In her *Book*, Margery Kempe provides us with a rare intersection of two of the most important female visionaries of the fourteenth century: Julian of Norwich and St Bridget of Sweden. When Margery visits Julian’s anchorhold, she is warmly received and counselled by the anchoress. Later on at Bridget’s house in Rome, Margery goes on a guided tour of the saint’s last resting place and kneels on the stone where Bridget once knelt in rapture. In both these encounters it is not only Julian's and Bridget’s words which influence Margery, but also her own physical proximity to the two holy women’s spaces of living and praying, which imbues her with renewed confidence to be their colleague. As Liz Herbert McAvoy notes, Margery seeks out these experiences in order to ‘carefully construct around herself an edifice of female *communitas* and understanding’. This self-validation is not only located in an abstract edifice of authority: it takes root in the brick-and-mortar edifice of Bridget’s and Julian’s physical spaces, for without this physical intimacy Margery’s spiritual intimacy with these women is but an empty construct.

Margery’s experiences highlight central elements of physical and spiritual space, of physical and spiritual intimacy, that can be fruitfully explored in the lives and writings of Julian and Bridget. Julian, born in 1342, and Bridget, born in 1303, both led ascetic and orthodox holy lives and documented vivid revelations shown to them by God. Nothing firm is known of Julian’s life before her enclosure in an anchorhold attached...
to St Julian’s church in Norwich, probably well before 1394 until at least 1416, as the evidence of wills attests. Bridget married, bore eight children, travelled extensively, and dedicated her life to social and ecclesial reform. Although she created a new monastic order primarily for enclosed women, Bridget was denied ever making a profession of her own, while Julian was able to take the most extreme vow of strict bodily enclosure under the anchoritic rule.

Julian’s and Bridget’s respective revelations reveal that their contrasting living spaces have a specific relationship to the formation of spiritual spaces within the sacred vision. When Julian and Bridget describe their visionary interactions with the godhead, space emerges as a common rhetorical definition of that interaction, as asserted by the use of various spatial metaphors and visualizations. But, what is the nature of the connection between concrete living spaces and visionary spaces? Ultimately, one space seems to compensate for the other in order to maintain a kind of equilibrium between divinity and humanity. Julian’s limited personal space contrasts her visions’ infinitely inclusive enclosure of all souls; conversely, Bridget’s lack of limited personal space contrasts with her visions’ sheltering enclosure of personal solitude. These related, inverted parallels help to elucidate important issues of spiritual and temporal authority, Christian community and mystical unity within the writings of these two visionary women.

At the age of thirty-and-a-half and in the grips of a near-fatal illness, Julian experienced a series of visions from the confines of her bed. This bed, and the anchorhold which she enters perhaps twenty years later, are the two main experiential spaces whose influence can be seen on the enclosing imagery in the two texts of her Revelation of Love, the Short Text and the Long Text. The sixteen showings finalized in the Long Text present a range of different scenes, most strikingly visual and some purely abstract, accompanied by interpolated commentary gained through the clarity of protracted meditation. Several of the images employ a ‘cinematic’ transformation of space and dimension in order to demonstrate the limits of human, spatial comprehension of a infinite, unmade godhead. The first such revelation is the well-known image of the hazelnut. Lying motionless on her deathbed, Julian suddenly receives a rapid series of visions, the third of which she describes in the fifth chapter:

Also in this he shewed a littil thing, the quantitye of an hesil nott, lying in þe palme of my hand; and it was as rounde as a balle. I lokid therupon with
eye of my vnderstanding and thowte: 'What may this be?' And it was generally answered thus: 'It is all that is made.'

This most small, insignificant and quotidian nut functions on a huge scale of metaphor: it is the seed and womb of a single plant or of all creation; it is Julian's own enclosed anchorhold room or the entire earth; it is her soul or every Christian's. But this tremendous potential of divine fecundity can only be understood in human scale by her human mind, and thus it becomes this 'littil thing . . . lying in þe palme of my hand'. How does Julian reconcile this paradox? She interprets the image:

But what is to me sothly the maker, the keper, and the lover I canot tell; for, till I am substantially onyd to him, I may never have full rest ne very blisse; that is to sey, that I be so festined to him that there is right nowte that is made betwix my God and me. It needyth us to have knoweing of the littlehede of creatures and to nowtyn all thing that is made for to love and have God that is unmade.

The enclosed single sphere that Julian beholds with her spiritual vision prompts a twofold goal: to consider its littleness as the insignificance of the made world which must be rejected, and to consider its completeness as the intimate pinnacle of mystical union with the unmade God. Initially it seems that human dimension defines this metaphorical image: she can hold it in her hand and see it with her eyes. But this proportion is challenged by her interpretation, wherein those assumptions of spatial reckoning are completely inverted: the 'littil thing' is 'all that is made'. This inversion can be clearly seen again in the third revelation, where Julian writes: 'I saw God in a poynte, that is to sey, in myn vnder-stondyng, by which sight I saw that he is in al things.' She challenges the reader, and herself, to focus on the approachability of God while simultaneously acknowledging his infinite nature. Space is formed and then turned inside out because, ultimately, space becomes ineffective as a tool for expressing the mystical relations of self to God within the vision: it is not measurable closeness, but oneness; not physical enclosure together, but inexpressible unity. To express this unity, however, Julian again and again returns to spatial metaphors of enclosure and inclusion, metaphors which she ultimately explodes. Size looses its relevance, space ceases to bear scale or form, and physicality collapses in light of the mystical infinity of God.
We can see this particular usage of space in Julian’s description of the open wound in Christ’s side, part of the tenth showing:

Than with a glad chere our lord loked in to hys syde and beheld, enioyand; and with his swete lokyng he led forth the understandyng of his creture be the same wound into his syde withinne. And ther he shewid a faire delectabil place, and large enow for all mankynd that shalle be save to rest in pece and in love.10

Christ’s human-scaled wound becomes a perpetual, divinely scaled womb, a stunning vision of the New Jerusalem framed by the humanity of God-made-man. Like the hazelnut scene, the physical boundaries of Christ’s body are initially invoked to provide a comprehensible space for the divine. Moving inward, the space again loses size and structure, as suddenly Christ’s human body can hold all mankind. Just as language intrinsically fails to render the divine, so do three-dimensional metaphors collapse in their very effort to portray the godhead.

In her sixteenth and last revelation, Julian inverts the spatial reference of the tenth showing by placing Christ in majesty with the soul:

And than our lord opened my gostly eye and shewid me my soule in midds of my herte. I saw the soule so large as it were an endles world and as it were a blisfull kyngdom; and be the conditions I saw therin I understode that it is a worshipful syte. In the midds of that syte sitts our lord Iesus, God and man, a faire person and of large stature, heyest bishopp, solmnest kinge, worshipfulliest lord; and I saw him clad solemnly and worshiply. He sitteth in the soule even ryte in peace and rest.11

Before, mankind could fit within Christ’s wound; now, Christ can be found within mankind’s soul. The rhetorical inversion of this pair of images emphasizes the intimate fluidity of visionary space, where human scale is counterbalanced by divine scale, where enclosure is protective without being exclusive. As in her other parables, Julian relies on the material image to concretize her theology, all the while acknowledging the ineffable divinity which refuses concrete definition by insufficient language. This is a fundamental tenet of the rhetoric of mystical writers, Grace Jantzen has argued, as they presuppose that in terms of the ineffability of God, their representations of him assume their own negation because of the limitations of language; descriptions of God ‘are fatally misunderstood . . . if their self-negation is not taken
into account’. Nonetheless, negation does not imply futility. Indeed, Julian employs her metaphors to great cataphatic effect, as their complex rhetoric of space challenges the reader continually to redefine his or her own conception of intimate space with God as inclusive of all Christianity.

Julian’s physical settings of sickbed and anchorhold and her consequent social context are central to understanding how these dramatic transformations of space function within her visions. Because the confines of the anchorhold ensure a space of continual intimacy with God, she does not need to retreat into closed-off visionary spaces to achieve this divine privacy. Julian, focused and immobile in the sickbed or anchorhold, is not forced to struggle against her fellow Christians in order to validate her relationship with God. Instead she is centralized within and nurtured by her surrounding parish while simultaneously afforded a sense of isolation from the world, a balance which enables humanity to become welcome in her visionary realm. As Christopher Abbot has noted regarding the tenth showing excerpted above, ‘her movement into Christ is depicted in such a way as to signify also a movement into the heart of the church and the discovery of a union with her fellow Christians, effected through the mystical Christ in whom all are to be enclosed’. Enclosure in the vision does not mean the individual, solitary isolation of Julian and God – that is part of the function of the anchorhold walls. Enclosure in the vision means, rather, the communal enclosure of all souls within an infinite God, a combination of paradoxes which language does not bear easily. Thus Julian’s metaphors free themselves from the rigidity of worldly dimension and much more accurately represent the ineffable God, unmade and unformed.

In keeping with Sauer’s argument in her essay in this volume, the above examples establish that, for Julian, intimacy with the divine does not require privacy of space in the visionary realm. Note that in Julian’s discussion of the hazelnut she switches effortlessly from ‘me’ to ‘us’. Julian and her ‘evencristen’ to which she so frequently refers can be conflated within the same space because her role as anchoress, physically authorized and contained by the church, can dissolve personal struggle with society. She has a secure room of her own, and so she can afford to open wide the door of her vision. This spiritual intimacy with both God and his creation is further demonstrated by the depictions of the relationship between the Trinity and the soul, specifically in this passage from the fourteenth showing:
We are beclosid in the Fadir, and we arn beclosid in the Son, and we arn beclosid in the Holy Gost; and the Fader is beclosid in us, and the Son is beclosid in us, and the Holy Gost is beclosid in us: almythyede, al wisdam, al goodnes, on God, on lord.14

To emphasize the mutual indwelling of godhead and the soul, Julian deftly uses two of her preferred rhetorical strategies, repetitio followed with a flourish of conversio.15 Space is created and then turned inside out in order to suggest both intimacy and community. God is intrinsically intimate with his creation in a way that baffles human comprehension, and thus Julian must use language that gently, provocatively reflects this bafflement. Her rhetoric in this passage supports a layered substitution: she is enclosed in the Christian community, and the community is enclosed in her. Because of the security of the physical spaces of sickbed and anchorhold, Julian does not have to isolate herself from the rest of humanity in her visions to find divine intimacy; because of her constant physical enclosure, the visionary space releases its containment and is utterly permeated by the godhead and his creation.

Though we know little else of Julian’s life, it is clear that her written revelations have a definite relationship with the two known spaces of sickbed and anchorhold, both spaces marked by focused immobility. Bridget’s life, on the other hand, is a well-documented flurry of movement.16 She was born into an influential noble family in Sweden, married to Ulf Gudmarrsson at the age of thirteen, and managed a large and wealthy household of eight children. In 1341 Bridget and her husband went on a pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostella, and upon their return home they mutually decided to enter monasteries. A few years later, Ulf died, and within a few days Bridget received a calling vision in which God stated her role as ‘bride and channel’ of Christ.17 By 1350 Bridget had permanently relocated to Rome in order to petition the Pope’s return to the city and await the pontiff and emperor’s simultaneous presence there, as instructed by Christ in her visions. Over the next twenty-seven years Bridget worked tirelessly as ecclesial, political and social activist; she undertook several more pilgrimages to both holy sites and royal courts in need of reform; and she concluded her corpus of over seven hundred visions, the Revelationes. Yet her public life was nurtured by a private life of intense prayer, harsh ascetism and periods of quasi-monastic isolation.18 This spiritual lifestyle originated during her five-year attachment to a Cistercian monastery in Alvastra, Sweden, after her husband’s death and before her departure for Rome.
During this enclosure Bridget received nearly half of her revelations, including the vision wherein Christ outlines the rule for a new double order first and principally for women, the *Ordo Sanctissimi Salvatoris*. Even then, she was never permanently enclosed by vow.

Like Julian and her showings, Bridget’s revelations also turned her inward for deeper, prolonged internal development of her theology. For Bridget, however, Christ’s words also propelled her out into the world, and so we see that the world likewise permeates Bridget’s visions in the form of a large cast of characters, both heavenly and human. The saint’s visionary experiences took place during fervent prayer in private rooms, liturgical settings, or at the many holy shrines and pilgrim sites she visited. Bridget even received one of her most important visions while travelling on horseback. But no matter the locale of the ecstatic experience, the visions themselves frequently return to architectural, sheltering spaces excluding everyone but herself and Christ. Like Julian, Bridget engages various physical metaphors to describe the godhead as enclosing and intimate. While Julian inverts these physical metaphors in order to express God’s infinite, intimate enclosure of all humanity, Bridget relies on the fixed physicality of the enclosing metaphor to express her own solitary intimacy with God.

The most prominent spatial metaphor in Bridget’s *Revelationes* is the house, complete with all its quotidian accoutrements. In book I, chapter XVII, Christ explains to Bridget: ‘I will shewe vnto þe what þe house bitakens þat I will haue bigged. In þat house is religion, of whome I ame fundament and ground, bi whome all þinges are made and are upstanding. In þis house are foure walles.’ Christ goes on to identify the four walls as his righteousness, his patience, his power and his mercy, all of which protect and comfort the dwellers within the house. The metaphor, a standard in monastic thought, is direct and clear as each part of the house is assigned a signification:

‘In þis walle is þe revesalpe of mi grace, bi þe whilke is comon entre of all . . . þe simpill windous and bright bitokens þat all if mi wordes are plaine and sympill, sete bi þaime þe light of knawlege of God sall entire into þe werld. þe roofe þat is mesurabili hie bitokens þat þai ware shewed abill to be vndirstanden and knawen what þai mene.’

The image is firmly rooted in the reality of an architectural structure whose scale and size fit the human body and which can be seen and comprehended by the human mind. Part corporeal similitude and part
mnemonic device, this passage introduces the centrality of enclosing space for Bridget’s conceptualization of her relationship with God. In the next chapter, Christ continues by likening himself ‘to a mightie kinge þat hase foure þinges, and of þe tresoure houses’, which he explains are ‘mi loue and þe loue of þe world’. Though the architectural structures that appear in Bridget’s visions always have a symbolic counterpart, the rhetoric of the imagery itself is worthy of analysis despite her own longing ‘to perceive incorporeal, transcendent realities without corporeal symbols and likenesses’, as Sahlin notes. She also aptly points out that throughout the *Revelationes* Christ reminds Bridget that ‘her veiled vision of spiritual entities was a necessary concession to the human condition: not only are similitudes indispensable for human understanding, but the human body is also too frail to see the essence of things’. These similitudes capture the most human part of Bridget’s understanding of her visions, as they do for Julian, and therefore serve as an excellent witness to the visionary’s comprehension of the relationship between human and divine.

Bridget’s frequent use of this imagery early in her visions can be connected to her contemplative seclusion in the monastic setting of Alvastra where the cloister gave her a necessary spiritual privacy with her new holy spouse. Undisturbed by household or motherly duties, she is for the first time able to facilitate a fresh divine intimacy within her visions. However, Bridget did not enjoy the same security as Julian did in her anchorhold, as her presence was seen as a temporary arrangement by the less than welcoming monks. The saint has a taste of complete bodily enclosure, as it were, but is never able to secure that life of perpetual prayer for longer than that five-year period. Therefore the walls, roof and gate of her visionary house with Christ are vital to the preservation of the intimacy she is able to share with him in her visions. There is no inversion of the vision’s metaphorical enclosure, as Julian can afford to do from within the fixed privacy of her anchorhold. Bridget does not have the permanent protection of a cell, so her revelations must compensate with their own architectural creation of a private space for God and the soul. It may exist only in the ephemeral ecstatic experience, but it is a house built with the concrete strength to provide eternal refuge from the criticism and attack which often marked her interactions with humanity.

These examples highlight Christ’s focus on Bridget herself; though the lessons may have a more universal application for her readers, the rhetoric of the passages, always between Christ and the singular hearer,
prioritize the saint above all others. Later visions are even more concerned with Bridget’s spousal status as singular among souls, and the rhetoric of the enclosing imagery reflects this increasingly intimate connection with God. The conversations with Christ which focus on Bridget’s role as spouse domesticate metaphors of space by shifting from generic house to personal home, from representative enclosure to individualized privacy. In book II, chapter XXV, Christ addresses Bridget directly, saying, ‘þarefore þou mi spouse, for cause þou art mine, bi Goddes lawe vs bose haue thre howeses’. Each of the three houses has three types of contents (food, clothing and instruments and vessels) which signify a range of good deeds and virtues, as explained by both Christ and Mary. Christ’s possessiveness – ‘þou art mine’ – perhaps evokes Bridget’s expectations of a husband figure. The detailed description of the houses and all their myriad things definitively reminds us that Bridget had once been in charge of running a large household. More than just metaphor, however, the rhetoric of the architectural structure reveals how Bridget envisions her relationship with divinity: protective and enclosed on a private, individual basis. The concrete description of the houses’ structure makes them achievable, personal goals wrapped up in a private relationship with Christ. It is a lesson on how to create an interiorized space for the soul to visit God while the body must inhabit the world.

Towards the end of the long description of the three houses, Christ briefly interrupts the sense of isolation which has so far enveloped Bridget and himself. He reminds her that her role as spouse functions to represent other souls as well: ‘þarefor, mi spouse, bi whome I vndirstonde all mi frendes, gete we to oure house two þinges, in þe whilke God is speciali plesid’. So we discover that Christ intends this narrative, this concrete compound of divine intimacy, not for Bridget alone, but also for others following him. This does not mean this space is shared, however, but, rather, enjoyed by each soul on individual terms. Bridget’s language departs from the radically inclusive rhetoric that Julian employs: the interaction for each of Christ’s ‘friends’ remains on an individualized level, and the common union of souls which Julian embraces again and again is absent from Bridget’s vision here and in general. The saint is keenly aware of those in the world whom her revelations demand she engage and help, and the loss of personal privacy that work entails. Nonetheless, she never allows humanity access to the space she shares with Christ in her visions: it is an exclusive right accorded to the bride of Christ. His friends may also be accorded this
right, their own spiritual house with Christ, but it is for each alone to enjoy, as Bridget insists with her rhetoric. With no physical walls, no anchorhold, no cell to ensure a true life of enclosed divine intimacy, Bridget compensates by constructing these fixed spaces of intimacy in the visionary realm.

Enclosed space, which in Julian’s rhetoric is enabled and exploded to accommodate the infinite godhead, is gated and locked in Bridget’s visionary rhetoric. This sealed enclosure is so vital to the saint’s relationship with her divine bridegroom that the last several paragraphs of Christ’s description of his houses concern only their doors, locks and keys. Like actual walls, the houses completely encompass and defend the soul, with the door being hope and the lock being charity, as Christ explains at the end of book II, chapter XXVII:

Also, this loke buse hafe a kei to vndo it with, þe whilke sall be one hertli desire to be with God, acordinge on swilke wise with gudeli charite and gudeli werke, þat he will noþinge bot þat God will, and noght bot God himselfe. þe kei of swilke a desire closes God in þe saule and þe saule in God. þe husband and þe wife – þat menes God and þe saule – aloneli sall have þis kei, þat God may haue fre entre to delite himselfe in þe virtue of þe saule, and þe saule to com to God when it likes . . . Se nowe, spouse, what þe charite of God is to þe saule, and stand stabbilli in mi lufe and fulfill mi will.’

Bridget’s expression of the mutual indwelling of ‘God in þe saule and þe saule in God’ perfectly echoes Julian’s rhetorical technique of *conversio*. Its context, however, drastically changes the tenor of the rhetoric: space is created and then turned inside out in order to suggest only shared intimacy with Christ, not a sense of wider communion with Christianity. Intimacy in the vision demands the conception of enclosing concrete space: walls, roofs, gates, locks, keys. In Bridget’s visionary realm, there is no ‘we’, no ‘evencristen’, no unified Christian communion, just husband and wife in private intimacy. Though part of her bridal role was to labour tirelessly in the world for the union of the Christian community, in her revelations she is as alone with God as if her cell had long been sealed.

In their visions, then, Julian and Bridget both create intimate spaces with God, but how they use those spaces rhetorically in their texts reveals a world of difference. The difference is more than a subtle divergence of style, more than just ‘empty rhetoric’. The difference is a deeper reflection of the individual gaze on a vision seen from within, a reflection of external surroundings and pressures. Between Julian
and Bridget there exists a basic proportion: intimate space with God, and shared space with humanity. For Julian, the intimate space with God is in the temporal world – provided by the physical isolation of the anchorhold – so that her space in the vision can be shared with humanity, like the salvific wound of Christ’s side ‘large enow for all mankynd’. For Bridget, the proportion is inverted: the intimate space with God must be in the vision, because God calls her to engage the world with all her heart. Julian uses the rhetoric of space to explode the materiality of an infinite divinity, while Bridget uses the rhetoric of space to build divinity into a sealed, solitary enclosure.

It was her visionary space that Bridget re-created as the physical reality of her new enclosed order, the Ordo Sanctissimi Salvatoris. A divine revelation itself, the Order’s rule was dictated by Christ to the saint during her time in Alvastra, though the Regula Sancti Salvatoris was not given papal approval in its full form until after her death. Never was Bridget able to live the life of a Bridgettine nun. When Christ calls her to work in the world, Bridget’s daily life becomes a public life with humanity, and her visions become her cell, her intimate enclosure with the divine. What Bridget gives the nuns of her Order is what she experienced only in her heart: an undisputed private life as the spouse of Christ, physically enclosed in his house, wearing a holy crown, fully released from worldly authority into divine authority. Literally, her visions become reality – her vision of Christ’s words becomes a living text for her nuns (the Regula), and the metaphorical space of the bride-groom’s house takes physical form in the cloister and cell of the Bridgettine house. Little critical attention has been paid to the Regula as a vision, but its interpretation is crucial to understanding Bridget’s negotiation of her relationships with God and with the world.

The twenty-three chapters of the Regula, in Christ’s own words, begin to reveal the parallels between Bridget’s rhetoric of enclosure and its monastic expression. A new sister physically crosses the threshold of the monastery’s church to join the Order, and once professed she will never again stand face to face with anyone outside the house. She is constantly reminded of both her impending mortal death and her current death to the world by a bier set by the entrance of the church, reminding us of the words of the Ancrane Wisse:

Beo æ ibunden inwið fowr large wahes? Ant he in a nearow cader, inellet o rode, i stanene pruh bicluset hetefeste. Marie wombe ant þis þruh weren his ancre-huses.
Are you imprisoned within four wide walls? – And he in a narrow cradle, nailed on the cross, enclosed tight in a stone tomb! Mary’s womb and this tomb were his anchorhouses.)

In the Bridgettine Rule we see the kind of strict enclosure that, like the four wide walls of the anchorhold, liberates the enclosed soul to long for, and achieve, a divine mystical intimacy that does not leave humanity at the door. Within the cloister, the female community sanctions and nurtures each woman’s call to holy life. Bridget provided an environment that released women from the demands and critiques of society in order to preserve their marriage to Christ, so that the nuns could freely incorporate those souls into their prayers, even as Julian did for her fellow Christians. The private space with God that Julian enjoyed as a physical reality in her anchorhold thus becomes a reality for Bridget, not in life, but in death: it is Bridget’s monastic legacy that brings to life the intimacy with God which she could only enjoy in passing rapture.
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