

Clothing and Gender Definition: Joan of Arc

Susan Crane
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey

Joan of Arc wore men's clothes almost continuously from her first attempts to reach the Dauphin, later crowned Charles VII, until her execution twenty-eight months later. In court, on campaigns, in church, and in the street she cross-dressed, and she refused to stop doing so during the long months of her trial for heresy. Joan's contemporary supporters and adversaries comment extensively on her clothing, and the records of her trial provide commentary of her own, making her by far the best-documented transvestite of the later Middle Ages.

Because Joan's use of men's clothes partakes of her self-proclaimed identity as "la Pucelle," the maiden sent by God to save France from the English, scholars have generally considered her transvestism to be an attribute of her military and religious mission, a strategically useful behavior without implications for sexuality. But isolating transvestism from sexual identity risks assuming both that heterosexuality is the only possible position for Joan and that self-presentation has nothing to do with sexuality—that sexuality is innate and prior to choices about gendered behavior. I would like to reconsider Joan's cross-dressing from the position that gender encompasses both the exterior, social interpretation of sexual practices and the more diffused generation, expression, and organization of desire that makes up sexuality itself. Locating sexuality within the complex of interpretive articulations that constitute gendered identity urges the possibility that Joan's transvestism refers to her sexuality as well as to her campaign to save France.

During her trial Joan articulates a gender position in conditions that directly shape the performance of gender. Michel Foucault's crucial insight concerning the institutional regulation of sexuality was that regulation is not primarily repressive but productive, and productive not only of normative repetitions of sexuality in new subjects but also of the conditions for revising

can) and that deserves a name. Third, I recognize that the testimony of "Joan" about her past deeds and words is not always true to other records or testimony; I am concerned primarily with her self-articulation under the pressure of the trial itself. For example, I am not concerned to determine if God told her to crossdress or if she did so at the suggestion of Jean de Nouillompont, but rather to clarify how her stated motives fit with each other and with her wider self-defense, and what place she makes for cross-dressing in her self-conception. Finally, in dropping the scare quotes from the name of "Joan," I am resisting what seems to me a misguided tendency among medievalists to claim that (other) medievalists believe that the past is fully recoverable—that "the making of texts is, severely and always, the making of meaning," or that history is "foundational and primary, the thingly origin" for language that itself eludes linguistic indeterminacy.⁴ This naive version of the past's accessibility is no more tenable (and, I would argue, no more practiced) than the inverse claim that the past is an untranscendable horizon. To write of the past while claiming it is simply irrecoverable would be a futile contradiction; to assert the past's full identity with the present would equally eradicate it. Any writer about the past is caught paradoxically between what goes on from it—Nietzsche's and Gadamer's "effective past," *wirkliche Historie* or *Wirkungsgeschichte*—and all that language fails to mean or to convey.⁵ There is no escape into the simplicity of either position, access or loss, in isolation from the other. To cite "Joan" without scare quotes is to recognize that she is a remnant but also a remain, a vestigial text that still has a few things to say for itself.

Joan was captured in May 1430 by Burgundian forces, sold to the English in November, and tried for heresy in Rouen during the following February, March, and April by the Bishop of Beauvais, Pierre Cauchon, and the Papal Deputy Inquisitor, Jean le Maistre, and well over a hundred assistants. She was convicted of heresy in May 1431, abjured during a public exhortation in the cemetery of St. Ouen, but relapsed a few days later, reassuming the men's clothes she had agreed to stop wearing and reporting that she heard her voices reproaching her for having abjured them. The next day, the episcopal court declared her a relapsed heretic, and she was burned by the secular authorities on the following day, May 30.⁶ This was not, however, her only trial; when Charles VII at last took control of Rouen eighteen years later, he initiated an investigation into the findings of her "procès de condamnation" which culminated in a "procès en nullité" that declared her conviction for heresy to have been invalid.⁷ Evidence collected at this second trial seeks to validate the records from the first: despite its obvious bias toward a martyred supporter of Charles VII, the "procès en nullité" received much testimony sus-

and resisting those norms: "At issue is not a movement bent on pushing rude sex back into some obscure and inaccessible region, but on the contrary, a process that spreads it over the surface of things and bodies, arouses it, draws it out and bids it speak, implants it in reality and enjoins it to tell the truth: an entire glittering sexual array, reflected in a myriad of discourses, the obstination of powers, and the interplay of knowledge and pleasure."¹ Foucault's well-known tendency is to define the medieval as the time before competing discourses on sexuality developed, and before power diffused itself so completely throughout the social fabric, but recent work brings into question his view of a "markedly unitary" medieval discourse on sexuality that was fully encompassed in penitential doctrine and that conceived homoerotic acts but not homosexual identity.² These reconsiderations of the medieval/modern dichotomy do not license treating the medieval as if it were modern, but rather predict that medieval discourses of sexuality will be multiple, even contradictory, as are modern ones. Discourses of sexuality such as *fine amor* and mystical marriage with God may be less visible now than penitential doctrine, but their effects on subjectivity deserve the greater efforts of recovery.

Joan's judges ask her to defend the self-presentation she is in the process of developing in part through adopting masculine dress. As the institution most concerned with regulating sexuality, the church in varied manifestations—its authoritative texts, its sacraments, its courts of inquisition—encourages and enforces gender's "performativity," in Judith Butler's terminology, its reproduction in specific persons through their ongoing repetitions of its norms.³ Yet, as Butler emphasizes, the repetition of sexuality's laws is a process during which a revisionary performance might be developed. In the case of Joan of Arc, I will argue, an intensified relation to the law produces not her acquiescence in self-correction but instead her persistent effort to distinguish herself from the category of womanhood as she understands it.

In writing of Joan's identity and Joan's statements I am of course making a number of decisions about "Joan." First, I use her name to stand for her documentary traces, partial and uneven as they are, and for my interpretation of those traces. This documentary "Joan" is an appropriate subject for an analysis that takes gender to be constituted in its performance rather than derived from a preexisting true self. Second, I choose to attribute recorded actions and statements to "Joan" while recognizing that her self-construction is heavily coerced, her will conditioned by her culture, and her responses circumscribed by her interlocutors' preoccupations. It is her ongoing enactment of constraints and resistances alike that articulates her identity (as best she

church, and the biblical Deborah and Esther.¹³ Her detractors cite the prohibition against cross-dressing in Deuteronomy and the Pauline text that women's hair is the veil of their modesty.¹⁴ Invoking textual authority is not a strategy Joan uses (and of course is not a strategy fully available to one of her background), nor do her statements about her dress coincide very well with the authorities her supporters invoke. Given the unusual care with which the records of this trial were made and the validation they received at the nullification trial, I have found Joan's own statements to be a more compelling subject for discussion than those of her contemporaries. Joan's explanations move beyond the more recognizable genealogies for cross-dressing provided by her contemporaries into a gender revision that is specific to Joan's practice and could count as one of her most significant acts.

Early in the trial and at several later points as well, Joan explains her male dress as a merely instrumental gesture without moral or gendered significance. In her testimony she refuses to charge anyone with advising her to change clothes, stating instead that "il falloit necessairement qu'elle changeast son habit" [it was necessary that she change her clothes].¹⁵ Several of her early statements dismiss her dress as a minor issue: "de veste parum est, et est de minori" [dress is a small thing, among the littlest]; she cannot recall if Charles, or his wife, or the ecclesiastical body that interrogated her for several days in Poitiers, asked her anything about her dress.¹⁶ These dismissive statements imply that cross-dressing has no significance beyond a merely functional convenience. Indeed, when offered women's clothes she responds that if she were allowed to leave prison in them, she would wear them gladly: under those circumstances women's clothes, like men's in other circumstances, would serve her purpose of resisting the English.¹⁷ In a telling formulation she links men's clothes directly to armed opposition: she "ne feroit pour rien le serement qu'elle ne se armast et meist en abit d'omme" [would never for anything swear not to arm herself and wear men's clothes].¹⁸

Associating transvestism with military goals and with the exigencies of travel characterizes her contemporaries' justifications as well. Typically they mention her clothing only in relation to her arming for battle. In Percival de Cagny's chronicle, "elle print et se mist en habit d'homme et request au roy qu'il luy fist faire armures pour soy armer" [she put on men's clothes and asked the king to have armor made with which to arm herself]. The *Chronique de la Pucelle* has her explain at Poitiers, "il fault, pour ce que je me doibs armer et servir le gentil Daulphin en armes, que je prenne les habillemens propices et nécessaires à ce" [because I must arm myself and serve the

taining the accuracy of the record of Joan's words in the "proces de condamnation."⁸ The original trial's procedures and conclusions, rather than the evidence taken from Joan, were the basis for nullification.

Testimony from the nullification trial traces in fascinating detail how records from the first trial were generated. To summarize briefly, two official notaries and occasionally some other recorders kept running notes in French during the interrogations. The notaries compared their texts each day after dinner and drew up the minutes of the trial, still in French. One of the notaries, Guillaume Manchon, submitted his minutes to the authorities in charge of the nullification trial, and two copies deriving from those minutes have survived.⁹ Remarkable as it is to have a French record of Joan's interrogation, it is yet more remarkable that Joan seems to have considered herself its coproducer. The surviving copies of the minutes record, and testimony at the nullification trial recalls, numerous occasions on which Joan demanded that her responses be corrected in the record, admonished the notaries to be more careful, asked for a copy of the work to be sent to Paris if she was to be interrogated again there, and refused to answer questions she felt she had already answered. Instead she replies, "luisés bien vostre livre et vous le trouverés" [read your book carefully and you will find it], or "vous estes respondus de ce que vous en aurez de moi" [you already have as much of an answer as you will get from me].¹⁰ The French minutes were read aloud to Joan at the end of the weeks of interrogation for her corrections.¹¹ After the minutes' completion, according to the Orleans manuscript, when a herald at the cemetery of St. Ouen cried out that she was a heretic, Joan retorted "qu'il n'estoit pas vray, ainsy qu'il est escript ailleurs" [that it was not true, as was written down elsewhere].¹² Although Joan's voice is in several ways constrained in the French minutes—by the questions her many inquisitors choose to ask, by certain omissions from the minutes that were noted during the nullification trial, and by the notaries' collating tendency to group responses to several questions together—it appears that, in Joan's opinion as well as that of the notaries and other witnesses, the French record of her statements is fairly accurate.

Throughout the trial, Joan refused to change from men's into women's clothing. Her dress was a continual source of friction with her inquisitors, for whom it was the visible sign of Joan's questionable spiritual status. In my view, the responses of Joan's contemporaries to her dress, from her inquisitors' hostility to her supporters' justifications, are more at odds than in consonance with Joan's testimony. In the best learned tradition, Joan's contemporaries refer her dress to one or more precedents. For her defenders, she is reminiscent of Camilla and the Amazons, the transvestite saints of the early

gentle Dauphin in arms, I must take the clothing that is suited and necessary for the purpose].¹⁹

In fact, however, there is much about Joan's dress that escapes instrumental explanations, both before and during her imprisonment. Joan cross-dresses at all times, not just for battle but in court, in prison, even to receive Communion. Her persistent transvestism requires an explanation that goes beyond mere instrumentality. How can it further her opposition to the English to refuse to wear a dress in church? This framing of the issue is concrete, not merely hypothetical, as the judges deny Joan's many requests for access to the sacraments until she has agreed to give up male attire.

Here Joan's self-justification takes a turn that is intriguingly different from that of her contemporary allies. She supplements the argument from instrumentality with the assertion that her cross-dressing pleases God, and later that she took it by God's command: "il plaist a Dieu que je le porte"; "je le fais par le commandement de nostre Sire et en son service" [it pleases God that I wear it; I do it on the command of our Lord and in his service].²⁰ She links her civilian attire to her military purpose in the assertion that "l'abit et les armes qu'elle a portés, c'est par le congié de Dieu; et tant de l'abit d'omme que des armes" [the clothing and the arms she has worn have been by the permission of God, and just as much the men's clothing as the arms].²¹ God's will becomes her standard explanation for why she will not leave off her male dress, even in order to hear Mass and take Communion at Easter. In the week before Palm Sunday she asserts that "quant a l'abit de femme, elle ne le prendra pas encore, tant qu'il plaira a nostre Sire" [as for women's clothes, she will not take them yet, until it pleases our Lord]. In the week before Easter she replies concerning her clothes "qu'elle ayme plus chier mourir que revoquer ce qu'elle a fait du commandement de nostre Sire" [that she preferred to die rather than to abjure what she had done at the command of our Lord].²² Her insistence that she cannot leave off men's clothing even to gain access to the sacraments is the more striking for her repeated pleas for access.

Joan's insistence on God's command that she crossdress even in prison contrasts with the explanations generated during the nullification trial around threats to her chastity. The conditions of Joan's imprisonment were harsh. Rather than being held in an ecclesiastical prison with women attendants as was normal in heresy cases, Joan was guarded by English soldiers and kept in fetters day and night. A witness at the nullification trial recalled that one of her guards had threatened to rape her and that the Earl of Warwick had replaced two guards and admonished the others. A number of witnesses explained her resumption of male clothing after her abjuration with accounts

that her guards had removed her women's clothes from her room during the night, or had harassed her, or that an English lord had raped her.²³ Other supporters linked her cross-dressing throughout her mission with her commitment to chastity.²⁴

Joan's male attire may have had some symbolic meaning for her guards, but it is important not to exaggerate the degree to which it could have protected her chastity from forcible rape. She continued to be identifiably female, and she apparently slept undressed both in the field and in prison.²⁵ Only after her abjuration and relapse, when she rejected the woman's dress provided for her at her abjuration, did Joan herself attribute her clothing (somewhat obliquely) to the conditions of her imprisonment. At this point she stated both that she preferred men's clothes to women's and "qu'il luy estoit plus licite de le reprendre et avoir habit d'omme, estant entre les hommes" [that it was more suitable for her to resume men's clothing, since she was among men].²⁶ Here Joan incorporates her defense of cross-dressing into her long-standing argument with the court that she should be in an ecclesiastical rather than a secular prison. She continues, on this final day of interrogation, that she resumed male attire because she was not allowed to hear Mass as promised and was not taken out of her fetters, but that if she were allowed to hear Mass and were transferred to a better prison, she would obey the church.²⁷ The implication that her male guards constitute a sexual threat is strong, and renders the more striking that during many weeks of interrogation, Joan, in contrast to her supporters before and after the trial, does not use that threat to explain her clothes. Indeed, even when her interrogators refer to her imprisonment, she refers to God's will: admonished as late as May 2 that she is wearing men's clothes "sans necessité, et en especial qu'elle est en prison" [without cause, and especially since she is in prison], she answers, "quant je auray fait ce pourquoy je suis envoyee de par Dieu, je prendray habit de femme" [when I have done what I was sent to do by God, I will take women's clothes].²⁸

Where is the place for self-definition within the Christian visionary's assertion of divine command? Many women mystics of the later Middle Ages attribute their behavior to God's will, evading (with limited success) institutional attempts to regulate their behavior by presenting themselves as merely the channel for divine messages and interventions in the contemporary scene. That "merely" has the character of litotes, however, in claiming direct contact with God in place of the more mediated spirituality available to most Christians through the institutional church. The visionary risks appearing not to be the selfless vessel of the Lord but an ambitious self-promoter.²⁹ Joan's judges

regard her claim to hear God's commands in this light, attending closely to aspects of her conduct such as her transvestism that might betray worldly aspirations. But Joan does not endorse their version of an exclusive relation between divine command and self-promotion. Her proverb "Aide toy, Dieu te aidera" [Help yourself and God will help you] expresses her refusal to dichotomize divine and human agency—indeed, her tendency is to foreground the role of her own initiative in acting on God's will.³⁰ In the struggle over whether to give up cross-dressing in exchange for access to the sacraments, Joan takes initiative by omitting to ask her voices if she may do so in the days before Easter, asking for delays in responding to questions about her dress, and insisting to her judges that cross-dressing should not be an impediment to taking Communion. Joan does not simply accede to what she understands as God's will but shapes and supplements it through her strategic resistances to the court.³¹

In the weeks of her testimony, to summarize, Joan moves from the position that her cross-dressing is instrumental to her cause and of little significance, to the position that it is a crucial sign of her identity regardless of her circumstances at any particular moment. This surplus to its practical use is where transvestism most clearly shapes Joan's sexuality. Attributed directly to God, it instantiates the relation of sexual and religious identity: as Simon Gaunt notes in his study of transvestite saints, "Sexuality is central to the construction of sanctity in the Middle Ages."³² Vows of chastity, mystical marriage with God, martyrdom in sexually suggestive contexts, and transvestism do not simply remove holy men and women from sexuality but continue to define them through reference to sexual identities they have reshaped and redirected. Gaunt's important perception can also be read the other way around, to say that sanctity is central to the construction of sexuality in this period. Joan draws on God's authority to face down her judges; in other contexts she draws less contentiously on Christian values to present herself. But she refers as well to secular standards and values that have been less noticed in her self-presentation than the religious motivations for which she has become celebrated.

Three contexts that provided for cross-dressing in the interrogation records are Joan's commitment to virginity, her claim to military and social authority, and her relations with women and their conventional tasks. In each context Joan's testimony imbricates secular and sacred meanings to develop and defend a gender position distinct both from conventional femininity and from the biblical, Amazonian, and saintly models suggested for her by her defenders.

Virginity has powerful secular and religious merit in women, protecting their value in the economy of heterosexuality until such time as they marry and enacting their rejection of the sexual economy in favor of a spiritual life within religious practice. These two roles of virginity are to some degree at odds, the former presuming a sexuality to be engaged at marriage and the latter evading marriage definitively. In calling herself "Jeanne la Pucelle" instead of "Jeanne la Vierge," Joan aligns herself with the secular pattern of virginity, in which the stages of a woman's maidenhood, wifehood, and widowhood succeed one another.³³ The pattern is implicit as well in her account of committing her virginity to her voices at the age of thirteen "tant qu'il plairoit a Dieu" [for as long as it may please God].³⁴ Similarly, she often says that her cross-dressing will have a terminus, although she defers it when specific moments of choice are presented to her.³⁵

Like her uncloistered vocation of leading troops against the English, Joan's conception that her men's clothes and her virginity may be put off at some future time calls into question the many contemporary and modern analogies drawn between Joan and several transvestite saints of the early church.³⁶ If Joan knew the stories of these saints, for example the version of St. Margaret's legend in which she evades marriage by cropping her hair and living in disguise as "Brother Pelagius," they may have influenced her own refusal to marry and her pledge of chastity.³⁷ However, Joan's transvestism contrasts with the saints' in important respects. Thecla, Marina, and Margaret/Pelagius adopt ascetic dress that minimizes sexual difference and rejects the sex-marked position of the feminine. John Anson labels such stories a "monastic fantasy" designed to appease sexual longing by imagining a woman in the monastery who is unpolluting and need not inspire guilt; Gaunt points out that the sexual longing so appeased is complexly gendered by the apparent masculinity of its cross-dressed object.³⁸ Although I am arguing that Joan's cross-dressing does complicate her gender, it does not do so by submerging her sex in a male disguise. Nor does Joan's testimony suggest that she regards her sex as a hinderance to her spirituality. And she does not retreat from the world but rather enters it more fully by cross-dressing. Her virginity amounts to a mobilization of her sex: as a "Pucelle" she lays claim to the status of innocence and purity associated with secular women's virginity, rather than repudiating her womanhood in the manner of the transvestite saints—who often supplement their cross-dress with the ability to grow facial hair, perform extraordinary penances, and hide their sex from everyone until their deaths.

In conjunction with her secular transvestism, then, Joan's maidenhood works less to signal abnegation and rejection of the world than to claim

status within its hierarchies. Kirsten Hastrup has argued that Joan would not have been able to lead men if she had not had the status of “Pucelle,” unpoluted by sex and uncontained as yet by marriage.³⁹ Maidenhood also has strong religious meaning for Joan; she indeed states that it is the single condition necessary for her salvation.⁴⁰ The spiritual merit assigned to virginity within the church endorses Joan’s maidenhood—but can it temper the transgressiveness of her cross-dressing? As noted above, her contemporary allies tend not to mention her dress except as a necessity of military campaigning; her adversaries call her “femme monstrueuse,” “femme desordonnée et dif-famée, estant en habit d’homme et de gouvernement dissolut” [monstrous woman, disorderly and notorious woman who dresses in men’s clothes, whose conduct is dissolute].⁴¹ Joan’s testimony responds to the charge that her cross-dressing is immoral by aligning it with her vow of chastity: she pledged her virginity to God “tant qu’il plairoit a Dieu” [for as long as it pleased God], and God commanded her to cross-dress “tant qu’il plaira a nostre Sire” [for as long as it pleases our Lord].⁴² Attributing her transvestism directly to God associates it with her vow of chastity to God, claims for both the highest moral status, and assigns to both a central importance in her identity.

Despite her alignment of transvestism with maidenhood, there is much evidence that during the trial Joan felt extraordinary pressure concerning her transvestism. She first anticipates execution when refusing to wear a dress made up to her specifications, asking that if she is to be undressed at her sentencing she be given a long woman’s dress and a kerchief to wear at execution.⁴³ Late in the trial she begins to avoid attributing her cross-dressing to God, using formulas for evasion such as “donnez moy dilacion” [grant me a delay] and “vous en estes assés respondu” [you have been sufficiently answered about this]. She concludes enigmatically that “elle sçait bien qui luy a fait prandre l’abit, mais ne sçait point comme elle le doit reveler” [she well knows who made her take (men’s) clothes, but she does not know at all how she should reveal it].⁴⁴ Does her refusal to give up cross-dressing come to appear so transgressive to her that she hesitates to ascribe it to God’s will? Still later, when asked how she prays, she gives this example; “tres doulz Dieu . . . je sçay bien, quant a l’abit, le commandement comme je l’ay prins; mais je ne sçay point par quelle maniere je le doy laisser. Pour ce, plaise vous a moy l’an-seigner” [very sweet God, I well know concerning my dress by what command I took it, but I do not know at all in what way I should give it up. So may it please you to teach me that].⁴⁵ This formulation again suppresses the source of cross-dressing and might even be read as Joan’s request for aid in giving it up, as if her own will to cross-dress were the impediment. Her will also

intrudes, though asserted only hypothetically, when she testifies on Palm Sunday that if it were in her power to change to women’s clothes, she would do so; and contradictorily, that if it were up to her, she would not change her clothes in order to receive Communion.⁴⁶ Again, since Joan understands her will to be contiguous with God’s, I believe her testimony is less relevant to her judges’ dichotomized view of willfulness versus submission to the church than to Joan’s evolving self-presentation. In these later interrogations, the parallel between maidenhood and transvestism slips from view. Joan’s sense of trouble around cross-dressing becomes salient, while her virginity apparently remains unproblematic.

Much earlier in the trial, Joan was asked “se elle eust bien voullu estre homme” [if she really would have liked to be a man] when she set out on her mission. Joan responds with an evasive formula, “dit que autresfoys y avoit respondu” [she said she had answered this elsewhere], though no answer can be found in the record.⁴⁷ Since Joan’s evasions tend to appear where a question does not allow for a response accurate to her convictions, it is possible that Joan did not believe that either “yes” or “no” would properly represent her position. Cross-dress itself, according to Marjorie Garber, confuses categories; “this interruption, this disruptive act of putting into question, is . . . precisely the place, and the role, of the transvestite.”⁴⁸ Taken in isolation, Joan’s virginity could represent the highly orthodox spiritual retreat of a heterosexual from marriage. But her continued engagement in secular affairs and her noninstrumental, secular cross-dressing queer her virginity—that is, they move her virginity beyond its canonical meanings in ways that suggest a revision of heterosexual identity.

Joan’s secular role and her claim to high social status involve her in persistent and even flamboyant cross-dressing during the two years between her departure from Vaucouleurs and her capture at Compiègne. When she set out from home to find the Dauphin Charles, she was in women’s dress; some townspeople in Vaucouleurs presented her with a set of clothes in which she completed her journey to Charles (a contemporary witness details a black doublet, a short black tunic, and a black cap on her now shorn black hair).⁴⁹ There is a slight possibility that Joan continued to wear a dress on some occasions for the first few months of her mission: she gave a red garment, probably the red dress in which she had left home, to her godfather five months later; the 1429 treatise *De quadam puella* relates that Joan is as capable as an experienced war leader when on horseback “vestibus et armis virilibus induta” [clothed in male attire and armor]; “ubi autem de equo descendit, solitum habitum reas-

sumens, fit simplicissima, negotiorum saecularium quasi innocens agnus imperita" [but when she descends from her horse, and assumes her usual clothes, she becomes completely naive, as inexperienced in the ways of the world as an innocent lamb].⁵⁰ This equation of femininity with ignorance and innocence might seem to restrict Joan's authority to the battlefield, but the mediating role the treatise assigns to clothing implies that masculine capability is as easy to acquire as masculine garments. If Joan's cross-dressing was indeed only occasional during the early months of 1429, this passage suggests what was to be gained by giving up female attire altogether: part of the attraction of male attire was surely its associations with masculine authority.

The authority Joan claims through cross-dressing violates class as well as gender lines: Joan soon abandoned the sobriety of her black *Vaucouleurs* clothing and began to dress as a knight and courtier. The *Chronique des cordeliers* mentions, in addition to her armor, "très noble habis de draps d'or et de soie bien fourrés" [very noble clothes of cloth-of-gold and silk well trimmed with fur]. Other records note a hat of blue silk or velvet with gold embroidery and a brim divided into four parts, a robe of scarlet Brussels cloth and a dark green tunic ordered for her by Charles d'Orléans, decorations of embroidered nettle leaves to represent the house of Orléans, and a slashed tunic of cloth-of-gold.⁵¹ These records tally with the trial's charge that she dressed in clothes "curtis, brevibus, et dissolutis" [short, small, and dissolute], in "sumptuosus et pomposus vestibus de pannis preciosis et aureis ac etiam foderaturis" [sumptuous and magnificent clothes of precious fabrics and gold and also of furs].⁵² Joan is caught between two semiotics: the tailoring and luxury that express high status in secular circles are susceptible to moral objections from the clergy.

I will slight the relations between cross-dressing and social authority to focus on sexuality. For some scholars my omission covers the whole field of female transvestism, which in their view has social meaning only. Vern Bullough argues that whereas medieval sources attribute male cross-dressing to lust for women or effeminacy, female cross-dressing is motivated by desire for the social advantages of men—protection from sexual assault, mobility, access to arms, and so on.⁵³ Caroline Bynum makes a similar point in generalizing from the case of Joan of Arc: "cross-dressing was for women primarily a practical device. . . . Perhaps exactly *because* cross-dressing was a radical yet practical social step for women, it was not finally their most powerful symbol of self."⁵⁴ The practical advantages of taking the role of a knight rather than a peasant, and a man rather than a woman, are evident in Joan's case, but to consider her cross-dress only in terms of social advantage elides her damaging

refusals to give it up in prison and oversimplifies the gender identity Joan articulates during her trial.

Joan's testimony about her conduct in war is one context for considering that identity. Bynum argues that religious women who cross-dress continue to see themselves "in female images . . . not as warriors for Christ but as brides, as pregnant virgins, as housewives, as mothers of God."⁵⁵ Joan in contrast sees herself most accurately as a warrior, never drawing on imagery of pregnancy, motherhood, or nurturing, but she is a warrior with a difference: asked which she loved better, her standard or her sword, she replies that she loved the standard forty times better, and that she carried the standard herself in battle "pro evitando ne interficeret aliquem; et dicit quod nunquam interfecit hominem" [in order to avoid killing anyone; and she added that she had never killed anyone].⁵⁶ She does approve her sword, "quia erat bonus ensis guerre et bonus ad dandum bonas alapas et bonos ictus, gallice *de bonnes buffes et de bons torchons*" [because it was a good sword for war and good for giving good slaps and good blows, in French "good whacks and good wallops"].⁵⁷ The French phrase testifies not only to Joan's colloquial vocabulary but again to her curious restraint about killing. Her sword seems less to threaten life than to punish and chastise in the manner of her weapon of choice, a heavy stick or *martin* by which she was known to swear ("par mon martin") and which she sometimes used on her own disobedient soldiers and their camp followers.⁵⁸ This diffidence about killing may also motivate Joan's discomfort with the term *chief de guerre*, which she used in a letter of warning to the King of England but repudiated during her interrogation, later explaining that "s'elle estoit chief de guerre, s'estoit pour battre les Angloys" [if she was a war leader, it was to fight the English].⁵⁹ Her letter indicates that she would rather the English simply left at her warning, though if they do not, "je les feray tous occire" [I will have them all killed]: again she distances herself from the killing by however small a margin.⁶⁰ She sees herself as a fighter, then, not a mother or a bride; but the modifications she brings to war leadership by carrying her own standard, refraining from killing, and preferring her stick and her standard to her sword constitute her refusal to succumb uncritically to the conventional model of the masculine warrior.

Joan's testimony about women's roles and her relations to women both defers to femininity and departs significantly from it. The trial's focus on clothing can present this range of evidence succinctly. Following Deuteronomy's prohibition, Joan's judges consider cross-dressing to be a reprehensible violation of the feminine category—"contra honestatem sexus muliebris et in lege div-

ina prohibita ac eiam Deo et hominibus abhominabilia et per ecclesiasticas sanctiones sub pena anathematis interdicta” [against the uprightness of the female sex and prohibited by divine law, equally abominable to God and to men, and forbidden by ecclesiastical law under pain of anathema].⁶¹ The faculty of the University of Paris sustains the connection between cross-dressing and cross-gendering in their opinion that “relicto habitu muliebri, virorum habitum imitata est” [having given up women’s way of dressing, she imitated the comportment of men]: the recurrence of *habitus* in its literal and figurative senses reinforces the argument that clothing expresses gender.⁶² As detailed above, Joan counters during the trial that her clothing is insignificant to the state of her soul and (quite differently) that her clothing signifies her mission rather than her gender alignment. Both positions become less tenable as the struggle over access to the sacraments reveals her deep commitment to cross-dressing and as pressure from the court calls into question for her whether her cross-dressing should be attributed to God’s command. The explanation she gives after her relapse, that “elle ayme mieulx l’abit d’omme que de femme” [she likes men’s clothes better than women’s], gains credit from earlier testimony revealing the ease with which she adapted to them from the beginning: when asked what reverence she showed to St. Michael at the Dauphin’s court, she replied that she “se agenoulla et oulta son chaperon” [knelt and took off her cap].⁶³ Here again Joan’s identity as “Pucelle” appears complexly gendered; she inhabits the masculine gesture as well as men’s clothing. Joan’s masculine *habitus* helps account for doubts about her sexuality when she presented herself to the Dauphin: Jean Pasquerel testifies that Joan was twice visited by women to determine “si esset vir vel mulier, et an esset corrupta vel virgo; et inventa fuit mulier, virgo tamen et puella” [if she were a man or a woman, and if she were deflowered or a virgin; and she was found to be a woman, but a girl and a virgin].⁶⁴ That women were chosen to make this determination suggests Joan’s female sex was not in much doubt: male physicians would have been more appropriate investigators of sexual anomaly had it seemed likely that Joan was male. However, that the sex determination needed to be made at all indicates that Joan’s cross-dressing and cross-behavior were perceived to complicate her sexuality and move it beyond the normative.

Joan rejects feminine roles while continuing to identify herself as a woman. Of women’s occupations (“oeuvres de femme”) she declares “que il y a assés autres femmes pour ce faire” [that there are enough other women to do them].⁶⁵ When she determines that Katherine de la Rochelle is not a true visionary, she admonishes her “que elle retornast a son mary faire son mesnaige et nourrir ses enfans” [that she should return to her husband to keep

house and raise her children], opposing women’s conventional tasks to the visionary’s way of life.⁶⁶ Marie Delcourt concludes that Joan is hostile to her family and to the lot of women which she has escaped, but I would argue on the contrary that Joan testifies to strong identifications with her mother and other women.⁶⁷ For example, Joan dismisses the men who have tried to convince her to give up cross-dressing, but notes her allegiance to the women who have done so, even to women aligned against Charles VII: “s’elle le deust avoir fait, elle l’eust plustost fait a la requeste de ces deux dames que d’autres dames qui soient en France, exceptee sa royne” [if she had been able (to give up men’s clothes), she would rather have done so at the request of these two ladies (Jeanne de Luxembourg and Jeanne de Béthune) than of any other ladies in France, except for her queen].⁶⁸ When asked at the end of interrogation for her corrections to the minutes, Joan repeats that she would wear a dress to escape imprisonment, but she substitutes her mother for her earlier references to her mission: “tradatis michi unam tunicam muliebrem pro eundo ad domum matris et ego accipiam” [give me a woman’s dress to go to my mother’s house and I will accept it].⁶⁹ This fascinating revision seems to deny the dichotomy Joan has articulated between other women’s lives and her own by equating her mother’s domestic space with the public space she claims in opposing the English. In the revised escape scenario, Joan complicates her mission with a certain nostalgia for normalcy, a wish that her life could be brought into consonance with her mother’s again through so simple a gesture as returning home in a dress.

The Latin record of the trial prepared after Joan’s death by Thomas de Courcelles tends to suppress Joan’s expressions of allegiance to women. In early testimony as to whether she knew any art or trade, “dist que ouy; et que sa mere luy avoit apprins a coustre; et qu’elle ne cuidoyt point qu’il y eust femme dedens Rouen qui luy en sceust apprendre aulcune chose” [she said yes, that her mother had taught her to sew; and that she did not think there was any woman in Rouen who could teach her more about it].⁷⁰ One of the most visible distortions of the French minutes occurs at this juncture in the Latin record: the mother vanishes, and the teaching relation with other women is replaced by competition: “Dixit quod sic, ad suendum pannos lineos et nendum; nec timebat mulierem Rothomagensem de nendo et suendo” [She said yes, to sew and stitch cloth, and she feared no woman in Rouen for sewing and stitching].⁷¹ Courcelles’ Latin record deletes altogether her testimony that during her captivity in Burgundy, Jeanne de Luxembourg interceded for Joan with her nephew, asking him not to turn her over to the English.⁷² Courcelles also edits out Joan’s request for a female servant after her

abjuration.⁷³ These alterations to the French record sustain the court's accusation that Joan's cross-dressing indicates a loss of feminine traits in general. But it is more accurate to Joan's testimony to note the persistence of positive relations with women even as she rejects women's tasks for herself, dressing and acting in masculine modes. This masculine *habitus* distances her from the heterosexual norm, stretching her strong bonds with women across the space that separates her complexly gendered present from her feminine past.

In what terms were Joan and her contemporaries able to perceive her redefined sexuality? There is little contemporary evidence for a medieval discourse of bisexuality or lesbianism, although as noted above the evidence is somewhat stronger for male homosexual consciousness.⁷⁴ Instead, the sexual binary dominates, and Joan's identity is perceived in terms of its poles, as a construction vacillating between them. *De quadam puella*, cited above, imagines this vacillation as a series of temporal shifts from one pole to the other, a shifting that respects Deuteronomy's enforcement of categories: Joan is alternately a clever leader when in armor and an ignorant maiden in a dress.⁷⁵ Unfortunately for Joan, her practice did not observe this purifying polarity. A final discrepancy between the Latin and French records brings out the transgressive potential in Joan's mixed position. The fifth of twelve articles drawn up at the end of the trial for deliberation by the court and other advisers charges that Joan cross-dressed and cut her hair like a man's, "nichil super corpus suum relinquendo quod sexum femineum approbet aut demonstret" [leaving nothing on her body that proves or reveals her female sex]; the Orleans manuscript stops at that while the Latin record continues "preter ea que natura eidem femine contulit ad feminei sexus discrecionem" [except for what nature has provided her to distinguish the female sex].⁷⁶ The full Latin accusation suggests that Joan's fault is the greater in that she has not crossed over entirely (like the transvestite saints perhaps) into a masculine position. Her body is the more visible and shameful for its imperfect containment in cross-dress. She occupies neither position in the gender binary, but contaminates both by combining them—hence Jean d'Estivet, one of the major figures in her trial, is said to have called her "putana" and "paillarda" [whore, wanton], although her physical virginity is unquestioned.⁷⁷

Among her contemporaries, only Christine de Pisan imagines positively a Joan who conflates masculinity and femininity in one persona. The *Ditié de Jehanne d'Arc* (1429) uses the masculine form "preux" for Joan while maintaining "preuses" to modify other heroic women. This grammatical cross-gendering reinforces Christine's mixed imagery for Joan, "le champion et celle

/ Qui donne à France la mamelle / De paix et douce norriture, / Et ruer jus la gent rebelle" [the champion, she who gives France the breast of peace and sweet nourishment, and who casts down the rebel host].⁷⁸ The simultaneity of feminine and masculine attributes contrasts to *De quadam puella's* version of pure sequentiality. To be sure, Christine finds nothing normal in this simultaneity. "Vééz bien chose outre nature!" [Here truly is something beyond nature!] concludes this stanza, and a similar passage rhymes the doubly gendered adjectives for Joan, "fort [m.] et dure [f.]" with "fors nature" [outside nature].⁷⁹ But Christine's "Pucelle de Dieu" is miraculous, supernatural rather than unnatural. She is elevated beyond sex by dedication to God yet also a credit to the feminine sex in general: "Hee! quel honneur au femenin / Sexe!"⁸⁰ Of all her contemporaries, Joan might have found Christine her most congenial advocate. The poet's urgently prophetic voice parallels Joan's, and the *Ditié's* cross-gendered persona recalls the trial's evidence that Joan felt strongly allied with women even as she distinguished herself from them. Yet Christine's version of cross-gendering, in its poetic and miraculous harmony, floats at some remove above the conflicted and shifting self-presentation that Joan attempts under the pressure of interrogation.

Marina Warner invokes the androgyne, an idealized nonsexual status, to describe Joan: "she was usurping a man's function but shaking off the trammels of his sex altogether to occupy a different, third order, neither male nor female, but unearthly, like the angels whose company she loved."⁸¹ But gender theorists have argued compellingly that the concept of the androgyne, in its unconflicted wholeness, evades the issue of sexuality by idealizing it away.⁸² Androgyny's prior sexuality, moreover, is conceived only in bipolar terms: only conventional masculinity and femininity come before androgyny, doing away with the possibility of any other sexuality. Androgyny evades sexuality while reasserting that it is binary; Joan's testimony, in contrast, draws on femininity and masculinity to present a *habitus* that matches neither. Joan's commitment to virginity frees her from genital sex, but her commitment itself, and her masculine dress and way of life, continue to shape her sexuality in the construction of "la Pucelle." At the very least, Joan's choice of the secular category of "Pucelle," her vocation to arms rather than prayer, and her strong relations with women leave open the possibility that she rejects heterosexual identity; at most, Joan's abstinence may have made it more possible for her to revise her gender, if one consequence of her new position would have been either unclarity about its implications for physical desire or a transgressive desire for women. Joan's virginity shields her self-construction from its most radical implications, but virginity is a crucial part of her sexuality, not an escape from

- "The Literary Image of Joan of Arc: Prior Influences," *Speculum* 56 (1981): 811–30; see also *Procès de condamnation et de réhabilitation*, vols. 3–5.
- 14 *Procès de condamnation*, 1.14, 339, 377; Deuteronomy 22.5; 1 Corinthians 11.5–6, 13.
- 15 *Procès de condamnation*, 1.51. The minutes usually record Joan's statements in the third person.
- 16 *Ibid.*, 1.75, 93–94. Where there are gaps in the French minutes, I quote from the Latin record of Thomas de Courcelles.
- 17 *Ibid.*, 1.168: "se on luy donnoit congié en abit de femme, elle se mectroit tantoust en abit d'omme et feroit ce qui luy est commandé par nostre Seigneur" [if they let her go in a woman's dress, she would resume men's dress immediately and do what is commanded of her by our Lord]; see also 1.67, 181, 209–10.
- 18 *Ibid.*, 1.168–69.
- 19 *Chroniques de Perceval de Cagny*, ed. H. Moranvillé (Paris: Renouard, 1902), 140; Guillaume Cousinot, *Chronique de la Pucelle*, ed. Vallet de Viriville (Paris: Delahays, 1864), 276.
- 20 *Procès de condamnation*, 1.67, 153.
- 21 *Ibid.*, 1.227.
- 22 *Ibid.*, 1.167, 210; see also 1.227, 344.
- 23 *Procès en nullité*, 1.181–82, 186–88; *Procès de condamnation*, 3.151–59; *Documents et recherches relatifs à Jeanne la Pucelle*, vol. 3, *La réhabilitation de Jeanne la Pucelle: l'enquête ordonnée par Charles VII*, ed. Paul Doncoeur and Yvonne Lanhers (Paris: Argences, 1956), 36–37, 40–45, 51, 54. Jean Toutmouillé recalls Joan saying she was virginal at her death, 40–41.
- 24 For example, Cousinot, *Chronique*, 276–77: "quand je seroie entre les hommes, estant en habit d'homme, ils n'auront pas concupiscence charnelle de moi; et me semble qu'en cest estat je conserveray mieulx ma virginié de pensée et de fait" [when I am among men, dressed as a man, they will not have carnal desire for me; and it seems to me that in this manner I will better maintain my virginity in thought and deed].
- 25 *Procès en nullité*, 1.350, 387; Joan testifies, however, that she slept "vestue et armee" [dressed and in armor] when in the field (*Procès de condamnation*, 1.263).
- 26 *Ibid.*, 1.396.
- 27 *Ibid.*, 1.396–97.
- 28 *Ibid.*, 1.344.
- 29 On the expression of holiness through clothing, see Dyan Elliott, "Dress as Mediator between Inner and Outer Self: The Pious Matron of the High and Later Middle Ages," *Mediaeval Studies* 53 (1991): 279–308; and Gábor Klaniczay, *The Uses of Supernatural Power: The Transformation of Popular Religion in Medieval and Early-Modern Europe*, trans. Susan Singerman, ed. Karen Margolis, chap. 4, "Fashionable Beards and Heretic Rags" (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1990), 51–78.
- 30 *Procès de condamnation*, 1.156; for contrasting conclusions about Joan's agency see the interesting discussion by Karen Sullivan, "Inquiry and Inquisition in Late Medieval Culture: The Questioning of Joan of Arc and Christine de Pizan" (Ph.D. diss., University of California at Berkeley, 1993), 16–41.
- 31 See *Procès de condamnation*, 1.156–58, 182–83, 208.
- 32 Gaunt, "Straight Minds/'Queer' Wishes," 439.
- 33 Marina Warner, *Joan of Arc: The Image of Female Heroism* (New York: Knopf, 1981), 22–24; Sullivan, "Inquiry and Inquisition," 22–23. Joan testifies that her voices call her "Jehanne la Pucelle," *Procès de condamnation*, 1.126.
- 34 *Minute française*, 157, from the Orléans manuscript; Urfé has "tout qu'il plairoit a Dieu" but Courcelles has "tamdiu quamdiu placeret Deo" (*Procès de condamnation*, 1.123; see also "quamdiu placeret Deo," 1.250).
- 35 *Procès de condamnation*, e.g. 1.95, 153–54, 344.
- 36 Warner, *Joan of Arc*, 135, 151–55; Marie Delcourt, "Le complexe de Diane dans l'hagiographie chrétienne," *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 153 (1958): 1–33.
- 37 Only two lives of transvestite saints are extant in Old French (see Gaunt, "Straight Minds/'Queer' Wishes"), but Joan could have known saints' stories from sermons and feast-day celebrations.
- 38 John Anson, "The Female Transvestite in Early Monasticism: The Origin and Development of a Motif," *Viator* 5 (1974): 1–32; Gaunt, "Straight Minds/'Queer' Wishes."
- 39 Kirsten Hastrup, "The Semantics of Biology: Virginity," in *Defining Females: The Nature of Women in Society*, ed. Shirley Ardener (New York: Wiley, 1978), 58–59.
- 40 *Procès de condamnation*, 1.149, 244; see also 1.174–75 where Joan is asked if she would still hear her voices if she were married or were not a virgin.
- 41 *Procès de condamnation et de réhabilitation*, 4.382, 406.
- 42 *Procès de condamnation*, 1.123, 167.
- 43 *Ibid.*, 1.167–68; Courcelles obscures Joan's statement by deleting the phrase "se ainsi est . . . qu'il la faile desvestir en jugement" [if it is necessary to strip her in judgment], which imagines that the court may tolerate physical coercion to change her way of dressing. See also 1.210, 227 where Joan again refers to death in relation to her cross-dressing. Testimony at the nullification trial (e.g., *Procès en nullité*, 1.184) discredited the original sentence by declaring that Joan was executed for wearing men's clothing, an offense not grave enough to warrant death. Penances of one to three years are prescribed for cross-dressing in contemporary manuals: Vern L. Bullough and Bonnie Bullough, *Cross Dressing, Sex, and Gender* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993), 61; *Procès de condamnation*, 3.87. Modern scholars also occasionally attribute Joan's execution to cross-dressing, but the first emphasis throughout the trial is on the validity of Joan's claim to hear voices; at the interview following her relapse, Joan's declaration that she continues to hear her voices carries in the Courcelles trial record the marginal annotation "responsio mortifera" [the fatal reply] (*Procès de condamnation*, 1.397 n. 1).
- 44 *Procès de condamnation*, 1.208.
- 45 *Ibid.*, 1.252.
- 46 *Ibid.*, 1.183.
- 47 *Ibid.*, 1.64, 3.31 n. 1.

- 48 Marjorie Garber, *Vested Interests: Cross-Dressing and Cultural Anxiety* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 13.
- 49 In the account of the Greffier de la Rochelle, “elle avoit pourpoint noir, chausses estachées, robbe courte de gros gris noir, cheveux ronds et noirs, et un chappeau noir sur la teste,” Jules Quicherat, “Relation inédite sur Jeanne d’Arc,” *Revue historique* 4 (1877): 336. Jean de Nouillompont testifies that Joan cross-dressed slightly earlier in clothes of a member of his household, *Procès en nullité*, 1.290.
- 50 *De quadam puella*, in *Procès de condamnation et de réhabilitation*, 3.411–21 (quotation at 412). This treatise is sometimes attributed to Henri de Gorcum, sometimes to Jean Gerson: see Georges Peyronnet, “Gerson, Charles VII et Jeanne d’Arc: La propagande au service de la guerre,” *Revue d’histoire ecclésiastique* 84 (1989): 334–70. Anne Llewellyn Barstow translates *De quadam puella* into English in *Joan of Arc: Heretic, Mystic, Shaman* (Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen, 1986), 133–41. Jean Morel testifies that in mid-July 1429 he received from Joan “unam vestem rubeam quam habebat ipsa indutam” [a red garment she had worn]; several witnesses recalled that when Joan arrived in Vaucouleurs “erat induta veste mulieris rubea” [she was wearing a red woman’s garment]: *Procès en nullité*, 1.255, 299.
- 51 Adrien Harmand, *Jeanne d’Arc: ses costumes, son armure* (Paris: Leroux, 1929), esp. 261–71, 320, 361–63; *Procès de condamnation et de réhabilitation*, 5.112–13.
- 52 *Procès de condamnation*, 1.207.
- 53 Vern L. Bullough, “Transvestism in the Middle Ages,” in *Sexual Practices and the Medieval Church*, ed. Vern L. Bullough and James Brundage (Buffalo, N.Y.: Prometheus, 1982), 43–54; see also Bullough and Bullough, *Cross Dressing, Sex, and Gender*; and Michèle Perret, “Travesties et transsexuelles: Yde, Silence, Grisandole, Blanchandine,” *Romance Notes* 25 (1984–85): 328–40.
- 54 Caroline Walker Bynum, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), 291 (her italics). Jonathan Goldberg makes a case for not ruling sexuality out of discussions of cross-dressing in *Sodometries: Renaissance Texts, Modern Sexualities* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1992), 105–16.
- 55 Bynum, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast*, 291.
- 56 *Procès de condamnation*, 1.78.
- 57 *Ibid.*, 1.78. The vernacular intrusions in the Latin record deserve an article of their own. Justice, “Inquisition, Speech, and Writing,” provides a lively one for heresy trials in Norwich, but his explanation that vernacular intrusions should be attributed to the notary’s boredom because they “possessed no evidentiary advantage as vernacular phrases—no more than they would in Latin” (p. 3, his italics)—is belied by two of the three examples he cites. They make their arguments in verbal puns—every Friday is *fre* day and the stinging *bee* of oaths *by* God—that would be lost if translated into Latin (pp. 2–3). These puns would have been more evident before long *i* diphthongized in the later fifteenth century.
- 58 See *Procès de condamnation et de réhabilitation*, 4.4 n. 1; Cagny, *Chroniques*, 141.
- 59 *Procès de condamnation*, 1.82, 221, 262.
- 60 *Ibid.*, 1.221.
- 61 *Ibid.*, 1.207.
- 62 *Ibid.*, 1.363; *habitus* is also the pivotal term in the passage quoted above from *De quadam puella* on Joan’s shifting dress and behavior. See Sullivan, “Inquiry and Inquisition,” 32 and 35, on the language the court chooses for Joan’s transvestism.
- 63 *Procès de condamnation*, 1.396, 118.
- 64 *Procès en nullité*, 1.389.
- 65 *Procès de condamnation*, 1.213.
- 66 *Ibid.*, 1.104.
- 67 Delcourt, “Complexe de Diane,” 18–28.
- 68 *Procès de condamnation*, 1.95.
- 69 *Procès de condamnation*, 1.181; see n. 17 for Joan’s earlier references to wearing a dress in order to leave prison.
- 70 *Ibid.*, 1.46.
- 71 *Ibid.*
- 72 *Ibid.*, 1.94.
- 73 “Se on la veult laisser aler a la messe et oster hors de fers et meitre en prison gracieuse et qu’elle eust une femme, elle sera bonne et fera ce que l’Eglise voudra” [If they would let her go to Mass and take off her fetters and place her in an appropriate prison and give her a woman servant, she would be good and do as the church wished] (*Ibid.*, 1.396–97; 2.345 n. 1; italicized phrase omitted in Courcelles’ text). In some cases, such as his omission of his vote in favor of torturing Joan, Courcelles may be striving to protect himself or the court from discredit, but many of his changes seem to distort Joan’s statements in order to discredit her. Doncoeur’s notes in *Minute française* are particularly attentive to Courcelles’ changes.
- 74 But see Rudolf M. Dekker and Lotte C. van de Pol, *The Tradition of Female Transvestism in Early Modern Europe* (New York: St. Martin’s, 1989), which finds traces of transvestite practices in the fifteenth century; and Judith C. Brown, *Immodest Acts: The Life of a Lesbian Nun in Renaissance Italy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).
- 75 Attempting to reassert the categories of male versus female clothing in the face of their disruption makes sense only if transvestism has substantial meaning (rather than being merely circumstantial). Kirsten Hastrup applies Mary Douglas’s concept of purity and danger to sexuality and transvestism in two articles, “The Sexual Boundary—Purity: Heterosexuality and Virginity,” and “The Sexual Boundary—Danger: Transvestism and Homosexuality,” *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford* 5 (1974): 137–47, and 6 (1975): 42–56.
- 76 *Procès de condamnation*, 1.293; *Minute française*, 257. Here the collator of the Orléans manuscript is translating from the Latin record, and the omission is consistent with earlier expressions of support for Joan in this manuscript.
- 77 *Procès en nullité*, 1.349, 351.
- 78 Christine de Pisan, *Ditié de Jehanne d’Arc*, ed. Angus J. Kennedy and Kenneth Varty,

Medium Aevum Monographs, n.s. 9 (Oxford: Society for the Study of Mediaeval Languages and Literature, 1977), lines 199, 222, 188–91.

79 Ibid., lines 192, 274, 277. Although we reach different conclusions, my discussion is indebted to Sullivan, "Inquiry and Inquisition," 235–39.

80 *Ditié de Jehanne d'Arc*, ll. 265–66.

81 Warner, *Joan of Arc*, chap. 7, "Ideal Androgyne," 139–58 (quotation at 146).

82 See Marjorie Garber, *Vice Versa: Bisexuality and the Eroticism of Everyday Life* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1995), esp. 214–19.

83 See *Jeanne d'Arc: ses costumes*, 381–400.