Julian of Norwich: Containment and Mediation of the Body of Christ in the Anchorhold

“My sister, my spouse, is a garden enclosed, a garden enclosed, a fountain sealed up”\(^2\)

“Women have sat indoors all these millions of years, so that by this time the very walls are permeated by their creative force...”\(^3\)

The spiritual shape of Julian of Norwich’s Showings is a consequence of the physical enclosure of her cell, the anchorhold\(^4\). The anchorhold is the residence of the anchoress, built against one of the walls of a community’s church. It is a transitional space in which her visionary activity can be emplaced, embodied, and entextualised. Julian’s journey inside this space began with her revelations of 1373, long before she explicitly embraced anchoritic life. The sickroom where her visions occurred becomes, her figurative anchorhold; the inert body which houses her soul echoes its tomb-like walls and the only visible animation is that which emanates from the suspended crucifix before her. Thus, a homogeneity between Julian’s worldly
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\(^1\) Peter Farrugia is a graduate of the University of Malta, George Mason University, and the University of Cambridge. He is consultant to the Office of the President of the Republic of Malta for intercultural dialogue and peace-building among faith communities.

\(^2\) Sg 4:12.

\(^3\) Virginia Woolf, *A Room of One’s Own* (London: Hogarth, 1929), 91.

\(^4\) Julian of Norwich (ca. 1342-1416) was an English anchoress, important mystic, and theologian. Her series of visions (showings) of Jesus are recounted by herself in two, “short” and “long” text, versions. The latter version includes a theological exploration of the meaning of these visions.
suffering in the sickroom and the otherworldly existence she will later embrace within the anchorhold is established even in the early stages of the “Short text.”

Julian’s exploration of these visions, subsequently expanded and compiled in the “Long Text,” took place after her formal enclosure in the anchoress’ cell. The relationship between her Showings, the “otherworldly” anchorhold, and the decades-long process of returning to the visions, in the course of writing them down, involves a series of mutually reinforced experiences of the suffering Christ.

This essay will consider these experiences as the result of a unique system of English anchoritic life, contextualised by Julian’s “living out” of an affective theology fixed on Christ’s Passion within her anchorhold. I intend to show how each experience encompasses its own distinct structures of containment and mediation, contributing a more holistic understanding of how liturgy, life, and the historical-cultural resonances of physical space combine to create the particular way of life experienced by the anchoress of Norwich.

First, in the rite of enclosure’s emplacement of the anchoress, establishing a theoretical ground for Julian’s theology sketched in ritual images of liminality. Secondly, in the cell’s domestic interior where Julian lived out an embodied anchorhold through the praxis of anchoritic life. Finally, I will offer a reading of key images from Julian’s ordered reconstruction of her visionary experience of the body of Christ, disclosed in acts of entextualisation; the writing and sharing of Christ through the textual survival of Julian’s visions.

This essay will explore the way Julian of Norwich’s liturgical, contemplative, and textual spaces generate one another, and how Julian’s visionary activity transforms the physical, spiritual relationships between anchoress and community. Perhaps most importantly, this occurs by Julian’s authorial performance of mediating the body of Christ, which continues to extend itself to all “euyn Crysten.” I will address the historical and theological implications of Julian’s containment and mediation of the body of Christ as communicated in the ritual of enclosure, the anchorhold life, and the composition of her Showings.

Bombed to rubble in 1942 and rebuilt a decade later, the church of St Julian in twenty-first century Norwich is a composite creature. Just as Julian appears in “images of fragmentation...broken through sin and suffering” only to be reconstructed by literal enclosure in the anchorhold and our readings of her textual enclosure in the Showings, the church’s present-day fragmentation displays a patchwork residue of cultural significance. Julian’s theology permeates the ruined buttresses and reconstructed tower, carrying their own echoes of crisis - liturgies of the dead during the Great Plague, the violent uprisings led by Geoffrey “King of the Commons” Litster, and Lollard heresy trials, where bodies were burned and buried nearby.

All that remains of the medieval church of St Julian (apart from a couple of floor-slabs) is the north wall of the nave and the south wall of the chancel. There could be no more fitting space beyond the altar, the privileged place of the Passion’s re-presentation. A corresponding reliving of the God-Man’s Passion was embodied in Julian’s identity as an anchoress, communally inaugurated and officially authorised in the rite of enclosure described below.

Julian’s experience of the rite, and other participants’ experience too, was mediated through a schema of fragmentary liturgical sources. These are evident in eleven extant English orders of anchoritic enclosure.

---

7 The tower had been one of four such round towers in medieval Norwich. It suffered a direct hit.
8 Norwich’s “population is estimated to have fallen from 25,000 in 1333, to about 7,500 in 1377.” Richard Britnell, “The Black Death in English Towns,” *Urban History* 21, no.2 (October 1994): 200.
9 Henry le Despenser (1341-1406), Bishop of Norwich, led a successful campaign against Litster and presided at his execution.
10 The first time the burning of dissidents was sanctioned under Henry IV.
13 Several manuscripts exist. The earliest is the manuscript at Westminster Cathedral, compiled between 1450 and 1500.

---

the rite is found in the twelfth century MS Cotton Vespasian D XV.\textsuperscript{15} It describes the ceremonial induction of the anchoress into enclosed life as a uniquely hybrid “para-sacrament,” and bishops would have only performed it “a handful of times in their career, and most members of a congregation would perhaps only [have witnessed the rite] once or twice in a lifetime.”\textsuperscript{16} Participants’ performance of the rite was necessarily mediated by its relationship with other liturgies, more commonly witnessed - holy orders and extreme unction in particular, but also baptism and burial.

This quality of appropriation, echoes of other sacramental activities, would have been clear to all involved. Indeed, it grounds the interpretive structures of containment and mediation as they were lived out by Julian. She is an urban recluse who participates in ecclesial mission, yet is located outside the Church hierarchy.\textsuperscript{17} She is immured in an anchorhold that is affixed, barnacle-like, to the church but sealed off from it, an active member of her community who has been proclaimed, in the liturgical rite, dead to the world. The rite emplaces Julian within particular performative situations, as a specially consecrated creature, that effect her entry into an ecclesiastically sanctioned state of life.

It also forms the nucleus of her subsequent relationships with the institutional Church, the Norwich community, and the place of the anchorhold itself. These relationships are mediated by a sophisticated negotiation of liturgical boundaries, which justify and enable Julian’s new spiritual role. In fact, the liturgy, which publicly defines her new identity, also affords Julian the potential to transcend them - “the enclosed woman... [is] rendered marginal whilst simultaneously occupying a central discursive space within socio-religious culture.”\textsuperscript{18}

The anchoress is socially and spiritually redefined in layers of liminality, encoded within the rite. The concentrated tensions of life and death, of participation and exclusion, place Julian in a threshold space of betweenness. The office of enclosure unfolds dramatically in the boundaries of the sacramalised space of the anchorhold, framed in a liturgical procedure that achieved a certain creative dissonance by overlaying images and symbols of eternal regeneration, of human mortality, and of spiritual consecration.

\textsuperscript{15} Developed in later manuscripts, including a version established by the eleventh century Use of Salisbury (Sarum Rite) and adopted as normative in England, Wales, Ireland and later Scotland, until the 1560s.

\textsuperscript{16} Jones, "Ceremonies of Enclosure," 37.


Julian would have begun the ceremony prostrate on the ground, like a postulant, still as a corpse. She then abandoned the western part of the church, farthest away from the sanctuary "where it is usual for [medieval] women to be accommodated,"\textsuperscript{19} and traversed the nave to enter the chancel. At the altar, the anchoress prayed \textit{Suscipe me domine} (Ps 118:116) - echoing services of ordination, monastic profession, and extreme unction.

After litanic recitations, aspersing, and the exchange of lighted tapers, the anchoress and clergy entered the anchorhold. Psalms taken from the office for the burial of the dead were sung,\textsuperscript{20} and (together inside the anchorhold for the first and last time) anchoress, bishop, and ministers intoned the \textit{Ingressus Raphael}, an antiphon unique to the anchorite rite.\textsuperscript{21} Taken from the Book of Tobit (Tb 5:12-13)\textsuperscript{22} the verse plays off Tobit’s question, “What manner of joy shall be to me, who sit in darkness, and see not the light of heaven?” and the archangel’s response, “Be of good courage, thy cure from God is at hand.”\textsuperscript{23}

Centralising its “powerful strangeness,”\textsuperscript{24} the rite concludes with the anchoress singing the burial antiphon \textit{Haec requies mea in saeculum saeculi}. She was then sprinkled with dust and the door of the anchorhold was sealed shut. The Vespasian manuscript recommends that the congregation quietly disperses at this point, but other manuscripts prescribe a mass for the dead to underpin the rite.\textsuperscript{25}

From this moment the anchoress is “dead” in her anchorhold. She is a living icon of Christ in his tomb. The liminal space inhabited by Julian in her anchorhold constitutes a “disturbing memory of what we ought to be and are not, the critical consciousness of humanity that can never be content with that which it is or may have achieved.”\textsuperscript{26}


\textsuperscript{21} Jones, “Ceremonies of Enclosure,” 40.

\textsuperscript{22} This section is part to the Vulgate translation, The Vulgate Bible: Douay-Rheims Translation [DV], ed. Edgar Swift (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2010).\textsuperscript{23} The Book of Tobit was valued throughout the period for the covenantal significance it ascribed to the burial of the dead. Elizabeth Brown, “Death and the Human Body in the Later Middle Ages: The Legislation of Boniface VIII on the Division of the Corpse,” Viator 12 (1981): 223-224.

\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., 42.

\textsuperscript{24} Leonardo Boff, Jesus Christ Liberator: A Critical Christology for Our Time (New York: Orbis, 2013), 53.
Julian’s anchorhold spirituality was embodied in the extended living out of the medieval anchoritic rule and its way of life. By virtue of her detachment from society, in anchorhold isolation, new shapes of authority were able to emerge. Through these, Julian was able to engage more radically with her visions. Enclosed within and yet distanced from more mundane modes of Church authority, Julian acquires privileged access to God beyond the scope of ecclesial structures in the “outside” world.

The physical anchorhold’s interior significance as a tomb is built up throughout the rite – she is left alone in her grave, singing “this is my rest forever and ever: here will I dwell, for I have chosen it.” Julian invites the community to participate in her visionary freedom. A freedom paradoxically born of her symbolic death, in enclosed union with Christ.

This union is embodied through a meditative mode of sacred interiority, where her visions of 1373 can evolve in an anchoritic context. Julian becomes capable of the “bodily sight” of Christ by her own bodily experience of solitude in the anchorhold-as-tomb, received as a site of ongoing transformation. She presents Christ in “an imitation of his humanity - his bodiliness.” Julian’s anchorhold becomes a reflective space of crafting and combining, a corporeal enclosure of the body, and also a closed textual space for the continued re-envisioning of her visionary experience. This process is challenged by the anchorhold’s intimacy, dissolving as it does the distances between Julian and the object of her contemplation, and by the ambiguous liminality of her anchoritic status.

The Ancrene Riwle, a rule of life for anchoresses written by an anonymous male author early in the thirteenth century, emphasizes the need for “quietness and rest from all the world’s din, that nothing may hinder [you] from hearing the voice of God.” It does so in imitation of Mary, sister of Lazarus, whose contemplative vocation is contrasted with the active service of Martha. Julian is encouraged to be “introspective and self-analytical, particularly in the universal discipline of confession.”

Julian’s main interaction with her priest would have been framed by sacramental collaborations. The implications of an authorised, listening priest and disempowered, speaking penitent take on a deeper level of significance when we understand that the locus of power, seen through Julian’s anchorite identity, always rests with the penitent. It is the penitent’s sin which affords access to the sacramentally expressed forgiveness and love of Christ. Furthermore, Julian’s relationship with her confessor extends to her relationships outside the anchorhold - Julian assumes a similarly sacramental role as a deposit for communal revelations and desires.

A little parlour veiled by a curtain, embroidered with a cross, was available for guests to the anchorhold. Thus, these visitors spoke and were spoken to through the mediating image of Christ crucified. The anchorites was incorporated back into the community through her almost sacramental mediation of solidarity, an overflow of the mutually accommodating relationship with Christ experienced in the anchorhold.

Julian is absorbed in “the relation between Julian the creature and Julian the interpreter,” and her embodied approach to the Passion, expressed in her way of life and her writings, derives from that rhetoric of creatureliness (the defining feature of her humanity) in an affective identification with the suffering and redeeming Christ. The anchorhold acts as a space for reuniting with and incarnating (Julian’s body is “fulfilled with mynd and feeling of his blessed passion”) Christ, in the “holy of holies” - her entombed body. She includes the community in this reconciliation with God by a subsumption of those who visit her into Julian’s performance of the Paschal mystery. This participation in Christ redefines communal identity. Indeed, it reworks the

---

35 Robert H. Flood, St Julian’s Church, Norwich and Dame Julian (Norwich: the Author, ca. 1931), 53.
very nature of personhood,\textsuperscript{39} enjoined in creaturely solidarity with Jesus Christ.

Julian’s office of silent solidarity is famously revealed in the deluge of confessional narrative she must have endured from Margery Kempe,\textsuperscript{40} who seems neurotically predisposed to tell her story to every figure of spiritual authority she encountered. Throughout, Julian was engaged in an openness and accessibility that departs “from the influential twelfth and thirteenth century anchoritic guidance texts,”\textsuperscript{41} where human interaction of any kind is interpreted as a potential distraction rather than an opportunity for spiritual reciprocity. It would be difficult to overestimate the intensity of the relationships formed between Julian and her visitors, conflated in a single visionary space capable of “[dissolving] personal struggle with society”\textsuperscript{42} by virtue of the anchorhold’s liminal status.

The Riwle and other anchorite manuals are keenly aware of the difficulties presented by the vulnerability of anchoritic life. This would have been all the more evident in Julian’s anchorhold experience, moving between extended periods of solitude and intense engagement with the community. The Riwle advocates a busy regimen of prayer and guided contemplation to combat the risk of physical malaise, spiritual unease, and mental anxiety. Julian (uncharacteristically) dwells on the specific sin of sloth as “oure unskylfulle hevynesse and oure droughtfulle dredes,”\textsuperscript{43} and the efforts to overcome it by a “healthy alternation”\textsuperscript{44} of psalms, prayer and the emulation of Christ’s divine patience.

The long-suffering of Christ “is wurschypfulle, wher by hys goodnes shalle be know without ende.”\textsuperscript{45} The bodily and spiritual vulnerability of the anchor in her tomb, in this way, takes on the quality of divine sufferance, likened by Julian to the sacramental flowing of Christ’s blood and a mother patiently providing milk for her children.\textsuperscript{46}

The image of the crucifix in Julian’s writings exemplifies the mutuality of her relationship with Christ, which she fruitfully explores through bodily vulnerability. The Showings begin with Julian gazing upon and being gazed at by the image of the Crucified, held up as she lay on her sickbed.\textsuperscript{47} The crucifix becomes a point of perfect stillness - the paralysed body of Julian (“my bodie dead from the micies downward”)\textsuperscript{48} is mysteriously poised between time and eternity.\textsuperscript{49} This collapse into divine time, where “all there was besed the crosse was oglye and ferfull,”\textsuperscript{50} is Julian’s fundamental identification with the Passion narrative.

It incorporates the seed of affective spirituality so crucial to the period,\textsuperscript{51} and finds deep expression in Julian’s combination of hallucinatory, hypnagogic, and imaginative envisioning. As a springboard for self-questioning, Julian carefully works “to balance orthodoxy with heterodoxy as she discovers within her own experiences a mode of spiritual exercise”\textsuperscript{52} that transposes the vulnerability of her own body onto the body of Christ.

Julian’s bodily desire for Christ is contained in this vision of the living crucifix - the centrally suspended corpus that she at once adores, approaches, and “completes” by participation in suffering and solidarity.\textsuperscript{53} This identification reaches such a point that Julian’s own prophetic vocalising becomes indistinguishable from the voice of Christ. Julian’s anchorhold participates in the larger project of ecclesial salvation through the redemption of the body and the mind at their most vulnerable, framed in a spiritual hierarchy of containment and mediation.

\textsuperscript{39} 1 Cor 2:9-10.
\textsuperscript{40} Margery Kempe (ca. 1373-1438) was an English mystic. Her domestic tribulations, extensive pilgrimages and mystical conversations with God were dictated by her English in The Book of Margery Kempe. Kempe visited Julian of Norwich ca. 1413 to obtain reassurance regarding her own religiosity and mystic visions. Kempe found Julian full of “sweetnesse and devocyon, compassyon wyth holy medytacyon and hy contemplacyon.” Lynn Staley, ed., The Book of Margery Kempe (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1996), line 957.
\textsuperscript{42} Miles, “Space and Enclosure,” 164.
\textsuperscript{43} Baker, The Showings, 111.
\textsuperscript{45} Baker, The Showings, 48.
\textsuperscript{46} Parallel imagery of breast milk and blood (often linked to the Eucharist) was prevalent in the period. Caroline Walker Bynum, Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 132.
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., 6.
\textsuperscript{49} Baker, The Showings, 7.
\textsuperscript{50} Louis Gouguaud, Devotional and Aesetic Practices in the Middle Ages (London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1927), 75.
\textsuperscript{52} Christ’s eschatological “goostly thyrst” slaked by our ultimate wholeness in him. Baker, The Showings, 43.
Readers of her work participate in the transformative rewards of the anchorhold by sharing its claustrophobic space and vulnerabilities. This is achieved in the narrative density of Julian's textual anchorhold. By virtue of this unity, readers are invited into the visionary space of the Showings, “a fair, delectable place, and large inow for alle
Showings anchorhold by sharing its claustrophobic space and vulnerabilities. This is achieved in the narrative density of Julian’s textual anchorhold. By virtue of this unity, readers are invited into the visionary space of the Showings. By refiguring metaphors of size and scale the “human-scaled wound containing all with whom Julian shares her intimate encounters of Christ’s love. Julian embodies the mediating gestures and actions of Christ’s redemptive suffering by enacting an ongoing process of assimilation (of Christ’s passion) and conversion (to Christ’s promise of eternal life). This takes place in the sphere of mortality on one hand, and gestures to their fulfillment and the overcoming of “the last enemy,” in the Kingdom, on the other. As Julian would have it, Christ “livyng in [our] deadly bodie.”

This is also conveyed in the ambivalent image of Christ as an item of clothing, where “he is oure clothing that for love wrappeth us and wyndeth us” and we are entirely enclosed (“all becloseth”) in him. This tight wrapping of the Christian body echoes an infant’s swaddling clothes and a corpse’s shroud. The metaphor registers as a domestic image of warmth but also a sinister foreshadowing of death.

The image of Christ as cloth is directly followed by the image of a small round ball, likened to a “haselnott.” This image of an enclosed space par excellence, the hazelnut, contains “all that is made,” held in being by divine love. Within these textual enclosures, Julian reveals the personal intimacy and communal sharing of anchorhold spirituality that opens itself to identification with and by the community. Julian as an individual Christian and the corporate life of the Christian community are together enclosed within the “haselnott,” within the anchorhold, within the Body of Christ.

In developing her theology, there is little doubt that Julian was influenced by prevailing trends both locally (the striking dearth of direct scriptural quotations in her Showings trials) and farther afield. She is not unique in this respect - Margery Kempe’s writings reflect the continental tradition encountered on her pilgrimages, and her Showings may be due to the then recent events of the Lollard trials and farther afield. She is not unique in this respect - Margery Kempe’s writings reflect the continental tradition encountered on her pilgrimages, and the tenth vision of the Showings, “a fair, delectable place, and large inow for alle mankind.” By refiguring metaphors of size and scale the “human-scaled womb becomes a perpetual, divinely scaled womb” containing all with whom Julian shares her intimate encounters of Christ’s love.

Julian embraces the mediating gestures and actions of Christ’s redemptive suffering by enacting an ongoing process of assimilation (of Christ’s passion) and conversion (to Christ’s promise of eternal life). This takes place in the sphere of mortality on one hand, and gestures to their fulfillment and the overcoming of “the last enemy,” in the Kingdom, on the other. As Julian would have it, Christ “livyng in [our] deadly bodie.”

This is also conveyed in the ambivalent image of Christ as an item of clothing, where “he is oure clothing that for love wrappeth us and wyndeth us” and we are entirely enclosed (“all becloseth”) in him. This tight wrapping of the Christian body echoes an infant’s swaddling clothes and a corpse’s shroud. The metaphor registers as a domestic image of warmth but also a sinister foreshadowing of death.

The image of Christ as cloth is directly followed by the image of a small round ball, likened to a “haselnott.” This image of an enclosed space par excellence, the hazelnut, contains “all that is made,” held in being by divine love. Within these textual enclosures, Julian reveals the personal intimacy and communal sharing of anchorhold spirituality that opens itself to identification with and by the community. Julian as an individual Christian and the corporate life of the Christian community are together enclosed within the “haselnott,” within the anchorhold, within the Body of Christ.

In developing her theology, there is little doubt that Julian was influenced by prevailing trends both locally (the striking dearth of direct scriptural quotations in her Showings may be due to the then recent events of the Lollard trials) and farther afield. She is not unique in this respect - Margery Kempe’s writings reflect the continental tradition encountered on her pilgrimages, and

— Melita Theologica —

59 The theme of Marian suffering and compassion is prevalent throughout the period, with examples in Anslem of Canterbury’s Oratio XX (a meditation on Mary’s suffering at the foot of the cross) and the writings of Bernard of Clairvaux (especially Dominica infia Ostavam Assumptionis B. V. Mariae Sermo, PL 183: col. 1012).
61 Millett, Ancrene Wisse, 46.
sophisticated lines of communication between monastic houses, along with the growing impact of mendicant orders, all contributed to a charged atmosphere of theological enquiry.

However, Julian’s anchorhold mediation of the continental mystical tradition is noteworthy. Medieval English anchoresses were typically encouraged to pursue a spirituality that “differed markedly in its caution (some would say parochialism) from that of northern continental Europe.”  

This is especially clear where the business of visions was concerned.

Insular works like the _Ancrene Riwle_ encourage moderation in all things, a primary characteristic of “home-grown” spirituality with roots in English traditional religion. They “expressly prohibit ascetical heroics” and are wary of revelations, anxious about the uncertainty of their potential source. Although a movement towards women’s mystical writing in England was gaining momentum throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, Julian’s situation was not directly analogous with the thriving tradition of affective spirituality on the Continent. “We should not... make too much of regional diversity” is a misleading refrain in the scholarship concerning both English and continental religious traditions among medieval women mystics. By taking on the authority of Christ through visionary activity, the continental female mystic joined a dynamic tradition that finds no easy parallel in England. The situation was such that Christine Ebner, a fourteenth-century German nun, expressed disappointment and surprise that there were no visionaries in her convent (and she proceeded, in no small way, to make up for it).

The _Showings_ mediates elements of this continental tradition to a receptive English audience, hungry for visionary encounters. The Church of St Julian is located about a mile from Carrow Abbey, and it is likely that the Benedictine nuns there gave Julian her education. It is no surprise that Aelred of Rievaulx, whose *De institutione inclusarum* forms the basis of the _Ancrene Riwle_, was a Cistercian.

The Benedictine tradition (certainly under Bernardine reforms) preached an influential spirituality of embodied “unitive love.” Although little given to visionary experience, per se, the emphasis on affective spirituality bequeathed a wealth of devotional literature. This had a profound effect on English late medieval mystics, and made a fundamental impression on Julian. Together with works directly authored by Bernard of Clairvaux (promulgated by preachers and religious), the tradition links “Middle English devotional authors with the past, particularly St Augustine and Gregory.” It maps the Church in England’s Patristic heritage across a religious landscape, rooting and nurturing the autobiographical writing of “highly regarded spiritual leaders” of the period. Julian of Norwich presents an exceptional female voice working in the genre, while engaged in a thoroughly English system of anchorite living.

Julian's imaginative-meditative approach is fixed in the customs of Benedictine monasticism, further reinforced by the Cistercian renewal. Body and mind participate in scriptural reading, liturgical immersion, and prayerful practices. Such work is performed alongside the fostering of inwardness, cultivated as a means of seeking self-knowledge, where “we may nevyr come to full knowyng of God tylle we knowe furst clerely oure owne soule.”

Julian is no longer in a position of tension with the outside world, having effectively abandoned it by her ritual death in the rite of enclosure, and her isolation within the anchorhold. It is through our receptive reading of this release, in the _Showings_, that the text Julian would have us read comes into focus. Mediated through her visions and the enclosed intimacy of her

---


80 On a basic level, this can be seen in Julian’s familiarity (e.g. Vision 3) with the greeting _Benedicite_ (Bless me) and _Dominus te benedicat_ (The Lord bless you), exchanged between Benedictine monks and nuns. Watson and Jenkins, *The Writings of Julian of Norwich*, 4.

81 Jantzen, *Julian of Norwich*, 57.

anchorhold, we are presented with "the text of Christ's crucified body."  

A reader is incorporated into the visionary landscape through the fact of Julian's physical reality, her living out of intimate seclusion with God. The "confines of the anchorhold ensure a space of continual intimacy with God" that allow Julian the freedom to open her visionary world and refigure it as a textual artefact for the benefit of other Christians. The visions are a site of what is "real in the midst of the formless expanse," always pointing outside their textual borders to a privileged reception of the divine. Readers follow Julian into the anchorhold in pursuit of Christ, "enclosing the mystical space within the framework of contemporary spiritual and theoretical inquiry."  

The pilgrim soul is challenged by a desire that leads deeper into the apparent solitude of the body itself. Confronted by the impenetrability of her experience, by the apparent difficulty with which a mystic communicates their experiences, Julian is moved to ask, "Wherfore shewyth he it the?" and the answer comes, "For love." Love is the final answer, to the question of why Julian experiences and feels compelled to share her visions. 

Mystical space unfolds in infinite potential, enclosing Julian's embodied experience of Christ. It is the mediation of that sustained encounter that is made present to us in the containment of the anchorhold Showings. It is within this particular way of life, which exists in the intersections between liturgical rite, the praxis of anchoritic spirituality, and the physical enclosure of the anchorhold, that Julian is capable of living out her spiritual destiny. She is graced by a God-informed sense of her own bodily mortality, and cultivates a spirit that is ceaselessly redeemed through its encounter with the living Christ.
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84 Miles, "Space and Enclosure," 159.  
86 Davies, *Mysticism and Space*, 250.  
88 Lichtmann, "I desyrede a bodylye sight," 17.