



BRILL

Basic Structures and Signs of Alienation in the "Rihla" of Ibn Jubayr

Author(s): Ian Richard Netton

Source: *Journal of Arabic Literature*, Vol. 22, No. 1 (Mar., 1991), pp. 21-37

Published by: Brill

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4183233>

Accessed: 25-10-2016 08:44 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>



Brill is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Arabic Literature*

BASIC STRUCTURES AND SIGNS OF ALIENATION
IN
THE *RIHLA* OF IBN JUBAYR*

In a previous article I identified in the *Rihla* of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa (AD 1304-1368/9 or 1377) what I termed his “pilgrim paradigm”.¹ Using insights garnered from the three-tier approach to history devised by the great French scholar Fernand Braudel (1902-85), doyen supreme of the French *Annales* school of history, I maintained that this paradigm comprised “a series of four searches: for the shrine and/or its circumambient religious geography; for knowledge; for recognition and/or power; and for the satisfaction of a basic wanderlust”.² Now it is frequently—and rightly—claimed that the *Rihla* of Ibn Jubayr (AD 1145-1217) constituted a prototype for several others of the genre including that of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa.³ Indeed the debt of the former to other authors like Ibn Jubayr and al-‘Abdārī⁴ becomes ever more apparent, as recent scholarship continues to show.⁵ To what extent then, it may be asked, may a similar (prototype)

* This article was originally a paper presented to the Fourth International Colloquium of the Department of Arabic and Islamic Studies, University of Exeter, on *Hijra, Hajj and Rihla*, 19-22 September, 1989.

¹ See my “Arabia and the Pilgrim Paradigm of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa: A Braudelian Approach” in Ian Richard Netton (ed.), *Arabia and the Gulf: From Traditional Society to Modern States*, (London: Croom Helm 1986), pp. 29-42.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 37-38.

³ See, e.g. Ch. Pellat, art. “Ibn Djubayr”, *EP*, vol. III, p. 755; and Michael Karl Lenker, “The Importance of the *Rihla* for the Islamization of Spain”, unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1982, p. 34.

⁴ Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-‘Abdārī was the author of a notable *Rihla* entitled *al-Rihla al-Maghribiyah*. His birth and death dates are unknown but he commenced the travels which he describes in December 1289. His *Rihla* has been edited twice in recent times in 1965 and 1968: Algiers/Constantine, 1965, ed. by Aḥmad b. Jadū; and Rabat: Jāmi‘at Muḥammad al-Khāmīs, 1968, ed. by Muḥammad al-Fāsi. See Muh. Ben Cheneb-W. Hoenerbach, art. “Al-‘Abdārī”, *EP*, vol. I, p. 96 and Amikam Elad, “The Description of the Travels of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa in Palestine: Is it Original?”, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1987, no. 2, esp. pp. 259, 269 nn. 27, 28.

⁵ See the aforementioned latest article to appear on the subject, dealing with the Palestinian material in the works of al-‘Abdārī and Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, by Elad, pp. 256-272; see also Muh. Ben Cheneb-W. Hoenerbach, art. “Al-‘Abdārī”, p. 96. See my remarks on Ibn Baṭṭūṭa’s plagiarism of Ibn Jubayr in my article ‘Myth, Miracle and Magic in the *Rihla* of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa’, *Journal of Semitic Studies*, vol. XXIX: 1 (1984), p. 132 esp. n. 6; and also Pellat, art. “Ibn Djubayr”, p. 755; J. N. Mattock, “The Travel Writings of Ibn Jubair and Ibn Baṭṭūṭa”, *Glasgow Oriental Society Transactions*, XXI (1965-6), pp. 35-46 esp. pp. 38-39; idem, “Ibn Baṭṭūṭa’s use of Ibn Jubayr’s *Rihla*”, in Rudolph Peters (ed.), *Proceedings of the Ninth Congress of the Union Européenne des Arabisants et Islamisants (Amsterdam 1st-7th September 1978)*, Publications of the Netherlands Institute of Archaeology and Arabic Studies in Cairo, no. 4, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981), pp. 209-218.

pilgrim paradigm be identified in the *Rihla* of Ibn Jubayr? As an aid to answering this question, it is proposed first in this article to analyse this *Rihla* in terms of (1) its basic *structures*, and (2) some of its relevant semiotics.

The concept of *talab al-‘ilm* is a noteworthy factor in the *rihlatayn* of Ibn Jubayr and Ibn Baṭṭūṭa,⁶ but it is one which should be handled with care. We see, for example, that Lenker has stressed the general relationship between pilgrimage and study: he notes that in certain Andalusian works after the middle of the eighth century ‘‘both the pilgrimage and study are two essential components of each biographical entry’’;⁷ and, he goes so far as to maintain that ‘‘as a motive for travel [*talab al-‘ilm*] surpassed in significance all other incentives including the pilgrimage itself’’.⁸ While this statement may well have been true, however, ultimately of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa with his unquenchable wanderlust,⁹ it must be something of an exaggeration if applied *unreservedly* to Ibn Jubayr, despite his advice to the youth of the Maghrib [I.J. p. 258; see further in this article]: Ibn Jubayr’s *Rihla* was undertaken for a specific *religious* purpose which had the pilgrimage to Mecca as its heart and goal. Indeed, his *rihla* was a pilgrimage undertaken to make expiation (*kaffāra*) for the specific fault of wine-drinking: even though he had been forced to drink the wine by the Almohad governor of Grenada, Abū Sa‘id ‘Uthmān b. ‘Abd al-Mu‘min, to whom he was secretary, his delicate conscience bade him to make amends.¹⁰ This motive of *kaffāra*, rather than pure *talab al-‘ilm*, must have been the driving force on his journey, and omnipresent to him, though it is indeed strange that Ibn Jubayr nowhere refers directly in his *Rihla* to the real reasons for his journey. The details must be gleaned from other sources such as the seventeenth century *Nafh al-Tib* of al-Maqqarī.¹¹

Despite however, the basic difference in motivation behind each of the *rihlatayn* under discussion, there is no doubting the exuberant delight which *‘ilm*, and the experiences deriving from the search for *‘ilm*, produced in both Ibn Jubayr and Ibn Baṭṭūṭa. The energetic visiting by both of mosque, tomb, shrine, college, saint and scholar bears ample witness to that.

Apart from their respective motivations, perhaps the other major essential difference between the works of Ibn Jubayr and Ibn Baṭṭūṭa lies

⁶ See Lenker, ‘‘The Importance of the *Rihla*’’, pp. 189-191 for more on this concept.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 103.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 189.

⁹ See my ‘‘Arabia and the Pilgrim Paradigm of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa’’, p. 37.

¹⁰ See my article ‘‘Ibn Jubayr: Penitent Pilgrim and Observant Traveller’’, *UR*, 2, 1985, pp. 14-17.

¹¹ *Nafh al-Tib*, ed. Ihsān ‘Abbās, (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir 1968), vol. 2, p. 385.

in their basic structures. Ibn Jubayr's *Rihla* encompasses a much shorter timescale from the point of view of actual travel recorded (between 1183-1185), and consequently, far fewer cities and countries are visited than, for example, in the more wide-ranging *Rihla* of his successor, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa. Ibn Jubayr's work is much less a frame story like the latter's (which was designed for the propagation of myths which might enhance a returning traveller's reputation and massage an already large ego,¹²) and much more "a simple narrative of a voyage undertaken and experienced".¹³ Mattock has divided the content of Ibn Jubayr's work into two basic categories of description and narrative.¹⁴ Having observed that "[the *Rihla*] is a straightforward, non-technical work, written in a simple style",¹⁵ Mattock remarks:

Ibn Jubair's descriptive writing seems to me to be good but unremarkable. It is interesting, simply written and well detailed; it does very well what it is intended to do: describe the places that he visits, so that their main features are clear to his audience.¹⁶

The *structure* of Ibn Jubayr's *Rihla* may, therefore, also be conceived in a simpler fashion than the more elaborate frame of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's, and I propose to do so here by concentrating upon three very simple elements which seem to me to be the quintessential blocks upon which Ibn Jubayr's work is structured and founded. These elements are, respectively, a trinity of time, place and purpose as expressed in (a) the author's precise, almost neurotic, use of the Islamic calendar, (b) the travel or *rihla* impulse and associated "sense of place" which imbues the entire narrative, and (c) the primary orientation towards, or focus on, Mecca, goal of the Islamic pilgrimage.

It is useful, in any examination of Ibn Jubayr's usage, to examine first the later practice of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, as far as dating is concerned. The latter author certainly deploys some dates in his text but what he provides certainly do not constitute a kind of textual punctuation or frame as happens in the earlier *Rihla* of Ibn Jubayr. Indeed Gibb has noted, succinctly, of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's practice, which may, in any case have been that of his scribe and editor Ibn Juzayy: "Many of the dates give the impression of having been inserted more or less at haphazard, possibly at the editor's request, but the examination and correction of them offers a task so great that it has not been attempted in this selection".¹⁷ Dunn confirms this

¹² See my "Myth, Miracle and Magic", *passim*.

¹³ Netton, "Arabia and the Pilgrim Paradigm of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa", p. 40.

¹⁴ "The Travel Writings of Ibn Jubair and Ibn Baṭṭūṭa", p. 36.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 36.

¹⁷ H. A. R. Gibb (trans.), *Ibn Battūṭa: Travels in Asia and Africa, 1325-1354*, The Broadway Travellers, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul 1929), pp. 12-13.

observation: “In composing the book, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa (and Ibn Juzayy, the literary scholar who collaborated with him) took far less care with details of itinerary, dates, and the sequence of events than the modern ‘scientific’ mind would consider acceptable practice for a travel writer”.¹⁸ And while we do find formal dates at, for example, the beginning of the entire *Rihla* [I.B.¹⁹ p. 14] and scattered infrequently elsewhere in the text [e.g. I.B. pp. 53, 110, 172, 339, 393, 529], we find that Ibn Baṭṭūṭa’s more usual narrative punctuation consists of such phrases as “I went next to ...”²⁰ (*thumma tawajjahtu ilā ...*) [I.B. p. 31], “I travelled next through ...”²¹ (*thumma sāfartu fī ...*) [I.B. p. 33] and “We came to ...”²² (*waṣalnā ilā ...*) [I.B. p. 277].

By acute contrast, Ibn Jubayr uses his precise dating, in a surely conscious fashion, as a method of punctuating and dividing up his text. The entire *Rihla* is laid out, *month by month*, according to the Islamic lunar calendar, [e.g. I.J.²³ pp. 13, 122, 190 and *passim*]. Each section, thus precisely, carefully and, apparently accurately,²⁴ introduced by date then at once contains a statement or description of the traveller’s exact present location and often a description of, or reference to, his next projected destination(s), and the journeying involved. Ibn Jubayr’s convention in his dating is to refer to the rising of the new moon, and also to provide Christian calendar equivalents; thus two typical diary entries, encapsulating all the above, read:

The Month of Rabi' al-Awwal of the Year [5]80, may God acquaint us with His blessing

Its new moon rose (*istahalla hilāluhu*) on the night of Tuesday, corresponding to the 12th June, while we were in the previously mentioned village.

¹⁸ Ross E. Dunn, *The Adventures of Ibn Battūṭa: A Muslim Traveller of the 14th Century*, (London: Croom Helm 1986), p. x, see also p. 313.

¹⁹ I.B. = the Arabic text of the *Rihla* of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa as contained in the edition edited by Karam al-Bustāñī: *Rihlat Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*, (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir 1964).

²⁰ Trans. by H. A. R. Gibb, *The Travels of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa A.D. 1325-1354*, (Cambridge: Pub. for the Hakluyt Society at the University Press 1958), vol. I, p. 34.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 36.

²² Trans. by H. A. R. Gibb, *The Travels of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa A.D. 1325-1354*, (Cambridge: Pub. for the Hakluyt Society at the University Press, 1962), vol. 2, p. 405.

²³ I.J. = the Arabic text of the *Rihla* of Ibn Jubayr in the following edition: *Rihlat Ibn Jubayr*, (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir 1964).

²⁴ William Wright, in his early edition of the *Rihla* (*The Travels of Ibn Jubayr*, ed. from a Ms. in the University Library of Leyden by William Wright, 2nd edn. rev. by M. J. de Goeje, [Leiden: E. J. Brill/London: Luzac 1907; repr. New York: AMS 1973]), has the following comments in his “Preface”: “The dates are, I believe, with the alterations I have made, everywhere correct, though perfect uniformity with calculations according to the method laid down in the *Art de vérifier les dates* is not to be expected” (p. 16). See the important comments on Ibn Jubayr’s prose style and his fetish for dating by John Mattock, “The Travel Writings of Ibn Jubair and Ibn Baṭṭūṭa”, p. 43.

Then we set out from there at dawn on that Tuesday and arrived at Niṣibīn before midday of the same day [I.J. p. 214]

The Month of Jumāda al-Ūlā, may God acquaint us with His blessing.

Its new moon rose on the night of Friday, corresponding to the 10th August in foreign dating.

A Descriptive Survey of Conditions in the City [of Damascus], may God make it thrive in Islam [I.J. p. 254].

The formula occasionally varies as where Ibn Jubayr refers to the new moon being obscured (*ghumma hilāluhu ‘alaynā*) [I.J. pp. 286, 318]. It is clear, furthermore, that the provision by the traveller of dating equivalents from the Christian calendar reflects the eclectic milieu in which he travelled, often, as is well known, using Christian ships [e.g. I.J. pp. 8, 317]. It was a strange age of real intercultural *travel and trading*, produced by centuries of co-operation, on the one hand, co-existing beside very real intercultural *military* strife produced by the Crusades, on the other, an apparent paradox upon which Ibn Jubayr himself felt moved to comment and rank among the ‘*ajā’ib* of his narrative [I.J. p. 260, see also 271-3].

There is no doubt that, from a literary point of view, Ibn Jubayr’s passion for dating can seriously slow down his narrative, making his text appear sometimes more ponderous and monotonous than that of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa which is less obviously subject to formal considerations of strict chronology, though also less fluid in other respects. Nonetheless, the precision of the former can also have distinct advantages: it is clear that, while Ibn Baṭṭūṭa claims to have lost some of his very few notes [I.B. p. 369],²⁵ Ibn Jubayr must have been a frequent, careful and punctilious diarist (or had an extraordinary memory). Furthermore the chronological problems encountered in any study of the *Rihla* of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa²⁶ are mercifully absent in that of Ibn Jubayr though, in fairness to the later traveller, it may be stressed that this is due as much to his predecessor’s comparative shortness of voyage as the methodical nature of Ibn Jubayr’s notetaking.

²⁵ What he lost were details which he had copied down from scholars’ tombs in Bukhārā. Whether he made any *other* notes is highly debatable: see Gibb, *Ibn Battūṭa: Travels in Asia and Africa, 1325-1354*, p. 10; Dunn, *The Adventures of Ibn Battūṭa*, pp. 312-313. John Mattock does seem to believe that some notes were made by Ibn Baṭṭūṭa: see his ‘Ibn Baṭṭūṭa’s use of Ibn Jubayr’s *Rihla*’, p. 217 and idem, ‘The Travel Writings of Ibn Jubair and Ibn Baṭṭūṭa’, p. 42.

²⁶ See my ‘Myth, Miracle and Magic’, p. 133, n. 12, and Ivan Hrbek, ‘The Chronology of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa’s Travels’, *Archiv Orientalní*, XXX (1962), pp. 409-86.

If attention to precise dating constitutes an obvious initial foundation for the *Rihla* of Ibn Jubayr, then a “sense of place”,²⁷ and the travel impulse ineluctably associated with that sense, constitutes a second. Here Ibn Jubayr is much more in harmony with Ibn Baṭṭūṭa. The former, like the latter, visited many of the great cities of Islam. And where Ibn Baṭṭūṭa expressed a wish to avoid, if at all possible, travelling over the same route twice [I.B. p. 191] Ibn Jubayr’s own, admittedly smaller, *rahħala* impulse is concretely expressed in his advice to the youth of the Maghrib to travel East to such great cities as Damascus, in search of success and knowledge (*fī ṭalab al-‘ilm*) [I.J. p. 258]. Though there is, from a quantitative point of view, less anecdotal and fantastic material in Ibn Jubayr’s *Rihla* than that of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa,²⁸ nonetheless, there is sufficient to identify some genuine examples or aspects of such broad literary genres as ‘ajā’ib²⁹ or *nawādir*.³⁰ [It will be recalled that the full title of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa’s own *Rihla* was *Tuhfat al-Nużzār fī Gharaib al-Amṣār wa ‘Ajā’ib al-Asfār*.]³¹ But the genuine in Ibn Jubayr is mixed in with much unnecessary rhetoric.

A few examples of what appears really to interest and intrigue Ibn Jubayr, not necessarily to be classified under either ‘ajā’ib, or *nawādir*, may be provided here: he is amazed (lit: *shāhadnā ‘ajaban*) at the bitumen well on the Tigris whose bitumen is dried out so that it congeals and can then be removed [I.J. p. 209]; he is enchanted by the sight of a Christian wedding in Tyre attended by both Christians and Muslims [I.J. pp. 278-279]; and he is fascinated by the strange story of an allegedly royal youth at the court of King William of Sicily [I.J. pp. 310-311]. But Ibn Jubayr’s is basically a tourist vocabulary which becomes rapidly debased in its addictive use of superlatives. Mattock has already commented elsewhere on Ibn Jubayr’s prose style: “... it employs a certain amount of unnecessary rhetoric ... This verbal flatulence and empty praise after a while fails in its effect. It is irritating to the reader, and eventually turns

²⁷ A phrase used here by me to designate specifically both the delight in, and curiosity about, new places visited by a *rahħala*.

²⁸ See my “Myth, Miracle and Magic”, p. 134.

²⁹ See C. E. Dubler, art. “‘Ajā’ib”, *EP*, vol. I, pp. 203-204 for a description of the genre. The author notes the degeneration of the concept of ‘ajā’ib from early times when they “were correctly situated in geographical space” to a later type which “transport us from tangible reality to the realm of fancy constituted by the oriental tales” (p. 204). Both types are apparent in Ibn Jubayr’s work. See also Ibn al-Khaṭīb, *al-Iḥāṭa fi Akhbar Gharnāṭa*, vol. 2, ed. Muhammad ‘Abdallāh ‘Inan, (Cairo: Maktabat al-Khanjī 1974), p. 232.

³⁰ For a lengthy example of this genre, see M. T. Magüz, “A Critical Edition of the 14th Part of *Kitāb an-Nawādir wa az-Ziyādāt* by Ibn Abī Zayd al-Qayrawānī 310 A.H.-386 A.H.”, unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Exeter 1989.

³¹ See Karam al-Bustāni’s “Preface” (p. 6) to the 1964 Beirut edition of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa’s *Rihla* cited above at n. 19; see also my “Myth, Miracle and Magic”, p. 132 n. 4.

him from his admiration for the author's ingenuity to consideration of his choice of words, and consequently to doubt of the sincerity of his description".³² His point may be briefly underlined and reiterated here: the almost "baroque" and overblown nature of much of Ibn Jubayr's prose style sometimes makes the distinction between genuine elements of the *'ajā'ib* and *nawādir* genres on the one hand, and mere rhetoric, on the other, somewhat blurred, at least at first sight.³³

His effusive style particularly invades his sense of place, producing false echoes of that early time when the *'ajā'ib* "were correctly situated in geographical space".³⁴ Indeed, Ibn Jubayr may be likened in intention to a prototype Roberts (1796-1864) or even Delacroix (1798-1863), trying to put into words what those Orientalist painters later produced so much more successfully on canvas.³⁵ Of the latter artist's work it has been observed: "His vision of a living, sublime Antiquity in these countries [of North Africa] enabled him to strike a balance between the romantic and classical elements in his work".³⁶ What Ibn Jubayr's prose style often lacks is a sense of *linguistic* or stylistic balance.

Thus the city of Damascus is described as "the Paradise of the East" (*Jannat al-Mashriq*) [I.J. p. 234]; its hospitals and colleges are ranked among "the great glories of Islam" (*mafkhar 'azīm min mafakhir al-Islām*) [I.J. p. 256]; and Ibn Jubayr enthusiastically informs his reader that "one of the greatest and most amazing sights in the world" (lit: *wa min a'zam mā shāhadnāhu min manāzir al-dunyā al-gharīb al-sha'n*), which is held

³² Mattock, "The Travel Writings of Ibn Jubair and Ibn Baṭṭūṭa", p. 36; see also Pellat ("Ibn Djubayr", p. 755) who writes: "[Ibn Jubayr's] style, though in certain narrative passages lively and vivid in a way which recalls the manner of modern reporters, is over-florid ...".

³³ This may, of course, have been a deliberate consequence of the magpie instinct with which many an author collected and reiterated phenomena in terms such as *'ajā'ib* and *nawādir*. However, Rosenthal's remarks on another "minor branch of Muslim literature with affinities to *Adab*, historical and theological literature", namely the *awā'il* literature, are, in general, equally true of the *'ajā'ib* and *nawādir* genres: they "are brilliant expressions of the cultural outlook and historical sense of their authors, and they are full of valuable material and interesting insights" (F. Rosenthal, art. "*Awā'il*", *EI*², vol. 1, p. 758). This is not, of course, always the case in Ibn Jubayr's *Rihla*, as we can see. However, for a specimen of writing in Ibn Jubayr's text which may genuinely, and usefully, be classified under the *'ajā'ib* genre, and where the fantastic nature of the marvel cited is confirmed by others, see his enthusiastic description of the temple architecture at Ikhmīm in Upper Egypt [I.J. pp. 35-38]. See S. Sauneron, "Le Temple d'Akhmīn Décrit par Ibn Jobair", *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale*, vol. 51 (1952), pp. 123-135, esp. p. 125. For Ibn Jubayr the temple which he describes at Ikhmīm is one of "the wonders of the world" (*'ajā'ib al-dunyā*) [I.J. p. 37].

³⁴ See above n. 29.

³⁵ See Mary Anne Stevens, (ed.), *The Orientalists: Delacroix to Matisse: European Painters in North Africa and the Near East*, (London: Royal Academy of Arts/Weidenfeld and Nicolson 1984), esp. pp. 42-45, 52-55, 122-128, 223-225.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 122.

to be indescribable, is that to be gained after the ascent to the top of the Lead Dome which crowned the Cathedral Mosque in Damascus [I.J. p. 264].

His immediate and insistent tourist delight in the *places* which he visits, however, does not preclude an interest in the diverse *people* of those places. In this, too, Ibn Jubayr resembles Ibn Baṭṭūṭa. Like the latter he is interested, though to a less passionate degree, in the ascetics of Islam³⁷ [e.g. I.J. pp. 220, 256-257]; and Ibn Jubayr also manifests a particular interest in, or veneration for, imams and notables, for example, of the Shāfi‘ī *madhab* whom he mentions frequently [e.g. I.J. pp. 22, 122-123, 177, 195, 224].

The third and final foundation upon which the *Rihla* of Ibn Jubayr rests is its literal, as well as spiritual, orientation towards Mecca. Though, as we have previously noted, the purpose of the *Rihla* is nowhere in the text precisely articulated in expiatory terms, it should never be forgotten by the reader of the *Rihla* that its primary motor is the expiation of the “sin” forced upon him in Grenada. Whether this desire for penitence and expiation unconsciously informs the occasional virulence of his writing about sectarian Islam, or Christianity, in an excess of zeal, remains a matter for speculation. It must surely be responsible, however, in part at least, for the extended narrative about, and description of, the Cities of Mecca and Medina: by laying such conscious stress on their physical description and the pilgrimage ceremonies, Ibn Jubayr, at least unconsciously, manifests to all, including the Almohad governor of Grenada, that his purpose is accomplished, expiation is made and forgiveness from Allah surely achieved. [See I.J. pp. 58-160, 167-181].

The semiotics of the *Rihla* of Ibn Jubayr may next be considered. It is a truism that everything signifies;³⁸ the Qur’ān itself identifies an entire world, apparent and hidden, conceived of in terms of signs: “We shall show them Our signs in the horizons and in themselves ...” (*Sa-nurihim āyātinā fi ’l-āfāq wa fi anfusihim*).³⁹ So it would be perfectly valid to say here that the *Rihla* of Ibn Jubayr is also a world of signs, whose examination would be sufficient to fill a major thesis in itself. Our analysis will, therefore, be restricted to an identification of some of those

³⁷ See my article “Myth, Miracle and Magic”, for Ibn Baṭṭūṭa references. See also Ibn al-Khaṭīb, *al-Iḥāṭa*, vol. 2, pp. 232-233.

³⁸ See Umberto Eco, *A Theory of Semiotics*, Advances in Semiotics, (Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press 1976), pp. 6-7.

³⁹ Q.XLI: 53, trans. by A. J. Arberry, *The Koran Interpreted*, (London: Allen & Unwin/New York: Macmillan 1971), vol. 2, p. 191.

signs which contribute, in some way, towards illuminating or assessing the primary question posed at the beginning of this article: to what extent, if any, may a pilgrim paradigm, prototype to that identified in the *Rihla* of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, be identified in the *Rihla* of Ibn Jubayr?

In the first place, his *Rihla* is interesting for what is *not* signified: while Ibn Jubayr, like Ibn Baṭṭūṭa [I.B. p. 14], at the beginning of his work, makes a formal expression of intent to perform the pilgrimage (*lit.* *li-'l-niyya al-hijāziyya al-mubāraka*, I.J. p. 7), the intention *behind* the pilgrimage intention, as we have emphasised, remains hidden. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's *Rihla* unfolds at length as the ultimate satisfaction of a primary and insistent wanderlust which takes *that* traveller far beyond the Cities of Mecca and Medina. Ibn Jubayr's *Rihla*, once the Holy Cities are visited, is the narrative of a much-briefer, return voyage to Spain, mission accomplished. Ibn Jubayr's work, then, signifies a search "for the shrine" and wallows in the "circumambient religious geography".⁴⁰ But it provides little evidence that Ibn Jubayr's wanderlust, such as it was, approached in any way the magnitude of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's.

What Ibn Jubayr's text *does* signify, most clearly, throughout, is an Islamic world already divided upon itself by religious faction and suspicion. A deeply riven sectarian milieu in the whole of *dār al-Islām* is apparent from Ibn Jubayr's view of and comments upon the state of Islam in Arabia, whose entire peninsula might be said to constitute a species of "religious geography"⁴¹ for the holy City of Mecca. This City, one of the profoundest symbols of the Islamic faith, and its theoretical and yearned-for unity, is thus, paradoxically, for Ibn Jubayr the focus of a voyage which sometimes instructs that traveller in a variety of aspects of Islam at its most *disunited*. His disillusionment and rage are only exacerbated and compounded by the strife of the Crusades and the conflicting and ambivalent attitudes which those wars generate about Christianity and Christians within his heart.⁴² Broadhurst, writing of the age and milieu of Ibn Jubayr, observes: "The eastern Muslim world was now one; the Frankish kingdom was enveloped, and its death-knell had sounded. If the opponents of the Cross were at last united, all within the Christian realm was anarchy and alarm. King Baldwin IV was a dying

⁴⁰ See my "Arabia and the Pilgrim Paradigm of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa", p. 37.

⁴¹ For the term "religious geography", see my article "Arabia and the Pilgrim Paradigm of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa", esp. p. 36.

⁴² Ibn Jubayr's attitudes to Christians and Christianity will be surveyed at a later stage in this article. He was not the only one to wrestle with the problems generated by the presence of Christianity and the Crusades in the Middle East. For the attitudes of some of the Muslim jurists, for example, towards those Muslim pilgrims etc. who travelled in Christian ships, see A. Gateau, 'Quelques Observations sur l'Intérêt du Voyage d'Ibn Jubayr', *Hespéris*, vol. XXXVI: 3-4, (1949), pp. 293-295.

leper ...”.⁴³ Broadhurst’s rhetorical intention is clearly to contrast Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn with such Christian figures as Baldwin. For Broadhurst, “it was the role and achievement of Saladin to unite Islam”.⁴⁴ But this translator of Ibn Jubayr’s *Rihla* into English only provides an exaggerated and partial picture, drawing primarily upon the *politics* of the age: Ibn Jubayr himself, in what is a lengthy, and clearly deeply-felt passage, articulates his disgust at the “events”⁴⁵ which have currently become associated with the eternal “religious geography” of Arabia and Mecca. He writes:

The lands of God which most deserve to be cleansed by the sword and have their filth (*lit: arjāsahā*) and uncleanness purged in blood shed in Holy War are these lands of the Hijāz. This is because they have untied the bonds of Islam and regarded as fair game both the wealth and the blood of the pilgrim [to Mecca]. Those among the jurists of al-Andalus who believe that [people] should be released from this religious obligation [of pilgrimage] are correct in their belief for this reason and because of the way in which the pilgrim is handled, which displeases God Almighty. He who travels this path exposes himself to danger and certain hazard. God intended His franchise in that place to be bestowed in quite another manner. So how is it that the House of God is now in the hands of people who seek a forbidden subsistence from it and make it a way to plunder wealth and unlawfully lay claim to [that wealth] and seize pilgrims because of it: in consequence the latter are humiliated and brought to dire poverty. May God soon remedy this in a cleansing which will remove these ruinous heresies from the Muslims with the swords of the Almohads, who are the Followers of the Faith, the Party of God, the People of Truth and Sincerity, Defenders of the Sanctuary of God Almighty, solicitous for His taboos, making every effort to exalt His name, manifest His mission and support His religion. God can do what He wishes. He is indeed a wonderful Lord and Ally. Let there be absolutely no shadow of doubt about the fact that there is no Islam except in the lands of the Maghrib ... [*I.J.* p. 55].

While this stream of biased invective from Ibn Jubayr is clearly provoked, in the first instance, by his outrage at the treatment of pilgrims in Arabia, there is little doubt that it also reflects much more: it signifies a real deep-seated religious malaise and division within the Islamic world and reflects genuine sectarian squabbles, rather than simply the righteous anger expressed in a somewhat overblown fashion by one irate pilgrim at the cruel treatment of his fellows, and the unfair exactions levied against them, and himself.

⁴³ R. J. C. Broadhurst, (trans.), *The Travels of Ibn Jubayr*, (London: Jonathan Cape 1952), p. 18.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁴⁵ See my “Arabia and the Pilgrim Paradigm of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa”, p. 36.

This is confirmed by Ibn Jubayr in a typically exaggerated comment which appears in the text of the *Rihla* shortly before the lines quoted above and which deserves to be cited here:

Most of [the people of] these Hijāzī regions and other areas are sectarians (lit. *firq*) and Shīites who have no religion (*lā din lahum*) and have split into diverse schools of thought (*madhāhib*) [*I.J.* p. 54].

We may safely conclude that Ibn Jubayr's *Rihla* betokens a certain lack of enjoyment, in Arabia especially, as he strove, finally successfully, to reach his goal of Mecca and all that this City held for the pious pilgrim in terms of shrine and ritual.⁴⁶

If the first *major* set of signals thrown up by the text reveals a divided Islamic world which itself inhibits or, at the very least, intrudes upon the search "for the shrine",⁴⁷ then a second, which provides a significant contrast, is that which betokens the intrusive Christian presence in the Middle East. The signs and symbols of Christianity, embedded in many parts of the text, would have reminded Ibn Jubayr's reader of the contemporary crusading wars between Muslim and Christian, and also served as overt indicators to that reader of the author's Almohad 'orthodoxy' [see *I.J.* pp. 55-56] which he felt constrained to champion and proclaim. This was particularly the case when such signs and symbols of the Christian faith were linked to dirt and filth and some examples of this will be cited shortly. A semiotic examination of all this highlights Ibn Jubayr's occasionally ambivalent attitude to Christianity in a particularly vivid way. Such an examination also reveals a semiotics of cultural-religious alienation in which, paradoxically, the exotic (represented for Ibn Jubayr by certain aspects of Christianity), plays some role.⁴⁸

We may identify in the *Rihla* at least five basic 'signs' of alienation for Ibn Jubayr: several are tinged by aspects either of the 'exoticism' or the ambivalence referred to above. These signs recur to a greater or lesser degree in the text and may be enumerated briefly as follows: (i) *the Christian cross*, (ii) *the Christian ship*, (iii) *Christian regal power*, (iv) *Christian taxation*, and (v) perhaps most oddly and paradoxically, *Christian chivalry, courtesy and mores*. Each will be surveyed here.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 36-37.

⁴⁸ For a reverse picture in which elements of Islam were perceived as exotic by Europeans, see my article "The Mysteries of Islam", in G. S. Rousseau and R. Porter (eds.), *Exoticism in the Enlightenment*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press 1989), pp. 23-45.

(i) *The Christian cross* for Ibn Jubayr is not so much a sign or message of folly⁴⁹ as a sign of oppression, a sign of what impedes the search for the shrine. It is the arch-symbol of an invader who has stolen away some of the most precious sites of the Muslim peoples like, for example, Acre [See *I.J.* pp. 276-277]. Of the latter City Ibn Jubayr writes: “The Franks wrested it from the hands of the Muslims ... Islam wept grievously (*lit.*: *mil'a jufūnih*) for it. It was one of [Islam's] griefs” [*I.J.* p. 276]. Little wonder, then, that the cross in Ibn Jubayr's text is linked with dirt and filth, or deliberately devalued in an equally derogatory association: Acre “burns with unbelief and tyranny, boiling over with pigs and crosses. [The City is] filthy and squalid and all of it is filled with dirt and shit” [*I.J.* p. 276]; the City of Messina is “overcast through unbelief; no Muslim resides there. It is laden with cross worshippers (*'abādat al-Šubān*) ... [and] is full of stench and dirt” [*I.J.* p. 296]. Elsewhere “the cross worshippers” are described (somewhat resentfully?) as living a life of comfort and ease on the island of Sicily and though Muslims *do* share to a degree in this comfort, it is subject to a tax levied by the Christians twice a year [*I.J.* p. 297]; by severe contrast, the Muslim populace is said to suffer painfully under “the cross worshippers” (*'ubbād al-Šalib*) in the Sicilian town of Trapani [*I.J.* p. 313]. The cross is an exotic sign of prosperity and wealth among the Christians of Palermo where Ibn Jubayr remarks upon the numerous churches with gold and silver crosses [*I.J.* p. 305]; and a symbol of apostasy *par excellence* when it is trampled by a Christian convert to Islam [*I.J.* p. 312]. All these examples demonstrate the multivalent symbolism of the cross in Ibn Jubayr's text and the derogatory associations with which it is endowed.

It is tempting to try and tease out the semiotic connotations of the *hilāl* to which Ibn Jubayr always refers in his dating at the beginning of each chapter, and contrast it as an Islamic symbol with the semiotics of the Christian cross elaborated above. But such a superficially promising and attractive idea seems doomed to failure: Ibn Jubayr's own usage of the word *hilāl* is purely for dating purposes, rather than any latent or overt Islamic religious symbolism. In any case, recent research seems to conclude that, in medieval times, and later,

there cannot have been a strong religious association with the *hilāl* in the Muslim world, as the emblem occurs also on secular buildings ... and on military flags and textiles as well ... There are also many renditions of mosques and other buildings dating from the 10th/16th century to the 12th/18th century which lack the crescent finial, and the motif plays no role on prayer rugs or on tiles applied to the walls of mosques ... This indicates that in Muslim eyes, and in particular during the Ottoman

⁴⁹ See 1 Corinthians 1:18, 23.

period, the *hilāl* was not of great importance. It certainly does not seem to have had a major religious significance and was apparently applied mostly for decorative purposes.⁵⁰

The most that we can say then is that, while the *hilāl* certainly had *some* cultural and religious symbolism in the Islamic Middle Ages,⁵¹ it was by no means as dominant a motif in purely symbolic religious terms as the cross: this difference in emphasis, at least in medieval times, is reflected in Ibn Jubayr's own text. Where, of course, the *hilāl* did have real significance in Islam, from a religious point of view, in medieval times as in modern, was in the area of religious law because of the need to date the pilgrimage and the start and finish of Ramaḍān.⁵² Ibn Jubayr himself, not surprisingly, took an interest in the new moon from this point of view and, on at least two occasions in his text, he draws particular attention to the vital necessity of using the new moon to date such important events in the Islamic religious calendar [see *I.J.* pp. 117-121, 146-147] and how rumour, falsehood, eclipse or cloud could confuse the reckoning.

(ii) It might be thought at first sight that the *Christian ship* as well as being a symbol of wanderlust *par excellence*, would be a symbol or sign of unity, harmony and friendship, traversing as it did the boundaries of *dār al-harb* and *dār al-Islām* and bearing, as it did, a mixed cargo of Christians and Muslims. And, as we have already seen, Ibn Jubayr himself sailed in Christian ships [e.g. see *I.J.* pp. 8, 317] while being perfectly aware of the anomalous situation created by Christian and Muslim travellers such as himself, and especially merchants, moving freely in each other's lands while their respective armies fought each other [*I.J.* p. 260]. Ibn Jubayr certainly appreciated the travel facilities thus extended to him by ships from Christendom but there is a clear ambivalence in his attitude and a latent prejudice and resentment never seems to be far from the surface: he admires the nautical skill of a Genoese Christian sea captain [*I.J.* p. 285] but clearly dislikes the fact that that captain inherits the posses-

⁵⁰ J. Schacht/R. Ettinghausen, art. "Hilāl", *EI²*, vol. III, p. 383.

⁵¹ See *ibid.* where Ettinghausen notes: "The *hilāl* was also used in religious settings. W. Barthold states after N. Marr that when in the 5th/11th century the Cathedral of Ani was converted into a mosque the cross on its dome was replaced by a silver crescent, which could imply a symbolical value or at least a cultural identification for this emblem". The same author notes the usage of the crescent on Arab-Sāsānian coinage "including one probably struck for 'Abd al-Malik in Damascus in 75/695" (*ibid.*, p. 381); and, in connection with the mosaics of the Qubbat al-Şakhra in Jerusalem, Ettinghausen believes that the Sāsānian-type crowns, to which the crescent constitutes "the customary finial", and the Byzantine-type crowns from which the *hilāl* is suspended, are reflective "of a pre-Islamic usage now introduced into a Muslim context" (*ibid.*, p. 381).

⁵² See *ibid.*, p. 379.

sions of both the Christian and Muslim pilgrims who die on the voyage [I.J. p. 287]. On this large boat from Acre Ibn Jubayr notes how the Muslims secure berths separate from the Christians and his obvious approval of this is mixed with considerable resentment at the later boarding of more than two thousand Christian pilgrims from Jerusalem, from whose company Ibn Jubayr uncharitably prays to be speedily delivered! [I.J. p. 283] During his description of the events which lead up to the shipwreck off Messina, Ibn Jubayr unfavourably contrasts the griefstricken behaviour of the Christians with the more pietistic and fatalistic attitude of the Muslim passengers [I.J. p. 294] Yet the salvation from the wreck of many impecunious Muslim passengers, unable to pay their rescuers' fee, is freely attributed to the generosity of the Christian King of Sicily, William II [reg. AD 1166-1189] [I.J. p. 295]. Indeed, Ibn Jubayr goes so far as to state, in a manner that has some significance for the semiotics of the ambivalent Muslim-Christian relations of the age, that the (almost miraculous) presence of the Christian king at this shipwreck was an example of God's kindness towards the Muslim passengers [I.J. p. 295].

The previous examples of Ibn Jubayr's description of his dealings with Christian ships, and the Christian section of the passengers and crew who sailed in them, constitute a microcosm of the broader frame of Muslim-Christian relations. Elements of trust, gratitude, appreciation and indeed, occasional admiration, mingle with disapproval, deep-seated hostility, suspicion and fear.

(iii) There are few areas in the *Rihla* of Ibn Jubayr where the author's frequent bias against Christianity is more pronounced and manifest than in his succinct characterisation of those who hold *Christian regal power*. For example, Baldwin IV (reg. AD 1174-1185), King of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem and "Lord of Acre" (*Sāhib 'Akka*) is bluntly characterised by Ibn Jubayr as "this pig" (*hādhā 'l-khinzīr*) [I.J. p. 282; see also p. 274]; his mother, Agnes of Courtenay, is called a "sow" [I.J. p. 274]; William II of Sicily, despite the good things said about him, as noted above, in connection with the shipwreck—and despite also the existence of a treaty or truce between him and the Almohad ruler Abū Ya‘qūb Yūsuf b. ‘Abd al-Mu’min [reg. AD 1163-1184]⁵³—is still brusquely deemed to be "this polytheist" (*hādhā 'l-mushrik*) [I.J. p. 299], capable of considerable harshness towards the Muslims of Sicily, including forced conversion [I.J.

⁵³ See Broadhurst, *The Travels of Ibn Jubayr*, p. 387 n. 171; Helene Wieruszowski, "The Norman Kingdom of Sicily and the Crusades" in Robert Lee Wolff and Harry W. Hazard, *A History of the Crusades: Volume II: The Later Crusades 1189-1311*, 2nd edn, (Madison, Milwaukee & London: University of Wisconsin Press 1969), pp. 32-33; A. Huici Miranda, art. "Abū Ya‘qūb Yūsuf B. ‘Abd al-Mu’min", *EP*, vol. I, pp. 160-162.

p. 313]. Of him, Ibn Jubayr further notes: “He is about thirty years old. May God save the Muslims from his misdeed[s] and his extension [of power]” [I.J. p. 298]. Count Raymond of Tripoli [AD 1152-1187] is described as “a man of great importance among the cursed Franks”. He is “the cursed Count, Lord of Tripoli and Tiberias” [I.J. p. 282].

Of course, the ideal paradigm of the just ruler, and ‘Mirror’ for all other princes, Muslim as well as Christian, in the view of Ibn Jubayr was the redoubtable Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn. Not only was he a renowned Muslim champion in the crusading wars [see I.J. p. 270] but he was a model of rectitude as well: Ibn Jubayr states that the confusion and dishonesty of the Egyptian customs would certainly have been sorted out by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, had he known about it [I.J. pp. 13-14]; indeed, Ibn Jubayr states that Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn abolished several iniquitous taxes levied in Egypt, including a pilgrim tax and one on drinking Nile water! [I.J. pp. 30-31] The theme of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn’s justice is a constant one throughout the *Rihla*. (See, for example, I.J. pp. 14, 30, 55-56, 270-271). It is small wonder that, by contrast, the Christian rulers surveyed above receive little but opprobrium from Ibn Jubayr’s pen.

(iv) Taxation by one’s own government is an obvious irritant and an often alienating feature in most societies! It is not surprising, then, that in the milieu in which Ibn Jubayr travelled, he should have found the imposition of *Christian taxation* a source of some annoyance. This annoyance would have been clearly exacerbated in his mind by the generosity and justice perceived from his great hero, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn. We have just noted above the abolition by the latter of several taxes in Egypt and other examples are admirably recorded in the *Rihla* of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn’s generosity as far as taxation was concerned [e.g. see I.J. p. 16]. All this contrasts with examples cited in the text of taxes imposed by Christians: some, because of the element of reciprocity involved, are clearly not too irksome: “The Christians levy a tax on the Muslims in their country which guarantees the Muslims full protection; in a similar fashion Christian merchants pay a tax on their goods in Muslim countries” [I.J. p. 260]. Others, however, rouse Ibn Jubayr’s resentment to a greater degree: in Sicily the Muslim populace is subjected to a twice-yearly tax by the Christians which thus bars them from a full exploitation and enjoyment of the land [I.J. p. 297]. Ibn Jubayr prays for a full restoration of their rights. At the fortress of Tibnīn it is the itinerant Maghribis who are subject to taxation as punishment for a previous attack. Ibn Jubayr notes: “When the Maghribis pay this tax, they are happily reminded of how they annoyed the enemy: this makes it easier for them and softens their hardship for them” [I.J. p. 274]. In the light of all this, Ibn Jubayr’s acute embarrassment—which shines through the

text—may be imagined when he discovers on the road from Tibnīn that there are Muslims living under Frankish occupation who are taxed and threatened far *less* harshly than some Muslims living under Muslim rule [I.J. pp. 274-275]. As Ibn Jubayr wryly remarks: “Muslims complain of the tyranny of their own kind and praise the conduct of their Frankish enemy” [I.J. p. 275].

(v) Basically, for Ibn Jubayr, Christianity, with all it entails of *Christian chivalry, courtesy and mores*, is a snare and an exotic delusion from which Ibn Jubayr is perpetually praying to be delivered, the more he gains in knowledge about that faith. He has a natural curiosity about Christianity, especially what he perceives to be its ‘exotic’ elements; but he also seems to sense a seduction, and the potential for a fall from the true faith of Islam, behind every Christian smile and courtesy. Certainly, as we have seen, he is grateful to King William of Sicily for his help and generosity towards distressed Muslim passengers. This is freely acknowledged by the author. Credit is given elsewhere in the text to Christians where it is due. But, when all is said and done, Ibn Jubayr fervently prays for Muslims to be delivered from King William’s ‘enticement’ or ‘temptation’ (*fitna*) [I.J. p. 298]. He is extremely wary of the courteous Christians whom he meets in Sicily: “We perceived in their conduct and gentle demeanour (*lit: maqṣid*) towards the Muslims something which might cause temptation (*fitna*) in the souls of ignorant people” [I.J. p. 302; see also p. 304]. He prays that the people of Muḥammad may be protected from such a *fitna*. The exotic beauty of some of the decoration in the Christian Church of the Antiochian in Palermo creates temptation (*fitna*) in the souls from which the priggish Ibn Jubayr prays to be delivered [I.J. p. 306]. The author is similarly enchanted *and* disturbed by the exotic spectacle of the Christian wedding which he witnesses in Tyre. He admits to its being a spectacular sight, admires the finery of the bride and yet prays to be preserved from any temptation (*fitna*) arising out of the sight, a prayer which is repeated again, with the use of the same word *fitna* at the end of his description of the wedding [I.J. pp. 278-279, compare p. 307].

Ibn Jubayr’s insistent usage of the word *fitna* is interesting. As is well-known, the Arabic word can mean ‘civil strife’ as well as ‘temptation’. We can only speculate about the degree to which Ibn Jubayr surveyed a world divided upon itself religiously and politically and linked the two meanings in his own mind. What we can say is that Ibn Jubayr’s usage of the word *fitna* often signals, or reinforces, a certain sense of the strange, the alien or the exotic which may deviate, or cause others to deviate, from the *sirāt al-mustaqīm* as he knows it and, in consequence, lead the soul to perdition.

Taken altogether, this fivefold semiotic survey of the principal elements of cultural-religious alienation in the *Rihla* of Ibn Jubayr, imbued as they are with a certain authorial ambivalence on the one hand and aspects of the exotic which can both please and frighten on the other, lead inexorably to one conclusion which comes as no surprise. We may identify in the person of Ibn Jubayr a basic gut reaction: Ibn Jubayr did not really like Christians or Christianity. It is true that he may, on occasion, admire individual Christian people or their actions, but the Crusading milieu and his own religious upbringing and environment prove too strong to disguise Ibn Jubayr's fundamental attitude: Christianity is intrinsically the enemy from every point of view, whether it be moral, spiritual or physical.

We are now in a position to attempt an answer to the question posed at the beginning of this article: to what extent may a prototype pilgrim paradigm, similar to that identified in the *Rihla* of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, be identified in the work of Ibn Jubayr? The answer must be that a *partial* paradigmatic prototype *does exist* which is in neat accordance with the idea of Ibn Jubayr's *Rihla* being a general prototype for much else in the *Rihla* genre: thus, Ibn Jubayr *does* undertake a search for the shrine and traverse its religious geography; he *does* seek knowledge from people and places where he can find it, being directly familiar with the concept of *talab al-‘ilm* [see *I.J.* p. 258]; he *is* interested in the exercise of power though usually by others, e.g. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, William of Sicily, rather than himself: in this respect, at least, he is a rather humbler figure than that of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa. There remains, then, the question of a basic wanderlust: here, as we have noted, there *is* some divergence between Ibn Jubayr and Ibn Baṭṭūṭa. This is not to say that Ibn Jubayr is *totally* devoid of the travel urge but simply to note that his illustrious successor was beset by that urge to a sublime degree.

In conclusion, then, it is the contention of this article that, in the matter of a pilgrim paradigm, as in so many other areas, Ibn Jubayr's *Rihla* foreshadows, or acts as a precursor to, the *Rihla* of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, and acts as worthy forbear of that later work.

University of Exeter

IAN RICHARD NETTON