
JOAN OF ARC AND EPISTEMOLOGY

by Pierre Beaudry, 6/20 /17

INTRODUCTION

“Joan of Arc saved France; she also helped save Christianity out of the crisis where the moral unity of the world had become in great danger of failing. It is fitting, therefore, that the Church erect her on its altar, as it is fitting that France and humanity celebrates her for all times to come.” Gabriel Hanotaux, *Jeanne d’Arc*.

In February 1994, after serving a sentence of five years as a political prisoner, Lyndon LaRouche wrote an extraordinary report on economics which he identified as “the Platonic epistemological basis” for all human knowledge. Is there a missing connection here, between economics and epistemology? How do you make the connection between economics and epistemology? How do you relate the known to the unknown? How do you make the connection between the Earth and the Heaven? That’s the question. The answer is: the connection is not perceptible by sense perception; therefore, you have to make the connection mentally, by *preterition*.

It is not an exaggeration in the least to say that the document that Lyndon LaRouche wrote when he got out of jail represents the most important insight into the difference between man and God since Leibniz wrote his *Theodicy*. The point Lyn made in his report is that the limitations of our minds cannot be understood mathematically or logically, but only epistemologically. You ask why this cannot be understood mathematically. The answer is because such an axiomatic limitation

does not originate from a formal system of deductive logic. Therefore, that knowledge bypasses logical people and mathematicians. In other words, it is the opposite which is true; that is, when deductive logic is the expression of a discontinuity within a higher continuous domain which can only be expressed as an epistemologically proportional function. Leibniz had already developed that idea in the form of a harmonic proportion between power and reason. Lyn expressed the same matter geometrically; that is, by investigating the incommensurability between two crossing lines. He said:

“Cut one line with another. If we make the second of those lines sufficiently thin, can it become the case that the length of the first line coinciding with the second will be a point on the first line for which there is no denumerable determination of exact position? “Yes,” says Cantor’s demonstration. This issue was already featured in such locations as Bernhard Riemann’s 1854 Habilitation Dissertation; the model of the problem was introduced by Richard Dedekind. It was central in the work of Cantor’s teacher, Karl Weierstrass. This is a true mathematical discontinuity. Asymptotic limits which are true discontinuities are therefore never existing theorems of a continuous function which they bound. For an example of this latter principle, compare B. Riemann’s construction of his *On the Propagation of Plane Air Waves of Finite Magnitude*, published in 1860, in which the central point is this notion of an asymptotic limit as a singularity which is not a theorem of the function which it bounds. Similarly, true axiomatic-revolutionary discoveries are not themselves functions (theorems) of the formal (e.g., mathematical) system which is their putative point of origination. Similarly, a series of such functions, as a Cantorian type, is a quality of function which resides outside all generally accepted classroom mathematics, yet inclusively bounds the latter externally.” (Lyndon LaRouche, [*The Science of Physical economy as The Platonic epistemological basis for all branches of Human Knowledge*](#), EIR, Feb, 25, 1994 and June 9, 2017, p. 55.)

1. PRETERITION OR THE ART OF DISCOVERING WHAT'S NOT THERE

Too many people think there is only one way to know, and that is to believe with sense certainty what your eyes tell you: “*But, how can this not be true, I saw it with my own two eyes.*”

The problem with this way of thinking is not in your eyes, but in your mind. Sense perception only gives you a shadow as opposed to the real thing. Sense perception only gives you what appears to be true; which means that reality is never what it appears to be. In other words, you never *see* what is important in life, because the knowledge of what is most important is not there for your eyes to see; it is made to be visible only to your mind. In that sense, what is not there doesn't mean that it should be there instead of its shadow; it means that *it is missing* for sense perception. Therefore, the knowledge of its omission is the most important thing to discover, because that is the nature of a true axiomatic singularity. The epistemological form of such an axiomatic singularity is called *preterition*. Yes, you have to look it up in the dictionary, because it is a term that is not very often used.

Etymologically, *preterition* comes from the Latin: *praetereo*, meaning to go beyond (*praeter*, beyond, *ire*, to go). In its original Latin form, the term also means, to leave aside, to omit, to pass over, to surpass or to be passed. In Law, *preterition* refers to the omission of an heir who is entitled to a portion of a testament inheritance. In modern languages, *Preterition* refers to a rhetorical figure of speech by means of which one declares not wanting to speak of something, which one nevertheless speaks about in order to express its omission. For example: “I don't have to remind you how happy we were when we met in Tangier last summer.”

From the vantage point of epistemology, *preterition* is a form of knowledge which is acquired by *learned ignorance* in the sense of Nicholas of Cusa, because

what is to be stated about something is not fit for sense perception, but only for the human mind. It is also generally ignored deliberately as a form of knowledge by most people, simply because it is above their heads.



Figure 1 Albrecht Durer, *Saint Michael fighting the Dragon*, 1498.

The best artistic form of *preterition* can be found in Durer's woodcut of the Archangel Michael battling the Dragon. (See **Figure 1**) In this case, *preterition* is a metaphor of compassionately passing over a higher truth which is not understood from a lower manifold.

2. THE LAROCHE SINGULARITY AND PLATONIC EPISTEMOLOGY

“As Lyndon LaRouche demonstrated, the difference between man and animal is a discontinuity which can only be known by means of a principle of incommensurable proportionality among true axiomatic singularities within the continuous function which they bound.”

Dehors Debonneheure

Lyn's notion of a “mathematical singularity” also has the characteristic of a *preterition* because it cannot be grasped by sense perception. The epistemological relevancy of this fact can be found in his discussion of the ontological paradox of Plato's *Parmenides* dialogue. This is what Lyn wrote about it:

“As Plato demonstrated this famous ontological paradox by his *Parmenides* dialogue: that unifying conception of change which, as a generating principle, subsumes and thus bounds all of the members of a collection cannot be itself a member of that collection. This was demonstrated in a fresh way by Cantor, a demonstration which Cantor situated explicitly in terms of Plato's work, and which Cantor developed as a revolution respecting both the formal and ontological features of all possible mathematical thinking. Thus, if we state the “hereditary principle” of any formal system, such as today's generally accepted university classroom mathematics, in its proper form as a generating principle, that statement lies outside the formal system of elements which it defines implicitly. That fact lies outside the reach of comprehension by today's generally accepted mathematical thinking; but that principle is nonetheless intelligible, knowable.” (Lyndon LaRouche, [*The Science of Physical economy as The*](#)

Platonic epistemological basis for all branches of Human Knowledge, EIR, Feb, 25, 1994 and June 9, 2017, p. 52.)

This is the crux of the matter, a sort of epistemological *Gordian Knot* which is not introduced for anyone to undo or to cut, but to be internalized and get caught up into because the future of mankind depends on understanding and applying its profound significance. Lyn identified beautifully the significance of this epistemological *preterition* from the standpoint of the history of mathematics. I do not intend to go into the history of mathematics here but to simply identify the appropriate axiomatic point for epistemological purposes.

As Lyn showed, the fallacy of composition of mathematical thinking is located in the anti-Leibniz economic dogmas whereby “profit is something gained by one person out of the pocket of another.” (Ibidem, p. 55) Nowhere in mathematics or current economics does one find the opposite, which is true; that is, the idea of “profit” as a benefit for someone else’s mind.

Ironically, the economy of nature, that is, God’s economy, shows that Lyn was right in understanding that the human mind increases in power as the changes in potential population-density do throughout historical time, because “the characteristic of those changes in potential population-density which have brought us to this time is an increase in both standard of living and productivity expressed in both per-capita and per square-kilometer terms.” (Ibidem, p. 55.)

The crucial point that Lyn is making, therefore, is that although such an axiomatic-revolutionary discovery can be represented as an “absolute mathematical discontinuity,” that is to say, as a non-perceived missing link to the future, such an increase in human power over nature is not accessible by mathematical thinking, because, as all formal-deductive systems are axiomatically limited and finite, so are mathematics. That is also the paradox of the future that Joan of Arc was confronted with and for which she died.

3. JEAN GERSON AND THE AXIOMATIC CHANGE OF JOAN OF ARC

“False things are even more probable than true ones.”

Jean Gerson

When historian Gabriel Hanotaux investigated the life of Joan of Arc, during the first decade of the twentieth century, he made a crucial axiomatic discovery that no other historian up to his time had made concerning the competence of the judges who sentenced her to death on May 30, 1431. He saw that her judges were incompetent from a standpoint of principle and not simply for a lack of available knowledge; they had failed from the vantage point of a Platonic epistemology which resonated from a profound understanding of the difference between man and beast, which none of the judges had been willing to admit existed, let alone internalize and assimilate.

Hanotaux discovered that the incompetence of the judges was not understood by the judges themselves, because they ignored the *principle of preterition*. The best they could do was to project their ignorant incompetence into a scholastic distinction that was reflected in religious terms as a misunderstanding of the difference between the *Triumphant Church and the Militant Church*; a difference which the scholars of the University of Paris had established as an axiomatic singularity between the *Heavenly domain and the Earthly domain*. They were attempting to understand from below a distinction that could only be understood from above. In the Catholic Church, the doctrinal distinction is between God, the Saints, and the saved souls in Heaven on the one hand, and the Pope, the Cardinals, the Bishops, the priests, and the sinners on Earth on the other hand.

From the standpoint of religion more generally, the Triumphant Church is the Church of those who have died and are enjoying eternal bliss in the union with God and all of the Saints. The Militant Church is the Church which is struggling against sin and against "the rulers of the world of this darkness, against the spirits of wickedness in high places." (*Ephesians* 6, 12.) Although the two Churches are separated by death, they are nevertheless united as One Church because they relate

to one another through prayer. This is the distinction that the so-called “theologians” of the University of Paris chose to set a trap for Joan of Arc to fall into and condemn her for heresy.

A single individual of that period wrote about the significance of that axiomatic function of change in history and chose to set the condition of the question of Joan of Arc on the terrain of truth versus apparent truth. His name is Jean Gerson.

Six days after the liberation of Orleans, on May 14, 1429, in his capacity as Chancellor of the University of Paris, Gerson wrote a short treatise in defense of Joan of Arc which stands to this day as a great monument of truth against his scholastic colleagues who decided to execute Joan because she threatened to exterminate their obsolete way of thinking.

Gerson died two months later, on July 12, 1429, two days before the crowning of Charles VII at Reims, and therefore, he could not witness the fulfillment of Joan’s mission. However, what is interesting about Gerson’s defense of Joan is that he treats the subject as a matter of axiomatics. This is what he wrote in the first part of his treatise:

“On the subject of the admirable triumph of a certain Maiden who has gone from shepherdess to commander of the French King’s armies in a war against the English:

“First of all, on the matter of truth about the Maiden and about the belief that concerns her actions, it is necessary to understand that many false things can be considered as probable; even better, according to the philosopher, that certain false things are even more probable than true ones. That is the reason why two contradictory propositions can both be equally probable, but they cannot both be true.

“Secondly, if such a probability is properly understood and well grounded, one can consider it to be in error only when one attempts obstinately to apply it beyond its limits. And the reason for this is because whoever gives an opinion which is considered to be probable, merely wishes

to assert the existence of verisimilitudes. This is true, unless such a verisimilitude is completely unbelievable. But, he who supports the contrary opinion also has verisimilitudes at his disposal, that is to say, a number of motives which support his conjecture, and may sometimes be truthful. Therefore, there is no real contradiction between the two.

“We must consider, thirdly, that in matters of faith and morality, there are two orders of truth. There are truths which are imposed by necessity of faith and it is not permissible to doubt them or to consider them only as probable, because, as the saying goes: “To doubt in matters of faith is to be unfaithful.” (*De Heretics* [Xa V.7.1]) It should be added in our case that the “*Barbarius Philippus*” civil law¹ does not apply [Dig. 14. 3], no common error may be considered to be right; on the contrary, the more the error is common, the more it is wrong. It should be exterminated by fire and the sword, according to ecclesiastical and civil judgments against heretics. This is the place where we can also apply this appropriate verse: *Non patitur ludum, fama, fides, oculus*. « One doesn't play with a man's good name, his faith, and his eyes.²»

“Playing with matters of faith could lead the culprit to be brought before the competent court of justice, under suspicion of erring in matters of faith.”

“There is a second order of truths contained within faith, or relative to faith. They can be qualified as truths of pious opinions and of devoted beliefs, but they are by no means necessary object of faith; hence the popular expression about them: ‘He who does not believe, is not damned.’”

¹ *Barbarius Philippus* is an old Roman Law known as the “equity axiom” which was instituted as a justification for the perception that a “common error makes right” (*error communis facit jus*). According to Hanotaux, the issue also refers to Gerson's polemic against Cauchon over Jean Petit's claim that it is permissible to kill tyrants without the formality of justice. This was the decisive issue of this entire period; the issue which will lead Gerson to defend Joan of Arc and Cauchon to burn her at the stake.

² Playing with someone's “eyes” means filling his eyes with illusions.

“However, three conditions are specially required for something to be the object of a pious belief.

“1. It must bring about devotion and pious sentiments toward God and the holy things. It must lead to the exaltation of the divine miracles of power or clemency, and the veneration of the Saints.

“2. It must be based on probable arguments, such as those which may be adduced from a general belief, or from the account of credible witnesses, asserting that they have heard or seen the object of belief.

“3. To this is added a third condition, counting on the discretion of men of theology and of learned men of good morals; that is, in such cases where the relations of those things that apply to the devotion of the faith, are not included or mixed with any falsehood or errors, which are obviously opposed to the faith or to the good morals, directly or indirectly, openly or in hidden manner.

“But, the ability to know and to decide of these things, to accept and to reject such things loudly and haphazardly pronounce oneself competently on these questions in order to provoke disputes, is not for just anyone to do; especially when there is toleration on the part of the Church, on the part of the prelates of the Church in one or several provinces. The judgement and the determination over such matters must be differed to this same Church, to its prelates and to its doctors. [...]

“In conformity with theses premises, and in consideration with the diverse circumstances and the effects which followed from them, it is pious, salutary, and in conformity with faith and with good devotion to declare oneself in favor of the Maiden.

“The objective that she is pursuing is just; that is, the restoration of the King in his kingdom by means of the very legitimate defeat and expulsion of very desperate enemies.

“I will further add that in the actions of this young girl, nothing smells of magical spells which are condemned by the Church; there are no reprobate superstitions, neither fraud nor treason, nothing in the order of personal interest, nothing equivocal. As proof of her faith in her mission, she exposes her life to supreme perils.” (Jean Gerson, [Proces de Rehabilitation, VIII – Traité de Gerson](#). Translated from the original Latin by P.B.)

This treatise is one of the last things that Gerson wrote before he died. It was written between the liberation of Orleans and the Crowning of Charles VII at Reims. This means that anyone in power who was concerned with the injustice of the Rouen Trial had the opportunity to read this memorandum which circulated widely at the University of Paris and beyond before and during the trial, and the relevant people could easily equip themselves with Gerson's arsenal in defense of Joan. No one did.

The first part of the memorandum, which I have just quoted above, is an epistemological exposé of what the human mind must take into account when confronted with the appearance of truth given by the common error of public opinion through sense perception. Gerson described the required sort of faith which was attached to the divinity of Joan of Arc's mission and he forecasted the fallacy of the arguments that the Rouen Trial was later going to use in order to condemn her to death two years later.

No need to state that not a single judge at the Rouen trial used the defense of Gerson, which is encapsulated in his axiom busting statement: *“False things are even more probable than true ones.”* Why? Because it is always easier to go along with public opinion, than it is to openly condemn a common error.

As Lyn demonstrated on the matters of axiomatics between reason and mathematical logic, Gerson also identified between faith and reason; that is, the mystery of the epistemological boundary conditions coming from a higher truth. Thus, the limitations of logical thinking, just as the limitations of faith are not able to define the boundary conditions of human reason; they can only represent singularities, discontinuities as Lyn identified them. In both cases, the axiomatic issue is the reliance on a higher ordering principle; that is, faith relying on the

divine mission of improving mankind as a species. That singularity is what the distinction between the *Triumphant Church* and the *Militant Church* was meant to uncover, but which was instead used to cover up.

The higher heavenly domain calls for such a *pretermission* in which the lower earthly domain is passed over intentionally by superior forces, allowing the masses of people below to sleep undisturbed and without the knowledge of what is taking place above their heads in the war between a handful of angels and the forces of evil.

The irony in all of this, of course, is that the divine power of Joan of Arc's intervention did not produce all that was expected because of the inequity of men. However, my question is: will the discovery of Lyndon LaRouche's principle of relative population-density have the power to alter that expectation? It can be done if the governments of the world institute the legislations of Lyndon LaRouche's [*Four Laws*](#).

4. THE SINGULARITY OF THE TRIUMPHANT CHURCH

From the standpoint of epistemology, the *Triumphant Church* and the *Militant Church* are separated by an axiomatic singularity which is generally not understood from the lower level of the living, because logic and sense perception do not give access to the eternal manifold. Here, there is a difference of manifolds in the sense of Bernhard Riemann, where a higher manifold cannot be understood from a lower manifold.

During Joan of Arc's time, the meaning of the *Militant Church* was the prevailing manifold that people adhered to, because it meant that living Christians were considered as militant soldiers in the service of the Church. A "Church militant" was considered to be a "Soldier of Christ" engaged in spiritual warfare against the devil and fighting to win in order that he might join the Triumphant Church when he died. This is not how Joan of Arc viewed herself and her mission.

As a Renaissance woman, Joan was fighting from the vantage point of the Triumphant Church; that is, from higher up and from the top down.



Figure 2 Andrea di Bonaiuto da Firenze, *The Triumphant Church and the Militant Church*, Spanish chapel of Santa Maria Novella, Florence, c. 1365.

In fact, her participating in the *Triumphant Church*, while she was still alive, was the very reason she was put on trial. What she was doing, directly from God, was considered as a heresy. In reality, this is what made Joan different from her century; this is what made her a creature of the future, because she was entirely determined from the *Triumphant Church* by time reversal, and she had to make sure that she did not flinch from that commitment. The reality of being able to work from God without mediation except for her voices was the singularity of her *preterition moment*.

It was precisely on this crucial point that her evil Judge, Bishop Cauchon, attempted to break her spirit and her resistance; but that was Joan's biggest victory. Her attachment to the *Triumphant Church* was precisely the motive for her death as it was clearly identified during her trial in Rouen. But the silence on the truth of this axiomatic matter was universal.

As a result of this incommensurable *axiomatic singularity*, the entire historical period of Joan of Arc had become complicit in her condemnation. Every single soul was an accomplice in her murder; because everyone alive in Europe at that time was silent and sinned by omission. They were made to believe that Joan of Arc had to perish because she refused to recognize the authority of the Militant Church. This omission, however, was not an *epistemological preterition* because everyone knew what they were doing was wrong.

The whole intellectual elite of the period was at fault, especially the academics of the University of Paris. Joan of Arc demonstrated the failure of the Middle-Ages way of thinking from the past to the future and was causing an axiomatic change by ushering in a Renaissance of thinking from the future to the past; that is, by time reversal. As Hanotaux put it insightfully:

“Victim of the English, of Cauchon, of the Normans who were being paid or terrorized, her death would have been only a local event or, at most, an incident of national defense. But, she became a universal cause because she had set into motion these people of science and doctrine, at a time when their science and their doctrines were wandering and were leading the world astray.

“The death of Joan of Arc, the crowning of her mission, was the most serious defeat suffered by this “knowledgeable” body so full of itself. If one scrutinizes the profound meaning of history, one is able to see how such a fall was important and why this body never recovered. The pride of the old Sorbonne perished on that day. The common sense of a girl of the people, who understood the social duty and knew how to die, was more eloquent than the pompous speeches and the quibbles of the doctors.” (Gabriel Hanotaux, *Jeanne d’Arc*, Hachette, Paris, p. 286.)

This is the nature of the *epistemological preterition* of Joan’s genius, whose function was to cause an axiomatic change between two Riemannian manifolds; the higher manifold of the *Triumphant Church* and the lower manifold of the *Militant Church*; the higher manifold responding with mercy to the desperate call of pity of a general population which is threatened by extinction by war, famine, and disease. The point to understand in this mysterious process is that every time a human population is threatened by extinction, there is the emergence of a high density of singularities within human society which coalesce into a single individual who takes charge of the axiomatic change. Joan of arc was that person for the European Renaissance of the fifteenth century.



Étendard de Jeanne d'Arc - face
Reconstitution par le Col. de Liocourt



Figure 3 Detail of Christ sitting on a rainbow from Andrea da Firenze and of Joan of Arc's standard:

The reality of this axiomatic change can be seen in a reversed form through a singularity which connected the standard to Joan of Arc and the unique artistic celebration of the Triumphant Christ in the masterpiece of Andrea di Bonaiuto da Firenze. Compare the two figures of Christ.

The curious singularity of Christ sitting on a Rainbow represent the triumphal aftermath of the victory against a near destruction of the human species which only a Renaissance was able to restore. As classical artistic compositions

must always do, the work of Andrea da Firenze must tell the truth by *preterition*. Here, Christ sits with a hammer and a book in his hands, representing the two forms of Dominican Church teaching: the heathen must be saved either by the Holy Scripture or by the hammer. The same idea is reflected in the *Militant Church* form below, with the portrait of Thomas Aquinas teaching the Holy Book to heathens. Note that one of the heathens doesn't want to hear what the Dominican is saying, and another is tearing the pages off the holy book in reaction to his preaching. You don't need to know what is going to happen to these two people after Thomas Aquinas finishes his preaching. The Dominican method is exemplified in the lowest part of the fresco where black and white dogs (*Domini Canis*) are attacking and killing off the wolves of heresy. Those were the methods of the Middle-Ages.



Figure 4 Detail. The Hounds of the Lord (*Domini Canes*) led by Thomas Aquinas (right) preaching and converting the heathens.

A deliberate shift was made in the emphasis in the artistic rendering of the Triumphant Christ immediately after Joan of Arc's death, as if someone had promoted revenge against the ironies of Andrea da Firenze's joking about the Dominicans (*Domini Canes*) in his fresco of the *Triumphant Church and the Militant Church*. Important German and Lower Country artists had been commissioned to transform the "Christ sitting on the rainbow" into the "Christ of *The Last Judgment*." Thus, the Triumphant Christ of Andrea da Firenze and of Joan of Arc was transformed into a retribution God. In a very short period of 30 years, immediately following the death of Joan of Arc, three artists of renown, Stefan Lochner (1435); Rogier van der Weyden, (1445); and Hans Memling, (1460's), abandoned the idea of the Triumphant Church and adopted the idea of a vengeful Church of the Last Judgment.



Figure 5 Stefan Lochner, *The Last Judgment* c. 1435



Title: Last Judgment
Artist: Rogier van der Weyden
Style: Early Netherlandish
Date: ca. 1445-50

Figure 6 Rogier van der Weyden *The Last Judgment*, 1445-50.

After Joan's death, the Chancellor of the Duke of Burgundy, Nicholas Rolin, the main architect of Philippe the Good's "English policy" since 1422, commissioned Rogier van der Weyden, to paint a wall to wall polyptic of the *Last Judgment* to be located in plain sight of the dying inside of the Hospice de Beaune in order to have them prepare themselves for their last destination. It was not made to remind people of God's COVENANT OF THE RAINBOW.³ I don't think

³ THE COVENANT OF THE RAINBOW: The Biblical reference to God and the rainbow can be found in the Book of Genesis, after creating man in His Image and calling on him to be fruitful, to multiply, and fill the Earth: "12 God said, 'This is the sign of the covenant which I am

“*The Last Judgment*” is what Joan of Arc had in mind either, when she put the rainbow of the Triumphant Church on her standard.



Figure 7 Hans Memling, *The Last Judgment*, late 1460's

making between Me and you and every living creature that is with you, for all successive generations; 13 I set My bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a sign of a covenant between Me and the earth. 14 It shall come about, when I bring a cloud over the earth, that the bow will be seen in the cloud, 15 and I will remember My covenant, which is between Me and you and every living creature of all flesh; and never again shall the water become a flood to destroy all flesh.’ 16 When the bow is in the cloud, then I will look upon it, to remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh that is on the Earth. 17 And God said to Noah, ‘This is the sign of the covenant which I have established between Me and all flesh that is on the Earth.’” ([Genesis. 9:12-17.](#))

Joan's real genius was actually epistemological and her courage and the method of her action made intelligible the Renaissance that was already under way. As a result, the world gave us a Nicholas of Cusa and a Louis XI, who were the direct fruits of her action. It was in that sense that the mission of Joan of Arc was to replicate the Covenant of the Rainbow in order to restore peace in Europe and not to bring retribution.



Figure 8 Raphael, *The Dispute*, 1509. The *Triumphant Church* is sitting in a half circle on both sides of the Holy Trinity, while the *Militant Church* is disputing the value of the Holy Sacrament below.

The complete epistemological significance of this breakthrough of the development of the human mind was fully captured and elaborated by Raphael de

Sanzio in the two compositions of *The dispute* (1509-1510) and *The School of Athens* (1509-1511), representing the perfect embodiment of the Renaissance.

CONCLUSION

Hanotaux has a masterful insight into the epistemological function of Joan of Arc in history. He said:

“Of course, the boundaries seemed very uncertain at that time, the national feeling was very diffuse, the feudal hierarchies very complex and very fleeting. Yet, among these defectors there was not a single one who did not know he was doing wrong by taking the side of England. Since this woman had dared to say that their cause would perish, it was necessary that this woman should perish.

“There they are, all together. The tragedy of the Lancastrians has its rendezvous here: the dramas of France and of Burgundy have their knots here; the alternatives of the two councils which decided the fate of Christendom meet here: these doctors, who got acquainted in Constance, were eager to leave the Place du Vieux-Marché in order to run to Basle.

“It is the evolution of consciousness which is being decided here: this shepherdess summons the doctors to her bar; the rights of free thought, of vocation, the limits of independence and of submission, the relationship of the soul with the Militant Church and the Triumphant Church; that is, between the earth and the heaven, all of this shall find surprisingly clear definitions expressed by the answers of Joan of Arc with incomparable insight.” (Gabriel Hanotaux, *Jeanne d’Arc*, Hachette, Paris, 1811, p. 294.)

