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Abstract

MAPPING WOMEN’S MOVEMENT IN MEDIEVAL ENGLAND

By Claire K. Clement. M.U.R.P.

A Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Urban and Regional Planning at Virginia Commonwealth University.

Virginia Commonwealth University, 2012

Thesis Director: Dr. Michela Zonta, Assistant Professor, Department of Urban and Regional Planning

This thesis investigates women’s geographical movement in medieval England from the perspective of mobility and freedom. It uses pilgrimage accounts from medieval miracle story collections and to gather information about individual travel patterns. The study uses GIS to analyze gendered mobility patterns, and to investigate whether there were noticeable differences in the distance which men and women travelled and the geographical area of the country they originated. It also analyzes the nearness of men’s and women’s respective origin towns to alternative pilgrimage locations, as a means of examining the factors determining gendered travel mobility. The study finds that women’s travel distances were less than men’s, especially in the later medieval period, but that they were in fact more likely than men to come from areas proximate to alternative pilgrimage sites. This suggests the existence of higher mobility capacity for women living in areas with greater contact with other travelers.
Chapter 1. Introduction

Spatial limitations have historically been one of the major methods used by dominant groups to control individuals outside their group. As military strategy uses spatial limitations to protect (through fortresses), and to attack (through siege), and as political strategy has at times used the containment of less-dominant ethnicities (through ghettos and legislated racial segregation), so too has social control been effected through the imposition of spatial limitations. Women, as a less-dominant group in all periods and most cultures in history, have experienced many forms of spatial limitation. While some of this was rationalized as fortress-like protection of women from the dangers of the world, the “precautions” also limited women’s ability to move freely within the geographical boundaries of their cultures. The limitations of women’s ability in a given culture has, however, been largely dependent on a number of variables, such as behavior, clothing, companions, and justifications for movement. The study of these variables and their correlations with women’s scope and character of movement is crucial for a greater understanding of women’s mobility in general, and therefore, of women’s freedom and the systems of social control that serve to limit it.

A comprehensive study of this kind is far beyond the scope of a Master’s thesis, but there is certainly room for a specific case study of women’s spatial mobility and its correlating socioeconomic and cultural variables. This thesis is a case study of women’s spatial mobility in
medieval England, using medieval pilgrimage accounts from miracle story collections. Textual data – keywords and contextual descriptions – are used to create a database of spatial and social variables, which are then analyzed and correlated using Geographic Information Systems (GIS). The critical questions to be answered are: To what extent did women’s journeys differ from journeys of men, and in what ways? How much did women’s justification of their travel correlate with the distance they travelled? To what extent was women’s travel to one pilgrimage site limited by their own home’s proximity to other pilgrimage sites? That is, was travel based on access to any spiritual “services”, or did women exercise a greater scope of agency over the choice of their pilgrimage destination?

At the core, this research addresses problems central to the freedom of disadvantaged groups, and the challenges of living with difference and tension in a peaceful way, without subjugation, segregation, and oppressive systems of social control. These problems are so central to all of history, that they can be examined from many historical and theoretical viewpoints. In this thesis, I have chosen to investigate them from the perspective of medieval England, using detailed quantitative and spatial research as a means to both expand our knowledge of medieval women’s mobility, and to add depth to theories of women’s mobility in general.

This will in turn be of relevance to our understanding of women’s mobility in the modern world, in a variety of urban and geographic contexts. Today, women are far from free to wander in cities or travel long-distance without taking precautions or ensuring sufficient company – carrying mace, having male friends walk them home, travelling abroad with companions, avoiding certain male-dominated bars, and the like. Women’s mobility is still limited, in some
countries more than others. Women’s “right to the city” – to comfort and belonging in public space, is still very much in question. Gaining a greater understanding of the historical background of women’s freedom of movement will also contribute to the debate regarding what is different and unique about the modern Western context of women’s freedom, and what is, perhaps, not so different after all.

The questions have relevance for urban planning, as well. Planning theorists who deal with gender in the city have routinely referred to findings of women’s history to frame their studies – both the questions they ask, and the recommendations they make. Often, they rely solely on modern women’s history, or frame their arguments within a narrative that presupposes a dichotomy between pre-modern and modern women’s agency. While there are certainly many differences between women’s opportunities in medieval and modern contexts, some similarities are striking – such as the evident lack of clear distinction between public and private space throughout most of history, and the way in which “private” or “female” space seems to have been “portable” through certain behavioral patterns, such as eye contact rules and levels of submissiveness. So even though the study of medieval England may seem quite removed from the problems of planning in urban areas today, the issues of female access and mobility, and of gendered spaces, are still highly relevant for the context and conceptualization of feminist urban planning in the modern world. This is especially true for planning in those many areas of the world in which spatial limitations and gender segregation are even more prominent parts of women’s lives than they are in the West, but the Western world also continues to grapple with tension surrounding gendered spaces – and women’s safety and comfort in the city. The study of women’s mobility in medieval England will therefore contribute to the theory of female mobility
in all contexts, and in doing so will help to widen the focus of planning theory, which has largely conceptualized mobility in terms of transportation alone, to other aspects of mobility, such as *spatial belonging*, the right to the city, and especially, the *right to presence*.
Chapter 2. Literature Review

In looking at mobility, we must start from a point of “From where?....To where?” Mobility is an inherently geographical concept, and an investigation of it must begin with a discussion of space. When the question is one of mobility of a particular group, this first of all has meaning only as compared with that of another group. And additionally, the comparison, similarities, and differences can only be understood within the context of the relationships of those groups with each other. Thus the question “Where (and why, and how) did women move?” must be addressed within a historical, socio-economic, and political context. For we find that the reasons for and method of movement (the why and how) are deeply embedded in the social, economic, and micro-political associations a specific culture assigns to a given space. And furthermore, that all of these factors in turn define both the origin of movement and the destination, as well as the chosen route of travel.

Mobility also has associations with transportation technology, in a pure sense, as modes of transportation available to the society, and in an economic and spatial sense, as modes of transport which are both affordable and practically (locally) available. Mobility also has associations with health. In this sense, it is a similar problem to transport technology – that is, the physical means to move from one place to another. In a medical sense, in cases of physical disability, it is access to the biological technology of the human body which is limited. This also has an economic dimension, however; the affordability of wheelchairs or other mechanical
assists. Both of these are also connected with the idea of political access – the level of voice and real citizenship (the state of having one’s needs heard and met, at least in part). In transportation, this political dimension manifests in the ability to gain, through political processes, increased access to modes of transportation, for example, through extended public transit routes, or subsidized car loans. In the sense of physical disability, this political voice can ensure physical access to public buildings through mandated wheelchair ramps, for example.

The question of mobility sits at the intersection of women’s history, feminism, geography, and even psychology, and all the questions of socioeconomic and cultural variation over space. Yet very few scholars have looked at it from this perspective. They have instead focused on mobility in terms of transportation, mobility in terms of access, the public or private nature of space, the gendering of public and private space, and limitations arising from that gendering of space. A few scholars have investigated the mobility of medieval women in the sense of movement and presence. Yet none have attempted to depict it visually or to use software to determine spatial-to-socioeconomic, and spatial-to-spatial correlations in a quantitative way. Because questions of public and private have been at the very heart of the debate about women and space in both the social sciences and history, they are entwined with issues of gendered space. If it is impossible to look at mobility of women versus men without looking at issues of power, spatial limitations, and gendering of space, then it is equally impossible to look at the gendering of space, which often (but not always) equated women’s space with the private realm, without reviewing how

---

society drew the boundaries between public and private spaces. A brief examination of how public and private spaces were defined and categorized in medieval England will therefore be my point of departure. Before that, however, I will briefly review the major planning, geography and social theories relevant to questions surrounding women’s mobility.

_Social Theories of Mobility_

Physical movement is at the foundation of human biological life and is so basic that it has affected every aspect of civilization. The topic of physical mobility has been touched upon in research in many fields, from history to geography to urban planning, but only recently have scholars called for the study of mobility itself as a theoretical concept and suggested a new “mobilities paradigm” for future interdisciplinary research.² Much of the existing research on mobility in geography relates to migration patterns. In sociology, mobility has been investigated from a socio-economic viewpoint, as class or occupational mobility. Urban planners have discussed mobility as a transportation problem created by the modern land use regime which strictly separated residential from commercial and industrial areas.³ Literary theorists have “mapped” women’s movements, but these have been attempts to examine emotional and mental attitudes toward place rather than investigations of women’s physical movements on any level.⁴

---

Feminist geographers, on the other hand, have focused on physical movement and have begun to expand the study of mobility to the spatial embeddedness of social life.\(^5\)

One of the most influential ideas in the study of mobility, particularly the mobility of marginal groups and individuals, and one which has rarely been used to frame historical research, is the idea of “the right to the city”, a term coined by philosopher Henri Lefebvre. Anthropologists, feminist geographers, and urban planning thinkers have investigated the city and people’s “rights” to it from the perspectives of mobility, access, political voice, citizenship, belonging, recognition, redistribution, encounter, and even emotional therapy. The problems of citizenship, access to city areas and other geographical space, and like issues affecting those at the margins of society, have existed as long as civilization, and scholars have investigated their permutations in various historical and cultural contexts. The phrase, “right to the city”, however, was coined in the twentieth century by French philosopher Henri Lefebvre, and has proven to be a useful joining of political and geographical concepts which continues to raise important new questions about people’s use of, and control over, space.

Henri Lefebvre, writing in the 1940 to 1970s, argued that space, including urban space, is *produced* by people, through their everyday lives and the economic means of production of their societies. Urban configurations and use of city space are therefore social constructions which reproduce the economic system (in the West’s case, capitalism) which created them.\(^6\) This creation of space is effected through the everyday actions of individuals, and in their political

---


acceptance or denial of the subtle and explicit rules regulating their use of space. The working class, Lefebvre argues, agitates for important rights to and in the city, remaining dedicated to the urban space. Others, however, call for a right to nature, to life in the countryside – using visits to cities and towns only as nostalgic tourist sites. To Lefebvre, these latter attempt to displace the city, and therefore a right to the city, by fleeing urban life and neglecting the urban core. The right to the city is therefore a right to remain in urban spaces that are livable, not deteriorated. It is a right to urban life in general, for all, but particularly for the working class.\(^7\)

Other scholars have since taken up the theme of the working class’s rights to urban life, and while it has been expanded to other groups and issues, as discussed below, the main trend in scholarship on “the right to the city” has focused on the relationship of economic to political disadvantage. It is, as Purcell says, “the growing power of capital” that threatens to disenfranchise the urban masses.\(^8\) Harvey also diagnoses the problem as “a global struggle with finance capital,” and as a question of who controls surplus production and use.\(^9\) A “right to the city” in this sense is almost equivalent with democratic power in urban settings, and these authors both connect the issue to broad processes of widespread urbanization and globalization.

The work of James Holston also focuses on the economic and political power of the lower classes in urban settings. In his book on Insurgent Citizenship, he examined the relationship of law, property rights, public and private power, and socio-spatial inclusion/exclusion in the neighborhoods of Sao Paolo, Brazil. His study found that those with social and economic status

---

were able to use the “rule of law” in illegal ways, through obfuscation and delay, to exert their power over the shape of the city, create private exclusion zones, and prevent those with less influence from obtaining necessary city services and clear land rights. Despite these challenges, however, Holston finds that the people of the working-class neighborhoods found ways to use the misapplied and ambiguous laws for their own benefit, themselves often delaying proceedings in hopes that the truth would come out. These are, Holston argues, “insurgent” forms of citizenship. Their rights to the city withdrawn by those holding economic and political power, the people of the favelas become economic and legal insurgents through their manipulation of existing, antagonistic power structures, and thus win back some of their rights.¹⁰

Fincher and Iveson (2008) also address the issue of economic and political access. They frame the problem as one of “redistribution”, arguing that large disparities of wealth and unequal property distribution enable disproportionate political access to the wealthy. The rich are therefore in a better position to influence decisions about how the city is shaped and used.¹¹ There is a further spatial element to this, as the rich and high-status groups in society tend to cluster in certain areas, drawing in public facilities and consumer services to cater to them. The poor neighborhoods, not having the gravitational pull of spending power so influential in capitalist systems, do without such services, and often lack as well the transportation systems that would make physical access to these resources possible.¹²

¹² Ibid., 30.
The question of political access to and decision-making say in the city has also been addressed by a number of authors from the perspective of difference and belonging. This builds on Holston’s work on insurgent citizenship, and in fact Holton himself expanded on the idea in his article on “Spaces of Insurgent Citizenship”. He begins with a critique of modernist planning and the idea of national citizenship in the modern state. Such country-wide and political classifications of identity are not sufficient in our increasingly multicultural societies. The formal citizenship of national belonging is inadequate for addressing the true nature of belonging at local levels – in cities and neighborhoods – and in social and economic contexts. It is also insufficient for expressing the multiple and sometimes conflicting identities and belongings expressed by individuals in modern, multicultural societies. The ambiguity of “actual social life” is, Holston argues, an “ethnographic present” which must be acknowledged and made part of our conceptualizations of belonging and substantive citizenship. The ability to belong to these conflicting identifications is therefore a crucial aspect of “the right to the city”.

This acknowledgement is also a major theme in the work of Fincher and Iveson, whose book Planning for Diversity discusses in detail the need for recognition of group and individual differences as a major component in being full citizens of society. They, like Holston, contrast this with modern conceptualizations of citizenship, and add as well a critique of traditional society – in which, they note, cultural diversity was treated as a fault of society which needed to be surmounted through reinvigoration of dominant community life. This, they argue, is still the case with neo-traditional approaches to urban planning, such as the New Urbanist movement,

---

which seeks to form close-knit communities with shared values.\textsuperscript{14} This approach to community, however, causes denigration and stigmatization of ‘others’ – individuals and groups whose ways of being in the city are different from the norm.\textsuperscript{15} A recognition of the differing needs and values of diverse people in society, on the other hand, will, they argue, open the way for a free right to the city that emerges from true belonging.\textsuperscript{16}

Sandercock also emphasizes the importance of difference and belonging to the full expression of citizenship in modern multicultural society. She not only recognizes the need for multicultural awareness, but following Salman Rushdie, also celebrates the “mongrel” or mélange aspect of the diverse city, in which “newness enters the world…change by fusion, change by conjoining.”\textsuperscript{17} Such melding, morphing, and the fragmentation they bring has been the object of fear by many, she notes, and this fear has led to oppression of anyone seen as ‘other’.\textsuperscript{18} It has led in particular to the banishment or transformation of those ‘others’.\textsuperscript{19} Sandercock situates the problem in struggles over belonging, what she terms “emotional economies”, or the “political economy of fear”.\textsuperscript{20} At the center of the conflict is the question of what it means to be “at home” in a multicultural world.\textsuperscript{21} She thus expands on the idea of simple political citizenship and voice to include feelings of belonging in the city, of being unafraid to be oneself in the urban space.\textsuperscript{22}

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., 90.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 145.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., 109.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., 10, 108.
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., 87.
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., 109.
This idea of being oneself, freely, in urban spaces has led to larger questions of mobility and safety within the city, and to related issues of encounter with the ubiquitous strangers of the urban world. In this sense, ‘the right to the city’ can be thought of as a *right to presence* within the city, in the public spaces of urban life. This presence can be thought of in two different ways: as the free physical movement and situation of an individual within urban place, and as the free interaction with strangers and the unexpected which results from this unhindered movement and self-placement.

Capron has articulated the importance of ‘public space’ as a space of movement, and “simple, shared presence”. In her article on modern public spaces in Latin America, she identifies the shopping center as an important location of “publicness” in the modern world, and a focus for the ongoing redefinition of the meaning of public space. It is, she argues, an intermediary space, a combination of public and private. To the extent that it is expressed as private, it may be inaccessible, inhospitable to certain groups. It may also be inaccessible due to its spatial location in relation to the neighborhoods of some sectors of the population, and the relative ease of travel between the sites. This idea of access is central to issues of a ‘right to presence’ and therefore of a ‘right to the city’. As Capron puts it, the right of access to a place is to have a “universal right of visit”. It is, she says, a “quality of welcome”, a sense that one’s presence is accepted and even desired.23

This idea of accessibility-as-welcome is taken up by Fincher and Iveson (2008) as well, but they argue that an important aspect of true access to a space is a sense of entitlement – *belonging*

---

there as a right at the deepest level. But this does not equal a right to be a local. Instead, they claim, it is a matter of being able to move about the city as a stranger, with opportunities for a wide range of urban experiences. An important aspect of access and a sense of belonging in a place is physical safety, something which has traditionally been denied to women and minorities in many parts of the city. For women, especially, as discussed in depth by Wilson in her book *Sphinx in the City*, the city was historically a place of danger for those who moved beyond the ‘feminine’ physical space of house or neighborhood, proscribed by patriarchal norms. This stemmed, she argues, from the perceived necessity to distinguish between prostitutes or loose women on the one hand, and honorable women on the other – and thus to distinguish between those women who were sexually available outside of marriage, and those to whom a social and financial commitment was expected. The primary mode of distinguishing between the two (though Wilson herself does not put it like this) was enclosing the committed (or, rather, “spoken-for”) ones in private space – in a sense corraling them – and letting the others roam relatively free and easy on the open sexual market. Women have never, however, had full and free access to the city streets, says Wilson, and therefore have never been full citizens of any country or urban jurisdiction. Despite this, she argues, when ‘honorable’ women found ways to roam in broader city spaces, they found it liberating. They had access to not only the physical places of streets and meeting halls, but also to the spectacle, the intensity of risk in the city.

---

25 Ibid., 153.
27 Ibid., 10.
This sense of access to the intensity of the city is important for the other aspect of the ‘right to presence’ mentioned above: the right to encounter. A crucial part of the ‘right to the city’, Fincher and Iveson claim, is the right to move through urban life, exploring different sides of oneself and exploring possible alternative identities through unexpected interactions with strangers.28 Like Wilson’s argument that an element of risk is a positive aspect of city experience for women, Fincher and Iveson argue that a degree of disorder is necessary for the encounter with the unknown that makes the evolution of self-knowledge through the city possible.29 This growth of self-knowledge (or, as Sandercock puts it, the need to be exposed to different versions of “the good life”30) is a crucial part of the ‘right to the city’. However, unlike Wilson, Fincher and Iveson argue that an element of danger does not need to be retained to enable the intensity and unexpectedness of encounter. In fact, through an increased sense of safety in their movement through the urban environment, women and other minorities can have expanded opportunities for encounter, in places and contexts they would otherwise avoid out of fear.31 This safe access should not be understood as the removal of all conflict, however. A potential for confrontation and tension must exist to an extent in the disorder and unscriptedness that makes newness possible.32

Iveson, in an earlier article, added an interesting caveat to the roles of open accessibility, hospitality, and safety in the ‘right to the city’. In a study of a women’s swimming pool in Sydney, he found that some forms of exclusion could actually serve to enhance the right of some

---

29 Ibid., 147.
32 Ibid., 184.
to the city. Certain groups, disadvantaged, discriminated against, or otherwise made uncomfortable by dominant groups in society, might only be able to express themselves publicly, in spaces set apart for them. That is, in separate public places, they can be free enough from domination to interact with others in forms of unscripted encounter otherwise restricted in the wider public realm. Women in a female-only pool may therefore be able to meet other women and enjoy a quiet swim, without the hassle of ogling or male physical dominance of the pool.

Iveson thus declares a “right to withdraw and exclude” in which those who still have less access to safe, free movement elsewhere, might be protected in order to “explore what they might become, with safety.”

Iveson’s justification of semi-public spaces for “counterpublics”, and Capron’s case that modern public spaces, such as shopping centers, are inherently both public and private, are both excellent examples of an argument that Sandercock makes about the way we need to think about the city in the postmodern era. She argues that multicultural urban spaces, “mongrel cities”, are best reflected in postmodern feminist thought, which denies the logic of the binaries so popular in modern conceptions of both the city and the person. It is not, she argues, “either reason or emotion”, but rather, “both reason and emotion”. As Capron and Iveson would say as well perhaps, “both public and private”. As Fincher and Iveson would argue, “both safety and risk/confrontation”.

The ‘right to the city’, then, as an idea, has evolved from its origins in conceptualizations of economic and political access and belonging, to concepts of both spatial

---

and mental/emotional access and belonging, all of which have significant impacts on the urban experience and freedom of the individual.

The whole notion of freedom, on investigating mobility, is only important because we can imagine something different – a vision of higher freedom not expressed in medieval society, not even expressed in modern society. Clarifying what we are examining – mobility – and why, requires clarifying what we measure it against; and it demands to know why we even ask the question. We imagine higher levels of freedom for medieval women, but do not have such freedom ourselves. So, what are we measuring spatial limitations against? What is the ideal to which we compare the past and the present? The ideal relates to comfort in conflict – surrender to difference and disorder – a concept created by Leonie Sandercock in her call for an embrace of ‘mongrel cities’ through ‘therapeutic planning’ in which healthy conflict is embraced as a means to circumvent violent conflict and heal as a society from past and present wounds. The ideal of women in the city, thought of in this way, is a situation in which there is comfort in risk (vs Wilson’s risk/danger only), safe conflict.

These theories outline the most up-to-date ideas regarding the nature of true geographical freedom in society. They are therefore significant perspectives with which to inform the study of women’s mobility as a theoretical problem, and also have the potential to add great insight into the nature of women’s mobility in specific historical contexts, in the present case – medieval England. In sum, the theoretical implications for mobility lie in the concepts of “right to the city” or ”right to presence”, and the “right to encounter”. The first, the right to presence/the right to the city, could be defined as the free physical movement and situation of an individual within urban
and other geographic space. It might also be thought of as the right to self-placement, the individual’s self-determination of the space he or she occupies and moves through. As with all things in society, this right is limited (in differing combinations and degrees in different societies) by other conflicting considerations, such as the right to personal space, and the private ownership and control of property. Connected to this right to presence is the right to a “quality of welcome” in public space, a sense that one’s presence “is accepted and even desired”.

It has a physical aspect, on the one hand, requiring both physical access through transportation and lack of physical barriers to movement into that public space. On the other hand, the sense of welcome requires a feeling of emotional belonging, and a belief (or trust) that being oneself in public will not create negative consequences.

The right to encounter is another theoretical concept with important implications for mobility research. At its simplest, it can be defined as the free interaction with strangers and with the unexpected, which results from unhindered movement and self-placement. It has elements of risk, intensity, disorder, even conflict, but at its best (as identified by Sandercock), it deals with this potential for confrontation and chaos in a therapeutic way – engaging emotionally, honestly, and directly with difference, rather than segregating to minimize tension. The rewards of such engaged interaction with “others” are the potential of individuals to explore alternative identities, and the potential of society to evolve through fusion.

Clearly a right to self-placement, a “quality of welcome” and ability to be oneself in public space, a right to encounter with strangers, and a right to the individual growth arising from such
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encounters did not exist in medieval England, even more so for women than for men. Indeed, it could be argued with some strength that they have never existed fully anywhere, even in the modern West in which the concepts arose. In combining a look at social theory, however – which imagines and investigates ideals – with historical analysis of the premodern past, I am looking not at a difference between modern (in its imperfect form) and premodern. I am instead looking at human versus a particular ideal, one which can provide a useful perspective from which to examine in detail the permutations and limitations of women’s mobility in medieval England.

**Women’s Mobility in Historical Research**

These conceptualizations of what true freedom means for women in their occupation of and movement through urban and geographic space, have not yet made impact in medieval historiography. Some scholars have, through their analysis of the sources, come to conclusions about women’s spatial freedoms and limitations which are closely aligned with aspects of these social theories. A conscious effort to examine women’s mobility in the Middle Ages from these theoretical perspectives will, however, deepen our understanding of the theoretical concepts and their potential to enhance the understanding of mobility in all periods, as well as expanding our understanding of the spatial constraints faced by women in the medieval world.

Space is a growing subject of study by scholars of premodern history. The issue of public and private spaces, the gendering of those spaces, and the many other social, political and economic
meanings of those terms, have been major themes of women’s history. These interests have necessarily brought up questions of women’s access to public spaces, but by and large, scholars have focused on women’s involvement in the political and economic aspects of the “public sphere” (in a Habermasian sense), rather than their physical movement in urban and rural public spaces. There are some exceptions, however. Scholars of female monasticism have discussed at length the degree of spatial enclosure of nuns, and the architectural boundaries erected to enforce legal limitations on religious women’s movements. There have been no systematic studies of individual nuns’ actual movements, however, due in part to a lack of sources, but also due to the limited geographical focus of many premodern historians.

A few scholars have investigated the movements of premodern women in some detail, however. Hanawalt used coroners inquests to determine place of accidental death, in both villages and London. She found interesting patterns of spatial mobility which differed by gender, and connected these with didactic literature regarding acceptable female movement, to create a conceptually rich and historically grounded study of medieval English women’s mobility.
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Unfortunately, while she laid a fascinating conceptual groundwork, the article and chapter were brief, and many questions regarding correlations between occupation, class, and age on the one hand, and women’s movement on the other, were not considered.

Craig’s work on medieval women pilgrims went a great deal further to examine the cultural and spatial context of women’s mobility in the Middle Ages, and Webb has also addressed the topic, though much more briefly. McSheffrey also took up the theme of women’s mobility in medieval England, by looking at the location of marriage making in London. Her study provides fascinating insights into the medieval understandings of public and private space, and their associations with gender. Korhonen’s study of beauty on the early modern London street extends to late medieval conditions as well, and considers both the role of women in public spaces, and how their mobility was conditioned by male desires and social signifiers designed to contain those desires. Cohen, in her research on the mobility of women in the streets of early modern Rome, adds significant conceptual considerations to the historical study of women’s mobility. Finally, McIntosh’s book, while not overtly considering women’s mobility in urban space as a central question, returns to the theme throughout the work. Her research on women’s work in a medieval English town unavoidably confronts the ability of women to move through
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urban space in the course of that work, and in the process, provides a great deal of rich detail about women’s mobility in medieval England.\footnote{Marjorie Keniston McIntosh, \textit{Working Women in English Society, 1300-1620}. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.}

Aside from these few scholars who have addressed women’s mobility directly (and whose works will be discussed in detail below), the majority of research to date on medieval women’s relationships with geographical space, has focused on the definitions and boundaries of public and private space, the gendering of both these labels, and the spaces to which they were attached by custom. It is to these labels that I now turn.

\textit{Definitions of Public and Private in Medieval England}

There have been many conceptualizations of public and private in historiography and social theory. The terms have quite often been mistakenly conflated with the ‘separate spheres’ idea which arose out of nineteenth century women’s history and posited two distinct and carefully delineated areas of influence and physical presence for men and women – the ‘public’, economic, political, and intellectual realm for men, and the ‘private’ space of home, family, and emotion for women.\footnote{Amanda Vickery, “Golden Age to Separate Spheres? A Review of the Categories and Chronology of English Women’s History,” \textit{The Historical Journal.} 36:2 (1993): 383-414.} The terms were also used by Jurgen Habermas to distinguish between the ‘public sphere’ where public opinion is formed, and where interaction with and within political structures takes place, and the ‘private sphere’, defined in the negative as everything else.\footnote{Craig Calhoun, \textit{Habermas and the Public Sphere}. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992.}

Other scholars have taken ‘public’ to mean formal employment, print, clubs, companies, the
neighborhood, and public office.\textsuperscript{48} Still others have considered ‘public’ that which is in the streets, or simply ‘the world outside the front door’\textsuperscript{49}. Dictionary definitions portray ‘public’ as describing ‘the people as a whole’, openness, and access. ‘Private’, on the other hand, is often defined simply as a negative contrast to ‘public’ – as that which ‘public’ is not. It is not open, not accessible to all, not ‘open to public scrutiny’\textsuperscript{50}. Davidoff defines the dichotomy as ‘the open and revealed versus the hidden or withdrawn; and the collective versus the individual’\textsuperscript{51}. Ryan makes the analogy with other pairs: home and work, intimate and anonymous, free market and state\textsuperscript{52}. Laitinen and Cohen relate the pair of terms to the dyads of order and disorder, personal and shared, domestic and communal, male and female, and allowed and forbidden\textsuperscript{53}. There is also the emotional, mental, and communicative side of the issue. Ryan speaks of the private realm as that of ‘private conscience, pleasure, and contemplation’, versus the open discourse of the public realm\textsuperscript{54}. McSheffrey, in her study of marriage negotiations in late medieval England, conceptualizes the private end of the dyad as ‘clandestine’, secretive, and intimate\textsuperscript{55}. She questions the usefulness of the dichotomy of public and private at all, however, concluding that

\textsuperscript{49} Ibid.
in a majority of cases the process was open – and could be better characterized as taking place in ‘widening circles of publicity, rather than from private to public’.

These questions of the location of the boundaries between private and public realms, and how those locations differed depending on wider cultural and more immediate contexts, have been the subject of some interesting studies. One of the more notable directions of public/private conceptualization has been the investigation of the body and clothing as sites of public/private boundaries. ‘Body studies’ situates the transition at the point where the bodily flesh touches the clothing, which is a culturally specific communication between the individual and society.

From this perspective, bodies become sites of political conflict, as individual, unique being meets social and political expectations. This dynamic is particularly noticeable in the modern debate about the veiling of Islamic women, and in the medieval sumptuary laws dictating allowable clothing by economic and political class.

Within these many definitions, there lie two types of public/private realms – spaces as geographic or architectural areas, and ‘spaces’ as the mental, affective, and communicative realms of political and social groups or fora. Some historians and social theorists have attempted to parse the varied meanings of these terms in a wide range of contexts, and to understand the ways in which they relate to each other and to other spatial and gendered-power concepts. One group of scholars in a special issue on the subject explored whether public and private were


necessarily linked at all, and if so, if they were dichotomous, or contiguous, or some other configuration of meaningful relation. All of these also investigated the relationship of the two concepts with gendered power relations.\footnote{Mary Ryan, “The Public and the Private Good: Across the Great Divide in Women’s History.” \textit{Journal of Women’s History} 15:2 (2003): 11.} This has been a general theme of research on public and private, in part stemming from the origins of the topic in the historiography of modern women.\footnote{See Amanda Vickery, “Golden Age to Separate Spheres? A Review of the Categories and Chronology of English Women’s History.” \textit{The Historical Journal}, 36:2 (1993): 383-414.} Ryan in fact concludes that there is an inherent gender bias in the \textit{border} between public and private.\footnote{Mary Ryan, “The Public and the Private Good: Across the Great Divide in Women’s History.” \textit{Journal of Women’s History} 15:2 (2003): 12.} Fraser and Killian both argue that the bias exists in the greater power of some to \textit{define} the border between the two. It is therefore in the definition and defense of the borders of private space or public space that power is manifest.\footnote{Nancy Fraser quoted in Joan Landes, “Further Thoughts on the Public/Private Distinction” \textit{Journal of Women’s History} 15:2 (2003): 34. Ted Killian quoted in Riitta Laitinen, with Thomas Cohen. “Cultural History of Early Modern Streets – An Introduction.” \textit{Journal of Early Modern History} 12:3-4 (2008): 199.} Private and public are, therefore, not characteristics of space, Killian argues, but inherent manifestations of power relations. Furthermore, because these unequal power dynamics exist everywhere in a given society, he claims, both ‘public’ and ‘private’ exist in every space as power manifestations, and are therefore \textit{nowhere} as independent elements of space.\footnote{Ted Killian quoted in Riitta Laitinen, with Thomas Cohen. “Cultural History of Early Modern Streets – An Introduction.” \textit{Journal of Early Modern History} 12:3-4 (2008): 199.} Like many other authors, discussed below, he uses the complicated dynamics within ‘public’ and ‘private’ and their relationships with power and gender, to strip the concepts of independent usefulness, while eventually concluding that they are ultimately useful terms for analysis, when accompanied by thoughtful caveats.
A complicating factor to all of this is the difference in public and private boundaries and uses in varied cultures and time periods. As Vickery notes, home/world is a traditional and ancient dyad in Western culture. The application of the terms private and public to that dyad, however, is not consistent. The ‘spectrum’ is much messier than feminist historians initially believed.

Nineteenth-century American or British gender roles and spatial definitions are not directly translatable to medieval or non-Anglo contexts. Ryan, assuming the gendered Victorian definition of the terms, concludes that public and private are not relevant at all as concepts for the study of earlier periods, despite her own admission of a prominent global and historical pattern in which social space is divided into public and private sectors. It is, she says, a futile exercise; the relationship of the two concepts is just too complicated, and their expression too varied to make for reasonable analysis. The dyad has perhaps, she suggests, ‘worn too thin or been stretched beyond its capacity to frame gender relations in a meaningful way’. As McSheffrey says, ‘Our public/private dyad is neither natural nor universal’

Examples of the variation in the forms can be seen even within modern American society. Some urban planning scholars have found cultural differences in public/private definitions at the core of social problems and the use of modern urban housing and public space. Day, for example, finds that the perceived ‘publicness’ of any public space varies according to socioeconomic status: members of the working class and lower-income groups are more likely to perceive public
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areas such as parks as ‘semipublic extensions of the home, rather than as “public” spaces that belong to everyone and thus to no one’. 69 Loukaitou-Sideris finds a similar difference in conceptions of use and ownership of public space, but correlating with ethnicity. Hispanic groups in particular, she found, tended to ’privatize’ the public space of community parks, by setting up soccer pitches, playing loud music, congregating in large groups, using the space for a wider variety of social activities, and remaining there for longer durations than park-users of other ethnicities. 70 The ethnic difference in public/private definitions and uses was also apparent in Pader’s findings regarding sleeping arrangements in Hispanic versus White (Anglo) U.S. homes. In dominant U.S. culture, she notes, each child is expected to have its own bedroom, to enable him or her to develop independence and satisfy the ‘need’ for emotional and physical privacy. This assumption has led to laws regarding suitable homes for foster children, which require one room per child. Pader’s research, however, discovered that Hispanic families often go out of their way to sleep in the same room or even the same bed, even if plenty of sleeping space is available in other rooms. Loneliness and social isolation are seen as greater threats to emotional well-being than lack of privacy. To a Hispanic foster child, being put in a room of her own may therefore be felt as a punishment, causing more harm to an already vulnerable child – all based on differing cultural perceptions of the value, boundary, definitions, and uses of public and private space. 71

Public and private are confused and intertwined concepts, in the past as well as in the culturally diverse present. This is the conclusion of most historians who grapple with the terms in their research, especially those who focus on pre-Victorian eras and the non-Western world.\textsuperscript{72} Cohen, for instance, finds that in early modern Rome, boundaries between ‘urban’ and ‘domestic’ (her terms for non-governmental public space, and private space), were porous, pierced by windows, doors, and shared courtyards and stairways.\textsuperscript{73} McSheffrey argues that a clear separation of public and private in medieval England would have been ‘wholly foreign’, as the Church, government, and neighbors routinely dictated and interfered with the ‘private’ realm of sexual relations.\textsuperscript{74} Harris meanwhile finds that there was no clear boundary between the personal and political in Tudor society, and therefore no clear distinction between public and private. Informal channels of power (and therefore women’s influence through the family) were just as important.\textsuperscript{75} Both Kaartinen and Balint argue that early modern spaces were porous, and did not exist as either public or private alone. Instead, a space was both public and private, its nature in any given moment determined by the individual(s) using it.\textsuperscript{76} Alcock echoes this with his argument that ‘space is practiced place’ – that is, that architectural or urban space is transformed, becomes what it is, by the people inhabiting it, using it, and moving through it.\textsuperscript{77} Public and private, like


their associated dyads of male and female, order and disorder, and the many others mentioned above, are always understood, and can only be defined, in relation to each other.\textsuperscript{78}

Those searching for clear-cut definitions and solid taxonomies of space will be disappointed with the continued use of the words for analyzing gender and power relations in a spatial context. It is messy, to be sure. Yet, for all the complicated, contingent parsing required, they still provide a framework for analysis broad enough to apply to things outside of a home/world dichotomy, yet specific enough to have something to say. A key to this semiotic conclusion is that public and private are \textit{perspectives}, not fixed things, spaces, or categories.\textsuperscript{79} Social theorists, urban planners, and historians seeking to understand the past and present, and women’s place in them, should therefore refine, rather than discard the terms. As Ryan argues, until the power differentials which draw the boundaries between public and private become equalized, the dyad must be a subject of study.\textsuperscript{80} I argue, furthermore, that for any historical context in which didactic literature drew a parallel between one sex’s ‘proper’ region of presence, influence, and activity, and the public or private realm, that the terms are of high importance for historians. Understanding the past on its own terms means entering its mindset, as much as it means refraining from the imposition of anachronistic viewpoints.

All of this being said, what were the spaces in medieval England which were ‘public’ or ‘private’? These terms were associated to a degree with prescribed gender roles, and therefore with gendered spaces, and gendered mobility. McSheffrey argues that few things in medieval

England were fully private, due in part to the long reach of Church and royal legal systems into sexuality, gender roles, and family relations. Her analysis did find some complaints regarding nosy neighbors and a lack of privacy when neighbors could see inside windows or into gardens. Houses, most parts of which were grey zones of public and private, did have some intimate spaces reserved for members of the household only, such as bedchambers.  

Many spaces and circumstances which might normally be thought of as ‘private’ spaces in the West today, were in many ways ‘public’ in medieval England. Sexuality, as mentioned above, was often a public issue. The sex act and circumstances surrounding it were carefully regulated to prevent or minimize fornication, adultery, sodomy and any other forbidden sexual contact. They were regulated in fact as well as in law, as neighbors sometimes called in the authorities to intervene in suspected cases. According to McSheffrey, such oversight was not only accepted by medieval people, but expected. Even sexual desire itself, apart from any intention to act upon it, was subject to public control. The attempted regulation of female sexual desire through claustration and other methods of social control, was a prominent example in the Middle Ages. Other intangible threats were also controlled through Church and government legislation, especially thoughts and beliefs considered heretical or otherwise threatening to the existing
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83 Ibid., 989.
social order.⁸⁵ Freedom of thought, and the ‘privacy’ of personal beliefs had an entirely different meaning in the medieval world than in modern democracies.

The ‘home’ in medieval England was also not a purely private space, as it is often thought today, and as it was conceived of in the Victorian era of ‘separate spheres’ ideology. Residences in medieval London had ‘halls’ which were like large combination dining, living and meeting rooms. They could be considerably public spaces within the medieval house, where servants, visitors, and overnight guests might come and go, and mingle with the family. Larger medieval homes also had a number of ‘chambers’, where meetings of a public nature, such as the exchange of betrothal vows in front of numerous witnesses, could take place. Many merchant and artisan homes also had attached shops, which were primarily public spaces during open hours, and potentially private family spaces at other times. Most homes in medieval London had numerous non-family members residing within them, either integrated into an artisan or merchant family as apprentices, or integral members of the larger household, with administrative, provisioning, or housekeeping duties.⁸⁶ The later pattern of a division between ‘upstairs’ and ‘downstairs’ does not seem to have existed as starkly in the medieval period as in the Victorian and Edwardian ages. Servants and staff were more smoothly integrated into life with the family, creating one more way in which ‘public’ and ‘private’ blended into one another in medieval London.⁸⁷ One of the major shifts in understandings of private and public space from the medieval, to Victorian, to modern eras in England, may in fact be, as Davidoff suggests, an increasing unease with ‘living
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private life under the scrutiny of strangers’, and a related decline in domestic servants among the middle classes.\(^88\)

Thus the very fact of an event taking place inside a ‘private’ home did not make it a private affair.\(^89\) Even within the home, some spaces were said to be more private than others, however, such as the bedchambers mentioned above, as well as gardens and the parlor, and have been determined so by historians analyzing their accessibility from the street: the more doors which had to be crossed to access the room from the street, the higher its level of privacy.\(^90\) However, even this quantitative way of measuring privacy does not adequately describe the ‘publicness’ of acts within a space. One early modern woman, for example, after her husband’s death, ran a large national business from her personal writing desk in her home. She never travelled to the areas whose business she managed, but she was in control nonetheless, and corresponded extensively with male business contacts. She had access to the most public, social, and economic aspects of the external world, from within the most private spaces of her home. For this woman, Vickery suggests, ‘her public and private cannot be mapped onto the physical home and the external world.’\(^91\) The same seems to be true of many medieval women, especially enclosed nuns, many of whom ran extensive household organizations and real estate empires, from within a cloister.\(^92\)
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\(^90\) Ibid., 976.
\(^92\) See especially the nuns of Syon Abbey, the subject of my Cambridge PhD dissertation (In progress).
As is the case with what we assume to be ‘private’ spaces, ‘public’ spaces could also be sites of privacy. Masschaele identifies a number of places in medieval England as very public, including markets, churches, graveyards, saints’ shrines, village greens, town squares, streets, ports, and even agricultural fields. Some were less so: he describes alehouses, shops, manor houses, and baronial halls as shifting back and forth between private and public depending on circumstance. McSheffrey echoes this conclusion in her study of marriage-making, in which she found drinking houses functioning as second homes, substitute domestic spaces, and areas of courtship for lower classes who lived with their employers.

This idea of the transitory and circumstantial nature of public and private in medieval England is a common theme in the literature, and there is scarcely a public place listed by Masschaele which is not seen as private in some circumstances, by some scholar. Streets, for instance, are seen as ‘shaded, nuanced places’, liminal areas bordering both public and private. For Cohen, the street is a porous space, pierced by doors and windows in building facades, and extended through shared courtyards and stairwells. Artisan storefronts also added to the extension, through an inside intermediate zone of overlapping public and private life. McSheffrey notes the private

---

nature of whispered conversations in the street and other public places, and Masschaele himself considers the possibility of secret rendezvous’ in public markets.\(^9\)

In conclusion, as McSheffrey argues, for medieval Londoners, public and private were concepts not as tied to space as we might assume. They were not devoid of spatial meaning, but had a crucial situational component.\(^9\) Part of the reason for this is the complexity of the society. Medieval people were situated within a whole matrix of social control – it was not a simple dyad of public and private. They also had neighbors, family, the Church, government, etc. The individual against society, male versus female, family against neighbors.

Perhaps another reason for the complex interaction of public and private is the intimate nature of the latter, in many senses of that word, and the gendering “caretaking” as female (discussed in the following section). What is “public” could in large part be associated with those spaces or contexts in which social role-playing, “performance”, and a display of strength and personal control are heightened, and individual actions are more guarded. The “private”, contrary to this, is a space (geographic or contextual), where an individual can be less guarded, more familiar, more natural in personality, and more open about vulnerabilities. Vulnerability is, I argue, at the heart of intimacy, which in turn is at the heart of many conceptions of privacy and private space. Seen in this light, whoever is “caretaker” of private space – of the space and context of intimacy – will have significant influence and even control over those whose vulnerability is expressed

within that privacy. This has interesting implications for the power of women in medieval society, as discussed in a later section.

**Gendering of Public and Private in Medieval England**

While the concepts of public and private space clearly have meaning for all people in a given society, and for medieval England in particular, they have special resonance for the study of women. It is the gendering of space which has created the mobility limitations of women throughout history, and the spaces gendered were usually categorized as well by a number of dichotomies, mentioned above, which were said to align with the male/female dyad. The most prominent of these, however, was the public/private pair. This has certainly been the framework most investigated by modern scholars. The specific ways in which gender was associated with different degrees or manifestations of public and private, however, varied over culture and period. The Victorian age gave rise in the West to the ‘separate spheres’ ideal, in which home and private life was the strict domain of the woman, and the ‘world’ of public, political and economic life was the domain of the man.\(^{100}\) This dual-sphere concept was carried into the twentieth century, especially in the strict separation and gendering of suburban, ‘private’ versus urban ‘public’ space of the post-World War II generation.\(^{101}\)

Islamic countries have had their own varied genderings of public and private space. In medieval Islam, as Thompson notes, women had access to non-domestic space in a variety of ways,


especially as workers in cottage industries or as peddlers, servants, and more. Elite women were generally more restricted, physically, to their homes, but not entirely so; they visited female friends and maintained social and information networks through servants and intermediaries.\textsuperscript{102} The encounter with the West during the colonial era in the nineteenth century caused a shift in many Middle Eastern practices of gendered space, as the traditions of Islamic countries interacted with the Victorian separate spheres ideology.\textsuperscript{103} In some cases, this led to a stricter separation of male and female than had been seen before in either region. In modern Morocco, for example, studies have identified a strict sense of gendered ownership of space, to the extent that a woman entering male space is seen as trespassing. She has no right to use such space, and her attempt to do so is seen as a literal act of \textit{aggression}, since her presence upsets the men’s order and peace of mind.\textsuperscript{104}

According to Flather, the paradigm of separate spheres arising from Victorian notions of gender roles, or reflected in the gendering of space in some Muslim cultures, is inappropriate to the study of earlier periods of even English history. Her analysis of gender and space in early modern England determines that although the social forces assigning women’s responsibilities and roles to domestic spaces was strong, it was not at all consistent in application. Not only was the rhetoric of early modern gendered space uneven, and its nature varied dependent on class and other social variables, but it was applied unevenly in time as well: a single space could shift in the short term between male and female, depending on the use and circumstances.\textsuperscript{105} Flather also

\textsuperscript{103} Ibid., 53.
\textsuperscript{104} Ibid., 59.
outlines a matrix of gender identities and hierarchies dependent on age, and on social and marital status, as well as sex. She depicts spaces as the locations in which these varied identities were negotiated on a daily basis. In the household, women had a great deal of control over space, especially when practical and economic considerations were on their side, but when use was in question and practicality was not an issue, the husband’s will often dominated. Practicality was also a paramount concern in the organization of space for work, but there was an overarching sexual division of labor. Finally, the social use of space was the most fluid of all, shifting with time of day, age, marital status and class of the people involved, and type of establishment (for example, drinking house versus public square). Space, was, therefore, differently gendered in each moment in time based on a contextual social web. There was no static men’s space or women’s space. The reality was too complex to fit within any binary, and the truth was instead, a constant flux of overlapping and intersecting male and female worlds.

Cohen, in her study of women in early modern Rome, echoes these findings. Contemporary travel accounts indicate that they lived lives of greater seclusion than northern European women, but, Cohen argues, they were by no means in completely segregated spaces with no outside contact. Roman women of the period were rarely entirely secluded. Lower-class women moved about the streets for housework and to their employers’ houses. Upper-class ladies used these working-class women as their eyes and ears in the city, travelled around the city for social visits, and watched festivals from windows. While they had less urban mobility than the comparatively ‘free’ women of England, for instance, they did have a presence in public space,
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both directly, and through surrogates. Given these overlaps with male space outside, and non-segregated internal space of domestic dwellings, Cohen challenges the conceptualization of any space in early modern Rome as either male or female, instead determining that both domestic and urban spaces should be gendered both male and female.

The gendered nature of space was equally complex in medieval England. While there were definite expectations of women remaining within specified spaces the majority of the time, and while these spaces were generally identified as private, women did have a degree of flexibility in their movement and presence. As Hanawalt says, there was no space which absolutely excluded either sex. Men, for example, lived in houses (especially great households, which had numerous male staff), while women often worked in fields, met in taverns, and attended church. The guidelines of gendered space were not, as Webb says, ‘an unbreakable code’. Hanawalt’s research, however, has shown that while there was some flexibility (priests, for example, were a constant presence in the ‘female’ space of the daytime village), the majority of medieval people’s lives were spent within the spaces considered appropriate to their gender. Her study of the location of accidental deaths of one thousand men and women found that in rural areas, the majority of women’s deaths occurred in the home, or near to home, related to domestic

chores, while the majority of men’s deaths were in the fields or on the road. In cities, where gendered spaces were more porous, due to the presence of artisan shops in homes, and the necessity to provision for the household through market shopping, the accidental deaths were less strictly separated, spatially. Women still moved within a smaller radius, however, keeping more consistently to their own city quarter. Even those employed outside of their birth families kept close to their ‘home’ – in their case, the household of their master.

The location of the woman’s home was important to marriage-making in medieval London, with implications for the gendered use of space. McSheffrey’s study of courtship and marriages finds that couples made verbal, witnessed marriage contracts almost exclusively in the woman’s space, whether the home of her family, her employer (if living with her master’s family), or herself (if widowed). If she did not live in the city, or the home of her employer was unsuitable for some reason, a public tavern could substitute for the woman’s space. Interestingly, such private moments in public were not seen as problematic. The morality of a courtship situation was only questioned when the woman entered male space – if, for instance, the betrothal occurred in his or his parents’ home. This, McSheffrey argues, would have been a reversal of roles scandalous to society; the man was supposed to go to the woman, as an independent actor, while the woman was generally expected to display dependence on family or employers, presaging her own dependence to her new husband.

117 Ibid., 974.
Though women’s space was not starkly segregated from men’s in medieval England, there were certainly limitations on female movement and roles. While there were some suspicions with a male crossing too much into predominantly female territory, it does not seem to have been seen as equally threatening to the social order. Men’s scope of action was more readily assumed by contemporary thinkers to extend into both public and private, male and female spaces, whereas women were assumed to act primarily in female spaces. The flexibility and overlap of gendered spaces found in medieval England therefore had more to do with men’s flexibility of movement and action, than women’s.

Some women did move into normally male spaces and independent roles, but these were transgressions, to a certain degree, which medieval men sought to control, largely through spatial restrictions. This was done in part by defining those women who remained under male control and within defined ‘female’ spaces as ‘honorable’, and labeling those independent of male control (and thus threatening to male control) – and freely moving within ‘male’ spaces – as ‘marginal’. Women who were simply single – had never been married and subject to a husband’s rule – were marginal. Certain kinds of single women were even more of a threat, because they chose to live in circumstances removed from male power. Nuns were independent to an extent, but they were often spatially enclosed, and were in all cases subject to the male religious hierarchies which regulated their monastic vows. Beguines were an even greater
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threat to the male-dominated social order, since they were single women, removed from families
and free to move about, living in groups (akin to religious communes) with other single women,
and living religious lifestyles unregulated by the Church.\footnote{Barbara Hanawalt, “At the Margins of Women’s Space in Medieval Europe.” In Of Good and Ill Repute: Gender and Social Control in Medieval England, by Barbara Hanawalt. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998, 72.} Prostitutes, interestingly, were both a
threat to the male order, and subject to it. They were considered a necessary evil, and were
acceptable to Church and state because they were still subject to male influence and control
through the sex act and the economic exchange with the hiring men integral to it.\footnote{Ibid., 71-2.} This was
particularly the case when prostitutes were confined spatially to brothels or certain areas of
town.\footnote{Ibid., 73, 84.} Freelance street-walkers, however, were still seen as a threat, because they escaped
regulation, threatened ‘honorable’ quarters of the city, and could even be mistaken for
‘honorable’ women.\footnote{Ibid., 71-2.} The free-roaming prostitute therefore threatened the social order by
challenging the markings of sexual availability that protected ‘honorable’ women from unwanted
(or wanted, but inappropriate) advances which might threaten virginity, patrimony, and family
honor.

The trespass of women in predominantly male space was not only threatening: it was cause for
consequences to the women, even for severe social and sexual punishment. Unlike men
wandering into women’s space, women moving outside of ‘female’ areas into ‘male’ spaces
could only do so safely by adopting behaviors, such as a submissive attitude with eyes lowered,
and by wearing certain clothes, or by travelling in company with male kin. These were cues that
allowed an honorable woman to move within the streets and public areas of a city or village, and
maintain her honor. How a woman moved within male space was a key characteristic of her
respectability and therefore her safety.\textsuperscript{126} Women who did not follow these rules could be subject to harassment and even rape.\textsuperscript{127} Despite the threats, women did challenge the limitations. Women who had economic power or religious influence could find exemptions to the rules of proper female conduct without putting themselves at risk.\textsuperscript{128} In the majority of cases, however, women who wished to move beyond female spaces could only do so safely by adopting what I will call ‘portable’ private space, discussed in more depth below.

While it could be argued that women were complicit with these arrangements, which limited their own freedom of movement (they were, after all, half of the population, and may be seen as having struck a bargain of limitation in return for protection), it nevertheless stands that medieval men were the group largely setting the boundaries of women’s physical movement, and regulating women’s behavior and roles within those boundaries.\textsuperscript{129} The action of setting those boundaries contributed to men’s sense of control over women, who were regarded as unruly in essence, and the boundaries clearly identified as marginal and ‘easy targets’, any who disregarded the spatial limitations.\textsuperscript{130} Like agitated livestock, then, women were best controlled (and protected) by their keepers, through enclosure.

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{127} See below.
\end{footnotesize}
Supporting men in their role as women’s keepers, were the government and the Church. The role of the state in the subjugation of women has been a major theme of women’s history and feminist theory, especially since the nineteenth century agitations for women’s suffrage. It has resonance for all periods of women’s history, however, since the state, as the bureaucratic embodiment of ‘justified’ physical force (military and police power), was the ultimate arbiter of law, and therefore of legal and illegal action. What is acceptable to society (including what are acceptable economic, political, and sexual roles, and to whom within society, for instance to men or women, is delegated the task of defining those roles) is therefore regulated by the government. This is the ‘public sphere’ of Habermas, the sphere to which women must turn and in which they must demand rights, to ‘achieve and protect their private as well as public objectives.’

In medieval Europe, this role of the state was reinforced and complicated by the role of the Catholic Church, which held parallel and ultimately supreme power over the definition of morality, and therefore of any social, sexual, and gender roles which were tied by them to moral issues. Women in medieval England were therefore situated at the bottom of a large superstructure of intertwined religious and governmental regulations that promoted and reinforced male social control and female submission to that control.

**Motives for Female Spatial Limitation**

Fears of social disorder are at the heart of the gendering of space and the attendant limitation of women’s spatial mobility. The reasons for the association are complex, however, and relate to such basic human issues as love and sexuality, family unity, and physical safety. They also lie,

---

however, in the economic and legal structures of property ownership and inheritance, and in simple misogyny.

Protection of women was a major motive for the gendering of spaces and the limitation of women’s movement. Women were believed to be physically weaker and less able to defend themselves from potential attacks than men, and thus in greater need of protection. Rape was a danger, especially while travelling long distance, but within urban non-female spaces as well (partly as a consequence of moving beyond gender norms; there is therefore some circular logic here).\textsuperscript{132} Men and women both, especially the wealthy, were vulnerable to robbers on the roads, but the threat of violence existed in city and village spaces as well.\textsuperscript{133} One motive for the limitation of medieval women’s movement therefore stemmed from these physical threats, and a sort of fortress mindset that sought protection of women by creating domestic strongholds fortified against dangerous male intruders.

It was not merely the safety and wellbeing of women, as inherent values, which justified the physical protection. The safety of women also had wide-ranging social implications, particularly for the upper classes. Familial reputation was at stake in a woman’s chastity, and the honor of the city as a whole could be endangered by the assault or rape of a well-to-do woman.\textsuperscript{134} There was,

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
however, less anxiety about the safety of lower-class women. Those women who had social honor (the wealthy) had more to lose, it was believed, than women already lacking social honor (the poor). Poor women were therefore not given the protection afforded to wealthy women, nor were they pressured into the limited mobility resulting from those attempts at fortress-like protection.\textsuperscript{135} This implies, again, that it was not the emotional and physical well-being of a woman which was important to medieval society, but the continuation of the social status which a particular woman embodied. This preeminence of social status over individual physical and especially emotional well-being is a theme seen repeatedly in medieval history.

While scholar Christine de Pizan, writing in the early fifteenth century, argued that the danger in women’s movement, particularly travel on roads for pilgrimage, was due entirely to the predatory practices of lustful men, her male contemporaries claimed that women were inherently sources of sexual disorder and lust.\textsuperscript{136} She was a rarity in being a well-known female scholar of the later Middle Ages, and her views were drowned out in the dominant misogynist discourse of clerics and university men. At the heart of this was the belief that women were sources of sexual disorder. According to some prominent thinkers, such as Thomas Aquinas (following on from Aristotle’s beliefs about women’s inferiority), women were not only physically weaker in comparison to men, they were also morally and mentally weaker. They must therefore be guided by men, who were physically stronger, more intelligent, and more moral than women.\textsuperscript{137} Because of their moral weaknesses, they were centers of sin, especially of pride and lust, which emanated


outward from them, affecting others, particularly men. Their moral and mental weaknesses also made them more vulnerable to the predations of sinful men. Women were therefore both generators of sexual and moral disorder, and magnets for it. This was the primary justification of monasteries for excluding women, of cities for restricting women’s movements in urban areas, of society for valorizing women’s domestic seclusion, and of the Church for demanding the strict spatial enclosure of nuns. “Women who wandered”, as Craig phrases it, were seen as desiring and taking advantage of freedom to indulge their vices. Greed, pride, lust, and deceit were easier for women to act out when they were away from domestic spaces, and unsupervised by watchful male guardians. Mobility (and especially pilgrimage) provided opportunities for women to act out their sins.

Women therefore had a “disability” of moral weakness, which required their enclosure and separation from a paternalistic society, much as the mentally ill have historically been locked up in asylums, both “for their own good and for the good of the community”. In medieval England, the partial segregation of genders and the limitation of women’s movement and spatial presence were seen as ways of not only protecting women from violence and predation, but were in fact seen as ways of protecting society (especially men) from women.

These issues are considered in depth in Korhonen’s study of women and beauty on the early modern English streets. In the late medieval and early modern mindset, she finds, women were

---
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seen as inherently dangerous to men through their beauty. From the perspective of her sources, the sexual disorder rising from women came primarily in a mechanical relationship between women’s assumed beauty, their presence in a place, and men’s inability to control themselves in the face of that beauty. Men are here seen as the weaker sex, in their emotional and physical vulnerability to women’s sensual powers. Women need do nothing other than be present in the same spatial location as a man to arouse him, or look in his eye while passing him by. Men, meanwhile, were not just seen as vulnerable, but rather as fully powerless. In the “emotion theory” of the time, Korhonen argues, “love” (usually meant as desire) was seen as an automatic response to beauty. When faced with a beautiful woman, a man was forced by nature to respond sexually. Men had no agency or decision in the matter. And, furthermore, men were not only powerless to stop their arousal, they were also powerless to stop themselves from acting upon that arousal. They could indeed feel forced to act upon that desire in any way they wanted, even through rape.\textsuperscript{141}

From this perspective, the gendering of spaces and limitation of female movement into male areas has a certain logic. Men and women could comfortably overlap only in the home, where legitimate sexual relations could occur, that is, where a woman’s beauty was an asset to legitimate procreation, not a temptation to illegitimate procreation, and where men’s inability to control their own bodies and emotions would help stabilize the social and political order, rather than attack its patriarchal legal foundations.

This need to assure lines of paternity – that is, to ensure legitimacy of offspring, for legal reasons, was central to justifications for limitations on women’s movement. Women’s sexuality needed to be controlled so men could be confident of who fathered which children (and due to their inherent moral weaknesses, women couldn’t be trusted to tell the truth about paternity). And because women were, as noted above, embodiments of a family’s social class, their bodies were primary mediums for the maintenance and perpetuation of that class – both through intangible “social honor” and the very tangible children potentially resulting from any union. Because property moved through paternal lines, and because the laws surrounding property ownership were central to the maintenance of order in society, the legal, political, and social stability of society was at stake in paternity, and was therefore vulnerable to women’s sexual decisions.\textsuperscript{142} The easiest way to control women’s sexuality, and therefore to maintain this social and political order, was to cut women off from contact with inappropriate men. Mobile women, because they could interact and potentially have sex with non-husband men (and potentially produce secretly illegitimate offspring), therefore threatened the very foundations of the social order. The free movement and public presence of women (and their assumed sexual interaction in the course of such movement) could therefore lead to utter political chaos.

\textit{Women’s Power in Public and Private Space}

Despite limitations on female movements and presence in public areas, women of medieval England could wield significant power in the private areas of the home and family, and even occasionally in the public areas of law and property. Both of these had implications for the

circumstances under which women’s movement outside of normal gendered spaces was legitimized.

In medieval England, married women could not control their own property, due to the custom of coverture, which placed all of the wife’s goods in joint marital ownership, under the head and control of the husband. While this went a long way toward limiting women’s freedom, it was a “specific proprietary incapacity”. Women were not in fact seen as personally incompetent, and could have a great deal of control over economic resources outside of the institution of marriage. Married women could, for instance, act as executors of others’ wills, and administrators of their property during the executor period. Women also gained active legal control of their own property once their husbands died. Widows could be prominent landladies, and often found that the advantages of legal and economic freedom outweighed temptations to remarry. Even within marriage, a woman might exercise some power over property, especially if she was seen as competent and the most practical choice of administrator. This did depend in the end on her husband’s willingness to delegate, and his personal respect for her. These opinions also seem to have depended in turn on the amount of money and land the woman had brought into the marriage from her family and dowry. There is a great deal of evidence, as well, that women of the upper classes intervened with their husbands and petitioned other lords on behalf of their servants and friends: women therefore could exercise a degree of public political power as well as economic. The most effective of these publicly active women, however, were usually
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praised through a negation of their femininity: they were admired as “manly” and were considered miraculous or at the least atypical exceptions.\footnote{Barbara Harris, “Women and Politics in Early Tudor England.” \textit{The Historical Journal} 33:2 (1990): 281.}

Another major arena of female power was religious influence. Again, this often acted through the affective influence of women on their family members, but it was also strictly spiritual influence. A woman could, and many did, claim to have received a mystical vision, or to have witnessed a miracle, either while at home or on pilgrimage. These religious experiences, when deemed legitimate, gave women a certain accepted authority, but only if they attributed it all to God, rather than to any wisdom or virtue of their own.\footnote{Leigh Ann Craig, \textit{Wandering Women and Holy Matrons: Women as Pilgrims in the Later Middle Ages}, Boston: Brill, 2009, 127-8, 266.}

Women’s other primary source of public power, which in the eyes of men was both strong and threatening, was their beauty, and their use of that beauty to manipulate and control men. According to Korhonen’s study, while early modern men wanted women in the public spaces of the city, for the men’s visual enjoyment, they were also made vulnerable by female presence. As noted above, men were not thought to control their own sexual impulses, so women’s presence made men less ordered in public. The most threatening potential in women’s presence and beauty, however, was romantic love; while sexual attraction could still be understood within a narrative of male domination, romantic love gave women a power over men’s hearts and will, causing male emotional anxiety, which was unacceptable to society. Women, in these scenarios, were seen to have the agency, and therefore to have power over men in a public setting. Women caused themselves to be seen, by appearing in public, “male” spaces, and therefore actively instigated their effect on men. The fear was that women would become fully conscious of
power of their beauty over men, and begin purposely empowering themselves, to men’s detriment.  

Women also had power in medieval society through the more subtle means of familial influence. Historians have pointed to the significant influence women could have on public affairs, through their discussions with husbands and sons about political and economic matters, and through their role in arranging the often politically significant marriages of their children. It is even possible, as Wrightson and Pugh argued separately, that theoretical adherence or lip-service to male control and female submission may have masked “a strong complementary and compassionate ethos.” Ryan suggests that it is unclear on which side of the border between public and private that ultimate power truly amasses. Vickery, meanwhile, while accepting the institutional limitations on women’s agency, argues that women had access to public power as they understood it, i.e. they were behind the scenes, but not at all powerless to affect the public sphere. Harris, furthermore, argues that women cycled through a number of roles in their lives, each one of which held different scope and contexts for public power.

While women’s power could definitely be seen as existing on a continuum of public to private, which varied according to marital status, class, and life circumstances, there were certain types

of private power which women more consistently had in their “toolbox”. 155 The first of these was affection – the affection of a son for his mother or sister, or of a husband for his wife. Women could “exploit” their personal relationships with their husbands, brothers, or sons to lobby for their interests. 156 In relationships between husbands and wives, the power of women’s beauty, felt to be so potent in public spaces, could also be used to the wife’s advantage in private space. 157

Whether the woman used emotion, logic, or both to win her point, social, economic, and political matters were often her end in negotiations with the men in her life. There were, however, some areas of private space which were both mainly in the control of the women, and had significant public implications. Upper-class women, for example, were largely in charge of the management of the castle or great household, with their many male servants and substantial administrative and financial oversight tasks. 158 This household management, especially the hiring and firing of personnel, with the sometimes large social and political implications such human resource decisions could have in the close patronage networks of medieval England, could lead to a great deal of female influence in the public sphere – though through the nominally “private” area of household management. 159

Another arena of private power for women was that of emotional and physical intimacy – the private spaces of familial and marital vulnerability. In the Middle Ages, women took care of the kids, took care of the home, the physical space in which sex happens, and most of love happens. It is the physical space of familiarity, which is in its most intimate sense the state of being acquainted with the tiniest facets of a person – daily rhythms, daily moods, emotions, feelings, their physical being, flaws, habits, vulnerabilities. It is perhaps too easy to overlook such details of daily emotional and relational life in the past, but they were undoubtedly vastly important for those living through it. The emotional life of the home and family was central to people’s lives, as it is to most people’s lives today. It is important as well, however, to consider the extent to which this micro-history of emotions may have affected power relationships among the sexes at the macro level. If home is the region of vulnerability, the space in which emotional vulnerability was safe – what did this mean for larger society? If that space of vulnerability and intimacy was largely controlled by women, what did it mean for men?

Often in gender studies is can be too easy to think about the ‘other’ – that is, other than white, socially dominant men. But aspects of men’s experience have also been neglected due to the patriarchal emphasis on certain depictions of masculinity. In the dominant historical discourse, men are seen as political, military, and economic actors. Not as people who are emotionally vulnerable and physically vulnerable in certain situations. A major context of potential male emotional and physical vulnerability is the male/female relationship. While certainly the power dynamic was lopsided economically, politically, and in terms of sheer physical strength, when romance is involved, when a man is in love, he exposes his heart to the possibility of rejection. Though patriarchy in the Middle Ages took a specific form, medieval men were human, and
could feel as rejected and helpless in love as a man today who is hurt by a lover. The same is also true of physical vulnerability. In the sex act, a man is exposed, literally, to the woman, and, like her, his most vulnerable parts are shown.

There could also be great power, on the part of women, in managing familial relationships. While it is important to emphasize the women’s agency in a context where such authority was seldom found, it is also significant that this could create interpersonal dynamics in which the men of the family were vulnerable. Like the sexual and romantic relationship, where a man made himself exposed to the woman emotionally and physically, the familial relationships managed by a woman could also put men in an inferior and vulnerable position. If women have historically been the caretakers of the private spaces of familial and emotional intimacy, then they have been, to a degree, the protectors of men in men’s states of vulnerability. While men have theoretically protected women through their economic, political, and military production, women have in turn, perhaps, protected men emotionally and even physically, in providing a safe space for intimacy. In this area of the private realm, therefore, women could hold, or have the potential for, a great deal of power.

Despite these major contexts for female power, these arena were, ultimately, in the legal control of the men. By custom, women did much of this work, and played the caretaking role, but the final say if a dispute arose was the man’s. Coverture meant that the legal authority over property was the man’s, and this ultimate control must have affected the degree of freedom

women felt within their relationships. Furthermore, husbands who were abusive could actually make the theoretically protective fortress of private domestic space, a nightmare for their spouses. Several scholars have remarked that in many cases, public places, open to the eyes of neighbors and strangers, may have been safer for women than domestic privacy. The concept of refuge, of course, requires the definition of "refuge from what?" In such circumstances, women may have had very little power in private space.

Characteristics of Female Mobility in Medieval England

The study of women’s mobility is intimately intertwined with these varied contexts of public and private power. In domestic abuse situations, a woman’s freedom and safety could hinge on whether she could move outside of her house, whether that movement was legitimated by the circumstances, or whether that movement in itself carried consequences to her safety. Widows, on the other hand, who had legal control of property or businesses, could in many cases only fully assert that control through visiting their lands and meeting with tenants and businessmen. Wives whose power rested mainly in familial influence, still were generally active in maintaining social-cum-political networks which were crucial to their husbands’ and their families’ livelihoods. Social visits to others’ houses were a major method of maintaining such ties.

Lower-class women almost invariably had to move about the streets of their city to shop, do

---


laundry, or walk to their employers’ residence or workshop. Mobility was an essential ingredient of their livelihood. Despite the prevalent need of medieval English women to move about the city and countryside, they faced restrictions on where, exactly, they could go, with whom, at what time, and for what reasons. Women who ignored these rules faced sometimes severe consequences, risking their safety, reputations, and even lives.

The Desire for Mobility

While it is not likely that all women in medieval England questioned and felt consciously limited by the spatial boundaries they were given, the literature suggests that some certainly did. Moralist literature of the period consistently assumed that women sought mobility. These authors believed that women desired this for the greater ease of illicit sexual connections and prideful fashion display that mobility allowed.\(^{163}\) Even the period’s protofeminist writer, Christine de Pizan, condemned women’s desire to pilgrimage “in order to frolic and kick up their heels in jolly company”, and their will to go “trotting about town as is the custom”.\(^{164}\) Some writers believed that women made vows of pilgrimage precisely and primarily to escape the domestic sphere.\(^{165}\) Women (and men with them) were castigated for travelling due to curiosity, “the needless examination of worldly things which do not help one to attain salvation”.\(^{166}\) Some moralists asserted that women desired mobility in public in order to display their beauty and

---


\(^{164}\) Ibid., 73.


thereby have undue influence over men.\textsuperscript{167} Regardless of their supposed motives for movement, the repeated calls for women to be spatially limited indicates that these limitations were consistently challenged. It is clear that women desired greater mobility in urban and geographical space, or the literature would not be filled with rules for their containment.

**Geographic Restrictions**

At the core of mobility restrictions were spatial restrictions – limitations regarding the gendered use of space. This paper has outlined some of the major delineations of gendered space in medieval England, particularly in a public/private conceptualization. The specifics of geographical restrictions on women’s presence in the public realm were much more complicated, however. When women moved beyond their “normal” space, into “male” spaces, they did so with an awareness of the intricate rules governing transgressive and non-transgressive female presence in each of those types of spaces. The city streets, for example, had different rules than taverns, and those had different rules than long-distance inter-city roads.

Streets are fundamentally both borders between the public and private, and public spaces themselves. The margins of streets include the thresholds of homes and private space, but these were permeable – dotted with doorways and windows at which women, ostensibly in their private realm, might converse with others in the public space of the streets. In medieval London, doors and windows were common locations for conversation and female sociability.\textsuperscript{168} As public spaces, the streets themselves contained women as well, for a variety of reasons. Lower-class


women used the street network to gather water at the well, shop for food, and visit friends and family. They also did laundry in public spaces, including fountains, and in London, women brought their clothing to the Thames bank to wash. Women also moved along city streets in pursuit of wayward children or animals. Midwives would move about the city to assist with childbirth, and well-known female healers would be called to nurse the sick. Some of the poorest women sold ale and small goods in makeshift booths or blankets on the streets, and others offered their services as laundresses for hire, collecting dirty clothing door-to-door.

Wealthier women were seen on the streets less often; they sent their servants to run errands and make purchases, and asked artisans to bring fine good to their homes for choice and purchase. They did, however, travel locally to visit friends and family, or to conduct personal or familial business. Korhonen finds, as well, that some public places, namely the middle aisle of St Paul’s Cathedral, were well-known as places to show off one’s fine clothing and see others: to see and be seen. Even in Italy, where women led much more secluded lives, middle class and gentlewomen could be seen carrying on business around the city.
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172 Ibid., 295.
England in fact had a reputation in the Middle Ages for being a place where women of all classes moved more freely in the streets than in other parts of Europe.\textsuperscript{178} In fact, women were so prevalent that moralists warned about too many women “gadding about” the streets.\textsuperscript{179} The many regulations about women’s clothing and behavior in public also indicates that they were a significant presence on the streets.\textsuperscript{180} The women of London were known for their beauty as well as their visibility, and visitors to the city looked forward to them almost as a tourist attraction.\textsuperscript{181}

According to Korhonen’s study, the display and objectification of female beauty was in fact one of the main uses of the street. Because of the belief, described earlier, that women were the active agents in the male gaze, women’s presence on city streets was seen by moralist writers as a purposeful solicitation of men’s attention. “There was an assumption that seeing meant open invitation to touching. To moralists, the rationale was clear: if women consciously showed themselves, they were ready for any bodily exchange.”\textsuperscript{182} Women’s presence on the streets was therefore a result of their pride (i.e. their belief in their own beauty), and their lust (i.e. their active attempt to solicit male attention and touch through the display of that beauty).\textsuperscript{183} Conversely, the streets were used by men as places to gaze on, woo, and ogle beautiful women, partly for the pleasure of it, but partly as well, as a performance of masculinity, which was ever defined in relation to, in fact usually in opposition to, the feminine. As a result, women on the
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streets, whatever their class, were in many ways seen as a “service industry” present primarily to indulge men’s desires, and act as tools to create male identity.\textsuperscript{184}

Aside from this sexual and gender role, medieval streets were also used as the physical foundation of social networks. Functioning much like the physical wires upon which the modern internet depends, the streets served as the channels of personal and affective energy which bound the city’s social life together. Information flowed along them, as did acquaintance, social favors, and friendship.\textsuperscript{185} Marriage contracts and courtship generally did not occur physically in the open streets (carrying there too much association with prostitution), but the negotiations surrounding marital arrangements might flow back and forth along them.\textsuperscript{186}

Markets were more physical embodiments of this social networking – acting as real locations where strangers might see each other regularly over a course of years. They were also sites of \textit{encounter} (in the sense of Fincher and Iveson, above) with diverse others. Markets drew in the well-to-do, artisans, peasants, merchants, clerics, outsiders, locals, and both men and women.\textsuperscript{187} They were therefore important destinations for, and locations of women’s mobility in medieval London.

Despite the presence of a variety of women on London’s streets, there were limitations to their movement. The casual saleswomen hawking their wares or laundry services door-to-door were

suspected of immoral acts, and legal measures were instituted to limit their use of public
space. 188 Women also were discouraged from moving around the city at night, since it was both
dangerous and risked one’s reputation. 189 Hanawalt’s research also shows that there were
limitations in geographic scope of urban movement for all kinds of women in medieval London.
Her study finds that although working class and upper class women mingled with men in the
streets to a degree, they tended to stay much closer to home than men, and for the most part
remained in their immediate neighborhood. 190 This was partly a response to male attitudes
towards women’s movement: there is a great deal of evidence in the advice literature that men
were uneasy when women moved beyond their normal city quarter. 191

Within the public realm of the medieval city, there were also public buildings, taverns – which
were open to women and governed by both spoken and unspoken rules about women’s presence.
The literature is mixed in its assessment of these spaces in relation to women. Hanawalt notes
their ambiguous nature, being both public, as a place for strangers, and private, as a home-like
space where women’s domestic work expanded beyond their family’s needs to the service of
strange men. There were sexual connotations to this servicing and the proximity of men and
women in domestic-like settings. For this reason, women associated with taverns, she claims,
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had bad reputations. McSheffrey, however, finds no such disapproval of female tavern visitors, so long as they were there accompanied by appropriate men. Interestingly, such appropriate men could include those trying to court her. Indeed, taverns were very often the site of betrothals and even marriages among the lower classes. The evidence McSheffrey relates makes it clear that such agreements in tavern settings had no stain of disrespectability about them. Taverns were in fact respectable lower class locations for courtship. Upper-middle class women’s marriage-making would be more supervised by their families, but even they would appear in taverns from time to time, with male relatives, often in celebration of something like a betrothal. Despite the presence of women, however, taverns were by and large male and public spaces. Women had to be careful to follow social rules about behavior and suitable companions in these public spaces, as much as they did on the streets.

Long-distance travel, and especially pilgrimage, were also permutations of women’s mobility that were immersed in a matrix of gendered social rules. Women certainly did travel outside of their towns in medieval England. Women of the nobility had the time and money to travel, and often visited friends, attended court, travelled to London for family business, and even their own alternative homes, all of which could require journeys several days in length. Occasionally,

they would even travel to visit relatives in other countries. Their radius of travel expanded as they aged, or as they progressed along the “uxorial cycle” – from maiden to young wife to experienced wife, to widow. They also travelled for marriage itself – to join a new husband at his property.

Women of lower ranks were more limited by lack of money and time. Women of the artisan and merchant classes also were limited to their own cities for business. They might travel further afield for family reasons, but widows who took over their husband’s businesses would not, as a rule, personally take their goods to fairs or other towns for sale. The poorest and most marginal women, however, often had a great deal more mobility – as vagrants, beggars, camp followers, and strolling players.

Pilgrimage was another popular reason for travel by all ranks of women, one that was widely acceptable and gave women greater scope for mobility than other justifications for travel. A great deal of pilgrimages by women of all classes seem to have been to visit local shrines. These shrines proliferated through the later Middle Ages, as the cult of saints became a more prominent
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part of medieval Christianity.\textsuperscript{201} Women consistently made up a large proportion of pilgrims throughout the period, and may have constituted almost half of local pilgrimages.\textsuperscript{202} While local and even national shrines attracted a variety of female visitors, the longer-distance pilgrimages to Rome and especially Jerusalem were expensive and time-consuming enough to prevent all but the rich (and their servant-companions), or nuns, from travelling.\textsuperscript{203} Men were also much more likely to undertake the Rome and Holy Land pilgrimages than were women.\textsuperscript{204}

Much of the gender differences in pilgrimage attempts is due to the differing reasons for those journeys, and the acceptability of certain justifications for men’s travel, on the one hand, and women’s on the other. Women were much more likely than men to go on a pilgrimage seeking help for others – particularly for members of their family. These appeals to a saint for a miracle, or thanks for one that already occurred, were much more likely to have been done locally, and sometimes at further-off shrines. Very rarely did a pilgrim travel as far as Rome or Jerusalem seeking a cure or paying a debt of gratitude for one. Instead, these very long-distance pilgrimages were primarily done for devotional reasons, to deepen the person’s religious life, and to collect indulgences which would help in the afterlife.\textsuperscript{205} It was well within gender norms for men to pursue such religious self-fulfillment, but women were expected to justify their travel with a family-oriented rationale. Even when women did seek a saint’s help for some ailment of their own, they often emphasized the negative effect of the illness on their ability to fulfill

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{202} Ibid., 9, 261.
  \item \textsuperscript{203} Ibid., 140.
\end{itemize}
household duties. Even when a woman was sick, therefore, it was only fully acceptable for her to travel in search of a cure (or in thanks for a cure), if others were suffering.\textsuperscript{206}

The Rome and Jerusalem pilgrimages were much more difficult to fit into this intercessory role, or any other socially acceptable female roles, so fewer women pursued them, and the ones who did faced both more resistance beforehand, and more discomfort and unwelcome during the journey. Medieval pilgrims travelled in groups, and women travelling to the Holy Land or even Rome were often excluded from groups of men, or, if reluctantly allowed to join the other travelers, were expected to stay quiet and invisible, unless performing “female” roles such as taking care of the sick or mending clothing. If they transgressed these expectations, they were seen as annoying, intrusive, and even worthy of abandonment.\textsuperscript{207} Women continued to pursue these long-distance, devotional-type pilgrimages, however.\textsuperscript{208} Clearly a major reason was the opportunity they provided for deep and unmediated spiritual experiences.\textsuperscript{209} Another was very likely the pretext for travel and exploration that pilgrimage offered to adventurous women.\textsuperscript{210}

Whatever the motives for pilgrimage, or for travel in general, women’s justifications and decisions had to fit within certain prescribed guidelines in order to be considered acceptable by society, and they had to fulfill certain prerequisites in order to go. Vows of pilgrimage were taken very seriously by medieval society. They were seen as legally binding contracts with the saint of the shrine the person vowed pilgrimage to, and reneging was seen as cheating the saint –
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which had serious religious and social consequences.\textsuperscript{211} So serious were such vows, that they were not made lightly – particularly vows of pilgrimage to Rome or Jerusalem, which bound the pilgrim to a great financial burden.\textsuperscript{212} Despite the contractual nature of the vow, anyone (male or female) wishing to go on a pilgrimage was required to get the permission of his or her spouse. The “marital debt” was seen as a real obligation, and only agreement to release the pilgrim from that for a specified time could allow the pilgrim to begin her journey. It could be difficult to obtain this permission, however, and many female pilgrims either bargained with their husbands for release, convinced their husbands to travel as well, or waited until they were widows to go on pilgrimage.\textsuperscript{213}

Even when women’s pilgrimage or other types of travel were seen as roughly justified, they faced discomfort and even danger on the road. On the devotional pilgrimages to Rome and Jerusalem, often seen as less justified for women, they were subject to strong negative attitudes and treatment by men, and occasionally even rejection of their company, or abandonment.\textsuperscript{214} They sought to minimize the discomfort by acting meek and humble around men, by keeping company with other women as much as possible, and by avoiding public areas.\textsuperscript{215} Women travelling also faced violent robbery, illness and death far from home, and accidents at land and sea.\textsuperscript{216} Medieval travel was dangerous for anyone, but the wealthy could minimize the risks by
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hiring guards, and this gave them a greater degree of mobility.\textsuperscript{217} There were some institutional protections, however, for poorer travelers – as long as they travelled as part of a pilgrimage. Trips to Jerusalem had become an organized tour-group industry by the fourteenth century, with the journeys advertised in information offices in Rome, and setting forth from Venice. These tours of the Holy Land, led by Venetians, were given official sanction by the Muslim governments of the area, and therefore provided a level of protection for the travelers not available to those who wandered alone.\textsuperscript{218} Within Europe, pilgrims were also protected legally and by custom could seek protection and shelter within all monasteries and churches.\textsuperscript{219} Individual pilgrims also banded together and sometimes helped one another, as shown by the offer of a noblewoman to welcome the famous English pilgrim Margery Kempe into her retinue on the way to Rome, and help pay for her food.\textsuperscript{220}

**Justifying Women’s Mobility**

Regardless of the final assessment about a specific woman’s travels, the long-distance mobility of women *in general* continued to be a source of social anxiety. It was the potential for women’s unsupervised mobility which worried men the most.\textsuperscript{221} “Wandering women”, as Craig puts it, were believed to endanger their own souls, the stability of their families, and their personal well-being.\textsuperscript{222} They used financial resources which should have gone to their family’s needs, they put themselves in physical danger on the road, and, as the morally frail beings they were assumed to
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be, they put themselves in the way of temptation to sin.\textsuperscript{223} Beyond these concrete reasons grew an amorphous resistance to the idea of women’s travel, women’s “wandering”, which was exhibited in didactic literature and verse, creating a permeating climate of hostility towards women’s mobility.\textsuperscript{224}

There were some acceptable reasons for women’s movement outside of the home and neighborhood, however, and these generally reflected the needs of the household or family as a whole, as opposed to an individual woman’s wishes for adventure, exercise, knowledge, or any other personal gain. Women could be seen on the streets of a city for a variety of reasons, as noted above, and most of these related to the economic, social and medical needs of their families or those of their masters. Attendance at religious services in town was also an acceptable motive for movement in the urban streets, and women might even leave village or town to visit nearby churches known for preaching or indulgences.\textsuperscript{225}

Female pilgrimage to more distant locations required a higher standard of justification. Moralists claimed that travelling for pleasure, whether for devotions or curiosity, only led to a woman’s sin and shame.\textsuperscript{226} Generally speaking, women’s pilgrimage could only be considered acceptable if it was seen as an act of caregiving, and, if it was for the woman herself, if it was an initially reluctant act, acceded to only after divine or familial insistence. This passivity was important –
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women could not be seen in these cases as having any agency in the decision. Women who vowed pilgrimage to help heal a family member, however, did display a degree of agency in making the vow, and their spiritual intercession (when it successfully produced a miracle) did give them a degree of status in their community.\textsuperscript{227} Even when acting on behalf of her family, however, a woman was seen as an “empty vessel” or conduit for the transmission of divine grace, through her to her family.\textsuperscript{228}

This intercessory role was the primary acceptable justification for women’s pilgrimage, whether seeking help at the shrine, or giving thanks for a miracle resulted after prayer to a saint. A far higher percentage of women’s pilgrimages were on behalf of family members than were men’s. The travel was seen as especially justified if the person who benefited from the woman’s journey was a man – whether son, husband, or other.\textsuperscript{229} The illness or death (and resurrection) of a child were other main motivators for women’s pilgrimage, and these were seen as natural and unquestionably justified, extending as they did from the woman’s traditional role as caregiver.\textsuperscript{230} Even pilgrimage in search of healing for the woman herself was often framed as a type of intercession on behalf of her household or family, which was affected by her pain and debilitation. Problems with pregnancy or childbirth were easily justified, since they threatened the basis of family and the core of the women’s role in the home.\textsuperscript{231} Other illnesses or ailments, however, only justified pilgrimage when the pain was so great as to stand in the way of her performance of household, marital, and family duties. Only when the woman’s sickness became
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a problem for others, was her seeking a cure seen as acceptable to medieval society.\textsuperscript{232} So great was the emphasis on caregiving roles in female pilgrimage, that even those women who set out on devotional journeys to Rome and the Holy Land for personal fulfillment, often assumed such roles on the road, such as nursing the sick, in order to ease the resentful resistance of male fellow travelers.\textsuperscript{233} Whether in local or long-distance pilgrimages, then, women’s mobility could be considered by medieval society as justified, as long as it was seen as a necessary and logical extension of normal female roles and daily duties within the home.\textsuperscript{234} The same was true of women’s movement within urban spaces, and generally for the travel of aristocratic women between town and country – all were justified with reference to the woman’s traditional roles as mother, caregiver, and household manager.\textsuperscript{235} Women’s mobility in medieval England was therefore not an escape from the traditional female gender role, but a carefully justified manifestation of it, in circumstances of somewhat reduced male supervision.

\textbf{Signifiers of Acceptable Mobility}

Even in their mobility in public spaces, somewhat free of architectural limitation and supervision by known men, women were subject to expectations about their behavior and dress that served to limit their mobility further, by controlling how that mobility was manifested on a minute scale. In public spaces, medieval society often sought to distinguish between women who had honor and social status, and were thus unavailable for casual sexual encounters without serious social,
economic, and political repercussions to the pursuing man (i.e. expected marriage or consequences to social and political networks), and those women whose conquest a (higher-status) man could attempt without potential impact to his standing in society. The main ways of distinguishing (or for men, determining) women’s level of appropriate sexual availability were the clothing she wore, her behavior and eye contact with men, and the types and number of companions she moved with.

The easiest way to distinguish sexually available women from those who were off limits, was to ensure that women with “honor” were surrounded by a shield of male company as long as they were in public. Women had more mobility when accompanied by husbands, male kin, or hired guards. With such companions, they could enter taverns and move more widely within the city without compromising their reputations, and go on longer-distance pilgrimages without risking the dangers and sexual temptations of the road.\(^{236}\)

Clothing was a more complicated marker, indicating in subtle ways both status and availability, two distinguishing signifiers which were intricately linked. Women with higher economic, political and social status wore noble and upper-middle class clothing, made of finer materials, with finer detailing. Sumptuary laws throughout the Middle Ages attempted to enforce the limitation of such luxurious clothing to the upper classes only, but as merchant and artisan groups in London became wealthier, they aspired to the fashions and tastes of the upper class. The number of reiterations of clothing legislation indicates the prevalence of cross-class dressing in medieval England, and suggests the high importance to the upper class of being able to

determine in a moment who, in a public space, was an equal, and who was of lower status.

Medieval England was a highly class-based society, and all social interaction within it was informed and determined by the hierarchy and relative status of the individuals in an encounter. As with all areas of medieval female mobility, the clothing women wore on the streets was embedded in a complicated matrix of class and gender, and an individual woman’s fashion choices could hold great sexual meaning.

Medieval women were warned that any tight, low-cut, or flashy clothing could send signals of willingness to have an affair, or signify that an affair was already in progress. Overly colorful clothing was associated with prostitutes, who were required to wear hoods of multicolored cloth to “maintain truth in advertising” – that is, to ensure that any man conversing or carousing with a prostitute in public would do so fully aware of the circumstances and potential consequences to his reputation. Somber clothing projected an air of untouchability, as did wearing headdresses and veils, which served to protect the private space around the woman. These veils and hoods limited others’ view of the woman, and strictly limited her own ability to look at the world around her, and especially to make eye contact with unknown men.

---


The problem of eye contact was a central one in regards to female mobility. There was sexual danger in it. The meeting of male and female eyes, even the briefest glance, could, it was believed, spark an affair. A woman who purposefully made eye contact with an unknown man was openly inviting invasion of her personal space and contact with her body. Eye contact and gazing at surroundings also had connotations of dominance, an inappropriate attitude for women. While men were encouraged by medieval advice literature to look around them, and make eye contact with those they passed, as means to assert dominance and impress others, women were enjoined to “preserve their private space” in public areas by keeping their heads down and looking only at the path in front of them, thereby maintaining an air of modesty.

The impact of eye movements was echoed by women’s expected deportment and behavior. When walking in public places, they should keep a somber attitude, never laughing or stopping to talk to acquaintances, never changing plans spontaneously, but always adhering to their predetermined tasks and destinations. Female pilgrims, when travelling with to Jerusalem with males, were expected to remain “invisible” through their silence, modesty, and containment in limited physical spaces of the ship. The same behavioral and spatial limitations may have faced women travelling with male groups on land within Europe.

---
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Hanawalt argues that with a combination of proper clothing and behavior, and limited eye contact, women could preserve a private space around them even as they moved into public areas. By limiting their eye contact, they limited their participation in public space, and by doing so, they kept “spatial decorum”. This fascinating observation suggests that in some sense, private space was believed to be portable. Many scholars, as discussed above, have argued against a strict division of public and private spheres in medieval Europe, claiming that that theoretical dichotomy never existed fully anywhere, and was only conceptually important in the Victorian era. The notion of the portability of private space in medieval England, however, suggests not simply that public and private were enmeshed and overlapping. Instead, its suggests both the permeability of public and private space in medieval England, and its strict gendering.

By and large, medieval women did not act in public space without reference to the private roles considered appropriate to their sex. I argue that they were still contained in a private sphere – but they brought that portable private sphere with them into the public arena. As discussed by Hanawalt, this could be done through limitations on eye contact, clothing, and behavior which signified the continuance of female private space in public settings. It could also be effected through rhetoric, as even the greatest of aristocratic ladies justified their involvement in public political and economic actions with reference to their private roles as mother, sister or wife.

This was also, as discussed above, a primary justification for women’s pilgrimages – without which their motives were deemed suspect and their reception by male pilgrims was chilly. Even nuns often couched their public actions in justifications based on “family” needs – referring to

---


the abbess or prioress as mother to the convent. Only widows seem to have been somewhat exempt from the need to justify their public actions through private rhetoric.

**Consequences of Transgressing Normal Gendered Space**

Women who chose to move beyond the geographical boundaries of normal “female” space without acceptable justification, attire, or demeanor, faced consequences to their safety and reputation. Female pilgrims who were seen to act inappropriately or who traveled for reasons seen as unjustified could be treated with outright contempt and abuse, could be refused entry to shrines, and might even be abandoned by their travel groups and left to make their way alone on risky roads. Rape was a prominent and seemingly justified fear for women who were forced into solitary travel. Even in cities, women who strayed from their normal urban quarter, moved without suitable male companions, walked without proper headdresses, wore tight clothing, looked about them while they walked, or made eye contact with unknown men, risked reprimands, ridicule, harassment, and even sexual assault.

**Discussion**

The literature suggests that women’s mobility in medieval England was only considered justified and acceptable when it was done for others, when it otherwise played out normal female caretaking roles, and when it was done in a way that maintained a level of private space around

---


the woman, protecting her from encounter with unknown men and therefore from a potential
sexual union which might threaten her family’s reputation and inheritance lines, and through
them, the larger social order. Women’s movement outside of normal female (and private) space
was not, therefore, an escape from standard female roles. Indeed, I argue that private space could
move with female space, and therefore with the female body. Only women who disregarded
social rules about eye contact, clothing, submissiveness, companions, and justifications for
movement – that is, only women who declined to bring private space with them – escaped
traditional gender roles. In doing so, they put their bodies and reputations at risk.

Women who did follow these rules, keeping private space with them through the rhetoric of
family and care, or through behavioral and clothing signifiers, did not challenge the norms, but
only stretched the boundaries and circumstances in which these norms could be applied. That is
not to say that some women were not consciously situating their justifications within the
traditional female roles in order to gain more freedom, but it certainly was not a declaration of
women’s rights to choose their own roles. In this respect, the theoretical approaches of Lefebvre,
Sandercock, and Fincher and Iveson regarding the right to the city and the right to encounter –
with the surprise, risk, and difference in slightly disordered public spaces, as a means to
constantly recreate one’s individual identity – these seem irrelevant to the mindset of medieval
England, which sought social and sexual order through spatial separation, and when that wasn’t
possible, symbolic separation of men and women who were strangers to one another. Encounter
between men and women undoubtedly did occur as women moved about the urban street, or
travelled on pilgrimage, but it was strongly discouraged, and even legislated against.
A major means of controlling this encounter with strangers, and especially strange men, was symbolic separation through clothing and behavior, discouraging interaction and especially touch – and therefore creating geographic separation at a much smaller scale than is normally investigated in studies of social segregation. “Women’s” space, “private” space, the space of acceptable physical intimacy, which were all linked together in the medieval mindset, were portable. Each woman on a medieval street could therefore be seen as a bubble of intimacy, privacy, and sexual potential, moving through the male public space of dominance and power. These bubbles might engage with the world of dominance to a degree, but they did so from behind the shield of the traditional female gender role, in the process protecting both their own femininity, and the masculinity of the men around them.

This analysis suggests that there were indeed “separate spheres” for men and women in the Middle Ages. When we allow for the potential portability of private space, the gendering of public and private does look very much like separate spheres – with the women being limited to the private realm of care and intimacy, which they must bring with them in order to interact acceptably with the (male) public realm of economics, politics, and encounter with strangers. While this has a limiting sense, it is also expansive, as it allowed a greater scope of mobility, the greater the amount of private space brought by the woman – whether through private/family justifications, eye contact and behavior limiting interaction, or untouchability signified by clothing or companions.

This portability of private space, and the viability of the “separate spheres” approach in this context, has implications for the idea of women’s degree of “right to the city” and right to
encounter. Can we say that women had any right to the city when they could only move about it, or in other geographic space, with certain privately-oriented justifications, behaviors, and clothing? Certainly, they had no freedom to be themselves in public space and maintain their safety and social reputation, but were constrained to gender roles to avoid trouble.

These social theories of mobility, encounter, and the right to the city are therefore useful in providing a new framework for the examination of medieval women’s mobility. They encourage a perspective that takes into account difference, the uncontrolled meeting of “others”, the characteristics of spatial use which allow for such encounters, and the maintenance of a “good society” in the face of interaction and conflict.

While these social theories of mobility, encounter, and the right to space in the city assume conceptualizations of individual freedom which were far beyond the norms of medieval English society, interesting and innovative research questions arise from adopting their perspectives. The most prominent of these is, to what extent was medieval women’s scope of mobility conditioned by practical circumstances, such as access to wealth and other resources, and to what extent was it instead conditioned by elements of the “portable” private sphere women brought with them, such as the (portable) rhetorical “private” of the justifications for travel, and the (portable) physical “private” of veils and other clothing signifiers which created spatial distance? A comprehensive answer to this question is beyond the scope of this thesis, therefore this study addresses a set of specific sub-questions which can be investigated through a case study of selected medieval sources.
First, I examine the distance of women’s journeys and distribution of their geographical origins. Did women have the same scope of travel as men? How much did women’s journeys differ in length from men’s journeys? Were there differences in the geographical concentration of men’s and women’s origin towns, other than distance? Next, I investigate the degree to which the neighborhood and alternative travel choices affected women’s journeys. To what extent was women’s travel to one pilgrimage site limited by their own home’s proximity to other pilgrimage sites? Did women who had nearby access to a pilgrimage location tend to travel less to larger, more distant pilgrimage sites? That is, was travel based on access to any spiritual “services”, or did women exercise a greater scope of agency over the choice of their pilgrimage destination? With these questions, I continue to explore the concept of portable privacy, and work toward a more thorough understanding of women’s mobility in medieval England.
Chapter 3. Methodology

Given the variety of justifications and signifiers indentified in the literature as impacting women’s mobility, a spatial analysis of women’s long-distance travel will greatly contribute to our understanding of the context of medieval women’s freedom of movement. While Geographic Information Systems (GIS) have been used in urban planning to address a wide range of questions about the modern world, especially regarding land use, transportation, access to services, racial segregation, and socioeconomic patterns, its use in historical research has been somewhat more limited.

GIS and Historical GIS

At its core, GIS is an approach to investigating how spatial patterns (human, natural, or man-made) vary across the surface of the Earth.²⁵² It allows for the analysis of a variety of data sets, and their integration through coordinate locations. It works with two types of location-related data – either objects (such as buildings, streets, towns, or landmarks) or continuous fields (such as elevation or population density).²⁵³ Such data sets contain spatial data – the location of counties, towns, continent boundaries, pollution readings, and elevations, to name a few. This is the where of geographical information systems. In addition to the purely spatial data, however,

the data sets also include *attribute* data – the *what* of GIS. What exists at a location is as important for GIS as where it is. In the examples noted above, the what would be the name of the county, town, or continent at that location, the meters or miles from sea level indicating elevation, or the pollution readings taken at that spot. Such spatial information is necessary when we are interested in understanding not only the variation of some phenomenon, but also the location of that variation.\(^\text{254}\)

GIS is essentially a geographical database management system, combining several different location data sets into one system which is conducive to integrated analysis.\(^\text{255}\) Mapping is perhaps the best-known application of GIS, and it does create effective visualizations. It’s primary purpose, however, is analysis of data. The integration of data sets through geographic coordinates allows for comparisons of geographically-related information in tables, and statistical summaries of spatial relationships, which can often be most effectively communicated through graphs.\(^\text{256}\) The mapping capacity can also be used to analyze and compare data, however. Visualization of spatial relationships in maps can be used in an exploratory way, to reveal geographic trends not seen initially, and to suggest new hypotheses or new potentially fruitful analyses.\(^\text{257}\) This integrated data management, manipulation, and spatial analysis system is the major advantage of GIS for dealing with location-related information.


Geographical information systems have great potential to contribute to historical research.\textsuperscript{258} As Gregory and Ell state, “Space…frequently determines the arrangement of how people interact with each other, and with the natural and man-made environment.”\textsuperscript{259} Spatial analysis, therefore, is key to understanding many factors in human history. Due to the complexity of dealing with many sets of location-related data, analysis of spatial patterns, especially of non-aggregate information, was often neglected by past historians. GIS and its related computer software is ideally suited to such large and complex spatial data sets. However, there are some disadvantages of GIS for historical analysis. The cost of setting up a project can be high, especially if one is involved in the creation of large databases – but also for the basic computer hardware and software requirements. Historical spatial data sets such as geographical boundary files for vanished kingdoms or long-covered medieval roads are also rare and must often be made from scratch by the researcher. Compared with the modern urban planner, who can usually download shape files of roads, building plots, bus routes, vegetation zones, rivers, utility networks, and many other data sets directly from a municipality website, the medieval historian has no such luxury. Even hand-drawn maps of a medieval town are rare, necessitating extensive archival research into land ownership documents to identify property boundaries and city street-plan features.\textsuperscript{260} Attribute data, such as that collected in national tax surveys like the English Domesday book of 1086, does exist, but was only collected occasionally. They can also contain inconsistencies, incomplete sections, inaccuracies, and ambiguities. Such uncertainty is not


\textsuperscript{260} One such archival study was excellent survey of medieval Winchester, with an extensive set of detailed property and street maps – none of which have, as far as I know, been converted into GIS shapefiles and database. See Derek Keene and Alexander R. Rumble. Survey of Medieval Winchester (2 vols). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
easily dealt with in GIS, but historians have long developed strategies for dealing with them, which can be applied in a GIS context.\textsuperscript{261}

Because GIS is at its best when dealing with extensive data sets, historical GIS work has mostly been skewed toward questions making use of large volumes of census, tax, and population data. There is nothing in GIS preventing its use with smaller sets of data, but those working in the field have tended toward large data sets, and as a result towards the questions most easily answerable by them. As a further result, time periods in which such bulk data sets are less available, have been relatively neglected by historians who use GIS. Both factors are apparent in medieval historiography. A majority of published historical GIS work addresses the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.\textsuperscript{262} Very few medievalists have ventured into GIS, and those who have, focus primarily on agriculture, land ownership, and economics – at large geographical scales.\textsuperscript{263} Given the relatively extensive data sets available for these subjects in medieval history, such focuses are understandable. To date, however, no study has yet used GIS to focus primarily on medieval social history, let alone medieval women’s history. The present thesis is an example of how this can be done. While the available data set is smaller (compared with medieval tax and land-ownership records), the questions are as valid, and the results are as interesting.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research Question A) Did women have the same scope of travel as men? How much did women’s journeys differ in length from men’s journeys? Were there differences in the geographical concentration of men’s and women’s origin towns, other than distance?

Hypothesis 1: The length of women’s journeys to a given pilgrimage destination was shorter than the length of men’s journeys to the same destination.

Hypothesis 2: The origin towns of male and female pilgrims did not differ in geographical distribution, other than by distance or population density.

Hypothesis 3: The geographical mean of women’s origin towns was closer to the destination than that of men’s origin towns.

Hypothesis 4: Women arrived from a smaller “catchment area” around the Pilgrimage Destination than men did, and their origin towns faded more quickly outside of that catchment area than did men’s.

Research Question B) To what extent was women’s travel to one pilgrimage site limited by their own home’s proximity to other pilgrimage sites? Did women who had nearby access to a pilgrimage location tend to travel less to larger, more distant pilgrimage sites? That is, was travel based on access to any spiritual “services”, or did women exercise a greater scope of agency over the choice of their pilgrimage destination?

Hypothesis 5: The proximity of other pilgrimage sites exerted a limiting influence on the journeys of women to more distant, pilgrimage destinations, as compared to the journeys of men.

Hypothesis 6: There is a positive relationship between the distance of an origin town from an alternative pilgrimage site, and the distance traveled to the actual pilgrimage destination, particularly for women.

Data Collection

A spatial analysis of women’s mobility requires numerous records of individual journeys in order to reach a sample size large enough for meaningful comparison. Medieval people themselves rarely recorded individual persons’ movements simply for the sake of such information, as transportation planners today study individual commuting patterns, for instance, or as airlines might analyze their markets and hubs. Historians, however, specialize in innovative ways of drawing desired information out of ostensibly unrelated sources. For the study of women’s mobility, several source types have been used. McSheffrey used court records
regarding marriage contract disputes to investigate the location of betrothals and weddings in medieval London, and thereby to ascertain women’s degree of movement, and how that movement correlated with the "public" or "private" nature of space.\textsuperscript{265} Hanawalt used coroner’s inquests to examine the location of women’s accidental deaths in London and medieval English villages, and thereby to investigate the scope of women’s travel within urban and rural space, and the degree to which that movement was correlated with certain activities and justifications.\textsuperscript{266} Finally, Craig used information about female pilgrims, recorded in the miracle stories supporting the canonization of saints, to analyze the parameters under which women’s mobility was deemed acceptable.\textsuperscript{267}

While all of these source types would be excellent for a quantitative spatial analysis of women’s mobility, for the purposes of this thesis, I must be limited to one. The miracle stories of St. Thomas Becket of Canterbury and King Henry VI of England (never canonized) are available online, and are therefore readily accessible for analysis. The examples below are from the Canterbury miracles. The highlighted areas illustrate sections of text which will be mined, stored in the database, then coded for quantitative analysis. The process of mining the text consists of reading it for context as well as keywords and proper nouns. Context is particularly important in the Canterbury miracles, since the compiler used subtle phrases, substantial medical jargon, and rhetorical allusions. It can be difficult to discern through keywords only, whether a pilgrim actually arrived at Canterbury, or whether the record was second-hand or hearsay. Furthermore,

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
it can also be difficult, in a keyword search, to determine who accompanied the primary pilgrim to Canterbury. All of this information is crucial for determining who was a pilgrim (and should be included in the present study) and who was not. An example of the process is given in the first example below, which relates the story of the woman named Acelina (Mulier Acelina). She travels to Canterbury (veniens Cantuariam), with her husband Maurice (vir ejus, Mauricius), from the town of Wigewale, because of paralysis in her face, which had obscured her normally elegant face. This example contains an origin of travel, a destination, a type of companion (husband), and a justification for travel (because her beauty was diminished).

Excerpt of a miracle story.268

The second example records two women’s travels. Osanna, the abbess of Polesworth, travels with the holy woman named Bertha, who is of noble blood. The abbess travels because of an affliction in her throat, which she had gravely suffered from for a long time. Bertha may have been on the journey primarily to keep Osanna company (but that does not rule out the possibility that she may have wanted to travel or go on pilgrimage regardless).

A full miracle story.\(^{269}\)

As the foregoing demonstrates, not all miracle stories recorded the same information about pilgrims. Some, such as that in the first example, leave out class, while others, such as Bertha in the second example, leave out the reason for travel. Not all of the miracle stories contain clear

data on pilgrim sex and origin town, making the available core sample size too small for consistent and meaningful analysis of these other variables.

**Using Miracle Story Data**

One caveat to the usefulness of the miracle stories as sources is that they record only those journeys by women seen as socially acceptable to the monks who recorded them. These sources were essentially arguments in support of a holy person’s claim to sainthood, meaning that any story which might be seen as detracting from the holiness of the saint or his devotees, would have been discarded before compilation. Therefore, it is possible that larger numbers of women travelled to the pilgrimage shrines than are recorded. This limitation with the source also means that any analysis of miracle stories to discern women’s mobility is inherently biased towards the women’s mobility which was deemed *acceptable* by male clerics.²⁷⁰ It is unfortunately impossible to ascertain how many “unacceptable” female journeys were simply never recorded, and under what circumstances they were undertaken. However, there is still substantial merit in the investigation of the circumstances of “acceptable” women’s mobility, and the spatial limitations that they may have had.

Using medieval miracle stories for a quantitative spatial analysis creates other limitations as well. The volume and consistency of the data are limited, and the process by which they were compiled creates additional challenges for the analysis. Unlike the majority of modern socioeconomic data used by GIS analysts – such as Census records – the information collected in miracle stories was meant to serve a rather different purpose. While some have argued that they
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were propaganda to increase veneration of a saint (and consequent increase in offerings) at a shrine (and there is certainly enough evidence of miracle-competition between shrines to make it look like medieval spiritual advertising), Koopmans convincingly argues that the collections of English miracle stories that have come down to us were in fact meant primarily, if not exclusively, for the use of fellow priests and monks. To what end, however, depends on the period.

The purpose, as well as the form and style of the miracle collections, changed substantially in the course of the thirteenth century. Koopmans identifies approximately seventy-five collections of miracles written in England between 1080 and 1220, and contrasts this “miracle-collecting mania” with the only-occasional collection made in later medieval England. This craze to collect was, she argues, part of the wider movement throughout Europe in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, to put oral knowledge, customs and stories into writing. Much like those linguists today who record vanishing languages, the monks who wrote down the stories of miracle healings and visions, acted out of anxiety about impending loss of oral knowledge. They were concerned with the memory of their saint, and the knowledge (for posterity, it seems) of the works of God. They could also be driven by other motives. William of Canterbury, for example, reveled in sensational stories, and strove to collect the most interesting miracles of Thomas Becket he could find. He held himself to no bureaucratic consistency, and his motto, given to him in a vision, was “Choose what you will.” In the midst of his “hunt for good stories”, he also

273 Ibid., 7.
lapped up every medical detail he could.\textsuperscript{274} He worked all the latest medical jargon into his thorough descriptions of the progressions of ailments and cures, and he seems to have seen his miracle collection as either an outlet for his own medical hobby, or a venue for educating his fellow monks about medical knowledge and practice. His writing is not all technical terminology, however; his playful rhetorical style used obscure vocabulary, references to classical authors, and “sermonlike digressions.”\textsuperscript{275} In one section, for example, William argues with his own hand about whether or not to write down a specific miracle.\textsuperscript{276} While William’s main purpose was to record the miracles of Thomas Becket, he clearly used his collection for personal expression as well as a platform to communicate medical knowledge.

Other twelfth century miracle collections, while rarely as colorful as William’s, also had their makers’ personal marks on them – whether in choice of miracles to include, statements about what processes of miracle collecting were appropriate, or degree of detail. There were, simply, no editorial standards – and these early collections were, in many cases, editions, although Craig’s point about the collaborative community creation of the oral and subsequent written stories - the creation of collective memory - stands.\textsuperscript{277} While William’s collection largely resulted from stories told directly to him or another Canterbury monk at the shrine, other collections were based on earlier compilations, preexisting collections of stories, or previously unassembled letters and texts about the saint and his or her miracles.\textsuperscript{278} In many of these collections, there was, therefore, not necessarily a specific pilgrim involved at all. Even William
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of Canterbury’s collection, which focused largely on stories from the laity told at the shrine, included letters from priests and monks which contained hearsay and second-hand accounts – again not involving a (recorded) pilgrim.

These textual circumstances – the rhetoric, the medical jargon, the playful phrasing and allusions - make a close analysis of the Latin essential for determining whether or not a particular miracle in William’s collection actually yielded a pilgrim to Canterbury, and if so, how many. Despite this, the length of his collection, and the ease of online access to the source make it a good candidate for analysis. William was also largely consistent in recording the origin towns of the pilgrims – or the location where the miracle happened, and in most cases the sex of the miracle recipient or pilgrim (though towards the end of his collection, all of these details were increasingly absent). While the inconsistencies that do exist remove many miracles from analysis, the length of his work provides enough stories with data sufficient for quantitative spatial analysis.

Later medieval miracle collections create far fewer problems for the social historian than early ones like William’s. In the thirteenth century, concerns about the veracity of miracle stories and a desire to formalize the canonization process of new saints prompted the papacy to require increasingly bureaucratic formats for miracle story collections. Procedures for interviewing miracle recipients and witnesses were instituted, with specific questions to be asked, and specific data to collect, including names, places, professions, dates, types of illness, lengths of illness and
the nature of healings. The collectors of the miracles were now more notaries than editors. The result is a more consistent data source, more amenable to spatial analysis.

The miracle stories collected at the tomb of Henry VI formed one such data set. Compared with William of Canterbury’s Thomas Becket collection, the Henry VI miracle stories provide much more consistent data regarding origin town and occupation of the pilgrim or her family. They are often short and to the point, but if the recipient of the miracle was a child, they usually specify which parent made the vow, bent the coin, or dedicated the candle, and therefore which parent was the primary pilgrim. The sex of travelling companions is identified more often – though vague references to a pilgrim and “her party” still exist.

The foregoing analysis makes clear that any use of miracle stories for spatial analysis will require careful consideration of the types of information examined. Finding pilgrims in the miracle stories is not always straightforward, especially in the early period, including in the Thomas Becket collection. A miracle is often mentioned, perhaps with the adult recipient’s name, and passing reference to a companion – but no sex of the companion is given. A story relating the miracle healing of a child is recorded, but with no further details, leaving us to wonder who exactly the pilgrim was who passed on the information. In cases of adults, it is generally safe to assume that the healed person had come to the shrine him/herself to give thanks, likely with unidentified companions, but children certainly were led by a parent, relative or neighbor. Or an adult may have come without the child, to give thanks for healing. It was,

after all, the parent or adult bystander who invoked the saint, made the vow, or dedicated the candle, which led to the miracle. Obtaining an accurate counting of pilgrims is also muddled by the second-hand stories brought by lay and clerical pilgrims alike, and the hearsay or stories of miracles occurring in distant abbeys and parishes, communicated to the compiler by letter. This is especially an issue with the Thomas Becket miracle collection, while the Henry VI miracle stories, despite their more legalistic form, are still prone to the lack of clarity regarding companion and parent pilgrims.

The strategy adopted in this study in translating this information into quantitative data consisted of holding strictly to the number of pilgrims of which I can be certain. Because the focus of analysis is on a gender difference in mobility, cases with any companion whose sex is not indicated are not included in the analysis (primary pilgrims are nearly always identified by name and sex). In cases of child healings, if no specific adult pilgrim is mentioned, the related stories are omitted from the analysis. Excluded from analysis are also any recipients of miracles reported by means of a letter or second-hand reports to the miracle collection compiler, unless the report clearly states that the miracle recipient went on pilgrimage to the shrine in question.

Given that the subject of this thesis is mobility in medieval England, the analysis focuses on the origin of the men and women who came to the pilgrimage destination from within England. Therefore, any pilgrims originating outside of England, and those without identified origin towns are not included in the analysis. There is an important exception to this. In some cases, while the

281 Most cases of child healings in the Henry VI miracles identify either the mother or father making a vow or bending a penny as a vow, or specify that both parents came to Windsor. Most cases of child healings in the Thomas Becket miracles do not mention a primary pilgrim, or an adult making a vow.
origin town for a pilgrim is not mentioned, the origin county is. I have included these pilgrims by estimating their origin town as the geographical center point of the county.

Despite the large total number of miracle stories in the William of Canterbury and the Henry VI collection, these necessary exclusions leave a sample size too small for analysis of other variables which are recorded much less consistently, such as mode of transportation, relationship of the companion(s) to the primary pilgrim, class/status group and age of pilgrims. The core information collected has therefore been the sex and origin town of each identified pilgrim in each miracle collection (including any identified companions recorded in the same miracle story, but excluding those not meeting the criteria above). This has provided the raw data for analyses of journey distance, by sex, and part of the data for an analysis of origin town proximity to alternative pilgrimage locations.

The alternative pilgrimage locations used in this analysis are based on the most prominent pilgrimage destinations in medieval England, as noted in Webb, Koopmans, and Finucane.\(^{282}\) Several shrines developed in the century after the Canterbury miracles were recorded, so I have created separate data sets for pilgrimage destinations c.1200 (used to analyze the Canterbury pilgrim data), and pilgrimage destinations c.1200-c.1500 (used for the Henry VI pilgrim data). The point of this analysis is to determine whether the proximity to another pilgrimage site had a limiting effect on women’s journeys – more than men’s.

I have also included in the analysis medieval county-level population data (from a published secondary source), to shed light on the geographical distribution patterns of the origin towns of the pilgrims in each miracle collection. Further data used include GIS shapefiles (geographic boundary files) of Europe and English Historical County Borders.

**Data Analysis**

This study uses GIS to analyze a number of spatial relationships related to women’s mobility in medieval England. The data analysis method is performed on existing digital (spatial and numeric) and non-digital (textual – Latin and English) sources. In the pilgrimage stories which constitute the primary sources for this study, I read the Latin text, recording three variables for each pilgrim or companion: Sex, Origin Town, and Pilgrimage Destination. These are analyzed in GIS in conjunction with a list of major alternative pilgrimage sites, and medieval population data for the counties.

These variables were entered into an Access database manually, then used to select groups of origin towns and pilgrimage destinations for inclusion in GIS layers. I also compiled a list of alternative pilgrimage destinations for the time period of each miracle collection under examination in the present thesis, and used this to create layers of alternative pilgrimage towns.
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284 ESRI Dataset, “European Countries, GIS shapefile.” (Included with ArcGIS software).

Foundational data:

- Gazetteer of British Place Names (data table – from Ordinance Survey website\textsuperscript{286})
- Europe geographical boundary shapefile\textsuperscript{287}
- Historic Counties boundary shapefiles (from Historic Counties website\textsuperscript{288})
- Excel spreadsheets with extracted Canterbury pilgrim data (data collection as above).\textsuperscript{289}
- Excel spreadsheets with extracted Windsor pilgrim data (data collection as above).\textsuperscript{290}
- Alternative Pilgrimage Locations, compiled from Webb, Finucane and Koopmans.\textsuperscript{291}

General Data Preparation: A dissolve action was applied to the shape file with European national boundaries, in order to obtain a single continental boundary. This was added as a layer to an ArcGIS map document to provide visual geographical context for my analysis of England. To obtain the historic county boundaries of England, I imported the Historic Counties from the County Borders website and added it to the same map document.\textsuperscript{292} To obtain locations for all village, town and other place names in England, I imported the Gazetteer database from the UK Ordinance Survey website. In order to use this in GIS, in ArcCatalog, I used the existing XY

\textsuperscript{286} “50K-Gazetteer”, UK Ordinance Survey. Data Table.  

\textsuperscript{287} ESRI dataset, included with ArcGIS software.

\textsuperscript{288} History County Boundaries, GIS shapefiles. http://www.county-borders.co.uk/ accessed on February 2, 2012.


coordinate data in the Gazetteer database to convert the 250,000+ place name records into a GIS shape file, with a point representing each town or place. Some of these various shapefiles began with a different geographical projection, so I used the “project” tool in ArcCatalog to convert them all to the UK National Grid projection. This ensures spatial compatibility among the many shape layers. Furthermore, in ArcCatalog, I created a geodatabase – a database able to store a variety of spatial and other data in the same, compatible location. When a shapefile is imported into a geodatabase, certain spatial calculations are automatically added to each record in its attribute table. Area and length are calculated for polygons and lines, respectively. This is crucial information for subsequent distance analyses.

Creation of Base Shapefiles (Foundation for Analysis): In addition to those layers, as just noted, that were readily available and simply needed preparation, the analysis of the present thesis also necessitated the creation of several new shapefiles. Because the research questions and hypotheses of the thesis surround issues of gender difference, and because the two miracle collections used as data sources differed so drastically in time and circumstance, four basic layers, or “pilgrim sets”, were created – one for each sex, in each miracle story collection. The pilgrim set shapefiles created were: Canterbury Men, Canterbury Women, Windsor Men, and Windsor Women. The method by which these shapefiles were created was as follows. I created reports from my pilgrimage database, of each gender by each pilgrimage destination. Using these lists as guides, I turned on the point-shapefile layer of the Gazetteer points (prepared in the steps discussed above) in my map document, then used the “Find” tool to search for the place names of pilgrim origin towns. As I located each origin town in a pilgrims set (say, Canterbury Women), I would “select” it, adding it to the towns previously selected. Keeping all of the
relevant origin places selected allowed me then to turn the selection into a layer. This action copies all of the spatial and attribute features of each of the selected points, to another layer. When each pilgrim set was in editable shapefile format, I added a field to each pilgrim set attribute table, called “NumberPilg”, and entered the number of pilgrims whose journeys originated in each origin town. When all of the origin towns for each pilgrim set had been selected and edited, I converted each layer into a feature class. This action copies the spatial and attribute data permanently into a separate shapefile, making it available for future editing. I then used the “Merge” tool in ArcGIS to create a single shapefile for each pilgrimage destination (one for all Canterbury pilgrims, for instance). This was in preparation for analyses in which I wished to compare the overall spatial pattern of a pilgrimage destination’s origin towns, as opposed to the gendered results.

Research Question 2 required some additional information in order to create a proximity analysis. This necessitated the creation of two more shapefiles. Using the same process for the creation of “pilgrim sets”, I used my compiled list of alternative pilgrimage destinations to select two “alternative pilgrimage destination” sets from the Gazetteer place name points. I created two new layers, then converted them into permanent shapefiles, as described above.

Using these foundational shapefiles, with spatial and attribute data, I began the data analysis to investigate the stated hypotheses. The first research question concerns distance, scope of travel, and geographical concentrations of origin points. My first hypothesis was that the length of women’s journeys to a given pilgrimage destination was shorter than the length of men’s journeys to the same destination. To test this, I first had to create shapefiles that would allow me
to measure length of journey. I decided to create straight lines between each origin towns and its pilgrimage destination. Although this is not a true measure of the distance a pilgrim would have travelled (since this surely would have been longer, given winding roads and geographical obstacles), it does approximate distance, and most importantly allows a comparative analysis of men’s and women’s relative journey distances.

To create the journey lines, I copied the XY coordinates for each pilgrimage destination, and copied them onto each origin town record of the corresponding set. For example, each origin town of Canterbury pilgrims, both male and female, had the Canterbury X and Canterbury Y coordinates added as new fields in the attribute table (through “Field Calculator”). With this second set of coordinate data, each record could be converted into a line using the tool “XY to Line”. This tool created separate line shapefiles for each pilgrim set. Because they were saved into the geodatabase, the length of each line was automatically generated and added to the shapefile’s attribute table. From this information, I used the “Statistics” tool to obtain the Maximum, Minimum, Mean, and Standard Deviation of each set of lines (by gender and pilgrimage destination). This information was then placed in a table for analysis. With the lines shapefiles, I then created maps with each pilgrim set, showing both the journey lines, and the origin towns, which were symbolized to reflect the number of pilgrims from each town. This allowed me to visually analyze both length, and geographical distribution.

When the above analysis was finished, I then addressed hypothesis 2, that the origin towns of male and female pilgrims did not differ in geographical distribution, other than by distance or population density. This analysis was started with the lines and pilgrim-number analysis, but the
population density variable necessitated the creation of another shapefile. Using the county-level population data for medieval England published in the LSE report, I averaged two sets of population data years, in order to estimate the population of each county at the date of each miracle collection. From this information, I calculated density per square mile, for each time period. This density was then symbolized in choropleth maps, to which were added the layer containing origin town points, symbolized by number of pilgrims from that location. Visual analysis was then completed, in order to show the degree to which population density correlated with distribution of origin towns. A table of county by number of pilgrim origin towns, and graphs showing the relationship of the same, were also created, in order to further facilitate analysis of the geographical trends.

In order to test hypothesis 3: that the geographical mean of women’s origin towns was closer to the destination than that of men’s origin towns, I used the existing shapefiles to create the mean center of each pilgrim set’s origin towns (using the ArcGIS “Mean Center” tool). This tool created a new shapefile for each mean center point. I then used the “Measure” tool to determine the distance between each mean center point and its corresponding pilgrimage destination. To visualize the distance more clearly, I used graphics operations in the Draw toolbar, to create graphic lines between each of the male and female mean center points, and the pilgrimage
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http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/economics/staff/academic/broadberry/wp/medievalpopulation7.pdf.

Initial population data were taken from the following report: (LSE report) Table 8B, pg. 25. The report provides county-level population data for the years 1086, 1290, 1377, and 1600. To derive a rough estimate of population in 1170, I average the 1086 and 1290 values for each county. To derive an estimate for the year 1500, I averaged the values for 1377 and 1600. This is necessarily problematic, as the English population saw large shifts between each set of averaged years. It does, however, avoid averaging any widely disparate pre- and post-Black Death figures. Given that the years of my study both sit in the middle of each set of years available for averaging, I argue it is a compromise worth making for the insights it might yield.
destination. I then labeled these with the distances measured with the “Measure” tool. A table was created with the results, as well.

To test hypothesis 4, that women arrived from a smaller “catchment area”294 around the pilgrimage destination than men did, and that their origin towns faded more quickly outside of that catchment area than did men’s, I needed to create a way of measuring distance zones around each pilgrimage destination. First, I created separate shapefiles from each pilgrimage destination point. Then, I used the “Multiple Ring Buffer” tool to automatically generate concentric distance “buffer” zones around each destination. I set the buffer zones at 0-10 miles, 10-20, 20-30, 30-40, 40-50, 50-75, 75-100, 100-125, 125-150, 150-175, 175-200, 200-225, and more than 225. This tool creates a new shapefile with buffer zones. I therefore acquired four new shapefiles, one from each pilgrim set. The point of this analysis is to count the number of origin towns existing in each buffer area, for each sex and pilgrimage destination. The tool “Intersect” creates a new shapefile of points in which each origin town point record has its new buffer zone added to its attribute table. This data can then be summarized, and the towns classified in a table. In addition to creating such a table, I have also created graphs (in Excel) which depict the percentage of pilgrims by destination zones.

Addressing the second research question – to what extent women’s travel to one pilgrimage site was limited by their own home’s proximity to other pilgrimage sites, and did women who had nearby access to a pilgrimage location tend to travel less to larger, more distant pilgrimage sites – requires several analyses. The first hypothesis, that the proximity of other pilgrimage sites

exerted a limiting influence on the journeys of women to more distant, pilgrimage destinations, as compared to the journeys of men, can be tested in a number of ways in GIS. The first analysis I use is based on Euclidean Distance. This tool creates a raster (pixel-based) image with a continuous field of distance, calculated from the distance of any place in England to the closest alternative pilgrimage locations. This creates an image depicting the “dead zones” – the areas of the country least served by pilgrimage locations. The created raster layer includes areas beyond the English shore, however, so a step was required to clip it to the boundary of England. For this, I relied on the “Extract by Mask” tool, which creates a new raster layer showing only those raster pixels inside the boundaries of a chosen boundary shapefile (in this case, the Europe continental boundary shapefile). To this map, I added the origin towns, symbolized by number of pilgrims, in order to discern whether the women’s origin towns were, in fact, more likely to be in a dead zone than near a pilgrimage center.

Another method used to test the effect of proximity to alternatives, on eventual destination journey, was the “Near” tool in ArcGIS. This tool added a field to the attribute table of each pilgrim set feature class, and calculated and recorded in that field, for each origin town record, the distance from each origin point to the nearest alternative pilgrimage location. To facilitate analysis, I used the “Statistics” tool to acquire Maximum, Minimum, Mean, and Standard Deviation of distance from alternative pilgrimage sites. The origin town points were then symbolized to show the categories of distance, with darker dots indicating an origin town that was further away from an alternative pilgrimage center.
A final way of analyzing the proximity to alternative destinations is to create concentric distance rings around each destination, with the “Multiple Ring Buffer” tool. This is done in the same way as the use of this tool described above, with the difference that the points around which the distance zones are formed, are the alternative pilgrimage locations. The resulting buffer shapefile was then clipped using the “Clip” tool (with the European continental boundary as the clipping mask), to erase those portions of buffer zones which lay beyond the British coast. The purpose was to make the busy layers of multiple buffers around many points more easily readable. Using the “Intersect” tool, as above, a new shapefile of points was created for each pilgrim set, with information in its attribute table regarding which distance buffer zone each origin town lay within. Finally, from this distance zone data, a table and graphs were created, illustrating the percentage of pilgrim origins falling within each zone.

Finally, to test hypothesis 6 – that there is positive relationship between the distance of an origin town from an alternative pilgrimage site, and the distance travelled to the actual pilgrimage destination, particularly for women, I performed a “Spatial Join” operation, to join the Distance-to-Destination buffers with the Distance-to-Alternative buffers. The resulting shapefile’s attribute table then included information on both distance zones, for each origin town, in each pilgrim set. To determine whether there was a measurable relationship between an origin’s proximity to an alternative pilgrimage site, and the distance the town’s pilgrims travelled to their actual pilgrimage destination, I exported this data into Excel, and created graphs depicting the relationship between buffer zones. I then added trendlines to each graph to illustrate the degree of relationship.
This extensive GIS analysis of pilgrimage journeys, origin towns, and destinations, yielded interesting and sometimes unexpected results, as discussed in the following chapter.
Chapter 4. Results and Discussion

While the total sample size for the present study is not large, it is substantial enough to yield recognizable patterns in the data. The total sample size collected in the two case studies is 248 pilgrim journeys, 90 (36%) of which are the travels of women. This percentage holds roughly true for both the Canterbury (38% women) and the Windsor (35% women) samples. Because the nature of medieval miracle stories makes them unrepresentative of pilgrimage journeys in general, it is not possible to estimate from them the overall true proportion of male to female pilgrim-travelers. Other authors have attempted analyses of the sort, but none has been able to accurately gage the full number of female versus male pilgrims.\(^{295}\) This is especially true given the gender context in which the miracle collections were formed. Story-selection processes and agendas which biased against women (or for upper-class or religious men, seen as more reliable, impressive, or interesting) may have skewed the sex ratio in William of Canterbury’s Thomas Becket miracle collection, and potentially the Henry VI collection as well (though this was compiled with more bureaucratic rigor).\(^{296}\) Cultural biases against women speaking in public, holding a position of authoritative knowledge of spiritual matters, or travelling long


Distances, also contributed to the low ratio of women to men in both the Windsor and the Canterbury miracles.297

**Distance and Gendered Mobility**

The key questions of this thesis therefore look beyond the issue of absolute numbers, and instead examine relative data – comparing male with female in compatible scenarios and testing them for geographical differences. The first research question asks whether women had the same scope of travel as men – whether they rode or walked as far, on average, as men. I first hypothesize that the length of women’s journeys to a given (pilgrimage) destination was shorter than the length of men’s journeys to the same destination. To test this hypothesis, I added the XY coordinates of the appropriate pilgrimage destination, to the attribute tables for each gender/destination pilgrim set, and then used the “XY to Line” tool to create lines between the points and to calculate the length of the lines (and therefore distance between each origin and the destination points). Using the “Statistics” option in the “Length” field menu in the attribute table, I obtained the values for Maximum, Minimum, and Mean line lengths – which are equivalent to the distance between origin and destination – and the Standard Deviation from the mean line length. The results of this analysis are shown in Figure 1 and Table 1.

As Table 1 illustrates, the mean distance of travel for those women going on pilgrimage to Windsor was 58.2 miles, or 12.7 miles less than that of the men. Their journeys also varied in length less than men’s, with a standard deviation 13 miles less than men’s. The maximum journey distances of the Windsor-bound men and women did not differ from each other much,
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297 See sources discussion in methodology chapter, above.
however, which is a surprising finding given Finucane’s insistence, in his 1977 statistical analysis, that female pilgrims never originated from beyond 50 miles away from the pilgrimage destination.\footnote{Ronald C. Finucane, \textit{Miracles and Pilgrims: Popular Beliefs in Medieval England}. Rowman and Littlefield: Totowa, NJ, 1977.} It is clear from Figure 1, however, that the Windsor women’s maximum journey distance was caused by a single significant outlier. More will be said on the distribution of distances in the buffer analysis, below. The female Canterbury-bound pilgrims also reflect this new finding, and in fact the maximum distance travelled within England by a woman even exceeded that of the Canterbury men. The mean journey distance to Canterbury for women was lower than that for men, but by only 3.5 miles. The standard deviation of journey lengths for Canterbury men and women was nearly identical. These findings wholly contradict Finucane’s argument about the gender difference in pilgrimage site “catchment areas”, and the Canterbury findings in particular call into question the assumptions in the historical and feminist theory literature that women’s mobility was more limited than men’s. Perhaps the discrepancy results from a reliance on cultural proscriptions as opposed to data-based spatial analysis. Medieval pronouncements on women were notoriously misogynist, giving the impression of women as a fully subjugated sex, but research on a variety of topics has shown women exercising significant power in several arenas. It is possible that women’s mobility limitations were not as clear cut as has been assumed.
As is clear from Figure 1, the geographical distribution of origin towns, and pilgrims, was quite different for the Canterbury pilgrims and the Windsor pilgrims. Canterbury attracted fewer pilgrims from each town or village, but from towns and villages more evenly spread throughout England. The geographical spread was slightly different for women and men, with women’s origin towns concentrated more to the southeast of the country. Fewer towns were also origin points for more than one woman, than for more than one man. The geographical distribution by gender was more striking for the Windsor pilgrims. Figure 1 shows that most origin towns of women were much closer to the pilgrimage destination than those of men. There is also an interesting pattern of Windsor-bound men’s origin towns along the northwest boundaries of England, which will be discussed below. The origin towns of Windsor-bound men produced more men per town than the women’s origin towns produced women. In both cases, the London area (Middlesex County) was a significant origin point. Interestingly, in contrast, London/Middlesex was not a significant origin location for Canterbury pilgrims, as illustrated in Table 1.5. The same is true of Northamptonshire, which provided far more pilgrims to Windsor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journeys by Pilgrim Category</th>
<th>Mean Journey Distance (Miles)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation from Mean of Journey Distance (Miles)</th>
<th>Maximum Journey Distance (Miles)</th>
<th>Minimum Journey Distance (Miles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Windsor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women (n=45)</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men (n=86)</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>235.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n=131)</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>235.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canterbury</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women (n=45)</td>
<td>125.6</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men (n=72)</td>
<td>129.1</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>291.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n=117)</td>
<td>127.8</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>5.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
than to Canterbury. Kent and Sussex produced higher numbers of pilgrims to each shrine, and Essex was also a significant origin, slightly more so for Windsor. Canterbury, on the other hand, attracted many more people from Norfolk and Suffolk than did Henry VI’s shrine in Windsor. The most striking difference, however, is the large number of pilgrims that Canterbury attracted from Yorkshire (19 pilgrims), compared to the complete absence of Yorkshire pilgrims to Windsor. As Figure 1 shows, the northeast in general provided few pilgrims to Windsor, compared with the northwest. Another interesting pattern is the concentration of both male and female Windsor-bound pilgrims’ origin towns in Kent. One might think that potential pilgrims in this area would be drawn instead to Canterbury. Nilson’s study of the income of medieval cathedral shrines, however, provides convincing evidence of an ebb and flow of pilgrimage fads. New saints and new destinations, it seems, attracted far more visitors than familiar shrines, and it could be that c.1500, Henry VI’s fame could outshine even Thomas Becket.299

---

Table 1.5: Number of Pilgrims per County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Canterbury Pilgrims (c.1170)</th>
<th>Windsor Pilgrims (c.1500)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedfordshire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckinghamshire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herefordshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntingdonshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shropshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwickshire</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Journey Distances and Origin Towns
Whether this finding is due to any reverberations from the Yorkist/Lancastrian divide of the Wars of the Roses is uncertain. Finucane argues that pilgrimages could sometimes function as protest marches, in which the body of a vanquished enemy of the king became a focus for demonstrations of anti-royal sentiment.\textsuperscript{300} Perhaps the opposite could be true: the people of Yorkshire, Northumberland, and other Northern counties may have been little inclined to venerate a Lancastrian king. The North of England was notably fractured during the Wars of the Roses, however, and when it was less fractured, its leaders switched sides several times. Richard III, the brother of the man (Edward IV), who had sentenced Henry VI to death, eventually gained a strong following in the area. Richard III was in turn eventually killed by Henry VII, the current king at the time of this miracle collection. Henry VII was, like Henry VI, himself a Lancastrian, and so following the cult of Henry VI should logically not have been seen at this time as a demonstration of anti-royal sentiment.

Instead, it is more likely that the years of strong support in Yorkshire for Richard III (after the area’s many previous decades supporting the Lancastrian cause), bred some skepticism towards claims of the Lancastrian Henry VI’s miracle-working. It is also possible that this period of strong Yorkist power in the area saw the migration of any remaining Lancastrian-leaning nobility or gentry to less hostile parts of the country.\textsuperscript{301} The existence of statues of Henry VI in the cathedrals of Durham, Ripon and York, potentially pointing to popular devotion to the king as saint, would seem to contradict this analysis, and the lack of pilgrims from these areas to his


It is possible that local devotees of Henry VI as saint created local shrines. It is not likely, however, that word of miracles there would not have reached Windsor. It is also probable that if such a shrine existed, at least one or two pilgrims from these areas would have been so moved by a miracle, as to vow a longer pilgrimage to Windsor. Instead, the most likely explanation is that these statues were placed during an earlier era of Lancastrian loyalty which no longer held spiritual value to the locals of the North.

The Windsor-bound men’s origin towns also partially string along the northwestern side of England – unlike the women’s origin towns. This is not at all suggested by the population density of those counties (as illustrated in Figure 2), and is in striking contrast to their absence in the northeast. The latter factor has been discussed above, and perhaps the explanation once again lies with the politics of the Wars of the Roses. Lancashire is, after all, one of the northeastern counties, and Henry VI was a Lancastrian king. A political reason may explain the lack of women pilgrims from these areas, as well. Finucane argues that the tombs of political-martyr saints (or would-be saints) were more attractive to men than to women. If people in Lancashire and surrounding counties were attracted in part by political and military affiliation, it is not too unreasonable to conclude that it would be the men – who fought in the wars with or for Henry VI – who would be more inclined than the women toward this royal would-be saint.

Another potential reason for the disparity in pilgrim origin distributions between Windsor and Canterbury, is simple demographics. The two miracle collections were recorded at very different

---

times in medieval English history. The late twelfth-century, when William of Canterbury wrote down Thomas Becket’s miracles, was a period of expanding population, before the Black Death arrived in the 1340s. The Henry VI collection, on the other hand, was compiled at the end of the fifteenth century, about 150 years after the first wave of the plague, after numerous repeat invasions of that and other diseases, and after the entirety of both the Hundred Years War and the Wars of the Roses. It is possible that the different patterns found in the Windsor and Canterbury pilgrim origins in fact reflect simply the changed demographic landscape, a changed distribution of people. Using population data collected during several country-wide tax surveys in the course of the middle ages, I have estimated the population c.1170, when the Thomas Becket miracles began, and c.1500, when the Henry VI miracles were being recorded. Figure 2 illustrates the population density of each county – calculated with the area in square miles, and the population according to my estimates – and the location of pilgrim origin towns in each period.

What is immediately noticeable from Figure 2 is the significant drop in population density between the two periods, in nearly all regions of the country. It is less clear from the figure to what degree pilgrim origin towns (and pilgrim numbers from each town) conformed to population density. The Canterbury maps do seem to show some relationship between density and pilgrim origins, but the women’s origin towns are relatively lacking in the dense, central-eastern portions of the country. The Windsor origin towns also seem to have some relationship.

---


Table 8B, pg. 25. The report provides county-level population data for the years 1086, 1290, 1377, and 1600. To derive a rough estimate of population in 1170, I average the 1086 and 1290 values for each county. To derive an estimate for the year 1500, I averaged the values for 1377 and 1600. This is necessarily problematic, as the English population saw large shifts between each set of averaged years. It does, however, avoid averaging any widely disparate pre- and post-Black Death figures. Given that the years of my study both sit in the middle of each set of years available for averaging, I argue it is a compromise worth making for the insights it might yield.
with population density, especially in London, its neighboring county of Middlesex, and in the
Midlands counties. The population-pilgrim connection is illustrated more clearly in Figures 2.5-
A and 2.5-B. The trend lines in these figures suggest that there was only a slight relationship
between the two variables. The one major outlier is Middlesex county, which attracted large
numbers of pilgrims, in keeping with its extremely high density c.1500.
Figure 2. Pilgrim Origins and Population Density
Figure 2.5-A. Pilgrims by County Population Density: Canterbury Pilgrims

Figure 2.5-B. Pilgrims by County Population Density: Windsor Pilgrims
The geographical distribution of origin towns by gender of pilgrim and destination of journey can also be examined through an analysis of the spatial mean of origin town locations. To test my hypothesis (Hypothesis 2) that the geographical mean of women’s origin towns was closer than that of men’s origin towns, I used the “Mean Center” tool of ArcGIS, and calculated the location of the geographical mean for each pilgrim set’s origin points. Using the “Measure” tool, I also identified the distance between each mean and its corresponding pilgrimage destination. Figure 3 illustrates the locations of the means, and shows that the origin towns of Windsor-bound pilgrims were generally closer to the pilgrimage destination, and tended slightly to the north of Windsor itself. The mean of women’s origins was slightly more to the East, and slightly closer to Windsor than the men’s. As shown in Table 2, the mean of women’s geographical origins was 15 miles from Windsor, compared to 23 miles for the men’s mean.

Figure 3. Mean Center of Origin Towns
The mean geographical centers of origin towns for Canterbury pilgrimages were much further to the north than those for Windsor journeys, illustrating a much broader geographical impact, and there was a more significant difference between the mean for men’s origins, and that for women’s. The distance of the women’s origin mean from Canterbury was 103 miles, versus 113 miles for the men – a 10 mile distance.

Another way of examining the geographical distribution of men’s and women’s origins, and the length of their journeys is to see where they fall within multiple buffer zones around the pilgrimage destination. The “Multiple Ring Buffer” tool in ArcGIS creates rings at specified distances around a point. The “Intersect” tool then adds data to each origin point, indicating in which of the distance buffer rings that point is located. Doing a “Summarize” analysis of the table of point data then allows a count of how many origin towns fall within each distance zone. This further enables comparison with Finucane’s analysis of the “catchment area” of pilgrimage sites. Figure 4 illustrates the buffer zones and where the origin town points fall within them. It is again clear from this image that the majority of Windsor pilgrims’ origin towns were within closer range of their destination than those of Canterbury pilgrims. Table 3 quantifies these buffer zones, and shows a remarkable difference between the two sets of pilgrims, with 71% of total Windsor pilgrims’ origin towns falling in the 30 to 100 mile range, with only 27% of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance of Origin Geographical Mean to Destination Shrine (Miles)</th>
<th>Windsor</th>
<th>Canterbury</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Canterbury pilgrims’ origins falling within that range. Instead, 68% of Canterbury total pilgrims’ origins were between 100 and 225 miles away from the destination, as opposed to only 11% of Windsor-bound pilgrims’ origin towns falling in this range.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miles from Shrine (Windsor or Canterbury)</th>
<th>Women (n=45)</th>
<th>Men (n=86)</th>
<th>Total (n=131)</th>
<th>Women (n=45)</th>
<th>Men (n=72)</th>
<th>Total (n=117)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>3 (7%)</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
<td>7 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
<td>6 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>3 (7%)</td>
<td>9 (10%)</td>
<td>12 (9%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>6 (13%)</td>
<td>7 (8%)</td>
<td>13 (10%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>4 (9%)</td>
<td>13 (15%)</td>
<td>17 (13%)</td>
<td>3 (7%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>6 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-75</td>
<td>17 (38%)</td>
<td>23 (27%)</td>
<td>40 (31%)</td>
<td>5 (11%)</td>
<td>7 (10%)</td>
<td>11 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-100</td>
<td>9 (20%)</td>
<td>13 (15%)</td>
<td>22 (17%)</td>
<td>3 (7%)</td>
<td>11 (15%)</td>
<td>14 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-125</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>7 (8%)</td>
<td>8 (6%)</td>
<td>4 (9%)</td>
<td>8 (11%)</td>
<td>12 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125-150</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>7 (16%)</td>
<td>6 (8%)</td>
<td>13 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150-175</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>8 (18%)</td>
<td>9 (13%)</td>
<td>17 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175-200</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>3 (7%)</td>
<td>7 (10%)</td>
<td>10 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-225</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>4 (9%)</td>
<td>9 (13%)</td>
<td>13 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 225</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
<td>3 (7%)</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
<td>8 (7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4. Origin Towns by Pilgrimage Destination Distance Buffers
The spatial distribution of origin towns is also slightly different for both men and women, in each pilgrimage destination set. This is shown most strikingly in the graphs in Figures 5 and 6, which together plot the information in Table 3. As shown in Figure 5, the Windsor-bound women came disproportionately from the 50 to 75 mile range. There is quite a steep fall, with women’s origin towns dropping precipitously, to almost nothing after 100 miles away from the shrine. There is not a flat line until this drop, however. Women going to Windsor were far more likely to come from at least 50 miles away than they were to come from zero to 50 Miles. While men’s origin towns also peaked at the 50 to 75-mile range, the slopes of the rise and fall are much more gradual.

![Percent of Windsor Pilgrims by Origin Town Distance](image)

**Figure 5. Percent of Windsor Pilgrims by Origin Town Distance**
Finucane tried, without the benefit of GIS software, to identify the half-way mark for other pilgrimage destinations— that distance by which a pilgrim returning home from a site would have found that half of the shrine’s pilgrims were behind him. He did not examine the Henry VI miracle collection, and decided that the distance could not be easily calculated for the Becket miracles, but such a calculation is possible with the present buffer analysis. Using percentage data on Table 3, it can be calculated that for both men and women, the 50% mark for origin towns, that point at which half of the pilgrim origins are behind the traveler, lies in the 50 to 75 mile range. This is wholly consistent with the large spike seen on the graph in Figure 5. A calculation from the data on Table 3 shows that 78% of the women were in this group or lower – that is, 78% of the Windsor-bound women came from less than 75 miles away – while only 66% of the men did. Turning the calculation around, this means that only 22% of women came further than 75 miles, while 34% of men did. This 12% difference is a significant pattern in journeys of men and women, with men far more likely to come from further away, than women.

The 50% mark is much further out for the Canterbury origin towns, as expected from a comparison of Figures 5 and 6 and the data in Table 3. A returning pilgrim would have to be between 125 and 150 miles from Canterbury in order to have half of the other pilgrims’ towns behind him. This holds true for pilgrims of either sex. There seems, in fact, to be far less difference in the distance-distribution of origin towns of each sex of Canterbury-bound pilgrims, in general than for the Windsor-bound pilgrims. The differences that do exist are striking as well.

---

Figure 6. Percent of Canterbury Pilgrims by Origin Town Distance

The peak for men’s origins is in the 50 to 75-mile range, at 15% of men’s origin towns, while the peak for women’s origins is in the 150 to 175-mile range, at 18% of women’s origin towns. This is also not an outlier group – the graph shows a clear (though up-and-down) trend in women’s origins toward higher numbers at further distances, until a drop after 175 miles. The count of men’s origins also increased with distance, but this increase was more or less sustained at further distances. A quick glance at Figure 6 might lead one to assume that women were, quite unexpectedly, more likely than men to come from further away. The data in Table 3, however, shows that the drop in women’s origins after 175 miles, combined with the relatively stable count of men’s origins after this point, evens out the origin-distances of the sexes. Sixty percent of women came to Canterbury from origin towns less than 150 miles away, compared with 57% of men. Thus, 40% of women came from more than 150 miles away, compared with 43% of
men. Men were, therefore, slightly more likely to arrive in Canterbury from a greater distance than women. The Canterbury pilgrims do show, however, more equality between men and women in terms of distance travelled.

It is clear from all these analyses that there was a significant difference between mobility patterns of Windsor-Bound pilgrims and Canterbury-bound pilgrims, but they can tell us little about why this might be the case. Finucane has a theory which might explain it. In his study of pilgrimage “catchment areas”, he found that the origin towns of pilgrims to the tomb of political martyrs (such as Simon de Montfort, d. 1265, enemy of King Henry III) had a different geographical distribution than pilgrims to other saints. They tended to come from further away, drawn by a particular interest, rather than a more general search for healing. The pilgrimage cults of non-political figures he studied had very localized pilgrim origins – with the majority of visitors travelling less than 40 miles to the shrine, and in the cases of some pilgrimage destinations, less than 20 miles. In all these cases, participation declined sharply after a point, indicating a clear catchment area. The shrine of Simon de Montfort, however, saw a very different pattern – with far fewer origin towns in close proximity to the shrine at Evesham, and greater numbers farther out, beyond 100 miles away. The present study’s findings regarding pilgrims to Henry VI’s tomb at Windsor seems to support Finucane’s theory – in its general pattern, anyway, and in part. As discussed above, origin towns for Windsor-bound pilgrims, both men and women, tended to be lower in more proximate areas, and peak at a distance. There was,

---
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however, a sharp drop after this peak buffer, suggesting that in some ways Henry VI’s “catchment area” mirrored those of local saints instead.

Thomas Becket was also a political martyr, as Finucane notes, and the geographical distribution of his pilgrims’ origin towns could be expected to follow a similar pattern to that of Simon de Montfort. As mentioned above, however, Finucane saw the Becket miracles as too daunting and complicated in origin to attempt a manual analysis of distance buffers. Instead, he calculated more broadly the percentage of English pilgrims who came from southeastern England – 56%, declared that one-quarter of all the English pilgrims came from Kent, and listed (without statistics) a number of counties with greater or fewer numbers of pilgrims recorded as journeying to Canterbury. For him, the Canterbury pilgrims were still strikingly localized.\(^{309}\) Finucane’s findings are not comparable to those in this thesis, since they include the Becket miracles recorded by both Benedict and William, while I only include the latter in my analysis. It is clear, however, that the present study finds a geographical distribution of Canterbury-bound pilgrims that is much less localized than suggested by Finucane’s results. William’s collection is known to be more focused on the nobility than Benedict’s.\(^{310}\) Noble laity, churchmen, and religious (both men and women) were more likely to have the funds, flexibility, and time to travel great distances, which would expand the distance distribution of my results, relative to Finucane’s. William of Canterbury’s miracle collection also included seven times more non-English pilgrims than did Benedict’s.\(^{311}\) This may have been due to an actual geographic expansion of interest in the saint since the time when Benedict wrote, which is suggested by the spread of manuscript

\(^{309}\) Ibid., 164.


copies of Benedict’s miracle collection. It may also have been due to some broadened selection criteria by William. In any case, the broader geographical scope internationally probably expanded the geographical distribution of pilgrims within England as well, leading to wider distance distribution in my results than in Finucane’s. My exclusion of Canterbury residents from analysis contributes to this disparity, as well. It is possible that by including Benedict’s collection of Thomas Becket miracles, the distribution of Canterbury pilgrims in my findings would have more closely resembled the concentration pattern of the Windsor pilgrims. It is not likely to have resembled its scope, however. What my findings do show, in this regard, is that the geographical scope of Canterbury-bound pilgrims’ origin towns is much wider than that of the Windsor-bound pilgrims. This is demonstrated in both the calculation of geographical means, and in the concentration of origin towns in more distant buffer zones. This is consistent with the fame and popularity of Canterbury as a pilgrimage destination throughout the high and later middle ages – a pilgrimage which inspired Chaucer and attracted pilgrims from the farthest reaches of Latin Europe.

Local Pilgrimage Alternatives: Proximity Analysis

As suggested in the literature review, research on medieval women’s mobility has tended to emphasize the limited nature of women’s movement. Women could, I argue, have more freedom of mobility if they carried with them some elements of portable privacy, which included clothing and behavior signifiers, as well as justifications for movement. One such justification for pilgrimage-related mobility was family need, especially the healing of a child, or the healing of a

mother who could not otherwise take care of her children and husband. While certainly there was a somewhat faddish quality to the popularity of a pilgrimage destination at a given time, distance to alternatives may well have played a part in the justification for travel. For example, could a woman who lived c.1500 in a major pilgrimage center such as Canterbury, justify a pilgrimage to distant town, such as Windsor, to seek healing? If the spiritual home and center of miracles of one healing saint was less than a mile away, could a woman justify travel to another town for similar healing? While an answer to this question as it stands may have more to say about the perceived effectiveness of one saint versus another in curing the sick, a comparison of men’s and women’s pilgrimages in terms of origin town proximity to shrines points the question toward gender, and towards a possible difference between men’s and women’s scope of mobility. A clear gender difference in movement based on origin-proximity to other pilgrimage sites, would indicate that gender expectations regarding mobility justifications had a measurable impact on actual travel.

The results in the first part of this chapter show that, indeed, journeys made by women were shorter, on average, than those made by men, sometimes to a striking degree. Some authors have suggested, in addition to this, that women often preferred (or settled for), more local pilgrimage sites. That is, where an effective local saint was available, women tended to rely on him or her, and his or her shrine, rather than seeking healing from farther afield. Whether because of the greater cost of the journey (acceptable for a man but not a woman?), or due to women’s “hearth-

---

bound” nature (in the words of Finucane), in one case Finucane studied (that of Thomas Cantilupe) proportion of women to men fell as distance from the shrine increased.  

This is corroborated, in general, by my own findings, with some qualifications, as noted above. The question remaining, however, is whether there is in fact a measurable relationship between women’s access to alternative, local pilgrimage sites, and their decision to make a long-distance pilgrimage to another saint. This section will examine this potential relationship through a variety of analyses. My analysis begins with identification of the major alternative pilgrimage sites existing at the time of each miracle, shown in Figure 7.  

![Figure 7. Alternative Pilgrimage Destinations](image)
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One method of depicting proximity is the “Euclidean Distance” tool in ArcGIS, which creates a raster image in which each pixel takes on a color symbolizing distance from a point. This is useful for getting a feel, visually, for the proximity-distribution of origin towns. Figure 8 illustrates this, with the lighter, string-like areas of the map depicting those areas farthest from the alternative pilgrimage destinations depicted in Figure 7.
Figure 8. Proximity to Alternative Pilgrimage Destinations: Euclidean Distance
The resulting map does not depict the expected relationship between women’s origin towns and distance from alternatives. In fact, it seems that Canterbury women are more likely to come from quite close to a major pilgrimage destination (the darker areas), than from the distant light zones. The Canterbury-bound men’s pattern is not as clear, though there does seem to be a trend in the same direction. A similar pattern does not appear with the Windsor-bound women or men.

Another, more precise, method of calculating proximity is to use the “Near” tool in ArcGIS, which identifies the distance from each Origin Town, to its nearest alternative pilgrimage site (alternative to the final destination, that is). The results are depicted in Figure 9, and are analyzed with basic statistics such as mean, maximum, minimum, and standard deviation, in Table 4. The most immediately striking pattern is that in every pilgrim set, the minimum distance from an alternative pilgrimage destination was zero miles. That is, in each set, there was at least one man and one woman who set off from the same town as an alternative pilgrimage location. Also striking are the general similarities in mean distance to an alternative pilgrimage site, between men and women of each set. The Windsor-bound women in fact had a mean distance closer to other pilgrimage centers than did the men.
Figure 9. Proximity to Nearest Pilgrimage Destinations
This contradicts the expectation that women near to an alternative would be more likely to choose that alternative than to travel long-distance. Women here are seen as slightly *more* likely to travel to Windsor if they lived nearer to an alternative. One possible explanation for this is a potentially freer attitude toward women in urban culture. Pilgrimage sites were generally in towns, and women living closer to them may have expected more freedom of movement than their more rural counterparts. Another noticeable difference, for both Windsor and Canterbury, is that the maximum distance from an alternative pilgrimage site was higher for men than for women. This suggests, again, that women whose origin towns were closer to urban centers were more likely to travel long-distance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin Towns, by Pilgrim Category</th>
<th>Mean Distance from other Major Pilgrimage Center (Miles)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation from mean Distance to other Pilgrimage Center (Miles)</th>
<th>Maximum Distance from other Pilgrimage Center (Miles)</th>
<th>Minimum Distance from other Pilgrimage Center (Miles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women (n=45)</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men (n=86)</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n=131)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women (n=46)</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men (n=72)</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n=117)</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another way of examining the way that proximity to alternative pilgrimage sites affected a long-distance pilgrimage, is to depict and quantify it using a multi-ring buffer analysis, as done above in Figure 3, but using the alternative pilgrimage locations in Figure 7 as the buffers’ central points. This can then be intersected with each set of pilgrim origin towns, to create counts of number of origins per distance category. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 5 and depicted in Figure 10. For Windsor pilgrims, there is quite a clear, though slight, difference between the percentage of women who originated in a town between zero and 30 miles of an alternative pilgrimage location, and the percentage of men who did. Women were slightly more likely to originate from a town or village closer to another pilgrimage site than men were. This difference holds steady through the first three distance zones. The predominance flips, however, after 30 miles. Far fewer pilgrims in total came from these distance zones, but Windsor-bound men were more likely to than were women. This relationship is depicted in Figure 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miles from Other Pilgrimage Location</th>
<th>Women (n=45)</th>
<th>Men (n=86)</th>
<th>Total (n=131)</th>
<th>Women (n=45)</th>
<th>Men (n=72)</th>
<th>Total (n=117)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>14 31%</td>
<td>24 28%</td>
<td>38 29%</td>
<td>10 22%</td>
<td>15 21%</td>
<td>25 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>14 31%</td>
<td>24 28%</td>
<td>38 29%</td>
<td>15 33%</td>
<td>22 31%</td>
<td>37 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>14 31%</td>
<td>25 29%</td>
<td>39 30%</td>
<td>12 27%</td>
<td>28 39%</td>
<td>40 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>3  7%</td>
<td>8  9%</td>
<td>11  8%</td>
<td>4  9%</td>
<td>4  6%</td>
<td>8  7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>1  2%</td>
<td>2  2%</td>
<td>3  2%</td>
<td>4  9%</td>
<td>1  1%</td>
<td>5  4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 50</td>
<td>0  0%</td>
<td>3  3%</td>
<td>3  2%</td>
<td>0  0%</td>
<td>2  3%</td>
<td>2  2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 10. Proximity to Alternative Pilgrimage Destinations: Distance Zone Buffers
The patterns are more complicated for the Canterbury-bound pilgrims, and quite unexpected. Women were more likely than men to come from origin towns in all distance zones away from an alternative pilgrimage site, but two. Men were more likely to originate from a town more than 50 miles away from an alternative pilgrimage site. This is in keeping with the pattern found in the other evidence. More significantly, however, 12% more men came from a zone 20 to 30 miles away from an alternative destination than women did. This is illustrated in Figure 12. This is a substantial difference, especially in an analysis in which most gender differences are a matter of a few percentage points. An examination of Figure 10 provides few clues to an explanation. There are no geographical groupings of these points that might provide an answer. Perhaps men at this time (rather than women, as I expected) were more likely to use the nearest local shrine –
up to a point. Once the 20 to 30 mile zone away from an alternative was reached, they saw some benefit in going to Canterbury instead, but less benefit when they lived further away from any pilgrimage site. Exactly why distance from any pilgrimage site would discourage men’s pilgrimage to Canterbury in contrast to women’s, even in areas of the country which were close in length of journey to Canterbury, is a mystery. As opposed to women, there is nothing in the literature that suggests that men’s mobility was limited by anything gender-specific. Given the small sample size, it is possible that the discrepancy is partially due to a sampling error.

![Percent of Canterbury Pilgrims' Origin Proximity to Other Pilgrimage Destinations](image)

**Figure 12. Canterbury-Bound Pilgrims' Origin Town Proximity to Alternative Pilgrimage Sites**

The general drop in numbers of pilgrims going to Canterbury, who originated more than 30 miles from an alternative pilgrimage site, is explained by the many connecting buffers (shown in Figure 10), leaving little space in southern and eastern England that was not covered by one of
the first three buffer zones. However, there are substantial areas of the densely-populated Midlands and East Anglia, as well as Sussex, that were more than 30 miles away from an alternative pilgrimage site. Perhaps proximity to another pilgrimage site got one used to the atmosphere, or served to advertise the alternative offerings. New cults, as Becket’s certainly was at this time, may have disseminated primarily through the networks of trade and religion – both of which had their major nodes in larger towns. Another possibility is the proximity to better modes of transportation – major roads, inland waterways, and ports. Travel in medieval England could be quite difficult, given that most roads were unpaved, security was an issue, and public inns were not pervasive. All of this assumes that proximity to an alternative pilgrimage site was the same as proximity to a major town with more transportation and communication amenities. Although this is likely the case, future studies should do a similar buffer analysis around major urban centers to ascertain whether the relationship holds true.

**The Proximity-Distance Connection**

One of my expectations at the beginning of this study was that distance from an alternative pilgrimage location would both justify going on a long pilgrimage elsewhere, and justify a longer pilgrimage. The farther a woman was from a pilgrimage site, I reasoned, the less proximity to a site would justify pilgrimage to that location, and the more women might find other, non-proximity related justifications for travelling. This would increase the opportunity for mobility to much farther pilgrimage destinations. The results in the foregoing section have disproved my first proximity hypothesis. Women were in fact more likely to go on a long-distance pilgrimage if they came from a town near to another pilgrimage site.

---

In order to test the second proximity hypothesis, I have measured distance to an alternative pilgrimage site, against the length of the journey actually taken. The results depicted in Figures 13 through 16 show that there was, in fact, a slight correlation. In all cases, for both men and women of both pilgrim sets, the trend line has a low positive slope. That this is consistent in all cases demonstrates that there was some trade-off between proximity to a more-local pilgrimage destination, and decision to travel to a more-distant pilgrimage site. The slope is slightly steeper for Canterbury women, suggesting that the trade-off was more important to them. This supports my hypothesis. The Windsor women, however, show the opposite results, as compared to Windsor men, who had the steepest slope (and thus largest trade-off) of all groups. A glance at Figure 10 reveals the reason for the Windsor men’s unusual slope. A number of their origin towns were located in the northeastern parts of England, which had no major alternative pilgrimage sites.

With this outlier explained, it becomes clear that there was a generally consistent, though slight, trade-off between proximity to a pilgrimage site, and decision to travel to either Canterbury or Windsor. Given that the two shrines had such different catchment areas, as discussed above, this commonality is notable. More studies are needed in order to test whether the pattern holds for other pilgrimage destinations as well, and whether other case studies will show significant gender differences that the present one does not.
Figure 13. Proximity-Distance Correlation: Canterbury Men

Figure 14. Proximity-Distance Correlation: Canterbury Women
Figure 15. Proximity-Distance Correlation: Windsor Men

Figure 16. Proximity-Distance Correlation: Windsor Women
Discussion

This chapter has demonstrated several key findings. The distance analysis concluded that the lengths of women’s journeys were shorter than those of men, though to different degrees in the Windsor and Canterbury sets. Gender inequality in length of journey was more prominent among Windsor pilgrims. Canterbury-bound women’s journeys varied the same amount as men’s, and their maximum journey length was actually longer than Canterbury-bound men’s. The distance-distribution of Canterbury pilgrims’ origin towns also varied little by gender, though more men did come from slightly farther away. The gender differentials in distance travelled are greater among Windsor-bound pilgrims, and the men were far more likely to have journeyed from more than 50 miles away. The reason for this discrepancy between Windsor and Canterbury gender patterns is likely due partially to the special appeal of Thomas Becket’s shrine for people throughout Europe. It is possible that the spiritual or healing justifications of the pilgrimage far outweighed mobility limitations normally applied to women. That is, the heightened spiritual legitimacy of the shrine lent more legitimacy to the woman’s justification for pilgrimage, and thus gave her more mobility.

The nature of the sources has also likely influenced this outcome. The William of Canterbury collection of Thomas Becket miracles is known to contain more upper-class miracles than other pilgrimage collections. If the Canterbury-bound women were wealthier, on average, than those bound for Windsor, they could have a greater “portable privacy”, purchased by their wealth. Body guards, better transportation methods, and more companions, could all increase a woman’s

---

capacity for acceptable mobility, by creating a bubble of female “private” space in which to move through the male-dominated world. Still, despite the greater mobility of Canterbury-bound women, they still travelled less far, as a whole, than Canterbury-bound men – and Windsor-bound women travelled shorter still, compared with their male counterparts. The limitation of female mobility here is clear. Women had less “right to the city”, or rather right to the country, than men did.

The results from my proximity analyses, however, suggest that the picture is more complicated. My findings show that women pilgrims to both Windsor and Canterbury were more likely to originate from close to another major pilgrimage destination, rather than farther away, as I had expected. There may be many possible reasons for this. Their proximity to a pilgrimage site could have given them greater access to trends in miracle healings of new saints, which would make them more likely to know about far-off pilgrimage destinations. Pilgrimage sites were often in urban areas, as well, which would have had easier access to better transportation routes and methods. Being in or near an urban area may have influenced women’s level of independence in general – whether through greater wealth, or urban cultural factors – which would have implications for their long-distance mobility.

Finally, their proximity to another pilgrimage site could have made them familiar with the justifications used for pilgrimage by other women. If so, this would suggest a process by which women’s mobility expanded collectively as they interacted with women from distant places, and learned their new or different ways of negotiating society’s gender expectations. This is reminiscent of urban planning theorists’ stress on the importance of encounter with unexpected
others for the individual’s self-discovery, and through that, a wider community evolution. It seems likely that women who lived near to major pilgrimage destinations had more opportunity to exchange mobility-strategies with other women, and could apply these strategies in justifications for their own long-distance pilgrimage travel, in opposition to the criticisms of polemicists who attacked the motives of “wandering women”. Craig suggests that women’s justifications generally had to refer to wider family (rather than individual) needs, in order to be considered acceptable for travel. Mobility was not an escape from a role, but a carefully justified manifestation of a traditional role. Nevertheless, women living in proximity to pilgrimage destinations probably had access to larger networks of other women who had experience finely tuning their justifications for travel, than did women in less-pilgrimage-oriented areas. Encounter and the knowledge-transfer that accompanies it, can therefore be seen as crucial to women’s expanded mobility. It is tempting to imagine these women passing on quantities of their “portable privacy” to other women, who passed some on to others – increasing, in time, the quantity of mobility available to women as a whole.


321 Ibid., 78, 264.
Chapter 5. Conclusions

In this thesis, I have argued that women in medieval England carried with them a bubble of privacy – a small realm of the (historiographically contested) “private sphere”. It was social segregation – finely grained, and symbolically enacted. The findings presented in Chapter 4 reveal not only the mobility differential between men and women, but also a relationship between proximity to pilgrimage sites, and distant journeys taken by women – which suggests the existence of networks of female strategy-sharing and mobility-enhancing in medieval England. These findings lend support to the theories of Fincher, Iveson, and Sandercock, that encounter with “Others” can have transformative potential. It can transform both people, and people’s use of space, and even more, people’s freedom of access to and mobility through that space.

Limitations and Recommendations

The major limitation of this study is the sample size. Two case studies were chosen, yielding a total of 248 pilgrim journeys, only 36% of which were journeys by women. It is therefore difficult to say how representative the results are. Although the miracle stories are themselves biased as sources, the representativeness would be greatly enhanced by adding several more case studies. Future research should expand the same analyses to the data sets provided by the miracle collections of Thomas Cantilupe, Godric of Finchale, Frideswide of Oxford, Gilbert of Sempringham, and the other collection of Thomas Becket miracles, compiled by Benedict of Peterborough. Further expansion could include non-English pilgrims to these shrines, and those
shrines I have considered already for England. In addition to this, inclusion of case studies from non-English shrines would help to reveal how consistently the gender differences in movement hold true throughout medieval Europe.\textsuperscript{322} Expansion of the sample of case studies would provide aggregate totals of some comparable variables, large enough for more extensive spatial analysis. Socio-economic class of pilgrim, type of miracle or other justification for travel, companion gender, type and number, and any clothing or behavior indicators recorded, with a large enough sample size, could all be tested for correlation with distance and proximity factors. Similar research into women’s spatial mobility in other periods and cultures would be valuable, as well.

These and other variables would enable future studies to examine the reasons for some of the surprising results presented in this thesis. Is the increased likelihood of a woman near an alternative pilgrimage site, to travel to a far-off pilgrimage destination due in fact to the knowledge-dissemination I propose? Or are factors such as wealth or urban culture more important? Is the proximity pattern due more inherently to urban settlement patterns than to the presence of a pilgrimage location at all? That is, what matters more for long-distance mobility – being near a town, or being near a pilgrimage site? Can a control group be added to the analyses – that is, a group of men and women who ended up going on pilgrimage to a local shrine instead? If contemporaneous miracle collections can be found with large enough sample sizes, an integrated analysis of the two may be possible.

\textsuperscript{322} For example, Dorthea of Montau and Bridget of Sweden.
Finally, one avenue for future study is a spatial comparison of voluntary versus involuntary pilgrimage.\textsuperscript{323} Did women’s mobility patterns and journey lengths differ when they were forced to travel, versus when they went of their own free will? Feminist geographers have identified \textit{motility} as a crucial piece of geographic freedom. While mobility is actual travel, motility is defined as the \textit{opportunity} to travel – or \textit{not} to travel – as one chooses. The focus is on individual freedom of choice, control over one’s own presence or absence, self-positioning in a spatial world.\textsuperscript{324} Motility therefore includes within it the awareness of other options, of potential trips not made due to internal and external circumstances.\textsuperscript{325}

Feminist geographers have increasingly been calling for a “deterriorialization” of space – the decoupling of space from gendered “property”, and with it, a reconceptualization of privacy and “private” spaces. Duncan argues that it is this dichotomy, set up initially to support men’s claims to supremacy in the home, that hampers women’s mobility in the world.\textsuperscript{326} I argue, however, that while such a dichotomy existed in medieval England, it was in most circumstances on such a finely-grained scale, determined in its expression and the radii of its zones, by the class, age, marital status, behavioral, sumptuary, and rhetorical context of the people involved, that women’s mobility could function in ways not predicted by simplistic territorial conceptualizations of gendered “separate spheres”. Modern geographers and urban planners

seeking to understand women’s use of cities and regional spaces could benefit from an examination of the multi-faceted, finely-grained expressions of public and private spaces, mobility, and the portability of gendered space, seen in medieval England.
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# Appendix: The Pilgrimage Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saint</th>
<th>Village of Origin/Miracle</th>
<th>County of Origin/Miracle</th>
<th>Primary Pilgrim Name</th>
<th>Prima ry Pilgrim Sex</th>
<th>Companions on Pilg?</th>
<th>Nature of Miracle</th>
<th>Book/Source</th>
<th>Page number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Pontefract</td>
<td></td>
<td>(mother) Jordan, son of Heisulfi</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>came with his wife and son</td>
<td>boy restored to life after death on invocation of Thomas.</td>
<td>Thom vol 1</td>
<td>160-162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Winchester?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>cured of falling sickness</td>
<td>Thom vol 1</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Wite, next to Glastonbury</td>
<td></td>
<td>(mother) Nicholas, father and Nicholas boy, with mother</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>mother and father both with boy</td>
<td>lame boy cured as he began to approach Canterbury</td>
<td>Thom vol 1</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td></td>
<td>(wife) Richard, his wife and his grandson</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>All three were cured of various serious complaints has hand contracted for working on a Whitsun holy day, but she is restored by relics of the martyr Stephen has guest, Stephen's wife speaks against Thomas, and her younger son derides the Canterbury pilgrimage, and is paralysed in one arm. The mother repents, and the son receives a vision.</td>
<td>Thom vol 1</td>
<td>171-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Halberton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Emma, 'puella'</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thom vol 1</td>
<td>193-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Huerveltuna (Warbleton)</td>
<td>Sussex?</td>
<td>Stephen's wife, and probably her son.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thom vol 1</td>
<td>195-98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as</td>
<td>Laleham</td>
<td>Godlief F</td>
<td>woman admonishes people in her parish</td>
<td>Thom vol 1 198-99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as Winthoniensis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Laeticia. F</td>
<td>a child recovered when buried by the fall of a wall</td>
<td>Thom vol 1 206-07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as Cheshire (wife) Ranulf, knight and probably his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>his child fell, died, was restored on invocation (suggested by wife)</td>
<td>Thom vol 1 208-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as Brocklesby Lincoln</td>
<td>a girl, no name</td>
<td>Mabilia F</td>
<td>girl restored after a fall cured of leprosy</td>
<td>Thom vol 1 209-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as Dudley Leighton - says ed. (Lictune) (too many. not counting it.) none given:</td>
<td>there are several in UK</td>
<td>a woman F</td>
<td>cured at the tomb with the water of the martyr delivered from three days of agony in childbirth, by vow of pilgrimage</td>
<td>Thom vol 1 221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as Leighton - says ed. (Lictune) (too</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thom vol 1 221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as Hamilton</td>
<td>Leighton - says ed. (Lictune) (too many. not counting it.) none given:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thom vol 1 221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as Hamilton Margaret F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thom vol 1 226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as Wiggenhall Ascelina F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thom vol 1 236-238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as Wiggenhall Botilda F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thom vol 1 236-238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Page Numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luton</td>
<td>Wimarga</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>cured of blindness brought on by pilgrimage to St Giles in Provence</td>
<td>238-39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey</td>
<td>Seivia, a young woman</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>cured of blindness</td>
<td>239-40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faversham</td>
<td>Adelicia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>cured of blindness</td>
<td>240-41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eynesford</td>
<td>a woman</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>cured of blindness</td>
<td>241-42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hapisburgh</td>
<td>Agnes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey</td>
<td>Seivia, a young woman</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faversham</td>
<td>Adelicia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eynesford</td>
<td>a woman</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hapisburgh</td>
<td>Agnes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ifield</td>
<td>Salerna, daughter of Thomas</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>threw herself into a well, but was saved. with husband cured of infertility, gave birth to child cured of a flow of blood cured of a swelling cured in reward of kindness to pilgrim</td>
<td>258-61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitby</td>
<td>Susanna</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>264-65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grindall</td>
<td>Richolda, wife of knight</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grindall</td>
<td>Richolda, wife of knight</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>270-71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felton</td>
<td>(wife) wife and daughter of Herbert</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>271-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felton</td>
<td>(daughter) wife and daughter of Herbert</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>271-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polesworth</td>
<td>Ossana (Deo), abbess (Petronilla?)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>with companion Bertha cured of a disease of the throat, and Bertha recovers money intended for offerings at shrine</td>
<td>287</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polesworth</td>
<td>(Bertha) Ossana (Deo), abbess (Petronilla?)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>287</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rye</td>
<td>(woman) a man and woman</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thom as Rye a woman F cured of inflammation in her foot Thom vol 1 289
Thom as Welsford a woman F recovers the use of her feet Thom vol 1 292

Adelicia, daughter of William (not counted. Her story was told by someone else) Thom vol 1 294

Thom as Tarvin Cheshire (woman 1) two possessed women and one man F cured two possessed women are cured, and John is cured of worms and a quinsy Thom vol 1 306

(woman 2) two possessed women are cured, and John is cured of worms and a quinsy possessed woman cured Thom vol 1 307

Thom as Shenfield Essex (woman 1) two possessed women and one man F cured of lameness Thom vol 1 309-10
Thom as Shenfield Essex (woman 2) two possessed women are cured, and John is cured of worms and a quinsy possessed woman cured Thom vol 1 309-10

Thom as Gloucester a woman F cured of deformity of her feet Thom vol 1 311-12

Livevia (stood at window, may not be in Cant.) (but counted) F cured of leprosy Thom vol 1 315

Thom as Ledbury (Liddebere) Eva F daughter brought back to life Thom vol 1 344
Thom as Glastonbury Malota F son restored after death under a mill-wheel Thom vol 1 345-46

Thom as Market Cecilia F cured of leprosy Thom vol 1 330-32

Thom as Weighton Odelina F daughter restored after drowning stillborn child Thom vol 1 344

Thom as Salisbury (area) a girl, with parents? F son restored after death under a mill-wheel Thom vol 1 345-46

Thom as London (the far side of) (too many. Hard to tell. Not counting) a girl, with parents? F

Thom as Widford (too many. Hard to tell. Not counting) (wife) Alan and Eva, his wife F

Thom as Burton a woman tells story F

Thom as Lichfield a woman living in sin woman living in sin
Thom as Northwood Whitstable (father) small girl -parents F

5 year old girl restored after drowning, after father gave her Thomas water

Thom as Willesborough (Wicheburgum Anglicus) concubine of Robert, a clerk F

Thom as near Rye Beatrice F

Thom as Shepton-George (Ovium Custodia) near Bridport Edith F

Thom as Hullavington Wilts Margaret F

Thom as Yorkshire Sygerid F her husband

Thom as Cranbourne a woman F

Thom as Witsand (bay, next to current Crafthole?) a woman F

Thom as Worceester Elveva F

Thom as Eye Angli woman whose child swallowed a ring F

Thom as Stockton too many. No idea. Not counting. a woman F

Thom vol 1 366

Thom vol 1 390-92

Thom vol 1 393

Thom vol 1 394

Thom vol 1 395-96

Thom vol 1 395-96

Thom vol 1 450

Thom vol 1 453

Thom vol 1 453

Thom vol 1 465

Thom vol 1 467-68
and give a calf to St Thomas, is punished
Thom as Dorset a woman F
Thom as Oxford Eleanor, wife of a knight F
Thom as Burton too many. No idea. Not counting. daughter of William, priest F with father
Thom as Exeter (near) Devonshire (wife) man and wife F man and wife together
Thom as Lindsey concubine of Ralph, dean F
Thom as Necton dioc Norwich (mother) Nicolas, son of priest - parents vowed pilgrimage F
Thom as Norwich Reginald M
Thom as Nottingham Ralph M
Thom as Etton Yorkshire Thomas of Etton (Ectune) M
Thom as Westoning Ailward M
Thom as Pontefract (father) Jordan, son of Heisulfi M came with his wife and son
Thom as St Albans William M

recovered a stolen web delivered in the danger of childbirth cured of disease in her breast
Thom as Oxford Thomas vol 1 469
Thom as Burton Thomas vol 1 469-70
Thom as Burton Thomas vol 1 470
Thom as Exeter (near) Devonshire Thomas vol 1 472-74
Thom as Lindsey Thomas vol 1 504-05
Thom as Necton dioc Norwich has a vision in which an English anthem is sung to Thomas as martyr Thomas vol 1 150-51
Thom as Norwich Thomas vol 1 154
Thom as Etton Yorkshire Thomas vol 1 153
Thom as Westoning Thomas vol 1 156-158
Thom as Pontefract Thomas vol 1 160-162
Thom as St Albans Thomas vol 1 166
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Diocese</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Age, Gender, Condition</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thom Wite</td>
<td>Glastonbury</td>
<td>(father)</td>
<td>Nicholaus, father and Nicholaus boy, with mother</td>
<td>lamb boy cured as he began to approach</td>
<td>Thom vol 1</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom</td>
<td>Lincoln diocese</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>169-70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom</td>
<td>Lindsey</td>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>171-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom</td>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>Richard, his wife and his grandson</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>All three were cured of various serious complaints</td>
<td>Thom vol 1</td>
<td>171-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom</td>
<td>Chichester</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>173-74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom</td>
<td>Marton</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom</td>
<td>Chineside</td>
<td>Heinif</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>174-75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom</td>
<td>Beverley</td>
<td>Symon</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>175-76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom</td>
<td>Chingford</td>
<td>Ralph</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>176-77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom</td>
<td>Chichester</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>177-78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom</td>
<td>Aldrington</td>
<td>Odo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>178-79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom</td>
<td>Marchaneus</td>
<td>a young man</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A young man, disabled in Irish war, healed on</td>
<td>Thom vol 1</td>
<td>181-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marcham, Berks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vowing pilgrimage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom</td>
<td>Ritherfeld</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom</td>
<td>Beverley</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
punished with affliction for doing so, but was cured on the way. cured of dropsy after vision of Thomas and St Edmund.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middleton, Suffolk</td>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>(not found. Possibly Brampton, but there are a lot of those. Could be any.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>184-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromton</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>cured of dropsy by goin on pilgrimage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>187-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hythe (Hingue)</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>too many to tell. Not using. with Phillip of Teynham (next)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>188-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doddington</td>
<td>Reiner</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>too many to tell. Not using. restored from seeming death</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>189-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teynham</td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>cured of paralysis died of cancer, then restored.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>189-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumstead Hostorpe (Osgathorpe Leicestershire or Ousethorpe, Yorkshire?)</td>
<td>William, the father</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>(too vague, can't find) son restored from death son Philippus, 8 years old, restored after drowning child of a priest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>199-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>Hugh Scotus</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200-202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somersal Herbert, Derbyshire</td>
<td>Radulfus</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>(father) Gaufridus, boy; fatHer Robert and mother Laetitia.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>203-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winthoniensi s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>206-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crondall (Cicestrensis or Wintoniensis)</td>
<td>Petrus (jester)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>207-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>Ranulf, knight and probably his wife</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>208-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Condition and Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon abbey</td>
<td>foundling</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>invocation (suggested by wife) teenage boy cured of leprosy with husband, who is also cured of blindness in one eye, and companion Botilda, also recovers eyesight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiggenhall Colchester abbey</td>
<td>Ascelina’s husband</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>cured of a paralytic infliction of her face cured of vomiting cured of diabetes cured of desperate sickness in a dream buried by fall of earth while working cured of a wound from a hatchet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingworth Norfolk</td>
<td>Randulf</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>vision: Thomas appears with message for king. Thomas imprisoned on charge of manslaughter, is delivered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>Nigel</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>twice cured loses ring containing relic of St Thomas then finds it again when about to offer at the tomb returning from pilgrimage, loses then recovers a spur.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellet near Lancaster</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stafford</td>
<td>Guy</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selham Sussex</td>
<td>Ralph</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chearsly (Chasle) Bucks</td>
<td>Ralph</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thom as region of Bury St Edmunds a pilgrim to St Thomas, male M

Thom as Rye (man) a man and woman M

Thom as Hedon Bethune, France (Henry) Henry, with father M father

Thom as Hedon Bethune, France (father) Henry, with father M father

Thom as Richmond (North) Yorkshire a horse dealer M

Thom as Dover Gerard and his crew M

Thom as Bristol crew of the Colresand, ship M

Thom as Colchester priory Colchester Robert M

Thom as Shenfield Essex (the man) two possessed women and one man M

Thom as Stourton too many to tell. Not using. a young boy M
cured of paralysis on recovering after refusing food for 18 days delivered after a shipwreck

Thom as Dover Nicolas M

Thom as Dover Geoffrey M

lost money at Sudbury, recovered it at Rochester

St Thomas rejects the oblations of a man and woman living in sin recovers his eyesight, and his father is cured of swelling in his knees

a horse dealer, falsely charged with having stolen a colt, gets the victory in judicial combat

they abandoned ship, but then it was saved and followed them. twice delivered from a devil two possessed women are cured, and John is cured of worms and a quinsy

Thom vol 1 286-87

Thom vol 1 288

Thom vol 1 291

Thom vol 1 291

Thom vol 1 295-96

Thom vol 1 300-01

Thom vol 1 301-02

Thom vol 1 305

Thom vol 1 306

Thom vol 1 309

Thom vol 1 315-16

Thom vol 1 316-17
many miracles on long journey to Rome and back, goes to Canterbury sailing overseas, delivered from storm and brought home cured of leprosy cured of leprosy cured of leprosy was grievously hurt by ruffians, had part of brain restored and wounds healed. brain injured by large stone, is cured a lamb restored to life after slaughter stillborn child brought back to life son restored from death son of miller restored after passing under a mill-wheel on the Arrow river son of miller restored after passing under a mill-wheel on the Arrow river cured of gout after 20 years cured of an abscess under the arm Thom as Monkton (Thanet) William M Thom as Sandwich George M Thom as Nottingham John M Thom as Derby Simon M Thom as Boxgrove monastery Godwin M Thom as Lilford Robert M Thom as Eye (near Peterborough) son of priest M Thom as Newport near Northampton Widonem M Thom as Burton too many to tell. Not using. (man) Alan and Eva, his wife M Thom as Malton too many to tell. Not using. Ralph Goodman M Thom as dioc Worcester (father) Alexander and Walter M Thom as dioc Worcester (son) Alexander and Walter M Thom as Bramwith Thomas, parson M Thom as Woodhorn near Morpeth Richard, a priest M Thom vol 1 330 Thom vol 1 334-36 Thom vol 1 34-41 Thom vol 1 341 Thom vol 1 343-44 Thom vol 1 345-46 Thom vol 1 347 Thom vol 1 348 Thom vol 1 348 Thom vol 1 348-49 Thom vol 1 349-50
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thom as</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Thom vol</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thom as Binbrooke (Lincoln dioc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geoffrey</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>cured of paralysis brought on by indulgence of appetite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>350-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as near Exeter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Osbern</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>cured of a rupture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>351-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as Holton Suffolk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edmund, shepherd boy (Ralph)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>cured of blindness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>352-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as Standon Herts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(son) Ralph and his son</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>with son</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>357-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as Northwood Whitstable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(mother) small girl -parents</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5 year old girl restored after drowning, after father gave her Thomas water</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as Pontefract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>boy of 15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>cured of frightful visions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>380-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as Pontefract Bury St Edmunds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>cured of blindness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>381-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as dioc Coventry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>385-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as dioc York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hugh</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>cures related</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>386-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as Northampton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>cures related</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>386-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as Cheshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(father) knight's son, with father</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>delivered from a thorn in hand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>387-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as Cheshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(son) knight's son, with father</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>delivered from a thorn in hand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>387-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as Yorkshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sygerid's husband</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>cured of a disease in the breast his son restored when seemingly dead</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>395-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as Evesham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bertram</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>struck down by lightening, brought back to life and right mind. lost a finger, offers the bone of it at Canterbury, then a new finger grows</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>403-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as Hoole (Cohel) near Chester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geoffrey</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>404-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as Durham dioc (cannot find)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a man</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>423-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Diocese</td>
<td>Thomas, a</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>from his hand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as</td>
<td>Taunton</td>
<td>monastery</td>
<td>John King, monk</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>is wounded and mutilated by a jealous man, but restored by St Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as</td>
<td>Lilleshall (Beleshale)</td>
<td>Chester diocese</td>
<td>Robert, a Templar</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>cured of leprosy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as</td>
<td>Follingham (I found Fillingham)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>cured of sickness restored to life by water of St Thomas, warned to go to tomb to give thanks finds a candle re-lit on altar of St Thomas, and his child is cured of blindness pig, given as reward for working to construct a chapel of St Thomas, is preserved 40 days incorrupt in the river</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as</td>
<td>York</td>
<td></td>
<td>William</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>finds a candle re-lit on altar of St Thomas, and his child is cured of blindness pig, given as reward for working to construct a chapel of St Thomas, is preserved 40 days incorrupt in the river</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as</td>
<td>Arthington</td>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>Turgis</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>man and wife</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as</td>
<td>Exeter (near)</td>
<td>Devonshire</td>
<td>(man) man and wife</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as</td>
<td>Newcastle-on-Tyne</td>
<td></td>
<td>crew of a ship</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as</td>
<td>Rotherby (ed says Rutheby?)</td>
<td>Leicestershire (prob)</td>
<td>Hugh, parson</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom as</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ralph</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thom as</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dioc Norwich</td>
<td>girl and father</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>girl wounded by father with hayfork</td>
<td>Thom vol 1</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>Gilbert, knight</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>cured of a pain in his arm</td>
<td>Thom vol 1</td>
<td>507-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>Walter, a dean</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>cured of gout and dizziness</td>
<td>Thom vol 1</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>Stephen, parson</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>son restored when in extremity</td>
<td>Thom vol 1</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stocksbury</td>
<td>William, a canon</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>cured of epilepsy</td>
<td>Thom vol 1</td>
<td>508-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>small daughter of Elfwin</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>child restored after falling into well</td>
<td>Thom vol 1</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Stockbury)</td>
<td>small son of Henry</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>child restored from death</td>
<td>Thom vol 1</td>
<td>522-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(father) Nicolas, son of priest</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>parents vowed pilgrimage</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thom vol 1</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>man building hospital to St Thomas</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>directed in dreams where to find water and how to procure a book for the chapel</td>
<td>Thom vol 1</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptons hire</td>
<td>mad woman, or her husband Geoffrey Brawnston (or Beanston)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>cured through invocation</td>
<td>Hen</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(St Ledgers)</td>
<td>little girl, swallowed too-big head of wheat. Cured by invocation.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hen</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Joan Estmond</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>girls sat under large stack of firewood. Huge trunk fell on her</td>
<td>Hen</td>
<td>50-54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Thomas Fowle and) wife  F  brought boy who was cured of death and vision on invocation.

Elizabeth, wife of John Lowe  F  a "party"

parents of sick boy (boy's name John Lincoln)  (mother)  F  boy struck down by sudden disease. Cured when parents vowed pilgrimage to Windsor from unknown origin.

(Thomas Barrow and) wife  F  names of deposition witnesses (from second pilg) are: Haryes. Johannes Mason. Johannes Perkyn. Willelimus Welobed Agnes Haryes. working in a sand pit digging out sand, when huge weight of it fell on her. Delivered by invocation.

Alice Parkyn  F
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Brawnston (4 miles from Welford and 2 from &quot;Legesashby&quot; or Ashby St Leger)</td>
<td>Northamptons hire</td>
<td>Agnes Haryes (in Alice Parkyn party)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Stoneleigh near Coventry</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agnes Shene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>Henry Walter de Guildford's sister made the pilgrimage on his behalf.</td>
<td>Henry Walter de Guildford's sister made the pilgrimage on his behalf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Burnham near Windsor</td>
<td>Abbess of Burnham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>London (St Dunstan's parish)</td>
<td>mother of Agnes Alyn (and wife of John Watson)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hen VI
Sawndryche (Sandwich) Kent (mother) parents of child named John Colman F infant sick with St Anthony's Fire, healed instantly when parents commended him to Hen and vowed pilgrimage Hen 99

Hen VI
Adisham near (4 miles from) Canterbury (Kent) (William Walter, and) wife-parents - and 13 year old Joan F yes, girl and parents Joan suffered from strange and terrible swelling of her tibia, nearly died, was restored to health on invocation and measuring. Hen 106-109

Hen VI
Church Honeybourn (provinciae Cantianae) maybe Kent, but only one in 19th cent was in Worcestershire near Evesham) (mother) Agnes Freeman and parents F 9 year old girl cured of the King's Evil upon her parents making a vow of pilgrimage nun had epilepsy, cured on invocation by other sisters Hen 109-110

Hen VI
Littlemore near Oxford Christina Marshall (nun/sister) F

Hen VI
Reading Joan Knight F young girl hanged by neck accidentally while playing. Hen 112

Hen VI
Lambourn Berkshire mother of Joan (who was daughter of Richard Walran) F lost sight due to evil spirit, cured on invocation Hen 114-118

Hen VI
Henley-on-Thames Alice Barbour F burning house cooled after invocation of Hen. Hen 119-120

Hen
Alerton (Ollerton) Sherwood Forest, Nottinghamshire (Peter and) Margaret Barley F
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hen VI</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Person(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keyton (Ketton) Rutland</td>
<td>(mother) John Hargrave (boy) - parents went to Windsor F</td>
<td>small boy burnt head, cranium fell off, near death, revived on invocation, cured and grew back afterwards. Hen 130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellingly Sussex</td>
<td>(mother) parents of Agnes, daughter of John Devenish F</td>
<td>had plum stone stuck in nostril for 6 months, suffered long and death thought likely. Stone fell out after mother invoked Hen. Fire in convent put out on invocation Hen 133-134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denny Abbey near Ely</td>
<td>Abbess of Denny Abbey F</td>
<td>fire in convent put out on invocation Hen 134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge (St Edward's parish) Cambs</td>
<td>Katherine Bailey F</td>
<td>went to Windsor with 40 witnesses of her drowning, and cure, probably including both of her parents, who had been looking for her after drowning. Hen 136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rye Sussex</td>
<td>(a woman witness) Margaret, daughter of John Denys F</td>
<td>young girl drowned, restored to life when Hen invoked by neighbors and bystanders. Hen 137-140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hen VI

Rye, Sussex

(a male witness)
Margaret, daughter of John Denys

went to Windsor with 40 witnesses of her drowning, and cure, probably including both of her parents, who had been looking for her after drowning.

Hen VI

Wolsingham (Wosyngham)

Durham

mother Alice Featherstonehugh (daughter Cecily, husband: Thomas Featherstonehugh)

young girl drowned, restored to life when Hen invoked by neighbors and bystanders.

Hen VI

Buckingham

Joan Sawyer (also called Walsh)

5 year old girl, head hit by horse hoof, skull shattered, near death, recovered and skull healed, on invocation (and brought her into church)

Hen VI

Tottenham

Margaret Buckingham

after 5 years of blindness, sight restored after prayer to Hen.

Hen VI

North Waltham (Northwalton)

near Basingstoke

(mother) parents of William Lamhall, then mother alone

young man crushed under wheel of loaded wagon

Hen VI

Hyham Ferres (Higham Northampons)

hire

mother of little boy Edmund Brown

little boy was drowned in a pool of very dirty water, recovered breath when Hen invoked.

Hen 137-140

Hen 140-142

Hen 148-149

Hen 157

Hen 157-158
Hen VI

Sheppey (isle). Lived just outside of Minster convent.  

Mother of infant Anne, daughter of Thomas Plott F

Yes: witnesses to the miracle recorded as John Besy and his wife Alice, and Agnes Andrew, who had bent the penny. small girl's shoulder was crushed by the wheel of a loaded wagon, (she was thoroughly run over), she died, and was brought to life again on invocation.亨 159-163

Sheppey (isle). Lived just outside of Minster convent.  

(John Besy's wife) party of Mother of infant Anne, daughter of Thomas Plott F

Yes: witnesses to the miracle recorded as John Besy and his wife Alice, and Agnes Andrew, who had bent the penny. small girl's shoulder was crushed by the wheel of a loaded wagon, (she was thoroughly run over), she died, and was brought to life again on invocation. 亨 159-163

Sheppey (isle). Lived just outside of Minster convent.  

(Agnes Andrew) party of Mother of infant Anne, daughter of Thomas Plott F

Yes: witnesses to the miracle recorded as John Besy and his wife Alice, and Agnes Andrew, who had bent the penny. small girl's shoulder was crushed by the wheel of a loaded wagon, (she was thoroughly run over), she died, and was brought to life again on invocation. 亨 159-163

London (parish of St Martin Orgar)  

Helen Barker F

Drive to madness by an extreme melancholy, cut her own throat, but saved and recovered thanks to Hen 亨 163

Kennington, Kent  

(mother) boy and mother and father (Richard Woodward) of little boy F

15 month old boy fell into pool near father's door and drowned 亨 167-169
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Condition and Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>near Abingdon,</td>
<td>Agnes Greene</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>recovered from Hen. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtenay</td>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>year old boy weakened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>by strange disease that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>spread over his body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cured after mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>measured for candle and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prayed to Hen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croyden</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>(the mother)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of boy F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mother and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>father (John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adowne)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryarsh, near</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Agnes Wren</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>the mother and father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of boy F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Wallyng)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryarsh, near</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>(Alice Lesy)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>party of Agnes Wren F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Wallyng)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkenby</td>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>Alice Smyth</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Hacconby)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Lucy Gye)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John and Lucy Gye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(perhaps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>neighbors or friends of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>neighbors or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>father (Richard Taylor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>friends of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and mother of baby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Isolde F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grested (East</td>
<td>Sussex (or</td>
<td>mother of Alice</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>died from plague, cured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinstead)</td>
<td>Surrey)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>by vision of Hen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mere (Myre)</td>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>mother of Alice</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Newnett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Condition/Event</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton</td>
<td>(probably Abbots)</td>
<td></td>
<td>F boy long afflicted with pain from a rupture, cured upon parents' vow of pilgrimage</td>
<td>Hen 181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(probably Abbots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreton or Morton</td>
<td>diocese Worcester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underhill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albourne</td>
<td>Marian Cowpar</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>throat was pierced by pitchfork in a fall, was near death, cured on invocation</td>
<td>Hen 187-188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury,</td>
<td>Elizabeth, wife of</td>
<td></td>
<td>had a lingering disease, cured after invocation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parish St Mary</td>
<td>William Kyffyn</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bredman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>six month old boy, caught and hanged to death in his cradle, recovered when mother bent a penny</td>
<td>Hen 191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mother of infant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Trevagnes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(son of Thomas)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brackley</td>
<td>Mother of John</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11 year old boy had great cancer in his mouth for years, restored when mother</td>
<td>Hen 193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptons hire</td>
<td>Sharp</td>
<td></td>
<td>bent a penny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playden</td>
<td>Margaret Coterell</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>she was ill with plague, went into mad fit. Health restored when her servants</td>
<td>Hen 193-194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex (near Rye)</td>
<td>mother of John</td>
<td></td>
<td>measured her for a candle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharp</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteparish</td>
<td>Margaret Coterell</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>two neighbors attested the facts:</td>
<td>Hen 195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near Salisbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Littlesea and John Clavell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wimborne Minster</td>
<td>Agnes Billing</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>sick of a strange disease for 7</td>
<td>Hen 198-199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Agnes Sulton</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(parish of St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clement's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Place 1</td>
<td>Place 2</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Beynest (probably Batheaston) near Bath</td>
<td>(the mother) parents of Joan Hudd (girl), and the girl herself</td>
<td>6 year old girl with strange sickness for three years, in danger of death, recovered health on invocation. Hen 199-202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>London, close to the Thames</td>
<td>(the mother) North (Katherine North) of little son of Robert</td>
<td>4 year old boy disfigured on top lip Hen 202-203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>London (near Thames)</td>
<td>(the mother) parents (Robert and Katherine North) of girl Joan (sister of boy in ID 126)</td>
<td>7 year old girl drowned to death by recovered life after invocation. Hen 203-204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Cliffe, Lewes</td>
<td>Joan Reynolds (her mother prayed to Hen)</td>
<td>3 year old boy swallowed a large brass pin, near death, threw up pin when parents vowed pilgrimage went blind from terrible head pain, was bline for a year, sight restored after a visit from Hen and prayers to him for a year. Hen 204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Heyde (Hythe) Kent</td>
<td>Agnes, wife of William Primrose</td>
<td>died of plague, sewn up in shroud, restored to life on invocation. Hen 204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Henry VI | Ashby Leger (St Ledgers) | Northamptons hire | (husband of) mad woman, or her husband Geoffrey Brawnston (or Beanston) | M | mad woman cured through invocation 
forester had chief veins in right arm severed by a catapult, healed on calling on Hen. 
<p>| Hen VI | Saverake Forest | Alexander Senior | M | Hen 39 |
| Hen VI | Farlington near Portsmouth | Thomas Symon (his house) | M | Hen 40 |
| Hen VI | Hollington Sussex | Master William Edwardes, vicar of a parish church | M | Hen 41 |
| Hen VI | Wodmaston dioc. Winchester (prob. Woodmanstern e in Surrey) | Thomas Attwood | M | Hen 49 |
| Hen (?) | Harysam (Harrietsham Kent) | young man | M | Hen 50 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Marden, Kent</td>
<td>Thomas Fowle (and wife)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>boy named Thomas, son of Thomas Fowle, hit in eye by arrow, and cured of death and vision on invocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>Richard ap Meredith</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>man pierced by a spear during a scuffle with trespassers, almost died, healed on invocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen</td>
<td>Midhurst, Sussex</td>
<td>David Bucknell</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>cured of colic which he had been suffering for 10 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>Thomas Burton</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>freed from imprisonments by apparition of Hen, and freed from prison by said apparition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Fernham/Fernhurst, Sussex</td>
<td>John Steven</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>farmer struck by lightning, nearly died. Restored by prayer to Hen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td>Robert Warton</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>sick with strange disease in Brittany, healed instantly by invocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Appleby/Maidenhead, Westmorland</td>
<td>Miles Branbryke (poss. Bainbrigge)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>unusual pain from a rupture for several years, until help of Hen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Appleby/Maidenhead (possibly wounded in France, maybe still following the wars)</td>
<td>John Stevenson</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>hit in head by a javelin, delivered by invocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Isle of Wight</td>
<td>Edward Fyce</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>man's head shattered by fall of log from wagon. Restored after invocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>Henry Fromby</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>stabbed in belly with sword, saved through mental prayer to Hen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>run over and killed by a loaded wagon. Revived through prayer to Hen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>(Elsenham)</td>
<td>Thomas Paynston</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>boy struck down by sudden disease. Cured when parents vowed pilgrimage to Hen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>daughter cut her throat accidentally in a fall. Delivered from death by prayer to Hen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>boy (boy's name John Lincoln) (father) M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Temple (Temple Hall) (saying belonging to Knights Hospitalliers) Leicestershire</td>
<td>Robert Barton</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>fell upon a knife while playing, cut her throat, cured on prayer to Hen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Cranbrook</td>
<td>Thomas Barrow (and wife)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>run over by a wagon, laydead all night, healed by invocation next day. Occurred after returning home with supplies bought from London. Travelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Roothing</td>
<td>John Wall</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>went with his master Robert, John's father, and one previous companion, within 10 days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>White Roothing</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>master, Robert (John Wall)</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Hen VI | White Roothing | Essex | father of (John Wall) | M | went with his master Robert, John's father, and one previous companion, within 10 days. | Hen | 65-72 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hen VI</th>
<th>Brawnston (4 miles from Welford and 2 from &quot;Legesashby&quot; - or Ashby St Leger)</th>
<th>Northamptons hire</th>
<th>Haryes (in Alice Parkyn party)</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>names of deposition witnesses (from second pilg) are:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>working in a sand pit digging out sand, when huge weight of it fell on her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivered by invocation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hen 72-73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Names of depositions witnesses (from second pilg) are:

- Haryes.
- Johannes Mason.
- Johannes Perkyn.
- Willelimus Welobedd.
- Agnes Haryes.

Working in a sand pit digging out sand, when huge weight of it fell on her.

Delivered by invocation.

Hen 72-73
names of deposition witnesses (from second pilg) are: 
Haryes. 
Johannes Mason. 
Johannes Perkyn. 
Willelimus Welobedd. 
Agnes Haryes. 
working in a sand pit digging out sand, when huge weight of it fell on her. Delivered by invocation. restored sight in lost eye when vow of pilgrimage made. blind man recovered sight after vowing pilgrimage lame man restored to heath at the king's tomb sick man regained health at Henry's tomb. sick man saw vision of Hen, and friends prayed for him, then he was cured of sickness. innocent man hanged as robber (in Cambridge), but Hen appeared and supported him, and in doing so cleared him and saved his life. (he had taken up with a man for company, but that man had stolen flock
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hen VI</th>
<th>Sawndryche (Sandwich)</th>
<th>Kent</th>
<th>(father) parents of child named John Colman</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>infant sick with St Anthony's Fire, healed instantly when parents commended him to Hen and vowed pilgrimage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hen 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>St Michael's Mount</td>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>Richard Whitby, priest of St Michael's Mount (may find him in Syon info)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>priest was sick for a long time with fever, almost wasted away, healed by miracle at pilgrimage to tomb at Widsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hen 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Caversham (taking wine from Reading to Aylesbury)</td>
<td>Oxfordshire, near Reading</td>
<td>Stephen Payne (and Henry Lugey)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>flow of wine from a burst barrel (from overturned cart) stopped when drivers of cart called on Hen. And afterwards, no loss of wine found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hen 99-105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Caversham (taking wine from Reading to Aylesbury)</td>
<td>Oxfordshire, near Reading</td>
<td>(Stephen Payne and) Henry Lugey</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>flow of wine from a burst barrel (from overturned cart) stopped when drivers of cart called on Hen. And afterwards, no loss of wine found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hen 99-105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adisham</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>William Walter, (and wife and 13 year old Joan)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Strang and terrible swelling of her tibia, nearly died, restored to health on invocation and measuring.</td>
<td>Hen 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Honeybourn</td>
<td>Worcestershire</td>
<td>(father) Agnes Freeman and parents</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9 year old girl cured of the King's Evil upon her parents making a vow of pilgrimage</td>
<td>Hen 109-110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luton</td>
<td>Beds.</td>
<td>Walter Barker</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sudden shock, regained health after three days of continual crying out Hen's name.</td>
<td>Hen 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bildeston</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>Richard Swetocke</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Deaf, finally healed on invocation. Eye pierced by javelin, 7 inches deep, escaped death on invocation.</td>
<td>Hen 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Saxton</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30 years of severe pains in the head cured on prayer to Hen. Struck blind after insulting Hen, then sight restored when vowed pilgrimage to Hen's tomb.</td>
<td>Hen 111-112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas Crakebon</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ynkeborough</td>
<td>Worcestershir</td>
<td>John Robins</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkhamsted</td>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>William Hardford</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hen 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal (Kirkby Kendal)</td>
<td>John Robinson</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Regained health on pilgrimage sick and disabled after 2 years of illness, cured at tomb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton Cheney Northamptons hire</td>
<td>George Buttery</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>&quot;was brought to the tomb&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doddinghurst Essex</td>
<td>John Locksley, priest (also attested by another priest, Nicholas Terre, chaplain of Kelvedon, nearby)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chalice and breviary stolen from a church, miraculously restored and put back a few days later, after invocation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penzance</td>
<td>Richard Vyvian</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Almost dying of plague, cured by prayers of Hen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alerton (Ollerton) Sherwood Forest, Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>Peter (and Margaret) Barley</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Small boy burnt head, cranium fell off, near death, revived on invocation, cured and grew back afterwards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyton (Ketton) Rutland</td>
<td>(father) John Hargrave (boy) - parents went to Windsor</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kicked in a game (of football/soccer - described in detail), suffered long pain, recovered after seeing Hen in a dream. He then made a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caunton Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>William Bartram</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

on remembering Hen.

had been lame and crippled for 10 years.

Hen VI 118=19

Hen VI 119

Hen VI 120

Hen VI 129

Hen VI 129

Hen VI 130

Hen VI 131-132
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hen VI</th>
<th>Sowthow (Southoe)</th>
<th>Huntingdonshire</th>
<th>Richard Archdeken</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>vow of abstinence on all Tuesdays.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Sowthow (Southoe)</td>
<td>Huntingdonshire</td>
<td>Richard Archdeken</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>vow of abstinence on all Tuesdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Hellingly Well, near Wisbech (Upwell and Outwell, on the Well Creek)</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>William Gronger</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>cow near death after calving, restored to health through invocation of Hen by owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Hellingly Well, near Wisbech (Upwell and Outwell, on the Well Creek)</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>William Gronger</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>cow near death after calving, restored to health through invocation of Hen by owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Smallhythe (near Tenterden)</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>John Agelde</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>phthisis (consumption) trouble for 2 years, recovered full health on invocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Barking</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>John Gery</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>phthisis (consumption) trouble for 2 years, recovered full health on invocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Hynce Lynn (illness and cure there), but lived in London (St Thomas Wryth)</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>John Well</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>tongue swollen, near death, cured on invocation sick, no speech for four days, received cure at mental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Hynce Lynn (illness and cure there), but lived in London (St Thomas Wryth)</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>John Well</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>tongue swollen, near death, cured on invocation sick, no speech for four days, received cure at mental</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Zachary parish

Bryzthelmeston (Brighton) Sussex William Hill (and John Raynold) M

yes, both together, with "other trustworthy witnesses" (three men named: John Reynald himself, John Strenger, and John Key) when trying to get dead ducks out of a well, both men fell into a deep well, near to drowning, supported up by Hen after invocation. Hen 142-148

Bryzthelmeston (Brighton) Sussex (William Hill and John Raynold) M

yes, both together, with "other trustworthy witnesses" (three men named: John Reynald himself, John Strenger, and John Key) when trying to get dead ducks out of a well, both men fell into a deep well, near to drowning, supported up by Hen after invocation. Hen 142-148

Bryzthelmeston (Brighton) Sussex John Strenger (with William Hill party) M

John Strenger, and John Key) by Hen after invocation. Hen 142-148
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bryzhelmost (Brighton)</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Key (with William Hill party)</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>yes, both together, with &quot;other trustworthy witnesses&quot; (three men named: John Reynald himself, John Strenger, and John Key)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Harprey (Harptree)</td>
<td>Somerset, five miles from Salisbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Beys</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>wrongly hanged for theft, saved by Hen, who held rope from his neck when nearly dead, and Virgin Mary, who held up his feet with her hands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Waltham (Northwalton)</td>
<td>near Basingstoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(father) parents of William Lamhall, then mother alone</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>young man crushed under wheel of loaded wagon chaplain was planning suicide by hanging, but then admonished by Hen, and put away the ladder and noose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stretton Magna</td>
<td>about three miles from Leicester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a chaplain</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Yes: small girl's shoulder was crushed by the wheel of a loaded wagon, (she was thoroughly run over), she died, and was brought to life again on invocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheppey (isle)</td>
<td>Lived just outside of Minster convent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(John Besy) party of Mother of infant Anne, daughter of Thomas Plott</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>witnesses to the miracle recorded as John Besy and his wife Alice, and Agnes Andrew, who had bent the penny.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Hen 142-148
- Hen 149-156
- Hen 157
- Hen 158
- Hen 159-163
W. Freebridge, father of Miles, the 9 month old boy M yes, Thomas Nicholas, who pulled the boy to land, and W. Barbour 6 year old boy drowned, restored to life upon invocation. Hen 167

Richard Bythewey: father (or other relative) of John Bythewey, six year old boy M yes, Thomas Nicholas, who pulled the boy to land, and W. Barbour 6 year old boy drowned, restored to life upon invocation. Hen 167

(Thomas Nicholas) party of Richard Bythewey: father (or other relative) of John Bythewey, six year old boy M yes, Thomas Nicholas, who pulled the boy to land, and W. Barbour 6 year old boy drowned, restored to life upon invocation. Hen 167

W. Barbour 6 year old boy drowned, restored to life upon invocation. Hen 167

(father) boy and mother and father (Richard Woodward) of little boy M 15 month old boy fell into pool near father’s door and drowned six year old boy drowned after falling off a boat moored by the river Thames, brought to life after invocation. Hen 167-169

father of boy William Granger M hit between eyes by arrow, recovered health on invocation. Hen 169

William Weld M
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hen VI</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farnham, Dorset</td>
<td>father (John Ashe) of infant boy died of drowning in well half full of water, restored on invocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Croyden, Surrey</td>
<td>(the father) mother and father (John Adowne) of boy weakened by strange disease that spread over his body. Cured after mother measured for candle and prayed to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ryarsh, near Malling (Wallyng), Kent</td>
<td>(John Borre) party of Agnes Wren yes: Alice Lesy, John Borre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burnham Deepdale (Burnham Deepdale), Norfolk</td>
<td>William Sanderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grested (East Grinstead), Sussex (or Surrey)</td>
<td>(John Gye) John and Lucy Gye (perhaps neighbors or friends of father (Richard Taylor) and mother of baby Isolde) received health and straightness on prayer to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honiton, Devon</td>
<td>Richard Denys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hen 171

Hen 171-176

Hen 176

Hen 177

Hen 177

Hen 178
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location1</th>
<th>Location2</th>
<th>Name1</th>
<th>Name2</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Laughton</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Stapleton</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>out on fasting in honor of Hen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Merton (probably Abbots Moreton or Morton Underhill)</td>
<td>diocese Worcester</td>
<td>(the father) parents of Richard Lee (Henry Lee is father)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>stabbed in belly in murderous attack, most guts gone. Near death, but saved by invocation of Hen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Higham</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Edmund Crumpe</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>178-179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Stratford (East) (Stratford of the Bow)</td>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>John Styrman, father of Elizabeth Styrman</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Preston</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Elston</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>182-183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Kingsclere</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Preast - father of John, 8 yr old boy</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>188-189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
companions prayed to Hen
had been blind for three years, regained
sight on prayer to Hen.
gilded penny promised to Hen's tomb
but never taken there, was lost
along with a wallet of money. Then
restored by miracle.
gilded penny promised to Hen's tomb
but never taken there, was lost
along with a wallet of money. Then
restored by miracle.
ship in danger at sea during storm,
made it safely to shore after collection
taken and promise to convey to Windsor
had been ailing for three years, bent and cripples.
Cured after bent a penny sliced
through his foot with an axe,
recovered health on invocation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle undirlyme</td>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>James Smith</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichfield</td>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Richard Browne (and Richard Berow) (friends of Thomas Mowmford, recipient of miracle)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichfield</td>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Richard Browne (and Richard Berow) (friends of Thomas Mowmford, recipient of miracle)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axbridge</td>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>helmsman of ship of John Jarvyse</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptons hire</td>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Ralph Gabbott</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakering</td>
<td>Hen VI</td>
<td>Thomas Stephen</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
his horse was pierced by a pitchfork, almost unseated the rider, stood quiet and was healed on invocation.

Hen VI

Elstree Hertforshire John Nobl M

ill with plague, lay dead for 7 hours, restored to life and health.

Hen VI

Newnham Bridge near Tenbury William Young M

a king's bailiff out collecting rents near the Welsh border was wounded by robbers and left for dead in roadway. He was saved on invocation and prayer had been lame and on a wooden leg for 7 years, cured on invocation.

Hen VI

Salop John Curyer M

two neighbors attested the facts (but maybe only on investigation in village): John Littlesea and John Clavell gave birth to a child "happily enough" after a delayed pregnancy, and Hen prophesied to her.

Hen VI

Wimborne Minster Dorset (John Littlesea) party of Agnes Billing Clavell

Hen VI

194

Hen VI

196

Hen VI

196-197

Hen VI

197

Hen VI

198-199
| Hen VI | Wimborne Minster | Dorset | (John Clavell) party of Agnes Billing | M | two neighbors attested the facts (but maybe only on investigation in village): John Littlesea and John Clavell gave birth to a child "happily enough" after a delayed pregnancy, and Hen prophesied to her.
| Hen VI | Beynest (probably Batheaston) near Bath | (the father)parents of Joan Hudd (girl), and the girl herself | M | 6 year old girl with strange sickness for three years, in danger of death, recovered health on invocation.
| Hen VI | Cumnor not far from Univ Oxford | Master Richard Hynstoke | M | 7 year old girl drowned to death by recovered life after invocation. Hen 199-202
| Hen VI | London (near Thames) | (the father) parents (Robert and Katherine North) of girl Joan (sister of boy in ID 126) | M | 7 year old girl blind for 6 months, recovered sight on invocation.
| Hen VI | Pulton (Poulton-le-Fylde) Lancashire | Richard Herdman | M | 7 year old girl kicked in leg by horse - in severe pain, driven to madness, restored when saw vision of Hen
| Hen VI | Lindfield Sussex | William Wotton | M | 7 year old girl fell into well and drowned, recovered on invocation.
| Hen VI | Staplehurst Kent | young man | M | 7 year old girl fell into well and drowned, recovered on invocation. Hen 206-210 |
Hen VI  Staplehurst  Kent (stepfather of young man) fellow-servant Thomas Stokes, young man M yes, came with his stepfather 7 year old girl fell into well and drowned, recovered on invocation. Hen 206-210

Hen VI  London (father) parents of young boy (Thomas Garat - father's name or boy's) M 3 year old boy swallowed a large brass pin, near death, threw up pin when parens vowed pilgrimage stuck dumb by a mishap and terrible pains in tongue, recovered speech when kissed relic of Hen at Windsor

Hen VI  Malpas  Cheshire (near Whitchurch) John Williams M stuck dumb by a mishap and terrible pains in tongue, recovered speech when kissed relic of Hen at Windsor

Hen VI  Nethorpe (Neithrop) in the parish of Banbury Fremens Oliver (poss. Oliver Freeman) M stacking stalks of beans and pease, was buried when supports of platform gave way. Escaped death on invocation. He mocked Hen, was knocked down by a strange blow, then lost health of mind and body. Only recovered after visions of Hen. Vowed pilgrimage when recovered wits. Then body also healed.

Hen VI  Cobham  Kent William Sprewer M