



2018

The Personal is Political: Performing Saint Joan in the Twenty-First Century

Susan Frances Russell
Gettysburg College, srussell@gettysburg.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://cupola.gettysburg.edu/theatrefac>

 Part of the [Dramatic Literature, Criticism and Theory Commons](#), and the [Feminist, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Commons](#)

Share feedback about the accessibility of this item.

Russell, Susan Frances. "The Personal is Political: Performing *Saint Joan* in the Twenty-First Century." *The Journal of Bernard Shaw Studies* 38, no. 1 (2018): 88-112.

This is the publisher's version of the work. This publication appears in Gettysburg College's institutional repository by permission of the copyright owner for personal use, not for redistribution. Cupola permanent link: <https://cupola.gettysburg.edu/theatrefac/2>

This open access article is brought to you by The Cupola: Scholarship at Gettysburg College. It has been accepted for inclusion by an authorized administrator of The Cupola. For more information, please contact cupola@gettysburg.edu.

The Personal is Political: Performing Saint Joan in the Twenty-First Century

Abstract

Contemporary theater makers aiming to present feminist-inflected interpretation of Shaw's *Saint Joan* could benefit from the practice of intertextuality: examining feminist playwrights' versions of Joan's story. Two plays by contemporary writers, Carolyn Gage's *The Second Coming of Joan of Arc* and Martha Kemper's *Me, Miss Krause and Joan* can illuminate the most pressing contemporary issues, highlighting the ways that Shaw's version overlaps with current feminist concerns, including intersectionality, positionality, and sexual assault. Such a process would empower performers and audience members alike, and would help playwrights, directors, and dramaturgs avoid some of the pitfalls exhibited in the recent rock musical *Joan of Arc: Into the Fire*. Also, since audiences in the United States and Canada are increasingly female-dominated and plays by women often make more money, such strategies not only could engender more culturally sensitive productions but also possibly even result in a higher box office return.

Keywords

feminist, dramaturgy, intersectionality, Saint Joan

Disciplines

Dramatic Literature, Criticism and Theory | Feminist, Gender, and Sexuality Studies | Theatre and Performance Studies

The Personal is Political: Performing Saint Joan in the Twenty-first Century

"[O]ne who really loves texts must wish from time to time to love (at least) two together."—G. Genette, quoted in S. Boselli¹

For this special issue on performing Shaw, I want to suggest that examining the contents and performances of two contemporary one act plays by women about Joan of Arc can inform future productions of Shaw's *Saint Joan* in a fruitful way. Embracing a feminist dramaturgical standpoint (regardless of your gender) through the practice of intertextuality can lead to richer and more compelling productions of canonical works like Shaw's and others. By looking at Shaw's *Saint Joan* side by side with Carolyn Gage's deliberately provocative polemic, *The Second Coming of Joan of Arc* and Martha Kemper's autobiographical collage, *Me, Miss Krause, and Joan*, directors, dramaturgs, and actors could access a more feminist performance of Shaw's play. In doing so, they might also avoid some of the pitfalls exhibited in the recent rock musical version of Joan's story, *Joan of Arc: Into the Fire*. Additionally, Shaw's version and any subsequent dramatizations of Joan's life might appeal more fully to what is increasingly becoming a predominantly female audience in the United States and Canada, engendering not only a more culturally sensitive production which participates in the imagining of a more

just society, but also possibly even resulting in a higher box office return.

“With More Dedication and Depth”

A recent article in *Theatre Topics* on feminist dramaturgy posits a compelling challenge for contemporary theatremakers: “Since women dominate ticket-buying audiences and plays by female writers apparently make more money, the stage ought to take this into consideration and reflect their experiences with more dedication and depth.”² And there is more than just the economic aspect, of course; inclusivity and diversity in theatre making spawn new possibilities for creativity and innovation; there is also an unspoken ethical dimension to this appeal.

Playwright Sarah Schulman, writing specifically about sexist tropes, maintains that “American theatre will neither reflect the American playwright nor serve the American audience until it decides to expand what is known about being alive, instead of endlessly repeating already established paradigms.”³ There are many obvious ways in which theatre companies could include more women’s voices, such as, of course, producing more plays written by women, and hiring more female directors, dramaturgs and designers. But how can male or female directors unpracticed in feminist dramaturgy assist in this change-making endeavor?

Director John Lutterbie describes his experience as a man “sympathetic to [feminist] discourse,” who ultimately opted for a co-director model, where he worked together with a female director, Trish Hawkins, on a feminist play with student actors.

Lutterbie realized that directing women (especially in feminist plays by women) is

complicated “by the fact that it is a man encouraging them to explore and perform, *intimately*, what it means to be a woman (my emphasis).”⁴ He determined that his best effort to remain ethical in this situation was to come up with more questions than answers, including: “How can I empower the women in the cast to assume agency within the rehearsal process, to take responsibility for the creation of their characters, against the distortions of the male gaze?”⁵ He concludes that “it is time, and there is time, for men to recognize and act on the need to empower women within theatre, to privilege their voices and their issues.”⁶ While Lutterbie’s solution was to work with a female director, who was “familiar with feminist issues,...an experienced actor and director, and interested in working with a man on the project,” other dramaturgical strategies are available if the co-director model is not possible. For example, Laura Hope and Phillipa Kelly, in their article “Feminist Dramaturgy: Notes from No-(Wo)Man’s Land,” suggest useful questions for feminist-leaning directors and dramaturgs to chew on: “Is feminism [or, more specifically, feminist dramaturgy that informs directors, as I’m arguing] primarily recuperative, still redressing the ideologies that might render the play incompatible with, or oppositional to, women’s interests? Or does the feminist dramaturg see herself as collaborating with [the directors, the actors and the playwright] to complicate gendered expectations of female subordination? Perhaps...the feminist dramaturg identifies and draws on feminist possibilities already latent in the play?”⁷ I suggest that feminist dramaturgy could operate in one or more of these ways. Hope and Kelly stipulate that these questions must play out against a backdrop of the assumption that “[p]roductions mediate an author’s text for an

audience...[T]heir aim has never been to represent the author in any neutral unbiased fashion but to represent the director's interpretation of that author..."⁸ If the director is, like Lutterbie, sympathetic to empowering women through privileging their voices and their issues, then s/he serves the cast and audience best by paying attention to the questions listed above. As director Jo Bonney stated in the New York Times, "It just seems obvious that when 50% of the population is female that you would want their voices—both as directors and playwrights—to be heard equally and forcefully in the theatre."⁹ Lutterbie suggests empowering the actors to become co-authors of the text in rehearsal. But simply being a woman does not guarantee that one knows how to create "characters undistorted by the male gaze," as Lutterbie suggests. Women can bring their personal experiences to bear, but we live a world that has also trained us to sometimes question or denigrate our own perceptions. Thus, feminist directors would want to incorporate a feminist interrogation of the text into the actual production concept (perhaps in collaboration with the cast) and through particular research (such as that I'm suggesting for *Saint Joan*), which can then be shared with actors to assist them in subverting what Lutterbie calls the "distortions" of the traditional male gaze in the theatre.

Practicing Intertextuality

One way to provide space for these forceful and feminist women's voices can be through the practice of intertextuality: through "listening" to what women playwrights have to say about Joan (or other canonical characters/narratives),

playwrights who have thought long and hard about these stories and how they relate to contemporary society.¹⁰ Ralph Williams defines “intertextual moments” in plays as moments when “as we read one text, another so obtrudes on our awareness that it is importantly and simultaneously present to our consciousness.”¹¹ I experienced this phenomenon after viewing the two one acts I’m discussing and then re-reading Shaw’s *Saint Joan*: never again can I watch any version of Joan’s story without their echoes obtruding on my awareness.¹² Claes Schaar has described a model of intertextuality wherein he points out that “many literary works are composed in part of semantic echoes of earlier works,” which then “affect our response to the work we are reading, or hearing, either annotating, enriching or commenting on it.”¹³ Schaar mostly describes these moments as enriching the reader’s /spectator’s experience of one text informed by an earlier text. There are well-known examples of plays written explicitly in dialogue with others: for example when *Hamlet* and Stoppard’s *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* are staged in repertory, deeper layers of meaning emerge. Several years ago, Baltimore’s Center Stage presented *The Raisin Cycle*, producing two new plays written to “speak to” the canonical *A Raisin in the Sun*: Bruce Norris’s Pulitzer-prize winning *Clybourne Park* and Kwame Kwei-Armah’s *Beneatha’s Place*. Post-colonial adaptations of *The Tempest*, such as Aimee Cesaire’s *A Tempest* have definitely influenced directors’ staging, casting and production concepts. These modern texts can often then *re-inform* the originals through re-visioning the stories for contemporary audiences, foregrounding the issues most pressing for the current day, including changing mainstream attitudes (e.g., racism, sexism, homophobia).

What I am advocating is reading the story of the historical Joan of Arc alongside two recent plays about Joan of Arc by feminist playwrights, Carolyn Gage's *The Second Coming of Joan of Arc* and Martha Kemper's *Me, Miss Krause and Joan*, as examples of texts that can be studied in conversation with Shaw's *Saint Joan* in order to see how these modern texts by women can illuminate Shaw's, potentially empowering women even more than Shaw initially imagined, and drawing out more fully the latent liberatory possibilities in his drama. Additionally, I will discuss how failing to do this kind of work can also hinder the impact of a stage production for various audience members, the majority of whom may well be women. Thus, instead of Shaw's plays echoing in their work, Gage's and Kemper's works, when studied by directors and actors of Shaw's *Saint Joan*, can glimmer backwards to inform the canonical work, complicating and updating our understanding of gender politics in the twenty-first century. Gage's feminist polemic and Kemper's poignant memory piece are two radically different scripts that nonetheless offer valuable insights into the most crucial aspects of Joan's legacy for women today.

Joan in Popular Culture

As feminist-friendly dramaturgs and directors, our responsibility is to provide detailed extra-textual resources that contextualize and illuminate the primary text. This dramaturgical stew satisfies our curiosity about the past, but also whets the appetite for more discoveries in our future creative endeavors. The following section chronicles the rich landscape of background materials that could be helpful

in informing actors and directors about the play's content and context through a feminist lens. The story of Joan of Arc has inspired people to tell and re-tell her story for almost six hundred years; though popular and scholarly attention have waxed and waned over the years, the last quarter of a century has resulted in a resurgence of interest due, most likely, to changing perceptions of sex and gender, as evidenced by the growing trans movement. It is astounding to realize that we have more firsthand documentation of this thirteenth century peasant girl than about, for example, Shakespeare. If you Google Joan of Arc today, you'll find an unbelievable spectrum of artifacts attesting to her contemporary appeal: a random sampling includes a review of a new film, "Joan of Arc Sings Heavy Metal Music in Bruno Dumont's 'Jeanette' at Cannes 2017;" a novel, *Joan of Arc, Zombie Slayer; The Erotic Adventures of Joan of Arc and Space Pirate Captain Cynn Yoshiba*, sci-fi erotica; *If Joan Had Cancer*, a book of healing meditations for cancer patients; *You Wouldn't Want to be Joan of Arc*, a biography for kids; Joan of Arc coloring books; Joan of Arc paper dolls, not to mention a brand of baked beans whose label states, "A great name in history and famous brand of canned foods—Joan of Arc, the Heroic Bean! Be the hero of mealtimes with Joan of Arc beans—the leading brand since 1878."¹⁴ You can even become Joan's friend on Facebook. Shaw's version of Joan's story was written in 1923, just three years after Joan's canonization became front-page news. Just as Shaw's version ghosts his contemporaries' struggles around women's suffrage, so, too, Joan has continued to speak to us through our own popular culture—as a symbol of female and also trans-pride and gender non-conformity. As we compare the two contemporary theatrical versions of Joan's story, these insights

can reflect back on any staging we may want to tackle of Shaw's version. Each one of these three versions is reflected through the prism of the politics, personalities, and purposes of the individual author; yet each results in a kind of "redemptive feminism": through the process of self-discovery/finding one's voice, the declaration of one's liberation; and, in the two contemporary versions, acknowledging the love of other women. Since all three plays share the same major motif—radical change through radical faith—shoring up some of the other strands of the story that resonate more with today's audiences could potentially make for a stronger, more satisfying production of Shaw's play for contemporary audiences.

The History Behind the Myth

It is well known amongst Shavian scholars that Shaw based his *Saint Joan* on the English translations of the French transcripts of her trials, first published in 1902. I will outline in brief detail the history of these translations. Joan was born in 1412 in a small village in France, which was burned to the ground by invading English in 1421. Four years later, at the age of 13, Joan had her first vision: of two female saints and one male angel, adjuring her to lead a military conquest against the English. Part of the allure of her tale is that this uneducated, lowly young woman hears voices from Heaven and declares that she is the savior of France. In 1429, at age 17, she led the successful battle at Orleans, and later that year, she crowned Charles VII king of France. Three years later, she was deemed so dangerous to that same crown that the French failed to help her once she was captured by the English. She was tried and burned for heresy. Only four years later, in 1435, there are

records of plays performed about her. Less than twenty years later, in the years 1452-1456, the church in France called a “Rehabilitation” or “Nullification” Trial in which her good name was restored and the church admitted its mistake in disbelieving her. This period marks the first major period of obsession with her story for obvious reasons.

The late nineteenth century/early twentieth century proved another saturation point of Joan stories (although interest proliferated throughout the fifteenth through the early nineteenth centuries). In 1803, Napoleon declared her a national symbol of France, and in 1841, French writer Jules Michelet published the trial documents and other primary sources in French. In 1869, Joan’s canonization process began within the Catholic Church. And from 1841-9, one of Michelet’s students, Jules Quicherat, published a five volume series on the primary source documents of Joan’s trial, providing a more detailed transcript and additional sources, including interviews with some of those involved in the trials, including statements that were not used as evidence in the trials themselves. Finally, in 1902, an English translation of Quicherat’s volumes appeared.

After the English translation came out, European “Joan Mania” increased; also she began to be associated with the nascent women’s suffrage movement in England. In 1908, French poet and novelist Anatole France published his biographical novel, *The Life of Joan of Arc*.¹⁵ His polemical verdict was that her voices were not divine but hallucinations most likely incited by trauma. He also believed that she was not a

true military leader, more of a mascot figure; that she was condemned by the French, not the English; and that she remained a virgin, an important detail to many who have told her story before and since. In 1909, a Parisian stylist cut hair in a bob for the first time, citing Joan as his inspiration, and her association with the New Woman was solidified. In 1909, Professor Francois Amedee was repeatedly beaten in his classroom at the Sorbonne for teaching a more rationalist view of Joan: questioning the authenticity of her voices, her military abilities and her virginity. In 1918, English women's suffrage was achieved (though women were not entirely equal before the law until 1928), and in 1920, Joan of Arc was canonized.¹⁶ In 1921, Pierre Champion published an even better annotated version of the Quicherat text. Also in 1921, a very famous and influential book was published by Margaret Murray called *The Witch Cult in Western Europe* in which Murray claimed Joan was most likely a witch.¹⁷ In 1923, Shaw's play *Saint Joan* premiered in New York, followed by the London premiere in 1924. In 1926, Shaw won the Nobel Prize in Literature, and in a public address in 1931, Shaw compared reactions to Joan of Arc to his countrymen's benighted reception of Sylvia Pankhurst, a leading English suffragette.

Locating Joan's Intersectional Identity

As we begin the process of trying to understand Joan from a feminist perspective, both the historical figure and Shaw's creation, it is useful to ascertain how Shaw's overall work as a playwright resonates with contemporary feminist thought. Shaw is famous for his desire to change the way women were viewed in Victorian society;

thus, many of his plays lend themselves relatively easily to feminist interpretations, what Jill Dolan refers to as “a transformative politics of hope so that we can imagine, together, a better, more equitable future for us all.”¹⁸ By attending to and foregrounding such ideas, theatre artists can begin to “see ourselves—artists, producers and spectators alike—as partners in the production of culture and social transformation.”¹⁹ Dagmara Krzyzaniak describes Shaw’s Joan as “strictly modern”: Protestant, anti-imperialist, and feminist.²⁰ Shaw arguably saw himself in Joan and used her story as a scaffold on which to hang his own personal and political beliefs. Much has already been written about why Shaw anachronistically attributes ideas of anti-imperialism/nationalism and Protestantism to Joan; however, another way to think about Shaw’s choices ties them to two important contemporary notions in feminist theory: *locating oneself* and *intersectionality*. In the late 1980s, feminist theorists grappled with the notion of what they considered the myth of objectivity. They noticed that (especially) male writers often seemed to be speaking for everyone from a perspective of neutrality (or “objectivity”), rating their own experiences as generic or universal, when in fact their writing was definitely colored by their own gender, race, class, etc. One can aim for a kind of objectivity, they argued, but true objectivity is not possible. Responding to critiques of racism, classicism and heterosexism, some white middle-class straight feminists also realized that they, too, often pulled the same trick by assuming they spoke for all women, when in fact, not all women might agree on the same strategies to be applied or even the particular issues to be addressed to better society. From this realization came the practice of “locating oneself” or “positionality”: the practice of

full disclosure, stating one's own background in order to highlight the possibilities of one's own conscious or unconscious biases. Some feminist theatre critics argue not only that objectivity is not possible, it's not even desirable: it's the very biases, in fact, which "comprise a way of seeing that makes the critic's work helpful and compelling. Such predispositions should be openly acknowledged and exploited."²¹ It is Shaw's clear biases that make his work so endearing to some and off-putting to others. By using blatant anachronisms in *Saint Joan*, Shaw was purposefully revealing his own agenda, in essence, locating himself. It's obvious that this highly educated and opinionated writer was creating a Joan in his own image. He was a rationalist, so he made her one, too; he was a Protestant, so her objections to the Catholic Church are quite persuasive; and, although Shaw was not a nationalist per se, he uses Joan's hatred of the English as a way of echoing his own criticism of English occupation of his homeland of Ireland. Not only does Shaw's treatment of Joan resonate with the feminist strategy of locating oneself or positionality, it also foreshadows another vital notion in feminist theory since the late 1980s: intersectionality.²²

Intersectionality is a way to understand power, discrimination and identity that does not assume that any individual identifies themselves or endures persecution or enjoys power solely on the basis of one single aspect of his/her/their being (gender, sexuality, race, ability, age, class, etc.) but instead considers the interlocking matrices of power, oppression and privilege through a more complex lens. For example, a black woman who is victim of domestic abuse by her black husband

might not want to contact the police for fear that the police might brutalize him instead of just arresting him. A poor woman may not want to call the police if she does not have the means to support herself if her abuser husband is taken away. But a middle class white woman who has faith in the justice system because of her own past experiences and who is able to provide for herself economically might not hesitate to contact authorities—or to advocate for policies that punish abusers without looking at the larger consequences for the victims. Thus, people who are marginalized in more than one way have different experiences of the world and may have distinctly different needs from their white middle-class or upper class female counterparts. Joan is one example of a person whose place in society determined that she was marginalized and privileged in complicated ways. She suffered not only because she was a woman, but also because she was French: during her childhood, the English occupied her country and burned down her village. This trauma may indeed have led to her visions telling her to rid her homeland of the invaders. She was also persecuted because of her belief system that Shaw shorthand names “Protestantism,” though she lived before the advent of the Protestant Reformation. Shaw explained he used this term to define anyone who reserved the right to his/her own judgment in spiritual matters over those of the ecclesiastical leadership. In other words, she was cruelly punished because she believed her own personal experience of God over the Catholic Church’s dogma. She was, of course, also denigrated in her society because she was a woman—as Shaw knew his female contemporaries still were. In addition, her status was low due to her lack of education and wealth. And she was considered an unnatural outsider

because of her cross-dressing, which was one of her worst offences, according to her contemporaries. In her book *Transgender Warriors: Making History from Joan of Arc to Dennis Rodman*, Leslie Feinberg sheds light on what Joan's cross-dressing might have signified noting that, in the Middle Ages, cross-dressing was associated with paganism: the Latin word "paganus" meant rural dweller or peasant, because in the countryside, many people continued to practice pre-Christian religious rituals.²³ Cross-dressing for women, then, was not only associated with usurping male power, but also signaled perhaps a protest against the Catholic Church.

All these factors—plus Joan's illiteracy, her youth, and perhaps her sexuality (some have suggested maybe she was a lesbian)—together make her deeds even more mind-boggling. And yet as we look at the intersections that make up her identity, we see a more complex picture than just victimhood: her youth and perceived sexual purity also gave her extra legitimacy in the eyes of the male soldiers who followed her, as did her Catholic faith. And her courage continues to inspire and empower women today, as we witness her noble struggles dramatized. In "Saint Joan: From Renaissance Witch to New Woman," Karma Waltonen argues that Shaw believed Joan was ultimately condemned for "what we call unwomanly and insufferable 'presumption.'"²⁴ Though Shaw enjoyed many privileges of being a white male, the Fabian Socialist Irish-born Protestant also must have identified with the ways that Joan was punished for her bodacious behavior by speaking truth to power, as Shaw himself did. Furthermore, "Shaw saw Joan as the 'paragon of the New Woman;' contrasted with the womanly woman," who had previously been the

ideal.²⁵ He esteemed this new figure, calling her “the Unwomanly Woman,” and Joan became its poster child. Shaw was influenced by Mary Wollstonecraft, John Stuart Mill, and of course, Ibsen. You can hear the echo of Ibsen’s Nora in the following quote by Shaw about the New Woman: “The sum of the matter is that unless Woman repudiates her womanliness, her duty to her husband, to her children, to society, to the law, and to everyone but herself, she cannot emancipate herself.”²⁶ This notion is radical even today. Joan’s unwillingness to conform to societal expectations has dire consequences for her in the play and in her real life; however, Shaw does not end his play with her death. In fact, each of these three playwrights who have chosen to tell a version of Joan’s story holds out the possibility of hope, redemption, and liberation, of a new, transformed society. Shaw’s epilogue illustrates that the world is not ready for someone like Joan, but also implies that if we would only work harder at understanding her perspective and ourselves, perhaps someday it will be.

Carolyn Gage’s Radical Rage

In her deliberately didactic one woman show, *The Second Coming of Joan of Arc*, Carolyn Gage in a direct address to the address at the very beginning of the play foregrounds explicitly what Shaw implies: that women today face many of the same struggles facing the Maid.²⁷ Gage, an actor and artistic director of “No to Men,” a radical feminist theatre company in Ashland, Oregon from 1989-1991, premiered *The Second Coming of Joan of Arc* in 1989. She toured the U.S. for several years with her show, which is how I encountered it, during a production at Gettysburg College

in 1999. Joan (played by Gage) with short hair, piercing eyes, dressed like a soldier, able to pass as a man, addresses the women in the audience directly: “My story is the story of all women, and my suffering is identical to yours. My trial is the trial of all women. My misguided crusade is all of our misguided crusades. My enemies are your enemies. The voices I hear are your voices. And the voices you hear are my voices.”(7) Gage as Joan embodies what she describes in the introduction to her play: “*The Second Coming of Joan of Arc* gives voice to a character conspicuous in her absence from hetero-patriarchal theater: the angry young woman. This Joan of Arc is a far cry from the eroticized and idealized Joan of Anouilh...No longer a martyr and a victim, this Joan redeems her experience through unmasking her betrayers and rallying contemporary women with a rousing cry to arms.” (1) This Joan has been through the wringer and is coming out on the other side, empowered by her knowledge and ready to share her compelling insights with other women whom she hopes will see the parallels in their own lives. For example, when describing the varied voices she hears, she references similar attitudes towards women in today’s world. “Hey, come on,” she nudges the audience with her voice, “we all invent our voices. Mine were just blatantly fictional, that’s all. And that is because I didn’t like the selection available to young women in Domremy. There was my father’s voice: ‘Jeanne, a rich young man will come and marry you...and he will help your poor old father take care of his sheep.’ And then there was my mother: “...[A] nice young man will come and marry you and you will go and have lots of babies and then you will understand exactly how I feel.’ [And] the priest: “...God has called you to give yourself to him, and you will go and enter the convent...” (9) Even her dress had a

voice: "In fact, that dress spoke louder than I did. Before I even opened my mouth, that dress had already introduced me. 'Hi. You don't know me, but I'm someone who chooses to wear this thing that is uncomfortable, impractical and unsafe...[it] won't even let me walk outside without falling over, unless I have both hands free to hold up my skirts...I'm someone who chooses to wear this thing that will make rape very, very easy for men...' Right. So I went back to see the governor in real clothes, like the clothes men get to wear. And, what a surprise, this time he let me talk." (16)

Joan is what we would currently call a "gender non-conformist," in tune with a queered or trans perspective, cutting through the male/female binary that society has forced upon her to determine her actions. One way to give agency to the actor playing Joan would be to ask her to think about the "voices" that have shaped her own life. In understanding what Joan was rebelling against, it becomes easier to recognize what her "heavenly voices" symbolized to her personally and also validates a transformative politics for the present day. In his *Saint Joan*, Shaw gives a rational explanation for her voices: whether Joan truly believes in them or not, her faith in them causes others to follow her, which enables miracles to happen. In other words, words and actions, ideologies, beliefs, systems, traditions all have the power to shape reality, and Joan (or perhaps God?) uses the systems in place in order to liberate France. Gage describes the voices as Joan's individual and strategic escape route or survival mechanism against the dominant gender ideology, a route that is open to present-day gender non-conformists who have opened up cross-dressing as a liberatory stance against traditional gender norms. Such rebellion might still lead to death, as it did for Joan; however, the more Joans who attempt to

stand up to tradition, bringing along followers, the more times become ripe for the miracles of liberatory struggles to become manifest.²⁸ Finding your own voice and creating your own look are political acts, and Joan was one of the earliest known martyrs for her self-expression.

Interestingly, in Joan of Arc's original trial, the issue of Joan's voices and Joan's clothing absolutely dominated the discourse. Dressing like a man was considered as serious a crime as going against church doctrine. Gage's Joan explains this historical mystery: "The trial lasted five months [and] focused on two issues: my voices and my clothing...That seemed strange to me at first...why would all these important men be interested in something so personal? [pause] Of course. My perceptions and my identity. They wanted me to renounce my voices—that is, to invalidate my perceptions, and to wear a dress—that is, change my identity to suit them. Of course." (24) Later she concludes: "These were my crimes. And if you think they don't burn women for these anymore—ask any dyke! She'll tell you." (27)

One of the most important details of Gage's re-telling is the foregrounding of Joan's rape in prison. One of the documents from the actual trial reveals that one priest claims that Joan confessed to him that she was raped in prison in her female garb. In Shaw's version, there is hardly any mention of the rape, and it definitely does not seem to be the reason Joan decides to die. It is true that by the end of Scene V, she no longer believes that "they could not burn a woman for speaking the truth;" however, she does not seem to fear any other bodily harm besides the fire. She

realizes that she is thoroughly alone except for God, but also claims that this “loneliness shall be [her] strength.” Still she seems assured that her physical person will be kept safe because of her association with God. In Scene VI, she asks the priests, “Why do you leave me in the hands of the English? I should be in the hands of the Church,” suggesting she is more in harm’s way under the English, but not in any way more so than a male prisoner might be. She tries to escape, even denounces her voices because it seems God has forsaken her, but again she argues that anyone would attempt to flee if detained, still not suggesting any sort of sexual assault. It is only when she finds out that denying her voices would mean imprisonment once more that she decides not to. We know historically that when she was jailed she had to don women’s clothing, which made her much more vulnerable to the soldiers’ attacks. So part of taking on male garb was to protect her from rape. In Shaw’s play, this detail was hinted at: in Scene VI, Joan says, “If I were to dress as a woman, they would think of me as a woman, and then what would become of me?” But the meaning remains ambiguous and the moment could easily be brushed aside in production. It is important to remember that the last straw for Joan—the moment where she decides she would rather burn than be perpetually locked up—is the moment when she realizes that confinement meant being subjected to the whims of the soldiers for the rest of her life, i.e. being raped over and over. Therefore, it is not surprising that this detail of Joan’s story is one that Gage focuses on. What is confusing to me as a female/feminist spectator, is that most male playwrights don’t mention it at all.

Joan as Trans Rock Star

A recent example of this blindness to the real physical danger Joan faced specifically as a woman occurred in the recent production of *Joan of Arc: Into the Fire*, a rock musical that opened for a short run at the Public in March 2017 to sold-out houses. Written by Grammy-winning composer David Byrne and directed by Golden Globe winner Alex Timbers, this version focused on Joan as a sort of trans rock star, without delving deeply into her psyche or anything else. The storytelling is vapid, if epic, and the only redeeming quality, in my opinion, besides the brilliant staging of the battles and the talented actors, was the star herself, Jo Lampert.²⁹ “I’m not a boy, I’m not a girl,” she wails. “This tale is for everyone.” In a way it was fun to watch Joan as a modern day trans-warrior; kick-ass female heroines are popping up all over in popular culture these days. A banner hanging above the stage seemed to signal feminist politics. “She was warned,” it read, quoting Senator Mitch McConnell’s rebuke of Elizabeth Warren. “She was given an explanation. Nevertheless, she persisted,” in a tribute to Senator Warren’s Senate floor challenge that got her banned from the chambers by Republican men. Katie Baker of *The Daily Beast* reported, “Everything about The Public’s new production, intentional or not, seems like a pointed message to Trump, from the play’s diverse cast to its gender-blurring main character who helps save her nation from the clutches of a brutish foe.”³⁰ Baker also comments on the question of how “masculine” one should present Joan; in this production, she has a Mohawk, Goth eye make-up and “lots of leather,” and Baker notes, “She’d prefer not to be defined by your binaries, thanks.” But Ms. Baker, like me and the other reviewers, ultimately rated the script and score as

tremendously disappointing. In his *New York Times* review, Ben Brantley called Joan a bore and “definitely not a paradigm for today’s wearers of the pink pussy hats, as its director Alex Timbers, has suggested.”³¹ How sad that this new musical about such a compelling heroine was described as “opening in a blaze of monotony at the Public Theatre” by the *New York Times* lead theatre critic! For me, an especially troubling moment occurred when mention was made of checking Joan to see if she is a virgin; the other (male) actors simply held her up and passed her over their heads, not looking at her at all; the director completely disregarded the ways in which her body would have been violated by such acts. And the script does not at all mention the torture that the historical Joan suffered through rape. An examination of eleven critical reviews (all negative) gives us a glimpse of the status of surprisingly present feminist critical awareness of both male and female reviewers in the mainstream press.³² For example, the issue of the virginity test arose in many of the reviews. Like me, Katie Baker of *The Daily Beast* was disturbed by how the virginity exam was staged, noting that “the cardinals tell her that only a virgin can lead the French army, ... Joan submits to a purity test—a demand that, bafflingly, does not seem to trouble her.”³³ It is not just the female critics who take note of this episode, however. *Hollywood Reporter* reviewer David Rooney, who characterizes the show as a whole as “Martyrdom for Dummies,” “a musical Wikipedia entry,” and “Andrew Lloyd Webber lite,” mentions the test itself but does not comment on the problematic staging: “There’s a note of feminist outrage in the humiliation of Joan being subjected not once but twice to creepy virginity examinations to determine whether she is really able to talk to God.”³⁴ Worst is

Robert Hofler of *The Wrap*, the only explicitly sexist reviewers, who uses his references to the two tests as a way to make tasteless jokes: “These two vaginal inspections are not repetitious. The first is conducted by the French, and Joan not only passes the test with flying colors, she endures it with less trauma than your standard airport security pat down. Apparently, the French know how to handle these things,” unlike the English, who turn it into a “long grizzly ordeal of pain and humiliation.”³⁵ Hofler also mentions that Lampert plays Joan more as a “wicked witch” than a “good saint,” suggesting her physical resemblance to the actor Margaret Hamilton who played Wicked Witch of the West, but doesn’t elaborate further. Revealing the most knowledge of contemporary feminist critical discourse, *Daily Beast’s* Katie Baker also notes the connection to battles over trans identities, likening the virginity test to “all of our recent reductive fights over bathroom bills and the move to define everyone by their genitals;” referring to the “toxic masculinity” Joan endures; and mentioning that the only other female character in the play, Joan’s mother, receives short shrift, appearing only briefly at the very end.³⁶ Baker also notes that Joan is presented as very “masculine,” “a-sexual, a-typical, and a-female,” and ends her review by yearning for the day when “we’ll get a real life Joan as our very own commander in chief. Maybe she’ll be a trans Joan. Maybe she’ll be a butch Joan. Maybe she’ll even like to wear long curls and a peasant dress: a Joan who is allowed to be a warrior and a woman—any kind of woman she wants—all at the same time.”³⁷ The most explicitly feminist critic I encountered, however, was NBC New York’s Robert Kahn, who wrote: “This seems like the right era for a musical about an independent woman asserting her place in the universe,

never mind one who has inspired modern pop culture figures from Madonna to Arcade Fire. But this Joan isn't a leader of women and men—she's simply a leader among men, who are going to devour her." He laments: "In a production that establishes its tone off a controversial quote from a United States Senator, the focus on men doesn't wash. Joan is frequently asked by her tormentors, 'Are you a boy? Is it a girl?' I'm not sure that counts as the feminist bent I'd been counting on."³⁸ A feminist version would also most certainly have included the fact of Joan's rape, as Gage's play did. In his effort to portray Joan as a triumphant pop hero/ine, Byrne erased that part of her story that our society most needs to examine and change. Though the intent seems to be to align this production with movements for social justice, Byrne is blind to the most traumatic discrimination that still exists today: Joan's (and contemporary women's) right to traverse the world free from the danger of violent sexual violation. It is difficult as a woman to watch this story and have these concerns overlooked. I cannot even imagine how someone who has actually suffered from a sexual assault might experience this oversight. In order to tell this story more completely, those directing *Saint Joan*, as well as playwrights and actors wishing to take on her story, ought to heed Gage's attention to this significant detail of Joan's life as a vital part of the story that resonates most with contemporary audiences.

Specific Strategies

Perhaps you do not envision your production of Shaw's *Saint Joan* or your new adaptation of the story as didactic, angry or harsh as Gage's play. Nonetheless, her

attention to particular aspects of Joan's story can productively inform choices that incorporate more women's perspectives in your interpretation. For example, paying attention to those lines, however scant, that suggest Joan's vulnerability to sexual assault would be a step in the right direction. In Scene VI of *Saint Joan*, Joan says, "If I were to dress as a woman, they would think of me as a *woman*, and then *what would become of me?* (emphasis mine)" In this moment, actors and directors could do their best to make it clear Joan knows the very real danger she is alluding to, and that the men in the scene understand it too. And when Shaw's Joan pronounces her beautiful and famous speech "to shut me from the light of sky...to chain my feet," the company should help the audience understand that imprisonment means something worse to her than simply solitary confinement (something different from the famous speeches from many a *Sturm und Drang* hero who wishes to die rather than be cooped up). If theatre artists pay attention to these moments, then the resonances of contemporary fascination with Joan's story will glimmer more brightly. In the final scene, if Joan's clothes were dirty, torn and bloodied, and her body were marked by the trauma of rape, this aspect of her story would be clearer to the audience. A brilliant example of such attention to details of women's lived experience appears in the RSC production of *A Winter's Tale* directed by Gregory Doran and starring Anthony Scher (available on DVD) where Queen Hermione is brought to trial with blood on the front of her dress and milk on the chest of her dress, painfully revealing the horror of her having given birth just days before in prison and now being hauled out and put on display before a court of men on charges of adultery.

Such attention to the details of the story that women bring to the table would enhance the contemporary resonances of the play. Neglecting these aspects lessens the impact of the play and might even be considered offensive, especially to anyone who has endured sexual assault or knows someone who has, or to people who work to educate the public in order to help alleviate such crimes.

Femme/Butch Joans

Casting the role of Joan plays a major role in how audiences interpret her. Oftentimes, as the reviewers of *Joan of Arc: Into the Fire* noted, Joan is cast as androgynous or asexual. Some directors present a stark differentiation between the girl at the beginning with the curls and the peasant dress, and the girl who can pass as a boy who gains access to the authorities. Other recent productions of *Saint Joan* have presented Joan as a pretty girl child who then transforms into someone still quite recognizable as an attractive girl---much as Shakespeare's female characters are often portrayed in contemporary productions, even though, of course, the original parts were played by actual boys. In these instances, the figure of Joan is not really androgynous, and she is generally played as a very naïve innocent, bordering sometimes on simpleton. For example, in the December 2016 production of *Saint Joan* at Donmar Warehouse in London, reviewer Michael Billington describes Gemma Arterton as "an unusually tactile Joan, who innocently caresses her male antagonists and is unafraid to exercise her persuasive charm."³⁹ If Joan is a country girl who knows enough about men to dress as one herself to protect herself from their "thinking of her as a woman," and all that implies negatively, it seems

highly unlikely that she would be particularly prone to touching her male colleagues excessively. To a male spectator, perhaps these actions would be endearing, but to this feminist spectator, it is illogical. The “persuasive charm” she might exert upon her followers would probably exist mainly in the allure of her utter purity (they nickname her “the Maid”—like Jesus’s mother Mary), which also, it seems to me, would suggest that she would not “innocently caress” anyone. But Billington suggests that Joan is so sweet and innocent that she does not realize the impact of her touch, a choice I find unrealistic and therefore distracting. Most often, Joan is portrayed as “masculine” or “sexless,” and several reviewers refer to the idea that Shaw supposedly based his Joan on Mary Hankinson, his friend in the Fabian Society, who was considered “ascetic” or “sexless”—Michael Holroyd in his review of a July 2007 London production mentions Hankinson “pouring her energies into gymnastics and flute-playing and sharing her domestic life with her friend Ethel Moor.”⁴⁰ In the Jewel Theatre Company of Santa Cruz’s production in September 2014, Joan is described by director Susan Myer Stilton as a “proud and naïve rebel.”⁴¹ Photo stills from this production show a Joan who initially appears as a very pretty young girl with long, beautiful hair that is later shorn. Though Shaw himself insisted that Joan is not supposed to be “heaven forbid, sexy,” this Joan seems to borrow from ideas of authors like Mark Twain and others who tended to romanticize/sexualize her.

Another relevant issue that arose in several reviews of recent productions of *Saint Joan* involves the assertion that “there are no heroes or villains in Shaw’s play.”⁴² It

is true that Shaw deliberately penned a play that is dialectic—for example, the Bishop has the interests of the community in his mind and is not simply a cruel monster. Still, condemning a young girl to either repeated sexual assaults in prison or the flames does seem like a villainous action, despite whatever good intentions prompt it. Granting both sides equal moral weight seems to belie Shaw's intentions; he does, after all, ultimately favor Joan's perspective.

A final contemporary production I wish to discuss also foregrounds the dialectic nature of Shaw's script. This production occurred at the Shaw Festival at Niagara-on-the-Lake in 2017, directed by the new artistic director Tim Carroll, and starring Sara Topham, who is very talented but definitely a woman and not a teenaged girl. The set, which consisted of "immaculate lines and sparseness," served to prohibit any Hollywood or Disney ideas of this story; according to the reviewer, the cuts in the script also "block most of the potential sentimentalization of Joan's character as a romantic, tragic heroine: she is presented as someone whose unequivocal convictions pit her against more complex or weaker souls—all men—and thus render her an impossibly threatening figure."⁴³ Why is it that a Joan who is a more "masculinized" heroine seems threatening rather than, say, inspiring? If a brave and self-assured Joan is perceived by the critic as "threatening," then how can a director hope to present a Shavian Joan who is fully human—a warrior and a woman, a victim and a victor? In my opinion, Topham's Joan was thrilling as a kind of sexless or androgynous powerhouse, but the subtleties of her experiences as a very young woman in a male-dominated world were not apparent: the story was simplified to

represent a battle of wills, more of an intellectual exercise than an illustration of the dangers she truly faced and faced down. Carolyn Gage created a truly “butch” Joan--but she also decried the discrimination she faced specifically as a woman. In her one-woman show, Martha Kemper believably embodies a “softer, gentler” Joan, but one who is just as strong, inspiring, and empowering, revealing subtleties within Joan’s character that directors, actors and dramaturgs can use as a light to shine onto other Joan texts. Indeed, perhaps it is the very empathy for Joan’s experiences that Kemper articulates and embodies that makes her play the most powerful of all to me.

Me, Miss Krause and Joan

Unlike Gage’s or Shaw’s Joan plays, Kemper’s is autobiographical. She uses the story of Joan as a vehicle to tell about her own struggles and triumphs. Kemper, an accomplished actor living in Philadelphia, toured this play to Gettysburg College in 2006 shortly after it was completed and has since presented it in other venues as well, particularly on campuses. At the time, Kemper was fifty-five, with shoulder-length dark hair, and a fit but curvy figure. She begins the one-woman play, like Gage, with a direct address to the audience: “I was thirteen when I heard a Voice from God for my help and guidance.”⁴⁴ Inspired by Shaw’s *Saint Joan*, the playwright wanted to use excerpts from Shaw’s text in her own play, but she ran into difficulties with the Shaw estate and had to return to the original trial documents instead. Like Gage, Kemper’s Joan narrates in retrospect. But she also

plays another character, herself, Martha, thereby entrusting the audience with the gift of the wisdom of her experience as an adult woman looking back at her younger self. This wisdom is hard-won, and for it, she is also indebted to another sage, her elderly mentor, Miss Alvina Krause, as the story later reveals. After she initially presents herself as Joan and explains how the voices came to her and instructed her to crown the King of France and make war on the English, the lights change and, with a soft, slightly Southern accent, Kemper becomes herself, “Martha”:

I am fifty-five years old. It is unlikely that I will ever be cast as Joan of Arc. But ever since I was in sixth grade and heard my classmate do Joan’s defiant “Light your fire” monologue from the trial scene in Shaw’s play, *Saint Joan*, I have wanted to play the part. Why not? She’s young: seventeen. She’s French [She smiled]: I *love* that. She rides horses and climbs hills. I’ve twelve and I live in a house where the TV is on eight hours a day and the windows are never open. Not in summer: it’s Houston. We have central air conditioning. Not in winter: we have central heat. And not in spring or fall because my father is afraid of thieves and assailants. They might come through the windows and steal the television. Or assault me while I’m sleeping in my bed. I’m twelve, but I’ve already been warned about things like that. But Joan is out riding horses and climbing hills in the open air of the French countryside! Hearing voices telling her to save France. And she’s so positive! She tells the king, the army, the archbishop what to do and they do it. For a while. Until they get tired of taking orders from a girl and burn her at the stake. But for a Catholic girl like me, dying at the stake after a short life of adventure and devotion seems preferable to slow asphyxiation in the Houston suburbs. (2)

Kemper then deftly intertwines the story of Joan of Arc with her own blossoming as a theatre artist as she and other newly graduated acting students from Northwestern University move to Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania to study with legendary acting teacher, Alvina Krause, who was in her late eighties at the time. Eventually, Kemper became one of the founding members of the Bloomsburg Theatre Ensemble, established in 1978. In Kemper’s play, she parallels Miss Krause’s exacting demands of her as an actor with Joan’s insistence that the Dauphin become King, with Martha acting as the Dauphin and Miss Krause (nicknamed by

her real-life colleagues “The Fierce Old Lesbian”) the indomitable Joan. She wonders at Miss Krause’s unremitting belief in her younger, doubtful self: “How do you turn someone into something they really want to be but they’re afraid to be or think they can’t be?” (4) Martha identifies with the timid Dauphin, locating herself as a white, middle-class Catholic girl who has been trained to be passive, to do as she’s told. But she also recounts her history as a rebel against bullies and an advocate for weaker and poorer children. She is empowered by the idea that God wants her to do good and be good in the world, and she feels safe in the world because of her faith. Martha relates her own story through her happy days as a young performer, juxtaposing those days with the glorious days of Joan’s victories on the battlefield as Martha becomes a more courageous risk-taker in her own life. Eventually, however, she reaches a point in Joan’s story that she tells us was not in the official trial transcripts but rather within other witness statements she encountered while researching Joan: the statement by the priest about Joan’s rape. At this point, Martha turns, quietly troubled, to the audience: “How do I play this moment?” she asks. (7) Because this play is about her own personal story as an artist and a woman, Martha/Kemper knows that she must include the story of her own rape as a way to fully relate Joan’s story, and use Joan’s story as a way to process her traumatic experience. We watch this process as she performs for us not only the story of her rape, but the narrative of herself as an artist learning how to come to terms with expressing her own feelings about that terrible experience. The juxtaposition of the narrative of the sexual assault Kemper suffered and Joan’s brutal trial scene is the most moving part of this profound little play. Kemper does

not blatantly parallel her own experience with Joan's, nor does she universalize her own experience as indicative of all women's, like Gage. Instead, Kemper's sequencing of events operates like juxtaposition in film: the audience is encouraged to make connections on their own. As she tells the story, she acts it out: On a beautiful spring evening in Bloomsburg, she was walking home from the theatre, youthful, full of the joy and excitement of a lovely evening when you've just finished a wonderful rehearsal, and she was attacked by a strange man, dragged into a shed, assaulted and raped. Kemper's delivery of the material in this scene was level—not unemotional but somewhat detached. The story is wrenching, and yet such stories are heartbreakingly commonplace. The next scene takes place in a hospital where Miss Krause is comforting Martha who has sustained a broken collarbone. In that moment, Martha feels that her teacher has once again become Joan, her saving grace: "Miss Krause was for me the human hands of God: earthly evidence of divine love." (10) This was the beginning of the healing Martha journey describes. In the penultimate scene of the play, she visits the cathedral of the Holy Cross in Orleans, France, many years later, where she finds solace gazing at the images of Joan in the stained glass windows. The colored lights of the gobos speckled the floor, and Kemper's face glowed as she looked upwards. As a child, she felt safe. She thought nothing bad could happen to her if she was a good girl. As an adult, she learned that was not true, and yet she also learned there was hope on the other side of horror. In the final scene of the play, we are in the present day as Martha relates how Miss Krause has become her savior Joan once more, helping forge Kemper through her love and encouragement to endure the flame of her own personal suffering and

become the artist she was meant to become. Though Miss Krause has since passed away, the light her teacher kindled back in her then has led some thirty years later to Kemper's ability to write this autobiographical piece—for healing and some sort of redemption, and to give courage to others, especially other survivors.

Joan and Hauviette—a Sequel?

One element that Shaw leaves out that is central to so many women's lives is a trope that Gage and Kemper both utilize: the love of another woman as salvational. In the final moments of Gage's play, Joan talks about her childhood friend, Hauviette, a real person, who testified at length at Joan's Rehabilitation Trial, some twenty five years after Joan's death, where Joan's verdict was nullified and her good name restored. In Gage's version, Hauviette was actually in love with Joan, and Joan with her. Joan's biggest regret is that she became a warrior in the world of men because she was too afraid to accept the love of another woman. Like Martha, looking back over the decades, Gage's Joan grants us wisdom in retrospect: she confesses that if she had only been true to her own feelings, she could have avoided her tragedy. Anyone wishing to write another adaptation of Joan should certainly investigate this aspect of the story—Hauviette definitely deserves her own play! Joan's mother (who is the only other female character who appears, albeit briefly, in *Joan of Arc: Into the Fire*) is the one who advocates for Joan's Rehabilitation Trial. She could be another source of inspiration for future playwrights. Other female characters could people such a narrative: besides Hauviette and Joan's mother, surely Joan acquired a friend

she meets along the way (perhaps another cross-dresser who makes Joan promise to keep her gender secret), a nun, a sympathetic prison guard wife, etc. And Joan doesn't have to function as a mainly one-dimensional character as she does in *Saint Joan* and *Into the Fire*. If Saint Mother Therese and even Jesus at times felt abandoned by God, then Joan very well could have too, and playwrights could certainly mine this rich vein as well. In this way, future plays could continue to tell the story of Joan, foregrounding various elements that resonate with current audiences.

Conclusion

All of these plays, including the rock musical, the Shaw version, and the two one acts, illustrate how Joan's story has evoked inspiration, adulation and emulation over hundreds of years. Key to the continuing fascination with the story is the idea that if the world could only understand and appreciate Joan and make more room for the Joans of the world—their ability to speak truth to power, their gender, their sexuality, their expressions of their identity, and/or their courageous commitment to their beliefs—it would be a better place, as Shaw suggests in his famous epilogue. These works also hold out the hope that someday that day will come. As we imagine new worlds on the stage, we also contribute to, as well as reflect, the reality we inhabit: the theatre is the perfect place to reflect upon the status quo, not only holding up the mirror to Nature, but sometimes shattering old images of ourselves to make way for new creations.

¹ Stefano Boselli, "The Intertextual Short Play: An Example Using Verga's *Cavalleria rusticana* and Capuana's *Il piccolo archivio*," *Modern Language Notes*, Volume 126, Italian issue (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, January 2011), 47.

² Laura Hope and Phillipa Kelly, "Feminist Dramaturgy: Notes from No-(Wo)Man's Land," *Theatre Topics*, Volume 24, Number 3 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, September 2014), 225.

³ Sarah Schulman, "Supremacy Ideology Masquerading as Reality: The Obstacles Facing Women Playwrights in America," *Theatre Journal*, 62 (4) (December 2010): 567-570.

⁴ John Lutterbie, "Codirecting: A Model for Men Directing Feminist Plays," in *Upstaging Big Daddy: Directing Theater as if Gender and Race Matter*, edited by Ellen Donkin and Susan Clement (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993), 263.

⁵ "See Laura Mulvey, "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema," *Screen* 16 (3) (Autumn 1975): 6-18, for her discussion of the psychoanalytic mechanisms, including 'scophophilia,' (pleasure in looking), that she suggests organize the gendered differences of spectatorship." Quoted in Jill Dolan, *The Feminist Spectator in Action: Feminist Criticism for the Stage and Screen* (London: Palgrave/Macmillan, 2013), 215.

⁶ Lutterbie, 275.

⁷ Hope and Kelly, 229.

⁸ Hope and Kelly, 229. In other words, directors who claim they are interpreting the play solely "as the playwright intended," are falsely masking their own subjectivity, unless, of course, it's the playwright who is directing!

⁹ Jo Bonney, quoted in the *New York Times*, January 31, 2013, "Meet the Directors."

¹⁰ A recent example of a production that is actually less feminist than the original canonical work occurred with Simon Stone's adaptation of Lorca's *Yerma* (2016) at the Young Vic.

¹¹ Ralph Williams, quoted in Boselli, 225.

¹² After hearing an earlier version of this paper at the International Shaw Society conference in Niagara-on-the-Lake in the summer of 2017, a prominent Shaw scholar said that she would never again be able to read or see *Saint Joan* without thinking about the issues I raised. Hence, I believe this practice of intertextuality is paramount.

¹³ Schaar, quoted in Boselli, 225.

¹⁴ www.joanofarc.com

¹⁵ Anatole France, *The Life of Joan of Arc*, translated by Winifred Stephens (London: John Lane, 1909).

¹⁶ French women did not win the right to vote until 1945.

¹⁷ Margaret Murray, *The Witch Cult in Western Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1921).

¹⁸ Dolan, 1.

¹⁹ Dolan, 13.

²⁰ Dagmara Krzyzaniak, "From Heresy to Sainthood: Joan of Arc's Quest for Identity in Bernard Shaw's *Saint Joan*," *Studia Angelica Posnaniensia* 41 (2005), 290.

²¹ Dolan, 5.

²² The term “intersectionality” was first coined in 1989 by American feminist legal scholar and civil rights activist Kimberlee Williams Crenshaw, building on the work of the Combahee River Collective, a trailblazing group of radical Black feminists who formed in 1974 and named themselves after Harriet Tubman’s 1853 raid on the Combahee River in South Carolina, which resulted in the freeing of 750 enslaved people. In 1977, they published a statement articulating ideas of identity politics and interlocking oppressions, arguing that as women of color, understanding the discrimination they faced was not possible without considering the intersecting aspects of their identities, including their race, class, gender, and sexuality.

²³ Leslie Feinberg, *Transgender Warriors: Making History from Joan of Arc to Dennis Rodman* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1996).

²⁴ Karma Waltonen, “Saint Joan: From Renaissance Witch to New Woman,” *Dionysian Shaw 24* (University Park: Penn State University Press, 2004), 192.

²⁵ Waltonen, 192.

²⁶ Quoted in Walton, 198.

²⁷ Carolyn Gage, *The Second Coming o Joan of Arc and other plays* (Santa Cruz: Herbooks, 1994), 5-34.

²⁸ Maggie Astor, “Violence Against Transgender People is on the Rise, Advocates Say,” *The New York Times*, November 9, 2017.

²⁹ Jesse Green in *New York Magazine* (among most other reviewers) also praised Lampert’s performance, though she lamented that the material she had to work with was so lacking; Green wrote that she wished she could see Lampert as Shaw’s Joan!

³⁰ Katie Baker, Janice Kaplan, “Why a Real Hero Stands Alone: Review of ‘Joan of Arc: Into the Fire’ and ‘Enemy of the People,’” *The Daily Beast*, 3.15.17, 11:00PM ET

³¹ Ben Brantley, “Review: ‘Joan of Arc’ and the Monotony of Sainthood,” *New York Times*, 15 March 2017 (2).

³² Playbill, “The Verdict: How Did Critics Review *Joan of Arc: Into the Fire*”? January 13, 2018.

³³ Baker.

³⁴ David Rooney, “ ‘Joan of Arc: Into the Fire’ Theater Review,” *Hollywood Reporter*, March 15, 2017.

³⁵ Robert Hofler, “David Byrne is a True Believe About Butch Saint,” *The Wrap*, March 15, 2017.

³⁶ Baker.

³⁷ Baker.

³⁸ Robert Kahn, “David Byrne Misfires with Aimless ‘Joan of Arc,’” *NBC NY*, March 15, 2017.

³⁹ Billington.

⁴⁰ Michael Holroyd, “A Tragedy without Villains,” *The Guardian*, 14 July 2007, 3.

⁴¹ Susan Myer Sifton, “Director’s Notes,” www.jeweltheatre.net

⁴² Holroyd.

⁴³ Toronto Star (thestar.com), “Saint Joan at Shaw Festival’s design dazzles: review,” 26 May 2017, 2.

⁴⁴ Martha Kemper, *Me, Miss Krause and Joan*, unpublished script, 2006, 1.