

The Julian Lecture 2016

# **'to drede him reverently and to love him mekely'**

**Julian's development of the catechetical teaching  
on the gift of dread**



**Revd. Dr. Emma Pennington**

**'to drede him reverently and to love him mekely': Julian's development of the catechetical teaching on the gift of dread**

By Rev'd Dr Emma Pennington

*For when thay/we begin to hate sinne, and to amende tham/us by the ordinance of holye kyrke, yit there dwelles a drede that stirres/lettith them/us to/for the behaldinge of thamselwe/ourselwe and of ther/oure synnes before done, and sum of us for oure everdayly synnes; for we holde nor oure covenants ne kepe not oure clenness that our lord settith us in, but fallen oftentimes into so much wretcidness that shame it is to seen it. And beholding of this makyth us so sorry and so hevy that onethis we can finde ony comfort. And this drede that they/we take sumtime for a mekenesse, bot this is a foulle blindehede and a waykenesse.*

*(Short Text section 24 1. 20-21 and Long Text chapter 73)*

**[2], 'to drede him reverently and to love him mekely': Julian's development of the catechetical teaching on the gift of dread**

In about the year 1413 a colourful character from King's Lynn arrived at this church to seek the advice of a certain anchoress who lived in its adjoining cell. It is clear that whilst Margery Kempe did not seem to know of Julian's writings, she was certainly aware that if you needed advice on the validity of your visions, this was the person to come to, at least in Norfolk. Margery was not disappointed by the good councils of the anchoress and states that she spent many days with her 'communing in the life of our Lord Jesus Christ'. Even if we take into account the probable fact that Margery's portrayal of her conversation with Julian of Norwich was written to bolster the legitimacy of her own revelations, her brief documentation of their meeting in *The Book of Margery Kempe* gives us a rare insight into a holy conversation which took place at Julian's anchorhold window. It is interesting that in her account of Julian's words Margery chooses not to convey what she says about visions or high contemplations but rather on the spiritual advice which Julian gives her on how to discern the presence of God in the devotional life. It is this devotional aspect of Julian's writings that I wish to speak on today.

Sadly we cannot know whether Julian's two versions of *A Revelation of Love* were disseminated as widely as Julian had hoped.<sup>1</sup> The Constitutions of Archbishop Arundel in 1409 which forbade use of scripture in English and curtailed the teaching role of women may have meant that her writings never emerged in textual form in her own lifetime and instead they went underground held by religious communities such as the Sisters of Sion who later fled to France following the Reformation. Apart from the fifteenth century Amherst manuscript which <sup>[3]</sup>contains the only known version of the *Short Text*, the long version is found in three other roughly seventeenth

century manuscripts and are therefore copies of copies of the original which is now lost to us. *The Revelation of Love* only really came to the attention of 'mine even cristen' at the beginning of the twentieth century when there was a renewal of interest in such devotional or mystical texts by the likes of Baron von Hugel, Dean Inge and Evelyn Underhill. Since then her texts have been widely available and translated from the original Middle English into many different languages across the world. She is studied in the academy for her depth of theological thinking and complex interplay of language. But has also inspired artists, musicians and filmmakers who have found in her vision and words a liminal space for the imagination to flourish and self-reflect. Alongside and amongst those who study Julian and her writings are of course many of us who have found her words a springboard to the ineffable and an aid to our spiritual lives.

When you turn to her text and read it in its entirety, it is clear to see why such a breadth and depth of meaning, comfort, inspiration and interpretation can be found in a relatively short, if not at times dense, work. Julian writes on many different levels and at times to different purposes. Sometimes in a self-reflective mode simply to seek self-understanding for what she has seen, at others she is journaling what happened to her in 1373 and yet at other times she is addressing those 'even cristen' to whom the long text seems to be primarily directed.<sup>2</sup> It is in this mode that we find Julian taking on a more instructive, teaching role, and this is especially the case when she broaches devotional or pastoral issues such as the one she raises in section 24 of the *Short Text*. She writes:

*For when they begin to hate sinne, and to amende tham by the ordinance of holye kyrke, yit there dwelles a drede that stirres tham to behaldinge of thamselpe and of ther sinnes*

*before done.*

[4] In this passage Julian sounds very much like a spiritual director describing a problem that some of her directees are having after confession. Though she does not mention confession directly, it is already assumed by the words 'amende tham by the ordinance of holy church'. Within the fourteenth century, there was only one way to deal with sin; the sacrament of reconciliation, namely contrition, confession, absolution and satisfaction. It was assumed that careful self-examination of the heart and the naming of sin had taken place largely outside the confessional forum rather than in it, at least by the increasing literate middle classes. Evidence for this can be found in the fact that during the fourteenth century penitential Latin manuals, which were written to aid the priest in his examination during confession, were being adapted and transferred into English for a lay audience. In addition penitential verse texts were being written in the vernacular to meet this growing need to search the heart privately prior to confession, for the efficacy of the sacrament was still heavily weighted on the depth of contrition which the penitent showed, despite the fact that, as far back at the twelfth century Peter Lombard had theologially reasoned that all four elements must be fulfilled for reassurance of forgiveness. It is this lack of reassurance of forgiveness that Julian highlights. Even though the penitent soul has come to a full knowledge and abhorrence of sin and gone to confession, there yet remains a dread which turns the soul in on herself to linger on past sins which have been forgiven.

This is not a devotional concern or issue which is restricted to the fourteenth century. Anyone who has been involved in accompanying people on their spiritual journey will be familiar with her words. However, when we turn to the same passage in the longer and later

version of her writing, this devotional experience seems to have become more of an issue:

*For when thay/we begin to hate sinne, and to amende  
tham/us by the ordinance of holye kyrke, yit there dwelles a  
drede that stirres/lettith them/us to/for the behaldinge of  
thamselfe/ourselfe and of ther/oure synnes before done, and  
sum of us for oure everdayly synnes; for we holde nor oure  
covenants ne kepe not oure clenness that our lord settith us in,  
but fallen oftentimes into so much wretcidness that shame it is  
to seen it. And beholding of this makyth us so sorry and so  
hevy that onethis we can finde ony comfort. A <sup>[5]</sup>sumtime for a  
mekenesse, bot this is a foulle blindehede and a waykenesse.*

(ST section 24 l. 20-21 and LT chapter 73)

Julian makes a number of significant changes to the short text. First, the sense of sinfulness has increased within this passage. The soul no longer lingers on those sins which they had named and repented during confession; instead Julian expands this sense of sinfulness to encompass a daily awareness of falling short of the mark. On one level the sense of sin has become all consuming, but on another the pastoral process is no longer giving reassurance of the forgiveness of sins.

Secondly, this all-pervasive experience of sin is actually causing a breach with the church. The sacraments of the church, which were meant to bring a sense of the surety of salvation through the belonging of baptism and the forgiveness of absolution, are now simply reminding people of the depth of their sin for even here they are unable to 'holde nor oure covenants ne kepe not oure clenness that our lord settith us in, but fallen oftentimes'. For Julian the very

means of the church which sought to enable the sinner to handle their own sin is compounding the problem and instead causing sinners to dwell upon their sinfulness and their inability to keep clean. Rather than bringing a sense of forgiveness, confession is simply reminding the penitent of the extent to which they are continually falling through sin.

The third significant change Julian makes to section 24 of the short text is to shift from the exclusive third to the more inclusive first person plural pronoun. Scholars have argued that this reflects a general broadening within the long text to address 'mine even christen' instead of those who 'desire to lyeve contemplatyfelye'.<sup>3</sup> As a consequence Julian's 'voice' similarly alters at this stage as she no longer adopts the role of 'ghostly father' to denote the devotional concerns of those who would be 'goddes luffers' but instead acquires a more universal tone. It is for this reason that she no longer sets herself aside, observing the concerns of others, but rather identifies with them and presents them as concerns which have a much wider remit. Julian may just be identifying with some of the problems she hears at her anchorhold window, or she may be expressing a more general, ecclesial concern at the time.

Finally, Julian develops the short text to highlight the debilitating consequences of the sense of dread which lingers after the soul has undergone confession. This <sup>[6]</sup>dread no longer stirs us to behold ourselves and our sin, but now it actively prevents us from beholding God. Using her unique language of 'beholding', Julian emphasizes the damaging manner in which this dread has shifted the object of our contemplation away from God and to ourselves. So that we now contemplate ourselves in our sin with as much devotion as we did our lord. As a result the soul is not only brought down and disordered but it is also blinded to the sinful state which it is in, for

'this drede we take sometime for a mekenes, but it is a foule blindhede and a wekeness. And we can not despise it as we do another sinne that we know, for it cometh of enmite and it is againe truth.' In these lines there is the sense of the fallen servant from the parable of the lord and servant who writhes in pain and confusion, unable to see the loving eyes of his lord. But here Julian locates the problem in one devotional issue, that of a dread or fear which lingers after confession.

So what is Julian's remedy to this debilitating and very serious devotional concern that she too identified with? I would like to spend the rest of my talk exploring just one answer which she gives within the long text and can be summed up in the title to this paper 'to drede him reverently and to love him mekely'. It comes at the end of the following chapter, chapter 74. This is the devotional stance that Julian states we should desire God to give us. Surprisingly perhaps, you will notice that she has not abandoned the language of dread. Instead, by delving into the devotional teaching on dread at the close of the fourteenth century, Julian clarifies and develops the standard teaching and imagery of dread to bring light and truth to the blinded, struggling soul. It is therefore to this teaching that I now wish to turn.

The theology of dread or fear held a significant place within the catechetical or the basic teaching of the church which included knowledge of the Lord's Prayer, Apostles Creed, the Ten Commandments, the seven deadly sins and their corresponding virtues. It often formed the basis of a confessional examination. Based on a line from Proverbs 'the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom', fear played an important part in the process of reconciliation itself. It not only excited contrition in the sinner's heart but it was also the first of the gifts of the Holy Spirit which



established the penitent in the life of virtue. We shall look at both in turn.

In the late thirteenth century Thomas Aquinas set out the different forms of dread within the second part of his *Summa Theologiae* (c. 1273), this clarified previous thinking but also shaped the understanding of the nature of dread within the <sup>[7]</sup>penitential process in the centuries to come.<sup>4</sup> His demarcation into three types: initial, servile and filial or chaste fear is found in numerous Latin penitential manuals, but also in literature for anchoresses and later popular didactic prose and verse writings in English. In each case fear held an important position in awakening the soul to its sinful situation and exciting contrition, the first stage on the road to reconciliation. Initial fear often began this process. The thirteenth-century handbook for anchoresses the *Ancrene Wisse* likens 'initial fear' to someone shouting 'Fire' in the way that it awakens the soul to its perishing condition.<sup>5</sup> For the author of *The Pursuit of Wisdom*, a version of Richard St Victor's *Benjamin Minor*, which circulated in the *Cloud of Unknowing* corpus, dread is 'the first virtue experienced in man's affection' the first step on the path to wisdom is fear itself.<sup>6</sup> Similarly, in the more popular mid fourteenth-century didactic text *Prick of Conscience* fear is that which 'may lofe bygyn'.<sup>7</sup> Each in turn see initial dread as that first impetus which starts a process of conversion. It may not be very pleasant but it is the wakeup call the soul needs at times to show where it has wandered off course. It therefore has the effect of opening the eyes and freeing the soul from that blinded state of sin. In the fourteenth-century English adaption of the *Somme le Roi* moral text called *The Book of Vices and Virtues* we find a graphic description of the seriousness of the state out of which initial fear brings the sinful soul.

*Euere-more be synful, as seip Salamon, farep as he bat is in a*

*schip alone in be see, and slepep and leteþ the schip drenche  
for defaute of gouernaile, and he ne wot no bing ber-of, ne he  
nys not a-ferd.<sup>8</sup>*

[8]In this image the helplessness of the soul in sin is emphasized. He is alone and unable to do anything about his perilous situation and yet at the same time is blissfully unaware of the state he is in. It is for this reason that fear is seen as a gift, for it enables the sinful soul to see that it is on a sinking ship and therefore seek for the anchor of contrition and repentance.

The second form of dread, 'servile fear', is the kind of fear which the prospect of hell awakens in the soul. This type of fear comes with a judgement warning. It would be very easy to dismiss it as simply a terrifying of souls in order to lead them into church submission, but this would be a caricaturing of the medieval period, and slightly missing the point. Servile dread was again a gift of God with the purpose of awakening the sinner to recognize of the consequences of sin in order for there to be a conversion and renewed desire to live a virtuous life. *Sawles Warde* another anchoritic text (c. 1220) encapsulates this notion of servile fear in the way it personifies Fear as a messenger of Death who comes to tell Caution, the gatekeeper of the soul, about the horrors of the afterlife in hell, so that the Virtues may defend and protect the castle of the soul.<sup>9</sup> In part V of the *Pricke of Conscience*, Christ appears on the day of Judgement with fifteen accusers, who call a sinful man to account for the sins of his youth and old age, the first of which is the man's own conscience. This is dramatically represented in the Doomsday scene at the end of the N-town play.<sup>10</sup> After the blessed have entered the gates of heaven, the damned are led before God and cry out for mercy. In a rage Deus asks them why they should be shown mercy having not shown any themselves and, using the words of Matthew chapter 25

verses 41-46, he tells them that their deeds 'doth yow spylle' (destroy).<sup>11</sup> The seven deadly sins are then described as written on each of their faces and they are read out by the demons until the damned cry out 'we have synnyd. We be to blame.'<sup>12</sup> In this powerful scene, which in some sense echoes the confessional format of self-examination, the Judge reveals the hidden and unrepented sins to the sinful soul<sup>[9]</sup> and the shocking realisation of their sin.<sup>13</sup> Such a text was written again as a wake-up call to the consequences of sin, to bring the soul out of its blinded sinful state before it is too late and repent.

Finally filial or chaste fear is characterized by reverence to God and submission to his will. It was the kind of fear or respect that a child has for its parent and was associated not so much with rousing the soul from the sleep of sin, as securing the soul in the life of virtue. This process is visualized in *The Book of Vices and Virtues* where fear is closely associated with the virtue of humility. Using the image of a tree humility is depicted as having four roots which spring up in a person as a result of thinking upon 'the pouerte, the foulnesse, the brotelnesse of his berthe', 'how he is ful of synne', 'whidere he goth' and the righteouness of God. This tree of meekness is set beside the well of dread which waters the soul in humility. Fear is an essential component as it enables the process of noughting to take place that leads to the growth of humility:

*ban zeuep God hym a felynge bat powere of man is nougt and  
bat he hap nougt and bat he can nougt and bat he may nougt,  
ban bigynneb he to be pore gostliche.*<sup>14</sup>

In the devotional world of the fourteenth century fear was therefore never meant to be experienced for fear's sake, but to begin and aid a process whereby the soul came to know itself in relation to its need

of God and excite that sense of contrition which turns its eyes away from itself to God's healing and forgiveness. Hence in the schematic penitential manuals of the twelfth century, which were written to aid priests in their pastoral office of hearing confessions, fear was seen as one of the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit.

[10] Based on the Biblical text of Isaiah 11:3 these gifts are given by the Holy Spirit in order to enable the soul to live the life of virtue.<sup>15</sup> Dread was the first of these gifts. Often allied to the seven petitions of the *Pater Noster*, or Lord's Prayer, the gift of dread is usually related to the petition '*sed libera nos a malo*' (deliver us from evil) within the Latin manuals. The fourteenth-century *The Book of Vices and Virtues* (c. 1375) similarly associates the *Pater noster* petition 'deliver us from evil' with the gift of dread and reflects the notion found in the Latin manuals that this gift is given by God for protection and building the soul up in order to live the life of virtue. Therefore to daily pray the words of the Lord's Prayer was to request the seven gifts including that of dread so that 'we mowe be delyuered of the schrewe (evil one) and of alle othere euel, that is of alle synnes and of periles, in this world and in that othere, amen'. It not only protects the soul from evil but also makes it secure in virtue, so 'we lese not bi pride the giftes that thou hast geue us'. In this context the gift of dread is seen not so much as an active force in rooting up sin and planting meekness, but more as an attitude or state of the mind which holds the soul in virtue.

One of Julian's remedies to the debilitating nature of the dread that she identifies afflicting blinded souls is to clarify precisely the nature of this fear as opposed to the theology of dread taught by the church. This she does in chapter 74 of the *Long Text* where she describes four manner of dreads. The first two dreads closely echo Aquinas' teaching on initial and servile fear. Julian describes the first

as 'drede of afray' or attack and is similar to initial fear in the way it seeks to awaken the sinful soul to its state of sin. Julian describes this fear coming upon a soul suddenly when they are vulnerable. This is all she says on the nature of dread of affray and instead focusses on its beneficial nature in purging the soul. She advises that it should be borne patiently, again emphasizing that it is good for the soul.

Her second manner of dread can be likened to servile dread as the 'drede of paine' stirs the soul from the hard sleep of sinne. Again Julian focusses more on the dread's beneficial properties rather than lingering on the dread itself. For this dread, which as we know can be easily misconstrued, she is quite specific about why a soul needs this dread. For, without it, she says, the soul is 'not able for the time to receive the softe comferte of the holy goste'. Julian also equates this dread with confession when she writes that 'this drede helpeth us as an entre, <sup>[11]</sup>and abileth us to have contrition by the blisseful touching of the holy gost'. Following the teaching of the church, Julian emphasises that dread and contrition are both a gift from God. In these two forms of dread Julian closely follows standard catechetical teaching but she also take pains to emphasise their beneficial and God given nature.

Thirdly, Julian comes to 'doubtful drede', which she equates with the devotional experience of dread which is seen to linger after confession. In the long text Julian says nothing about the nature or effect of this dread on the soul. It is elsewhere that we find various descriptions of its destructive nature. In contrast the same section of the short text gives a more detailed description of this 'doubtful drede' and reveals its sinful, even demonic basis. Not only is it known by its effect on the soul, but also it 'stirres tham to behaldinge of thamselve and of ther sinnes before done'. Julian verbalises this internal state in chapter 76 where 'our owne foly and blyndhede,'

becomes an inner voice that goads the soul with its own sense of failure and sin:

*but for the chongeabilitie that we arn in in ourselfe we fallen often into synne. Than we have this be the stering of our enemy, be our owne foly and blyndhede; for they seien thus: 'Thou wittest wele thou art a wretch, a synner, and also ontrew; for thou kepist not the command; thou behotist oftentymes our lord that thou shalt don better, and anon after, thou fallist agen in the same, namely in slauth, in lesyng of tyme'; for that is the begynning of synne, as to my syghte, and namely to the creatures that have goven hem to serven our lord with inward beholding of his blissid goodness. And this makith us adred to apear afore our curtes lord.<sup>16</sup>*

These words bring to life the devotional concern Julian has raised and even echoes the words of failure to keep the covenants of the church. In chapter 73 Julian describes 'doubfulle drede' as a sickness, which along with 'unpatiens or sloth', most 'traveyleth and tempesteth us'. In this context doubtful dread is equated with despair, the sin which places a soul beyond the loving reach and forgiveness of God. In this sense doubtful dread has no place among the categories of dread. It is not really a dread at all, in the sense that dread is a gift of God to draw the soul into the process of reconciliation, but rather doubtful dread is a mortal sin. By placing it among her categorizations Julian is not so much legitimizing it as revealing that this so-called dread is easily confused with the true understanding <sup>[12]</sup>and teaching on dread. Whereas, in fact, it has no place within the teaching on dread and even contradicts the theology of dread and its proper role in the devotional life. She has turned the light of truth onto this debilitating sense of fear which masquerades as meekness and revealed it for what it is, a foul

blindness and weakness, a mortal sin. As if to emphasize this Julian pares back her description of it in the short text, simply stating in the long text that in as much as it 'drawth the soul to despair' it must be transformed by love into true knowing.

The process which is going to transform this doubtful dread or despair into love is the fourth and final dread in Julian's category, reverent dread.

*The fourth is reverent drede. For ther is no drede that fully pleseth God in us but reverent drede, and that is full softe, for the more it is had, the lesse it is felte, for swetnesse of love. Love and drede are bredren, and they are roted in us by the goodnesse of oure maker, and they shall never be taken from us without end. We have kind to love and we have of grace to love. And we have of kind to drede, and we have of grace to drede. It longeth to the lordeshipe and to the faderhed to be dred, as it longeth to the goodness to be loved. And it longeth to us that are his servantes and his children to drede him for lordshippe and faderhed, as it longeth to us to love him for goodhed. And, though, this reverent drede and love be not both in one, but they are two in properte and in working, and neith of them may be had without other. And, there, I am seker, he that loveth, he dredeth, though he feele it but litille.*

*Alle dredes other than reverent drede that are proffered to us, though they come under coloure of holinesse, they are not so tru. And therby may they be knowen onsonder. That dred that maketh us hastely to fle fro alle that is not goode and falle into oure lords brest, ast the childe into the moders barme, with alle oure entent and with alle oure minde-knowing oure febilnes and oure greate need, knowing his everlasting*

*goodnesse and his blisseful love, only seeking into him for salvation, cleving to with seker trust - that dred that bringeth us into this working, it is kinde and gracious and good and true. And alle that is contrarious to this, either it is wrong, or it is medelde with wrong.*

*Than is this the remedy, to knowe them both, and refuse the wrong. For the kind properte of drede which we have in this life by the gracious werking of the holy gost, the same shall be in heven afore God: gentile, curteyse, fulle delectabile. And thus we shalle in love be homely and nere to <sup>[13]</sup> God, and we shall in drede be gentile and curtesse to God, and both in one manner, like even.*

*Desyer we than of oure lorde God to drede him reverently and to love him mekly and to trust him lightly. For when we drede him revently and love him mekly, oure trust is never in vaine. For the more that we trust and the mightilier, the more we lese and wurshippe oure lorde that we trust in. And if us faile this reverent drede and meke love, as God forbid we shuld, oure trust shalle sone be misruled for that time. And therefore us nedeth mekille to praye oure lorde of grace, that we may have this reverent drede and meke love of his gifte, in hat and in worke, for without this no man may plese God.*

This is not the only place where Julian sets out her notion of 'reverent dread' but here we find Julian expressing, in imaginative and powerful terms, the basic teaching which lay behind the theology of dread in order for the reader to undergo a transformative process themselves which will shift their understanding of fear from doubtful to reverential dread even as they read her text.



Julian has revealed doubtful dread for what it is, the sin of despair, and set it beside the other categories of dread to highlight its duplicitous nature. Now she draws on the core meaning of 'filial or chaste' fear to enable that transformative process from *timor* to *amor* to take place. The essential element which characterized filial fear in the teaching of the church was that of love. Filial fear was the highest of all the fears for it was the loving respect of a child for its parent. It sought to please the father, never offend him by his actions and was a consequence of the will of the father and child being united. Filial fear therefore was the true expression of humility and meekness. It is this loving aspect which Julian brings out strongly in her definition of reverent dread. Love and Dread are depicted as brothers which are inextricably linked; one cannot be had without the other. But she takes this notion to a deeper level, and in rather technical terms explains why love cannot be without fear and vice versa. Using the image of love and dread as plants, an image which echoes the penitential manuals, these two aspects are described as being rooted within the nature of the soul by God as well as being given as a gift of his grace in order for the soul to properly know and respond to his nature. Julian has taken the notion of fear as a gift of the Holy Spirit to a new level. Now fear, along with love, is the very means by which the soul knows and responds to God.

[14] Without even knowing it, the reader has also begun to change in their attitude to fear. From focussing on the categories of fear that set out what is beneficial or not for the soul, Julian has turned us away from thinking about ourselves to dwelling on God and his nature. We have been drawn out of ourselves, firstly from the blindness of believing doubtful dread is a meekness, and now to the explanatory words about the nature of fear itself and the extent to which it is pure gift and grace from God. Our eyes have been turned from the debilitating self-centred view of sin to the work of God.

Julian then goes on to qualify the categories that have gone before, 'alle dredes other than reverent drede that are proferred to us, though they come under coloure of holinesse, they are not so tru'. In these words Julian does not so much override the others dreads as give the penitent soul the ability once again to discern where fear is beneficial and where it is not. To have the eyes opened once again to the doubtful fear that can masquerade as a meekness. She does this by distilling the central teaching of dread into an image. At their heart both dread of affray and drede of paine sought to call the soul back to God through awareness of its need of God to excite contrition, in the image of a child running to its mother's arms knowing its weakness and need of forgiveness, Julian visualises that teaching into a measure for discerning the dread that is kinde and gracious and good and true as opposed to all that is wrong or medelde with wrong. Given the penitential nature of the teaching Julian develops as well as the confessional context to the devotional issue, it seems to me that this image of the child is not simply a metaphorical one but has more constructive and practical ramifications. One of the problems with doubtful dread was the extent to which it undermined the sacrament of reconciliation and lingered in the soul even after confession. Now Julian gives the struggling soul an image which counters this and advocates a form of dread which will bring the soul to seek 'into him for salvation, cleaving to with seker trust'. In fourteenth century terms the practical manifestation of this statement would be confession, where that process of reconciliation was substantiated and not just a matter of private wishful thinking.

From this practical image of reconciliation and penance the reader is then taken up into heaven by Julian. So often it was the other way that we would be taken downe, through the dread of paine, to contemplate the souls in hell. But for Julian's transformation we go

up and see the souls in heaven who look on the throne of grace. These souls have the same 'kinde properte of drede' that we are given in this lifetime through the 'gracious werking of the holy gost. Julian ends the chapter by connecting us with those souls in heaven. We are to desire the same attitude they have, 'to drede him reverently and to love him mekely'. There <sup>[15]</sup>are no more categories to dread, instead in Julian's hands the basic teaching of the church on dread has taken on a new meaning and depth, a pure gift which unites the soul to God, in heaven and on earth, so that we as a loving child may please our God. Our journey began with an all-consuming despair but ends in the desire for humble love but also reverent dread.

In Julian's development of dread in chapter 74 of the *Long Text*, she does indeed bring a remedy to the devotional problem set out in the chapter before. She defines this dread that lingers even after confession as a doubtful dread, sets it alongside the church's teaching on fear to reveal its false basis and uses her exploration of reverent dread to bring the reader to the heart the role of dread in the relationship with God. We do not know what she said to any of those who came to her anchorhold window seeking advice and guidance for their many spiritual and devotional problems, but I for one would have travelled miles to hear her depth of teaching and love of God.

*The fourth is reverent drede. For ther is no drede that fully pleseth God in us but reverent drede, and that is full softe, for the more it is had, the lesse it is felte, for swetnesse of love. Love and drede are bredren, and they are roted in us by the goodnesse of oure maker, and they shall never be taken from us without end. We have kind to love and we have of grace to love. And we have of kind to drede, and we have of grace to*

*drede. It longeth to the lordeshipe and to the faderhed to be dred, as it longeth to the goodness to be loved. And it longeth to us that are his servantes and his children to drede him for lordshippe and faderhed, as it longeth to us to love him for goodhed. And, though, this reverent drede and love be not both in one, but they are two in properte and in working, and neith of them may be had without other. And, there, I am seker, he that loveth, he dredeth, though he feele it but litille.*

*Alle dredes other than reverent drede that are proffered to us, though they come under coloure of holinesse, they are not so tru. And therby may they be knowen onsonder. That dred that maketh us hastely to fle fro alle that is not goode and falle into oure lords brest, ast the childe into the moders barme, with alle oure entent and with alle oure minde- knowing oure febilnes and oure greate need, knowing his everlasting goodnesse and his blisseful love, only seeking into him for salvation, cleving to with seker trust - that dred that bringeth us into this working, it is kinde and gracious and good and true. And alle that is contrarious to this, either it is wrong, or it is medelde with wrong.*

*Than is this the remedy, to knowe them both, and refuse the wrong. For the kind properte of drede which we have in this life by the gracious werking of the holy gost, the same shall be in heven afore God: gentile, curteyse, fulle delectabile. And thus we shalle in love be homely and nere to God, and we shall in drede be gentile and curtesse to God, and both in one manner, like even.*

*Desyer we than of oure lorde God to drede him reverently and to love him mekly and to trust him lightly. For when we drede*

*him revently and love him mekly, oure trust is never in vaine. For the more that we trust and the mightilier, the more we lese and wurshippe oure lorde that we trust in. And if us faile this reverent drede and meke love, as God forbid we shuld, oure trust shalle sone be misruled for that time. And therefore us nedeth mekille to praye oure lorde of grace, that we may have this reverent drede and meke love of his gifte, in hat and in worke, for without this no man may plese God. (A Revelation of Love chapter 74)*

*Emma Pennington*



## References

1. Quotations are taken from Nicholas Watson and Jaqueline Jenkins edition of the Paris manuscript in: Watson, Nicholas and Jenkins, Jaqueline (editors) (2006), *The Writings of Julian of Norwich: A Vision Showed to a Devout Woman and A Revelation of Love*. Pennsylvania, Minnesota: Pennsylvania State University Press.
2. The different 'voices' within the text is discussed by Elizabeth Dutton and Vincent Gillespie in: Dutton, Elizabeth (2008). *Julian of Norwich: The Influence of Late-Medieval Devotional Compilations*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer; and Gillespie, Vincent, ' '[S]he do the police in different voices': Pastiche, Ventriloquism and Parody in Julian of Norwich' in McAvoy, Liz Herbert (editor) (1984). *A Companion to Julian of Norwich*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer. pp. 192-207.
3. Tugwell, Simon (1984). *Ways of Imperfection: An Exploration of Christian Spirituality*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
4. St. Thomas Aquinas (1966). *Summa Theologiae*, volume 33, Hope, 2a2ae, 19. Washington D.C.: W. J. Hill.
5. Watson makes a similar connection in Watson & Jenkins (editors.), *The Writings of Julian of Norwich*, p. 354, n. 1-2 which refers to Millett, Bella , EETS, OS, 325 (editor) (2005). *Ancrene Wisse: A Corrected Edition of the Text in Corpus Christi College MS 402 with variants from other manuscripts*. p. 92, l. 907. The same image is also used by the *Cloud* author in Hodgson, Phyllis (editor) (1982). *The Cloud of Unknowing and Related Treatises*. Exeter: Catholic Records Press. p. 43, l. 10-16 [hereafter Hodgson (ed.), *The Cloud of Unknowing and Related Treatises*].

6. A Tretyse of the Stodye of Wysdome that Men Clepen Beniamyn, in Hodgson (ed.) (1982). *The Cloud of Unknowing and Related Treatises*, p. 131, l. 15-19.
7. Hanna, Ralph & Wood, Sarah (eds.) (2013). *Richards Morris's Pricke of Conscience: a corrected and amplified reading text*, EETS, OS, 342. p. 12, l. 345 [hereafter Hanna and Wood (eds.), *Pricke of Conscience*].
8. Francis, W. Nelson, (ed.) (1942). *The Book of Vices and Virtues: A Fourteenth Century English Translation of The Somme le Roi of Lorens D'Orleans*, Early English Text Society, Original Series, 217. London: Oxford University Press. p. 126, l. 25-28.
9. Sawles Warde in Savage, Anne & Watson, Nicholas (1991). *Anchoritic Spirituality: 'Ancrene Wisse' and associated works*. p. 213.
10. The N-town Play: Cotton MS Vespasian D.8, ed. by Stephen Spector, vol. 1: Introduction and Text, EETS, SS, 11 (1991) [hereafter Spector (ed.), *The N-town Play*].
11. *Ibid.* p. 412, l. 87.
12. *Spector* (ed.), *The N-town Play*, p. 413, l. 130.
13. Hanna and Wood (eds.), *Pricke of Conscience*, pp. 150-1, ll. 5422-5467; Delumeau argues that the perpetual stress on sin inevitably lead to the overriding image of God as Judge: Delumeau, *Sin and Fear*, p. 291. Emile Mâle reveals the extent to which the image of the Matthean version of the Last Judgement during the thirteenth century portrayed Christ showing his wounds not only to recall his mercy but also to justify his wrath: Emile Mâle, *Religious Art in France: The Thirteenth Century. A Study of Medieval Iconography and Its Sources*, trans. by Marthiel Mathews, Bollingen series XL.2 (Princeton: University Press, 1984), pp. 351-367.
14. Francis (ed.), *The Book of Vices and Virtues*, p. 129, ll. 34-37.

15. The seven gifts of the Holy Spirit were a common element in Latin summa and can be found in the works of Chabham, Wetheringsett, Flamborough, Simon of Hinton's *Summa iuniorum*, c. 1250/60.
16. Glasscoe (ed.), *A Revelation of Love*, pp. 92-93.