On the pleasant, sunny afternoon of December 11th 2017, Jerusalem saw an unusual crowd gathering upon the ramp of the ancient citadel, the ‘Tower of David,’ on other days used as the entranceway to the city history museum inside. Men and women in suits positioned themselves at the guard rail, together with men wearing the vestments of Greek Orthodox, Armenian and Coptic clergymen, the dark suits and fezzes of Turkish officials and the thawbs and agals of Arab gentlemen. Dressed in a khaki field uniform, riding boots, belt and peaked cap, one of them planted himself behind the microphone stand in the center and, addressing “the Inhabitants of Jerusalem the Blessed and the People Dwelling in Its Vicinity,” read a proclamation of martial law over the city and solemnly declared inviolable the holy sites and traditional rights of all resident religious communities.¹

With this event the Jerusalem municipality marked the centenary of the official seizure of the city by the British Egyptian Expeditionary Force under the command of General Edmund Allenby, after four hundred years of Ottoman rule. To honor this occasion the Tower of David Museum also opened an exhibition entitled “A General and a Gentleman: Allenby at the Gates of Jerusalem.” The reenactment took place in the presence of mayor Nir Barkat and the famous general’s great-grandnephew Henry J.H. Allenby, among other dignitaries, who in their speeches praised the world-historical significance of the “liberation of Jerusalem.” Five days prior to the celebration, the US president had, opportunistically enough, announced his country’s recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of the State of Israel.²

One hundred years before, the real general Allenby had dismounted his horse outside of Jaffa Gate, entered the city on foot, then climbed the ramp to the citadel’s portal, and had addressed the local and global public in English, French, Italian, Hebrew, Arabic, Russian, and Greek.³ In all its matter-of-factness and sobriety that ceremony could scarcely belie the fact that it made Allenby the latest in a long and formidable series of conquerors and pilgrimaging rulers⁴ – of particular significance

---

³ English text in Horne 1923, 417.
⁴ A tentative list of such entries into the Holy City/al-Quds includes the following figures (episodes commonly or frequently seen as ‘mythical’ marked with *): King David of Judah and Israel* (ca. 1010 BCE); King Alexander of Macedon* (ca. 332 BCE, mythologically constructed as a Christian king avant
obviously being the professed Christians among them – whose entries into the Holy City had each marked a more or less momentous historical change. This article aims to determine in how far such entries followed a performative tradition, or to which extent their representation in texts and other media conformed to a narrative tradition, by gathering, analyzing and comparing source materials on a number of significant cases. Of interest is the impression they were meant to make on the public. Whether, therefore, the sources document a performative practice or instantiate a representational paradigm is of secondary importance.

Prototypes

In an episode much pondered over since time immemorial, chapter 14 of the Book of Genesis narrates how Melchizedek, “the king of Salem” (i.e. Jerusalem⁵) and “priest of the most high god” once “brought out bread and wine” to host Abram and to “bless him of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth.” In return for the divine protection that the priest-king of Jerusalem had thus conveyed to him, Israel’s progenitor henceforth was to pay tithes to him, i.e. to submit himself to his rule.⁶ Shortly afterwards God had made a covenant with Abram, renaming him Abraham and promising him offspring as countless as the stars of heaven and to them the possession of the “land from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates.”⁷
Of Melchizedek (Malki-Ṣedeq, “King of [or: My King is] Righteousness,” in Hebrew), furthermore, the Bible mentions neither his birth nor death (nor, for that matter, any other biographical detail), a fact that came to be widely understood as indicating that he was not bound to the laws of becoming and passing in time and, by implication, his was an everlasting priest-kingship. A complex interpretative process then led to the attribution of this twofold dignity to his ‘servant’ Abraham.

The Second Book of Samuel narrates that David, after having been anointed king of both the southern kingdom of Judah and its northern counterpart Israel, invaded the ancient Jebusite city of Jerusalem with the fortress Zion, situated right on the border of the two states, to make the city his residence, the dwelling place of YHWH, and the capital of the united kingdom.

When, according to another tradition, Jacob, the father of the Israelite people, on his deathbed bid farewell to his twelve sons and patriarchs-to-be of the twelve tribes, the fourth of them, Judah, David’s ancestor, received a peculiar blessing. Judah, Jacob said, was irresistible like a lion; he would overcome his and his brothers’ enemies and his brothers would “bow down before” him. And he prophesied that “the scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be.” This verse came to be understood to mean that some day, Judah’s, David’s and their descendants’ reign would be assumed by a messianic ruler named Shiloh, but until that remote moment, it would last uncontestedly, by divine warrant.

Finally, in order not to leave room for any doubt about the full validity of the Davidian prerogatives, Psalm 110 added that “The lord hath sworn, and will not repent: Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.” Thus David had inherited three titles from the primeval ruler Melchizedek, that of the eternal kingship over God’s people, the high priesthood, and the right to Jerusalem. By implication, the ruler who would one day rise to establish the true theocracy would be a priest-king like Melchizedek and David, and restorer of their sovereignty.

After his conquest of Jerusalem, the biblical narrative continues:

David went and brought up the ark of God ... into the city of David with gladness. And it was so, that when they that bare the ark of the LORD had gone six paces, he sacrificed oxen and fatlings. And David danced before the LORD with all his might; and David was girded with a linen ephod.

---

8 In contrast, some apocryphal works offer more information on Melchizedek – see e.g. ‘(Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,’ transl. Anderson 1983 (repr. 2009), 91–221, there 207–211.
9 Cf. e.g. Hebr. 7:1–3.
11 2 Sam. 5; cf. 1 Chron. 11:1–9.
12 Gen. 49:8–10; cf. de Hoop (1999), s.v. Gen. 49:8–10; הליש.
14 2 Sam. 6:12–14; cf. 1 Chron. 15–16.
Afterwards, his wife Michal would deride him for his shameless self-exposure, even before “the eyes of the handmaids of his servants.” The ephod, a type of long shirt, was part of the ceremonial vestment worn by the high priest in the tabernacle and later in the Jerusalem temple.¹⁵ This episode about David leading a procession, wearing a cultic garment, and offering sacrifices is the closest to officiating as high priest as he is ever described in the biblical tradition. Yet the narration about him consecrating the new capital by installing the sacred ark there obviously implied presenting him as political ruler and as chief religious official.

According to the First Book of Chronicles, the Ark had been brought from a place called Kirjathjearim that, in the Book of Joshua, is also named Kirjathbaal.¹⁶ Today Qiryat Yearim is a Jewish religious community just outside the ancient Arab village of Abu Ghosh, about 15 km west of Jerusalem. The remains of the biblical site are currently being excavated.¹⁷

Samuel 2 further narrates that King David bought a threshing floor on Mount Moriah from its Jebusite owner, Araunah, for the price of fifty silver shekels, in order to “erect an altar to the Lord”¹⁸ – a place commonly identified with the Temple Mount. But it was not granted to David to build a house for God, a task that he had to leave to his son Solomon. And it was through Solomon, too, God promised David, that “thine house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee: thy throne shall be established for ever.”¹⁹ To officiate as high priest, however, was not given to David but to Zadok the Levite, descendent of Aaron. The Temple, eventually, would be built by David’s son, Solomon.

To summarize this complex of ideas as suggested by the scriptural tradition: David, conqueror of Jerusalem and unifier of all the twelve tribes of Israel is king and high priest like Melchizedek before him; his descendants nominally are kings and high priests forever, until a man by the enigmatic name of Shiloh – none other than the messiah – will appear, take over these offices and, by virtue of them, will rule over the peoples of the world. Spatially, the claim to power thus expressed, is most closely connected with the city of Jerusalem, while the claim to the priesthood is bound to the Temple Mount in that same city.

These notions were to be inherited, whether actually or implicitly and potentially, by later, Christian conceptions of legitimate imperial rule.²⁰

When, a millennium later, the gospels tell us, Jesus of Nazareth arrived at Jerusalem it was no less revolutionary an event. A large crowd, present for the imminent feast of Passover, received him outside the gate, “took branches of palm trees, and

---

¹⁵ Cf. Exod. 28:4–8, 29:5, 39:2–5; Lev. 8:7.
¹⁶ 1 Chron. 13:5; Joshua 15:60.
¹⁹ 2 Sam. 7; 1 Chron. 22:1–16.
²⁰ Cf. Dagron 2003, 49 – 52.
went forth to meet him, and cried, Hosanna: Blessed is the King of Israel that cometh in the name of the Lord.” The Gospel of Matthew has the crowd further hail Jesus as the “son of David;” in the Gospel of Mark they praise the coming “kingdom of our father David.” All four gospels present the event as the fulfilment of Zechariah’s prophecy about a messianic king, “righteous and redeeming,” riding on “the foal of an ass.” The narrative is also reminiscent of Psalm 118 with its imagery of a solemn passage: “Open to me the gates of righteousness: I will go into them, and I will praise the lord ... Blessed be he that cometh in the name of the lord.” In addition, chapters 5 to 7 of the Letter to the Hebrews state that Christ had been appointed “high priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.” A genealogy constructed to firmly establish the combined royal and sacerdotal charismata by ascribing to Jesus (and his mother Mary) a lineage going back to Judah and Levi would be added in the third century – “the ‘divine economy’ which assured the Messiah the double title of king and priest.”

Thus, there remains little uncertainty about the claim raised by the evangelists and Paul: Jesus of Nazareth is the foretold descendent of King David who has come to restore the kingship of his ancestor and to assume his eschatic priest-kingdom over Israel; hence, the ancient royal residence in Jerusalem belongs to him, too. And finally, the implication that he was also identical with Shiloh whose coming the patriarch Jacob had prophesied, that he, therefore, had come to rule over all the other nations as well, immediately suggested itself.

All four gospels relate that Jesus approached Jerusalem from the Mount of Olives to the east. There were two entryways to the city on its eastern side, the Lions’ Gate, later also known as St Stephen’s Gate and, leading straight onto the elevated plaza that formed the precinct of the Temple (considered to be identical with the Haram al-Sharif of Muslim lore), the Gate of Mercy (Sha’ar ha-Rahamim in Hebrew, Bāb al-Rahma in Arabic) or Golden Gate. It has widely been assumed that it was this latter gate through which Jesus the Christ had entered the Holy City, an inference suggested by the gospels themselves since their narrations all proceed directly to the episode of the Cleansing of the Temple.

The entry of King David, and that of the “son of David,” Jesus of Nazareth, into Jerusalem were both perceived as markers of epochal changes. The first instituted the

---

22 (Deutero-)Zechariah 9:9 “Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass.”
24 Hebr. 5:6.10.
26 Mark 11:11 even deals with the change of scene in one concise sentence: “And he went into Jerusalem, into the temple.” However, the earliest extant source that explicitly mentions Jesus’s entry through the Porta Aurea is a homily on Palm Sunday by Ps.-Bede, dated 8th/9th c.: Patrologia Latina vol. 94, col. 507.
divinely ordained eternal kingship in Israel and made Jerusalem a sacred city; the
second signaled a revolutionary universalization of the salvation that had previously
been reserved for Israel alone, making Jerusalem the center of this universal order of
salvation, the capital of a symbolical world empire.

Heraclius

Almost exactly 600 years after Jesus’s atoning sacrifice in Jerusalem and around 300
years after the beginning of the Christianization of the Roman monarchy, a Roman
emperor for the first time bothered to come to the Holy City in person. Neither Con-
stantine nor Justinian had deigned to do so, even while the former’s mother Helena,
by finding the True Cross and by overseeing the construction of the Church of the
Holy Sepulcher, had made the rock of Golgotha and the tomb of Christ the physical
center of the Christian world and bound the Christian emperors’ throne to it, and
even though the latter had one of the most formidable projects of his building pro-
gram realized here, the great Nea Church. One may wonder, therefore, if the signifi-
cance ascribed to the earthly, the real Jerusalem did not only fully catch up with that
of the spiritual and symbolic one by the time of Heraclius.\footnote{27}

During the first three decades of the seventh century, the Byzantine Imperium
Romanum went through a profound crisis. In 602 the centurio Phokas seized
power, only to be overthrown by a counter-usurpation from Heraclius senior, exarch
of Carthage, and his son, who was crowned emperor in 610. In addition to this do-
mestic crisis, an even more severe one appeared in the realm of foreign policy.\footnote{28}
From 603 onwards, the Romans’ centuries-long arch-enemy, the Persian Empire,
reigned over by the Sasanian dynasty since 224, relentlessly conquered province
after province of Byzantine territory, in 626 even threatening, together with its
Avar allies, the capital Constantinople.

Already in 614 Persian troops had conquered Jerusalem and not only deported its
Christian population to Mesopotamia but also carried off to Ctesiphon (near today’s
Baghdad and not far from ancient Babylon) the relic of the True Cross that had been
enshrined in the Church of the Holy Sepulcher since its construction in the time of St
Helena. As attested by literary works such as the Syriac Cave of Treasures and the
Ethiopic-Arabic Book of Adam and Eve, the inhabitants of the eastern provinces of
the Empire regarded Golgotha as the actual center of the world. The Cross, in their
view, was made from the very wood of the Tree of Life in Paradise which was the
same wood as that of the tree in whose branches the ram had been caught that Abra-

\footnote{27}{For a wider contextualization of these partly legendary events cf. Wilken 1992 and the contribu-
tion of Howard-Johnston to this volume.}

\footnote{28}{For a comprehensive overview of the period cf. Greatrex and Lieu (2002), 182–228; Dignas and
ham sacrificed instead of his son Isaac,²⁹ as well as the wood that had been used to build the Ark of the Covenant roughly a millennium later.³⁰ Viewed in this light Shah Kosrow II (590 – 628) had not merely heisted the most sacred relic of Christendom, he had uprooted the wooden axis around which the whole of salvation history revolved – a disaster of cosmic proportions.

The significance of this loss seems to have dawned only gradually on the Constantinopolitan government after the fall of Jerusalem, perhaps because one half of the Cross was kept (together with the Holy Nails, Lance and Sponge) in the Hagia Sophia. It was at this very time, however, that the celebration of the Feast of the Cross on September 14th appears to have been introduced in the Constantinopolitan Church, and soon the retrieval of the True Cross became an official war objective. From 622 onward, the Byzantine army conducted a large-scale counterattack under the personal command of Emperor Heraclius and, after six years, forced the enemy to surrender. The Persian troops withdrew and Byzantine ones moved back into their former fortresses and garrisons. The Cross was restituted to Heraclius who transferred it back to Jerusalem in triumphal procession. What transpired upon his arrival is related in the Latin translation of a lost contemporary Greek document. The Reversio Sanctae Crucis, a text frequently adapted throughout the Middle Ages (perhaps most influentially in Jacobus de Voragine’s Legenda Aurea³¹), describes the memorable event as follows:

Thus, taking charge of the wood of the most glorious Cross that the impious one (i.e. Kosrow) had carried off, he (i.e. Heraclius) hurries to Jerusalem. All the people are rejoicing, with palm fronds, candles and torches or other signs of glory, with hymns and canticles, some proceeding to meet him and others following in his train.

But when the Emperor, coming down from the Mount of Olives, sitting on a royal horse decorated with imperial ornaments, wanted to enter by the same gate that the Lord had entered when coming to His passion, the stones of the gate suddenly descended and joined themselves to one another, making a solid wall.

As they were wondering in astonishment, constricted by exceeding sorrow, they looked up on high and saw the sign of the Cross in the sky, shining brightly with flaming splendour. An angel of the Lord took it in his hands, stood above the gate and said: When the King of the heavens, the Lord of all the earth, entered through this gate on his way to fulfilling the mysteries of the passion, he did not appear in purple or as shining diadem, nor did he ask for a strong horse to carry him, but sitting on the back of a humble donkey he left his servants a paradigm of humility. This said, the angel quickly returned to heaven.

Then the Emperor rejoiced in the Lord because of the angelic visit, and having removed the tokens of imperial rank he proceeded without shoes, girded only with a linen belt, took the Cross of the Lord in his hands and hastened forward, face covered in tears and eyes raised to the sky, making his way to the gate. As soon as he approached with humility the hard stones sensed the

³⁰ La Caverne des Trésors, ed., trans. Ri (1987), IV,2 – 3; XXIX,4 – 9; LIII,6.11.
³¹ For a comprehensive reconstruction of the reception history in Medieval Europe, see Baert 2004, 133 et seqq.
celestial command, and raising itself at once the gate gave free access to those who were going in.\footnote{32}

The palm branches, the route taken from the Mount of Olives through the Eastern Gate, the enthusiasm of the crowd, and the numerous miraculous healings, raisings from the dead, and castings out of demons that, we are told, subsequently came to pass, all unmistakably remind the reader/listener of Jesus’s entry on Palm Sunday, so that the text’s explicit linking of the two events almost appears as a redundancy.

Around 630, the time of his victory, Heraclius renounced the title of emperor (\textit{imperator} / \textit{autokrator}) – which, formidable though it might have been, was no more than the designation of an administrative office – and assumed that of a “king faithful in Christ” (\textit{πιστὸς ἐν Χριστῷ βασιλεύς}), implying a right to rulership and entitlement to dynastic succession ordained by God.\footnote{33} Unlike his predecessors and immediate successors Heraclius furthermore was frequently presented as a New David.\footnote{34} As David had once brought the Ark of the Covenant to Jerusalem, now the New David brought the Ark of the New Covenant, the Cross, back to Jerusalem. Like David, he stripped down almost completely on the occasion, wearing not a linen ephod but a linen belt, and like David, he was said to have received the ordination to the priesthood.\footnote{35} And finally a rumor spread that Heraclius had not only defeated the Persians but had them converted to the Christian faith, had disabused the sole opponent of the Christian empire from unbelief and, therefore, had removed the main obstacle to the worldwide expansion of the gospel.\footnote{36}

All this taken together, Heraclius seemed to be on the verge of founding nothing short of an everlasting dynasty of priest-kings with a God-given right to world power. That this pledge remained unfulfilled, therefore, might be ascribed to the advance of the Arabs. Only a decade after Heraclius’s splendid victory the Roman troops had to withdraw from Palestine; shortly thereafter Egypt fell, and the Sasanian Empire collapsed. The “king faithful in Christ” sank into a deep depression and would never more leave his summer residence on the shore of the Bosporus opposite the capital.

But even though Heraclius’s salvation-historical mission never advanced beyond its early stages, there remained one more task to be performed. Establishing a universal Christian empire could not restrict itself to an implementation of the Great Commission as it was given in Matthew 28: “Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” It was also necessary for the people of the Old Covenant to be regarded in a way adequate

\footnote{33} Shahid 1981, 288–296; Dagron 2003, 29–32.
\footnote{36} Greisiger 2014, 117–121.
to its salvation-historical weight. Regardless of their rejection of Christ, God had, according to Romans 11, never abandoned His people to simply replace them with the New Israel, the Church, but had preserved them for their unification with the latter.

Jews, especially in the Galilee, their main area of settlement, had by all accounts supported – not least militarily – the Persian advance. After 614, the occupiers granted a messianic king and high priest, named Nehemya ben Ḥushiel in the apocalyptic midrashim that mention him, the sovereignty over Jerusalem and permitted some kind of cultic and sacrificial routine to be put into practice on the Temple Mount. Christian sources accuse ‘the Jews’ of destroying numerous churches and even of trying to forcibly convert a multitude of civil detainees and of committing a mass execution among those who would not obey. In Edessa, Jewish combatants were resisting the Byzantine reinvasion as late as 628.³⁷

Heraclius exercised clemency. When he arrived at Edessa, he granted a general amnesty to all members of the Jewish resistance. In Tiberias, he and his entourage were hosted by a wealthy member of the Jewish community named Benjamin, who had apparently been involved in the Galilean movement, the insurgents’ collaboration with the Persians, and the persecution of Christians. Heraclius took him along on his further journey to Jerusalem and converted him at their stopover in Neapolis (Nablus/Shekhem) in Samaria.³⁸

Upon his arrival in Jerusalem, the emperor granted a writ of protection to all the Jews of Palestine – but after his solemn entry he revoked the promise at the insistence of the Christian population and Patriarch Modestus (r. 614–634) and renewed the old prohibition of access to the city for Jews. A few years later he even decreed that all the Jewish subjects of the empire must be baptized.

Thus, all indications are that Heraclius and his advisors initially hoped that the Jews, realizing that in Nehemya ben Ḥushiel they had backed the wrong horse, would now submit themselves to the victorious and benevolent “king faithful in Christ,” and realize, just like Benjamin of Tiberias had, that Jesus of Nazareth was their Christ, too. Shortly afterwards this benevolence once more changed into repression, but the goal of the conversion of all the Jews remained. Orthodox circles would regard these efforts as tantamount to meddling in God’s design, maintaining that He had provided for the salvation of Israel not until for the end of time.³⁹

Heraclius’s entry into Jerusalem was obviously meant to mark an epochal change, not without striking eschatological undertones: the “king faithful in Christ” assumed world rulership, complying with God’s will (to which the Jews were also bound), bringing in a new age of unprecedented splendor, peace and prosperity for the Christian Imperium Romanum.

³⁷ For an attempt at a reconstruction of the events, which, for want of straightforward historical accounts, largely depends on vaticinia ex eventu from apocalyptic texts, see Greisiger 2014, 46–63, 68–77.
³⁹ Greisiger 2014, 97–106.
Godfrey

On 15 July 1099, after an eight-day siege, thousands of armed Frankish pilgrims invaded Jerusalem and – according to the chronicle of William (ca. 1130 – 1186), archbishop of Tyre and chancellor of the Kingdom of Jerusalem – caused an appalling bloodbath among the Muslim and Jewish civilians. Regardless of these horrors the chronicler felt compelled to imbue his narrative with salvation-historical significance:

It was a Friday at the ninth hour. Verily, it seemed divinely ordained that the faithful who were fighting for the glory of the Savior should have obtained the consummation of their desires at the same hour and on the very day on which the Lord had suffered in that city for the salvation of the world. It was on that day, as we read, that the first man was created and the second was delivered over to death for the salvation of the first. It was fitting, therefore, that, at that very hour, those who were members of His body and imitators of Him should triumph in His name over His enemies.⁴⁰

The first crusaders to enter the Holy City, William informs us, were Godfrey, Lord of Bouillon and Duke of Lower Lorraine (ca. 1060 – 1100), and his brother Eustace.⁴¹ William notes that Godfrey’s men participated in the looting and bloodshed⁴² but another historian, Albert of Aachen (fl. ca. 1100) (relying on the chronicle of an eyewitness, one of the duke’s vassals), draws a different picture of Godfrey:

[W]hile all the princes were gazing open-mouthed at the possessions and the turreted buildings, and all the common crowd was ... inflicting a massacre with excessive cruelty on the Saracens, Duke Godfrey soon abstained from all slaughter, and ... took off his hauberk and linen clothes, went out of the walls with bare feet and made a humble procession around the outside of the city; then, entering through that gate which looks out on the Mount of Olives, he presented himself at the Sepulcher of Lord Jesus Christ, son of the living God, keeping up steadfastly tears, prayers, and divine praises, and giving thanks to God because he had earnt the sight of that which had always been his greatest desire.⁴³

The enactment – real or fictitious – of Godfrey’s pious and humble entry into the Holy City was obviously meant to emulate that of Heraclius as the Reversio Sanctae Crucis had depicted it.⁴⁴ Just like Heraclius, barefoot and dressed only in his shirt, the coming ruler of the Christian Kingdom of Jerusalem (he would renounce the

---

⁴¹ Wilhelm 8,18. In Albert’s account, Godfrey and Eustace were preceded by Lithold and Engilbert, see n. 43. below, 6,19–428–429.
⁴² Wilhelm 8,19.
royal crown) enters through the gate opposite the Mount of Olives and, drowned in tears, thanks God for the grace He has bestowed on him.

Throughout the Middle Ages, Heraclius’s entry would remain an inherent part of the collective memory of Christians.⁴⁵ A thirteenth century Old French translation and continuation of William’s chronicle even bears the title *Estoire d’Eracles*.⁴⁶ Moreover, liturgical customs attest to a belief held among Jerusalemites of the Crusader period, that it was through the Golden Gate that the Lord and Heraclius had entered the city. Kept closed throughout the year, the gate was opened twice, once on Palm Sundays and once on the feast of the Exaltation of the Cross on September 14th, to allow for processions which connected the gate with the Dome of the Rock (at that time a church dedicated to the Mother of God and named *Templum Domini*) and with the Holy Sepulcher.⁴⁷ Through Godfrey and his literary ‘voice,’ Albert, this tradition of commemorating Jesus’s and Heraclius’s entries via the Eastern Gate was further amplified.

The Nineteenth Century

In the course of the nineteenth century, especially following the ‘Oriental Crisis’ of 1839–1841, Palestine’s geopolitical significance dramatically increased once again. Western powers, including the Russian Empire, were now able to assert their and their subjects’ interests in the Middle East more forcefully. This was further facilitated by improved traveling conditions resulting from innovations in steam navigation and railway construction, while the ‘Holy Land’ witnessed a steadily increasing influx of Christian pilgrims and a growing presence of Christian, by now also Protestant, religious institutions.⁴⁸ One of the most significant of these new foundations was the establishment of the first Protestant bishopric in Jerusalem in 1841, a Prussian-Evangelical and Anglican cooperation that was to last until 1886.⁴⁹ In order not to fall short of their political and religious aspirations, various royal families also dispatched members, among them at least two crowned heads of state, to make their appearance in the Holy Land.

---

⁴⁵ Baert 2004, 167 et seqq.
The first example concerns Russia, the longstanding protecting power of the Orthodox Christian communities under Ottoman rule.⁵⁰ In the spring of 1859, Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolayevich, brother of Tsar Alexander II (r. 1855–1881) traveled to Palestine for an official visit, accompanied by his wife Alexandra Iosifovna and his son Nikolai. Subsequently one of the largest urban building projects in nineteenth century Jerusalem – and one of the first quarters outside of the city walls – was carried out: the Russian Ecclesiastical Mission. Known among the locals as al-Muskubiya in Arabic, Migraš ha-Rūsim in Hebrew or “the Russian Compound”, the building complex comprising pilgrims’ hostels, residences for priests and clerics, cathedral, mission, marketplace, and the Russian consulate, left an unmistakable mark of the Russian claims to the Holy City and the Holy Land.

Konstantin von Tischendorf (1815–1874), the renowned discoverer and editor of the Codex Sinaiticus, who had already won the Grand Duke’s and the Tsar’s favor and accompanied the imperial pilgrims, portrayed their journey for Die Gartenlaube, the newly founded first German illustrated magazine. On his way, Konstantin Nikolayevich rode at the head of his large entourage and baggage train on a white Arabian horse that the governor of Jerusalem had sent him – a splendid sight, Tischendorf writes, “the like of which the great pilgrims’ road scarcely may have seen since the time of the Crusades”, a thought that “stirred a sublime emotion of Christian patriotism within my soul.”⁵¹

Christian pilgrims or settlers in Palestine apparently never passed up an opportunity to see in their present reality a reverberation of the glorious days of the Crusades. Thus, when British and Austrian troops occupied the Ottoman sea fortress of Acre in 1840 – they had actually come to the aid of Sultan Abdülmecid I (r. 1839–1861) against the defecting governor of Egypt, Muhammad Ali Pasha – James Edward Hanauer (1850–1938), an Anglican priest and photographer born and raised in a German-American family in Palestine, perceived this as a repetition of Richard the Lionheart’s conquest of the city during the Third Crusade in 1191.⁵² In a similar vein, the Swiss Oriental scholar Titus Tobler (1806–1877) exclaimed in the report of his fourth exploratory journey to Palestine in 1865, in view of the heavily increased number of European Christian settlers in the Holy Land: “The peaceful crusade has begun. Jerusalem must become ours.”⁵³

The Russian travelers’ party stayed the night at the residence of Mustafa Abu Ghosh where, according to historical tradition, the Crusaders had also lodged on their way from the coast to the Holy City. Sometime in the twelfth century, the Knights Hospitaller had taken over a fortified compound with a church there,
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⁵¹ Tischendorf 1862, 251.
⁵³ Tobler 1868, 322. For an overview of the role crusader imagery played in 19th c. religious and political discourses cf. also Knobler 2006, 293–325.
which henceforth served pilgrims as sleeping quarters. At that time, the tradition that
connected the place with the Ark of the Covenant had not entirely been forgotten,
although in the Crusader period it seems to have been (partly) replaced by another
tradition that identified it with the biblical Emmaus (Luke 24:13–35).

On the following day, the Greek Patriarch of Jerusalem Cyril II (r. 1845–1872) and
provincial governor Mustafa Süreyya Paşa (1825–1879) came to meet the caravan. On
their arrival, Tischendorf relates, “the Patriarch and the Grand Duke both dismounted
their horses. Then the former blessed the guest and exclaimed: ‘Blessed be he that
cometh in the name of the Lord.’” Few of those present may have been more keenly
aware of the messianic implications of this utterance than the Greek-Orthodox eccle-
siastical prince who made it and the Lutheran New Testament scholar who preserved
it for posterity.

Konstantin Nikolayevich, however, would not go so far as to emulate the one
who had first “come in the name of the Lord” by entering Jerusalem from the
east. He took the Jaffa or Hebron Gate on the opposite side of the city, which was tra-
ditionally also known as the Pilgrims’ Gate. Having arrived at the portal, we are fur-
ther told, “the Grand Duke ... descended in order to enter, according to ancient cus-
tom, the city on foot.” Inside the city the Russian bishop received the distinguished
pilgrims “with the cross and holy water;” to the cheering of the crowd they proceed-
eder from there without delay to the Church of the Holy Sepulcher.

Now, that “old pious custom” to dismount one’s horse at the gate had most cer-
tainly been common practice among Christian Jerusalem pilgrims since time imme-
morial. In the account of his great Oriental journey in the 1750s, for example, Ste-
phan Schultz (1714–1776), the director of the Institutum Judaicum et Muhammedicum in Halle, writes that Christians had been expressly forbidden to
enter in any way other than by foot. However, given the ubiquity of memories of
the Crusader past in nineteenth-century Palestine, one is justified in seeing in this
custom a reflection of Godfrey of Bouillon’s entry as well, not just its historical ante-
cedents.

To Tischendorf, however, the Grand Duke’s journey seemed to point not only to
the splendid past but also to an even more glorious future:

That [the entry into the City of God] turned out more solemn than that of virtually every other
European prince ... since the Crusades, carried the more weight the more it resulted from the
interaction of so many and diverse forces ... The entry of the Tsar’s intimate friend and brother
turned into a beautiful manifestation of the most animated sympathies. I am convinced that it
kindled in many a heart the desire that it may foretell another entry of enduring importance.
And also this I know, that many others conceived this entry and everything it was tied up
with as significant for the future of the Holy City.

---

56 Tischendorf 1862, 251–253, there 253.
Few of the actors or those who recorded their acts had dared to be this explicit. Nonetheless, the German scholar’s remarks demonstrate that contemporaries could see such processions of mingled triumph and humility as also alluding to the eschatic re-entry of Christ in Glory, whether as anticipating a future moment or as asserting that the redemptive events were unfolding before their very eyes.

A particularly significant figure to visit Jerusalem was Franz Joseph I, Emperor of Austria, King of Hungary (r. 1848–1916) who travelled to the Orient in order to attend the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 and on his way made a detour to Palestine. Even though his precursor, Franz II (r. 1792–1806), had already renounced the crown of the Imperium Romanum sixty years earlier, and Franz Joseph himself could no longer lay claim to the leadership of Greater Germany following the Battle of Königgrätz in 1866, the Emperor’s visit was still special because as a member of the house of Habsburg he also bore the title of King of Jerusalem. ⁵⁷

The Benedictine abbot Beda Dudík (1815–1890), who accompanied the royal traveler as his chaplain, and published a comprehensive account of the journey in the following year, relates that “as the Crusaders of old had done, so also the crowned pilgrim spent the night at the biblical site near Abu Ghosh, whence the Ark of the Covenant was carried to Jerusalem.” And he continues: “Although the emperor did not bring the Ark of the Covenant with him, he carried a pious and faithful heart to the Holy City, and the determination to pray for his empire, for himself and for his house at the grave of the Savior, and to do deeds of charity and Christian love.”

On November 9th, 1869 – only weeks before the twentieth anniversary of his coronation – Franz Joseph, too, dismounted his horse outside Jaffa Gate and entered the city on foot. The entire Catholic clergy stood ready for his reception and a bishop who deputized for the Patriarch presented him the cross for a kiss and, when the festive procession proceeded to the Holy Sepulcher, “bell-ringing and the thunder of cannons announced to the world that after 600 years once again a Christian Emperor made pilgrimage to the holy place.” ⁵⁸

Only five days earlier, the Prussian Crown Prince Friedrich Wilhelm, the future German Emperor Friedrich III (r. 1888), and father of Wilhelm II, likewise on his way to attend the opening of the Suez Canal (November 17th), had visited Jerusalem. The prince’s sojourn was less magnificent and ceremonious, and he did not exercise any caution at the gate but went in with his entourage on horseback, “in the face of the narrow streets and the awful pavement, only concerned that we might at any moment end up sprawled on the ground with our horse.” ⁵⁹

---

⁵⁷ For the emperor’s full “Great Title” cf. e.g. Hof- und Staats-Handbuch des Kaiserthumes Österreich für das Jahr 1857, Vienna 1857, pt. 1, p. 1.
Emperor Franz Joseph, in contrast, exercised humility. As soon as the city first came into view he knelt down and kissed the earth, and remained in silent meditation for several minutes, contemplating, as Dudík suggests, the images that crossed his mind, considering that he bore the title of King of Jerusalem. The chaplain’s reckoning that this was the first time in six hundred years that a Christian Emperor visited the Holy City was a reference to the *stupor mundi et immutator mirabilis*, Frederick II (r. 1220–1250), who had led the Sixth Crusade in 1228/29 and had occupied the city not by force of arms but by treaty concluded with the Ayyubid Sultan al-Kāmil (r. 1218–1238). We do not know any details about the manner in which he made his entry on 17 March 1229, but we do know that on the following day he assembled clerics and knights in the Church of the Holy Sepulcher and crowned himself King of Jerusalem. Thus Franz Joseph I was indeed a remote heir to both of the crowns of that other Holy Roman Emperor and King of Jerusalem – leading, as it were, a crusade by peaceful, symbolic means. The Austrian Hospice, a landmark building opened in 1863 at the Third Station of the Via Dolorosa, was to commemorate the Emperor’s sojourn on the occasion of its fortieth anniversary with a monumental mosaic on the chapel wall entitled “The Military and Peaceful Pilgrimages of Austria-Hungary to the Holy Land since Ancient Times,” showing an ensemble of figures replete with references to the Crusades. Thus, Franz Joseph, too, made performative references to King David, Jesus Christ, Heraclius, as well as Godfrey of Bouillon, and combined them with an allusion to Frederick II.

Much better remembered than the journeys of other nineteenth-century royal figures such as Konstantin Nikolayevich and Franz Joseph is that of the German Emperor (1888–1918) Wilhelm II in 1898. The visit was a genuine media event: newspaper reports, picture postcards and numerous promptly published illustrated luxury volumes covered the meticulously orchestrated sequence of public acts performed by Wilhelm and his wife Augusta Victoria: their glamorous sea voyage to Constantinople and onwards to Haifa, the trek of the enormous retinue for several days southwards, the visits to the various German communities, the consecration of the neo-Romanesque Church of the Redeemer in Jerusalem specially built for the occasion, the handing over of a plot of land on Mt. Zion, recently procured from the Sultan, to the German Catholics to build the Abbey of the Dormition, and the endowment of the malaria hospital (opened in 1910) with the soaring neo-Byzantine Church of the Ascension (‘Augusta Victoria Church’) on the Mount of Olives, overlooking all of Jerusalem and its surroundings.

---

60 Dudík 1870, 180–181.
61 Runciman 1955, 188–189.
62 Arad 2015, 251–280.
63 For a detailed account and in-depth analysis of the events and their broader context, see Benner 2001.
The event displayed an equally weighty symbolism that, however, had its own peculiarities. Under the legal principle of the Territorial Sovereign’s Church Government (“landesherrliches Kirchenregiment”), then in force in Protestant German states, Wilhelm, in his capacity of King of Prussia, also held the office of Summus episcopus, chief bishop and head of the Prussian Evangelical Church, by far the largest territorial Evangelical Church in the Empire. Indeed, he often conducted services, especially when no ordained minister was at hand, among the inner circle of courtiers and confidants. Of course, millions – more than a third – of his subjects were Catholics whose spiritual leader resided in Rome, not Berlin. Nevertheless, there was a recognizable, if ultimately not enforceable, tendency among civil servants and Evangelical clergy towards equating Germaness with Protestantism and, by implication, the Imperial Office with that of the highest religious authority. This near-conflation of secular and spiritual power at the head of the Empire, moreover, echoed medieval attempts at sacralizing the earthly monarchy, connections made to Old Testament models of kingship and even representations of the emperor as vicar of Christ.⁶⁴

Despite having reason to stress these quasi-messianic claims in the performance of Wilhelm’s visit to the Holy City, remarkably, they remained in the background. Not unlike with Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolayevich or Franz Joseph I, it was instead the Palestinian population who struck such undertones when receiving the Emperor. The Arab Muslim and the Jewish communities both had erected triumphal arches where the royal visitor and his entourage would stop and listen to welcome addresses from the respective dignitaries and receive ceremonial ovations. The Jewish arch was inscribed with Psalm 118:26: “Blessed be he that cometh in the name of the Lord: we have blessed you out of the house of the Lord,” in Hebrew and German, and was crowned with a depiction of the breast-plate of the high priest.⁶⁵ A boy’s choir intoned a song each of whose nine strophes ended with “Blessed be he that cometh in the name of the Lord,” which even some of the Emperor’s attendants found “more suitable for welcoming the messiah than for that of the German Emperor.”⁶⁶

The Palestinian German Protestants had a similar message to the distinguished visitor: when he came for the dedication of the Church of the Redeemer on October 31st – Reformation Day – the congregation sang the famous Advent song Tochter Zion, freue dich (“Zion’s daughter, rejoice”), composed by George Frideric Handel, the words of which, written by Friedrich Heinrich Ranke in 1823, revolve around the themes of the Son of David coming to Jerusalem, riding on a donkey, to erect His eternal kingdom.⁶⁷ The messianic exaltation of the earthly ruler implied in this festive performance seems not to have met with any disapproval from the German public.

⁶⁵ See www.loc.gov/pictures/item/mpc2004007274/PP (last accessed August 8, 2022).
⁶⁶ Von Mirbach 1899, 193 (quotation); cf. Schneller 1899, 90.
Not only does Wilhelm appear to have been little inclined to encourage such fulsome reverence by religious audiences, the dignity that the head of the World Zionist Organization, Theodor Herzl (1860–1904), envisioned for him ultimately did not appeal either. The Austrian Jewish journalist and political visionary met no fewer than three times with the imperial traveler, trying to engage him for his project of an autonomous Jewish settlement in Palestine under German protectorate—which he argued would also be advantageous for Germany’s ally, the Ottoman Empire, given its current economic plight. After some initial signs that Wilhelm sympathized with the Zionists’ proposal he eventually, not least in deference of Sultan Abdülhamid’s aversion to it, declined the opportunity to go down in history as the emancipator of the Jewish people.⁶⁸

In the afternoon of October 29th, the Emperor rode into the Holy City—not on a donkey but on his white stallion Kurfürst (‘prince-elector’), and followed by the Empress in a dress coach-and-four. They did not enter through the Jaffa Gate, the “Pilgrims’ Gate” of old, which would have been too narrow for the Empress’s carriage, but took the newly opened access-road just beside the gate.⁶⁹ Only a hundred meters into the city, at the beginning of David Street, when forced by “the narrow streets and the awful pavement” Wilhelm’s father had once complained about, did the couple descend and proceed on foot towards the Church of the Holy Sepulcher.⁷⁰

It would appear, then, that Wilhelm himself, otherwise not exactly renowned for his sense of tact on the stage of international politics, did everything he could to divert the innuendoes that had long been customary with princes, monarchs, and conquerors when entering the Holy City. His careful avoidance of any religious, messianic, or Crusader reminiscences is a curious exception to the established rule that awaits further elucidation.

Edmund Allenby

As early as in the summer of 1917, at the beginning of the Palestine campaign under the command of General Edmund Allenby, the London War Office asked the newly-appointed field commander to make a Christmas present of Jerusalem to the increasingly war-weary British population. Allenby was to comply with this request, on December 9th, after the surrender of the Ottoman garrison.

---

⁶⁹ A persisting rumor has it that it was at Wilhelm’s request that Ottoman authorities tore down part of Suleiman the Magnificent’s city wall between the Gate and the Tower of David, in order to make way for the Emperor’s entry. In fact, when he got wind of the project he was horrified and tried to prevent it, but it turned out that the works had long been planned in order to broaden the access road there – Benner 2001, 285.
At the same time, his superiors did their best to dampen overly high religious expectations of the populace. When, after two weeks, the advance began to bear fruit, the War Office issued a “D-notice,” (short for “Defence Advisory notice”):

The attention of the Press is again drawn to the undesirability of publishing any article, paragraph or picture suggesting that military operations against Turkey are in any sense a Holy War, a modern Crusade, or have anything whatever to do with religious questions. The British Empire is said to contain a hundred million Mohammedan subjects of the King and it is obviously mischievous to suggest that our quarrel with Turkey is one between Christianity and Islam.⁷¹

Prohibitions are only needed against things that are frequently done. In fact, with the growing success of the campaign, suggestions that it was a “modern Crusade” and a “Holy War” grew rampant. Moreover, Foreign Secretary Arthur Balfour (1848–1930) had recently sent his famous Declaration to the Zionist Federation of Great Britain and Ireland, in which the King and the British Government declared “the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people” to be an objective of British foreign policy. It was an obvious presumption, therefore, that the Empire was preparing for liberating Palestine from the rule of the infidels not least on behalf of the Jews. Signals of this kind went down well with British Christian circles that cherished a biblicistic ‘philosemitism’ – and with which senior state officials and politicians, such as Lord Balfour himself and, by his own account, Prime Minister David Lloyd George (1863–1945), were also associated. This philosemitism was closely connected, not unlike its present-day Evangelical counterpart (especially in the U.S.), with an eschatology in which the restoration of the People of Israel to their ancestral home, followed by their eventual acceptance of Jesus Christ as their savior, played a central role.⁷²

On December 11th General Allenby formally took possession of Jerusalem on behalf of the British Crown. He had been instructed on how to proceed by the Chief of the Imperial General Staff, William Robertson (1860–1933):

In the event of Jerusalem being occupied, it would be of considerable political importance if you, on officially entering the city, dismount at the city gate and enter on foot. German emperor rode in and the saying went round, ‘A better man than he walked’. Advantage of contrast in conduct will be obvious.⁷³

Allenby, ever the dutiful soldier, fulfilled these instructions to the letter. The photograph of his “humble entry” (Fig. 23) literally went around the world. In order to ef-

---

⁷² Lewis 2010 (repr. 2013).
fect the requested “contrast in conduct” he did not take the gap in the city wall that had allegedly been made for Wilhelm II, but had the long-shuttered Jaffa Gate opened for himself. As he wrote to his wife, he himself would have preferred to enter through the Golden Gate – a messianic gesture that obviously would have gone against all political reason. In order to hint at his famous predecessors, Godfrey, Heraclius, Jesus, and King David, he had to content himself instead merely with ostentatious humility. Hence, the address he subsequently delivered to the population exuded a very British sense of sobriety, fairness, prudence and reliability.

The crusading enthusiasm so dreaded by the authorities, however, proved unavoidable. Most famously, the satirical magazine *Punch* published a full-page cartoon with the caption “The Last Crusade,” showing the King of England, Richard the Lionheart, overlooking Jerusalem, the city he had been unable to conquer in 1191, exclaiming “My dream comes true!” The Anglophone markets were flooded with books and booklets celebrating Allenby and his soldiers as victorious Crusaders. Sales of such literary classics as Walter Scott’s *Ivanhoe* and *Tales of the Crusaders*, and Torquato Tasso’s *La Gerusalemme liberata*, soared. The London actor Vivian Gilbert (1882–1932), who in the 1920s went on a tour of the United States to promote his war memoirs, *The Romance of the Last Crusade*, concluded: “In all the ten crusades organized and equipped to free the Holy City, only two were really successful, – the first led by Godfrey de Bouillon, and the last under Edmund Allenby.”

Attempts to win the hearts of the Palestinian Muslims likewise resorted to religious themes. According to a story whose origin is hard to trace, going around in varying versions in the heroic literature of the time and even frequently re-emerging in present-day popular accounts of World War I and the Palestine campaign, the British victory resonated with an alleged ancient Muslim prophecy according to which “a prophet from the west” would one day arise and expel the Turks, and that the General’s name was understood by the Arab population to mean “the prophet” – “*al-nabi*.” Apparently, this odd story was devised by some British army officer and it certainly appealed more to the English than the Arabic-speaking audience.

Already by the time the Ottoman troops had left the city to the British forces, an additional keynote resounded among the advancing soldiers – and soon after in the

---

75 Goldhill 2008, 144: “This plan was ‘unfortunately’ scrapped, as Allenby ruefully wrote to his wife.”
79 E.g. *A Brief Record*, loc. cit.; Finley 1919, 16–17. In actual Arabic pronunciation it ought to be *annabi*, not ‘*al-nabi*.’ Even worse, other versions cite the fake Arabic formula as “Allah nabi” and the like; further references in Cline 2004, 247; Bar-Yosef 2005, 261–262; Goldhill 2008, 144.
CHRISTIANS RULE THE LAND OF CHRIST

Seven hundred years of Moslem supremacy in the Holy Land ended with General Allenby’s modest entrance into Jerusalem. Then arose the cry, “The day of deliverance is come.”

Fig. 23: Frank G. Carpenter: The Holy Land and Syria. Frank G. Carpenter’s World Travels, vol. 1, Garden City, NY, 1922, Frontispiece.
press. The exclamation “The day of deliverance is come!” is said to have spread – and is again hard to trace to its origin. Its frequent appearance in print, however, is indicative of a widespread sense that the Empire had not just won a decisive victory but that it had brought mankind to the brink of redemption. Not only had the “war to end (all) war(s)” become “the last crusade,” it was also seen as the final battle between good and evil.

It was, however, only in the following year, from September 19th to 25th 1918, that the British victory was completed, in a number of skirmishes fought in the vast area between the cities of Haifa, Damascus and Amman. These events collectively went down in military history as the “Battle of Megiddo.” Indeed, the ancient site in the Valley of Yezreel lay within the contested area but no significant military action took place anywhere close to it. In recognition of his achievements, Edmund Allenby subsequently was not only promoted to the rank of Field Marshal but also raised to the peerage and henceforth bore the title 1st Viscount Allenby of Megiddo and of Felixstowe.

In the title of one of the many popular biographies of the great commander, playing on the common equation of the Old Testament city of Megiddo with the site of the great battle of the last days according to Revelation 16:16, he was forthrightly dubbed “Allenby of Armageddon.”

---

Onset or Suspension: Two Salvation-Historical Passage Ways

The ceremonial entries of Christian sovereigns and other supreme leaders into Jerusalem and their occupations of the city – whether factual or symbolic – were rites de passage from the profane space of the general surface of the earth into a sacred precinct with its own material-spiritual texture and corresponding rules of human conduct. By the same token, these passages marked a transition, as it were, from the current salvation-historical dispensation to another, more advanced one. Thus, the actor of such a rite performed it vicariously for God’s people. Since in the Christian conception of history there remained only one more epochal threshold to be crossed, that of the Second Coming, any such entry inevitably suggested that it was meant to herald the expected eschatic events, and the entrant was the harbinger of Christ returning.

In the course of the eight centuries from the Crusaders’ capture of Jerusalem to the seizure of the city by the British in World War One, those performing this rite appear on the whole to have grown increasingly cautious of invoking these grave impli-
cations,\textsuperscript{81} in deference of the contemporaries’ sensitivities – both religious and non-religious –, or to prevent wide-ranging political consequences of their action. However, to avoid the procedure and its inherited sacred significance altogether was not an option available.

The original locale of such (proto-)redemptive passages, the Golden Gate was mostly kept closed from the Crusader period onwards, until it was finally walled up altogether under Süleyman the Magnificent (1520 – 1566),\textsuperscript{82} thus effectively blocking the way for the anticipated messianic breakthrough.

While the entry to the Holy City thus retained its symbolic quality as a gesture that heralded the dawning of a new age, the corresponding ceremony at the access to the \textit{capital} city of the holy empire appears to have borne virtually an opposite significance. As a rule, the entry of a crowned head into Constantinople was a re-entry: the Roman emperor’s own homecoming from a victorious military campaign to restore the appropriate imperial power relations, or similarly, the return of orderly, righteous rulership, embodied by the restored emperor – either way, reconfirming the world-political \textit{status quo}. The many rites of passage at the emperors’ entries to the city thus were less celebrations of epoch-altering revolutions than of restorations, in tune with the theme of a regularly recurring, even perpetual \textit{restauratio} or \textit{renovatio imperii}, of a salvific stability and persistence that ran through the representations of imperial rule.\textsuperscript{83} Future comparative studies would shed light on the extent to which this concept is evident in the representations used at these events.\textsuperscript{84}

The ceremonial entry in practice may be tentatively reconstructed as follows: typically (or, rather, ideally) the emperor would make his way into the city through the southernmost entrance of the Theodosian wall that was, strikingly enough, likewise called the ‘Golden Gate’ (\textit{Chryseia Pyle}, \textit{Porta Aurea}, \textit{Altıkapı}). After acts of humility by the emperor, such as dismounting his horse and prostrating himself toward the east, the procession would follow a ca. 5.5 km long route that has been called the

\textsuperscript{81} The post-Crusader entrants’ avoidance of the Golden Gate may not only have been prompted by the walls that blocked its two passageways, but partly motivated by the legend that the returning Christ would enter Jerusalem there, of which the Iraqi Karaite commentator Yefet b. ʿAli (fl. 10th c.) seems to have left the earliest extant testimony – cf. Bargès (ed. and trans.) (1846), on Psalm 122:2.
\textsuperscript{83} Girardet 2000, esp. 104 – 107; Gutteridge 2006, 574 – 581. In the introduction to his \textit{New Constantines} collected volume, Paul Magdalino referred to the fact “that the emperors who made the most noise about imperial renewal cast themselves, or were cast, in distinctly eschatological roles” as “hard to interpret” (1994, 8 – 9), a state of affairs that seems not to have changed much since. For the role attributed to Constantinople in the projections of the Byzantine apocalyptic tradition, see Kraft 2012. For an attempt to come to terms with this deep contradiction in the sources’ representations of Heraclius (in association with whose reign it appears first to have occurred in full, inspiring the most influential Apocalypse of Ps.-Methodius) cf. Greisiger 2014.
\textsuperscript{84} Cases that would have to be covered in such a comprehensive comparative study include those of Theodosius I (386 and 391), Heraclius (629/630), Leo III (717), Theophilos (838), Basil I (871 and 882), Nikephoros II Phokas (963), John I Tzimiskes (971), Basil II (1019), Alexios Komnenos (1081), John II (1133), Manuel I (1159), Andronikos I (1182), and Michael VIII Palaiologos (1261).
Constantinopolitan via triumphalis, along the southern branch of the Mese through the Fora of Arcadius and of Constantine, and reaching the Milion in the actual center of the city, and thus of the Empire, between the Hippodrome and the Hagia Sophia. The emperor would then enter the imperial church for a thanksgiving service, solemnly deposit his crown on the altar, and have himself crowned anew, as it were, by the patriarch. ⁸⁵

The reassuring impression of these magnificent public performances naturally became unsettled after the Frankish invaders of the Fourth Crusade held their entry in 1204 and maintained their hegemony for almost six decades. Accordingly, in the late Byzantine period the Golden Gate was increasingly seen as a location of the vulnerability and frailty, rather than the constant rejuvenation, of the Empire. As early as 1190 the gate seems to have been walled up and, after these walls had been broken down by the fleeing Byzantine troops in 1204, they likely were restored. Following the accession of Michael VIII in 1261 – a veritable restoration of the Byzantine Empire – none of his successors seems to have taken this way into the city anymore, probably indicating that it remained closed or walled up. ⁸⁶

After the conquest of the city by Mehmed II in 1453, the Ottomans inherited this wariness regarding the gate, considering that it might serve for a Christian re-conqueror to enter the city, claim the imperial throne, and to put an end to their rule. In 1457/58, the gate was integrated into a structure known as the Castle of the Seven Towers (Yedikule Zindanları) and thereby lost its function as an entryway for good. ⁸⁷ Legends of a Byzantine emperor in some subterranean hideout, waiting for the divinely ordained day to reappear and restore the Christian empire, remained current among Constantinopolitans, Greeks and Turks alike, well into the modern age. ⁸⁸

If the above reconstruction is correct, we may conclude that, while the Golden Gate of Jerusalem served the mytho-ideological function of one day giving access to the redeemer, a new King David or Melchizedek, the Golden Gate of Constantinople embodied, as long as the Empire lasted, not a messianic but a katechontic promise. Ceremonial entries into both cities inevitably reflected the respective, opposed salvation-historical roles they were assigned for.

---

⁸⁵ Treitinger 1938, 146–147, 149–150; Mango 2000.
⁸⁶ Madden 2012, 320 – 322.
⁸⁷ Müller-Wiener 1977, 293, 295, 297–300; Ousterhout 2019, 139–140; Mango 2000, 181; Madden 2012), 322–323; Asutay-Effenberger 2007, s.v. Konstantinopel, Theodosianische Landmauer, Goldenes Tor; and cf. the contribution by Asutay-Effenberger and Weksler-Bdolah to this volume.
⁸⁸ Madden 2012, 323 – 326.
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