

Leeds Studies in English

Article:

Marta Cobb, 'Orthodox Editing: Medieval Versions of Julian of Norwich's Revelations of Divine Love and The Book of Margery Kempe', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 35 (2004), 57-79

Permanent URL:

https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=123812&silo_library=GEN01



Leeds Studies in English

School of English

University of Leeds

<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/lse>

Orthodox Editing: Medieval Versions of Julian of Norwich's *Revelations of Divine Love* and *The Book of Margery Kempe*

Marta Cobb

In the prologue to *The Cloud of Unknowing*, the unnamed author gives his famous warning about the responsibility of his prospective audience and the dangers of selective reading:

I charge þee & I beseche þee, wiþ as moche power & vertewe as þe bonde of charite is sufficient to suffre, whatsoeuer þou be þat þis book schalt haue in possession, ouþer bi propirte ouþer by keping, by bering as messenger or elles bi borrowing, þat in as moche as in þee is by wille & auisement, neiþer þou rede it, ne write it, ne speke it, ne 3it suffre it be red, wretyn, or spokyn, of any or to any, but 3if it be of soche one or to soche one þat hap (bi þi supposing) in a trewe wille & by an hole entent, purposed him to be a parfite folower of Criste, not only in actyue leuyng, bot in þe souereinnest pointe of contemplatife leuing þe whiche is possible by grace for to be comen to in þis present liif of a parfite soule 3it abiding in þis deedly body.¹

This lengthy passage demonstrates just how thorough the *Cloud*-author was in composing his warning, attempting to foresee the many possible ways his text might be transmitted and read. His words reveal not only a deep interest in the materiality of the book, but also an awareness of just how little control an author has over his text or his audience once the text has left his possession. His only option, aside from either refusing to let anyone read his treatise or perhaps refusing to write at all, is to charge any readers, listeners, or copyists of the text with their responsibility to him, to themselves, and perhaps most importantly, to others. They must assess whether they or anyone who may receive the text from

them is the right sort of person for the text. Moreover, they must charge each potential audience member, including themselves, to 'take hem tyme to rede it, speke it, write it, or here it, al ouer'.² If the text is not absorbed at leisure and in its entirety, they risk leading themselves and others into 'error'.³ Thus the author seems to imagine his text in the hands of a community of readers joined by the 'bonde of charite', all of whom must look out for one another.

In other circumstances, however, a potential secondary transmitter of the text—that is, someone who is in possession of the text after it has left the control of the author—decides that his or her responsibility towards others is not to transmit the entire text. In other words, that transmitter decides that the best way for an intended audience to read a particular text is to read it selectively. That is indeed what occurs in certain medieval versions of the writings of Julian of Norwich and Margery Kempe. No complete medieval version of the Long Text of Julian's *Revelations* survives. Indeed, the three existing manuscripts of the entire long text were most likely copied by English Benedictine nuns in France in the seventeenth century.⁴ The unique surviving manuscript of the 'full' version of *The Book of Margery Kempe* was preserved in the Carthusian monastery of Mount Grace, where was it read and commented upon by the monks, but it does not seem to have received the lay readership that Kempe possibly imagined for it. The prologue of the book announces that it was created to comfort 'synful wrecchys', implying that it was not specifically written for the edification of monks but for all Christians.⁵ Yet, for all their lack of circulation, especially among a broader lay audience in the medieval period, these longer works provide the focus for the majority of contemporary Julian and Margery scholarship.

Both of these texts, however, evidently circulated in the late Middle Ages in other forms. Julian's Short Text survives in a mid fifteenth-century manuscript, British Library, MS Additional 37790 (commonly referred to as Amherst), which was in turn copied from another manuscript that was made within her lifetime.⁶ Marleen Cré convincingly argues, however, that, the 'milieu in which Amherst originated and was read was almost undoubtedly Carthusian', again limiting the likelihood of a broader lay readership.⁷ More importantly for the current discussion, selections from the Long Text were gathered along with other religious writings into a manuscript—Westminster Cathedral Treasury MS 4—dated around 1500. Following the earlier opinions of College and Walsh, Hugh Kempster in his study of the Westminster text differentiates 'between the scribe who [. . .] mechanically copied the whole manuscript and an earlier editor who undertook the task of piecing together the various extracts'.⁸ In 1501, Wynkyn de

Worde printed a selection of passages from the *Book of Margery Kempe*. As in the case of the Westminster text, it is generally assumed that de Worde is not responsible for revising the text, but that he printed a collection of extracts that were already in circulation.⁹ Thus it is possible to view both texts as the product of earlier editing processes. These condensed editions represent not so much attempts to summarise accurately the texts in question, as efforts to transform them into something else altogether. This study seeks to investigate why and how the unknown secondary editors of these texts attempted to bring them safely into the narrower confines of fifteenth-century orthodoxy and what sort of audience they may have intended for their selective creations. What these editorial processes reveal is a concern about the subversive potential of the body of Christ, especially in the English vernacular, as well as the way female mystics relate to that body. Yet these texts also suggest that the distinction between lay and clerical audiences is not as rigidly fixed as has often been assumed.

It is important to note that these processes of orthodox editing are not a sign of contempt for either text, but rather evidence of a secondary editor's anxiety about unorthodox interpretations made by that text's audience. Indeed, what evidence survives suggests that Julian of Norwich and Margery Kempe themselves were anxious about the production and transmission of their texts. *The Book of Margery Kempe* begins with the highly wrought tale of the text's production involving many stops and starts, the efforts of more than one scribe, and even divine intervention. As Sarah Beckwith suggests, this prologue 'testifies to the dangers and difficulties of female authorship at a time when the Church was anxious to control an increasingly literate laity, and where women in particular were the object of a vernacular devotional literature that attempted to channel, construct, and contain feminine spirituality'.¹⁰ Likewise, as shall be seen further on, Julian's depiction of her three wishes at the beginning of the Long Text is quite defensive, assuring her audience that she knew that her desire for bodily sight of the passion and physical illness 'was not the commune vse of prayer'.¹¹ She clearly wants her audience to understand that her visions are the result, not of her own desire, but of divine will. Such anxiety might explain why no medieval versions of the Long Text survive and why the Short Text was copied in 1413, long after she claims to have gained the clearer understanding of her initial visions that prompted the writing of the Long Text. She may have taken a long time to write it or, once it was written, felt that it should not circulate in her lifetime.¹²

This anxiety may stem from the fact that, although neither Julian nor Margery can be properly defined as heretics, neither are they rigorously orthodox. Margery, whose unique brand of devotion prevented her from either being a proper housewife or joining a religious order—she is neither 'closyd in an hows of ston' (*BMK* 870), nor does she 'spynne and carde as other women don' (*BMK* 4330-31)—was perpetually getting into trouble with religious authorities, a tendency that was not helped by her determination to obey only those authorities with whom she was in agreement.¹³ She does seek clerical approval from Archbishop Arundel, Julian of Norwich, and many others, but she also demands 'special treatment', the right to take frequent communion, to choose her own confessor, and to wear white clothing as if she were a virgin.¹⁴ Margery's loud shouts and weeping during sermons and Corpus Christi processions, as well as her desire to be an object of derision wherever she goes, mark her out as a disruptive force in society.¹⁵ Yet, the 'meche slawndyr and meche evyl langage' directed at Margery simply provides her with the opportunity to 'suffyr for hys [Christ's] lofe' as Christ suffered for her (*BMK* 4091, 4103-04). Even though her beliefs, which are examined by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, are relatively orthodox, her behaviour—the outward manifestation of those beliefs—subverts communal worship and clerical authority. Moreover, throughout the work, Christ not only tolerates, but actually supports and even requires her erratic behaviour. Thus, her text, which is as much about her unruly life as her conventional beliefs, is problematic. The Carthusians at Mount Grace may have read and annotated the complete text with great interest, approvingly comparing Margery's weeping with that of others of their order,¹⁶ but it seems unlikely that they or anyone else in a position of clerical or secular authority would have wanted a broader lay audience to follow her example too closely. Thus, a later editor of *The Book of Margery Kempe*, possibly a cleric himself, was faced with the task of creating a text in which Margery sets a good example for an audience of pious readers; to do this he had to remove her disruptive activity and create a new context for her often subversive relationship with Christ.

Another secondary and possibly clerical editor hoping to broaden the readership of the long version of the *Revelations* of Julian of Norwich confronted a different set of problems. Julian herself was an enclosed anchoress: her public behaviour did not have the same potential for being problematic that Margery's did. Nor does her text, especially the long version, focus upon her public or even her private life much beyond the events of her divine revelations. Yet the arrangement of the long text, consisting of vivid descriptions of the contents of

Julian's visions followed by more didactic sections explaining what is to be learned from them, is unusual when compared to other 'vernacular mystical texts available to the lay populace of late-medieval England'.¹⁷ As Kempster argues, mystical writing in English usually divides into one of two genres, either narrative accounts of personal visionary experiences with little theological explanation, or texts consisting largely of contemplative theology with little or no description of visionary experiences. Julian's Long Text, however, contains both genres inextricably intertwined. For example, in her first 'shewing', Julian witnesses 'the reed bloud rynnyng downe from vnder the garlonde' of Christ (LT 4: 3-4). As part of that 'syght', the 'trinitie' fills her 'hart most of ioy', and she understands 'it shall be in heauen without end to all that shall come ther' (LT 4: 9-11). She then reflects upon the nature of the Trinity:

For the trinitie is god, god is the trinitie. The trinitie is our maker, the trinitie is our keeper, the trinitie is our everlasting loue, the trinitie is our endlesse ioy and our blisse, by our lord Jesu Christ, and in our lord Jesu Christ. And this was shewed in the first syght and in all, for wher Jhesu appireth the blessed trinitie is vnderstand, as to my sight. (LT 4: 11-16)

In the Short Text, Julian makes no mention of the Trinity at this point, she only describes the bleeding of Christ. The Virgin Mary also appears in the first showing in both versions. A pattern emerges in the Long Text in which the 'shewings' incorporate more abstract reflections as Julian increasingly describes her visions less in terms of what she has seen and more in terms of what she understands.¹⁸ These reflections, however, never lead Julian far from Christ and from Christ's human body, which remain central throughout the text. In a sense, therefore, Christ's body authorises the hybrid nature of the work itself. The editor of the excerpted text utilises a different strategy than that previously discussed for Kempe's text, instituting a kind of generic orthodoxy upon the text; he creates a more purely didactic work by eliminating many of the more affective aspects of Julian's mysticism, especially her more vivid descriptions of Christ.

Furthermore, although Julian voices acceptance of the Church's teachings in her Long Text, she also sets forward, in the parable of the Master and the Servant, the doctrine that God does not condemn human sins; in fact, his love for the soul never diminishes (LT 51). Previously the 'comyn techyng of holy church' and her own feelings that the 'blame of oure synnes continually hangyth vpon

vs' cause her to resist the teaching of her showings regarding God's tolerance of human error (LT 50: 11, 12). Her visions teach her, however, that although 'it longyth to man mekely to accuse hym selfe', it also 'longyth to the propyr goodnesse of our lorde god curtesly to excuse man' (LT 52: 70, 71-72). Thus, as Nicholas Watson suggests, if 'at the highest level, the soul and God are eternally one in their sinlessness' then 'the Church's teachings on sin and God's wrath are only true in a provisional and secondary sense'.¹⁹ In other words, the teachings of the Church only hold true in this world; in the next the worshipper comes into a deeper understanding of God's perspective. By removing the content of many of the showings, the editor of the Westminster text is not only able to adjust the text so that it fits more comfortably within one of the traditional genres of English mystical writing, he also simultaneously removes any indication that the Church may not have the final word on sin and damnation.

Not only do the secondary editors of the reduced versions smooth over these previously discussed difficulties, they also, more obviously, remove the majority of the texts in question in their attempts to reconfigure and rework the texts' meaning. For example, the Wynkyn de Worde edition reduces *The Book of Margery Kempe* to a seven-page quarto referred to as 'a shorte treatyse of contemplacyon taught by our Lorde Jhesu Cryste, or taken out of the boke of Margerie Kempe of Lynn'.²⁰ This shortened version, by making reference to the longer work, announces its extracted nature, but these extracts provide little insight into contents of the text from whence they came. Rather than focusing upon the life of Margery Kempe, emphasis is placed upon Christ as the teacher and the source of the text rather than Margery herself. Although the treatise presents the selections as separate units, it reads as a series of dialogues between Margery and the Lord in which Margery acts as a passive receptacle for God's instruction. According to Sue Ellen Holbrook, 'eighteen per cent of the words come from the woman as direct or indirect speech; twenty-two per cent are in the voice of the narrator; and sixty per cent are uttered directly by Christ'.²¹ This is hardly an accurate representation of the longer text in which the words and, moreover, the deeds of Margery dominate throughout.

In spite of the rearrangement of the reduced text, however, some of Christ's instructive utterances allude to Margery's more disruptive behaviour. For example, in the 'shorte treatyse', Christ tells Margery:

'Doughter, it is more plesure to me that thou suffre despytes,
scornes, shames and repreves, wronges, dyseases, than yf thyne
hede were stryken thre tymes a day every day in seven yeare.'

'Lord, for thy grete payne, have mercy on my lytell payne'.
(*'shorte treatyse'* 148-52)

In the context of the complete *Book of Margery Kempe*, Christ speaks these words to Margery after she has been driven out of Hull by the contempt of 'the malicyows pepil' (*BMK* 4307), detained by the orders of the Duke of Bedford and accused of Lollardy, threatened with burning by a mob of angry women wielding distaffs—a symbol of the dutiful wifhood that she so conspicuously rejects in her relationship with her earthly husband and reinterprets in her relationship with Christ, her heavenly spouse—and placed under house arrest in Beverly. Nor are these empty threats: Sawtrey, the first Lollard burned in 1401, was not only from Lynn, but was a priest at her parish church before being charged with heresy.²² The Archbishop of York, whom she encounters twice, does not condemn her, but neither does he want her to remain in the vicinity; her presence has provoked civil unrest throughout Yorkshire. Thus, not only does she fail to demonstrate social decorum; her need for shames and reproofs requires others to behave in a disruptive manner toward her. She uses the scorn of those around her 'to transcend the world while staying in it'.²³ In other words, not only does Margery reject the world, she forces the world to reject her. Moreover, this rejection from the world, however much it might raise difficulties for her from secular and clerical authorities—and vice versa—validates Margery in the eyes of Christ.

In the new context of the *'shorte treatyse'*, however, Christ's instructions are suitably vague: he does not clarify what he means by 'despytes' and 'scornes', nor does he tell her that she should seek out such treatment. Furthermore, his mention of 'dyseases' implies the sort of feminine spirituality, described by Caroline Walker Bynum, that usually shows itself through sickness and fasting rather than extensive travel and public scorn.²⁴ Margery's response, taken from a later portion of the complete text in which she does suffer from physical illness, suggests quiet humility. By creating a dialogue in which God does most of the talking and Margery only reveals her eagerness to follow his instructions, the *'shorte treatyse'* goes a long way toward curbing the irascible personality of Margery Kempe, producing what Holbrook describes as 'a coherent set of excerpts' that commend 'the patient, invisible toleration of scorn and the private, inaudible, mental practice of good will in meditation rather than public or physical acts'.²⁵ Christ

repeatedly tells Margery that it is her intentions rather than her actions that lead to heavenly reward. For every time she wishes that 'her hede myght be smyten of with an axe [. . .] for the love of our Lorde Jhesu' or blesses 'all the holy places in Jherusalem', she will benefit as if she had suffered martyrdom or gone on pilgrimage in reality ('shorte treatyse' 4-5, 130). The 'shorte treatyse', however, makes no mention of the fact that Margery's life was often threatened or that she did actually visit the Holy Land. In the *Book of Margery Kempe*, Christ does frequently reward Margery for her pious thoughts rather than her deeds, but it is also clear that her actions are of consequence to him and, indeed, inspired by him. The editor of the 'shorte treatyse', however, chooses to ignore these deeds, focusing upon how someone might emulate Margery's irreproachable inner life without creating the same difficulties in the public sphere. Margery Kempe can provide a good example for an audience of pious readers; but it is necessary to carefully control and contain that example—something no-one seemed able to do while Margery was alive.

Once produced, it is easy to see why this collection of extracts appealed to Wynkyn de Worde, a printer known for his interest English contemplative works such as Walter Hilton's *Scale of Perfection* and *Mixed Life* (printed in 1494) and for his connections with the Brigittine monastery at Syon.²⁶ The textual enclosure of Margery Kempe became complete when Henry Pepwell, describing her as a 'deuoute ancre', reprinted the 'shorte treatyse' in an anthology of mystical writings in 1521.²⁷ Included in this anthology were several treatises attributed to the *Cloud*-author, Walter Hilton's *Of Angel's Song*, and selections from a *Legenda* of Catherine of Siena. C. Annette Grisé argues that, in spite of the seeming sanitization of Margery and her *Book*, from another perspective, 'Margery Kempe achieves her goal of becoming recognised publicly as a holy woman: she no longer merely emulates Bridget, Catherine, and their sisters, she is placed alongside them and subjected to the same reading and extracting practices that they are'.²⁸ This treatment of Margery and continental female mystics indicates the 'changing devotional fashions and the adaptations which the texts by and about holy women from the continent underwent in the printed tradition'.²⁹

Yet the 'shorte treatyse' advocates a very different type of piety than that exemplified by Margery herself in *The Book of Margery Kempe*. As Jennifer Summit suggests, Pepwell's later edition, with its emphasis upon earning indulgences through prayer and contemplation rather than pilgrimage or strict ascetic practices, asserts the orthodoxy of the practice of indulgences, recently attacked by Luther and his followers, and demonstrates 'how both the printed

book and the genre of female prayer could be wielded for polemical purposes' by ecclesiastical authorities.³⁰ De Worde and Pepwell continue, however, a process of reshaping the text begun by the earlier editor who created the set of extracts; he clearly was someone with an interest in the benefits of contemplation, but also had a desire to see that contemplation conducted in an orderly manner. In his hands, the example of Margery Kempe offers a far more conventional—less outgoing and, thereby, less threatening—example of orthodoxy.

Another unknown secondary editor used a slightly different strategy to adjust the writing of an actual devout anchoress. The Westminster text reduces the long version of Julian's *Revelations* to about forty folios. The manuscript also includes extracts from commentaries on two Psalms traditionally assigned to Hilton, as well as a compilation from his *Scale of Perfection*. According to Barry Windeatt, this is no careless collection; he argues that 'the pattern of abridgement in all four texts alike seems so comparably intelligent and purposeful as to suggest the outcome of the same mind intently reading these four different contemplative texts'.³¹ Yet, although this editor seems to have read Julian's work carefully and obviously found much there that was worth keeping, he completely changes the text's focus. In both the Long and the Short Texts, Julian begins by describing her desire for 'thre gyftes by the grace of god' (LT 2: 4-5), including having 'bodilie' sight of Christ's passion (LT 2: 10). The Westminster text opens not with this desire, nor with the illness that provoked her revelations, but with the Virgin Mary:

Oure gracious and goode Lorde God shewed me in party þe wisdom and þe trewthe of þe soule of oure blessed Lady, Saynt Mary; wherein I vnderstood þe reuerent beholdynge þat she behelde her God þat is her maker, maruelynge with grete reuerence þat he wolde be borne of her þat was a simple creature of his makynge. For this was her meruelynge, þat he þat was her maker wolde be borne of her þat is made. And this wysdom and trowth, knowynge þe grettenes of her maker and the lytyllness of herselfe þat is made, caused her to sey full mekely vnto Gabryell: 'Lo me here, Goddis handmayden'.³²

As stated above, both the long and short versions of the text include Julian's vision of Mary in the first showing. The secondary editor's choice to begin with her humble presence, however, undermines the emphasis—unavoidable in both

the Short and the Long Text—upon Julian's attachment to the human Christ. She specifically desires 'mynd of the passion', to witness the Crucifixion with 'Magdaleyne and with other that were Christus louers' (LT 2: 5, 9-10). Her revelations begin with the bleeding of Christ on the cross and it is to this image that she keeps returning. Yet, as even Julian herself seems aware, this desire for direct access to Christ's body is not unproblematic. She admits that she worried that her wish might not be 'the commune vse of prayer', and therefore insists that she wanted to receive it only if it was God's will (LT 2: 35-36). The Westminster text's new emphasis on the Virgin Mary makes the text more rigidly orthodox. Mary serves as a mediatrix and a meek exemplar, and so qualifies the longer text's attention to Julian's unmediated access to God.

Such alterations create the feeling that the presence of Julian is gradually being removed from the text. In some ways, however, the editor of the Westminster text only continues the process made in the changes from the short to the long version of the *Revelations* in which Julian edits out biographical details included in the previous version, such as the presence of her mother at her supposed deathbed. All references to Julian's gender, save one, have also disappeared in the Westminster text. The one passage in question reads: 'Also in the nyneth shewyng our Lord God seyde to *her* thus: "Art þou well payed þat I sufferd for thee?" And *she* sayde: "Ye good Lord, grannt mercy"' (WT 201-03, my emphasis). As Kempster suggests in his edition of the Westminster text, that one inclusion reads like an editorial mistake.³³ The rest of the text is given in the first person and makes no reference to the number of individual showings; it is worth noting, however, that Julian does remove most gendered references to herself in the Long Text. For example, although she refers to herself as a 'womann, leued, febille and freylle' in the Short Text, she does not repeat this comment in the longer version (ST 6: 41-42). In some ways, the editor merely seems to complete this process.

Yet this later editor makes other, more startling changes to the text in order to bring it into line with those it follows. Most of the showings that create the framework around which the original text is arranged have disappeared. These missing showings largely consist of Julian's more affective visions of Christ's crucifixion—such as the vision of the blood streaming from Christ's head resembling pills, herring scales, and rain from the eaves. What is left are the more abstract showings, such as all of creation reduced to the size of a hazelnut, God in a point, and Christ revealing the wound in his side, not as an emotionally charged reminder of his suffering, but as 'a feyre delectable place, and large inow for all

mankynde þat shall be sauf to reste in pees and loue' (WT 263-65). Also present, at least in part, is Julian's discussion of the role of prayer as well as the concept of God as mother. Clearly the removal of the more difficult theological concepts from the Long Text is not what is at issue for the editor of the Westminster text. Beyond the removal of the problematic passages about God's tolerance of sin—a concept that Julian herself insists that she struggled to accept—this is not a simplified version of the Long Text by any means. The text that results from the editing, however, is differently focused, more didactic and less concerned with the contents of the visions than is its source. If selective editing transformed Margery into what might be considered the perfect female mystic, a passive receptacle of the Lord's wisdom, Julian, whose Long Text represents the mingling of both experience, the traditional realm of the female mystic, and instruction, usually belonging to male contemplatives, almost becomes masculine.

The most profound omission from both texts, however, is the almost complete removal of the body of Christ and, consequently, the intimate relationship that both women have with that body. In *The Book of Margery Kempe*, Margery experiences vivid visions of the nativity and the crucifixion, visions in which she is not only a viewer, but also a participant.³⁴ She famously swaddles the infant Christ at his nativity, and, after the crucifixion, she wishes to banish the Virgin and Mary Magdalene in order to have his 'precyows body be hirself alone' (BMK 6524). Christ is her father, but also her son, her brother, and her husband. In the 'shorte treatyse', this intimacy with the human Christ is only implied: when she sees 'the crucefyxe' or 'a man had a wounde or a best', she sees 'our Lorde' suffering ('shorte treatyse' 65-66, 68). In the context of the complete text, however, this passage leads to a discussion of her violent 'cryingys' and the contempt her weeping often creates among those, whether clergy or lay, who witness it (BMK 2233).³⁵ Through her tears, private devotion becomes public action,³⁶ thus the impact of these tears, both upon Margery's faith and those around her, must be minimised. Likewise, Christ only refers to her as 'doughter' in the 'shorte treatyse', indicating a narrowing and a containment of the multifaceted relationship between them.

Most importantly, in *The Book of Margery Kempe*, Margery's seeking out of shame and abuse becomes her own personal form of *imitatio Christi*.³⁷ As she tells Christ:

Now trewly, Lord, I wolde I cowde lovyn the as mych as thu
mythist makyn me to lovyn the. Yyf it wer possibyl, I wolde

lovyn the as wel as alle the seyntyng in hevyn lovyn the, and as wel as alle the creaturys in erth myght lovyn the. And I wolde, Lord, for thi love be leyd nakyd on an hyrdil, alle men to wonderyn on me for thi love, so it wer no perel to her sowlys, and thei to castyn slory and slugge on me, and be drawyn fro town to town every day my lyfetye, yf thu wer plesyd therby and no mannys sowle hyndryd, thi wil mote be fulfillyd and not myn (BMK 6177-85).

Christ showed his love for her and for all humanity through public suffering. In return, she wishes to make a spectacle of herself, to be laid out naked so that all men may not only wonder at her, but also contribute to her humiliation. In this way, she hopes to prove the depth of her love. Thus the body of Christ could be seen to be problematic in *The Book of Margery Kempe* because it leads to and justifies her excessive behaviour. Although most of this passage is included in the 'shorte treatyse', the new context changes its meaning ('shorte treatyse' 124-28). As Voaden argues, it 'is to be read as an expression of devotion rather than of actual ambition'.³⁸ Margery does not need to seek out humiliation; it is enough that she wishes to do so.

Julian never plays nurse to the infant Christ, but she also enjoys an intimate relationship with his human body. As mentioned above, Julian's visions of Christ's body are central to her learning about God's divine love. Never is this more apparent than when, in the midst of her visions, Julian receives a suggestion to look from Christ's suffering body on the cross to 'hys father' in heaven (LT 19:7). Julian feels that there is no danger in shifting her gaze, but she refuses to comply:

I answeyrd inwardly with alle the myght of my soule, and sayd: Nay, I may nott, for thou art my hevyn. Thys I seyde for I wolde nott; for I had levyr a bene in that payne tylle domys day than haue come to hevyn other wyse than by hym. For I wyst wele that he that bounde me so sore, he shuld vnbynd me whan he wolde (LT 19: 10-14).

Julian announces to whomever or whatever is 'speaking' that she will not look away, that, for her, Christ is both her way into heaven and heaven itself. The learning she receives from her visions comes through the suffering and the joy of

his body. This body 'remains for ever the medium through which the whole pattern of the divine plan is understood'.³⁹ In the Long Text, it is Christ's role in the parable of the master and servant that explains why humanity suffers because of their sins even though God's love for them never alters. When the servant, who is Christ but also Adam and all of humanity, falls into the slade that represents both Christ's incarnation and human sinfulness, the Lord never ceases to look upon his servant with love. The servant suffers, but only because he cannot see the Lord's loving gaze. Thus the showing reveals that the suffering caused by sin is the result of human inability to perceive God's love. Just as Christ inspires Margery's indecorous behaviour, the body of Christ authorises both the hybrid nature of Julian's text and her unorthodox views on sin. In both cases, that body must be removed, or at least reduced, in order for the later editor to establish conformity.

It is impossible to determine the identity of the editor of either extracted text. In both cases, the editor's original manuscript—together with any clues it might have held—seems to have been lost. Yet, by looking at the texts themselves, it is possible to reconstruct not only the editors' motives, but also what sort of audience they may have imagined for their selective creations. For comparison, it is useful to consider one text that states quite clearly the sort of audience it has in mind: Nicholas Love's *Mirror of the Blessed Life of Jesus Christ*. An English translation and adaptation of the pseudo-Bonaventurian *Meditationes Vitae Christi*, the *Mirror* specifically received approval from Archbishop Arundel after the publication of his *Constitutions* in 1409. Designed to halt the spread of Lollardy, the *Constitutions* forbade the unauthorised translation of any part of scripture into English or the ownership of any translation of the Bible made since the time of Wyclif.⁴⁰ When taken to their most extreme interpretation, the terms of the *Constitutions* also censure the ownership and production of texts such as *Piers Plowman*, *The Cloud of Unknowing* and the *Revelations*, which make extensive use of biblical passages. As Nicholas Watson has argued, this decree did much to stifle the production of devotional and mystical texts, as well as biblical translations, in the fifteenth century.⁴¹ Unsurprisingly, Love's text adopts a similar agenda that affects the shaping of his text and its imagined audience. By offering a repetitive series of carefully selected and interpreted meditations upon the life of Christ, it urges its audience to follow his human example of humility and obedience. A more rigidly orthodox text than that of Julian or Margery, the *Mirror* advocates a sort of inward and decorous piety similar to that suggested by the 'shorte treatyse'.

In his proem, Love creates the rhetorical situation of a sermon in which the priest mediates God's divine meaning to a lay audience:

Ande for þis hope & to þis entent with holi writte also bene wryten diuerse bokes & trettes of deuoute men not onelich to clerkes in latyne, but also in Englyshe to lewde men & women & hem þat bene of symple vndirstondyng. Amonge þe whiche beþ wryten deuovte meditacions of cristes lyfe more pleyne in certeyne partyes þan is expressed in the gospell of þe foure euaungelistes. Ande as it is seide þe deuoute man & worthy clerke *Bonaudentre* wrot hem to A religiouse woman in latyne þe whiche scripture ande wrytyng for þe fructuouse matere þerof steryng specialy to þe loue of Jesu ande also for þe pleyn sentence to comun vndirstondyng semeþ amonges opere souereynly edifyng to symple creatures þe whiche as childryn hauen nede to be fedde with mylke of ly3te doctryne & not with sadde mete of grete clargye & of hye contemplacion.⁴²

Love's introduction imagines an audience of 'lewde men & women & hem þat bene of symple vndirstondyng'. It is, of course, difficult to ascertain precisely who would be included in such a description. David Lawton, for example, suggests that the 'very disparate groups that writers had in mind when they proclaimed the "lewet and englis" nature of their audience might have comprised [. . .] clerics, lay people excluded from Latinate education by class or gender, and those illiterate not in the medieval but the modern sense, unable to read or write in any language'—in a word, just about anybody.⁴³ Love, however, is more precise, for he distinguishes the 'clerkes', who can read in Latin, from those other 'lewde' readers and listeners who cannot. In this passage, Love seems to imagine the laity as an unlearned mass requiring illumination from clerics and clerically produced texts. As a concession to the supposed limitations of this readership, Love's text concerns not contemplation of divinity, but rather meditation upon vividly imaged scenes from the life of Christ and the Virgin. Denied the 'sadde mete' of contemplation in favour of the 'mylke of ly3te doctryne', Love's presumed lay audience is not only feminised—given subject matter originally designed for the edification of an enclosed nun—but infantilised, considered incapable of consuming 'solid' spiritual food.

If Love's text creates boundaries between lay and clerical readers, it also divides meditation upon the human life of Christ and contemplation of his divinity into separate categories. In this way, the *Mirror* controls its audience's access to him. Both Julian's and Margery's extended texts insist upon the difficulty of maintaining such divisions: the boundary between the human and divine Christ is a fluid one, and their access to him is seemingly unlimited. Love, however, consistently turns his readers away from thoughts of Christ's divinity, focusing upon the extremes of his human life, his nativity and his passion. Love's text offers a series of vivid, guided meditations, asking the worshipper to place him or herself into the scene and to become emotionally involved with its events. In this way the *Mirror* creates a structured, imaginative space in which the worshipper may approach Christ.

This structured series primarily involves the human suffering of Christ that begins, not with the Passion, but with the Incarnation. Describing Christ's circumcision, Love urges his audience to weep with the child Christ:

Miche owht we to wepe & haue compassion with him, for he wept þis day ful sore, & so in þees gret festes & solempnites, we sholde make miche mirþe, & be ioyful for oure hele, & also haue inwarde compassion & sorowe for þe peynes & anguysh þat he suffret for vs. For as it is seid before, þis day he shedde his blode, when þat aftur þe rite of þe lawe, his tendere flesh was kut, with a sharp stonen knife, so þat zonge childe Jesus kyndly wept for þe sorow þat he felt þerþorh in his flesh. For without doute he hade verrey flesh & kyndly suffrable as haue oþer children. Shold we þan not haue compassion of him? (*Mirror*, p. 41, ll. 9-19)

Christ's circumcision becomes the Crucifixion in miniature: as Love reminds his audience, on this day he first 'began to shede his preciouise blode for oure sake' (*Mirror*, p. 41, ll. 5-6).⁴⁴ Indeed, the Crucifixion ceases to be an isolated event at the end of Christ's human life and becomes the very process of Christ's life. This pain must be repeated, over and over again, in the mind of the faithful worshipper. Even now, as he has just begun to live, Christ has already begun to die for humanity's sins. The infant Christ is already the sacrificial lamb who will die on Good Friday, but he is also any child with 'verrey flesh' who weeps for the hurts that he cannot understand. On both levels, he deserves our 'compassion'. The

audience is asked to identify with Christ, using their own experiences. Through the compassion of the reader or listener, spiritual truth becomes earthly reality and Christ's divinity disappears into his humanity. It is a powerfully effective method of arousing devotion, but it does not require participants to reach beyond a very physical love of the more human aspects of Christ.

Moreover, and what is perhaps most important, Christ suffers after 'þe rite of þe lawe'. In this, as in the rest of his life, Christ yields to the authority of the law, although, as the son of God, he is above it. Throughout the text, Love uses the human Christ and the Virgin Mary as paragons of obedience, patience, poverty, and meekness. For example, Mary has herself purified after giving birth even though she and her son are already pure (*Mirror*, pp. 46-49). Love emphasises this point, insisting that both Mary and her son 'kepten þe comune lawe as oper' (*Mirror*, p. 46, ll. 30-31). Mary and Christ not only obey the commandments of their God, they also bend willingly to secular and religious law. Through their example, Love encourages the audience of the *Mirror* to do the same.

The *Mirror* presents the Crucifixion in a similar manner. Addressing his audience directly, Love urges them to 'depart in manere for þe tyme þe miht of þe godhede fro þe kyndely infirmite of þe manhede', to forget temporarily about Christ's divinity in order that they might concentrate on his human suffering (*Mirror*, p. 161, ll. 5-8). Love asks that they 'take hede of his most perfite obedience' in submitting to the will of his divine father (*Mirror*, p. 163, l. 28), as well as his patient tolerance in the face of his undeserved persecution:

Take nowe gude hede to oure lord Jesu, how paciently & benyngly he receyueþ þat fals feynede clippyng, & traytours kosse, of þat vnseily disciple, whos feete he woshe a litel before of his souereyne mekenes, & fedde him with þat hye precious mete of his owne blessedde bodye, þorh his vnspekable charite.

And also beholde how paciently he suffreþ him self to be takene, bonden, smyten & wodely ladde forþ, as þei he were a thefe or a wikked doare, & in alle maner vnmihty to help him self. (*Mirror*, p. 167, ll. 19-28)

Love's text stresses Christ's extreme patience and meekness in the face of others' wrongdoing, the betrayal of Judas and the abuse he suffers at the hands of those who arrest him. Christ freely accepts his undeserved fate and feigns

powerlessness by his own choice for the salvation of humanity. In this way, the text insinuates that its audience should emulate Christ and, like him, suffer willingly for the good of Christian society. Love's Christ passively submits to the clerical and secular powers that would have him put to death, quietly bearing torture and humiliation because it is God's will. Such a portrayal forms a sharp contrast to the servant Christ/Adam of Julian's *Revelations* who is so eager to perform his lord's bidding that 'he stertyth and rynnnyth in grett hast for loue' (LT 51:14). Love's Christ has the Lord's bidding performed upon him. Even Margery's Christ, although willing to suffer humbly enough in Margery's visions, does not allow his servant Margery to submit to clerical or secular authorities when their will contradicts his own.

The extracted versions of Julian's *Revelations* and *The Book of Margery Kempe* might suggest an anxiety on the part of the later editors similar to that of Love's about the need carefully to control the representation of Christ. Love manipulates his Christ in order to impose a kind of social decorum upon his audience; the secondary editors both choose to restrict the presence of the human Christ in their selective creations in order to impose a more straightforward sense of orthodoxy. Neither of these transformed texts, however, is as explicit as the *Mirror* about the readership it hopes to receive. The publication of the Wynkyn de Worde edition of the 'shorte treatyse' suggests a mixed audience consisting of London lay people, but also, given de Worde's connections with Syon Abbey, clerical readers.⁴⁵ Likewise, although the material of the Westminster text suggests an editor as well as a potential audience with an interest in contemplation, the removal of the Latin from the commentaries on the Psalms also included in the text indicates the possibility of a lay audience. If this is the case, these two texts reveal how artificial Love's distinction between clerical and secular readers must have been. Although the audiences of these extracted versions of the writings of Julian of Norwich and Margery Kempe might not have understood Latin, they are not simply being given the milk of meditation upon Christ's suffering humanity. That sort of 'milk' is precisely what has been removed from both texts. Even greatly reduced, Julian's text is a complex theological work, perhaps even more so with so many of the visions that clarify the commentary largely being removed. The extracts from *The Book of Margery Kempe* are not as complicated theologically, but the final extract privileges the experiences of a single woman over those of 'relygyous men' and 'prestes':

'O my dereworthy Lorde, these graces thu sholdest shewe to relygyous men and to prestes.'

Our Lorde sayd to her ayen: 'Nay, nay, doughter, for that I love best, that they love not, and that is shames, repreves, scornes and despytes of the people; and therfore they shall not have this grace; for, doughter, he that dredeth the shames of this worlde may not parfyghtly love God' ('shorte treatyse' 160-66).

In claiming that priests are denied access to a higher form of Christ's grace because they 'dredeth the shames of this worlde', these closing words mark a curious reversal of Love's proem. Thus it is an individual who seeks Christ without priestly mediation who comes closest to God.

This study has attempted to re-create the decisions of medieval editors who felt that the best reading was a selective one. Examining these texts reveals important insights into fifteenth-century orthodoxy as well as the lack of fixed divisions between clerical and lay audiences. It is perhaps inevitable, if unfortunate, that the presence of the longer and, in some ways, more obviously interesting versions has attracted the majority of scholarly attention in recent years. It might, therefore, be constructive to imagine a present in which neither the Long Text of the *Revelations* of Julian of Norwich nor the complete *Book of Margery Kempe* survived. On the basis of the existing evidence, Margery Kempe would have been a devout anchoress, denied the mobility that seems to distress so many both in her time and in our own. Julian would be viewed as a more 'typical' mystic, although some confusion might be created by the extracts in the Westminster manuscript. Some of the showings would be recognised, but it is difficult to ascertain what scholars would make of the more didactic sections. It is, of course, ludicrous to suggest that it would be an improvement if scholars only possessed these shorter witnesses, but if that were the case, they would gain a greater understanding of the way the writings of Julian of Norwich and Margery Kempe may have been experienced by a medieval lay audience. The fortunate survival of multiple editions, however, offers modern scholarship the opportunity, as well as the responsibility, to focus more rigorously on medieval editing and reading practices and the regulation of female voices through these practices.

NOTES

¹ *The Cloud of Unknowing and Related Treatises on Contemplative Prayer*, ed. by Phyllis Hodgson (Exeter: Catholic Records Press, 1982), p. 1, ll. 8-18.

² *Cloud of Unknowing*, p. 1, ll. 24-25.

³ *Cloud of Unknowing*, p. 1, l. 29.

⁴ *The Idea of the Vernacular: An Anthology of Middle English Literary Theory, 1280-1520*, ed. by Jocelyn Wogan-Browne et al. (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999), p. 233. There is some debate over the dating of the manuscripts. Marion Glasscoe suggests that one of three Long Text manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds Anglais, 40 (P), 'belongs to the late sixteenth or early seventeenth century', while the other two, British Library, Sloane MSS 2499 and 3705 (S1 and S2), 'belong respectively to the early and later seventeenth century'. See Glasscoe's edition of Julian's Long Text, *A Revelation of Love*, rev. edn (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1993), p. viii. In contrast, Edmund Colledge and James Walsh in their edition describe P and S1 as being 'roughly contemporary' (c. 1650), but date the hand of S2 to the eighteenth century: see *A Book of Showings to the anchoress Julian of Norwich*, 2 vols (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1978), vol. 1, p. 15. For a fuller discussion of the manuscripts and their various editions and translations, as well as the difficulties they pose for scholars, see Alexandra Barratt, 'How Many Children Had Julian of Norwich? Editions, Translations and Versions of Her Revelations', in *Vox Mystica: Essays on Medieval Mysticism in Honor of Professor Valerie M. Lagorio*, ed. by Anne Clark Bartlett (Cambridge: Brewer, 1995), pp. 27-39.

⁵ *The Book of Margery Kempe*, ed. by Barry Windeatt (Harlow, Essex: Longman, 2000), ll. 1-2. Hereafter cited as *BMK*.

⁶ Barratt, 'How Many Children Had Julian of Norwich?', p. 27.

⁷ Marleen Cré, 'Women in the Charterhouse? Julian of Norwich's *Revelations of Divine Love* and Marguerite Porete's *Mirror of Simple Souls* in British Library, MS Additional 37790', in *Writing Religious Women: Female Spiritual and Textual Practices in Late Medieval England*, ed. by Denis Renevey and Christiania Whitehead (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), pp. 43-62 (p. 45).

⁸ Hugh Kempster, 'A Question of Audience: The Westminster Text and Fifteenth-Century Reception of Julian of Norwich', in *Julian of Norwich: A Book of Essays*, ed. by Sandra J. McEntire (New York: Garland, 1998), pp. 257-89 (p. 257).

⁹ Sue Ellen Holbrook, 'Margery Kempe and Wynkyn de Worde', in *The Medieval Mystical Tradition in England: Exeter Symposium IV*, ed. by Marion Glasscoe (Cambridge: Brewer, 1987), pp. 27-46 (p. 40).

¹⁰ Sarah Beckwith, 'A Very Material Mysticism: The Medieval Mysticism of Margery Kempe', in *Gender and Text in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. by Jane Chance (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1996), pp. 195-215 (p. 197). Rosalynn Voaden also discusses the role of the interaction between Margery and her scribe(s) in 'Words of Flame and Moving Cloud: The Articulation Debate in the Revelations of Medieval Women Visionaries', in *The Medieval Translator 6: Proceedings of the International Conference of Göttingen (22-25 July 1996)*, ed. by Roger Ellis, René Tixier and Bernd Wittemeier (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998), pp. 159-74 (p. 167).

¹¹ *A Book of Showings to the anchoress Julian of Norwich*, ed. by Colledge and Walsh, 2, 35-36. Hereafter cited as LT by chapter and line numbers.

¹² Nicholas Watson discusses some of the difficulties Julian would have faced as a female visionary writer in England and argues for a later dating of the long and short versions of the *Revelations* than is usually assumed in 'The Composition of Julian of Norwich's *Revelation of Love*', *Speculum*, 68 (1993), 637-83.

¹³ Ruth Shklar, 'Cobham's Daughter: *The Book of Margery Kempe* and the Power of Heterodox Thinking', *Modern Language Quarterly*, 56 (1995), 277-304 (p. 292). See also Rosalynn Voaden, *God's Words, Women's Voices: The Discernment of Spirits in the Writing of Late-Medieval Women Visionaries* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: York Medieval Press, 1999), p. 129. Wendy Harding also addresses the tensions between Margery and members of the clergy in 'Body into Text: *The Book of Margery Kempe*', in *Feminist Approaches to the Body in Medieval Literature*, ed. by Linda Lomperis and Sarah Stanbury (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993), pp. 168-87.

¹⁴ Sarah Beckwith, *Christ's Body: Identity, Culture and Society in Late Medieval Writings* (London: Routledge, 1993), p. 94.

¹⁵ Anthony Goodman, 'The Piety of John Brunham's Daughter, of Lynn', in *Medieval Women*, ed. by Derek Baker (Oxford: Blackwell, 1978), pp. 347-58 (p. 355).

¹⁶ David Lawton, 'Voice, Authority, and Blasphemy in *The Book of Margery Kempe*', in *Margery Kempe: A Book of Essays*, ed. by Sandra J. McEntire (New York: Garland, 1992), pp. 93-115 (pp. 111-12). See also Karma Lochrie, *Margery Kempe and Translations of the Flesh* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991), pp. 206-12, as well as Voaden, *God's Words, Women's Voices*, pp. 151-54. Barry Windeatt includes these annotations in his edition.

¹⁷ Kempster, 'A Question of Audience', p. 269.

¹⁸ David Aers and Lynn Staley, *The Powers of the Holy: Religion, Politics, and*

Revelations of Divine Love and The Book of Margery Kempe

Gender in Late Medieval English Culture (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996), p. 116.

¹⁹ Nicholas Watson, "'Yf wommen be double naturelly': Remaking "Woman" in Julian of Norwich's *Revelation of Love*', *Exemplaria*, 8 (1996), 1-34 (p. 21).

²⁰ References to the 'shorte treatyse of contemplacyon' are from the text provided by Barry Windeatt in his edition of *The Book of Margery Kempe* (see note 5).

²¹ Holbrook, 'Margery Kempe and Wynkyn de Worde', p. 29.

²² Clarissa W. Atkinson, *Mystic and Pilgrim: The 'Book' and the World of Margery Kempe* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983). Atkinson suggests that, as Margery must have known Sawtre, her failure to mention him in her text could be the result of scribal editing. Moreover, Margery's county of Norfolk was considered a hotbed of heretical activity; the surviving records reveal that at least sixty men and women were tried for heresy at the episcopal court in Norwich between 1428 and 1431 (p. 103-04).

²³ Susan Dickman, 'Margery Kempe and the English Devotional Tradition', in *The Medieval Mystical Tradition in England: Papers Read at the Exeter Symposium, July 1980*, ed. by Marion Glasscoe (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1980), pp. 156-72 (p. 169). Dhira B. Mahoney also discusses how, in order to 'live in the world while not of it', Margery seeks 'to find a role in society which could fulfill a function similar to that of the anchorite without the actual enclosure, a role which would exercise a similar power'. See 'Margery Kempe's Tears and the Power Over Language', in *Margery Kempe: A Book of Essays*, ed. by McEntire, pp. 37-50 (p. 38).

²⁴ Caroline Walker Bynum, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987).

²⁵ Holbrook, 'Margery Kempe and Wynkyn de Worde', p. 35.

²⁶ George R. Keiser, 'The Mystics and the Early English Printers: The Economics of Devotionalism', in *The Medieval Mystical Tradition in England IV*, ed. by Glasscoe, pp. 9-26.

²⁷ Lochrie, *Margery Kempe and Translations of the Flesh*, p. 223.

²⁸ C. Annette Grisé, 'Holy Women in Print: Continental Female Mystics and the English Mystical Tradition', in *The Medieval Mystical Tradition in England: Exeter Symposium VII*, ed. by E. A. Jones (Cambridge: Brewer, 2004), pp. 83-95 (p. 94).

²⁹ Grisé, 'Holy Women in Print', p. 94.

³⁰ Jennifer Summit, *Lost Property: The Woman Writer and English Literary History, 1380-1589* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), p. 134.

³¹ Barry Windeatt, 'Constructing Audiences: A Mystical Example' (unpublished conference paper, Queen's University Belfast, April 2001).

³² 'Julian of Norwich: The Westminster Text of *A Revelation of Love*, ed. by Hugh Kempster', *Mystics Quarterly*, 23 (1997), 177-245, (ll. 1-10). Hereafter cited as WT by line numbers.

³³ Kempster, 'The Westminster Text', p. 198.

³⁴ Denis Renevey, 'Margery's Performing Body: The Translation of Late Medieval Discursive Religious Practices', in *Writing Religious Women*, ed. by Renevey and Whitehead, pp. 197- 216 (p. 207).

³⁵ Margery's weeping is mentioned in the 'shorte treatyse': for example, she asks Christ that she may never have any other 'joye in erth, but mournynge and wepynge' for his love ('shorte treatyse' 45-46). Such remarks do not convey the disruptive intensity of her weeping in the complete *Book of Margery Kempe*. For further discussion of Margery's weeping see Lochrie, *Margery Kempe and Translations of the Flesh*, pp. 167-202, Mahoney, 'Margery Kempe's Tears', and Beckwith, *Christ's Body*, pp. 88-91, among others.

³⁶ Fiona Somerset describes Margery's tears as 'not only an expression of introverted (yet uncontainable) devotional emotion at the thought of Christ's suffering and her own contrition, but a form of social action': see 'Excitative Speech: Theories of Emotive Response from Richard Fitzralph to Margery Kempe', in *The Vernacular Spirit: Essays on Medieval Religious Literature*, ed. by Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski, Duncan Robertson, and Nancy Warren (New York: Palgrave, 2002), pp. 59-79 (p. 70).

³⁷ Beckwith, *Christ's Body*, p. 82.

³⁸ Voaden, *God's Words, Women's Voices*, p. 148.

³⁹ Watson, "Yf wommen be double naturelly", p. 5. Likewise, Frederick Christian Bauerschmidt suggests that 'Julian takes affective piety's emphasis on the suffering body of Christ and transforms it into a christocentric theology of revelation and redemption': 'Seeing Jesus: Julian of Norwich and the Text of Christ's Body', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 27 (1997), 189-214 (p. 190).

⁴⁰ Anne Hudson, 'Lollardy: The English Heresy?', in *Lollards and Their Books* (London: Hambledon, 1985), pp. 141-63 (p. 147).

⁴¹ Nicholas Watson, 'Censorship and Cultural Change in Late-Medieval England: Vernacular Theology, the Oxford Translation Debate, and Arundel's Constitutions of 1409', *Speculum*, 70 (1995), 822-64 (p. 829).

⁴² *Nicholas Love's 'Mirror of the Blessed Life of Jesus Christ'*, ed. by Michael G. Sargent (New York: Garland, 1992), p. 10, ll. 3-17. Hereafter cited as *Mirror* by page and line numbers.

⁴³ David Lawton, 'Englishing the Bible, 1066-1549', in *The Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature*, ed. by David Wallace (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 454-82 (p. 468).

Revelations of Divine Love *and* The Book of Margery Kempe

⁴⁴ Love's evocation is not unusual. The sermon of John Mirk as well as a Lollard sermon concerning the circumcision portray the event in a similar manner, establishing it as the first of many times that Christ would bleed for humanity. See 'Circumcision (New Year's) Day', in *Lollard Sermons*, ed. by Gloria Cigman, EETS o.s. 294 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), pp. 66-73, and 'De Circumcisione Domini Nostri, Ihesu Christi', in *Mirk's Festial: A Collection of Homilies by Johannes Mirkus (John Mirk)*, ed. by Theodor Erbe, EETS e.s. 96 (London: Kegan Paul, 1905), pp. 44-47.

⁴⁵ Holbrook, 'Margery Kempe and Wynkyn de Worde', p. 41.