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Abstract: This paper explores how, despite an inherited Christian tradition that worked to elevate hearing and denigrate sight in an unofficial hierarchy of the senses, the fifteenth-century English mystic Margery Kempe came to privilege sight as a vehicle through which to achieve intimacy with Jesus. The paper suggests that for Kempe, sight gave way to vision, and this experience was achieved through a pattern of ritualized weeping. While some of her critical contemporaries viewed Kempe as an anomaly, this spiritual pattern locates her in a long and wide tradition of religious men and women who receive, both literally and metaphorically, new vision and insight following experiences of weeping. 
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The Unofficial Construction of a Hierarchy of the Senses 

In his twentieth chapter, the author of the New Testament Gospel of John tells the story of Mary Magdalene, a female companion of Jesus who is mourning his death and his disappearance from the tomb in a garden. The resurrected Jesus approaches Mary, who, through her tears, fails to recognize him: “Jesus said to her, 'Woman, why are you weeping? Whom are you looking for?' She thought it was the gardener and said to him, 'Sir, if you carried him away, tell me where you laid him, and I will take him.' Jesus said to her, 'Mary!'” At the sound of his voice, Mary recognizes the one for whom she mourns. Her own sight betrayed her – she imagined the man before her was someone else entirely, a gardener. At the sound of his voice, however, Mary knows her intimate friend. He calls her by name and she calls him what he has been for her, “Teacher.” She attempts to touch him, and he rebukes her: “Stop holding on to me, for I
have not yet ascended to the Father. But go to my brothers and tell them, 'I am going to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God.'” Mary does as she is instructed and tells the story.\textsuperscript{lxv}

This passage is flooded with sensory imagery: a dew-soaked garden, a dark, vacant cave, wet tears, a comforting voice, familiar skin. Yet of all that Mary takes in, it is only sound that proves faithful to her. What she sees is not to be trusted; what she touches, she is commanded to release. Only the sound of Jesus’ voice reveals his identity to her and asks her to use her own voice to share her experience of the risen Jesus. When she tells her story, the Gospel author informs readers that one of the “brothers,” Thomas, is absent. The others try to pass on the news to him, but he refuses to be so easily convinced: “He said to them, 'Unless I see the mark of the nails in his hands and put my finger into the nail marks and put my hand into his side, I will not believe.’” The next scene takes place one week later, where Jesus allows Thomas the proof-touch that he has been waiting for. Thomas’ affirmative response, “‘My Lord and My God!,’” is met with a reproof from Jesus that echoes his rebuke of Mary’s earlier touch: “‘Have you come to believe because you have seen me?’” Jesus asks Thomas. “‘Blessed are those who have not seen and have believed.’”\textsuperscript{lxvi}

The community that carries on the Jesus tradition after the execution of its leader has a highly unlikely story to tell. Their claim – that their slain leader was resurrected – is one that defies everyday sensory experience. They will struggle to offer skeptics any foundation on which to stand except their own story. For them to succeed, their hearers must ground themselves in story. They must be convinced that truth can be communicated, understood, and preserved through hearing, and, perhaps most importantly, that revelation can happen that way. Of Jesus, there will be no frame to which they can cling, no wounds into which they can reach. Their sight will fail them as well. It is only if people trust their ears that this movement has a chance to continue. The Gospel author’s condemnation, placed on Jesus’ lips, of his characters’ attempts at
intimacy and understanding through their other senses, namely sight and touch, make sense in this context, as he attempts to convince a hearing and reading audience that will be left without those options. A hierarchy of the senses is created.

It is, perhaps, not terribly hard to convince those of the author’s time that hearing is a privileged sense. Jesus and his followers lived, taught, and died in an oral culture. Story was a primary, sometimes an exclusive, method of passing on tradition, history, and belief. But the other senses could not be denied their access to Jesus, and mystics from the early church into the Middle Ages and beyond have sought to cultivate intimacy with their Lord through taste, touch, and sight. This paper will explore how Margery Kempe, a fifteenth-century English mystic, came to privilege sight/vision as a means to achieve intimacy with Jesus and how that vision was achieved through a pattern of ritualized weeping, locating Margery Kempe in a long tradition of religious men and women who receive, both literally and metaphorically, new vision and insight following experiences of weeping.

**Sound, Touch, and Sight in Margery Kempe's Religious Experience**

Despite how loud and boisterous Kempe's tears are often characterized as being, sight, not hearing, dominates her more mature spiritual experiences. And yet hearing plays a sort of introductory, and continuing, role in Kempe's mysticism. Among her first experiences with the divine is “a melodious sound so sweet and delectable” that she imagines herself in heaven. As the first sensory experience of the divine that she records, this sound is enough to cause a kind of conversion in her. The memory of the melody remains with Kempe, urging her to tell the story of the bliss of heaven. “She could not very well restrain herself from speaking of it.” In her earliest experiences of being drawn to her Lord, Kempe relies heavily on hearing and speech, the primary means by which she connects to God and conveys her experience of God to others.
Following this experience of the sound of heaven, Kempe radically changes her activity. She renounces meat, wine, and sexual intercourse, establishes a strict schedule of keeping vigils and bears years of difficult temptations. Within this newly discovered and highly disciplined religious identity, Kempe begins to experience “contrition and great compunction, with plentiful tears and much loud and violent sobbing.” It is my contention that this movement from sound to tears, eventually a symbol for new sight/vision, is a move in Kempe’s spiritual evolution and signifies her reconfiguration of the hierarchy of the senses unofficially established by early Christianity.

It is not that Kempe intentionally distances herself from early Christianity; more that the reliance on hearing proffered by the author of the Gospel of John comes to be less important in her own experience as sound gives way to sight, allowing her a deeper intimacy. But she patterns her own intimacy with her Lord after that of Mary Magdalene, imagining herself as that weeping woman anew. When Kempe is despairing her own unworthiness, her Lord assures her, “‘You will never be despised by God. Bear in mind, daughter, what Mary Magdalene was . . . [o]f unworthy, I make worthy, and of sinful, I make righteous.’” And when she visits the grave of Jesus’ mother, Kempe receives instruction not to be “‘ashamed of him who is your god, any more than I was ashamed when I saw him hang on the cross – my sweet son Jesus – to cry and to weep for the pain of my sweet son, Jesus Christ. Nor was Mary Magdalene ashamed to cry and weep for my son’s love.’” Kempe is consistently assured that as Jesus loved, forgave, and favored Mary Magdalene, so will he love, forgive, and favor her, knowing her devotion to him. Kempe takes this identification so far that she decides to retrace the steps of her first-century counterpart.

Her journey to the Holy Land came from a desire to see the place Jesus was born. To walk there, to smell the air, to feel the wind, to hear the sounds of worship and wailing, all might be imagined to constitute major parts of her experience, but it is the sight and recognition of the sites of Christ’s life that Kempe wants to experience. On
her journey through Jerusalem, where Kempe claims her first “cries” came.\textsuperscript{133} Her intense weeping gives way to revelation: “And later she rose up with great weeping and sobbing, as though she had seen our Lord buried right in front of her. Then she thought she saw our Lady in her soul: how she mourned and how she wept for her son’s death, and then was our Lady’s sorrow her sorrow.”\textsuperscript{134} The pattern holds throughout Kempe’s work: she contemplates the suffering of Jesus, or those who loved him, and she is moved to tears. Her own tears, then, move her again, to a visionary experience, perhaps to a revelation. Though her tears are sometimes followed by conversation with her Lord, often those consist of content that exists elsewhere, namely, in Christian Scripture. However, the visions that follow her periods of weeping offer scenes and words unique to Kempe, expansions on the canonical stories, or retellings of them, with Kempe as a character.

Karma Lochrie agrees that this scene in Jerusalem is pivotal in Kempe’s spirituality, noting that her interactions with her Lord prior to this consist mostly of words: “Her dialogues with Christ up to this point confirm her ability to hear the divine word” (emphasis mine).\textsuperscript{135} Lochrie notes the key difference between the vision and Jerusalem and earlier “colloquies between Christ and her soul is that [in this one,] Christ is silent.”\textsuperscript{136} Instead of what her Lord had been for her in earlier communions, a conversation partner for her soul, here he offers her a new way of knowing, that is, seeing his suffering. Now that Kempe boasts a more developed spirituality, replete with the gift of tears, sight has overtaken the place of sound as the sense granting spiritual access.

One of Kempe’s meditations on Christ’s Passion illustrates the special access that her weeping-induced sight offers and the way in which she responds to vision more than sound: “When she heard the words and saw the compassion that the Mother had for the Son and the Son for his Mother, then she wept, sobbed, and cried as though she would have died for the pity and compassion she had of that piteous sight.”\textsuperscript{137} It is a
piteous sight that moves her, though she “hears the words” of the event as well. Her tears spring from both, the hearing and the seeing, and yet somehow it is the seeing that affects Kempe most. But her vision leads her to tears, which lead her to another vision: “She wept and cried surpassingly bitterly, so that many people in the church were astonished. She straightaway saw them take up the cross with our Lord’s body hanging on it . . . and then our Lord’s body shook and shuddered, and all the joints of that blissful body burst and broke apart, and his precious wounds ran down with rivers of blood on every side, and so she had ever more reason for weeping and sorrowing.”

From then on in this passion scene, what she hears is largely parts of the story as recorded in the Gospels of John and Luke. But what she thinks and sees – Mary swooning, Joseph of Arimathea laying Jesus’ body on a marble stone, John and other friends come to bury Jesus – are her own insertions into the story, expansions of the ways the Gospels record the story. Again, hearing is a sort of primary sense, allowing an initial access, but not necessary a privileged one; it is sight that expands and deepens the story.

Kempe’s privileging of sight is curious, but perhaps not surprising, in that it seems consistent with her life before her conversion. In her earliest descriptions of herself, Kempe admits that she hoped to be judged by her outward appearance. Even after her conversion, she confesses that “she would not leave her pride or her showy manner of dressing . . . [S]he wore gold pipes on her head, and her hoods with the tippets were fashionably slashed.” Her style choices are made in an effort to turn heads, “so that she would be all the more stared at, and all the more esteemed.” Long into her autobiography, Kempe remains preoccupied with fashion, often reporting descriptions of her own clothing or that of others whom she encounters. Appearance, then, is a basis for judgment, a sort of competition in which Kempe has always been involved. To elevate sight above hearing as a means by which to come to know her Lord is then perhaps to be expected of Kempe.
The competitive nuances of sight/appearance that occupied Kempe’s secular life spill over into her spiritual life as well. After a vision in which Kempe sees the communion host shake and flutter “as a dove flutters her wings,” Kempe is told by her Lord, “‘Thank God that you have seen it. My daughter Bridget never saw me in this way.’” As she continues the conversation with her Lord, he admits, “‘In truth I tell you, just as I spoke to St. Bridget, just so I speak to you, daughter,’” and he continues to affirm her in her work of sharing spiritual truth and persevering in the face of ridiculing enemies. The latter quote affirms the authority of Kempe’s spiritual endeavor by equating her with Bridget, a Swedish mystic who in 1344 became the mother of a new order of religious women, the Brigittines, and who is remembered for her love of meditating on the Passion of Christ. The former quote, however, goes further in elevating Kempe even above her mentor in its suggestion that Kempe has spiritual insight never granted to Bridget. Hearing, then, is again an initial and cherished gift, but sight and vision of God, or of the things of God, is bestowed more sparingly and is, therefore, the gift to be prized.

Bhattacharji also points out that Kempe’s “seeing” Christ’s sufferings in her imagination provokes in her a kind of “seeing” Christ in the sufferings of all those around her: “. . . when she saw the crucifix, or if she saw that a man was wounded, or an animal, whichever it might be, or if a man beat a child in front of her or struck a horse or other animal with a whip, if she saw it or heard it, then it seemed to her that she saw our Lord being beaten or wounded, just as she saw it in the person or animal.” Here, though Kempe admits that seeing or hearing the suffering of another could elicit a reaction from her, the correlation she makes is concentrated in sight – she could see or hear the sufferings of another, and it is as though she “saw” the Lord, just as she “saw” it in the person or animal. As with her wailing and weeping earlier, both sight and hearing are present in the experience, but sight is privileged above hearing.
Though she is persecuted by many for her weeping, asked to informally stand trial\textsuperscript{86} and “wondered at” a great deal,\textsuperscript{86} Kempe understands her bouts of weeping to be a gracious privilege. When an archbishop roughly questions her about the cause of her weeping, she replies with an avoidance, “Sir, you will someday wish that you had wept as sorely as I.”\textsuperscript{87} Interestingly, this encounter continues with an argument in which Kempe and the archbishop each hint of rumors tarnishing the other’s character. To his “I hear very bad things about you. I am told you are a wicked woman,” she replies, “Sir, I also hear it said that you are a wicked man.”\textsuperscript{87} These two who have set their lives apart for their God are attacked by words, and harm is done to each of them by what people say and hear. This sense, again, that was perhaps initially privileged in the church has become a site of destruction, and sight is elevated; in Kempe’s mind, her weeping - which leads to visions - establishes her as a true daughter, mother, sister, and lover of Christ,\textsuperscript{88} regardless of how what is spoken and heard threatens that identity.

Even Kempe’s sense of touch/feeling is subordinated to sight. Her own bodily sensations, painful though they may be, lose import in the light of her vision of her Lord’s suffering: “Sometimes, notwithstanding that the said creature had great bodily sickness, the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ so worked in her soul that at that time she did not feel her own illness, but wept and sobbed at the memory of our Lord’s Passion, as though she saw him with her bodily eye suffering pain and Passion before her” (emphasis mine).\textsuperscript{89} Similarly, Kempe’s Good Friday meditations lead those surrounding her to worry – a priest drags her out of the church, that she might get air and lose her blue color – but Kempe's concern is not with her own body, but with the other body she sees “with her spiritual eye in the sight of her soul.”\textsuperscript{90}
Weeping Gives Way to Vision for Hasidic Jews and Julian of Norwich

With its mystical overtones, Hasidic Judaism concurs with the idea that weeping gives way to revelation. In a discussion of the cultivation of weeping as a device, a mystical port of entry in Jewish practice, Moshe Idel notes that certain Hasidic circles engage in a form of ritualized weeping: “According to earliest Hasidism, crying and, I assume also, tears, seem already to have been a part of mystical technique.” Hasidic weeping practices called forth an appearance by the feminine face of God in Jewish thought, the Shekinah. Idel explains the process by which this revelation was achieved: “If participation in and affliction for the state of the Shekinah occurred, these were the result of the revelation, not its cause. In [several cases], weeping preceded the appearance of the Shekinah . . . . The activation of the eye ends in a visual experience.” Though the formation of Hasidism precedes Kempe by perhaps 200 years, Idel argues that “as late as the second half of the nineteenth century, the old mystical technique of weeping was still being practiced in order to attain the same goals alluded to in the Midrash Hallel: visual revelation and disclosure of secrets.” Weeping causes visual revelation and secret disclosures to flow together in Kempe's text as well. Because she has been so faithful in her compassion for Christ and his “bitter Passion,” God promises her, “I shall show you my secrets and my counsels.”

Though similar themes can be found in the spiritual practices of Hasidic Jews and those of Kempe, no evidence suggests that she encountered or was influenced by that community. There is record in Kempe's book, however, of the profound influence of her contemporary, anchoress Julian of Norwich. Kempe tells us that she went to Julian seeking confirmation that her tears were from God and not from demonic sources, as many were accusing. Julian apparently comforted Kempe in her worry and spoke to her of how tears dismay the devil. And though Kempe does not record all that Julian said, she does tell her readers, “Great was the holy conversation that the
Julian “responds to Margery’s anxieties with measured and comforting advice ... In effect, Julian is advising Margery to circumvent the limitations of imposed socio-religious proscription and trust instead in the language of her own mystically inspired impulses as manifested by her own female body, specifically her act of weeping.”

Since Kempe came to Julian with questions about tears, it may be helpful to consider the meditations Julian recorded in her own book of revelations regarding the shedding of tears. While affirming the ever-presence of God, Julian describes a kind of longing for intimacy through a visual connection: “Even though our Lord God dwells now in us, and is here with us, and embraces us and encloses us for his tender love, so that he can never leave us, and is nearer to us than tongue can tell or heart can think, still we can never cease from mourning and weeping, seeking and longing, until we see him clearly, face to his blessed face.” Julian mourns the blindness of “our” spiritual eye, suggesting that “we” cannot see the face of God through the barriers of mortal flesh and sin. And yet a disciplined, continuous weeping breaks through those barriers and allows the kind of visioning she hopes for to occur. She explains: “[T]he natural desire of our soul is so great and so immeasurable that if all the nobility which God ever created in heaven and on earth were given to us for our joy and comfort, if we did not see his own fair blessed face, still we should never cease to mourn and to weep in the spirit, because, that is, of our painful longing, until we might see our Creator’s fair blessed face.”

Julian continues to expand on the wonders of seeing the face of her Lord, calling “that blessed vision the end of every kind of pain to loving souls, and the fulfillment of every kind of joy and bliss.” Here again, sight is elevated to primary importance among the senses. Whatever painful sensation might be felt, the glimpse of the divine face can heal it. Even bodily access that allows the sufferer understanding of the
physical pain of Jesus' Passion is subordinated to the intimacy, and here healing, that can be gained through looking at the face of Julian's Lord: “And at the end of the woe, suddenly our eyes will be opened, and in the clearness of our sight our light will be full, which light is God, our Creator, Father, and the Holy Spirit, in Christ Jesus our saviour.”

**Margery Kempe's Place in a Communion of (Weeping) Saints**

Living as isolated from community at times as she does, either by her own desire to commune only with her Lord or because those with whom she shares space become so annoyed with her they ask her to leave or go to great pains to encourage her to abandon them, it may be simple to think of Kempe’s weeping as an isolated phenomenon. Several scholars take this approach, and label her as “a failed mystic or a freak – in short, as some sort of aberration.” Kempe reports that a religious man suggests that her tears are a symptom of a heart condition or “some other sickness,” and concedes to allow her to cry if she will claim her tears result from a natural illness. Her refusal to attribute her fits of crying to biological causes means, linguistically at least, that Kempe admits her tears to be unnatural. But Nancy Bradley Warren suggests that “in her use of interpretive schemes drawn from Brigittine monasticism to negotiate the process of crafting a spiritual life in the material world, . . . Margery Kempe was not alone in fifteenth century England.” If Warren is correct in giving Kempe a place among other mystics of her time, then to read Kempe’s tears as a sign of a dysfunction is to ignore the connections she shares with her own tradition and, as I will argue, other traditions as well. Although Kempe's behavior was looked upon with condemnation by some of her contemporaries, who leveled accusations of play-acting or hypocrisy, Santha Bhattacharji concurs that she represents a piece of a pattern, noting that church authorities (with exceptions) were not as surprised – or as disapproving – of Kempe’s outbursts: “This is because Margery in fact fits into a well-attested late medieval
Christian tradition of weeping . . . Her experience is standard, almost to be expected.\textsuperscript{cvi}

The concept of the communion of saints suggests that all who share the Christian faith belong to a community that is not subject to conventional boundaries of time and space. Kempe shares a sort of communion, for example, with Angela of Foligno, a thirteenth-century Franciscan tertiary. Angela is often overwhelmed by her tears, which become her only consolation when she remembers her sin. These tears, though, give way to “increasingly frequent visions of Christ on the cross and . . . violent ecstasies.”\textsuperscript{cvii}

These women live in a time when “the faithful were instructed to 'read' Christ’s body, to visualize his earthly life as intensely and vividly as they could, and to feel empathy for his human needs and sufferings.”\textsuperscript{cviii} Kempe’s “gift of tears,” then, can be read as her participation in a sort of kinship that values tears as a privileged means by which guilt is acknowledged, repentance sought, passion shared, insight gained, and visions achieved. Though Kempe insists that her tears are not of her own contriving,\textsuperscript{cix} their valuing as spiritual gift acknowledges that they are something other than a physiological or biological response. As noted by Gary Ebersole, the function of Kempe’s tears is contested, valenced both positively and disapprovingly, but always a subject of social negotiation\textsuperscript{cx} and, perhaps also, spiritual tension. Though her righteousness is debated by her contemporaries, one scholar describes Margery as “improvis[ing] on female monasticism in Franciscan and, especially, Brigittine keys,” a process through which “she and her Book demonstrate that late medieval secular women could and did capitalize on the transformability of signifiers to craft empowered spiritual lives in the material world.”\textsuperscript{cxi}

\textbf{Concluding Thoughts}

This privileging of sight will not, perhaps, last forever for Kempe. When Jesus speaks to Kempe of her own death, he promises her a heavenly welcome that awakens
all her senses. “. . . with my own hands which were nailed to the cross I shall take your soul from your body with great joy and melody, with sweet smells and fragrances, and offer it to my father in heaven, where you shall see him face to face.” This longed-for rapture that unites Kempe with her Lord is imagined as a sort of feast for the senses – she sees, smells, hears, touches and is touched by the one for whom she yearns and mourns. Until then, though, Kempe's intimacy is cultivated through her eyes and ears. She is moved to cry when meditating on the Passion, and crying deepens her sense of connection both to Christ and to others who mourn him, namely, his mother and Mary Magdalene.

“Weeping appears as the natural response to human awareness of distance from the Creator,” suggests William Chittick in an essay on Islamic spirituality. The sentiment echoes Christian and Jewish thinking about weeping, and yet Kempe challenges that notion. It is awareness of pain or loss that first calls forth her tears, and yet her tears both intensify and quell that pain and loss. Like Julian of Norwich, Angela of Foligno, and twelfth- and thirteenth-century Hasidic Jews, weeping lessens the distance between Kempe and her Creator. It allows her glimpses of the face, the grace, the body, and the pain of the divine. As Ellen Ross contends, “The [example] of . . . Margery Kempe indicate[s] that spiritual life, while suffused with joy at times, is also beset with pain – though pain is never pursued for its own sake but is a by-product of, and a catalyst in, the difficult process of spiritual transformation.”

A significant difficulty in Kempe's spiritual transformation is the rebuke she consistently receives from those who hear her weeping. And yet Kempe's weeping, for all the intimacy it creates, is not a privately spiritual affair. She believes that her weeping can convict people, change lives, and save souls. In this, and by its intrusive nature, it is a public affair. Her screaming, writhing, and hysterics are disruptive in their volume; they are, largely, what upset those nearby. And yet it is the sense of sight, again, and not of hearing, that Kempe emphasizes when she speaks of her own tears.
“She has a personal mission to be a sign, a “mirror,” for others, calling them to a similar repentance and awareness of Christ.” Not only does her weeping give way to privileged sight and insight, then, it also allows those who encounter her to gain access to a new way of viewing their own souls.
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