The proceedings which ended in Joan's conviction were to last five months, from January 9 to May 30, 1431, and were in three phases. First came what was called the procès d'office which we should now call the instruction of the case*. This comprised investigations and interrogations lasting from January 9th to March 26th. Then came the ordinary trial, ending in the scene of Joan's "abjuration" (May 24th). Finally came the very short Relapse trial, on May 28th and 29th.

In trials touching the faith, the bishop and the Inquisitor sat together as judges. We have seen how Pierre Cauchon had been appointed by means of certain procedural artifices to judge the case: his whole past, a consistent story of attachment to the English cause, as well as his quality as a jurist, a doctor of both civil and canon law, guaranteed in advance the cleverness which, in the event, he deployed. With him sat Jean Lemaitre, vicar of the Inquisition at Rouen, designated for the task by Jean Graverent, Inquisitor of France. Lemaitre was to give a pitiful performance: he was present as rarely as possible; a month after the trial had opened he had not put in an appearance. On February 20th, expressly summoned by Cauchon, he did appear; but to declare "that he would not meddle in the matter as much for the scruple of his conscience as for the surety of the instruction of the trial, were it not for the fact that he had been given the authority and in so far as he had it." (C.29). He did not appear thereafter until March 13th, and although the minutes several times mention his presence, he did not once intervene.

These two were Joan's only judges. But in conformity with inquisitorial custom, to which we owe the idea of a jury in trials, a certain number of assessors had to take part, although their function was purely consultative. Cauchon, if only to add to the prestige of his court, did not fail to summon a large number of assessors, about sixty in fact, forty of whom sat fairly regularly: they were Norman and English prelates, canons of Rouen, masters of canon and civil law, advocates of the "Officidité", an ecclesiastical court of which there was one to each bishopric, etc. Among the most assiduous of these officers of the court were the Masters delegated to Rouen by the University of Paris, Jean Beaupère, Nicholas Midy, Jacques de Touraine, Gérard Feuillet, Pierre Maurice and Thomas de Courcelles. We may be quite sure that they brought to the trial the spirit which animated the university at the time. Also present at the trial was the cardinal of Winchester, Henry Beaufort, great-uncle of the King, usually referred to as the cardinal of England in contemporary texts; and the bishop of Thérouanne, Louis of Luxembourg, brother of the man who had sold Joan. At the start of the trial on January 9th Cauchon named one of his own men, Jean d'Estivet, as promoter, ironically nick-named Master Benedicite because of his filthy language. As commissioner he chose a clerk of the diocese of Bayeux, master Jean de la Fontaine. Finally, Cauchon chose his three notaries, clerks of the court, from the Rouen "Officidité", master Guillaume Manchon, master Guillaume Colles called Boisguillaume, and master Nicolas Taquel, while another priest of Rouen, Jean Massieu, filled the office of usher.

It is highly instructive, in measuring the worth of these men whom Joan had to face throughout her trial, to refer back to certain earlier documents, notably to the account rolls of the King of England. We note, for example, that Louis of Luxembourg, as Chancellor of France, draws a salary of 2,000 pounds tournois; the abbot of Fécamp, Gilles de Durermont, draws a thousand a year as does the abbot of Mont Saint-Michel, Robert Jolivet (he had long since fled from his valiant abbey whose resistance to English attacks during this last phase of the Hundred Years War is well known). Several other assessors, notably André Marguerie, Raoul Roussel and Denis Gastinel, picked out by Cauchon at the beginning of the trial, are also to be found in receipt of regular salaries noted in the account rolls, of diverse sums. (See Joseph Stevenson's Letters and papers illustrative of the wars of the English, London, 1864, Vol 1, pp. 561 et seq.) Nor were honours to be denied them: Gilles de Durermont was to be appointed Bishop of Coutances; another assessor, Robert Guillebert, became Bishop of London in 1436; Louis of Luxembourg became Archbishop of Rouen and Raoul Roussel succeeded him in 1444. Jean Fabri, or Lefèvre,
who survived at the time of the trial of Rehabilitation, became titular Bishop of Demetriade. And so forth, only Cauchon failing to obtain what he had hoped for. Hanotaux has this to say about Cauchon's failure, that there happened to him what does happen to over-complaisant servants, who in the long run earn nothing but contempt. Cauchon had expected the archbishopric of Rouen; he over-complaisant servants, who in the long run earn nothing but to obtain what he had hoped for. Hanotaux has this to say about the procedure laid down required, an inquiry was made in the neighbourhood of Joan's birth. But nothing about this is to be found in the records of the trial, nor, as we shall see, is that the only gap in those records. In fact this inquiry was not known about until very much later; it was not until the Trial of Rehabilitation that some of the commissioners who had carried out this inquiry were to come forward, among others Nicolas Bailly, tabellion royal in the provostry of Andelot:

"Joan came from Domremy and from the parish of that place and her father was Jacques d'Arc, a good and honest farmer (laboureur) as I saw and knew him; I know it also by hearsay and upon the report of many, for I was tabellion appointed by messire Jean de Torcenay, then bailiff of Chaumont, who held his authority from him who was then called King of France and England, at the same time as Gerard Petit, defunct, at that time provost of Andelot, to hold an enquiry in the matter of Joan the Maid who was, as it was said, detained in prison in the city of Rouen. It was I, tabellion, who made (compiled) in her time the information to which I was commissioned by messire Jean de Torcenay ... when myself and Gerard made (compiled) ... this information on Joan; by our diligence we so wrought that we procured twelve or fifteen witnesses to certify this information. We did this before Simon de Thermes, esquire, acting as lieutenant to the captain of Chaumont, on the subject of Joan the Maid; we were suspect because we had not done this information badly (evil); these witnesses, before the lieutenant, attested the evidence which they had given and as it was written in their interrogatory; then the lieutenant wrote again to messire Jean, bailiff of Chaumont, that that which was written in this interrogatory made by us, tabellion and provost, was true. And when this bailiff saw the lieutenant's report, he said we the commissioners were false Armagnacs." (R. 89–90)

It seems quite clear from this that Nicolas Bailly and Gerard Petit, having carried out their inquiry, were suspected of having done so in a cunningly sides-taking spirit, thus presenting a too favourable image of Joan. They were obliged to hail the witnesses before the bailiff of Chaumont's lieutenant in order to establish their good faith. Other depositions bore witness to this inquiry, and also to its outcome, wholly negative from the judges' point of view.

Jean Moreau, merchant: "I know that at the time when Joan was in Rouen and they were preparing a trial against her, someone important from the country of Lorraine came to Rouen. As I was of the same country I made his acquaintance. He told me that he had come from Lorraine to Rouen because he had been especially commissioned to gather information in Joan's country of origin to learn what reputation she had there. Which he had done. And he had reported his information to the lord Bishop of Beauvais, thinking to have compensation for his work and his expenses; but the bishop told him that he was a traitor and a bad man and that he had not done what he should have done and was ordered to do. This man complained of it to me for, from what he said, he could not get his salary paid him because his informations were not useful to the bishop. He added that in the course of (collecting) his informations he had found nothing concerning Joan which he would not have liked to find about his own sister, although he had been for information to five or six parishes near Domremy in that town itself." (R.88–89)

The fact is further confirmed by yet other witnesses.

Michel Lebuin: "When Joan was taken, I saw one called Nicolas, bailiff of Andelot, who was come with many others to Domremy, and at the demand of messire Jean de Torcenay, then bailiff of Chaumont, in the name of the so-called King of France and England, made inquest into the repute and habits of Joan, as it was said. And, as it seems, he dared not force anyone to swear, for fear of the people of Vaucouleurs. I think that Jean Begot of that town was examined, for they were lodged in his house. I believe also that when they made this inquiry they found nothing evil touching Joan." (R. 87)

Joan was also forced to undergo an examination into her virginity which was carried out probably during the first days of January. The Duke and Duchess of Bedford were staying in Rouen from January 1st to the 13th and it was the Duchess of Bedford who took charge of this examination, which she had done by certain matrons
of her choice. The evidence establishing this was given during the Trial of Rehabilitation.

Jean Fabri or Lefevre, one of the assessors at the Trial of Condemnation: "I know well that once, when Joan was asked why she was called the Maid and whether she was one, she answered: 'I can well say that I am so, and if you do not believe me have me examined by some women.' And she declared herself ready to suffer this examination provided it be done by decent women, as is the custom."

Boisguillaume, the notary: "I heard it said by one, whom I no longer remember, that Joan was examined by some matrons and that she was found to be a virgin and that this examination had been made by order of the Duchess of Bedford and that the Duke of Bedford stood in a secret place from which he could see Joan examined."

Jean Massieu: "I know well that she was examine'd to discover if she was a virgin or not by some matrons and midwives, and that on the orders of the Duchess of Bedford and notably by Anna Bavon and another matron whose name I do not remember. After this examination they declared that she was a virgin and intact and that I heard said by Anna herself for which cause the Duchess of Bedford had the warders and others forbidden to offer her any violence."

No trace of this examination into Joan's virginity is to be found in the trial records either.

Throughout the whole course of the trial Joan was held in a civil prison, looked after by English gaolers and kept in irons. This was in flagrant disregard of the rule of Inquisitorial tribunals by which she had a right to be held in the archbishopric prison and guarded by women. Another irregularity: Joan had no advocate, and as we shall see anyone who tried to encourage or advise her, did so at his risk and peril.

The interrogatories began on February 21st. They began in open court in the Chapel of Rouen Castle; but after March 10th the proceedings continued in the prison itself, in camera, and with a much reduced court. Jean Massieu gives an account of how things were done: "On several occasions I took Joan from the prison to the place of jurisdiction and passing in front of the castle chapel; at Joan's request I allowed her, in passing, to make her orison. For this I was reproved by the said Benedicite, promoter of the cause, who said to me: 'Truant, who maketh thee so bold to allow that excommunicated whore to approach the church without permission? I will have thee put in a tower so that thou shalt see neither sun nor moon for a month if thou dost so again.' And when the said promoter perceived that I obeyed him not, he several times placed himself before the chapel door and Joan asked deliberately: '_Here is the body of Jesus-Christ._'"

The interrogatories were conducted according to procedures which are still used by examining magistrates (juges d'instruction). Questions succeed each other without apparent order, some designed to distract the accused's attention, others, reverting suddenly to subjects already explored, intended to lead the accused to contradict himself. Joan, without any assistance, kept her end up superbly in the face of these attacks.

Jean Massieu: "_When my lord of Beauvais, who was judge in the case, accompanied by six clerks, to wit by Beaucoup, Midy, Maurice, Touraine, Courcelles and Feuillet, or some other in his place, first interrogated her, before she had given her answer to one, another of the assistants interjected another question, whereby she was often precipitate and confused in her answers. . . . The assessors with the judges put questions to her, and sometimes at the moment when one was questioning her and she was answering his question, another interrupted her answer so much so that she several times said to those who were interrogating her: 'Fine lords, ask one at a time. . . . And I was astonished to see how she could answer the subtle and captious questions which were put to her, which a lettered man would have had difficulty in answering. The examination lasted usually from eight o'clock to eleven._" (R.208)

Guillaume Manchon, the notary, describes these interrogatories in the same way: "During the trial Joan was harassed by numerous and diverse interrogations and almost every day there took place interrogatories which lasted about three or four hours and sometimes, according to what Joan said, difficult and subtle questions were extracted on the subject of which they questioned her again after the midday meal for two or three hours, and often there was translation from one question to another while changing the manner of questioning. And notwithstanding this change, she answered prudently and with a very good memory, for very often she said: 'I have already answered on that point,' or, again, 'I refer to the clerk,' pointing at me._" (R.209)
Manchon also throws some light on the circumstances under which he filled his office: "In the first of Joan's interrogatories there was great tumult on the first day in the chapel of Rouen Castle and almost every word of Joan's was interrupted when she spoke of her apparitions, for there were present certain secretaries of the King of England, two or three, who registered as they liked Joan's sayings and depositions, omitting her excuses and what might serve to acquit her. I therefore complained of that, saying that unless a better order were introduced I would no longer undertake the task of writing in that business. Because of that, on the morrow the place was changed and we gathered in the court of the castle near to the great court. And there were two Englishmen to guard the door. And as sometimes there were difficulties about Joan's answers and sayings and there were some who said that she had not answered as I had written it, wherever there was difficulty I put nota at the head, so that she could be questioned again and light thrown on the difficulty."

Joan's answers were, then, recorded as she gave them, then collated and examined by the judges and assessors who sought for weak points in her answers which might give them a basis for further questioning.

Certain inadmissible procedures were employed in the court itself. This is, again, revealed by Manchon: "At the beginning of the trial, during five or six days, while I set down in writing the Maid's answers and excuses, sometimes the judges tried to constrain me, by translating into Latin, to put into other terms, changing the meaning of the words or, in some other manner, my understanding (of what had been said). And were placed two men, at the command of my lord of Beauvais, in a window (embrasure) near to the place where the judges were. And there was a serge curtain drawn in front of the window so that they should not be seen. These men wrote and reported what was charged against Joan; and suppressed her excuses. I think it was Loiseleur (who was thus hidden). And after the session, while collating what they had written, the two others reported in another manner and did not put down Joan's excuses. On this subject my lord of Beauvais was greatly enraged against me." (R.49)

The better to recreate the atmosphere of this trial, we give below the complete text of one day's interrogatories: that of Saturday, March 17th, 1431. The reader will get from this a clearer idea of the manner in which these proceedings were managed. On that day Joan was questioned on two occasions, morning and afternoon. Master Jean de La Fontaine was charged by the bishop to question her in his, Cauchon's, presence, and in the presence of the vice-Inquisitor Jean Lemaitre, two masters of the University of Paris, Nicolas Midy and Gerard Feuillet, Brother Isambart de la Pierre and the usher Jean Massieu. Joan was first required to take the oath, as was usual, and thereafter the questioning began:

**La Fontaine:** In what form, size, appearance and clothing does St. Michael come to you?

**Joan:** He was in the form of a true and honest man, and as for the clothes and other things, I shall not tell you any more. As for the angels, I saw them with my own eyes and you will get no more out of me about that. I believe as firmly the doings and sayings of St. Michael who appeared to me as I believe that our Lord Jesus Christ suffered death and passion for us. And what moves me to believe this is the good advice, *Her word is prud'homme.* I give the only approximate equivalent.—E.H.
the good comfort and the good doctrine that he did and gave me.

LA FONTAINE: Will you leave to the determination of our Holy Mother the Church, all your matters whether in good or in evil?

JOAN: As for the Church, I love her and would wish to sustain her with all my power for our Christian faith. And it is not I who should be prevented from going to church and hearing mass. As for the good works which I have done and at my coming, I must put my faith in the King of Heaven, who sent me to Charles, son of Charles, King of France, who is King of France. And you will see that the French will soon win a great thing which God will send to these French, such that it will rock the whole kingdom of France. I say it that when it happens you may remember that I said it.

LA FONTAINE: After how long will this happen?

JOAN: In Our Lord's own time (Je m'en attends à Notre Seigneur).

LA FONTAINE: Will you abide by the Church's determination for your sayings and deeds?

JOAN: I abide by God who sent me, by the Holy Virgin and all the saints in paradise. And I am of opinion that it is all one and the same thing, God and the Church, and that of that one should make no difficulty. Why do you make difficulty over that?

LA FONTAINE: There is a Church Triumphant where are God, the Saints, the angels and souls already saved. And there is the Church Militant in which are the Pope, God's vicar on earth, the cardinals and prelates of the Church, the clergy, and all good Christians and Catholics. This well-composed Church cannot err and is ruled by the Holy Spirit. That is why I ask you whether you are willing to abide by (put your trust in) the Church Militant, that is to say, the one which is on earth, as I have explained to you.

JOAN: I went to the King of France from God and the Virgin Mary and all the saints in paradise and the Church Victorious above and by their commandment. And to that Church I submit all my good deeds and all that I have done and shall do. As for submitting myself to the Church Militant, I shall answer you nothing else for the time being.

LA FONTAINE: What say you of that woman's clothing which is offered you that you may go and hear mass?

JOAN: As for women's clothing, I shall not put it on until it please God; and if it should be that I must be brought even to judgment, I trust in the lords of the Church that they will grant me the mercy of having a woman's shift and a covering for my head. And I would rather die than revoke what God has made me do, for I believe firmly that God will not let it happen that I be brought so low without I have immediate succour, and by miracle.

LA FONTAINE: Since you say that you wear (a man's) habit by God's commandment, why do you ask for a woman's shift when it comes to dying?

JOAN: It will suffice if it be long.

LA FONTAINE: Your God-mother who has seen the fairy ladies, is she reputed a well-conducted woman?

JOAN: I hold and repute her a respectable woman* and not a diviner or witch.

LA FONTAINE: Since you have said that you would wear woman's clothes if you were allowed to go away, would that please God?

JOAN: If permission were given me to withdraw in woman's clothes, immediately (thereafter) I should dress myself in man's clothes and do what is commanded me by God; and I have answered elsewhere that not for anything whatsoever would I take oath not to put on armour and not to wear man's clothes to do the Lord's commandment.

LA FONTAINE: What ages (are), and what garments are worn by, Saints Catherine and Margaret.

JOAN: To that you shall have the answer you have already had from me and none other. I have answered as most certainly as I know.

LA FONTAINE: Did you believe before to-day that the fairy ladies were evil spirits?

JOAN: I know nothing about that.

LA FONTAINE: Do you know whether Saints Catherine and Margaret hate the English?

JOAN: They love that which God loves and hate that which God hates.

LA FONTAINE: Does God hate the English?

JOAN: Of the love or hate which God has for the English and of what He does to their souls, I know nothing; but well I know that they will be driven out of France, excepting those who will die.

* Prude femme: it means, like prud'homme, a decent, sensible, well-mannered, respectable person.—E.H.
there, and that God will send victory to the French over the English.

LA FONTAINE: Was God for the English when their cause was prospering in France?

JOAN: I know not if God hated the French, but I believe that it was His will to let them be stricken for their sins if there were sins among them.

LA FONTAINE: What guarantee and what succour do you expect from God for your wearing of man's clothes?

JOAN: For the clothes as for the other things I have done, I expect no other recompense than the salvation of my soul.

LA FONTAINE: What arms did you offer up in the church of Saint-Denis of Paris?

JOAN: I gave a white harness entire such as is fitting for a man of arms, with a sword which I won before the town of Paris.

LA FONTAINE: With what object did you give these arms?

JOAN: It was done in devoutness, as is the custom among men of arms when they are wounded; and because I had been wounded before the town of Paris I offered them up to Saint-Denis, because that is the (war-)cry of France.

LA FONTAINE: Did you do so that the arms might be worshipped?

JOAN: No.

LA FONTAINE: What was the purpose of the five crosses which were on the sword which you found at Sainte-Catherine of Fierbois?

JOAN: I do not know.

LA FONTAINE: Who was it led you to have painted on your standard angels with arms, feet, legs and clothes?

JOAN: You have been answered.

LA FONTAINE: Did you have the angels painted such as they come to you?

JOAN: I had them painted in the manner that they are painted in churches.

LA FONTAINE: Have you seen them like to the manner in which they were painted?

JOAN: I shall not tell you anything else about that.

LA FONTAINE: Why did you not have painted there that light which comes to you with the angel or with the voices?

JOAN: I was not commanded to do so.

The interrogatory was suspended at this point and resumed in the afternoon. In the second session there were more assessors present, since they now included Jean Beaupère, Jacques de Tou­raine, Pierre Maurice and Thomas de Courcelles in addition to those who had been present during the forenoon. Jean de La Fontaine continued the questioning:

LA FONTAINE: Did the two angels painted on your standard represent Saint Michael and Saint Gabriel?

JOAN: They were there only to honour God who was painted on the standard. I had that representation of two angels made only to do honour to God who was figured there holding the world.

LA FONTAINE: Those two angels figured on your standard, were they the two angels guarding the world? Why were there not more of them there, since it had been commanded you by God to take this standard?

JOAN: The whole standard was made at God's commandment by the voices of Saints Catherine and Margaret who said to me: "Take up the standard in the name of the King of Heaven." And because they said to me: "Take up the standard in the name of the King of Heaven," I had made that figure of God and of the angels, and in colours. And I did all by God's commandment.

LA FONTAINE: Did you then ask those two saints if, by virtue of that standard, you would win all the wars in which you would be, and whether you would be victorious?

JOAN: They told me to take it up boldly and that God would help me.

LA FONTAINE: Is it you who helped the standard or the standard which helped you, or the contrary?

JOAN: My victory or the standard's, it was all in our Lord.

LA FONTAINE: Was the hope of being victorious founded on the standard or on yourself?

JOAN: It was founded in our Lord and not elsewhere.

LA FONTAINE: If someone else had borne that standard, would it have brought as good fortune as when you had it?

JOAN: I do not know; I refer you to God (Je m'en rapporte a Dieu: God knows and I abide by Him).

LA FONTAINE: If someone on your side had given you his standard to bear, would you have carried it and would you have had in that one likewise as good hope as in your own standard which was given you in God's name, in particular the standard of your King, had you had it?

JOAN: I carried with a better will that which had been ordered me to carry by God, and yet in all I trust in God.
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La Fontaine: What was the purpose of that sign which you put on your letters and those names: Jhesus-Maria?

Joan: The clerks who wrote my letters put it and they said that it was fitting to put those two names: Jhesus-Maria.

La Fontaine: Was it revealed to you that if you lost your virginity you would lose your (good) fortune and that your voices would come to you no more?

Joan: That was not revealed to me.

La Fontaine: Do you believe that if you were married, the voices would come to you?

Joan: I do not know and I (refer that to) trust in God.

La Fontaine: Do you think and firmly believe that your King did well to kill the lord Duke of Burgundy?

Joan: That was a great pity (brought great harm to) for the kingdom of France; and whatever may have happened between those two princes, God sent me to succour the King of France.

La Fontaine: Since you have told us, and also the bishop, that you would answer to us and our delegates as freely as you would do to our Most Holy Father the pope and that nevertheless there are many questions to which you will not reply, would you answer them more fully before the pope than you do before us?

Joan: I have answered all as truly as I could, and if I knew that in anything which I remember I have not spoken, I would willingly speak.

La Fontaine: Does it seem to you that you would be bound to answer, speaking the truth more fully, to our Lord Pope, vicar of God, of all that he might ask you touching the faith and the matter of your conscience, than you do to us?

Joan: I demand to be taken before our lord the pope and then I will answer before him all that I ought to answer.

La Fontaine: Of what material was one of your rings on which were written these names: Jhesus-Maria?

Joan: I am not sure, and if it was gold, it was not pure gold, and I know not whether it was of gold or base metal; and I think that there were on it three crosses and no other sign as far as I know, excepting Jhesus-Maria.

La Fontaine: Why did you like to look at that ring when you were going to do some war-like deed?

Joan: That was for my pleasure and in honour of my father and mother; and I, having that ring in my hand and on my finger, I touched Saint Catherine who appeared to me visibly.

La Fontaine: In what part of this Saint Catherine did you touch her?

Joan: You will have nothing else on that.

La Fontaine: Did you kiss or embrace (accole) Saints Catherine and Margaret?

Joan: I embraced both of them.

La Fontaine: Had they a pleasant odour?

Joan: It is good to know that they had a pleasant odour.

La Fontaine: When embracing them, did you feel any warmth or any other thing?

Joan: I could not embrace them without feeling and touching them.

La Fontaine: In what part did you embrace them, the upper part or the lower?

Joan: It is more fitting to embrace them by the lower part than the higher.

La Fontaine: Did you give these saints any garlands or chaplets?

Joan: In honour of them I many times put such garlands on their images or representations in churches; and as to them who appeared to me, I never gave them any, that I remember.

La Fontaine: When you put garlands of that kind on the tree of which there was some talk before, did you put them in honour of them who appeared to you?

Joan: No.

La Fontaine: When these saints came to you, did you make them a reverence by bending the knee and bowing?

Joan: Yes, and as much as I could I made them my reverence, for I know well that they are of those who are of the kingdom of paradise.

La Fontaine: Know you ought of those who go wandering with the fairies?

Joan: I have never been there and I know nothing else about it; but I have indeed heard it said that they went on Thursdays; but in that I do not believe and I believe that there is nothing in it unless it be witchcraft.

La Fontaine: Did someone make the other standards float around the King's head when he was consecrated at Rheims?

Joan: Not as far as I know.

La Fontaine: Why was your standard more carried in the church of Rheims at the King's consecration than the standard of the other captains?
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JOAN: That standard had borne the heat and burden; it was but right that it have the honours. (C.164–178)

To be glimpsed through these succeeding questions and answers are the principal accusations of which Joan was, if possible, to be convicted. There was the charge of witchcraft, to which we can refer those questions touching her standard and the story of it floating round the King’s head; and those about her ring, with the suggestion that it had magical powers. Then there are the charges which, if proved, would convict Joan of impurity, of questionable intercourse with the beings whom, she claimed, appeared to her. And there are the questions relative to her deeds and prowess in war, with the possibility of convicting her of expressing hate or cruelty. Finally, there are the two charges which, cleverly confounded together, were, in the event, to enable the prosecution to convict her: wearing men’s clothes; and the question of submission to the Church. It was on this point, and by making her male attire the symbol of her refusal to submit to the Church, that they contrived to give an appearance of justification to the final sentence; for Joan’s answers gave the prosecutors absolutely no foundation upon which to build up a case against her in the matter of her morals, and still less in the matter of witchcraft. It is worth remembering that in the fifteenth century witchcraft trials were rare: there were to be some resounding ones, notably that of Gilles de Rais, which was as much a matter of morals as of magic, but they were not common, and did not become so until the end of the century, more so in the sixteenth and in the first half of the seventeenth centuries. On the other hand, trials for heresy had been common ever since the setting up, in the middle of the thirteenth century, of the Inquisition courts.

As the interrogatories proceeded, the charges which the prosecutors had in mind appear more and more clearly. We give here a complete calendar of the sessions, with Joan’s principal answers, answers which, after five centuries, still fill us with admiration.

She first appeared before her judges on Wednesday, February 21st. It was at this first session that Cauchon adjured her to swear to tell the truth, and that Joan avoided the oath, saying that there were certain matters touching which she would not swear. She agreed to take the oath concerning anything to do with her father, mother, place of birth and incidents of her childhood, but not in the matter of her revelations. She made this reservation expressly, and she was never to go back on it.

CAUCHON: Swear to speak the truth with your hand on the Holy Evangels in all matters on which you will be questioned.

JOAN: I do not know on what you will question me. It may happen that you will ask a thing which I shall not tell you.

CAUCHON: You will swear to speak the truth on what will be asked you concerning matters of faith and what you will know.*

JOAN: Of my father, of my mother, of all that I have done since I arrived in France, I will willingly swear; but the revelations made to me by God, I have not told nor revealed to anybody excepting only to Charles, my King, and I shall not reveal them though it cost me my head. I have had that by my visions and by my secret counsel, to reveal them to nobody. In the next eight days I shall know well whether I am to reveal them.

CAUCHON: Swear to tell the truth in everything touching our faith.

It was at this point, as we have said above, that Joan took the oath while maintaining that reservation in the matter of her revelations. She then complained about being kept in irons, to which Cauchon replied that it was to prevent an escape and to guard her more securely that orders had been given to keep her in irons.

JOAN: It is true that formerly I tried to escape from prison as it is licit for any prisoner to do. Even if I could escape I could not be reproached with having falsified or violated my word, for I have never given it to anybody.

At this the bishop made her three gaolers, John Grey, John Bernard and William Talbot, swear to guard her safely and in secret—that is to let nobody come near her. Which oath they took with their hands on a prayer-book. Another argument with the Bishop of Beauvais interrupted this session of questioning, in which Joan showed her mettle, proving that she was quite able to confound more than one kind of adversary.

CAUCHON: Recite Pater Noster and Ave Maria.

JOAN: I will say them willingly provided you hear my confession.

Cauchon, as may be imagined, dodged this request for, had he granted it, as a priest it would have put him in a very awkward

* i.e. this is within your knowledge.
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situation. If he heard Joan's confession he would, thereafter, be prevented on his soul and conscience from declaring her guilty; on the other hand to refuse to hear her confession was to avoid doing his sacerdotal duty. The minutes of the trial mention that the bishop was obliged to admonish her "several times" and that in the end he attempted a compromise solution.

CAUCHON: Willingly will we order appointed for you one or two notable men who speak French to whom you can say Pater Noster.

JOAN: I shall not say it to them if they will not hear me in confession.

They were forced to drop the point and pass to the next subject.

Thursday, February 22nd

The second session was held on February 22nd and Master Jean Beaupère was appointed to undertake the questioning. His questions dealt chiefly with Joan's voices and with an account of the events which occurred at Vaucouleurs. This was after Cauchon had tried in vain to get the accused to take a more complete oath than she had taken the day before.

BEAUPÈRE: Are you going to speak the truth?

JOAN: You may well ask me some thing concerning which I will answer you the truth and to another I shall not answer. If you were well informed about me, you ought to wish that I were out of your hands. I have done nothing excepting by revelation.

Saturday, February 24th

On this day Cauchon again tried to get from her an oath free from reservations. Three times he required this of her: these were her answers:

JOAN: By my faith, you might ask me a thing that I would not tell you...

JOAN: It may happen that on many things which you might ask me, I would not tell you the truth touching my revelations, for perhaps you would force me to say a thing which I have sworn not to tell and thus would I be foresworn, which you ought not to wish. And me, I tell you, consider well ere you call yourself my judge, for you are assuming a great charge, and you charge me too heavily. I have twice sworn in judgment and that is enough.

Questions and answers followed in the matter of this oath which Joan would not take.

JOAN: I will willingly tell anything I shall know and (but) not all. I am come by God's will and have nothing to do here, and demand that I be sent back to God from whom I am come.

On that day more than half the session was given up to this question of the oath, Joan remaining unshakable. After that Beaupère questioned her, notably about her voices.

BEAUPÈRE: Since what time have you neither eaten nor drunk?

JOAN: Since yesterday afternoon.

BEAUPÈRE: Since when have you heard your voice?

JOAN: I heard it yesterday and to-day.

BEAUPÈRE: At what time did you hear it?

JOAN: I heard it three times, one in the morning, one at the hour of vespers, and the third time when they were ringing the evening Ave Maria. And still have I heard it more often than I say.

BEAUPÈRE: What were you doing yesterday morning when the voice came to you?

JOAN: I slept and the voice awoke me.

BEAUPÈRE: Did the voice wake you by touching your arm?

JOAN: I was awoken by the voice without touch.

BEAUPÈRE: The voice, was it in your chamber?

JOAN: Not that I know, but it was in the castle.

BEAUPÈRE: Did you thank this voice and do you go down on your knees?

JOAN: I thanked it by rising and by sitting down on my bed and I clasped my hands and alter that I asked it to come to my aid. The voice told me to answer boldly... (turning towards the bishop) you say that you are my judge. Consider well what you are about, for in truth I am sent from God, and you are putting yourself in great danger.

BEAUPÈRE: Has this voice sometimes changed its mind? (Changé sa délégation.)

JOAN: Never have I found it of two contrary minds... (Lit: of two contrary sayings.)
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BEAUPÈRE: This voice which you say appears to you, is it an angel or does it come immediately (i.e., directly) from God, or is it the voice of some saint?

JOAN: This voice comes from God and I think I (shall) tell you not fully what I know; and I have a greater fear of being at fault by saying something which displeases these voices than I have of (not) answering you.

BEAUPÈRE: Do you believe that it displeases God that the truth be told?

JOAN: The voices have told me that I should say a thing to the King and not to you. This very night it has (sic) said to me many things for the good of my King, that I would my King might now know, though I had to drink no wine until Easter, for he would be the more joyful for it at dinner.

BEAUPÈRE: Could you not so manage things with this voice that it would obey you and carry a message to your King?

JOAN: I know not if the voice would obey, unless it be the will of God and that God consented it. Were it not by God’s grace, I could do nothing.

BEAUPÈRE: This voice, of which you ask counsel, has it face and eyes?

JOAN: You shall not have that either. Little children say that sometimes men are hanged for having spoken the truth.

BEAUPÈRE: Do you know if you are in God’s grace?

JOAN: If I am not, may God bring me to it; if I am, may God keep me in it.* I would rather be torn apart by four horses than to have gone to France without God’s permission.

BEAUPÈRE: Did he command you to wear man’s clothes?

JOAN: Give me a suit, I will take it and go away. Otherwise I will not take it. I am satisfied with what I have on since it pleases God that I wear it.

Tuesday, February 27th

The questioning was again left to Jean Beaupère and, after the usual argument about the oath, he again questioned her about the voices and on certain other details such as her sword.

BEAUPÈRE: Do you see Saint Michael and the angels corporeally and really?

JOAN: I see them with my corporeal eyes as well as I see you, and when they withdrew from me I wept and I should have liked them to take me with them.

BEAUPÈRE: Is it Saint Catherine and Saint Margaret with whom you speak?

JOAN: I have told you often enough that they are Saint Catherine and Saint Margaret. And believe me if you will.

BEAUPÈRE: Is it forbidden you to say so?

JOAN: I have not yet fully understood whether it is forbidden or not.

BEAUPÈRE: How do you know how to make the distinction when you answer on certain points and others not?

JOAN: On certain points I asked permission and received it. I would rather be torn apart by four horses than to have gone to France without God’s permission.

BEAUPÈRE: Did he command you to wear man’s clothes?
THE TRIAL OF CONDEMNATION

Joan: The clothes are trifles, the very least of things. I did not put on man’s clothes by the counsel of any man in the world and I did not do anything excepting by the commandment of God and the angels. . . .

Beaupère: Do you believe that you did right to put on man’s clothes?

Joan: All that I have done, I have done by God’s commandment and I believe that I did right, and I expect from it good warrant and good succour.

Beaupère: In the particular case of taking on man’s clothes, do you think that you did right?

Joan: Of what I have done in the world I have done nothing but by God’s commandment.

Beaupère: When you see this voice which comes to you, is there light?

Joan: There is much light everywhere, and that is very fitting. Not all light comes only for you.

After this Beaupère made Joan explain in what manner she had found the sword of Sainte-Catherine de Fierbois.

Beaupère: Have you ever made a prayer that this sword be right fortunate?

Joan: It is good to know that I should have liked that my harness be right fortunate!

Beaupère: Had you your sword when you were taken prisoner?

Joan: No, but I had a sword that had been taken from a Burgundian.

Beaupère: Where has the sword been left, in which town?

Joan: I gave a sword to Saint-Denis and a suit of armour, but it was not that sword. I had that sword at Lagny and from Lagny I carried the sword of the Burgundian to Compiègne. It was a good war sword and good for giving good buffets and good swipes. . . . (bonnes baffes et bonnes torchons).

Beaupère: Which did you like the better, your standard or your sword?

Joan: I liked much better; even forty times, my standard than my sword.

Beaupère: Who made you have a painting done on the standard? Joan: I have told you often enough that I have done nothing without God’s commandment.

Thursday, March 1st

On this day an attempt was made to confuse Joan by recalling a certain letter from the Count of Armagnac asking her which pope he ought to obey. We have here an echo of that great schism which divided Christendom for years, while first two and finally three popes wrangled over the pontifical office, until the election of Martin V put an end to the strife, although not everybody was willing to accept his supremacy without hesitation.

Joan: To what he asked me: whom God would have him, the Count of Armagnac, obey, I answered him that I did not know, but I sent word to him of several things which were not put in writing, and as for my own part, I believe in the lord pope who is in Rome.

Cauchon: Is it your custom to put on your letters the names Jhesus-Maria with a cross?

Joan: On some I put them, and sometimes not. And sometimes I put a cross as a sign that he of my side to whom I was writing should not do what I wrote to him.

This cross then, which Joan drew on such letters which she dictated as contained false information or orders designed to deceive the enemy, was simply a war ruse. The detail has a certain importance, as we shall see when we come to the end of this chapter.

In this session, moreover, Joan was to fling down a veritable challenge before her judges, and that in the ironical style which she enjoyed using.

Joan: Before seven years be passed, the English will lose a greater gage than they had at Orleans, and they will lose all in France. And the English will even suffer a greater loss than they ever had in France and this will be by a great victory which God will send to the French.

Question: How do you know that?

Joan: I know it well by a revelation which has been made to me, and it will happen before seven years; and I should be very vexed should it be so long deferred. I know it as well as I know that you are there in front of me.

Question: When will this happen?

Joan: I know not the day nor the hour.

Question: In what year will it happen?
Joan: That too you shall not have, but I would that it might be before Saint John's Day.

Touching these words, which were noted down and registered in the month of March 1431, it is worth recalling that the liberation of Paris occurred on April 13, 1436. And it may be thought that she was alluding to the raising of the siege of Compiègne, a retreat to which the Duke of Burgundy was constrained on October 25, 1431, when she added:

Joan: I have said that before the feast of Saint Martin of the winter we shall see many things, and it may well be that there will be Englishmen stricken to the ground.

It was Cauchon himself who conducted the interrogation on that day. One wonders whether it was this which stimulated Joan in her vein of insolence, for she rarely carried defiance and irony to such lengths. Thus, on the subject of her voices:

Question: What figures do you see?
Joan: I see their faces.

Question: These saints which appear to you, have they hair?
Joan: It's good to know!

Question: How do they speak?
Joan: This voice is beautiful, sweet and humble (low) and it speaks the French language.

Question: Does not Saint Margaret speak the English tongue?
Joan: How should she speak English since she is not on the side of the English?

Question: Have you any rings?
Joan: You have one of mine. Give it back to me. The Burgundians have another ring. You have that ring, show it to me.

Question: Who gave you the ring which the Burgundians have?
Joan: My father and my mother, and I think that it had written on it the names Jhesus-Maria. I do not know who had them written; there was no stone, as I recall; it was given to me in the town of Domremy. It was my brother who gave me that ring...

Question: What have you done with your mandragora?
Joan: I have no mandragora and never had any. I have heard it said that near to my town there is one, but I have never seen any.

* C'est bon a savoir! Joan often used this phrase. I think it was a jee—*Wouldn't you just like to know!*
I know neither the day nor the hour; and that I boldly put a cheerful face on it.

At this point the interrogations were suspended for one week.

Saturday, March 10th.

The interrogatory was resumed in the prison and in the presence of a small number of assessors. Jean de La Fontaine undertook the questioning and his questions bore chiefly on her last campaign, which had taken her to Melun, Crépy-en-Valois and Compiègne. He also alluded to the things which Joan was able to get from the King: horses, money; and to the ennobling of Joan's family.

LA FONTAINE: Have you an escutcheon and arms?

JOAN: I never had any, but the King has given arms to my brothers, to wit a shield of azure on which were two fleurs-de-lis in gold and in the middle a sword. I described these arms to a painter because he had asked me what arms I bore. They were given by my King to my brothers, without request from me and without revelation.

It was in the course of this interrogation that, asked once again about the "sign" given to the King, she began, possibly to throw her judges off the scent, to allude to that sign as to a concrete object, a crown brought by an angel. In the course of the following interrogations she amplified that image as if at random; it is easy to grasp the symbolic bearing.

LA FONTAINE: What is the sign which you gave to your King when it came to you?

JOAN: It is good and honourable and right credible and the richest there be in the world. . . . The sign is in my King's treasury.

LA FONTAINE: Is it of gold, of silver, of precious stones or a crown?

JOAN: I shall tell you nothing more. Nobody could describe a thing so rich as the sign.

Monday, March 12th.

Jean de La Fontaine again conducted the interrogation. He reverted to the beginnings of her mission, her vow of virginity, her setting out for Vaucouleurs, and he again put to her the question which had been put by Cauchon: would she recite Pater Noster?

LA FONTAINE: Did not your voices call you "daughter of God", "daughter of the Church", "great-hearted daughter"?

JOAN: Before the raising of the siege of Orleans and since, every day, when they speak to me, they have often called me "Joan the Maid, daughter of God".

And, on the subject of angels, she added: "They come many times among Christians but are not seen. And I have many times seen them among Christians."

LA FONTAINE: Since you are daughter of God why will you not say Pater Noster?

JOAN: I will say it willingly, and formerly when I refused to say it, I did so with the intention that the Bishop of Beauvais should hear me in confession.

Tuesday, March 13th.

Jean de La Fontaine continued his interrogation:

LA FONTAINE: How did the angel bring the crown. Did he place it on the King's head?

JOAN: The crown was delivered to him by an archbishop, to wit the Archbishop of Rheims, as I recall, in the presence of my King. And the archbishop received it and gave it to my King. I was present and the crown was placed in the treasury of my King . . .

LA FONTAINE: The day when you yourself saw that sign, did your King see it too?

JOAN: Yes, and it was my King himself who had it.

LA FONTAINE: Of what material was the crown?

JOAN: It is good to know that it was of fine gold and this crown was so rich and opulent that I could not number or appreciate all the riches which are in it, and this crown signified that the King would hold the kingdom of France.

LA FONTAINE: Were there precious stones in it?

JOAN: I have told you all that I know.

There were more questions on the same theme. To one of the following questions Joan made the answer which probably holds the secret of her whole conduct:

Question: Why you rather than another?
JOAN: It pleased God thus to do, by a simple Maid to drive out the King's enemies.

Wednesday, March 14th.

Jean de La Fontaine was still the interrogator; dealing with events of mark in Joan's life, he questioned her especially on her leap from the tower at Beaurevoir; and again about her voices and what they could foretell for her.

JOAN: Saint Catherine has told me that I shall receive succour and I know not if it will be by being liberated from prison or rather whether, being brought to judgment, there would be some trouble (disturbance, confusion) by means of which I should be set free. I believe it will be by one or the other, and several times the voices have told me that I should be delivered by great victory. And thereafter my voices say to me: "Take all in good part, do not whine over thy martyrdom; by it thou shalt come at last to the kingdom of Paradise"; and this my voices say to me simply and absolutely, that is to say (meaning) without fail. I call it martyrdom because of the misery (peine) and adversity that I suffer in prison and I know not if I shall suffer greater misery, but I trust in God.

LA FONTAINE: Since your voices have told you that in the end you would go to Paradise, do you hold yourself assured of being saved and of not being damned in hell?

JOAN: I know not if I have sinned mortally, but if I were in mortal sin I believe that Saints Catherine and Margaret would abandon me at once. I believe that one cannot overdo cleansing one's conscience.

The charge which was to assume substance later was here foreshadowed: the matter of her submission to the Church.

Thursday, March 15th.

The interrogation began with this question of her submission to the Church:

Question: If it happens that you have done anything which is against the faith, will you abide by the determination of our Holy Mother Church in whom you should trust?

JOAN: Let my answers be seen and examined by clerks (clergy) and let me be told thereafter if there be in them anything against the Christian faith. I shall be well able to say what there is in it, and thereafter I will say what I have found in it by my counsel. If there be anything bad against the Christian faith which God ordains, I would not maintain it and I should be right eager to come to the contrary opinion.

Question: The distinction between the Church triumphant and militant and what pertains to the latter and to the former, has been explained to you. I now ask you to submit yourself to the determination of the Church upon what you have done and said of good, as of evil.

JOAN: I will make you no other answer for the present.

The remainder of this session was devoted chiefly to the wearing of man's clothes and her apparitions, notably that of St. Michael.

Saturday, March 17th

The interrogation for this day appears earlier in this chapter.

Finally, March 24th and 25th, Joan was again visited in her prison, still by only a restricted number of the assessors, but these included all the delegates from the University of Paris. More detailed answers were demanded of her in the matter of certain questions, notably that of wearing man's clothes which she still refused to change for female attire. It was on this occasion that

* Joan's words are "rien irrité", we might say "on tenterhooks to come to, etc."
she gave the answer which, for her, summed up the whole business: "These clothes do not burden my soul and to wear them is not against the Church." (C.181–183)

That concluded the "instruction" of the case, that is the preliminary examinations.

Jean Beaupère was still alive, being seventy years of age, at the time of Joan's Rehabilitation. He was interrogated during the royal enquiry (preliminary to the Trial of Rehabilitation) in 1450. His memory was still coloured by resentment: "She was right subtle, with a subtlety pertaining to woman." (R.2p)

As for the other assessors, it is obvious that they felt much what we feel ourselves when we read Joan's answers as they have been preserved for us. Martin Ladvenu, a Dominican of the convent of Rouen who was to be at Joan's side in her last moments, testified: "In my judgment she might be nineteen or twenty years of age; in her bearing she was very simple and in her answers full of discernment and prudence."

Others went a good deal further; Jean Riquier, who was not present in person at the trial but reported what he had heard, said, for example: "I heard it said that she answered with so much prudence that if certain of the doctors had been questioned as she was they would hardly have answered so well."

Jean Fabri or Lefevre: "They greatly fatigued her by long interrogations which lasted from two to three hours. . . . Sometimes those who questioned her cut into each other's questions to such an extent that she could hardly answer them. The wisest man in the world would have answered with difficulty. I remember that once, during the trial, while Joan was being examined on her apparitions and while a record of her answers was being read to her, it seemed to me that it had been wrongly recorded and that she had not answered thus. I told Joan to pay attention. She asked the notary who wrote the record to read it to her again and that done she told the notary that she had said the opposite and that he had not written it rightly. And that answer was corrected. Then master Guillaume Manchon told Joan that in future he would pay attention." (C.251)

Pierre Daron: "I heard it said by several that during that trial Joan did wonders in her answers and that she had an admirable memory, for once when she was being questioned in a matter about which she had already been questioned a week before, she answered: 'I was already asked that on such a day' or 'A week ago I was questioned about that and I answered in such-and-such way,' although Boisguillaume, one of the notaries, told her that she had not answered, some of those present said that Joan was speaking the truth. The answer for that day was read and it was found that Joan was right. She rejoiced greatly at it, saying to this Boisguillaume that if he made a mistake again, she would pull his ears . . . ." (R.212–213)

The second phase of the trial, the ordinary hearing, began on Monday, March 26th. On that day and the next, the act of accusation drawn up by the promoter (prosecutor), Jean d'Estivet, was read to the assembled assessors. This act of accusation which is in seventy clauses (C.192–286) goes interminably over the principal points of the foregoing interrogations, without, moreover, taking any account of Joan's replies. It was interrupted by her at the end of almost every clause with a denial of its contents or with "I refer you to what I said elsewhere." (Lit: I abide in that by what I said elsewhere). It is worth our while to put some of Joan's answers back into French, among others Joan's own prayer which, however, is not given in the minutes of the trial: Questioned as to the manner in which she summons her voices, she answers: "I call upon God and Our Lady that they send me counsel and comfort and thereafter they send it to me." Asked by what exact words she summons them, she replies in this fashion in French: "Most gentle God, in honour of Your Holy Passion I call upon You, if You love me, that You reveal to me how I should answer these Churchmen. I know well, as to the clothes, the commandment whereby I assumed them, but I know not in what manner I should leave them off. For this, please You to teach me." (C.252)

On Saturday, March 31st, Joan was again questioned in her prison on the particular point of her submission to the Church.

**Question:** Will you confide yourself to the judgment of the Church which is on earth in all that you have said and done both good and evil, and especially in the cases, crimes and misdemeanours of which you are accused and in all touching your trial?

**Joan:** On that which is asked of me, I will abide by the Church militant provided it does not command anything impossible to do, and what I call impossible is that I should revoke the deeds I have done and said and what I have declared concerning the visions and apparitions sent to me by God; I shall not revoke
them for anything whatsoever; that which Our Lord has made me do and commanded and will command, I shall not fail to do for any man alive, and in the case of the Church willing me to do otherwise and contrary to the commandment which has been given me by God, I should not do it for anything whatsoever.

Question: If the Church militant tells you that your revelations are illusions or things diabolical, will you abide by the Church?

Joan: In that I will always abide by God whose commandment I have always done, and I know well that that which is contained in the proceedings (she is referring to the answers she has given) comes by the commandment of God, and that which I affirm in those proceedings to have been done by God's commandment, it would have been impossible for me to do the contrary. And in the case of the Church militant commanding me to do the contrary, I should not abide by any man in the world but only by our Sire whose good commandment I have always done.

Question: Do you not believe that you owe submission to God's Church on earth, that is to our lord the pope, to the cardinals, archbishops, bishops and other prelates of the Church?

Joan: Yes, our Sire being first served.

Question: Have you commandment from your voices not to submit yourself to the Church militant which is on earth, nor to its judgment?

Joan: I shall not answer otherwise than I take into my head, but what I answer is by the commandment of my voices; they do not command me that I obey not the Church, God first served.

(C.286-288)

Meanwhile another act of accusation, more precise than Jean d'Estivet's woolly and verbose prose, was drawn up to serve as a basis for the rest of the trial. During the course of the Trial of Rehabilitation, some interesting details were given about this proceeding, by the notaries.

Guillaume Manchon: "It was decided by the councillors and especially by those who had come from Paris, that, as was usual, out of all these articles and responses there should be made a few short articles and that the principal points should be summarized to present the matter briefly in order that the deliberations could be better done and more rapidly. It was for that (reason) that the twelve articles were drawn up, but it was not I who did them and I do not know who composed or extracted them."

"How was it done," asked the promoter of the Trial of Rehabilitation, "that such a multitude of articles and responses could be reduced to twelve articles, especially in a form so remote from Joan's confessions? It does not seem very likely that such important men would have thus composed these articles."

Manchon: I think that in the principal text of the proceedings done in French, I inserted the truth of the interrogations and articles drawn up by the promoter and the judges, and of Joan's answers. As for the twelve articles, I refer them to those who composed them, whom I did not dare to gainsay, any more than my companion.

Question: When the twelve articles were inserted, did you collate those articles with Joan's answers to see if they corresponded with those answers?

Manchon: I do not remember.

Now at this point Manchon was shown a folio in his own handwriting, extracted from the dossier which he himself had produced before the court of Rehabilitation and dated April 4, 1431. On this folio Manchon had noted the discrepancies between certain of the articles in question, and Joan's answers: the fact is that, as in the earlier and longer act of accusation, certain of the articles expressed the very opposite to what Joan had, in fact, answered. For example, the reply given under the head of submission to the Church becomes: "She will not submit herself to the determination of the Church militant, but to God only."

Question: Do you believe that these articles were composed in a spirit of truth, for there is a great difference between these articles and Joan's answers?

Manchon: What is in my text of the proceedings is true. As for the articles, I refer them to those who did them, for it was not I who did them.

Question: Were the decisions based on the whole proceedings (i.e., on the full record) or on these twelve articles?

Manchon: I believe that the decisions were not based on the full proceedings, for it had not yet been put in form and was not drafted into the form it has now until after Joan's death, but the decisions were made on the twelve articles.

Question: Were these twelve articles read by Joan?
What Manchon said was confirmed by the other two notaries, Boisguillaume and Nicolas Taquel, who disclaimed all responsibility when confronted with the twelve articles and attested that they served as a basis for the subsequent judicial decisions. A witness who was particularly well informed, Thomas de Courcelles himself in fact, completed the detailed evidence taken on this point: "Certain articles, to the number of twelve, were edited and extracted from Joan's admissions and answers. This was done, as far as I can conjecture with some degree of likelihood, by the late master Nicolas Midy. It was on the twelve articles thus extracted that all the deliberations (i.e., decisions) and opinions were based and given, but I do not know if it was decided that they should be corrected or if they were corrected." (R.256)

Thus, then, the procedure followed could well seem correct and regular; the authorities did not fail to call the foreign doctors and jurists who were at the trial into consultation, as was the custom; nor to call the assessors to deliberate in complete freedom on the accusations brought against Joan; but the text which served as the basis of these deliberations was truncated, falsified and had never been read by the accused.

Consultations and deliberations went on from April 5th. On the 12th there was a deliberation in which the masters from the University of Paris played the preponderant part. A letter was subsequently drawn up by them accusing Joan of relying upon false revelations, of erring in her faith in claiming that the articles of faith were not better founded than her own revelations (a singular manipulation, as can be seen, of Joan's actual protestations), and finally of being guilty of idolatry, schism, heresy, blasphemy, vain-gloriousness, etc. Cauchon was careful thereafter to place this letter with the twelve articles before the other assessors when they were called into consultation.

We shall not here go at length into the attitude of these other assessors. But at all events it should be noted that the majority of them had attended only the first of the interrogations during the "instruction" of the case and were judging the matter from articles of accusation which were a travesty of the truth. It is also the case that a fair number of them, chosen by Cauchon for their devotion to the English cause and the theory of the double monarchy, could without difficulty range themselves alongside the representatives of the university. Among these we may distinguish some more clearly decided in the hostility to Joan apparent in their answers: the Bishop of Lisieux, Zanon de Castiglione, for example, and Philibert de Montjeu, Bishop of Coutances; likewise Denis Gastinel, and the almoner of the abbey of La Trinité de Pécamp, Jean de Bouesque. The same sort of response could safely be expected from the abbot of the same monastery, Gilles de Duremourt, whose services, as we have seen, were generously rewarded by the King of England. The same may be said of several others, among whom we shall mention only the archdeacon of Eu, Nicolas de Venderères, whom we shall meet again.

Some, however, showed themselves less forthcoming. Between the lines of their answers we can read an uneasy feeling about the whole business. Thus the abbots of Jumièges and Cormeilles asked that the whole trial be transferred before the University of Paris. Then, in a second letter required of them by Cauchon who was not satisfied with this, they asked that Joan be better informed of the case and that the danger she was running be clearly expounded to her. They added: "As there are facts which we cannot know... more especially as we were not present at the examination of the said woman, we refer to and rely upon the masters of theology for an ulterior judgment."

Furthermore, eleven advocates of the Rouen Officiality expressed reservations, and three of the assessors, Bachelors of Theology, Pierre Minier, Jean Pigache and Richard de Grouchet, were in disagreement with Cauchon: "If these revelations proceed from God or from a good spirit, which however for us is not self-evident, they could not be taken as evil."

Richard de Grouchet, giving evidence at the Trial of Rehabilitation: "Myself and the two called Pigache and Minier, gave our opinion in writing according to our conscience. It was not agreeable to the bishop and his assessors, who said to us: 'Is this what you have done?'" (R.198)

And finally there was Raoul le Sauvage, Bachelor of Theology, who, albeit far from favourable to Joan, considered that the case should be taken before the Holy See.

It is only from certain indications and from the evidence given at the Trial of Rehabilitation, when Rouen had been liberated and lips could be unsealed, that we know of the resistance which Cauchon encountered. It should be noted, to start with, that the canons of Rouen were in no hurry to give their opinion. Having called an
assembly of the chapter for the first time on April 13th, they found that there were too few of them present to enable them to deliberate. There was another chapter meeting on the next day at which they agreed to ask that the twelve articles be read to Joan in French and that she be better instructed in the matter of submitting to the Church. Their letter, as if accidentally omitted, is not to be found in the definitive text of the proceedings. Cauchon had summoned them to hold a third chapter which they did on May 4th, and at this one (and we can imagine the pressure which was brought to bear on it) the canons pronounced Joan guilty.

Also missing from the final text of the proceedings is a letter written by the Bishop of Avranches, Jean de Saint-Avit, and we only know of its existence from the evidence given by Isambart de la Pierre during the Rehabilitation proceedings:

"Myself, in person, I was called before the Bishop of Avranches, a very old and good cleric, who like the others had been summoned and requested to give his opinion on this case. For that, the bishop questioned me, asking what my lord Saint Thomas said and determined touching the submission which was owed to the Church. I gave the bishop, in writing, the determination of Saint Thomas, who says: In things doubtful regarding the faith, recourse should be had to the pope or the general council (syndod)." The good bishop was of that opinion and seemed to be very ill-pleased with the deliberation (decision) which had been taken already. This deliberation (the bishop's) was not put into the writing, it was left out by malice." (R.269)

His conduct in this matter earned the Bishop of Avranches the rancour of the English and of Cauchon. In the following year, 1432, accused of having taken part in a plot designed to liberate Rouen, he was to be imprisoned despite his great age. And this is the place to mention two other people who, despite the danger they ran, had the courage to oppose Cauchon. "Threats were uttered against master Jean Lohier and master Nicolas de Houppeville, under pain of being drowned because they would not attend the trial," declared Guillaume de La Chambre, one of the Rehabilitation witnesses. And Guillaume Manchon himself was to give details of Jean Lohier's conduct on this occasion:

"When the trial was started," he says, "master Jean Lohier, a learned Norman clerk, came to the town of Rouen and there was communicated to him by the Bishop of Beauvais, what was in writing. Lohier asked for a delay of two or three days to see (consider):

it. He was told that he must give his opinion at once and that he was constrained. And Master Jean Lohier, when he had seen (read) the proceedings, said that it was worthless for several reasons: for as much as it had not the form of an ordinary trial. It was carried on in a place closed and locked where those present were not at liberty to say their full and pure will; they were dealing in this matter with the honour of the King of France whose cause Joan supported, without calling himself or anyone from him; neither libels nor articles had been delivered (to the prisoner) and this woman, who was a simple girl, had no counsel to answer so many doctors and masters and on great matters, especially those touching her revelations, as she said. And for all that, it seemed to him that the proceedings were not valid.

"My lord de Beauvais," he went on, "was very indignant against Lohier, and although he had told him to remain and see the said trial carried on, Lohier replied that he would not stay, and at once my lord de Beauvais... sought out the Masters (of the university) to whom he said: 'Here is Lohier who wants to wreck our trial with his interlocutory judgments.* He would calumniate the whole thing and says it is worthless. If he is to be believed, everything is to be done over again, and what we have done is good for nought.' And, reporting the reasons why Lohier wanted it annulled, he said, 'It is easy to see which side he is lame. By St. John we shall do nothing of the sort and will continue our trial as it began.' It was then the Saturday afternoon in Lent. On the following morning I spoke to Lohier in the church of Our Lady of Rouen, and asked him what he thought of Joan's trial. He answered: 'You see the manner of their proceeding. They will catch her if they can by her own words, that is to say in the assertions where she says, "I know for a certainty", there is not a man living who could condemn her. It is easy to see which side he is lame. By St. John we shall do nothing of the sort and will continue our trial as it began.' It was the Saturday afternoon in Lent. On the following morning I spoke to Lohier in the church of Our Lady of Rouen, and asked him what he thought of Joan's trial. He answered: 'You see the manner of their proceeding. They will catch her if they can by her own words, that is to say in the assertions where she says, "I know for a certainty", there is not a man living who could condemn her. It is easy to see which side he is lame. By St. John we shall do nothing of the sort and will continue our trial as it began.'

At the time of the Trial of Rehabilitation there still survived one of those righteous souls for whom the word justice really meant something, Nicolas de Houppeville. He himself was thus able to

---

*R.259-61

† Rota: a court judging appeals to the Holy See.
give an account of the sanctions which were applied to him: ‘I was sent for one day at the beginning of the trial and I did not go because I was prevented by another case. When I went, on the second day, I was not received; I was, indeed, ordered out of court) by the lord Bishop of Beauvais, and that was because I had said earlier, when I was discussing it with Master Colles, that there was a danger in bringing this case for several (many) reasons. This remark was reported to the bishop. That was why the bishop had me put into the royal prisons at Rouen from which I was delivered at the prayer of the then lord abbot of Fécamp. I heard it said that, on the advice of certain people whom the bishop had called together for that purpose, it was decided to send me into exile in England or elsewhere, out of the city of Rouen, which would have been done but for the intervention of the abbot and some of my friends.”

(R.262)

It is well known, of course, that after Joan’s burning, a Dominican, Pierre Bosquier, was cast into prison for having given his opinion of her condemnation.

Meanwhile Joan, in her prison, had fallen ill. The Duchess of Bedford’s* physician, Jean Tiphaine, was sent to treat her. He gave an account of this occasion during the Trial of Rehabilitation: “When Joan was ill the judges sent me to visit her and I was taken to her by the man d’Estivet. In the presence of d’Estivet, of Master Guillaume de la Chambre, Master of Medicine, and of several others, I felt her pulse to learn the cause of her sickness and I asked her what was the matter and where she felt pain. She answered me. When we made our report to the Earl of Warwick he said: ‘Be careful when bleeding her, for she is cunning and might kill herself.’ Nevertheless, she was bled, which gave her immediate relief. As soon as she was thus better, came one Master Jean d’Estivet who exchanged insulting words with Joan and called her ‘whore, wanton’. She was by this so irritated (excited) that she became feverish again and fell ill again. That came to the earl’s knowledge who forbade d’Estivet to insult Joan thenceforth.” (R.205–206)

From the point of view of proper procedure, the next stage was that of the so-called “charitable admonitions”. This was the regular thing in the Inquisition courts: when the preliminary examination (instruction) of the case had revealed that the accused was guilty, he must be brought either to a full admission of guilt, or to repentance. That was the aim of the admonitions. In cases where there was a beginning of proof of guilt in the accused, the use of torture was permissible.

On Wednesday, April 18th, Joan being still sick and confined to her bed, the first charitable admonition was administered to her. Into her cell went Cauchon, the Vice-Inquisitor Jean Lemaitre, three Masters from the University of Paris, Jacques de Touraine, Nicolas Midy and Gérard Feuillet, an English clerk William Baiton, and three other men whose names appear only rarely in the minutes of the proceedings, Guillaume Boucher, Maurice Du Chène, Guillaume Adelie. It was Cauchon himself who undertook the admonitions. He first proposed to Joan that she should choose among the assessors composing the court who would be her counsel. He pointed out that if she would not take counsel or follow the Church’s advice, she was in great danger.

JOAN: It seems to me, in view of the sickness that I have, that I am in great danger of death; and if it be so that God would do
His will upon me, I ask to have confession and the sacrament of the Eucharist and to be buried in holy ground.

CAUCHON: If you have the sacraments of the Church you must declare yourself a good Catholic and submit to the Church.

JOAN: I am not able to say anything else to you at present.

CAUCHON: The more you fear for your life because of the sickness which you have, the more should you amend your ways.

JOAN: If my body dies in prison, I expect you to put it in holy ground, and if you do not have it put there, I expect it of God.

CAUCHON: Since you ask that the Church give you the sacrament of the Eucharist, will you submit yourself to the Church Militant and a promise to give you that sacrament would be given you?

JOAN: I shall not do otherwise about that submission.

CAUCHON: Would you have us order a beautiful and notable procession to restore you to a proper state if you are not in such a state?

JOAN: I should indeed like the Church and Catholics to pray for me. (C.329-333)

A second admonition took place on May 2nd. With her health restored Joan had recovered her attitude of defiance. It is probable that an episode which the official account leaves out, as it leaves out the opinions given by Jean de Saint-Avit and Jean Lohier, should be placed here, just before this solemn admonition. This episode was not known until later, when it came out at the Trial of Rehabilitation.

Guillaume Manchon: "Master Jean de La Fontaine, from the beginning of the trial until the week after Easter 1431, was substitute for my lord of Beauvais in questioning her when the bishop was absent. Nevertheless he was always present with the bishop during the argument of the trial, and the Maid was hard pressed to submit herself to the Church by this La Fontaine and brother Isambart de la Pierre and Martin Ladvenu, by whom she was warned that she must believe and hold by our Holy Father the pope and those who presided over the Church Militant and that she must not doubt that she ought to submit to our Holy Father the pope and the Holy Synod, for there were both, at her side and elsewhere.

There is no equivalent to the form of words Joan used here but the implication was not quite so downright. A modern equivalent might be "I cannot handle myself differently." — E.H.

many notable clerks; and that, if she did not so, she would put herself in great peril; and on the day after she had been thus warned, she said that she would readily submit herself to our Holy Father the pope and to the Holy Synod. When my lord of Beauvais heard of this remark, he demanded to know who had been to see her the day before. He sent for the Maid's English guard and asked who had spoken to her. The guard answered him that it had been the said La Fontaine and the two religious. And for that, in the absence of La Fontaine and the religious, the bishop became furiously angry with Jean Lemaître, vicar of the Inquisitor, loudly threatening to cause them distress (or, "do them mischief", "bring them to grief"). And when La Fontaine had word of this and that he was menaced for that cause, he left that city of Rouen and since came not back. And as for the two religious, had it not been that Lemaître made their excuses and supplicated on their behalf, saying that if any grievous thing was done to them never would he appear at the trial, they would have been in danger of death. And thenceforth it was forbidden by my lord of Warwick that any go into the Maid, excepting my lord of Beauvais or on his behalf, and whenever it should please the bishop to go to her. But the vicar was not to go to her without him." (R.218-219)

Guillaume Duval, who belonged, like the two other Dominicans and the vice-Inquisitor, to the convent of Saint-Jacques of Rouen, confirmed this evidence. And in the event neither La Fontaine nor Ladvenu were among the sixty-three assessors present at the charitable admonitions of May 2nd, which is what makes it likely that the scene described above may have occurred on May 1st.

The questioning was undertaken by Jean de Chatillon.

Question: Will you correct and amend yourself according to the decision of the doctors?

JOAN: Read your book and then I will answer you. I trust in God my creator, in all. I love Him with all my heart.

Question: Will you answer more fully to this general admonition?

JOAN: I trust in my Judge, that is King of Heaven and earth...

Question: Will you submit to the Church Militant?

JOAN: I believe indeed in the Church here below, but for my deeds and sayings, as I said formerly, I trust in and abide by Our Lord. I do believe that the Church Militant cannot be at fault nor fail, but as for my sayings and deeds, I place them and refer them in all to God who has made me do all that I have done.
THE TRIAL OF CONDEMNATION

Question: Do you mean that you have no judge upon earth? Our Holy Father the pope, is not he your judge?
Joan: I shall say nothing else to you about this; I have a good master, God to wit, in whom I trust in all things and not in another.

Question: If you will not believe in the Church and believe in the article Unam sanctam Ecclesiam catholicam, you are a heretic in maintaining that, and other judges may punish you with the pain of fire.
Joan: I shall say nothing else to you about this. And if I saw the fire, I should say all that I am saying, and do not otherwise.

Question: If the Holy Council General (Synod) and our Holy Father the pope, the cardinals and others of the Church were here, would you refer (the matter) and submit to that holy council?
Joan: You will get nothing else out of me.

Question: Will you submit to our Holy Father the pope?
Joan: Take me to him and I will answer him. (C.342-343)

Did this interrogation in fact occur exactly as it appears in the record? It may be doubted that it did if we can rely upon some of the witnesses at the Trial of Rehabilitation. For several of them affirmed that Joan said more than once that she would abide by the pope's decision. Here, as an example, is Richard de Grouchet's deposition: "I saw and heard, at the time of the judgment, that when Joan was asked if she would submit herself to the Bishop of Beauvais and to certain among those who were there and were named, Joan answered that she would not, and that she submitted herself to the pope and to the Catholic Church, demanding that she be taken to the pope. When she was told that the proceedings would be sent to the pope that he might judge them, she answered that she would not have them do so, for she knew not what they would put in the proceedings, but that she wanted to be taken to the pope. When she was told that the proceedings would be sent to the pope that he might judge them, she answered that she would not have them do so, for she knew not what they would put in the proceedings, but that she wanted to be taken to the pope.

And we may also quote the deposition of Isambart de la Pierre: "Joan, asked if she would submit herself to our Holy Father the pope, answered yes provided she was led and taken to him, but that she would not submit herself to those who were present, that is to say the Bishop of Beauvais, for they were her mortal enemies. And when I persuaded her that she should submit herself to the Council General then assembled, at which were many prelates and doctors of the King of France's party, that heard, Joan said that she submitted herself to the Council. Then the Bishop of Beauvais called upon me violently, saying, 'Be silent, by the devil!' That heard, Master Guillaume Manchon, notary of the trial, asked the bishop if he should write down her submission. The bishop answered no, that it was not necessary. And Joan said to him: 'Ah, you take care to write down what is against me, and will not write down what is for me'; and I believe that it was not written down, whence arose a great murmuring in the assembly." (R.222-223)

The record shows that Isambart was indeed present at that session of May 2nd. After Joan's answer, "Take me to him and I will answer him," the text of the proceedings notes simply: "... and more about it would not answer." (Lit: "... and more about it would not answer.") After that the subject of questioning was changed completely: woman's clothes, the sign given to the King, etc.; the change occurring from the direct style to the indirect, and from one question to another, leads us to think that it is here that the incident reported by Isambart should be placed.

Wednesday, May 9th, Joan was taken to the Great Tower of Rouen Castle—it still survives and is the only vestige of the ancient fortress of Bouvreuil. The judges were accompanied by only a reduced number of assessors; and in their presence Joan was threatened with torture. She was called upon thereafter to speak the truth on various points in the trial "which she has denied or in which she has answered in a lying fashion".

Joan: Truly, though you were to have my limbs torn off and send the soul out of my body, I should not say otherwise; and if I did tell you otherwise, I should always thereafter say that you had made me speak so by force.

And she added:

At the last feast of the Holy Cross (May 3rd) I had comfort from Saint Gabriel, and I believe that it was Saint Gabriel, and I learned it from my voice, that it was Saint Gabriel. I asked counsel of my voices if I should submit myself to the Church, since Churchmen were pressing me hard to submit myself to the
Church: and these voices told me that if I wanted God to help me, I must trust in him for all I did. I know well that God has always been the master of all that I have done, and that the devil has never had power over my deeds. I have asked my voices whether I shall be burnt and my voices have answered me that I should trust in Our Lord and that he would help me.

Question: About the sign of the crown of which you say that it (the crown) was delivered to you by the Archbishop of Rheims, will you abide by what that archbishop says?

Joan: Bring him here and then I will answer you. I would not dare to say the opposite of what I have told you.

Thereupon, the masters present decided to put off the torture and to deliberate first as to whether or not it should be applied to her. The record mentions the presence of some "officers" who were there in readiness to put John to the torture. The principal man among them was the executioner, Maugier Leparmentier: he was still living at the time of the Rehabilitation and he remembered the episode perfectly. "I met Joan at the time when she was brought to the town of Rouen and I saw her at Rouen Castle when me and my companion were sent for to put Joan to the torture. She was then questioned for some time and she answered with much prudence, so much so that those who were there marvelled. Finally we withdrew, I and my companion, without laying hands on her person." (R.215)

Saturday, May 12th, Cauchon assembled twelve of the assessors to discuss the question of whether Joan was to be put to the torture. Only three among them gave an affirmative opinion: Thomas de Courcelles of Paris University; Nicolas Loiseleur, the man who had passed himself off as a fellow-countryman of Joan's in an attempt to extract damaging confessions; and one Aubert Morel, Doctor of Canon Law, whose appearance at sittings of the court were few and far between. The details of this discussion do not appear in the definitive text of the proceedings drafted by Thomas de Courcelles; it is only to be found in the text of the "French Minute" given in the Urfé MS. and in that of Orleans. (See Commentary, p. 227.)

The English, however, were becoming impatient. A document recently brought to light, the Beauchamp Household Book now preserved in the Earl of Warwick's archives and not yet published,* yields fresh confirmation of the texts we already possessed.


In this register of accounts for the year 1431–32 are entered, day by day, the names of all the guests entertained by the then Earl of Warwick, who lived in Rouen as Governor representing the King of England. On Sunday, May 13th, the earl gave a grand dinner; first among the guests were the Bishop of Beauvais, Pierre Cauchon, and the Bishop of Noyon, Jean de Mailly. Also present were certain persons who had played important parts in Joan's life, John of Luxembourg, his brother Louis, Chancellor of France, Humphrey, Earl of Stafford, one of the principal English captains, and the wife of John Talbot who had been captured by the French at Patay and was still held by them; she was Richard Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick's daughter.

After the list of names the Beauchamp's major domo entered in his register the expenses necessitated by their keep. We thus know the details of an entertainment which seems to have been very grand, if we are to judge by the substantial purchases made on that day. (Folios 68 V. and 69 of the MS.)

It is very probable that we may ascribe to this Sunday, May 13th, the scene recounted by one of the witnesses at the Trial of Rehabilitation, Haimond de Macy, who, it will be recalled, had had some conversation with Joan in her prison at Beaurevoir; among the guests of that day the Account Book mentions "duo milites Burgonie," two Knights of Burgundy, one of whom must be Haimond himself. Here is what he had to say about the matter:

"(After her stay at the castle of Beaurevoir and the castle of Crotoy) Joan was brought to the castle of Rouen, to a prison on the country side (of the castle). In that town, at the time when Joan was held there, the Count of Ligny (John of Luxembourg) went to see her, and me with him. One day this Count of Ligny wanted to see Joan. He went to her, accompanied by the lord Earls of Warwick and of Stafford, and the present Chancellor of England, at that time Bishop of Thérouanne and brother of the Count of Ligny, and myself. This Count of Ligny addressed himself to Joan, saying: 'Joan, I am come to ransom you provided you will promise that you will never take up arms against us.' She answered: 'In God's name, you are making game of me, for well I know that you have neither the will nor the power.' And she repeated that several times because the count persisted in saying the same. And she said next: 'I know that these English will put me to death, because they think, after my death, to win the Kingdom of
FRANCE. But were they a hundred thousand godons* more than they are now, they will not have the Kingdom.' At these words the Earl of Stafford was angry and he half-drew his dagger to strike her, but the Earl of Warwick prevented him.” (R.187)

This Earl of Stafford, one of Warwick's intimates (his name constantly recurs in the pages of the register) seems to have been one of the most implacable against Joan. An episode recounted by Guillaume Manchon shows him as a man of quick and violent temper: "One day someone whose name I do not remember said something about Joan which displeased the lord of Stafford; this sire of Stafford pursued him who had spoken to a place of sanctuary, with drawn sword to the point that, if the sire of Stafford had not been told that the place where this man was, was a holy place and enjoying the right of asylum, he would have struck the man."

What decisions were taken at that dinner on May 13th? What is certain is that thereafter events came much faster.

On the following day, May 14th, the University of Paris met in plenary session to deliberate on the twelve articles of accusation which had been sent to it with a letter from Cauchon and another from the King of England, which letters can have left no doubt as to what the tendency of the deliberations ought to be. Not that there was any need to bring pressure to bear on that assembly as to the conclusion it was desired to come to, considering the unequivocal proofs of devotion which the University had long given to the English cause. The deliberations concluded by finding Joan guilty of being a schismatic, an apostate, a liar, a soothsayer, suspect of heresy; of erring in the faith, and being a blasphemer of God and the saints. A letter to the King of England, in support of these conclusions, was drawn up by the masters, who wrote:

"Your Most Noble Magnificence . . . has commenced a right good work touching our holy faith: to wit the judicial proceedings against the woman known as the Maid and her scandals, faults and offenses so manifest throughout this Kingdom . . . "

"We humbly implore your Excellent Highness, that very important matter be brought swiftly to an end, for verily length and dilation is most perilous and it is very necessary to make in this (matter) notable and great reparation for that the people who, by this woman, have been mightily scandalized‡, be led back into good and holy doctrine and belief." (C.355-356)

As soon as he received these conclusions, so favourable to his cause, Cauchon hastened to assemble the assessors for a session of the court on Saturday, May 19th. After the letters and conclusions from the university had been read, the assessors were called upon, each for his opinion. Most of them, as we might expect, gave an opinion in the same sense as that of the authority par excellence of that time, the University of Paris. A few only had reservations, notably Brother Isambart de la Pierre, who referred the court to the first deliberations he had put before it and who insisted that Joan be warned again.

On Wednesday, May 23rd, Joan appeared before the court in a room in the castle near to her prison cell, to be solemnly exhorted by one of the university Masters, Pierre Maurice, to "renounce her errors and scandals". A long and verbose exhortation was answered by Joan as follows:

"The way that I have always spoken and held to in this trial, that will I still maintain. And if I was brought to judgment and saw the fire lit and the faggots ready, and the executioner ready to stoke the fire and that I be within the fire, yet should I not say otherwise and should maintain what I have said in the trial even unto death." (C.384)

It was at this point that it was decided to set a scene designed to shake her. On Thursday, May 24th, in the cemetery of Saint-Ouen, a scaffold and tribune were erected. Here Joan was to be brought to judgment. The great prelates were all present; the scene was presided over by the Bishop of Winchester, Henry Beaufort, known as the "Cardinal of England". He was Bedford's uncle and Henry VI's great-uncle. With him sat the Bishop of Beauvais and Noyon; Louis of Luxembourg, Bishop of Thérouanne; and William Alnwick, Keeper of the Privy Seal and Member of the Grand Council of the Crown. The principal assessors were also present, and a crowd had collected all round the platforms. Joan was brought out to a tribune facing the prelates; at her side was the usher, Jean Massieu, who was, as always, delegated to accompany her.

A sermon was preached to her, for which office Master Guillaume Erard had been chosen, a university man, a friend of Cauchon, and politically devoted to the English cause; he was to die in England, in 1439.

Isambart de la Pierre: "I was present at the first preaching to Joan which was done by Master Guillaume Erard who took as his text: the branch can produce no fruits if it stay not on the vine—
saying that in France there never had been such a monster as Joan was, who was a magician, heretic, schismatic, and that the King who was favourable to her was like unto her in that he had tried to recover his kingdom with the help of such a heretical woman. He added, 'Because of that, I believe that they were moved, among other things, by the desire to defame the royal majesty.' " (R.226)

This impression was confirmed by other witnesses, such as Martin Ladvenu and Jean Massieu himself.

Jean Massieu: "When she was brought to Saint-Ouen, to be preached to by Master Guillaume Erard, during the preaching, at about half way, when Joan had been greatly blamed by the preacher's words, he began to shout in a loud voice, saying: 'Ah! France, thou art much abused, thou hast always been the most Christian country; and Charles, who calls himself King and of thee ruler, has adhered like a heretic and schismatic to the words and deeds of a woman vain and defamed and of all dishonour full; and not him only but all the clergy in his obedience and lordship, by whom she was examined and not corrected, as she has said'. ... Then, addressing himself to Joan, he said, raising his finger: 'It is to thee, Joan, that I speak, and I tell thee that thy King is a heretic and schismatic.' To which she answered: 'By Illy faith, sir, with respect, that I speak, and I tell thee that thy King is a heretic and schismatic.' To which the preacher said to me, 'Make her be silent.' " (R.227)

We read as follows in the record of this session: "After his sermon the preacher said to Joan: 'Here be my lords the judges who many times have summoned and required of you that you submit all your deeds and sayings to our Holy Mother the Church, and that in those deeds and sayings there be many things which, as it seems to the clerks, were not good to say and maintain.'"

JOAN: I will answer you. As for the matter of submission to the Church, I have answered on that point; of all the works I have accomplished, let them be sent to Rome to our Holy Father the Sovereign Pontiff, in whom, and in God first, I trust. As for my sayings and deeds, I have done them as from God. And with them I charge no man, neither my King nor any other; and if fault there be, it is in me and no other.

Question: Will you revoke all your sayings and deeds which are reproved by the clerks?

The text of the record continues here: "And it was said to her that this did not suffice, and that to go for the pope to such a great distance could not be done, that the Ordinaries (diocesan bishops) were judges, each in his own diocese, and that it was necessary that she throw herself upon the Holy Church and that she abide by what the clerks and other learned men said and had determined on her sayings and deeds."

It should be noted here that in Joan's own epoch there were several precedents for what she asked: heretics who, having appealed to the Pope, were in fact taken before his court in Rome; in fact that was the rule in cases of judgment by the Inquisition.

Guillaume Erard repeated his exhortation three times. Here follows what Massieu, charged with reading to Joan the form of abjuration which she was called upon to sign, had to say: "When Joan was required to sign this document (cédule) there was a great murmuring among those who were present, to the point that I heard the bishop say to someone: 'You will make reparation for that' ('You shall pay for that') asserting that he had been insulted and that he would proceed no further unless he received an apology. Meanwhile, I warned Joan of the danger which threatened her in the matter of signing this abjuration document. I saw well that Joan understood neither the document nor the danger which threatened her. Then Joan, pressed to sign, answered: 'Let this paper be seen to the Pope, were in fact taken before his court in Rome; in fact that was the rule in cases of judgment by the Inquisition.

Jean Monnet who was then clerk, that is secretary. "I was at the sermon preached at Saint-Ouen and was myself on the tribune, seated at the feet of master Jean Beaufé. When the sermon was finished, as they began to read the sentence, Joan said that if she was advised by the clerks according to their conscience as it would seem to her (as best she could judge), she would willingly do what she was advised. That heard, the Bishop of Beauvais asked the cardinal of England, who was there, what,
given Joan's submission, he should do. The cardinal then answered the bishop that he should admit Joan to penitence. Thereupon the sentence which they had started to read was withdrawn and Joan was admitted to penitence (received as a penitent). I saw at the time a cédule of abjuration which was read, and it seems to me that it was a little cédule of five or six lines: and I remember that she threw herself upon the conscience of her judges as to whether she ought to recant or not." (R.228-229)

The intervention of the English in this scene was constant, as it was behind the scenes throughout the trial. This was attested by Haimond de Macy: "Some time thereafter (i.e., after the above scene of May 13th) I was still in Rouen. Joan was taken to a place before Saint-Ouen where was preached to her a sermon by Master Nicolas Midy. (Here he is confusing the occasions; Midy was to preach the sermon at the Vieux-Marché.) Among other things he said to her, as I heard, 'Joan, we have such pity for you: you must retract what you have said or we shall hand you over to secular justice.' But she answered that she had done nothing bad and that she believed in the twelve articles of the faith and in the ten precepts of the Decalogue, saying thereafter that she referred her case to the court of Rome and would believe all that the Holy Church believed. Despite that, she was hard pressed to retract; but she said to them: 'You take great pains to lead me astray that, and, to avoid the danger which this Laurent Calot, secretary, handed Joan the paper and a pen that she might sign, and by way of derision Joan drew a circle. Then Laurent Calot seized Joan's hand with the pen in it and made Joan make a mark which I no longer remember.'

Laurent Calot was a man well-known in other aspects: secretary to the King of England, he several times signed the official acts for the provisioning of the English armies in France and he was an intimate of the Earl of Warwick, often a guest at his house, as witness the Beauchamp Household Book.

What exactly had Joan abjured?

The record is very brief on the circumstances in which Joan made her submission: "As the sentence was begun to be read, she said that she would hold all that the judges and the Church said or pronounced, saying that in all she would obey our order. She said several times that since the men of the Church said that the apparitions and revelations she said she had had were not such as should be maintained or believed in, she would not maintain them and in all referred herself to Holy Mother Church and to us, judges. Then, in the presence of the above-named and in view of a great multitude of clerks and people she made and produced her recovation and abjuration according to the form of a cédule which was read to her, written in French, which she repeated: and signed this cédule with her own hand under the form which follows." (C.388-389)

Now the cédule of abjuration which follows in the record is a very long document (forty-seven lines of type in the French version) in which Joan accuses herself in great detail of having "feigned lyingly to have had revelations and apparitions from God", of having blasphemed God and his saints, of having worn "Clothes dissolute, mis-shaped and indecent, against natural decency", of having "desired cruel effusion of human blood... despaired God and his sacraments... been a schismatic and many ways erred from the faith...". She declares that she "abjures, detests, denies, and entirely renounces and separates herself from" her "crimes and errors". (C.388-389)

But during the Trial of Rehabilitation the notaries and other witnesses revealed the existence of another cédule of abjuration, differing from the one contained in the official record of the trial. Nicolas Taquel: "I was present in Rouen when the first preaching was delivered, but I was not on the tribunal with the other notaries. I was, however, near enough and in a place where I could hear what was done and said. I remember well that I saw Joan when the cédule of abjuration was read to her. There were in all six lines of coarse handwriting. This letter (sic) of abjuration was in French, beginning with 'I, Joan, etc.'"

Another witness, Guillaume de la Chambre, confirmed this evidence: "I was present at the sermon made by Master Guillaume Erard. I do not remember the abjuration which Joan made, although she had much deferred making it. Master Guillaume Erard, however, decided her to make it and telling her that she should do what she was advised, that afterwards she would be delivered from prison; and it was on this condition and not otherwise that she did it, reading thereafter another little cédule containing six or seven lines on a sheet of paper folded in two. I was so near that I could easily see the lines and how they were disposed." (R.60-61)
Better than anybody the usher Jean Massieu, charged with reading aloud the form of abjuration, could recall the scene: "In what concerns the abjuration, when she was preached to by Master Guillaume Erard at Saint-Ouen, Erard held in his hand a cédule of abjuration and said to Joan: 'Thou shalt abjure and sign this cédule.' Then this cédule was handed to me that I might read it and I read it to Joan; and I well remember that in this cédule it was noted that in the future she would no longer carry arms nor wear man's clothes, nor shorn hair, and many other things which I no longer remember. And I know well that this cédule contained about eight lines and not more. And I know absolutely that it was not that of which mention is made in the proceedings, for that which I read to her is different from that which was inserted into the proceedings, and it was the former which Joan signed." (R.62)

As a result of this the judges of the Trial of H.ehabilitation called Thomas de Courcelles, who had drawn up in form the record of the Trial of Condemnation, to give explanations of the real nature of the abjuration:

**Question:** Who composed the cédule which is contained in the proceedings and which begins with "I, Joan, etc."?

**Courcelles:** I do not know. Nor do I know that it was read to Joan or that it was explained to her. A sermon was preached to her at Saint-Ouen by Master Guillaume Erard: I was on the tribune behind the prelates. I do not, however, remember the preacher's words excepting that he said "the pride of this woman". Afterwards the bishop began to read the sentence. I do not remember what was said to Joan nor what she answered. However, I remember well that Master Nicolas de Venderes made a cédule which began with, "When the eye of the heart", but if that be the one which is contained in the proceedings, I know not. I do not know if I saw this cédule in the hands of Master Nicolas before the Maid's abjuration, or after, but I believe it was before. And I did hear it said that some of those present spoke to the Bishop of Beauvais because he did not apply his sentence and admitted Joan to repentance. But as for the words spoken and who spoke them, I do not remember.” (R.61–63)

However wanting in precision were these explanations given by Courcelles whose memory, at the Trial of Rehabilitation, proved grievously faulty whenever his own actions were in question, what he did say was enough to establish that there had been a substitution of texts. The cédule inserted into the official proceedings was not the one which had actually been read to Joan at Saint-Ouen. The promoter of the Rehabilitation, Simon Chapi-tault, in his summing-up, declared that the document in the record was an abjuration "artificially fabricated".

In our own time Father Doncoeur believed that he had found the text of the cédule, which was actually read to Joan and signed by her with a cross, in the text of the abjuration contained in the Orleans MS.; a document of six or seven lines, which corresponds with what Jean Massieu said. This would be quite likely if, as may be presumed, that MS. is a copy of the notes taken during the hearing by Guillaume Manchon. (See Commentary, p. 227.) The question, at all events, remains undecided: not all historians are of that opinion.

The circumstances in which the "abjuration" occurred were recounted by various witnesses whose words evoke Joan's curious attitude and the misunderstandings which arose between Cauchon and the English who were present.

Guillaume Manchon: "Two sentences had been prepared: one of abjuration and another of condemnation which the bishop had with him, and while the bishop was reading the sentence of condemnation, Master Nicolas Loiseleur was telling Joan that she should do what she had been told and accept woman's clothes. And as there was then a small interval of time, one of the English who was there told the bishop that he was betraying (them). The bishop answered him that he lied. And meanwhile Joan answered that she was ready to obey the Church. They then made her speak an abjuration which was read to her, and I do not know if she spoke it after whoever was reading it, or whether, once it had been read to her, she said that she accepted it. She was laughing.* The executioner was there with a cart in the vicinity, waiting for her to be delivered to him, to be burnt. I did not see the letter of abjuration," he added, "but it was written after the conclusion of the deliberations and before she came to that place. I do not remember that this letter of abjuration was ever explained to Joan nor that she had been given to understand or read it, excepting at the very moment when she made that abjuration." (R.60)

Another witness, Guillaume du Desert, an assessor at the trial, declared: "I was present at the sermon preached at Saint Ouen.

* It could mean only "smiling". —E.I.
There I saw and heard the abjuration made by Joan submitting herself to the determination, judgment and mandate of the Church. There was there an English doctor who was present at the sermon, and who was displeased at Joan’s abjuration being accepted. And as she was laughing while uttering certain words of that abjuration, he said to the Bishop of Beauvais, the judge, that he did ill to admit this abjuration and that it was a derision. The bishop, furious, answered that he lied; and that, being judge in a case of (the) faith, he must rather seek her salvation than her death.

That laugh of Joan’s, so unexpected at such a moment, needs an explanation. It may be that we can find it in a detail given above (and provided that the witnesses may not have recalled correctly the precise moment of her laughter), to wit that Joan—we have seen that she could sign her name—was obliged by the King of England’s secretary to sign with a cross. It will be recalled that this cross was the sign agreed upon with those of her own side to warn them not to believe the contents of a letter. It was surely curious that the English should now be making her use it to sign a document whose contents she considered false. This may be the explanation of her laughter which, moreover, must have exasperated the English present who, bailed by Cauchon’s attitude, saw their prey escaping them. There was a complete muddle of misunderstandings.

Jean Fave, an eye-witness of the scene: “After the first preaching... according to what I heard said, the leading Englishmen were very angry with the Bishop of Beauvais, the doctors and other assessors at the trial, because she had not been convicted, and condemned and delivered over to execution. I even heard it said that some of the English, in their indignation, raised their swords to strike the bishop and the doctors on their way back from the castle—but they did not strike them—saying that the King had ill spent his money on them. I heard people tell, moreover, that when the Earl of Warwick was complaining to the bishop and the doctors saying that all was going badly for the King because Joan was escaping them, one of them answered him: ‘My lord, have no care, we shall catch her yet.’”

Following this event and contrary to her expectation, Joan was to be condemned to imprisonment for life. In the course of the Rehabilitation the judges showed surprise at this, and asked Guillaume Manchon this question:

Question: Who urged the judges to condemn her to perpetual imprisonment, whereas they had promised her that she would not be punished?

MANCHON: I think that happened because of the diversity of powers (the two powers who then shared France between them) and because they were afraid that she might escape.

And in answer to later questioning Manchon added: “On leaving the preaching at Saint-Ouen, after the Maid’s abjuration, for as much as Loiseleur said to her: ‘Joan, it has been well for you this day, if it please God, and you have saved your soul,’ she asked: ‘Come now, among you men of the Church, take me to your prisons and let me be no longer in the hands of these English.’ Whereupon my lord of Beauvais answered: ‘Take her to where you found her’; wherefore she was taken back to the castle whence she had set out.” (R.231)

Cauchon’s “Take her to where you found her” was Joan’s real sentence of condemnation. For there is a fact which dominates the whole trial, the fact that Joan was detained in a lay prison and guarded by English warders, while being tried for heresy: now she should have been held in an ecclesiastical prison—in the prison cells of the archbishopric where she would have been guarded by women. This is the fundamental contradiction which makes it impossible to see this trial as a normal trial for heresy—although Cauchon insisted that it was so—and which underlines, quite clearly, its political character. Joan was a political prisoner whose enemies contrived to get her dealt with as a heretic in order to destroy the prestige which her personal saintliness and her extraordinary exploits had made for her.

Now Cauchon, as an advocate experienced in dealing with the law, knew that, according to the rules of the Inquisition courts, none but those who, having recanted their heresy, had relapsed, could be condemned to suffer death by burning. And having succeeded in making the wearing of man’s clothes (it is certain, from the evidence given by Jean Massieu, that the wearing of such clothes was expressly mentioned in the cédule) the symbol of Joan’s failure to submit to the Church, he might be fairly sure that she would, without much delay, show herself to have relapsed by retaining her male attire. Events were soon to prove him right.

The importance given to the matter of her male attire for the conclusion of Joan’s trial and condemnation was felt and understood by an observer as impartial as he was well-informed, Aeneas Sylvius
Piccolomini, the future Pope Pius II. He summed up the business in his Memoirs, as follows: "It is known that, taken in the war, the Maid was sold to the English for ten thousand gold crowns and conveyed to Rouen. In that place she was diligently examined to discover whether she used sortileges (spells) or diabolical aid or whether she erred in any way in her religion. Nothing worthy to be censured was found in her, excepting the male attire which she wore. And that was not judged deserving of the extreme penalty. Taken back to her prison she was threatened with death if she resumed the wearing of man's clothes." (Q.517) And he added that her gaolers brought none but male attire.

Two different versions have been given concerning the male attire which Joan was to resume on the following Monday, May 27th. One by Jean Massieu according to which Joan, on that day, when she woke up, found only a suit of man's clothes, her gaolers having hidden her woman's clothes: "That day, after dinner, in the presence of the council of the Church, she put off male attire and assumed female attire, as she was ordered to do. It was then the Thursday or Friday after Pentecost, and the male attire was put into a bag in the same room. And when came the Sunday morning following, which was the day of the Trinity, and she had to rise, as she told it to me, she asked the Englishmen, her guards, 'Take off my irons and I will get up.' And then one of the Englishmen took away her woman's clothes which she had upon her, and they emptied out the bag in which were the man's clothes, and flung this attire upon her, saying, 'Get thou up.' And hid the woman's clothes in the bag. And, by what she said, she put on the male attire which they had given her, saying, 'Gentlemen, you know that it is forbidden me, without fail I will not wear it.' And nevertheless, would they not give her other, so that in this argument they remained until the hour of noon; and finally, for the necessity of the body, was she constrained to go out, and wear that attire, and after she had returned within would they not give her other, notwithstanding the supplications or requests which she made them."

The other version is given by several witnesses. Among others is one called Pierre Cusquel, a burgher of Rouen who, apparently, was a master mason in the service of the "master of masonry works of the castle"; for, he says, it was by that officer's permission that he twice entered Joan's cell and was able to talk to her. He declared: "People were saying that her condemnation had no other cause excepting that she had resumed man's clothes; and that she had not worn and was not wearing this male attire excepting in order not to give herself to the soldiers with whom she was. Once, in the prison, I asked her why she was wearing this male attire and that was what she answered me." (R.232)

Martin Ladvenu's evidence is in the same sense: "As for knowing whether anyone approached her secretly at night, I heard it from Joan's own lips that a great English lord entered her prison and tried to take her by force. That was the cause, she said, of her resuming man's clothes."

Again, there is Isambart de la Pierre: "After she had renounced and abjured and resumed man's clothes, I and several others were present when Joan excused herself for having again put on man's clothes, saying and affirming publicly that the English had had much wrong and violence done to her in prison when she was dressed in woman's clothes. And in fact I saw her tearful, her face covered with tears, disfigured and outraged in such sort that I had pity and compassion on her." (R.268)

**THE TRIAL FOR RELAPSE**

Sunday, May 27th, Cauchon learned that Joan had resumed male attire. On the following day he went to the prison, accompanied by the vice-Inquisitor and several assessors. The following is from the official record:

"The Monday following, 28 of the month of May, on the day following Holy Trinity, we, judges aforesaid, went to the place of Joan's prison to see her state and disposition. Were present the lords and Masters Nicolas de Venderes, Thomas de Courtelles, Brother Isambart de la Pierre, Guillaume Haiton, Jacques Camus, Nicolas Berin, Julien Floquet and John Gray.

"Joan was dressed in a man's clothes, to wit tunic, hood and gippon (a short robe worn by men) and other man's clothes, attire which on our order she had formerly left off and had taken women's clothes; therefore did we question her to know when and for what cause she had again put on man's attire."

**Joan:** I not long since resumed man's attire and left off woman's attire.

**Question:** Why have you assumed this male attire and who made you take it?
JOAN: I have taken it of my own will. I have taken it because it is more licit and fitting to have man's clothes since I am with men than to have woman's clothes. I have resumed it because what had been promised me has not been observed, to wit that I should go to mass and should receive the Body of Christ and should be taken out of irons.

PIERRE CAUCHON: Have you not made abjuration and promised especially not to resume man's clothes?

JOAN: I would rather die than remain in irons; but if it be permitted me to go to mass and I be taken out of irons and that I be put in a pleasant (gracieuse) prison, and that I have women, I will be good and will do what the Church wishes. (The item "have women" is down in the French Minute but not in the official text of the proceedings.)

CAUCHON: Since that Thursday, have you heard the voices of Saints Catherine and Margaret?

JOAN: Yes.

CAUCHON: What did they tell you?

JOAN: God has sent to me by Saints Catherine and Margaret great pity for the mighty betrayal to which I consented in making abjuration and revocation to save my life, and that I was damning myself to save my life.

(Here the clerk has noted in the margin, responsio mortisera, mortal (fatal) answer.)

JOAN: Before Thursday my voices had told me what I was going to do that day, and what I then did. My voices told me, when I was on the scaffold and the tribune before the people, that I should reply boldly to that preacher who was then preaching. He was a false preacher and he said I had done many things which I have not done. If I said that God had not sent me, I should damn myself; it is true that God sent me. My voices have since told me that I did a great injury in confessing that I had not done well in what I had done. All that I said and revoked that Thursday, I did only because of fear of the fire.

CAUCHON: Do you believe that the voices which come to you are those of Saints Catherine and Margaret?

JOAN: Yes, and that they are from God.

CAUCHON: And the crown which you mentioned?

JOAN: In all, I told you the truth at the trial, as best I could.

CAUCHON: You said, upon the scaffold and the tribune, before us, judges, and before others and before the people, when you made abjuration, that it was falsely (lyingly) that you had boasted that those voices were the voices of Saints Catherine and Margaret.

JOAN: I did not mean to do and say so. I did not say or mean to revoke my apparitions, to wit that they were Saints Catherine and Margaret. And all I have done I did for fear of the fire and I revoked nothing but it (the revocation) was against the truth. I would rather make my penitence once and for all, that is to say die, than to suffer any longer the pain of being in prison. I have never done anything against God and against the faith, whatever I may have been made to revoke; and for what was contained in the cédule of abjuration, I did not understand it. I did not mean to revoke anything unless provided it pleased God. If the judges wish it I will resume woman's clothes; for the rest, I will do nothing about it.

"That heard," continues the record, "we went away from her to proceed thereafter according to law* and reason." (C.395-399)

Isambart de la Pierre, who was present at this exchange, adds an epilogue which, needless to say, does not appear in the official record: "Before all present," he says, "when she was reputed heretic, obstinate and relapsed, she answered publicly: 'If you, my lords of the Church, had kept and guarded me in your prisons, peradventure would it not be so with me.' After the issue and end of this session and instance the lord Bishop of Beauvais said to the English who awaited without: 'Farewell, it is done.'" (R.268)

In one of his depositions at the Trial of Rehabilitation Martin Ladvenu also recalled the bishop's attitude at the time; and in that attitude saw, in his opinion, proof of the bishop's partisanship: "The first (sign): When the bishop offered himself as judge, he commanded that Joan be kept in a secular prison and in the hands of her mortal enemies, although he could very well have had her detained and guarded in an ecclesiastical prison. As it was, he permitted, from the beginning of the trial until the consummation, that she be tormented and treated cruelly in a secular prison. Moreover, at the first session and instance, the said bishop required and asked the advice of the whole court to know which was the most

* Or "according to right and reason".—E.H.
fitting, to keep her in a secular prison or in the prisons of the Church. Whereupon it was decided that it was more decent to keep her in the ecclesiastical prisons than the others. Then answered this bishop that he would not do that for fear of displeasing the English.

"The second sign is that, the day when the bishop with some others declared her a heretic, recidivist and backslider into her misdeeds, because she had within the prison resumed male attire, coming out of the prison, he perceived the Earl of Warwick and a multitude of English about him, to whom, laughing, he said aloud, intelligibly: 'Farewell, farewell, it is done, farewell' or words to that effect."* (R.266)

Cauchon wasted no time in bringing Joan to trial for her "relapse". After the interrogation set out above, on May 28th, he summoned the principal assessors to meet on the 29th, and gave them a brief exposé of the state of her case: after the solemn preaching and admonitions addressed to her, Joan had renounced the error of her ways and signed an abjuration with her own hand .... However, at the suggestion of the devil she had started saying again that her voices and spirits had come to her, and having rejected woman's clothes, had resumed the wearing of male attire. Which is why he was now asking the assessors to give their opinion on what should now be done.

The first asked to speak happened to be Master Nicolas de Venderés, the man who had drawn up the false abjuration document, the one which was not read to Joan. As may well be imagined, his opinion was clear: Joan must be held to be a heretic and without further delay handed over to the secular arm, "with a recommendation to be gentle with her". This was a conventional formula (employed by Inquisition courts) and everyone knew what it implied.

But Giles de Duremort, abbot of Fécamp, asked next to give his opinion, introduced a request which must have made Cauchon uneasy. "It seems to me," he said, "that she is a relapsed heretic and that the word of God should be preached to her; that the cédule which was read to her shall be read to her again and explained; that done, the judges will have to declare her a heretic and abandon her to secular justice."

Of the forty assessors listed as giving their opinion in the text of the proceedings, after the first two had spoken, only two were for passing sentence at once: Denis Gastinel—a canon of Rouen who was, as we have seen, in receipt of regular payments from the English crown; and Jean Pinchon, archdeacon of Jouy-en-Josas, with canonical stalls in Paris and Rouen. All the rest, including those who had shown themselves most implacable to Joan, rallied to the abbot of Fécamp's opinion, some going further—Isambart de la Pierre, for example—and insisting that it should be made perfectly clear to Joan that the matter was one of life or death for her. Thus, of forty-two, thirty-nine demanded that more light be thrown, in the first place, on the abjuration question.

Whereupon—we are still quoting the official proceedings—"Having heard the opinion of each one, we, the judges, thanked them and thereafter concluded that the said Joan be proceeded against as a relapsed heretic according to law and reason." (C.408)

The assessors having only a consultative voice, it is perfectly obvious that Cauchon was not going to hamper himself with a formality which would be doubly awkward for him, since the cédule which had been put into the file of the proceedings was not the one which had been read to Joan.

During the afternoon of the same day a missive was sent, by the notaries, to all the assessors, informing them that Joan, having fallen again into the errors which she had abjured, would be taken the next day to the Old Market Place in Rouen, at eight o'clock in the forenoon, to be declared "relapsed, heretic and excommunicate".

**COMMENTARY**

The reader will already have formed some idea of the manner in which the proceedings of this trial were drawn up, from the texts quoted in this chapter. While Joan was being questioned, the notaries wrote down her answers; and they were also responsible for the record or minute of each session with such details as the list of persons present, the place in which the court was sitting, and so forth. The notaries also added to the dossier all other papers involved in the proceedings, assignations and convocations addressed to the assessors, letters from people who were implicated in some way or other, these ranging from the King of England when, for example, he entrusted judging Joan, a prisoner-of-war, to Pierre Cauchon, down to the usher Jean Massieu, charged with the task of producing the prisoner to the court whenever it sat in public, and of returning her to her cell thereafter.
THE TRIAL OF CONDEMNATION

The whole formed a stout file which was not to be arranged in formal order, as we can tell from the texts, until after Joan's death. By "arranged in formal order" we mean what follows: all the questions and answers were translated into Latin and the diverse papers, after classification according to the actual order of the proceedings, were copied into a register which the notaries were then called upon to "authenticate". This authentication consisted in signing the bottom of every page to attest the conformity of the text with their own notes, and to prevent the addition of any document or writing whatsoever, contrary to juridical custom. At the end of the file they placed their "sign manual", that is a signature accompanied by a flourish which was personal to each clerk, a copy of which was deposited at the Officiality, the seat of the archbishopric's ecclesiastical court, exactly as, nowadays, we depose a copy of our signature at the bank when opening an account.

This formality, it should be noted, assumed its full import in the case of the proceedings of the trial of condemnation, when it came to the matter of those Posthumous Informations (Chapter 8) which Cauchon wanted to integrate into the file itself. For the simple fact of their not being included in the authenticated pages and of their being filed after the signs manual of the notaries, is a proof of their misleading character: the notaries were able to plead the illegality of what was proposed to them in refusing, out of professional honesty, to carry out Cauchon's orders. The bishop was obliged to resign himself to having the Posthumous Informations put into the file only outside the limits of the authenticated proceedings. He was able to substitute a bogus édifice for the real one, by doing it without the knowledge of the notaries at a time when the file was composed of loose leaves not yet copied into the register; but he was not able to do likewise with those "informations" which had nothing whatever to do with the declarations properly heard or received by the court in session.

We know from the depositions of Guillaume Manchon that there were five authenticated copies of the proceedings of the Trial of Condemnation. Three were for the Inquisitor, one for the King of England, and one for Cauchon. Of these five, three have come down to us. One, the most carefully produced, written on parchment, is now in the library of the National Assembly; a facsimile reproduction of this was made, thanks to J. Marchand, the chief librarian, and published in 1956. The two others are in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Fonds Latin 5965 and 5966). Several copies of the original five were made, but they have not the value as juridical instruments given to the remaining three originals by the notaries' signatures.

It was this official and authentic text of the Trial of Condemnation in Latin which was published by the scholar Jules Quicherat, forming the first volume of that important work which anyone wishing to know about Joan will always have to refer to (Procès de condamnation et de réhabilitation de Jeanne d'Arc, dite la Pucelle, Paris 1841-1849). The publication of this work marks the beginning of any real knowledge of Joan of Arc, in her person and in the events of her life. For it is self-evident that, so long as the documents in the two cases remained in MS. only, then only those few scholars who had access to them, and who knew both medieval Latin and palaeography, could be exactly informed as to Joan's answers, and what the people who knew her really said about her when they gave evidence. Until Quicherat published his great book, the story of Joan could only be followed in the works of chroniclers, whose information, gathered at second-hand, could not have the same value as a direct reading of the questions and answers at the trials. In point of fact only one scholar, in the seventeenth century, had both the idea and the occasion to read the MSS. of the trial proceedings. This was Edmond Richer, whose work was not published in his lifetime and was not, in fact, to be published until the twentieth century (1911-12) by Canon P. II. Dunand. In its MS. form, however, Richer's work served as the basis for Lenglet-Dufresnoy's Histoire de Jeanne d'Arc, vierge, heroïne et martyrre d'État, suscitée par la Providence pour rétablir le monarchie française, which appeared in 1753; but the abbé Lenglet-Dufresnoy made but indifferent use of it.

All this explains, of course, the errors, nonsense, and in general the want of exact knowledge of Joan, which were the rule until the nineteenth century. We have dealt elsewhere with this aspect of the matter (see our Jeanne d'Arc, Ed. du Seuil, 1959), and a more thorough treatment of the same subject will be found in a scholarly work by Pierre Marot (Memorial de la Réhabilitation), published in 1956 (see Commentary to Chapter 10).

Before Quicherat only one scholar, Clement L'Averdy, had had the idea of publishing États des manuscrits des procès; but his publication, which appeared in 1790, was incomplete and remained little known.

In our own time we have at our disposal a publication of the highest order in which to study the Trial of Condemnation; this we
owe to Pierre Tisset and Yvonne Lanhers; it appears under the aegis of the Société de l'Histoire de France, and replaces Quicherat, now unobtainable excepting in the major libraries. This re-edition gives not only the Latin text of the proceedings, but also that of the "French Minute".

For in fact, while Joan was being questioned, the notary Guillaume Manchon was taking down her answers in French; he had kept for himself, among his personal papers, the MS. of the questions and answers in French (he refers to this MS. as the notula in gallico), and he handed this over to the judge at the Trial of Rehabilitation, on December 12, 1455, when this last trial was opening. Now of this French Minute, which has unfortunately disappeared, copies were made, and these are to be found notably in two of the MSS.; the so-called Urfe MS., preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Fonds Latin 8838), and another which is now kept at the Bibliothèque d'Orléans and bears the number 518. It is probably in this French text that the least attenuated echo of Joan's own language is to be found, a language full of freshness and which is well worth reading in the original text despite the difficulties which that may entail for us.

Excellent translations of the Trial of Condemnation have been made, among others those of Pierre Champion (Paris, 1920-21, 2 vols.), which had both Latin text and translation; and of Robert Brasillach, which happily combines a translation of the Latin with the text of the French Minute (Paris, Gallimard, 1939, and often reprinted).