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John Rykener’s story, a legal record of his transvestite prostitute life, remained buried for centuries in the volumes of A. H. Thomas’ Calendar of Select Pleas and Memoranda of the City of London 1381-1412. While reading through A. H. Thomas’ Calendar of Select Pleas and Memoranda, Ruth Mazo Karras and David Lorenzo Boyd, professors of medieval gender and sexuality, chanced upon a case involving a transvestite prostitute. This case is the only known instance of a transvestite as well as the only known legal record involving homosexuality in a temporal court—in fact any court—during the Middle Ages in England. The entry Karras and Boyd found dated from 1395. Rykener’s case sheds light on how medieval society dealt with sexuality. Furthermore, this case helps guide modern perceptions of sexuality. It reveals how people’s appearances and conduct in the Middle Ages connoted their sexuality and how sexuality was handled in a legal setting, all very similar to modern issues surrounding sexuality. More broadly, studying how medieval society dealt with sexuality guides us today on how we can better engage and support people of all sexualities. Rykener’s own story, however, begins on a wintery London night.

Rykener’s story

Soper’s Lane, running south of Cheapside in London, was dreary and cold in December, filled with ragged houses and merchants’ stalls. Cheapside, or just Chepe, was a center for vendors and guilds, and in 1411 was only a stone’s throw from Guildhall.1 John Rykener, a male prostitute going by the alias Eleanor, walked the streets searching for a customer. Eventually, late in the evening, John Britby spotted Rykener and asked him for his services. Lying together in a stall, John Rykener and John Britby had sex. However, certain officials interrupted the two and dragged them off to a city jail. Later, in the court of the Mayor of London and the Alderman of the City of London, John Rykener revealed his story.

Trained to be a prostitute by a servant’s whore, Rykener had sex with not only many men including priests, monks, and scholars, but also many women including nuns and married wives.2 While nearly all of Rykener’s sexual encounters with men involved payment, his encounters with women did not involve money. Moreover, Rykener declared that at one point he had been the wife of a man, and had used his husband’s name to threaten lawsuits.

Here, it is necessary to lay the foundations of this paper in the relevant gender theory. Gender and sex are related; gender is how people are perceived in society as a man or a woman (or, more recently, intersex), and sex refers to biological anatomy. Rykener was often identified as a woman due to how society viewed his dress and work, but his sex was male, regardless of what clothes he wore or how he worked. In this sense, gender is somewhat fluid, while sex remains constant (in the twenty first century, however surgical sex changes have made sex more fluid as well). Additionally, as Joan Scott argues, “gender is a primary field…by means of which power is articulated.”3 Men were devalued if they were rendered effeminate and women were perceived as both good and bad, but always feminine.4 Acting effeminate for men and acting empowered for women, two constructs that reach far outside typical gender roles, do not define a complete change in gender. Acting effeminate and acting empowered define someone who acts other-gendered, but not someone who feels like they are truly the other gender. In History of Sexuality, Volume One, Foucault argues that gender relations (sexual deviancy) that were outside the societal norms, and atypical sexual relationships (deviant sexuality), remained confused.5 Rykener created a great deal of confusion and disrupted the contemporary gender constructs.

In this context, we can ask many questions about Rykener’s sexuality. How did he view his own sexuality? How did society understand his sexuality? Did society marginalize him— or cast him as ‘deviant’— because of his fluid gender? It is important to keep in mind that sexual deviancy (prostitution in this case) is separate from deviant sexuality (here, transvestitism). Rykener talks too about his payments from his customers: twenty pence to two shillings from ordinary customers and a gold ring from Franciscan monks.6 Rykener argued that he preferred to accom-
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2 “[He] swore willingly on [his] soul that a certain Anna, the whore of a former servant of Sir Thomas Blount, first taught him to practice this detestable vice in the manner of a woman.” Quoted from Karras and Boyd’s translation of the text in “‘Ut Cum Muliere’; A Male Transvestite Prostitute in Fourteenth-Century London,” Premodern Sexualities (1996): 111. An identical translation of the text by Paul Halsall can be found online at: http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/source/1395rykener.asp.
6 Because Rykener does not specify the value of the coin, it is impossible to make a direct comparison between the gold ring and the coin payments. Howell, in Commerce Before Capitalism in Europe, 1300-1600, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 17, notes that forgeries and constant reminting devalued coins. A gold ring, even vermeil, would have more worth because of its stable value and probable sheer weight.
modate priests because they paid him more generously. This raises the next question of how sex and clergy related; namely, why did clerics pay more for sex? The last question asked is of the entire text as a whole, a unique legal record documenting a transvestite prostitute. Despite the limited documentation of Rykener’s case – one small memorandum in a large volume – this document, in tandem with a few other cases of documented medieval sexuality, sheds light on how sex and sexuality were handled in courts.7 This case raises questions such as how ecclesiastical courts and temporal courts compared in terms of laws on sex and sexuality, and how this case might fit into the context of previous legal cases on sex and sexuality.

“Ut cum muliere”

Rykener dressed “ut cum muliere” — as a woman. He was brought into the court in women’s clothing, establishing him as a woman in the eyes of the court.8 His clothes may have been part of his guise, but they were also how he identified himself within society. Certainly, people in society saw his clothing at first glance and identified him as a woman. Clothing, albeit superficial, can be an indicator of gender. His guise was certainly convincing enough to stimulate sexual desire.9

Looking at medieval gender structures, Beattie argues that Rykener’s actions created his/her gender identity more so than external appearances such as dress. Rykener did work, such as embroidering and selling ale, which was typically done by women.10 Rykener was more than a cross-dressing man, as his sexuality was further defined by the feminine work he did.11 Here, it is important to understand the gender distinctions in terms of sexual encounters, for Rykener’s main feminine job was prostitution. As a woman, “men had sex with [Rykener], where as [as a man] he had sex with women.”12 Men are portrayed as active, while women are passive. Indeed, the language of this document, preserving the contemporary gender norms, fits Rykener into “distinct gender binaries.”13

Acting as a woman, Rykener temporarily married and claimed female legal status. Rykener’s femininity was more than surface deep. Rykener, accused of stealing two gowns, claimed legal protection under his husband.14 It is impossible to know whether or not Rykener was able to conceal his sex in marriage, but his sex was overlooked and he fit into society as a woman. Throughout his life, he positioned himself as the dependent within relationships — dependent on clients’ payments as a prostitute and on spousal support as a wife.

Rykener’s actions — marry a man, doing women’s work, and prostituting — were all roles that were societally passive. Prostitution, in particular, connoted femininity. The Liber Albus, a codebook for Medieval London law, documents the gender distinctions surrounding prostitution: men were only accused of being pimps or brothel owners while only women were accused of being bawds and prostitutes.15 Rykener’s roles, coupled with his passive sexual status, went against the norms of male behavior. Medieval literature interpreted gender switching in general as an offense against God and Nature’s established roles for male bodies.16 Yet cross-dressing, although for different reasons than Rykener, occurred in medieval society.

In “Robin Hood and the Bishop,” a medieval ballad collected by Francis Child, Robin Hood exchanges clothes with an old woman in order to escape a Bishop in pursuit. Dressed in women’s clothes and carrying a spindle, Robin Hood successfully makes it back to his men unrecognized. Robin Hood’s tactic not only breaks down the ability to judge people (in this case a male bandit) based on societal norms of dress, it also exemplifies the ease at which people might change their gender identity.17 Changing dress, as Clark and Sponsler point out, offered protection for men and women alike: men dressed as women to gain protection in riots and women dressed as men to “travel safely
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7 Namely, I draw on the Venetian record of Rolandina Ranchia, another cross-dressing prostitute in the 15th century. This case was brought to my attention in Guido Ruggiero’s book The Boundaries of Eros.
8 “Rykener, calling [himself] Eleanor, having been detected in women’s clothing…. [was] brought here in woman’s clothing and questioned,” Karras and Boyd, “‘Ut Cum Muliere,’” Premodern Sexualities (1996): 111.
9 Although, as Dinshaw notes, Rykener’s customers may not have cared what was under his clothes and perhaps they even “want[ed] a feminized man, or a phallic woman,” “Queer Relations,” Essays in Medieval Studies 16 (1999): 88.
12 Ibid. 156.
14 “When Phillip requested [the stolen gowns] from Rykener, [Rykener] said that [he] was the wife of a certain man and that if Phillip wished to ask for them back [he] would make [his] husband bring suit against him,” Karras and Boyd, “‘Ut Cum Muliere,’” Premodern Sexualities (1996): 111.
alone.”18 Still, these cases of cross-dressing and the majority of medieval cross-dressers employed cross-dressing and blurring of gender norms for purposes other than wishing to be other-gendered. Ballads or plays with cross-dressing always end with the characters “in their ‘proper’ social and sexual places.”19 Rykener, however, was different; he showed no end to his transvestitism. Rykener’s internalized sexuality, if ever fully understood, was not widely accepted in society.

But he was not alone. Rolandino/Rolandina Ranchaia, a transsexual prostitute in mid-fourteenth century Venice, is another case of a man stepping out of normal sexual behavior. Ranchaia was perhaps hormonally imbalanced and looked female, yet was male enough to take a wife. Nonetheless, after a sexual encounter with a male family friend in which Ranchaia was the passive partner, Rolandino began working as a female prostitute under the name Rolandina. Ranchaia, now completely disguised as a woman, had sex with many men, claiming that none of the men realized his true sex. For a time, he successfully maintained his feminine sexuality. Despite Ranchaia’s long success at concealing his sexuality, Ranchaia was caught and eventually burned between Venice’s columns of justice — literal stone pillars where people were tied and burned.20 While Ranchaia’s public punishment was for his sexuality, not his sexual deviancy, prostitutes and bawds were punished similarly, but for their sexual deviancy. Prostitutes were paraded from prison to a pillory where their hair was shorn.21

Both Ranchaia and Rykener were categorized as sexually abnormal due to their passive actions. Prostitution was defined in medieval society as the type of person, not necessarily the exchange of money for sex.22 In a similar way, Rykener was viewed as a woman, not a man acting as a woman.

Sex, prostitution, and the Church

The Catholic Church provided much of the momentum for defining and eradicating sexual deviancy, acting as the driving force behind the exclusion of people such as Rykener from society. It was not the sin itself that frightened Church officials; rather, Church officials were scared of negative publicity created by scandals because such scandals reduced Church authority and prestige. In order to maintain an outward image of purity, Church law, such as that found in the 12th-century Canon law textbook Decretum Gratiani, stressed private punishment, ordering clerics guilty of fornication to do private penance for thirteen years.23

Nearly all cases involving sex and sexuality during the late Middle Ages come from ecclesiastical courts. Rykener’s case, a rare exception because only temporal court records remain, may have moved on to an ecclesiastic court. But that assumption, based on negative evidence, does not help to understand how Church courts functioned in relation to sexuality. What is more enlightening is how courts formed their cases against perceived sexual deviancy. Ecclesiastical courts regulated sex and sexuality by rumors, tales, and social networks.24 Poos further argues that women suffered defamation in ecclesiastical courts in much greater numbers than men because clerics used the courts to suppress unwanted female behavior in the community. Accusations in court related to “actual occurrence[s] of defamatory behavior in their communities.”25 This, in part, explains why the London city court, documenting Rykener in a feminine fashion, viewed Rykener as the guilty party. As a woman, Rykener was more susceptible to defamation.

Around the same time when Rykener’s arrest, the Lollards, a rising religious reform sect, were preaching a strict, traditional ideology of sex and sexuality. In the Lollard Sermons, virginity is hailed as the highest form of sexuality, but marriage is necessary and sex — purely for procreation, they argue — cannot be avoided.26 The father of the Lollard movement, John Wycliffe, explains in his work Trialogus that marriage must be between a man and a woman and “cannot exist where there is no possibility of procreation.”27 In 1395, the same year that Rykener was apprehended, Wycliffe’s followers posted The Twelve Conclusions of the Lollards. In this document, the Lollards accused the clergy of rampant sodomy, at times even hurling the term “sodomite” as a general insult. The Church, in turn, accused the

19 Ibid. 338.
25 Ibid. 600.
27 Ibid. 23.
Lollards of sodomy. The Lollards not only directed their accusations at clerics, they also fueled a climate of anti-sodomy in established institutions such as temporal courts. Dinshaw ultimately argues that in this climate, Rykener was being prosecuted in an effort to eradicate sodomy. However, the lack of a court decision or any form of closure still makes it impossible to determine the outcome of Rykener’s case.

Nonetheless, the Lollards’ accusations of sodomy among the clergy ring true in Rykener’s case. Rykener received a gold ring from Franciscan monks for his service. The gold ring he received was far greater in value than the other payments of lay customers. Moreover, Rykener said that he “accommodated priests more readily than other people because they wished to give [him] more than others.” Priests not only broke their vows of chastity, but also bribed Rykener to keep quiet. Rykener’s preference to service clergymen can be nicely related to defamation. The Franciscan monks who gave Rykener a gold ring, a payment worth many times that of his other customers, likely gave him the ring for his services as well as for his discretion. They needed his secrecy to protect themselves from future monetary loss and character defamation.

Rykener, who claimed a particularly unusual sexuality, was perhaps not tried in an ecclesiastical court because he did not represent a problem that was visibly rampant in the community. Indeed, Karras and Boyd find that Rykener’s sexuality was confusing to contemporaries. Prostitution and female sexuality were so closely connected that the idea of a male prostitute conflicted with the established gender roles. In all medieval English ecclesiastical courts, there were no cases of accused male prostitutes. The oxymoron of a male prostitute in the eyes of the London court may have further removed Rykener from the prostitution category and therefore farther from the influence of ecclesiastical courts. Rykener was not tried as a prostitute because his gender identification differed so greatly from social norms that the court, “not know[ing] quite what to make of him,” simply released him.

Sexual deviancy and deviant sexuality were two separate issues in medieval society. As discussed above, the Church was not as concerned about the actual sin of sodomy as it was about the scandal. That is to say, sexual deviancy was troubling but tolerable, while deviant sexuality was unheard of and unacceptable. In 1392, three years before Rykener’s case, Richard Edmund, a professor at Oxford, was expelled from Merton College for sexually harassing young students. He waited one and a half months until the scandal dissipated, reapplied to a different college within Oxford and was accepted as a lecturer. Edmund was not expelled for his actions, but rather for the scandal he produced: he had sex inappropriately but did not challenge the boundaries of sexuality. Edmund was accused for his abuse of power over students and likely for the age difference between Edmund and the harassed students. Additionally, though Richard Edmund was not tried in a Church court, the precedents established in Church courts concerning scandals and sexual deviancy had spread into other legal institutions. Richard Edmund’s case exemplifies how lay courts modeled themselves after precedents in Church courts. Lay courts started to regulate sexuality, yet implemented only minor penalties in comparison to Church courts’ punishments.

As discussed above, Poos argues that court cases involving sexuality were mainly for persecuting sexual behavior that went against Church doctrine. Church law, especially concerning sexual affairs, was slow to manifest itself in temporal courts. For instance, in England, sodomy was not officially criminalized until the Buggery Act of 1533. In the case of John/Eleanor Rykener no Church court records exist. If they had existed, they would likely provide a structured case against Rykener. However, from the legal document we have, we can infer the nature of the case. John Britby, the active partner, was ignored, yet active partners typically received the harsher penalty: death. Since the active partner was ignored, and no court decision to our knowledge was made about either person, the case may have served as a window for the members of the court to become aware of homosexuality.

29 “Two Franciscans, one named Brother Michael and the other Brother John…gave [him] a gold ring, and one Carmelite friar and six foreign men committed the above-said vie with him, of whom one gave Rykener twelve pence, one twenty pence, and one two shilling.” Karras and Boyd, “‘Ut Cum Muliere,’” Premodern Sexualities (1996): 111-112. A gold ring, even if it was vermeil, would have been much more valuable than the money he received from his other customers (see footnote 3).
30 Ibid. 112.
31 It was not uncommon for city priests to run brothels because they “found that prostitutes contributed to the city coffers.” Barbara Hanawalt, “Rituals of Inclusion and Exclusion,” in Of Good and Ill Repute: Gender and Social Control in Medieval England, ed. Barbara Hanawalt (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 26.
33 Ibid. 110.
35 This demonstrates the lag between ecclesiastical and temporal courts. Canon law began regulating sexuality by the 12th century, through works such as Decretum Gratiani, while common law, nearly four centuries later, began to emulate Canon law.
**Temporal court protocol for deviant sexuality**

In Venice, Ruggiero found that passive partners received mild penalties while active partners often burned between the Columns of Justice.\(^\text{36}\) The Council of Ten, a governing body in Venice, regulated sexuality similarly to English ecclesiastic courts. Venice at the incipience of the Renaissance was earlier than England in its shifting of the responsibility of regulating sexuality from Church courts to lay courts. Indeed, the social regime in Venice was very different than in England, more closely regulated and documented, driven by the need for Venetian unity in order to strictly govern their growing trade empire. Still, the Ten’s actions were somewhat similar to those in England. The Ten did not deem passive partners culpable, instead persecuting active partners.\(^\text{37}\) Strong anti-sodomy rhetoric was used to frighten people away from sodomy. Under the guise of sodomy charges, the Ten removed unwanted clergymen from Venice.\(^\text{38}\) Sodomy was decreed “the most infamous deed,” in a similar way in which the Lollards in England campaigned against sodomy.\(^\text{39}\) Even though secular law did not codify anti-sodomy sentiments until the Buggery Act of 1533, English legal textbooks from the late thirteenth-century recommended death as punishment for sodomy.\(^\text{40}\) Still, the Ten waged a more active campaign against sodomy than anything found in England.

The focus on Rykener in the A. H. Thomas’ Calendar of Select Pleas and Memoranda signals the importance of Rykener’s sexuality to the court; his sexuality overshadowed Britby’s crimes. Considering the tendencies of courts (albeit primarily Church courts) to act as grounds for eradicating sexual behavior and the precedent of persecuting active sexual partners, the emphasis on Rykener and his sexuality signify the rarity and curiosity of Rykener’s case. Dinshaw argues that Rykener’s case, likely one of the first records of male prostitution, set a precedent for dealing with similar cases.\(^\text{41}\) Regardless of how society understood Rykener, his existence hints at the presence of a homosexual and even transgender subculture — a subculture that was not fully acknowledged or understood in its time.

**Concluding lessons from Rykener’s story**

Rykener’s case teaches us many lessons. By showing us a glimpse of how homosexuality fit into medieval society, we can understand more about modern sexuality. Many people believe queerness is a contemporary phenomenon. Homosexuality, transvestitism, and general queerness (non-heterosexual) are ever present in society regardless of the transparency of queer activity. Studying the lives of such people as Rykener leads to an understanding of how medieval courts handled sexuality. Similarly, his case helps to trace the shift of sexual regulation from ecclesiastical to temporal courts. Anti-homosexuality has been inflamed largely by serving as a scapegoat accusation and being linked with scandal. Whether the Ten in Venice labeled certain sexual acts as sodomy and used it as a pretense to remove unwanted clergy or the Lollards cried sodomy to defame morally corrupt clergy, homophobic language raged throughout Medieval Europe. There was also marginal protection of the vulnerable, including women and gay men abused by those with power.

Defamation, including defamation centered on sexuality, only marginalizes people and degrades their social standing. Indeed, as Poos writes, defamation of both men’s and women’s honor still endures in modern society and is intensified through rumors, gossip, and social networks.\(^\text{42}\) Rykener was labeled deviant because of his sexuality and doubly so because his professions made him a dependent. Thus people like Rykener and Ranchaia became marginalized by the people who secretly employed them and by the ecclesiastical and temporal courts that condemned them and rarely acknowledged them.

As all types of sexuality become more accepted in society it is crucial that we understand how sexuality developed throughout history. By better understanding the history of sexuality we arm ourselves against those who claim that transsexuality, homosexuality, and other forms of queerness have never existed. We learn, too, that defamatory words like “faggot” and phrases like “that’s so gay” have been ever-present throughout history (e.g. “sodomite”). We ultimately understand that the very social networks that lead to the defamation of people such as Rykener can now be harnessed to better societal conception of homosexuality, and all sexualities. Inclusion of all ranges of sexualities incorporates people like Rykener and Ranchaia into society and keeps them from relying on fringe professions such as prostitution to survive.


\(^{37}\) Ibid., 121.

\(^{38}\) Ibid., 143.

\(^{39}\) Ibid., 113.


\(^{41}\) Ibid., 91.

Bibliography


