**The Pilgrim, the Book, and the World: Understanding and Devotion in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College Library MS 426**

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College Library MS 426 is a small, not particularly striking, fifteenth-century manuscript that brings together a number of texts that relate to geography, the Holy Land and, specifically, Jerusalem pilgrimage with an unusual circular map of Jerusalem and surrounds. The manuscript has never previously been studied in any detail. Yet this is a particularly interesting manuscript: one of the texts within it, referred to in M. R. James’ 1912 catalogue as ‘tract without title,’ has not been identified or discussed elsewhere.[[1]](#footnote-1) It also contains a unique abridgement of the medieval geographical ‘bestseller,’ *The Book of Sir John Mandeville*, and, while medieval maps of Jerusalem are not common, that in MS 426 is of an apparently unique design. The fact that the known texts included within the volume are either late copies, incomplete, or abridgements has no doubt contributed to its neglect by scholars generally more concerned with reconstructing original or authorial versions than with the study of their reception. The map’s superficial resemblance to known circular Jerusalem maps may also have led to the mistaken apprehension that it also derivative: merely a less well-produced example of a familiar genre. However, MS 426 offers us rare insights into the interaction between pilgrimage writing and geography, the reception of cosmographical and geographical thought, and geographical textual production in fifteenth-century England.

This article will interpret MS 426 as a kind of pilgrim’s book, produced by or for a learned reader, knowledgeable about what David Woodward has termed the “scholarly mathematical geography” of the world as taught in Universities and curious as to the place of the Holy Land within it.[[2]](#footnote-2) An assemblage intentionally selected, adapted, bound and used together, the manuscript is the product of a conscious process of selection and design, and provides evidence of the thought processes behind that selection. As geographical historian Patrick Gautier Dalché reminds us, scholars of medieval geographical thought have historically overlooked the significance of such works in their too hasty dismissal of the supposedly intellectually derivative practices of extracting, glossing, and anthologizing the texts of earlier writers. Dalché points out that “la pratique de l’extrait, de la glose est une opération qui met en jeu la réflexion et souvent la critique de celui qui s’y livre. Ce n’est pas au hasard que l’on choisit et que l’on organise des extraits: c’est toujours selon une intention, pour faire correspondre le récit à une image mentale.”[[3]](#footnote-3) This article will examine the processes of selection and organization of the geographical and pilgrimage material in MS 426 to illuminate the types of reflection and critique to which they bear evidence, and, ultimately, the mental image of the world to which they correspond. It will show how the manuscript works to harmonize the understanding of sacred topography generated through the practice and textualization of holy land pilgrimage with the most recent syntheses of scholarly mathematical geography.

 Recent scholarship on texts and maps associated with medieval pilgrimage has focused increasingly on the notions of virtual pilgrimage, spiritual pilgrimage, or imagined pilgrimage, in which representations of the pilgrimage process, or Jerusalem and its buildings, or even entirely different buildings and sites elsewhere in the world, might allow a would-be pilgrim to participate vicariously in pilgrimage without leaving home. Much work in this field thus far has focused on virtual pilgrimage as a licit alternative to physical pilgrimage for members of enclosed monastic orders, for whom pilgrimage was either considered undesirable or outright forbidden.[[4]](#footnote-4) But scholars have also pointed to evidence of virtual, imagined, or spiritual pilgrimage as viable alternatives to physical Jerusalem pilgrimage for many laypeople.[[5]](#footnote-5) We do not know the name, social status, or religious affiliation of the designer of MS 426. However, its texts bear witness to and incorporate recent astronomical and cosmographical scholarship, suggesting a manuscript produced for or by someone trained in and familiar with the language and methods for the geometrical study of the globe elaborated through the University Arts curriculum.[[6]](#footnote-6) This article thus extends our conception of the kinds of individuals who engaged in the processes of virtual, imagined, or spiritual pilgrimage in the fifteenth century, the kinds of books that they used to do so, and the kinds of intellectual and cognitive experiences that this set of terms can encompass. MS 426 offers evidence for a form of vicarious pilgrimage that could link the intellectual with the devotional. It provides an idiosyncratic, highly personalized testament to a harmonizing vision of pilgrimage and geography in which to understand the world cosmographically, and to travel vicariously around its holy places, is to worship that world’s creator.

 This article will first introduce the manuscript, before turning to discuss the way that two of its texts in particular — the *Mandeville* and the anonymous treatise — are adapted and presented. Through consideration of the practices of extraction, abridgement, placement of extracts, and annotation to which the manuscript bears witness, we can get a sense of how these texts were intended to work together as mutually complementary and enlightening. The article then turns to the unique Jerusalem map towards the end of the volume. I identify the map’s likely sources, before considering its likely intended function within the wider miscellany.

*The Manuscript*

Corpus Christi College Cambridge, MS 426, vol. II (hereafter MS 426), is the second of a two-volume item listed as a single manuscript in library printed and online catalogues. However, there is no connection between the two volumes other than the shelfmark and size (14cm x 20cm), and the fact that they were placed together in the early modern period, as an early modern Italic note on the verso of fol. iv in vol. 1 makes clear. This is likely due to its collector Archbishop Matthew Parker’s known habit of assembling unconnected volumes on the basis of size.[[7]](#footnote-7) A quire signature at the foot of the first folio with the numbering “d i” indicates three quires (or 36 leaves) worth of missing material at the start. However, the early addition of a blessing formula appropriate to the opening of a volume in a fifteenth-century gothic display script at the top of the first folio, above and in addition to the opening rubric for the Bacon “Tractatus” that opens the manuscript, suggests that the Roger Bacon extract was the first text in the manuscript from a very early stage in its life.[[8]](#footnote-8)

 As it now stands, MS 426 is, as it has been from an early stage in its existence, a coherent codex of texts that were created to belong together (Table 1):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | fols 84r - 133rpaper | Roger Bacon, Tractatus fratris Rogeri Bacon in quinta parte mathamatice de situ orbis(Roger Bacon on Geography, from Book 5 of the *Opus Maius*) |
| 2 | fols 133r -138rpaper | Beda Sanctus presbiter venerabilis de situ terre sancte(Bede, *De locis sanctis*) |
| 3 | fols. 138r-154vpaper | Iohannes Maundevile de itinere et de situ terre sancte(Extracts from *Mandeville’s Travels*) |
| 4 | 154v | Secundum Sanctum Jeronimum epistola 50 ad Dardanum (Note on the dimensions of the Holy Land) |
| 5 | fol. 155rparchment | Map of Jerusalem  |
| 6 | 155v | Urbis situs (Note on the situation of Jerusalem, probably from Ranulph Higden’s *Polychronicon*)[[9]](#footnote-9) |
| 7 | fol. 156r- 158vparchment | Secundum Ptholomeum una linea(Cosmographical tract) |

An examination of the presentation and hand in the manuscript clarifies immediately that items 1, 2, 3 and 4 form an intentionally matched volume of six quires. Parchment tabs pasted onto the right hand margins of fols 84r and 138r enable readers to find the Bacon and Mandeville texts particularly easily. These texts are written — with the exception of marginal notes — in secretary script within a frame ruling of closely similar dimensions (8.5 x 13.5-14cms), at between 32 and 34 lines per page, on a single paper stock.[[10]](#footnote-10) The principal secretary script resembles hands of the mid-to-later fifteenth-century and, at its best, combines currency with elegant, angular and calligraphic secretary forms, but is often written in a more hurried and basic way.[[11]](#footnote-11) There is a possible change of hand at fol.132r, where, towards the end of the Roger Bacon sections, the writing abruptly becomes smaller and slightly more flourished part way down the page.[[12]](#footnote-12) Generally, though, the change in handwriting is gradual, and is broadly in the direction of becoming less well-executed, formal, and calligraphic as each text, and the manuscript as a whole, progresses. Given that only the Roger Bacon extract that opens the volume is decorated (blue initials with red flourishing), and foliated with an original medieval foliation, this is consistent with a change in the perceived status or function of the manuscript part-way through its production, and a consequent decision to expend less resources on its production, while nonetheless visually matching the texts within it as closely as possible.

These first six quires feature contemporary marginal notes throughout, some of which appear to be in the hand of the text, while others appear to be in closely similar, but not identical hand (or hands; sample sizes are often not sufficient to be definitive here).[[13]](#footnote-13) These quires are also peppered with marginal upright and inverted noting symbols that resemble flags, almost certainly added by a contemporary annotator.

 While the unity of items 1-4 is clear from an immediate examination, the relationship of this section with the seventh quire is harder to determine. The map of Jerusalem, dated by art historians on the basis of its iconography and decoration to the third or fourth quarter of the fifteenth century, the note on the Urbis situs on its verso, and the anonymous treatise op “Secundum Phtolemeum” are contained into a quire of four parchment leaves, of which the outer bifolium is a tougher, and outwardly dirtier membrane than the slightly softer and whiter innards.[[14]](#footnote-14) It has been bound into the codex after the *Mandeville* and the pasted-down stub of the missing final folio of the preceding quire. The hand of the map inscriptions differs significantly from the main text hand in the rest of the manuscript: an often irregular attempt to produce a calligraphic display script, with gothic spacing and many gothic forms but some secretary features.[[15]](#footnote-15) While there are occasional examples of attempts to emulate elements of gothic display script in rubrics and headers in the rest of the volume, it is not possible to definitively link the map’s inscriptions to any other examples of handwriting in the rest of the volume, not least because the sample sizes of each are so small and letter forms irregular.[[16]](#footnote-16)

 While the map inscriptions cannot be linked to the text, we can nonetheless be confident that it was intended for the final quire, where a single folio was left unruled to accommodate it, and that the quire was intentionally matched to the rest of the volume. While the frame ruling of the text sections of the final quire is of marginally different dimensions to that in the rest of the manuscript (8.5 x 14.5), it was done in crayon of the same color. Moreover, the hand that writes both the “Urbis situs” note on the verso of the map and the short cosmographical tract beginning “Secundum Phtolomeum” is likely the same hand as that found in the *Mandeville* that precedes it. The writing is very similar and, while simpler, more rapidly writable letter forms predominate in in the final manuscript quire, none of these forms are not *also* found in the quires containing Bede, Mandeville, and Bacon. Indeed, most variation in the hand between this and the preceding quire is likely due to compression; the scribe has crammed between 37 and 39 lines to each page in the final quire, compared to the 32-34 lines found earlier in the manuscript. This was likely intended to ensure that he could fit too long a text into the two bifolia available, as is evidenced by the exceptional levels of compression towards the foot of folio 159v. Two final pieces of evidence testify to these quires being together from a very early moment in their lives. All wormholes at the end of the sixth quire line up precisely with those in the seventh, and lightly inked versions of the inverted marginal flags that annotate the rest of the codex also appear in the margins of the final folio of the final quire (fol. 158v). Bearing all this evidence in mind, I treat this manuscript as one designed, whether by its scribe(s) or commissioner, as a coherent unit of texts intended to complement one another.

 *Textual Adaptations*

From the choice and treatment of the texts in MS 426 it is clear that we are dealing with a volume that was either conceived of as a Holy Land miscellany or begun to be adapted to perform that function early in its production process. As I have outlined, the manuscript begins with Bacon’s discussion of geography from the *Opus maius*,a work produced at the instigation of Clement IV after 1266 to set out Bacon’s program for the reform of learning within the Church, in the context of the immanent coming of the antichrist and apocalypse.[[17]](#footnote-17) Although this text is not the focus of this article, it is worth highlighting Bacon’s stated aims in producing his detailed geography, and considering how the material text of MS 426 meets them. Bacon’s text is well known for making the case for the utility of geography for Christian purposes. As Woodward and Hackett have sketched out, while Bacon is concerned with the practical uses of geography — which include the furthering of Christian missions and preparation for the coming of the Antichrist — he also stresses its importance in the correct interpretation of scripture.[[18]](#footnote-18) Correct spiritual understanding of scripture and sacred topography is dependent on accurate place location (through latitude and longitude) and description:

Qui vero imaginationem bonam locorum habuerit, et situm eorum et distantiam et altitudinem et longitudinem latitudinem et profundum cognoverit, necnon et diversitatem eorum [...] et optime placebit ei historia literalis, et de facili atque magnifice poterit ingredi ad intelligentiam sensuum spiritualium. Non enim est dubium quin viae corporales significent vias spirituales, et loca corporalia significent terminos viarum spiritualium et convenientiam locorum spiritualium[.][[19]](#footnote-19)

Following this logic, when his description reaches the Holy Land, Bacon states that he will describe the holy places — sites first trodden by the patriarchs, Christ, his mother, and the apostles — with particular care.[[20]](#footnote-20) And indeed, a visibly significantly greater density of marginal finding notes (for places) and flags (for sites and stories of interest) pepper the margins of this section, attesting the manuscript’s adaptation for the purpose of better geographical understanding of the literal sense of scripture.[[21]](#footnote-21) The texts of Bede’s *De locis sanctis* and *Mandeville*, which follow on directly from the Bacon and on which I focus below, take this aim further.

 *The* Mandeville *Extracts*

MS 426’s text of the *Book of Sir John Mandeville* is an abbreviated and abridged version of what is known in *Mandeville* scholarship as the Royal Latin text, which is itself a translation of the early — possibly original — Insular French version, and was probably produced in final years of the fourteenth century.[[22]](#footnote-22) While the Royal version does not appear to have circulated very widely — Seymour notes seven manuscripts, not counting MS 426 — it is a very full text, faithfully translating its insular source and not subject to the kinds of textual losses that affected the widely-read contemporary Middle English Defective Version.[[23]](#footnote-23)

In its earliest French forms, *The Book of Sir John Mandeville* (c.1356) purports to record the journeys of the eponymous English knight to Jerusalem, around the Eastern Mediterranean, through Central Asia, around the Indian Ocean, and to China, but pausing along the way to survey the regions through which the traveler’s imagined journey passes. It draws on topographical, historical, and pilgrims’ accounts for the description of the Holy Land that, according to the *Book*’s prologue, is its primary purpose.[[24]](#footnote-24) But more than half the *Book* in its full form is devoted to an equally widely-researched, purportedly first-person account of the “many diverse kingdoms, countries, and isles in the eastern part of the world, where live different kinds of men and animals, and many other marvelous things.”[[25]](#footnote-25) This unsignalled mid-point change in direction, combined with its generically diverse source material, create a generically slippery work. Indeed, Iain M. Higgins has persuasively termed it a “medieval multi-text,” in part on the basis of the internal generic multiplicity that has led to widely divergent perceptions of it by both medieval and modern readers.[[26]](#footnote-26)

 The adapter of the Royal version of *Mandeville* for its new context in MS 426 reacts against this generic multiplicity by reshaping the text in a way much more closely focused on pilgrimage and its object: the Holy Land. Moreover, the adapter shows an interest, unrivalled in any other adaptations from the period, in how the land the text describes relates to its wider cosmological context.

The choice of selections made by the adapter is revealing. The bulk of MS 426’s text is broadly equivalent to chapters 1-15 in C.W.R.D. Moseley’s widely-available modern English translation, meaning that it covers “the Holy Land and the countries around, the ways thither, and to Mount Sinai, to Babylon and other places.”[[27]](#footnote-27) He also includes a little of the start of Chapter 16, which offers an overview of the eastern and southern regions of the world, divided by the four rivers of paradise. However, the adapter has clearly *read* the whole text; towards the end of the extracts on the Holy Land, he leaps ahead by four chapters to Mandeville’s account of Lamory (Sumatra). Disregarding this chapter’s description of the island and its people (with the exception of the nugget that they “comedunt carnes humanas libencius quam alias” (eat human flesh with greater pleasure than others: fol. 153v), MS 426 then focuses on what Higgins has called the text’s “cosmographical excursus:” a digression that “places the portrait of the eastern world into a larger ideological framework.”[[28]](#footnote-28) This idiosyncratic excursus, compressed slightly in MS 426, uses astronomical observation to demonstrate how many degrees of the earth’s circumference the traveler has seen; that England’s antipodes (imagined as the lands of Prester John) are inhabited; and that it is possible to “go all round the world, above and below and return to [one’s] own country,” finding inhabited regions at every point on the way.[[29]](#footnote-29) It discusses astronomers’ division of the world into seven climes, corresponding to seven planets, noting the exclusion from this schema both of the British Isles in the far west and the lands of Prester John in the Far East, which are instead to be attributed to the moon. Particularly pertinent for the adapter, though, the excursus also places Jerusalem at the center of the world and demonstrates its centrality by both experience and scripture.[[30]](#footnote-30)

The *Mandeville* in MS 426 witnesses a range of adaptations to its source text. While added marginal guide notes draw attention to the text’s function as guide to the routes taken by its eponymous pilgrim, the main change that the adapter makes is abridgement.[[31]](#footnote-31) A rough categorization of the abridgements made shows a pattern of cuts principally in the following areas: myths and legends, including Christian myths and legends associated with specific (and often apocryphal) holy sites; biblical stories; contemporary and historical political information on the near and far east; ethnographic detail, marvels, and, perhaps most surprisingly, practical information that would have been of use to pilgrims.

One of the main types of cuts that the adapter makes is to details of apocryphal Christian sites and associated miracles, along with other mythological sites. Falling victim to this are: the bones of a giant, Andromeda, in Joppa/Jaffa (Royal 13 E IX fol. 42r; MS 426 fol. 139v); the Fosse of Mynon: a pit of gravel whipped up by the wind with the power to turn metal into glass (42r/ 140r); the story of Alexander and the Trees of the Sun and moon; the identification of the pyramids as Joseph’s barns (43v; 140v); many miracles of St Katherine of Sinai (45r; 141r); legends associated with Mt Etna (44v; 140v); the place where Joseph of Arimathea washed Jesus’ wounds (47r; 144r) the tree that grew on the night the Blessed Virgin Mary conceived (48r; 144v); the writing still visible on a stone where Jesus taught the apostles the Pater Noster (49r; 146v); the stone stained with the milk of the Blessed Virgin Mary (46r; 141r). The result is a text shorn of exactly the kind of popular and entertaining religious wonders and legends for which it is most widely known.

That the abridgement also dispenses with information of political significance is perhaps not such a surprise; after all, information about the organization of the court and power of the Sultan of Egypt and the influence of the Great Khan (42r-45v; 140r-141v) produced by *Mandeville*’s thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century sourcescenturies had long since lost its relevance. However, the eradication of material potentially of practical use to travelling pilgrims is more of a surprise. Such omissions include: the distance from Venice to Acre (42r; 140r); precise information about potential routes through Italy (44v; fol. 140v); that one does not travel through the desert by horse (44v; 141r); information on interpreters and the need to take provisions (44v; 141r). And, while an account of St Katherine of Sinai is retained, information about the Bedouins a pilgrim might expect to encounter along the route is not (45v; 141v).

 While the adapter clearly prioritizes this multi-text’s function as a guide to Jerusalem pilgrimage, the edits give a sense of the kind of pilgrimage work the resulting adaptation was intended to perform. The adapter cuts down considerably on stories attached to places, whether these are biblical or historical digressions, or apocryphal stories that might prompt devotion. Also particularly noticeable is the removal of references to sites and stories intended to trigger affective forms of devotion to Christ’s wounds, or to the Virgin Mary. But neither is it a practically useful account, given that information that might reasonably be of use to a potential pilgrim has been stripped out. What remains is quite a sober and sparse account of journeys around the Holy sites. The version also relies more than its source on prior knowledge on the part of the reader, since biblical and historical stories associated with the places mentioned are often culled, though references to the sites or persons to which they pertain remain.

The treatment of the final *Mandeville* excerpt in the volume, the “Cosmographical excursus,” on the other hand, serves quite a different function: to put the text into global perspective. Following *Mandeville*’sdiscussion of the shape and navigability of the world and the centrality of Jerusalem, the compiler, without any paratextual signal, runs the *Mandeville* text directly into two further notes, this time not taken from the Royal version. While the second of these is simply a short note on the dimensions of the Holy Land repurposed from a letter of St Jerome to Dardanus, the first endeavors to situate the geography sketched out in the cosmographical excursus within the context of mathematical geography. [[32]](#footnote-32) After — following the Royal version — attributing to certain “astronomi,” including Ptolemy, the belief that the islands of the far west and far east, including England, lie outside the seven climes but under the influence of the moon, the adapter starts to deviate significantly from his Royal Latin source. He adds:

Quantitas rotunditatis terre est milaria 20040. Quantitas diametri circuli terre est miliarum 6491. Et sic a centro terre ad superficiem sunt milaria 3245 et aliqua minuta, ex quo patet quot milaria sunt ad Infernum ponendo infernum in centro terre.[[33]](#footnote-33)

While the “gross underestimate” of the circumference of the earth here derives from Arab philosopher al-Farghānī (Alfreganus), both this and the following calculations were almost certainly taken by the compiler from the early-fifteenth century works of the philosopher and cosmographer, Cardinal Pierre d’Ailly, though the use of the information to calculate the distance between the surface of the earth and hell appears to be original.[[34]](#footnote-34) .

 The adapter of the version of *Mandeville* in MS426, then, reframes and fundamentally repurposes his inherited text. A newly pared-down, de-mythologised, *Mandeville* puts forward a sober account of the Holy Land and Holy City that is placed firmly in the context of global and regional geography. What emerges is a more streamlined pilgrimage account, but something of the work’s multi-textual nature is lost in the process. Moreover, when the editor strips out references to places where Joseph of Arimathea washed Christ’s wounds, or to the physical evidence for Mary’s breastfeeding of Christ, he removes some of the text’s prompts to affective forms of devotion to the humanity of Christ and his mother, making it quite unlike many known virtual pilgrimage texts from its era, which tend to work through an interplay between journey and memory (of a previous visit, or of prior knowledge through stories), and between the virtual experience and affective forms of devotion.[[35]](#footnote-35) Through the cosmographical and geographical notes appended to it, the text is instead connected to a scientifically understood, geometrical global vision.

*The Anonymous Cosmographical Tract: “Secundum Ptholomeum”*

The final text in MS 426, the hitherto unstudied anonymous cosmographical tract, goes further than selecting extracts and placing them side by side, as we see at the end of the *Mandeville.* In it, we see rare evidence of an attempt to synthesize the God’s-eye worldview of scholarly, mathematical geography with the pseudo-empirical observations on Holy Land sites provided through *The Book of Sir John Mandeville*.

 The tract, like the sections on the measurement of the earth that bookend the *Mandeville* extracts two folios earlier, draws silently on the work of Pierre d’Ailly, whose *Imago mundi* over the course of the fifteenth century became a “standard text book,” and whose collected cosmographical and astronomical works were eventually printed by John of Paderborn (or Westphalia), printer for Louvain University, between 1477 and 1483.[[36]](#footnote-36) The text’s principal sources are d’Ailly’s *De concordantia discordantia astronomorum* and his *Epilogus mappae mundi*. While the latter is a short summary cosmography appended to d’Ailly’s *Imago mundi* of 1410 and treating such matters as the heavens, years, hours, days, movement of the planets and the extent of the earth and sea, the former is a more technical astronomical and astrological work. The *De concordantia* discusses the influence of the stars on the earth, including how planetary conjunctions coincide with significant events and how dominant zodiacal signs shape the characteristics of peoples. But above all it argues for the influence of triplicities — divisions of the zodiac according to four elements — and in particular shifts between triplicities, on earthly events.[[37]](#footnote-37) In the anonymous treatise in MS 426, however, the extracts from the compiler’s source texts are used to quite different ends.

The treatise begins by sketching out the extent of the habitable world in longitude and latitude, with reference to scientific authorities (notably the second-century Alexandrian, Claudius Ptolemy). It argues for the influence of ruling triplicities and planets on specific areas and groups (e.g. the Christians of the North East are under Aries, Leo and Sagittarius), and that the ruling sign of a people can be detected from their customs, manners, and behaviors. Thus the wrathful nature of the Germans is attributed to Aries and Spanish skill at arms to Sagittarius (fol. 156v; *De concordantia,* sig. hh4v). Drawing on the *Epilogus* —which in turn draws on Roger Bacon — the text then moves on to discuss the division of the habitable world by astronomers into seven climes, and, like the *Mandeville* extracts in the preceding section, to discuss the existence of inhabited lands and cities beyond these, including below the equinoctial line (fol. 157v).[[38]](#footnote-38)

After a discussion, again drawing silently on the *Epilogus*, of the extent and disposition of the oceans, the treatise compiler performs a surprising twist.[[39]](#footnote-39) He first follows Pierre d’Ailly and certain other cosmographers and theologians who, having established that the area under the equinoctial circle is very temperate and habitable, consider whether this “loco temperatissimo” might be the location of the “prima habitacio” of humankind: that is, the terrestrial paradise.[[40]](#footnote-40) This is a question on which, in his *Compendium cosmographiae*, the Cardinal chooses to follow the lead of Roger Bacon and refuse to give a firm ruling.[[41]](#footnote-41) But the anonymous treatise author is not so hesitant. Adam was sent from Paradise, he tells us, according to Genesis, to till the earth from which he was created. According to various histories this was “in agro damasceno,” where Cain also killed his brother Abel, and near which Adam and Eve were buried in the “spelunca duplici” (double cave). This field, according to the treatise, is “in valle Mambre iuxta Ebron ad orientem, sic dictus a damasco servo Abraae sicut scribunt cosmographi” (in the valley of Mambre near Hebron towards the East, thus named after Damascus, servant of Abraham, as the cosmographers write: fol. 157v).

While the different elements in this section derive ultimately from a range of sources, most of the information on the “ager damascene” compiled here is, prior to the production date of this manuscript, found gathered together only in *The Book of Sir John Mandeville*.[[42]](#footnote-42) Indeed, potential sources for this are to be found in MS 426 itself; the “spelunca duplex, vel caverna vel fossa duplex” (double cave, cavern or grave), and a “caverna” nearby where Adam and Eve dwelt following their ejection from Paradise; the identification of the place as the “ager damascenus” (Damascene Field) into which he had been ejected from paradise and from which he was subsequently “translatus in paradiso” (taken up into paradise) and its location as at the beginning of the Valley of Hebron (“ibi incipit vallis Ebron”) all appear on fol. 142r, while the information that “Eleazar, procurator domus Abrahee” (overseer of the house of Abraham) founded the city of Damascus is on fol. 151r. While missing from the Latin versions in Royal 13 E IX and MS 426, the tradition that Damascus is named after Abraham’s servant, and that Cain slew Abel there is nonetheless recorded in other versions of Mandeville’s *Book* .[[43]](#footnote-43) Reflecting, then, on the evidence he has collated and interpreted, the treatise author locates the “ager Damascenus” and thus the First Habitation of humankind in the region of Hebron. He then locates this region geometrically (around the tropic of Cancer), estimates its size (eight degrees, or 453 miles), and situates it in terms of distance and direction in relation to Jerusalem, Bethlehem and other Holy Land cities.

 The final section of the “Secundum Ptholomeum” treatise, then, performs a parallel move to the closing sections of the *Mandeville* text in the previous quire. Just as, in the previous quire, *Mandeville*’s Holy Land is recontextualized within the worldview of scholarly mathematical geography, so the synthesis of scholarly mathematical world geography in “Secundum Ptholomeum” is placed into dialogue with pilgrims’ empirically observed topography of the Holy Land, and the archaeological traces that it bears. Indeed, such Christian topography is treated as an essential part of cosmography; cosmographical authorities are, it is implied, negligent and inaccurate if they do not take into account empirical descriptions of the region. In its evident concern to correctly locate the Terrestrial Paradise in a manner that harmonizes with both scripture and empirical, archaeological evidence, moreover, the treatise is putting into practice the theory outlined by Roger Bacon at the opening of the volume: that the principal use of geography to Christians is to enable the correct understanding of scripture in the literal sense. Thus a detailed account of the distances between and latitudes and longitudes of sites in the Holy Land becomes a natural and essential complement to, if not the culmination of, the God’s-eye view of the globe and its inhabited parts with which the treatise begins. Scholarly mathematical geography is placed in the service of a better, more multi-dimensional understanding of the Holy Land within an ordered cosmos.

*The Jerusalem Map*

We have seen how MS 426 carefully assembles and adapts a range of texts into a compendium that unites a conception of the world understood in scholarly, mathematical, geometrical terms with focus on the detailed chorography of the Holy Land. The focus of the compendium is on understanding the world, the Holy Land, and the literal sense of scripture, and. Through its form, the volume models the indivisibility of these concerns for its compiler. I want to turn now to the unique map of Jerusalem and surrounds that opens the final parchment quire at the end of the volume (Fig. 1). As we shall see, the map shows evidence of a similar set of synthetic mental processes at work to those witnessed by the textual extracts in the same volume. However, I want to argue that this map, uniquely in the volume, acts not just as a prompt to understanding, as do the textual items in the volume, but to contemplation and devotion. As Gautier Dalché has pointed out with reference to medieval world maps, no texts exist that tell us explicitly how these were used as prompts or aids to contemplation, but it is nonetheless possible to establish “la réalité de la méditation cartographique et découvrir les conditions idéologiques de sa réalization effective” (the reality of cartographic meditation and to uncover the ideological conditions of its actual realization) by beginning from the maps themselves.[[44]](#footnote-44) Victoria Morse, however, cautions that to uncover these “ideological conditions”, we need to approach medieval maps “not as transparent windows into their creators’ and users’ minds, but as rhetorically constructed documents belonging to specific times and specific contexts.”[[45]](#footnote-45) To begin to get a sense of the range of functions, including the proposed contemplative function, that this map was intended to perform, we need then to consider its relationship to two contexts. This section will thus begin by considering the rhetorical context: the cartographic traditions on which the mapmaker was able to draw to present his synthetic vision of Jerusalem within the Holy Land. It then shows how elements of the map’s construction suggest that it was intended, partly through interaction with the other texts in the manuscript codex, to prompt the user, through active engagement, to transform understanding of the Holy Land, its topography, and its place in the world into devotion. [Add fig 1 as close to here as possible. Caption: Figure 1: Map of Jerusalem and surrounds, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College Library, MS 426. 155r. Reproduced by kind permission of the Parker Library, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.]

 The map in MS 426 (Fig. 1) shows Jerusalem as a circular, walled and crenellated city set within the wider Christian topography of the Holy Land.[[46]](#footnote-46) The eastern coastline of the Mediterranean is implied but not delineated at the foot of the folio, where “port chaf” (Jaffa) is marked, while the east is towards the top. Jerusalem is depicted as having seven gates, all of which are identified by name (Table 2 below). The map identifies different sites of significance to pilgrims within the city, most of which are identified with labels: the “sepulchrum domini” (tomb of the Lord), placed centrally in the city; the “templum,” probably intended, given its location, to represent the “templum Salomonis,” the name given by Crusaders to the al-Aqsa Mosque;[[47]](#footnote-47) the Probatica Piscina (Pool of Bethesda) miracle site, represented as a small, plummet circle that has not subsequently been lined over in ink; the “hospitale,” or hospital of St John, where pilgrims would have stayed. One church on the south side of the city lacking an inscription may be intended to represent the Latin Church, which is represented in a nearby location on the so-called “Crusader” maps discussed below.[[48]](#footnote-48) Sites of significance to pilgrims are also dotted in the empty folio space around the city. To the east are the house of Martha; the church of the Magdalene; churches at the sites where Christ prayed and wept (Mount of Olives); the location where Mary was buried. To the south, one finds the “domus Anne,” the road to Jericho, Mount Syon, and the Tower of David. To the west are located, in addition to Jaffa, a building marked “Samuel,” indicating the tomb of the prophet on Mount Joy; Emmaus, “Rama civitas,” and “Sancti Georgii,” indicating the Church of St George at Lydda.

Iconographically, it is important to note that the drawings representing sites are not ideograms, but varied, with no two churches represented in the same way and a not unrealistic hospice gatehouse alongside the inscription “hospitale.” Similarly, the change in the angle of the depiction of the crenellations and gates between the eastern and western sides of the city indicates a partial attempt at perspective, clearly aiming at the illusion of looking down, from above and slightly to the west, not on a symbol or ideogram, but on a physical city.[[49]](#footnote-49)

 There are several indications that the map is not quite finished: two churches lack inscriptions, while the plummet circle of the Probatica Piscina has not been lined over in ink. There are also, as will be discussed further below, a number of other plummet lines on the map connecting holy sites around the map. Two of these are marked with inscriptions: the “via ad Iericho” to the South and the “via ad sepulchrum” within the city. The labels indicate that these lines formed an integral part of the map, and it is likely that they were intended to be inked over, a process that was never completed.

MS 426 is, of course, not unusual in depicting a walled, circular Jerusalem. In an illuminating recent article, Hannah Vorholt has distinguished three broad designs of circular maps of Jerusalem circulating by the thirteenth century, which would potentially have been available to the mapmaker.[[50]](#footnote-50) The first group are the so-called “Crusader” maps produced and copied principally in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (Figs 2 and 3). The city is shown schematically, with five gates, separated into quarters by straight roads, and with key holy sites — the Holy Sepulchre, the Temple of the Lord, the temple of Solomon, Calvary, Golgotha, the Probatica Piscina — marked. Significant sites around the city are also depicted, notably Mount Joy, Bethlehem, Bethany, Mount Sion, the church (or tomb) where Mary was buried. Jerusalem and surrounds are represented as a region of pilgrimage, as well as marked out by crusade; the Brussels MS 9823-4 map represents groups pilgrims treading the paths that the map delineates between different gates of the city and holy sites beyond. As Pnina Arad observes, these maps present a “fusion between earthly and heavenly [the heavenly Jerusalem implied by their circular form] and between past and present.”[[51]](#footnote-51) [Add figs 2 and 3 as close to here as possible. Captions: Figure 2: ‘Crusader’ Map of Jerusalem. circa 1190–1200; with additions circa 1290–1300). Koninglijke Bibliotheek, Den Haag, National Library of the Netherlands, KB 76 F 5, fol. 1r. Figure 3: ‘Crusader’ Map of Jerusalem (later twelfth century). Brussels, Bibliothèque royale de Belgique, MS 9823-9824, fol. 157r.]

The second broad design that Vorholt discusses originates in the late twelfth century with the schematic plan designed by Peter of Poitiers, following Peter Comestor, for the diagrammatical chronicle *Compendium historiae in genealogia Christi*. This schematic map (Fig. 4) accompanies an account of the rebuilding of Jerusalem after the Israelites return from exile, though it follows Peter Comestor’s account of the city planned by Solomon, and not the biblical narrative.[[52]](#footnote-52) Maps following this general design show a city with six gates (of special significance for Comestor) and three concentric circles marking the living areas of the king and the priests, of the nobles and the prophets, and of the people.[[53]](#footnote-53) They present Jerusalem as a kind of idealized but historical space: an Old Testament Jerusalem whose orderly perfection prefigures the Heavenly City.[[54]](#footnote-54) Peter of Poitiers’ compendium was frequently copied; the plan enjoyed a wide distribution in the thirteenth century and was adapted in other diagrammatic or illustrated chronicles. It forms the basis, as Andrea Worm has shown, of depictions of Jerusalem in the *Rudimentum novitiorum* 1475 (Fig. 5), and in Hartman Schedel’s *Liber Chronicarum* of 1493. In the *Rudimentum* version, we can see that the historical-ideal city has been re-mapped into post-Crusade, pilgrimage space. The ship at the foot of the page prompts the onlooker to think of themselves as landing at Jaffa, and travelling, like the pilgrims depicted on the route, via “Ramata” and Emmaus, through the Old Gate into the city. [Add figs 4 and 5 as close to here as possible. Captions: Figure 4: Map of Jerusalem following the return of the Israelites from exile, from Peter of Poitiers, Compendium historiae in genealogia Christi. Last quarter of the twelfth century. © British Library Board. London, British Library, MS Harley 658, fol. 37r. Fig. 5: Map of Jerusalem from the Rudimentum Novitiorum (Lübeck: Lucas Brandis, 1475). Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, München, 2 Inc.c.a. 408 m, fol.11r.]

A final group of circular Jerusalem maps identified by Vorholt is also linked to Peter of Poitiers’ chronicle (Fig. 6). While highly schematic, this map of a four-gate city is clearly oriented towards the representation of the contemporary city as a site of pilgrimage. A kind of “round trip” for pilgrims (whether physical or mental is not clear) is marked out through the formal straight lines and to the roundels denoting sites of interest: “hac via intrantur peregrini” (pilgrims enter by this route) indicates the way into the city via a gate labelled “Porta Siloe,” and an identical red line leading away from the “Porta Syon” on the right side of the page denotes the route of the return trip.[[55]](#footnote-55) [Add fig. 6 as close to here as possible. Fig. 6: Map of Jerusalem with pilgrimage route marked, from Peter of Poitiers, Compendium historiae in genealogia Christi, Last quarter of the twelfth century. © British Library Board. London, British Library, MS Harley 658, fol. 39v.]

 Comparison between the map in MS 426 and these three traditions in the representation of a circular Jerusalem reveals, once again, a designing intelligence at work, seemingly selecting and combining elements into a new synthesis. Unlike the other circular maps, MS 426 shows seven gates, and these are clearly adapted from the Peter of Poitiers map and Crusader map traditions:

Table 2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Peter of Poitiers** **(from Worm, “’Ista est Jerusalem’”, 132-3)** | **MS 426** |
| (1) porta sterquilinii (Dung Gate) | porta sterquilini  |
| (2) porta vetus vel iudiciari (old gate or Judgement Gate) | porta Syon vel porta vetus vel iudicaria |
| (3) porta piscium vel David (Fish Gate or David’s Gate) | porta piscium vel David |
| (4) porta fontis syloa vel aquarum (Gate of the Spring of Siloam or Water Gate) | porta fontis silo vel aquarum |
| (5) porta gregis vel probatice piscine vel offel vel negotiatorum (Sheep Gate or Probatica Piscina Gate or Gate of Ophel or Merchants’ Gate | porta regis vel probatica piscina vel Aphel vel negociatorum |
| (6) Porta vallis iosaphat vel geon (Gate of the Valley of Jehoshaphat or Geon) | porta vallis Josophat vel Gedeon |
| (7) | porta aurea |

We can see from Table 2 that the ‘porta vetus vel iudiciari’ (2) on the Peter of Poitiers maps has been conflated with the Syon gate found on Crusader maps, while the Sheep Gate has turned into the King’s Gate in (5), probably due to conflation with a gate in the East of the city mentioned in 1 Chronicles 9.18. The Porta Aurea, through which Christ entered Jerusalem and marked in gold on the Hague Crusader map (fig. 2), has been added in the corresponding location on MS 426.

 If the map’s treatment of Jerusalem’s gates tells a story of an attempt to harmonize the Old Testament, ideal rebuilt Jerusalem of the Peter of Poitiers maps with the pilgrims’ city of the Crusader maps, the representation of sites outside the city presents the Holy Land first and foremost as a space marked out by New Testament events and sites of Christian pilgrimage. The map marks out numerous waystations on the contemporary pilgrimage routes around the Holy Land. Like the Peter of Poitiers map found in the *Rudimentum*,the Brussels Crusader map and the four-gate Peter of Poitiers maps, it suggests that one can land at Jaffa and move through this space, and proposes routes to take to do so. Indeed, the places it maps along the route from the eastern shore of the Mediterranean to the city — Jaffa, Rama, St George (Lydda), Emmaus and Nebi Samwil (Mount Joy) — are recognizable as stops on a pilgrim route to the city recorded in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century accounts, including the extracts from the *Book of Sir John Mandeville* bound up in the same codex.[[56]](#footnote-56)

 The map, then, performs two parallel moves in its synthesis and recasting of its sources. Firstly, it attempts to harmonize the vision of the Old Testament ideal, rebuilt Jerusalem with the Christianized image of the city constructed following the First Crusade. This synthesis assumes and constructs a smooth continuity between the depicted Christian city and its Old Testament, Jewish history. The Christian city represented is of course a construct; the map does not acknowledge the contemporary Muslim presence in, let alone control of, the region.[[57]](#footnote-57) Furthermore, the map encourages an exploratory, meditative, devotional wandering on the part of its users. The plummet lines — marked out in red on in the reproduction in Figure 7— leading to the city and connecting it with sites in the surrounding lands encourage a mental, vicarious, traversal of a landscape known through books, including, of course, the Bacon, Bede and *Mandeville* texts in the same volume. [Fig. 7: Map of Jerusalem and surrounds, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College Library, MS 426. 155r, with plummet lines overlaid in red. Reproduced by kind permission of the Parker Library, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.]

The engagement required in the process of physically tracing the routes, marked out by plummet lines, between sites, and occasionally turning the map to read inscriptions is significant; route options are multiple, thus the map user must choose which site to vicariously ‘visit’, drawing them into a simulacrum of the Holy Land. In different contexts, Matthew Connolly and Kathryn Rudy have argued that the demands made by maps and images of physical engagement on the part of readers — reorienting a map to follow a journey or read an inscription; turning over a page to reveal an empty Holy Sepulcher — stand as proxies for the physical engagements of real pilgrimage. [[58]](#footnote-58) Encouraged to choose and follow a route, whether with an implement or with the eye alone, the map user is prompted to contemplative, devotional activity.[[59]](#footnote-59) Unlike the second Peter of Poitiers map in London, BL Harley 658 (Fig. 6), the lines on the map visibly curve rather than taking the most direct route between sites, encouraging a focus on the journey, not just the destination.

Through its unusual inscriptions, the map also focuses the attention of the user on events and stories rather than places. Inscriptions east of the city mark buildings as where “Maria fuit sepulta” (Mary was interred), where “Christus oravit” (Christ prayed), where “Christus flevit” (Christ wept), and the location of the “ascensus domini” (ascension of the Lord). The actual locations to which these events are normally attributed (the valley of Jehosophat; the Mount of Olives) are not named. The page thus functions not so much as a topographical map as a portal to the storehouse of memory: a virtual space to, as Mary Carruthers says of the city experienced physically by pilgrims, “*locate* the recollective images from their reading.”[[60]](#footnote-60) The image provides a simulacrum of the Holy Land through which the eye and mind can wander, pausing to recall and contemplate the events of the New Testament along the way.

*Conclusion*

This article has shown how, in order to understand the significance of geography and the value of textual and cartographic spatial representations in the intellectual and devotional lives of medieval people, we need to consider the material, codicological conditions of these representations. Despite the absence of evidence for its ownership by a pilgrim and its scholarly, geographical focus, I have suggested that Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 426 is nonetheless a pilgrim’s book. It attests, however, to a form of virtual or spiritual pilgrimage that has received little scholarly attention. The material form of the book suggests that it was intended and used for a form of mental traversal of the Holy Land, but seemingly not one that involved the kinds of affective forms of devotion often studied in other contemporary prompts to virtual pilgrimage.[[61]](#footnote-61) Instead, the manuscript witnesses the transformation of the physical and mental process of geographical study — selecting, anthologizing, editing, adapting, and annotating texts pertaining to the Holy Land — into devotional activity.

Anthologies of copies, excerpts, versions and abridgements that are often considered of limited textual, art-historical or cartographic-historical value, but MS 426 shows that these can be of profound importance for helping us understand not just what such texts and maps represented, but how they were reshaped for intellectual and devotional use by readers. The types of sources gathered, adapted, and glossed in MS 426 are highly significant. Not only do they provide rare witnesses to engagement with the works of Pierre d’Ailly, and to the use of *The Book of Sir John Mandeville* as a geographical source in fifteenth-century England;[[62]](#footnote-62) they also cumulatively build up a multi-dimensional understanding of the Holy Land and its place within the cosmos. In an influential 1984 book, historical Geographer Janni has discussed in relation to Greek geography a distinction between ‘hodological’, and ‘cartographic’ conceptions of, and ways of representing space.[[63]](#footnote-63) The designing intelligence behind MS 426 seems to have made an attempt to bridge the gap between these. As a whole, the volume presents knowledge and understanding of the Holy Land, empirically obtained by traversing it as a pilgrim, as essential to the proper understanding of cosmography. It follows Roger Bacon, whose geography of the Holy Land opened the volume, in modelling through practice the role of geography as enabling the correct literal, and thus spiritual, understanding of scripture. The volume as a whole attests to the practice of a kind of mental pilgrimage in which not just to travel vicariously through the Holy land, but to understand it topographically and geometrically in its regional and cosmological context, is to worship its creator.

The volume’s inclusion of the map in its final quire, however, suggests that this mode of intellectual work was preparatory and complimentary to a more contemplative, devotional mental pilgrimage through a Holy Land of the mind. This space of contemplation integrates Old and New Testament Jerusalem with the city of the Crusaders into one timeless, Christian space, untouched by contemporary political realities. The material form of the map suggests the physical engagement required on the part of the user to choose and trace routes from place to place, as well as the mental engagement required to recollect — to gather together in the memory — the assorted stories and facts associated with these found elsewhere in the volume. With this thought in mind, I wish to end by turning briefly to the top center and right-hand corner of the folio that contains the map. The art historian Kathryn Rudy — whose research on virtual pilgrimage I have also cited earlier — has demonstrated that it is possible to identify the most well-used portions of medieval manuscripts by comparing the amounts of dirt that the accumulate by being, quite literally, well-thumbed.[[64]](#footnote-64) Even without the use of a ‘densometer’ to measure the quantity of dirt, it is evident from a comparison of the top margin and right hand corner of folio 155r in MS 426 with the rest of the manuscript’s folios that this particular image has been studied with particular frequency, with a finger or thumb probably used to hold down the top center or right hand edge of the page. This suggests repeated, prolonged study, perhaps by a scholarly, pious reader, using the map’s lines to connect up and root in the memory the sites about which he has read throughout the volume. “There is no doubt”, as Roger Bacon put it in the text that opens MS 426, “that corporeal roads signify spiritual roads, and corporeal places signify the ends of spiritual roads and the corresponding spiritual places.” Following the meandering lines from site to site on the map with the eye or finger, such a reader could take a vicarious journey around a simulacrum of the Holy Land; visit holy sites; remember and contemplate their connected stories and literal and spiritual meanings, on the way to his journey’s end.
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