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CHAPTER I

THE INFLUENCE OF SHAW'S JOAN IN THE WORLD OF LETTERS

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the record of the life and trial of Joan of Arc in order to determine what departures George Bernard Shaw made from historical fact when he wrote Saint Joan. His play, first performed in New York by the Theatre Guild at the Garrick Theatre on December 28, 1923, has had the rather unique distinction of virtually eliminating preceding versions of the life of the Maid from the stage and has been used as a basis of comparison for any subsequent characterizations of Joan, more often than not to the detriment of any successor.

Two versions of the life of Joan most frequently played before Shaw's Joan were those of Émile Moreau, Le Procès de Jeanne d'Arc, a vehicle for the considerable talents of Sarah Bernhardt, and Schiller's Die Jungfrau Von Orleans. Maude Adams was playing successfully in Schiller's version as late as 1909. John Gassner said of Schiller's work:

But the Maid of Orleans (Die Jungfrau Von Orleans) for all its noble sentiment which gave it much popularity, often wallows in slush. Joan of Arc escapes from prison miraculously, and everything is pretty and flamboyant. Set beside Shaw's St. Joan it rouses more than a suspicion that Schiller, for all his dabbings in history, philosophy and esthetic theory, possessed
a diluted intellect.  

Maxwell Anderson's Joan of Lorraine, which made its appearance on Broadway on November 18, 1946, and starred Ingrid Bergman as Joan, was described by critic Joseph Wood Krutch in the following manner:

...But the whole seemed to me something which could, with uncomfortable accuracy, be described as Shaw and water. A good many things in Saint Joan were left out, including, for example, the hard-boiled conclusion that heretics cannot be distinguished from saints until after they have been burned. Nevertheless, most of what Joan of Lorraine says about faith, Shaw seems to me to have said first.  

Time magazine suggested that Anderson attempted a different approach to Joan because of Shaw's version:

Bernard Shaw having walked off with Saint Joan for the theatre of his time, and perhaps of all time, Playwright Anderson prudently goes at her sidelong, writing a play within a play. He portrays actors rehearsing, on a bare stage, a play about Joan.

Critic Euphemia Van Rensselaer Wyatt formed a minority of one in choosing Anderson's play over Shaw's, and found herself in the awkward position of admitting that "Anderson follows generally the same chronology as Shaw," while concluding "Anderson's story of Joan is straightforward and

1John Gassner, Masters of the Drama (New York, 1940), p. 326. For a provocative discussion of the relative approach of Shaw and Schiller to the subject of Joan, see John C. Blankenagel's article in the Journal of English and Germanic Philology, XXV (July, 1926), 379.

2The Nation, CLXIII (December 7, 1946), 672.

3Time, XLVIII (December 2, 1946), 54.
simple like herself and his Joan, all in all, seems closer to the canonized saint than Shaw's.  

Lillian Hellman's adaptation of Jean Anouilh's The Lark met with much the same comparative sort of treatment. The event would have to suffer one way or the other when presented on November 17, 1955, at the Longacre Theatre in New York. Though Julie Harris' performance was given due praise for its sensitivity and rare artistry, The Lark did not compare so well with Saint Joan. Brooks Atkinson said, "Everyone who writes about Saint Joan has to deal with the same characters and facts. That is why The Lark inevitably seems like a rearrangement of Shaw's masterpiece." William Hawkins said, "...the trial has little of Shaw's exalted intellectual glitter." Robert Coleman put it this way: "...Wasn't it Carl Van Doren who described a classic as something so right that there is no need for ever doing it again? Well, G.B. Shaw, in our opinion, penned the definitive play about the Maid of Orleans. It was called, of course, "Saint Joan.""

Time magazine remarked: "...Compared of course with the virile mace-work of George Bernard Shaw in his Saint Joan, it is sometimes oversubtle rapier play in the Gallic fashion that scores points but does not really make a wound." In reviewing Shaw's Saint Joan, Carol Montgomery Newman once said that each southern appetite hungered for trials to be

4Catholic World CIX (January, 1947), 356.
6Ibid., 207.
7Ibid.
8Time, LXVI (November 28, 1955), 76, 1925.
... the fact remains that she seems to live here as
she does nowhere else in literature. However correct
or incorrect the conception may be, Shaw's Joan is
certainly a creature of flesh and blood.9

This statement would seem to suggest one reason for the
curious intrusion of Shaw's Joan into the fields of litera-
ture and history, as well as the theatre which it has
dominated for so long a period. His Joan is so vivid a
character that many of her mannerisms are accepted uncon-
sciously as those of the historical Joan. Some writers,
like A. R. Ropes, interpolated Shaw's Joan with the true
Joan even while criticizing the play:

... France, torn by civil and foreign war and dis-
credited by past adherence to the antipopes, took a
minor place. This may explain why many of the French
clergy were ready to fall in with the English claim
to France, and also why Joan had no wish to submit
to the judgement of the Pope.10

As will be shown in Chapter III, the real Joan did
appeal to the Pope as a matter of historical record. Shaw's
Joan does not. She is characterized as being an early
Protestant, and she recognizes no one between herself and her
God. The historical Joan was a "willing daughter of the
Church" who made several appeals during her trial to be
heard by the Pope and the Council. Both requests were denied
her by the officials at Rouen, though technically she was

9Carol Montgomery Newman, "Joan of Arc in English
Literature," Sewanee Review, XXXIV (October-December, 1926)
436-37.

10Contemporary Review, CXXVII (March, 1925), 349.
entitled to both as part of the complicated machinery of the Inquisition. It must be noted in passing, however, that seldom was this machinery used. Joan of Arc was not the only person tried for heresy who was denied the right to be heard by the Pope. Ropes, in being so swayed by Shaw's eloquent Joan, is only one writer who has shown the influence of the Shavian Maid in his work. The eminent historian James Westfall Thompson, in his book An Introduction to Medieval Europe, reflected the characterization of her by Shaw rather than the Joan of the trial translations when he said:

... His [the King's] advisors preferred rather than to continue to fight to negotiate with the English and Burgundians. Under these circumstances Joan got out of hand; her Voices were driving her on; she would not listen to advice or take orders, and became a nuisance.11

Historically, Joan never "got out of hand" with the King except in Shaw's characterization of her. To modern minds she appears exasperatingly loyal to Charles, particularly at the trial when confronted with the proof of his perfidy, his cowardly refusal to ransom her, which Andrew Lang and Anatole France have said he was bound to do out of common decency. Joan's only recourse to Charles was in pleading. This she did well until the political maneuverings of Tremoille turned the King from her, as will be traced in the following chapter in all its complications. Thompson,

in his description of her, has suggested that she was obstinate and headstrong, as Shaw depicts her. It fits well with Shaw's basic concept of her, but it will be shown later to be one of the liberties he took with fact to bring home a point. Thompson seems to have fallen under Shaw's spell. The same could be said for another historian, James Harvey Robinson, who frankly noted in his chapter on Jeanne d'Arc Shaw's interpretation of her, and his description of her followed Shaw's when he said:

... Under the guidance and inspiration of her indomitable courage, sound sense, and burning enthusiasm, Orléans was relieved and the English were completely routed.12

Before Shaw's interpretation of her, Joan was regarded as a visionary who awaited the instructions of some voices. She seems so in the trial records. But in the play, Shaw has her mention "common sense" frequently; when she is being questioned in the trial scene about wearing men's clothes, she does not merely say, as the historical Joan did, that she dresses that way until her voices give her leave. She adds, "What can be plainer common-sense?" This facet of Shaw's Joan, her common sense, has been unconsciously accepted by Robinson. Another, of her military genius, which Shaw develops in the course of his play, also seems to have been unconsciously accepted as being part of the historical Joan. An example of this is to be found in the program note for

12 James Harvey Robinson, An Introduction to the History of Western Europe (New York, 1924), p. 177.
the Celebration Jeanne d'Arc, a pageant held in San Francisco as part of the fifth Centenary of the Maid of Orleans:

... her mission came from God, and His Divine will was her only rule of action... Ever since, the French have honored the warrior-maid as a symbol of heroism, of military courage, and patriotism. Her knowledge of military tactics and strategy appeared of a supernatural nature and for this reason the Maid was known as "La Pucelle de Dieu."³

While the note added that Joan's knowledge of military tactics was divinely inspired, it would seem to reflect Shaw's view that Joan was a military genius when in actuality her greatest gift to the French was her confidence in victory which she instilled in them. Nothing in the Murray translation of the trial nor the two subsequent publications which have dealt with the same material, the works of W.P. Barrett and W.S. Scott, has revealed any clear-cut reference to Joan's use of any military innovation or gun emplacement tactic not already known to the French themselves. Anatole France had a point here when he said Joan's real contribution was in building morale. He went too far, however, in attempting to prove that she was merely a "mascotte" when it is plain from the testimony of both the Duke d'Alençon and Dunois that she led the troops in battle, her banner beckoning to them to take heart and follow her.

It would seem, after having reviewed the confusion which exists regarding the two Joans, that a careful examination of Shaw's sources and what he did with them, would

---
be in order. In his preface to *Saint Joan* he criticized what he felt was wrong with previous interpretations of the life of the Maid. Among these were the works of Anatole France, Andrew Lang and Mark Twain. He said that he himself went to the original documents for his material. Actually, he used T. Douglas Murray's translation of the trial documents. Archibald Henderson revealed this in his recent biography of Shaw:

... In 1923 Shaw's close friend, Dr. (later Sir) Sydney Cockerell, Curator of the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge to which Shaw presented his striking portrait by Augustus John, brought him a copy of T. Douglas Murray's *Jeanne d'Arc*, because of the signal dramatic qualities latent in the records of her trial, and in particular the revelation they gave of her courage, radiant personality, and gallant soul.¹⁴

Though Murray's book was published in 1902, it seemingly attracted little attention until the Catholic Church set in motion the complicated procedure for Veneration, Beatification and Canonization of France's Warrior-Saint. Doubtless Murray's book stimulated Shaw actually to write his play; but as several of his biographers have noted, the Irish dramatist had long been interested in the life of Joan of Arc. Henderson quoted Shaw's famous letter to Mrs. Patrick Campbell after he had taken a motor trip through Domremy and Orleans in 1913:

... Strangely enough I have never been in Orleans before, though I have been all over the Joan of Arc country... I shall do a Joan play some day. ¹⁵

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 598.
In the letter Shaw indicated that he had read considerably of the available material on Joan of Arc, telling Mrs. Campbell that one scene in the play would "have God about to damn the English for their share in her betrayal" when Joan produced the burnt stick given her by the English soldier, an idea which he later abandoned in writing Saint Joan.

He mentioned the work of Jules Quicherat as "entirely realistic documents" and implied that he knew them. He said in Sixteen Self Sketches, "I can read French as familiarly as English," but there is no evidence that he used the work of Quicherat in writing Saint Joan, nor did he use the 1920 version of the trial which Pierre Champion edited from the work of Quicherat. His entire trial scene was taken from Murray. This leads to certain complications in evaluating Shaw's Joan and the historical Joan. At first glance, the criticisms leveled by subsequent scholars at Murray's translation suggest that little remains of the historical Joan to evaluate how she differs from Shaw's Joan. W.P. Barrett, who published his translation of the trial of Joan of Arc in 1931 said of the Murray book:

... English readers have had to depend on a good translation by Mr. T. Douglas Murray, first published in 1902, and now out of print. It is, however, considerably abridged where no warning is given, and suffers in addition from a particular defect which it has been

the care of this present edition to avoid. In the effort to restore the dramatic quality of the first occasion, the translator permitted himself to make slight alterations in the form of the definitive version, and substituted for its legal-indirectness the more vigorous form of oratio recta. This is a dangerous expedient: the apparent gain is more than offset by the loss in authenticity. W.S. Scott corroborated Barrett's criticism regarding Murray's omissions. He was also critical of Murray's source, Quicherat himself. Scott said of Quicherat's translation from the original Latin:

He unfortunately did not transcribe it from only one of the available copies. For the most part he used MS Lat. 5965 in the Bibliotheque Nationale, but occasionally he used one of the others, without mentioning the fact that he switched from one original to another. This considerably lessens the value of his text, particularly as from time to time his transcription is not altogether accurate. The three books, Murray, Scott and Barrett nonetheless contain the same trial testimony. Except for the use by Murray of oratio recta, or direct quotation instead of oratio obliqua, or third person form, little of the actual trial is omitted by Murray as far as what Joan had to say. Every one of her replies is recounted. What Murray omits are the repetitious, though very interesting, interpretations given by the Assessors of what Joan had said at a previous session, some of the letters exchanged by the Doctors of the University


of Paris, and the Twelve Articles reply of the University of Paris, to Joan and the Inquisition. All of this material will be developed in the course of the trial scene in Chapter III. In the chapter to follow, where there are references to Murray, the same references which are in both Scott and Barrett will be noted also.

In order to determine how much of Shaw's play is based on fact, and how much is fabrication, a summary of the known facts of the life of Joan of Arc will form the next chapter. Chapter II, therefore, will attempt to discover the historical Joan as the records reveal her. Many of the references will be from Murray's translation of the Rehabilitation Trial, with which no fault has been found by the critics or by Mr. Scott. Other sources are Anatole France, Andrew Lang, Lucien Fabre, and Francis Lowell for biographical data, as well as historians Thompson, Robinson, and Coulton for diverse opinions concerning the life of the Maid of Orleans and the age in which she lived.
CHAPTER II

THE COMPLEX HISTORY OF JOAN OF ARC

On January 6, 1412, the feast of the Epiphany, Joan of Arc was born in the village of Domremy, which lay at the extreme eastern boundary of France. She was the daughter of Jacques d'Arc, a native of Ceuffords in Champagne, and Isabelle Romeé. Andrew Lang, in his book *The Maid of France*, described the d'Aros as "good Catholics of good repute, and honorable position as 'laborers.'"¹ Lang depicted Jacques d'Arc as a relatively rich and prominent member of the little community of Domremy, owner of horses and cattle, and representative of the village in some litigation.

Joan had three brothers: Jacquemín, Jean, and Pierre, and a sister Catherine, who died young. It was Joan, pious and deeply religious from childhood who came in 1429 to Charles the Dauphin² at Chinon and told him quite simply that with God's help she would relieve the siege of the town of Orléans and crown him king at Rheims Cathedral.


²James Harvey Robinson in *The Background of Modern History*, p. 177, explained Charles' title this way: "Charles VII had not yet been crowned; and so he was still called the Dauphin. The title Dauphin originally belonging to the ruler of Dauphiny, was enjoyed by the eldest son of the French King after Dauphiny became a part of France in 1349, in the same way that the eldest son of the English king is called Prince of Wales."
It had taken Joan several months to reach Chinon. The first step had been to go to Burey where her "uncle" Laxart and his wife lived. Laxart's wife was expecting a baby, and Joan was to stay with them until its arrival. This fortuitous event had gotten Joan away from Domremy some ten miles distant. She could never have won her father's permission to go to Vaucouleurs, where she was to ask the king's representative Robert de Baudricourt for an escort to Chinon. According to Joan's testimony at her trial, her father had kept her under close watch ever since he had dreamed she would run away with the soldiers. Somehow she convinced Laxart, and in a deposition taken at Domremy in 1455, Laxart himself said:

... She told me she wished to go herself, and seek Robert de Baudricourt, in order that he might have her conducted to the place where the Dauphin was. But many times Robert told me to take her back to her father and to box her ears.... Alain de Vaucouleurs and I bought her a horse for the price of twelve francs, which we paid, and which was repaid to us later by the Sieur Robert de Baudricourt. This done, Jean de Metz, Bertrand de Poulengey, Colet de Vienne, together with Richard the Archer and two men of the suite of Jean de Metz and Bertrand, conducted Jeanne to the place where the Dauphin was.4

Joan's first attempt to see Baudricourt was on or

---

3 Durand Laxart had married the daughter of a sister of Joan's mother; he was her cousin by marriage, but as he was much older, she called him "uncle."

about May 11, 1428. He finally gave his consent sometime in February of 1429. Scholars have debated whether it was Joan's first "sign" to Baudricourt concerning the Battle of the Herrings that won his consent. In attempting to prove or disprove Joan's knowledge of the battle, some scholars have questioned whether Joan left Vaucouleurs on February 23 as Lucien Fabre said she did.\(^5\) Anatole France avoided controversy by stating that Joan left Vaucouleurs "on a day in February."\(^6\) France said that it was possible that the prophetic gift of Joan, legendary in her own time, was the result of tales told by the Mendicant Friars who investigated her past record for the benefit of the Doctors at Poitiers:

... They may have spread abroad the story that, when she was at Vaucouleurs, on the day of the Battle of the Herrings, she knew of the great hurt inflicted on the French at Rouvray. The success of such little stories was immediate and complete.\(^7\)

J.M. Robertson dismissed any possibility of the tale being based on fact:

... Baudricourt's assent was given to Jeanne's expedition to the Dauphin before the Battle of the Herrings was fought; and she started for Chinon on the morning after it was fought. All the refusals to accept that well-established date evidently originate in the desire to save the legend.\(^8\)


\(^8\) J.M. Robertson, *Mr. Shaw and the Maid* (London, 1925), p. 32.
His argument was based on the supposition that his dates were figured correctly, that the Battle of the Herrings was fought on February 12, that Joan departed from Vaucouleurs on February 13, and that it took her three weeks to reach Chinon. It has been established that she reached Chinon March 6, which fits part of Robertson's theory. His contention, however, ignored the testimony of Joan's traveling companions Jean de Metz and Bertrand de Poulengey, who said that they were eleven days on the road to Chinon.9 Robertson cited as the source of the legend a statement in Chronique de la Pucelle, Chapter XLII, edited by Valet de Viriville, 1859, p. 272:

Jeanne is made to say merely that "Aujourd'hui le gentil Dauphin a eu assez près d'Orléans un bien grand damaige." Thereafter the story grows.10

Whatever Robert de Baudricourt believed concerning Joan, he outfitted her in the clothes of a young squire with spurs and a sword. He later reimbursed Laxart and Alain de Vaucouleurs for Joan's horse. As the little band rode out the gate, Baudricourt has been reported as saying to Joan, "Go! And let come what may."11 Shaw uses virtually the same words in *Saint Joan* at the close of Scene I.

Traveling mostly at night to avoid Burgundian and

9Murray, pp. 223-229.
10Robertson, p. 32.
11Murray, p. 12; Scott, p. 16; Barrett, p. 1.
English stragglers Joan and her escort rode the three hundred miles to Chinon without incident. The expense of the journey was borne by Jean de Metz and Bertrand de Poulengey, who were later repaid by the royal treasury. Francis C. Lowell, in his book Joan of Arc, said that once Joan had reached Gien, the news had spread among the people that "a maid was come from the borders of Lorraine to raise the siege and crown the Dauphin."¹² Thus Charles and the court knew well in advance that Joan was coming to Chinon. Charles and his advisors were discussing her when news of Joan's arrival reached them.

Charles VII has been characterized by historians as a weak and vacillating monarch, very little like his grandfather Charles V (1364-1380), who had been an able king. During the reign of Charles V most of the territory formerly won by Edward III of England and the Black Prince was recovered for France. Calais in the north and Bordeaux in the south were all the English held. Lowell remarked:

Charles V did much more than win back lost territory. With some success, he attempted to organize the administration of France, to regulate its finances, and to secure justice for all. In the century and a half which separated Philip the Fair from Louis XI, he was the only man of ability to sit on the throne, and his early death was a calamity to the kingdom.¹³

¹² Francis C. Lowell, Joan of Arc (Boston, 1896), p. 52.

¹³ Ibid., p. 2.
What Charles V managed to build for France in his lifetime was lost under his son's rule. Charles VI was for some years insane and incapable of controlling the quarreling factions which surrounded his throne. During these years Charles' uncles and some of the ambitious nobles plundered the kingdom at will. The two strongest who fought for control of France were Louis, Duke of Orléans, who was Charles VI's brother, and Philip, Duke of Burgundy, who was the king's youngest uncle.

The territory of Burgundy was rich. It included the trading cities of Flanders which maintained a powerful influence in political matters. When finally in 1435 Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy, renounced his alliance with the English and joined Charles VII, it spelled the end of English domination on the Continent. According to James Harvey Robinson, "Owing to his acquisition of the Netherlands the possessions of Philip were so great that he might well be regarded as a European potentate whose alliance with France rendered further efforts on England's part hopeless." ¹⁴ It was due to Burgundy's importance and power that much of France's strife came about, and by which much of it ended. The murder of Louis of Orléans by followers of the Duke of Burgundy precipitated the civil war which was raging over France when Henry V landed with his army and slaughtered a

¹⁴ Robinson, p. 178.
great number of French at Agincourt. The name Armagnac
became associated with the avenging forces of the young Duke
of Orléans, Charles, who was supported by his father-in-law,
the Count of Armagnac. It was Armagnac versus Burgundian
for many years, with the English able, through Henry V's
marriage to Charles VI's daughter Catherine, to gain control
of a large part of France.

In her eagerness to secure power for her daughter
Catherine, the Queen of France, Isabeau, declared that
Charles the Dauphin was illegitimate, not the true son of
Charles VI. Henry V suddenly died of dysentery, his plan
of conquest unfulfilled. The recent Treaty of Troyes he had
signed with Philip the Good of Burgundy made Henry's infant
son of nine months, king of France. The Duke of Bedford,
uncle of the infant king, was to rule as Regent.

Thus in 1422 the northern part of France was under
the rule of an English duke. With the single exception of
Dunois' victory over them at Montargis in 1427, the English
won every battle. In 1428 it was decided that Henry VI should
be made in actuality king of all France as his title indicated.
The territory south of the Loire river still loyal to the
Dauphin Charles had to be taken. Under the leadership of
Thomas Montagu, Earl of Salisbury, the English army marched
south to take several strategic Loire river towns, among them
Meung, Jargeau, and Beaugency.

By October 5, 1428, the last town of the three to
surrender, Jargeau, fell. Immediately the army set out for Orléans. The actual siege of Orléans began a few days later. In the midst of the heavy fighting the Earl of Salisbury was mortally wounded by a cannonball. No one in Orléans knew who had fired the shot; the French were sure it was the hand of God. The effect of the earl's death was demoralization in the English ranks. No more fierce fighting like the early action ensued. Each side was content to hold its position. That was the way matters stood when Joan of Arc came on the scene.

When Joan told the Dauphin Charles she would raise the siege at Orléans he could well have thought her another fanatic; the history of the Valois kings is full of prophets and seers who volunteered their services. Shaw makes use of this fact in his play, having Charles say, "It is in our family; and I don't care what you say: I will have my saint too." The historical Dauphin took the proper precautions of the age against Joan's possible sorcery. He ordered her questioned by the clerics who surrounded him at court before he would allow her in his presence. If he, the future king of France, were to associate with a witch it would discredit him. It is interesting to note that the English used this very form of reasoning against Joan, burning her as a witch and heretic in order to discredit Charles in the eyes of the superstitious medieval world.

At first Joan refused to answer the clerics' questions, saying she would wait upon the Dauphin; but soon
she was answering the questions of Bishop Gelu and Pierre l'Ermité, who was the Dauphin's confessor. It was this same Bishop Gelu who demanded later that Charles ransom Joan from the English.

When l'Ermité recommended that Charles talk with Joan, she was led into the royal presence by the Count de Vendôme. In his play Shaw raises Vendôme to the title of Duke. This is only one of the "historical inaccuracies" that drew the fire of critics like Robertson, Charles Sareola, and J. Van Kan. In his play, Shaw depicts Joan's discovery of the Dauphin in the midst of his courtiers as a comic bit. Anatole France said, "What is most probable is that those who were kindly disposed towards her pointed out the King."  

Joan herself described the incident when questioned at her trial:

"After dinner, I went to the King, who was in the castle. When I entered the room where he was I recognized him among many others by the counsel of my Voice, which revealed him to me. I told him that I wished to go and make war on the English."  

When questioned as to the number of persons present when she recognized the Dauphin, she replied, "There were more than three hundred knights and more than fifty torches, without counting the spiritual light."  

As to her mission,

15 France, p. 171.
16 Murray, p. 13; Scott, p. 69; Barrett, p. 57.
17 Murray, p. 27; Scott, p. 80; Barrett, p. 71.
she said, "I was quite certain of raising the siege at Orleans; I had revelation of it. I told the King that before going there." After raising the siege, she was to bring the Dauphin to Rheims Cathedral in order that he might be crowned king of France.

The Dauphin, according to the beliefs of the time, had Joan questioned by the clergy at Poitiers over a six weeks' period to determine her sincerity. In addition, she was examined by reputable women, among whom was the Duchess of Anjou, to determine whether Joan was a virgin. Meanwhile the Mendicant Friars were sent to Domremy. By virtue of their order they were able to go through alien territory "without exciting the suspicion of English and Burgundians." Joan was pronounced by the women to be truly a maiden, pious and devout. In her sessions with the clerks and masters at Poitiers she had difficulties. She displayed some of the bluntness and "pert" answers which later characterized her at the trial in Rouen.

When questioned by Brother Guillaume Aimery as follows, "According to what you have said, the Voice told you that God will deliver the people of France from their distress; but if God will deliver them he has no need of men at arms," Joan replied, "In God's name, the men at arms will fight, and God will give the victory." When asked,

---

18 Murray, p. 32; Scott, p. 82; Barrett, p. 73.
19 France, p. 79.
"What language do your Voices speak?" she said, "A better one than yours." She made this reply to Brother Seguin, who had a slightly different dialect in speaking than did Joan. Anatole France observed:

... Had the doctors of Poitiers been less zealously Armagnac they would henceforth have mistrusted Joan and suspected her of heresy. But they were loyal servants of the houses of Orléans and of France.

Lucien Fabre said that the investigation was "much the same as those at Rouen, except that in this case the Judges were devoid of hate and fear, and were a great deal more knowledgeable."

Joan was given permission, then, to accompany the army to Orléans. In addition, she was presented with a suit of "white armor". Anatole France summed up the Poitiers examination:

... In this Church holy and indivisible, there were the doctors of Poitiers who deliberately pronounced God to be on the side of the Dauphin, while the University of Paris as deliberately pronounced God to be on the side of the Burgundians and the English.

Joan arrived near Orléans on April 29, 1429. She had met the French forces at Blois with her wagon train of supplies. She told the French commanders to attack the

---

20Ibid., p. 200.
21Ibid., p. 199.
22Fabre, p. 119.
23France, p. 191.
English forces, under the command of Talbot, on the north bank of the river. The French pretended to follow her orders when in fact they were planning to attack the English from the Sologne, or south bank of the river. When Joan discovered she had been deceived she was furious. As Dunois, the Bastard of Orléans approached her, having crossed the river by boat to meet the French, Joan rebuked him for doubting the wisdom of her inspired voices. In his testimony in the deposition at Orléans taken in 1445, Dunois recounted the incident this way:

I think that Jeanne was sent by God, and that her behavior in war was a fact divine rather than human. All, at the head of the army transporting the convoy, came, with Jeanne, in good order, by way of the Sologne, to the Loire, facing the Church of Saint Loup. But the English were there in great number: and the army escorting the convoy did not appear to me, nor to the other captains, in sufficient force to resist them and to ensure the entrance of the convoy on that side. It was necessary to load the convoy on boats, which were procured with difficulty. But to reach Orléans it was necessary to sail against the stream, and the wind was altogether contrary.

Then Jeanne said to me: "Are you the Bastard of Orléans?" "Yes," I answered; "and I am very glad of your coming!" "Is it you who said I was to come on this side of the river, and that I should not go direct to the side where Talbot and the English are?" "Yes, and those more wise than I are of the same opinion, for our greater success and safety." "In God's Name," she then said, "the counsel of My Lord is safer and wiser than yours. You thought to deceive me, and it is yourselves who are deceived, for I bring you better succour than has ever come to any general or town whatsoever — the succour of the King of Heaven. This succour does not come from me, but from God Himself, Who, at the prayers of Saint Louis and Saint Charlemagne, has had compassion on the town of Orléans, and will not suffer the enemy to hold at the same time the Duke and his town."
At that moment, the wind, being contrary, and thereby preventing the boats going up the river and reaching Orleans, turned all at once and became favourable. They stretched the sails; and I ordered the boats to the town, which I entered with Brother Nicholas de Geresme, then Grand Prior in France of the Order of Rhodes. We passed before the Church of Saint Loup in spite of the English. From that time I put good hope in her, even more than before.  

While impatiently awaiting the decision of the Council at Poitiers, Joan had dictated the first of her famous letters to the English. It had arrived by courier to the forces of Talbot at Orleans as Joan's army was taking up battle positions. In part, the letter said:

... give up to the Maid, who is sent hither by God, the King of Heaven, the keys to all the good towns in France which you have taken, and broken into. She is come by the order of God to reclaim the Blood Royal. She is quite ready to make peace, if you are willing to give her satisfaction, by giving and paying back to France what you have taken. And as for you, archers, companions-in-arms, gentlemen and others who are before the town of Orleans, return to your own countries, by God's order; and if this be not done, then hear the message of the Maid, who will shortly come upon you, to your very great hurt. King of England, I am a Chieftain of war and, if this be not done, wheresoever I find your followers in France, I will make them leave, willingly or unwillingly; if they do not obey, I will have them put to death. I am sent here by God, the King of Heaven, body for body, to drive them all out of the whole of France.  

The English reply to Joan's letter was that if they ever caught her, they would burn her as a strumpet.
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and a witch. At her trial this, as well as other letters she had dictated (for she could not write), was used in evidence against her. When confronted with this particular letter, Joan insisted upon some corrections:

... In place of "give up to the Maid," it should be "give up to the King." The words "Chieftain of War" and "body for body" were not in the letter I sent. None of the Lords ever dictated these letters to me. Nevertheless, I always showed them to some of my party. Before seven years are passed, the English will lose a greater wager than they have already done at Orleans; they will lose everything in France. The English will have in France a greater loss than they have ever had, and that by a great victory which God will send to the French.27

Murray adds a footnote to Joan's prophesy, saying that the English lost Paris in 1436.28

Joan's first taste of battle came with the storming of the fort of St. Loup by the French. St. Loup was situated about a mile and a half above Orleans. The first assault, attempted without Joan's knowledge was stopped and the French driven back. Chroniclers of Orleans have told how Joan was resting at the house of James Boucher, treasurer of the Duke of Orleans, when the noise of the battle aroused her. Taking the first horse she could find, Joan rode out to the battle scene with her banner streaming in the wind. She met the retreating French forces, encouraged them to turn and follow her to the assault.
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27 Murray, p. 38; Scott, p. 31; Barrett, p. 77.
28 Murray, p. 38.
They shortly won the fort, capturing a large supply of provisions and taking many prisoners. As the victorious French returned to Orléans, the townspeople flocked to the churches to thank God, and the church bells rang joyfully.

The next English strong point to be taken was the Tourelles, a small fortress which connected with the shore of the south river bank. It formed a bridgehead for which the English had paid dearly with the Earl of Salisbury's death several months earlier. Joan gave orders that this fortification should fall next. It was during the assault that Joan was wounded in the shoulder by an arrow.

When the English heard that Joan was wounded, they were sure her career was ended. Even if she did not die, according to the belief of the time, a witch lost her power when cut in any way. To maintain a medieval mood in his play, Shaw has Joan say that the doctor sent to attend her in prison during her illness was forbidden to bleed her "because the silly people believe that a witch's witchery leaves her if she is bled," (Scene VI); actually, Warwick refused to let the doctors bleed Joan because "she is artful, and might kill herself." 29

Seeing Joan wounded, Dunois wanted to pull back into the city. Joan begged him to wait while she withdrew a little way from the soldiers to pray. According to Dunois' testimony, she came back in about half an hour. Seizing her
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banner by both hands, "she placed herself on the edge of the trench. At sight of her the English trembled, and were seized with sudden fear; our people, on the contrary, took courage and began to mount and assail the Boulevard, not meeting any resistance. Thus was the Boulevard taken and the English therein put to flight."  

The capture of the Tourelles forced Talbot to retreat, his position now outflanked by the French. At first it seemed that he was preparing his remaining troops for battle when Joan and the French rode out from Orléans the following Sunday morning. The French, flushed with their victory, were eager to attack. Joan surprised them by restraining them. She asked instead that a priest should say mass. Dunois said, "...she forbade the English to be attacked or in any way molested but that they should be allowed to depart, which they did, without any pursuit. From that moment the town was delivered."  

Overjoyed at the raising of the siege, the people of Orléans gave thanks to God for their deliverance. According to a modern translation of the Mysteré du Siege d'Orléans, Joan was honored from that time on as the city's deliverer. In the foreword to the play there is this notation:

---
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... Under her leadership the Tourelles were recaptured from the English on the 8th of May, 1429, and the long siege brought to an end. The joy of the citizens found expression in a triumphal procession; ere long this came to be repeated in annual celebration of the city's deliverance, as is done to this day.32

Joan then set out for Tours, where the Dauphin Charles was waiting for her. Together they proceeded to Loches, a small fortress some thirty miles from Tours. Dunois, having failed to take Jargeau without Joan's help, came back to Loches to beg the Dauphin to allow Joan to lead the army once again. Dunois spoke of it this way:

After the deliverance of Orleans, the Maid, with myself and the other captains, went to seek the King at the Castle at Loches, praying him to attack immediately the towns and the camps on the Loire, Mehun, Meung, Beaugency, Jargeau, in order to make his consecration at Rheims more safe and sure. This she besought the King often, in the most urgent manner, to hasten, without longer delay. The King used the greatest haste possible, and sent, for this purpose, the Duke d'Alençon, myself and other captains, as well as Jeanne, to reduce these towns and camps. All were reduced in a few days — thanks alone, as I believe, to the intervention of the Maid.33

In his book, Andrew Lang referred to the campaign for these towns as "The Week of Victories." On June 9, Joan set out for Jargeau. It was at Jargeau that she impressed the Duke d'Alençon as she had formerly impressed Dunois:
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"Forward, gentle Duke, to the assault!" cried Jeanne to me. And when I told her it was premature to attack so quickly: "Have no fear," she said to me, "it is the right time when it pleases God; we must work when it is His Will: act, and God will act!" "Ah! gentle Duke," she said to me later, "art thou afraid? dost thou not know that I promised thy wife to bring thee back, safe and sound?"\[34\]

During the battle, Joan came over to d'Alençon and said, "Go back from this place, or that engine -- pointing out an engine of war in the city -- will kill you." D'Alençon tells in his testimony that shortly after Joan's warning, the Sieur de Lude was killed on the very spot Joan had indicated. D'Alençon was convinced from that moment that Joan was inspired of God.

By June 12, Jargeau fell. With it the French won control of the Loire river for some fifty miles above Orléans. The next objective was to relieve the territory below Orléans. That meant attacking the English at Meung. On June 14, Meung fell, and the French set out for Beaugency. As Joan gathered with the French, awaiting the next move of the English at Beaugency, the Duke d'Alençon informed her that the Constable of France, Arthur of Richemont, had come with a considerable force, to help fight the English. Richemont wielded great influence in the north of France, being the brother of the Duke of Brittany, and brother-in-law of Philip of Burgundy. He steadfastly hated the English, refusing to make any
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settlements with them. He was currently out of favor with Charles the Dauphin through the intrigue of the Sire La Tremoille, who hated Richemont. Either not knowing of the court intrigue, or not caring, Joan welcomed the aid of Richemont in fighting the English.

The combined French forces met the English at Patay as Talbot's army tried to prevent a French break-through past Beaugency to the more important stronghold of Janville. Talbot's forces were slaughtered, Talbot was captured, and the way was nearly open for Charles all the way to Rheims. Only a few fortified towns would offer any resistance, none of them strong enough to turn the French tide. Lowell says of the Battle of Patay: "It was bloody work; even at the Tourelles Joan had never seen such slaughter, -- for the most part slaughter of unresisting fugitives. After the English broke, the French cavalry had but to ride down the common soldiers, and receive the captains to ransom." 35

The Battle of Patay was won on June 18, 1429. By June 29, Charles began his march to Rheims to be crowned. Town after town opened its gates. The populace attributed the victory of the French at Patay to Joan; superstitious as they were, they did not want to be the ones who refused God's messenger. They looked upon Charles' recent victories as proof of the help of Heaven. The exceptions
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were Auxerre and Troyes. The burghers of Auxerre finally supplied the hungry army with food, paying La Tremoille to protect the town from attack. The French then moved on to Troyes, which refused to give the army food or supplies; nor would the town open its gates.

Charles called his council together and asked what should be done. The Archbishop of Rheims advised against a direct assault. When asked her opinion, Joan turned to the Dauphin and told him that the French army should besiege Troyes in God's name, and that the town would surrender in three days. The Archbishop then declared that they would wait for six more days. Joan told him not to doubt the outcome. According to Dunois' testimony, Joan's inspired leadership brought the town's immediate surrender. He said:

... Afterwards, it was known that, at the moment when she had told the King's Council not to pass by the town, the inhabitants had suddenly lost heart, and had occupied themselves only in seeking refuge in the Churches. The town of Troyes once reduced, the King went to Rheims, where he found complete submission, and where he was consecrated and crowned.36

Charles was crowned King of France July 17, 1429. The ceremony, which began at nine o'clock in the morning, ended at two in the afternoon. One of Charles' first acts as King was to raise the Sire de la Tremoille to Count. Charles also appointed the Sire de Rais marshall of France.
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The King then decreed that the inhabitants of Greux and Domremy should be free from taxation in honor of Joan of Arc. In official tax records where a sentence noted "Néant, a la Pucelle," the order stood through the year 1574.37

Immediately after his coronation, Charles went in turn to the towns of Vailly, then Soissons. He was then but sixty miles from Paris. Joan was impatient to attack Paris. According to d'Alençon, Joan had told Charles that "she would last but one year and no more; and that he should consider how best to employ this year."38

Charles allowed Joan only a small body of men for frequent skirmishing with the English, but would promise no supplies nor arms for a direct assault on Paris itself. Until August 4, 1429, Charles and the Duke of Burgundy negotiated for a truce. They signed it on that date. Any further campaign plans were halted, at least temporarily. Towns which under the truce's terms belonged to Burgundy kept surrendering themselves to Charles. Among these was the town of Beauvais, which drove its Bishop Cauchon out of his rich feudal estates; historians suggest that some personal animosity existed on Cauchon's part regarding Joan because of that particular event. Such independent action brought frequent skirmishes, but no pitched battles of importance developed after the truce was effected. Rebel
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towns which refused Burgundian rule included Senlis in addition to Beauvais. Some enthusiastic admirer of Joan presented her with the Bishop of Senlis' horse. Shaw makes capital of this event in the trial scene of Saint Joan.

In late August, Charles agreed to a secret treaty with Philip of Burgundy. Its actual terms did not include Paris; that fortified town was open to French attack at any time. Philip was obviously playing each side against the other in order to better his own position. Joan's pleas to Charles finally won her a conditional permission to reconnoiter the Paris defenses.

On September 8, which was the birthday of the Virgin Mary and a feast day in the Catholic church, Joan led her troops against the gate of Saint Honore and soon captured the boulevard, or earthwork which covered the gate, without much difficulty. Between the French and the city lay the deep moat which protected all medieval towns. The moat was so deep that filling it with faggots and blocks of wood still failed to make substantial footing. While the French struggled in the deep water, the English fired at will, cutting them down. Joan's standard-bearer was shot through the head and Joan herself was wounded in the leg by an arrow. She still urged her men to fight but they lost heart. D'Alençon with Gaucourt, the other commander, dragged Joan from the line of fire and mounted her on her horse, taking her back
to La Chapelle where they had set up camp. As Joan rode away with them, chroniclers have said she kept repeating, "By my staff, the place would have been taken."\textsuperscript{39}

Before Joan and D'Alençon could regroup their army for another attack, René of Bar and the Count of Clermont came from the King saying Charles had ordered Joan and D'Alençon to return at once to Saint Denis where Charles awaited them. It was then decided in the King's Council to retreat back to the Loire river, abandoning the towns which had offered themselves to Charles, among them Rheims and Compiègne.

Before Joan left Saint Denis, she left her full suit of white armor and a sword as a votive offering, as soldiers commonly did, in thanksgiving for recovery from battle wounds. Both Joan and D'Alençon had hoped to return to the attack on Paris, trying it from the south side where d'Alençon's men had constructed a bridge across the river. La Tremoille's men sabotaged the bridge before it could be used. La Tremoille jealously blocked any further action on the part of d'Alençon, had him deprived of his command and d'Alençon returned to his estates in disgust. He never served with Joan again.

Joan's failure to take Paris coupled with her later failure to take the strong fortified town of La Charité began
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to demoralize the French army. The people still seemed to believe in her, but the arrival on the scene of a rival prophetess in Catherine de la Rochelle confused and bewildered them. Catherine claimed she had been visited by the Virgin Mary. Joan said flatly that her voices had told her that "the mission of this Catherine was mere folly and nothing else." Catherine warned Joan not to go to La Charité "at this time of year." When the French were badly defeated at La Charité it appeared that Catherine had been right. Joan's reputation suffered accordingly.

Charles made another truce with Burgundy in November which was to last until Easter. A period of inactivity followed for Joan until April when the town of Melun threw out the English and Burgundians and held it for Joan, who was on an exploratory expedition along the Seine. It was at Melun during Easter week that her voices told her she would be captured before Saint John's day, June 24. At her trial, Joan described the incident this way:

During the Easter week of last year, being in the trenches of Melun, it was told me by my Voices -- that is to say, by Saint Catherine and Saint Margaret -- "Thou wilt be taken before Saint John's Day; and so it must be: do not torment thyself about it; be resigned; God will help thee." Though forewarned of disaster, Joan rode from Melun toward Lagny, a small town on the south bank of the Marne.

---
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river. There she and her followers met the forces of the brigand Franquet of Arras, who was nominally among the followers of Philip of Burgundy. His actual worth to his lord might be questioned because he literally lived off the countryside, doing Philip little real good and the peasantry a great deal of harm. He and his men had reduced a defenseless town and abbey, then turned to Lagny to reduce it in the name of Philip. The townspeople awaited him with their well-placed artillery on the walls. Joan and her men rode up in his rear and Franquet was captured, his men killed and their booty taken by the French.

Later at her trial, Joan was questioned regarding Franquet. Her manner of dealing with him created much ill will, and this feeling was exploited at the trial. According to feudal law, a man of Franquet's value was usually held to ransom, being treated fairly until the money was paid. At first Joan had ordered him held as an exchange prisoner with one Jacques Guillaume, a French partisan who had helped to plan an abortive uprising in Paris. Joan was sent word that Guillaume had been butchered. She turned Franquet over to the French for trial. He was tried forthwith and beheaded. The Burgundians were incensed when they learned of the incident and it is just possible that they felt no longer bound by feudal law of ransom when they later captured Joan.

From Lagny Joan turned to Compiègne, a town of
some five thousand inhabitants which lay on the eastern
bank of the Oise river, forty miles northeast of Paris.
The town, loyal to Charles since August of 1429, refused
the terms of the truce between Charles and Philip which
would deliver it into the hands of Philip. Compiègne
announced to La Tremoille, who was trying to negotiate its
surrender, that Compiègne had no intention of abiding by
the truce.

As Lowell notes in his book, Philip of Burgundy
was a powerful man whose good will was courted by both
French and English. His price to the French was the truce
which gave him complete freedom to move his army into commanding positions. His price to the English was Champagne, Brie, and twelve thousand five hundred marks in cash. According to Lowell, Philip's marriage to his third wife, Isabella of Portugal, made him "probably the richest prince of his time, and his court was the most splendid."\(^{42}\)

Philip determined to reduce Compiègne and took to the
field with a large force as soon as his truce with Charles
had expired. He headed directly for Compiègne, reducing the
towns of Gournay and Choisy, defeating the French at a strategic bridge called the Pont l'Evêque. Joan was with the French troops at the bridge, unable to rally her men. They were completely demoralized.

Despite the overwhelming Burgundian and English forces
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surrounding Compiègne, Joan and a few men slipped through the lines. Joan had told them she wanted to go to see her good friends at Compiègne. There, according to two men who told the story many years later, Joan had said:

My children and dear friends, I tell you that they have sold and betrayed me, and that soon I shall be delivered to death. I beg you to pray God for me, since I shall never more have power to serve the king or the kingdom of France.43

Lowell noted that it is possible the stories are colored by the events of that afternoon. That day Joan led her small party through the gate of the city. She was richly dressed, wearing a cloak made of cloth-of-gold over her armor and riding a fine dappled gray horse.

She led the small French force against the Picards, a detachment posted just opposite the city. For a brief time the element of surprise worked in the French's favor. Then a band of Burgundians under John de Luxemburg moved on Joan's flank as some English troops moved in from the rear, cutting off any hope of retreat. Joan stayed back of her men, forming a rear-guard action to permit them to reach the safety of the town. A Burgundian chronicler said of her, "Passing the nature of a woman, she did great feats, and took great pains to save her company from loss, staying behind them like a captain, and like the bravest of the troop."44

As the French fled back through the town gate, the
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commander, Flavy, who had accompanied Joan out on the sortie but had gotten back to the gate safely, panicked at the sight of the oncoming English in pursuit of the French, and closed the gate of the town before Joan and her escort could reach it. Lucien Fabre suggested that Joan's capture was through the collusion of Flavy, La Tremoille and Cauchon, the Bishop of Beauvais:

It is perfectly possible that the situation leading to Joan's capture had been a deliberately planned trap. Cauchon had been present at Calais when Winchester landed with Henry VI. He prowled round the walls of Compiègne within which one of his "damned souls," Dacier, Abbot of Cormeilles, had remained. The one indisputable certainty is that Flavy made no effort to save her.\(^{45}\)

Joan was actually captured by the Bastard of Wandonne, a follower of Jean de Luxemburg; therefore, she was nominally Jean's prisoner. Shortly after her capture, Philip of Burgundy rode up with his reinforcements. So exultant were the Burgundians over the capture of the Maid that they began to celebrate, deciding against a direct assault upon Compiègne, wishing instead to retire safely with their valuable prisoner before her followers could rally and attempt a rescue. Philip spoke with Joan but what was said between them has never been recorded. The first night of her captivity, May 23, 1430, Joan spent in the quarters of Jean de Luxemburg. As soon as arrangements
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could be made, she was taken under strong escort to Beaulieu, about twenty miles northeast of Compiègne.

Plans were immediately set in motion by the English to buy Joan from the Burgundians, who may at first have held her awaiting Charles' offer of ransom. One outspoken churchman, the Archbishop of Gelu, wrote immediately to Charles VII, "telling him that he must 'spare neither effort nor money in an effort to recover this girl,' and warning him that, if he did not do so, he would incur blame as 'one who had been culpably ungrateful.'"46 On June 5, in reply, Charles promised he would do something. As the people waited impatiently, he moved from town to town. He was again in the midst of negotiations with Philip.

In the meantime, the English and Cauchon, Bishop of Beauvais, made their plans. From the beginning of her trial until the day of her death, Joan put the blame on Cauchon. The character of Cauchon will be dealt with in the next chapter as will those of the other historical characters depicted in Shaw's play. An attempt will be made to discover Shaw's deviations from history for dramatic purposes, as well as the reasons he made them.

Historians have argued the legality of the actions of Cauchon. According to G.G. Coulton in his book Inquisition And Liberty, Cauchon was extremely conscientious in bringing the Inquisition into the case at all. Coulton maintains that

46 Ibid., p. 244.
Cauchon could simply have offered Jean de Luxemburg a price for Joan without the complicated machinery of the Church:

... It was perfectly natural, given the ordinary mentality of the age, that the English should attribute her almost miraculous victories to witchcraft; and, since sorcery came legally within the competence of lay magistrates as well as ecclesiastical, they could have condemned and burned her off-hand without violating medieval conceptions of justice to any very scandalous extent. But, for her complete discredit and for the world-wide justification of their cause, they needed her solemn condemnation by the Church.47

Murray contends that the whole proceeding was illegal, whatever the English wished to believe to the contrary. He notes in his translation of Joan's trial that not only was it illegal for the Church to act as intermediary to the English in buying Joan, but that the Bishop of Beauvais had no legal right to negotiate for her at all, since Joan was not captured in his diocese; she was captured north of the bridge, on the right bank of the river. That would place her either in the diocese of Noyon or Soissons. Scott corroborates Murray in this.

Though Coulton notes that "almost anything was permissible" in Inquisition procedure, Joan's case remains unique in that she was cited as both a prisoner of war and a heretic. Others tried by the Inquisition such as Pierrone, a follower of Joan, who fell into the hands of the University of Paris, were not bought, as she was. They were surrendered

to the authorities, tried, and burned. Jean de Luxemburg held Joan as a political prisoner, a prize of war. He refused to surrender her until he was paid ten thousand gold livres.

While the English levied the Normandy provinces for the money, Joan remained with Luxemburg, being transferred from Beaulieu to Beaurevoir, where she nearly escaped by leaping from the tower. The fact that the great height from which she leaped did not kill her convinced her superstitious captors that she was indeed a witch, and she was subsequently questioned at her trial concerning the leap.

During her captivity, one of her voices' predictions came true to comfort her. That was the relief of Compiègne in late October; it was accomplished despite the English troops and the added forces of Jean de Luxemburg. By November the negotiations for Joan were over. The money was paid to Jean de Luxemburg; Joan was in the hands of the English and the University of Paris demanded her immediate trial.

The trial, which will be examined in detail in the next chapter actually began on January 9, 1431. It ended on May 30 with the subsequent burning of Joan of Arc that day. How much of the actual dialogue of the original trial Shaw interpolated and what he chose to exclude will form the larger part of the next chapter.

Almost immediately after her death, legend sprang up concerning Joan of Arc. One of these was that the
executioner reported freely using sulphur and charcoal to complete the burning of Joan's body, but her heart would not burn. Another tale was that some of Joan's accusers were convinced upon her death that they had burned a saint. Her name became a household word. She was regarded as a martyr. The English plan began to backfire as her predictions began to come true.

The first of Joan's enemies to fall from power was La Tremoille, who was nearly assassinated in 1433, barely escaping with his life when attacked by partisans of the constable Richemont. He never regained his control of Charles VII and died in 1446, long forgotten and discredited. In 1435 the Richemont faction in power managed to bring real peace with Philip of Burgundy. Bedford died, and with his death an internal struggle for power gripped the English and their power in France waned. In 1436 Paris went over to Charles. In 1444 the English were forced to sign a truce.

The truce lasted for five years. Then, in Normandy trouble broke out between French and English forces which led to the eventual victory of the French. Charles led his forces into Rouen in 1449; by 1450 he had won all of northern France except Calais. It was at this time that Charles VII set about restoring Joan of Arc to her rightful place as France's great heroine. He commissioned one William Bouillé, a doctor of theology, to make inquiry concerning the trial of Joan.

With the official record of the trial in his hands and "many of
the men who had taken part in it under his control, Charles meant to reverse the judgement which had declared him to have gained his throne by the help of sorcery."

A great deal of political maneuvering was necessary to set a new trial in motion. Joan had been tried by an ecclesiastical court, and without permission from the Pope its proceedings could not be reviewed. A French cardinal named Estouteville examined some twenty witnesses in Rouen. This action was followed by a re-examination of the minutes of the trial by ecclesiastical experts, who ruled in favor of Joan.

In 1455 the Pope, Nicholas V, who did not like Charles VII, died. The new Pope, Calixtus III, favored re-opening the case and Isabelle d'Arc, Joan's mother, with expert legal council to help her, asked for a new trial in order to make right the great wrong done her daughter Joan. Many witnesses who testified in Joan's behalf were examined. Some of them, d'Alençon, Dunois, and Laxart, have been previously quoted. Manchon, who was Notary at the first trial of Joan stated that he felt the whole trial had been a travesty of justice. Only Thomas de Courcelles, who had helped Manchon in "collating the written evidence and interpreting the texts with utter impartiality" held that "Jeanne is now what she was. If she was heretic then, she is so now."

On July 7, 1456 the judges pronounced sentence,
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which consisted of the following conclusion:

We say, pronounce, decree, and declare, the said Processes and Sentences full of cozenage, iniquity, inconsequences, and manifest errors, in fact as well as in law; we say that they have been, are, and shall be — as well as the aforesaid Abjuration, their execution, and all that followed — null, non-existent, without value or effect.\(^\text{51}\)

The trial had been conducted for the most part in Paris. But to make doubly sure that full reparation was made to Joan, the verdict of the judges was read publicly in Rouen. Two processions marked the steps of the Maid: one to the market-place near the Cemetery of Saint Ouen where Joan had recanted, the other to the place of her execution. There a cross was erected on the spot where the stake had been. In addition, "the findings of the Court were read with due solemnity in every city or town of consequence throughout the Kingdom."\(^\text{52}\)

Though she was declared innocent of the charges of the Inquisition in 1456, little more is recounted of Joan of Arc until 1805 outside of the reference to her in Shakespeare's \textit{Henry VI}, Part I and Voltaire's crude travesty of her career in \textit{La Pucelle}. Interest was aroused in 1805 by a piece written by a Frenchman named Gaze in which he attempted to prove that Joan of Arc was in reality the daughter of Duke Louis of Orléans, who was killed by John
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the Fearless. In checking on his theory, French scholars rediscovered the trial of the Maid. The most important work to come of the study was that of Jules Quicherat in 1841 in his five-volume recounting of the trial plus various and sundry chronicles of Joan's contemporaries. He included Minutes taken down in French by Manchon, the Registrar, on which the Latin translation was based.

Shortly afterwards a book on Joan of Arc's life was published by H. de Lescure. In 1868 Earnest O'Reilly, Counsellor to the Imperial Court at Rouen, published the entire Trial and Rehabilitation with appropriate explanations and introduction. More simply written than the massive volumes of Quicherat, this book had wide popular appeal and from his praise of the book the Bishop of Orléans set in motion an appeal for canonization proceedings on behalf of Joan.

By 1894 Pope Leo XIII was petitioned to venerate Joan. His successor, Pope Pius X, declared Joan blessed in 1909; on May 16, 1920 the official canonization ceremonies were conducted by Pope Benedict XV. An article in the Literary Digest of June 5, 1920, described the ceremony:

Always a saint in the popular mind, the canonization of Joan of Arc on May 16 in the historic basilica at Rome five hundred years after her martyrdom was hardly more than an official ratification of a sainthood revered by free people everywhere. All Christendom joined in paying tribute to the memory of the French heroine. The canonization ceremony, conducted by Pope Benedict, was described in the press dispatches as the most impressive function in several centuries.
Thirty thousand persons, including 140 descendants of the shepherd girl's family and Church dignitaries from all parts of the world, witnessed the rites in Saint Peter's.\(^53\)

The article recounted that while the official ceremony was in progress in Rome, a pageant and appropriate celebration was being performed at Fordham University while ships of the United States Navy stationed in the Hudson River "fired the national salute of 21 guns in honor of her entry into the peerage of Heaven." It went on to say:

The first petition of canonization was made in 1869 by the Bishop of Orleans and 12 colleagues. The decree of heroicity was published in 1904; the proof of the three required miracles -- three modern cures following invocation of Joan -- was admitted in 1908; beatification ensued in 1909 and in March, 1919, the Pope's decision was given for canonization. \(^54\)

People of all religions have long been captivated by the remarkable career of Joan of Arc. As duly noted by Euphemia Van Rensselaer Wyatt in the Catholic World, Joan of Arc has been examined by writers and biographers of various religious persuasions. Mrs. Wyatt said:

...Quicherat, who first edited and translated the minutes of her trial, was a skeptic. So was Michelet; so were Fabre and Viriville. Andrew Lang was a canny and coolly industrious filter for historical accuracy; while few satirists have viewed the world with more penetrating disillusionment than Anatole France or our own Mark Twain. It is thus more than appropriate that the most acidulously witty Irishman of our day should add his name to their list.

Personally we shall always be convinced that it was a paradox, as ever, that inspired Mr. Shaw to create

\(^53\)The Literary Digest, LXV (June 5, 1920), p. 47.
\(^54\)Ibid.
Saint Joan. We can almost hear his chuckle when he picked up his paper one morning and read how that very Church, which once burned her body to ashes, had now canonized her soul as a saint. His thesis is to prove that in the end the laugh is on the Church, and that the halo of sanctitude has been meted out to one who was really a Protestant! To further offend conservative British ears, he hails her as a Nationalist as well.55

It will be the purpose of this paper to examine the play Saint Joan in the next chapter in order to determine whether Shaw had any basis in historical fact for his premise.

CHAPTER III

SHAW'S VERSION OF THAT HISTORY

In the program notes of the English production of Saint Joan, George Bernard Shaw summarized the points at which his play departed "from historical truth" since, as he noted, "historical facts cannot be put on the stage exactly as they occurred, because they will not fit into its limits of time and space."¹ He explained his variance with historical fact in several specific places as necessary for dramatic technique. One of these places is in the first Scene:

The visit of Joan to the castle of Vaucouleurs, and her conquest of its captain, occupy about twenty minutes on the stage. Actually she made three visits before she carried her point with him. The apparent miracle which impressed him was the news of the Battle of the Herrings. Joan learnt of this from the mouth to mouth wireless of the peasantry. She was therefore able to tell him what had happened several days before the news reached him by the official routine of mounted messenger. This seemed to him miraculous. A much simpler form of miracle has been substituted in the play to save tedious and unnecessary explanations.²

²Ibid., p. 546. Henderson's footnote says, "The substitution was fortunate, as Mr. John MacKinnon Robertson, attacking Shaw's history, scored a solitary point in dating the Battle of the Herrings three days later than Joan's departure from Vaucouleurs. See J.M. Robertson, 'Mr. Shaw and the Maid' (London, 1925)." Henderson's quotation of Robertson is not correct. See p. 14 in the previous chapter for Robertson's exact quotation, and the controversy among scholars as to the exact date of Joan's departure from Vaucouleurs.
The simpler form of miracle which Shaw uses in his play is Joan's power, in the eyes of the superstitious steward and soldiers of Vaucouleurs, to keep the hens from laying their usual eggs until Robert de Baudricourt gives her permission to go to Chinon. It helps set the mood of the play, reflecting the superstition of medieval times, and actually seems no more strange a power of Joan's than the historic changing of the wind at Orleans.

Critics in general had little fault to find with Shaw's first Scene in which Joan wins permission from Baudricourt to go to Chinon. No one seems to have quibbled about Shaw's placing the meeting at Vaucouleurs on "a fine spring morning" rather than pinpointing it as Robertson did, in February. Shaw's depiction of Baudricourt is perhaps a bit Shavian rather than historical in making him a weak-willed loud-mouth. Records show that Baudricourt was quite an able commander of men, though he was much like the soldiers of fortune of the day who lived off the "plunder which he gathered from the peasants of the country and from the merchants who traveled through it." He commanded the garrison at Vaucouleurs for over twelve years.

According to the program note, Shaw based his physical description of Joan upon a sculptured head he had

---

3Lowell, p. 39.
once seen:

No portrait of Joan was made to her knowledge; but a St. Maurice sculptured at Orléans by an artist who presumably saw her is so extraordinary, being obviously a portrait and yet stranger in its impressiveness and the spacing of its features than any ideal head, that it can be accounted for only as an image of a very singular woman; and no other such woman than Joan is discoverable.  

The red dress which Joan is wearing in her first entrance is authenticated by the description of her given by Jean de Metz, who said "When Jeanette was at Vaucouleurs, I saw her dressed in a red dress, poor and worn;" Bertrand de Poulengey spoke of "her woman's dress, which was of a red colour" from which Joan changed to her squire's outfit when she left for Chinon.  

In Scene II Shaw's characterization of La Tremoille and the Archbishop of Rheims is not so historically accurate but is extremely good theater in setting the scene at court. His description of young Gilles de Rais is accurate except for the affectation of the blue beard. Rais' beard was red; Shaw's suggestion that Frenchmen at court dyed their beards is his device for giving Rais the nickname of Bluebeard. Actually, Rais was the original Bluebeard according to Lucien Fabre. A thorough examination of his life and later trial for murder of young children is given in Henry Lea's book

---

4Henderson (1932) p. 39.
5Murray, p. 223.
6Ibid., p. 230.
7Fabre, p. 139.
A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages. Shaw was hanged as Shaw has the Archbishop warn him he will be.

Shaw's depiction of La Hire follows the record closely. He uses La Hire's incredulity at the death of the blasphemous "Foul-mouthed Frank" as a dramatic introduction to Joan at court. It is because La Hire is impressed by her that Charles decides to have a look at her himself. As Shaw said in his program note, the miracle of the drowned blasphemer is historical. According to the testimony of Brother Pasqueral, who had been Joan's chaplain, the incident was witnessed by several people:

... At last, by the advice of the Council, she was permitted an interview with the King. The day on which this interview was to take place, just as she entered the Castle, a man, mounted on horseback, said, "Is that the Maid?" He insulted her, and swore with horrid blasphemy. "Oh! in God's Name," she said to him, "dost thou blaspheme God, thou who art so near thy death!" And, an hour after, this man fell into the water and was drowned. I report this fact as I gathered it from Jeanne and from many others, who said they had been witnesses of it.9

Lucien Fabre described the insult as being "Is that the Maid? Zounds! give me but a night with her, and she will be one no longer!" Fabre noted also, that within an hour, the man had fallen into the water and drowned.10 It apparently was a moat into which the man fell but for reasons of his own

---

9Murray, p. 282.
10Fabre, p. 112.
Shaw has Frank fall into a well.

The first real criticism of Shaw's play by reviewing critics was his characterization of the Dauphin Charles. One critic, J. Van Kan, specifically criticized the court sequence at Chinon, saying that royal courts were more dignified than that. He also cited "the King's defiant exclamation to the assembled Court, 'Who dare say now that I am not my father's son?'" as "quite unhistorical."\(^{11}\)

Such minor points of criticism are worth noting when they pinpoint small inaccuracies that Shaw might better have corrected; otherwise such complaints as those of Van Kan, Henderson, and Mrs. Wyatt regarding Joan's calling the Dauphin "Charlie" become mere carping. Historical fact is on Shaw's side in this matter and the critics become merely technical hair-splitters who are pedantically eager to catch the dramatist in error. They might better have picked other points that this one, for Joan is recorded as being notorious for her disregard of stiff formalities, though she knew court etiquette as well as anyone. She simply did not attach any importance to ceremony and spoke of Charles as her "petit gentil dauphin" and called him "Charlot" before he was crowned king. She called the Duke d'Alençon her "bon Duke" as well. It is interesting to note that though the critics complained of this mannerism of Shaw's Joan, none criticized

the very same familiar form of address in Jean Anouilh's version of Joan, *The Lark*.

Shaw's program notes also enumerated his departures from exact fact in his second Scene:

Joan's second venture: the visit to Chinon and the conquest of the Dauphin, has been compressed in the same way. Actually, Joan was received after days of hesitation, and sent to Poitiers to be examined by a body of Churchmen there before she was sent with reinforcements to Orléans.\(^\text{12}\)

The third scene opens on a rare poetic note with Dunois composing a sonnet, idly watching a kingfisher as he awaits the approach of Joan and the army. He is accompanied by a pert page for comic relief, a youngster who reflects a sense of confidence in and comradeship with his master, a typically Shavian device. Shaw has caught the character of Dunois amazingly well. The Bastard of Orléans comes alive, matching Anatole France's historical sketch of him, though with little Shavian refinements not shown in France's description of him:

... He was le Seigneur Jean, Count of Porcien and of Montaing, Grand Chamberlain of France, son of Duke Louis of Orléans, who had been assassinated in 1407 by order of Jean-Sans-Peur, and whose death had armed the Armagnacs against the Burgundians. Dame de Cany was his mother, but he ought to have been the son of the Duchess of Orléans since the Duke was his father. Not only was it no drawback to children to be born outside wedlock and of an adulterous union, but it was a great honor to be called the bastard of a prince.\(^\text{13}\)

\(^{12}\)Henderson (1932), p. 547.

\(^{13}\)France, p. 128.
The records show that Dunois was about twenty-six at the time of the siege of Orléans. It was said of him that his amiability, courtesy, and discretion made him a favorite of the ladies and even with the Queen. In his affability and intelligence he resembled his father, but he was "more cautious and temperate. In everything he did he was apt, in war as well as in diplomacy, marvellously adroit, and a consummate dissembler."\textsuperscript{14}

The dialogue of Joan and the Bastard recapitulates much of Dunois' own description of his meeting with Joan. (See reference to Murray, p. 23 in Chapter II). Shaw follows Joan's own account of the breach of promise trial at Toul. There actually was such a case. Joan's family wanted her to marry the young man. He was so determined to marry her that he had her cited before the ecclesiastical tribunal of Toul. The Toul court had jurisdiction over all matters of marriages in the diocese which included Domremy. Joan described the action when questioned during her trial about obedience to her parents. She said it was the first time she disobeyed them, pleading her own case and winning it. In the subsequent Act of Accusation which the Inquisition drew up against Joan, the breach of promise was deliberately reversed, though the testimony was written down elsewhere on the Examination of March 12, 1431. In the Act the contention was that Joan had

\textsuperscript{14}Tbid., p. 129.
sued the man, and that he had refused to marry her because she was a bad woman. This minor point suggests further evidence of the cozenage at Joan's trial, though Shaw has organized his trial scene on more fair lines. It is evidence like this that caused Barrett and other biographers to protest Shaw's stand on the matter of the two trials of Joan.

He is accurate in his account of Joan's finding the sword behind the altar at the chapel of Saint Catherine of Fierbois. The conversation between Dunois and Joan only becomes typically Shavian when Joan begins instructing Dunois on the art of warfare. The actual Joan always seemed to regard herself merely as the messenger of her heavenly voices, repeating their instructions. The actual Dunois said more than once in his testimony that Joan "executed many marvellous manoeuvres which had not been thought of by two or three accomplished generals working together," but he believed those maneuvers she performed were divinely inspired. There is no historical indication that Joan's companions listened to lectures from her concerning gun emplacement as Shaw's Joan indulges in here.

Critics have noted that at this point in the play,
Shaw began to have difficulty maintaining his theory that Joan's inner voices, or innate common sense, was the actual source of her inspiration. In reply to Baudricourt's "They come from your imagination," the historical Joan would never have said, "Of course. That is how the messages of God come to us." Nor would the actual Joan have said, "I will not go to church until we have beaten them." Historically, Joan heard mass with the priests who had accompanied the army to Blois, just before the attempt to raise the siege at Orléans. Dunois' own account of the changing of the wind emphasizes Joan's religious inspiration. Shaw plays it down for dramatic effect, and as he said in his famed letter to the Abbess of Stanwood regarding his play:

In reading heathen literature like mine you must always allow for the special meaning given by the Church to the word supernatural. Also you must remember that I am addressing an audience not exclusively Catholic, including not only Protestants and Modernists of all sorts, but also Indians and Orientals whose religion has an iconography entirely different to the Christian one. Whether God makes different iconographies for different peoples, or whether he lets us all make our own iconography, it is clear that to a pious Hindu or Moslem St. Michael and St. Catherine mean nothing just as to a Worcester dairymaid Allah and Brahma mean nothing... It is therefore necessary for me to present Joan's visions in such a way as to make them completely independent of the iconography attached to her religion. But I did not therefore deprive the visions of their miraculous character. 18

Shaw even injects a light note with the changing of the

wind by having the page sneeze, and Joan matter-of-factly says, "God bless you, child!" Then the scene builds in dramatic intensity as Joan, half-hysterical, pleads for Dunois to help her lead the charge.

Of the critics, Van Kan seems to have attached the most importance to Shaw's unhistorical (he contends) meeting of Cauchon, Bishop of Beauvais and Warwick following the Battle of Patay, and preceding the coronation of Charles at Rheims. Van Kan doubted that the actual Cauchon and Warwick were so organized and polished a pair. Immediately following the Battle of Patay there seemed little likelihood of Joan's falling into the hands of the enemy. All of her predictions had thus far come true; the English were on the run for the first time in years. Joan was at the height of her power and appeared to be invincible. Van Kan said:

... Shaw makes it appear as if in the summer of 1429 the Earl of Warwick had already formed the plan for getting Joan into his hands and then having her condemned by an ecclesiastical court. Even before the coronation Warwick is in negotiation about it with Cauchon. Now there is no historical evidence whatever of such a plan having been formed to secure Joan through the treachery of the Armagnacs; and Cauchon's business, directed towards a process of law, does not begin till after her imprisonment in Compiègne. It has even been ascertained upon good authority that the plan for transferring the prisoner from Jean de Luxemburg to the English for the price of ten thousand pounds originated at the Paris University, whose messenger Cauchon was on his visit to the Burgundian camp, and introduced the negotiations. 19

---

19 Van Kan, p. 44.
Though it may have no basis in historical fact, Scene IV is an excellent piece of foreshadowing. It achieves a balance between the two factions involved in the struggle, and it provides a synopsis of past events which have direct bearing upon the present action of the play. Tucked among such Shavianisms as "Oh! You are an Englishman, are you?" "Certainly not, my lord: I am a gentleman," come the historical bits of information that Warwick was defeated previously by Dunois at Montargis and that Talbot has been taken prisoner at Patay. Shaw is able to keep the mood of the play through such devices and to make his version of history acceptable by building to a point of argument with historical data no one disputes. In this way he can launch into the speech of Cauchon regarding Joan as an instrument of the devil. Here Shaw's idea of what the medieval Church felt about heretics comes forth in brilliant and penetrating lines by Cauchon. Shaw's churchman is rather too sophisticated for the Middle Ages. Perhaps feeling that criticism would be leveled at his Cauchon, Shaw used an actual historical quotation of the Bishop's when he says, "My first duty is to seek this girl's salvation." The real Cauchon actually said these words, but it was at Joan's trial, long after her capture. He was replying to an English ecclesiastic who had accused him of favoring Joan in the questioning. Cauchon had said, "You lie. It is my duty and profession to seek the salvation of her soul and body."^20

---

Shaw's fair-minded Doctor of the Church is quite a different person from the historical Cauchon. Biographers have described him as a worldly prelate, a man born in the Champagne region of France whose family was of no particular distinction. Possibly he chose the religious life for its educational benefits. He studied at the University of Paris, taking his degree in canon law. He had impressed his superiors so favorably that he was named Rector at the University in 1403, when he was in his early thirties. He continued filling responsible posts for the rest of his life. A staunch Burgundian, he had no compunction for defeated Armagnacs and incited the Paris mob to slaughter some luckless Armagnac prisoners in the bloody fighting of 1413.

When the Armagnacs came to power, he fled to the protection of Philip of Burgundy. When the Burgundians again controlled Paris, he directed the University, represented it at court, and won, through his zeal, the bishopric of Beauvais. As was mentioned earlier in Chapter II, he was driven from his feudal estates when the citizens of Beauvais gave the town to Joan. Having been driven from his territory, he sought the vacant archbishopric of Rouen. Some writers suggest that he was promised the post as a reward for successful delivery of Joan to the stake. When he took up the task of negotiating for the Maid from the Burgundians, he was a man approaching sixty, wise in the ways of the Inquisition and as competent in canon law as any man in France.
As he often does later in the trial scene, Shaw here puts into the mouth of one person what another person actually said, when he has Cauchon remark about the evils of heresy, "... it is cancerous: if it be not cut out, stamped out, burnt out, it will not stop until it has brought the whole body of human society into sin and corruption, into waste and ruin..." Historically, the same phrasing belongs to Brother Jean Graverent, Inquisitor of Heretical error, in the letter of authorization he wrote to Jean Lemaitre, the Deputy Inquisitor, in which he said, "Heresy is a disease which creeps like a cancer, secretly killing the simple, unless the knife of the inquisitor cuts it away." It helps Shaw establish the position of the Church regarding heresy, by using nearly the exact words from the records. He can hardly be accused then of putting modern concepts into medieval minds. He did use dramatic license in substituting Cauchon for Graverent, who never appears in Shaw's play, but by inserting Graverent's viewpoint, he demonstrates the position taken by the Church in the matter of heresy.

In this connection, Cauchon's discussion with Warwick about Joan's acting "as if she were the Church" brings forth Shaw's point in the play, to be emphasized later in the trial scene, which was that Joan was an early Protestant. The scene between Warwick and Cauchon ends with the Bishop and the

---

21 Barrett, p. 44.
Englishman agreed upon the necessity of Joan's destruction; that it is the only way in which their way of life can hope to survive.

Scene V meets with much the same criticism from Van Kan as Scene IV, in that Shaw compresses into a single dramatic event what took place much later. But for the purpose of the play it sharpens the point of conflict between Joan and the people she sought to help. Van Kan said:

The whole of Scene V is unhistorical in this respect. At the coronation no one would have dared publicly to set himself up or express himself as antagonistic to Joan, neither the Archbishop-Chancellor nor the newly created Marshall Gilles de Rais and least of all the King or Dunois.22

Shaw is being both historically correct and providing at the same time excellent foreshadowing when he has the Archbishop of Rheims warn Joan that the University of Paris has just burned a woman for praising the deeds of Joan. That woman was Pierrone, referred to in Chapter II, p. 41. It demonstrates that Shaw recognized the importance of depicting the University's authority in the procedure of the Inquisition. He uses the fate of Pierrone to outline the further action of the play. The inevitable net of circumstances begins to gather, and ultimately events conspire to lead Joan to the stake.

With the exception of Murray and Shaw, writers and biographers of the Joan of Arc legend do not have kind words

22Van Kan, p. 44.
to say for the Archbishop of Rheims. Historically, the Archbishop is recorded as "a false priest without a heart, who would gladly have sacrificed his own mother if, by doing so he could keep his employment."^23 Lowell described him as a "selfish and worldly prelate, incapable of finding anything unselfish and unworldly in others."^24 Shaw's Archbishop first shows his hostility to Joan after her imprudent reply to his lecture concerning her voices. Historically, the Archbishop of Rheims appeared to grow jealous of Joan after the people's adulation of her in Orleans. He first voiced opposition to her at Troyes when she ordered an attack on the city and he wanted to bypass it. When she was victorious in spite of him, he seemed to take a great dislike to her.

Fabre said of him:

... Canon and Dean of Beauvais at twenty-two, Papal Chamberlain at thirty-six, at thirty-eight he was given the Dical Bishopric of Rheims -- a city which he visited for the first time twelve years later, thanks to the shepherd-girl with whom from the very first moment of their meeting, he had felt himself to be in conflict, heart, soul and blood...^25

Shaw's Archbishop is well-motivated in the play, and is treated with a certain amount of sympathy so that he can be brought back later in the Epilogue to speak some of the most touching lines in the play in his part of the

---

^23Fabre, p. 92.
^24Lowell, p. 54.
^25Fabre, p. 173.
litany spoken to Saint Joan. He becomes, with Dunois, in Scene V, the agent of prediction of Joan's downfall.

The character of Dunois develops most sympathetically in this scene, for he represents, as Shaw stated in his program note, the character of both Dunois as recorded and some of the characteristics of Joan's favorite, the Duke d'Alençon, who does not appear in the play. Dunois is both a soldier, as is La Hire, and a court personality. As such, he has certain privileges of expression and Shaw uses him to forecast Joan's future trouble with the superstitious army. With the wisdom of a statesman, Dunois can see that people emotionally inspired by seeming miracles can be just as quickly deflated by failure of the seemingly miraculous agent. With kindness, Dunois tries to tell Joan that she will not be allowed to take Paris. It was one thing to lead Charles' army with his permission; it would be quite another to lead a small band of adventurers without the King's sanction. He also hints that there are betrayers in the ranks of Charles who "would just as soon Paris took you."

Historically, it was at Compiègne that Flavy, the French commander, closed the gates of the town on Joan, leaving her to be captured by the Burgundians without making a move to help in any way. As was noted in Chapter II, some historians and biographers thought, as Fabre did, that Flavy was in collusion with the Burgundians and Cauchon. Shaw makes use of this point as Dunois warns Joan she has done as much as
can be done, and any further attempts to take Paris at this time will prove disastrous. Though Dunois tells Joan he would be jealous of her himself if he were ambitious enough, he begins to show annoyance with her when she lectures him on how to fight a battle. That is too much for his professional pride, and he declares that the battles were not won solely by miracles, but by generalship, and that some were killed in the fighting. Miracles or no miracles, it is war all the same. He then predicts the price the English will pay for Joan: sixteen thousand pounds, which then corresponded with the historical ten thousand livres.

The admonitions of the Archbishop and Dunois, the petulance of Charles and the arch remarks of Gilles de Rais are preparation for Joan's touching speech which includes the brilliant lines, "I see now that the loneliness of God is His strength: what would He be if He listened to your jealous little counsels? Well, my loneliness shall be my strength too; it is better to be alone with God: His friendship will not fail me, nor His counsel, nor His love. In His strength I will dare, and dare, and dare, until I die..." With Dunois' parting remark about Compiègne, the action builds for the next sequence.

Scene VI has been called the high point of Shaw's play by both those who have praised the play without reservation and by those who have dismissed Saint Joan as tedious chronicle drama. Critic Stark Young, while accusing Shaw
of "garrulity and confused detail," had praise for the trial scene:

... The ideas here are, of course, only those implicit in the great social wisdom of the traditional Church, but Shaw's writing is magnificent. The body of the play is by this scene, at least, lifted to the plane of greatness.26

Critic Van Kan was unstinting in his praise of Shaw's trial scene:

In Scene VI Bernard Shaw rises to his full power. All the available material of the procedure is concentrated in masterly dramatic style in one sitting, which the poet places on the ultimate day of May 30, 1431. The great dramatist in his supreme effort is here at the same time an accurate historian.27

In the program note to the English production of Saint Joan, Shaw remarked: "...one or two speeches have been transposed for stage purposes..."28 Other critics as well as Van Kan recognized this as legitimate theatre; on the issue of the "fairness" of Joan's trial, there has been more argument. W. P. Barrett took the view that Joan had far from a fair trial:

The case against her was weak. The protraction of the trial from January until near the end of May, when all parties, the University, the Church, and the English, were anxious for her conviction, is proof enough of that. But by this time the machinery of the Inquisition was at the height of its perfection: every security of justice was removed, and no person in the situation in which

27Van Kan, p. 45.
Jeanne found herself, accused of witchcraft and heresy in a hostile ecclesiastical court, had the faintest chance of a fair trial. 29

Scott's opinion differed from Barrett's. From the vantage point of thirty-three years in which to evaluate the trial and Shaw's version of it, Scott said of the Shavian version (though never mentioning it by name):

The trial, although held before the Bishop of Beauvais as Ordinary of the diocese where Jeanne was taken prisoner, was in fact a trial by the Inquisition. Although this form of trial is offensive to modern ideas of equity, it must be realized that it was the customary method of procedure at the time, and as such was no more unfair than was the procedure in the civil courts. 30

In his review, Carl Van Doren found Shaw's version the more arresting for its impartiality, finding in this approach more dramatic depth:

... Her defeat is due, as he sees it, in part to her inability to meet learned sophistication on its own ground. Her defeat, that is to say, is more or less natural. For fools of God, be they useful as they may be in emergencies, are no match for the shrewd lawyers and theologians and soldiers who govern mankind in the long run. To this ironical conclusion the play commits itself.

The irony is the more arresting since it is so little partisan. Mr. Shaw lacks the disposition, which Mark Twain, for instance, had, to dance upon the graves of Joan's persecutors. 31

Brooks Atkinson, in commenting on the recent portrayal of Saint Joan by Siobhan McKenna, said:

---

29Barrett, p. 3. For the other side of the argument, in which the fairness of the trial is cited, see the book by Patrick Braybrooke, The Genius of Bernard Shaw (Philadelphia, 1925), p. 143.

30Scott, p. 12.

... But as a statement of the instinct that public institutions have for self-preservation in the presence of individuals who adhere to private conscience, the trial scene is brilliant and moving. It represents the most sublime part of Shaw's character -- his understanding of conflicting points of view, his compassion for individuals trapped by forces they cannot control, his ethics and insight, his courageous devotion to intellectual truths, whether pleasant or ugly.32

In compressing the trial into one session on the thirtieth of May, Shaw is able to breathe life into an otherwise dreary proceeding, if one reads either Barrett or Scott. The trial for heresy is shown in both Barrett and Scott to have dragged on from session to session with countless repetitions, and incorrect testimony was recorded from previous sessions. The Churchmen who are represented in the records lack the polish and verve of Shaw's characters.

Historically, the trial opened on January 9, 1431. The Inquisitorial form was punctiliously observed, according to Murray. First, there was the Process ex officio which consisted of the facts of accusation, examination of the accused concerning this inquiry, and the case, if any, was then drawn up by the Promoter. Upon completion of the foregoing, the Process in Ordinary was the second part. It consisted of trial and examination of the Accused, torture optional, followed by the Sentence.

The entire procedure was scrupulously observed according to Murray, but Scott and Barrett insist that some

irregularities occurred. Scott gives an example: "According to the 'Authentic Document' the reading of each article was followed by the reading of Jeanne's avowals made during the earlier examinations, but this is almost certainly false, and in at least one case the extract is from a subsequent interrogation." 33

The "Authentic Document" of which Scott is speaking is the Latin translation which Thomas de Courcelles made from the original French Minute, the work of Notary Manchon and his two assistants, composed from their individual daily trial notes. Scott claims that Courcelles' version was "intentionally falsified in a number of important respects, in an attempt to justify the proceedings." 34

The Original Minute, which Manchon presented in evidence at the time of the Trial of Rehabilitation in 1455, has been lost. A part of a copy of this Original Minute is to be found in the National Library at Paris. It is called the D'Urfé manuscript. It begins on March 3, the last Public Examination, and is in the handwriting of Manchon. The sessions prior to March 3 are to be found only in the Authentic Document of Courcelles.

Scott's version is based on the Orléans manuscript, which Scott feels is "the only complete copy of the original

---

34 Ibid., p. 16.
text, giving Jeanne's actual words.\textsuperscript{35} This manuscript, thought to have been written about the year 1500, records Joan's replies to the court in direct language. This fact would seem to weaken the criticism Scott has leveled at Murray for employing the same tactics throughout the trial. Scott prefaces the direct quotations of Joan with "she replied" whereas Murray uses the direct form for both the assessors and Joan. Scott is valuable in that his direct form substantiates much of Murray. In checking Murray for omissions it was of interest to discover some of the omissions of the Orléans manuscript which Murray supplies.

Of the three books, Barrett's is the most complete. As he says, the judges appeared anxious to use every weapon at their command to vindicate their tactics with Joan. In attempting to prove her a witch who had deceived Charles VII, they demonstrated what petty fears, combined with zeal for the defense of theological doctrine, could result in during the superstitious middle ages. Not only does Barrett include every bit of trial testimony but all manner of letters of deposition and every shred of evidence at the command of the Doctors of the Church by which they tried to justify the proceedings.

As far as Shaw is concerned, Murray's translation serves as well as Barrett's would have. The reason for this

\textsuperscript{35}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 18.
is that in recording the testimony of the trial, Murray was faithful to the original. The famous quotations of Joan such as "God must be served first" appear in Barrett as well. Barrett, however, records the recapitulation of each session which the assessors read back to preface their new day's line of questioning. Barrett also carefully records by name, which assessors sat at each session, whereas Murray merely notes "forty-two assessors present." Murray summarizes the content of letters of deposition which do not directly apply to the questioning itself. He also summarizes the tedious business of the appointment of the various officers to serve during the trial. Barrett encloses letters by Cauchon to describe the entire procedure. Barrett includes the ruling of the University of Paris on the final twelve Articles of accusation. Murray merely notes that the ruling of the University of Paris was adverse to Joan. It would have weakened Shaw's premise of "learned, impartial Churchmen" if he had read the replies of the University; the play as he has written it improves upon the actual record.

In examining Scene VII, it might be well to study Shaw's way of making the trial for heresy modern and interesting to twentieth-century audiences. The sessions in 1431 were not exactly as Shaw depicts them. A trial for heresy, to put it simply, was actually a long session of questioning. The prisoner was not charged with specific offenses of which the Promoter had to prove him guilty. Shaw does it this way,
even substituting the term "prosecutor" as he has Cauchon explain the procedure to Warwick. The prisoner was simply questioned, repeatedly, in the hope that he would admit to an offense. The Promoter then based his charges on those replies. These charges were in the form of Articles. These Articles were then read to the prisoner. He could refute them, and attempt in some way to prove his innocence. He was in fact considered guilty unless he could prove himself innocent. In the case of Joan of Arc it was an open and shut case. She admitted to the offense from the outset. Cauchon's actual aim, according to Barrett, was to destroy Joan's reputation through a recantation. Shaw's Cauchon is bent on saving Joan if he can. This, in itself, is one great point of departure Shaw took. The only support for Shaw's premise is the statement quoted previously in Chapter III, p. 59, where Cauchon says, "It is my duty and profession to seek the salvation of her soul and body." Counter to that is the historical statement of Joan herself to Cauchon, "Bishop, I die through you." 36

Shaw presents the Inquisitor, Le Maître, as a man dedicated to the theory of the Inquisition as a cleansing fire, as a man who believes in his "profession." The actual Lemaître was a most reluctant Inquisitor. He did little of the actual trial work, leaving the burden of the whole matter to Cauchon. Only when expressly ordered to act in his official

36 Murray, p. 158.
capacity by his superior, Graverent, did he act at all. For purposes of the play, however, Shaw presents him as a counterbalance to Warwick, who is also a "professional" type of man. Both characters are developed further in the trial scene as at the event of Joan's execution, Lemaître goes calmly out to witness the death as befits his official capacity. Warwick too shows his "professionalism" as he questions the executioner as to the complete destruction of Joan's body. He can ill-afford any reminder of her among the common people, though he feels a momentary sort of compunction about her painful death. It is, however, no more than that. He is first, last and always an English soldier. Shaw's use of him is actually two-fold. He serves as the means of exposition, bringing the audience up to date as to events in the play. He also serves, as shown above, as a balance to the character of Lemaître, as well as to that of Cauchon in Scene IV. The audience is informed, through Warwick's questions, and Cauchon's and Lemaître's replies, that Joan has already been subjected to the first part of her trial for heresy; she has been examined in six public and nine private sessions.

Perhaps to suggest there were factional disagreements among the assessors, Shaw depicts Courcelles and de Stogumber as disgruntled at the presentation of the final Twelve Articles. It makes good drama. But it has no basis in historical fact. Besides being in error as to the original number of Articles, Shaw misrepresents the case of
Courcelles and de Stogumber. Originally, there were seventy Articles upon which Joan was questioned. Shaw mentions sixty-four. Murray, Barrett and Scott all list seventy, with Joan's replies to all of them. The Articles were not reduced by Lemaitre; it was Nicholas Midi who did so. Thomas de Courcelles did not prepare the seventy Articles; they were the work of d'Estivet, the Promoter. Courcelles read the seventy Articles at the sitting of March 27, but he had no hand in preparing them. The final Twelve Articles were typical of Inquisition procedure. They were in actuality a summary of the case against the person on trial, which was separate from the trial procedure itself. The trial procedure concerned itself with the ruling on the Seventy Articles; the Twelve Articles formed a "document, which according to usage in trials for heresy, was sent at a later stage of the proceedings to theologians and lawyers to gain their opinion."

Shaw, however, saw in the use of the Twelve Articles an opportunity for a bit of comedy. It comes about in the discussion of Lemaitre's "reduction" of the articles. There is the question whether Joan's voices spoke to her in French. This question actually was asked the real Joan in Article 53 of the Seventy. The other point, which seems Shavian in its humor, is actual fact; Joan was questioned about the

37Van Kan, p. 46.
horse of the Bishop of Senlis, and replied, as Shaw has Cauchon say, that she had not stolen the horse, that if the Bishop did not get the money it was unfortunate because she, Joan, had paid for the animal. Historically, Joan added that the horse "was worth nothing for weight-carrying."

Shaw makes one more departure from historical record in establishing his Cauchon's character. The real Cauchon is said to have repressed the evidence found in Domremy concerning Joan's early years because it was favorable. Shaw's Cauchon actually mentions the fact that nothing serious was found. It is Courcelles and de Stogumber who protest.

In the actual trial testimony which follows, Shaw has lifted direct quotations from Murray. One of these is Joan's remark, when requested to "tell us the whole truth," "It is an old saying that he who tells too much truth is sure to be hanged." "

Joan's statement, "If you tear me limb from limb until you separate my soul from my body you will get nothing out of me beyond what I have told you," comes from the May 9 session. Murray has it:

Truly if you were to tear me limb from limb, and separate soul from body, I will tell you nothing more; and, if I were to say anything else, I should always afterwards declare that you made me say it by force.

---

38 Murray, p. 52; Scott, p. 115; Barrett, p. 117.
39 Murray, p. 18; Scott, p. 73; Barrett, p. 63.
40 Murray, p. 117; Scott, p. 151; Barrett, p. 279.
Shaw represents Courcelles as in favor of the torture. The records show this to be true though Courcelles said he never did recommend that Joan be tortured when questioned during the Rehabilitation Trial. According to Barrett's more complete record of the discussion, of the fourteen assessors only Courcelles and Morel recommended torture:

... Master Thomas de Courcelles said he thought it wise to torture her. She ought also to be examined whether she would submit to the judgement of the Church. Master Aubert Morel said he thought it expedient to put her to the torture in order to discover the truth of her lies.\(^1\)

Joan's comment that she could "spin or weave against any woman in Rouen" is also to be found in Murray, for the real Joan was proud of her skill. Scott's translation is more literal: "And she did not believe there was any woman in Rouen who could teach her anything in this matter."\(^2\) Barrett's interpretation follows Murray here.

As the issues of Joan's trial begin to take shape and the teachings of the Catholic Church clash with the Maid's revelations, Shaw uses more and more of the real Joan's testimony. So effective is the combination of fact and fiction that it would be difficult to determine where Shaw's Joan ends and the historical Joan begins were it not for the corroboration given Murray's work by Barrett and

\(^1\)Barrett, p. 54.

\(^2\)Murray, p. 9; Scott, p. 66; Barrett, p. 54.
Scott. Without the trial testimony as a guide, it is impossible to prove what is Shaw and what is historical fact. An instance of this is the discussion of the Church Militant and the question of Joan's submitting to its ruling. The historical Joan actually replied, "I will obey the Church, provided it does not command anything impossible," just as Shaw's Joan does. Her statement "What He has commanded or shall command I will not fail to do in spite of any man alive" is right out of the trial testimony. When Lemaître asks Shaw's Joan if she does not believe the Church to be wiser than herself, she replies, as did the real Joan, "I shall mind God alone, whose command I always follow."

Shaw's "Protestant" Joan uses the real Joan's own words when confronted with a choice between the wisdom of the Church and her own revelations: "My voices do not tell me to disobey the Church; but God must be served first."

The words which one Master Jean Beaupère uttered at the real trial are put into the mouth of Cauchon: "... you are in a state of grace?" to which Joan replies, as did the historical Joan, "If I am not, may God bring me to it; if I am, may God keep me in it."

Courcelles' question, "Does he [Saint Michael] not

---

43 Murray, p. 103; Scott, p. 144; Barrett, p. 219.
44 Murray, p. 104; Scott, p. 145; Barrett, p. 219.
45 Murray, p. 104; Scott, p. 145; Barrett, p. 219.
46 Murray, p. 18; Scott, p. 73; Barrett, p. 63.
appear to you as a naked man?" to which Joan replies, "Do you think God cannot afford clothes for him?" are part of the original questioning during the six public examinations.

The historical Joan said, as Shaw's Joan does, "Saint Catherine bade me be bold;" but Shaw's Joan departs somewhat from fact when she says, "...my voices promised me I should not be burnt." The historical Joan never said that. She said:

Saint Catherine has told me that I shall have help; I do not know if this will be to be delivered from prison, or if, whilst I am being tried, some disturbance may happen, by which I shall be delivered. The help will come to me, I think, in one way or the other. Besides this, my Voices have told me that I shall be delivered by a great victory; and they add: "Be resigned; have no care for thy martyrdom; thou wilt come in the end to the Kingdom of Paradise." They have told me this simply, absolutely, and without fail. What is meant by my martyrdom is the pain and adversity that I suffer in prison; I do not know if I shall have still greater suffering to bear; for that I refer me to God.

Shaw's Joan, for dramatic purposes, must falter here and recant in a matter of minutes, whereas historically Joan was actually taken out to the Cemetery of the Abbey of Saint-Ouen and placed on a scaffold, with the Executioner ready to light the faggots, as Master Erard began to read the Admonition. It was then that Joan asked that her case be reviewed

---

47 Murray, p. 42; Scott, p. 89; Barrett, p. 81.
48 Murray, p. 69; Scott, p. 107; Barrett, p. 108.
49 Murray, p. 76; Scott, p. 113; Barrett, p. 115.
by the Pope. Cauchon reported it:

Then she was told that this answer would not suffice; that it was not possible to send to seek the Pope from such a distance; that the Ordinaries are Judges, each in their own diocese; that it was necessary she should refer to our Holy Mother the Church; and that she should hold as true all that the Clergy and other people cognizant thereof have said and decided on the subject of her words and deeds.  

As Erard was reading the Admonition, Joan suddenly interrupted him to say:

I will hold all that the Church ordains, all that you, the judges, wish to say and decree — in all I will refer me to your orders! Inasmuch as the Clergy decide that the apparitions and revelations which I have had are not to be maintained or believed, I will not believe nor maintain them; in all I refer me to you and to our Holy Mother Church.

Then Joan signed her name, with her hand guided to make the letters, for she could not write, and the Sentence was read to her. Shaw uses it nearly word for word in his play, only simplifying some of the more formal terms. In order to denounce her judges, Shaw's Joan seizes upon the words "condemn thee to eat the bread of sorrow and drink the water of affliction to the end of thy earthly days in perpetual imprisonment" and chooses what she says is the lesser of the two evils, a painful death rather than prison.

Historically, Joan had no immediate comment upon the sentence of imprisonment. And it was not until four days later, May 28, 1431, that she assumed men's dress against express orders to the contrary. Some biographers say that

---

50 Murray, p. 129; Scott, p. 163; Barrett, p. 312.
51 Murray, p. 130; Scott, p. 163; Barrett, p. 312.
Joan was tricked into putting on her men's clothes; that the four soldiers who guarded her stole her dress while she slept, leaving in its place the old garments. Others say, as Murray does, that she resumed her male attire because one of the guards attempted to assault her. Joan's reason, according to her own testimony was, "I have resumed it because the promise made to me was not kept; that is to say, that I should go to Mass and should receive my Savior and that I should be taken out of irons."52 When Cauchon questioned her further, she said that her voices had reproached her for denying them, and added, "All I said and revoked, I said for fear of the fire."53 The assessors met again then, on Tuesday, May 29, 1431, and rendered their opinion that Joan was a relapsed heretic. She was ordered to appear before them on Wednesday, May 30 to be sentenced. This is the day upon which Shaw places the final session of the trial, condensed for his dramatic purpose. Historically, Joan was brought to the Old Market square in Rouen at eight o'clock in the morning. The sentence was read "before the people" according to Cauchon's record, as Joan was placed on the scaffold.

Shaw uses the words of Cauchon: "We declare that thou art a relapsed heretic."54 He has Lemaître and Cauchon

52 Murray, p. 136; Scott, p. 169; Barrett, p. 319.
53 Murray, p. 137; Scott, p. 170; Barrett, p. 320.
54 Murray, p. 144; Scott, p. 173; Barrett, p. 329.
intone the rest of the sentence, and follows the historical record, with slight changes in phrasing, but in its general spirit. "...[cast out from the unity of the Church"55 is taken exactly, whereas "sundered from her body" replaces the historical "separate from her body"56 "infected with the leprosy of heresy" is taken from the historical Sentence, though transposed from its original position. So is "a member of Satan," which in reality followed "We declare thee of right excommunicate and heretic,"57 which Shaw phrases as "We declare that thou must be excommunicate." He simplifies the final admonition, which historically is repetitious. For Shaw's "Admonishing the same secular power that it moderate its judgement of thee in respect of death and division of the limbs," the record shows "... in order that thou mayst not corrupt also the other members of Christ; praying this same power, that, as concerns death and the mutilation of the limbs, it may be pleased to moderate its judgement; and if true signs of penitence should appear in thee, that the Sacrament of Penance may be administered to thee."58 Shaw repeats this phrase closely, inserting the name of Brother Ladvanu as the one provided for her confession.

Shaw has Lemaître, his thoroughgoing "professional"

55Murray, p. 144; Scott, p. 173; Barrett, p. 329.
56Murray, p. 144; Scott omits this; Barrett, p. 329.
57Murray, p. 145; Scott, p. 173; Barrett, p. 331.
58Murray, p. 146; Scott omits this; Barrett, p. 331.
Inquisitor, attend the execution of Joan. Historically, according to Scott, "After the sentence was read, the Bishop, the Inquisitor, and many of the judges went away, leaving Jeanne upon the scaffold." Shaw has Cauchon about to accompany Lemaître to the execution when Warwick comes in so that the often-mentioned question of the legality of Cauchon's participating in the trial can be raised. The hostility between the two men which Shaw emphasizes here has no apparent basis in fact. Biographers and historians agree that Cauchon was sympathetic to the English. His actions clearly demonstrate that fact. He had no reason to dislike Warwick, and being a politically conscious man, would be more inclined to appease Warwick, certainly not to antagonize him.

The fact that Joan was turned over to the English soldiers without formal sentencing has been pointed out by numerous authorities. It was only a technicality, but Shaw has Cauchon mention it to Warwick in order to give Cauchon the dramatic line, "It is to God that we both must answer."

The character of Chaplain de Stogumber is a Shavian combination of two Englishmen who played a small but important part in the story of Joan of Arc. Shaw says in his program note:

59Scott, p. 173.
... the nameless chaplain who is known only by his having lost his temper and called Cauchon a traitor for accepting Joan's recantation. I have given him a Somerset name which is appropriate when mispronounced.

De Stogumber's complete reversal of character upon witnessing Joan's death comes from the testimony of Brother Ysambard de la Pierre concerning an English soldier:

... a certain Englishman, a soldier, who hated her greatly, had sworn to bring a faggot to the stake. When he did so, and heard Jeanne calling on the name of Jesus in her last moments, he was stupified, and, as it were, in an ecstasy at the spectacle; his companions took him and led him away to a neighboring tavern. After refreshment, he revived. In the afternoon, the same Englishman confessed, in my presence, to a Brother of the Order of Saint Dominic, that he had gravely erred, and that he repented of what he had done against Jeanne. He held her to be a good woman, for he had seen the spirit departing from her, as it were a white dove, going away from France.

The episode of the English soldier who gave Joan a little wooden cross appears in the testimony of Massieu, who was one of the Inquisitorial officers appointed by Cauchon. He said:

When she was given over by the Church, I was still with her; and with great devotion she asked to have a Cross: and, hearing this, an Englishman, who was there present, made a little cross of wood with the ends of a stick, which he gave her, and devoutly she received and kissed it...

Ladvenu's description of Joan's last words to him before she died, that he get down from the scaffold lest he

60 Henderson (1932), p. 547.
61 Murray, p. 191.
62 Ibid., p. 175.
too should be burned is taken from Ladvenu's actual testimony in the Rehabilitation Trial:

... The pile was on a scaffold, and the executioner lighted it from below. When Jeanne perceived the fire, she told me to descend and to hold up the Cross of the Lord on high before her that she might see it.63

The scene ends with Shaw's inclusion of the "legend" that Joan's heart did not burn, but was taken, along with her ashes and cast into the Seine by the executioner. Massieu testified at the Rehabilitation Trial that this was an actual fact, and he understood that the executioner had reported it:

I heard it said by Jean Fleury, Clerk to the Bailly, that the executioner related how, when her body was burnt and reduced to powder, her heart remained whole and bleeding. I was told that her ashes and all that remained of her were collected and thrown into the Seine.64

Some critics, among them Shaw's lifetime friend St. John Ervine, deplored the Epilogue which follows the powerful trial scene. He remarked, "It is lamentable that this powerful scene is followed by the Epilogue, though we should have lost the fine character of the English soldier who tied two sticks together to make a cross, and gave them to Joan as she was hurried to the pyre."65

A. R. Ropes dismissed the Epilogue as "something of a Harlequinade, something of a Litany, and something of a

63Tbid., p. 195.
64Tbid., p. 207.
Carl Van Doren took the view that anyone who saw the play's Epilogue as anticlimactic could not "have got at the central idea." He said:

... It is not the mere fact of the girl's martyrdom which prompted the writing of the play: it is the fact that after her death she lived more vividly than ever, despite all that had been done to rid Christendom of her perilous example. She is thus, as Mr. Shaw sees her, the eternal symbol of genius and simplicity, forever sacrificed and yet obstinately reborn. The symbolical elements in her he had to stress no less than the real and personal... Her death is but an episode. Technically, the structure of the play is adapted to the theme. It moves steadily and easily, without any pomp of paraphernalia or any affectation of being "constructed" through scenes of varying length and weight.

Richard Watts, Jr., in reviewing Siobhan McKenna's Saint Joan commented:

There used to be a widespread opinion that the epilogue to Saint Joan was unnecessary and redundant, that its sardonic Shawianisms were a kind of tasteless excrescence. I think it is clear now that the comments on mankind's embarrassment at living sainthood are not only vital to what the play is saying but are highly effective theatrically.

The Epilogue is important theatrically. It is also important historically. Shaw said in his original program note:

The Epilogue is obviously not a representation of an actual scene, or even of a recorded dream; but it is none the less historical. Without it the play would be only a sensational tale of a girl who was

---

66 Ropes, p. 350.
67 Van Doren, p. 720.
burnt, leaving the spectators plunged in horror, despairing of humanity. The true tale of Saint Joan is a tale with a glorious ending; and any play that did not make this clear would be an insult to her memory.69

Using brilliant touches of fantasy, Shaw tells of the Rehabilitation proceedings. He suggests, without historical authority to confirm his view, that the Rehabilitation Trial was conducted more unfairly than the original trial. Since he used so much of the Rehabilitation testimony as basis for his characterization of Joan and the people about her, it seems hardly logical to turn around and announce that the proceedings of 1455-56 were a farce. As Scott puts it, "Evidently the Rehabilitation was not devoid of political purpose -- but whatever view may be held as to its sincerity there is no doubt of the truth of the verdict."70 Shaw's contention that the Rehabilitation was able to proceed because Cauchon and Lemaitre were safely dead would scarcely square with the facts. Thomas de Courcelles was very much alive, holding responsible positions for the rest of his life, one of his celebrated acts being to conduct the funeral service for Charles VII some years after the Rehabilitation. Pierre Champion, commenting on Charles' funeral, said, "Master Thomas de Courcelles, doctor in theology, the unrighteous judge of Jeanne d'Arc, praised the

70Scott, p. 9.
King who owed everything to the Maid." At the time of the proceedings, Courcelles was stubborn enough, and bold enough, to contend that Joan had been judged according to the evidence, and as had been previously noted in Chapter II, p. 44 that if she was a heretic then, she was still a heretic. He went unpunished for such remarks. The same cannot be said of any outspoken priests like Lohier, who criticized Cauchon's conducting of the trial and had to flee Rouen for his life. Shaw has been criticized for ignoring facts which hurt a pet theory. This seems to be one such instance. It serves Shaw's dramatic purpose, though it tends to offend the purist critics. By means of this juxtaposition of the two trials Shaw is able to report what has happened in France since Joan's death. Charles has finally shown some courage; he leads the armies; he at last effects a sensible peace with Philip and the English are gone from France. The English soldier has been rewarded in a Shavian manner for his good deed to Joan. De Stogumber is portrayed as mentally affected from the shock of Joan's death.

The executioner emphasizes the popularity of Joan among the people of France. Warwick returns to discuss the historical mistake of the English in burning Joan. The Gentleman who represents the Vatican brings the audience up to date as to the honors bestowed upon Joan of Arc. Shaw

---

injects both a legendary and historical note here concerning Joan's sword which she found at the chapel of Saint Catherine of Fierbois. Shaw has Joan say of the statue which shows Joan mounted on her horse, holding a broken sword in her hand, "Who has broken my sword? My sword was never broken..."

Both Murray and Anatole France claim that Joan's sword, the one she found at the chapel of Saint Catherine, was broken when Joan struck a camp-follower broadside to drive her away from some soldiers. The superstitious French said that Joan's power left her when the magic sword broke. Murray described it:

"It was certainly broken in striking a camp-follower, one of a class the Maid had forbidden to enter the Camp; but whether this was just after the retreat from Paris or earlier, it does not seem possible to decide."\(^2\)

Anatole France said:

"... At Saint-Denys, being accompanied by the Duke of Alençon, Jeanne pursued another of these wantons. This time she was not content with remonstrances and threats. She broke her sword over her."\(^3\)

The basis of their opinion is the deposition of the Duke d'Alençon, who said, "Jeanne was a chaste maiden; she hated the women who follow in the train of armies. I saw her one day at Saint Denis on the return from the coronation, pursuing one of them sword in hand: her sword was broken on this occasion."\(^4\)

\(^2\)Murray, p. 28.
\(^3\)France, p. 75, I.
\(^4\)Murray, p. 280.
When questioned during her trial about this particular sword, Joan gave evasive answers, finally declaring, "When I was taken prisoner I had not got this sword... My brothers have all my goods -- my horses, my sword, so far as I know, and the rest, which are worth more than twelve thousand crowns." She also said, "To tell what became of the other sword does not concern this Case and I will not answer about it now."

Shaw has Joan say that her sword never struck a blow. From Joan's testimony about another sword she had, taken from a Burgundian, she infers that she did strike a blow now and then: "... from Lagny to Compiègne, I bore the sword of this Burgundian: it was a good sword for fighting -- very good for giving stout buffets and hard clouts." Historically Joan did say that she had never killed anyone: "...It was I, myself, who bore this banner, when I attacked the enemy, to save killing anyone, for I have never killed anyone."

In Shaw's fantasy the Archbishop of Rheims and Lemaître then appear to represent the old position of medieval Catholicism as Shaw puts the question whether all would be willing to accept Joan again as a living woman.

To suggest the universality of their reaction to

75 Ibid., p. 30.
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Joan, Shaw shows how all in turn would react. Not only the political enemies of Joan prefer her dead, but her friends as well. As Alexander Woollcott put it in his review of the play, everyone is held equally to account:

... It is as though Shaw were to step out into the audience and shake the fat fellow in the front row whom the play had worked up into such a glow of sympathy, such a flutter of sweet pity -- shake him and whisper in his ear: "If you had been in Rouen that day, are you sure you would not have voted with the Bishop of Beauvais and run with the witch-burning mob to see the torch applied?"/8

Shaw's Joan is left alone then as the dramatist suggests all saints and persons of genius must be. The world might at last pay Joan homage, but it is just as uncomfortable in her presence in the worldly dimension of time whether it is in the lifetime of Charles VII or in the twentieth century, when her sainthood was finally acknowledged.

In summary, Shaw's Joan departs from the historical Joan in certain basic points, which will be brought together in the next chapter. It will then be determined, on the basis of the evidence collected here, whether Shaw's Joan measures up to her historical prototype.

78"Joan of Arc Recreated By Shaw," The Literary Digest XXC, January 19, 1924, p. 27. An article which appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle September 11, 1956 tends to demonstrate Woollcott's point. It concerned the beating to death and subsequent burning "to purify their souls" of two Mexican women suspected by villagers of witchcraft. The article was datelined Alfajucan, Mexico.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

The critics, once harsh with Shaw's Saint Joan, have tended to mend their fences with the years. In 1925 writers like W. M. Conacher said:

The success of Shaw's St. Joan, which is surely due to a highly uncritical public which sees no objection to a tragedy being striped with burlesque, will go a long way towards creating for this generation the current legend of the Maid.¹

Charles Sareola commented:

... No doubt, from a theatrical point of view, his play has been a wonderful and deserved triumph. An almost unanimous chorus of praise hailed it in Paris as well as in London. But I am afraid that the literary critic cannot be as unqualified in his praise as the dramatic, and I believe that the sober historian is likely to be even less enthusiastic. Indeed no student of medieval history who has taken the trouble to study the facts will be inclined to admit that Mr. Shaw has given us the real Maid. I feel sure that there is no more relation between the historical Joan of Arc and his theatrical heroine than there is between the historical MacBeth and Shakespeare's.²

Archibald Henderson was sure in 1932 that the Epilogue would never be played after Shaw's death. By 1956, Henderson had become reconciled to Shaw's contention that it was

¹W.M. Conacher, Queen's Quarterly, XXXII (April - September, 1925), 392.
²Charles Sareola, The English Review, XLIII (August, 1926), 175.
necessary for historical as well as dramatic reasons. Just as Richard Watts has said, the critics have changed their minds with the years. In his biography of Shaw St. John Ervine discussed at length the reception the New York critics gave the play in 1923. He noted that Percy Hammond of the Tribune denounced the play, saying, "... the play is just another example of Mr. Shaw's gift for interminable rag-chewing;" and that Kenneth Macgowan said, "Age seems to be withering the scorn of this iconoclast, tarnishing the perverse brilliance of his mind, and taming his wit."\(^3\) By 1957, these comments seem as hollow as the 1948 pollster's predictions in the presidential election.

The critics who discussed Saint Joan in conjunction with its Preface seemed to be the ones who denounced the work as unhistorical. Their comments must be reviewed with this point in mind because it is a very important one. The Preface is as vivid an example of Shaw's pamphleteering as can be found. Patrick Braybrooke said, "This historical attitude Shaw seems to miss a little in his preface, when he suggests that Joan should have been left to mark out her own religion. Yet in his play, Shaw 'gets' the Church point of view far more profoundly..."\(^4\) J.M. Robertson did not quarrel

\(^3\)Irvine, p. 502.

\(^4\)Braybrooke, p. 143.
with the dramatic technique Shaw used; he liked the play very much. His long discussion, while acknowledging his admiration for the play, declared that the Preface was something else again. Charles Sareola quarreled with Shaw's statement, "When Joan said 'God must come first,' that is, before the Church, there was nothing for it but to burn her or canonize Wycliff and Hus." This is much stronger stuff than anything which appears in the play. Hus comes into Cauchon's speech in Scene IV, but it is within the characterization of Cauchon that he describes Hus as a heretic; it is for dramatic purpose. The reference to Hus in the Preface is typical of Shaw's overstatements when he wished to attract attention. It is not surprising that Sareola should take exception to the statement. When critics refer to Saint Joan as unhistorical they cite as evidence some Shavian statement in the Preface rather than the play itself. It is in the Preface that Shaw blandly states that Joan "really was a Protestant" and that she was "the pioneer of rational dressing for women;" he adds, "She patronized her own king, and summoned the English king to repentance and obedience to her commands." In the play his view is largely in keeping with the historical facts of Joan's life, as has been shown in the previous chapter.

On four major points he twists the truth a bit for his own purposes. These have been shown to be the omission of Joan's appeal to the Pope; Joan's voices as the expression
of her innate common sense; her generalship which rivaled, in Shaw's opinion, that of Napoleon; and finally, that the Rehabilitation Trial was the real travesty of justice, for Joan's original trial was conducted along fair lines, with Cauchon an "impartial Churchman" who really sought to save Joan. It is interesting to note, in passing, that the idea of Cauchon's position in the trial sparked an even more sympathetic characterization of the Bishop in Jean Anouilh's recent play The Lark. Before Shaw's impartial Bishop, Cauchon was always the villain; in Anderson's version, Joan of Lorraine, he was once again a villain.

Critics like Mrs. Wyatt have said that Shaw was guilty of sins of omission in slanting the trial scene away from Joan's historical Catholic viewpoint and inferring by this omission that Joan was actually an early Protestant. Mrs. Wyatt then found herself faced with the dilemma of explaining the actions of the medieval Catholic Church. She said, "All men -- even Churchmen -- must be brutalized after a hundred years of particularly brutal guerrila warfare, and those judges who condemned her were either very young, or, like the real Cauchon, men with political axes to grind..."

Joan's voices have been a considerable source of trouble for the critics. Many persons would be inclined to agree with Shaw's method of defining these voices; it seems

5Wyatt, p. 203.
too incredible to the modern mind for visions such as Joan's to be anything but moments of interior illumination or brief flashes of intuition. As Shaw explained to the Abbess, as quoted on p. 57 his Joan was written to be played before and read by all people anywhere in the world. With this idea in mind, his Joan had to have a universality of spirit; she could belong to no one cult or religious persuasion. Her historical uniqueness seemed to fit her for such treatment. There are many saints in the Catholic Church with devoted followers within the faith; Joan's own saints, Saint Catherine of Fierbois and Saint Margaret, are popular in France. Saint Michael the Archangel is known to every child with a smattering of information about the Bible. The number of martyrs in the faith is incalculable in the long history of Christianity. Yet the appeal of Joan of Arc stands alone in its universal popularity. Shaw felt that his approach best served to honor her memory.

Joan's generalship needs little more discussion. One possible basis for Shaw's theory is in Dunois' remark during the siege of Troyes in which he described Joan's "marvellous manœuvres" already referred to in Chapter III, p. 56. This action of Joan's was, according to Joan herself, at the express instructions of her voices, who had assured her that the siege would be lifted within three days. Given Shaw's premise that the voices were her own intuition, it was necessary for him to demonstrate Joan's remarkable ability in battle maneuvers.
His Joan says, "You must always attack!" The historical Joan was just as apt to let the whole English force retreat in full order, as she did following the clash at Orléans, as she was to attack. Her only expressed wish was that the English get out of France.

Little need be said of the Rehabilitation Trial and Shaw's view of it other than to conclude that his treatment of the latter trial served to focus the ironic observation that what to one generation appeared right may well appear to subsequent generations as the worst kind of wrong.

After examining Shaw's Joan minutely with the historical evidence, the conclusion must be a slightly paradoxical one. Shaw's Joan may not be a Catholic Joan, but she gives every indication of being the universal Joan, and that, after all, is the aim of any dramatist; or, for that matter, of any historian or biographer whose task it is to put before the greatest number of people the living image of a great figure. The critics, in viewing the 1956 production of Saint Joan largely echoed the sentiment of Carol Montgomery Newman: "... the fact remains that she seems to live here as she does nowhere else in literature."
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