

Primary Sources and Context Concerning Joan of Arc's Male Clothing

Joan of Arc: Primary Sources Series

ISSN: 1557-0355 (electronic format)

PSS021806



Primary Sources and Context Concerning Joan of Arc's Male Clothing

Joan of Arc: Primary Sources Series

ISSN: 1557-0355 (electronic format)

PSS021806

ISBN: 1-60053-047-8

ISBN-13: 978-1-60053-047-0

(PDF format)



Robert Wirth (editor), Virginia Frohlick (peer-review), Margaret Walsh (peer-review), Allen Williamson (authorial contribution and translation)

**Copyright © 2006, Historical Academy (Association) for Joan of Arc Studies.
All Rights Reserved.**

**Historical Academy for Joan of Arc Studies
(Historical Association for Joan of Arc Studies)**

Copyright © 2006, Historical Academy (Association) for Joan of Arc Studies.

All Rights Reserved. Except as permitted under current legislation, no part of this work may be photocopied, stored in a retrieval system, published, performed in public, adapted, broadcast, transmitted, recorded or reproduced in any form or by any means without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

First published 2006
Historical Academy (Association) for Joan of Arc Studies

Primary Sources and Context Concerning Joan of Arc's Male Clothing

PSS021806

ISBN: 1-60053-047-8

ISBN-13: 978-1-60053-047-0

(PDF format)

Joan of Arc: Primary Sources Series

ISSN: 1557-0355 (electronic format)

A complete list of items in this series can be obtained from the
Historical Association for Joan of Arc Studies
or by accessing the website for the same.

Historical Academy (Association) for Joan of Arc Studies

Introduction

The issue of Joan of Arc's male clothing is one of the more controversial points related to her history, and an issue continually inspiring much writing which has often been based on an incomplete understanding of the evidence. Due to the greater availability of the Condemnation transcript in English translation, the version given in this document is often accepted at face value, with little or no effort to examine the many other sources nor the 15th century theological principles governing the subject of cross-dressing. Moreover, the nature of the clothing, and hence the eyewitness descriptions of its usage for purposes of necessity, are often misunderstood.

As the series to which this piece belongs is designed to focus on the primary source documents, only a brief summary of the context will be provided before presenting excerpts from the documentary evidence. A fuller examination can be found in an article in Vol. I Issue 1 of the *Journal of Joan of Arc Studies*.

Context

The stated legal justification for Joan of Arc's conviction and execution on 30 May 1431 was her resumption of male clothing on the 28th. Her judges implied that her actions were sinful; certain modern authors have surmised that she was motivated by transgender feelings or other such identity issues. Both positions allege that she was guilty of heresy under the tenets of 15th century theology. To any historian of the subject, these assertions present a number of obvious problems, on both factual and theological grounds.

A number of the clergy who had served on the tribunal later testified, during the posthumous investigations and appeal of the case (1450, 1452, and 1455-56) after the English were expelled, that the transcript and judges had misrepresented the circumstances and hence the theological implications. In detailed testimony [see section farther below], these witnesses related that Joan of Arc had told them that she had worn, and had resumed, this clothing and kept the hosen and doublet "firmly fastened and tied together" because this provided her with the only means she had of protecting herself against the incidences of attempted rape which her English guards were inflicting on her. This description will be immediately understandable if one is familiar with this type of clothing. Based on a description in the Condemnation transcript itself as well as period illustrations of the general type of garment in question, her outfit was equipped with two layers of hosen securely fastened to the doublet, the inner layer being waist-high conjoined woolen hosen attached to the doublet by fully twenty cords, each cord tied into three eyelets apiece (two on the hosen and one on the doublet), for a total of forty attachment points on the inner layer of hosen. The second layer, which was made of rugged leather, seems to have been attached by yet another set of cords. [1] Once this outfit was thus fastened together by dozens of cords connecting both layers to the doublet, it would be a substantial undertaking for someone to try to pull off these garments, especially if she was struggling. While there is no foolproof protection against rape, this was a reasonably effective form and the only option available to her. There is likewise considerable evidence from a variety of sources that she had worn such clothing throughout her campaigns in order to similarly discourage sexual assault while camped with the army in the field, stating that the saints in her visions had told her to wear this clothing primarily for this purpose as well as for a few other stated practical purposes. [2] This stated motive is further confirmed by several factors which would be difficult to explain if she were cross-dressing for any other purpose than protection, including the following

points. The use of twenty cords on the inner layer was an excessively large and exceedingly awkward amount for this type of clothing, which normally had no more than half that number, [3] indicating that she was deliberately taking measures to further increase its protective utility at the cost of her own convenience. Additionally, the accounts say that during her campaigns she had sometimes gone so far as to seek the added protection of sleeping in full plate armor [4] despite the pain and bruising that would result from spending the entire night with metal plates digging into her flesh. The recurring pattern is a desperate fear of rape, not a desire to wear male attire as a personal identity statement: if the latter had been her genuine goal, she could have done so simply by wearing the regular, comfortable and convenient, male fashions under the usual conditions, rather than the extreme measures she repeatedly took.

Although it has often been assumed that Joan of Arc wore male clothing at many points when it wasn't necessary, or that she wore it continuously from the point of her departure from Vaucouleurs up until her death, there seems to be very little credible evidence to support either assumption. [see sidebox] It is likewise often assumed that she felt obedience to her visions would require her to wear this clothing at all times, although, as briefly noted farther above, her most complete recorded quotations concerning that subject state that her visions had told her to wear it primarily for reasons of necessity, indicating that the two issues may have been interlinked. In any event, it seems reasonable to state that the only clear evidence we have tends to attribute a motive of necessity to her, and the various speculative theories on the subject are not grounded upon a sufficient foundation for overruling this evidence.

Both the Condemnation transcript and the eyewitnesses related quotes from Joan of Arc protesting that she was not in violation of the Church's laws. [5] This will be immediately understandable to anyone familiar with medieval doctrinal regulations concerning cross-dressing, which were in fact based entirely on context. The chief summary of medieval doctrine, the "*Summa Theologica*", as well as other documents which were given the approval of the medieval Church, expressly state that when cross-dressing is done *for reasons of necessity*, an exemption from the normal prohibition is granted. Medieval Catholic doctrine held that although the Biblical prohibitions in the Torah or Old Law were still valid and upheld under the New, these nevertheless did not apply in cases of necessity since the intent of the law was not being violated in such cases. Excerpts from some of the theological sources concerning this point are translated farther below, from which it can be seen that Joan of Arc's judges misrepresented the Church's position on the subject by treating the rule as if it were an absolute prohibition regardless of circumstances. Moreover, it was a reasonably standard practice in that era for women in danger to make use of such clothing for purposes of necessity, and such was considered perfectly sensible. Two of the men who had escorted Joan of Arc through enemy-held territory from Vaucouleurs to Chinon (i.e., the first time she wore male clothing) testified that it was they themselves and other people of Vaucouleurs who had suggested and helped

Some sources, such as "De Quadam Puella", directly refute the idea that she wore male clothing at all times, stating that even during her military campaigns she often resumed female clothing after dismounting. There is little to contradict this: Nider's thoroughly erroneous account claims that she always wore male clothing, but this is neither an eyewitness nor a reliable source. There are a few ambiguous statements in Anglo-Burgundian sources such as the "Chronique des Cordeliers" and the Condemnation transcript which might be interpreted to imply the same, but without any explicit statements to that effect: these have often been interpreted based merely on the assumption that she did wear male clothing at all times. Moreover, these two accounts are also unreliable, as the information they provide on other, verifiable topics proves them to be erroneous or falsified on certain crucial issues or other specific points. Such a small set of often ambiguous descriptions in unreliable sources would not normally be considered a solid foundation for a theory.

facilitate this course of action. [6]

This contextual nature of the law was the reason Joan of Arc's male clothing was defended or accepted not only by Inquisitor-General Bréhal and other theologians consulted during the appeal of her case - e.g., the Papal theologian Teodoro Lelio, the beatified Bishop Élie de Bourdeilles and a long list of other Bishops - but approval had also been previously given during her military campaigns themselves by a substantial number of clergy such as the Inquisitor of Toulouse, the Archbishops of Rheims and Embrun, the influential theologian Jean Gerson, and many others whose opinions are documented. Excerpts from a number of these are likewise included in the section farther below.

The opposing view tended to emanate from clergy who are known to have been partisans of the English faction, as was true of the tribunal members and the few other French clergy who opposed her, mostly clerics from the thoroughly pro-English University of Paris. There was also a German cleric (Johannes Nider), who received his information on Joan of Arc chiefly from a pro-English member of the tribunal whom he had met at the Council of Basel. [7] This explains why Nider's version is little more than a repetition of the familiar English version circulated by their faction, and has little in common with the established information confirmed by the rest of the documents. Due to the many available translations of the trial transcript and the online availability of Nider's brief comments, popular treatments of the subject have often ignored the majority of clerical opinions while granting an inflated significance to the relatively small number of partisan or partisan-influenced clerical sources. This has created a misleading impression of ecclesiastical opinion: outside of the latter group much of the clergy throughout Europe appear to have either supported her or at least maintained a neutral stance, and many wrote opinions specifically defending her use of male clothing.

There are a few additional contextual issues which are important for an understanding of the evidence below. One recurring theme is the crucial issue of Joan of Arc's English guards and the manner in which the threat they posed finally resulted in her "relapse" - the readoption of her protective clothing. In other Inquisitorial trials, the normal procedure was to bring in nuns to guard female prisoners, precisely in order to prevent the abuse which Joan of Arc was facing. The Appellate witnesses testified that she had repeatedly begged for this arrangement to be granted, a complaint which appears in a much more vague form in the Condemnation transcript: the latter includes a statement from her asking to have a woman with her, but without including any further elaboration in this version. [8] The virtual omission of this critical context is one of numerous falsifications of that transcript. Another omission concerns a related issue which is also mentioned in the testimony below and likewise requires a more thorough explanation: many of the clergy testified that in addition to attempted sexual abuse, which intensified after she agreed to wear a dress under the terms of her abjuration on May 24th,

The nature of the clergy who opposed Joan of Arc is an issue which is often misunderstood. The clerics who served on the tribunal which convicted her in 1431 are well documented to have been pro-English partisans, and English government records confirm that it was they who selected and paid these men. The University of Paris, which was consulted for an "outside" opinion, had been filled with English partisans in the years since Paris came under English occupation. Similar circumstances were behind other clergy who provided authorization for the trial, such as Inquisitor Jean Graverent. Contrary to the assertion found in far too many modern writings on the subject, Pope Martin V was not among these: there is no letter of authorization from Martin V anywhere in the transcript.

A number of the clergy who later testified at the Appellate trial said that they themselves or other consulted theologians had also pointed out the need to follow standard Inquisitorial guidelines on the issue of appropriate custody: she should have been held in an ecclesiastical prison rather than in an English secular prison.

the final act involved deliberately giving the forbidden male clothing back to her. The bailiff additionally testified that the guards finally prevented her from having access to anything else. The significance of this extends beyond the issue of Joan's motives for readopting this clothing: not only was her decision based on a different context than what is implied in the transcript's version, but the tribunal's deliberate effort to induce a "relapse" was a profound violation of the doctrinal precept that such tribunals were instead required to lead a suspected heretic back to the correct path if at all possible. Since this was in fact the defined function of an Inquisitorial court, scholars have pointed out that the above circumstance, and many other egregious offenses throughout the trial, would indicate that this tribunal was in such fundamental violation of 15th century ecclesiastical law as to bring upon its members the penalty of excommunication *latae sententiae* - i.e., automatic excommunication without the need for a formal sentence against them. This is why the Inquisitor-General who presided over the appeal essentially stated as much in his lengthy judicial analysis of the case, citing precepts of ecclesiastical law from the *Decretum Gratiani*. [9]

As a final contextual note: a somewhat related issue concerns her hair. Underneath the hats which she is known to have often worn, her hair was cut in some approximation of the 'rounded' style popular with men in that era, apparently clipped around her ears (not likely shorter than that) in a bowl-shape. Some 15th century theologians defended this decision as well, whether because it made it easier for her to wear a helmet while on the battlefield or for other practical reasons. It should be noted that in modern times this hairstyle is often misrepresented as more masculine-looking than it probably actually was, and more so than it would have likely seemed to contemporaries. There were several variations of the 'rounded' style: hers is unlikely to have been the extremely short form since even the Condemnation transcript, despite its heated language on the subject, tends to describe it as being cut *around* the ears rather than above the ears. This implies a mid-ear length version which, judging from extant illustrations, was often quite rounded and full, and certainly does not bear any resemblance to the stereotypical crewcut or butch style that has sometimes been associated with Joan of Arc in modern times. Moreover, anyone familiar with 15th century *female* hairstyles will recognize an irony here: although most women in that era did have hair with a long strand length, it often did not appear that way given the common fashion of tightly pulling the hair upwards under a headdress while additionally plucking out much of the hair from the scalp, in such a manner that these women almost look as if they could be bald underneath their headcovering. The ears are generally fully exposed, and the upper forehead is clear of any suggestion of hair, which is often completely hidden under a headdress or closely fixed under a netting. Joan of Arc, even when she wasn't wearing one of her hats, would have *appeared* to the casual observer as if she had as much or more hair than some of these other women; and her habit of wearing a hat would have normally hidden her hairstyle entirely. The Condemnation transcript's inflated invective on the subject has often given readers the impression that society was shocked and outraged, but in fact such complaints appear only in this and a few other sources produced by the pro-English faction: the rest of European society scarcely commented on it, and probably scarcely noticed.

Excerpts From The Documents

A few representative excerpts from the sources are included below, beginning with excerpts from the Appellate testimony, then proceeding to medieval theological sources concerning cross-dressing in general, then 15th century theological opinions concerning Joan of Arc's use of male clothing in particular.

For the Appellate excerpts, it should be explained that a number of the witnesses each gave three or more depositions apiece during the course of the several investigations, which were conducted in 1450, 1452 (during which there were two sessions), and 1455-56 (during which several separate sessions were conducted). Only a few representative examples have been given here, rather than including all the relevant quotes on the subject from each deposition.

The testimony has been left in the original format. Court transcripts of that era typically rendered witness testimony in the third person voice (e.g., "the witness testifies that he...."), and this form has been retained for the translations below rather than adopting the method, found in many books, of converting it into the first-person voice.

Explanatory side-notes are referenced via superscript numbers in the text. Endnotes documenting sources are referenced via larger bracketed numbers in the standard font.

Excerpts from the Appellate Testimony

From the deposition on 12 May 1456^[1] given by Guillaume Manchon,^[2] who had served as the chief notary at Joan of Arc's trial:

"Subsequently questioned concerning the contents of the 26th and 27th articles, he testifies that during the trial the witness heard Joan complain to the aforesaid Bishop^[3] and Earl of Warwick - when she was asked why she wasn't wearing women's clothing, and [they told her] that it wasn't proper for a woman to wear a man's tunic [and] hosen firmly tied together with many cords - she said that she didn't dare give up the aforesaid hosen, nor to keep them but firmly tied, because the aforesaid Bishop and Earl well knew, as they themselves said, that her guards had attempted to rape her a number of times; and on one occasion when she had cried out [for help], the Earl himself came to her aid at the sound of her cry,^[4] under such circumstances that if he hadn't come the aforesaid guards would have raped her; and she complained about this." [10]

1. **Note:** This deposition was given during the formal appeal, which took place from November 1455 - June 1456 and was presided over by Inquisitor-General Jean Bréhal.
2. **Note:** At the time of this deposition, Manchon was listed as about 58 years old, a parish priest of Saint Nicholas Church in Rouen and still a notary of the archiepiscopal court at Rouen.
3. **Note:** This refers to Bishop Pierre Cauchon, the chief judge at the trial, a longterm supporter of the Anglo-Burgundian faction and member of the occupation council which governed English-held portions of Northern France. Since Cauchon didn't have legal jurisdiction to preside as judge, the Duke of Bedford had arranged a dispensation for him.
4. **Note:** This should not be interpreted as evidence that Joan had nothing to fear: although English noblemen such as Warwick were sworn to uphold the law, their aid was both unreliable and sometimes unavailable (especially during the night). Moreover, it was her securely-fastened garment which hindered the guards enough for such aid to be feasible when responsible leaders were nearby to intervene.

From one of Manchon's earlier depositions, on 2 May 1452:^[5]

"...And she was then dressed in male clothing, and was complaining that she could not give it up, fearing lest in the night her guards would inflict some act of [sexual] outrage upon her; and she had complained once or twice to the Bishop of Beauvais, the Vice-Inquisitor,^[6] and Master Nicholas Loiseleur^[7] that one of the aforesaid guards had tried^[8] to violate her." [11]

From the deposition given on 10 May 1456 by Jean Moreau (of Rouen)^[9]:

"Concerning the contents of the 23rd, 24th, and 25th [articles] ... he [the witness] testifies under oath that he had been present at Saint-Ouen during the lecture preached to Joan [i.e., on 24 May 1431 when she was threatened with summary execution] ... And among other things, he heard Joan reply to the preacher [Guillaume Énard] that she had adopted male clothing because she had to live among soldiers, among whom it was safer and more appropriate for her to be in male, rather than female, clothing; and that what she was doing and had done, she had done properly [or 'lawfully']." [12]

The eyewitnesses likewise related that this motive was also behind her relapse (the resumption of male clothing after her abjuration):

From the deposition given on 13 May 1456^[10] by Friar Martin Ladvenu,^[11] one of the clergy who had served as an assessor (theological advisor) at her trial:

"Concerning the contents of the 26th and 27th [articles], he testifies that he heard from the aforementioned Joan that a certain high-ranking English lord^[12] visited her in prison and attempted to violate her by force.^[13] And she told the aforesaid witness that this was the reason she had readopted male clothing after the first

5. **Note:** This deposition was given during Inquisitor-General Bréhal's initial investigation in May of 1452.
6. **Note:** This refers to Jean LeMaitre, who held the rank of Vice-Inquisitor for Northern France under the pro-English Inquisitor Jean Graverent. The witnesses said that LeMaitre had developed scruples about taking part in an illegal trial and had to be coerced into cooperation by the effective method of threatening his life. [25]
7. **Note:** Loiseleur was one of the assessors (advisors), whose most famous role during the trial was the covert gathering of information by pretending to be a clergyman of Joan of Arc's own faction who, he told her, was a prisoner-of-war like herself. He would sometimes take her confession while playing such a role, in the hope of drawing her into saying something that could be used against her.
8. **Note:** It needs to be noted that Manchon and other witnesses describe *attempted* rape, which is a traumatic enough experience; but there is no justification for the attempts made by a few modern authors to convert this into the type of gang-rape which has become a staple of a certain class of book on the subject. The witnesses describe attempted, not actual, rape; moreover, Joan of Arc was quoted as saying, immediately before her death, that her body was still 'uncorrupted'.
9. **Note:** During the Appellate trial there were two witnesses who happened to have the name "Jean Moreau". This one was a Rouen citizen, about 52 years old at the time of his testimony, who had witnessed some of the events connected with the trial.
10. **Note:** See note farther above concerning the formal appeal in 1455-1456.
11. **Note:** Martin Ladvenu, a friar of the Dominican Order, had the unique distinction of having taken her final confession and giving her the Eucharist before she died (which Cauchon had inexplicably allowed, although the Eucharist can only be given to someone who is assumed to have been purged of mortal sin by repentance, which would not be the case if she were the "unrepentant heretic" he was claiming her to be). At the time of this deposition Ladvenu was about 56 years old.
12. **Note:** To avoid misinterpretation, the choice of the translation "high-ranking" should be explained. The original Latin - "magnus dominus Anglicus" - means that the lord in question belonged to the upper ranks of the nobility, not necessarily that he was one of the top commanders such as Bedford or Warwick. Among the other nobles present was the Earl of Stafford, who had tried to stab Joan at one point (as well as one of the clergy who had defended her), and there were likewise other noblemen there who may have been the offender.
13. **Note:** It should be noted that, here as elsewhere in these witness accounts, an *attempted* rape is what is being described - "temptavit vi opprimere" - with the key word here being "temptavit" ("(he) attempted", "tried", etc). "Opprimere" in this context means to "ravish, rape, violate" etc.

sentence."^[14] [13]

From the deposition given on 3 May 1452^[15] by the Rouen citizen Pierre Cusquel:^[16]

"Concerning the 9th Article, he says that people were saying that there was no other reason for her condemnation except the readoption of male clothing, and that she had not worn, and was not wearing, this male clothing except in order to avoid accommodating the aims of the soldiers she was with; and [the witness said] that once in prison he asked her why she was wearing the aforesaid male clothing, to which she replied as above." [14]

From Guillaume Manchon's deposition on 12 May 1456:^[17]

"And in the witness' presence she was asked why she had readopted this male clothing, to which she replied that she had done it for the protection of her virginity, for she was not secure while wearing female clothing with her guards, who had tried to rape her, which she had complained about many times to the Bishop and Earl; and [she said] that the judges had promised her that she would be placed in the custody of, and in the prisons of, the Church, and that she would have a woman with her [i.e., a nun, following Inquisitorial procedure];^[18] additionally saying that if it would please the lord judges to place her in a safe location in which she would not be afraid, then she was prepared to readopt female clothing..." [15]

From his deposition on 2 May 1452:^[19]

"Concerning the 10th article, he refers to the law. He says, however, that after she was sentenced following her abjuration and she put on female clothing, being content with this clothing, as she said,^[20] she asked that she be granted women [i.e., nuns] to be with her, and to be placed in the prisons of the Church, and held in the custody of churchmen. And afterwards she put on male clothing, explaining that if she had been placed in the prisons of the Church she wouldn't have put on this male

14. **Note:** I.e., the judgement handed down after her abjuration at Saint-Ouen cemetery on 24 May 1431.

15. **Note:** See note farther above concerning the investigation in 1452.

16. **Note:** Pierre Cusquel was a citizen of Rouen who had a reasonable knowledge of the subject: he had visited Joan in prison several times due to his association with Jean Son, Master of the Stonework; and his own home had been used for weighing a metal cage which had been contemplated as a prison for Joan (although Cusquel indicates that this plan may not have been implemented). At the time of this deposition he was about 55 years old.

17. **Note:** See note farther above concerning the formal appeal in 1455-1456.

18. **Note:** This is again a reference to the standard Inquisitorial practice of placing female prisoners in the custody of nuns.

19. **Note:** This deposition was given during the first round of testimony during the Inquisitor's initial investigation in 1452; see the note farther above concerning this investigation.

20. **Note:** Following DuParc's transcription "ut dicebat" ("as she was saying").

clothing, [since] she didn't dare stay with her English guards while wearing female clothing." [16]

From the deposition given on 3 May 1452^[21] by Friar Isambart de la Pierre,^[22] who had served as an assessor at her trial:

"...And he [the witness] additionally says that after she made her abjuration, she put on female clothing, and asked to be brought to the prisons of the Church; which wasn't permitted her. In fact, as he heard from Joan herself, she was subjected to attempted rape by someone of great authority; because of which, in order to be better equipped to prevent this, she said she readopted male clothing, which had been purposefully left near her in the prison. Additionally, [the witness says] that after the readoption of the aforesaid clothing, he saw and heard the aforesaid Bishop, with other Englishmen [i.e., other members of the English faction], rejoicing and saying openly to everyone, to Lord Warwick and others: 'It is done!'"^[23] [17]

From Isambart de la Pierre's first deposition (5 March 1450):^[24] "...[the witness] stated and testified that after she had made her abjuration and [subsequently] readopted male clothing, he [the witness] and a number of others were present when the aforesaid Joan defended herself for having put on male clothing again, publicly stating and affirming that the English had committed, or caused to be committed, much wrongdoing and outrage against her in prison when she was wearing female clothing; and in fact he saw her weeping, her face covered in tears, contorted and distressed^[25] in such fashion that [the witness] felt pity and compassion for her.

Additionally [the witness] said and related that in front of all of those who were present, when she was labeled an obstinate and relapsed heretic, she replied publicly: 'If you, my lords of the Church, had brought me to, and kept me in your own prisons, perhaps it wouldn't be this way for me.'^[26]

"Moreover, he states and testifies that, after the end of this session, the aforesaid Lord Bishop of Beauvais said to the Englishmen who were waiting outside: 'Farewell, be of good cheer, it is done!' " [18]

A number of the witnesses confirmed that the male clothing had been deliberately placed in her room, followed (according to the bailiff,

21. **Note:** See the note farther above concerning the investigation in 1452.
22. **Note:** Isambart de la Pierre was a Dominican friar who served as an assessor at her trial, and was one of the few who mounted some opposition to the proceedings. At one point he was threatened with drowning by the Earl of Warwick for having tried to help her during one of the hearings; on another occasion he landed in trouble for pointing out that she could submit her case to the (non-partisan) group of clergy at the Council of Basel. [26] At the time of this deposition he was about 55 years old.
23. **Note:** This exchange is one of many indications that Cauchon had either orchestrated this trap or at the very least was deliberately trying to find an excuse to convict her.
24. **Note:** This deposition was given during the first preliminary investigation in 1450, conducted by Guillaume Bouillé shortly after the eyewitnesses and documents first became available for investigation after Rouen was regained by the French in November of 1449.
25. **Note:** This should not be taken as an indication that she was raped: attempted rape is by itself sufficiently traumatizing to produce such a reaction in most victims, and eyewitnesses said that Joan herself tended to weep as a result of much lesser occurrences such as verbal insults (e.g., when English troops called her a 'whore' at Orléans on 5 May 1429.) [27]
26. **Note:** This is a reference to the fact that she wouldn't have needed to wear protective clothing if she had been held in an ecclesiastical prison guarded by nuns.

Jean Massieu) by the final step of leaving her nothing else to wear.^[27]

As with all eyewitness accounts, the specific details vary in some cases.

From the first deposition (5 March 1450)^[28] of Jean Massieu,^[29] who had served as bailiff at the trial:

"And on that day [the day of her abjuration], after dinner, in the presence of the ecclesiastical council, she gave up the male clothing and put on female clothing, as she had been ordered. And it was then the Thursday or Friday after Pentecost, and the male clothing was put in a sack, in the same room where she had been held prisoner, and she remained under guard in that location, in the custody of five Englishmen, of whom three stayed inside the room at night and two of them stayed outside... And when the following Sunday morning came, which was Trinity Sunday,^[30] when she had to get out of bed, as she related and told [the witness], she had requested of these Englishmen, her guards: 'Unchain me, so I can get up'. And then one of these Englishmen took away the female clothing which she had, and they emptied the sack in which the male clothing was, and tossed this clothing upon her while telling her, 'Get up'; and they put away the female clothing in the aforementioned sack. And, as she said, she put on the male clothing they had given her, [after] saying, 'Sirs,^[31] you know this is forbidden me: without fail, I will not accept it.' But nevertheless they wouldn't give her anything else, so that she continued in this argument with them until the hour of noon; and finally, she was compelled by the necessity of the body to leave the room and hence to wear this clothing; and after she returned, they still wouldn't give her anything else [to wear] regardless of any appeal or request she made of them." [19]

Some additional details are provided in Massieu's final deposition (12 May 1456):^[32]

27. **Note:** Deliberately maneuvering a suspect into a "relapse" was a profound violation of medieval doctrine. The stated goal of Inquisitorial trials was to lead a heretic back to orthodoxy, with execution defined in the *Directorium Inquisitorium* as a last resort. [28] Medieval doctrinal sources warn the clergy not to convict someone wrongly out of anger or bias, lest they be punished by God in the afterlife. [29] At the end of the Appellate trial, the Inquisitor-General commented that he could not see how Cauchon could escape the charge of "manifest malice against the Roman [Catholic] Church, and indeed heresy". [30]
28. **Note:** See note farther above concerning the initial investigation in 1450.
29. **Note:** Jean Massieu, a curate of Saint-Candres Church in Rouen, had served as bailiff during the Condemnation trial. At the time of his first deposition in 1450 he was listed as about 50 years old.
30. **Note:** Trinity Sunday is the first Sunday after Pentecost. Pope John XXII (reigned: 1316-1334) had made this a general feast day of the entire Church in the 14th century, whereas prior to that it had only been celebrated as such in some locations. (see article: "Trinity Sunday" in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1917 edition.)
31. **Note:** The rendering "sirs" is an attempt to translate "messieurs", a common respectful form of address which has no suitable equivalent in modern English.
32. **Note:** See note farther above concerning the formal appeal in 1455-1456.

"Questioned, furthermore, concerning the contents of the 26th Article, [the witness] testifies that on the day of the Holy Trinity [i.e., Trinity Sunday], when Joan was accused of having relapsed, she replied that, as she was lying in bed, her guards removed the female clothing from the bed in which she was lying, and gave her the male outfit; and, although she asked the guards to return the female clothing so she could leave her bed to go relieve herself, they refused to give it back to her, saying that she would not receive anything but the aforesaid male clothing. And when she additionally said that the guards knew perfectly well that the judges had prohibited her from wearing this clothing, they nevertheless refused to give her the female clothing they had taken; and in the end, induced by bodily necessity, she put on the male clothing; nor was she able to obtain any other clothing from the guards during all the rest of the day, so that she was seen in this male clothing by many people, and judged relapsed as a result of this - for during that Trinity Sunday many people were called in to see her in this state, to whom she related the motives described above; and among these he saw Master André Marguerie,^[33] who was in great danger because when he said, 'It would be a good idea to ask her why she has readopted male clothing', an Englishman raised a spear which he was holding and had the intention of striking Master André. And at that point Master André and a number of others left in fear." [20]

Less specific, secondhand testimony in essential agreement with the above is found in other witnesses' depositions, including the following examples:

From the deposition given on 2 April 1456 by Guillaume de la Chambre:^[34]

"Item, questioned concerning the contents of the 26th article, he says that he heard it said that the English impelled her into readopting her [old] clothing, and her female clothing was taken away from her and she was given male clothing; and because of this, people said that Joan had been unjustly condemned." [21]

From the deposition given on 13 May 1456 by Pierre Daron:^[35]

"Concerning the contents of the 26th [article], he testifies that common knowledge held that she was induced into wearing male clothing after the first sentence." [22]

From the deposition given on 12 May 1456 by Guillaume Colles (aka

33. **Note:** André Marguerie, an assessor during the trial, was also a counselor for the English government. [31] A clergyman with a degree in civil law, he held positions as Archdeacon of Petit-Caux and Canon of Rouen.

34. **Note:** Guillaume de la Chambre had been present during Joan of Arc's trial in his capacity as a doctor who had been called in to treat her during her illness: he testified that the Earl of Warwick had told him to keep her alive long enough for her to be burned in disgrace after conviction. At the time of his testimony during the appeal, he was listed as about 48 years old.

35. **Note:** Pierre Daron had been the *Procureur* of Rouen at the time of Joan's trial. At the time of his testimony during the appeal, he was the lieutenant of the Lord Bailiff of Rouen, and about 60 years old.

Boisguillaume),^[36] who had served as one of the three notaries during the trial:

"...and [the witness] believes that she had been maneuvered into doing this [readopting male clothing] given that some of those who took part in the trial engaged in great applause and rejoicing because she had resumed this clothing,^[37] although a number of notable men were sad, among whom he saw the late Master Pierre Maurice^[38] looking extremely sorrowful, and a number of others." [23]

From the Bishop of Noyon's^[39] deposition on 2 April 1456, which presents a muddled secondhand version but nevertheless is consistent on the central point:

"Questioned concerning the contents of the 26th [article], he testifies that he had heard it said... that male clothing had been thrown in to her through the window or grate." [24]

Excerpts From Medieval Doctrinal Sources

It would be fitting to begin with the principal late-medieval theological work, the *Summa Theologica* by St. Thomas Aquinas,^[40] which was written in the 13th century and subsequently was used as one of the chief summaries of official doctrine. The exemption for necessity-based cross-dressing is found in II^a-IIae, q. 169 a. 2 ad 3: "...it is sinful for a woman to use male clothing or vice-versa... Nevertheless, in some circumstances this may be done without sin due to some necessity, whether for the purpose of concealing oneself from enemies, or due to a lack of any other clothing, or due to some other matter of this type..." [33]

A similar exemption is cited in many other prominent theological sources which were utilized by the 15th century Church, such as the following:

In one of the more authoritative commentaries of its era, "Rosarium super Decreto"^[41] by Guido de Baysio, Archdeacon of Bologna, written between 1296 and 1300, we have the following: "If a woman should have a proper purpose, such as in order to [safely] travel abroad, or to protect her chastity under other circumstances when there is fear of losing it, or if some other necessity should arise, she is not committing a sin if she should then make use of male clothing to more easily evade danger or otherwise engage in proper and fitting

36. **Note:** Guillaume Colles, often referred to as "Boisguillaume" or "Boscguillaume", etc, had served as one of the three notaries during the Condemnation trial, along with Manchon and Taquel. At the time of this deposition during the appeal, he was listed as about 66 years old.
37. **Note:** Boisguillaume cites this as a significant issue: among other reasons, there is the central point that Inquisitorial tribunals were supposed to work toward the salvation of the accused, meaning that if some of the tribunal members were rejoicing over her 'relapse' then it indicates that they were deliberately seeking such an occurrence rather than the other way around.
38. **Note:** Pierre Maurice, an assessor during the trial, would serve as the King of England's ambassador to the Council of Basel in 1435. He had also held positions as Rector of the University of Paris and Canon of Rouen. [32]
39. **Note:** Jean de Mailly, Bishop of Noyon, had been present near the end of Joan's trial. At that time he had been a counselor of the English occupation government. At the time of this deposition during the appeal, he was about 60 years old.

40. **Note:** The *Summa Theologica*, up to section III q 90, was written by St. Thomas Aquinas, who ceased work on it after 6 December 1273 and died a few months later. The remainder was compiled from Aquinas' "Scriptum super Sententiis", probably by Aquinas' friend, Friar Rainaldo da Piperno. The *Summa Theologica* quickly became one of the chief texts used by the medieval Church: in 1286 Aquinas' doctrines were already pronounced by an assembly of the clergy in Paris to be required tenets of the faith. [37]

41. **Note:** The *Rosarium* was an important commentary on the *Decretum Gratiani* which was often cited by medieval theologians. Its author, Guido de Baysio (died: 10 August 1313) was a professor of ecclesiastical law, Archdeacon of Bologna, Chancellor of the University of Bologna, and author of a number of famous theological works. [38]

activity." [34]

The above source echoes another important work, the "Summa" of Hugo of Pisa (aka Huguccio), Bishop of Ferrara, written c. 1187. [35]

Likewise, in the book "Scivias" (completed 1151) by St. Hildegard von Bingen,^[42] - a collection of revelations which were approved by the Church during her lifetime and subsequently enjoyed a degree of popularity - in Book II, Vision 6, 77, God is quoted on the matter under the heading "Men and women should not wear each other's clothes except in necessity" :

"A man should never put on feminine dress or a woman use male attire... Unless a man's life or a woman's chastity is in danger; in such an hour a man may change his dress for a woman's or a woman for a man's..." [36]

Opinions of 15th Century Theologians Concerning Joan of Arc's Cross-Dressing

There were many theologians, during Joan of Arc's lifetime as well as during the course of the posthumous appeal of her case, who commented on her usage of male clothing. A selection of these would include the following examples:

We may start with the clergymen commissioned to examine her at Poitiers,^[43] a group which included: Regnault de Chartres (Archbishop of Rheims); [40] Pierre Turelure (Inquisitor-General of Toulouse); Hugues de Combarel (Bishop of Poitiers); [41] Guillaume Leroy (Bishop of Maguelonne); [42] Pierre de Versailles (Abbot of Talmont and later Bishop of Meaux); Gérard Machet (later Bishop of Castres); [43] Jean Raffanel (later Bishop of Senlis); [44] and other ecclesiastical dignitaries. Although Pope Pius II (1405 - 1464) says in his Memoirs that her male clothing was a potential point of difficulty, [45] they ruled in their official conclusions that "nothing improper has been found in her, only good, humility, chastity, piety, propriety, simplicity". [46]

42. **Note:** "Scivias", which is believed to represent the phrase "Scito Vias Domini" ("Know the ways of the Lord") was approved by Pope Eugenius III during the Synod of Trier (1147-1148). Its author, St. Hildegard von Bingen (1098 - 1179), was a Benedictine nun and mystic who was widely regarded as a saint during her lifetime and consulted on numerous matters by both clergy and laity. [39]

43. **Note:** She was examined by theologians at Poitiers, on the orders of the Royal government, in March of 1429. Some of the discussions which occurred during these examinations are related in the appellate depositions of a few men who had been present. The group's official verdict granting their approval is found in a document issued at the end of March or early April. [112]

Important support also came from the prominent theologian Jean Gerson,^[44] who is included as a "Blessed" ("Beatus") in a number of Catholic lists of saints. [47] He had been Chancellor of the University of Paris (before the Anglo-Burgundian takeover of the city) and author of numerous influential works on theology, including two on the judgement of visions, *De distinctione verarum visionum a falsis* (1401) and *De probatione spirituum* (1415). Shortly after the lifting of the siege of Orléans, Gerson wrote a treatise called "*De Mirabili Victoria*" (dated 14 May 1429) which, among other comments in support of Joan of Arc, presents a "three-fold truth" ("*triplex veritas*") in defense of her male clothing. The first two points concern the Old Testament's rules on the matter, for which he notes that the moral component of the law, which has been retained, nevertheless does not apply in cases of necessity. [48] For the third point, he argues in essence that the Divine Law does not forbid the use of male, military clothing by Joan in her military circumstances, "*whom the King of Heaven has selected, by clear signs, as the standard-bearer in the effort to crush the enemies of justice and uplift its friends*". [49] As a final part of this third point Gerson additionally defends her short hair. [50]

He continues with the statement: "*Therefore, let the unjust speech [against her] cease and be silenced, for whenever the Divine might is at work... it is not safe to disparage or condemn, with rash presumption, those things which were ordained by God, [as says] the Apostle.*" [51]

Also written in May of 1429 was the Archbishop of Embrun's "De Puella Aurelianensi Dissertatio".^[45] Although his early letters to Charles VII on the subject had counseled skepticism, the Archbishop had by now changed his mind, pronouncing Joan to be "the angel of the Lord of Hosts". [52] He justifies her use of male clothing by pointing out that it is the intent of the Law which must be taken into account: the needs of her military calling require suitable clothing. [53] He states that in her case, he can find "nothing which is not proper to feminine modesty". [54]

Likewise in 1429, additional support came from a text incorporated into a book called the *Breviarium historiale* (aka *Collectarium historiarum*), written at Rome by, it is believed, Inquisitor Jean DuPuy.^[46] [55] This is one of the more enthusiastic texts written

44. **Note:** Jean Gerson (14 December 1363 - 12 July 1429) was among the most famous and influential theologians of his era. Having begun his studies at the University of Paris at the unusual age of fourteen, he became Chancellor in 1395. He was pulled into the Armagnac-Burgundian dispute when he called for the condemnation of Burgundian clergy who had tried to justify the assassination of Duke Louis of Orléans in 1407. This brought him into conflict with Pierre Cauchon and other pro-Burgundian clergy who would later similarly take opposite sides concerning Joan of Arc. The debate over the assassination also made Gerson a target: after an attack on his home in Paris and further menaces from Duke Jean-sans-Peur of Burgundy, he left France for the Abbey of Mölk in Germany, then settled in Lyons after Jean-sans-Peur himself was assassinated in 1419. Gerson's treatise in support of Joan of Arc was among his final writings, written less than two months before his death. [113]

45. **Note:** Jacques Gelu (1369 - 1432) had served first as Archbishop of Tours (1414 - 1426) [114] and then as Archbishop of Embrun from 1427 to 1432. [115] As with Gerson, he was opposed to, and opposed by, the Burgundian faction: when the latter gained Paris in 1418, Gelu was residing in the city but managed to escape on June 16th. [116] His initial correspondence concerning Joan of Arc, which was directed to both Charles VII and his Queen, cautioned them, in fairly blunt terms, not to risk ridicule by credulously accepting an unknown girl, advising the king to have a thorough examination conducted by theologians. [117] Gelu's view had changed by the time of his *Dissertatio* summarized at left, which seems to have been written after the siege of Orléans was lifted on 8 May 1429.

46. **Note:** Jean Dupuy, Bishop of Cahors and Inquisitor of Toulouse, was a Dominican friar then associated with the Papal Court of Martin V. His text on Joan of Arc was an addendum to the *Breviarium historiale*, added after word reached him of circumstances he described as "so profound, so lofty, never before witnessed, that one cannot read of anything similar since the foundation of the world", [118] thereby recording in this unusually direct manner his initial reaction to the news as it reached him in Rome.

about Joan, stating that her actions are "Divine rather than human". [56] The text's author accepts her use of male clothing, referring to a "*triplex veritas*" [57] which, in one copy of the manuscript, was provided by entering a copy of the "*triplex veritas*" of Gerson's defense of her male clothing contained in his treatise mentioned above. [58]

On 27 September 1429 a German clergyman, likewise an enthusiastic supporter, defended her use of male clothing in the second part of his *Sibylla Francica* ("Prophetess of France").^[47] The treatise is in the familiar form of a dispute between himself and an opponent. He cites the *Summa Theologica* concerning the matter of necessity, [59] and brings up the case of Saint Marina, [60] who had adopted male clothing and short hair when her father brought her to live with him in a monastery.

A clerical opinion written a few years after her death is contained in "Le champion des dames", written in 1440 by Martin le Franc,^[48] a clergyman who served alongside the future Pope Pius II under Felix V, and then served in the Papal court of Pope Nicholas V. During the war, he had studied under Thomas de Courcelles (one of the assessors at Joan of Arc's trial). [61] Franc's piece is all the more remarkable given that he was a Norman clergyman tied to the Burgundian faction who courageously (or rashly) sent his supportive description of Joan of Arc to Duke Philip of Burgundy, whose troops had captured her at Compiègne. Franc notes in a later writing that his piece met a hostile reception at the Burgundian Court, [62] as he must have known it would.

The book is in the form of a debate on women, written in verse, between the usual rhetorical antagonists. The section concerning Joan of Arc, whom "the Champion" successfully defends against his opposition, includes a few lines justifying her male clothing. He notes that she does wear a doublet, a short robe, a hat, etc, but points out that long garments (i.e., a dress) would be unfitting in a military campaign; the practice of arms requires proper clothing. [63] This theme is further developed with the view that such martial clothing serves to cast her in a more appropriate light, rather than appearing as a "simple little shepherdess". [64] He gives the view that "I also believe in good faith / that angels accompanied her / for they, as I read in [Saint] Jerome / love and support chastity." [65] In response to his adversary's mention of Joan's conviction in 1431, he compares her execution to

47. **Note:** *Sibylla Francica* is composed of two sections, the second dated 27 September 1429, the first apparently written not long before that date. The second part was inspired by a debate between the author and an unnamed lawyer who had just come from England. The latter was one of Joan's detractors; the cleric who wrote the piece argued in her favor. [119]

48. **Note:** Martin le Franc studied theology at the University of Paris during the English occupation, served Felix V as secretary, and was included in a book written by his old acquaintance, Pope Pius II, entitled "*Dialogues on the Authority of a General Council*". [120] He was appointed Provost of the Cathedral of Lausanne and subsequently served Pope Nicholas V after the latter's ascension in 1447. [121] The opening page of his "*Champion des Dames*" makes the surprising statement, given its pro-Joan content, that it is written for "the most powerful and excellent prince Philip, Duke of Burgundy, of Lotharingia, of Brabant, and of Limbourg; Count of Flanders, of Artois....(etc)", although his daring decision to present this book to the outraged Burgundian court would be one which Franc would have reason to regret. Philip's officials denounced it as a disseminator of "poisons", and wanted him to rewrite it. [122]

that of Christ and the martyrs: "What number of saints do we honor / who died in disgrace / Think of Jesus first of all / and then His blessed martyrs". [66]

During the Appellate ("Rehabilitation" or "Nullification") Trial, the theologians called to give opinions on the matter ruled in a similar fashion. A number of the former tribunal members themselves testified that they hadn't (willingly) supported condemning a woman for wearing such clothing. To place the comments of the latter in proper context, it needs to be noted that elsewhere in the testimony it is repeatedly recounted that a number of the clergy, who had developed scruples about the trial despite their partisan leanings, had cooperated only out of fear of English reprisals. Some still seemed bitter, and described it flatly as a corrupt process. [67]

Examples from the Appellate documents include the following representative excerpts, beginning with a few excerpts from the testimony and then proceeding to the opinions handed down by the Inquisitor-General and consulted theologians.

From the deposition given on 2 May 1452^[49] by Friar Isambart de la Pierre:

"Concerning the 10th [article], he says that he wouldn't have condemned a woman [to death] as a heretic on account of her dressing in male clothing."^[50] [68]

A similar view is found in the depositions given on 2 May 1452^[51] [69] and 12 May 1456 by Pierre Miget,^[52] who had likewise served as an assessor during the Condemnation trial. His statement concerning this subject in the second of the abovementioned depositions reads as follows:

"[Concerning the 26th article] ... it doesn't seem to him that she should have been judged a heretic for wearing male clothing; indeed it seems to him that whoever would have judged her a heretic solely for that reason should have been punished in the same manner she was." [70]

The descriptions given by these and other tribunal members concerning the physical context of her cross-dressing have already been covered farther above.

49. **Note:** This deposition (Isambart de la Pierre's second, since he had testified during Bouillé's preliminary investigation in 1450) was likewise given during the abovementioned investigation in May of 1452.
50. **Note:** To place this in context, it should be noted that he is not saying that cross-dressing would never count as a sin under any circumstances, but rather than he wouldn't condemn someone to death for it. Moreover, extensive studies of Inquisitorial transcripts have found that the most common penalty in cases of conviction was a penance such as almsgiving, fasting, making a certain number of prayers, etc. [123]
51. **Note:** This deposition was given during the first of two sessions which were part of the Inquisitor-General's investigation in May of 1452.
52. **Note:** Pierre Miget was a professor of theology and Prior of Longueville-la-Giffard (now Longueville-sur-Scie) in Normandy. In the transcript's entry for this deposition, he is listed as approximately 70 years old.

The Inquisitor and other theologians consulted during the appeal presented lengthy treatises on the legal issues, copiously larded with citations from canon law and doctrinal sources. For the sake of brevity, the portions of these which concern the cross-dressing issue will merely be summarized here rather than translated in full.

The presiding appellate judge, Inquisitor-General Jean Bréhal,^[53] gave his verdict on her male clothing in Part I, Chapter VI of the "*Recollectio F Johannis Brehalli*",^[54] his summary of the evidence, written in June of 1456 at the close of the appeal. [71]

Applying the standard format of considering potential arguments both for and against, Bréhal cites those tenets of the faith which would seemingly condemn her actions, in sources such as the *Decretum Gratiani* and Deuteronomy ch. XXII, but points out that her specific circumstances do not fall within the context of this prohibition.

Sources concerning the exemption granted in cases of necessity, such as the passage from the *Summa Theologica* already mentioned above, are cited by the Inquisitor, [72] and other practical issues connected with the wearing of such clothing are likewise covered. Perhaps more significantly, Bréhal refers to specific tenets of ecclesiastical law which would justify Joan's obedience to her visions' order to wear such clothing, citing two sections from Pope Gregory IX's Decretals (X^a V. XXXIX XLIV; and X^a I. XI V). [73]

Likewise, the Inquisitor cites a precedent for such cross-dressing by female saints and beati, mentioning previous women such as Blessed Thecla,^[55] [74] Blessed Eugenia, [75] Saint Pelagia, [76] Saint Marina, [77] Saint Euphrosyne, [78] and Blessed Natalia. The latter's circumstances are typical of the group: Natalia wore male clothing as a disguise while visiting her husband, Saint Adrian, and other early Christian martyrs in prison. [79]

Concerning the protection of chastity which was at the core of Joan's motive for cross-dressing, Bréhal gives his agreement by noting: "*Indeed the fear of losing one's virginity should be greater than the fear of death*". [80]

Other theologians consulted during the appeal, a group which included clergy from as far away as Vienna in Austria,^[56] gave similar opinions on the matter. At the time of Joan's trial in 1431, some of these clerics had been members of the University of Paris or otherwise

53. **Note:** Jean Bréhal (died c. 1479) was a Dominican friar who had spent the war as a member of the English-founded University of Caen, gaining a doctorate in theology in 1443. Appointed Inquisitor-General of France in 1452, he would serve in that position for 22 years, stepping down in 1474. His books include "De libera auctoritate audiendi confessiones religiosi mendicantibus concessa". [124] His writings sometimes contain a variation of the "Jesus, Mary" phrase famously used by Joan of Arc as well as by the Dominicans and other Mendicant clergy (see, for example, his letter to Inquisitor Brixental on 31 December 1452). [125]

54. **Note:** The "Recollectio" was Bréhal's definitive judicial analysis of the case, stretching for a length of some 195 pages in DuParc's transcription.

55. **Note:** Saint Thecla (of Iconium) was, according to the *Acta Pauli et Theclae*, an aristocratic woman who was converted to Christianity by the Apostle Paul during a visit to Iconium. Although this *Acta* has long been considered apocryphal, there are historical accounts of various early Christians with that name. [126]

56. **Note:** This was Leonhard Hüntpüchler von Brixental, a Dominican professor of theology at the University of Vienna and Inquisitor of Salzburg beginning in 1453, whom Bréhal had consulted via a letter sent on 31 December 1452. [127]

partisans of the pro-English faction. A representative sample of their opinions would include the following:

Élie de Bourdeilles (c. 1423 - 1484), Bishop of Périgueux and a recognized 'Beatus' or 'Blessed',^[57] cites the principle given in the "*Summa Theologica*" [81] and "*Rosarium super Decreto*" [82] already covered farther above, and explains that Joan of Arc's circumstances seem to fall into the category of activity which would justify this exemption. He states that her motives were not evil, but rather the protection of her chastity. [83] Since Joan said she wore armor and male clothing by Divine order, Bourdeilles cites the Biblical prophetess Deborah^[58] as an example of a woman who accompanied an army, [84] and who was assumed by many medieval theologians to have worn armor while so doing.

Another consulted cleric was Teodoro Lelio^[59] (1427-1466), an Italian theologian attached to the Papacy who was considered one of the greatest canon lawyers of the 15th century, whose eloquence inspired Pope Pius II to label him "[my] harp". [85] In his paragraph on the male clothing issue, Lelio notes that her motives were connected with the practical needs of participating in a military campaign, among soldiers whose lust she did not want to excite, rather than from any indecent or otherwise forbidden motive. He adds that she should not be judged a heretic for taking the sacraments while in this clothing, as she had adopted it for good purposes. He points out that St. Marina repeatedly took the Eucharist while dressed as a monk, and likewise mentions St. Eugenia as another example. As proof of Joan of Arc's proper attitude toward the sacraments, Lelio cites one of her statements concerning the Eucharist recorded in the Condemnation transcript. [86]

Thomas Basin (1412 - 1491), Bishop of Lisieux,^[60] points out that in order to take part in military campaigns among soldiers it was necessary for her to dress in the manner she did, noting that female clothing would have been a hindrance as well as having the potential to incite carnal urges among the troops. [87] He gives the requisite paraphrase from the *Summa Theologica*, [88] and lists a number of female saints who wore such clothing for motives of necessity, such as St. Margaret, St. Theodora, St. Marina, and St. Euphrosyne. [89] Basin notes that Joan, in addition to having a motive of necessity, was ultimately maneuvered into the readoption of the male clothing. [90]

57. **Note:** Known as "Blessed Élie de Bourdeilles", his beatification process was begun in 1526 and he has been considered a "Beatus" since then. During his lifetime he served in many positions within the Church, becoming Bishop of Périgueux in 1447, [128] Archbishop of Tours in 1468, and a Cardinal in 1483. [129]

58. **Note:** According to the Biblical book of *Judicum* (Judges), Chapters 4 and 5, the prophetess Deborah, wife of Lapidoth, accompanied the Israelite commander Barak to a battle against a Canaanite army under the general Sisera. Deborah's exact role is not specified: Barak had asked her to be present with the army, to which she agreed. Sisera's 900 chariots were overwhelmed; Sisera himself escaped, only to be killed in his sleep by a woman named Jael, who pounded a nail through his temple while he slept.

59. **Note:** When Teodoro Lelio wrote his *Consultatio* analyzing Joan of Arc's case, he held a position as Auditor of the Rota at the Papal Court. [130] He became Bishop of Feltre in 1462 [131] and served as Bishop of Treviso from 1464-1466. [132]

60. **Note:** Thomas Basin had spent much of the war as a supporter of the English. Obtaining degrees in both civil and ecclesiastical law at the universities of Pavia and Louvain, respectively, he became Bishop of Lisieux in 1447. [133]

Martin Berruyer (died 1465), Bishop of Le Mans,^[61] takes a slightly different approach with regard to the *Summa Theologica*, citing section I^a-IIae, q. 102 a. 6, [91] which is concerned with the Christian relation to the laws in Leviticus and Deuteronomy. [92] As with the more commonly-cited section mentioned above, this passage clarifies the intentions behind the clothing regulations in the Bible, such as prohibiting the practice of cross-dressing for sexual reasons or in connection with ancient pagan religious rites. Berruyer notes that Joan of Arc therefore was not violating the intent of these laws, quoting as an example her statement that since she was among men it was "more lawful and proper to wear male clothing" in order to avoid various problems that could result otherwise. [93] He then refers to the more familiar passage (II^a-IIae, q. 169 a. 2 ad 3) justifying such a usage, and notes that the protection of one's chastity, as well as the greater suitability of such clothing for horseback riding and other activities associated with military campaigns, are perfectly lawful purposes, especially as she believed to have been acting under God's orders. [94] He lists the cases of other female saints who wore male clothing for various purposes of necessity - Thecla, Eugenia, Pelagia, Marina, etc - and cites the Biblical prophetess Deborah. [95]

Jean Bochard, (d. 1484) Bishop of Avranches,^[62] defends her male clothing and short hair, noting that her involvement in war requires certain things: the wearing of armor for protection and the cutting of her hair (to wear a helmet, evidently) and the wearing of male clothing rather than a dress. He notes that a girl at her age would be a constant temptation for the soldiers if she were wearing the latter. He states that the prohibition against cross-dressing in Deuteronomy ch. XXII does not apply to cases in which someone is protecting her chastity. [96] He goes on to provide the usual list of female saints who also wore male clothing and cut their hair for similar purposes, naming St. Thecla "disciple of the Apostle St. Paul", St. Eugenia, Bl. Natalia "wife of the martyr Bl. Adrianus", St. Palagia, Saints Marina, Euphrosyne, Audoène, "and many others". [97]

Jean de Montigny, (d. 1471) a professor of ecclesiastical law who had served in such positions as Ecclesiastical Judge of Paris, Canon of Sézanne, and Dean of the University of Paris,^[63] deals at length with

61. **Note:** Martin Berruyer served as Bishop of Le Mans from 1452-67. [134] His theological ruling on Joan of Arc is dated 7 April 1456. [135]

62. **Note:** Jean Bochard (Bochard de Vaucelles) spent the war as a member of the University of Paris, serving as Rector in 1447. He became Bishop of Avranches in 1453 and died on 28 November 1484. [136]

63. **Note:** Jean de Montigny likewise spent the war years at the University of Paris, teaching ecclesiastical law there beginning in 1426 and becoming Dean in 1445. In 1440 he served as Ecclesiastical Judge of Paris. [137]

the legal issues on each point. Concerning her male clothing, he states that the trial's foundation upon a charge of cross-dressing was invalid, since her manner of clothing was suited to a military campaign and should have been granted for such a purpose. [98] He points out that the prohibition in Deuteronomy XXII was intended to apply to other contexts, such as the use of cross-dressing in ancient pagan religious rituals connected with the worship of Aphrodite/Venus and Ares/Mars; or similarly the use of cross-dressing for sinful purposes related to sexual immorality, or in order to illicitly sneak into private areas where members of the opposite sex are. [99] He covers a substantial number of sources of ecclesiastical law, such as the passage in the *Decretum Gratiani* beginning "Si qua mulier suo proposito...", which he notes only forbids cross-dressing when used for sinful purposes; and the section in the "Rosarium super Decreto" likewise quoted farther above, which grants an exemption in cases of necessity. [100] He then transitions into a discussion of the related charges concerning her participation in military campaigns, which he notes is not forbidden by any ecclesiastical law. [101]

The next opinion is from Guillaume Bouillé^[64] (d. 1476), a professor of theology and Superior of the Cathedral of Noyon. His treatise begins: "To the honor and glory of the [Divine] King of Kings, Who defends the cause of the innocent..." [102] Bouillé covers the issues of her male clothing, armor, and short hair, beginning with the customary explanation that the prohibitions in Deuteronomy 22:5 and in the *Decretum Gratiani* (I.30.6 and I.30.2) would not apply in this case since it was fitting for her to make use of these things in order to live among soldiers; moreover, if she was commanded via Divine revelation to do so then it would be justified on that account. [103] He comments that she was not wearing this clothing for reasons connected with sexual depravity or idolatrous purposes, noting that it is these cases which the Bible forbids, "as says the Holy Teacher [St. Thomas Aquinas]". Here he cites the usual passage in the *Summa Theologica*. [104] Among the female saints who had worn such clothing, he mentions Natalia, Marina, Eugenia, and Euphrosyne.^[65] [105]

Robert Ciboule,^[66] (d. 1458) professor of theology at the University of Paris and Chancellor of Notre Dame Cathedral in that city, wrote a long treatise defending Joan of Arc against the various charges connected with her case. Concerning the male clothing issue, Ciboule

64. **Note:** Guillaume Bouillé had conducted the initial investigation (in 1450) of Joan of Arc's trial, and is here giving his opinion as a theologian. During the war he had served in such positions as Rector of the University of Paris in 1439. [138]
65. **Note:** St. Euphrosyne (died c. 470) was, according to the *Vita Patrum*, a native of Alexandria, Egypt who had dedicated her virginity to God. When her father, Paphnutius, arranged a marriage for her with a local man, she kept her religious vow by entering a nearby monastery disguised as a monk, adopting the name 'Smaragdus'. She lived in that manner for 38 years. On her deathbed she revealed to her father that she was his lost daughter, after which her father also entered the monastery. [139]
66. **Note:** Robert Ciboule (1403 - 1458), was another clergyman who earned his degree in theology from the University of Paris, of which he became Rector in 1437. His other honors included positions as Dean of Évreux, Ambassador to the Papal Court of Eugenius IV, Chancellor of Notre Dame (in 1451), and Chamberlain to Pope Nicholas V. [140] His opinion on Joan of Arc was dated 2 January 1453. [141]

says that she wore such clothing among soldiers who included those of murderous, rapacious, and impious tendencies, noting that this is a setting especially harmful for women. Listing first the ecclesiastical sources which might condemn her clothing, he cites Deuteronomy XXII, the *Decretum Gratiani* (I.30.6) and Rabanus Maurus' *De rerum naturis*. [106] Moving to the opposite side of the argument and his own position, he cites Biblical examples of women in similar circumstances. In the case of Deborah, Ciboule refers to the second book of Alexander of Hales' *Glossa in quatuor libros sententiarum Petri Lombardi* to back up his assumption that Deborah wore male clothing and armor while taking part in the campaign against Sisera. [107] The case of Judith is cited as an example of a woman saving her people (by cutting off the head of the sleeping Assyrian general Holofernes after he passed out at a banquet), and likewise for the unnamed woman of 2 Samuel 20:16-22 who saved the besieged city of Abel by convincing the citizens to execute the rebel leader "Sheba son of Bichri" and hand his head over to King David's army commander, Joab.^[67] [108] Ciboule notes that the prohibition in Deuteronomy does not apply to cases in which Divine commandment provides a dispensation, as with Deborah, nor to cases in which a woman's chastity is in danger or other cases of necessity, giving a paraphrase of the statement in the *Scivias* quoted farther above. [109] He notes that the Church allows cross-dressing in such cases, as in the examples of many saints, and quotes the *Summa Theologica* on that point. The reasons for the prohibition and the circumstances to which it would apply are then enumerated, along similar lines as the theologians given farther above. [110] Ciboule states that in his judgement, Joan cannot be condemned for her actions. [111]

67. **Note:** There is apparently a scribal or transcription error in the text, since it cites 2 Kings 20 rather than 2 Samuel 20. The events alluded to in the text (a woman who convinces Joab to lift the siege of Abel by handing over the head of a rebel leader), refers to 2 Samuel 20, verses 16-22.

The documentary evidence concerning Joan of Arc's motives for utilizing male clothing is extensive, sufficiently corroborated, and consistent with what we know of the type of clothing in question. The 15th century theological principles governing the issue of cross-dressing are likewise well-known, and confirm Joan of Arc's own recorded statements protesting that she was not in violation of the Church's rules. Under 15th century ecclesiastical law, the court's allegations against her concerning this point did not qualify as valid grounds for a conviction, much less execution, and the matter could not have been used for that purpose if the tribunal had been operating under the standard guidelines instituted for such courts.

Although historians have long demonstrated significant portions of the above, the nature of much recently published material indicates the continued need for a presentation of such information in an accessible form. A more extensive version can be found, as stated farther above, in Vol. I Issue 1 of the *Journal of Joan of Arc Studies* for those who wish to see more information on this topic.

Endnotes

1. The passage in the Condemnation transcript which describes this portion of her clothing is in Article XII of the initial set of 70 charges against her. The first layer of legwear is described as follows: "long conjoined hosen, attached to the aforesaid doublet with twenty cords (aiguillettes)"; and the second layer is described as: "tight leggings [or 'boots', etc]". (translated from ms BAN Lat. 1119 f. 47r; also in Quicherat's "Procès...", Vol I pp. 220-221).

An "aiguillette" is a cord with two metal tips on the ends which were inserted into two eyelets on the hosen and through a corresponding eyelet on the doublet, then knotted tightly to tie the hosen and doublet together. Since each aiguillette ran through two eyelets on the hosen, there were therefore a total of 40 eyelets serving as attachment points on the inner layer of hosen alone.

Adrien Harmand's detailed study of Joan of Arc's clothing, "*Jeanne d'Arc: Ses Costumes, Son Armure*", makes note of this on pp. 143-144 and provides (in figure 22 on p. 145) a reconstructed pattern for one leg and the crotch piece for such hosen. The leg has 17 eyelets (meaning 34 on both legs), plus another 6 on the crotch piece, for a total of 40 eyelets. Harmand notes on pp. 143-144 that Joan of Arc was therefore using an excessive quantity of cords. He points out that twenty aiguillettes is twice the largest number seen on any surviving illustration of this type of garment, and comments that the reason for such an unusually large number on Joan of Arc's hosen is perfectly clear.

On pp. 177 - 185, Harmand covers the issue of the outer leggings or boots, noting that they were made of leather (p. 177). Many of the surviving examples extend all the way up to the doublet and are tied to it, such as the one shown on p. 180; other types were tied to the underlying hosen, as Harmand notes on pp. 143 and 184 (footnote 1), and illustrates on p. 140, fig. 21.

2. Descriptions of her wearing such clothing for protection during her campaigns are found in a number of sources. Aside from the Appellate testimony from soldiers such as Jean de Metz, Bertrand de Poulengy, and Louis de Coutes, who mentioned cases in which she either kept the hosen and doublet tied securely or slept in full plate armor while camping in the field (see DuParc's "Procès en Nullité..." vol. I pp. 291, 306, 363), there are also outside sources which provide other details. For example, "La Chronique de la Pucelle" provides a quotation from her which perhaps is the clearest summary of her motives, dovetailing the other reasons listed separately in other sources. She says that the saints in her visions had commanded her to wear male clothing, primarily in order to protect her virginity, and because it would be "too strange" to ride in a dress among so many soldiers (Quicherat, vol. IV, pp. 250 - 251).

3. Harmand, pp. 143-144. He comments that twenty cords (aiguillettes) would be twice the usual amount, since extant illustrations only show up to ten. He alludes (on p. 144) to the practical reasons which would induce her to use this many.

4. Examples of this information would include the following. Appellate witnesses such as Louis de Coutes remembered cases in which she was bruised from having slept in her armor the previous night (DuParc vol. I p. 363). This is echoed by sources such as "La Chronique de la Pucelle", which says: "if it so happened that she had to lodge in the fields with the soldiers, she never removed her armor." (translated from Quicherat, vol. IV, p. 250). The Condemnation transcript likewise quotes her on the subject, summarizing her reply to Article LIV as: "when she was on campaign, she slept

clothed and in armor" (ms BAN Lat. 1119 f. 65v; also in Quicherat v. I p. 294). A letter from Perceval de Boullainvilliers on 21 June 1429 says that at one point she had gone for six days and nights without removing her armor (Quicherat, vol. V, p. 120); and so on.

5. In the Condemnation transcript's entry for March 25th, there is a quotation from Joan of Arc stating that "wearing [the male outfit] is not against the Church" (translated from ms BAN Lat. 1119 f. 41r; also in Quicherat, v. I p. 193).

Witnesses at the Appellate trial additionally quoted her on this point, such as in the deposition on 10 May 1456 given by Jean Moreau, already presented in translation farther above.

6. In the Appellate testimony, Jean de Metz and Bertrand de Poulengy, who had been among the soldiers who escorted Joan of Arc from Vaucouleurs to Chinon in February 1429, said that it was Jean de Metz who first brought up the subject of dressing her in male clothing, and many citizens of Vaucouleurs donated items for that purpose. Catherine le Royer of Vaucouleurs likewise confirmed the latter point in her testimony. (DuParc vol. I pp. 290, 298, 306).

7. At the Council of Basel, Nider met, and obtained his information from, a clergyman named Nicholas Lami (not "Midi", as Coulton erroneously interpreted the name: Nicholas Midi was another English partisan who served on the tribunal, but is not the one who met Nider at Basel. The name is given in Latin as "Amici" (or "Amfici" in Coulton's defective version) which is the Latin rendering of the name "Lami"). Nider's recounting of events is one of the more thoroughly garbled versions to be found in any document, and is contradicted by the great preponderance of the evidence.

8. Concerning her allusion to the procedure of placing female prisoners in the custody of other women (i.e., nuns) rather than male guards: Relevant excerpts from the Appellate testimony are included in the article farther above; a similar quotation from her, in far less detail, was entered into the original minutes of the Condemnation trial (in the section dealing with her 'relapse' on 28 May 1431) but was left out of the Latin translation. In the original minutes, her quote was summarized as follows: "but [she said that] if they would be willing to allow her to go to Mass, and remove her chains and place her in a decent prison, and that she would have a woman with her, she would be obedient..." (translated from Quicherat v. I p. 456 - see the French minutes from the Urfé manuscript at the bottom).

9. Inquisitor Bréhal cites the *Decretum Gratiani* [II XXIV q. 1 c. XIV] in connection with his statement: "I cannot see how that Bishop [Cauchon] and others supporting him in this matter could legitimately absolve themselves from [the offense of] manifest malice against the Roman [Catholic] Church, or in fact heresy" (translated from DuParc vol. II p. 504).

10. Translated from: DuParc Vol I, p. 426; Quicherat Vol III, pp. 147 - 148.

11. Translated from: DuParc, Vol I, p. 181; Quicherat, Vol II, p. 298.

12. Translated from: DuParc, Vol I, p. 463-464; Quicherat, Vol III, pp. 193-194.

13. Translated from: DuParc, Vol I, p. 442; Quicherat, Vol III, p. 168.

14. Translated from: DuParc, Vol I, p. 188; Quicherat, Vol II, pp. 306 - 307.

15. Translated from: DuParc, Vol I, p. 427; Quicherat, Vol III, pp. 148 - 149.

16. Translated from: DuParc, Vol I, p. 183; Quicherat, Vol III, p. 300.

17. Translated from: DuParc, Vol I, pp. 186 - 187; Quicherat, Vol II, p. 305.

18. Translated from: Quicherat, Vol II, p. 5.

19. Translated from: Quicherat, Vol II, p. 18 (DuParc did not include Bouillé's investigation in 1450).

20. Translated from: DuParc, Vol I, p. 434; Quicherat, III, pp. 157 - 158.

21. Translated from: DuParc, Vol I, p. 352; Quicherat, III, p. 53.

22. Translated from: DuParc, Vol I, p. 470; Quicherat, III, p. 201.

23. Translated from: DuParc, Vol I, p. 439; Quicherat, III, p. 164.

24. Translated from: DuParc, Vol I, p. 354; Quicherat, III, p. 55.
25. For testimony concerning the threats issued against LeMaitre, see, for example: Jean Massieu's deposition on 12 May 1456 (DuParc, Vol I, pp. 430 - 431); Friar Isambart de la Pierre's deposition on 9 May 1452 (DuParc, Vol I, p. 221); Nicholas de Houppesville's deposition on 8 May 1452 (DuParc, Vol I, p. 204); and Friar Martin Ladvenu's deposition on 13 May 1456 (DuParc, Vol I, p. 441).
26. For testimony concerning the various threats issued against Isambart de la Pierre, see, for example: Nicholas de Houppesville's deposition on 8 May 1452 (DuParc, Vol I, p. 203); Martin Ladvenu's deposition on 13 May 1456 (DuParc, Vol I, p. 441); and Isambart de la Pierre's deposition on 5 March 1450 (Quicherat Vol II, pp. 4 - 5).
27. This is mentioned in the Appellate testimony of Joan of Arc's confessor, Friar Jean Pasquerel, on 4 May 1456 (DuParc, Vol I, p. 394).
28. This Inquisitorial manual was among the most prominent of its type used in the 15th century (see *Directorium Inquisitorum*, listed in the References section below).
29. See: *Scivias*, book II, vision VI, 98; p 287.
30. See: *Recollectio* part I c VIII (DuParc vol. II p 504).
31. See: Quicherat vol. I, p. 39, footnote 13.
32. See: Quicherat vol. I, p. 30, footnote 1.
33. See: *Summa Theologica* II^a-IIae, q. 169. (online at: <http://www.corpusthomisticum.org/sth3155.html>)
34. See: DuParc vol. II pp. 460-461; vol. V p. 278 (reference in index).
35. See: DuParc vol. II p. 460; vol. V p. 279 (reference in index).
36. See: *Scivias*, p. 278.
37. See: article "St. Thomas Aquinas" in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (online at: <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/14663b.htm>).
38. See: article "Guido de Baysio" in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (online at: <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/02361a.htm>).
39. See: *Scivias* pp. 9-10, 12-13.
40. Quicherat vol. V p. 471; also "Les juges de Jeanne d'Arc à Poitiers" p. 15; Ayrolles' "La Vraie Jeanne d'Arc", vol. I, p. 7.
41. Ayrolles vol. I, p. 7.
42. Ayrolles vol. I, pp. 7-8.
43. Ayrolles vol. I p. 10.
44. Ayrolles vol. I p. 11; Fraioli's *Joan of Arc: The Early Debate*, p. 47.
45. Quicherat vol. IV p. 509.
46. Quicherat vol. III p. 392.
47. Article "Jean de Charlier de Gerson" in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (online at: <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/06530c.htm>).
48. DuParc vol. II pp. 38-39; Quicherat vol. III pp. 304-305.
49. DuParc vol. II p. 39; Quicherat vol. III p. 305.
50. DuParc vol. II p. 39; Quicherat vol. III p. 305.
51. DuParc vol. II p. 39; Quicherat vol. III p. 305.
52. Quicherat vol. III p. 409.
53. Quicherat vol. III p. 407.

54. Quicherat vol. III p. 407.
55. Fraioli p. 150.
56. Léopold Delisle's *Nouveau témoignage relatif à la mission de Jeanne d'Arc*, in Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes 46 (1885), p. 663.
57. Delisle p. 663.
58. Fraioli p. 150-151.
59. Quicherat vol. III p. 440.
60. Quicherat vol. III pp. 440-441.
61. Fraioli p. 174.
62. Fraioli pp. 187-188.
63. *Champion des Dames*, (in 1530 edition, f. 284r; in 1485 edition, (PDF version), "page" 264).
64. *Champion des Dames*, (in 1530 edition, f. 284r; in 1485 edition, (PDF version), "page" 264).
65. *Champion des Dames*, (in 1530 edition, f. 283v; in 1485 edition, (PDF version), "page" 264).
66. *Champion des Dames*, (in 1530 edition, f. 284v; in 1485 edition, (PDF version), "page" 265).
67. Among other depositions concerning the means of intimidation utilized against some of the more reluctant members of the tribunal, we have the following examples: Manchon's deposition on 12 May 1456 (Quicherat Vol III, p. 137, 139 - 140; DuParc Vol I, pp. 417-418,420); Massieu's deposition on 12 May 1456 (Quicherat Vol III, pp. 152 - 154; DuParc Vol I, pp. 430 - 431); Grouchet's deposition on 9 May 1452 (Quicherat Vol II, pp. 356 - 357; DuParc Vol I, p. 228); Isambart de la Pierre's deposition on 5 March 1450 (Quicherat Vol II, pp. 4 - 5); and his deposition on 9 May 1452 (Quicherat Vol II, pp. 348 - 349; DuParc Vol I, pp. 221-222); Houpeville's deposition on 8 May 1452 (Quicherat Vol II, pp. 325 - 326; DuParc Vol I, pp. 203 - 204); and his deposition on 13 May 1456 (Quicherat Vol III, p. 171; DuParc Vol I, p. 445); Ladvenu's deposition on 9 May 1452 (Quicherat Vol II, p. 364; DuParc Vol I, p. 234); and his deposition on 13 May 1456 (Quicherat Vol pp. 166 - 167; DuParc Vol I, p. 441); LeFevre's deposition on 12 May 1456 (Quicherat Vol III, pp. 174 - 175; DuParc Vol I, p. 448); LeMaire's deposition on 12 May 1456 (Quicherat Vol III, pp. 177 - 178; DuParc Vol I, p. 450); Thomas Marie's deposition on 9 May 1452 (Quicherat Vol II, p. 370; DuParc Vol I, p. 239); Pierre Miget's deposition on 12 May 1456 (Quicherat Vol III, p. 130; DuParc Vol I, p. 412); Beaupère's deposition on 5 March 1450 (Quicherat Vol II, p. 21); Guillaume de la Chambre's deposition on 2 April 1456 (Quicherat Vol III, p. 50; DuParc Vol I, p. 350); and likewise for other testimony on the subject.
68. DuParc Vol I 186; Quicherat Vol II 304.
69. DuParc Vol I 184; Quicherat Vol II 302.
70. DuParc Vol I 414; Quicherat Vol III 133.
71. DuParc Vol II, pp. 457 - 475; Belon & Balme's "Jean Bréhal, Grand Inquisiteur de France et la Réhabilitation de Jeanne d'Arc.", Book IV, pp. 56 - 74.
72. DuParc Vol II pp. 461-462.
73. DuParc Vol II pp. 466-467.
74. DuParc Vol II p. 465.
75. DuParc Vol II pp. 465-466.
76. DuParc Vol II p. 466.
77. DuParc Vol II p. 466.
78. DuParc Vol II p. 466.
79. DuParc Vol II p. 466.

80. DuParc Vol II p. 460.
81. DuParc Vol II pp. 114-115.
82. DuParc Vol II p. 116.
83. DuParc Vol II p. 116.
84. DuParc Vol II pp. 110-111.
85. Quicherat Vol II p. 22 ftnt 1.
86. Quicherat Vol II pp. 41-42.
87. DuParc Vol II p. 207.
88. DuParc Vol II pp. 207 - 208.
89. DuParc Vol II p. 208.
90. DuParc Vol II pp. 184-185.
91. DuParc Vol II pp. 248.
92. *Summa Theologica* Ia-IIae, q. 102 a. 6.
93. DuParc Vol II pp. 248-249.
94. DuParc Vol II p. 249.
95. DuParc Vol II p. 249.
96. DuParc Vol II pp. 262-263.
97. DuParc Vol II p. 263.
98. DuParc Vol II p. 280.
99. DuParc Vol II p. 280.
100. DuParc Vol II pp. 281-283.
101. DuParc Vol II p. 283.
102. DuParc Vol II p. 317.
103. DuParc Vol II p. 327.
104. DuParc Vol II p. 327.
105. DuParc Vol II p. 328.
106. DuParc Vol II p. 377.
107. DuParc Vol II pp. 377-378.
108. DuParc Vol II p. 378.
109. DuParc Vol II p. 378.
110. DuParc Vol II p. 379.
111. DuParc Vol II p. 380.
112. Quicherat Vol III pp. 391-392.
113. Quicherat Vol III pp. 298 ftnt 2; article: "Jean de Charlier de Gerson" in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (online at: <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/06530c.htm>).
114. Quicherat Vol III pp. 394 ft 1.
115. Article: "[Diocese of] Gap" in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (online at: <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/06378a.htm>).
116. Fraioli p. 16.
117. Fornier, vol. II pp. 314-315, 317.
118. Delisle p. 633.

119. Quicherat Vol V pp. 475-476.

120. Fraioli p. 174.

121. Fraioli pp. 174-175.

122. *Champion des Dames*, (in 1530 edition, first page of the Prologue; in 1485 edition, (PDF version), "page" 4).

123. Recent studies have found that Inquisitorial penalties tended to become more severe as time went on (not the other way around, as is popularly but erroneously assumed), but it should be noted that even the Spanish Inquisition and later tribunals mostly handed down penances or prison sentences. In a study on the Spanish Inquisition by Gustav Henningsen, the execution rate was estimated at 1.8 percent of trials; E. William Monter and John Tedeschi reported that the rate likewise remained low under later Italian tribunals (see, for example, Alan Macfarlane's article in *Temenos; Studies in Comparative Religion*", vol. 24, 1988, p. 168).

A few statistics (below) from Henry Charles Lea's series, *"A History of the Inquisition of Spain"*, will demonstrate the relative numbers of people burned in person (left column), burned in effigy (middle), and given a penance (right column):

Location	Burned In Person	Burned In Effigy	Given a Penance
----------	---------------------	---------------------	--------------------

Years: (up to 1580)

Lisbon	37	2	270
Evora	87	12	1023
Coimbra	45	37	705
Totals:	169	51	1998

(source: Lea vol. 3 bk 8 Ch 1, endnote 57)

Years: 1581-1600

Lisbon	29	6	559
Evora	98	16	1384
Coimbra	35	37	1036
Totals:	162	59	2979

(source: Lea vol. 3 bk 8 Ch 1, endnote 73)

Years: 1620 - 1640

Lisbon	75	51	1231
Evora	73	56	1891
Coimbra	82	54	1873
Totals:	230	161	4995

(source: Lea vol. 3 bk 8 Ch 1, endnote 93)

Years: 1641-1650

Lisbon	37	14	341
Evora	5	9	632
Coimbra	8	36	143

Totals: 50 59 1116

(source: Lea vol. 3 bk 8 Ch 1, endnote 109)

Years: 1651-1673

Lisbon 68 18 868

Evora 54 41 2201

Coimbra 62 -NA- 1724

Totals: 184 59+ 4793

(source: Lea vol. 3 bk 8 Ch 1, endnote 116)

124. Belon & Balme pp. 8-10; article "Jean Bréhal" in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (online at:

<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/02752b.htm>).

125. Belon & Balme pp. 55-56.

126. Article "Sts. Thecla" in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (online at: <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/14564a.htm>).

127. Belon & Balme pp. 51 - 58; Brehal's letter is given in the original Latin on pp. 55-56.

128. Article "Diocese of Périgueux" in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (online at:

<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/11668a.htm>).

129. DuParc vol V p. 53.

130. Quicherat Vol II p. 22.

131. Quicherat Vol II p. 22 ft 1.

132. La Storia Della Diocesi: Serie cronologica dei Vescovi di Treviso. Diocesi di Treviso. Accessed: 25 March 2006. <

<http://www.diocesisv.it/menu/html/storia/storia.html> >.

133. DuParc Vol V p. 54.

134. Article "Le Mans" in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (online at: <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/09143b.htm>).

135. DuParc Vol II p. 257.

136. DuParc Vol V p. 55.

137. DuParc Vol V p. 56.

138. Quicherat Vol II p. 1.

139. Article "St. Euphrosyne" in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (online at: <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/05606c.htm>).

140. See: DuParc Vol V pp. 57-58, and the article "Robert Ciboule" in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (online at:

<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/03768a.htm>).

141. DuParc Vol II p. 400.

References

___ MS 1119, Bibliothèque de l'Assemblée Nationale (Reproduction: Le Procès de Condamnation de Jeanne d'Arc. Reproduction en fac-similé du manuscrit authentique, sur vélin, no. 1119 de la Bibliothèque de l'Assemblée Nationale. Introduction by Jean Marchand. (Paris: 1955)).

Aquinas, St. Thomas. Summa Theologica; online at: Sancti Thomae de Aquino Summa Theologiae
<<http://sophia.unav.es/alarcon/amicis/sth0000.html> >.

Ayroles, Jean-Baptiste-Joseph. La vraie Jeanne d'Arc 4 volumes. (Paris, 1890-1898).

Belon, Marie-Joseph & Balme, François. Jean Bréhal. Grand Inquisiteur de France et la Réhabilitation de Jeanne d'Arc.
(Paris: 1893).

Delisle, Léopold; ed. *Nouveau témoignage relatif à la mission de Jeanne d'Arc.* In Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes 46
(1885). (Paris: 1885). [PDF version from La Bibliothèque Nationale de France, code number N012421]. pp. 649-668.

DuParc, Pierre; ed. Procès en Nullité de la Condamnation de Jeanne d'Arc. 5 Volumes. (Paris:
1977,1979,1983,1986,1988).

Eymerich, Nicholas. Directorium Inquisitorium. Written c. 1376; later edition of 1578 online at:
<<http://racrel.library.cornell.edu:8090/cgi-bin/cul.witch/docviewer?did=045> >.

Fornier, Marcellin. Histoire générale des Alpes Maritimes ou Cottiènes : et particulière de leur métropolitaine. Ambrun, chronographique, et meslée de la séculière avec l'ecclésiastique. Paul Guillaume, ed. 3 volumes. (Paris: 1890-1892) [PDF version from La Bibliothèque Nationale de France, code numbers N049744, N049745, N049746].

Fraioli, Deborah. Joan of Arc: The Early Debate. (Woolbridge: 2000).

Harmand, Adrien. Jeanne d'Arc: Ses Costumes, Son Armure. (Paris: 1929).

Le Franc, Martin. Le champion des dames. Written 1440; later printed edition. (Lyon: 1485) [PDF version from La Bibliothèque Nationale de France, code number N070116].

Le Franc, Martin Le champion des dames, livre plaisant, copieux et habondant en sentences, contenant la deffence des dames contre Malebouche et ses consors, et victoire d'icelles, composé par Martin Franc, secrétaire du feu Pape Felix V & nouvellement imprimé à Paris. Written 1440; later printed edition. (Paris: 1530) [PDF version from La Bibliothèque Nationale de France, code number N070917].

Lea, Henry Charles. A History of the Inquisition of Spain. 4 volumes. (New York and London: 1906-1907).

Quicherat, Jules; ed. Procès de la Condamnation et de Réhabilitation de Jeanne d'Arc, dite la Pucelle 5 Volumes. (Paris: 1841,1844,1845,1847,1849).

Raguenet de Saint-Albin, M. Octave. Les juges de Jeanne d'Arc à Poitiers. (Orléans: 1894) [PDF version from La Bibliothèque Nationale de France, code number N0073968].

