem. Upon departing from Joppa to begin his journey home, he writes:

... and therefore crossing by the coastal cities, of which the Franks
possess certain ones, but the Saracens still possess certain ones, of which
the names are these: near Joppa [is the city] commonly called Arsuh, but
in Latin Azotum; then is Caesarea Palestine, afterwards Caiphas [Haifa]:
Baldwin, the flower of kings, possesses these cities. Indeed after that is
Acre, a very strong city, which is called Accaron, then Sur and Saegete,
which are Tyre and Sidon, and afterwards Jubelet, then Baruth [Beirut]
and thus Tartusa [Tortosa], which duke Raymond possesses, afterwards
Gibel, where the Gelboan Mountains are, and then Tripolis [Tripoli] and
Lice.25

In addition, Saewulf’s ship, in company with other ships carrying pilgrims, was attacked
by Saracens after it had left Joppa. In telling of the pilgrims’ encounter, Saewulf details
that these pirates were “clearly of the emir of the cities of Tyre and Sidon, making for
Babylon with an army in aid of the Chaldeans for waging war on the king of
Jerusalem.”26 Tortosa had been captured on February 17th, 1099, by Raymond Pilet.27

---

23 Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 59, ll.8-10: “nos autem Monopolim, dieta distante Varo, navim ascendimus die
dominico, festivitate sanctae Mildride virginis, III¹ Idus Iulii.”
24 A. Capelli, Cronologia, Cronografia e Calendario Perpetuo: Dal Principio Dell’Èra Cristiana ai Nostri
25 Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 75, ll. 555-64: “et ideo civitates maritimae pertransuntes, quorum quasdam
Franci optinent, quasdam vero Sarraceni adhuc possident, nomina quorum sunt haec: proxima Ioppen
vocatur Arspuh vulgaliter sed latine Azotum, deinde est Cesarea Paelstina, postea Cayphas: has civitates
Baldwinus flos regum possidet. Postea vero est Acrae civitas fortissima, quae Accaron vocatur, deinde Sur
et Saegete, quae sunt Tyrus et Sydon, et postea Iubelet, deinde Baruth et sic Tartusa, quam dux Remundus
possidet, postea Gibel, ubi sunt montes Gelboe, deinde Tripolis et Lice.”
26 Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 75, ll. 567-69: “amiralidì vidilicet urbium Tyri et Sydonis, Babiloniam cum
exercitu tendentes in adiutorium Chaldeis ad debellandum regem Ierosolimorum.”
Baldwin I then captured Arsuf and Caesarea in the spring of 1101. Baldwin was “consecrated and anointed king” at Bethlehem on Christmas Day, 1101. Presumably Acre, Tyre and Sidon, Jubelet, Beirut, Tripolis, and Lice were still held by Muslims at the time of Saewulf’s return home, as no name of a Christian possessor is attached to them. Acre, although under siege beginning in 1103, did not fall until 1104. Of the others, Tripoli was captured in 1109, Beirut in May of 1110, and Sidon in December 1110, with Tyre the last to be taken, by Baldwin II in 1124. Saewulf’s pilgrimage clearly took place after Joppa, Haifa, Caesarea, Arsuf and Tortosa were in Christian hands, and after Baldwin had been crowned king, so that he must have left Bari in the summer of 1102 at the earliest; as Acre was still in Muslim hands when he left Jerusalem, he must have departed before 1104. Together with the date he provides for his departure from Bari – Sunday, July thirteenth – Saewulf’s account of his pilgrimage in the Holy Land may be precisely dated as beginning in July 1102, when he left Italy (he must have left his homeland some months earlier.) The text ends shortly after the twenty-ninth of September 1103, the feast of St Michael, which he mentions as he is sailing towards Constantinople.

While the dates of Saewulf’s pilgrimage and the dates implied by William’s account are not overly difficult to align, coincident dates are not sufficient to identify the two as the same. A more thorny difficulty is the question of what language the account

---

32 Capelli, *Cronologia*, 51.
was composed in, and whether a merchant would have been literate, in either the vernacular or Latin. M. T. Clanchy thoroughly analyzes this issue of language and literacy throughout all society in Norman England. He concludes that while educated men – the nobility and some gentry and clerics – would have been trilingual, most would have known only English, their native language; in general, most English had only a very basic acquaintance with Latin from its use in the Mass. At this time, a knowledge even of rudimentary Latin had little practical use not only for the commoner but also for the knight, “because Latin was a foreign language and books were not generally available.”

Thus William of Malmesbury’s merchant may well have had a rudimentary understanding of Latin, if simply from attending Mass regularly, but it seems unlikely that someone lacking a clerical or at least a noble education would have had the ability to compose in Latin. He certainly would have been in no position to learn Latin well enough to write his account in that language when he finally did enter the religious life, elderly and ill.

It is not necessarily true that the account was written in the Latin in which it has been preserved. It is a text which, if it were not originally in Latin, the clergy might nevertheless be interested to preserve as such, for its clear and detailed descriptions of the Holy Land and especially Jerusalem. Saewulf, whether pilgrim or merchant, would have known Old English as his native language. William of Malmesbury could read Old English, and in fact had translated the monk Coleman’s vita of Bishop Wulfstan from Old English to Latin. So it is possible to speculate that Saewulf’s account was written in Old English and translated by William. If this is the case, though, it is certainly odd that

---

William makes no reference to the account or pilgrimage in his description of Saewulf; indeed, it is odd that William does not mention it even if his Saewulf composed in Latin. In addition, Clanchy emphasizes that Latin, as the “traditional language of literacy and sacred Scripture,” was the cornerstone of all education, and so composition in any vernacular required the creation of “novel and complex structures on a foundation of Latin.” Accordingly, it was “the most sophisticated and not the most primitive authors” who attempted works in the vernacular during the medieval period. Furthermore, Clanchy states flatly that “Before the Norman Conquest, and for a century after it, the majority of writers (in every sense of the word) were monks.”

Prior to the fourteenth century there are few records of knightly culture, as it, like that of the commoners, was primarily oral. It is possible that a number of knights were able to read royal writs, and possibly “draft” their replies, “although the assumption that such men could or would write on parchment is contentious.” “Knighthly merchants” would have had the same education, and literacy, as most knights. “With lesser merchants, it is doubtful whether literacy in Latin was yet an essential skill, as they worked from memory and tally sticks. Book learning and book keeping became crucial to merchants only when they ceased to travel with their wares and sat in offices instead.” This was a trend not much found in England until the fourteenth century, well after the time of Saewulf.

Since William of Malmesbury’s Saewulf had as his confessor not the village

---

35 Clanchy, From Memory to Written Record, 233.
36 Clanchy, From Memory to Written Record, 214-15.
37 Clanchy, From Memory to Written Record, 146.
38 Clanchy, From Memory to Written Record, 248.
39 Clanchy, From Memory to Written Record, 236.
40 Clanchy, From Memory to Written Record, 237.
priest but Wulfstan, bishop of Worcester and the only Anglo-Saxon bishop permitted to remain in his office after the Norman Conquest, he might have been a better-educated “knightly merchant” rather than a “lesser merchant.”41 Still, Clanchy’s evidence presents a general picture of a society in which any merchant of the late eleventh and early twelfth century, whether knightly or common, would have had at best the ability to understand some spoken Latin, and perhaps read basic Latin documents, but not to compose in that language.

The evidence of the text itself further supports the conclusion that it was composed in Latin, and so is not the work of Saewulf the merchant. There are a number of direct quotations from the Vulgate, in addition to numerous biblical paraphrases and references. From this it seems that Saewulf was sufficiently well-versed in the Vulgate to quote it readily and naturally. At other times his vocabulary and phrases echo, even if they do not directly quote, the Vulgate and such sources as Bede and Boethius. Most significantly, Saewulf claims to draw from the works of St Augustine (although, in fact, it is Jerome whom he quotes). This range of sources indicates a fairly well-educated author composing in Latin.

The central portion of the text, in the form of a guidebook to Jerusalem and the surrounding area, was almost certainly written in Latin. It often quotes the Vulgate, as well as paraphrasing it in ways that make it apparent that the writer had the Latin of the Vulgate in mind. When Saewulf’s guidebook recalls Jesus’ approach to Jerusalem, the passage is shorter than the actual Vulgate but retains nearly all the same language. The account found in Luke 19:41-44 is somewhat longer, but the guidebook has only omitted

phrases and sentences; what remains is essentially direct quotation.\textsuperscript{42} In particular, the portions of the guidebook dealing with the Passion are very often direct quotations of the Bible.

The guidebook also contains somewhat misguided scholarship, as the author prefaces one description, “in the Sentences of blessed Augustine one reads . . . .”\textsuperscript{43} Huygens notes that in fact the passage which follows is not from Augustine but rather the \textit{Liber de situ et nominibus locorum hebraicorum} of Jerome.\textsuperscript{44} This error does indicate that the author had a knowledge of both Jerome and Augustine, however hazy his mind may have been on the details. Other parts of the guidebook parallel Bede’s \textit{De locis sanctis} and contemporary guidebooks to Jerusalem. Both Bede and Saewulf’s guidebook describe Mount Tabor as “very grassy and flowery.”\textsuperscript{45} The guidebook states that “Moreover the water of the Jordan [is] whiter and more similar to milk than all other waters, and therefore it is seen by its long course in the Dead Sea,” while Bede writes, “Indeed it is of a whitish color like milk and from this it is distinguished by its long course in the Dead Sea.”\textsuperscript{46} Only someone who knew Latin well, in addition to the Church fathers and other Latin authors, could write in this manner; it seems almost certain, then, that the guidebook was composed in Latin, probably by a cleric, and


\textsuperscript{43} Saewulf, \textit{[Peregrinatio]}, 66, l. 229: “in Sententiis beati Augustini legitur.”

\textsuperscript{44} Huygens, introduction to \textit{Peregrinationes tres}, 66 n.229-230.

\textsuperscript{45} Saewulf, \textit{[Peregrinatio]}, 74, l. 512; Bede, \textit{De locis sanctis}, in \textit{Itineraria et Alia Geographica}, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 175 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1965), 276, l. 4: “herbosus valde et floridus.”

perhaps most likely by a monk.

If the guidebook, the centerpiece of Saewulf’s account, was written in Latin, then it is almost certain that Saewulf wrote the surrounding portions, describing his travels, in Latin as well. He would certainly have had to read Latin in order to use the guidebook as a part of his account, if he did not in fact compose it himself, and it does not seem likely that he would insert a Latin guidebook into a vernacular work. Clanchy’s argument that the vernacular literature of the twelfth century represented a novel and difficult form of composition is convincing, and supports the idea that a common and traditional form such as a travel account would have been written in the common and traditional literary language, Latin. Moreover, the other portions of Saewulf’s account also frequently paraphrase the Vulgate or use its vocabulary, strongly indicating that it was composed in Latin. Nor are the biblical quotations limited to obvious descriptions of holy sites: Saewulf also uses phrases and verses from the Psalms and Gospels in his prayers of thanksgiving, as would be natural to one who regularly heard them used in prayer in Latin. One phrase in the beginning of Saewulf’s narrative, Huygens notes, is similar to a line from Boethius’ *De consolatione philosophiae*, suggesting that Saewulf knew the work well enough to echo its vocabulary in his own writing.\(^47\) Since Saewulf, then, was able to both read and write Latin, and either composed or had access to a Latin description of Jerusalem which appears to have been written by an ecclesiastic, it is far more probable that he, too, was a cleric, rather than the merchant Saewulf of William of Malmesbury’s chronicle. Although Wright asserts that “Nothing in the narrative proves

---

that our traveller was a monk,” I believe that this is, in fact, a reasonable and likely conclusion, based on the evidence of the text.\footnote{Wright, Early Travels in Palestine, xx.}

**The Structure of Saewulf’s Account**

In addition to the Latin sources of the account, its structure further indicates Latin composition. One of its most distinctive features is that it appears to be two separate works: a travel account written by the pilgrim who identifies himself as Saewulf, and a separate guide to Jerusalem interpolated in Saewulf’s more personal narrative. The portions clearly written by Saewulf are in the first person, refer to companions, and relay the experiences of Saewulf himself as he sailed from Monopoli to Joppa, then walked to Jerusalem, and again after he departed Jerusalem for Constantinople. The central section of the work, though – the description of Jerusalem and the surrounding area – is entirely in the third person. There is no reference to Saewulf or to any of his companions, although as their time in the Holy Land was the centerpiece and reason for the journey, it would not be unreasonable to expect descriptions of their reactions and experiences, especially given the nature of the rest of the account. The contrast among the three sections suggests that they constitute two independent texts corresponding to two separate genres of pilgrimage literature.

In his article on “Pilgrimage and Crusade Literature,” J. G. Davies outlines nine types of literature associated with the journeys of pilgrims and crusaders. Several of these bear little relation to Saewulf’s account, including the “Aids to Devotion,” “Letters,” “Libri indulgentiarum [books of indulgences],” “Canons,” and “Maps, Plans
and Illustrations.”  Nor can Saewulf’s work be classified as a simple itinerary, as it consists of considerably more than a list of the places that he passed in his travels. Davies, interestingly, considers Saewulf’s account to be a “Pilgrim Diary,” which he describes as an itinerary filled out “by the addition of details and personal comments recorded en route;” more specifically, he says that “the Anglo-Saxon merchant Saewulf … in 1102-1103 filled out his itinerary with many personal observations.” This seems to be a classification based on only a quick reading of Saewulf, though. It is certainly possible that Saewulf kept some sort of diary or took notes during his journey; the detail and accuracy in his record of the places the ships passed strongly imply this. Most importantly, he begins by announcing that he was unable to proceed to Jerusalem by the direct sea route taken by most pilgrims and that, thus compelled to a more circuitous route, he determined to record the names of the islands which he passed. Saewulf likely did keep a diary during the course of his pilgrimage, but that is not what survives; what we have instead is a full and coherent account of the pilgrimage written after its completion. He consistently writes in the past tense, from the perspective of one who has finished his journey. The work appears as a whole, composed at a single time, rather than as a composite of daily or otherwise regular entries.

According to Davies’ classifications, then, two types remain: “Guidebooks” and “Travel Accounts.” Interestingly, either of these might be based on the pilgrim diary, which could “provide source material for guidebooks and easily be expanded into full-

51 Davies, “Pilgrimage and Crusade Literature,” 3-4.
52 Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 59, II 1-5.
length travel accounts." Although I have dismissed Davies’ classification of Saewulf’s account as a pilgrim diary, I think that it belongs to the two categories stemming from the pilgrim diary. The nature of the account, though, is such that it cannot tidily be compressed into either one of these categories alone.

"Travel Accounts," according to Davies, are texts composed by pilgrims who had "completed their journeys and returned safely to their own countries," where they "committed their experiences to writing." They were fast becoming common at the time that Saewulf made his pilgrimage; Davies notes 526 written between 1100 and 1500. These were personal accounts, with descriptions of geography and religions occurring at "the appropriate point in the journey." Certainly this is a description of the first portion of Saewulf’s narrative. He alternates between portions which appear to be compilations of his notes and more dramatic descriptions of actual events on the way. Thus there is a slightly disjointed description of geography such as the following:

Thereafter we came to the islands Lero and Calimno, afterwards Ancho, where Galen was born, the physician most excellent among the Greeks. Thence indeed we traveled through the port of Lido, a ruined city, where Titus the disciple of Saint Paul preached, then we came to Asimi, which translates ‘silver.’

This sort of passage certainly sounds as if it were composed from notes taken along the way, with its itinerary of places interpolated with various unrelated facts. Saewulf continues with more geographical description immediately after this passage, but shortly

---

58 Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 59-64, II. 1-169.
59 Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 60, II. 46-51: "Deinde venimus ad insulas Lero et Calimno, postea Ancho, ubi natus fuit Galienus medicus probatissimus apud Grecaos. Inde vero transivimus per portum Lido civitatis destructae, ubi predicavit Titus discipulus sancti Pauli apostolii, deinde Asimi venimus, quod ‘argentea’ interpretatur."
arrives at the story of the terrible storms which plagued them as they arrived at Joppa:

In the morning, indeed, when we came from the church, we heard the sound of the sea, the clamor of the people, and all of them running together and wondering about such things unheard-of before; now we, being afraid, by running with the others came to the shore. For when we had come to that place, we saw a storm exceed the height of the mountains, indeed we beheld the bodies of innumerable men and of the other sex, drowned, most wretchedly lying on the shore; at the same time we saw ships broken into bits tumbling about nearby. But who could hear anything more than the roaring of the sea and the breaking of the ships?⁶⁰

This is certainly “personal experience,” and told vividly. Saewulf continues to write the story of this great storm in colorful language, pausing only to interject heartfelt thanks to God. The coherence of the story, though, and the relatively matter-of-fact way in which Saewulf concludes it, suggest that it was actually written some time after the actual events. Certainly this portion of his account represents the “travel account” described by Davies, perhaps based upon notes or a diary kept during the journey.

The end of Saewulf’s account is written in a similar style, and also fits Davies’ “Travel Account” classification.⁶¹ Again there are portions listing the names of places which the pilgrims passed:

For indeed we, sailing as close to Syria Palestine as we could, after eight days landed at the Port of Saint Andrew on the island of Cyprus, from there, in truth, by sailing on the following day toward Romania, in crossing the Port of Saint Simeon and the Port of Saint Mary, we came after many days to Little Antioch.⁶²

---

⁶⁰ Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 62, ll. 106-15: “Mane vero, dum ab aecclesia venimus, sonitum maris audivimus, clamorem populi omnesque concurrentes atque mirantes de talibus prius inauditis, nos autem timentes currendo simul cum aliis venimus ad litus. Dum enim illuc pervenimus, vidimus tempestatem altitudinem superexcellere montium, corpora quidem innumerabilia hominum utriusque sexus summersorum in litore miserrime iacentia aspexitmus, naves minutatim fractas iuxta volutantes simul vidimus. Sed quis preter ruditum maris et fragorem navium quicquam audire potuit?”

⁶¹ Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 75-77, ll. 551-622.

⁶² Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 76, ll. 585-90: “Nos etenim, iuxta Syriam Palestinam prout potuimus velificantes, post octo dies ad Portum Sancti Andreae in insula Cipros appulimus, inde vero sequenti die velificando versus Romaniam, Portum Sancti Simeonis et Portum Sanctae Mariae pertranseundo post multos dies ad Parvam Antiocham venimus.”
Again, these detailed itineraries are accompanied by accounts of personal adventures and the events of the journey; for example, just before the above passage, Saewulf writes:

... behold, twenty-six Saracen ships before our eyes ... Indeed two ships coming with us from Joppa, filled with palmers, abandoning our ship alone, because they were lighter fled to Caesarea with oars and sails. The Saracens, however, circling around our ship and directing an ambush from as far away as an arrow may be thrown, rejoiced about such great plunder.\textsuperscript{63}

This structure of a basic itinerary filled out by details on the places seen, intermingled with much more dramatic accounts of the events of the journey, predominates throughout the initial and final portions of Saewulf's account. It is a narrative style that is clearly in line with Davies' description of a "travel account."

The parallel structure of these two portions of Saewulf's account is not found in the central section of the work, which describes the city of Jerusalem and other holy places in the surrounding area.\textsuperscript{64} Rather, the tone and structure of this part of the account are much more like that of a guidebook than a travel account. Although Saewulf describes his adventures in the first person, and often interjects comments on the pilgrims' progress through the cities and islands he enumerates, the middle section of the account, the guidebook to the Holy Land, is written entirely in the third person without a single personal reference. The first sentences of the section are typical of the style and form of the rest of the section:

The entrance of the city of Jerusalem is to the west beneath the citadel of king David, through the gate which is called David's Gate. Going [through it], first there is the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, which is called 'Martyrium,' not only on account of the situation of the streets, but

\textsuperscript{63} Saewulf, [\textit{Peregrinatio}], 75-75, ll. 566-67, 569-74: "ecce viginti sex naves Sarracenororum coram oculis nostris ... Naves vero duae nobiscum opipae venientes, palmaris oneratae, nostram navem derelinuentes solam, quia leviores erant Cesareae remis confugerunt, Sarraceni, autem, nostram navem circumquaque girando et quantum iactus est sagittae insidias alione tendendo, de tanta preda gavisi sunt."

\textsuperscript{64} Saewulf, [\textit{Peregrinatio}], 64-75, ll. 170-550.
because it is more famous than all the other churches, and this is right and just, because all things which were foretold or forewritten by the holy prophets in the whole world about our Saviour Jesus Christ, here are truly fulfilled.\footnote{Saewulf, [\textit{Peregrinatio}], 64, ll. 170-77: \textquote{\textit{Introitus civitatis Jerusalem est ad occidentem sub arce David regis, per portam quae vocatur Porta David. Primum eundem est ad ecclesiam Sancti Sepulchri, quae \textquote{Martyrium} vocatur, non solum pro conditioe platearum, sed quia celebrior est omnibus alis ecclesiis, et hoc dignae et iuste, quia omnia quae ap sanctis prophetis in toto mundo de Salvatore nostro Iesu Christo erant predicta vel prescripta, ibi sunt omnia veraciter consummata.}}

All this is explanatory, providing the reader with directions to the site as well as the prevalent Christian view of the prominence of the Holy Sepulcher, but not recording any individual thoughts or unusual reactions of the pilgrims on reaching this most important and holy place. Since their time in Jerusalem was the purpose and central part of the pilgrims’ journey, it seems rather odd that Saewulf here suddenly ceases the vivid descriptions he used previously, and instead resorts to such matter-of-fact language.

Other differences are also evident. The section on Jerusalem can stand alone as a coherent whole, and in fact seems rather more carefully planned. The descriptions of places in the rest of Saewulf’s account generally consist of one or two details, not necessarily related to anything else, such as might be expected of one composing an account based on notes taken en route. The Jerusalem section, however, is much better constructed. Each place is described carefully and thoroughly, incorporating information from the Bible and Church tradition. One description leads logically to the next, usually linked by biblical stories. Although the first and last portions of Saewulf’s work are not disorganized, they are not so carefully written and woven together, and details are included only as a matter of interest, not as a guiding theme.

The actual language of the three sections also differs. In the notes to his edition of the Latin text, Huygens cross-references occurrences of the same or similar vocabulary
within the entire account. When the forty-five sets of correspondences are analyzed, the majority are found to occur within sections, or between sections one and three. Thirteen occur only within section one; twelve are found only within section two; and one is discovered within the much shorter section three. Between sections one and three, there is a total of 12 correspondences. There is very limited overlap between section one and two; Huygens notes only two places. Sections two and three contain similar vocabulary a total of five times, but most of these appear to be forms of place names, such as "Mare Adriaticum" and "Adriatici Maris," or common expressions such as measurements of distance, including the biblical "quantum iactus est lapidis." The differences in genre, style, and language that are apparent between the beginning and end of the work, and its central section, indicate that Saewulf's account is in fact two works: a travel account, penned by the pilgrim who identifies himself as Saewulf, and a separate guidebook to Jerusalem. It is not clear whether the guidebook is Saewulf's work, or that of another author; as Davies notes, travel accounts commonly "unashamedly plagiarized" guidebooks. The differences which mark the two works as separate do suggest that they also have different authors. If Saewulf was responsible for the composition of both works, then he probably penned the guidebook some time earlier, and only later wrote the full account incorporating it. It does seem fairly certain that it was Saewulf who inserted the guidebook to Jerusalem into his own work. It fits neatly

---

66 See Appendix.
67 Section one refers to the portion of the text covering the journey from Bari to Jerusalem (ll. 1-169). Section two refers to the middle portion, consisting of the guidebook to the Holy Land (ll. 170-550). Section three refers to the end of the work, the journey from Jerusalem towards Constantinople (ll. 551-622).
68 See Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], l. 465: "Mare Adriaticum" (section 2); l. 554: "Adriatici Maris" (section 3). For variations on Luke 22:41 "quantum iactus est lapidis," see Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], ll. 351-52; l. 373 (both in section 2); l. 573 (section 3).
between the sections which he certainly wrote, with no duplication of material, although the transitions are not entirely smooth. Indeed, the fact that there is so little duplication of vocabulary between the first part of his account and the Jerusalem guidebook, but more between the Jerusalem portion and the last part of Saewulf’s account, could well be explained by the fact that the words of the Jerusalem guidebook would have been fresh in Saewulf’s mind immediately after he had copied it.

The guidebook may, in fact, have been one that Saewulf used. In the transition from the guidebook to his own writing at the end of the account, he writes, “For indeed, with each of the sanctuaries and of the lands of the city of Jerusalem, having been examined as far as we could, and also with the sanctuaries having been adored, on the day of Pentecost we ascended a ship at Joppa in order to return home.”70 This statement implies that Saewulf saw all the places described in the guidebook, so it is possible that he either had used the guidebook himself, or edited one he did not use in copying it into his account in order to match his actual itinerary. Since most Holy Land guidebooks covered the same places, though, neither of these speculations is necessarily true.

Sumption notes that while prior to the eleventh century pilgrims had generally traveled alone or with a few companions, the danger of the journey meant that by the mid-eleventh century traveling in groups had become a necessity, and “the departure of an abbot or great nobleman was the signal for pilgrims from all the surrounding provinces to gather together and follow in his suite.”71 Saewulf does not appear to have had such a large group as this with him, but he clearly was traveling with a number of others, over

70 Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 75, ll. 551-53: “Persecurtatis etenim singulis Ierosolimitanae urbis finiumque suarum sanctuariorum posse nostro atque adoratis, die Pentecostes repatriandi causa lopen navim ascendimus.”
71 Sumption, Pilgrimage, 196.
whom he had some authority. His pilgrimage occurred during the time of transition from traveling alone to traveling with a great company, and his small group of companions was more likely to be composed of men he knew personally from home, such as fellow monks. Perhaps it is most probable that he was an abbot, or at least a member of some standing in a monastic order. This supposition is further born out by the fact that he had not only the literary knowledge but the time in which to compose his account, and the access to a library which copying the Jerusalem guidebook required.

Consequently, it is reasonable to conclude that Saewulf made his pilgrimage to the Holy Land in 1102-1103. He was not the merchant described in William of Malmesbury’s chronicle, but he was an Anglo-Saxon, and probably a monk or abbot who led other members of his monastery to Jerusalem. He rehearsed his tale to this community at home before writing it down for their future reference and study. He composed his account in Latin, inserting an independent guidebook, probably by another author, to describe Jerusalem and the surrounding area, which he likely found in the monastic library or purchased en route. He was fairly learned himself, and the Vulgate, and to a lesser degree the works of important Christian writers, was always foremost in his mind as he wrote, shaping his literary idioms. Little can be conclusively and inarguably proved about who Saewulf may have been, or for whom he wrote and why, but enough evidence is furnished by his account to provide a basis for a reasonable conjecture.
CHAPTER 2

PILGRIMS AS TRAVELERS

Authors, Genres, Audiences, and Intentions

"During the Middle Ages," de Vogüé asserts, "a great favor attached itself to descriptions of the Holy Land and to the narratives of pilgrims. There is not a great library in Europe which does not contain a certain number of these writings."\(^1\) Although a number of accounts from twelfth-century Holy Land pilgrimages do survive, they are primarily in the form of guidebooks. Relatively few authors recorded their experiences in a more personal manner, or at least few made them public in the form of a travel account, which, created as it was for wider consumption, was more likely to be copied and so survive than a pilgrim diary or itinerary. Besides Saewulf, the most important pilgrimage account of the time is unquestionably that of the Russian abbot Daniel. He visited the Holy Land from 1106 to 1108, and recorded his account immediately afterwards, in Old Russian.\(^2\) His text survives complete, and not only is it considerably longer than Saewulf's, but the very detailed and lengthy section describing Jerusalem and the Holy Land is clearly the work of Daniel, rather than an insertion. Thus Daniel's account is at least of equal importance to Saewulf's, if not greater, for the information it provides on pilgrimage and the pilgrims themselves, in this case from Russia. As Daniel visited the

---

\(^1\) Melchior de Vogüé, *Les Églises de la Terre Sainte* (1860, Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1973), 407: "Pendant tout le moyen âge, une grande faveur s'attache aux descriptions de la Terre Sainte et aux récits des pèlerins. Il n'est pas de grande bibliothèque en Europe qui ne renferme un certain nombre de ces écrits."

Holy Land only a few years later than Saewulf, his narrative is especially valuable for comparison with Saewulf's.

For further pilgrimage accounts it is necessary to turn to two rather different sources. The first is found in the life of St Godric of Finchale, written by Reginald of Durham. Godric was born to poor parents in about 1065.\(^3\) He eventually became a very successful merchant, and both independently and in the course of plying his trade made numerous pilgrimages to places including St Andrews, Lindisfarne, St Gilles, Rome (three times), and Jerusalem (twice). His final pilgrimage to Jerusalem was the most important, and the one for which we have the most information; he seems to have made it in about 1105.\(^4\) After this last pilgrimage to Jerusalem, Godric became a hermit at Finchale in 1110.\(^5\) Reginald's work is hagiography, and Francis Rice, Godric's modern biographer, complains of his lack of interest in the details of Godric's pilgrimages.\(^6\) Still, Reginald knew Godric personally – he was a "younger contemporary" – and he wrote the biography prior to Godric's death in 1170. Reginald, after conversations with Godric, commonly "reduce[d] to writing such incidents as that individual mentioned to him in conversation, while the impression was fresh in his memory; ...it was his wish to preserve the very words and expressions which had been employed."\(^7\) He also relied on the testimony of others, including his fellow monks and Godric's servant and nephew, and he insists that in doing so he used stories only from "the most respectable authority,"

\(^5\) Rice, *Hermit of Finchale*, 45.
\(^6\) Rice, *Hermit of Finchale*, 27.
once even going to Godric to ask him about the authenticity of an anecdote. Given the often personal and vivid nature of his narrative on Godric’s final pilgrimage to Jerusalem, it is likely that the information he does provide is based on what Godric had told him.

Accounts of crusades and crusaders form the most questionable sort of pilgrimage literature. As military endeavors, the Crusades seem, from a modern perspective, to resemble little the “pilgrimage” whose name contemporaries gave them. However, the Crusaders did consider themselves pilgrims as well as holy warriors, and so it is worthwhile to give attention to one account, the saga of the Norwegian King Sigurðr the Crusader, recorded in Icelandic in about 1220-1236. Sigurðr is mentioned by William of Tyre for his aid to King Baldwin I at the siege and capture of Sidon in late 1111. Unsurprisingly, most of the material of the saga is concerned with the adventures and feats of the king and his army, but the portion recounting his stay in Jerusalem does mention two incidents that reflect the idea of a religious pilgrimage: he bathes in the Jordan, and he receives a relic of the True Cross from Baldwin, in return for which he swears to promote Christianity in Norway. Compared to the lengthy accounts of Saewulf and Daniel, this is scanty “pilgrimage” material indeed, but it is important for the connection between the Crusades and pilgrimage which it illustrates.

Some later pilgrimage accounts which are primarily guidebooks are of interest for their introductory statements explaining the authors’ reasons for making their pilgrimages and writing their accounts. John of Würzburg, a priest, wrote an account of Jerusalem

---

8 Stevenson, preface to *Libellus*, xiv-xv, xv n.1.
and Nazareth in about 1170. He principally describes the cities of the Holy Land, with very detailed descriptions of the monuments and buildings, and carefully recorded inscriptions; Wilkinson notes that he relies on another text in writing of places he had not seen. He also includes comments on the conquest of the city by the Crusaders, with evident dislike of the Franks. Theoderic, a German monk, may have been the “Dietrich” to whom John of Würzburg’s account was addressed, and may have relied on that account in composing his own a few years later. He describes himself as “Theoderic, the refuse of all monks as well as all Christians.” Wilkinson describes him more positively, as “an even better observer and writer than John of Würzburg;” he appears to have visited almost all the places John describes, and shows a special interest in the local religious communities. The last of these later writers is John Phocas, a former soldier from Crete. His pilgrimage “consisted in visiting holy men as much as Holy Places,” and he succeeded in travelling through almost all of the Holy Land, with the exception of Hebron. His work was written in about 1185, according to a marginal note in the manuscript.

The different genres of pilgrimage literature naturally had different audiences and intents. Davies lists a variety of motives for composing a pilgrimage account. Firstly, he suggests that they are intended as a form of a guidebook, or an alternative to it, designed

---

12 Wilkinson, introduction to Jerusalem Pilgrimage, 21.
13 Wilkinson, introduction to Jerusalem Pilgrimage, 21.
15 Wilkinson, introduction to Jerusalem Pilgrimage, 21-22.
17 Wilkinson, introduction to Jerusalem Pilgrimage, 22.
18 Wilkinson, introduction to Jerusalem Pilgrimage, 23.
19 Wilkinson, introduction to Jerusalem Pilgrimage, 23.
“to provide information for those who would follow the same pilgrimage road.”

Furthermore, an author might be moved by a “desire to stir up others to imitation,” or “to provide themes for meditation for those who could not make similar journeys.”

Saewulf, in failing to state any particular motivation for writing his account, also occludes his audience. He does not seem to intend his account to be used as a guidebook, although he does insert one into it; the sections of his own composition are of interest for the stories which they relate, rather than for concrete information on the best way to reach Jerusalem. Nor does he anywhere urge others to follow his example, or to meditate upon his experiences. Graboïs comments that Saewulf seems, in the travel portions of the text, to be writing in the manner of one repeating a story orally to “lay audiences,” as indicated by some of the expressions he uses. He commonly asks the reader (or listener) to join him in rejoicing and thanking God for his deliverance from danger: “Now I beseech you, all my dearest friends, clap with hands extended into the heavens, rejoice to God with me in one voice of exultation.” This seems to suggest that Saewulf may have first told his tale orally, perhaps to other members of his monastic community, before committing it to parchment. Rather like the fourth-century account of Egeria, the account seems designed to enable those reading, or listening, to picture for themselves the pilgrimage route and the holy city of Jerusalem.

Daniel the Abbot makes his audience and intention much clearer:

I have described this road and these holy places not vaunting myself or boasting of my journey as if I had done some good on my way ... but for love of these holy places I have set down everything which I saw with my own eyes, so that what God gave me, an unworthy man, to see may not be forgotten. I feared [to be like] that lazy servant who hid his master's talent and made no profit by it and so I have written this for the faithful. For if anyone hearing about these holy places should grieve in his soul and in his thoughts for these holy places, he shall receive the same reward from God as those who shall have traveled to the holy places.  

Daniel is writing, then, for the monks of his abbey, but also for a wider audience of the "faithful." Wilkinson notes that the account survives, complete, fragmentary, or "reworked," in some 148 "manuscript texts." These varying forms of the text indicate that it was read both for its "literary or religious merit" and for its descriptions, which could form a "practical guidebook for pilgrims."

Reginald of Durham prefaces his descriptions of Godric's two pilgrimages to Jerusalem with explanations of his decision to make the pilgrimage. The first came about as Godric looked back over his sixteen years as a merchant and concluded that he needed a "more mature" way to aid his soul, and "so that he could rejoice rightly in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, all the pomp of the world, which so far he had exerted very much to maintain, he hastened to relinquish entirely to the praise and glory of God." In the course of his mercantile travels, he had already visited most of the more easily accessible shrines and pilgrimage centers; now "the sacred dwellings of foreign regions, the refuges of frequent use, the places most removed from conflict, he longed to view, to admire,

---

26 Wilkinson, introduction to Jerusalem Pilgrimage, 9.
and, diligent, to imitate whenever it was in his power.”

Godric’s later pilgrimage to Jerusalem sprang from more complex spiritual motivations, as he struggled with revelations from God about human mortality, precipitated by the death of four brothers of the monastery. This, then, summarizes Godric’s intent in making the pilgrimage, but it was Reginald, not he, who recorded his wanderings. As a hagiographer, Reginald wished both to illustrate the sanctity of his subject and to present him as a model for others. He was more interested in the pilgrimages for what they revealed about Godric’s life and character, through his acts during the journey and his reactions to the Holy Places, than in the actual substance of what Godric visited and when. In recording Godric’s intentions, then, it is fair to assume that Reginald considered them to be evidence of Godric’s holiness as well as an example to be imitated by the readers or hearers of the *Libellus*.

Sigurðr’s travels, appearing as they do in the Magnússon saga of the *Heimskringla*, are written merely as episodes in longer tales of adventure. Snorri Sturluson, the author of the saga, was born in 1178 or 1179 in Iceland, and raised by the powerful chieftain Jón Loptsson, whose family estate was “the seat of the highest culture the island could boast of.” The authorship of the books attributed to him is not certain, nor is their dating; the *Heimskringla* was “likely … the occupation of a lifetime.” Wilkinson places the date of its composition at about 1220-1236, more than a century after Sigurð made his journey. A number of Norwegian histories existed at the time, in both Latin and the vernacular, and it is not known which would have been familiar to

---

31 Hollander, introduction to *Heimskringla*, xv-xvii.
Sturluson. He does incorporate stanzas of Icelandic skalds throughout, specifically naming the authors.

John of Würzburg, Theodoric, and John Phocas composed accounts which are largely guidebooks, but the more personal comments which sometimes appear, and especially their introductions, also make them valuable to a study of travel accounts and their audiences and intentions. John of Würzburg addressed his account “to his own beloved companion and member of his household, Dietrich.” After praising Dietrich’s “disposition so in agreement with all good men, and also [his] eager devotion to the care of divine duties,” John explains that he made his pilgrimage to Jerusalem “for the love of our Lord Jesus Christ,” but realizing that his friend was not present, determined to write about “the venerable places, on account of your delight.” This book was to serve as a practical guide should Dietrich ever travel to the Holy Land himself, since earlier accounts were now rendered inaccurate by the changes to the city, but “if, by chance, by not coming you will not see these with bodily gaze, nevertheless from such knowledge and contemplation of these you will have more devotion as far as their holiness.”

Whether or not Theodoric was this Dietrich, Wilkinson surmises that he was familiar with John’s book and relied on it in writing his own account, if not in making his own travels. Huygens is less impressed by the idea, noting that Dietrich, meaning Theodoric, is a common name; other identities have also been suggested for Theodoric.

In addition, it seems odd that Theodoric would not even mention his friend’s name in his

---

33 Hollander, introduction to Heimskringla, xvii-xx.
34 John of Würzburg, [Letter], 79, 1. 2: “dilecto suo socio et domestico Dietrico.”
35 John of Würzburg, [Letter], 79, II. 4-6, 12-14. II. 4-6: “tam conformis omnibus bonis viris dispositio necnon et illa tam studiosa ad cultum divini obsequii devotio;” II. 13-14: “pro domini nostri Iesus Christi amore, tui tamen absentis non immemor, dilectionis tuae causa loca venerabilia.”
36 John of Würzburg, [Letter], 79, II. 24-27: “si forte non veniendo haec intuitus non videbis corporeo, tamen ex tali noticia et contemplatione eorum ampliorem quoad sanctificationem ipsorum devotionem habebis.”
37 Wilkinson, introduction to Jerusalem Pilgrimage, 22.
own account after such a loving dedication by John. Rather, Theoderic addresses his work broadly, “To all worshippers of the holy and indivisible Trinity and especially to the lovers of our most generous lord Jesus Christ.” He explains that he has sought to describe the Holy Places in careful detail, either based on his own visits or “from the truthful report of others.” The purpose of the book, Theoderic says, is “so that we may satisfy the desires of those who, not able to follow there with bodily step, ... who by sight are unable to touch [these], rather receive by hearing ... so that from this by that reading or telling, he may learn always to have Christ in his memory and keeping [him] in his memory he may be eager to love him, in loving him, who suffered, he may suffer with him.” Through a chain of these associations, Theoderic eventually explains that reading the account can incite desire for God, and thus lead to absolution from sins and, through grace, attainment of heaven. Of all the accounts, Theoderic most explicitly states the importance of the pilgrimage account, or even of the detailed guidebook, for others: by reading it, they may obtain the same spiritual benefits as those who journeyed physically, culminating in salvation.

John Phocas’ explanation of the purpose of his text seems conventional. “It has been our joy to see holy things, the Holy Places in which of old God was at work,” he begins. “Should we thus be the only ones to have a part in this blessing ... We must attempt, therefore, as best we can, to paint a picture, using words on our canvas, and to

---

39 Theoderic, [Peregrinatio], 143, ll. 1-2: “Omnibus sancte et individue Trinitatis cultoribus et precipue benignissimi domini nostri Iesu Christi dilectoribus.”
40 Theoderic, [Peregrinatio], 143, l. 9: “aliorum veraci relatu.”
41 Theoderic, [Peregrinatio], 143, ll. 9-16: “ut desideriis eorum, qui, cum corporali gressu illuc sequi non posseunt, ... que visu nequeunt attingere, vel auditu percipiant, ... satisfaciamus ... ut ex hac ipsa lectione sive narratione Christum in memoria semper discat habere et eum in memoria retinens studeat amare, amando ei, qui pro passus est, commatiatur.”
42 Theoderic, [Peregrinatio], 143, ll. 14-19.
those who love God to give a full written account of what we saw directly with our own eyes." He cannot hope to show the Holy Land as it truly is, with only words, but "I think it will more clearly teach those who have not shared in these excellent places with their eyes, or those who from time to time have heard about the places from the words of those who have not examined them. Furthermore, it will give some pleasure to those who have seen the places." This, then, is a somewhat more worldly view of the Holy Land description; certainly John would have said that his "joy" came from religious sentiment, but he seems, at least superficially, more concerned with the enjoyment of those reading the text for the sake of its literary merit than for the salvation of their souls. He concludes his account, "If any one who happens to read this work judges it to be useful, that will be my reward for the work I have done, and I shall regard it as a precious prize." Here the fundamental reasoning of John of Würzburg and Theodoric is still present, for John Phocas also states that he writes "for those who love God," in order to "teach" them; in rereading his own writing, he hopes that "with its stammers may it remind me of these Holy Places, so that I can recreate their memory in my mind. For that too will be a sweet delight." In considering John's audience, it is interesting to note that he expects that the text will be read aloud, rather than read by individuals, for while he is concerned to provide a "full written account," he also comments on "the object of speaking," and expects his audience to "hear" this account as they have heard previous ones.

---

The evidence of a few accounts of varying sorts is not sufficient to generalize about the audiences and intentions of every pilgrimage account author, but they do allow for some suggestions. The primary concern of those writing “orthodox” pilgrimage accounts was to accurately depict the Holy Land for those who could not make the journey themselves. With the exception of John of Würzburg, who addresses his account to a single friend, all the authors appear to be writing with a fairly large group of people in mind, such as the monks of their monastery, parishioners, or anyone else who might be present at a gathering where such an account was read. The idea, though, is not only to allow those remaining at home to envision the physical aspects of Jerusalem and the Holy Land, but to enable them to obtain the same benefit for their souls as if they had gone on the pilgrimage themselves. Pilgrimage accounts could serve as a kind of group devotional: the hearing of the account would incite listeners with a desire to see the places for themselves, leading to sorrow for their sins, repentance, and ultimately salvation. The authors may well have enjoyed the chance to tell a good story, as is so evident in Saewulf’s tales of his adventures, but there is always an underlying religious motive for the actual recording of the account. As Daniel the Abbot writes, “May all who read this work in faith and love receive the blessing of God and the holy tomb of the Lord and all the holy places and may they receive a reward from God no less than that of those who have visited these holy places. Blessed are those who, having seen, have believed; thrice blessed are those who have not seen but have believed.”48

The Making of the Pilgrimage

Sumption flatly states that “No one doubted that the journey to Jerusalem was by

48 Daniel the Abbot, The Life and Journey, 171.
far the most dangerous that a pilgrim could undertake.” 49 The First Crusade, and the subsequent capture of Jerusalem, created a great growth in pilgrimage to the Holy Land, but the safety of the roads and area did not likewise increase. 50 The danger led most twelfth-century pilgrims to travel in groups. 51 The majority of those pilgrims would also travel by sea, often no safer or more comfortable a journey than the overland route. 52 These generalizations are largely born out by a consideration of the accounts of Saewulf and his contemporaries.

It is clear that Saewulf was traveling with a group of companions, although he never names or otherwise identifies them. In the travel portions of his narrative, Saewulf consistently writes in the first person plural: “we boarded the ship,” “we came to an island,” and so on. 53 Saewulf first refers, rather vaguely, to “ours” who died before reaching Jerusalem, “whence we were much saddened.” 54 Near the end of the account, on the way to Constantinople, he relates that “In the same place we went from our ship, with [our] comrades sent away, into Constantinople in order to pray.” 55 Most specifically, he writes that, despite the dangers of the road from Joppa to Jerusalem, “We, however, with all those accompanying [us], came to that longed-for place uninjured.” 56 Thus it is apparent that while Saewulf may often use “we” to refer to all those on the ships, or all the other pilgrims, there was also a specific group with which he was traveling throughout the pilgrimage.

50 Sumption, Pilgrimage, 184.
51 Sumption, Pilgrimage, 196.
52 Sumption, Pilgrimage, 184-87.
53 Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 59, l. 9: “navim ascendimus;” l. 18: “venimus ad insulam.”
54 Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 59, ll. 20-21: “ibiique nostri obierunt, unde multum contristabamur.”
55 Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 77, II 603-04: “Ibidem navi nostra cum sociis amissa iter Constantinopolitanum orandi causa intravimus.”
56 Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 64, II 167-68: “Nos autem cum omni comitatu ad desiderata pervenimus illesi.”
The only indication of Saewulf’s position within this group is found in his account of the storm in the Joppa harbor. “Hear the mercy which the divine clemency showed to me … and to mine,” he begins, going on to explain that on the day their ship arrived in the Joppa harbor, a man advised him to go to shore immediately. “When I heard that, [I was] immediately seized with a desire of boarding a little ship and I contracted [a ship] for boarding with all mine.”57 It is Saewulf who hires the boat to take them to shore, and who directs those traveling with him to join him in going ashore, contrary to the actions of the other pilgrims, who remained on board. He must have possessed a certain amount of authority, if he was not in fact their leader.

Daniel the Abbot likewise traveled with a large group. He may well be one of the abbots of whom Sumption writes: “the departure of an abbot or great nobleman was the signal for pilgrims from all the surrounding provinces to gather together and follow in his suite.”58 Wilkinson even suggests that “Daniel’s journey was perhaps as much a diplomatic mission as a pilgrimage.”59 Like Saewulf, Daniel often writes that “we” traveled to a place or saw a place, but he is also more explicit in referring to companions. At a particularly hazardous mountain crossing, he writes that “if anyone in a small party tries to travel that road he cannot; but God granted me a good and numerous escort.”60 He did not always travel with such a large group; at another perilous crossing, to Nazareth, he says that “It is dangerous to travel that way in a small group; only with a large escort can you pass that way without fear, and we were not vouchsafed an escort,

57 Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 62, II. 96-102: “audite misericordiam quam divina clementia michi, licet ultimo servu suo, meisque exhibuit. Nam eadem die qua appulimus quidam dixit michi, ut credo deificie: ‘Domine, hodie litus ascende, ne orte, hac nocte vel diluculo tempestate superveniente, cras ascendere non possis.’ Quod dum audivi, statim captus desiderio ascendendi naviculam conduxi et cum omnibus meis ascendii.”
58 Sumption, Pilgrimage, 196.
59 Wilkinson, introduction to Jerusalem Pilgrimage, 10.
60 Daniel the Abbot, The Life and Journey, 145.
there being only eight of us and unarmed." Daniel gives the names of some of this entourage who were present at the Church of the Holy Sepulchre on Holy Saturday: "the whole company, sons of Russia, Novgorodians and Kievans who were there on that day: Izyaslav Ivanovich, Gorodislaw Michailovich, and two Kashkiches and many others." When he prays there, Daniel says that

I did not forget the names of the Princes of Rus' and the princesses and their children, and the bishops, abbots and great lords and my spiritual children and all Christian people ... And I thank the good God that he permitted me, unworthy as I am, to inscribe the name of the Russian princes in the Laura of Saint Saba, and now their names are now remembered in the prayers [ektzenia] together with their wives and children. And their names are Mikhail Svyatopolk, Vasiliie Vladimer, David Svyatoslavich, Mikhail Oleg Pankratie Svyatoslavich, Gleb of Minsk.

It is the fact that Daniel names laymen who accompanied him, and made such a list of the Russian princes, that leads Wilkinson (following "some scholars") to his conclusion that Daniel's pilgrimage may have had as much a diplomatic as a religious end. Whether or not this is the case, it is clear that Daniel was an abbot of considerable standing even outside his home monastery.

Once Daniel was even escorted by "the chief of the Saracens" as protection against other Saracens; he and his party must have been recognized as important to garner such attention. The most interesting evidence of this, though, comes when Daniel and his companions are making yet another dangerous trip, from Jerusalem to Galilee:

And God granted me to make this journey in the following manner: Baldwin, the prince of Jerusalem, was going on a military expedition towards Damascus past the Sea of Tiberias. Knowing that the Prince

---

61 Daniel the Abbot, The Life and Journey, 163.
62 Daniel the Abbot, The Life and Journey, 169.
63 Daniel the Abbot, The Life and Journey, 171.
64 Wilkinson, introduction to Jerusalem Pilgrimage, 10.
65 Daniel the Abbot, The Life and Journey, 150.
intended to go by that road to Tiberias, I went to the Prince and bowed to him and said: I would like to go with you to the Sea of Tiberias so that I might visit all the holy places there. For the sake of God, take me with you, Prince. The Prince gladly permitted me to go with him and attached me to his suite.66

Daniel must have possessed considerable authority not only to be aware of Baldwin’s planned movements and to be the one from his party to approach the prince (as Daniel consistently refers to King Baldwin I), but also to garner what appears to be a ready concession from him. Nor was this Daniel’s only encounter with Baldwin; on Holy Saturday both were present at the Church of the Holy Sepulcher for services. Daniel accompanied the abbot and monks of the hospice of St. Saba there, where they approached the prince and bowed before him. Baldwin ordered these monks and their abbots, with Daniel, to walk alongside him to the Church while his retinue followed behind. There “the Prince commanded the abbot of Saint Saba to stand above the tomb with his monks and the orthodox priests. Unworthy I was commanded to stand high above the very gates of the tomb opposite the great altar so that I might see through the doors of the tomb.”67 Daniel was accorded considerable respect by the monks and abbots he met throughout his journey, as well as King Baldwin, further evidence of his standing.

Daniel’s personal authority and “importance” has no doubt been much of the reason why his account enjoyed the popularity evidenced by the number of copies and forms in which it survives. It also means, though, that Daniel’s account cannot be taken as entirely typical of pilgrimage at the time. While he certainly would have had many of the same experiences and even encountered many of the same hardships, he always traveled as a person of some rank, if not at the head of his entourage, then as an important

66 Daniel the Abbot, The Life and Journey, 154.
67 Daniel the Abbot, The Life and Journey, 168.
part of it. This is a consideration for Saewulf as well, though to a lesser degree. Saewulf
never makes remarks that would indicate a personal standing equal to that of Daniel’s;
while he may have traveled as the head of his party, there is no evidence in his narrative
that it was at all “diplomatic” in nature or had any sort of influence, or even contact, with
the most important personages of the Holy Land. It is always possible, of course, that
Saewulf destroyed any such information by his decision not to compose his account of
the Holy Land himself. On the whole, Saewulf seems to be closer to the “regular”
pilgrim of the day, and it is interesting to see how much of the evidence of his account is
similar to that provided by Daniel, apparently a much more “important” figure.

Reginald of Durham does not say much on any companions of Godric. Once he
does state that, despite the physical trials to which Godric subjected himself to on the
road to Jerusalem, “not at any time was he completing less of the journey than his
comrades,” indicating that Godric traveled with the same group for the majority of his
pilgrimage. Rice extrapolates from this that Godric must have traveled with a group
from Durham, in which he would have enrolled before departing England. Reginald is
the only author to describe the pilgrim’s preparations before beginning his journey, rather
than beginning his narrative at the outset. In writing of Godric’s first pilgrimage to
Jerusalem, he says that Godric went to be blessed by a priest who used a standard
formula of benediction for pilgrims; Godric then departed “carrying the standard of the
Cross of the Lord on his shoulder.” At the commencement of Godric’s second
pilgrimage to Jerusalem, Reginald again emphasizes that he was “bearing the Cross of the

68 Reginald of Durham, Libellus, 55: “nec minus itineris quam socii sui aliquando conficiebat.”
69 Rice, Hermit of Finchale, 27.
70 Reginald of Durham, Libellus, 33-34: “Dominicae vexillum Crucis in humeris deferens ...”
This is a clear reference to the customary pilgrim garb, which arose in the eleventh century, of a tunic with a cross on the shoulder. Pilgrims were ordinarily vested with this sign at the ceremony described by Reginald. Thus Godric began his pilgrimage in what would have been the ordinary manner for most, if not all, pilgrims: as part of a group, blessed by the local priest or bishop, and given the cross to wear on their garments as a sign of their special status and journey.

Sigurðr, as a king and crusader, was accompanied by all his fleet. He traveled as a crusader, rather than a purely religious pilgrim; while the linguistic, and cultural, distinction between the two is a modern innovation, it was surely Sigurðr’s position as a crusading king that caused men such as Roger of Sicily and Baldwin of Jerusalem to show him great hospitality. The three later pilgrims, John of Würzburg, Theoderic, and John Phocas, with their primary interest to present an accurate description of the Holy Land, do not provide information on their manner of travel.

**Journey by Sea and by Land**

These pilgrims traveled both by sea and by land, depending on where they had come from; most of them would have traveled in both ways in the course of their journey. Sumption reports that “among sincere pilgrims” the practice of making the pilgrimage to the Holy Land on foot was “almost obligatory,” especially as “a long tradition of the Church held that walking was the most virtuous method of traveling.” While it was usual to reach Jerusalem by various means of travel, once in the Holy Land the

---

75 Sumption, *Pilgrimage*, 127.
pilgrimage was almost always completed on foot.

Saewulf begins his account at the time when he was boarding ship at Monopoli. He makes no mention of how he reached Italy; he may have traveled overland, by sea, or a combination of the two. Pryor remarks that Saewulf departed unusually late in the sailing season, and this, probably in combination with the high number of pilgrims who visited the Holy Land after the First Crusade, meant that he could not find a ship sailing there directly.\(^{76}\) It is certain that he sailed from Monopoli to Joppa; the numerous stories he relates of storms, his references to different ships and to harbors and islands make this abundantly clear. Once landing at Joppa, he and his party “went up ... to the city of Jerusalem, a journey of two days by a very hard and dangerous mountain road,” where they faced the threat both of Saracen attack and of the great heat.\(^{77}\) Saewulf does not expressly state how he went along this road, but his concern with heat and thirst indicates that he probably walked it, as was usual. There is no way to tell how Saewulf traveled within the Holy Land; his own narrative begins again just as he is boarding a ship at Joppa to leave for his home. As far as his narrative continues, he is still traveling this way, though he has changed ships.

Daniel the Abbot traveled overland, probably from Chernigov (he fails to specify where, exactly, he is from) to Odessa, and then by sea onward from Odessa.\(^{78}\) Like Saewulf, he does not generally specify the method by which he made his journey within the Holy Land; presumably he traveled by foot much of the time, as he says of Galilee

---


\(^{77}\) Saewulf, \textit{[Peregrinatio]}, 63-64, ll. 149-50: “Ascendimus ... in civitatem Ierusalem, iter duorum dierum per viam monosam, asperrimam et periculosissimam.”

\(^{78}\) Wilkinson, introduction to \textit{Jerusalem Pilgrimage}, 10; Daniel the Abbot, \textit{The Life and Journey}, 123.
that “God let me see and travel with my own unworthy feet.” He later thanks God for “permitting me to see such grace and walk those holy places.” In Lebanon, he explains that “I could not reach Mount Lebanon on foot myself for fear of the pagans,” but here he means that Mount Lebanon was only described to him; he did not reach it by other means. Evidently, had he gone there, he would have walked. A somewhat more confusing statement is made of his journey from Caesarea to Samaria, where he says that “we were in Samaria on the following day at midday but we went slowly on account of the heat, for those who went on foot could not travel in this heat.” From this it appears that some of his company – quite possibly including himself, given the reference to “those” – were not traveling on foot, but on horseback or some other form of transportation. At another time he specifies that “the town of Tiberias is four days’ journey on foot from Jerusalem,” but apparently he is merely citing a common measure of distance as this was the journey he made in the company of King Baldwin, and he specifies that he “hired horses” for the trip. Because he specifies the hiring of the horses for the journey, it seems likely that for the most part he and his entourage traveled on foot; the horses were necessitated by the danger of the road and the fact that they were to travel with the king. At the same time, the fact that he mentions the horses only in passing suggests that such an act was not foreign to him, and he must have used this method of travel at other times, presumably when covering a great distance or traveling along more dangerous roads.

Reginald makes it quite clear that Godric completed the greater part of his journey
on foot. Of his first pilgrimage to the Holy Land, Reginald only states that Godric visited first Jerusalem and the shrine of Saint James of Compostela; “from there approaching his maternal land, he walked back to his paternal farm.” In recounting Godric’s second pilgrimage, Reginald never specifically states that he walked, but the extraordinary deprivations of his pilgrimage which Reginald does expand upon leave no doubt as to this. Among other forms of self-mortification,

he did not even permit himself to remove his foot covering. Indeed, the reed-matting shoes having been worn out on the journey, he did not relieve the injuries, but with very sharp pebbles piercing the soles of his feet everywhere, he substituted a more severe a torment for walking than if he had walked with entirely bare feet. Whence with little sands seeping in everywhere, and nothing prohibiting them to enter, they carried weights of immeasurable mass.  

Godric continued his pilgrimage in this way until he reached the Holy Sepulcher, at which point he threw away his shoes, vowing to always go barefoot thereafter. As Reginald never specifically says that Godric walked for much of his pilgrimage, but emphasizes the torments to which he subjected his feet, it can be reasonably assumed that it was ordinary to travel extensively on foot, though not with such great self-imposed suffering.

Sigurðr sailed from Norway first to England, and then around the coast of Spain to Sicily and finally to Palestine, fighting numerous battles along the way. After crossing the Greek Sea, Sturluson reports that the crusading army “marched up to

---

84 Reginald of Durham, Libellus, 34: “exinde vero maternum solum adiens, ad villulam paternam repediavit.”
86 Reginald of Durham, Libellus, 56.
87 Sturluson, Heimskringla, 689-695.
Jerusalem,” presumably completing this part of their journey in the manner of the more conventional peaceful pilgrimage. John Phocas once notes that the entire journey from Samaria to Jerusalem can be completed along a paved road, implying that he was accustomed to walking on much poorer roads, like the “long, narrow, and extremely rough track” on the journey to Jericho. At another time, he writes that “It was dangerous climbing to the monastery because the place is so steep, and because of the fierce glare of the sun;” this climb must have been completed on foot. He also expressly states that “when you enter it [Jerusalem] you walk along a broad street,” although it is less notable to find a reference to walking within the confines of Jerusalem. John of Würzburg and Theoderic again do not expressly indicate how they reached the Holy Land or traveled within it, although presumably they followed common practice. Those who do mention it, though, indicate that while it was usual to reach the Holy Land by sea, or possibly even horseback, the majority of pilgrims followed the traditional practice of walking from Joppa to Jerusalem and throughout the Holy Land.

No matter how they traveled, pilgrims faced considerable difficulties along the way. Saracens were a threat both at sea and on land. At sea there were sometimes severe storms; when the sea itself did not threaten, there was always the danger of disease from the poor food and crowded conditions of the ships. Once on land, pilgrims found the condition of the roads to be poor, and the heat, to which many of them would have been completely unaccustomed, a great danger as well. Not every pilgrim endured every possible difficulty, or recorded it if he did, but all were aware of the possibilities, and

---

88 Sturluson, Heimskringla, 695.
89 John Phocas, A General Description, 323, 328.
90 John Phocas, A General Description, 328.
91 John Phocas, A General Description, 324.
none escaped them entirely.

Given the focus of Saewulf’s account on his travel by sea, it is not surprising that almost all of his dramatic stories involve the dangers inherent there. His difficulties began when he could not find a ship sailing directly to the Holy Land, and was compelled to travel by a more indirect route. Nor did he have good fortune in choosing a ship even then – it was “at an Egyptian [unlucky] hour” – he says, for almost as soon as they had left the shore, the ship was damaged by the waves and they were fortunate to return to shore uninjured.\textsuperscript{92} Not long afterwards, the now-repaired ship was “driven by a great tempest” to an island that was not on anyone’s itinerary, Cephalonia.\textsuperscript{93} There they would encounter another enemy of pilgrims, disease, as a number of their company died in that place. Saewulf implies the discomfort of travel by sea when he states that their arrival in Joppa concluded thirteen weeks “always living either on the waves of the sea or on islands in cottages and in abandoned huts, because the Greeks are not hospitable.”\textsuperscript{94} Thus, having suffered nearly all the misfortunes that a pilgrim could expect to experience at sea, they arrived in the Joppa harbor “with great happiness.”\textsuperscript{95}

This harbor was, in fact, to provide little shelter to the pilgrims, and the storm that follows stands as probably the most dramatic story in Saewulf’s account. Scarcely had they arrived in the harbor at Joppa when a man advised Saewulf to go ashore immediately lest a storm come up over night.\textsuperscript{96} Saewulf followed his advice, and even as they sailed to land “a powerful storm was made,” but they arrived safely on the shore.\textsuperscript{97}

\textsuperscript{92} Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 59, l. 10: “hora egyptica.”
\textsuperscript{93} Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 59, l. 19: “magna tempestate compulsi.”
\textsuperscript{94} Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 61, l. 88-91: “vel in marinis fluctibus vel in <in>sulas in tuguriis et in mappaliis desertis, quia Greci non sunt hospitales, semper habitando.”
\textsuperscript{95} Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 61, l. 90: “cum laeticia magna”
\textsuperscript{96} Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 62, ll. 99-101.
\textsuperscript{97} Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 62, ll. 102-05. ll. 103-04: “facta est tempestatas valida.”
The following morning, drawn to the shore by the sound of the waves and the cries of the populace,

we saw a storm exceed the height of the mountains, indeed we beheld the bodies of innumerable men and of the other sex, drowned, most wretchedly lying on the shore; at the same time we saw ships broken into bits tumbling about nearby. . . [It was] not long before we saw the anchors slip from the violence of the waves or of the billows, indeed the ropes were broken, moreover the ships released by the severity of the waves with all hope of escaping snatched away, were flung about, now raised to the height, now forced down into the lowest.  

Saewulf graphically describes the breakup of the ships, unable to reach either the shore or the deep water, and the drowning of all those on board. "From thirty of the biggest ships, . . . all filled with palmeris or goods . . . scarcely seven of these remained, indeed more than a thousand of either sex perished on that day." Even in the harbor there had been no protection from storms; Saewulf's description demonstrates the continual uncertainty and danger of the pilgrimage.

Storms were not the only danger Saewulf encountered at sea; there were also pirates, who were eager to take what they could from pilgrims carrying the substantial sums needed for their journeys. After setting sail from Joppa, the ship "from fear of the Saracens" traveled along the coastal cities rather than "by the high open seas of the Adriatic Sea, as we came." Despite this precaution, the pilgrims found themselves pursued by twenty-five Saracen ships on the fourth day; several smaller and faster ships

---


99 Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 63, ll. 141-45: "ex navibus triginta maximis, . . . omnibus oneratis palmaris vel mercimoniiis, . . . vix septem illesae permanerunt, homines vero diversi sexus plusquam mille die illa perierunt."

100 Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 75, ll. 553-56: "sed Saracenorum metu per altum pelagus Adriatici Maris, ut venimus, classem illorum metuentes tendere ausi non sumus."
traveling with them fled, leaving only the ship on which Saewulf was traveling to fend off the attack.\textsuperscript{101} Sumption says that “the law of the sea required all passengers to assist in defending the ship, and although pilgrims were exempt from this obligation on account of their religious calling, they usually fought as hard as any.”\textsuperscript{102} Saewulf’s ship was no exception. Saewulf does not say that he took up arms when the ship was attacked – and as he does generally record his actions, it is likely that he was a bystander – but he reports that those on board “took up arms and in accordance with the time, they defended the castle of our ship with arms.”\textsuperscript{103} Interestingly, he describes those fighting as “ours, prepared to die for Christ…”\textsuperscript{104} The phrase “mori pro Christi parati” has biblical echoes, as Paul speaks similar words in Acts, but it also shows how it was easy for Crusaders and pilgrims to be considered one and the same; here the pilgrims view a potential battle with pirates as a Holy War.\textsuperscript{105} In the end, their show of force was all that was needed, and the pirates left them unmolested, although “[the Saracens] detained three of the same ships and were made rich from the spoils of those.”\textsuperscript{106} Saewulf almost casually mentions that this was not the last pirate attack: “Moreover on that journey we often were attacked by pirates, but with divine grace protecting us we still lost nothing by force, either from the attack of enemies or from the rising of storms.”\textsuperscript{107} Evidently such attacks were common, although they lost their dramatic appeal after the first occasion.

\textsuperscript{101} Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 75-76, ll. 565-74.
\textsuperscript{102} Sumption, Pilgrimage, 187.
\textsuperscript{103} Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 76, ll. 575-76: “arma arripuerunt et secundum tempus castellum navis nostrae armatis munierunt.”
\textsuperscript{104} Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 76, ll. 574-75: “Nostri vero, mori pro Christo parati.”
\textsuperscript{106} Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 76, ll. 576-85. ll. 584-85: “eisdem navibus tres detinuerunt et spoliis illorum divites facti sunt.”
\textsuperscript{107} Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 76, ll. 590-92: “In illo autem itinere a piratis sepe sumus invasi, sed divina nos protegente gratia neque impetu hostium neque motu tempestatum aliquid vi adhuc amissimus.”
Like Saewulf, Daniel the Abbot provides an itinerary of islands which makes it clear that much of his journey to the Holy Land was accomplished by ship. Unlike Saewulf, Daniel appears to have disembarked at a number of these islands and ports, as he provides more detail on places such as Rhodes and Cyprus. Although he sometimes refers to areas and roads dangerous because of the Saracens, he nowhere mentions threats at sea. Either he had a remarkably calm passage, or, as is more likely, such stories simply do not hold much interest for him. The evidence for his methods of travel within the Holy Land is based entirely on brief comments scattered throughout that portion of the narrative; no such illustrative phrases exist in the shorter portions describing his travels to Jerusalem. Throughout his account, his focus is always on the holy places he visits, and his reactions to them, rather than on his experience in journeying there.

As Godric was from England, at least part of his pilgrimage must have been completed by sea, but Reginald makes no reference to any sort of sea-voyage or ships. As a former merchant, and a very experienced one, it is possible that the crossing, even if involving storms and pirates, would have been too ordinary for Godric to relate to Reginald. Alternatively, the conditions of the sea voyage may not have lent themselves as readily to Godric’s unusual self-deprecations, which Reginald prefers to emphasize.

For Sigurðr, storms and pirates would certainly be only “minor” nuisances from the point of view of Sturluson, who was interested in his great battles and feats. Thus, although he completes most of his journey by sea, the only “danger” which Sigurðr appears to come upon there is a battle with “heathen men” on his way to other engagements. This first battle of the expedition is with a fleet of Vikings which Sigurðr encountered off the coast of Spain. Sturluson records:
He won eight galleys from them. As says Halldór Skvaldri:
And the paltry pirates
pounced – but many warriors
fierce before the onset
fell – on the mighty ruler.
Fast the fleet of men cleared –
few were there our losses –
eight of the enemy’s galleys:
heir was he to their riches.\textsuperscript{108}

Such, of course, was the fate of all Sigurðr’s enemies. At a later time he would use his
ships in gaining an island victory; if he had any other battles solely at sea, Sturluson does
not mention them.\textsuperscript{109} For a crusading army and its king, the threats of the sea were no
greater a consideration than the regular danger of battle.

John of Würzburg and Theoderic both begin their accounts in Jerusalem, saying
nothing of their journey there. John Phocas does describe the cities he passed through on
the way to Jerusalem, beginning with Theopolis of Antiochus, but does not speak of his
actual travels through them. He does record of Acre (which he calls “Ptolemais or
Akke”) that

This city is large and is more populous than any of the others. Into it came
all the passenger ships, and all those who travel abroad for the sake of
Christ visit it, whether they come by sea or land. The atmosphere there is
polluted because of the great crowds who arrive there. From time to time
diseases break out and they cause deaths among them, which causes a
stench and makes the air deadly. This is the irreremediable fault of this
city.\textsuperscript{110}

This compact, unattractive portrait of Acre tidily summarizes the dangers and
unpleasantness encountered by the pilgrims even after they had disembarked from their
dangerous sea journey.

The danger emphasized by both Saewulf and Daniel also came on land: the threat

\textsuperscript{108} Sturluson, \textit{Heimskringla}, 690.
\textsuperscript{109} Sturluson, \textit{Heimskringla}, 692.
\textsuperscript{110} John Phocas, \textit{A General Description}, 319.
of attack by bandits along the road. Saewulf’s description of the road from Joppa to Jerusalem is both vivid and grim. The two-day journey on a rough road through the mountains was very harsh and dangerous, because the Saracens, always ambushing Christians, lie hidden concealed in the caverns of the mountains and in the caves of the cliffs, keeping watch by day and by night, always hunting out who they would be able to attack, either from lack of comrades or from weariness after [being] negligent of [his] comrades: sometimes they seem everywhere in the surroundings, suddenly they appear [to be] nowhere.\textsuperscript{111}

As if the constant anxiety this must have caused were not enough, the pilgrims could see about them evidence that many others had fallen prey to the Saracens in a most horrible way, for the bodies of other Christians, mauled by wild animals, lay scattered along the road. Anticipating the question of how this could be allowed, Saewulf elaborates:

\begin{quote}

it is not to be marveled at, because there the soil is very scarce and a rock does not allow itself to be dug up easily. But if there were soil, who would be so foolish as to leave behind his comrades and alone, as it were, dig a grave for a companion? If anybody should do this, he would prepare a grave for himself rather than for his companion.\textsuperscript{112}
\end{quote}

And even if one survived all these threats, there was still the possibility of dying from heat and thirst.\textsuperscript{113} Saewulf and his companions, though, escaped unharmed and arrived in Jerusalem with great relief and rejoicing.\textsuperscript{114} Saewulf writes in such a way as to emphasize that the dangers he describes apply to all pilgrims to Jerusalem, and were not incidental or occasional, as the storms and pirates he encountered on the sea were.

\textsuperscript{111} Saewulf, [\textit{Peregrinatio}], 63-64, ll. 149-56. ll. 150-56: “asperrimam et periculosissimam, quia Sarraceni, insidias Christianis semper tendentes, absconditi latent in cavernis montium et in speluncis ripium die noctuque pervigiles, semper persecrantes si quos invadere possint vel penuira comitatus vel lassitudine post comitatum remissos: modo ubique in circumitu videntur, statim nusquam apparent.”

\textsuperscript{112} Saewulf, [\textit{Peregrinatio}], 64, ll. 156-64. ll. 159-64: “non est mirandum, quia ibi minime est humus et rupes non leviter se prebet fodere. Quod si in his esset, quis adeo esset idiota ut comitatum suum relinqueret et quasi solus socio sepulchrum foderet? Si quis hoc faceret, sibimet potius quam socio sepulchrum pararet.”

\textsuperscript{113} Saewulf, [\textit{Peregrinatio}], 64, ll. 165-67.

\textsuperscript{114} Saewulf, [\textit{Peregrinatio}], 64, ll. 167-69.
Daniel also frequently comments on the dangers of the road, further indicating the prevalence of this problem. He, too, comments on the perilous road from Joppa to Jerusalem, though less dramatically than Saewulf: “travellers rest by the water but with great fear, for it is a deserted place and nearby is the town of Ascalon from which Saracens sally forth and kill travellers on those roads. There is a great fear too going up from that place into the hills. And from St George to Jerusalem is twenty long versts and all in rocky hills and here the road is hard and fearsome.”

This is perhaps a more informed description of the danger: Daniel’s Saracens have a specific town as their base, and do not simply appear and vanish in a supernatural fashion, but the fear of them was probably not lessened by this knowledge.

The road from Joppa to Jerusalem was not the only dangerous passage; the way to the Jordan was another. “It is a very difficult road and dangerous and waterless, for the hills are high and rocky and there are many brigands in those fearful hills and valleys,” Daniel says simply. The last portion of the road, from Jericho to the Jordan, was particularly difficult: “here many choke from the heat and die of thirst; and the Sea of Sodom is near the road and it gives off a hot and stinking vapour and the heat burns up the whole of the area.”

The road from Jerusalem to Hebron presented similar perils: “on the other side of this river there is a very high rocky mountain and on it a great dense forest and there is a way over that terrible mountain but it is difficult to pass along it because the Saracens have a great fortress there from which they attack … nearby lies the town of Ascalon from which the pagans come forth in great numbers and attack [people]

---

115 Daniel the Abbot, *The Life and Journey*, 126.
on that evil road."\textsuperscript{117} The road from Mount Tabor to Nazareth presented another such
situation, and Daniel traveled it in even greater apprehension, as he was with only a small
group.\textsuperscript{118} The town of Bashan also presented a combination of natural and human
threats, which seemed to the pilgrims almost to be in complicity with each other:

Seven rivers flow from this town of Bashan and great reeds grow along
these rivers and many tall palm trees stand about the town like a dense
forest. This place is terrible and difficult of access for here live fierce
pagan Saracens who attack travellers at the fords on these rivers. And
lions are found here in great numbers.\textsuperscript{119}

The road to the Sea of Tiberias was so dangerous that Daniel and his companions were
able to travel there safely only in the company of Baldwin and his army, and the threat of
the Saracens completely prevented them from attempting to travel to Mount Lebanon.\textsuperscript{120}
The heat and aridity alone were a great problem; south of Bethlehem, Daniel observed a
monastery near the Sea of Sodom, an area "terrible and waterless and dry and beneath it
is a rocky and very awful ravine."\textsuperscript{121} Like Saewulf, Daniel counted himself blessed by
God for traveling through all the Holy Land without assault by bandits, wild animals, or
disease.\textsuperscript{122} For Daniel as well as for Saewulf, and doubtless most pilgrims, the bandits
were the principal danger of the roads, especially for those traveling in small groups, but
the unfamiliar and harsh climate and landscape were nearly as great a threat.

John of Würzburg only writes of the holy places within Jerusalem, where travel
posed no difficulty. Theoderic begins his description with an overview of Judea, but only
says that "the mountains themselves in certain places are made rough with very harsh

\textsuperscript{117} Daniel the Abbot, The Life and Journey, 145.
\textsuperscript{118} Daniel the Abbot, The Life and Journey, 162-62.
\textsuperscript{119} Daniel the Abbot, The Life and Journey, 156.
\textsuperscript{120} Daniel the Abbot, The Life and Journey, 154-55, 160.
\textsuperscript{121} Daniel the Abbot, The Life and Journey, 149.
\textsuperscript{122} Daniel the Abbot, The Life and Journey, 165.
masses of stones." Although he also describes the cities beyond Jerusalem, the
dangers and attacks he mentions are historical; he is not concerned with present-day peril
in traveling there. John Phocas, while once remarking that “It was dangerous climbing to
the monastery because the place is so steep, and because of the fierce glare of the sun,”
also generally refrains from comment on any dangers of travel. The heat and rough
terrain could not have changed since the earlier part of the century, when they made
travel so difficult for Saewulf and Daniel, even if attacks by bandits had. The general
omission of such difficulties in these accounts is again probably due to their interest in
describing the places of the Holy Land, rather than the journey.

Most pilgrims would have joined a group of their fellows before leaving their
home, and traveled with them throughout the course of the journey. Despite the added
security of traveling in a group, though, the dangers presented through travel by sea were
equaled by the dangers of traveling within the Holy Land. At sea or on land, the
Saracens were the most active and vicious threat, but the heat, dry climate, and difficult
roads also spared none. Only Saewulf, writing in the manner of one telling a tale,
presents the perils of the journey as incidents notable in their own right. The other
accounts refer to the dangers of road and sea almost parenthetically, commenting on them
only in reference to their description of the holy places. That pilgrims continued to flock
to the Holy Land despite these difficulties, advertised through returned pilgrims and in
narratives like Daniel’s and Saewulf’s, is a testament to the importance of pilgrimage and
to the religious centrality of Jerusalem and the Holy Land in the twelfth century.

123 Theoderic, [Peregrinatio], 144, ll. 52-53: “Ipsi autem montes in quibusdam locis durissimis saxorum
molibus exasperantur.”
124 John Phocas, A General Description, 328.
CHAPTER 3

“THE LONGED-FOR PLACE”:
PILGRIMAGE WITHIN THE HOLY LAND

Guidebooks and Tales of Jerusalem

Guidebooks to Jerusalem at the time of the Crusaders’ Kingdom survive in relatively numerous quantities. Almost all are anonymous, and although they are of the same genre of “guidebook” and follow similar formats, they are not uniform. All focus on Jerusalem; some provide more information than others on the surrounding area and other holy places. Most are written in the second or third person, but a number are in the first person, suggesting that the author was recalling his own experiences. In addition, while they are written primarily to relay information and descriptions, some authors cannot resist adding their own comments – as is the case with John of Würzburg’s unashamed disparagement of the Franks.

These anonymous guidebooks are too numerous to include all. Only a selection of the earliest will be considered here; all these accounts survive in a form independent of larger texts – although many are found as appendixes, prefixes, or chapters of them in manuscripts – and so are more likely actually to have been used as pilgrimage guides. One of the earliest, an attachment to the anonymous *Gesta francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitanorum*, called the *Descripition Sanctorum Locorum Hierusalem* (the
Descriptio), must have been composed before 1104, and probably in about 1101.\(^1\) A second early guidebook is usually known as Qualiter, as the text begins “Qualiter sita est Jerusalem.”\(^2\) It is preserved as an attachment to a manuscript of the Historia Hierosolymitana, by Baldric of Burguliens (Archbishop Baudry of Dol).\(^3\) Originally it must have been signed by its pilgrim author, as it concludes, “I [am] the eye-witness who saw and wrote this very little title.”\(^4\) Any further information as to author and date has been lost; Tobler estimates its composition to be “before the first sacred war?”\(^5\) Wilkinson places it as “in circulation ... between 1099 and 1103.”\(^6\) A third guidebook from this early time frame is the Ottobonian Guide, “so called because in the Vatican Library it is part of the collection of manuscripts preserved in Codex Ottobonianus latinus 169.”\(^7\) Wilkinson judges it later than the previous two, because, like Saewulf, it describes the Church of St Anne, and because it follows a more logical order in its description of Jerusalem, but it too is from 1099-1103.\(^8\)

Another guide, also lacking a specific date, was composed about the time of Saewulf’s pilgrimage and before Daniel visited Jerusalem, 1102-1106.\(^9\) De Sandoli speculates that the author was a priest from northwestern Germany; consequently, it is

---

\(^3\) Tobler and Molinier, praefatio to Itinerae Hierosolymitana, Iij.
\(^5\) Tobler and Molinier, Itinerae Hierosolymitana, 345: “Ante I bellum sacrum?”
\(^6\) Wilkinson, introduction to Jerusalem Pilgrimage, 6.
\(^7\) Wilkinson, introduction to Jerusalem Pilgrimage, 6 n. 1.
\(^8\) Wilkinson, introduction to Jerusalem Pilgrimage, 6.
\(^9\) Wilkinson, introduction to Jerusalem Pilgrimage, 7.
known as the *German Guide*.\(^{10}\) A guide which survives as chapters 31 to 33 of the *Gesta Francorum Jherusalem expugnantium* (the *Gesta Guide*) probably dates from after 1109, although the main work was composed before then.\(^{11}\) The final guide considered here, known as *De situ* from its first words, "De situ urbis Jerusalem," is, again, anonymous, and was probably written prior to 1114.\(^{12}\) In the manuscript from which de Vogüé publishes his edition, the text follows the chronicle of Robert the Monk.\(^{13}\) Its description of Jerusalem and the immediate vicinity is followed by an account of the larger area surrounding Jerusalem. De Vogüé considers this to be a single text, expanded and edited by the priest Fretellus or Fetellus in the early thirteenth century; Wilkinson believes that the guide to Jerusalem originally was entirely separate from the following *Descriptio locorum circa Hierusalem Adjacentium*, likely "copied down from an unrelated manuscript."\(^{14}\)

In addition to the guidebooks, there are the descriptions of Jerusalem found as integral parts of larger pilgrimage accounts. In describing Jerusalem and the other holy places, their tendency to list places and various details often bears a closer resemblance to the form of the guidebooks than to the travel accounts of which they are a part. Like the travel accounts, though, personal comments and reactions are routine rather than anomalies, as is also true for information on how the author reached the places he describes. Daniel the Abbot is perhaps the quintessential example of a blend between a

---


\(^{11}\) Wilkinson, introduction to *Jerusalem Pilgrimage*, 11.

\(^{12}\) Wilkinson, introduction to *Jerusalem Pilgrimage*, 11.


travel account and a guidebook: his account is laden with details both of the holy places and his own experiences and travels. A number of copies survive of only the Jerusalem portion of his narrative, strongly suggesting that it was in fact used independently as a guidebook.¹⁵

Saewulf’s account is the reverse of this; he apparently took an independent pilgrimage account and inserted it within his travel account. The guidebook of Saewulf’s account serves as a good basis for comparison with the others in large part because it is somewhat unusual and so distinct from the others. Although part of a travel account, and inserted by the author, it was probably written by another, and could easily stand separate of the account. It is an impersonal text inserted within a personal narrative. While in the third person and in the style of those texts that are exclusively general guidebooks, it is somewhat longer and more detailed than the average, while briefer than the later descriptions of Jerusalem or Daniel’s travel account.

Two accounts which would have been useless as guidebooks are of interest for the information they provide on the pilgrims’ experiences of Jerusalem. The saga of Sigurðr makes note of only two episodes that represent truly religious portions of his crusade, an expedition to the Jordan and his reception of a relic of the True Cross, suggesting that these two pilgrimage experiences were among the most important and memorable for travelers. Reginald of Finchale, in showing Godric’s holiness through his reactions and experiences of the Holy Land, also provides information on which shrines were most important for pilgrims. Accounts by John of Würzburg, Theoderic, and John Phocas are not considered here for their factual information on the Holy Land, since they were composed at a much later date than Saewulf’s account, but they are of interest for their

¹⁵ Wilkinson, introduction to Jerusalem Pilgrimage, 9.
general focus and occasional commentary.

Approaches to Jerusalem

While the subject of the guidebooks may have been uniform, their approach was not. The accounts of Saewulf and Daniel naturally contained at least some sort of segue from the rest of their travels into the description of the Holy Land, but a surprising number of the guidebooks also begin with at least vague directions for reaching the city. Once in Jerusalem, some guidebooks gave a general overview of the layout of the city; others simply began their description, sometimes logically, sometimes not. The genre of the text does not dictate a common structure.

Saewulf does not very successfully blend his own narrative to the text of the guidebook. After describing the dangers of the road from Joppa, he states simply that "We, however, with all accompanying, arrived at the longed-for place uninjured: Praise the Lord."\textsuperscript{16} At the conclusion of his short prayer of thanksgiving, the guidebook picks up somewhat abruptly: "The entry of the city of Jerusalem is to the west beneath the citadel of king David."\textsuperscript{17} His segue from the conclusion of the guidebook back to his own account is similar. The guidebook ends with a description of the waters of the Jordan joining with the Dead Sea; Saewulf then resumes writing with an attempt at a transition: "For indeed having examined and worshipped the city of Jerusalem alone and also the borders of its sacred places as far as we were able, on the day of Pentecost we


\textsuperscript{17} Saewulf, \textit{Peregrinatio}, 64, ll. 170-71: "Introitus civitatis Jerusalem est ad occidentem sub arce David regis."
boarded a ship at Joppa in order to return to our homeland."\(^{18}\) While the guidebook and the travel account were complimentary forms, in Saewulf's text they remain distinct even when combined.

Daniel, not hampered by the problem of inserting another text into his own work, successfully blends the two portions. Like Saewulf, he describes the difficulties of the road leading to Jerusalem, mentioning as well some saints' tombs. He then describes Jerusalem as seen by one approaching the city:

> The holy city of Jerusalem lies in valleys with high and rocky mountains about it and only when you come close to the town do you see first the Tower of David, and then, coming a little closer, the Mount of Olives and the Holy of Holies and the Church of the Resurrection in which is the tomb of the Lord, and then you see the whole city. And there is a flat hill about a verst from the road to Jerusalem and on this hill all dismount from their horses and place little crosses there and bow to the (Church of the) Resurrection on the road to town.\(^{19}\)

In Daniel's unified account, the transition from the account of his journey to an account of Jerusalem is not clear, because Daniel himself never made the distinction between his pilgrimage within the Holy Land and the rest of his journey. Daniel wrote his account as a spiritual rather than a practical guide for those remaining at home, and subsequently saw no need to alter his approach; indeed, maintaining a more personal style throughout the description of Jerusalem could aid in a vicarious pilgrimage. The divorce of the two portions of his account was the work of later copyists interested in the practical use of the account as a guide. The blurring of the two is also the great advantage of the text, for Daniel leaves an account which not only describes Jerusalem and the surrounding area at

\(^{18}\) Saewulf, \textit{[Peregrinatio]}, 75, ll. 551-53: "Perscrutatis etenim singulis Ierosolimitanae urbis finiumque suarum sanctuariis pro posse nostro atque adoratis, die Pentecostes repatriandi causa Ioppen navim ascendimus."

a particular point in time, but also records the emotions and reactions of the pilgrim upon visiting these places.

John Phocas likewise describes Jerusalem as first seen by an approaching pilgrim, although without Daniel’s emotional response. He had already devoted a good portion of the text to a description of the cities and landmarks along the road to Jerusalem, beginning in Theopolis. The last city he describes is Samaria; he then writes:

It is eighty-four stades from Samaria to the Holy City ... The Holy City lies among deep valleys and hills, and it is a surprising city to see. For at the same time the city seems to stand higher than everything and to be low down, for it does indeed stand higher than the Judaean countryside, but it is low in comparison with the neighbouring hills.  

Like Daniel, he describes Jerusalem as he first saw it, but his relation is, like the rest of the account, far less concerned with his own reactions or experiences and more interested in the geography of the place.

Reginald’s account of Godric’s arrival in Jerusalem utilizes the other half of Daniel’s approach, focusing solely on the emotional experience engendered by first arriving in Jerusalem. Even before he reached the city, Godric was eagerly visiting all the holy places of the Gospels on the way there. His greatest joy and emotional outpouring, though, was reserved for his arrival at the Holy Sepulcher, which for him seems to have been largely synonymous with the larger city of Jerusalem:

Thus arriving at the Sepulchre of the Lord, it is not possible to explain with what great eagerness of devotion he prayed, how much he clung to [it] with his eyes, ... Returned to himself on account of much joy which he took in at the Sepulchre of the Lord, as if he were made a wholly new man, ...he was burning with astonishing joy. Indeed there was in his breast such sweetness which transcended all things, ... measures of such jubilation resounded in his ears that he believed [it] as sweet as if the

---

heavenly spirits of the blessed ones had sung in chorus, such lightness filled his body.\textsuperscript{21}

All night, says Reginald, Godric remained sleepless, wandering about in prayer. This sense of overwhelming joy and awe permeates Godric's time in the Holy Land, an especially interesting emphasis since Reginald's rendition of Godric's earlier pilgrimage to Jerusalem notes only that "he departed first for Jerusalem."\textsuperscript{22}

Reginald's description of Godric details the intense reaction of a single, albeit unusually devout, pilgrim on his arrival at his destination; in contrast, the guidebooks provide a detached overview of the approach to Jerusalem. Wilkinson surmises that the very general directions given in some of the guidebooks may indicate that they were circulated by churches or shipping companies eager to encourage pilgrimage.\textsuperscript{23} The directions given, though, are so general as to make this conclusion seem a bit far-fetched. It is as likely that these guidebooks were written by returning pilgrims who expected them to reach a diverse audience that would be interested primarily in the city of Jerusalem, and so the authors took no care in providing specifics of the journey. The Descriptio begins simply:

If anyone from the western regions shall have wished to travel to Jerusalem, he should hold fast always to the rising of the sun, and thus he will find the oratories of neighborhood of Jerusalem, just as it is written here.\textsuperscript{24}


\textsuperscript{22} Reginald of Durham, Libellus, 34: "primo Ierosolimam prefectus est."

\textsuperscript{23} Wilkinson, introduction to Jerusalem Pilgrimage, 2.

These very general directions could have served no real practical purpose, beyond establishing a very rudimentary geography for the reader. The introduction to *Qualiter* is similar:

In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. Whomever shall have wished to go to the holy city Jerusalem, should direct his course always to the rising of the sun, and thus, with God leading, he will come to holy Jerusalem.\(^{25}\)

While this would have established, quite generally, the geographical relationship between a pilgrim’s homeland and his destination, he could not have relied on it to aid him in reaching Jerusalem. For this he would have had to turn to others more knowledgeable – hence Wilkinson’s supposition that this was an advertisement for a shipping company. These sentences should probably just be viewed as an introduction to the account and not imbued with any great significance.

Once the authors had arrived at Jerusalem – literally or literarily – they adapted different approaches to their tour of the city. Several of the guidebooks, particularly the earliest ones, simply begin with a description of one place, without introduction or necessarily any apparent order. Some similarly begin by describing places, but in a logical sequence. Other authors give an overview of the city and its geography; still another describes the topography of all Judea. The majority of the guides are practical, at least naming the gate through which the pilgrims would enter Jerusalem.

Saewulf, like many of the guidebooks, begins with the chief entryway into the city: “The entrance of the city of Jerusalem is to the west beneath the citadel of king

---

\(^{25}\) *Qualiter*, 347: “In nomine Domini nostri Iesu Christi. Quicumque ad Jerusalem civitatem sanctam ire voluerit, semper ad solis ortum intendat, & sic, Deo ductore, ad sanctam Jerusalem veniet.”
David, through the gate which is called David’s Gate.” 26 The Ottobonian Guide opens with very similar language. Qualiter, after directing the reader to travel east, informs him that first he will encounter the “remarkable Mount of Joy. From which mount [it is] one mile all the way to the city. Indeed at the entrance of the city [there] is held the strong tower of David.” 27

De situ begins with a brief overview of the city: “The city of Jerusalem is placed in the mountainous country of Judaea in the province of Palestine, and has four entrances, from the east, from the west, from the south and from the north.” 28 The author briefly comments on the distinguishing feature or history of each gate – “to the west is David’s Gate, which looks out opposite the sea, and opposite Ascalon” – before identifying the western gate as the one through which he entered the city: “For we entered into the holy city through David’s Gate, having David’s Tower to the right.” 29 Similarly, Daniel, after describing his first sight of Jerusalem and the last portion of the road leading there, writes, “And then all the people with great joy enter the holy city of Jerusalem by the gate near the house of the son of David.” 30

The Gesta Guide adopts a still broader approach, first advising the reader, “That layout of the holy city and of the surrounding walls, which exists now, although it differs greatly from the ancient and famous arrangement of former times, and from the condition

26 Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 64, ll. 170-71: “Introitus civitatis Jerusalem est ad occidentem sub arce David regis, per portam quae vocatur Porta David.”
27 Qualiter, 347: “mons Gaudij ...conspicuus. A quo monte unum miliarum usque ad civitatem. Ad introitum vero civitatis turris David habetur fortis.”
28 De situ urbis Jerusalem et de locis sanctis intra ipsam urbem sive circumjacentibus, appendix 1 in Les Eglises de la Terre Sainte, by Melchior de Vogtié (1860, Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1973), 412: “Jerusalem civitas sita est in montana Judee in provincia Palestine, et habet quatuor introitus, ab oriente, ab occidente, a meridie et ab aquilone.”
29 De situ, 412: “Ab occidente est porta David, que respicit contra mare, et contra Ascalonem”; “Per portam namque David introivimus in sanctam civitatem, habens ad dexteram turrem David.”
30 Daniel the Abbot, The Life and Journey, 127.
in which it was in the times of Jesus Christ, nevertheless even now contains certain memorials of that time, for which it must be renowned and distinguished and more brilliant before all cities in the whole circle of the earth.”

The *Gesta Guide* then describes the gates at the four cardinal directions with equal attention; it duly notes that “The western [gate] is called David’s Gate for this reason, that it is placed close by David’s Tower.” Equivalent detail is given for the other three gates, and none is indicated as the normal entrance to the city. The *Gesta Guide* also goes on to mention a fifth gate near the Holy Sepulcher, opened only on Palm Sunday.

John Phocas begins with a very general overview of Jerusalem which quickly blends into his description of places within the city: “This Holy Place is divided in two. On the lower part of the hill on the right is set the Holy City … Holy Sion is in front of the Holy City, lying on its right.” He then begins to describe “the outer boundary of the city,” quickly beginning to add such detail as to make this effectively the beginning of his guidebook for the city of Jerusalem. Theoderic provides by far the best overview. He first explains the geography and location of all Judaea, then describes the road which climbs to Jerusalem. “Finally on that highest prominence of the mountains, as Josephus and Jerome attest, the city Jerusalem is situated, which is held holier and more

---


33 John Phocas, *A General Description*, 323.

34 John Phocas, *A General Description*, 323.

outstanding than cities and places throughout the circle of the universe." He explains the importance of Jerusalem, and then embarks on a detailed overview of the city which occupies two chapters. Interestingly, he refers to seven gates into the city, of which six are used daily. He does devote space to describing David's Tower, commenting, incorrectly, that it is by the "south" gate to Bethlehem. After this general, if lengthy, description of the city, he writes, "It remains, therefore, that we should examine about the holy places, on account of which the city is called 'holy.'" This is by far the most comprehensive and ordered introduction to Jerusalem, as is fitting for an account which is significantly longer and more detailed than the basic guidebooks of Saewulf's time, many of which are little more than itineraries.

Geography was not the only organizing factor. The sites which the authors described were selected, and sometimes ordered, by their biblical, religious, and historical significance. The foremost guide was always the Bible; after this, though, the authors relied heavily upon local guides and sources, as well as their own religious traditions, in selecting and describing the holy places. These were both written and oral; Saewulf often states that certain facts were told to him by local guides, while in another place he cites the (written) Vita of St Mary the Egyptian.

Saewulf exemplifies all of these approaches. His first source and guide is always the Bible. He may quote it directly, especially when relating stories connected to the sites, as at the Temple: "there afterwards [Jesus] drove out the cows and sheep and doves,

---

36 Theoderic, [Peregrinatio], 145, II. 60-63: "In ipsa denique montium summa eminentia, ut Josephus atque Ieronimus attestantur, sita est civitas illa Iherusalem, que universis per orbem urbis et locis sanctior habetur et eminentior."
37 Theoderic, [Peregrinatio], 145-46, II. 90-93.
38 Theoderic, [Peregrinatio], 146, II. 106-110. II. 107-08: "austrelem."
39 Theoderic, [Peregrinatio], 147, II. 136-37: "Restat ergo ut de locis sanctis, propter que ipsa civitas 'sancta' vocatur, disseramus."
saying: ‘my house will be called a house of prayer,’ there he said to the Jews: ‘tear down this temple and in three days I will raise it.’”\(^{40}\) He relies on the Old Testament as well, often quoting from the Psalms and the Pentateuch. He is certainly aware of his reliance on the Bible, and often qualifies his statements, as in an earlier part of his description of the Temple, “where Peter cured the lame man while he and John were going up into the Temple at the ninth hour of prayer, as it is read in the Acts of the Apostles.”\(^{41}\) Even when he does not indicate his source, Saewulf’s guidebook is laden with Biblical references and descriptions of places; this was, of course, the essential motivation of his pilgrimage.

Saewulf also relies on a number of extra-biblical sources. At the very beginning of his account, he chooses to describe the Holy Sepulcher first both for its geographical placement and because it represented the fulfillment of all the prophecies ever made.\(^{42}\) Then, relating the history of the site, he explains which of two opinions on the reconstruction of Jerusalem he considers correct:

Certain people, however, say that the city was restored by the emperor Justinian, and, similarly, the Temple of the Lord, just as it is now, but they say that according to [their] opinion and not according to the truth. For the Assyrians, whose fathers were inhabitants of this homeland from the first persecution, say that the city was captured and destroyed seven times after the passion of the Lord, …but not wholly cast down.\(^{43}\)

Here Saewulf is not only relying on the testimony of local residents, but evaluating and


\(^{41}\) Saewulf, [*Peregrinatio*], 67, 275-77: “ubi Petrus curavit claudum dum ipse et Iohannes ascenderunt in templum ad horam orationis nonam, sicut in Actibus apostolorum legitur.”

\(^{42}\) Saewulf, [*Peregrinatio*], 64, ll. 173-76.

\(^{43}\) Saewulf, [*Peregrinatio*], 65, ll. 198-205: “Quidam autem dicunt civitatem fuisset a Iustiniano imperatore restauratum et templum domini similiter, sicut est adhuc, sed illud dicunt secundum opinionem et non secundum veritatem. Assirii enim, quorum patres coloni erant illius patriae a prima persecutione, dicunt civitatem septies esse captam et destructam post domini passionem … sed non ominino precipitatem.”
judging their statements. He clearly considered the Assyrians to be reliable, as in the next passage he also credits their statements: “[there is] the prison where our lord Jesus Christ after [his] surrender was imprisoned by the testimonies of the Assyrians.”

He also incorporates stories which he attributes neither to the Bible nor to the local inhabitants, as when he writes, “There is the gate of the city in the eastern part of the Temple, which is called Golden, where Joachim, the father of blessed Mary, with the angel of the Lord ordering [him], met his wife Anna.” This meeting is not found anywhere in the canonical Scriptures – nor are Joachim and Anna ever even named – and so must be based on religious tradition, either as relayed by the local guides who must have pointed out the site, although Saewulf does not cite them, or as preserved throughout the Christian world in apocryphal writings. Perhaps the most interesting demonstration of Saewulf’s use of sources comes in a passage where he integrates several:

Beneath is the place which is called Golgotha, where it is said Adam was raised from the dead by a torrent of the Lord’s blood fallen over him, just as it is read in the passion of the Lord: “and many bodies of the holy ones who were sleeping were raised up.” But in the Sentences of blessed Augustine it is read that he [Adam] was buried in Hebron, where indeed afterwards the three patriarchs were buried with their wives …

Saewulf may quote local tradition, judging from the phrase “it is said,” he then comments on the relevant biblical passage, and compares it to patristic writings (actually the Sentences of Jerome, not Augustine). This portion is an excellent synthesis of the many

---

44 Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 65, ll. 207-08: “carcer, ubi dominus noster Iesus Christus post traditionem incarceratus fuit testantibus Assiriis.”

45 Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 68, ll. 310-12: “Ibi est porta civitatis in orientale parte Templi, quae vocatur Aurea, ubi Joachim, pater beatae Mariae, iubente angelo domini occurrit uxori suae Annae.”

sources available to the guidebook authors.

Saewulf is not the only one to clearly state his sources. Daniel the Abbot, at the beginning of his account, elaborates on how he obtained much of his knowledge of the Holy Land during the sixteen months he stayed there:

It is not possible without a good guide and interpreter to explore and see all the holy places. And whatever of my meagre wealth I had by me I would give to those who were well acquainted with all the holy places in the city and outside the city so that they should show me everything thoroughly, and thus it was. And by God’s favour I found in the Laura a man holy and old in days and very learned ... and he showed me in detail all the holy places in Jerusalem and conducted me all over that land.\(^47\)

Daniel did not have such faith in other writings about the Holy Land, as he says once that “Many others who have reached these holy places have been unable to examine them properly and have been mistaken about these places, and others who have not reached them have lied much and deceived.”\(^48\) He reassures his readers that he will not be guilty of this, again mentioning his old and wise guide, and later adding that “if I have not written wisely, then at least I have not written falsely: what I saw with my own eyes I have written down.”\(^49\) He often repeats that he has seen for himself all that he writes about “with my own sinful and unworthy eyes.”\(^50\) Certainly the Bible was his source for the places which he wanted to see, although he does not cite it as Saewulf does, and on one occasion he renders a rather bewildering combination of biblical books, placing Melchizedek and Abraham together at a ceremony prefiguring the Last Supper.\(^51\) Like Saewulf, he refers to the \textit{Vita} of Mary the Egyptian, suggesting that his knowledge of

\(^{47}\) Daniel the Abbot, \textit{The Life and Journey}, 121.
\(^{48}\) Daniel the Abbot, \textit{The Life and Journey}, 157-58.
\(^{49}\) Daniel the Abbot, \textit{The Life and Journey}, 158, 166.
\(^{50}\) Daniel the Abbot, \textit{The Life and Journey}, 137.
\(^{51}\) Daniel the Abbot, \textit{The Life and Journey}, 162.
hagiography also influenced his travels.\(^{52}\)

The author of *Qualiter*, like Daniel, assures the reader that “I [am] the eye-witness who saw and wrote this very little title.”\(^{53}\) The *German Guide* reveals the influence of local guides in shaping the experience of the pilgrims: “In the outer edge of this stone wise men of the Greeks remaining in Jerusalem say the earth [is] worthy of veneration and of a kiss of Christians.”\(^{54}\) The *Gesta Guide* records of Golgotha that “In that place it is related from ancient times that . . .”\(^{55}\) Although the author accepts this tradition, he discredits another report, based on biblical evidence: “in the prophesy of the same Jeremiah it is found written that it [the Ark] may not be found, until many nations are brought together. Therefore the Ark is not in the temple now, as is believed by certain people.”\(^{56}\) The other pilgrimage guides do not mention the sources of their accounts. They probably do not go to the extreme of John of Würzburg, who writes some sixty years later, “If anyone should wish to be more informed about these things, let him come and from the more prudent inhabitants of this land let him seek the order and truth of the matter of the deeds, for I have not learned so much of these things in any scripture.” It is certain, though, that their accounts were grounded in the Bible and their own observations, and probably informed by local guides and traditions.

\(^{52}\) Daniel the Abbot, *The Life and Journey*, 137.

\(^{53}\) *Qualiter*, 349: “ego testis qui vidi & hunc parvissimum titulum scripsi.”


\(^{55}\) *Gesta Guide*, 148: “In quo loco traditur ab antiquis . . .”

\(^{56}\) *Gesta Guide*, 150: “in prophetia ejusdem Hieremiae scriptum inventur quod invenienda non sit, donec gentes multae congregarentur. Archa igitur in templo nunc non est, sicut a quibusdam creditur.”
Within the Holy City

The authors were firmly agreed that the Holy Sepulcher was the most important part of the city; many of them placed it first in their descriptions, and most devoted more space to it than to any other place. Saewulf explains,

First one must walk to the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, which is called the “Martyrium,” not only on account of the situation of the streets, but because it is more famous than all the other churches, and this is right and just, because all things which were foretold or forewritten by the holy prophets in the whole world about our Savior Jesus Christ, here are truly fulfilled.  

The carefully-ordered Gestas Guide gives similar prominence to the Holy Sepulcher, placing it, logically, immediately after the description of the gates leading into the city, which ends with the fifth gate through which Jesus entered on a donkey, now opened only on Palm Sunday. “And so by entering the city through this [gate], the Sepulcher of the Lord is approached from the left.” In similar form, De situ describes the entry to the city through David’s Gate. Here it alters, though, as the Temple is briefly described before the author records that “Indeed the Sepulcher of the Lord is below the city, a little to the left of us [as we were] going to the Temple.” Daniel writes, “As you enter the town your path lies through the town to the Holy of Holies on the right hand and on the left hand the Holy Resurrection where lies the tomb of the Lord.” Qualiter and the Ottobonian Guide both mention the Holy Sepulcher first as well. The Descriptio and the German Guide, though, do not accord it the same place of prominence. In the case of the

---

57 Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 64, II.171-77: “Primum eundem est ad aecclesiam Sancti Sepulchri, quae ‘Martyrium’ vocatur, non solum pro conditio platearum, sed quia celebrior est omnibus alis aecclesis, et hoc digne et iuste, quia omnia quae a sanctis prophetis in toto mundo de Salvatore nostro Jesu Christo erant predicta vel prescripta, ibi sunt omnia veraciter consummata.”
59 De situ, 412: “Sepulcrum vero Domini est infra civitatem, paululum ad sinistram nobis euntibus ad Templum.”
60 Daniel the Abbot, The Life and Journey, 127.
*Descriptio*, this seems to be due to the overall lack of order in the description. The *German Guide* is more logical, beginning outside the city with the Valley of Jehoshaphat. Once it reaches the city of Jerusalem, the Holy Sepulcher is given first place: “Now let us go into that city. There is the sepulcher of [the one] crucified for us, above which is built a temple.”[61] Theodoric sums up the general attitude of the authors, writing, “It remains, therefore, that we should examine about the holy places, on account of which the city is called ‘holy,’ whence from the holy of holies, that is the Lord’s Sepulcher, we will consider the beginning.”[62]

Saewulf explains how the church came to be built, by Archbishop Maximus at the direction of Constantine and Helena, and then describes the most unusual part of the architecture: the Lord’s Sepulcher stood in the center of the church, with the church roof open above it, yet “when it rains, no rain is able to fall over the Holy Sepulcher, because from above the church stands open completely uncovered.”[63] These two details are those most commonly noted by the accounts. The *Descriptio* is the vaguest, describing the church as “splendidly built by king Constantine.”[64] Both *Qualiter* and the *German Guide* comment on the skylight; *Qualiter* adds the additional information that the sepulcher itself “similarly [is] round from the outside, however within it is found [to be] squared.”[65] The author of the *German Guide* provides one hint as to his own origins in comparing the Holy Sepulcher to “the temple of Blessed Mary which was built by Charles the Great at

---

[61] *German Guide*, 156: “Modo ingrediamus ipsam civitatem. Ibi est sepalchrum pro nobis crucifixi, supra quod est edificatum est templum.”
[62] Theodoric, *[Peregrinatio]*, 147, ll. 136-37: “Restat ergo ut de locis sanctis, propter que ipsa civitas sancta vocatur, disseramus; unde a sancto sanctorum, id est a sepulcro dominico, duximus incipientum.”
[63] Saewulf, *[Peregrinatio]*, 64, ll. 177-83: “ne dum pluit pluvia cadere possit supra sanctum sepulchrum, quia aeclesiae desuper pariet discoperta.”
[64] Descriptio, 98.
[65] Qualiter, 347: “Similiter rotundum de foris, intus autem quadratum invenitur.”
Aquisgranus [Aix].

Saewulf also dedicates a fair amount of explanation as to how it came about that, although “we know that the Lord was killed outside the gate,” the Holy Sepulcher comes to be within the walls of the city. He particularly emphasizes that the expansion of the city walls was completed by the Emperor Hadrian, who afterwards called the city “Helias” after himself, rather than by Justinian, as some believed. It is this particular information that interests the author of the Gestas Guida as well, who writes, “[the Holy Sepulcher] is read to have been found outside the city at the time of the passion of Christ, and cut into the living rock.” The Gestas Guida author also reports that Jerusalem had come to be called “Helya” because of the improvements of Hadrian. This sort of historical detail, though, seems to have been of fairly limited interest to most authors, who were principally concerned with the religious significance of the city.

De situ expands the details of the other guidebooks somewhat, saying that “The round Church of the Sepulcher is built quite beautifully, and has four doors which are open facing the east of the sun. Indeed the sepulcher of the Lord is in the middle of it, protected quite well, and fittingly arranged.” Daniel, though, provides by far the most extensive description, describing the interior architecture and mosaics. About the roof, he clarifies that “The top of the church is not completely vaulted over in stone but is surmounted by fashioned timber planked like a floor and so there is no top and it is not

---

66 German Guide, 156: “templi quod edificatum est aquisgrani beate marie a karolo magno.”
67 Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 65, l. 191-92: “Nos scimus quod extra portam passus est dominus.”
68 Saewulf, [Peregrinatio], 65, l. 192-205.
69 Gestas Guida, 148: “quod extra urbem tempore passionis Christi fore inventum, vivoque lapide incisum.”
70 Gestas Guida, 154.
71 De situ, 412: “Ecclesia Sepulcri rotunda est satis pulchre fabricata, et habet quatuor portas que aperiuntur contra solis ortum. Sepulcrum vero Domini est in medio eius satis bene munitum, et decenter ordinatum.”
covered with anything. Beneath this uncovered roof is the tomb of the Lord.” 72 He then describes the tomb in minute detail:

[it] is like a little cave cut into the rock, with small doors so that men can enter stooping on their knees for it is low and round, four cubits in length and breadth. And as you enter the cave by the small door, on the right hand there is a kind of shelf cut into the rock of the cave and on this shelf lay the body of our Lord Jesus Christ. The sacred shelf is now covered with slabs of marble. On the side three small windows have been cut in order to see the holy stone. 73

Daniel continues to describe the contents and decorations in the tomb, as well as the sizes of these things. He also adds, to reassure his readers, that “this cave is the tomb of the Lord as I have recounted, having questioned those who have lived long there and truly know all the holy places.” 74 Only the later writers John of Würzburg and Theoderic describe the Holy Sepulcher at greater length.

The only other place within Jerusalem that merited as much attention from the guidebook authors was the Temple. Saewulf describes the physical building with approximately the same amount of detail as he does the Holy Sepulcher:

its court is of great length and width, having many gates, but nevertheless the principal gate, which is before the front of the Temple, is called ‘Beautiful’ on account of the nature of the work and the variety of colors. 75

Whereas the Holy Sepulcher contained many places associated with the life of Jesus, in speaking of the Temple Saewulf begins first by relating accounts from the Hebrew Scriptures, proceeding through the stories of Jacob’s Ladder and Solomon’s construction of the Temple to the incidents of Jesus’ childhood which were centered on the Temple,

---

72 Daniel the Abbot, *The Life and Journey*, 127.
73 Daniel the Abbot, *The Life and Journey*, 128.
74 Daniel the Abbot, *The Life and Journey*, 128.
75 Saewulf, *Peregrinatio*, 67, ll. 272-75: “cuius atriun magnae longitudinis est et latitudinis, plurimas habens portas, sed tamen principalis porta, quae est ante faciem Templi, vocatur ‘Speciosa’ pro ingenio operis et varietate colorum.”
and finally stories of Jesus’ defiance of the Jewish leaders there. A certain thematic approach can be detected in this arrangement: Saewulf has, as Dorothea French says of Constantine, “create[d] a Christian ‘Holy Land’ carefully laid over the Jewish sacred center of Jerusalem and interacting with it in complex ways.”

The importance which the Jewish Temple played in a Christian Jerusalem is seen in varying degrees in the other guidebooks and accounts. The German Guide scarcely mentions it, placing it at the very end of the account and noting only its position within the city. The Descriptio provides a description similar to Saewulf’s. Qualiter and the Ottobonian Guide actually provide more physical detail than Saewulf, describing the Tabernacle and its contents. In the Gesta Guide, the tendency to Christianize Jewish holy places again manifests itself, as the author describes the Temple with almost exclusively Christian detail:

In truth that place is described to be sacred in many ways, not only because the boy Jesus was presented and received by the elderly Simeon in it; but also because at twelve he was found there, sitting in the midst of the learned men; indeed throwing the money-lenders out from it, he said: “[This] will be called a house of prayer;” and it is religious and holy from the many signs and portents of miracles done by God in that very place.

De situ goes still further, citing only Christian events, without even the vague reference to the many miracles of God which could, in the Gesta Guide, be interpreted as a reference to Jewish writings.

---

77 German Guide, 156.
78 Descriptio, 99.
80 Gesta Guide, 150: “Verum locus ille multis modis sacer esse describitur, tum quia puer Jesus in eo praesentatus est et a Symeonone sene exceptus; tum quia duodennis, ibi in medio doctorum sedens, inventus sit; de quo etiam nummularios ejiens, dixit: Domus orationis vocabitur; multisque miraculorum signis et prodigiis ibidem a Deo factis, religiosus et sanctus est.”
Daniel the Abbot’s account is a notable exception to this trend, as he describes the appearance of the Temple in the greatest detail of any of the accounts, and then refers to only three stories connected to it, all from the Hebrew Scriptures: the murder of the prophet Zachariah, Jacob’s Ladder, and the vision of King David.81 Altogether, though, the pilgrimage guidebooks show a marked and increasing tendency to view all of Jerusalem, including the Jewish holy places, as Christian. This process doubtless both accelerated and was accelerated by influx of European, Christian, pilgrims following the First Crusade, with Saewulf and the others mentioned here among the first of these.

Beyond the Holy City

Many of the authors had as great an interest in places outside of Jerusalem as in the city itself; the German Guide probably carries this to an extreme, devoting three-quarters of the text to places to be seen before the pilgrim even reaches Jerusalem. Bethlehem, Nazareth, Galilee, and the Sea of Tiberias are all commonly described. The site which seems to have attracted the greatest devotion and emotion, though, is the River Jordan. Saewulf actually places no particular emphasis on it, particularly in contrast to places such as Galilee and Bethlehem:

The Jordan River is four leagues from Jericho, to the east. From that side of the Jordan up to the Adriatic Sea, certainly to the harbor which is called Joppa, is the region which is called Judea. Indeed from the other side of the Jordan is Arabia, most hostile to Christians and very dangerous to all the worshippers of God.82

This rendition is very basic and factual, as are most of the comments in the other

---

82 Saewulf, *Peregrinatio*, 72, ll. 464-68: “Iordanis fluvius est ab Iericho quatuor leugas ad orientem. Ex ista parte Iordanis est regio quae vocatur Judea usque ad Mare Adriaticum, ad portum scilicet qui Ioppen vocatur. Ex altera vero parte Iordanis est Arabia inimicissima Christianis et infestissima omnibus deum co lentibus.”
guidebooks. *Qualiter* and the *German Guide* never venture beyond the immediate area of Jerusalem, and so do not mention it at all. The *Gesta Guide* contains almost exactly the same information as Saewulf, and the *Ottobonian Guide* notes only the distance of the Jordan from Bethlehem.\(^{83}\) The *Descriptio* at least explains that it was the Jordan "in which the Lord was baptized by John."\(^{84}\) *De situ* expands this very slightly, noting the distance of the Jordan from both Jerusalem and Jericho (and disagreeing with Saewulf on the latter) along a "rough road," and reporting, "Indeed the Jordan runs coming from the north towards the south. Near the Jordan is the church of St John the Baptist, where there are about twenty Greek monks serving God. On the other side of the river is Arabia. Indeed not far from that place where the Lord was baptized, is the Dead Sea, where the river Jordan ends."\(^{85}\)

It is in accounts such as Daniel the Abbot’s and Godric’s – and, surprisingly, the saga of king Sigurðr the Crusader – that the religious and symbolic importance of the Jordan is most apparent. Daniel describes the Jordan in far more detail than any of the other accounts, explaining the source of the river in two others, the Jor and the Dan, and continuing fondly with a comparison to his homeland, "The Jordan flows fast and pure and meanders greatly, and in every way, in breadth and depth and in its watermeadows, is like the Snov."\(^{86}\) Admiration of the fish and bridges of the Jordan did not distract Daniel and his entourage from their pilgrimage, though, so "We stopped also at the very source

\(^{83}\) *Gesta Guide*, 152; *Ottobonian Guide*, 93.

\(^{84}\) *Descriptio*, 100: "in quo Dominus a Johanne baptizatus est."

\(^{85}\) *De situ*, 414: "asperum iter ... Jordanis vero ab aquilonari parte veniens currit contra meridiem. Prope Jordanem est ecclesia S. Johannis Baptiste, ubi sunt monachi greci deo servientes ferme viginti. Ultra flumen est Arabia. Non longe etiam ab ipso loco ubi Dns baptizatus est, est mare Mortuum, ubi deficit flumen Jordanis."

of the Jordan and we bathed in the source of the Jordan in the Sea of Tiberias."\textsuperscript{87} Rather surprisingly, Daniel does not comment on the symbolic significance of bathing in the river in which Jesus was baptized; for him, the importance of the Jordan seems to stem more from its position in the middle of Galilee, "which I had never expected to see: this God let me see and travel with my unworthy feet, and I saw with my sinful eyes all this holy and longed-for land."\textsuperscript{88}

Reginald's description of Godric's arrival at the Jordan is not as emotionally fraught as his arrival at the Holy Sepulcher; here it is his actions which are most significant, and which illustrate the importance of the Jordan to his pilgrimage:

he approached towards the bank of the Jordan, and there rubbed away and washed the sweat of his body in the sacred streams of water. And thus he finished that whole journey in a coarse garment of clothing, and he always bore a moderate Cross in front with his hands, with which he entered the river of the Jordan, ... Then for the first time on that whole journey he drew off from himself his foot-coverings, and his garments, with which he had been clothed, he took off, and with food of this land with moderate enjoyment he refreshed himself.\textsuperscript{89}

All of these actions are significant, for they represent the end of the deprivations that Godric had placed on himself throughout his journey. Reginald describes in great detail the appalling state of his feet, mangled by the rocks caught in his reed shoes. The Jordan was not only the end of these penances, though. After Godric had been "cleansed, consecrated, and washed in the sacred waters," he proceeded to vow that, as Jesus had traveled "with bare feet in the world for the redemption of mankind, and ... did not refuse [his] bare feet to be pierced by those affixing nails," so, too, would he, Godric, always go

\textsuperscript{87} Daniel the Abbot, \textit{The Life and Journey}, 157.
\textsuperscript{88} Daniel the Abbot, \textit{The Life and Journey}, 157.
\textsuperscript{89} Reginald of Durham, \textit{Libellus}, 56: "ad ripam Jordanis accessit, ibique sacris aquarum fluentis corporis sui sudores extersit et abluuit. Totum itaque iter illud cicilicio indutus confecerat, et Crucem quandam modicam semper manibus praeferebat, cum quibus Jordanis flumen introivit ... Tune etiam primum in toto ipso itinere sibi calciamenta detraxit, et vestes suas, quibus amictus erat, exuit, et cibo illius terrae cum fructu modico se refecti."
barefoot. It was a vow he kept for the rest of his life.

In contrast, Sturluson’s description of Sigurðr’s visit to the Jordan is fairly prosaic: “King Balduin received King Sigurth most graciously and with him rode to the River Jordan and back to Jerusalem.” He quotes from a skald which relates slightly more information:

Peaceful pilgrimage made the
prince – under wide heaven
nobler lord was never
known – through Land the Holy;
and the gladsome gold-ring-
giver – praiseworthy was that –
bathed in Jordan’s
burn, of sin to cleanse him.

Clearly the idea of their king bathing in the Jordan pleased the Scandinavians. Perhaps the most significant event in the saga is an incident that occurred some time later, after Sigurðr had returned to Norway. He and his brother and co-ruler Eystein entered into a bragging contest over dinner, beginning with comparisons of their swimming and fighting abilities as boys, and progressing through their battles and accomplishments as kings. The last boast made by either, as a capstone to all the others, is Sigurðr’s: “On this expedition, at its farthest point, I journeyed to the River Jordan and swam across it.” This could be a simple boast of a feat of athleticism, but coming as the last in a series of increasingly impressive claims, and following Eystein’s claims to have been a good, religious, moral ruler, it stands as the high point of all Sigurðr’s accomplishments.

---

90 Reginald of Durham, Libellus, 56: “Aquis igitur sacris purgatus, sanctificatus et ablutos;” “Qui nudis semper in mundo pedibus pro redemptione hominum ambulasti, et Tua nuda vestigia clavis affluentibus perforari. . . . non renuisti”
91 Stevenson, Libellus, 56 n 4.
93 Sturluson, Heimskringla, 695-96.
94 Sturluson, Heimskringla, 703-04.
95 Sturluson, Heimskringla, 704.
for its moral and religious significance. The importance attached to the act of bathing in
the Jordan in a saga which is largely a recital of military victories reinforces its
importance in religion and pilgrimage.

The guides describe far more places than those mentioned here; on the whole,
they agree as to which places were most significant and holy. The amount of detail used
by the authors in describing these sites is indicative of the sort of account that they are
writing: the short pilgrimage guides devote little more than a sentence to the Holy
Sepulcher, even as they accord it the highest place of importance. Those writing
somewhat longer guides adjust their description and emphases accordingly, with the
greatest amount of information recorded by those who expected their works to be read by
those who would probably never see the Holy Land in person.

**Jerusalem, the Holy Land, and Pilgrimage**

The importance of the Holy Land, and Jerusalem in particular, to medieval
religion and pilgrimage can best be summed up by the existence of a place which
received barely a mention in any of the accounts. In his description of the court of the
Holy Sepulcher, Saewulf writes:

Moreover on the outside at the head of the church of the Holy Sepulcher,
within the wall, not far from the place of Calvary, is the place which is
called "Compas," where our Lord Jesus Christ himself marked and
measured [where]: the middle of the world was with his own hand, with the
psalmist testifying: "Moreover God our king worked salvation in the
middle of the earth before the ages."\(^6\)

The *Descrip**io* and *Qualiter* both refer to "the middle of the world" as well; none of the

---

\(^6\) Saewulf, [*Peregrinatio*], 66, l. 236-41: "Ad caput autem aecclesia Sancti Sepulchri in muro forinsecus,
non longe a loco Calvariae, est locus qui 'Compas' vocatur, ubi ipse dominus noster Jesus Christus medium
mundi propria manu esse signavit atque mensuravit, psalmista testante: *deus autem rex noster ante saecula
operatus est salutem in medio terrae."
other early guidebooks or accounts even mentions it.\footnote{Descriptio, 98; Qualiter, 347: “medium mundi.”}

“The middle of the world” is mentioned again by John of Würzburg, with the same detail as Saewulf; Theoderic, too, describes it, though he identifies the markings on the floor as indicating the place where Joseph and Nicodemus laid Jesus’ body after it had been removed from the cross.\footnote{John of Würzburg, [Letter], 119-20, ll. 1008-13; Theoderic, [Peregrinatio], 147, ll. 150-54.} Both can be considered correct. In her article on pilgrimage to Mount Calvary, Dorothea French writes, “Pilgrims to Palestine and Jerusalem from Late Antiquity to the Renaissance had visited Mount Calvary not only because they believed it was the actual place where Christ had been crucified, \textit{sensus literalis}, but also because of its symbolic meaning for the salvation of the world, \textit{sensus allegoricus}.”\footnote{French, “Journeys to the Center of the Earth,” 45.} By the eleventh century, medieval \textit{mappae mundi} placed Jerusalem at the center of the known world, making the spiritual world synonymous with the material.\footnote{French, “Journeys to the Center of the Earth,” 62.}

Saewulf’s description of the \textit{medium mundi}, and the corresponding comments of John of Würzburg and Theoderic, aptly illustrate this point. As the site of Jesus’ death and resurrection, Jerusalem, and especially the area of Mount Calvary and the Holy Sepulcher, was the center for salvation and so, with religion as the center of daily life, the literal center of the world. Saewulf’s pilgrimage account is significant as the first surviving after the establishment of the Crusaders’ Kingdom, but it is also important for the light it sheds both on contemporary pilgrimage accounts and on the religious belief and practice of the twelfth century.
CONCLUSION

Saewulf’s account occupies a certain prominence among the other accounts as the earliest surviving from the Crusaders’ Kingdom. Although not the most detailed of the travel accounts, it is a full and interesting narrative of the pilgrimage journey, and the guidebook it incorporates is well-organized and descriptive. The text includes the author’s name and unusually precise dates for the pilgrimage, although other information on Saewulf and his origins must be inferred. Saewulf seems to have been not the merchant of William of Malmesbury’s chronicle, but rather a British monk or abbot. Like most pilgrims of the time, he made the journey with a group of companions from his home, encountering all the usual difficulties of pilgrimage on the way to the “longed-for place” of Jerusalem.

Together with other pilgrimage accounts and guidebooks of the Crusaders’ Kingdom, Saewulf’s account describes the area of Jerusalem and the pilgrims’ journey there. The travel accounts present further evidence of the place of pilgrimage in medieval society, describing the considerable dangers that the pilgrims faced on their journeys. The guidebooks do not only list the places which it was most important for pilgrims to visit; they also, through their descriptions, shaped the importance of the Holy Land and its sacred sites for pilgrimage and the Church. The descriptions of storms, bandits, places and views of the Holy Land and the Holy City of Jerusalem illuminate both the actual experience of pilgrimage at the beginning of the twelfth century, and the religious emphases and experiences of the time.
APPENDIX

The Vocabulary of Saewulf’s Account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Other Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>causa orandi</td>
<td>=23, cf. 604</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>causa orandi</td>
<td>=2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>orandi causa</td>
<td>cf.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>per altum pelagus</td>
<td>=554</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>per altum pelagus</td>
<td>=4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>nisi divina nos defenderet clementia</td>
<td>=596, cf. 79, 97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>nisi divina nos defenderet clementia</td>
<td>=11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>divina clementia</td>
<td>cf.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>divina clementia</td>
<td>=97, cf. 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>violentia undarum</td>
<td>=123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>violentia undarum</td>
<td>=13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>deo favente</td>
<td>cf. 104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>divina gratia favente</td>
<td>cf. 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>ad litus reverterbamur illesi</td>
<td>=104-05, 130-31, 140, cf. 167-68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>104-05</td>
<td>ad litus ... perveni illesus</td>
<td>=14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>130-31</td>
<td>ad litus pervenire illesas</td>
<td>=14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>ad litus illesi pervenerunt</td>
<td>=14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>167-68</td>
<td>... pervenimus illesi</td>
<td>cf. 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>hora egyptiaca</td>
<td>=10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>iterum die egyptiaca</td>
<td></td>
<td>=10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>magna tempestate compulsi</td>
<td>cf. 58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>maxima tempestate compulsi</td>
<td>cf. 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>postea inde remoti</td>
<td>=620-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>620-21</td>
<td>postea inde remoti</td>
<td>=21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Apostolus Paulus etiam scriptum epistolam</td>
<td>cf. 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>beatus Paulus apostolus ... epistolam scriptum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Rodam</td>
<td>cf. 595, 597</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>insulam Rodam</td>
<td>=51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>Roda</td>
<td>=51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Ioppren [=from Joppa']</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>Ioppren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>78-79</td>
<td>vento contrario et valido</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>vento valido et contrario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>omni spe evadendi privati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>omni spe evadendi privati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>omni spe evadendi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>coram oculis nostris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>coram oculis nostris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>92-93</td>
<td>expansis in almum manibus plaudite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>581-82</td>
<td>extensis in almum velis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>95-96</td>
<td>sit nomen eius benedictum ex hoc nunc et [usque in saeculum benedictus dominus, qui non amovit [deprecationem meam et misericordiam [suam a me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Quid plura</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Quid plura</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>107-08</td>
<td>clamorem populi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>115-16</td>
<td>Clamorem etenim populi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>111-12</td>
<td>corpora ... innumerabilia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>corpora ... innumerabilia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>hominum utiusque sexus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>homines ... diversi sexus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>112-13</td>
<td>miserrime ... minutatim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>miserrime ... minutatim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>(navibus) ... oneratis palmariis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>(naves) ... palmariis oneratae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>146-47</td>
<td>ab ... sui gratia eripuit me dominus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>582-83</td>
<td>ab ... sui gratia eripuit nos dominus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>151-52</td>
<td>Sarraceni, insidias ... tendentes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>572-74</td>
<td>Sarraceni ... insidias ... tendendo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>nusquam apparent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>nusquam apparat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 165 multi ... perimuntur cf. 421-22
2 421-22 maxima pars ... perempta cf. 165

2 174 digne et iustae see 337 Praefatio
2 337 dignum et iustum cf. 174 missae

2 180-81 muro fortissimo circumcinctum cf. 482
2 482 castello fortissimo circumcinctur cf. 180-81

2 208 testantibus Assirriis =322-323, 374-75
2 322-23 testantibus Assyriis =208
2 374-75 Assyriis testantibus =208
2 491 testantibus loci incolis cf. 208
3 608 testantibus Grecis =622, cf. 208
3 622 testantibus Grecis =608, cf. 208

2 218 Calvarium cf. 501, 585
2 501 Cesaream Palestinam =559, cf. 585, 218
3 559 Cesarea Palestina 'see note on 501'
3 585 Syriam Palestinam cf. 501, 218

2 270-71 quantum arcusbalista bis iactare potest cf. 355-56, 405-06, 270-71
2 355-56 quantum arcusbalista ter vel quater proicere potest cf. 270-71

2 405-06 quantum arcusbalista bis vel ter iactare potest =270-71
3 615-16 ut arcusbalista bis vel ter proicere potest cf. 270-71

2 351-52 ... quantum iactus est lapidis. ' cf. 373, 573 Luke 22:41
2 373 quantum est iactus lapidis =351-52
3 573 quantum iactus est sagittae =351-52, 373

2 359 antiquitus facta =481-82, 515
2 481-82 antiquitus facta =359
2 515 antiquitus constructa =359

2 376 a paganis omnino ... destructa =407-08, cf. 410-11
2 407-08 omnino ... a paganis destructa =376
2 410-11 a paganis in desolationem posita cf. 407-08 (376)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>376-77</td>
<td>a paganis omnino est destructa, sicut omnes [aecclesiae sunt extra murum Ibi nichil a Sarracenis est remissum habitabile,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>426-28</td>
<td>cf. 376-77 [sed omnia devastata sicut in aliis omnibus [sanctis locis extra murum civitatem Ierusalem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>394-96</td>
<td>ubi dominus Iesus quinque panes et duos =527-29 [pisces benedixit et postea quattuor milia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=94-96 [hominum inde saturavit, sicut in evangeli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[legitur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>527-29</td>
<td>John 6:8-10 ubi dominus piscantibus discipulis aderat, =394-96 [sicit evangeli um testatur... dominus Iesus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[saturavit quinque milia hominum ex [quinque panibus et duobus piscibus, ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>410-11</td>
<td>a paganis in desolationem posita =424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>=411 in desolationem... dimissum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>417-18</td>
<td>pulcherrimum et maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>cf. 417-18 maxima et pulcherrima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>=534 est dimissum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>cf. 424 est remissum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>=535 quasi in medio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>=431 quasi in medio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>=554 Mare Adriaticum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>=465 Adriatici Maris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>537-38</td>
<td>=612-13 habentes Nazareth in dextris, Galileam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[autem in sinistris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>612-13</td>
<td>=537-38 habens Greciam in dextra, Macedoniam in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[sinistra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>=546 rapidissimus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>=542 cursu rapidissimo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>564-65 pertranseentes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>564-65</td>
<td>has civitates pertransivimus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Section 1 = II. 1-169; Section 2 = II. 170-550; Section 3 = II. 551-622.
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