

Chapter 2: 'The Martiall Maide': Joan of Arc and the French in England

It is not to be doubted but that the magnanimity of the English would have spared her, had they not found it necessary to deface the opinion which the French, even with superstition, had conceived of her. John Speed, *Historie of Great Britaine* (1611)

An English traveler to Orléans in 1622 witnessed a “procession ’twixt Military and Ecclesiastic for the Maid of Orleans, which is perform’d every year very solemnly; her Statue stands upon the Bridge, and her Clothes are preserv’d to this day, which a young Man wore in the Procession.” James Howell, future historiographer to Charles II, adds that after the English were “driven to Normandy,” one “Anne de Arque” was “taken Prisoner, and the English had a fair revenge upon her, for by an Arrest of the Parliament of Rouen she was burnt for a Witch.”¹ In April 1644, another traveler described that same statue (later destroyed) of the medieval city’s liberator:

At one of the extreames of the bridge are strong toures; and about the middle neere one side, the statue of the Virgin Mary, or Pieta, with a Christo Morto in her lap, as big as the lif; At one side of the Crosse kneeles Charles the viith arm’d, and at the other Jane d’Arc the famous Pucele arm’d also like a Cavalier with boots & spurs, her hayre dischevel’d as the Virago who deliver’d the Towne from our Countrymen, what time they beseig’d it:

The valiant Creature being afterward burnt at Rouen for a Witch.²

Five years later, in the spring of 1649, yet another young Englishman visited Orléans in his turn, and reported, “In honor of [the Maid of Orléans] they make yearely a generall procession the eight of May, which is the day shee raised the seege of the english, where all the orders of the towne doth assist, which goes as farre as the bridge where there is a Masse said.”³ The 1644

tourist, diarist John Evelyn, while identifying with “our Countrymen,” praises Joan of Arc without apparent irony as a “virago”—simply, a warrior woman—and “valiant,” as Gabriel Harvey had written of her in his 1584 *Commonplace Book*.⁴ The later tourist, Robert Montagu, Lord Mandeville, can so distance himself from any defensive chauvinism as to refer to his ancestors as “the English.” Two hundred years after her death, two hundred years after she raised the English siege of Orléans and established Charles VII on his throne, the statue of Joan of Arc embodies neither shame nor threat to the descendants of those Englishmen who had called her “witch,” “whore” and “limb of the fiend.”⁵

Such nonchalance is not new or unusual among English redactors of the events that led eventually to the relinquishment of their nation’s last foothold on the Continent. The earliest chronicles denominate Joan of Arc as a witch. Some later historians impugn her virginity. Others seem deliberately to displace her from the scenes of her greatest triumphs in their accounts of the Hundred Years’ War or the reign of Henry VI. Still others transfer her successes to her male counterparts. Not a few ignore her completely, as does William Martyn in his 1615 *Historie and Lives of Twentie Kings of England*. Martyn gives all credit for the lifting of the siege of Orléans to Jean, duc d’Alençon, and all credit to the dauphin Charles himself for recovering Reims so that he could be crowned there.⁶ Yet by the turn of the seventeenth century, English writers, sometimes indignantly, sometimes wryly, generally acknowledge their ancestors’ culpability for Joan’s death. As Malcolm Vale puts it, “British national histories—not normally discussed in this context—have tended to be remarkably accepting of the view that it was as a result of English coercion, pressure and threat that Joan was condemned and put to death.”⁷ Indeed, the

histories often repeat the arguments in Bedford's letter to Europe, justifying the execution and arguing for the legality of the sentence, or asserting that Joan herself drove the English, proud of their native magnanimity, to their limit. In essence, the publication of John Speed's *Historie of Great Britaine* in 1611, with its extensive use of a recent French history and a prologue that boasts of an internationally favorable view of Great Britain, marks a point when Joan's story is definitively integrated into the larger narrative of English history by most historians. Speed is the first to move English opinion in a new direction: acknowledge the possibility of one's ancestors' error, but turn the ultimate blame back on the Maid herself. The execution of Joan of Arc, carried out by the civil—that is, English—authorities in Rouen on May 30, 1431 handed down to the island nation an unsettling legacy: the distasteful reputation of having burnt not an apostate, idolater, and relapsed heretic, but as the King of England's secretary Jean Tressart had lamented, "a holy person."⁸ From the fifteenth through the seventeenth centuries, English writers had to accommodate not only this conundrum but also the increasing number of printed French texts that began to incorporate information from the manuscripts of Joan's trials. In this chapter, I explore how the English approached the uneasy marriage of conflicting national points of view.

Given the focus on domestic affairs in England during the fifteenth century amid the upheaval of the struggle between Lancastrians and Yorkists during the so-called Wars of the Roses commencing in 1455, it is not surprising that most English chronicles of the time pay little or no mind to Joan of Arc. Nor was she mentioned in official documents, except those drafted by the Duke of Bedford: the 1431 letter to Europe and his articles of defense before the Privy Council in 1434. Not until after her conviction for heresy was nullified in 1456, coincident with

the struggle between Lancastrian Henry VI and Yorkist claimants to the throne, did the English begin to intuit the need to construct their own history of Joan of Arc. Thus, the story of Joan of Arc told by the London chronicle, dating from the beginning of the fifteenth century, is made to fit into a narrative highlighting the dangers of domestic upheaval.⁹ The invention of a new calumny, Joan's claim to be pregnant to avoid execution as printed in William Caxton's *Cronycles of England* in 1480, was a direct response to a post-Lancastrian England.

Early in the fifteenth century, while the English king was still in his minority and the war with France was ongoing despite Joan of Arc's efforts, the chroniclers recorded rather little about the Maid—likely all they knew. Even though they portray her as a witch and associate her capture with young Henry's arrival in France in 1430, they reflect none of the antipathy of Bedford or of her pro-English judges. As W.T. Waugh pointed out long ago, most emphasize the capture of the Maid with little attention to any of her battles and none to her role in Charles's coronation. They offer no account of her trial or execution.¹⁰ Some historians of the Hundred Years' War such as Edouard Perroy found the chroniclers' indifference rather strange, for "if Joan's feats of arms had created in the ranks of the English soldiers such dismay as legend would have been quick to exaggerate, fugitives and deserters would have communicated it to their fellow-countrymen." Perroy adds, "Moreover, if Bedford had staged the trial at Rouen in order to bolster up his tottering rule, he would not have failed to circulate its result widely in England. But nothing like this is to be found in the English chronicles, whose aridity, brevity, and inexactitude prove that there was little or no interest in England in the adventure which posterity turned into a wonderful epic."¹¹ That very brevity and inexactitude attest that in the decades

between Joan's death and the nullification proceedings, what was important to English writers was potential and actual civil upheaval, soon to be realized in Jack Sharpe's uprising against ecclesiastical wealth and property in 1432 and Jack Cade's 1450 rebellion against perceived abuses of power and mounting national debt, as well as in the struggle for the crown.¹²

The London chronicle's emphasis on the dangers of domestic disorder accords with concerns evident in the original articles of indictment at Joan's trial, which represented her actions as an affront to conventions of class and gender as well as to political and ecclesiastical authority. Article 66, for example, read to her on March 28, 1431, itemizes her divergence from such norms: "Some of these matters depart from divine, evangelical, canon, and civil law, and are contrary to decrees approved in general councils."¹³ Both in the articles and in the London chronicle, Joan is associated with political and religious rebellion; the latter overlook the potential narrative drama and didactic value of her military achievements, trial, and execution. This might seem surprising, for, as Mary-Rose McLaren notes, the chroniclers often narrate the course of major battles, not merely for their intrinsic interest, but "to discuss implicitly the qualities of kingship."¹⁴ Thus, for Chris Given-Wilson, they suggest a contemporary "sense of being English," which "meant above all supporting the nation at war, whether it be with France and Scotland, England's traditional enemies, or further afield."¹⁵ While the story of Joan's execution might have illustrated the appropriate punishment for rebellion (under the guise of heresy), the reminder might just as easily have evoked the debacles at Orléans and Patay and the disturbing achievement of the coronation of Charles VII.

Just over half of the surviving manuscripts of the London chronicle, fifteen out of twenty-

three manuscripts, even mention Joan of Arc. In her study of the fifteenth-century chronicles, Mary-Rose McLaren identifies four distinct versions, distributed among two groups dating from before and two dating from after the Nullification.¹⁶ The first and earliest version describes the English capture of a “wycche,” whom the Armagnacs (the supporters of Charles VII), it reports, considered “as a prophetesse and a goddesse.”¹⁷ The narrative juxtaposes the arrival of the newly crowned Henry VI in France with Joan’s capture, clearly inviting the reader to connect cause and effect.

The second version provides further details: “[On] the xxij day off May ayenst nyht, byfore the toun off Compayne ther was a woman takyn y-armed in the ffield with many other worthy capyteyns, the whiche was called Pucell de Dieux, a false witche, ffor thurh her power the dolphyn and alle oure adversariis trusted hooly to have conquerd ayen all ffrance, and never to have hadde the wors in place that she hadde ben Inne, ffor they helden hire amongst hem ffor a prophetesse and a worthy goddesse.”¹⁸ This second version anticipates Martyn’s 1615 *Historie* by crediting the “duke of Lanson” [Alençon] with the victory at Orléans. This is the earliest English example of the displacement of Joan from the scenes of her greatest triumphs, but it would not be the last. The chronicle makes clear that the young king had left his insular realm in reliable hands, because it then takes up the Duke of Gloucester’s defeat of Jack Sharpe’s rebellion back in England. It showcases the importance of the monarch’s presence in that part of France still held by the English and associates him favorably with the forces of godliness and good order that removed Joan from the field of battle and reduced her influence over the dauphin. Another manuscript rearranges the order in which it reports Henry’s landing at Calais

on St. George's Day (April 23) and Joan's capture (May 30), in effect transforming his arrival into a triumphal entry.¹⁹ McLaren suggests that such rearrangements were made deliberately, in order to bring attention to "causation and significance."²⁰ Yet another recension, dating from after the nullification, restores the chronology, suggesting no connection.²¹ As we shall see, after the nullification Joan's English reputation was radically altered.

These early city chronicles also deal circumspectly with Joan's attire, a matter that was later to dominate English considerations of her, and one that had been an integral part of the Rouen indictments and was emphasized in Henry's letter to Europe. She is a "woman" and armed, but not armed *like*, or dressed *as*, a man.²² The chroniclers make no direct connection between such transgressive behavior and their denomination of Joan as a witch. Yet they did demonstrate their interest in witchcraft trials, notably that of Eleanor Cobham, Duchess of Gloucester, in 1440.²³ Significantly, a version of the chronicle possibly dating from *after* the nullification refers to the capture and execution of "Pusylle," but does not name her as witch or sorceress. Rather, by reporting her death after its account of the beheadings of Jack Sharpe and his followers—including a woman—the chronicle implies, according to McLaren, that it was "simply one of a collection of deaths for heresy and rebellion."²⁴ Warnings of the consequences of rebellion against divine order had, of course, immediate echoes in the England of the 1460s. From those circumstances emerged a new way to denigrate Joan of Arc.

By the late 1450s, England had lost all the territory it had claimed or conquered in France save Calais, effectively ending the Hundred Years' War. Henry VI experienced his first mental breakdown in 1453 and did not reassume his duties for over a year.²⁵ He was forced into exile in

1461, the same year Charles VII died, removing from power both the uncle and nephew whose fates the Treaty of Troyes had sought to determine. Coincidentally, their respective fathers, Henry V and Charles VI, had died within weeks of each other in 1422. Both the new King of France, Louis XI, and Charles the Bold, who became Duke of Burgundy in 1467, had a stake in the outcome of England's internal power struggle. Duke Charles supported the Yorkist Edward IV's renewed claim to the French throne, while King Louis supported the troubled Lancastrians. This proxy dispute certainly contributed what Edward Meek describes as the "frosty" relations between the nations in the early 1460s.²⁶

Just as Charles VII's crown had been defended by a Frenchwoman in his time of adversity, so was Henry VI's—by Queen Margaret of Anjou, who, like Joan of Arc, hailed from Lorraine. Like Catherine of Valois's marriage to Henry V, Margaret's marriage was another attempt to reconcile the "contending kingdoms." After Henry's capture by Yorkist forces in 1460, she became the effective leader of the Lancastrians. Writing in 1611, John Speed called her the "true head and life of the contrary part."²⁷ However, amid the tumult of the events of 1460 and 1461 came allegations impugning Margaret's chastity and the legitimacy of her son Edward.²⁸ This particular strategy for damaging the reputation and credibility of a woman warrior foreshadows attacks on Joan of Arc's purity. Henry's brief return to power ended with his murder in 1471 and his posthumous sanctification.²⁹ The Yorkist supremacy itself did not last long and ended with the defeat of Richard III by Henry Tudor in 1485. Ironically, by marrying Elizabeth of York, Henry VII in his turn attempted to finesse any future strife—the same hope ultimately unrealized by the marriages of Henry V and Henry VI.³⁰

In 1449 King Charles VII of France recaptured Rouen, where Joan of Arc's trial transcripts were housed, and the following year, for what appear to be purely political reasons, he initiated an inquiry into Joan's trial of condemnation. Association with the woman burned as a heretic had tainted the legitimacy of his reign. He also desired to repair his relationship with the papacy, damaged as a result of the Pragmatic Sanction of 1438, which appointed a French ecclesiastical council that in some ways superseded papal authority.³¹ The nullification hearing was framed as an examination both of imperfect procedure and of personal malefaction on the part of Bishop Pierre Cauchon, as well as a response to a petition by Isabelle Romée for the restitution of her daughter's and her family's *fama* or good name—an important value in fifteenth-century France, especially, one assumes, for a family newly elevated to the nobility.³² As well, incorporating frequent suggestions of English remorse into the transcripts was a useful tactic in removing additional stigma from Charles, who apparently never even secretly offered to negotiate a ransom, exchange, or escape for Joan.³³ Since Henry VI still upheld his claim to the French throne, it was in England's interest to keep alive such guilt by association. As news of the nullification was disseminated, there came increasingly categorical accusations that the English had stacked the deck against Joan. Craig Taylor reads the nullification testimony as specifically “blaming the English for exerting pressure to secure the death of Joan, and arguing that they had been frightened into cooperating with such a manifestly unjust action. In short, the primary goal of the nullification inquiry may not have been to restore the reputation of the Pucelle but to expunge the legacy of collaboration with the English and to give added substance to her dream of a united France.”³⁴ Around 1459, Pope Pius II opined, “It is possible that the English, who had

been vanquished by her in so many battles, never regarded themselves as entirely safe with the virgin alive, even though she was a prisoner, and that they feared that she might escape or work some magic and therefore sought an excuse for her death.”³⁵ The Burgundian chronicler Georges Chastellain, writing in the second half of the century, declared the trial to have been conducted “well and justly,”³⁶ but Martial d’Auvergne, who wrote a verse account of Charles’ reign, declared the original judges “were biased.” In his opinion, the original sentence was “iniquitous, abusive, defective, and she was condemned wrongly by very suspect judges.”³⁷

After Joan’s trial had been declared iniquitous and her judges biased, and after the Yorkist Edward IV had established himself as king, an original defense of English magnanimity in the case appeared, supplementing the arguments for the justice of the trial in Henry VI’s letter to Europe. The London chronicle was not the only source of fifteenth-century English history. The so-called *Brut*, a history of England from its legendary origins begun during the reign of Edward I (1272-1307) and written originally in Anglo-Norman, was, according to Lister Matheson, “the most popular secular work of the Middle Ages in England.”³⁸ By the fourteenth century, it was translated into Middle English, and although many manuscript versions end with the reign of Edward III or Henry V, numerous continuations during the fifteenth century added material from the reign of Henry VI.³⁹ The story of Joan of Arc in one late continuation of the *Brut* prefigures the construction of Shakespeare’s whorish witch, conjuring the legend of her purported pregnancy seemingly, yet purposefully, out of thin air. Once Joan was condemned, it tells us, “she said that she was with childe, wherby she was respited A while; but in conclusion it was found that she was not with child, and then she was brent in Roane.”⁴⁰ Whether or not the

printer William Caxton was responsible for inventing this calumny, as Matheson and others have suggested, his printed compilation, *The Cronycles of Englonde* (1480) largely taken from the *Brut*, assured that it would be widely disseminated.⁴¹

As we have seen, after the nullification of Joan's conviction for heresy, there were ample political reasons for the English to rework the Maid's role in their history. Earlier in the century, it was enough to categorize her as a witch. However, after the verdict that had condemned her was nullified in 1456, the question of Joan's divine inspiration was no longer moot. From an English point of view, Joan's credibility had to be undermined. The most obvious way to demystify a heaven-sent virgin would be to show her to be promiscuous, the same tactic used to defame Margaret of Anjou. Even better to have her deny her virginity out of her own mouth. In its invention of a pseudo-pregnancy for the Maid, the *Brut* evokes English criminal law to show her sentence was neither precipitous nor arbitrary. At the same time, the *Brut* as well as some of the earlier narratives, consciously or not, also reflects a tradition of writing about women warriors.⁴²

Although the earliest chronicles have been scrutinized for any hints of English opinion about Joan, her appearance as a military leader who is also a potentially fertile female, despite her vow of virginity, has been overlooked. Once Joan of Arc enters the English historical stream, she becomes part of a narrative including several other women warriors who led men in battle.⁴³ Unlike Joan, they are generally high-ranking women and mothers, notably Ælfleda of Mercia (d. 918), the daughter of King Alfred, and the Empress Maud (d. 1167), the daughter of Henry I.⁴⁴ It is instructive to compare how early chroniclers of English history present these leaders with how

later ones situate Joan of Arc. The women's reproductive decisions and "masculine" behavior weigh heavily in the balance of chroniclers' evaluations of them, as did Joan's vow of virginity and her preference for men's clothing. Consistent in all eras is an unwillingness to uncouple a woman's leadership from her identity as a sexual being.

Medieval chroniclers' representation of women in military capacities varied considerably. In general, the seven extant manuscripts of *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, begun in the reign of King Alfred (reigned 871-99) report Ælfleda's activities following her husband Æthelred's death in 911 as part of a given year's important events: building fortresses, occupying Derby, and both sending out and leading military expeditions. In the year of her own death, 918, the *Chronicle* eulogized her as having ruled the Mercians "for eight years . . . with just authority," suggesting, as does her epithet "Lady of the Mercians," that she wielded power independent of her brother, King Edward the Elder, or of her husband. Yet another manuscript merely notes without comment that she died in that year.⁴⁵

Some time after the Norman Conquest, Anglo-Norman historian Henry of Huntingdon following the method of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, provides a year-by-year itemization of Ælfleda's political and military accomplishments. His language suggests he accepts her as a ruler in her own right; she ruled (*regebat*) for her infirm "father" (he confuses Alfred for Æthelred, her husband), and he consistently terms her *domina Merce*. In fact, Huntingdon writes, "Some call her not only lady, or queen, but even king." Ultimately, however, Huntingdon defines her valor as a masculine trait, eulogizing her in Latin verses as "O mighty Æthelflæd! O virgin, the dread of men [terror virgo virorum], conqueror of nature, worthy of a man's name! Nature made you a

girl, so you would be more illustrious; your prowess made you acquire the name of man.”⁴⁶ In the twelfth century, as well, chroniclers emphasized Ælfleda’s marital chastity even before her widowhood. The monkish historian William of Malmesbury states, “She was a woman of great determination who, after having difficulties with the birth of her first, or rather her only, child, abhorred her husband’s embraces ever after.” Calling her a “virago,” he adds, “It would be hard to say whether it was luck or character that made a woman such a tower of strength for the men of her own side and such a terror to the rest.”⁴⁷

As with Ælfleda, so with the Empress Maud, whose first husband was the Holy Roman Emperor, Henry V. Daughter of Henry I of England and at one point named as his heir, she went to war in 1139 to claim the English throne from Stephen of Blois, Henry’s cousin, against the opposition of most of the English nobility. Chroniclers both praised and damned her behavior based on their gender-driven expectations.⁴⁸ Equating her forthrightness with unfemininity, abbot William of Newburgh declared that both nobles and citizens were alienated by the empress’s “intolerable feminine arrogance.”⁴⁹ An account of King Stephen’s reign, *The Acts of Stephen*, goes further: “She at once put on an extremely arrogant demeanour instead of the modest gait and bearing proper to the gentle sex, began to walk and speak and do all things more stiffly and more haughtily than she had been wont, to such a point that soon, in the capital of the land subject to her, she actually made herself queen of all England and gloried in being so called.”⁵⁰ However, William of Malmesbury praises Maud as “unmindful of her sex and a worthy rival of the Amazons of old,” who “led into battle, woman as she was, the columns of men clad in mail.”⁵¹ He admiringly calls her “virago.”⁵²

In her study of medieval women warriors, Megan McLaughlin observes that, in the Middle Ages, an increasing intolerance of unwomanly behavior and the professionalization of the military combined to increase the possibility of woman warriors being viewed as not only “anomalous,” as she says, but threatening. She writes “From the late eleventh century on, a variety of sanctions were directed at women who participated in warfare, sanctions ranging from restrictive legislation to ridicule to charges of sexual misconduct or even witchcraft.” She provides the example of Richilde of Hainault, who acted as regent of Flanders in the early eleventh century. A contemporary account of the battle of Cassel (1070) merely reports Richilde of Hainaut’s presence, while two hundred years later, her role was, in McLaughlin’s words, “to throw ‘magic powder’ on the opposing army.”⁵³ The association of a woman warrior with unnatural magic clearly did not originate in the career of Joan of Arc. Focusing on medieval queenship, Pauline Stafford also traces the effects of increasing misogyny and “gender definition that stressed the public, military man” on complicating the picture drawn by twelfth century and later chroniclers of those whom William of Malmesbury had praised as viragos.⁵⁴ Although warfare was always assumed to be the domain of men, these early chroniclers did not overlook women who fought, even as they unsexed them or presented them as agents of men. Joan of Arc, as we shall see, was also sometimes accused of being the tool of powerful men, while her virginity became the locus of her authenticity.

Historically, viragos were portrayed as women even if praised for acting like men. They were especially praiseworthy if they tempered their sexuality or fertility. Nancy Huston argues that “the idea that the loss of virginity makes women vulnerable, or that motherhood deprives

them of their capacity to fight, is another proof of the specifically human nature of war.”⁵⁵ An exception was the Amazon woman who might give birth but who also might remain a virgin, such as Homer’s Penthesilea. Classical and medieval anxieties do seem to coalesce in the late fifteenth-century *Brut*. While, at least according to William of Malmesbury, chastity could be seen as favorable to a married woman’s martial career and reputation, a “pucelle de dieu” could afford no hint of sexuality, except to eschew it.⁵⁶ Not only did the historical Joan of Arc testify that she had (secretly) avowed her virginity to God around the time of puberty,⁵⁷ Jean d’Alençon recalled her intolerance for the usual camp followers in her army.⁵⁸

Thus, in the late fifteenth century, the *Brut*’s declaration that after being condemned, “she said that she was with child, whereupon she was spared a little while, but in conclusion it was found that she was not with child, and then she was burned,” is carefully framed to lend verisimilitude to calumny. Having lost her virginity, Joan lost her protection, as the sixteenth-century Scots historian Hector Boece makes explicit: “Some say that as long as she kept her virginity inviolate, no adverse fortune befell her. But after her unchastity contaminated her, as I have said, evil betrayed her.”⁵⁹ Joan herself was reported to have said that she was being harassed, possibly physically assaulted, if not actually raped, while in prison.⁶⁰ Nancy Bradley Warren reads Joan’s and others’ suggestive testimony about such threats as “ample grounds for Caxton’s mention of a possible pregnancy (albeit not a pregnancy plea)” based on contemporary English prison conditions, including males guarding women and the mixing of the sexes.⁶¹ Aside from reflecting current conditions, however, the invention of Joan’s pregnancy plea defended the English decision to have her executed.

If a woman in an English prison had been sentenced to die yet claimed to be pregnant, then she had legal recourse. The allowed custom of “pleading the belly” (*de ventre inspiciendo*) is recorded in English writs from at least the thirteenth century.⁶² In many instances, the plea hinged on questions of inheritance, not criminality, but a woman sentenced to death could make such a plea.⁶³ If such a writ were granted, the woman making this claim would be physically examined by a respectable group of women, commonly known as a “jury of matrons.”⁶⁴ The purpose was to protect the unborn child, but the mere fact of pregnancy was not sufficient to delay punishment in the case of a capital indictment. Even for a delay in the execution of a woman’s sentence (*in retardationem executionis*), the fetus must have begun to move. According to William Blackstone, if the matrons find the woman

quick with child (for, barely, *with child*, unless it be alive in the womb, is not sufficient) execution shall be staid generally till the next session; and so from session to session, till either she is delivered, or proves by the course of nature not to have been with child at all. But if she once hath had the benefit of this reprieve, and been delivered, and afterwards becomes pregnant again, she shall not be entitled to the benefit of a farther respite for that cause. For she may now be executed before the child is quick in the womb; and shall not, by her own incontinence, evade the sentence of justice.⁶⁵

Records for at least half a dozen cases from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries attest to the consistency of this procedure.⁶⁶ Fifteenth-century records of similar pleas are scant but show that the law had not changed. Katherine Newport was found guilty of larceny in the north of England in 1468 and condemned to death. Her pregnancy being proved, she was sent to prison instead.⁶⁷

In 1488, one Elizabeth Thomson of London was “convicted of robbery, pleaded pregnancy and used the respite to purchase a pardon.”⁶⁸ As Richard J. Sims reminds us, “in the medieval world, . . . expectancy would do nothing more than delay the inevitable and, as a result, few women would have feigned pregnancy,”⁶⁹ as Joan of Arc was alleged to have done. This is not to argue that in writing his account of the reign of Henry VI, Caxton was inspired by any particular case. However, he had found a way both to impugn the Maid’s character and to promote the legality of her execution under *English* law. Indeed, albeit for a later period and in a slightly different context, Frances Dolan argues that “to the extent that printed texts refer to women’s attempts to plead the belly, they usually do so in order to discredit the woman.”⁷⁰ In short, the *Brut* represents Joan as a woman tried under English criminal law (not the Inquisition), resorting to a legal and time-tested strategy for extending her life, even if her pregnancy were disproved. The conclusion we are to draw is that the English treated her fairly and justly in granting her this respite.

The emphasis on the justice of English law becomes an emphasis on Joan’s wickedness in the revised edition of Raphael Holinshed’s *Chronicles* (1587), one of the texts that formed the basis of Shakespeare’s *I Henry VI*—which portrayed Joan Puzel as a serial fornicator. Holinshed tell us Joan “stake [scrupled] not (though the shift were shamefull) to confesse hir self a strumpet, and (unmarried as she was) to be with child. For triall, the lord regents lenitie [leniency] gave hir nine moneths staie, at the end whereof she found herein as false as wicked in the rest.”⁷¹ The popularity of the *Brut* as promulgated in editions of Caxton and his successor printers doubtless contributed much not only to the perception that Joan of Arc’s reputation in England

throughout the sixteenth century was unremittingly hostile, but as Anke Bernau argues, that it was “expressed in a contestation of her virginity” even among those writers who do not repeat the tale of her pregnancy.⁷²

The historian Hector Boece (or Boethius)’s *Scotorum Historiae*, or *History of Scotland* (1526) illustrates this contestation. As we have seen, Boece suggests a connection between Joan’s execution and her unchastity based on hearsay. Boece does not offer an explanation as to how Joan might have been defiled. Two versions of a translation by the poet John Bellenden, commissioned by James V of Scotland, differ substantially on these lines: a manuscript (Pierpont Morgan Library ms. M.527) and the first printed edition of 1536.⁷³ The manuscript follows Boece closely: “It is sayd, sa lang as scho kepitt hir virginite scho was victorious in every batall, but ony experience of fortoun adversair, and fra scho was corruppit and tynt hir chaistite, scho fell in all thir inconvenientis afoir rehersitt.”⁷⁴ The printed edition eliminates the qualification “some say” but more importantly, states that Joan herself was aware of the protective power of her virginity: “Scho confessit, schortlie afore her deith, sa lang as scho keippit hir virginite, scho wes victorius in every battall, but only experience of evill fortoun; and fra scho wes corruppit, scho wes maid sone pray to hir ennimes.”⁷⁵ Ryoko Harikae points out that not only did Bellenden continuously revise his work before it was printed, but in doing so, he also consulted sources other than Boece. She notes that this occurs particularly in book 16 (which ends with Joan of Arc), where, under the influence of humanistic historiography, he strove more than in the earlier books to “provide useful moral or political lessons and models for readers.”⁷⁶ Perhaps Boece’s more direct accusation of Joan’s “sorcery and incantations” and their consequences was

intended as a moral lesson. (Such negative Scottish opinions of Joan of Arc are a little surprising. A hundred years earlier, the Scots had strongly supported their French allies, incurring devastating losses of life at the Battle of Verneil [1424] and elsewhere.)⁷⁷ The link between Joan's virginity and her ill fortune was widely published: Boece's *Scotorum Historiae* was printed four times in the sixteenth century and Bellenden's translation thrice. The publication of so many editions suggests that "it was read all over north-west Europe" and "written as much for a European audience as for a purely Scottish one," according to Nicola Royan in her comparative study of the two texts.⁷⁸ Both Holinshed and Richard Baker cite Boece as a source for their later chronicles.

The tradition of chronicle writing in England essentially died out by the seventeenth century, with the notable exception of Sir Richard Baker's 1635 *Chronicle of the Kings of England*,⁷⁹ which became a standard popular work of history—derided, but updated and reprinted well into the eighteenth century. Despite the comprehensiveness of Holinshed and John Speed to whom I will return, Baker unselfconsciously sought to produce an encyclopedic compilation of available chronicles to date, so that, in his own words, so "if all other Chronicles should be lost, yet this onely would be sufficient to informe Posterity of all passages memorable or worthy to be knowne, which of any other generall Chronicle, cannot perhaps be said" (A2v). Baker's work appealed to ordinary readers and was widely disseminated, so that, like the *Brut*, it serves as an important conduit for the English narrative of Joan of Arc. From 1643 to 1733, it was reprinted almost a dozen times, including as an abridgement and with continuations to the reign of Charles II, and was even translated into Dutch. Such contemporary historians as D.R.

Woolf praise its “elegant summary of all earlier chronicles,”⁸⁰ while Martine Brownley notes that “Baker’s longterm popularity with the general reader is particularly significant in view of the uniformly negative response to his work by educated men.”⁸¹ It was popular by virtue of his inclusion of vivid details, natural “wonders” such as dragons, and gossip. In his “Epistle to the Reader,” Baker admits as much: “Where many have written the Reignes of some of our Kings, excellently as in the way of History, yet I may say they have not done it so well in the way of Chronicle; For whilst they insist wholly upon matters of State, they wholly omit meaner Accidents, which yet are Materials as proper for a Chronicle, as the other” (A2). Moreover, he acknowledges that at times he “may seeme rather to transcribe than to write,” copying some passages verbatim. Yet Baker was not wholly indiscriminate in his use of sources. In writing of James I’s reign, for example, he omits “some Passages of small moment” because “for want of knowing the particulars, I dare not venture upon making the Relation: which if some men would have done, the truth of our Chronicles should not have been mingled with so many falsities” (2:145). Overall, his comprehensiveness made the *Chronicle* precisely the kind of work that serious amateur historians loved to consult.⁸² As such, it would be in Baker that many readers could find a lively and detailed narrative of Joan of Arc, printed in legible roman typeface and in an easy prose style.

Baker’s account of Joan of Arc, however, is not entirely straightforward. Whether so intent on comprehensiveness that he hesitated to abridge or edit his sources lest he overlook some detail, or as a result of the challenge of conveying simultaneous events in sequence as had Fabian and Rastell, as we shall see, or with some purpose to relegate Joan to the margins, Baker,

like his fifteenth-century predecessors, rearranges the chronology of events that involved the Maid. He also eliminates any mention of Joan's cross-dressing. His praise for earlier viragos is tempered. While acknowledging that some of her brother's "glory . . . must be imparted to his sister *Elflede*," who "made choyce to follow the warres," he also writes that she was not acting on her own but "assisting her brother both against the *Welch*, and against the *Danes*" (1:12). Similarly, he devalues Empress Maud's valor, for her escape from the siege of Oxford, "left such an impression of feare upon her, that she never after had any mind to appeare upon this stage of Warre, but left the prosecution of it to her Sonne Henry" (1:64).

Given his reluctance to allow that women could take autonomous action in war, perhaps it is not surprising that Baker, as had William Martyn, makes Jean, duc d'Alençon, not Joan of Arc, the hero of Orléans: "The Duke of Alanson . . . furnished the Towe with fresh Forces and Provision; which put such spirits into the Citizens, that they made a sally out, slew six hundred English, and adventured upon the Bastile, where the Lord Talbot commanded, who repelled them with great slaughter of their men; but yet the next day the Earle of Suffolk gave over his siege, and dispersed his Army into their Garrisons" (2:66). Indeed, it was Jean (later styled Dunois), the so-called "Bastard of Orléans," who was in charge of the defense of the city, not Jean, duc d'Alençon, but whatever role Joan of Arc played, she was present and in the thick of battle during the raising of the siege, a fact that Baker, like some of his sources, chooses to understate.

With the "wheele of Fortune" turning in favor of the French, Baker narrates the victories led by Alençon in early summer 1429—Jargeau and Meun—and Charles's coronation. Only after Baker interrupts matters in France to mention the coronation of Henry in England does he

add: “About this time, in France, a strange Impostor ariseth; a maid called la Pucelle, taking upon her to be sent from God, for the good of France, and to expell the English: and some good indeed she did, for by her subtle working, the King was received into Champaigne, and many Townes were rendered to him” (2:67).⁸³ This separation of events out of chronology follows a pattern established in the London chronicle with a similar effect, suggesting that Henry VI’s arrival in Calais is a triumphal entry, associating the boy monarch with Joan’s capture, but not her execution, which is not mentioned earlier. In Baker’s *Chronicle*, Joan’s real influence in leading Charles to Reims for the sacring that would transform him from dauphin to king is cleverly undercut by diverting attention to her “subtle working” on the road to, but not *into* Reims. According to Baker, although Charles’s subsequent attempt to break the alliance between Bedford and Burgundy failed, the Regent’s absence from Paris persuaded him to besiege it.⁸⁴ The remainder of her career is summarily dismissed. Captured after having earlier “caused an English Captaines head to be cut off, because he would not humble himselfe to her upon his knee,” Joan was tried “as a Sorceresse, and deceiver of the King and his subjects [and] (after many delays of promise to discover secret practises, and lastly of her feigning to bee with childe) publicly burnt at Roan” (2:68).⁸⁵

Baker followed in the tradition of the fifteenth-century English historians who dealt with Joan of Arc in various ways: from ignoring her, displacing her exploits, or making her an exemplar of rebellion, to impugning the virginity central to her authenticity. They also reflect continued English hopes for regaining a tangible foothold on the Continent and a reasserted claim to the French throne during periods of truce. It is, as Ellen Caldwell writes, “difficult to

overestimate the importance of the Hundred Years War in England's conception of itself as a nation,"⁸⁶ and, thus, how its historians presented their country to Europe. During the early sixteenth century, the combination of regnal instability (Henry VII himself was threatened with uprisings more than once) with the loss of all its French possessions save Calais had so undermined English self-image that humanist historians, according to Nicola Royan, had to write "history that celebrates the realm to which [the historian is] attached,"⁸⁷ so that it will be viewed as equal to its international counterparts.

From 1475, when Edward IV signed the Truce of Picquigny, until 1513, when Henry VIII sailed to invade France, English historians had the unusual opportunity to portray recent history against a backdrop of peace, not war, with France, even as Henry VII continued to uphold his claim to the French crown until his death in 1509.⁸⁸ Events during and after the reign of his son offered even more compelling reasons for redrafting the English past, which was marked by the king's three attempts to wrest back French territory, in 1513-14, 1521-26, and 1544. With Henry VIII's death, the swift succession of Protestant Edward, Catholic Mary, and Elizabeth I provided a dizzying reversal of alliances and therefore new contexts for evaluating the French Catholic Maid. Untangled from the triangulation with France and Burgundy, England found two new legs to stand with, briefly placing its hopes in Spain and the papacy to offset France. The English Reformation added a new imperative to historical writing: to demonstrate England's distance from and independence of Catholicism and the papacy.⁸⁹ In his study of the printing history of Robert Fabyan's *New Chronicles* (1516), David Womersley argues that each subsequent reprinting reflects how the contemporary state of Reformation or reaction was

“infus[ing] religious ideology into English historiography.”⁹⁰ For this reason, Anke Bernau reminds us, John Foxe, in his *Booke of Martyrs* (1563), links “saintliness and Englishness,” and Edward Hall, in his *Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Famelies of Lancastre & Yorke* (1548) contrasts the “effeminate” French and the manly English.⁹¹ Not surprisingly as we shall see, vituperation was Hall’s solution to the enigma of a Catholic, French, and female warrior such as Joan of Arc, when viewed from the perspective of a reformed religion that on the one hand encouraged female piety, but on the other hand circumscribed her role to wife and mother. In England, after the dissolution of the monasteries under Henry VIII, a woman such as Joan of Arc no longer had recourse to cloistered communities where she could live with others who eschewed marriage. Throughout the early modern period, humanist methodology, post-Reformation politics, and the influence both of the “woman question” and fascination with witchcraft are reflected in English accounts of Joan of Arc.⁹²

These changes in the audience and purpose of English history during the Tudor period coincided with the development of the so-called “new historiography,” or, more broadly speaking, European Renaissance historiography in general.⁹³ As described by Matti Rissanen, such narratives considered the “concept of history as a coherent whole—not just as a series of isolated events; a more critical attitude towards sources; an analysis of cause and effect and an idea of the didactic value of history; a new interest in human character as an influence on the course of events; and, last but not least, the inclusion of argument in history—the use of history writing, for instance, to serve political purposes.”⁹⁴ For example, Amos Lee Laine has written, once the Hundred Years’ War had ended, “it [was] difficult to find an objective English

viewpoint about contributions of the Normans [French] to the elements of English society thought to be unique.”⁹⁵ With regard to the Tudor kingdom specifically, historians focused more on accuracy derived from multiple sources than on an encyclopedic inclusiveness that did not discriminate among them.⁹⁶

What effect had shifts in diplomacy, internal politics, and historical methodology on narratives of Joan of Arc during the Tudor era and beyond? According to Nicola Royan, some pre-Reformation English and Scottish historians—Robert Fabyan, Polydore Vergil, and Hector Boece—were challenged by “fitting Jeanne into a recognisable narrative frame, for she breaks so many rules.”⁹⁷ The three write from different perspectives: the Englishman Fabyan towards the end of Henry VII’s reign; the Italian Vergil well into the reign of Henry VIII; and Boece as a Scotsman, but without the sympathy expected from a native of a country long allied with the French. But it is not just the narrative frame that stymied humanist historians; it was the problem of identifying a rhetorical stance that would, as Denis Hay writes in his study of Vergil, “justify the Tudors to the scholars of Europe,”⁹⁸ in part by downplaying the execution of Joan of Arc. It is in this context that later apologists have sought glimmerings of a shift in English opinion towards the Maid.

Early in the reign of Henry VIII, Robert Fabyan states his goal to make the history of England an international one in the “Prologus” to his *New Chronicles*:

Nat for any pompe, or yet for great mede,

This werke I have taken on hande to compyle;

But of cause oonly for that I wolde sprede

The famous honour of this Fertyle Ile,
 That hath contynued, by many a longe whyle,
 In excellent honour, with many a royall guyde,
 Of whom the dedes have sprong to the worlde wyde.⁹⁹

Fabyan separates the histories of England and France, so that the overlapping reigns of their respective kings often appear many pages apart and must perforce be read as fragments of a whole.¹⁰⁰ His method results in a curious division in his accounts of Joan. He describes her childhood and mission at length under the rubric of Charles VII, while his account of her military career and eventual execution falls under the reign of Henry VI. For both, he refers copiously to the French historian Robert Gaguin's *Compendium de origine et gestis Francorum*, published in Paris in 1504, which drew on manuscripts of both of Joan's trials and thus provided English writers with new primary material.¹⁰¹

Because Fabyan's organization of material is chronological by reign, we read about Henry VI's accession before that of Charles VII. Fabyan dates the former from September 1, 1422 (Henry V died August 31) and the latter from "the moneth of October" that same year (Charles VI died October 21). Less than two months' difference results in a chronology that first mentions Joan near the height of her success (assuming the coronation of Charles as her apogee) in the account of the Battle of Patay, on June 18, which took place after the lifting of the siege of Orléans and proved an even more humiliating defeat for the English: "After some wryters it was for to strengthe and replenysshe certayne holdes, that wekyd [weakened] by reason of a conflut [conflict] that the Englysshmen had with the Frenshmen, at the which the lord Talbot was taken

prysoner, and the lorde Scalys, with many other, to the nombre of .iii.M. Englysshemen, were slayne and taken. But after the oppinyon of the Frenshe Cronycle, this victory shulde be o[b]tyened by Jane or Johane, callyd in Frenshe la Puzele de Dieu, in the .ix. yere of this kynge (599).”¹⁰² Fabyan’s skeptical acceptance of the role of Joan of Arc marks what must be a nationalistic, not gender, bias, for he had written admiringly and at length about Ælfleda, the Lady of the Mercians, clearly positioning her as a military leader of men (117). More than once, he criticizes “Robert Gagwyne, whiche levyth no thyng out of his boke that may sounde to the avauncement of the Frenshe nacyon” (415).

Although Fabyan dates English misfortunes from the death of Salisbury in Orléans in 1428, he does not further refer to the French raising of the siege. Like the London chronicle a century before him, Fabyan rearranges his narrative so that the coronation of Henry VI and his entry into Calais precede Joan’s initial victories: “In this tyme and season that the kynge lay thus at Calays, many skyrmisshes were foughten atwene the Englisshmen & the Frenshmen in dyvers parties of Fraunce; and greatly the Frenshemen prevayled by the helpe of a woman, whiche they, as before is touched, named the Mayden of God” (601). He provides a clear and indeed compendious narrative of Joan’s early history, parentage, and “discovery” of the dauphin in hiding, not a close translation of Gaguin. He does not scoff at Joan’s reported claims of “Goddys purveyaunce.” He repeats, only to repudiate as “darke and fantastycall,” the story of Joan finding her sword at Ste-Catherine-de-Fierbois by divine revelation, as Gaguin had written.¹⁰³ This may be the first information from the trial testimony to appear in English. While acknowledging that his author “affermyth” that “she by hyr provydence causyd the sayde Charlys, as kynge of

Fraunce, to be crownyd at Raynys” in 1429, he adds that “nouthur the Frensh Cronycle, nor other whiche I have [seen] testyfyeth that, but affermyne that he was not crowned duryng the lyfe of the duke of Bedforde” (642).¹⁰⁴ This unsubstantiated claim seems an attempt to bolster the Regent’s reputation as well as to distance Joan from the coronation. After all, at the time of Fabyan’s writing, the Valois still ruled in France, in the person of Louis XII (reigned 1498-1515).

Fabyan’s integration of a French source with the English chronicle tradition results in a disjointed account of the Maid’s career. For neither king’s reign does he describe her role in the siege of Orléans, ascribing the gradual loss of England’s French possessions to the death of Salisbury during the siege. He further diminishes Joan’s mythic reputation by choosing to term her “woman,” “wenche,” and “mayden,” not “witch,” “sorceress,” or “prophetess.”¹⁰⁵ He condemns Joan for contravening divine order in crowning Charles VII: “Almyghty God, which for a season sufferyth suche sorcery and deuelysshe wayes to prospere & reygne” (642) permitted Joan to be captured and executed. His phrase “suche sorcery and develysshe wayes” refers not to the identification of the hidden dauphin, or to the miraculous discovery of the sword of St. Catherine, or to the raising of the siege of Orléans, or the humiliation of Patay. It refers explicitly to the coronation. Therefore, despite providing some accurate information about Joan’s early life and career, Fabyan continues a major theme from the London chronicle. While associating Joan with “sorcery,” he never names her witch. In the section on Henry VI, he repeats the tale of her pregnancy without comment, and without suggesting that she was otherwise promiscuous. His *New Chronicles* thus offers a new way of integrating Joan into

English history; along with Polydore Vergil's *Anglica Historia*, Fabyan's work influenced historical writers for the next century.

Yet while Vergil's *Historia* was still in manuscript, John Rastell compiled and printed his *Pastyme of Pleasure* in 1529 based chiefly on Fabyan. Although Rastell was associated by marriage with the humanist Thomas More and his circle, his approach does not much reflect the influence of humanism on the writing of history. It is an old-fashioned work. The *Pastyme* is organized even more ambitiously than Fabyan's history to present the separate histories of England, France, Northern Europe, the Holy Roman Empire, and the Papacy simultaneously, in parallel rows on each page.¹⁰⁶ Rastell seems fairly uninterested in Joan of Arc. Like Fabyan, he attributes all English misfortunes to the death of Salisbury "for after his dethe, / the englysshemen lost euer in Fraunce theyr possessyons / moche more than they wanne" [E3r]. Immediately following, under the rubric "Charles," we read that "he had great warre with the englysshemen / to whose helpe there came a mayde of Fraunce / whome the frenchemen called la pusell de dieu / but she was take and brent by the englysshemen."¹⁰⁷ His grammar—"whome the frenchmen called le pusell de dieu / *but* she was taken and brent" suggests either that she was not a "pusell de dieu" for, presumably, the English could not have captured and burnt her if she were really acting under God's protection and guidance, or that the English were in the wrong to doubt her heavenly inspiration.

By calling Joan "pusell de dieu" and "mayde of god" and by agreeing that she indeed played a military role in defeating the English, Rastell has been credited as the first English historian to present a neutral if not actually favorable view of the Maid.¹⁰⁸ But he took these

epithets from Fabyan. He also omits most of Fabyan's section on her birth and background, and omits the finding of the sword at St. Catherine de Fierbois, which Fabyan found so "darke and fantastycall." He does not refer to her "sorcery and develyshe wayes," even though his modern editor notes his "belief in superstitions, omens, and devils."¹⁰⁹ He says nothing about male clothing, only that the French "gatte her armour." There is no hint of sexual misconduct, despite his dependence on Fabyan and possible knowledge of Vergil in manuscript.¹¹⁰ He repeats without reservation Fabyan's own skepticism about the date of Charles's coronation, slightly changing the wording from Fabyan's "he was not crowned durynge the lyfe of the duke of Bedford" to "he was neuer crowned tyll after the dethe of the duke of Bedforde." This barebones approach is not unique to Rastell's account of Joan. He is equally economical and noncommittal when writing about earlier women leaders such as Ælfleda and Maud. In all these cases, Rastell's method seems to eschew sensationalism and to eliminate any individualizing details that might increase his audience's interest in anomalous situations. He neutralizes Fabyan's commentary on Joan by editing it, but is a lack of criticism to be read as approbation?

Unlike Fabyan and Rastell, the Italian humanist Polydore Vergil (c.1470-1555) spent the better part of three decades researching and writing his *Anglica Historia*. In 1502, under the sponsorship of his countryman Adriano Castelli, a favorite of Henry VII, Vergil traveled to England, where he resided until 1553.¹¹¹ Vergil had begun to study the history of his host country soon after his arrival, and around 1506, he related that "at the request of Henry VII . . . I wrote the deeds of his people and produced a historical work."¹¹² That diffidence belies his opinion that history "[redounds] as much to the glory of the author as to the usefulness of

posterity.”¹¹³ Even more than Fabian or Rastell, he attempted to view his sources carefully. He methodically consulted his medieval predecessors yet scorned the Latin annals as “bald, uncouth, chaotic and deceptive, so that they are read with distaste by the learned and by the unlearned they are scarcely to be understood.”¹¹⁴ Yet at the same time, as Denis Hay points out, he was willing to accept “the testimony of living tradition,” including “the French belief in the divine mission of Joan of Arc.”¹¹⁵

Vergil embeds his story of the Maid in the larger military and political context that interests him, as he does with another woman warrior, Ælfleda. The Lady of Mercia, he writes, “didde noe lesse upprightlie then wiselie administer the regiment a few yeares,”¹¹⁶ and his account of Empress Maud emphasizes her pragmatism.) His chronological integration of Henry VI’s and Charles VII’s reigns imparts a welcome coherence to the story of Joan of Arc. His discussion of the decade of the 1420s is rich and not unduly critical of Charles VII’s initial military leadership. He praises both the English preparations for the siege of Orléans and the inhabitants’ valor. But just as Fabian had done before him, he states unequivocally that after the death of Salisbury, “the English forrain affaires beganne to quaile; which infirmitie though the English nation, as a most sounde and strong body, did not feele at the first, yet afterward they suffered it as a pestilence and sicknes inwardly, by litle and litle decaying the strength: for immediatly after his death the fortune of warre altered.”¹¹⁷ Unlike the Scots historian Boece, writing at about the same time, Vergil does not link Joan’s downfall to her unchastity. He presents her plea of pregnancy as a claim on humanity, not law, writing that “the unhappie Maide, remembering, before execution done, what appertyened to humanitie, which naturally is

bredd in every one, fained herselfe to be with childe, to thende she might eyther move her enemies to compassion, eyther els cause them to appoynt some more milde punishment.” Indeed, he is highly critical of her execution:

This saide sentence thus pronounced was thought the hardest that ever had beene remembred, which could neyther be mollified nor mittigated by tract of time. Surely it was of some thought that this woman thus excited to martiall manly prowesse, for defence of her country, was woorthy favour, especially seeing there were many examples of mercie showed in such case, as that principally which Porsenna King of the Trurions hath left in memorie. For when as he, upon conclusion of peace with the Romanes, had receaved pledges, and amongst them Cloelia a virgin, who, conducting a company of others like, beguiled the watch, and amongst the middest of her enemies swam over Tiber and fledd to her owne people, notwithstanding that afterwarde she was by the league redelivered, yet he did not punish her, but with great commendation gave her her part of the pledges, and sent her home againe (38).

This passage is not in Vergil’s manuscript.¹¹⁸ Vergil’s comment that the sentence could not be “mitigated” is of course literally true, although it does not seem that the many mitigating statements of English remorse, as stated in the nullification transcripts, were available to him.

The Italian’s empathy for Joan of Arc was scorned by later English historians, notably in the 1587 edition of Holinshed’s *Chronicles*: “In this tale of Tillets is she further likened to Debora, Jahell, and Judith, and unto Romane Clelia compared by Polydor, that shames not somewhat also to carpe at hir judgments, and much pitieth hir paine” (172). What Jean du Tillet

had actually written in his monarchical history of France was in response to those French writers who thought Joan's achievements had been a ruse. He chides them, referring to Isaiah 59:1, for "having forgotten what is written about Deborah, Jael, and Judith, Behold, the Lord's hand is not shortened [unable to save]." ¹¹⁹ In the seventeenth century, the Italian historian Giovanni Francisco Biondi (Sir Francis Biondi) echoes Holinshed, in the words of his English translator Henry Carey: "I with *Polidorus* praise her as parallell to *Cloelia* since it so pleaseth him; but not as parallell to her in her actions. *Cloelia* fought not, fained not, did no harme to any: the Maid did hurt, and as much unto her selfe as others." ¹²⁰ Vergil in fact addresses the mercy of Porsenna towards the escaped hostage Cloelia as a model for the English, not Cloelia as a model for Joan of Arc. To be sure, the second edition of Holinshed is neither linguistically incompetent nor politically disingenuous; the reviser deliberately inserted this cavil.

Although Baker does not seem to have used them, French accounts of the Hundred Years' War and Joan of Arc had become increasingly known in England throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, some eventually translated and published there. Notable among those, and equally important as Gaguin's *Compendium*, was Jean de Serres's *Inventaire général de l'histoire de France*, translated into English by Edward Grimeston (1607), which became an important source for the cartographer John Speed's lengthy narrative of Joan's career in his *Historie of Great Britaine*. Unlike Vergil's carping about medieval chroniclers or Fabyan's dismissal of Gaguin, Grimeston admired de Serres because, as he writes in his address "To the Reader," he was

as free from affection and passion, as any one that ever treated of this subject. . . . And if

he hath not dilated at large the great attempts of Strangers in France, employed eyther for their Kings, or against them: he is not therefore to be blamed, nor to be held partiall. . . . You must consider, that he was a Frenchman: and although hee would not altogether smother and conceale those things, which might any way eclipse the glory of his Nation, least he should be taxed to have fayled in these two excellent vertues required in an Historiographer, Truth and Integritie without passion, yet happily he hath reported them as sparingly as he could.¹²¹

But Grimeston's own larger purpose was both patriotic and didactic, so that he also includes "the sundry Battailles woon by our kings of England against the French, and the worthie exploits of the English during their warres with France, whereby you may bee incited to the like resolutions upon the like occasions."¹²² This spirit of fair-mindedness was conveyed to, or shared by, John Speed, who drew extensively on Grimeston's translation of de Serres for his portrait of Joan of Arc.

Famous for his atlases, Speed has not received much praise for his history, yet it evinces methodologies born both of the humanists and of the antiquarians: selecting from among his sources; limiting marvels; and according to F.J. Levy, "judging kings on the basis of their ability to rule rather than on their morality, despite his belief in God's intervention in the world," for he "considered incompetent kingship a moral failing."¹²³ His proeme—"To the Learned and Lovers of Great Britain's Glory"—evokes a particular view of Britain, "this famous Empire." As far as Speed was concerned, Great Britain now enjoyed international cachet, for

that this our Countrey and subject of History deserveth the love of her Inhabitants, is

witnessed even by forraine writers themselves, who have termed it the Court of Queene Ceres, the Granary of the Westerne world, the fortunate Island, the Paradise of pleasure, and Garden of God. . . . Our Kings for valour and Sanctity, ranked with the worthiest in the world, and our Nations originals, conquests, and continuance, tried by the touch of the best humane testimonies, leave as fair a Lustre upon the same stone, as doth any other, and with any Nation may easily contend (saith Lanquet) both for antiquity and continuall inhabitants, from the first time that any of them can claime their Originals (A3).

It is tempting to find echoes of John of Gaunt's famous dying speech from Shakespeare's *Richard II* here.

Perhaps in part because he came to maturity during the reign of Elizabeth I (he was born in 1551/2), Speed's view of Joan of Arc is not based on conventional ideas about gender. Thus, he was not predisposed to subscribe to the view, then current among some French writers, that Joan of Arc was more mascot than martial maid. He understands that women may lead men into battle, and risk their own lives as well. He also shows that a woman can lead through tactical acumen, if not physical strength, for of Empress Maud he writes, "shee, a woman (whose sexe hath often deceived wise men) resolved once againe to overreach her foe by wit, whom shee could not by force" (495). He is flummoxed by Margaret of Anjou, however. He praises her "manly courage," adding that in the military defense of her husband, she "addeth stratageme, and wit to her force" (863). Yet he also writes that upon her marriage to Henry, "the mournfull tragedies of our poore Country began" (845).

Speed's view of Joan is also informed by his reading of Henry VI's reign as a providential tragedy ultimately attributable to a woman:

Never any Princes raigne since the Conquest did better deserve to bee described with a tragical Stile, and words of horror and sorrow, although the beginning (like the faire morning of a most tempestuous day) promised nothing more then a continuance of passed felicities. For the State of the English affaires was great and flourishing, England without tumult, the naturall fierce humors of her people consuming or exercising themselves in France, and France her selfe ... was at their devotion. There wanted nothing which might advance the worke begunn. Most noble and expert Leaders, as those which had beene fashioned in the Schoole of Warre, under the best Martiall-Master of that Age, the late Henry, armes full of veterant Souldiers, most of which were of skill sufficient to bee commanders themselves: their friends firme, no defect nor breach (by which dissipation might enter to the overthrow of the English greatnesse) as yet disclosing themselves. Wisdome, pietie, riches, forwardnesse at home, courage and like forwardnesse abroad. It is a fruitfull speculation to consider how God carrieth his part in the workes of men, alwaies justly, sometimes terribly, but never otherwise then to bring all worldly greatnesse and glory into due contempt and loathing, that the Soule may be erected to her Creator, and aspire to a Crowne celestiall (827).

This caution reminds his readers of the tragic future of the "fortunate island," a future in which Joan of Arc plays her own providential role, and whose short-term vanquishing of an internally contentious England was to be echoed—from Speed's point of view—in the utter destruction of

the Lancastrian dynasty at the hands that “manly” woman from Lorraine: Margaret of Anjou.

Speed takes most of his description of Joan from Grimeston. He grants the “martiall maid” a full measure of valor, but adds parenthetically “some have written that it was a practise or imposure” (833). He places her by implication either in an advisory, leadership position or in the midst of battle, as he does with Margaret. He cautions his readers, however, “Doe not rashly beleue Serres,” a French source, after all, just as Fabyan had denigrated Gaguin. “Our Writers”—*English* writers—sometimes tell a different story (834).¹²⁴ Although as Fabyan had done with Gaguin, Speed edits and critiques his principal French source; he mentions other works he consulted, not all English, including Vergil, Holinshed, Jean du Tillet and Paulus Aemelius.¹²⁵ When faced with de Serres’s emphasis on Bedford’s personal animus towards Joan, as well as the claim that the English Duke essentially bought off her examiners, Speed retreats to his English sources to depict the superiority of the English national character he had emphasized in his proeme. Grimeston, too, had called attention to “the worthie exploits of the English, during their warres with France” (“To the Reader”). Of Bedford, de Serres had written, “The unbridled passion of his deadly hatred conceived against this maiden as having ruined his affaires in France carried away his reason. And not being able to put her to death, as a prisoner of war, he deliberates to make her a prisoner of justice.” Grimeston’s translation is accurate, but he leaves out de Serres’s final sentence: “It was difficult to convert right into wrong, truth into falsehood” (731).¹²⁶

Speed recognizes that Joan reinvigorated the French. While Joan’s letter to the English before Orléans was “entertained by the English with laughter,” Speed wryly acknowledges, “to

some it may seeme more honourable to our Nation, that they were not to bee expelled by a humane power, but by a divine, extraordinarily revealing it selfe” (837). He continues, “Du Serres describes this Parragon in these words: Shee had a modest countenance, sweete, civile, and resolute, her discourse was temperate, reasonable, and retired, her actions cold, shewing great chastity without vanity, affectation, babling or courtly lightnesse. *Let us not dissemble what we find written* [emphasis added]: By her encouragements and conduct the English had Orleance pluckt out of their hopes” (824). After the coronation, he concedes, “shee might bee thought prophetically and fortunate.” But at Compiègne, “here the glory of Joan unfortunately ended” (835) and with it, her life.

Making Vergil’s analogy (that so upset Holinshed) suit his own ends, Speed concludes, “Clalia was saved by Porsenna; and it is not to be doubted but that the magnanimity of the English would have spared her, had they not found it necessary to deface the opinion which the French, even with superstition, had conceived of her.” As for Joan’s end, notwithstanding the French historians, “our Writers”—his marginal note here refers to the hostile Holinshed—“shew how the course of her life being legally examined by the Bishop of Beauois (in whose Diocesse shee was taken) and she thereupon for sorcerie, bloodshed, and unnaturall use of manlike apparell, and habiliments contrary to her Sexe, condemned to dye, was notwithstanding upon her solemne abjuring of such her lewde practises, pardoned her life, till againe convicted of perjurious relapsing, though acknowledging her self a strumpet, and fayning to be with child, she deservedly underwent that punishment which she sought to delay” (835). Speed pulls back only at the very end to justify his forebears’ verdict as legal and Joan’s own behavior as her downfall.

But he definitively diminishes Joan of Arc's importance in English history, as a factor in turning the tide of war, to be sure, but one less important than were the deleterious effects of Margaret of Anjou on England's own soil.

During the reign of Charles I, historians were eager to provide a new political perspective on their nation's history. They do not follow Speed's lead in granting Joan some valor. John Trussell, the antiquarian mayor of Winchester, brought Samuel Daniel's popular *Collection of the History of England* (1612), which had ended with the reign of Edward III, forward to the reign of Henry VII, publishing his *Continuation* in 1636, with subsequent reprintings in 1641, 1650, and 1685. In his address "To the Courteous Reader," Trussell stresses his exhaustive research: "I left no Chronicle of this land, that purse, or prayer could purchase or procure, unperused" (A3) and "examined, though not all, (yet without touch of Arrogance, I may speake it) the most and best, that have written of those times" (A3v-A4).¹²⁷ Following more in the tradition of the chroniclers than of the humanist historians, but echoing the Tudor historian Edward Hall in his disapproval of Joan of Arc's transgendered behavior, Trussell gives an entirely negative view of Joan of Arc,

that shee impostour Le pusill [,] who had bewitched the credulity of those times, and was for the more part esteemed as a prophetesse, and shee againe to give some colour to settle this opinion, did dare, and doe many things beyond the reach, modesty, & strength of a Woman, riding manlike astride, and in armour, making show of manhood, and giving forth in speeches, not without some ostentation, that shee was a messenger sent from God, to reconquer out of the hands of the English, whatsoever they had now in

possession there; By the subtile working of this Medean Virago, The French King was received into Champaigne (130).

Trussell's disapproval of the "Medean Virago"—a wonderful coinage—is centered on Joan's unwomanly behavior, not on the effects of her valor on the war. Furthermore, his Royalist sympathies are on display when he states that she was burned after "judiciall proceeding against her as a Sorceress, and deceiver of the King and his subjects, by her seeming show of sanctitie, and her inhumane cruelty, against the King of England and his subjects" (132). Joan of Arc offended against *both* kingdoms.

The epithets attached to Joan of Arc by English chroniclers and historians during the two centuries after her execution—from "witch" to "wench," "strumpet" to "mayden of God," "Martiall Maide" to "Medean Virago"—clearly demarcate the diversity of judgments on a woman whose brief but stunning military successes and execution clashed with the nation's postmedieval reconstruction of its history. Yet English writers realized they could not "dissemble what we find written" in the increasing number of French sources becoming available to them through print. Even as they record her condemnation as a "sorceress" or "witch," many make clear the political context that led to her execution. At the same time, as a woman, not merely a woman warrior, Joan became an exemplar for the religious and cultural literature of the *querelle des femmes* in England, as manifested in demonologies, defenses of women, and collections of curiosities, the subject of the next chapter.

Notes to Chapter 2

¹ J. Howell, *Epistolae Ho-Eliae*, 139-40.

² Evelyn, *Diary*, 137. Descriptions of the statue vary widely because it was at least twice destroyed and rebuilt. See Brun, “Le Premier Monument à Jeanne d’Arc,” 70-76 and Heimann, *Joan of Arc in French Art and Culture*, 7, 45, and Plate 4.

³ Brennan, ed., *Origins of the Grand Tour*, 83.

⁴ G.C. Moore Smith, *Gabriel Harvey’s Marginalia*, 90, 92, 96. The term “virago” is not so simple. Its English definition as “warrior” coexisted with a negative gender connotation from the third quarter of the fourteenth century, *OED* online edition, s.v. “virago.”

⁵ On English hostility to Joan, see Goy-Blanquet, “Shakespeare and Voltaire Set Fire to History,” 1-38.

⁶ Martyn, *Historie and Lives of Twentie Kings of England*, 221-3.

⁷ Vale, *Ancient Enemy*, 96.

⁸ Duparc, 1:454.

⁹ M-R. McLaren, *London Chronicles*, 85.

¹⁰ Waugh, “Joan of Arc in English Sources of the Fifteenth Century” 392. Clermont-Ferrand summarizes the chroniclers’ attitude toward Joan as “silence, absence, and demonization,” “Joan of Arc and the English Chroniclers,” 154.

¹¹ Perroy, *Hundred Years War*, 281.

¹² Rollison, *Commonwealth of the People*, 267-72 (Sharpe) and 275-8 (Cade).

¹³ Tisset, 1:283, trans. Hobbins, *Trial of Joan of Arc*, 153.

¹⁴ M.-R. McLaren, *London Chronicles*, 81.

¹⁵ Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, 185-6.

¹⁶ Scholars do not agree about the dating of these manuscripts, but for my purposes, exact dates are not crucial. See Kingsford, *Chronicles of London*, viii-ix; M.-R. McLaren, *London Chronicles*, 100, n6.

¹⁷ Representing this version, M.-R. McLaren quotes St. John's College ms. 57, which she identifies as a copy of an earlier source, *London Chronicles*, 86.

¹⁸ British Library ms Cotton Julius B.II, quoted in Kingsford, *Chronicles of London*, 96.

¹⁹ British Library ms Cotton Cleopatra C IV, quoted in Kingsford, *Chronicles of London*, 133.

²⁰ M.-R. McLaren, *London Chronicles*, 85.

²¹ M.-R. McLaren, *London Chronicles*, 89.

²² M.-R. McLaren argues that mentioning Joan dressed in armor is sufficient "to indicate her perversion," *London Chronicles*, 86n89.

²³ Kingsford, *English Historical Literature*, 93; *Brut*, 2:478-82. Keen notes the *political* dimension of both Dame Eleanor's and Joan of Arc's trials, *England in the Later Middle Ages*, 308, 337.

²⁴ M.-R. McLaren, *London Chronicles*, 89.

²⁵ Wolffe, *Henry VI*, 270, and Harriss, *Shaping the Nation*, 627-31. Henry's maternal grandfather, Charles VI of France, also suffered increasingly debilitating mental illness. See Green, *Hundred Years War*, 105-6.

²⁶ E. Meek, "The Practice of English Diplomacy in France, 1461-71," 64.

²⁷ Speed, *Historie*, 857. All citations to Speed are to the second, revised edition of 1623. Maurer, *Margaret of Anjou*, 187.

²⁸ Maurer, *Margaret of Anjou*, 175-8.

²⁹ Wolffe, *Henry VI*, 4-7 and 351-8.

³⁰ Henry VII was the grandson of Catherine of Valois by her second husband, Owen Tudor, although his claim to the throne derived from his mother, Margaret Beaufort, a great-great granddaughter of Edward III of England.

³¹ Vale, *Charles VII*, 61-4.

³² Akehurst, “Good Name, Reputation, and Notoriety in French Customary Law.”

Unsurprisingly, King Henry’s letter scorns this elevation: “And she dressed herself also in arms bestowed on knights and squires, raised a standard, and with the greatest contempt, pride, and presumption, demanded to have and to bear the most noble and excellent arms of France,” Tisset, 1:426.

³³ Vale examines Joan and Charles’s association in *Charles VII*, 45-69. Mention of “deux entreprises secretes” involving Jean Dunois in the spring of 1431 are suggestive, but in no way confirm a plan to rescue Joan; Du Fresne de Beaucourt, 2:255 and note. The ambiguities of status and the intricacies of ransom are discussed by Green, *Hundred Years War*, 221-29. As he notes, there was “friction between obligations of honour and the pragmatism of national self-interest,” (222).

³⁴ C. Taylor, *Joan of Arc*, 42.

³⁵ C. Taylor, *Joan of Arc*, 352.

³⁶ Chastellain, *Chronique*, 2:203.

³⁷ Martial de Paris, *Poésies*, 120, 122.

³⁸ Matheson, "Historical Prose," 210.

³⁹ Matheson, *Prose Brut*, 3.

⁴⁰ *Brut*, 2:501.

⁴¹ Matheson, concludes that Caxton "was the compiler of the continuation from 1419 to 1461," the version of the *Brut* that includes the story of Joan's pregnancy, *Prose Brut*, 164. See also Matheson, "Printer and Scribe: Caxton, the Polychronicon, and the Brut."

⁴² Hanawalt, "Golden Ages for the History of Medieval English Women."

⁴³ Even though women in the context of war are important ethical touchstones in medieval English literature, "especially rare is the image of the woman who takes up arms," according to Corrine Saunders, "Women and Warfare in Medieval English Writing," 209. However, in France, at least, they were not seen to be anomalous; Contamine, *War in the Middle Ages*, 241-2.

⁴⁴ Bandel, "The English Chroniclers' Attitude Toward Women." Maud is the English version of Matilda, which I use to avoid confusion with other contemporary royal Matildas, particularly the wives of Henry I and Stephen of Blois.

⁴⁵ Plummer and Earle, *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, 1:105, 103; Wainwright, "Æthelfled, Lady of the Mercians."

⁴⁶ Henry, Archdeacon of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, 309.

⁴⁷ William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regum Anglorum*, 199. It is not at clear where Malmesbury got this anecdote, or if there was any truth in it. Dockray-Miller suggests that a difficult first birth

along with her husband's debilitating illness might have led to Ælfleda's chastity "by default rather than design," *Motherhood and Mothering in Anglo-Saxon England*, 63.

⁴⁸ Beem reads accounts of Maud's career as gendered in "The Virtuous Virago: The Empress Matilda and the Politics of Womanhood in Twelfth-Century England," 85-98.

⁴⁹ William of Newburgh, *History of English Affairs*, 63.

⁵⁰ *Gesta Stephani*, 119.

⁵¹ William of Malmesbury, *Historia novella*, 42 and 98. The editors translate "virago" as "formidable woman."

⁵² For Malmesbury's diction, see K. Fenton, *Gender, Nation, and Conquest*, 50-2. See also LoPrete, "Gendering Viragos," 17-38.

⁵³ McLaughlin, "The Woman Warrior: Gender, Warfare and Society in Medieval Europe," 200.

⁵⁴ Stafford, "The Portrayal of Royal Women in England, Mid-Tenth to Mid-Twelfth Centuries," 157.

⁵⁵ Huston, "The Matrix of War: Mothers and Heroes," 163.

⁵⁶ In the sixteenth century, French detractors would impugn Joan's chastity. Notable among them was du Haillan, who alleged, "Some say this Joan was the whore [garce] of Jean, the Bastard of Orleans, others say of the Lord Baudricourt, Marshal of France," *De l'Estat et succez des affaires de France*, 69.

⁵⁷ Tisset, 1:123.

⁵⁸ Duparc, 1:387.

⁵⁹ Boethius, *Scotorum Historia*, fol. CCCLVIII, my translation.

⁶⁰ According to Isambart de la Pierre, Joan said that “she had been subject to many wrongs and injuries in prison,” Doncoeur and Lanhers, *La Réhabilitation de Jeanne la Pucelle*, 37.

Guillaume Manchon testified that certain guards had tried to violate her, Duparc, 1:181. Later, he elaborated that she resumed her male clothing to protect her virginity against such threats, Duparc, 1:427. Martin Ladvenu said that “a certain great English lord had entered her cell and attempted to seize her by force,” Duparc, 1:442. See also C. Taylor, *Joan of Arc*, 26.

⁶¹ Warren, “Joan of Arc, Margaret of Anjou, and Malory’s Guenevere at the Stake,” 142-143. Caxton, who resided in Bruges for many years, would presumably have known about European prison conditions. It is intriguing to speculate whether Caxton, who spent many years resident in Bruges and was close to the Burgundian court, had heard something about the nullification trial. See also Cf. C. Taylor, *Joan of Arc*, 26. Nevertheless, from the end of the fourteenth century in England, there is evidence of segregation of the sexes in prisons: Pugh, *Imprisonment in Medieval England*, 357-8.

⁶² Oldham, “On Pleading the Belly,” 2; De Haas and Hall, eds., *Early Registers of Writs*, lxxvii-lxxviii.

⁶³ Forbes, “A Jury of Matrons,” 24-5.

⁶⁴ C. Taylor, *Joan of Arc*, 48. For different reasons, a similar practice was evidently customary in France, as Joan’s virginity was examined by women at least twice .

⁶⁵ Blackstone, *Commentaries*, 388. See Hale, *Historia placitorum coronæ*, 368 and Hanawalt, “Women Before the Law,” 189.

⁶⁶ Forbes cites three cases from the thirteenth century, “Jury of Matrons,” 26. For additional

examples, see *Close Rolls of the Reign of Henry III*, 501; Sayles, ed. *Select Cases*, 56; Oldham, “On Pleading the Belly, 3; and De Haas and Hall, *Early Registers*, 75.

⁶⁷ Neville, “Gaol Delivery in the Border Counties, 1439-1549,” 57-58; Oldham, “On Pleading the Belly,” Appendix 2, 37.

⁶⁸ Blatcher, *Court of King’s Bench, 1450-1550*, 52.

⁶⁹ Sims, “Secondary Offenders? English Women and Crime,” 71.

⁷⁰ Dolan, “Tracking the Petty Traitor Across Genres,” 156. Levin examines the *Brut*’s claim in the political and cultural contexts of Shakespeare’s *1 Henry VI*, concluding that “presenting Joan as lying about a pregnancy and fearful of death would be another way for the English to destroy her reputation and credibility,”: “Murder not then the fruit within my womb,” 79-80.

⁷¹ Holinshed, *Chronicles*, 3:171. As we shall see in Chapter 4, the 1587 edition added much material, all of it denouncing Joan.

⁷² Bernau, ““Saint, Witch, Man, Maid or Whore?,”” 214.

⁷³ According to Royan, “Neither version is an entirely reliable witness to Boece’s text,” “Bellenden, John (c.1495–1545x8),” *ODNB*, online edition. See also Royan, “Relationship Between the *Scotorum Historia* of Hector Boece and John Bellenden’s *Chronicles of Scotland*.”

⁷⁴ Bellenden, *Chronicles of Scotland compiled by Hector Boece*, 2:379.

⁷⁵ Boece, *History and Chronicles of Scotland*, 2:495.

⁷⁶ Harikae, “John Bellenden’s *Chronicles of Scotland*: Translation and Circulation,” 138.

⁷⁷ Brown, “French Alliance or English Peace?”

⁷⁸ Royan, “Relationship,” 138.

⁷⁹ Baker, *Chronicle*, A2v. The book was published in one volume, but beginning with the reign of Richard II, the foliation/pagination recommences. For clarity, I cite as if there were two volumes.

⁸⁰ Woolf, "Genre into Artifact," 345.

⁸¹ Brownley, "Sir Richard Baker's Chronicle and Later Seventeenth Century English Historiography," 481.

⁸² Brownley, "Sir Richard Baker's Chronicle," 482.

⁸³ Baker was not the first to refer to Joan as "subtle," with an undertone of its secondary meanings of "crafty," "devious," or "treacherous." At the opening of Charles VII's inquiry into the validity of the proceedings that had condemned Joan, Jean Beaupère, canon of Rouen and one of the chief questioners, recalled that "she was very subtle with the subtlety of a woman, as it seemed to him," Doncoeur and Lanhers, *La Réhabilitation de Jeanne la Pucelle*, 57.

⁸⁴ In fact, Charles opposed Joan's determination to take Paris, absented himself from that action, and was in secret negotiations with Burgundy during the time. Vale, *Charles VII*, 58.

⁸⁵ This probably refers to Monstrelet's claim that Joan ordered the Burgundian mercenary Franquet d'Arras to be beheaded shortly before she was captured, *Chronique* 4:384-5. Joan had once jokingly threatened to cut off Dunois's head if he were tardy in informing her of fighting at Orléans, according to Jean d'Aulon, her steward, Duparc, 1:478.

⁸⁶ Caldwell, "Hundred Years' War and National Identity," 245.

⁸⁷ Royan, "National Martyrdom in Northern Humanist Historiography," 463.

⁸⁸ Giry-Deloison, "France and England at Peace, 1475-1513."

⁸⁹ Maccoll, "Construction of England as a Protestant 'British' Nation in the Sixteenth Century"; Schwyzer, "Archipelagic History," 599-601.

⁹⁰ Womersley, *Divinity and State*, 32.

⁹¹ Bernau, "'Saint, Witch, Man, Maid or Whore?,'" 218, 222.

⁹² I will discuss the two most famous sixteenth century historians, Edward Hall and Raphael Holinshed, in the context of the "woman question" in Chapter 3 and Shakespeare's *1 Henry VI* in Chapter 4. For approaches to writing history in this period, see Kelley and Sacks, eds., *Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain*; Woolf, *Reading History in Early Modern England*; Shrank, *Writing the Nation in Reformation England, 1530-1580*; Mottram, *Empire and Nation in Early English Renaissance Literature*; and A.B. Ferguson, *Clio Unbound*.

⁹³ Trimble, "Early Tudor Historiography, 1485-1548"; Hardin, "Chronicles and Mythmaking."

⁹⁴ Rissanen, *Studies in Style and Narrative Technique*, 13.

⁹⁵ Laine, "John Rastell and the Norman Conquest," 301.

⁹⁶ Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought*, 200-201. This is somewhat the case for Robert Fabyan, for example; see Trimble, "Early Tudor Historiography," 33-4 and Bean, "Role of Robert Fabyan."

⁹⁷ Royan compares the treatment of Joan of Arc and William Wallace as "icons of national identity," "National Martyrdom," 467-8.

⁹⁸ Hay, *Polydore Vergil*, 9.

⁹⁹ Fabyan, *New Chronicles*, 3. Goy-Blanquet concludes, "It is Fabyan, not Vergil, who inspires Hall's irate tones and sectarian views," "Shakespeare and Voltaire," 9.

¹⁰⁰ In Ellis's edition of Fabyan, these accounts of Joan of Arc fall some forty pages apart.

¹⁰¹ On Gaguin's knowledge of the trial transcripts, see Contamine, "Jeanne d'Arc après Jeanne d'Arc (IV) Sous l'Ancien Régime (1456-1789)," 408-9.

¹⁰² "Johane" is Latin, following Gaguin, not masculine, but later writers would make it so.

¹⁰³ "Deus est qui revelavit," Gaguin, *Compendium*, fol. CXVII.

¹⁰⁴ This is a mysterious comment, for neither Gaguin nor Monstrelet nor any of Fabyan's other named sources makes any such claim.

¹⁰⁵ At this time "wench" generally referred to a young female or one from the lower classes. But it did also refer to wantons. In the context in which Fabyan uses the word, it does not seem to be purposefully derogatory. See *OED* online edition, s.v. "wench."

¹⁰⁶ Harashima, "Narrative Functions of John Rastell's Printing," 43-86.

¹⁰⁷ Rastell, *Pastyme of People*, E3v.

¹⁰⁸ Thurston, "Blessed Joan of Arc in English Opinion," 450-51. Thurston's perception of Rastell's lack of hostility towards Joan might be because he "liked to compare differing accounts, but he often refrained from choosing sides," Geritz and Laine, *John Rastell*, 68.

Herman reads these abridgments of Fabyan's commentary as sympathetic, "Rastell's *Pastyme of People*: Monarchy and the Law in Early Modern Historiography," 283-4.

¹⁰⁹ Rastell, *Pastyme of People*, 20.

¹¹⁰ Geritz suggests that it is possible Rastell had access to portions of Vergil's history in manuscript because of their mutual connections with the More circle: Rastell, *Pastyme of People* 56n102.

¹¹¹ For Vergil's biography, see Polydore Vergil, *Anglica Historia*, ix-xi.

¹¹² Polydore Vergil, *Anglica Historia*, ed Hay, xx n.1.

¹¹³ Polydore Vergil, *Anglica Historia*, ed. Hay, xxvii: “It is in the dedication to Henry VIII of the *Anglica Historia* that we find the fullest of Vergil’s statements of purpose.... The specific function of history [is] ‘the only unique, certain, and faithful witness of times and things.’ It also reflects his obvious desire “to put a favourable interpretation on the rise of the house of Tudor,” (xix).

¹¹⁴ Polydore Vergil, *Anglica Historia*, ed. Hay, xxviii.

¹¹⁵ Hay, *Polydore Vergil*, 92.

¹¹⁶ Vergil, *English History*, 227 from an anonymous sixteenth century translation.

¹¹⁷ Vergil, *English History*, 22.

¹¹⁸ Hay, *Polydore*, 194.

¹¹⁹ Du Tillet, *Recueil des roys de France*, 163. He merely suggests that God may have acted through Joan as he had through the Old Testament heroines. The reference to disbelievers may be to Guillaume du Bellay de Langey who had asserted that “it was the King who had coached her in this deception”—that is, to claim she had been sent by God, *Instructions sur le faict de la guerre*, 56.

¹²⁰ Biondi, *History of the Civill Warres*, 1:69.

¹²¹ Grimeston, *Generall Historie of France*, “To the Reader.” G.N. Clark observed that de Serres’s *Inventaire* “was well suited in style and contents to make French history known to foreign protestants,” “Edward Grimeston, the Translator,” 59. According to Boas, Grimeston both added to and abridged de Serres, “Edward Grimeston, Translator and Sergeant-at-Arms,”

400.

¹²² Grimeston, “To the Reader.”

¹²³ Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought*, 198-9.

¹²⁴ In his *History of the Civill Warres*, Biondi observed of de Serres, “he is noted of falshood by his owne country men” (1.58).

¹²⁵ Paulus Emilius Veronensis, *De rebus gestis Francorum*, 459-61. Paulus had died in 1529 before completing his work, which appeared first in 1543. Since Speed also cites Holinshed, who himself mentioned Du Tillet, it is not clear whether Speed ever read the French source directly.

¹²⁶ De Serres, *Inventaire général*, 732-3.

¹²⁷ Trussell, *Continuation of the Collection of the History of England*, London, 1636.