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CHAPTER I

MODERN SPOTLIGHT ON A MEDIEVAL SAINT

In every nation there are heroes who are remembered and loved as symbols of liberty and patriotism. Just as Leonidas embodied the ideals of ancient Greece and Cincinnatus those of Rome, just as the name of Bruce became legendary among the Scotch and that of Paul Revere among the American lovers of freedom, so the memory of Jeanne d'Arc has remained sacred to the people of France. The fact that she is a saint as well as a patriot has aroused iconoclastic tendencies in such writers as Voltaire and Anatole France, but to most Frenchmen she is all the more to be venerated for having combined so well loyalty to her God and to her native land.

Throughout the ages the literature and art of France have expressed the nation's love for Jeanne d'Arc. Her story has been told and retold; her statues are everywhere; there is hardly a city in France that does not have its Place Jeanne d'Arc, Hotel Jeanne d'Arc, or Quai Jeanne d'Arc. The army regards her with special veneration, and it has long been the custom for soldiers marching down the old Roman road that runs through Domremy to stop and present arms when they pass the little cottage that was her birthplace.¹ At Orleans, at Rouen, and at Rheims annual celebrations marking the major events of her life

are traditionally celebrated, and poems and plays in her honor have part of these fêtes since her own century.

The Romantic Age saw a literary revival of the Joan of Arc material that affected not only France, but all of Europe and even the United States. Jules Quicherat, a noted historian, collected all available material into a five-volume work published between 1841 and 1849. Manuel Tamayo y Baus brought her story to the Spanish stage in 1847 with a play entitled *Juana de Arco.* Johann Schiller's drama pictures Joan as "a buxom German maid who falls in love, escapes from prison, and dies on the battlefield."

In Great Britain Andrew Lang produced a romanticized but fairly authentic biography; Robert Southey while still a student wrote a twelve-volume epic entitled *Joan of Arc,* and Thomas de Quincey penned a heated denunciation of Cau-chon. Mark Twain's *Personal Recollections of Joan of Arc* brought a fictionalized but fascinating version of her story to the attention of American readers, while in Italy Giuseppe Verdi composed an opera depicting her life and death.

---


4 Charles Phillips, "The Spiritual Drama of Joan of Arc," *Ave Maria,* XXXIII (June 27, 1931), 804.


Interest in St. Joan remained high throughout the nineteenth century. Michael Balfe made her the subject of a second opera which was performed in Drury Lane Theatre in 1881. Barbier’s French drama and Schiller’s romantic German play were both translated into English, with Sarah Bernhardt and Maude Adams respectively portraying Joan. Minor plays telling her story were written by Tom Taylor, George H. Calvert, and Edward Fitzball. In France Gounod composed a Mass in her honor, and Joseph Fabre published the text of the second trial and other documents relating to her life.

The outstanding publications of the early twentieth century were Peguy’s spiritual drama Le Mystère de la Charité de Jeanne d’Arc, which passed almost unnoticed, and Anatole France’s skeptical version of her life in the light of science which aroused open admiration from some and heated replies from others. Noteworthy among the replies is G.K. Chesterton’s essay “Maid of Orleans.”

Percy MacKaye’s drama Jeanne d’Arc was produced on the American stage in 1906. In England Robert Hugh Benson had written a less popular version entitled Maid of Orleans. Edward Garnett’s Trial of Jeanne d’Arc was published in 1911, though not produced until 1931. In France Moulinier’s Jeanne et les Juges and Soumet’s Jeanne d’Arc were added to the list of dramas about Joan.

---

8 Sara Agnes Ryan, p. 126.


10 Sara Agnes Ryan, p. 126.

11 Paine, I, 331.

In general, quantity rather than quality marked the early twentieth-century literature concerning Joan of Arc.

The First World War brought Jeanne d'Arc to the forefront of French thought in a new light. The emphasis this time was not so much on the patriot as on the virgin, not so much on the heroine of the battlefield as on the newly beatified of the Church. Her spiritual leadership was invoked by soldiers who confessed and communicated before going into battle, as she had taught her men to do. Her intercession for the safety of France's defenders was sought by all the nation in public and private prayers. These prayers of the French people were answered, and it was near the city of Compiegne, scene of her last battle and of her capture, that Marshal Foch received the surrendering German leaders and signed the Armistice on November 11, 1918.

This intense devotion to Jeanne d'Arc did not fail to impress the English and American soldiers who were fighting side by side with the French. They too began to carry her pictures and medals and to invoke her intercession. Their interest in her life story was heightened, and their letters home carried references to the Patroness of France. As the war drew to a close, this new enthusiasm gave impetus to a fresh harvest of literature concerning Joan of Arc (as she is more popularly known in English-speaking countries). And in this new literary era, England and America would compete with France in honoring her.

13 Joan's beatification had taken place in 1909.

14 Sara Agnes Ryan, pp. 205-206.
The year 1920 might be considered as a turning-point in the cultus of Joan of Arc, for that year saw two major events. The first was of importance to the whole Catholic world—her canonization in Rome by Pope Benedict XIV. The second affected France—the promulgation of a law asserting that "The French Republic will celebrate yearly the fete of Jeanne d'Arc, a festival of patriotism." The first major reaction was George Bernard Shaw's Saint Joan, published in 1923.

Biographies and prose studies of Joan have followed in a procession of the noblest names in modern literature. In France Leon Bloy, Georges Bernanos, Lucien Fabre, and Joseph Calmette, among others, sought to clarify her story for modern readers. Pierre Champion's essays and Regine Pernoud's text of the second trial answered theory with historical evidence. Joseph Delteil produced a fictionized biography which might more aptly be called a novel. Many of these works were translated into English, and Britons and Americans took up their pens to retell the story of the Maid of France. Among them are Hilaire Belloc, Victoria Sackville-West, Albert B. Paine, and Frances Winwar. The most popular recent biography of Joan is Maid of Orleans (Pantheon, 1956), written originally in Swedish by Sven Stolpe, translated into English by Eric Lewenhaupt. Juvenile versions of her story are also numerous, averaging about two a year in the last two decades.

Poets too have had their part in praising Joan, and magazine articles recalling and commenting on her story have abounded, especially around the five-hundredth anniversary of her death in 1931, and of her rehabilitation in 1956.

Joan's personality cannot remain long between the pages of books, and many of her devotees have followed the examples of Shakespeare, Voltaire, Schiller, and Shaw in bringing her story to the stage. These versions are sometimes more theatrical than historical, depending upon the convictions and intentions of the playwright. France, as usual, has taken the lead in these dramatic productions.


In England and America several dramatists made unsuccessful attempts to compete with Shaw for the honor of telling Joan's story. Among them are Maxwell Anderson, Harold Brighouse, Joe Corrie, Hugh Hastings, Hermon Ould, Antoinette Scudder, and Thomas W. Stevens. Of all these plays, only Maxwell Anderson's Joan of Lorraine, which appeared in 1946, achieved popularity on the stage. Anouilh's L'Alouette was produced as The Lark in two translations—one in England by Christopher Fry, the other in the United States by Lillian Hellman. Twice Joan's story has been told in Cecil B. DeMille's movie productions—Joan the Woman in 1917, with Geraldine Farrar in the title role, and Joan of Lorraine, starring Ingrid Bergman, in 1947.

16 Nicoll, p. 857.
Modern writers bring to Joan's story the viewpoints, techniques, and interests of the modern world. They fall roughly into four classes—the patriots, the historians, the hagiographers, and the psychoanalysts. The attitude of the patriotic viewer of the saint is typified in a sculptured group which now stands before her home in Domremy. This shows Joan listening to the voice of a female figure who is sending her on her mission. The voice portrayed is not that of a saint or of God's messenger, but of the Spirit of France. This patriotic impression of Joan as a symbol of French nationalism is of course a perennial viewpoint, but one which is especially strong in times of war when the freedom of France is threatened. The Second World War and the German Occupation renewed French interest and idealism in St. Joan as patriot. This may be noted in Anouilh's *L'Alouette*, and Maeterlinck's *Jeanne d'Arc*, as will be pointed out later. Jacques Maritain also points to Joan of Arc as a reason why occupied France should not give up hope of final victory, and Paul Doncœur uses her example to denounce the attitude of French Defeatists in occupied territories.

Among the historians are Regine Pernoud, Wilfred Barrett, and Pierre Champion, who have studied the records of Joan's trial and retrial and have made their findings available to the general reading public. Paul Doncœur, S.J. has defended the Catholic position in these historical studies. Many of

17Sara Agnes Ryan, p. 105.

18Maritain, p. 22.

Joan's biographers approach their subject with the attitude of the historian, emphasizing her importance as a figure influencing the destiny of the world, rather than as a patriot or a saint. Modern historical biographers tend to study her military tactics, her position with the army, her attitude toward feudalism, and her influence in bringing about its downfall. Shaw's *Saint Joan*, in so far as it can be classified, might be considered an historical study, for it considers Joan as a dominant historical personality in conflict with the institutions of her time.

The view of the hagiographer is most frequently found among Catholic writers, though it is by no means limited to them. Sven Stolpe, without ignoring the views of historians and psychoanalysts, still stresses Joan's sanctity, mysticism, and resemblance to Christ. Stanislas Fumet also points out similarities between Joan's trial and the Passion of Christ, and stresses the importance of her consecrated virginity in the fulfillment of her mission. Maxwell Anderson, a non-Catholic, shows in *Joan of Lorraine* her sanctity in conflict with the sordid worldliness of the court. Peguy's dramatic poem also falls into this classification, portraying the mind of the saint rather than her actions; so does Claudel's oratorio which emphasizes the spiritual implications of her mission.

In much of modern biography and fiction there is a tendency to psychoanalyze the subject, and among Joan's less religious biographers this frequently takes a negative turn. A saint is not easily psychoanalyzed, even by another saint, and when one who understands little of mystical experience undertakes the task it is not surprising that the diagnosis is frequently some form of insanity. Thus Dr. C. MacLaurin attributes Joan's "delusions" and
"repression of the sex complex" to physical abnormality and an unstable nervous system. Of her visions in prison he comments, "These specks before the eyes may have been the result of toxæmia from the intestine induced by confinement and terror." 20

Joseph Delteil portrays a messenger sent from God, but he notes that "she was not purely miraculous. This flower had roots." 21 The roots, according to Delteil's interpretation, were a dominant sensual personality, love of her native land, of pageantry, of self-importance, and an adolescent "crush" on the Dauphin. 22

Catholics too succumb to this temptation to psychoanalyze the saints. One Catholic student in an article entitled "Adolescence Among the Saints" pictures Joan of Arc as a typical teenager, "dreamy and imaginative, as all adolescent girls are inclined to be," a bit impertinent to her elders, and "not at all averse to the display of personal finery." 23

These four views of Joan—her patriotism, her dominant influence upon the course of history, her sanctity, and her human characteristics interpreted in the light of modern psychology—rarely appear singly in the works of any writer. Though one may be more marked in a particular writer, they are usually combined in the author's portrayal of the saint. These attitudes have been


22 Ibid., pp. 157-159.

singly out for particular notice here to point up the modern tendencies in the study of St. Joan as opposed to the romanticism and hero-worship of earlier writers.

The attempt to study intensively all modern literature concerning Joan of Arc, or even all modern plays about her, would be impractical. From the wealth of dramatic literature on the subject, five plays have been singly out for special study as the works of outstanding dramatists and the productions most effective and influential in the theater, particularly in English-speaking countries. They are George Bernard Shaw's Saint Joan, Maxwell Anderson's Joan of Lorraine, Jean Anouilh's L'Alouette, Paul Claudel's Jeanne d'Arc au Buchar, and Maurice Maeterlinck's Jeanne d'Arc. Two others, Charles Peguy's Le Mystère de la Charité de Jeanne d'Arc and Edward Garnett's Trial of Jeanne d'Arc will be considered briefly in contrast with them.

In studying these major Joan-of-Arc plays, comparisons will be made of theme, characterization, dramatic techniques, and conformity to historical fact. Special attention will be paid to the writer's purpose to discover why the story of Joan of Arc was chosen to convey his message, and how facts, dramatic limitations, and characterization have been adapted to fit the theme.

The life of Joan of Arc is one of the most completely documented of all the records of saints or historical personages. Much of the historical material used in this study will be taken from original sources—the records of the trial and retrial. Of the trial record several versions are extant, one known as the "authentic" record, which was the official Latin account of the trial sent by Jean d'Estivet, the Promoter, to the University of Paris and the English king. The others are the d'Urfe Manuscript, a fragment of the original French, and the Or-
leans Manuscript, apparently a Latin translation of the same text. These two versions are believed to be closely related to the French record kept by Manchon, the clerk of the trial, and are therefore more reliable than the manuscript known as the Authentic Text, which Manchon testified was translated erroneously and not corrected. Both versions have been consulted in English translations, that by Scott, which is taken from the Orleans Manuscript, being preferred in questionable points to that by Barrett, which is taken from the Authentic Text. Father Doncoeur's French edition of the trial, taken from both the Orleans and d'Urfe Manuscripts, had also been consulted. The record of the retrial has been edited and commented upon by Regine Pernoud, chief archivist of the museum of French history. This record is valuable for the other side of the picture of Joan's character and life and for its examination into the validity and conduct of her trial. The account of the trial is a contemporary record of her life as seen by her enemies; in the record of the retrial her friends also express their views of her.

The best modern scholars of Joan-of-Arc material are French, and their works are scarce in the United States. The essays of Pierre Champion and of Father Doncoeur have been relied upon for many historical details; biographies by Lucien Fabre, who presents a documented but popular life of the saint, Stanislas Fumet, who presents the Catholic viewpoint, Jehanne d'Orliac, who tends to see all in black or white with no shades of grey in between, but who summarizes well the historical aspects of court life, and Victoria Sackville-West, the best of Joan's English biographers, have been quoted frequently. Sven Stolpe's biography has proved valuable for its copious references to and quotations from works of French modern scholars not yet available in the United
States, as well as its unbiased discussions of controverted points.

Perhaps this study of five major modern dramatists representing three nations will reveal why Joan of Arc is a perennial and universal favorite—why a medieval saint has so much appeal to the minds of modern atheists and skeptics as well as to religious men, and why she should be chosen as an ideal and exemplar for twentieth-century society by men of such divergent views. It is hoped that the consideration of these five plays will confirm and explain the feeling expressed by a modern poet:

In a remote age, Joan, we find you
Someone familiar and at home
In books and plays, in our devotions,
You so combine them by your candor.24

CHAPTER II

SAINT JOAN IN HER OWN SETTING

In the summer of 1425 a young peasant girl was racing with her friends in the fields near Domremy. Pausing to rest, she heard someone say, "Your mother has need of your help." Joan hurried home, but Isabelle d'Arc had not sent for her. Returning toward the fields, Joan suddenly perceived an unearthly radiance, and her Voices spoke to her for the first time.¹

Her mother had need of her indeed—her Mother France, her Mother the Church. The values of Christian Europe were changing. This was the age of Chaucer, when cultural leadership was forsaking decadent courts for towns where trade and prosperity afforded leisure for the arts. This was the age of the Black Death, when survivors could still recall those two years of horror costing forty million lives, among them a high percentage of promising clergymen.² In many cases the priests who had replaced them were neither well-disposed nor well-trained, and the spirit of lust and avarice which infected the survivors of the plague was found even in monasteries and in the ranks of the higher clergy. This was the age of Hus and Wyclif, when the criticisms of worldly churchmen were preached openly or silenced by death if found heretical by the


Inquisition.

This was the age of the Great Schism. Pope Martin V had been elected by the Council of Constance in 1417, succeeding the true Pope Gregory XII, who had abdicated, and two anti-popes, John XXIII and Benedict XIII, who had been deposed by the Council. Though Martin's election brought the schism to an end, it was accompanied by another great evil, for this Council had explicitly declared that General Councils were superior to Popes. Joan of Arc's trial was, in a sense, a test of this issue, for her appeal of the Pope was ignored by her judges, who condemned her for not submitting to the Church, meaning themselves; and from her execution many of them went on to the Council of Basle where they defied the authority of the Pope and attempted to depose him. It

3Two anti-popes were later elected to contest the authority of Martin V, but by this time the entire Church recognized which was the true Pope. Before the time of Martin V, however, the situation had been so confused that clergymen and saints who wished to champion the papacy were lined up in opposite camps. Even in our own century this uncertainty is not entirely dispelled; while most students of Church history agree that Gregory XII was validly elected, Rev. Joseph A. Dunney in his Church History in the Light of the Saints (New York, 1944) lists John XXIII as the Pope reigning at the time of Joan's birth. (p. 300).

4Hughes, pp. 140-144.

5Pierre Champion, "On the Trial of Jeanne d'Arc" trans. Coley Taylor and Ruth H. Kerr, The Trial of Jeanne d'Arc, ed. W.P. Barrett (n.p., 1932), pp. 492, 494-496; Regine Fernoud, The Retrial of Joan of Arc; The Evidence at the Trial for Her Rehabilitation, 1430-1456, trans. J.M. Cohen (New York, 1955), "The faction which wished to put the papacy into wardship... was led by precisely those men who had just condemned Joan--by Jean Beaupere, Thomas de Courcelles, Nicholas Midy, Guillaume Erard... the whole of the pro-English University of Paris." (p. 19). This volume will be subsequently referred to as Retrial.
was the Pope's legate who presided at Joan's retrial and rehabilitation in 1456 and declared her original trial "to be contaminated with fraud, calumny, wickedness, contradictions, and manifest errors of fact and law, and together with the abjuration, the execution, and all their consequences to have been null, without value or effect, and to be quashed ... "

The conflict between Pope and bishops was mirrored on the political plane. The old feudal order was decaying from within because of the barons' abuses of their power, but forces from without were also marshalled to change the structure of society. Trade, travel, political turmoil, and new ideas were soon to blossom into the Renaissance, the Age of Discovery, Nationalism, and the Protestant Revolt. While Europe was occupied with her own problems, Mohammedan forces in the East were reunited for attacks on Christian provinces. The Pope's efforts to organize a Crusade were ignored by the Christian princes of Europe, and the new series of Islamic victories went unchecked until it culminated in the fall of Constantinople in 1453.

Nowhere was the disorder and chaos of Christendom so marked as in France. War with England, the Hundred Years' War, had been going on intermittently for eighty-seven years, filling the land with bloodshed, pillage, famine, and disease. Added to the evils of a foreign war were the even greater terrors of internal strife.

During a long reign of almost forty years, Charles VI of France had been the victim of periodic fits of madness which soon progressed into complete

6Retrial, p. 247.
insanity. The Duke of Burgundy, cousin to the king, attempted to control his policies, but was opposed by Louis, Duke of Orleans, the king's brother. The queen was a foreigner, Isabeau of Bavaria. She cared little for the welfare of France and was notorious for her illicit love affairs. When the strife between Orleans and Burgundy became civil war for the control of Paris, and John of Burgundy murdered Louis of Orleans, she who had been the mistress of the victim became the mistress of his murderer and adopted his political schemes.7

Charles of Orleans, son of the murdered duke, had married Bonne d'Armagnac. Her father espoused the cause of Orleans and carried on the strife for control of Paris after Charles had been captured at Agincourt. From him the adherents of the king's party received their name of "Armagnacs," while their opponents were known as "Burgundians." The civil strife between the Armagnacs and the Burgundians was even more fierce and devastating than the English war. Albert Paine describes its results in graphic terms:

In the country, ghastly living carcasses terrified even the thieves who had come to rob them. In Paris alone, eighty thousand died in one year. Wolves boldly entered the gates, to prowl in the streets. The city had changed hands several times, and was Burgundian and Armagnac by turn. Each change was the occasion of sweeping massacres and assassinations.

There was no honour or principle left among them; of loyalty to France not a shred on either side. Each in turn descended to the baseness of inviting help from England, the nation's enemy.9

---

8Paine, I, 73.
9Ibid., I, 74.
England was only too ready to take advantage of the internal strife to tighten her hold on France. An alliance with Burgundy was celebrated by a new series of English victories under Henry V and sealed by the infamous Treaty of Troyes. In this treaty Queen Isabeau, now Burgundy's mistress, signed away France in the name of her irresponsible husband, disowning her son Charles as a bastard, giving her daughter Katherine in marriage to the English king, and naming Henry as the heir to the French throne on the death of his father-in-law.  

Charles VI died in the spring of 1422, but the vigorous Henry V had preceded him by two months, and it was the infant whom Katherine had borne to him who was ceremoniously crowned Henry VI, "King of England, France, Scotland and Ireland."  

The young Dauphin Charles who had taken refuge in the South of France, made a supreme effort to claim his rights. Aided by Scottish reinforcements his army met the English and Burgundians at Verneuil and was devastatingly defeated on August 24, 1424. When Joan's Voices spoke for the first time in Domremy the following summer, he was a broken shadow of a prince, "surrounded by unscrupulous advisers, his coffers empty, and his legitimacy denied by his

10 Ibid., I, 77.  
11 Balloc, p. 4.  
12 This title was borne by the English kings until 1904 when Edward VII renounced the claim to France, according to Jehanne d'Orliac, Joan of Arc and Her Companions, trans. Elisabeth Abbott (Phila., 1934), p. 285.  
13 Paine, I, 78.
own mother.\textsuperscript{14}

Domremy was situated in the Villenie of Vaucouleurs Champagne on the Meuse, an oasis in a desert of English and Burgundian adherents. One historian describes its situation thus: "Vaucouleurs lay in the very jaws of an enemy which at any moment might swallow it up; but it was a poor morsel for Burgundy's hungry throat now when all France might be carved to his taste; and with poverty for their sufficient protection, the peasants tilled their fields ... in comparative peace. The district was so isolated by leagues of hostile country, that men spoke of 'going into France' as if it were an alien place; yet the valley was a hotbed of loyalty."\textsuperscript{15}

Here the family of Jacques d'Arc\textsuperscript{16} lived in comparative security. Jacques was a person of some importance in his little village, owning his own land and serving as the village "doyen."\textsuperscript{17} His wife Isabelle de Romee was a pious and

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{14}W.S. Scott, "Introduction," The Trial of Joan of Arc, being the verbatim report of the proceedings from the Orleans Manuscript (London, 1956), p. 9. This work will be referred to hereafter as "Trial, Scott" to distinguish it from the translation of the less accurate record edited by Barrett.

\textsuperscript{15}Bangs, pp. 11-12.

\textsuperscript{16}The true spelling and pronunciation of the family name have never been definitively agreed upon. Sackville-West (p. 27) points out that the name is written "D'Ay" on the Act of Ennoblement conferred by Charles VII, and adds in a footnote that the Chronique de la Pucelle spells it "Daix." Father Donceour has suggested that the name "Tart" which occurs in the Orleans Manuscript is perhaps the most authentic form of the family name. (Trial, Scott, p. 25 n.)

\textsuperscript{17}"It was his duty to summon the mayor, the burgurers and the jurymen in regular or special town meetings. He was also the town-crier, commanded the watch by day and by night, and had charge of prisoners" (Orliac, pp. 18-19).
\end{flushleft}
industrious woman who had borne him five children. Jeanne, their third child, or Jeannette, was born on the feast of the Epiphany, January 6, 1412.\(^{18}\) She appears to have been a good and sensible, but thoroughly normal child. The friends and neighbors of her childhood, giving their memories of her twenty-five years after her death at the trial for her rehabilitation, portray a girl who was industrious, lovable, fun-loving, but also prayerful, sympathetic, and happy. The adjectives they use to describe her are sufficient to give a clear picture of the child of Domremy:

"She was such a good girl that almost everyone in Domremy loved her," says Jean Moreau, one of her godfathers.\(^{19}\)

"Joan the Maid was a good girl, chaste, simple, and modest," the Beadle of Domremy testified.\(^{20}\)

One childhood friend describes her as "a good, simple, sweet girl, and well-behaved;"\(^{21}\) and Hauviette, her closest friend, says, "Joan was a good, simple, sweet girl. She often and gladly went to church and to the holy shrines, and she was often put to shame by what people said about her devotion as a church-goer."\(^{22}\)

\(^{18}\)Oriac notes that it may have been 1410 (p. 17). Most biographers, however, accept the date 1412, basing their opinion upon Joan's answer to her judges in 1431 that she was "nineteen or thereabouts" (Trial, Scott, p. 65).

\(^{19}\)Retrial, p. 65.

\(^{20}\)Ibid., p. 70.

\(^{21}\)Ibid., testimony of Colin Colin, p. 71.

\(^{22}\)Ibid., p. 72.
Regine Pernoud, reviewing these testimonies of those who had known her in her childhood, remarks two phrases that recur constantly; she was "just like other girls," and she did everything—worked, prayed, went to church—"gladly." This joyful willingness in all that she did seems to have been a dominant trait in her character.23

In the preparatory interrogation which preceded her trial Joan told her judges that "her mother taught her the Pater Noster, Ave Maria, and Credo; and that no one else save her mother taught her her faith."24 In the light of Joan's subsequent steadfastness and her answers which confounded the learned theologians who were judging her, no higher tribute could have been paid to Isabelle d'Arc. After Joan left home to fulfill her mission, her mother made a pilgrimage to the shrine of Our Lady of Puy, bringing with her two of her sons to join their sister in the army. At the age of sixty she moved to Orleans; it was from this city that she appealed to the Holy Father for a reconsideration of her daughter's condemnation. Having seen her child received into the Church a second time twenty-five years after her excommunication and execution, Isabelle d'Arc died peacefully on November 28, 1458.25

Though Jacques d'Arc probably lacked his wife's strength of character, he was a good man. His threat to drown Joan rather than let her ride off with

23Tbid., p. 74.

24Trial, Scott, p. 65.

soldiers was prompted by fatherly solicitude for her virtue rather than by cruelty. He accompanied Durand Laxart to Rheims to see Joan's triumph in the coronation of Charles VII, but, according to legend, died of a broken heart after her condemnation.26

Joan's only sister Catherine married a neighbor from Greux and died probably just before Joan left Domremy. Of her oldest brother Jacques nothing is known, but Pierre and Jean followed her into the service of Charles VII. They adopted the name of "Du Lys" conferred by Charles in the Act of Ennoblement which was meant to reward Joan for her service to the Crown.27 Pierre was captured at Compiègne with his sister, but was ransomed shortly after her death by the king.28 Pierre married and settled in the city of Orleans; Jean succeeded Baudricourt as governor of Vaucouleurs. Both appealed with their mother for Joan's rehabilitation and attended the hearings of the retrial, though, as the plaintiffs, they did not testify.29

Joan loved her family, but there were other personalities nearer to her heart. These were her Voices. The first to speak was St. Michael, and he foretold the coming of St. Catherine and St. Margaret. Stolpe points out the

26Sackville-West, p. 26; Orlisc, p. 294.
27Stolpe, p. 184.
28Ibid., p. 190.
29Retrial, p. 36.
significance of the messengers sent by God to prepare her for her mission. St. Michael was the patron of the Valois dynasty, and had been chosen as his special patron by Charles VII. Catherine and Margaret were both virgins; St. Catherine was patroness of young girls, especially of spinners, while St. Margaret was invoked by women in childbirth and by peasants. Both had died as martyrs in defense of their faith and their chastity. St. Catherine, according to her legend, had disputed with fifty philosophers and converted them by the wisdom of her answers.³⁰

The three saints visited her almost daily, sometimes two or three times in the same day. She not only heard their voices; she saw them, touched them, and smelled their heavenly fragrance, as she herself testified during her trial.³¹ At first they gave her only personal instructions: Be a good child and go often to church. Before long, however, their influence deepened; she became more serious and pious, entered less frequently into games, and vowed her chastity to God. Her young companions noticed her preference for solitude and prayer and teased her about it, but the girl continued to live a life remarkably well divided between heaven and earth, without neglecting her duties in either sphere.

Before long Joan's heavenly visitors began to instruct her in a different way, speaking of the great misery of France, the suffering of the poor, the

³⁰Stolpe, pp. 34, 36-42.

³¹Trial, Scott, pp. 85-86, 90, 120, 127.
helplessness of the Dauphin. Finally they said to her, "Go, child of God! You must leave your village and set out for France." Joan protested her ignorance, her weakness, her inability to ride and fight. But her saints insisted, promising God's help and giving her special instructions. She was to go to Robert de Baudricourt in Vaucouleurs, and he would send her to the Dauphin. With the army she was to go to the relief of besieged Orleans, and then to Rheims to crown the Dauphin Charles the lawful king of France.

The insistence of their command broke through her resistance. In May of 1428 while visiting her uncle Durand Laxart in Burey-le-Petit, she went with him to Vaucouleurs. Robert de Baudricourt only laughed at her and sent her home with the recommendation that some sense be whipped into her.

But Joan had not given up. By January of the following year her Voices could no longer be ignored. An opportunity presenting itself for another visit to Burey, accompanied again by Durand Laxart, Joan left Domremy never to return. Though she said good-bye to a few friends she passed on the way, she did not tell her parents where she was going. From Vaucouleurs she wrote, or rather had written for her, a letter asking their pardon for the pain she was causing them.

32 Stolpe, p. 36.

33 Ibid., pp. 49-50.

Robert de Baudricourt was only slightly more courteous on this visit than on her last one. By this time, however, the situation was so desperate that anything was worth trying. Since October of 1428 the English had occupied the towns around Orleans and had besieged this major city, the gateway to the entire South of France. If Orleans fell, all France would soon be in English hands. Even now the English were encamped at La Charite, just thirty miles from the Dauphin’s palace at Bourges. The entire court had fled from Bourges to fortified Chinon. Vaucouleurs itself was not safe. It had been saved from actual assault only by a pledge to turn the city over to Antoine de Veruy without resistance in the fall of 1429 if relief had not come by that time. And there was no sign of relief.

Meanwhile Joan was talking to the soldiers of Vaucouleurs or praying in the church. Her behavior, her sincerity, and the spiritual force of her faith convinced many of the townspeople that God had sent her. Among the believers were two of Baudricourt’s best soldiers, Bertrand de Poulengy and Jean de Metz. They offered to accompany the Maid to Chinon and to finance the journey. Convinced at last, or driven by desperation to snatch at any rope, Baudricourt sent her on her way to the Dauphin February 23, 1429, with the words, "Va, et advienne que pourra!"

35 Paine, I, 81.


37 Sackville-West, p. 107.
Bertrand de Poulengy has described this journey in his testimony at the retrial:

As we left Lorraine, on the first day, we were afraid because of the Burgundian and English soldiers who commanded the roads, and so we travelled by night. Joan the Maid said to me, and to Jean de Metz too and those who were riding with us, that it would be a grand thing if we could hear the Mass. But because of the war that was waged about the country we could not. We wanted to pass unnoticed. Each night she slept with Jean de Metz and me, keeping on her surcoat and her breeches laced and tied. I was young then; but all the same I had no desire or carnal urge to touch her as a woman, and I would not have dared to approach Joan, because of the great goodness I saw in her.

We were eleven days on the way, riding to the King, who was then Dauphin, and we had plenty of alarms on the road. But Joan always told us not to fear, and that once we had reached the town of Chinon the Dauphin would welcome us . . . And so, all together, without great difficulties, we rode to the town of Chinon where the King—then the Dauphin—was.38

Although the party attempted to travel without being recognized, word of Joan's coming had already spread throughout the land. Even before she wrote to the Dauphin from Fierbois to tell him that she was on her way, word had reached Orleans that a virgin from Lorraine was on her way to Chinon to deliver France. Her claims that she would raise the siege of Orleans and crown the Dauphin were discussed, and old prophecies were unearthed to verify the marvel. Dunois sent a message from Orleans to the Dauphin asking if this rumor were true. A letter from Baudricourt also reached him telling of Joan. Keen interest was aroused all around, but skepticism was prevalent too. The girl should be interesting; whether she would prove to be a messenger of God or a fake remained to be seen.

38 Retrial, pp. 91-92.
Joan's recognition of the Dauphin has often been played up as something miraculous. Stolpe points out that there is no sound contemporary evidence for the story of the Dauphin's exchange of garments with a page or his trick of hiding from her; this is a later interpretation of evidence given by some who were not present. He adds:

If there was anybody in the country easily recognized it was the King, about whom Joan must have learned all there was to know. He did not look like an ordinary man. The eleventh child of a madman and his completely amoral wife, he was the picture of degeneration and timidity. His face, with its long nose and watery eyes, was without eyebrows and almost without eyelashes, while his knees were abnormally large and he had spindly bowed legs. He went about in a state of constant fear... He was extremely pious and attended Mass three times a day, but also dabbled in astrology and magic.39

Joan did not just ride into power on the charger of her own dominant personality, saddled with the superstitions of those she met, as some interpreters of her story seem to believe. She was thoroughly sifted by both Church and State. Baudricourt brought a priest to exorcise her before he would consider sending her to Chinon;40 a committee of clerks examined her at Chinon;41 and finally she was sent to Poitiers where she submitted to a trial every bit as thorough as that which condemned her, by theologians equally eminent. This examination at Poitiers was presided over by Regnault de Chartres, Archbishop of Rheims; "it was subsequently reported to the Royal Council that those who had examined her said they found nothing in her contrary to the Catholic faith,

39 Stolpe, p. 79.
40 Belloc, p. 11.
and that, in view of his necessity, the King might well make use of her help. ④ When Cauchon, Bishop of Beauvais, headed the tribunal which reversed this decision and condemned her as a heretic, he ignored the testimony of this examination although the Archbishop of Rheims was his own ecclesiastical Superior.

Meanwhile Joan was becoming more and more restless. For while France was hedging, England was not idle. In the two months since Joan’s departure from Vaucouleurs the English had won more than fifteen towns. ④ The Maid’s eagerness was infectious, and when the hesitant Charles finally gave her the go-ahead signal men were not wanting to fill the ranks of an army. Forces and provisions were gathered at Blois to relieve the Orleanais, now in danger of starvation from the English blockade. The convoy set out along the river road like a procession, led by the clergy and monks chanting the Veni Creator.

At Orleans it was necessary to cross the Loire; the bridge was in English hands, and the wind was against the boats trying to push upstream. A sudden change in the wind was attributed to the Maid’s intercession, and her prestige with the army was again heightened. Dunois, half-brother of Charles the Poet

④Ibid., p. 137.

④Dumney, Church History, p. 308.

④Sir Edward Creasy, a student of military history, describes the situation of Orleans in Fifteen Decisive Battles of the World. ed. Robert H. Murray (Harrisburg, Pa., 1943). "The Orleanais now in their distress offered to surrender the city into the hands of the Duke of Burgundy, who though the ally of the English, was yet one of their native princes. The Duke of Bedford ... refused their terms, and the speedy submission of the city to the English seemed inevitable." p. 214.
and able commander of the defense of Orleans, conceived a great admiration for her.

Joan wished to attack immediately, but such haste did not seem wise to Dunois who knew the strength of the English position. He decided to wait until further reinforcements could be obtained from Blois, for the army that had accompanied Joan was merely an escort guarding the provisions. Dunois wished Joan to enter the city while her men returned to Blois for the main army, which would then proceed towards Orleans. Joan's unwillingness to leave her soldiers is understandable; they were "bien confesses, en etat de penitence et de bonne volonté," and she had her doubts how long they would stay in such a good state of preparedness without her supervision. She yielded, however, and Dunois himself went to Blois to lead the army to Orleans.

Joan's position with the army has often been debated. During her trial she denied that she had called herself chef de guerre, and most of her best biographers now agree that it was not as leader that she accompanied the army. The Dauphin had sent her "with" his army, and she herself had never asked for anything more than this. "The soldiers will fight, and God will give

45 Stolpe, p. 111.

46 The Trial of Jeanne d'Arc, trans. W.P. Barrett (n.p., 1932), p. 175. This work will be subsequently referred to as "Trial, Barrett."

47 Bangs, p. 182; Stolpe, p. 108.
the victory," she had said at Poitiers; she herself had no intention of fighting. Yet she accompanied the army in good earnest and in every situation; her companions-in-arms relate that she was often the first up the ladders or at the breach.

While waiting for the army to return from Blois, Joan spent her time in prayer, encouraging the citizens to do likewise. She turned their enthusiasm from herself to God, bidding them prepare for battle by prayer and the sacraments. The townspeople followed her to church as eagerly as they would later follow her into battle.

On May 4, Ascension Eve, with the full army now at Orleans, the bastion of St. Loup was attacked and won. The following day Joan forbade fighting, and all her soldiers celebrated the feast in a seemly manner and received the sacraments. On May 6 a second fortress, Les Augustins, was taken. The army remained there overnight, and on Saturday the strongest of all the fortifications, Les Tourelles, was attacked. Joan foretold that she would be wounded, but would return by nightfall over the bridge which had been in English hands for over six months.

Dunois himself tells the story of this battle:

48 Testimony of Seguin Seguin, Professor of Theology, Poitiers, Retrial, p. 101.

49 Stolpe, p. 123.

50 Orliac, p. 154.

51 Stolpe, p. 123.
And I have one more reason for believing that her deeds were of God. For on May 7, early in the morning, when the assault had begun on the enemy who were holding out beyond the bridge bulwark, Joan was wounded by an arrow which penetrated her flesh between her neck and her shoulder for a depth of six inches. Despite this, she did not retire from the battle and took no remedy against the wound. The assault went on from morning till eight o'clock in the evening, so that there was hardly any hope of victory that day. Therefore I was going to break off, and intended the army to retire into the city. Then the Maid came up to me and requested me to wait a little longer. Thereupon she mounted her horse and herself retired into a vineyard at some distance from the crowd of men; and in that vineyard she remained at prayer for the space of eight minutes. When she came back, she immediately picked up her standard and took up her position on the edge of the ditch. The moment she was there the English trembled with terror; and the King's men regained their courage and began to climb, delivering their assault against the bulwark and not meeting with the least resistance. Then that bulwark was taken, and the English who were in it fled... So the bastille was taken and I returned, together with the Maid and the rest of the French, to the city of Orleans, where we were received with great transports of joy and thanksgiving. And Joan was taken to her lodging so that her wound might be dressed. Once the surgeon had done his work, she had her supper, eating four or five toasts soaked in wine heavily watered, and she had taken no other food or drink all that day.

Next day, in the early morning, the English left their tents and drew up in array for a battle. Whereupon Joan left her bed and put on only a light coat of mail... However, she forbade anyone to go out against the English or to challenge them, but said that they must be allowed to retire; and they did retire unpursued, and from that hour the town was delivered from the enemy. 52

The next few weeks were devoted to the Loire campaign, in which the English were driven in a short time from Meung, Beaugency, and Jargeau. A decisive battle fought at Patay gave the French a victory equal in its consequences to that won by the English at Agincourt. The road was now clear for the Dauphin's journey to Rheims for his coronation. Charles still hesitated and some of his councillors were opposed to such a move at this time

Dunois again tells the story of this controversy:

And I remember that after the victories of which I have spoken, the Princes of the blood royal and the captains wanted the King to go into Normandy, and not to Rheims. But the Maid remained of the opinion that they should go to Rheims to anoint the King, and gave as reason for her advice that once the King was crowned and anointed the power of his enemies would decline continually until finally they would be powerless to harm either him or his kingdom. Everyone subscribed to her opinion, and the first place where the King halted with his army was before the city of Troyes.53

The siege of Troyes is another interesting story. Most of the king's councillors favored passing the city by, for it was very strong. Joan, however, insisted on taking it. She did not wish to leave a single disloyal town on the road where her king was passing to his anointing. The decision was delayed till morning, but Joan was allowed to make preparations for battle during the night. Her preparations were so effective that the town was surrendered at dawn without a struggle. The army then advanced through Chalons, which offered no resistance, to Rheims itself, which also surrendered without a struggle.54

Rheims, the city of Clovis and of St. Remigius, was the traditional place for the coronation of the kings of France. The coronation itself was of secondary importance; when Joan promised to bring her Dauphin to Rheims it was to have him anointed. Only anointing with the holy oils would make him truly King of France.

53Ibid., p. 126.

54Stolpe, pp. 158-160.
The anointing of the king was full of symbolism for the people of Catholic France. In the pre-Christian era Saul had been anointed by Samuel as a sign that God had chosen him to be king; and when Saul in his pride forgot that his kingship was a trust and a gift from God, the shepherd boy David had been chosen in his place, and Samuel was commanded by God to anoint him as a sign of his election. The Messiah was always spoken of as "the Christ," meaning "the Anointed of the Lord," the King who would restore God's Kingdom. In the Church the holy chrism was used in the ordination of priests and in the consecration of bishops.

Kingship too was regarded as a kind of consecration. When Joan first promised the Dauphin that the English would be driven from France, she told him that he should give his kingdom to God, and when he had made this offering sincerely, God would restore it to him and deal with him as with his predecessors. 55 Earlier Christian Kings had taken this oath of fealty to God; it was, in fact, part of the ceremony of the anointing and coronation of the kings of France. 56

An old legend told of the coronation and anointing of King Clovis by the holy bishop St. Remigius or Remy. Having no holy oils for the anointing, the bishop prayed, and a dove flew from heaven bearing in his beak an ampule of the oils. This same ampule was preserved at the monastery of St. Remy in


56 Stolpe, p. 164.
Rheims, and this was the oil used in the anointing of all the kings of France. To be anointed with this holy oil was to the people of the kingdom a sign of election by God, and this sign, so needed by Charles, whose cowardice seemed to verify the rumors of his illegitimacy, was all the more potent when the king-to-be traveled through hostile Burgundy to an English-controlled Rheims, led by a virgin from Domremy, the "house of Remigius."

Of the twelve peers of France who should have attended the coronation of the king, only two were present. But loyal adherents stepped forward to take their places, and Regnault de Chartres, presiding in his cathedral for the first time, conducted the ceremony. Joan herself stood in the sanctuary holding her banner; this was probably the first time a peasant had occupied such a place of honor. After the coronation she knelt before her king, her face bathed in tears, and said to him, "Gentle King, now has God's pleasure been accomplished who willed that I should raise the siege of Orleans and lead you to this city of Rheims for your coronation, thus manifesting that you are the true King to whom this Realm of France by right belongs." 57

"You have only a year," Joan's Voices had told her. It was now July 17, 1429, and her two major commands had been fulfilled. She had raised the siege of Orleans, thereby restoring all hope of freedom to France; and she had led the king to his anointing, giving the restored kingdom a ruler appointed by God. A feeling of homesickness appears in Joan's words at this time. She remarked one day to the Archbishop of Rheims, "I would that it might please God, my Creator, that I might now depart, abandoning the trade of arms, to

57 Fabre, p. 129.
keep my father's and my mother's flocks with my brothers and my sister, who
would much rejoice to see me again." There may have been a deeper reason
for her sense of melancholy uncertainty. Meeting a neighbor from Domremy on
her way to Rheims, she had remarked in answer to his question, "I fear nothing
but treason." Apparently this fear was not groundless. La Tremouille, the
king's councillor, had formerly been a member of Burgundy's household. His tie
with the Burgundian cause was still a strong one, and he seems at times to have
been more eager to further Burgundy's welfare than his king's. La Tremouille
was rich; it was suspected that much of his wealth came from England through
Burgundy in payment for false counsels given to the king. He also commanded
the army, and could keep the soldiers away from a city Burgundy wished to keep.
This was the case with Paris. Now, immediately after the moral victory of the
king's anointing, was the strategic moment for a move on Paris. But Charles,
influenced by La Tremouille and Regnault de Chartres, attempted to negotiate
with Burgundy. The army meanwhile was kept occupied with small, unimportant
enterprises or left in complete idleness.

In early August a truce for two weeks was signed; at the end of this
fortnight Burgundy was to hand over the city of Paris to the King of France.
Joan chafed at this delay, recognizing that it gave the enemy a chance to

58 Ibid., p. 219.
59 Testimony of Gerardin of Epinal, Retrial, p. 76.
60 Fabre, pp. 203, 210; Sackville-West, pp. 235-236.
summon reinforcement. She wrote to the impatient citizens of Rheims, "I have no liking of truces made in this way, and am not prepared to say whether or not I shall respect it. If I do, it will be simply and solely out of consideration for the King's honour." 61

Joan did observe the truce however, and when it expired Burgundy sent troops instead of the keys of the city. The French army, before advancing on Paris, attempted to make sure of the loyalty of the cities along the way so that they could not be attacked from the rear. These cities were soon liberated: Soissons, Compiègne, Senlis, Creil, and Beauvais, whose bishop Pierre Cauchon was among the English adherents expelled by this conquest. 62

At last the road to Paris was open, but even as the army approached the capital the vacillating Charles signed another truce with Burgundy, to last until Christmas—a secret truce which was unknown to contemporary historians and discovered only in 1866 by Quicherat. 63 Joan and D'Alençon knew nothing of it, and with the apparent approval of the king they attacked on September 8. Joan was wounded in the thigh by an arrow, but would have kept on in spite of it. When evening fell she reluctantly obeyed the order to retreat. D'Alençon and Joan were ready to renew the attack in the morning, intending to cross the Seine by a bridge they had constructed for the purpose. But the bridge, they

61 Fabre, p. 214.

62 Ibid., p. 221.

63 Ibid., pp. 223-224. Paine describes this truce: "In other words, Burgundy, in exchange for most of northern France, had agreed that Joan might attack Paris, Charles meantime remaining ostensibly neutral, though from what followed it is plain enough that his counsellors had pledged him to the Maid's failure." I, 309.
soon found, had been destroyed by La Tremouille's order.

There was nothing to do now but retire from Paris in defeat. The army was dispersed, and most of the noble captains who had supported Joan through the earlier campaigns were now scattered. Joan suffered through an idle winter, relieved by a few minor skirmishes fought with a handful of mercenaries and unseasoned fighters. But in the spring a new challenge asserted itself. Compiegne, the gateway to Paris, had been offered to Burgundy by Charles as a part of the proposed treaty. The people of Compiegne, however, were loyal Armagnacs and would have none of such a bargain. When the truce, which had been extended to Easter, came to an end, Burgundy made preparations to take the city. Joan hurried to defend it.

On Tuesday, May 23, 1430, Joan rode out from Compiegne with a small company of soldiers on a little sortie which at first took the Burgundians by surprise. Reinforcements were added, however, and it was the French who were routed. In the flight back to the city the rear guard was cut off by the untimely raising of the drawbridge and closing of the city gates. Among those captured were Joan, her brother Pierre, and her squire Jean d'Aulon.

Joan's captor, Lionel de Wandomme, was a knight under Jean de Luxembourg, who kept Joan prisoner at first in his castle at Beaulieu. When she nearly succeeded in an attempt to escape he transferred her to Beaucevoir where she was imprisoned in the high tower. She was treated with consideration, and
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her own squire was allowed to attend her. Luxembourg's wife and aunt treated her kindly and interceded with her captor not to deliver her to the English.

But no offer of ransom had come from Charles VII, and the two minor attempts at rescue made by Dunois and La Hire were pitifully ineffective. Finally Joan took matters into her own hands and, commending herself to God, jumped from the sixty-foot tower. She was stunned by her fall, but unhurt; her guards found her and returned her once more to her prison. This leap has been regarded by many as an attempted suicide, but Joan herself replied to her judges that she had not expected to kill herself when she leaped, but recommended herself to God, and believed that in this way she could avoid being sold to the English and return to help her desperate friends in Compiegne.

This jump was, however, contrary to the advice of her Voices, who assured her that God would aid the people of Compiegne. She herself regarded this action as sinful, because it was disobedience to her heavenly counsellors, but not because it was suicidal or presumptuous. Like Our Lady at Cana, she presumed to ask more than others because she lived so constantly in an atmosphere of supernatural favors.

Meanwhile Cauchon had been actively going back and forth between Luxembourg and Burgundy, Luxembourg and Bedford, Bedford and the University of

---

66 Trial, Scott, pp. 111-112.

67 Perhaps Joan expected St. Catherine to deliver her miraculously as she had others of the time. Bangs (p. 83) points out that: "St. Catherine was especially the patroness of captives, especially those held by the enemies of France, and many stories were told of their release through her intercession." One of these stories concerns a soldier whose miraculous escape involved a jump from a high tower.
Paris. By the time he had negotiated the payment which would bring Joan under English power her condemnation had already been decided upon and her sentence passed. It remained only to try her and to make the trial justify the sentence.

Joan was brought to Rouen in the heart of English territory where the trial could be conducted safely. Paris at that time was too uncertain; apparently the outcome of the trial was important enough to Bedford that he would leave no loophole by which the Maid might escape him; he made it clear to her judges that if they acquitted her, England would not. Her death seemed essential for an English victory; soldiers were deserting by the hundreds from the English ranks through fear of her "witchcraft." Furthermore, it was through her that Charles VII had been crowned and anointed King of France; if she came from God his claim was a holy and righteous one, but if she could be proved to be an instrument of Satan his kingship would be discredited as a design of the devil contrary to the will of God.

Although some writers agree with Shaw in claiming that her judges acted in good faith, there is little authentic evidence on which to base this opinion. Several of the Rouen witnesses at the trial for rehabilitation testified that the English king had paid the expenses of the trial and rewarded the judges and assessors with gifts of money. Father Doncoeur has

69 Testimony of Isambart de la Pierre, Retrial, p. 176.
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proved the truth of their testimony by publishing the receipts which are still extant. 71 Many of the assessors acted through fear, and there are reports of threats of imprisonment, actual imprisonment, and a threat of drowning directed at individuals who showed sympathy toward the defendant. 72 Guillaume Manchon testified that he acted as scribe reluctantly, "because I should not have dared to disobey the lords of the King's Council," and says of the others, "I do not think, however, that the Bishop of Beauvais was compelled to prosecute Joan, nor was the promoter Jean d'Estivet. They did what they did voluntarily. As for the assessors and other counsellors, I do not think that they would have dared to refuse. There was no one who was not afraid." 73

Before an ecclesiastical court could pronounce sentence for heresy it was necessary to have a representative of the Inquisition acting as judge, for the Pope had confided all matters of heresy to the Holy Inquisition. In the absence of the Inquisitor General of France Cauchon attempted to secure the cooperation of Jean LeMaitre, Vice-Inquisitor of Rouen. LeMaitre refused, pointing out that Cauchon's jurisdiction extended only to Beauvais, and his to Rouen; they could not collaborate validly in the same trial, as it must be
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considered as held in one diocese or the other. Cauchon exerted pressure, and after March 13 LeMaitre was present, though not active, in the sessions; Barbara Carter points out that "such tardy participation should have been sufficient to invalidate the whole trial."  

There were other points too which invalidated the trial. The testimony given at the retrial brought out twenty-seven of them; among them are:

The English hatred of Joan;
And the resultant constraint on the judges . . . .
Threats and pressure exerted on the officers of the court;
The lack of a defending counsel, which was contrary to the law;
Joan's detention in a secular prison, which was also illegal;
The underhanded methods employed . . . .76
The manner in which the interrogations were conducted . . . .
The lack of agreement between the Latin and the French texts of the proceedings;
The incompetence of the judges;
The surprising anomaly of their granting a heretic, or one adjudged so, the Last Sacraments;
The default of a secular sentence before the execution . . . .
The real motive of the case, or the wish to discredit the French king . . . .77

These flaws were found after only two days of questioning, before the actual proceedings had even begun. Two other major flaws were revealed in later

---


75 Carter, p. 276.

76 Nicolas Loiseleur proved himself adept at underhanded procedures, posing as a fellow-prisoner to win Joan's confidence and sacrilegiously revealing information obtained under the seal of the confessional. Stolpe, p. 206; testimony of Jean Massieu, Retrial, p. 48.

77 Retrial, pp. 30-31.
testimony, and are pointed up by Father Doncoeur: Joan had appealed for a consideration of the judgment of Poitiers, and this appeal was ignored; she had also appealed that her case should be brought before the Pope and before the Council of Basle, and these appeals were ignored. In an ecclesiastical judgment an appeal to the Pope is suspensive; all action taken by a lower court is ipso facto rendered invalid. 78

Jean Lohier, a Norman cleric, had pointed out some of these irregularities to Cauchon at the beginning of the case; Manchon testifies: "My lord of Beauvais was most annoyed with Lohier; and although the Bishop ordered him to stay and see the case through, Lohier said that he would not stay. Then my lord of Beauvais . . . rushed to the lawyers . . . and said to them: 'Here is Lohier trying to lodge a lot of interlocutories in our case.' He is trying to vilify everything and says that it is all invalid. If we are to believe him we ought to start it all over again . . . . It is easy enough to see which side he is on. By Saint John, we will do nothing of the sort. We will go on with our case as we have begun it." 79

Pierre Minier also gave his opinion in writing, which "displeased the Bishop of Beauvais, who had rejected it, saying that in delivering his opinions he must not confuse law and theology, but must leave law to the lawyers." 80

78 Qui a Brule Jeanne d'Arc?, pp. 22-25.
79 Retrial, pp. 234-235.
80 Testimony of Nicholas de Houppeville, Ibid., p. 236.
This is reported by Nicolas de Houpperville who was imprisoned for expressing his own opinion of the trial, which he repeated at the retrial: "In my belief, according to the feelings which I had then and still have, the whole thing could more properly be described as a deliberate and passionate persecution than as a judicial trial." 81

In the teeth of such testimonies as these any attempt to excuse Joan's judges or to say that they acted according to their consciences is pure white-wash. The brief biographies of the principals in the trial compiled by Pierre Champion reveal that there are many other things in the lives of these men which would need to be glossed over in the same way if they were to be exonerated. Most of them were the proud lights of the University of Paris, inveterate benefice-seekers, partisans of English rule, opponents of the papal authority. Several of them later incurred ecclesiastical censures for their misconduct, especially in connection with the Council of Basle. 82

There were others in the group who were influenced by their superiors or cowed into submission. Some among these, as has been noted, attempted to take Joan's part; others, Martin Ladvenn and Isambart de la Pierre, for example, tried to advise her how to avoid the traps set by her judges. Manchon, the clerk, defied Cauchon and refused to change his record to agree with the falsified accounts taken by the English clerks. 83 Some of the assessors absented

81 Ibid., p. 237.
83 Testimony of Manchon, Retrial, p. 47.
themselves from the sessions or even left the city; it was found necessary in some cases to enforce attendance by threats and fines, and even with these measures absenteeism was high. According to Julleville\textsuperscript{84} 113 judges appeared during the trial, though never more than sixty were present at one time. At least eighty of these belonged to the University of Paris. Another author examined the different sessions and found twenty newcomers in the third session, six in the sixth session, etc.\textsuperscript{85} It is apparent that Cauchon removed those he could not influence.

The trial lasted 114 days, from February 21 to May 30, the day of Joan's execution. During all this time the Maid was kept in chains in a cell of the castle where four brutal English soldiers guarded her constantly. She was deprived of privacy, of a woman companion, of protection from the assaults of her jailers. She was also deprived of the sacraments and even of the privilege of a visit before the Blessed Sacrament on the way to and from the sessions of the trial. After sleepless nights spent defending her chastity she faced her judges who fired tricky questions at her for hours at a time—sometimes up to eleven hours of questioning in one day. Often they spoke in unison and so rapidly that she had to beg them to take turns so that she could understand their questions. Yet through it all Joan kept her head, answering questions clearly or boldly refusing to answer. "That does not apply to your trial,"

\textsuperscript{84}Ibid., pp. 104-105.

\textsuperscript{85}Abbe Omer Englebert, \textit{Adventurer Saints} (New York, 1956), pp. 40, 47.
she would say, or "Pass over that," when questions relating to her personal spiritual life or to her Voices were asked. Often her answers startled her judges into admiration or showed them up in a foolish light, and her avoidance of their traps was phenomenal. Aside from a slight confusion between the Church Militant and the Church Triumphant, her judges failed after three months of intensive questioning to trick her into a single even slightly heretical statement. Through these questions of her enemies many facts of Joan's life were brought out or clearly explained that might otherwise have remained hidden.

But even Joan's heroic resistance had limits. After a year of imprisonment, the latter part of it accompanied by an inadequate diet, sleeplessness, lack of exercise, and tortures more grueling to her than physical torment, deprived of physical comforts and spiritual consolations, her condition was weakened. Attacked by a severe illness attributed to a fish sent to her by Cauchon, which, it was whispered, might have been poisoned, Joan was reduced to a shadow of herself by severe fits of vomiting. A doctor was called in to bleed her; she recovered, but was much weakened by the ordeal. During this time the questioning was hardly interrupted, the judges coming even to her bedside to fire questions and "charitable" admonitions at her.


87 Stolpe (p. 223) and Sackville-West (p. 316) doubt that the Bishop would want her to die a natural death; Orliac, on the other hand, suggests that he may have attempted to poison her through pity, to spare her further torment. (p. 216).
Shortly after her recovery her judges, impatient to end this trial which was putting them in a bad light, and perhaps fearing that she might die in prison instead of at the stake at Bedford and Warwick had planned, threatened her with torture. She was commanded to submit the question of her Voices to the authority of the Church in the person of her judges, and to admit that they were evil. She refused, saying: "Truly, if you were to tear me limb from limb and make my soul leave my body, I would not say to you anything else. (And if you forced me to do so), then afterwards I shall say that you made me say so by force." 89

The courage and prudence of this reply astounded her questioners and proved the uselessness of torture. Later, however, confronted with the stake in the cemetery of St. Ouen, worn out with sleeplessness and fearful of the fire, she replied, "I have already told you that concerning all that I have done I appeal, after God, to our Holy Father the Pope. Everything that I have done, I have done at God's command." 90

This submission was not considered sufficient; the Pope was too far away, Cauchon said, and the bishop was the judge within his own diocese. The sentence was read, and Joan, urged by Loiseleur, Massieu, and Erard to submit

88 Testimony of Jean Requier, Retrial, p. 177; of Guillaume de la Chambre, p. 187.

89 Trial, Scott, p. 151.

90 Trial, Scott, p. 163.
rather than be burnt, said that she was "willing to hold all that the judges and the Church desired, and to be obedient to them." She put a circle on the paper which was read to her (though she was able to write her name) and was remanded to prison—not the Church prison, as was her right, but the same cell which her brutal guards still shared with her. Their rudeness made it impossible for her to wear a woman's dress, one of the conditions of her pardon. On the twenty-eighth of May her judges came to the prison and, finding her in her man's dress again, told her she was a relapsed heretic and would be burned. Joan retorted that they had not kept their promise that she should hear Mass, receive Holy Communion, be kept in a Church prison, and be unchained. She added that she had signed the abjuration in order to save her life, and her Voices told her this had been wrong. "She said further that in saying that God had not sent her she had damned herself, for truly God had sent her . . . . She said also that everything she had said and revoked, she had done only through fear of the fire." She had never intended to deny her apparitions, and she would rather do penance by dying than bear any longer the agony of imprisonment.93

91 Ibid.

92 Paul Doncœur, "La Cédule Authentique de l'Abjuration de Jeanne d'Arc" France Illustration V (May 21, 1949), 526-527, points out that the text published by Cauchon as the abjuration signed by the Maid, in which she is supposed to admit herself guilty of many abominable crimes, was, in fact, a forgery; the actual paper Joan signed was the length of a Pater Noster, according to eye-witnesses, and differed also in wording. Doncœur adds that it is no wonder Cauchon refused to reread her abjuration to her publicly before her condemnation, as was customary in the case of a relapsed heretic; if he had done so all those present would have recognized the substitution.

93 Trial, Scott, pp. 169-170.
Leaving the prison, Cauchon said to the Englishmen standing outside, "Farewell, farewell! Have no fear; she is ours!"94 The next day he informed the assembly of Joan's recantation. The judges recommended that she be handed over to the secular arm. Stolpe points out that there is no indication that Cauchon explained the reason for her resumption of male attire, or that the others asked.95

Early in the morning of May 30 Joan was led to the square of the Vieux Marche where the stake was already prepared. A crowd of curious citizens, rabid Burgundians, soldiers of England and churchmen who had participated in her trial was already assembled. Nicolas Midi preached a long sermon justifying the action of her judges and surrendering her to the secular arm for punishment. Joan spent some time in prayer, her tears which had always flowed so freely streaming down her cheeks. As they bound her to the stake she asked for a crucifix; an English soldier took two pieces of wood and bound them together in the shape of a cross. She pressed this against her heart. Martin Ladvem, who had heard her last confession and given her Holy Communion that morning, brought the crucifix from the church and held it up before her eyes. He was at her side trying to encourage and help her, forgetful of his own danger. "When Joan saw the fire," he says, "she told me to get down and to raise Our Lord's

94 Stolpe, p. 279.
95 Ibid.
Cross very high so that she could see it; and this I did.  

As the fire caught the faggots around her she prayed constantly. She was heard to say, "Oh, Rouen, I am afraid that you may suffer for my death!" Her last word was the Holy Name of Jesus.  

By Warwick's order Joan's ashes were collected and thrown into the Seine so that there might be no relics or memorials of her. But none were necessary. Today a simple slab of cement set in the dusty sidewalk marks the place of her death; it says simply:  

Jeanne d'Arc  
30 Mai  
1431  

But memorials of her are everywhere, in churches, homes, and public places. Even her contemporaries felt her influence. Manchon used his fee to buy a missal to remind him to pray for her; many even among her enemies remarked the holiness of her death, and some were heard to exclaim, "We have burned a saint."

The people of Orleans remembered her with grateful affection. They provided for the maintenance of her widowed mother, honored her brothers, and followed in her victorious footsteps during their annual celebration of the city's deliverance, which was inaugurated in 1432.

---

96 Testimony of Martin Ladvenu, Retrial, p. 215.
97 Testimony of Guillaume de la Chambre, Ibid., pp. 216-217.
Charles VII has often been accused of ingratitude toward Joan because he did not ransom her. Regnault de Chartres who, as Cauchon's Superior, could have suspended the trial, sent a letter to the people of Rheims declaring that Joan had brought this upon herself by her pride and obstinacy, and offering in her place a shepherd boy who also had visions. La Hire and Dunois led expeditions to attempt her rescue, but with inadequate forces they were doomed to failure.

Charles seems to have roused a little after her death; he ransomed her brother Pierre, and it was he who inaugurated the first investigation of her trial in 1450. He could hardly have done so sooner, for the records and the judges were all at Rouen, and it was not until late in 1449 that the city was recaptured, partly through Dunois' strategy and partly because of a revolt staged by the citizens.

But it was not Charles VII who petitioned Rome for the retrial which restored Joan's reputation and reversed the decision of Rouen, though he may have suggested the idea to her brothers. This was the work of Joan's mother. On November 7, 1455, the eighty-year-old peasant woman entered Notre Dame Cathedral in Paris in a solemn procession of papal commissioners, clergymen, nobles, and common people. She presented a papal rescript signed by Pope Callixtus III authorizing her to open suit for the retrial of her daughter Jeanne d'Arc, who had been burned at the stake as a sorceress and relapsed.

---

heretic almost twenty-five years earlier.

Some critics have regarded this retrial of the dead Joan as an example of ecclesiastical opportunism; when the English were in power, the heroine of the Armagnac cause was burned as a witch and heretic; when the French gained the upper hand the Church hastened to make amends for her error by proclaiming Joan an innocent victim. Bernard Shaw goes so far as to place on the lips of Friar Martin Ladvenu, who had participated in both trials, Shaw's own estimate of them. The Shavian Ladvenu says in the Epilogue to Saint Joan:

At the trial which sent a saint to the stake as a heretic and a sorceress, the truth was told; the law was upheld; mercy was shewn beyond all custom; no wrong was done but the final and dreadful wrong of the lying sentence and the pitiless fire. At this inquiry from which I have just come, there was shameless perjury, courtly corruption, calumny of the dead who did their duty according to their lights, cowardly evasion of the issue, testimony made of idle tales that could not impose on a ploughboy. 102

But the real Ladvenu, giving voluntary testimony in 1450 before the commission appointed by the king to investigate Joan's trial, paints a very different picture of the first trial: "Many appeared at the trial rather for their love of the English and their partiality toward them than out of zeal for justice and the Catholic faith. This I would particularly say of the zeal and excessive partisanship shown by Messire Pierre Cauchon, the Bishop of Beauvais" . . . . 103

101 Retrial, pp. 37-38.


103 Testimony of Martin Ladvenu, Retrial, p. 239.
Throughout the course of the retrial testimonies were multiplied to show that the first trial was, in fact, partial, unfair, and legally invalid. This cannot be said of the second trial, in spite of Shaw's opinion to the contrary, for the investigation was conducted by lawfully constituted ecclesiastical authority acting freely and reasonably. Both sides were heard, and one uncontestable proof of the unbiased nature of the hearings is the fact that some of Jeanne's former judges—Thomas de Courcelles and Jean Beaupere, among others—could maintain their old position with impunity, claiming that "it was and still is my theory that they (her visions) were due to natural rather than supernatural causes and were the product of the human mind." Thanks to the general amnesty declared by Charles VII, these men were not forced to change their opinions, nor were they molested for maintaining them.

The retrial united three views of Joan of Arc into one solid and overwhelmingly beautiful portrait. Up to this time opinions of her had differed widely in different parts of France. Citizens of occupied France, influenced by the English, generally regarded her with suspicion as a girl who had dressed as a man, lived among soldiers, and been excommunicated from the Church as a heretic. The citizens of Orleans and other towns she had liberated remembered her as the triumphant Maid in armor, the messenger of God, their heroine. They knew of her capture and had heard of her execution; but whether these rumors were true they could not be sure, as is evident from the fact that an adventuress claiming to be the Maid who appeared in Orleans in 1436 was hailed

104 Testimony of Jean Beaupere, Ibid., p. 226.
with general rejoicing and even recognized by Pierre and Jean du Lys, Joan's brothers. The villagers of Domremy, Maxey, and Greux had their view of the Maid too. They remembered her as neither heroine nor heretic, but simply as herself, a good girl who visited the sick, prayed often, but was "much like the others."

The union of these three views of Joan and the revelation of many facts regarding her daily life and her trial was an important result of the retrial for her rehabilitation. For while the decision of the rehabilitation was pure negative, stating only that she was not a heretic, a sorceress, or a woman of bad character, the evidence upon which the decision rested remained on record through the centuries. When Felix Dupanloup, Bishop of Orleans, petitioned for Joan's sanctification in 1869, the evidence upon which the Church's decision would be based was already collected in the records of the retrial. It was on the basis of this evidence collected in the fifteenth century that Joan's sanctity was officially proclaimed in our own times.

105 Quicherat, V, 321-323; Winwar, p. 3.
106 Maynard, pp. 97-98.
CHAPTER III

THE PLAYWRIGHTS AND THEIR PLAYS

The story of Joan of Arc was first told in dramatic form at Orleans, probably in 1431, just three years after her death. The Mystere du Siege d'Orleans was presented as part of the annual celebration of the deliverance of the city. The author of the original script of the play is unknown and it is difficult to distinguish his work, for the script was enlarged and embellished year by year. Each major participant added his own ideas to the interpretation of the deliverance of the city; stages were set up at the various gates so that each scene could be enacted where it had taken place; costumes, properties, and backgrounds for action became more and more elaborate. The original dramatist would not have recognized the version of the play which has survived (probably that of 1474) for it is a magnificent spectacle whose performance covered several days.

In spite of copyright laws the modern playwright faces somewhat the same problem. His script is interpreted by a vast corps of specialists, each prepared to bring to technical perfection some phase of the play's production. This cooperation among dramatic artists and specialists can give a finish, a


2 Ibid., p. xi.
satisfying totality of impression to the production which the playwright alone could not achieve. Frequently, however, this system can become a hindrance rather than a help, for each artist brings to the work his own temperament, his own ideals, his own conception of the subject. These may or may not agree with the dramatist's; often they do not. Raymond Williams points up this difficulty of coordination in dramatic production as a basic factor in lowering the

literary standards of the drama:

It is a commonplace that the text of a successful modern stage play is usually disappointing, and rarely has any literary merit. For the dramatist is aware of theatrical practice; he knows that he cannot enforce an exact stage presentation. In most cases, then, he will compromise, and will be content to provide a sketch, a "treatment" of a certain theme, which the creative and interpretative talents of others will bring to full expression.³

The story of St. Joan lends itself well to dramatic presentation, for it is rich in both action and meaning. Unfortunately it also lends itself to over-production—lavish spectacle, technical novelties, over-acting in speech and gesture. It is peculiarly vulnerable to the changes wrought by the personality of the actress; it has been compared to the role of Hamlet as "the perfect part for the maximum challenge."⁴

For this reason it has seemed advisable to limit this study to the plays as they were written by the dramatists, rather than the productions as they were interpreted by the various artists of the dramatic professions. Sets, properties, lighting, and costumes will be considered only as they appear in


⁴"Joan of Arc as Interpreted by Actresses from Bernhardt to Bergman," Theatre Arts, XXXIII (January, 1949), 42-43.
the stage directions penned by the dramatist; characters will be considered as depicted in the written script, not as portrayed on the stage. This limitation seems necessary in order to study the plays as good literature rather than as good theater. The few references made to the circumstances of a play's production are included because these may have influenced the author in his preparation of the script, as Shakespeare's stage and company of actors are recognized to have qualified his writing.

Before studying the plays in detail it seems well to consider the men who wrote them, the circumstances under which they were written and produced, and the place which the "Joan" play holds in relation to the other works of the dramatist. Five major modern dramatists are to be studied: George Bernard Shaw, Paul Claudel, Jean Anouilh, Maxwell Anderson, and Maurice Maeterlinck. Two earlier plays will be considered briefly by way of comparison, the works of Edward Garnett and of Charles Peguy. The first of these in the order of time is Peguy's *Le Mystère de la Charité de Jeanne d'Arc*.

Charles Peguy, a native of Orleans, had an intense devotion to St. Joan. His ardent nature was always searching for a faith and a cause, and he seemed to have found both in the Sorbonne where he became wholeheartedly involved in Socialism and the Dreyfus Affair. Yet he left the Sorbonne after one year of study to complete his *Jeanne d'Arc*, an enormous historical pageant. In 1897 he wrote his *Premier Dialogue de la Cité Harmonieuse*, inspired by his Socialist friend Marcel Baudouin; he married Baudouin's sister, opened his publishing house "Librairie Georges Bellais," and published his *Jeanne d'Arc*.

---

Dru notes that only a few copies sold; the rest were stacked up and used as benches.

Peguy's publishing house printed many Socialist works, and his interest in the Dreyfus Affair continued. He campaigned tirelessly for a just retrial of the case which had sent this Jewish army officer to Devil's Island on a false charge of releasing military information to Germany. The case had divided France into two camps—traditionalists against freethinkers, Clericalists against Socialists. Dreyfus' release and subsequent reinstatement in the army led to an overwhelming Socialist victory at the polls in 1902, but the anticlerical policies adopted by Combes' party soon showed Peguy that his idea of freedom was not that of the Socialists. He broke with the party and founded the Cahiers de la Quinzaine, or fortnightly essays. He continued to write in a social and political vein until 1906, when he revised his Jeanne d'Arc and presented the first of his Mysteres, Le Mystere de la Charite de Jeanne d'Arc. Peguy had by this time returned to the Church in faith, which displeased his wife, still an ardent Socialist. Because of her unwillingness to have their marriage rectified he was not a practical Catholic and his children were unbaptized. Peguy's first return to Mass was August 15, 1914, just three weeks before he died in the Battle of the Marne.  

---

6 Ibid., pp. 8-9.

and thought showed a depth of faith and a penetrating awareness of God that few practical Catholics could equal. It was as a Catholic that he viewed his real poetic vocation. He wrote to his friend Lotte, "I have an office, enormous responsibilities. At bottom it's a Catholic renaissance which is happening through me. One must see things as they are and hold on." 

Peguy held on in spite of the fact that his poetry was not received as he had hoped. His former friends regretted his turn from Socialism, and the Catholics mistrusted him as one who was neither fish nor fowl. His work was not really appreciated in his own generation; it was only in the Second World War that the spirit of Peguy's work was understood and admired.

The difference between his early adherence to Socialism and the faith which characterizes his later works may be seen in his two treatments of Joan of Arc who, like a star, led him on throughout his life. The first Jeanne d'Arc is dedicated "to all those who give their lives to remedy the universal evil, and for the establishment of the universal Socialist republic." The second is a triumphant study of faith, hope, and especially of charity, in which Peguy sees the source of Joan's mission. His Le Mystere de la Charite de Jeanne d'Arc is really a dialogue rather than a play; as a dramatic poem it is more suited for reading than for production. It is now considered as among the best of Peguy's works.

---

8 Dru, p. 69.
9 Ibid., p. 73.
10 Ibid., p. 104.
Peguy's Joan had been included in this gallery of dramatic portraits of the saint because it is the only canvas which portrays her as a mystic, revealing the inward thoughts and aspirations which made her an instrument fit for the mission entrusted to her. It has little action but contains a striking characterization of the child who had not yet heard her Voices, who had not yet begun her mission. This is not the story of what Joan accomplished, but of what she was before she began to do.

The principal criticisms of Peguy's works have been summed up by Mary Purcell: "Peguy's style—or lack of style—annoys many critics. He is accused of 'merely talking in print'; of writing books 'that are always beginning but never end'; he is denounced for his rambling loquacity, for digressing and reiterating to a degree that infuriates readers."¹¹ O'Donnell adds, "Peguy has certainly his merely rhetorical moments, but at his best he is preoccupied with a vision and allows the words suggested by the vision to express it as best they can."¹² It is this vision which obsessed Peguy that increased his popularity to the point of veneration during the years of the German occupation, until he has become, as Fowlie points out, "a very sacred symbol of France."¹³

¹¹ "Peguy's Saint Joan" Irish Monthly LXXIX (January 1951), 22.


Edward Garnett's *The Trial of Jeanne d'Arc* is also included by way of contrast. He too takes only a section of her story, showing the saint in prison during her trial and after her condemnation. The fields of Domremy and the victories of the Loire campaign are only memories; Joan the prisoner is the only Joan portrayed. Garnett's portrayal of Joan is stereotyped, but his view of other characters in her story has some originality.

A Londoner born in 1866, Garnett was by profession a publisher's reader, and a very successful one. His wife was noted for her translations of Russian classics, and he made a small name for himself as a writer of criticism, essays, and biography.\(^{14}\) His *Trial of Jeanne d'Arc* fits into this pattern of successful mediocrity; it is a good second-rate play, but not great drama. Written in 1911, it was not produced until 1931 and was then a failure by box-office standards.\(^{15}\) Wagenknecht, however, includes it in his anthology, calling it *a piece de resistance*, a "unique and incomparable play," and "the 'truest' of all the Joan plays."\(^{16}\)

George Bernard Shaw, like Peguy, was a Socialist who became dissatisfied with the party's methods. He too is concerned with the conflict between tradition and freedom, and much of his satirical writing is aimed at the conventions of society which he pictures in a ridiculous light. Born in Dublin, Shaw's

---


\(^{16}\)Ibid.
earliest memories were of hardships caused by his father's drunkenness. He left school at fourteen, and with his mother's financial help began the slow climb to his ultimate success as the literary lion of London. Shaw joined the Fabian Society which sought to concretize Socialism in the British government. He wrote essays and pamphlets to further Socialism, but soon became disillusioned with the methods of the Fabian Society. A meeting with Ibsen revealed to him the advantages of drama as a channel for disseminating his ideas.

Besides Socialism and Ibsenism there was a third great influence on Shaw's thought. This was the evolutionary theory of purposeful selection: by means of the Life Force nature leads its creatures to improvement. Thus the finer elements in man will survive the weaker elements, and the result will be a Superman. Occasionally a foreshadowing of this Superman-to-be may be seen in outstanding Realists—people of common sense. Shaw's Saint Joan is a person of this stamp.17

According to Shaw the two great forces in this world evolution are the imagination and the will.18 Joan was an outstanding example of the Life Force perfecting itself because of the strength of her imagination, which perceived realities that were sensible and at the same time far in advance of her contemporaries—these were her "Voices" which, according to Shaw, were her own common sense. Her will was also highly developed, enabling her to carry out the projects conceived in her imagination. "For Shaw, Joan is a saint because

17J.P. Hackett, Shaw: George Versus Bernard (New York, 1937), pp. 143-144.

18Krutch, p. 54.
she has subordinated the facts of her person in order to become an uncomplicated instrument of the Life Force, of Creative Evolution.\textsuperscript{19}

This Creative Evolution takes the place of religion in Shaw's life. Hackett notes that he "has been working all his life on inside information about Christianity gathered prior to 1866, and that his doctrinal age is probably about nine years."\textsuperscript{20} To this doctrinal immaturity was added a cockiness which only his native wit makes palatable. Shaw proposed to answer all the questions which troubled modern society. Krutch attributes his long prefaces to this determination to solve all the questions he has raised.\textsuperscript{21}

Shaw was a good example of his own idea of Superman. He produced a total of forty-eight plays. At the age of ninety-two he was still writing plays and indulging in such strenuous pastimes as trimming trees. A fall from a tree at ninety-four brought on the illness which caused his death.\textsuperscript{22}

Saint Joan was written when Shaw was in his middle sixties. The occasion was the canonization of St. Joan in 1920, brought more sharply into the focus of his consciousness when Mrs. Shaw presented him with a copy of T. Douglas Murray's Jeanne d'Arc. This book was the basis of his information, though he also claims to have read Quicherat.\textsuperscript{23}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{19}Williams, p. 150.

\textsuperscript{20}Hackett, p. 206.

\textsuperscript{21}Krutch, p. 54.


\textsuperscript{23}Archibald Henderson, George Bernard Shaw: Man of the Century (New York, 1956, p. 599.)
\end{flushleft}
In his Preface to the play Shaw discounts all the dramas which have told her story in the past and rejects from the start the idea of heroine versus villains. "Joan got a far fairer trial from the Church and the Inquisition than any prisoner of her type and in her situation gets nowadays in any official secular court; and the decision was strictly according to law," he declares. In his determination to get rid of "the mud that is being thrown at her judges, and the whitewash which disfigures her beyond recognition," he presents her genius in conflict with the established social order, and if his story is told without strict historical verity it is also told without partiality. As Bentley points out, Shaw is not on either side, but on both sides.

This startling slant on Joan's story combined with Shaw's usual wit and his mastery of prose dialogue made Saint Joan a success from the start. It was first produced in New York with Winifred Lenihan in the lead, December 28, 1923. The first London performance starred Sybil Thorndike, opening March 26, 1924. In London it was received as a Christian play, and there was even a rumor that Shaw was about to become a Catholic, which he quickly scoffed out of existence.

---

21 Preface to Saint Joan, p. 987.

25 Ibid.


27 Hackett, p. 164.
Percival Howe writing ten years earlier had called Shaw "merely the most nearly major among the minor English dramatists." By this time there was no longer any doubt that Shaw was a major dramatist, and many critics place Saint Joan at or near the top of his list of dramatic successes. Raymond Williams says that "of Shaw's later work, Back to Methuselah and Saint Joan are the landmarks," and calls it his one successful tragedy; but he later points out that it is, as a whole, "very far from being a tragedy." Another critic agrees, saying, "There is no tragedy in Shaw. There is not even pathos . . . . But the play most likely to become a permanent part of the English-speaking theatre is Saint Joan. Into that play went his whole bag of tricks without exception." Thomas Mann calls it "the most fervent thing Shaw ever wrote—the play that is poetically the most moving, that comes closest to high tragedy, a work inspired with a truly elating sense of justice . . . a work fully deserving its world fame."

Desmond MacCarthy finds that "the extraordinary intellectual merit of this play is the force and fairness with which the case of her opponents is put," but Doyle shows this treatment of her trial to be completely unhistorical.

---
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Theophilus Lewis comments, "If this is tinkering with history, it does not affect the virility of the drama," which he adds is infinitely better written than Maxwell Anderson's Joan of Lorraine. Jean Kerr also prefers it to Joan of Lorraine, calling Shaw's play "already a modern classic."

The praise is often qualified, however. While John Gassner holds that Shaw "attained the summit of his artistry in Saint Joan," Frank Swinnerton disagrees. "The play is an admirable essay in the dramatic chronicle form... It has many beauties. It is very exciting. It is shot through and through with Shaw's unsurpassed lucidity. But it owed its popularity to the fact that respectable people, long shy of a revolutionary who was also an irreverent, found as they thought a new seriousness, a new faith, in an author whom they thought a new seriousness, a new faith, in an author whom they longed to admire because he was getting so old; and it was praised by dramatic critics because the hour had struck and Shaw was due for acclaim."

Bentley remarks that "Shaw's noble characterization carries the play beyond the political historical theme," but adds, "I am not suggesting that the play is satisfying in all respects. Many of the details are quite unimpressive: Joan's dialect is silly, her occasional prose poetry forced, many of the jokes... decidedy

---
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A French critic compared Shaw's drama with Peguy's and found it wanting. "In itself a good play," he wrote, "witty, emotional, lively, and human, but after Peguy's nothing at all: superficial, devoid of real spirituality, completely foreign to the spirit of Catholicism, unaware of what goes on in the simplest and apparently most detached of Catholic souls; historically futile and frivolous."\(^{39}\)

Charles Phillips points up what he considers the play's basic weakness in his criticism. "It is a fine play at many points, but it is spoiled by Shaw's inveterate propaganda writing. Making Joan the mouthpiece for Shavian philosophy, is a process which results in throwing the character of Joan entirely out of focus. . . . Shaw loved the centre of the stage too much to let even Joan keep it. Shaw can hardly be said to have been successful with Joan of Arc.\(^{40}\)

Whether or not Shaw was truly successful with Saint Joan, the fact remains that it is his version of her story that is most widely acted today. Shaw's Joan has been portrayed by leading actresses in the United States, Germany, France, England, Ireland, Italy, Spain, and Greece. Translations of the play are numerous; the latest is a Gaelic version translated by Siobhan McKenna.\(^{41}\)
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Shaw's play, like Shaw himself, has its faults, and very annoying ones they are, but it is indomitable, and when many of its critics have been forgotten it will still be enjoying a hale and hearty old age.

Truer to the spirit of Joan of Arc, but less palatable to the general public, is Paul Claudel's Jeanne d'Arc au Bûcher (Joan of Arc at the Stake) which appeared in 1933. Claudel was born in 1868 in a village of Champagne. Until he was sixteen he lived in small villages; then the family moved to Paris where Paul entered Law School and the School of Political Sciences. Hostile to the faith at first, he became a fervent Catholic after reading the works of Arthur Rimbaud and experiencing an extraordinary grace during Christmas Midnight Mass, 1886.

Claudel entered the diplomatic service and faithfully discharged his duties in China, Japan, Belgium, and the United States. At the time of his retirement in 1936 he had attained the rank of Ambassador and was Dean of the French diplomatic corps. His last assignment was to represent France at the Coronation of Pope Pius XII. In 1946 he was chosen a member of the French Academy. Married to Reine-Marie Perrin in 1906, he is the father of five children.

Claudel was in his sixties when he wrote Jeanne d'Arc au Bûcher. The play, a dramatic oratorio, was written at the suggestion of Arthur Honegger (who wrote the musical scores) and Darius Milhaud. Claudel himself tells the story of its conception:

Quand Honegger est venu me trouver pour m'en parler, je n'étais pas du tout partisan de cette idée. Je n'ai jamais aimé l'idée de

---

prendre un grand homme comme sujet d'une pièce, parce que l'auteur se trouve gène par une réalité trop sure que lui donne une liberté d'allure insuffisante. J'ai raconté maintes fois comment j'avais change d'avis, comment un geste de Jeanne d'Arc s'était imposé à moi dans mon voyage en chemin de fer entre Paris et Bruxelles. J'avais vu deux mains enchaînées qui fisaient le signe de la croix et, à la suite de quoi, tout le livret de Jeanne au Bucher s'était pour ainsi dire imposé à moi.43

When Honegger came to find me to talk about it, I was not at all in favor of the idea. I have never liked the idea of taking a great personage as the subject of a play because the author finds himself cramped by a too definite reality, which gives him insufficient liberty of direction. I have recounted many times how I changed my mind, how a gesture of Jeanne d'Arc thrust itself upon me during a train trip between Paris and Brussels. I saw two chained hands which made the sign of the cross and, following that, all the libretto of Jeanne au Bucher was, so to speak, forced upon me.

It was Claudel's aim to establish a religious drama, as opposed to the established forms of comedy, tragedy, and tragi-comedy. The Christian theme fits neither the levity of comedy nor the fatalism of tragedy; the fairy-tale ending in which the protagonist "lives happily ever after" is a vibrant reality when God has a part in the play. Claudel's plays are neither tragic nor comic, but exultant, depicting suffering as part of the pattern of life which ends on a note of triumphant joy.

Jeanne d'Arc au Bucher never attained the popularity in English-speaking countries of Claudel's Satin Slipper, The Tidings Brought to Mary, and Partage de Midi,44 but it was successful in France and Italy. Because of its spiritual


44 Cf. Audrey Williamson's review, quoted on p. 213n.
power and depth of symbolism, Claudel's work usually appeals to a small select audience. Few of his contemporaries appreciated his efforts, but since he did not depend on his writing for a living he could afford to write for the few rather than for the many. Michaud says of Claudel, "An architect as well as a poet, he built his cathedrals in an age of jazz and only a few of the elect came to worship in them." 45 Since his death in 1955 he has been gaining in popularity as well as fame and the idea of a religious theater has taken hold at least in his own country.

Criticism of Claudel centers around the obscurity of his symbolism and the inequality of his poetic diction. O'Donnell says of him, "Claudel's poetry is sometimes stiff and cerebral, abounding in assertions which are issued through him." 46 Joseph Chiari considers Claudel the most important French poet-dramatist since Racine, but agrees that he has failed to adapt versification to the drama:

Claudel's poetic diction offers no middle course; his poetry lives only when it is in full flight. Then it can soar very high, perhaps higher than other verse of our time, but when the flight ceases we fall to the ground, half-dead, and then we spend long moments of boredom and drudgery preparing for the next flight. His poetry has no vertebrae to hold it erect, waiting for life to flow in it; either the spirit is there and raises it, or it is nothing . . . . My feeling is that Claudel's pulse is not steady enough, and that is why I cannot place him on the topmost pinnacle where some of his enthusiastic admirers have set him; yet I share to the full their conviction that he is a major poet, and one of the greatest of our time.47

46Maria Cross, p. 195.
Maurice Maeterlinck is another symbolist who took up the subject of Jeanne d'Arc in his later years. Maeterlinck, a Belgian, was born in Ghent in 1862. He studied law, but soon turned to drama, where he became around the turn of the century a recognized leader among the symbolists. Most successful of his dramas were Pelléas et Mélisande (later set to music by Claude Debussy) and L'Oiseau Bleu (The Bluebird). Maeterlinck married the actress who played the lead in L'Oiseau Bleu, and it was to her that he dedicated his Jeanne d'Arc, calling her the incarnation of the Jeanne d'Arc he had tried to resurrect.48

Maeterlinck's Jeanne d'Arc is the work of a seventy-eight-year-old playwright, long past the height of his success. It was written in New York where he was then living as a war refugee. Despite touches of Maeterlinck's melancholy agnosticism, the play has a seriousness and a sensitive delicacy that reveal the dramatist's greatness. His Joan is portrayed tenderly and there is truth in the portrait though she sometimes speaks more like Madame Maeterlinck than Jeanne d'Arc, particularly in the scenes with the Dauphin. No evidence was found of the play's production; the text was published in 1948, the last year of Maeterlinck's life. Critical comment on Maeterlinck's later work is singularly lacking; only those written before 1915 are included in surveys of modern French literature.

Among the modern French Joan-of-Arc plays, the most successful has been L'Alouette by Jean Anouilh. Anouilh is a young man at the peak of his theatrical power. Born in 1910 in Bordeaux, Anouilh has among his earliest

48 Maurice Maeterlinck, Jeanne d'Arc (Monaco, 1948), dedication.
memories theatrical ones; his mother played the violin during operetta performances. As a child Jean was allowed to attend up to the intermission, which usually coincided with his bedtime. 49 Perhaps these early impressions influenced his dramatic technique, which is more concerned with arresting theatrical novelties than with the consistent development of plot. Anouilh believes that the dramatist should "play with" characters; this gives his work a literary and philosophical theatricality resulting in exaggerated character types and improbable plot solutions. 50

Although his technique is theatrical and his philosophy pessimistic, Anouilh is a playwright to be reckoned with. According to one of his enthusiasts:

His peculiar contribution to the theatre is this very mixture of opposites—the tragic and the ludicrous, the realistic and the romantic, the serious and the trivial go hand in hand throughout his plays. He has discovered new dramatic tones through the interplay of contrasting moods. The plays, the majority labelled Pieces Roses and Pieces Noires . . . are all tragi-comedies. It is the emphasis that makes them rose or noire . . . .

It is his ideas that have made him the most striking, and his remarkable sense of the theatre that has made him the most powerful dramatist of recent years. This does not mean that his ideas are particularly profound or that they are even sympathetic to the vast majority of people . . . but they are arresting, often deeply disturbing, and always impressively sincere. 51

50 Ibid., p. 31.
Gassner, though less of an enthusiast than Marsh, calls Anouilh "another nimble craftsman," and "the master of entertainments that had the spice of imagination in their composition." Allardyce Nicoll calls him "perhaps the most original dramatist of our present generation," and comments, "Although there are still things wanting in Anouilh's art, he has a truer sense than any other playwright belonging to the latest generation of what tragedy means, and to its noble confines he approaches nearer than any."  

Anouilh's faults as a playwright are also pointed up by these critics. Gassner finds his evasiveness and blithe arbitrariness acceptable in his pieces roses, but not in the pieces noires. He accuses Anouilh of producing "puzzling and sometimes frustrating variations on the bankruptcy of the human spirit," and finds his ambivalence and nihilism drawbacks to his tragedy. According to Nathan his dramatic writing is too labored; he "proceeds to the business of thickening it up with such determination that not only can no one understand it but it becomes overblown nonsense."

Anouilh was educated in law school, then worked for an advertising agency, but his aspirations were always towards the theater. At the age of twenty-two he became secretary to Louis Jouvet's company, married actress Monelle Valentin.

52 Twenty Best European Plays, p. 24.
53 Nicoll, pp. 914, 917.
54 Ibid., pp. 29-30.
and borrowed the scenery from Girardoux's Siegfried to set up housekeeping.

His close friendship with actor Pierre Fresnay led to his first financial success in 1937. Between plays Anouilh sometimes writes movie scripts as a source of income; one of the scripts he worked on for Fresnay was Monsieur Vincent.

Anouilh had become well established in France before he was noticed by the rest of the world. Bentley places him second only to Montherlant in Parisian popularity, adding that "Anouilh's name is not unknown in America, but it has largely been taken in vain." Many American productions of his plays have been unsuccessful; The Lark was, in fact, the first Anouilh success on Broadway. Gassner remarks that he is overrated in England, underrated in America, and Ivor Brown corroborates this statement as far as England is concerned. "Across the Channel," he says, "M. Anouilh's reputation and box-office returns have their ups and downs; but in London he is regarded as infallible."

The Broadway success of The Lark cannot be attributed entirely to Anouilh; Gassner considers Lillian Hellman's adaptation an improvement, and, combined with Julie Harris' acting, the reason for the American success of the play.
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Frank O'Connor, on the other hand, finds Miss Hellman's "chiming in" somewhat objectionable. He comments, "what Miss Harris did was remarkable, but it had nothing whatever to do with St. Joan and not much that I could see with Mr. Anouilh."61 Christopher Fry's translation of L'Alouette comes far closer to the original than Lillian Hellman's; but in this writer's opinion there are clever bits of dramaturgy in Anouilh's play which neither translator succeeded in capturing. In all fairness to Miss Hellman it must be remarked that she did not claim to be translating the play; she called her version an adaptation.

Criticism of The Lark has centered around its triviality, its historical inaccuracy, and its treatment of the character of St. Joan. Since many of these criticisms were based on the Hellman adaptation it seems unfair to quote them at this point as applying to Anouilh.

Gassner has remarked that "The Lark was not the play the author's advocates would have chosen for the purpose of forwarding his reputation."62 While it has been successful, Anouilh enthusiasts do not rank it among his best works, which include Mademoiselle Colombe, Eurydice, Antigone, and Ring Round the Moon. L'Alouette was written and produced in occupied Paris, under all the tensions and restrictions such a life involved. It was a timely piece, intended to give heart to the resistance movement and hope to the average Frenchman, and it achieved its purpose; but this very purpose and timeliness rob the play of the universal appeal that is a characteristic of great drama.

61 "Saint Joans, from Arc to Lark," Holiday, XIX (March, 1956), 77.
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It is saying much in favor of the play to point out that in spite of these limitations it rises above mediocrity.

The first leading American dramatist to present Joan's story since Percy MacKaye's romantic drama in 1906 is Maxwell Anderson. The son of a Baptist minister of Atlantic, Pennsylvania, Anderson was a teacher and a journalist before turning to the drama. His first successful play was *What Price Glory?*, written in collaboration with Lawrence Stalls. Gassner considers this still his best work. At the time of this success Anderson was in his middle thirties. He had attempted a poetic drama, *White Desert*, in 1923, but was unsuccessful in peddling poetry to a Broadway audience. Later, however, he did produce several poetic dramas which have been box-office successes, notably *Elizabeth the Queen*, *Anne of the Thousand Days*, and *Winterset*. Although he disclaims being a professing Christian, there is an element of faith and idealism in his work. Bailey comments, "his plays end on a note of affirmation which is not the traditional tragic tone."64

This combination of idealistic content and poetic form has made Anderson the scapegoat of caustic critics. Nathan says of him, "At the age of sixty-five he continues to gather the materials for temples and, though he converts them into woodsheds, firmly and contentfully persuades himself that the woodsheds are edifices of unusual majesty and beauty."65
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Lorraine, the same critic writes, "Mr. Anderson, in brief, enjoys all the attributes of a profound thinker save profundity," and calls the play "merely a double-decker theatrical sandwich, mit Mynons--and Ingrid Bergman." Eric Bentley remarks sarcastically, "Mr. Anderson is also brilliant. He has the gifts of a first-rate melodramatist but he wants to be all this and Shakespeare too." The object of all this scorn is, nevertheless, one of the leading American playwrights; he may not be making history with his plays, but he is at least making a living. The critics are not always favorable, but at least they do notice him and he does get talked about. Gassner remarks that he tries too hard to uplift, and notes that convictions, however tenaciously held, do not replace passion or vision in art. Nevertheless he concedes that Anderson has been "a good man to have around in the American theatre."  

John Mason Brown calls Joan of Lorraine "the best Mr. Anderson has written in many seasons." Another reviewer also called it "his best play; the most adult, least easily rhapsodic." "An exalted drama of Joan of Ars is the
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Comment of another viewer, while a fourth writes, "Anderson's story of Joan is straightforward and simple like herself."  

But not all the reviews are favorable. Others characterize it as a "far from satisfactory drama," "not so much a play as something playable . . . a serious stunt," "an earnest, pedestrian effort which seems unlikely to add anything appreciable either to our estimation of Mr. Anderson or our understanding of Saint Joan." "Instead of bothering to characterize Joan," comments one writer, " . . . Anderson makes her a vehicle for a debate on faith." Joseph Wood Krutch characteristically says the last word when he describes the play as "Shaw and water."

Most of the critics agree that much of Joan of Lorraine's success on Broadway was due to the acting of Ingrid Bergman rather than the writing of Maxwell Anderson. Yet the play is worth considering; as one review noted, "his Joan, all in all, seems closer to the canonized saint than Shaw's."  
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From this brief introduction to the playwrights and their standing in the theater world it is apparent that, even if the perfect Joan-of-Arc play has not yet been written, there is much merit in those that have appeared and they are all worth examining in more detail to judge their relative merits and demerits. In the succeeding chapters the theme, characterization, plot development, and dramatic technique of each play will be considered individually and compared with the others. Circumstances and details from the life and times of the real Joan will be brought out to point up the dramatist's adherence to or departures from historical fact, and their possible relationship to his theme will be noted.
WHY SAINT JOAN?

When a playgoer or reader studies a play, the theme or principal point being stressed by the dramatist is usually the last of his impressions of the play to be gathered. He sees first the settings, the costumes, the actions of the players; he hears the dialogue; he notices (though he may be unaware of it) the incidentals of tone, inflection, musical background, lighting, and all the subtle factors which go to make up that elusive quality known as "atmosphere." He may not observe specifically that Hamlet is wearing black, but the effect of Hamlet's dress has subconsciously been recorded, added to the guard's complaint of the cold, the tremor in his voice when he says, "Who goes there?", and the rumor of the ghost. Quietly and efficiently his mental calculator clicks these impressions and registers the total: "There's something rotten in Denmark!"

The action and the dialogue are constantly moving, like ocean waves breaking on the shore, tossing up the deepest secrets of each character, leaving behind broken bits of information and incident from which the playgoer, like a child on the seashore, can rebuild for himself the plot structure which was originally conceived and launched by the dramatist.

Standing back at last to view the results, he sees in a flash what was in the dramatist's mind. He too is caught in the spell of this voyage on the sea of life, and from the wreckage he salvages the compass by means of which the
original course was charted, and pockets it to use as a guide in his own voyages. This compass which has pointed the direction of the drama is the theme.

Actually the playgoer, like the child who views the boat washed up on the shore, is starting at the end and working his way back to the beginning. The dramatist may begin at the other side, conceiving first a theme or idea, a point to be put across. Next he may see how a particular story can express this idea, or he may invent one to express it. Then he embellishes the story with all the tricks of the dramatist's art--action, dialogue, characterization, incident, design, fusion of past, present, and future, sound effects, costuming, lighting and all the rest. Each of these factors in the drama is built around his theme, shaped to fit it, sharpened to point it up, and colored to express it more beautifully. In a study of a play of this kind, then, it is wise to begin at the dramatist's end and, having discovered his purpose and dominant theme--the compass which pointed the way he was going--to consider again in detail the structure and equipment of his ship, seeing how he fitted it in every particular for the specific voyage he was undertaking.

Peguy's undertaking was to show the virtue of charity as the source, not only of Joan's mission, but of the salvation of France in the twentieth century as in the fifteenth. In *Notre Jeunesse* he had criticized Catholic apologetics: "It is not arguments that are lacking, but charity."¹ In "La Bonne Annee" (1905), foreseeing already the danger of war he wrote, "It is a dreadful anguish to foresee and to see collective death, whether it be that a whole people goes under in the blood of a massacre, whether it be that a whole

¹Dru, p. 118.
people reels and succumbs in the retreatments of battle . . . . And as humanity possesses no inexhaustible reserves, it is a strange anguish to think upon the death of humanity.\(^2\)

Peguy was already stirred by world events—the Morocco crisis, Germany's demand for the replacement of the French minister of foreign affairs, the political disagreements in France itself. He saw men wasting time on arguments instead of binding up the wounds of society; he saw the old grievances between France and Germany festering like an unhealed sore, ready to swell and putrefy into another war. Disillusioned with Socialism, fed up with party politics, he saw as the only hope for the world charity which would lead to toleration for differences of opinion, sympathy and healing for suffering, political peace and unity brought about by love which, directed first in a steady stream to God, would descend all around on one's fellowmen like a life-giving fountain.

Peguy pictures the adolescent Joan sitting on a hillside near Domremy busy with her spinning, but more busy with her thoughts. She, like himself, surveyed the evils surrounding France, considered their causes and effects, and chafed at her own inability to remedy them.

He calls his piece a "Mystere" because, like the old Mystery plays, it was a story not of the earth alone, but of Heaven stooping down to aid the earth in its struggles against hell. But the key word in the title Le Mystere de la Charite de Jeanne d'Arc is not "Mystere," but "Charite." The action takes place within the heart of this young peasant girl whom God is awakening to her supernatural vocation, and the principle of that action is charity.

The first characteristic of this charity recommended by Peguy is hatred of war. Jeannette occasionally cares for a child or a wounded soldier near Domremy, but the worst of the war is farther away. She complains to Hauviette:

For every wounded man we happen to look after, for every child we feed, indefatigable war makes hundreds of wounded, of sick and homeless people, every day. All our efforts are vain. War has more power than anything when it comes to making people suffer . . . . All that is needed to set a farm ablaze is a flint. It takes, it took two years to build it . . . . It takes years and years to make a man grow, it took bread and more bread to feed him, work and more work, and all kinds of work. And all that is needed to kill him is one blow. One sword thrust and it's done . . . . It's like the plough to work twenty years and it's like the sword to work one minute. It's always that way. It's like the plough to work twenty years and it's like the sword to work one minute, and to do more, to be stronger, to make an end of things. So we people will always be the weaker ones.3

This hatred of war has a deeper motive than human suffering. Jeannette also considers the supernatural evils caused by war, and remarks that many lose their souls, the killers because they kill, and the weaker men because they despair. This natural and supernatural charity is closely linked in Jeannette's heart. "He who is too much in lack of daily bread no longer has any desire for bread everlasting, the bread of Jesus Christ," she says with insight beyond her thirteen years.4

Her charity leads to self-condemnation. Not satisfied to sit back complacently and do no evil, Jeannette reproaches herself because others are doing the evil. She accuses herself and her countrymen of being "content at present with empty charities, since we do not want to kill war . . . . We who let the

---
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soldiers do as they wish, do you know that we too torment bodies and damn souls?"

Through the lips of Madame Gervaise, Peguy points up a second theme, related to the first—the value of suffering. Madame Gervaise explains to Jeannette:

There are, there can be but two kinds, there can be but two races of suffering; the suffering that is not lost, and the suffering that is lost. We are of the suffering that is not lost, together with Jesus Christ; our suffering is of the same kind; . . . our suffering is never lost, when we are willing. There is, there is elsewhere a suffering that is lost, that is quite lost; that is always lost . . . . That's what hell is. Otherwise there would be no hell . . . . As soon as suffering can be of any use, it couples itself to, it connects itself, it binds itself with the suffering of Jesus Christ.6

Jeannette in her charity embraces this useful suffering willingly. "If then to save from the flame eternal the bodies of the dead that are damned and go mad with suffering, I must long abandon my body to human suffering, Lord, keep my body for human suffering; And if to save from eternal Absence the souls of the damned going mad because of Absence, I must long abandon my body to human suffering, Let it remain alive in human suffering."7

A final characteristic of Jeannette's charity is its recourse to God in prayer and contemplation, a contemplation so intense that she comes to share the thoughts of God Himself. This is her preparation for the mission God will
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entrust to her, and though her Voices have not yet spoken there is a premonition of them in her last lines which include a reference to the plight of Orleans.

In Le Mystere de la Charite de Jeanne d'Arc Peguy is reminding his countrymen of what war really is, and of the suffering it brings to the innocent as well as to the guilty. There is a note of warning, of foreboding, almost of despair in his cry, "We are the party of those who build up. They are the party of those who pull down. We are the party of the plough. They are the party of the sword. We will always be beaten. They will always get the better of us, on top of us. No matter what we say."8

But there is hope and courage too in his message. Hauviette speaks the hope: "It is nevertheless an extraordinary fact . . . it is one of the tokens of God's goodness that there should be for all that as many peasants as soldiers, as many martyrs as executioners: . . . and that one can't discourage peasants, and that one can't discourage victims and martyrs. And that soldiers will grow weary before peasants, and that executioners will grow weary before victims and martyrs."9 Jeannette herself adds the note of courage in her quiet response to Madame Gervaise, who has described the horrors of Calvary and the abandonment of Jesus: "I believe that, had I been there, I would not have forsaken Him . . . . French knights, French peasants, people from our country would never have forsaken Him."10

8 Ibid., p. 27.
9 Ibid., pp. 44-45.
10 Ibid., pp. 171-172.
Edward Garnett's theme in *The Trial of Jeanne d'Arc* might be described as "innocence betrayed." His piece is typical of the pre-Shavian treatments of Joan, stressing her ill-treatment in prison and the malice of her judges, to such an extent that she herself is hardly characterized. Historically it is remarkably accurate, and even the characterizations of some of the judges and assessors, which are the strong point of the play, are true to the glimpses of them found in records of the trial and retrial.

Garnett's aim was apparently to fit the drama of Joan's trial for stage presentation without changing any of it or adopting any slant that would reveal his own beliefs. It is obvious that he sympathizes with Joan and despises her judges; but he seems to blame them as individuals rather than as representatives of the Catholic Church. The play is apparently written from a Protestant point of view, but prejudice is not one of its faults. The lack of a definite theme is a fault, for without it the thought of the play wobbles in too many directions, like a rudderless ship.

If Garnett's weakness was too little theme, George Bernard Shaw and Maxwell Anderson go to the other extreme, making their themes so dominant, so thoroughly argued and explained, that they might be said to have failed by excess.

Eric Bentley expresses Shaw's theme very pithily as "the homelessness of genius." Joan, the genius, is in conflict with the world full of Philistines who are incapable of understanding her grasp of realities or of appreciating her value as a world leader. Joan, the individual, is in conflict with the
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institutions which control her world, notably the Catholic Church and feudal society. Shaw's point is that, while it is perfectly safe to canonize her after her death, she would be just as uncomfortable to have around in the twentieth century as she was in the fifteenth. This final punch at his audience is brought out in the epilogue.

In order to put over this point—that genius or "the Superman" is always out of place among ordinary people—Shaw had to make Joan's judges ordinary people. The role of villain which had generally been assigned to them—and which, incidentally, is well backed up for some of them by the facts in the case—had to be discarded to produce a conflict that would involve drama rather than melodrama. This conflict was to be between the individual tenaciously holding to her own ideals, and the leaders of society manfully upholding their positions, doing their duty, defending the society they represented against the innovations of this young upstart. With this compass directing the course of his drama, Shaw made the necessary alterations in historical facts by characterizing her judges as honest, dutiful men devoted to the Church rather than as time-serving politicians.

Shaw's theme is not good history but it provides an excellent frame for drama, and his skill with words wove it through the play in such a way that the dullest member of his audience could not have missed the point. But Shaw's trouble is that he never knows when to stop, and in Saint Joan the warp of theme is a bit too thick for the woof of plot. A hint of it flashes in the humor of the first scene where Baudricourt is overcome; it shows itself more clearly and seriously in the discussion of miracles between the Archbishop and La Tremouille in Scene II. As the plot thickens, so does the theme, becoming
the main element in Scene IV where Warwick and Cauchon punctuate their plans for capturing Joan with long dissertations on Hus, Wyclif, and Mohammed as compared to Joan, and on her threat to the established order as embodied in the Church and in feudal society. Joan becomes involved in the discussion of it in Scene V, where Dunois explains to her why she is unpopular at court. In this scene, a climax in the play, she reveals the faults of her character which will bring about her downfall, and it is made clear to her what the issue will be. In all this discussion the theme recurs constantly until even Joan is forced to recognize it. "Yes: I am alone on earth: I have always been alone . . . . I thought France would have friends at the court of the king of France; and I find only wolves fighting for pieces of her poor torn body. I thought God would have friends everywhere, because He is the friend of everyone; and in my innocence I believed that you who now cast me out would be like strong towers to keep harm from me. But I am wiser now; and nobody is any the worse for being wiser. Do not think you can frighten me by telling me that I am alone. France is alone; and God is alone; and what is my loneliness before the loneliness of my country and my God? I see not that the loneliness of God is His strength . . . . Well, my loneliness shall be my strength too: it is better to be along with God . . . ."\[12

The thread of theme is dominant still throughout the trial scene. The Inquisitor hammers home the point in an 85-line dissertation (pp. 1109-1112), and Cauchon adds twenty more lines as finishing strokes.

\[12Saint Joan, p. 1100.\]
Shaw's thesis is most cleverly pointed up in the epilogue, where the characters in her story congratulate Joan on her rehabilitation and canonization and solemnly praise her—but when she mentions coming back to earth they all think it's going too far—politics are still politics, and all that, and things might not be too different. Like the proverbial Indian, she's good only when dead!

Shaw has given strict orders that his three-and-a-half-hour play is not to be cut. He is unwilling to sacrifice a single thread of his argument, though it does at times hold up the action of the play. But even this is not enough; he explains and rehashes and illustrates and argues the theme in a fifty-four page preface appended to the play!

Shaw has carried out his plan well in the action and characterization of Saint Joan, but the lengthy historical discussions give the play an atmosphere more akin to modern times than to the fifteenth century. This is a weakness in the play—it has too much theme!

Of Maxwell Anderson's Joan of Lorraine the same might be said, and more. He presents two themes, thereby doubling the surplus discussions! His first theme is compromise—the necessity of working with others even when their actions are below moral standards—in the theatrical world, in the U N, in business, even in fifteenth-century France. Like Shaw he uses the coronation scene as his climax, making Joan realize at this moment that the Dauphin is a traitor to his country, unworthy of his crown. She refuses to let him be crowned, but is talked into a compromise by Dunois who points out, "Didn't your Voices tell you that you were to set the Dauphin on the throne in the cathedral at Rheims? . . . . Well—this is the Dauphin—the only one we have—and this
is the cathedral--and the people are waiting for us. You are doing what God
told you to do.\footnote{13}

But Anderson is not content to bring out this theme in the story of Joan.
He introduces it as the subject of an argument between Jimmy Masters, director
of his play within a play, and Mary Grey, the star. Mary objects to the
author's changes in the play: "But it seems to me the way the play is now it
means that we all have to compromise and work with evil men--and that if you
have a faith it will come to nothing unless you get some of the forces of evil
on your side." Masters responds, "That's right. I don't think I'd call them
the forces of evil--but you have to get some of the people who are running
things on your side--and they're pretty doubtful characters mostly."\footnote{14}

The argument is taken up again in the third interlude, when Masters ex-
pounds the necessity of compromise and talks down Mary's objections:

\textit{Masters. Mary, dear, the world is run by money-changers and
bargainers. Sometimes a saint or a prophet comes along and gets so
much influence with the people that the bargainers and politicians
have to pay some attention. But they don't quit running the earth
on that account. They just shift their bargains enough so that the
public conscience is satisfied, and get rid of the saint as fast as
they can. Once in a long while there's a saint who's a bargainer
also, like Lincoln or Roosevelt, and he plays ball with crooks and
works for the common good at the same time. But nearly always the
crooks are in control and the people and the men of good-will are
on the outside with no power except for the fact that they can tip
over the whole machine if they don't like the way things are going
... . She had to decide whether she's stay with the small-time
crook of a king and try to make him act for the people occasionally
or leave him, just as we have to decide whether we'll keep an eye on}

\footnote{13}{Maxwell Anderson, \textit{Joan of Lorraine} (Washington, D.C., 1946) p. 97.}

\footnote{14}{Ibid., p. 35.}
the United Nations or give up and look the other way. Right now the crooks are bargaining over who's going to own the earth—they're doing it in Paris and at Hunter College and wherever two or three politicians get together—and a lot of people look at those politicians, dividing up empires, and say, "What's the use?"... And they get cynical and give up. And what I want this play to say is that we should never give up. We have to have a faith, and we have to hold those brigands to our faith—to world government or world peace or whatever it is. Because they're in there making trades all the time, and we'll never get any part of our dream except by trading for it.

Mary. I think if she's ever said one thing she didn't mean, or allowed one dishonest word to pass without denying it, she couldn't have had any influence. Compromise is not a virtue. Once you begin to compromise you're lost.

Masters. We all compromise, every day of our lives.

Mary. But a saint doesn't! That's the difference between us and a saint!

Masters. Then the saint has to get somebody to do it for him.15

The argument is interrupted for a while to present another scene from the life of Joan of Arc. But in the fourth interlude (p. 80) it is resumed:

Mary. Look at what this play says now, Jimmy. It says that we have to tolerate dishonesty in high places in order to get things done! ... But you wouldn't tolerate dishonesty in your own plans! You wouldn't tolerate it in the theatre!

Masters responds by informing her that the owner of their theater had put through a swindle and he has to cover a bad check to get him out of jail. He adds that all theater sets are built with black market materials, plays are financed with shady money, and box-office men are usually guilty of graft. "The world's like that," he continues. "It's always been like that. And the theatre's in the world, like everything else. And I still think it's worth

15Ibid., pp. 51-53.
while to put on a play about Joan of Arc—in the middle of all this. The human race is a mass of corruption tempered with high ideals—You can't sacrifice your integrity, but short of that . . . You'll touch dishonesty somewhere as soon as you start to get anything done!" 

At the end of Act Two Mary finally gets the point, and in case the audience could possibly have missed it after all this discussion, she interrupts one of the most poignant scenes to give the solution. Joan compromised on small issues, not on large ones. Bentley laconically shows the holes in this solution by raising the practical problem of deciding which are which. 

The theme of compromise is already dragging anchor on the play, but Anderson has a second theme in the hold, and one equally weighty. This is the question of faith. Again it is Masters who expresses it. "When Joan was nineteen years old, after she'd crowned her king and saved France, she was captured by her enemies and put on trial for her life. And they asked her the toughest questions ever put to the human race. Why do you believe what you believe? . . . That's the question we all have to answer. And that's the big scene in anybody's life, when he has to answer that question." 

According to Anderson faith in something is necessary for every worthwhile human being, but there need not be a reason for the faith. Faith is not based on authority, but on something within a man's soul; ultimately it is his own opinions, his own ideals, himself in which he must have faith. That, according
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to Anderson, is the only faith that matters.

Besides these two themes there is some additional philosophical ballast packed into the play. One reviewer summed it up neatly: "Anderson makes quick jabs at actors, bankers, theater managers, and, indirectly this time, dramatic critics. He neatly twists Gresham's law of economics around to apply to the stage, saying that 'the cheap stuff drives the good stuff off the market.' He bogs down a little when he has Wanamaker do a dissertation on democracy and the state of the world, but the play picks up again as soon as Miss Bergman returns to the stage. This is what really keeps the play going."

George Jean Nathan, after a similar summary of the many and varied ideas presented in the play, comments, "In other words, Mr. Anderson has thought himself out of a better play." There is an old saying that no man should be condemned unheard even though an angel be his accuser, and since these accusers are critics, not angels, it is only fair to let Mr. Anderson voice an excuse for this excess. It appears in his collection of essays about the theater entitled Off Broadway. "During a war," he writes, "all civilian standards are revised downward, and that's as true of playwriting and criticism as of everything else. The playwright finds himself confined to propaganda or escape. The critic becomes inured to poor stuff or leaves his desk in disgust."

19 "Ingrid of Lorraine." Anon. rev. of Joan of Lorraine, Newsweek, XXVIII (December 2, 1946), 96.


Since *Joan of Lorraine* was written during the Second World War, it may be concluded that the play suffered from this lowering of standards. Maxwell Anderson is to be commended at least for his attempt to present propaganda rather than escape—an attempt which is in keeping with his general aim to "uplift" the American theater.

Jean Anouilh's *L'Alouette* is also a product of the Second World War; in it Anouilh attempts to combine propaganda and escape. His escape from the nightmarish realities of the German occupation of Paris, where the play was written and first produced, takes the form of bawdiness and light anachronisms. His propaganda is subtly threaded through the play, so subtly that Nazis in the audience would not recognize it as applying to modern Paris, yet so effectively that Anouilh's compatriots could not fail to get his message. *Joan of Arc* is a symbol of the greatness of France, a soaring lark which sings even in the face of death, a free soul which can never be subjugated, which will never be forced to give in, but will continue to say "No" to the very end—and because its spirit is unconquered, seeming defeat will be turned into victory, and the final end will be a glorious one.

This message is the compass which directs the course of Anouilh's play. The story of *Joan of Arc* seemed made to order to express such a theme, but the author found that some alterations were needed. His changes in character, time sequence, and incident are made, for the most part, to keep his play on the course set by his theme, which also determined his non-realistic dramatic technique. These alterations will be discussed in subsequent chapters.

Euphemia Wyatt calls *L'Alouette* a "political allegory," and Frank O'Connor
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identifies the allegorical figures. "Rouen is Occupied France; the judges are Petainists, collaborators, who are trying a girl of the Resistance movement under the orders of the Gestapo." Anouilh himself makes just such an allusion in the word-play between Warwick (who represents the Nazi occupation) and Cauchon (who represents Petain):

Cauchon. We shall go as far as ever we can to save Joan, even though we have been sincere collaborators with the English rule, which seemed to us then the only reasonable solution to chaos. It was very easy for those who were at Bourges to call us traitors, when they had the protection of the French army. We were in occupied Rouen.

Warwick. I don't like the word "occupied". You forget the Treaty of Troyes. You were quite simply on His Majesty's territory.

Cauchon. In the midst of His Majesty's army, and the execution of His Majesty's hostages; submitting to the curfew, and the condescension of His Majesty's food-supplies. We were men, with the frailty of men, who wanted to go on living, and yet at the same time to save Joan if we could.

Future times will be pleased to say we were barbarous. But I fancy, for all their fine principles, they will take to expediency faster than we did in every camp.

Throughout the play Anouilh makes subtle references to the Nazi occupation which heighten the humor while underlining the theme. Warwick comments on Joan's handling of Baudricourt: "Whether we're ruling the world with a mace or a crozier, in the long run, we do it by persuading fools that what we make them think is their own opinion." Charles makes several trivial comments which fit better into the twentieth century than the fifteenth, reminding the
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24Jean Anouilh, The Lark, Trans. Christopher Fry (London, 1955), pp. 29-30. This translation will subsequently be referred to as "The Lark, Fry" to distinguish it from the freer adaptation by Lillian Hellman.

25Ibid., p. 29.
audience that the play has a timely application. "Fashion is practically the only thing we can sell them: our fashions and our cooking. They are the only things which still give us some prestige with the foreigners." "I can always sign a draft on the Treasury . . . . The Treasury is empty, but there's nothing on this paper to say so." "I know my grandfather Charles was a great king; but he lived before the war when everything was much cheaper."26

Even Joan gets in timely remarks: "The Duke of Burgundy signs a bitter treaty and the English give him the Order of the Golden Fleece. They invented just such medals for foreign traitors."27

Nazi methods of propaganda are explained (p. 11) by Warwick: "Propaganda, my lord Archbishop, is black or white. The main thing is to say something pretty staggering, and repeat it often enough until you turn it into a truth." Warwick also comments (pp. 42-43) that the service de renseignements (prototype of Nazi Secret Service) was failing in its duty since it had not acquired information before Joan became so troublesome, and helped her father to prevent her military career.

During the trial (p. 61) the Promoter asks Joan for the secret message she gave to her king, and his question reeks with Nazi anti-Semitism. "Your secret has a name, whether it's a potion or a formula, and we mean to know it. What did you give him at Chinon to make him so heroic all of a sudden? A Hebrew name? The devil speaks all languages, but he delights in Hebrew."

26 Ibid., pp. 32, 36, 38.

Joan's reply reveals the deeper theme of the play—the inner strength of man which Anouilh is holding as an ideal before his countrymen. "No, my lord," she answers with a smile: "it has a French name. I gave him courage."

Reminders of this deeper theme, the inner strength of man when he stands alone against all odds, are also planted throughout the play. In an early discussion with Warwick (p. 31) Cauchon had said, "And yet, precisely in this loneliness, in the desert of a vanished God, in the privation and misery of the animal, the man is indeed great who continues to lift his head. Greatly alone."

In her meeting with the Dauphin Joan explains the meaning and the value of courage which is afraid, but acts as if it were not afraid. She tells him a charming story of a little poacher in her neighborhood who was chased by two huge dogs belonging to the nobleman on whose lands he was trespassing. Very much afraid, he stopped running and waited for the dogs, and strangled them one by one. "Of course he was bitten--this was not a miracle--but he strangled them anyway. He overcame his fear by facing it. God made the dogs stronger, but He gave man something better than brute strength."

Anouilh puts his own idea of Man into Joan's mouth. Speaking of a man who lived in sin but died in the performance of an heroic action she says, "He died in the light which was lighted within him when the world began. He behaved as a man, both in doing evil and doing good, and God created him in that contradiction to make his difficult way." This statement leads the fanatical


29The Lark, Fry, p. 63.
Inquisitor to describe Man as the enemy against whom the Inquisition (a symbol here of the Gestapo) is set up:

Would it were only a question of the devil. His trial would soon be over. The devil speaks our language. In his time he was an angel, and we understand him. The sum of his blasphemies, his insults, even his hatred of God, is an act of faith. But man, calm and transparent as he seems, frightens me infinitely more. Look at him: in chains, disarmed, deserted, no longer sure even in himself (isn't that so, Joan?) that the voices which have been silent for so long have ever truly spoken. Does he throw himself down, supplicating God to hold him again in His hand? ... No. He turns away, suffers the torture, suffers humiliation and beating, suffers like a dumb animal, while his eyes fasten on the invincible image of himself; (he thunders) himself, his only true God!

"But what I have done I shall never wish to undo!" You hear those words? And you will hear them said on the scaffold, at the stake, in the torture chamber, wherever they come to suffer for the errors they commit. And centuries hence they will be saying it; the hunting down of Man will go on endlessly. However powerful we become one day in one shape or another, however inexorably the Idea shall dominate the world, however rigorous, precise and subtle its organisation and its police, there will always be a man who has escaped, a man to hunt, who will presently be caught, presently be killed: a man who, even so, will humiliate the Idea at the highest point of its Power, simply because he will say "No" without lowering his eyes.30

This word-picture of Man facing death is verified in the scene of Joan's execution. The Inquisitor stares at her and says, "Look at her, defying us. Are we never going to be able to master this flaunting spirit of man?" Then, as the fire is lighted, he dares not look at her, but questions Ladvenu who assures him that she is looking straight in front of her, without flinching, with almost a smile on her lips. Overwhelmed, the Inquisitor groans, "I shall never be able to master him."31

30 Ibid., pp. 76-77.

These words are verified in the last scene; Man cannot be mastered, nor can Free France, his native land. The stake and faggots are dragged down and the play ends on the triumphant note of the coronation as it is shown in pictures in children's books. This is the Joan remembered in France, one who found victory even in defeat. This is Anouilh's last encouragement to his audience—France, even at her lowest ebb, will continue to resist and will survive all threats of destruction to rise again, glorious.

Maurice Maeterlinck, one of the early symbolists, a master of mood and atmosphere, has for a long time been out of the spotlight of European theater. In his old age he has lost some of his intensity of horror and mystery, but retains the ability to hold the imagination. His theme is not so well pronounced as those of Shaw, Anouilh, and Anderson; it is a misty light on the horizon of Joan's story, visible to those who look up, but giving only a faint glow of color to those whose primary interest is the story itself.

Maeterlinck has left his dream-world to portray the historical Joan—but something of his dreams shows through in his portrayal. The theme of the drama is a study of the effects of sinlessness in a human being. Joan's innocence is proclaimed by DeMets and Poulengy in the first scene; in the second she herself admits to the Dauphin Charles, "C'est que je n'ai rien fait." In saying it she is embarrassed, as though she were ashamed of having no sinful habits to confess. Yet she is aware that this faultlessness is the reason God has chosen her to crown her king. When (p. 14) Charles shows her the crown he had seen in his dream in the hands of an angel, she makes a move

32Maeterlinck, p. 22.
to crown him with it. "N'y touche pas!" he warns; but she declares, "J'ai le droit d'y toucher." "I have the right to touch it."

D'Alencon (p. 33) points out another effect of her holiness—an extraordinary skill in war, though she had never before seen a cannon—and an uncanny sense of where to strike and how to get there, though she cannot read or write. Joan replies that her saints know geography well, because they are in heaven where they see all.

Joan intervenes to save a camp-follower from public chastisement (pp. 39-40), but fails in an effort to convert her. When d'Alencon insists that the woman must be punished, Joan protests, "Non, non, je ne peux pas." She repeats several times, "I cannot," before she gives the reason. "I have not the right to strike her, because I have not yet sinned."

Joan's sinlessness depends upon her acceptance of God's decisions for her without questioning His reasons. When King Charles has made his foolish treaty with Burgundy and will not let her march on Paris (p. 49) she knows that he is acting unwisely. Yet he is now her king and she cannot go counter to his orders. What this act of resignation costs her shows in her words, "C'est Dieu qui l'a voulu, mais je n'y comprends rien." The king replies with the words, "On n'a pas besoin de comprendre."

After her capture Joan faces the big temptation of her life in the tower of Beaurevoir. Her innocence and goodness have been recognized by the women of her captor's family—a proof that they are genuine! But two rumors have reached her—that Compiègne has fallen and all its inhabitants are to be massacred, and that she has been sold to the English. She determines to jump from the tower to go to the aid of her friends, or die in the attempt. An invisible
voice warns her against this disobedience, and repeats in almost the same words as those used by the king, "Nous n'avons pas besoin de comprendre." The voice adds the assurance that later, when she will be with her Voices, near God, she will understand better.\(^{33}\) But Joan disobeys and jumps, saying, "I wish to die." Apparently Maeterlinck does not regard this jump, which he pictures as an attempted suicide, to be sinful, for the same aura of sinlessness surrounds her in subsequent scenes with no hint of repentance.\(^{34}\) Joan continues to hear her Voices, which come, as she had assured the Dauphin in her first interview with him, only when one is in the state of grace.

During her trial a different invisible voice is heard. This one is audible only to those who are in a state of sin; Joan herself does not hear it. This is the voice of the judges' consciences; it lays bare their sinful motives, foretells future misfortunes, and tells them, "Vous pourrez la tuer, mais elle ne mourra pas."\(^{35}\) The judges ignore this voice as a diabolical trick or hallucination, and proceed with the trial. But the invisible voice has the last word, proclaiming after her burning, "La plus grande de nos saintes s'élève vers le Ciel . . . . Elle y vivra pour nous et veillera sur nous . . . . Elle

\(^{33}\text{Ibid., p. 69.}\)

\(^{34}\text{Actually Joan said nothing more suicidal than that death would be preferable to capture, and she herself told her judges that she did not expect to die when she jumped from the tower, but commended herself to God. \textit{Trial,}\textit{ Scott, pp. 111-112.}\)

\(^{35}\text{Maeterlinck, p. 104.}\)
Maeterlinck contrasts the forces of good and evil, and shows that good triumphs in the end even in apparent defeat. In identifying the force of good with the spirit of France, he gives some meaning to the Beaurevoir scene; it is right for France to prefer total destruction rather than forsake her besieged friends (Belgium, perhaps?) and fall herself into the hands of the enemy. But there is an invisible power which preserves France and will not let it die, and which will declare its immortality to its enemies even in captivity and in the face of annihilation.

There is a similarity between this theme and that of Anouilh. It is interesting to note that Maeterlinck's play was written in 1940, but first published in 1948 when the aged playwright was still living in New York, a refugee. Anouilh's was written in 1944 in Occupied France. The similarity is apparently coincidental, due to the devotion of both men to the cause of France. It is unlikely that either had read the other's work.

The forces of good and evil are contrasted again in Paul Claudel's Jeanne d'Arc au Bucher, a dramatic oratorio. Claudel states his own theme and purpose in the introduction:

Pour comprendre une vie comme pour comprendre un paysage, il faut choisir le point de vue et il n'en pas de meilleur que le sommet. Le sommet de la vie de Jeanne d'Arc, c'est sa mort, c'est le bucher de Rouen. C'est de ce sommet, dans le drame que j'ai écrit pour Mme Ida Rubinstein avec la collaboration de Honegger, qu'elle envisage toute la série des événements qui l'y ont conduite, depuis les plus proches...
jusqu'aux plus lointains, depuis la consommation jusqu'à l'origine de sa vocation et de sa mission. Ainsi les mourants, dit-on, voient à la dernière heure se déployer tous les événements de leur vie, à qui sa conclusion imminente confere un sens définitif. Tout de suite, tout est expliqué au regard qui passe d'un horizon à l'autre et du terme au départ.

La Jeanne d'Arc que nous contemplons sur son bûcher, ce n'est pas le jeune être heroïque dont les minutes du procès de Rouen nous ont décrit la passion. Ou plutôt c'est l'héroïne d'un autre procès dont nous-mêmes avons vu, après la Grande Guerre, la conclusion, je veux dire le procès de béatification. C'est la Jeanne d'Arc éternelle, celle qui au seuil des temps modernes a été constituée la patronne de notre unité nationale . . . . Cette petite paysanne ignorante qui ne savait signer que d'une croix, tout de même en lettres de sang et d'or, elle a écrit un livre, et ce livre il était juste qu'elle fut la première à y porter les yeux.37

To understand a life as to understand a landscape, it is necessary to choose a point of view, and there is none better than the top. The crown of the life of Jeanne d'Arc was her death, that is, the stake at Rouen. It is from this height, in the drama which I have written for Madame Ida Rubinstein with the collaboration of Honegger, that she views all the series of events which have conducted her there, from the nearest even to the farthest, from the consummation even to the beginning of her vocation and her mission. Thus the dying, they say, see at the last hour all the events of their life unfolding, events to which the imminent end gives a definitive sense. Suddenly all is explained to the gaze which passes from one horizon to the other and from the ending to the starting point.

The Jeanne d'Arc whom we contemplate at her stake is not the heroic young being whose passion the minutes of the trial of Rouen have described to us. Rather she is the heroine of another process which we ourselves have seen, after the Great War, the climax, I mean the process of canonization. It is the eternal Jeanne d'Arc, that one who at the threshold of modern times had constituted herself the patroness of our national unity . . . . This little ignorant peasant who knew no sign but that of the Cross has all the same in letters of blood and gold written a book, and it is just that she should be the first before whose eyes this book is displayed.

The book mentioned by Claudel is carried by St. Dominic, who serves as the

raisonneur in the play. While Dominic was not one of the saints who spoke to Joan, it was fitting that he should be chosen by Claudel to open the book of her life and reveal it to her as it is seen in heaven. Many Dominicans were among her judges. Martin Ladvenu, who gave her the Last Sacraments and tried to make her death easier, was a Dominican. The presence of Dominic at the stake is reminiscent of Ladvenu's approach with the cross that she might look on Christ as she died, and of the necessity for Joan to remind him that he would be burnt himself if he did not get down. And the analogy between the cross and the book recalls another Dominican who said that the crucifix was his only book, and from contemplating it he had learned all wisdom. The symbolism of Claudel begins with the simplicity of a pebble dropped in a pond, but spirals outward to infinite levels of meaning.

Still another Dominican is symbolized in the presence of Dominic. This is Jean Brehal, the Grand Inquisitor, who presided over the trial for the rehabilitation and negated her condemnation in 1456. He spoke openly in the name of the Church proclaiming her innocent of the crimes for which she had been condemned, and his records served as the basis for her canonization. Dominic, then, speaks for his sons, regretting the malice and ignorance of some, confirming the decision of others, and recalling the charity which braved the wrath of the soldiers to stand by her at the hour of death.

Dominic, Catherine, Margaret, and the Blessed Virgin represent the powers of good encouraging Joan; the judges represent the powers of evil, and are caricatured as beasts. The powers of the world, kings, queens, soldiers, and courtiers, are a mere pack of cards, and it is not surprising to find the capital sins represented among them. The wisdom of the beasts and the power of the
armies is as nothing, and with a triumphant flourish Jeanne and the heavenly choir recognize that Joy is stronger, Love is stronger, God is the strongest of all! Joan's death is not a defeat, but a victory, an exaltation, symbolized by the movement with which she breaks her bonds and raises her arms joyously to heaven as the flame rises around her.

Claudel has made use of fewer facts than any of the other dramatists; by his fantasy he avoids controversy over minor points, and ignoring the letter of her story goes straight to the spirit of it. The theme of his opera might be summed up in the words of St. Paul (Rom. VIII. 28): "For those who love God, all things work together unto good."

These seven playwrights had each a different end in view. Why did they choose the story of St. Joan of Arc as the vessel to carry their theses?

The story of St. Joan is dramatic, compelling. It appeals to the heroic ambitions of man, and at the same time to his sympathies. But most of all it appeals to his need for faith and the courage to stand up to that faith. Whether it is the Protestantism of Shaw and Anderson, the Catholicism of Claudel, or the patriotism of Anouilh, it is still an inner strength that makes the individual important. Insubordination, the story of the individual defying authority, has a strong appeal to rebellious human nature and is one of the most satisfying conflicts the drama can portray. It is rare enough that this insubordination, this rebellion is justifiable. In St. Joan's case it is, and her innocence, her truthfulness, her humility, make her courage and constancy all the more admirable. Her human qualities combined with these virtues make her the ideal heroine for the drama.

But there were other, more particular reasons for each man's choice of
St. Joan. Shaw once wrote of himself: "I am not an ordinary playwright. I am a specialist in immoral and heretical plays. My reputation has been gained by my persistent struggle to force the public to reconsider its morals ... I write plays with the deliberate object of converting the nation to my opinion." Shaw's opinion with regard to truth was that there was none that was unchanging. The Life Force meant constant change, evolution, with yesterday's standards and values and beliefs giving way to today's, and today's becoming obsolete by tomorrow. In such a world each generation is in conflict with the previous one and neither side is completely right, as another generation will show. Joan's position in her times was a good example of this opinion, or could be made into one with a few changes in the facts. Shaw never hesitated to change facts to fit his opinions, especially if the result could be passed off as fact and would be disturbing to public complacency. In St. Joan's case this could be done by careful selection of evidence in favor of his thesis, and suppression of that which was not. The resultant view of Joan's trial was disturbing, to

38 Hackett, pp. 139-140.

39 Examples of Shaw's "purposeful selection" are: his treatment of the question of Joan's illness, which Shaw solves by having her say that carp does not agree with her; his anachronisms at Rheims, anticipating the Burgundian treaty by several weeks, the burning of Pierronne by several months, and the selection of Cauchon as her judge, which could hardly have been foreseen at this time. He suppressed the record of Joan's judgment at Poitiers and the approval of the theologians who examined her there, as well as her appeals to the Pope and to the Council of Basle. The contemporary evidence given at the trial for her rehabilitation is completely rejected by Shaw, and he justifies this rejection by putting his opinions into the mouth of Martin Ladvenu. Further distortions of Joan's character are noted in Chapter VI, pp. 185-186, 190, 193-194, 200, 203, 204, and 206.
say the least; historians are still trying to sift truth from Shavian opinion, and the public's view of Joan is often distorted by Shaw's polemics which have been echoed by many of her biographers since.

If Joan was an ideal subject for Shaw's thesis, she was equally adaptable to Anderson's. Since Shaw had raised the question as to exactly what she did believe and had pictured her as the first Protestant martyr, Anderson could use her to uphold the individual conscience rather than divinely appointed authority as the standard of faith. Anderson has a tendency to use history to back up what he has to say about his own times, and Joan's story was the kind of history which would support his comments on integrity and compromise. At the same time it provided a dashing role for a charming actress, which promised good box office results. All in all, it was just the story he needed.

Anouilh's choice of Joan was determined by French patriotism. Joan of Arc is to the spirit of France what Santa Claus is to Christmas, Charlemagne, Louis, and Genevieve, dear as they are to French hearts, lack the complete identity which in Joan's case is recognized by atheists as well as Christians. Since his theme was the indomitable spirit of free France, his choice of Joan was almost forced upon him. Having accepted it, he did not permit it to limit the scope of his drama; wherever alterations were indicated he made them without scruple.

Maeterlinck also chose Joan as the spirit of France, but his dedication shows a deeper preoccupation with her as a person. Perhaps his wife's devotion to Joan made him see her as the reincarnation of the Maid; at any rate it was with his wife in mind that Maeterlinck characterized his Joan, and the result is tender if not completely true. Since his thesis was not so limiting as those of Shaw, Anouilh, and Anderson, he could adhere more strictly to the actual
records of the trial, giving a more authentic touch to his version of the story.

Peguy had always loved Jeanne d'Arc; she was the patron saint of his life, the subject of an epic, an essay, a poem, and a play from his pen. His choice of her, then, was not determined by his theme; rather she was the expression of whatever theme he had in mind in the successive stages of his life. He found in her the answers to his questions, the exemplar of all nobility, the argument for every cause. The Joan he portrayed was often an expression of himself.

Garnett also wrote simply to tell Joan's story, which he thought worth retelling. Apparently it was the virility of the story itself rather than any point he wished to stress that made him select Joan as heroine of his drama.

Claudel, as was previously quoted, had no intention of writing about Joan of Arc. He disliked the idea of using great men for drama as their lives limited the dramatist. His play was written at the suggestion of a friend and as a result of a personal inspiration which was so strong that the play seemed almost to write itself. Its theme is the dominant theme in most of Claudel's work--God's nearness to, even within, His creatures, and the joy which results from this union with God. Since this theme was so much a part of Claudel's personality, it is not surprising that it permeates his Jeanne d'Arc au Bucher.

The themes, then, have been chosen; the compasses are set, and the dramatists have selected the materials necessary for their voyage. It now remains to show how the destination of each determined the style of the vessel and its accoutrements.
CHAPTER V

DRAMATIC TECHNIQUES IN THE JOAN-OF-ARC PLAYS

Early in 1955 Anouilh's L'Alouette was produced in London following on the heels of two other Joan plays—Shaw's Saint Joan, starring Siobhan McKenna, and the Claudel-Honegger Joan of Arc at the Stake, with Ingrid Bergman playing Joan.1 A London playgoer might have taken in all three in one season without a minute of boredom, such is the variety in the three presentations of the story. The fact that the three would be produced almost simultaneously in the same city is a proof of the appeal of the subject and the dramatic versatility of the playwrights.

Peguy and Garnett had little of this dramatic skill. Peguy's setting is a hillside near Domremy, where Jeannette sits spinning through most of the play. There is little action or movement except for her pauses in the spinning and the entrances and exits of the other two characters. The plot development is also minor; it consists of a gradual unfolding of the rich tapestry of this peasant girl's soul. Even the dialogue, beautiful as it is, lacks dramatic force because the characters have so little interplay. It is not dialogue, but dual soliloquys. Peguy was a poet rather than a dramatist, and Le Mystere de la Charite de Jeanne d'Arc is more suitable for reading than for stage presentation.

Garnett's work shows some knowledge of theater, but there is little originality in its dramaturgy. The style is realistic with leanings towards

melodrama, particularly in the scenes where the assessors express their opinions with fear of being overheard and when Cauchon's "priestly blandness" breaks.² In some of his lines Warwick gives the effect of the villain twirling his moustaches, and the final curtain falls on a highly melodramatic execution scene. Garnett's most original scene is probably the bawdy play-acting of the guards in Joan's cell, slightly reminiscent of Shakespeare at his worst. The dialogue is frequently stilted, though it comes to life at times with a sudden burst of genuineness. Occasional asides and soliloquys strengthen the impression of melodrama.

The ugly sensuality of Loiseleur deepens the reader's understanding of the spiritual torture Joan endured; this and the timidity of the priests who sympathized with her heighten the tragic atmosphere of the play. This atmosphere is not broken by the merriment of the jailers which rather deepens it by contrast, since its effect on Joan is not lost. Lighting is used to intensify this mood; there are places where the stage directions call for "a single flambeau ... A group of priests is standing together, their shadows are seen moving on the walls, but their figures cannot be identified in the flickering light," or "The door leading into the prison chamber opens and Jeanne is seen, by the light of a flambeau carried by an English soldier ... The soldier ... retires with the light, the way he has come ... Jeanne is heard murmuring in prayer in the darkness."³

³Ibid., pp. 344, 347.
The plot development follows the records of the trial with few departures from them. One of these departures is the actual application of screws on her hands; in the trial she was only threatened with torture. Others are the amorous advances of Loiseleur and the fainting spell of Master William Erard. The climax comes after the merry-making of the soldiers, when Jeanne is found wearing her soldier's dress again and is accused of being a relapsed heretic. After a momentary breakdown she shows herself stronger than her judges still as she holds them responsible for her death.

Garnett fits his action into a five-act framework, finding enough material in the trial to fill five acts. He has solved the problem of every dramatist who portrays Joan—that of so much action in her life—by showing only the trial scene and revealing what has gone before in the questioning of the trial. While the exposition given in this way is sufficient, some of the best action and characterization of Joan is sacrificed by showing her only in captivity.

Paul Claudel also uses the trial as the setting for his oratorio, but the exposition is given by means of flashbacks. It is sketchy, depending upon a fair knowledge of Joan's story in the audience—a supposition more justifiable in France than in England and America. The purpose of the exposition is more to explain the theme than the action.

Claudel's setting is a two-level stage joined by a stairway. On the second level is a stake to which Jeanne is attached by chains.\(^4\) St. Dominic sits on the steps while talking to her, and the recalled action takes place on

\(^4\)Claudel, Jeanne d'Arc au Bucher, p. 10.
the first level while the scene on the second level is obscured completely. This same setting is used throughout the play, with the lights picking up the action and, as it nears the climax, giving the effect of sunrise on the second level. Only the heavenly characters share this stage with Jeanne; all others act below.

The flashbacks and the two-level stage are not Claudel's only departures from reality. The entire play is unrealistic with a medieval touch to its fantasy which is simple enough to delight a child, yet so deeply symbolic that even a mystic could contemplate it for days without grasping all its possibilities of meaning. This depth of fantasy permits humor even in the trial scene, where the judges are shown as beasts rather than men and the sound-effects they utter are suitable to their animal characters! Yet even here the symbolism is deep, for the presiding judge is a pig (Cauchon means pig) and the assessors are sheep. (One of the actual assessors in Joan's trial was named Mouton, and many of them did follow their leader with the stolidity of sheep.) The recorder is a donkey; the reason for this is made clear when he becomes confused between what Jeanne replies and what the judges wish her to reply and the result is a false record. Other animals who possess more courage and cunning—the tiger, the fox, and the serpent—have refused to take part in the trial. They recall the men who had courage enough to denounce the invalidity of the trial to Cauchon or to leave Rouen.

Few props are used in Claudel's play. These include the stake, the book held by St. Dominic, the king's throne, and the flutes and trumpets which announce his coming. Costuming, however, is colorful. Besides the animal heads worn during the trial scene, there are the rustics, heralds, soldiers, kings and
queens, the giant Heurtebise, and the saints whose outfits add rich pageantry to the performance.

The action is also dramatic and meaningful. After the humorous trial scene comes the explanation of the game of cards, in which the suits are Burgundy, England, France, and Death. They dance through three mock battles in which the kings change sides, but the queens (Pride, Foolishness, Avarice, and Luxury) remain in their places. The result of the game is that both sides have won and lost and Guillaume Flavy, the knave on the side of death, has delivered Jeanne d'Arc to the English and Burgundians. (De Flavy was the commander of the fortress at Compiegne, and it was by his order that the drawbridge was raised, leaving Joan and her party outside at the mercy of the enemy.) In Scene VII Joan hears her Voices speak and sees herself as the little girl of Domremy answering them. There follows the preparation for the coronation of her king. On the road to Rheims groups of peasants rejoice at the reunion of the giant Heurtebise (a windmill wearing a straw hat) with his wife, the mother of the wine-casks. His accent of Picardy and her Burgundian speech reveal the symbolism in this reunion—they represent the parts of France reunited through Joan's victories. Here again there is a deeper religious significance, for Heurtebise represents the area where wheat is grown and ground for bread, while his wife symbolizes the rich vineyards which produce the wine. The reunion is celebrated with a grotesque dance (could a dance with a windmill be anything else?) which is interrupted by a herald rising up like a candle in the midst of the crowd. Bells sound, and Perrot from the height of a tree where he can see into the distance announces the coming of the king. If there is any doubt that the King of Heaven is meant as well as the king of France, it is dispelled by
Dominic's question at the end of this scene: "Jeanne! Jeanne! Jeanne! Est-ce pour un Roi de chair que tu as donne ton sang virginal?"  

In Scene IX the sun has risen and Jeanne in memory returns to Domremy, where she assists at a procession of children bearing gifts for the Virgin. She offers herself as a gift, a candle to burn before Mary's virginal altar. Our Lady accepts the gift, and in the midst of her flames Jeanne breaks the chains which bind her and throws up her arms in the joy of self-oblation.

Arthur Honegger's music, ranging from the spontaneity of a medieval chanson to the solemnity of Gregorian chant, is an ideal setting for Claudel's libretto. These two have collaborated on four musicals, and Honegger shares so intimately the inspirations of Claudel that the poet has called him "un autre moi-même." The stage directions give hints of other musical sound effects—trumpets, flutes, and particularly the bells, which sound the sweetness of the Angelus in which Joan heard her Voices, the hushed expectancy of the Sanctus bell which announces the coming of the King, and the toll of the knell reminding Christians to pray for Jeanne d'Arc who is about to die.

The vibrant rhythm of the music overflows into the dialogue which is basically an unrhymed poetry with a free cadence reminiscent of the psalms. Occasionally the French bursts into rhymed and metered song or gives way to Latin phrases or lines of canticles. The dialogue is always fitting, from the "Beel bee! bee!" of the sheep in the trial scene to the "Spira--spera--spira--

5Ibid., p. 67.
6Claudel, Mémoires Improvises, p. 302.
spera" of St. Margaret. Poetry is never far from the surface and occasionally breaks through in bursts of splendor, echoing and reechoing like cathedral chimes. Jeanne, for example (p. 82), chanting the children's hymn offering the gifts to make candles for the Virgin, changes the words and sings, "It is I who will be her beautiful candle." The choirs representing good and evil, after arguing Jeanne's case in song, join in a hymn of praise to fire, which is wise, strong, living, ardent, incorruptible—and repeat it with variations, finally chanting to praise our sister the flame who is pure, strong, living, invincible. They end by praising our Sister Jeanne who will always be as a flame in the middle of France. This use of choirs or choruses representing Good and Evil, to comment upon the action and echo the theme of the play adds to its poetic quality.

Claudel's drama is so rich in symbolism that a whole book could be given to this subject alone. The union of Heurtebise and his wife symbolizing the union of France and the Sacrifice of the Mass has already been noted. The coronation recalled Joan's determined proclamations of the Kingship of Christ, and symbolized that she had not only united France in its various parts, but had also reunited the kingdom of France to the Kingdom of Heaven.

The book which Dominic holds symbolizes the records of her two trials, but more especially the Heavenly Record of her deeds. Perrot, the peasant who sees from the top of the tree the coming of the king, symbolizes the infallibility of the Pope who can see from his position as Head of the Church more deeply than

7Claudel, Jeanne d'Arc au Bucher, pp. 34-35, 51.
others into the secrets of God. The sunrise symbolizes the freedom of France and its return to Christ, and the beautiful symbolism of Joan as a candle burned for France on Our Lady's altar has been noted above. The card-game scene is a reminder that in the sight of God the Hundred Years' War had no more importance than a game of cards, and even on earth it was often played with the same disregard for results. Colors are also symbolic, especially the black and white combined in Dominic's habit, in the black bell and the white bell, in Catherine, the Egyptian saint, and Margaret, the Greek, in the white of Hurettaise's bread and the black of the clerk, in the contrast of the forces of Good and Evil.

Joan's sword becomes another important symbol. She tells Dominic she had found it, not in an abandoned Church, but at Domremy where it was given to her by St. Michael. The sword is called love, and recalls to mind the sword of the spirit mentioned by St. Paul as the armor of the Christian.

Father Francisco Aparicio has said that the perfect symbol should have meaning on successive planes, a sense of vibration with the entire universe, a real union or integration with the universe. Claudel's dramatic symbols have this ever-widening range of meaning. This makes his plays too poetic for large audiences, too rich for the ordinary playgoer to stomach. To appreciate

8 Claudel, Jeanne d'Arc au Bucher, p. 78. Actually the sword was found behind the altar of the Church of St. Catherine in Fierbois, where Joan told the king's messenger to look. The Church was not abandoned, but the sword had long been buried there, and was rumored to have been the one carried by Charles Martel in the Battle of Tours. (Stolpe, p. 101).

9 "Neuvo Teatro Sobre Juana de Arco," Razon y Fe, CXLIX (June 1954), 551.
Claudel one needs the faith of a Catholic, the simplicity of a child, and the vision of a poet. It may be that a consistent study of Claudel would give the faith, the simplicity, the vision, to one who did not possess them.

Jean Anouilh has been accused of having borrowed the plan of L'Alouette, the trial with flashbacks of Joan's previous life, from Claudel. This may or may not be true; such a plan could have occurred to two dramatists independently, especially as they used the plan in such different ways; however Anouilh's use of the deck of cards to explain the war, even to giving the credit for their invention to the Dauphin's mad father is a very close parallel of this scene in Claudel and argues some relationship between the two works. And since Claudel's was published five years before Anouilh's was written, it is safe to assume that Anouilh had read Jeanne d'Arc au Bucher.

Anouilh's work is strictly non-realistic, beginning with all the characters grouped on the stage for the trial, which Warwick is in a hurry to begin. Cauchon protests: "But, my lord, before we do that we have the whole story to play: Domremy, the Voices, Vaucouleurs, Chinon, the Coronation!" In this

10williamson, p. 52.

11Playing cards were introduced into France sometime during the fourteenth century, but were originally invented in Asia. The early French cards had no queen; instead there was a king, a chevalier, and a knave. The queen was later substituted for the chevalier. Basic Everyday Encyclopedia ed. Jess Stein. (New York, 1954), s.v. "playing cards."

12The Lark, Fry, p. 1.
line Anouilh gives a preview of the scenes to follow and sets the tone—an artificial "playing" of the story. This tone is strengthened when Ladvenu protests at her father's brutality in beating Joan. "We can do nothing, Brother Ladvenu," Cauchon reminds him. "At this part of the story we have never met Joan; we don't get to know her until the trial. We can only act our parts, each his own, good or bad, as they are written, and in his turn." Such a theatrical approach is an obstacle to the creation of the dramatic illusion which should involve the audience in an empathic participation in the play. On the other hand it gives the impression of novelty, of whimsical triviality, which is more in keeping with Anouilh's style, and it fits his purpose by permitting twentieth-century allusions in the fifteenth-century dialogue.

Past, present, and future are so fused—sometimes confused seems a more apt word—that it is difficult to pin a date on any speech and say, "This was spoken in 1419—or 1431—or 1944." Joan, given permission to begin wherever she wishes, chooses to begin in the beginning, at Domremy. Yet even in these scenes of her childhood characters from her later life interrupt to comment, even to ask questions and involve themselves in a conversation with Joan—the peasant girl or the girl on trial? It is difficult to say which. Apparently Joan is confused about this herself, for when she is asked if she believes herself in the state of grace she wonders what phase of her life the question applies to—Domremy, which is the scene being played; the trial, framework for the entire first act; or after her recantation, which followed the trial at

---

13 Ibid., p. 15.
which she is being asked the question!

Each scene is introduced by discussion and acted out as Joan recalls it in a stream-of-consciousness kind of way, to be dispelled like a memory when something fresher is introduced. The weakness of this method is that it is not purely stream-of-consciousness; scenes are "recalled" of which Joan was not a part, and of which therefore she could not have remembrance. For that matter, neither could Warwick nor Cauchon, who act as interlocutors in tying the sections together, have recalled the scene at Chinon which involved only the court characters. Claudel had handled this problem more adroitly by using St. Dominic, a heavenly character, as the interpreter of the action, reading from the book of Joan's life. Superior knowledge of men and events could be supposed in a canonized saint returning to earth.

Anouilh's action, however, is cleverly contrived. In places his translators failed to appreciate this cleverness; for example, in the original Baudricourt waits somewhat impatiently for his turn to take the center of the stage, and starts forward eagerly each time Joan and her father mention his name. The other characters find it necessary to restrain him forcibly, telling him it's not time for him yet.\(^{14}\) When the time does come, however, he is taken by surprise as Joan, chasing her brother across the stage, hurls herself right into his protruding paunch, knocking the breath out of him. From this head-on meeting Joan goes right into her request for a horse and an escort and the show goes on. In places the action emphasizes the "urchinly" quality of Anouilh's Joan in a most unsaintly manner. She sits on the edge of a table draining a

\(^{14}\)_{L'Aloette}, pp. 16, 39.
wineglass while out-talking Baudricourt; she sticks out her tongue at the guard; she slaps her thighs in uproarious merriment with the Dauphin over the embarrassment of his counsellors; she throws herself into La Hire's arms in her joy at seeing him.15 Warwick's actions are equally effective in characterization, particularly his habit of languidly smelling the rose he holds in his hand, and his imperious rapping on his boot to sum on one of his men.16 Joan's brother is constantly picking his nose; Baudricourt looks furtively at himself in a mirror, or mops his brow when the effort to think is too much for him; the Dauphin stamps his foot like a child and plays cup-and-ball seated upside down in his throne.17 In general there is more action in the French version than in either translation, though some of these gestures are given in one or other of them.

Scenery is scant in L'Alouette, partly because of the theatrical style of the piece with its accent on simplicity, partly also because of wartime restrictions.18 Only for the coronation scene is any real scenery used. Lighting effects are important in production of this play, obscuring the characters not

15 Ibid., p. 64; p. 72; p. 130; p. 163.

16 Ibid., pp. 15, 43, 133.

17 Ibid., pp. 17, 51, 228; pp. 59, 70; pp. 79, 91.

18 Harold Hobson, The French Theatre of Today (London, 1953), describes the Paris wartime production of L'Alouette: "The electricity supply failed; the theatre in the Spring of 1944 played by daylight, which, for the Atelier, meant gathering the players round the prompter's box, in a narrow space on which fell a shaft of light through the roof." (p. 44).
concerned in a scene and highlighting those concerned. One curtain is used to divide the play into two acts. It falls, in Anouilh's version, as the Archbishop is giving his blessing before Joan sets out for Orleans, and rises on the same scene, which Warwick interrupts to get on with the trial.

Costuming is simple, suggesting medieval times vaguely; Joan's outfit is athletic and boyish, but gives no hint of shining armor. Sound effects are also simple; two musical sounds are introduced—a fife, which provides background for the appearance of the soldier La Hire, and bells during the coronation scene with which the play closes.

Anouilh's dialogue is clever and catchy. It sometimes gives a hint of poetry; more often it smacks of vulgarity, particularly in the speeches of the Promoter and the soldiery. Hellman's adaptation plays up most of the raciness, but introduces some lines that are supposed to give a loftier plane of meaning to the play. It is singularly reticent, however, in mentioning God, who has little to do with the Joan who appeared on the American stage. Anouilh's Joan has heard St. Michael explain that even if God has commanded what seems impossible, she must attempt it. He permits obstacles only that she may have more confidence in Him, but will be with her, especially when she overcomes her fear. Joan grasps this lesson well enough to convey it in her turn to the Dauphin, and she tells her judges that when a poor girl says a few words of common sense, that is God working in her. He doesn't waste miracles when he can get results more economically.19 Anouilh's Joan doesn't always behave like

19L'Alouette, pp. 49, 126, 129, 142.
saint, but she has an awareness of God which is somewhat diminished in translation. Fry captures more of it than Hellman.

Fry's translation is frequently more poetic than the original, particularly in the Promoter's speeches, where the ugly sensuality of this character—more beast than man—is softened with words equally suggestive, but less raw. Fry also omits the brother's nose-picking and substitutes for the soldier's unprintable insult to the Promoter in the last scene a mild, "You choke yourself." 20

The dialogue in L'Alouette seldom lags, even in the longer passages or in places where the theme is being emphasized. Always there is a subtle barb pointed at some phase of modern society, or a clever analogy, or a bit of whimsical nonsense or naive narrative to give life to the lines and hold the audience in relaxed but alert attention. Anouilh's dialogue, like his dramatic skill, is one of his strong points.

The dominant dramatic symbol in the play is the lark, which symbolizes Joan, "the herald of the dawn of individual freedom of mind and her own sainthood," 21 and France. Warwick draws out this symbolism, attributing the success of the French armies to Joan, "singing like a lark in the sky over the heads of your French armies on the march. I am very fond of France, my Lord; which is why I should be most unhappy if we lost her. This lark singing in the sky,

20 The Lark, Fry, p. 99.

21 Williamson, p. 53.
while we all take aim to shoot her down: that seems very like France to me. Or at least like the best of her. In her time she has had plenty of fools, rogues and blunderers; but every now and then a lark sings in her sky, and the fools and rogues can be forgotten. I am very fond of France."22 Charles's cup-and-ball also becomes symbolic when he holds it up as an orb and sceptre and pretends to govern. He prefers to play cup-and-ball, explaining to his mother-in-law, "When the ball misses the cup, it drops on to my nose and nobody else's. But sit me on the throne the right way up, with the orb in one hand and the sceptre in the other, then whenever I make a mistake the ball will drop on everybody's nose."23

Finally, Anouilh's violation of time sequence is symbolic. Joan is hauled down from the stake to take part in the coronation scene which closes the play at a high point of exultation and triumph. Warwick, symbol of the forces of occupation, departs, and this moment of triumph belongs to France alone, free France. This anachronistic ending clearly shows that Anouilh was more concerned with Joan as a symbol of France than as a person, for this was France's triumph; her death was hers. The Dauphin explains the symbolism of this last scene. (In his translation Fry gives this speech to Cauchon; Hellman divides what little she uses of it24 between Ladvenu and La Hire, whom she has substituted for Baudricourt as the one who interrupts the burning.) "The real

22The Lark, Fry, pp. 56-57.
23Ibid., p. 38.
24The Lark, Fry, p. 103; Hellman, p. 143.
end of Joan's story, the end which will never come to an end, which they will always tell, long after they have forgotten our names or confused them all together: it isn't the painful and miserable end of the cornered animal caught at Rouen; but the lark singing in the open sky, Joan at Rheims in all her glory. The true end of the story is a kind of joy. Joan of Arc: a story which ends happily. Fry, with a keen sense of climax, ends here; so does Hellman, though her ending is less climactic because the speeches are broken. Anouilh adds two ironic touches—Baudricourt's protest about the fools who "were going to burn Joan of Arc—can you imagine that,!" and Joan's father who tells her brother to take his fingers out of his nose and try to be like his sister. "I always said she was going to go places!"

Anouilh's purpose was to bring a note of hope, a stiffening of the backbone of resistance, to the French people in occupied Paris. Hence his story is not really of Joan, but of France at her lowest ebb surviving all threats of destruction. He attempts to weave in with this theme some of the light recreation which he felt the people needed in such troubled times; this is the purpose of his bawdy witticisms and his frivolous talk of women, styles, and sex, sometimes so prevalent in the dialogue that Joan seems to be merely the link which connects one course individual with another, or the magnet which brings out their less polished ore. This characteristic caused one writer to comment,

25 The Lark, Fry, p. 103. This speech, although spoken by Cauchon, is a pretty accurate translation of Charles's lines in Anouilh, p. 227.

26 Anouilh, L'Alouette, pp. 227, 228.
"L'Alouette is expertly put together, superficially clever, and very empty"—a neat summary of the play's strengths and weaknesses.

Maeterlinck's plot structure is realistic. Beginning with Joan's arrival at Chinon he presents all of her life, her battles, her captivity in all its phases, her trial, the abjuration, and her burning. With characteristic boldness he presents bits of battle-scene on stage and even the stake on which Joan is burning is seen off to one side. The difficulties which other playwrights cleverly avoided he tackled head on.

The settings are realistic but not elaborate. In the first scene where over one hundred courtiers are present only closed curtains in the background are needed. In subsequent scenes the stage directions call for light projections of the towns where Joan fought, a massive structure for the tower of Beaurevoir, forty stalls in the chapel where Joan is judged, two platforms at the scene of the abjuration, and one platform and the stake at the execution scene. The settings, in other words, change frequently—there are twelve tableaus in the play—and, though simple, scenes are not easily adapted from former settings. The play would require expert staging.

The time covered by the play is the two years from Joan's first interview with the Dauphin to her death. It is presented in order, and where it is necessary to condense, Maeterlinck explains this in the stage direction or in a footnote. Thus he presents six battles in rapid succession in the third tableau.

and condenses the entire trial into one sitting.

The fusion of past, present, and future is cleverly handled. In the first scene Tremouille and Gilles de Rais question de Metz and Poulengy, her companions on the journey from Vaucouleurs. In this way the necessary exposition is given and Joan is introduced to the audience through her friends before she appears on stage. In her conversation with the Dauphin Joan is given some inside information on the affairs of state, which the audience shares. The story of Joan's capture is brought out by the women of her captor's household, and further details of her childhood, her Voices, and her military life are brought out by questioning during the trial. Even the historical past is linked to the fifteenth century in the Dauphin's examples of military strategy taken from Roman history.

Maeterlinck's projection into the future is even more marked than his exposition. Here he is in his element, creating an atmosphere of impending doom combined with a mood of resignation and prophetic exaltation. In Joan's first interview with the Dauphin he tells her that he is afraid. She says that she has not yet known fear, but that a time will come when she will be afraid. "You will not be there ... you will have forgotten me." Later she tells him he will be a great king. "Yes," he replies, "but not immediately. It is necessary that I learn." Joan foretells her capture to her companions-in-arms, and as they continue to question her she tells them that she will be delivered—from what she does not yet know—a great fire, perhaps, or the end of the

---

28 Maeterlinck, pp. 29-40, p. 77.
world—but finally she will be with God in heaven. After his coronation she repeats the prophecy of her coming capture to the king. During her trial she tells her judges that her deliverance will come within three months, that her king will win back all of France, but she will not be living when this happens. Most fearful of all the glimpses into the future, however, is that given by the invisible voice which reproaches her judges during her trial. "I see the body of the promotor in a sewer of Rouen," he says. As to Cauchon, he dares not foretell. Ask it of God, he tells the bishop.

Musical effects are few, but effective. There are trumpets to announce the coming of the king, the Te Deum chanted in thanksgiving for the deliverance of Orleans and again at the coronation; there is a song by the captive poet Charles of Orleans sung by the wife of Jean of Luxembourg in the house where Joan is captive. Lighting effects and costuming are left, for the most part, to the discretion of those staging the play. Maeterlinck does mention, however, Joan's silver armor and the red mantle similar to that in which she was captured, which is offered to her by her captor's wife and which she wears when she jumps from the tower of Beaurevoir.

29 The above quotations are taken from Maeterlinck's Jeanne d'Arc, pp. 18-19, 23, 36-37, 48, and 93-94. trans. the author.

30 Ibid., p. 112. The body of d'Estivet was actually found in a Rouen sewer in 1438; Nicolas Midi contracted leprosy; Cauchon died of a stroke while his barber was shaving him. These sudden deaths were regarded by the people as the judgment of God upon those who had falsely judged the Maid. (Pierre Champion, "Dramatis Personae," pp. 417, 424-425, 407.)
Some of Maeterlinck's stage directions, particularly those calling for a crowd of one hundred people, or armies of several hundred, give the impression that the play is intended for reading rather than producing. This impression is borne out in the battle scenes where most of the action—including Joan's being wounded—is given in the stage directions at the beginning of the scene, and again in the coronation scene where the entire ceremony, words and actions, is condensed into a few lines of stage direction. A producer would have to decide whether to have these directions read by a narrator, pantomime them, or provide the words necessary to fill in the ceremonies. The same is true of the recantation scene where the stage directions call for an argument between Cauchon and an officer of the Cardinal of England and a disturbance by the crowd, but no words are given for the one or the other.

The final stage direction is an excellent example of Maeterlinck's dramatic quality at its best. All the high dignitaries have left the platform after the execution, and Cauchon, mitred, leaning upon his cross, groping as though suddenly blind, is the last to leave it as though he were descending into the tomb. 31

Maeterlinck's dialogue in many places uses the actual words of Jeanne d'Arc. This is especially true of the trial scene, but her words permeate other parts of the dialogue too, and Maeterlinck seems to have been familiar enough with her speech that the other lines he assigns her fit in, for the most part, with the lines he has taken from her history.

31 Maeterlinck, p. 136.
In the siege of Jargeau, for example, it is her own words Maeterlinck puts into Joan's mouth as she summons the men to the assault. "We have no time to lose. We must attack when God wills it. Strike, He strikes for you! To the assault! Are you afraid, my handsome duke? Have you forgotten that I promised the duchess to bring you back safe and sound?"\(^32\)

Her words to La Hire are not quoted from historical records, but they bear the stamp of the saint. She mildly reproaches him for his swearing (p. 35), but adds the reminder, "Do not forget that each oath you hold back becomes a prayer." The same is true of her conversations with the king. Except for a tendency to occasional kissing, which is more a characteristic of the French than of Jeanne d'Arc, the words Maeterlinck assigns to the saint might well be her own. In the trial scene they are her own words, and of all the dramatists who portray her earthly trial he is the only one besides Garnett who mentions her appeal to the Pope.

Maeterlinck's diction is a prose which gains poetic impetus by short, clipped lines, questions and answers, and artful repetitions. Occasionally there is a touch of strong dramatic irony, as when the judges, having decided to refrain from torturing her that she might die on the stake and not in prison (p. 125), conclude their deliberations with the "Pater noster . . . et ne nos inducas in tentationem" to which all respond, "Sed libera nos a malo. Amen."

The symbolism of the play centers around the angel and crown mentioned by

\(^{32}\)Ibid., pp. 30-31. trans. the author.
Joan in one of the sessions of the trial. Historians have long debated the significance of her words, especially since the bulk of her answers on this point are contained in documents appended to the trial record after her death and not signed by the notaries—documents which are generally recognized as the judges' efforts to justify their sentence. In this document the testimony is given by some of those who took part in the trial that Joan had admitted that the sign she gave her king was an angel with a golden crown, that she had accompanied this angel, and that later she had admitted there was no angel, but she herself was the angel.

No satisfactory explanation of this confused statement has yet been given; Stolpe comes closest when he suggests (p. 244) that Joan was speaking in allegory, trying to explain a spiritual experience which defied the power of words to express it. But Maeterlinck poses an explanation of his own in his second tableau, where he has Joan ask to see the crown. She describes the crown and the angel holding it as they have been revealed to her; Charles also has had this revelation in a dream, and has had a crown and a statue of an angel made like those of his dream. He keeps these hidden in his private chapel, and no one knows of them. Joan takes the crown from the angel and places it symbolically on Charles's head, claiming that it is her right. Later in the same scene, when the angel and crown are back in their hiding place, Tremouille and de Rais slip into the chapel, which they have never before been permitted

33 "Subsequent Documents" Trial, Barrett, p. 367.

34 Ibid., p. 369.
to enter. Their disappointment is ironic as they comment that it has no altar nor even any hidden treasure. In the light of this scene, Maeterlinck's presentation of the coronation and Joan's answers during the trial take on a new significance.

Maeterlinck is less at home in the atmosphere of the heavenly than in the imaginative horrors of the kind of supernatural he generally portrays. This has made his dramatic technique less effective in Jeanne d'Arc than it was in some of his earlier plays. The hand of the old master is a bit shaky, but it is still masterful, particularly in his staccato dialogue and in his creation of mood.

The structural plan of Shaw's Saint Joan is for the most part realistic. The play consists of six scenes and an epilogue; the playing time is three and a half hours. The epilogue, the only non-realistic element in the play, shows Joan's return to earth in 1456 and in 1920 and emphasizes that the world today would receive her no more eagerly than did France and England in the fifteenth century. This bit of fantasy is inspired by Shaw's theme. The contrast between its non-realistic effect and the realism of the rest of the play has been sharply criticized by some, and it was suggested to the playwright that he should omit the epilogue. He replied: "You're quite wrong there, Henderson. The Epilogue is indispensable as brief reflection will show you . . . Saint Joan will always be a star play for a big actress. Catch her cutting the Epilogue and letting Stogumber steal the end of the play from her!"35 Actually

35Henderson, p. 600.
the epilogue is Shaw stealing the end of the play, sending the audience away with a strong taste of Shavian propaganda in their mouths. In point of fact it is a clever device, and Shaw's propaganda seems to have been more successful in Saint Joan than in most of his other plays.

Shaw disliked spectacle in historical plays because it tends to widen the gulf between past and present. His stage directions call for minimal staging effects; he hoped by selective realism to emphasize the theme rather than the background. His action is compact and well chosen. He does not attempt to depict the battles or Joan's execution on stage; he portrays well what he portrays, limiting himself in the body of the play to the last year of Joan's life. Between actual events he inserts a few scenes created or enlivened by his own imagination, giving a fresh vitality to the old story. Two excellent examples of this are the comic discussion of eggs between Baudricourt and his steward and the lyrically lovely tapestry of Dunois and his page watching a kingfisher by the river as they wait for the coming of the Maid.

While Shaw's play is, in the main, historic, the dialogue makes projections into the future by hints, voiced by Ladvenu and repeated by Warwick, that perhaps Joan will not be forgotten. De Rais' death is foretold by the Archbishop, and Joan's capture and death are discussed in advance by both parties. Exposition is cleverly worked in, so that the audience learns of Joan's years in Domremy and her Voices without reliving her childhood; though his starting-point with regard to Joan's life is later than Anouilh's or Anderson's, his coverage is every bit as thorough.

Shaw's main projection into the future (our present) is given in the epilogue. This is not a mere caboose added on to give the play an extra boost;
rather it might almost be said that Shaw wrote the play for the sake of the epilogue. Joan's return to earth and men's failure to receive her underscores Shaw's theme of the unpopularity of men of vision.

Shaw has not the prophetic sense of foreboding noticeable in Masterlinck's play; this would be out of keeping with the lighter spirit of his work. In the coronation scene, however, the future is not just hinted; it is plainly stated. The king and Joan's soldier-companions warn her that the time will come when she will be captured if she keeps on being so presumptuous, and that when she is captured the French will not be able to save her and the English will burn her as a witch.

The strong prose for which Shaw is famous rises to new heights in the dialogue of Saint Joan. There are flashes of humor and of clever repartee; there are scenes where Shaw's wit predominates; nevertheless this is not intended to be a comedy, and is more seriously treated than most of Shaw's subjects. The play is long with many discussion scenes; some of the speeches are lengthy and tend to become tiresome. Shaw emphasizes that Joan cleaned up the language of the army; the language of Shaw's play also bears her mark—and his—with none of the bawdiness Anouilh and Anderson find necessary for atmosphere.

There is a strongly British flavor in the language of the play. Joan calls the Dauphin "Charley," John de Metz "Jack," Bertrand Poulengy "Polly," and Baudricourt "Robert." She says of herself that she is called "Jenny" at home. An artificial note is struck in her use of "thee" and "thou"; intended to sound rural, it sometimes sounds Quakerish instead. Her flowery speech at the time of her relapse has been highly criticized for its pantheistic praise of freedom and its overpoetic tones, especially on the tongue of the sensible Shavian Joan.
Desmond MacCarthy's criticism goes deeper: "This speech is the false note; to Joan the Mass and the Church were infinitely more important than lambs and larks or communion with nature. Mr. Shaw has made her out more of a modern Protestant than any facts warrant." 36

Even Bentley, usually rather partial to Shaw, has a criticism on this point: "Joan's dialect is silly, her occasional prose poetry forced, many of the jokes . . . decidedly musty." 37

Maxwell Anderson's Joan of Lorraine makes use of another non-realistic technique—that of a play within a play. The characters are theater people putting on a play about Joan of Arc; all the action and discussions take place at rehearsals. Stark Young points out the advantages of this technique in a review of the play: "This scheme first of all avoids the pageantry and pseudo-historical trappings of most such plays, almost sure to be trashy, to put it mildly. It also allows the dramatist to get in his views concerning history and truth, illusion, democracy, and what not." 38 This theatricalist technique also gives a fresh approach to the story of St. Joan and a casual atmosphere to the play itself.

But there are disadvantages too. In a sense the play is both realistic and non-realistic, for each time the Joan-sequences have absorbed the reader or

36 "Saint Joan" Shaw, p. 168.

37 Bernard Shaw, p. 172.

38 "Barrie, Ibsen, Anderson," New Republic, CIX (December 2, 1946), 726.
the audience, the illusion is broken by a return to the actors and their rehearsal set-up. This breaking of the dramatic illusion, although necessary for his theme, weakens the play. Yet it is saying a great deal in Anderson's favor to grant that the illusion has been created at all in the setting in which the piece is played. For an actress in modern street dress crouched between chairs with a box in her lap to give the effect of the young Joan of Domremy nursing a sick lamb in a stable, everything depends on the dialogue. That Anderson has put this power into at least some of his lines is undeniable.

The setting throughout the play shares this atmosphere of casual simplicity. The scene in Act One is described as "a stage as it's likely to appear at the beginning of a rehearsal. Some chairs are set in a semicircle to the left without much order. In the center ... a rehearsal version of a fifteenth century kitchen. A table ... with some miscellaneous, battered chairs around it. A chair and a stool are arranged to indicate a fireplace; two other chairs, back to back, stand for a doorway."39

Later the chairs are moved to form a sheep cote. Stools and benches are used to suggest a bed. Dunois opens an imaginary window and pretends to knock on an imaginary door, while the stage manager provides the sound by rapping on the table. Toward the end of the scene a piece of scenery is pushed onto the stage with its wrong side facing the audience.

39 Anderson, Joan of Lorraine, p. 3.
This expressionistic type of setting is modified somewhat in the second act, where "two pieces of scenery have been brought in, a cathedral altar, which stands at rear center, and a section of masonry—with one deep-set window—which has been pushed back to the rear wall." These suggestions of a cathedral give a loftier tone to the scene of the coronation, which is the climax of the play. Later for the trial scene props become quite simple again, with the heroine perched on a stool for questioning.

The costuming is just as artistically haphazard as the setting. Actors appear in street dress, but they try on bits of costume which relieve the monotony and help to distinguish the roles they play. Thus Kipner tries on the Bishop’s mitre, though he has no other suggestion of ecclesiastical garb; Ward puts on the Dauphin’s robe, and Mary Grey appears in Scene II wearing her silver armor.

The play is written in two acts. The first consists of a prologue, four scenes, and four interludes; the second of a prologue, three scenes, and three interludes. The prologue and the interludes concern the theater world of the twentieth century and give the actors and stage manager an opportunity to comment on the play, discuss their own problems, and relate the theme to American society today. The scenes are rehearsals of a play about Joan of Arc in which these same actors and actresses take part. Scenes presented include Domremy, the Voices, the trip to Chinon, Orleans, Rheims, and the trial.

---

40 Ibid., p. 87.
When Anderson shows action, it is good. For the most part he shows too little of it. The Orleans scene is well handled as the battle is described by characters watching it through a window, involved at the same time with their own arguments inside the room. The boudoir scene onstage was an uncalled-for, unhistorical touch, put in to make the play sell. Actually the Dauphin stayed far away from Orleans until long after the fighting was over.

Anderson, like Shaw, avoids battles and death onstage. Joan's execution, like the battle, is reported by an eye-witness, but takes place out of sight of the audience. Most of the action is more glamorous, however—the care of the sick lamb, the wounded girl-warrior, the coronation, the dedication of her armor. Anderson's choice of scenes to portray raises the suspicion that the part of Joan may have been written with Ingrid Bergman in mind.

In general the play has too little action, too much discussion. There are places where the action stands still while the stage manager Jimmy Masters airs his opinions—opinions which have no effect on the development of the plot. In one place (p. 49) this inactivity is broken by the rather clumsy device of having a chair break under Masters; often, however, the interludes are ponderous with the opinions of people who really matter very little to the audience.

Poor exposition is one of the weaknesses of Anderson's play. Neither the play characters nor the actors are sufficiently developed to arouse real interest. This can be partly due to the split nature of the play; but in the case of the acting cast a real lack of exposition is to blame. There is some hint of a loved one killed in the war which lends interest to Mary, but the interest is never satisfied; it could have been her great-uncle. Who is she? Who is Masters? In spite of all their talk very little information about
themselves is revealed. And the rest of the cast are mere names, harder to keep straight because they have no identity.

Within the Joan play exposition is better, particularly in the meeting with the poet Alain Chartier where an excellent preview of corrupt conditions at court is given and the principal characters described. Foreshadowings of the future are not marked; there is some hint of prophetic irony in the sample of a challenge to the English given by Joan's brother and later imitated by her, and some sense of foreboding comes with Joan's recognition of the Dauphin's weakness at his coronation. Projection into the twentieth century is more pronounced; the past is fused with the present by the combination of a twentieth-century rehearsal of a play about the fifteenth century. The wartime atmosphere drifts into the play in references to shortages and the war dead.

The dialogue of Joan of Lorraine is another of its weaknesses. For the most part it hits a middle ground between Shaw and Anouilh with regard to obscenity; it has neither Shaw's refinement nor Anouilh's crudity. It also hits a middle ground in manner and style; it has neither Shaw's strong, pliant prose nor Anouilh's agile cleverness. In other words it is mediocre. In the Domremy scenes Anderson's dialogue is at its best—warm, human, and delicate. The style changes too little with the characters, however, and the swashbuckling La Hire speaks with the same delicate correctness. The only hint of the swearing for which he was notorious is his own statement that he has given it up. His reform was not only sudden, but thorough; he speaks with the correctness of a professor and the sincerity of a Sunday-school teacher. This lack of distinction in the dialogue weakens characterization in the play and gives it a
"opera" effect.

The dramatic techniques of the major dramatists in their portrayals of Joan of Arc have been summarized individually; a comparison of the same scenes as portrayed by different authors will give a clearer picture of the differences in technique.

Three of the dramatists, Anouilh, Anderson, and Claudel, give a glimpse of Joan's life in Domremy. In Anouilh and Claudel this glimpse is seen as a flash-back. Claudel's Joan sees her younger self responding eagerly to the Voices of her saints; she takes part in the "Triumazo" dance celebrating the coming of Spring and honoring Our Lady. Anouilh's Joan is also listening to her Voices, and is brutally beaten by her father and upbraided by her mother, both of whom suspect her of a clandestine affair. Anderson's Joan nurses a sick lamb and pleads with her Voices that she is only a girl who cannot fight or speak before armies. She learns to speak up by imitating the play-acting of her brother.

Shaw and Anouilh are the only two who show Joan's visit to Vaucouleurs. The characterization of Baudricourt is similar, but Shaw's Joan convinces him, or rather overpowers him, by her superiority of intellect and her self-confidence; Anouilh's Joan uses flattery and feminine wiles to achieve the same end. Shaw's scene is humorous because of Baudricourt's blustering, his steward's timidity, and the fickleness of the hens who refuse to lay and then honor Joan's departure with an avalanche of eggs. Anouilh's humor depends upon Joan's handling of Baudricourt—"playing the old fish," as Warwick expressed it. While both scenes are humorous, Shaw's wit is displayed without damage

---

1. The Lark, Fry, p. 29.
to his Joan, but Anouilh's heroine is somewhat degraded by her shenanigans.

Differences are even more marked in the portrayal of the court, which is included in all five of the major dramatists—Shaw, Anouilh, Anderson, Claudel, and Maeterlinck. Claudel's portrayal is strictly non-realistic; he shows a deck of cards with four kings, four queens, four valets, besides the other members of each suit. The king of France has foolishness for queen; the king of England is an infant with pride for his queen; the Duke of Burgundy is matched with avarice, and the fourth king, death, with luxury. The valets are the Duke of Bedford, Jean of Luxembourg, Regnault de Chartres, and Guillaume de Flavy. Gains and losses seem to be synonymous in this game of the courts; the result of the game is the deliverance of Jeanne d'Arc to her enemies. The kings change, Jeanne is informed, but the queens remain always with us; pride, avarice, foolishness, and luxury are always part of court life.

Anderson describes the court in Joan of Lorraine through the poet Alain Chartier, an historical personage actually attached to the court of Charles VII. "There is nothing in that court but evil. A weak ruler draws evil to him as a dead dog draws buzzards. There's nobody left around Charles save the dead, the dying and the vultures. He's lost nearly all his kingdom, and what's left he's selling, acre by acre, to pay for his cheap little pleasures."\(^\text{42}\)

This is Anderson's only picture of Chinon, but at Orleans he brings Charles's "cheap little pleasures" onto the stage in the form of a mistress named Aurore. He also brings the "vultures" La Tremouille and Regnault de

\(^{42}\)Anderson, Joan of Lorraine, p. 38.
He has Charles throw the "vultures" out of his council, substituting Joan, Dunois, and LaHire.

This picture of the court is grossly unhistorical. In the first place Charles, Tremouille, and de Chartres did not go to Orleans with the army, and were not in the city when the battle took place or even after the victory was won. Next, Charles did not begin his "cheap little pleasures" until long after Joan's capture, and there is no record of an "Aurore" in his love-life. Finally Tremouille and the Archbishop remained on his council until the bitter end; it would have been a serious violation of medieval court practice to take a peasant girl, a bastard, and a mercenary soldier as the royal council (though Dunois did rate this honor in later years, after Charles had made him a count).

Shaw, Maeterlinck, and Anouilh all present the recognition scene in which, according to legend, the Dauphin posed as a courtier and set a page on the throne to receive Joan; but she saw through the disguises and discovered the true Dauphin in the crowd. The historical verity of this scene was discussed in Chapter Two, p. 26.

The treatment of the scene varies with the three dramatists. In Maeterlinck (p. 7), Joan's finding of the king is silent and dignified, and he

---

43 Champion, "Dramatis Personae," p. 389. "He was a very temperate man, but lacking in will-power. It was only in his middle age that he gave himself to pleasure and to women."


says to her a single word, "Viens," and then takes her to his private chapel, leaving the courtiers clapping their amazement. Shaw (p. 1061) has Joan enter into the fun of the game, saying to the enthroned de Rais, "Coom, Bluebeard! Thou canst not fool me. Where be Dauphin?" She then makes a dive into a row of courtiers, dragging Charles out by the arm. Anouilh (p. 104) has the timid Charles run away from Joan even when she has recognized him, and she chases him across the stage before cornering him.

What follows is equally different in the three plays. In L’Alouette Charles undertakes to teach Joan to play cards, and she gives him a lesson in the psychology of fear and courage. Shaw’s Joan is masterful and at times scornful, lecturing the Dauphin as she would talk to an errant child. Maeterlinck’s Joan is always respectful, seeing his human defects but seeing him above all as king, and believing so firmly that a king cannot be ugly or cowardly that Charles comes to have hope that he may one day measure up to his job after all. Her faith in him as God’s vassal and his faith in her as God’s messenger are the foundation of new strength for France, and in this respect Maeterlinck’s portrayal of their meeting is closer to the accounts given by witnesses and the traditional view of the event. Shaw’s and Anouilh’s are, of course, more entertaining.

Anouilh’s court scene presents Yolande of Sicily, Charles’s mother-in-law and in many respects the power behind the throne, Marie the Queen, and Agnes Sorel, the Dauphin’s mistress. The three of them are trying to convince the Dauphin that they need new steeple-hats for a ball which will be attended by English ladies as well, and where a new fashion will be more important than a great victory. The cost of these hennins is enough to pay the army for a month, and the treasury is empty, but it is useless for Charles to say "no" as the hats
have already been ordered. Yolande has another request; she asks Charles to see Joan, as this peasant girl might be a good incentive for the army to go on fighting. She adopts Joan as a matter of wise policy, not because she believes in her.

Anouilh's account, true enough in spirit, is still inaccurate in detail. The courtiers from Bourges had no part of the gay life of the English and Burgundian courtiers and were completely scorned by them. Even if it would have been safe for Armagnacs to move in Burgundian and English social circles--which it was not--it is quite unlikely that they would attend the same parties because of the social differences. Charles's courtiers were not recognized as courtiers at all since he was not considered a king. The introduction of Agnes Sorel at this point is also an anachronism since she was not in Paris before 1431, and neither of the queens was at Chinon when Joan arrived there.

Shaw shows Gilles de Rais, Tremouille, and the Archbishop of Rheims bullying the cowering Dauphin. His account of the financial state of the court is a true one; so is his portrayal of the characters and positions of the men of the court. Masterlinck's court scene likewise points up Charles's financial difficulties and the power Tremouille and de Rais have over him because of their

---


45 Eaton (p. 34) notes that Joan first met Yolande in Poitiers at the time of her examination there; Marguerite La Tourolde (Retrial, p. 109) testified that she and the queen were at Bourges when Joan came to Chinon.
wealth and his poverty, but it is mainly concerned with the symbolic angel and crown discussed in Chapter IV.

The trial scene is another place where differences in style and diction are apparent. Maeterlinck's account of the trial is taken almost word for word from the historical records, but he introduces the non-realistic element of an invisible voice which represents the consciences of the judges. Shaw's account justifies the judges, combines or changes historical personages, and reconstructs the record to include a lot of Shavian propaganda. Anouilh agrees with Shaw in whitewashing Gauchon, but imports a fanatical Inquisitor from Spain to represent the Gestapo and hunt down the enemy Man. He too loads the trial with his own propaganda. His trial scene is non-realistic in its use of flashbacks to show the rest of Joan's life. Anderson takes some actual words from the trial record, but many of Joan's answers are reworded. He too injects his theme into the trial. Claudel compares Joan's trial to the fate of the early Christian martyrs being turned over to the beasts, and his non-realistic treatment pictures the judges as a court of animals bleating out their accusations against Joan, ignoring her answers.

The coronation scene is a peak of dramatic interest in each of the plays, and is therefore an important point of comparison. Shaw has the newly-crowned king complaining of the endless ceremony and the weight of the robes. He meets the idea of an attack on Paris with fear and decides a treaty with Burgundy would be more sensible. The attack on Paris is suggested by Joan because she wants more excitement; she is bored, and her suggestion that she might go home to Domremy has not been rejected as emphatically as she had hoped. In fact both Charles and her companions-in-arms accept the statement calmly, and Joan, who is
bidding for encouragement and acclamation, is quite disappointed. The situation comes to a further pass when she reproaches Charles for his desire for a treaty, interrupting his question to the Archbishop. When de Chartres rebukes her for speaking out of turn she answers tartly, eliciting a further rebuke for her pride. Charles, Dunois, and de Rais agree with the Archbishop. The scene is an expose of the fault which will bring about Joan's downfall and ends with a clear prediction of her fate.

Anderson's coronation scene is also a moment of climax. Joan, hearing of the proposed treaty, recognizes that the Dauphin is selling out their cause and refuses to go on with the coronation. Dunois, reminding her that God has commanded it, convinces her that compromise with evil is necessary, and she agrees to let Charles be crowned though she thinks him unfit to rule. La Hire comments (p. 97), "It makes a man wonder if God could be wrong." This is the compromise in the play to which Mary Grey objects, and which is the cause of her argument with the stage manager.

Anouilh's coronation is so important to his theme that he breaks the time sequence in order to end the play on this note. It is a tableau resembling the traditional pictures of the scene.

Masterlinck, like Shaw and Anderson, brings a discussion of the treaty into the Rheims scene. His Joan and her king do not argue as vehemently as the others, but the disagreement is obvious. The king uses historical examples to back up his opinion, which is based on injudicious statecraft rather than cowardice. Joan disagrees, but accepts his decision as the Will of God; nevertheless she cries, knowing she has only a year in which to accomplish so much. The king comforts her, saying that the hour has not yet come. Masterlinck's
Joan is maturing in this scene, recognizing that the Will of God must be obeyed even when it is not understood.

Claudel pictures peasants waiting for the king to pass to his coronation; the king is not shown, nor is the actual ceremony. His scene is also a high point, stressing the fulfillment of Joan's mission in the reunion of the regions of France and of France with the Kingdom of Heaven. In its symbolism the scene suggests the Mass, and the audience is reminded that Joan came, not for an earthly king, but "De par le Roi du ciel," as her banner proclaimed.

Shaw, Anouilh, Anderson, Maeterlinck, Claudel—these five masters of stagecraft have interpreted the story of Joan of Arc each in his own way, applying all the skills and powers at his disposal to dramatize her life. The application of these skills has been modified, not only by the differences in the playwrights themselves, but also by the differences in their aims, in the ideas they wished to stress, in the points they wanted to impress upon their audiences. But even more than their techniques, their characterizations were modified by these themes. These characterizations will be studied and compared in the following chapter.
"Every good play expresses more of the author . . . than of the characters who inhabit it," Brooks Atkinson commented after seeing Laurence Housman's *Victoria Regina*.¹ The statement might apply to any historical play; it is certainly true of the plays discussed here, as a comparison of the characters presented in them with their historical counterparts will show. Perhaps even more of interest will be a contrast of the same characters as presented in different plays by twentieth-century playwrights.

Some of the minor characters in the Joan plays are too minor to be well characterized; some are pure inventions of the author; some appear in only one or two of the plays, and differences in characterization are not striking enough to warrant discussion. Eleven have been selected for comparison as the most important within the plays which feature them and most notably individualized in their characterization. They are:

Robert de Baudricourt (Shaw, Anouilh)

Charles VII, the Dauphin (Shaw, Maeterlinck, Anouilh, Anderson, Claudel)

Tremouille (Shaw, Anouilh, Anderson, Maeterlinck)

Regnault de Chartres, (Shaw, Anouilh, Anderson, Maeterlinck, Claudel)

¹ *Broadway Scrapbook* (New York, 1947), p. 29.
Dunois (Shaw, Anderson)

La Hire (Shaw, Anouilh, Anderson, Maeterlinck)

Warwick (Shaw, Anouilh, Anderson, Maeterlinck, Claudel)

Cauchon (Shaw, Anouilh, Anderson, Maeterlinck, Claudel, Garnett)

The Inquisitor (Anouilh, Shaw, Anderson, Maeterlinck, Claudel)

The Promoter (Shaw, Anouilh, Anderson, Maeterlinck, Garnett)

Martin Ladvenu (Shaw, Anouilh)

Robert de Baudricourt, the captain of Vaucouleurs to whom Joan was sent by her Voices, is mentioned by only two of the playwrights, Shaw and Anouilh. His character is worth studying, however, as both playwrights present him in a humorous light, giving him an indecisiveness of character which does not appear to be true in the light of history.

Shaw describes him as "a military squire, handsome and physically energetic but with no will of his own, . . . disguising that defect in his usual fashion by storming terribly at his steward." Unable to make a decision, Shaw's Baudricourt lets Bertrand de Poulengy decide for him. He is still doubtful when the steward comes to tell him that the hens have laid five dozen eggs (p. 1050). He crosses himself and says, "Christ in Heaven! She did come from God!"

Baudricourt is the butt of Shavian wit. Pictured as rather slow-witted, he is stunned by Joan's speed in arguing and reaching conclusions. "Well I'm damned," he ejaculates. "No Squire, God is very merciful," she replies. Later when he tells her to go to Chinon, she exclaims, "Your head is all circled with

---

2Saint Joan, p. 1037.
light, like a saint's." He looks up for the halo rather apprehensively. 3

Anouilh's Baudricourt has lost his good looks and has acquired a great
punch with which Joan collides head-on. He is at first "apoplectic with rage,"
then he becomes amused and bargains coarsely with her.

You know about me and you know what I want; the village girls have
told you all about it, haven't they? They come along to see me, usually
to beg for the life of a brother, or their old father who's been caught
poaching on my lands. If the girl is pretty, I always hook him down
off the gallows, being amiable at heart. If she's ugly, I hang the old
chap, to make an example of him . . . So now you know the rate of
exchange, and we can come to terms.

A greedy child, I see! Well, go on! You're amusing me. If I pay
well for my pleasures it helps me to believe I really want them. You
understand where this conversation is leading? 5

Anouilh's Baudricourt is just as indecisive as his counterpart in Shaw.
"They ask me to decide something," he confides to Joan (p. 24), "some tactical
or administrative point, and quite suddenly, I don't know why, my mind is blank
. . . I get out of it, without my face showing any change of expression; I make
a decision all right. And that's the essential thing when you're in command, of
course; make a decision, whatever it is."

Joan convinces this stupid soldier first that he is good, next that he is
intelligent and handsome, and finally that he has had the superb idea of sending
her to the Dauphin. Worn out from using his brain so much, he has agreed before
he quite understands what has happened.

The historical Baudricourt is every bit as coarse as Anouilh makes him out,

3Ibid., p. 1049.
4The Lark, Fry, p. 20.
5Ibid., pp. 20, 21.
but much more practical. Pierre Champion in his brief biographical sketches calls him "prudent and rich," and notes that he was subsequently Bailly of Chau-
mont, councillor and chamberlain to the Duke of Bar, a knight, and father of the first Lorrainer to be Marshal of France. These positions do not hint at either foolishness or indecision. Neither do the descriptions given by Joan's historians. Stolpe points out three prudent steps taken by Baudricourt before sending Joan to Chinon; he brought a priest to exorcise her, he sent her to Nancy for the opinion of the Duke of Lorraine about her, and he wrote a letter to the Dauphin telling him about this young visionary and asking his advice. It was with the approval of the Dauphin that he sent her on to Chinon. These are the actions of a sensible and responsible commandant. Sackville-West (p. 65) characterizes him as "a good-natured, practical, muscular, coarse-grained captain, neither more cynical nor more believing than the rest."

The indecisive credulous Baudricourt was then apparently an invention of Shaw's to give humor to the scene, to emphasize Joan's decisiveness, and to speed her on her way to Chinon. Anouilh may have adopted this characteristic from Shaw and added the coarseness which was more to his taste than to Shaw's. There is reason to suspect some relationship between the two, as Baudricourt's mannerisms in Anouilh—the furtive glance in the mirror, the efforts to get into the limelight before his turn—are reminiscent of the humorous antics of Shaw's squire, such as his furtive glance upward to see his halo.

6 "Dramatis Personae," p. 392.

7 Pp. 68–69.
Even more of a resemblance is noticeable between Shaw's and Anouilh's characterizations of Charles VII, the Dauphin. Shaw describes him at length: "He is a poor creature physically; and the current fashion of shaving closely, and hiding every scrap of hair under the head-covering or headdress, both by women and men, makes the worst of his appearance. He has little narrow eyes, near together, a long pendulous nose that droops over his thick short upper lip, and the expression of a young dog accustomed to be kicked, yet incorrigible and irrepressible. But he is neither vulgar nor stupid; and he has a cheeky humor which enables him to hold his own in conversation. Just at present he is excited, like a child with a new toy." 8

Most of the dramatists agree upon two qualities of the Dauphin which are also borne out by historical records: he is ugly and he is afraid. But there are several points in which Shaw and Anouilh are strikingly alike, while the other dramatists either differ or pass over them. For example, these two speeches of the Dauphin invite comparison:

Shaw's Dauphin. I only want to be left alone to enjoy myself in my own way. I never asked to be a king; it was pushed on me . . . . What is the good of sitting on the throne when the other fellows give all the orders? 9

Anouilh's Dauphin. Whenever I talk like a king for a moment, they always think I'm amusing myself . . . . Very well, then; leave me to amuse myself in peace. 10

8Saint Joan, p. 1053.
9Ibid., pp. 1003-04.
10The Lark, Fry, p. 40.
The Dauphin's attitude towards God is another point on which Shaw and Anouilh agree, and here Anderson joins them. Charles was generally characterized by historians as a good Catholic, unusually pious, but the dramatists do not agree. These are the words they put into his mouth:

Shaw's Dauphin. Oh do stop talking about God and praying. I can't bear people who are always praying. Isn't it bad enough to have to do it at the proper times?12

Anouilh's Dauphin. If you talk to me about God and the kingdom of France for an hour, I shall never last out. I propose we talk about something quite different. Do you play cards?13

Anderson's Dauphin. I've never had much faith in God, you know. Honestly, I haven't.14

There are other points of similarity between Shaw's and Anouilh's portrayals of the Dauphin. In both Joan uses his son Louis as an argument, asking him what kind of a kingdom he hopes to leave for his son. In both there is reference to clothes and the cost of them. Shaw's Dauphin objects, "If we go to Rheims, and have a coronation, Anne will want new dresses. We can't afford them."15 In Anouilh the coveted articles are steeple-hats, which are equally beyond the resources of the treasury. In both the Archbishop proposes an

11Sackville-West, p. 116.
12Saint Joan, p. 1065.
13The Lark, Fry, p. 147.
14Joan of Lorraine, p. 66.
15Saint Joan, p. 1066.
ecclesiastical examination before Joan sees the Dauphin, but in both this is
waived aside and she is given immediate command of the army. (Actually such an
examination took place at Chinon, and later a more extensive one at Poitiers,
before she was allowed to accompany the troops.)

In both plays the Dauphin expresses resentment when the example of his
grandfather Charles the Wise is thrown up to him. Shaw's Charles declares that
he is going to put his foot down; Anouilh's Charles stamps his. In both the
court scene ends with the Dauphin delighted with his authority, Tremouille as-
tounded and raging, and the Archbishop giving his blessing as the curtain falls.

There is also similarity in the Dauphin's opinion of himself and his
expectations of Joan, as shown in these quotations:

    Shaw's Dauphin. I am not such a fool as I look. I have my
eyes open. 16

    Anouilh's Dauphin. I've taken to behaving like a fool, so
that I shall be left in peace, but I know more than you think I
know. I'm not so easily gulled. 17

    Shaw's Dauphin. I don't want a message; but can you tell me
any secrets? Can you do any cures? Can you turn lead into gold,
or anything of that sort? 18

    Anouilh's Dauphin. Are you some sort of a witch? You
needn't be afraid to tell me; it isn't something I object to. 19

Finally, there is the matter of Agnes Sorel, whom Shaw's Dauphin describes
to Joan in the epilogue, but who appears in person as the mistress of Anouilh's

16 Ibid., p. 1004.
17 The Lark, Fry, p. 49.
18 Saint Joan, p. 1065.
19 The Lark, Fry, p. 49.
Dauphin; and there is the question of the change in Charles after Joan's capture. Shaw's Charles boasts to her in 1456, "Do you know I actually lead my armies out and win battles? ... I am Charles the Victorious now." Anouilh's Charles cannot claim so much, speaking in 1431, but he says to the imprisoned Joan, "I might say, if you ever come back to Court, you will have to call me Sire, like anybody else. I've seen to that, since my coronation. Even La Tremouille does it. It's a great victory."

These points of similarity are, with the exception of the one point shared by Anderson, restricted to Shaw and Anouilh. There is also some likeness in their portrayals of the Dauphin's behavior, particularly in his childishness. Shaw describes him as behaving like a child with a new toy; Anouilh provides him with the toy, a cup-and-ball, which he uses to amuse himself while sitting upside down on his throne. Shaw has him defying Tremouille and then running to hide behind the Archbishop; Anouilh describes him as hiding behind his throne from Tremouille's rage. Both Dauphins give the command of the army to Joan—a deed which has no historical background, though a few legendary works do speak of Joan as commanding—and both reject her after the coronation, a supposition equally devoid of historical foundation. Pierre Champion describes an embassy sent by Charles to Burgundy saying that "if there was nothing he could offer

20 Saint Joan, p. 1135.

21 The Lark, Fry, p. 93.
him to induce him to set her free, then he would exact vengeance for her upon his men that he had captive."

The speech of Shaw's Charles after the coronation, "why dont the voices come to me? I am king, not you," is also similar to one in L'Alouette, but here it is Joan's father who speaks: "why should St. Michael speak to you .

... Does he speak to me? Natural enough, if he had something to say to us he'd say it to me, the head of the family.

In Anderson's Dauphin there are also Shavian echoes. Both refuse to wear armor and fight. (The real Charles was a skulking coward at the time of Joan's arrival, but he had led the battle of Verneuil a few years earlier. War was not entirely unknown to him.) Both express their reliance on treaties; both express annoyance with Joan's arrogance and ambition. Both advance the Dauphin's decision to make a treaty with Burgundy to the scene of the coronation—actually the treaty was not made until a few weeks later—and both involve Dunois, Joan, and La Hire in the discussion and argument over this treaty. In the dialogue itself there are similarities:

Shaw's Dauphin. I'll risk it. I warn you I shant be able to keep it up; but I'll risk it .

Mind you stand by and don't let me be bullied.


23 Saint Joan, p. 1094.

24 The Lark, Fry, p. 13.

25 Saint Joan, p. 1066.
Anderson's Dauphin. Come, I'm willing to risk it if you are... Set me on the throne, and stay by me, Joan, for personally, you know, I have no visions at all. No visions and no faith.  

Shaw's Dauphin. Yes: she thinks she knows better than everyone else.  

Anderson's Dauphin. But she's annoying. She annoys nearly everybody. She arrogates power to herself. And we have to stop that.  

Both have the Dauphin say he did not really want to be king, that the fighting and the coronation were all Joan's idea. Both say that if Joan wants to leave she can go right ahead. Anderson's Dauphin goes into a bit more of a temper tantrum over the opposition to his treaty, asserting his authority as king, while Shaw's is more preoccupied with the cost of the coronation. None of the characters are identical; Anderson's Dauphin has the stormy self-centeredness of a four-year-old; Shaw's is weak-willed and irresponsible, though not stupid; Anouilh's is the most colorful of all—a sceptred Touchstone with more of an ear for love-words than for the messages of God.  

Claudel's Charles appears enthroned in the scene of the card-game; the only hint at his character is the statement that the valets really have more influence on the game than the kings do. Regnault de Chartres is the valet on Charles's side, and his queen is Foolishness.  

Maeterlinck's Dauphin is the most complimentary—and probably the most authentic—of all the portrayals of Charles VII. He is ugly and afraid; he

---

26 Joan of Lorraine, p. 67.  
27 Saint Joan, p. 109f.  
28 Joan of Lorraine, p. 46.
believes in God but has little faith in the saints; he is bullied by Tremouille and de Rais who control his resources; he is well read, as his quotations from ancient history reveal; he is more adept at making treaties than at making war. One point of the characterization by Maeterlinck rings surprisingly true—this is the Dauphin's sleepiness. "Je ne suis pas mechant, mais je dors tout le temps," he says of himself. Champion notes that he was like a sleep-walker in Jeanne's time, and one of his councillors wrote a letter about him in which the question "Quare obdormis, domine?" was repeated like a refrain. Maeterlinck's Charles is weak and inconstant, but he is not the pitiful creature portrayed by the others; when Joan prophesies that he will be a great king he agrees, with a qualification. "Not immediately. I will have to learn." Maeterlinck's Charles VII stands up better than the others under the scrutiny of the historian but it cannot be denied that Anouilh's—and perhaps Shaw's—

29 Maeterlinck, p. 19.
31 Maeterlinck, p. 23.
32 This description of Charles VII is borne out by Buchan (pp. 40, 77-78) and Sackville-West, who calls him a "weak, knock-kneed, pious little cad" (p. 115), and lists his chief characteristics as languor, piety, self-indulgence, weakness towards his favorites, and envy (p. 117). D. B. Wyndham Lewis (Atlantic Monthly CXIII, 27) says, "Charles was neither bad nor weak. His chief handicap, at this time, was a tendency to listen to advice."

The only contemporary description of Charles VII comes from Chastelain, a Burgundian chronicler, who may have intended a bit of flattery but probably gives a fairly genuine portrait. He writes that Charles was "very light and thin of body, had a weak constitution and a curious gait, was pale of face but rather handsome, very agreeable and sensitive, not of the best hearing. In him was a handsome and gracious bearing. Nevertheless a few vices he had and above all three: fickleness, diffidence in the highest degree, and the worst, envy for the third." (As quoted in Orliac, pp. 64-65.)
makes a more entertaining spectacle on the stage.

Regnault de Chartres, the Archbishop of Rheims and Chancellor of the Realm, appears for only a moment in Maeterlinck's coronation scene where he crowns the king; he has no speaking part. Claudel makes him the power behind the throne by picturing him as the French valet in the deck of cards and suggests his underhanded character in making victories out of losses.

Anouilh presents him as bearing "the whole burden of the kingdom's affairs," mistrusting God's interest in the affairs of France, and repudiating Joan by a letter sent out in the Dauphin's name. "You must surely admit, sir," he says to Charles, "the English have done us a good turn, making themselves responsible for her arrest and execution. If they hadn't done it, we ourselves should have had to, some day or other. She was becoming impossible!" With the exception of this last statement, a Shavian opinion, Anouilh's portrayal is historically sound. The letter mentioned was, however, sent in his own name to the people of Rheims, his archdiocese; in it he claimed that Joan had brought about her own downfall by refusing to listen to advice and taking pride in fine clothing, and mentioned a shepherd boy who also had visions and was now travelling with the army.

The most detailed characterizations of the Archbishop came from Shaw and Anderson. Shaw describes him as "close on 50, a full-fed political prelate

33 *The Lark*, Fry, p. 42.
34 **Ibid.**, p. 58.
35 Stolpe, p. 195.
with nothing of the ecclesiastic about him except his imposing bearing."36 Yet in spite of his lack of the quality we might call priestliness, he deeply resents the intrusion of others in affairs of religion. Baudricourt has no right to usurp the functions of the Church in sending a so-called saint to the king; Joan has no right to interpret God's will. "If I am not so glib with the name of God as you are," he tells her (p. 1093), "it is because I interpret His will with the authority of the Church and of my sacred office."

But for all his talk of his sacred office, the Archbishop has little real faith. In a conversation with Tremouille (similar to the one in Anouilh where he declares God's intervention undesirable) de Chartres defines a miracle as "an event which creates faith." He explains them as "simple and innocent contrivances by which the priest fortifies the faith of his flock."37 In this statement he is, of course, the mouthpiece of Shaw.

Shaw's Archbishop shows progression and development of character that lends interest to him. At first he declares against Joan, refusing to admit her, claiming that she is not even a respectable woman. Touched by her humility and her respect for his own office, he experiences a change of heart and declares, "The Maid comes with God's blessing, and must be obeyed." But his opinion gradually changes again, and he explains the reason for the change to Joan after the coronation. "You came clothed with the virtue of humility; and because God blessed your enterprises accordingly, you have stained yourself with the sin of

36Saint Joan, p. 1051.

37Ibid., pp. 1058, 1059.
pride. The old Greek tragedy is rising among us." He foretells her condemnation, even naming Cauchon as her judge—a fact he could hardly have foreseen at that time. He gives the matter of the sentence as Shaw interprets it: "The voice of God on earth is the voice of the Church Militant; and all the voices that come to you are the echoes of your own willfulness." Finally he emphasizes her position and the power of his own authority, which he refuses to use in her favor: "You stand alone: absolutely alone, trusting to your own conceit, your own ignorance, your own headstrong presumption, your own impiety in hiding all these sins under the cloak of a trust in God . . . . We and we only can stand between you and the stake at which our enemies have burnt that wretched woman in Paris."38

The Archbishop apparently spoke the truth in claiming power to save her, as he could have stopped the proceedings of a court presided over by a bishop under his jurisdiction. The "wretched woman" he mentioned was Pierrot of Brittany, who claimed that God had appeared to her; she supported the mission of Joan of Arc. For defending Joan and her own visions she was burned at the stake in Paris by the judgment of the University; this did not take place, however, until after the capture of Joan, and the Archbishop's account of it here is an anachronism.39

Anderson's Archbishop never shows faith in Joan or even toleration of her. He resents her interference in camp morality, which he considers none of her

---

38 The preceding quotations are from *Saint Joan*, pp. 1062, 1093-94, 1098, and 1099.

39 Sackville-West, p. 247; Stolpe, p. 198.
business. (Dunois characterizes him truly in attributing this to jealousy, for
she succeeded where he had failed.) He describes her letter to the English
commander at Orleans as "silly, boastful, illiterate, treasonous, and
heretical."¹⁰ There is no historical evidence to support this condemnation on
the part of de Chartres, nor for his declaration to La Hire that she is a
sorceress. Anouilh is more correct in showing the Archbishop upholding Joan
or the use of her until after her capture, when he finds it expedient to
denounce her and deny her, as she will probably be condemned. It must be
remembered that de Chartres presided at the court of Poitiers which pronounced
that she was not a sorceress just one month before Orleans.¹¹

Anderson's Archbishop echoes the judgment of Shaw's: "Prophecy among the
laity is certainly heretical."¹² This also is unhistorical; such an opinion
was never maintained by the Church, which even before Joan's time had canonized
lay visionaries. No such condemnation had been voiced of Bridget of Sweden or
Catherine of Siena. Shaw in advancing this Protestant theory is ignoring the
judgment of Poitiers, the written opinion of the learned theologian Gerson who
declared in favor of Joan's visions,¹³ and the evidence of history which shows

¹⁰Joan of Lorraine, p. 55.
¹¹Testimony of Seguin Seguin, Retrial, p. 100.
¹²Joan of Lorraine, p. 55.
¹³Stolpe, p. 98. Gerson distinguishes between matters of faith and matters
of devotion, and stresses that while the Catholic must follow the directives of
the Church in matters of faith, he possessed liberty to believe or not believe
in matters of devotion. Those who believed that Joan came from God could do so
with a good conscience; but no one was bound to believe in her. He gave, how-
ever, several reasons which supported her claim--her impressiveness, the belief
of many, her orthodoxy, and her sensible use of human means while relying upon
God. He also defends her use of male clothing. This defense of Joan written
that the gift of prophecy has never been limited to the clergy in any age of
the Church's history. Anderson, in following Shaw's lead, shows an equal
ignorance of the facts. Cardinal Baudrillart answers such propaganda with the
decision rendered by the judges of the retrial in 1456:

The judges of the rehabilitation trial settled the question ... in
the light of sound theology . . . . They acknowledged in God the
liberty to act through the medium of such revelation, and in the
human conscience, not merely the liberty, but the duty to obey such
a revelation. It suffices that these revelations contain nothing
contrary to Catholic doctrine or unworthy of true wisdom.

Only in matters of faith and morals is no definitive judgment
admitted except that which comes from the universal Church. 64

Anderson's Archbishop is a one-sided villain showing some remnants of the
animosity of Shaw's, but lacking his rounded character. Anouilh's portrayal is
probably closer to the truth—Champion describes him as an excellent diplomat
and believes that his antagonism to Jeanne dated from after the coronation and
was due to her opposition to victory by diplomacy rather than by arms. 45 Yet
Shaw's portrayal has more dramatic depth; in general his Archbishop plays a
more important part than Anouilh's, sometimes assuming the role of raisonneur.

The Duke de la Tremouille is characterized by Masterlinck as skeptical and
sarcastic regarding Joan, a bully who controls the purse-strings of the Dauphin,

before her capture and trial by the outstanding theologian of his day is
sufficient proof of the falsehood of Shaw's premise.

64 "The Saint" For Joan of Arc, An Act of Homage from Nine Members of the

45 "Dramatis Personae," p. 399.
and a traitor who gets from Burgundy the money through which he controls the Armagnac faction. His bargains with Burgundy are not incontestable facts, but there are strong reasons for suspecting him and evidence points to the likelihood of some underhanded agreements. 46

Shaw describes him as "a monstrous arrogant wineskin of a man"; 47 Charles calls him a bully, and Joan nicknames him "Old Gruff-and-Grum." When she asks who he is Charles replies, "He pretends to command the army. And whenever I find a friend I can care for, he kills him." 48 This accusation was true in several cases, notably that of Sire de Giac, whose widow Tremouille then married. She too gets the raw end of Shaw's wit; Joan asks if she is the queen to which the Dauphin replies, "No, but she thinks she is." 49 Shaw also stresses Tremouille's wealth and the Dauphin's indebtedness to him, but there is no suspicion of treason in Saint Joan.

According to Anouilh, Tremouille thinks he springs from Jupiter's thigh; he is fat, has an arrogant temper, and commands the army. Joan says that his fearlessness is based on stupidity. He hasn't enough imagination to be afraid.

Anderson calls him "a man of the world," and stresses his preoccupation with money. He claims to be angry with Joan because she is headstrong and

46 Stolpe, p. 149.
47 Saint Joan, p. 1051. This description is similar to Anatole France's, "a barrel, a wine sack, a kind of Gargantua" quoted in Stolpe, p. 149. The similarity underlines the influence of the famous skeptic on Shaw.
48 Ibid., p. 1063.
49 Ibid.
never thinks of ransoms to be collected. In consequence France is losing a lot of money. Dunois, however, gives Tremouille's real reason for wishing to be rid of Joan. "Yesterday was payday for the soldiers and they were not paid. Always before when they were not paid they laid down their arms and went home. In other words, our dear Tremouille used to have a veto power. He could stop a campaign at any point by withholding the money. But now they don't give a damn whether they're paid or not. They follow Joan. Look at them!"

Tremouille tells the Dauphin that Joan is "ambitious and unscrupulous. She intends to rule France. In your place." (p. 59). He conspires with Regnault de Chartres, suggesting a way to be rid of her by asking the opinion of the Church on private revelations.

The Dauphin accuses him of selling out France to Burgundy. At Rheims Tremouille proves the truth of this accusation, though the impoverished Dauphin does not at this time see through him. Tremouille tells him of Burgundy's offer of a hundred thousand gold crowns for a two-week truce, adding, "If you will only hold Joan back from attacking Paris--there's enough money in the wind to set up a king forever."51

50 Joan of Lorraine, pp. 56-57.
51 Ibid., pp. 88-89.
The characterizations of Tremouille are based on historical records, the main difference being in the treasonable activities noted in Maeterlinck and Anderson, omitted in Shaw and Anouilh. In Shaw the omission is evidently based on his theme, for he wants to show that all those around Joan were acting in good faith, and her tragedy was a result of a clash of the individual with social institutions. Anderson's inclusion of the treason of Tremouille was as necessary as Shaw's omission of it, for Tremouille leads the Dauphin into the evil with which Joan must compromise. Maeterlinck uses the treason of Tremouille to emphasize the innocent credulity of the Dauphin.

Dunois, called the Bastard of Orleans, was a half-brother of Charles the Poet and commanded the defense of Orleans in his absence. Although he played an important part in Joan's story he appears in only two of the plays—Shaw's and Anderson's. He is an important raisonneur in both plays.

Shaw's Dunois is twenty-six, "already marked by active service and responsibility, with the expression of a good-natured and capable man who has no affections and no foolish illusions." He is first introduced beside the

Stolpe (pp. 170-171) considered Tremouille's efforts to bargain with Burgundy an evidence of gullibility rather than treachery; Sackville-West, on the other hand, suggests (p. 229) that the treaty which prevented the capture of Paris was signed through the influence of Tremouille, who may have been bribed by Burgundy. Bangs finds the principal bases for suspicion of Tremouille's disloyalty in his background and immunity from attacks: "Of a Burgundian family, his bread probably was buttered on both sides; and for some dark reason his possessions were never molested by English or Burgundians." (pp. 60-61).

Saint Joan, p. 1068.
Loire where he is waiting for the Maid and hoping for a favorable wind. His kind gruffness towards his page and his interest in a lovely kingfisher win the audience's love for him immediately. His lyrical wishes for a change of wind show that he has inherited a streak of the poetry which made his brother famous.

Dunois is an experienced soldier with a sensible approach to his warfare. When Joan speaks of not being afraid (p. 1070) he replies, "If you delivered me from fear I should be a good knight for a story book, but a very bad commander of the army." That he is a good commander is testified by Warwick (p. 1075), who does not fear Joan, but calls the Bastard of Orleans "a harder nut to crack." Dunois is modest about his ability, willingly leaving the glory to Joan and remaining in the background.

Dunois' Shavian common sense is shown in his explanation to Joan (p. 1090) of the enmity of some of the courtiers. "Do you expect stupid people to love you for shewing them up?" he asks. "... Why I should be jealous of you myself if I were ambitious enough." He is equally Shavian in his attitude towards Joan's Vociies: "You make me uneasy when you talk about your voices: I should think you were a bit cracked if I hadnt noticed that you give me very sensible reasons for what you do, though I hear you telling others you are only obeying Madame Saint Catherine."

He becomes the raisonneur again in the climactic scene of rejection of Joan after the coronation. Asked his opinion of her, he says:
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I think that God was on your side; for I have not forgotten how the wind changed, and how our hearts changed when you came; and by my faith I shall never deny that it was in your sign that we conquered ... But if we presume on it further, and trust to God to do the work we should do ourselves, we shall be defeated; and serve us right!

Do not think, any of you, that these victories were won without generalship. King Charles: you have said no word in your proclamations of my part in this campaign; and I make no complaint of that ... But I know exactly how much God did for us through the Maid, and how much He left me to do by my own wits; and I tell you that your little hour of miracles is over.55

Anderson's Dunois is the most sensible person in Joan of Lorraine, seeing through the pretenses of Tremouille and the Archbishop and exposing their motives to the Dauphin, doubting Joan's methods at times, but convinced by the results. He gives the entire credit to Joan for the victory of Orleans, is surprised to find that she is only a little girl, and defends her against the accusations of the councillors. When the Archbishop tauntingly asks the Dauphin who governs the kingdom now (p. 52), Dunois replies, "God, perhaps."

Later at Rheims he tells the Dauphin he would be well advised if he followed Joan's counsel, but when Charles insists that he will be king and make his own decisions, it is Dunois who pleads with Joan to stick by him. He convinces her by reminding her that this is the Dauphin her Voices had commanded her to set on the throne. She is doing what she was told to do. He adds with wry wisdom that most governments are corrupt and foolish, and it's a fortunate one that has a saint around to put on some controls, even if her power is limited.

Both Shaw and Anderson stress the soldierly and intellectual abilities of
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Dunois and manifest his friendship for Joan. Anderson's Dunois is unswervingly loyal; Shaw's, with less historical basis, limits the extent of his friendship. "As God is my judge, if she fall into the Loire I would jump in in full armor to fish her out. But if she plays the fool at Compiegne, and gets caught, I must leave her to her doom," he says at Rheims. This threat is unlike the historical Dunois who led a campaign to Rouen in 1431 in a vain effort to rescue Joan. In fact Shaw's Dunois is in many respects a fictitious character whose criticism of Joan and contempt for her Voices is entirely contradictory to the testimony given by Dunois at the retrial. Here he states: "I believe that Joan was sent by God, and that her deeds in the war were the fruit of divine inspiration rather than of human agency." He also recounts a vision in which, as she described it to him, she saw Saint Louis and Charlemagne praying to God for the safety of Orleans and France, and he declares that when she repeated to the king and his council the words of her Voices, "she was seized with a marvelous rapture, and raised her eyes to heaven." These are not the words of a Shavian skeptic; but neither would they have fitted Shaw's theme. The changes made in the character of Dunois were necessary to emphasize Joan's unbearable individuality.

Another of Joan's army companions is worth noting. This is Etienne de Vignolles, commonly known as La Hire, a swearing, plundering mercenary soldier whose return to the sacraments was regarded by his contemporaries as a miracle.

---

56 Saint Joan, p. 1100.
57 Retrial, p. 119.
58 Testimony of Dunois, Retrial, pp. 119, 122, 126.
La Hire's portrait is significant as a point of comparison because all the dramatists agree in general upon the character history has accorded to La Hire—that of a soldier hardened in the vices that are common in warfare—so hardened in them that even among the soldiers themselves his name was a byword. In his characterization then, this very likeness points up the thematic and stylistic differences in the dramatists' treatments of him. La Hire is portrayed by Shaw, Anderson, Anouilh, and Maeterlinck.

Anouilh's La Hire is described by Joan as "a great bear smelling of sweat and onions and red wine ... you kill, and swear, and think of nothing except the girls .... And yet you shine in the hand of God as bright as a new penny." Going to fight some Englishmen they have met on the road, La Hire rushes forward shouting, "Hell, yes, by God I will! I didn't say anything, God, I didn't say anything. Pay no attention."

In Joan of Lorraine (p. 63) Anderson's La Hire says to Joan after the Battle of Orleans, "From now on it's your army. I'm an old and wicked soldier, but I've left off swearing and whoring at your word. We follow you, we follow the Maid." At Rheims (p. 95) he becomes angry at the news of Charles's treaty with Burgundy and shouts, "Nonsense, we'll march on Paris with or without sanction."

The La Hire in Shaw's Saint Joan is witness of an event which made Joan famous even before she saw the king. A soldier insulted her with an oath, and
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she reproached him for offending God when he was so near death. That same evening he was accidentally drowned. La Hire is childishly terrified by this manifestation of power and declares she is an angel in soldier's dress. "If ever I utter an oath again may my soul be blasted to eternal damnation!" he exclaims, to the keen amusement of de Rais. He warns de Chartres, "She may strike a lot of us dead if we cross her!"

After Rheims when Joan threatens to leave and go back to Domremy, La Hire answers, "Well, I shall be able to swear when I want to. But I shall miss you at times." Joan replies, "La Hire: in spite of all your sins and swears we shall meet in heaven; for I love you as I love Pitou, my old sheep dog. Pitou could kill a wolf. You will kill the English wolves." Maeterlinck's La Hire is reproached by Joan for swearing (p. 34). He answers with the only two oaths Joan allowed him, "In the name of God, it's true . . . . I forgot my oath--by my staff, by my staff, by my staff . . . ." But in the next sentence La Hire is caught swearing again (p. 35), and he protests to Joan that he cannot talk without swearing. La Hire without an oath is not La Hire, but La Hure, a boar. Joan replies that boars are necessary in the forest and adds, "But don't forget that each oath you hold back becomes a prayer."

In these treatments of the same characters in the same relationship, there
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are signs of the characteristics of all four playwrights in dealing with the Joan-of-Arc material. Anouilh presents La Hire as Man, with all his animal tendencies and human failings accentuated. Joan of Arc accepts him, finds a real delight in the very earthiness of him, and champions him before God. This is in keeping with Anouilh's theme of the gloriousness, the indomitability of Man.

Shaw's La Hire is superstitious, childishly impressionable, typical of the stupidity which sees an ideal as completely ideal and cannot recognize clay feet on its idols. Even when the others have given Joan up because of her insupportable pride, La Hire declares, "Then you had better chain me up; for I could follow her to hell when the spirit rises in her like that." 61

Maeterlinck shows La Hire as a man whose vice is so habitual that it seems impossible to correct it. Joan's patience with him and her supernatural encouragement of his efforts show the tenderness of the saint towards the sinner—a point in keeping with both Maeterlinck's theme and the character of the real Joan. There is more humor in this little scene than in all the rest of Maeterlinck's play.

Anderson reveals just the opposite—the sinner so thoroughly reformed that in a moment of anger he shouts, "Nonsense!" 62 The characterization is weakened by this bluntness, but the play itself does not suffer seriously from it as
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La Hire's main function is to exemplify the army's faith in Joan and their loyalty to her.

There are a few false historical details in the portrayals of La Hire. Shaw has him meeting the Maid at Chinon in the Dauphin's court; actually he saw Joan for the first time at Blois where provisions for the relief of Orleans were being gathered. Shaw is correct, however, in asserting La Hire's unswerving loyalty to the Maid, for, like Dunois, he led an unsuccessful attempt to rescue her. Anouilh has Cauchon describe such an attempt led by La Hire against Rouen; this was Dunois' army; La Hire's attack was against Louviers. Cauchon also tells Joan that La Hire had gone into Germany to fight; actually he had been captured by Burgundy.

Nowhere is distortion of history for the sake of theme so evident as in the depiction of Joan's trial. A marked difference will be noted in the characterizations of her judges by Maeterlinck and Garnett, who followed pretty accurately the records of the trial, as compared with those of Shaw, Anouilh, and Anderson, who practiced a kind of "purposeful selection," taking from the record questions and answers which suited their purposes, omitting those that did not suit them, and filling in the gaps with their own propaganda.

Three men were of basic importance in an ecclesiastical trial at this period; these were the presiding judge, the Promotor, and the Inquisitor. The
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men who played these roles in Joan's trial were Pierre Cauchon, Bishop of Beauvais, Jean d'Estivet, and Jean Le Maître. They will be considered individually as they have appeared on the modern stage.

Pierre Cauchon's record even in the objective phrasing of Pierre Champion is not an attractive one. As a student of the University of Paris he took part in the vote on withdrawing from obedience to Pope Benedict XIII; as Rector of the University in 1406 he carried the refusal of obedience to the Pope to the Parlement of Paris. He tried to obtain a benefice near Rheims, though he was already holding two besides his rectorship; by 1410 he had acquired at least three others. Banished from Paris for excessive severity against the Armagnacs and for leading an uprising, he entered the service of the Duke of Burgundy. Several more benefices were acquired in the next few years, bringing him an income of over 2000 livres a year.

It was on the recommendation of the University of Paris that he was elected Bishop of Beauvais and ecclesiastical peer in 1420. From this time he served the English party, was Bedford's confidant, an executor of the will of Charles VI, a councillor of Henry VI with a salary of 1,000 livres, and guardian of the privy seal in the chancellor's absence. Expelled from Beauvais he fled to Rouen where "the English indemnified him for the loss of his revenues and put him in charge of special missions in England, Paris, etc. The trial of Jeanne d'Arc was one of them." He became Bishop of Lisieux in 1432, attended the Councils of Basle and Arras, and fulfilled diplomatic missions for England. His sudden death occurred in 1442, when he was at the height of his honors. 66
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Stolpe adds to this account the information that Cauchon, as Bishop of Lisieux, was excommunicated for refusing to pay the diocese's stipend to Rome. He continued to say Mass and administer his diocese in spite of the excommunication until a threat to make it publicly known made him yield.67

This is the man whom Shaw portrays as an ecclesiastic thoroughly devoted to the Church, defending its established authority against this young girl who, as Cauchon describes her, "acts as if she herself were The Church . . . . Has she ever in all her utterances said one word of The Church? Never. It is always God and herself." 68 Cauchon compares Joan with Hus, Wyclif, and Mahomet. He is determined that she shall have a fair hearing and will do all in his power as a bishop and shepherd of souls to save her soul, but her soul must be saved within the Church. "Let all this woman's sins be forgiven her except only this sin; for it is the sin against the Holy Ghost; and if she does not recant in the dust before the world, and submit herself to the last inch of her soul to the Church, to the fire she shall go if she once falls into my hand." 69 He sees her as one diabolically inspired, an instrument which the devil employs, not only for her own damnation, but for the destruction of the Catholic Church.

Speaking to Warwick, Shaw's Cauchon says of himself, "I am no mere
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political bishop: my faith is to me as your honor is to you"; and to de Stogumber who calls him a traitor to England he adds the threat, "If you dare do what this woman has done--set your country above the holy Catholic Church--you shall go to the fire with her." 70

"I was just; I was merciful: I was faithful to my light: I could do no other than I did." 71 This is Cauchon's defense of his actions given in the epilogue, and confirmed by Joan who calls her judges "as honest a lot of poor fools as ever burned their betters." 72 Shaw carries out this description by having him apologize for the fish he sent to Joan in prison which caused a serious sickness, and having her answer his apology, "You meant to be good to me, I know; but it is a fish that does not agree with me. The English thought you were trying to poison me." 73 Shaw also has Cauchon refuse to use torture, though in the actual proceedings of the trial it was he who suggested it. 74

Anouilh's portrait of Cauchon is equally original. "I am an old man, Joan," he says. "I have no more ambitions in this world, and, like each of us here, I have put many to death in defence of the Church, as you have put many to death in defence of your Voices. It is enough. I am tired. I wish to die without adding to those deaths the death of a little girl. Help me." 75 When
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Joan signs the recantation he shouts exultantly, "She is saved, Brother La Venu, Joan is saved." To Warwick, who wonders if he were inclined to betray his king, he asks, "Which king, my lord?" The alternate in his mind is apparently not Charles VII, but God.

Throughout the trial Cauchon is kindness personified towards Joan. He is horrified by her confession of the guards' indecencies; he does all in his power to save her; yet he professes his unswerving loyalty to the English king rather than the French one, and claims that it is based on love for France. Finally, at Joan's execution he makes all pray for her and defies the Promoter who objects to the crucifix being given her. "You can refer it to the devil, if you like: for the present moment, the orders to be obeyed here are mine."77

One critic has called Anouilh's Cauchon "an amiable, conscience-stricken papa"; another finds him a copy of Pontius Pilate; while a third finds "something hyperromantic" in Anouilh's sketch of him as "a sweet old fellow, caught helplessly in the web of some fearful ecclesiastical syllogism, who must be chided by the Inquisitor for manifesting symptoms of human compassion for
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Anouilh's changes in the character of Cauchon were necessary, however—as necessary for his theme as they had been for Shaw's. Since his Cauchon represents the Collaborationist government under Petain, he could not show him as a traitor, an evil person, or one entirely devoid of mercy. The Petainists were not turncoats; but Anouilh is pointing out that they were opportunists, sacrificing some of their principles in order to live in comparative safety and security under the new regime. As Cauchon points out, there are many in every camp who prefer stooping to expediency to facing martyrdom. Cauchon chose expediency; Joan chose martyrdom.

It is interesting to note that in Cauchon's dialogue, as in the Dauphin's, there are Shavian echoes. Apart from the trial scene, where similarities may be due to the similarities of source, there is a striking similarity between a speech of Anouilh's Cauchon and one of Shaw's Archbishop of Rheims:

Anouilh's Cauchon. It isn't for you to correct the reverend Canon. You forget who you are; you forget that we are your priests, your masters, and your judges. Beware of your pride, Joan. If the devil one day wins you for his own, that is the way he will come to you.  

Shaw's Archbishop of Rheims. Maid: the king addressed himself to me, not to you. You forget yourself. You very often forget yourself . . . . You have stained yourself with the sin of pride. The old Greek tragedy is rising among us. It is the chastisement of the hubris.
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Anderson, Garnett, and Masterlinck have no reason for distorting the character of Cauchon, since he does not impede their themes when presented as history reveals him. Garnett's Bishop is protected by a coating of oily dignity which breaks when Joan directly blames him for her death and summons him to answer for it before God. Warwick paints him in true colors when he says, "Beauvais sticks like a rib to our flesh. He covets much fatness. His creatures breathe now in his flattered ear, 'His Grace of Rouen.' He has counted that the fire in which this sorceress burns will warm his fingers." 83

Masterlinck's Cauchon claims to act in good faith and to do his duty; he says that his prime interest is the salvation of Joan's soul; but the invisible voice of his conscience shows him up by pointing out his real motives. In a few places they show through in his talk also, though Cauchon apparently does not admit them to himself; nevertheless he refrains from torturing Joan because the English have paid much to see her burned at the stake; she must not die in the torture-chamber. He threatens Warwick that if he does not get the Archbishopric of Rouen the English will not get their sorceress. Warwick, the more determined of the two, reminds him that she belongs to those who have paid for her. 84

Anderson's Cauchon finds it very convenient that "the just thing is the politic thing," and "the laws of the church require of us the same verdict
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which is demanded of us by the heads of the state." He is convinced of Joan's
guilt as a heretic, blasphemer, and sorceress. "She has freely admitted enough
heretical beliefs and actions to burn all the virgins in Europe. In my mind
she is condemned and the trial is over. And yet we must go on with it. And we
must be more skillful and resourceful than we have been so far or we shall be
beaten." Later he gives his reason for going on with the trial--Joan must be
discredited. This need to dishonor her name is felt by both Church and state,
and he explains: "It happens, my dear Vicar, that this same need to discredit
Joan which is felt by the peers of Normandy and England is felt also by the
Church which you and I represent. For Joan has begun a heresy. She appeals
from the church on earth to the church in Heaven. She does not recognize the
necessity for an agent between the individual soul and its God." However un-
Shavian Cauchon may be, Anderson's Joan is still the Protestant Shaw made her
out to be!

Anderson's Cauchon is as treacherous as he is determined. He tricks Joan
into resuming male attire, reproves Father Massieu for pointing out his
treachery, and defends himself for making her break her promise by asking,
"Would you expect her to break it voluntarily? Would you expect her to walk
into the flames when we leave her a way out?"

Modern efforts to whitewash Cauchon's character, like his own efforts to
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cover up the illegalities of Joan's trial, are doomed to failure. There is always someone who, intentionally or not, comes up with the truth, or at least enough of it to show the rottenness of Cauchon's "good faith."

Jean d'Estivet, Promoter or Prosecutor of the trial, was nicknamed "Benedicite," an ironic name given him because of his constant use of curses and foul language. His conduct during the trial was severely censured by his associates. Manchon accuses him of having sent off falsified accounts of the trial as the authentic record; others present at the trial said that he refused to let Joan pause before the Blessed Sacrament on the way to the sessions and threatened Massieu with imprisonment if he permitted her to pray there; he slandered the clerks who tried to be fair and insulted Joan, treating her as a common prostitute. His behavior towards her was so abusive that Warwick intervened and forbade him to visit her.

The Promoter is portrayed in the plays of Maeterlinck, Garnett, Anderson, Anouilh, and Shaw. Anderson's Promoter asks a few routine questions which reveal nothing of his character; Maeterlinck and Garnett both show him accusing Joan of mortal sin in several actions of her life, including her wearing of men's dress and her jump from the tower of Beaurevoir. Aside from these two common points the "sins" listed differ widely, ranging from presumption of her salvation to attacking Paris on a feast day. Maeterlinck's invisible voice

87 Stolpe, p. 206.

88 Retrial, Testimony of Manchon, pp. 55-56; of Massieu, p. 189; of Bois-guillaume, p. 56.

89 Ibid., Testimony of Guillaume de la Chambre, p. 187.
foretells the manner of the Promoter's death. Garnett's Promoter is shown more completely, calling Joan a witch, recommending torture, and revealing his sensuality in an aside to Beaupere, "No. In her shift! In her shift! I would have her kneel at her prayers as a maiden should." 90

Shaw's Promoter is described as "on the young side of middle age, well mannered, but vulpine beneath his veneer." 91 He defends the mercy of the court to Warwick, pointing out that learned theologians have been sent to reason with her and that she has not been tortured. He interprets her attempt to escape as heresy and misconstrues some of her answers to turn them against her. He disdains to press the minor changes such as stealing the Bishop's horse, but charges her with "two very horrible and blasphemous crimes which she does not deny. First, she has intercourse with evil spirits, and is therefore a sorceress. Second, she wears men's clothes, which is indecent, unnatural, and abominable." 92 Towards the end the veneer wears off and he shouts for her excommunication.

The most vital and authentic characterization of the Promoter comes from the pen of Anouilh. From the beginning of the play his fanatical hatred of Joan shows in his interruptions. She mentions the Fairy Tree and he accuses her of witchcraft and superstition even as a child. Her father says about adolescent girls, "They're the devil, all at once," and the Promoter raises his
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finger and remarks, "The word has been said, my lords, and by her father!" Further interruptions accuse her of heresy, of denying the reality of miracles, of indecency, of abominable pride. He agrees that he will have to give up his accusation of heresy if she submits to the Church, but he will persist in accusing her of witchcraft as long as she wears male clothing.

Anouilh's Promoter is something of a heretic himself, maintaining that there is only one devil, whom he describes as a voluptuous woman disguised in beauty to ensare the soul of man. This sensuous description and his questions of whether her visions appeared naked reveal the nature of the Promoter and amuse the assessors. To the end the Promoter's lack of self-control is in evidence; he insults Joan and threatens with excommunication the soldier who gives her a cross; when the Bishop supports Ladvenu in his assistance to the dying girl, the Promoter threatens to refer the matter to the court of Rome.

Anouilh's portrayal of the Promoter is dramatic and keeps the trial scene lively in parts where it might otherwise become tiresome. But more than that, he is used by Anouilh as a proof underlining his theme by contrast. "He, the most obscene and despicable character in the play, defines Man as "filth, lust, a nightmare of obscenity." By putting this speech in the Promoter's mouth Anouilh cleverly disposes his audience to believe just the opposite.

Here as elsewhere lines similar to Shaw's are noticeable. Shaw used Courcelles and de Stogumber to lighten the trial; Anouilh uses the Promoter,
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whose refusal to kneel at Joan's execution until commanded by the Bishop is reminiscent of de Stogumber's refusal to sit down in Shaw's play.95 Other lines bear comparison:

Anouilh's Promoter. I shall persist in my charge of witchcraft, even though pressure is put upon me by the conspiracy to shield her which I see presides over this debate.96

Shaw's Courcelles. It seems to me that there is a conspiracy here to hush up the fact that The Maid stole the Bishop of Senlis's horse.97

Anouilh's Promoter. Will you note that, my lord? She insults me in the exercise of my public office.98

Shaw's Promoter. You hear, my lord, how I am reviled in the execution of my duty by this woman.99

The Inquisitor, Jean Graverent, was directing a trial in Paris at the time of Joan's trial and was not present at any of its sessions. He had no part in the judgment. Jean Le Maitre, vicar of the Inquisition for the diocese of Rouen and Prior of the Dominican monastery there, attended only the later sessions of the trial; this he did unwillingly and only when ordered to do so by his Superior. From the beginning he had told Cauchon that he had no authority in Beauvais and could not validly act for the Inquisition in a trial where its Bishop presided. Massieu testified of him: "Master Jean LeMaitre, the Inquisitor assigned to this case, tried several times to excuse himself and

95Ibid., p. 101; Saint Joan, p. 1123.
96The Lark, Fry, p. 86.
97Saint Joan, p. 1108.
98The Lark, Fry, p. 86.
99Saint Joan, p. 1114.
did his best to take no part in it. But he was told by certain persons known to him that if he did not take part, he would himself be in danger of his life. He acted under English pressure, and I heard him say several times, 'There is a good risk of death, as I can see, if one does not act as the English wish in this case'.

Le Maitre was dead at the time of the rehabilitation trial, and Massieu would have had no reason for seeking to excuse him; there is every reason to believe he spoke the truth.

The Inquisitor differs widely in the plays; he appears in Masterlinck, Shaw, and Anderson, while Anouilh goes them all one better and imports a Grand Inquisitor from Spain. Garnett, rightly assessing the importance of his role, does not even mention him. Masterlinck has him ask Joan a few questions, of which the most significant is an accusation, in connection with her jump from the tower of Beaurevoir, that she is denying man's free will.

Anouilh, Anderson, and Shaw use the Inquisitor as an important raisonneur, giving him long speeches which express the themes of their plays though they have little to do with the matter of Joan's historical trial. Shaw describes his Inquisitor as a mild elderly man with evident reserves of authority and firmness. He declares himself compassionate by nature as well as by profession, and warns that any man present who is not merciful, who does not

---

100Retrial, p. 197.
101Masterlinck, p. 108.
102Saint Joan, p. 1103.
hate cruelty, should leave the court immediately or his own soul would be in danger. He holds that torture cannot be used if the prisoner will confess voluntarily. His calmness is not disturbed even by the Chaplian's temper tantrums, and he refuses to be distracted from the main issue of heresy by minor transgressions of the Maid. In his description of heresy he prepares the way for Shaw's theme; he is supposedly expressing the opinion of the Catholic Church:

Brother Martin: if you had seen what I have seen of heresy, you would not think it a light thing even in its most apparently harmless and even lovable and pious origins. Heresy begins with people who are to all appearance better than their neighbors. . . . Heresy at first seems innocent and even laudable; but it ends in such a monstrous horror of unnatural wickedness that the most tender-hearted among you, if you saw it at work as I have seen it, would clamor against the mercy of The Church in dealing with it. For two hundred years the Holy Office has striven with these diabolical madnesses; and it knows that they begin always by vain and ignorant persons setting up their own judgment against The Church, and taking it upon themselves to be the interpreters of God's will. You must not fall into the common error of mistaking these simpletons for liars and hypocrites. They believe honestly and sincerely that their diabolical inspiration is divine. Therefore you must be on your guard against your natural compassion. . . . You are going to see before you a young girl, pious and chaste; . . . The devilish pride that has led her into her present peril has left no mark on her countenance. Strange as it may seem to you, it has even left no mark on her character outside those special matters in which she is proud; so that you will see a diabolical pride and a natural humility seated side by side in the selfsame soul. Therefore be on your guard. God forbid that I should tell you to harden your hearts; for her punishment if we condemn her will be so cruel that we should forfeit our own hope of divine mercy were there one grain of malice against her in our hearts. But if you hate cruelty . . . remember that nothing is so cruel in its consequences as the toleration of heresy. 103

The honesty of Shaw's Inquisitor, whom the playwright admits having
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portrayed as more able than history warrants, is not entirely above reproach. Thus when Cauchon points out that Joan has been burned without having been sentenced by the secular authority, he reassures him: "We have proceeded in perfect order. If the English choose to put themselves in the wrong, it is not our business to put them in the right. A flaw in the procedure may be useful later on; one never knows." He adds that Joan is "quite innocent. What does she know of The Church and The Law? She did not understand a word we were saying. It is the ignorant who suffer." 105

Anderson's Inquisitor reveals more about Anderson's views of the Catholic Church than about himself; yet there is some characterization also. He refuses to be swayed by English or Burgundian influence; he wishes sincerely to save Joan; he insists on the strict application of Canon law; and he refuses to sentence Joan if she has been tricked into a recantation. He is a judge of the kind Shaw believed Joan's judges to be, incapable of being cowed or bought, acting not through hatred or vengeance, but in a sincere effort to see justice done and upholding the laws of the Church.

It is in his interpretation of the laws and beliefs of the Church that Anderson's Inquisitor strikes a false note. "The individual soul cannot choose its own faith, cannot judge for itself," he proclaims, 106 thereby denouncing Joan's Protestantism. "The church, which is God's representative on earth, does

104 Preface to Saint Joan, p. 1031.

105 Saint Joan, p. 1127.

106 Joan of Lorraine, p. 126.
not recognize the possibility of direct inspiration from God to His children," he says to Joan. "If you have visions we must condemn them as evil and condemn you as evil . . . . Unless you condemn your visions as evil." 107

Anderson's Inquisitor is played by the stage manager, Jimmy Masters, who has declaimed most of the points Anderson wished to make in the play. He continues to do so in the speech which the stage manager has previously pointed out as the keynote of the play, the speech in which the Inquisitor asks the all-important question and gives the answer of authority, to which Joan will reply with Anderson's answer--the authority of the individual soul. This is the Inquisitor's side of it as given by Anderson:

You have come to the great question--the one that goes to the root--the one to which all thinking men must come--why do I believe what I believe? Isn't that it? I came to it myself, though not so young as you. I came to it in middle age, and it tortured me as it tortures you now. And I fought my way through to an answer. Do you wish to know what it was? . . . . It is this! One must believe nothing which cannot be solidly proved. All hopes, all dreams, all aspirations, all imaginings, must be ruthlessly emptied out. The soul must be rinsed to the bottom of all these things--and must hold only to what can be proved. . . . The doctrine and the teachings of the church. They come down in unbroken succession from the word of God. Nothing else is solid. Nothing else can be proved. Not even that we are here. Not that the sun rises and sets. Not even that I speak to you. . . . All these could be appearance, illusions, feverish concepts. We could awake tomorrow and find that we dreamed this trial, dreamed this place and time. How then can you trust your visions? When the church itself, the one thing solid, has said that they are lies? 108

107 Ibid., p. 112. The answer to this false view of the Church's teaching is given on p. 147.

108 Ibid., pp. 113-114.
The Inquisitor presented by Anouilh is a completely original character, so thoroughly determined by the playwright's theme that he has no logical existence except in connection with it. The only point of relationship between him and his historical counterpart is his connection with the Holy Office of the Inquisition. He is a rabid victim-hunter with a keen sense of the importance of his office, which he fulfills with a sinister zeal, expelling Ladvenu from the courtroom for upholding the individual's right to think, and declaring that he would denounce himself if God should permit him to go astray.

The great enemy pursued by the Inquisitor is Man, as personified in the slip of a girl before him so confident in her own lights, so determined to live by her convictions. His denunciation of this defiance of Man has already been discussed in Chapter V when Anouilh's theme was under consideration and will not be repeated here. There is a world of character portrayal, however, in the fanaticism of this man, shown especially in his regret that, even if Joan has capitulated, Cauchon has been moved to pity her—shown also in the execution scene where, overwhelmed by her constancy in the torments of death, he mutters, "I shall never be able to master him."109 Anouilh's Inquisitor is completely unhistorical, but he is a masterpiece of creative characterization and fits admirably into the theme in which he personifies the fanatical persecution of the German Gestapo.

A fourth character from the trial is worth considering; this is the warm and sincere Brother Martin Ladvenu, a Dominican, who had little influence in the

tribunal but played a large part in encouraging and sympathizing with Joan and administering the Last Sacraments to her. It was he who was so eager to help her at her death that she had to remind him of his own danger; he was also an important witness at the rehabilitation trial, revealing many of the illegalities of the original proceedings and giving touching details of Joan's imprisonment and death.

Ladvenu is mentioned briefly in Masterlinck at the scene of Joan's death, where he speaks only two words, "Have confidence." Shaw and Anouilh both portray him, personifying in him all those who were sympathetic towards Joan during her trial. Both give him a more important part in the proceedings than he actually had; both have him defend Joan's heresy, which a man of his age could not have done with impunity in the Rouen court. There are similarities in the portrayals of Ladvenu by the two playwrights and in his words—not the actual words of the trial. Compare, for example, the following speeches:

Shaw's Ladvenu. My lord: what she says is, God knows, very wrong and shocking; but there is a grain of worldly sense in it such as might impose on a simple village maiden.110

Anouilh's Ladvenu. My lord, Joan is talking to us in her rough and ready language about things which come instinctively from her heart, which may be wrong but are surely simple and genuine.111

Shaw's Ladvenu. But is there any great harm in the girl's heresy? Is it not merely her simplicity? Many saints have said as much as Joan.112

110Saint Joan, p. 1120.
111The Lark, Fry, p. 62.
112Saint Joan, p. 1109.
Anouilh's Ladvenu. Our Savior also loved with this loving-kindness, my Lord.\textsuperscript{113}

In both plays it is Ladvenu who draws up the formula of Joan's recantation, and in both he rejoices that she has saved herself by recanting. Actually it was Jean Massieu who presented the abjuration to her and Loiseleur who prevailed upon her to sign it.

Anouilh presents an original twist in having Ladvenu expelled from the tribunal for defending Joan's heresy; several of the assessors were threatened and some left Rouen in fear; it is even recorded that one, Nicolas de Houppeville, was imprisoned for criticizing the proceedings;\textsuperscript{114} but nothing of the kind is recorded of Ladvenu. Shaw was even more unhistorical in having Ladvenu praise the original trial and find the retrial unjust.

One more of the minor characters is worth noting in this study. This is Richard Beauchamp, the Earl of Warwick, Bedford's representative in Rouen and tutor to the young English king. Anouilh describes him as "tres jeune, tres charmant, tres elegant, tres race."\textsuperscript{115} Shaw is closer to the truth in calling him "an imposing nobleman, aged 46."\textsuperscript{116} Warwick was just a few months short of fifty at the time of Joan's death; Anouilh in picturing him as a dashing young courtier is probably confusing him with his son-in-law, the king-maker; the description given of his fiancée would fit Anne Beauchamp, daughter of the

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{113}\textit{The Lark}, Fry, p. 67.
\textsuperscript{114}\textit{Testimony of Nicolas de Houppeville, Retrial}, p. 236.
\textsuperscript{115}\textit{L'Alouette}, p. 9.
\textsuperscript{116}\textit{Saint Joan}, p. 1074.
\end{footnotesize}
Shaw's Warwick is a master of protocol, a stalwart defender of the power of the barons, and rather a skeptic in his attitude towards Churchmen and even towards Christianity. Joan's death is a political necessity which he regrets, but pursues diligently; his dislike for such scenes makes him stay away from her execution. (Actually he was present when she was burned.)\textsuperscript{117} He has a sense of humor; for example he says to the page, "Will it please your impudence to find the Bishop of Beauvais for me? . . . And mind you behave yourself. Do not address him as Pious Peter."\textsuperscript{118}

He is Shaw's \textit{raison\^{e}}neur in expressing a preference for Jews and Mohammedans as more honest and courteous than Christians. Particularly in the epilogue he expresses Shavian ideas which find a faint echo in the attitude of Anouilh's Warwick; he says to Joan: "The burning was purely political. There was no personal feeling against you, I assure you. . . . The truth is, these political necessities sometimes turn out to be political mistakes; and this one was a veritable howler; for your spirit conquered us, madam, in spite of our faggots."\textsuperscript{119} The erection of Joan's statue in Westminster Cathedral, shown in Shaw's epilogue, also finds an echo on the lips of Anouilh's Warwick.

Garnett pictures Warwick as radically hating Joan, despising her as a witch, yet testifying to her goodness and virginity by recognizing the effect

\textsuperscript{117} Stolpe, p. 282; Sackville-West, p. 340.

\textsuperscript{118} \textit{Saint Joan}, p. 1102.

\textsuperscript{119} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 1142.
his guards would have upon her. His attitude towards Joan is cruel and vengeful towards Cauchon he is outwardly courteous, though he speaks of him cynically to his own men. Masterlinck's Warwick is about as important as he was in reality, once threatening Cauchon for delaying and being too lenient, and later at the stake expressing fear that her spirit will win the sympathy of the crowd. Anderson does not portray Warwick at all. 

By far the most important role given to Warwick is in Anouilh's L'Alouette. Here he is an interested bystander commenting on the action of the play and expressing Anouilh's ideas on the story of Joan, the German occupation, propaganda, virginity, intellectuals, governmental procedure, faith, the qualities of military men, and particularly France. It is he who expresses the theme, describing France as the "lark singing in the sky." 120 One reviewer compared his role to that of St. Dominic in Claudel's Jeanne d'Arc au Bucher (he might have added Jimmy Masters in Anderson's Joan of Lorraine) and suggests that he fulfills the role of the chorus in Greek tragedy. 121

Anouilh's Warwick is a humorous character, constantly sniffing a rose in an attitude of urbane boredom, amused by Joan's cleverness, disdainful of the French court, decent towards Joan in spite of his determination to see this political trial through to a finish satisfactory to the English government, and a bit relieved at the prospect of discrediting her instead of burning her; he

120 The Lark, Fry, p. 56.

121 Aparicio, p. 543 n.
dislikes executions. Even more amusing than his effeminacy is his air of superiority; he finds the French hard to get along with, and refuses to attend the coronation scene as it would be most improper. He finds many things in bad form, and he is generally looking down his English nose when it is not more sweetly occupied with the rose.

Variations in the portrayals of the characters result from the style of the dramatists as well as from their theme. The minor characters, those who represent the Church and the State, get their gentlest treatment in Shaw. His kindness to them as individuals, however, is not such a tolerance as it at first sight appears to be; for in excusing the individual as one who is simply doing his duty as a Churchman, he hurls a subtle barb at the Church. His characters are sketched in broad, bold strokes, their seriousness somewhat modified by occasional flashes of wit.

The grossness of Anouilh's minor characters is a contrast to his birdlike Joan. Baudricourt is a stupid piece of conceit; the Inquisitor is almost psychopathic in his malice; the stench of sensuality surrounds both camp and court, marked in the bishops themselves. Most of Anouilh's characters are one-sided, but they are drawn with such cleverness, such subtle artistry, that they are more striking for being theatrically overdrawn than they would have been if realistically portrayed.

Anderson's double plot is a handicap to all his characters; as a result too little is known about any of them, and they tend to be either types of unknowns. None of his characters is as clearly sketched as those of Anouilh or Shaw.

Maeterlinck's characterizations are like silhouettes, their essential identities revealed in shadowy outlines which conceal minor defects of feature
as well as the living color. Though his characters are not so vital as the creatures of Shaw and Anouilh, yet the artistry in their vagueness heightens the other-worldly atmosphere; it seems to be deliberate rather than the result of carelessness, and may be due in part to his efforts to adhere to historical records.

Edward Garnett also adhered to the historical record, and his characterizations are in many cases those shown by the accounts of the trial. He has not needed to introduce Maeterlinck's invisible voice to point up the invalidity and prejudice of those conducting the trial; for this purpose he has used the frightened participants who took part unwillingly, those who protested and refused to take part, and those who were punished or threatened for their indiscreet comments. Frequently his characterizations and dialogue are taken directly from the records of the trial and retrial; in a few cases, notably those of Loiseleur, Cauchon, and the prison guards, he has supplied character traits to supplement what is recorded. His emphasis on villainy and intrigue and his use of conspiracies, soliloquies, and asides gives the play a melodramatic air unworthy of its rather close historical accuracy. It has the ring of fiction because of this romantic slant, when actually it is in many points very close to the authentic record.

Charles Peguy presents only three characters: Jeannette, Hauviette, her childhood friend, and Madame Gervaise, a nun, said by some interpreters to represent the Church. Madame Gervaise and Hauviette are not clearly characterized; they are important only as sounding-boards to amplify the poet's picture of his heroine.

Paul Claudel has made less effort at characterization than any of the
playwrights under consideration. His play is a study of events, not of persons; the only person of importance is Joan, whose life is being reviewed from the horizon between earth and heaven, with voices from both describing her. The unfolding of the symbols reveals that the heavenly interpretation is the true one. Claudel characterizes his minor actors by inference; Cauchon he pictures as the pig for which he is named, and the assessors as sheep who bleat their approval of everything he proposes. His use of St. Dominic as a kind of _raisonneur_ representing all her Cominican friends and defenders has been noted in Chapter IV, pp. 93-94. Claudel also makes use of the classical chorus, dividing it at times into two _demi-choeure_ representing the powers of good and of evil. Other characters are equally symbolic, representing not individuals, but a class or a section of the country. St. Catherine and St. Margaret are presented in a true enough guise, though their use of Latin and their poetic chant are reminders that they are visions, voices from heaven rather than creatures of earth.

The setting, the sound-effects, the dramatic techniques, the pageantry of costume, the minor characters—these are all part of the background in the story of Joan of Arc. As Anderson says through the mouth of his Inquisitor, "This will be her age, her century, and all the rest of us, priests and kings, will be minor figures in her tragedy!"\textsuperscript{122} Richard Gilman has very truly remarked, "No dramatist has ever succeeded in getting Joan's supporting cast right; not Shaw, certainly, nor Maxwell Anderson. And the reason, I think, is that Joan herself

\textsuperscript{122}Joan of Lorraine, p. 124.
is so formidable a figure, so huge and complex while at the same time so mercurial and evanescent, that a playwright finds himself juggling the other characters in her story so as to get them at the best possible angles for throwing light on her, like a forced rearrangement of decor to cope with some overwhelming piece of furniture. 123

So each of the dramatists has set his stage and grouped the minor figures according to the idea he has in mind; but always the important figure for whom all his arrangements are made is Joan—not perhaps the Joan of Domremy or Orleans, but Joan as the playwright has conceived her in the twentieth century.

123 Gilman, p. 64.
CHAPTER VII

JOAN ON TRIAL: FROM THE STAKE TO THE STAGE

When Shaw first conceived the idea of writing a play about Joan of Arc he wrote to Mrs. Patrick Campbell, "One of my scenes will be Voltaire and Shakespeare running down by-streets in heaven to avoid meeting Joan." It is a temptation to imagine Shaw himself in this heavenly scene. He would not run down any by-streets. One can picture the masterful genius striding down a celestial boulevard in search of his heroine to tell her what he has done for her. She had succeeded in getting her name blackened and had been sentenced to the stake; but he has set her name burning in neon lights all over the civilized world and has given her a permanent place on the modern stage. Close behind Shaw, half-running to keep up with him, would come Anouilh and Anderson to claim a share of the laurels. And four other men would be somewhere in the offing to round out the procession—Peguy, Claudel, Garnett, and Maeterlinck.

Somewhere on their journey through the City of God they would run into His Maid. Claudel and Peguy would go to meet her with a bold step and a glad cry of recognition, and her sweetest smile would reward their efforts to honor her. Perhaps her smile would fall on Garnett and Maeterlinck too, for she was

---

1Henderson, pp. 598-599.
always one to forgive faults and appreciate effort. If she had no smile for the other three it would not really matter, for Shaw and his two followers would have passed by this humble, gentle virgin, eagerly continuing their search for Joan of Arc.

Vincent O'Flaherty has pointed up some reasons why they would fail to recognize Joan:

Broadway's durable favorite is not Joan the peasant saint from Domremy at all, but an impostor—enchanting, of course, and clever and chameleon, as female impostors traditionally are.

Shaw's deception was a high-spirited lass, let's say from Devonshire, who, combining a sturdy peasant stock of common sense with a mystical fascination for church bells, called this amalgam her "Voices" . . . . Though she paid a sort of lip-service to the Creed, code and cult of the traditional faith, she was in reality the "first Protestant saint"; her martyrdom by fire was—as Shaw had her adversary, Warwick, put it—"the protest of the individual soul against the interference of priest and peer between a private man and his God" . . . .

Anderson's Joan was, under the mask, an idealistic actress with the noble, if amorphous convictions of a soap-opera heroine . . . .

An interesting bird, this Lark called "Joan" . . . . Her message is that if France is ever to be great again, it must shake itself free of its long, lost weekend and go back to Joan . . . .

She goads poor, bullied Charles into an assertion of his majesty by introducing him to a philosophy of fear very much like that of Rodgers and Hammerstein's "I Whistle a Happy Tune." It is all—we would almost say "cute"—delightful to watch, and about as supernatural as a fable by Fontaine.2

O'Flaherty adds that Joan makes sense only as a daughter of the Church and in a Catholic context. "These modern playwrights miss, or choose to ignore, the all-important fact about Joan. She was sent by the King of Heaven

to do a work for Him. Her voices were quite objective. (So objective that she did not sometimes understand the words they spoke.) . . . When a playwright undertakes to portray someone out of history," he continues critically, "he immediately imposes a limitation on himself. He must be true to that character. If it is quite another sort of woman he has in mind . . . it is the author's right to set her on paper and to call her Snow White, Daphne, anything but--Joan of Arc."³

O'Flaherty's article in *America* is one of the most caustically critical of any review which discussed the dramatists' portrayals of St. Joan. Whether or not a playwright is justified in distorting an historical character is a moot point--one that is seldom debated, however, when the stage character is more famous than his historical counterpart, as in the case of Macbeth. But when the protagonist is a saint, and one dear to many hearts, the case is more likely to be brought up and an irreverent portrayal will be given the description one reviewer applied to *L'Alouette*--"a piece of 'debunking' of the first order."⁴

This problem of literary ethics is incidental here; the point to be decided is whether or not O'Flaherty's accusation is correct--is "Joan of Broadway" an impostor, or several impostors, or is it the real Joan of Arc being presented on the stage, not only by Shaw, Anouilh, and Anderson, but also by the other dramatists under consideration? To judge this question objectively

³Ibid., p. 110.

⁴Farrell, p. 420.
and accurately the Joans will be studied and compared with their historical counterpart from several angles. Were her Voices real or imaginary? Was she a heretic, and why or why not? Why did she die? What was her attitude towards God, towards the king, towards her fellow-man, and towards herself? This last question necessarily involves the question of her virginity.

Shaw's Joan is a masculine farm girl with a natural astute common sense, which she used but did not recognize, imagining that the ideas which were her own came to her from "Voices." Dunois expressed Shaw's opinion when he said to her, "Then, Joan, we shall hear whatever we fancy in the booming of the bell. You make me uneasy when you talk about your voices: I should think you were a bit cracked if I hadn't noticed that you give me very sensible reasons for what you do, though I hear you telling others you are only obeying Madame Saint Catherine." Joan replied, "Well, I have to find reasons for you, because you do not believe in my voices. But the voices come first; and I find the reasons after: whatever you may choose to believe." Even more Shavian is her answer when Baudricourt suggests her Voices come from her imagination. "Of course," she says, "That is how the messages of God come to us." According to Shaw, then Joan's Voices are imaginary, and what is more, she recognizes that they are imaginary!

Maeterlinck lets the audience hear Joan's Voices, or at least one of them, in the Beaurevoir tower scene. Later at the trial an invisible voice accuses

5 Saint Joan, p. 1091.
6 Ibid., p. 1047.
the judges of their injustice and says, when Cauchon looks for the speaker, "Il est partout . . . Il est en vous." If this is true of the voice which speaks only when the soul is in mortal sin, it may be inferred that Joan's Voices, which she says come when one is in the state of grace, are also interior voices in Maeterlinck's opinion.

In Anderson's Joan of Lorraine (p. 8) the audience is also treated to the sound of the celestial Voices, complete with "radio-announcer gravy," as Masters comments critically. Lest they be deceived, however, into thinking that Joan actually heard Voices from Heaven, Mary Gray objects, "Won't the audience think that the voices came from outside her—from Heaven or something like that—and not from within herself?"

In his reply to her question (pp. 42-43) Masters puts all doubts aside regarding Anderson's view of Joan's visions. "I think the audience will understand. She had sub-conscious convictions so strong that they stood up and talked and moved around in front of her—and that's all it means." Mary is satisfied that the spectators won't be misled, and the rehearsal continues.

But later in the play (p. 119), when Joan has denied her Voices and they speak again in spite of her denial, St. Michael makes an interesting comment: "The church itself is built on revelations, and these revelations came out of darkness and went back into darkness like your own." (One might well ask what church this was that Joan belonged to, built on sub-conscious convictions, with

7Jeanne d'Arc, p. 103.

8Ibid., p. 24.
"Animations by Walt Disney" carved on the corner-stone?)

Anderson's Joan has renounced her Voices, and St. Margaret tells her that it is perfectly all right, and if she's afraid to die she can go on living and denying them and it will still be well done, though of course it would have been better to keep the convictions animated. But the real Joan told her judges that she had been wrong to deny her Voices; they had told her she had put herself in danger of perdition through fear of the fire.  

Anouilh gives the impression that he also regards Joan's Voices as "subconscious convictions" when she first begins to describe them in her theatrical trial. Someone asks who is going to be the Voice, and Joan replies, "I am, of course." This would indicate that, like Shaw's Joan, Anouilh's Maid knew that her Voices were subconscious. Indeed, she suggests to Baudricourt that, even if he does not believe in her Voices, it might be a smart political move to pretend that he does.

Throughout the play, however, Joan insists that her Voices come from God; the Promoter insists that they come from the devil; and the Inquisitor, an original creation who expresses many of Anouilh's opinions, sees them as the voice of man. He emphasizes this whenever Joan insists that her Voices had commanded something, by repeating, "You felt that you must . . .", "You felt that you should . . . ."

Joan herself in effect denies the miraculous quality of her Voices by her

---

9 *Trial*, Scott, p. 169.
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definitioo of a miracle: "The true miracle is done by men themselves, with the mind and the courage which God has given to them."\(^1^2\)

Garnett was apparently unfamiliar with the scientific theories of Anatole France, and he gives no hint that Joan's Voices lacked extrinsic reality. In his play their source must be either diabolical, as her judges believed, or heavenly, as Joan believed. It is evident that the author favored Joan's opinion.

Peguy is not concerned with Joan's Voices; he pictures her only before they had begun to speak. Her spiritual perception is such, however, that she is certainly prepared for heavenly revelations.

Claudel's spiritual fantasy shows the Voices as very real elements in Joan's life. There is no hint that they are psychological phenomena, though their relationship to the bells is pointed up in the rhythmical quality of their speech. If St. Dominic is real in Claudel's play, there is no reason to suppose that St. Margaret and St. Catherine are products of an overstimulated imagination.

The real Joan certainly believed that her Voices were real; all of her senses were involved in her perception of them. Furthermore there is evidence in her account to show that they were extrinsic, since she did not always understand what they were saying, she sometimes missed parts of their messages, as when they woke her to warn her of danger, and they sometimes gave orders she did not agree with, as at Beaurevoir. Furthermore the men around her had

\(^{1^2}\text{Ibid.},\ p.\ 62.$
no doubt of their reality, though insanity was not unknown in the Middle Ages and there were recognized cases of hallucination. There were few who regarded her as this kind of an impostor; the opinions were generally of two kinds—she was either inspired by God or by the devil. Stolpe gives an excellent argument for the wisdom of their views when he points out that victims of hallucination may resemble Joan in their visions, but not in the results obtained. 13

The second question to be considered about Joan is her heresy. Pernoud notes that the examiners who initiated the retrial began by wishing to find out if Joan was really a heretic; they ended wondering how she could ever have been made to look like one. 14 For in all her statements in all the sessions through months of questioning, she could not be trapped into a single heretical statement. The closest she came to any heretical tenet was her confusion when told the difference between the Church Militant and the Church Triumphant; in her ignorance—or was it simplicity?—she could not see a distinction, and argued that God and the Church are one and the same. 15

Garnett shows truly that Joan did not recognize the authority of those who judged her. When asked if she would submit to the Church, she questions directly, "What is the Church? Is it you? How can I submit to you while you

---

13 Stolpe, p. 58.
14 Retrial, p. 43.
15 Maynard, p. 95.
are my enemy?" Her willingness to submit to the Pope and to the Council of Basle are clearly recorded; so is Cauchon's willingness to use any means to trick her into a recantation and still bring her to the stake.

Claudel's Joan asks St. Dominic to explain why the priests and all those capable of knowing call her a heretic; what has she done? Dominic replies that those who condemn her believe in the devil more than they believe in God. Joan recognizes with relief the Voices of her saints who call her, not heretic, but Jeanne, the sweet name she received at Baptism. 17

Maeterlinck puts a few unorthodox statements into Joan's mouth; she says, for instance, "I have a right to die when I wish." She is accused by the Inquisitor of denying free will in explaining her leap from the tower, and of acting presumptuously; she herself seems to admit that her leap was made with suicidal intent. 19 In general, however, he follows the trial record closely and his Joan shows herself a true child of the Church. These few points may be attributed to mistakes on his part rather than on hers.

Peguy's Jeannette, in her infinite love for suffering men who are damned eternally because of war, expresses her willingness to suffer the pains of hell herself in order to save their souls. Madame Gervaise corrects her, saying

---

16 The Trial of Jeanne d'Arc, p. 325.


18 Jeanne d'Arc, p. 68.

19 Ibid., p. 108.
that God does not wish any soul to be damned, even to save others, and that the
suffering of hell can never be meritorious since it cannot be united to the
sufferings of Christ. Jeannette then revises her statement to a willingness to
suffer in this life in order to save souls. Her first statement was a
misunderstanding, and she accepted correction willingly; nowhere does she show
heretical tendencies.

Cauchon describes the heresy of "Joan of Shaw," as the heroine of Saint
Joan might well be called. "She acts as if she herself were The Church. She
brings the message of God to Charles; and The Church must stand aside. She
will crown him in the cathedral of Rheims: she, not The Church! . . . Has she
ever in all her utterances said one word of The Church? Never. It is always
God and herself." The Promoter sees heresy even in Joan's attempts to
escape, as she is seeking to put herself out of the hands of the Church! But
the Archbishop of Rheims states the case more clearly; Joan of Shaw has set her
private judgment above the instructions of the Church. Joan of Shaw is, then,
a heretic, since Shaw explicitly states that her Voices came from her private
judgment, and not from God. "I will obey The Church provided it does not
command anything impossible," she says, and again, "What other judgment can I
judge by but my own?" Shaw's point, as he explains in his preface, is that
all new ideas are heresy when they are new, but cease to be so when they have
become accepted. More explicitly, he shows her love for prayer and the

20Saint Joan, pp. 1082-83.

21Ibid., pp. 1116, 1118.
sacraments, but comments, "But when the Church was not offering her her favorite luxuries, but calling on her to accept its interpretation of God's will, and to sacrifice her own, she flatly refused, and made it clear that her notion of a Catholic Church was one in which the Pope was Pope Joan." 22

Needless to say this is rashly unfair to Joan, presuming as it does that the tribunal which judged her actually did represent the Church. In point of fact, these men could not judge her validly as they represented only one side in a political disagreement. She herself recognized the injustice of the trial and often said to them, "You who call yourselves my judges..." On the very first day of the trial Joan refused to say the Our Father for Cauchon unless he would hear her in Confession, thereby showing clearly that she recognized and respected his authority as a priest, but not as her judge.

Anderson also has a false view of Joan's standing with the Church. He has the Archbishop of Rheims state that "Prophecy among the laity is certainly heretical," 23 a statement with no foundation in history or in theology. According to Cauchon Joan "has freely admitted enough heretical beliefs and actions to burn all the virgins in Europe." Later he explains her heresy at length: "She appeals from the church on earth to the church in Heaven. She does not recognize the necessity for an agent between the individual soul and its God. And this heresy of hers begins to affect the whole western world." 24 The Inquisitor states the same falsehood in a different way: "The church,

22Ibid., pp. 1112, 1110.

23Joan of Lorraine, p. 55.

24Ibid., pp. 105, 106.
which is God's representative on earth, does not recognize the possibility of
direct inspiration from God to His children."  

So far these heresies have been stated by the priests, not by Joan. If
the play ended here it could be said that Anderson's view of the Church is
wrong, but his Joan is not heretical. But as the play progresses the number of
petty heretics grows, including even St. Michael, who states that "in all the
articles of belief and creed not one is capable of proof," and finally Joan
herself, who denies all spiritual authority. "I believe in them in my heart,"
she says. "There is no other authority." And again, "In all the world there
is no authority for anyone save his own soul." With these words which
Anderson has put into Joan's mouth she does become a heretic; needless to say,
these were not the words or the sentiments of Joan of Arc, who upheld to the
end the authority of the Church.

There remains Anouilh's Joan to be considered on the point of heresy.
Here again her judges are not free from heretical opinions. The Promoter
maintains that there is no salvation outside the Church and that there is
only one devil. He finds Joan guilty of believing in predestination, and in
the answer Anouilh has her give, there is reason for this accusation. "His
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will be done," she says, "if His will is to make me proud and damned. That is His right as well." Just before this she has inferred that God meant her to be proud when He sent His angels and saints to be her companions.

Joan is also accused of saying that there is no miracle except man; that other miracles are impossible. "The true miracle is done by men themselves, with the mind and the courage which God has given to them." Any other kind of miracle she seems to place in the realm of magic; while the actual statement of this is not in her words, she does not disagree with the interpretation her judges put upon her words, but rather enlarges upon it. She also defends sinful man in an example in which she hints that the Last Sacraments are not really needed. "He behaved as a man, both in doing evil and doing good, and God created him in that contradiction to make his difficult way." There is in this a slight misunderstanding of the doctrine of Original Sin and its consequences.

There are other statements made by Joan of Anouilh that are slightly suspect. "God likes to see action first, my lord. Prayer is extra." In general, however, she is still "a daughter of the Church," as Cauchon believes. Some of her words are more like those of the true Joan, and these are not suspect, even though they are Anouilh's rather than the words of the trial record. For example she says, "In what concerns the Faith, I trust myself to the Church.
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But what I have done I shall never wish to undo." This was a sufficient submission, and very similar to the one actually made by Joan of Arc. It is only in matters of faith and morals that the Church claims authority, and private revelations are rarely contradictory to this authority. Certainly Joan's were not, and so did not come under the ban of the Inquisition. Later she qualifies this "but," adding, "I do not wish to be made to deny what my Voices have said to me. I do not wish to be made to bear witness against my king, or to say anything which will dim the glory of his coronation . . . ."

Here too she was justified in making such a reservation, as any unprejudiced body of Churchmen would have recognized.  

But the Inquisitor imported by Anouilh can hardly be called unprejudiced. Such a fanatic is bound to be heretical himself in some points, and this one certainly is. "Love of Man excludes the love of God," he states without qualification, and he desires that the world may be "unburdened of every trace of humanity, so that at last we may in peace consecrate it to Thy glory alone."  

Euphemia Tyatt gives names to some of these heresies attributed to Joan. She points out:

Virginitity is not much in fashion, but, accepted as a Maid, Joan has been promoted for her individualism; all three modern dramatists, Shaw, Anderson, and Anouilh, having been as scrupulous as Cauchon in deleting her submission to the Pope. Each one of them has more or less disregarded the record of her Trial except for her very famous answers. Shaw has assigned to Joan the heresies of Nationalism and Protestantism;

33 The quotations in this paragraph are from The Lark, Fry, pp. 70, 75, 76, and 83.

34 Ibid., pp. 67, 89.
Anderson with what is technically known as Fideism—that faith needs no proof; and Anouilh with Humanitarianism as, according to Anouilh's Inquisitor, the love of man excludes the love of God.35

Another interesting question is Joan's reason for her final choice of death. According to Shaw it is a love for freedom; she will die rather than be imprisoned for life. In this the dramatist points out that her common sense, which made her deny her Voices rather than burn, makes her prefer to burn rather than to be imprisoned for life. This same motive is found in Masterlinck; Joan says, "I was not born in prison; I cannot live in a tomb. I would rather die."36 It is interesting to note that, according to these two dramatists, it is not her present prison which is being discussed, but a convent into which she would be permitted to retire! Again it is the misunderstanding of Catholicism which causes them to distort their saint.

According to Garnett Joan is forced to relapse by the insolence of her jailers and the removal of her dress. Nevertheless she declares that her recantation had been due to fear of the fire, and she would rather face it than remain among these beasts who share her prison. She adds that she did not know what was in the recantation when she signed it, and had never intended to deny her Voices or that God had sent her. The words used are practically those of the trial, and there is no discrepancy between the record and Garnett's version of it.

According to Anderson Joan did not have to die; she could have recanted
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and enjoyed peace without doing wrong. This decision is given by St. Margaret, who adds that it would be a better thing if Joan died for her faith. She finally makes the decision that she will, saying, "To surrender what you are, and live without belief—that's more terrible than dying."37

Anouilh's Joan is an actress to the end, and her main concern is how her final curtain will appear. "Do you see Joan after living through it," she asks herself, "when things have adjusted themselves: Joan, set free, perhaps, and vegetating at the French Court on her small pension? ... Joan accepting everything, Joan fat and complacent, Joan doing nothing but eat. Can you see me painted and powdered, trying to look fashionable, getting entangled in her skirts, fussing over her little dog, or trailing a man at her heels: who knows, perhaps with a husband?"38 The adolescent Joan of Anouilh is unable to picture herself in any other role than the glorious one she has chosen; she would rather die in the center of the stage than relinquish it for a background position. Her entire concern is with herself, not with God. This ending is in keeping with Joan as Anouilh has painted her, dramatizing herself for the benefit of her judges, showing off her ability to change moods and expressions with adolescent rapidity; but it bears no resemblance to Joan of Arc in whom the virtue of simplicity was noted by almost all who described her.

Claudel's description of Joan's death lacks the historical accuracy of Garnett's, but his fantasy makes no claim to follow the text of the records.

37Joan of Lorraine, p. 127.

38The Lark, Fry, p. 97.
Joan expresses fear, and the priests offer her the recantation to sign. How can she sign with her hands chained, she asks. They offer to remove the chains, but she declares that there are other, stronger chains which hold her—the chains of love and of truth. It is these which prevent her from signing. 39

While Joan did sign some form of a recantation, it is probably not this that Claudel has in mind, but the recantation which her judges hoped to hear from her again at the stake at the moment of her death. They were disappointed, and what they heard instead was a glorious confession of faith. This is the moment pictured by Claudel, and he is correct in assuming that it was love of God and respect for the truth which made her choose death rather than recantation.

Joan's attitude towards God, her mission, and her king is another important phase of her character. The real Joan was notably pious, gave much of her time to prayer, even retiring from battle for some moments to recollect herself in prayer as Dunois describes so graphically in his account of the Battle of Orleans. 40 Joan regarded her mission as God's will, preferring her life in the village of Domremy which she forsook only at His command and to which she would willingly have returned. 41 She loved Mass and the Sacraments, and tried to give others the same appreciation for them that she possessed;

39 Jeanne d'Arc au Bucher, pp. 88-89.

40 Retrial, Testimony of Dunois, p. 123.

41 Ibid., Testimony of Jean de Metz, p. 86.
when people honored her she led them to praise God instead. Her piety was practical as her insistence on camp morality and her own uprightness of life clearly showed. Her attitude towards her king was closely bound up with her view of God's will; he was God's representative chosen to rule France, and it was as such that she treated him always. Those who picture her sentimentally attached to Charles VII are just as foolish as those who imagine her criticizing and ridiculing him. Members of his court testified that she always treated him with the utmost respect; yet it is significant that she refused to call him king until he should have been anointed at Rheims; she generally referred to him as her gentle Dauphin.

Shaw states in his preface (p. 983) that Joan "claimed to be the ambassador and plenipotentiary of God, and to be, in effect, a member of the Church Triumphant whilst still in the flesh on earth. She patronized her own king, and summoned the English king to repentance and obedience to her commands." Shaw's Joan is shown as a very capable shrewd peasant, obnoxiously bossy, and claiming that she has a right to be so because she hears Voices. Joan, he hastens to add, really believes that she does hear Voices; she is "in love with religion," as the Archbishop of Rheims expresses it. Yet when Dunois asks her to pray for a change in the wind, she replies, "No. I love church; but the English will not yield to prayers . . . . I will not go to
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church until we have beaten them."45 The only place where it is actually suggested that she prayed is at Rheims where Dunois comes to tell her she has prayed enough. Her words after this prayer reveal more love for fighting than for God.46

The attitude towards God manifested by Joan of Shaw is not at all like that of Joan of Arc, which was always humble; Joan of Shaw seems to look upon God as something of an equal. "God is alone," she says, "and what is my loneliness before the loneliness of . . . God? I see now that the loneliness of God is His strength. . . . Well, my loneliness shall be my strength too: It is better to be alone with God; His friendship will not fail me."47

Joan of Arc regarded her recantation as a moment of weakness, a sin; Joan of Shaw blames it on God. "Only a fool will walk into a fire," she says. "God, who gave me my common sense, cannot will me to do that."48

Her attitude towards her king is, as Shaw says, patronizing, and there is little historical evidence for it. The "Charlie" she chooses to call him is far less respectful than the "gentle Dauphin" which was Joan's favorite title for him. Anouilh also shows Joan calling him Charles and the Dauphin responding with a surprised question, as in Shaw's play. (Incidentally, this same use of

46Ibid., p. 1089.
47Ibid., p. 1110.
48Ibid., p. 1112.
the baptismal name and the question and answer which follow it are similar in Shaw's and Anouilh's treatments of the scene with Baudricourt.)

Anouilh's saucy little saint is occasionally shown in attitude of prayer, but there is a flippancy about her regard for her mission. She argues with Baudricourt:

You see simply that the people of France have to be given a spirit and a faith. And it so happens that you have with you at this moment a young country girl. St. Michael has appeared to her, and St. Catherine and St. Margaret, or at least she says they have. You are not so sure about it, but for the time being it's not important . . . . You say to yourself: Here's a little peasant girl, of no consequence at all; all right. If by any chance she really has been sent by God, then nothing could stop her, and it can't be proved one way or the other whether God sent her or not. She certainly got in to see me, without my permission . . . . If she has the power to convince me, why shouldn't she convince the Dauphin and Dunois and the Archbishop . . . . I, Baudricourt, have my doubts about her coming from God, but I'll send her off to them, and if they think she is, it will have the same effect whether it's true or false.49

There are snatches of dialogue where Joan speaks of God with a spirit of faith somewhat out of harmony with the rest of her characterization. This is notable particularly in her conversations with St. Michael and with the Dauphin. The translators, with more of a sense for consistency of character than for spiritual value, have, for the most part, omitted or modified these parts. A bit of it remains in Fry's translation, lonely as a dangling participle because the earlier speeches to which it refers have been omitted. But in Joan's prayer after the recantation she says, "I know it would be too simple, too easy, if God always held me by the hand: where would the merit be? I know He took my hand at the beginning because I was still too small to be

49The Lark, Fry, pp. 27-28.
alone, and later He thought I could make my own way. But I am not very big yet, God.  

Later, having decided to face death, she cries out, "You kept yourself silent, God, while all the priests were trying to speak at once, and everything became a confusion of words. But You told St. Michael to make it clear to me in the very beginning, that when You're silent You have then the most certain trust in us. It is the time when You let us take on everything alone. Well, I take it on, O God: I take it upon myself! I give Joan back to You: true to what she is, now and forever." There is a hint of spiritual strength in these two prayers shown nowhere else in Anouilh's characterization of Joan.

Anouilh's Joan recognizes the weakness of her Dauphin, but, aside from calling him Charles, she speaks to him with respect even while teaching him his duty. Her loyalty to him is unwavering; she declares to Cauchon, who argues the political expediency of submitting to English rule, "Say what you like, you can't alter the truth. This is the king God gave you. Thin as he is, with his long legs and his big, bony knees." While Joan of Arc would not have criticized even the appearance of her king before his enemies, still this staunch loyalty which prompted the speech is true to her character. Even when she learns that he has done nothing to save her she remains loyal, and her only
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three speeches when the royal entourage visits her in prison are a plea to take care of him addressed to Agnes Sorel, a murmured "Poor Charles" when Agnes describes her methods, and "Goodbye, Sire. I am glad I got you that privilege at least," meaning the privilege of being addressed as "Sire." 53

Anderson's Joan on this point at least bears more resemblance to the original than does her Shavian predecessor. She speaks frequently of God's having sent her and humbly refers all questions about her coming and all praise of her victories to Him. Even to the Dauphin, when she says he must have faith, she promises, "God will send you faith," and when he asks, "You want me to be King even if I doubt it?" she replies, "God wants you to be King. You will have faith, and you will believe in yourself, and you will govern France for Him." 54 Joan's own faith and her respect for her king are severely shaken, however, at his coronation when he makes a treaty with Burgundy that is little short of treason. Here her characterization takes on a bit of Protestant skepticism which is alien to the true Joan of Arc; according to Anderson's theme no man can be sure of his faith and the best he can do is to follow it even while doubting it. Anderson fails to see that the Catholic Joan had a deeper foundation than her own soul for her faith, and so she could follow it without doubting it. Anderson's Joan doubts and criticizes her king to her friends, his subjects, but says to her judges, "I will listen to nothing against my king." 55 Later, however, when the Inquisitor asks if she can be
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sure her Voices were good when she looks at her king and the men around him, she replies, "No. I am not sure." Joan of Anderson goes further still. When her Voices speak again she argues with them that the king is not a good king. Michael does not deny it, but replies that a king is not permanent, and France will have its own kingdom even after his death.

The real Joan defended her king to her death, proclaiming that he was a good Christian and a noble man. In all probability she was not blind to his faults, but she could have faith in him in spite of them, overlooking or palliating them with the charity of a true Christian.

Joan of Anderson had begun her mission with a real resemblance to her historical counterpart, but in her thinking she confused her king and her God. Having lost faith in the man God had commanded her to set on the throne, she lost faith in the mission, the Voices which gave the command. In her heart she was as skeptical as Le Hire, who wondered if God could be wrong. From that moment she parted with the real Joan and grew more and more alien to her, for Joan of Arc never saw her king as anything more than the representative God had chosen, and she trusted God enough to bow to His judgment in spite of all human evidence against the man.

Maeterlinck is more concerned with Joan's relationship with the king than with God. The king is so important in his view of her mission that Maeterlinck has Joan say to him: "Je ne suis nee que pour vous . . . Je ne vis que par vous, je ne vis que pour vous . . . Il ne me reste rien et je suis seule au
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In jumping from the tower at Beaurevoir, recognizing that she does wrong, she cries out, not for God's pardon, but "Que mon roi me pardonne!"  

On the other hand Joan receives the aid of de Richemont, whom the king had sent away, saying, "It is necessary to disobey the king in order to obey God. I did not send for you, but since you are here, you are welcome." And Maeterlinck is the only one of the dramatists to mention one of Joan's most frequent exhortations, "Let us bury the dead and pray for them."  

At Beaurevoir Joan, complains, "What have I done to the good God that He should punish me in this way," and when her Voice answers, "What had Jesus Christ done?" she continues to argue, "I have done all that He wished ... I have never disobeyed Him ... I do not understand at all." Aside from these arguments with her Voices, there is little indication of Joan at prayer, and Joan without prayer could hardly be Joan of Arc.  

At the end of her life it is again her king who is stressed, and not God; she defends him as a good Christian who is innocent of whatever errors are attributed to her. While this speech is a reproduction of her own words, there were many other words about God which are not reproduced.
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Claudel's Joan regards her king in just the opposite relation to God. He is important only as God's representative; he can win and lose with his wife. Foolishness in the game of cards invented by the mad king, but when she leads him to Rheims to be crowned it is Christ who is crowned King.

Joan's piety is shown in several ways. When she hears the bells toll for her she rejoices because they are inviting good souls to pray for her. She finds joy also in the holy Names "Jhesus! Marie!" repeated to her so often by her Vocies—the holy Names which she has had painted on her banner because they were so dear to her. And in her death she repeats the triumphant refrain taught to her by her Voices, "Il y a Dieu qui est le plus fort!"\(^3\)

Garnett shows little preference for God or the king in selecting lines from the trial record to insert in his play. His Joan is seen frequently at prayer, and her loyalty to both God and her king is mentioned, but neither is stressed beyond the actual words of the trial.

Peguy, on the other hand, shows the young Jeannette in all the fervor of her youthful dedication to God. He is her only consideration; her whole thought is taken up with God's rights on earth and the great suffering of France. Devotion to her king is not a feudal loyalty with her, but a way of honoring God by honoring his regent and of helping poor France by restoring the kingdom. Charles VII as a person is not important; it is only as King of France that he has any meaning for her.

The true relationship of Joan with her God is shown most clearly by Peguy,
who reveals her simple, courageous Christian soul in all the splendor of its first dedication—the splendor which appeared radiant even in Heaven and drew to France the saintly messengers of the divine intervention.

The attitude of Joan of Arc towards her fellow-men was always characterized by intense charity. Even as a child she visited and cared for the sick of the village. In her travels with the army she spent much of her own allotment on the poor; to a friend who objected she replied that she had been sent for the consolation of the poor and destitute. She could not hear of French blood being spilt without grieving, but her charity extended even to her enemies. She had a search made for Glasdale's body to give it Christian burial; she forbade the massacre of prisoners of war; she buried the dead and ordered prayers for the souls of both armies. On one occasion she saved a group of Englishmen whose disguise in religious habits could easily be detected by smilingly declaring that the clergy must be respected; another time she reproached a Frenchman for cruelly striking his prisoner, and when she saw that the boy was dying she sent for a priest, held his head in her lap while he received the Last Sacraments, and promised him heaven. Such was the charity of the real Joan of Arc.

Peguy's Jeannette had a limited field for the practice of charity in the remote village of Domremy. Yet her words show that she makes use of every
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opportunity to feed and succor those in need of help, and she yearns always to do more, pining for the misery of those who are beyond her reach and her means. She could say as truly as the real Joan, that she was sent for the consolation of the poor.

Garnett shows Joan only in her trial. Here there is some evidence of her goodness in the sympathy she inspires among some of her judges and in her consideration for others shown even at the point of death. The point is not stressed, however; Garnett seems at times to be more interested in characterizing Joan's judges than herself.

Shaw's Joan might be considered completely self-centered were it not for Martin Ladvenu's testimonial after her death:

I took this cross from the church for her that she might see it to the last: she had only two sticks that she put into her bosom. When the fire crept round us, and she saw that if I held the cross before her I should be burnt myself, she warned me to get down and save myself. My lord: a girl who could think of another's danger in such a moment was not inspired by the devil.66

The same incident is shown in L'Alouette, and the complete history of her charities described above is given by the Inquisitor. When, however, Ladvenu comments, "My Lord Inquisitor, I am happy to hear you recalling all these details . . . Yes, indeed, everything we know of Joan since her earliest years has been gentleness, humility, and Christian charity," the Inquisitor retorts that only the Inquisition is qualified to distinguish between Christian charity and the "uncommendable, graceless, cloudy drink of the milk of human kindness."67 Anouilh, by placing this speech in the Inquisitor's mouth, under-

66 Saint Joan, p. 1130.
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lines his own theme which prefers the spontaneity of human kindness to Christian charity which he considers too impersonal. Further examples of Joan's charity are shown in her forgiveness of her father, her judges, and the people who come through curiosity to watch her burn. Even in her refusal to condemn her jailers for their indignities towards her there is charity, for they told her they would be hanged if their misdeeds were found out.

Joan's charity towards sinners is exemplified by Maeterlinck who shows her pleading gently with an adulteress to give up her sin; she is unable to win her to repentance, but still refuses to have her chastised, only sending her away. There is a gentleness in Maeterlinck's Joan that is not at all characteristic of the real Joan, who chased harlots away from the camp with her sword. The witness who relates this adds, "But she did not strike the woman. She warned her gently and kindly that she must never appear in soldiers' company again, or she, Joan, would do something to her that she would dislike."68 There is a firm touch here that is lacking in the milder maid of Maeterlinck.

Maeterlinck reveals also Joan's love for the people of Compiègne, so loyal to their king, and her eagerness to prevent their slaughter. He also repeats her command to Ladvenu to stay away and her cry of grief for Rouen, the city which will be her last resting-place. Anouilh has given Joan's actual words here, another evidence of her thoughtfulness even at the hour of death, for she fears that the city will suffer much because of her death. Fry replaces this in his translation with a poetic rapture about her Voices and the fields of Domremy, a line not at all in keeping with the agony of her death or the theme

of Anouilh.

The charity of the real Joan appears at Orleans in Anderson's Joan of Lorraine. Here she sends a harlot away from the Dauphin's bed firmly, but not harshly. Wounded herself she weeps for the English dead. "Death by fire is a horrible thing!" she exclaims to Dunois (p. 61). From that time on, however, her concern is with the failure of the Dauphin to live up to her expectations and the prospect of her own sufferings.

In the symbolic treatment by Claudel Joan declares joyfully that she was irresistible with her banner in one hand and her sword in the other. The banner bore the Names of Jesus and Mary; the sword represented charity. This is the only mention of her charity in the play, but the attitude she displays throughout, both to her judges and to the people present at her execution is one of regret that they hate her so, but not of resentment. She even calls them "my people of France." 69

A final point to be considered is Joan's attitude towards herself, particularly her virginity. Most of the dramatists note that Joan is a virgin, asserting her virginity through her own declaration and through the witness of other characters in the play. Shaw, Anderson and Maeterlinck have Poulengy and de Metz describe her effect on them, inspiring no promptings of nature in spite of their previous habits of thought and their proximity to her during the eleven days and nights of their journey to Chinon. Shaw attributes this to her masculinity, Maeterlinck and Anderson to her purity.

69 Jeanne d'Arc au Bucher, p. 86.
Anderson's Dauphin proves that she is a Maid by relating her examination by "the best possible authorities—a committee of Jealous and suspicious women. They say she's intacta." 70 It is necessary to point out that she is a virgin because the prophecy mentions a virgin from Lorraine. There is no indication that her virginity meant more than the pure maidenhood that can precede marriage.

Garnett shows Joan's concern to defend her virginity from her jailers. Yet even here there is no evidence that she is prompted by more than the decency of a pure young girl.

Anouilh has taken her father's words that he would drown her rather than permit her to go off with soldiers, and has reconstructed such a crude family life that it gives a very poor testimonial of the maidenhood of the daughter of the family. The girl's innocence is doubted, not only by her father, but by her mother as well. Needless to say this is not a true picture.

Joan of Anouilh declares herself a virgin to Robert de Baudricourt and naively misses the meaning of his foul proposals; yet a few speeches later she has dropped the naiveté and parried his proposals with a skill and understanding which belies her former air of innocence.

At her trial the Inquisitor attests her purity and she is forced to reveal the obscene attempts of her guards. When Agnes Sorel boasts that she can get as much courage out of Charles "by my little campaigns in the bedroom as ever you did with swords and angels," Joan comments only, "Poor Charles." 71 Joan
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declares her virginity again to Warwick and he corroborates her statement. He then states Anouilh's opinion on the subject: "Being a virgin is a state of grace. We adore them, and revere them, and yet, the sad thing is, as soon as we meet one we're in the greatest possible hurry to make a woman of her: and we expect the miracle to go on as if nothing had happened."\textsuperscript{72}

To Anouilh, then, as to the other dramatists previously mentioned, Joan's virginity was a state, not a dedication. Joan of Anouilh herself expresses the possibility of her marrying.\textsuperscript{73} There is no indication in any of these plays that Joan was a consecrated virgin, that her virginity was more than temporary, that she regarded it as a sacrifice demanded by God's use of her. Certainly she does not behave as a consecrated virgin; having to live constantly among men such a girl would be extremely careful (as it is testified that the real Joan was) to avoid being thought of as a woman. It is difficult to picture the virginal Joan of Arc throwing herself into La Hire's arms and kissing Warwick on the cheek as Joan of Anouilh does, saying to her king, "Maintenant, a genoux et prions en silence apres nous etre embrasses,"\textsuperscript{74} or to La Hire, "Viens m'embrasser"\textsuperscript{75} as Joan of Maeterlinck does, or kissing Dunois on both cheeks as Joan of Shaw does.

In Claudel's \textit{Jeanne d'Arc au Bucher} it is the Voices of Heaven--St. Dominie
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and the heavenly choir—who proclaim Joan's virginity. At the stake when she expresses fear of the fire, Our Lady tells her that she need not be afraid of it for she has already trampled it under her feet. "Is the fire then to be my nuptial robe?" asks Joan (p. 90). There is here a clearer understanding of the meaning of consecrated virginity. In Peguy's picture of the child of Domremy not yet thirteen years old this consecration is also evident when Joan makes her decision (p. 92): "If then to save from the flame eternal / The bodies of the dead that are damned and go mad with suffering, / I must long abandon my body to human suffering, / Lord, keep my body for human suffering; / And if to save from eternal Absence / The souls of the damned going mad because of Absence, / I must long abandon my body to human suffering, / Let it remain alive in human suffering."

Sven Stolpe has discussed Joan's virginity at length and gives the Catholic viewpoint of what it meant to her mission:

One thing, however, is quite certain, and that is the profound significance of Joan's vow. Through her revelations she was completely convinced that the reality which she encountered in sermons, legends, and religious imagery was true and tangible. She knew that it applied to her also. She does not say that the vow of chastity was demanded of her, although she gave it spontaneously because her heart longed for that life of obedience, sacrifice and love which the saints had lived . . . . We know that Joan of Arc was aware of the prophecies which had spread through the land . . . . Celibacy was here the first step towards an extraordinary summons. One need not believe that Joan was consciously influenced by dreams of becoming the Maid through whom the country was awaiting its salvation. In any case, not at the age of thirteen when she was still a child. But her decision was not unconnected with these rumors, which in their turn were rooted in the early Christian belief that personal sacrifice, particularly the sacrifice of sexual happiness, was necessary for a human being destined by God
to great deeds. 76

Stanislas Fumet is equally insistent upon the importance of Joan's virginity. He writes: "What God wanted, what his work needed then as ever, was a virgin whose virginity should be not only a fact but the fact, not simply a condition of her being, but the very purpose of her being; one who should be not merely a maid but the maid—La Pucelle." 77

It is clear then from these comparisons that O'Flaherty was correct in asserting that the Joans made famous on Broadway are impostors. Shaw's Joan is an emancipated farm girl with common sense. Her character is read well by Gilles de Rais who expresses it in his comment "Not content with being Pope Joan, you must be Caesar and Alexander as well." 78 He summarizes Shaw's point in her regard saying, "You know, the woman is quite impossible. I dont dislike her, really; but what are you to do with such a character?" 79 Joan of Shaw is too humorously treated to be a tragic character; yet she has the hamartia of pride, and it is certainly the cause of her downfall. She is made aware of it in the recognition scene following the coronation, but will not veer from her course and so causes her own tragic end. The same is not true of Joan of Arc whose actions were based, not on pride, but on humble obedience to divine inspiration.

76 Stolpe, pp. 47-48.
77 Pp. 9-10.
78 Saint Joan, p. 1096.
79 Ibid., p. 1100.
Garnett's Joan is characterized by Father Massieu, usher during the trial and of her sympathizers. "My little Maid!" he exclaims. "I have seen nothing in her but what is good and pure." She is Joan of Arc distorted a bit when seen through the glass of romanticism, but allowed to speak enough of her own words to show that it is really she who speaks.

Peguy's Joan is also unmistakably Joan of Arc; she is Joan the peasant child of Domremy, prayerful, sympathetic, warmly human yet reflecting the purity of the divine. Her whole life is centered in God; her whole being is attuned to His will, and so she is ready for the manifestation He is about to make to her.

Claudel's Jeanne d'Arc au Bucher is Joan the canonized saint. She is the little girl so rapt in the visions of her saints that she forgot to eat her lunch. She is the messenger going with a child's simplicity to fulfill the command of God, leading the king to Rheims by the bridle because he was reluctant to go. She is the Child of God, rejoicing in the beauty of her native Normandy, rejoicing in the knowledge that she has brought unity to her country and her country to God; rejoicing in the face of death itself in her knowledge that she is the Child of God and God is the strongest of all.

Masterlinck's Jeanne d'Arc is an angelic creature—pure, beautiful, radiant, lovable, gentle. It is a flattering portrayal, but this importation from paradise lacks some of the fire, the audacity, the earthly reality of the real Joan. Only in the trial scene where she is speaking Joan's actual words does some of this firmness show; but even here the selection is made with an

80 The Trial of Jeanne d'Arc, p. 352.
eye to the portrayal of an angel.

The Joan of Anouilh's _L'Alouette_ is a bird-like creature warbling a song of hope, soaring in the dawn of adolescence. Though Joan of Arc occasionally peeks through this mask, she is hard to recognize in this modern French miss, winning her way by her feminine wiles, artfully luring men into her determined traps, using the methods of a courtesan to achieve the designs of God. Her French enthusiasm is more apparent than her Christian zeal. One might find her parallel in a girl of the French resistance or in an Hungarian freedom fighter. Anouilh, however, cleverly preserves himself from criticism on this point by admitting that he does not understand Joan, that no one can, and claiming that one may play with flowers without being a botanist, or birds without being an ornithologist; in the same way he is childishly playing with the idea of Joan of Arc without fully understanding her.

Joan of Anderson is a little girl who learned bold declamation from her brother, a tireless soldier with so little time to complete her mission, a courageous leader who insisted that her soldiers go into battle with clean hearts, and a woman who wept because victory was ugly—these are all recognizable as a true facsimile of Joan. After Orleans, however, the portrait begins to tarnish; her sustaining faith weakens, her historical accuracy gives way to the dramatist's theme, and the temperamental, self-opinionated actress begins to show through the armor of Joan of Arc. Her spirituality becomes threadbare, and the somewhat obnoxious insinuation is made that Joan prayed in order to hear her Voices and was lost without them. The real Joan had more spiritual

---

81 _The Lark_, Fry. Note by Anouilh prefaced to the play.
depth than a mere vision-seeker.

All modern dramatists necessarily look at this fifteenth-century saint with a twentieth-century point of view. But the difference is not only one of time; it is also one of religious conviction and social background. The seven dramatists whose portraits of Joan have been studied chose varied methods to overcome these handicaps, with varying degrees of success. When Shaw was approached by an admirer who praised him for his portrayal of Joan he replied, "I have done nothing but arrange her for the stage. There really was such a woman. She did and said all those things. Make your offerings at her altar, not at mine." 82

The truth of the matter is that the arrangement for the stage is sometimes overdone; it is not true that "she said and did all those things," and the individuality of her dramatic portraits shows up most sharply in the things she did not do and say. Vincent O'Flaherty chose an apt title for his critical article: "St. Joan Wouldn't Know Herself."

82Henderson, p. 603.
CHAPTER VIII
SAINT JOAN'S MISSION IN THE MODERN WORLD

In the preface to *Theatre for Tomorrow*, Emmet Lavery hails "the recent re-emergence of a powerful spiritual force in the modern theatre . . ."¹ His note of hope is echoed by Father Calvert Alexander, S.J., who writes:

The saints today occupy a new position in our society. They have been recalled from a banishment of several centuries' duration, and have begun to fill the places from which they were expelled. The post-Reformation society, first with hatred and hammers, destroyed their images in the churches, and then . . . pitied them, called them fanatics, and handed them over to the abnormal psychologists . . . I have said that the saints have come back . . . trailing clouds of glory and in fresh garments, fashioned for them by the artists, to signalize their new position in society. Art and sanctity have indeed kissed.²

St. Joan of Arc, in conquering the modern world with the weapons of theatrical art, is in keeping with the trend of the times when religious questions are being faced squarely on the stage. But the question might be asked, Is the modern world ready for the answers? It is ironical, but true, that the greatest box office successes among the Joan-of-Arc plays have been those which dress the saint in a twentieth-century theme and distort her personality accordingly so that she is not really herself. Why are not the truer portrayals of St. Joan and her meaningful mission as popular on the


A summary of what has been said in the preceding chapters regarding each of the plays under consideration may give the answer to this question.

Peguy's Le Mystère de la Charîte de Jeanne d'Arc is a beautiful study of Jeanne's virginal soul before she had heard her Voices or begun her mission. The plot structure pictures only the interior growth of her soul as God is preparing it. The play lacks dramatic action. Unsuitied for stage production, it would probably be more successful as a radio drama, but even here Peguy's poetic use of progressive repetition must be considered. Until the listener or reader becomes accustomed to it and surrenders himself to its undeniable charm it can be an obstacle to enjoyment. Although Le Mystère de la Charîte de Jeanne d'Arc is entitled to a place among modern classics, its strength is in its poetry, not in its dramatic effect.

What Edward Garnett did was well done, and his Trial of Jeanne d'Arc is no exception. He has actually done what Shaw claimed to have done; he has taken the trial record and fitted it for the stage. In some places he has injected or enlarged on scenes glossed over in the record or hinted at in the retrial. The result is a compact, acceptable play in the nineteenth-century style, using soliloquys, asides, and dramatic scene endings. The mood is not tense enough for tragedy; the theme is not dominant enough for a discussion play; as a result the play has a melodramatic tone which is distasteful to modern theatergoers. In spite of his carefulness in reproducing Joan's story, his lack of dramatic genius lends an artificial note to his characterizations and the stigma of mediocrity to the work as a whole.

George Bernard Shaw's Saint Joan is a timeless defense of man's right to think for himself. The play consists of six realistic scenes and a
non-realistic epilogue portraying Joan's return to earth. The epilogue, the most important part of the play, points out that Joan's superiority would be as unacceptable today as it was in her own time, and the characterization of St. Joan gives the audience reason to believe that neither side could put up with her; the French would have had to get rid of her if the English hadn't done it for them. Although Shaw claims Quicherat as his source, the skepticism of Anatole France is strong in the play. The dialogue is Shaw's masterful prose, witty, vigorous, rich in quotable lines. As usual, Shaw injects entire essays into the dialogue, thereby weakening his plot development in favor of his theme. The play is top-heavy with theme; this causes distortion in characterization and standstills in plot movement. There is more of Shaw than of St. Joan in the play; this makes it poor history, but good theater, as Shaw's wit is always a guarantee of an evening's entertainment.

Maurice Maeterlinck's Jeanne d'Arc identifies Joan with the angel who brought the crown to Charles VII and deals with her accordingly. The characterization of the heroine goes to the other extreme from Shaw's; the truth lies somewhere between the two. Maeterlinck's play is rich in mood, modern in staging, using light projections as well as three-dimensional sets. The dialogue is good, specializing in short epigrammatic questions and answers which give a staccato effect even in discussion scenes. The play was written long after Maeterlinck's fame had eclipsed. No English translation is available; probably none has been made. The play is good and in the main historically accurate, but has little humor and lacks the timeliness which Shaw's epilogue gives to his drama. The staging would probably be expensive, and since the dramatist is no longer popular and the presentation lacks the appeal of novelty
it is likely that no good producer has bothered with it. Jeanne d'Arc might be
more successful if tried before an American audience than it would be on the
French stage.

Paul Claudel's Jeanne d'Arc au Bucher is an opera; the musical score was
written by Arthur Hoengger, a noted modern French composer. A spiritual
fantasy, the libretto depicts the canonized saint at the moment of her death
when, from the height of the stake, she surveyed her life and the episodes
which had brought her to die in the market-place of Rouen. As Jeanne watches
and prays chained to her stake on the upper stage, her life is dramatized in
fanciful symbolism on the lower stage. St. Dominic, seated on the steps of the
scaffold, interprets the action from Heaven's point of view. The interpretation
of Joan's life is rich in symbolism and spiritual depth; the action is
often expressed in the forms of the dance, and two choirs representing good and
evil enrich the musical background while performing the functions of the
classical chorus. The dialogue is a mixture of French and Latin mingled in a
poetry that moves with an almost liturgical rhythm, drawing from simple
language unprecedented depths of meaning. Claudel's portrayal of Joan of Arc
is authentic, yet original, possessing a symbolism deep enough to satisfy the
most probing mind and a fantastic pageantry colorful enough to delight a child.
Jeanne d'Arc au Bucher seems to have been well received in France and Italy;
its English presentation was harshly reviewed by at least one critic who failed
herself to grasp much of the play's inner meaning. If the oratorio was presented in French in England as it was in Naples this reviewer's failure is understandable.

Claudel's works are among the most excellent produced by Catholic writers today; he ranks among the foremost French poets and playwrights. Yet his audience is necessarily small because of the depth of his symbolism, not easily grasped by the uneducated. In America, though his name is venerated, his works are practically unknown. Only a small number are available in English translations, and this number does not include Jeanne d'Arc au Bucher.

Anouilh's purpose in L'Alouette was twofold: to stiffen the backbone of resistance during the German Occupation, and to provide light, gay recreation to ease the hardships caused by the war. Joan was just a tool in the process, an unimportant one. The real heroine is not Joan of Arc, but the Spirit of France; Joan of Arc is merely the symbol under which this spirit is presented. Her story is strongly linked to the present in Anouilh's presentation of it; fifteenth-century France occupied by the English symbolizes twentieth-century France occupied by the Nazis. Joan is a girl of the resistance movement, her judges are the collaborationist government of Petain, who is easily recognized in Cauchon. The Inquisitor stands for the Gestapo with its man-hunting methods.

3Audrey Williamson writes in Contemporary Theatre, "The Honegger work stands by its music rather than Paul Claudel's text, which like Fabre gives Joan's accusers the animalism of hot prejudice. This is expressed in Claudel's case through satiric and grotesque ballets. . . . Only in Joan's speeches on the beauty of Normandy, and the cold of winter yielding to the bloom of Spring, do we catch a glimpse of poetry and the spiritual core of the theme." (p. 50).
Warwick represents the officers of the army of occupation, and Rouen is Paris. Under the form of this little allegory Anouilh presents a secret message of hope to his countrymen. The dialogue is clever, catchy, gay, at times risque. Its references to French supremacy, the occupation, propaganda, and the like are loaded with meaning. His depiction of the burning of the saint is farcical; his triumphant ending at the Rheims coronation is an anachronism which clearly shows that he was more concerned with France than with Joan, for this was France's triumph; her death was hers. His play stands as a clever piece of dramaturgy, daring, new, risque at times, ingenious at others, but never a biography of Joan of Arc. The play lacks the universality of Shaw's; though it is still good entertainment, its message is dated as the crisis for which it was written has passed.

Maxwell Anderson's Joan of Lorraine was an earnest attempt to bring Joan of Arc to the modern world with a timely theme. The attempt is too earnest. The accent on the theme of faith and compromise leads to an excess of discussion in which little of real value is said. The play-within-a-play framework is a good theatrical technique and is cleverly handled, working in just enough costuming and scenery to accent the plot without overpowering it. But this double plot is a handicap to characterization. Too little is known about his characters; they are not well drawn, but tend to be conventional types. The success of Joan of Lorraine on Broadway was probably due more to the popularity of Ingrid Bergman, who played Joan, than to the excellence of the play, which is too pedestrian and too discontinuous to be more than a mediocre drama.

In an age when religious drama is once again finding acceptance on the
popular stage and when a trend towards history plays is noticeable, the story of Joan of Arc naturally has a prominent place in theatrical productions. It is a story rich in dynamic action, in dramatic conflict, in youthful adventure, and in the glamor of an improbability that would be considered too far-fetched if it were not so well documented. Joan's story is a "natural" for the dramatist. Since the main issues of her life are considered highly controversial and completely divergent views have been expressed by some of the most illustrious men in literature, the field is open for almost any theme the dramatist wishes to convey to his audience. This is another reason for the popularity of the subject. It is unfortunate that so few of Joan's dramatists hit upon the point that was the real theme of her life.

Shaw's Joan is the Apostle of Modernism, advocating freedom of the individual from the outmoded conventions of Church and State. Maxwell Anderson's Joan is the Apostle of Private Judgment, renouncing established authority to believe only what the soul chooses to believe. Anouilh's Joan is the Apostle of Nationalism, symbolizing a France that would rather die free than live in subjection.

Claudel's Joan is the Apostle of a national unity which unites, not only the separate provinces of France, but also the Kingdom of France to the Kingdom of Heaven. This is the closest view to that of the Church, which approves the

---


5Gassner, Theatre in Our Times, p. 487.
invocation of St. Joan of Arc as "Apostle of the Kingship of Christ." This is the real theme of her story; Joan "inaugurated the doctrine of Christ the King, the doctrine whereby human sovereignty is absorbed in the sovereignty of God." 

When Joan first came to Chinon, according to d'Alençon, she made a solemn request of the king "that he should give his kingdom to the Lord of Heaven; and when he had made this gift, she said, the King of Heaven would do to him as he had done to his predecessors and restore him to his former state." Joan chose for her banner "the figure of God seated on clouds, holding the globe, and on either side an angel knelt, one with a lily in his hand; beyond were the words, 'Jhesus, Maria.' On the reverse was a figure of the Virgin and a shield with the arms of France, supported by two angels." This banner is rich in symbolism; Christ the King is pictured much as we picture Him today, enthroned in glory, holding the world in His hands; an angel offers to Him the lily, the national symbol of France, and in return His angels uphold the arms of France.

This theme is carried still further in the personal blason of Joan of Arc, "a white dove on azure ground, holding in his beak a scroll with the words 'De par le Roi du ciel'." The dove, symbol of peace, upholds Joan's claim that

---


7Fumet, p. 21.

8Testimony of d'Alençon, Retrial, p. 136.

9Bangs, pp. 84-85. Dunois (Retrial, p. 122) describes this banner as "the figure of Our Lord holding a fleur-de-lis in His hand."

10Ibid., p. 85.
she has come "by the command of the King of Heaven." Others fought for the King of France, but she serves a higher Sovereign, and it is His authority she upholds by her motto. The purpose of her fight is not personal glory, not to win land for any earthly king or noble, nor even to achieve victory over the enemy. She wished to drive the English from France, not to overpower them; she had no intention of carrying the war into enemy territory. If her end could have been accomplished by peaceful means she would have preferred them; indeed she never entered into battle without having first offered terms of peace in the Name of her King. She saw the civil disunion occasioned by Burgundy's alliance with England as one major cause of the war and sent several letters to the Duke begging him to reunite with his own king and bring peace to France.

Even on the glorious day of the coronation, when all the supporters of Charles VII were holding glorious celebration in the streets of Rheims, the Maid was too busy to take part, for she was dictating another letter to the Duke of Burgundy entreati~ him to remember his duty and do homage to his king. Fumet has rightly defined the purpose of Joan's fight as peace. "It is necessary to grasp the orientation to peace of Joan's vocation. What she truly aimed at, in the victorious campaign she waged, was the extermination of war."

Why did her campaign fail? Fumet again gives the answer. The coronation

11Englebert, p. 20.


13Fumet, p. 28.
of Charles VII was an alliance between Heaven and France; the king must offer France to God and rule in stewardship as His vassal, His lieutenant. But Charles failed to live up to the conditions of the alliance. He was too human, and in his covetous treaty with Burgundy he deliberately betrayed his alliance with Heaven and the Maid whose ambassadorship had arranged it.\textsuperscript{14}

The world today is still concerned with the question of peace. And the answer is still the same--but this time it was not a mere virgin, but the Queen of Virgins whom God sent as His Ambassador to dictate the terms of peace--the consecration of Russia, and of the entire world. To borrow again the words of Fumet, "Joan revealed the solution of the prime political problem, and there is no other. It was the solution given her by God through St. Michael and St. Catherine and St. Margaret; the simple truth that the earth belongs to no man, but only to the King of Heaven."\textsuperscript{15}

In spite of all the interest shown in Joan of Arc, in spite of all the dramatic interpretations of her story, there is yet room for one more, one which would express the message she came to convey in the fifteenth century which is still so needed in the twentieth. Claudel approaches very near to filling this need, but his dramatic oratorio appeals mainly to Frenchmen and intellectuals. If the message so deeply imbedded in his portrayal of St. Joan could be brought

\textsuperscript{14}Ibid., pp. 30-32.

\textsuperscript{15}Ibid., pp. 20-21.
closer to the surface, simplified so that it would reach the many instead of the few, and universalized to include all the world instead of France only in its heavenly unity, then St. Joan of Arc's mission in the modern world would be fulfilled. In the meantime the world will have to be content with the entertaining, though misleading masterpiece provided by Shaw.
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