

WE ARE OUR HEROES: UNDERSTANDING WESTERN CULTURE THROUGH
FAUST, DON JUAN, AND JOAN OF ARC

A THESIS IN

Theatre

Presented to the Faculty of the University
of Missouri-Kansas City in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree
MASTER OF ARTS

by

ETHAN ROYCE ZOGG

B.A. University of Missouri-Kansas City, 2015

Kansas City, Missouri

2017

© 2017

ETHAN ROYCE ZOGG

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

WE ARE OUR HEROES: UNDERSTANDING WESTERN CULTURE THROUGH
FAUST, DON JUAN, AND JOAN OF ARC

Ethan Royce Zogg, Candidate for the Master of Arts Degree
University of Missouri-Kansas City, 2017

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this work is to identify and analyze patterns in three of the most popular characters in Western (Europe and the Americas) theatre history. Faust/Faustus, Don Juan, and Joan of Arc are the subjects of hundreds of plays over the course of four centuries. Because they are so popular, they must hold some significance in our understanding of Western culture. By using the works of cultural critic and scholar Camille Paglia and contemporary philosopher Ken Wilber, this thesis compares and contrasts the narratives and expressions of the characters central to these three myths.

Chapter 1 introduces the works examined in this thesis as well as key concepts. Chapter 2 unites the three figures under the assertion that all humans are subject to nature, of which sexuality is an expression. It then analyzes the implications of such an assertion. Chapters 3 and 4 explore the three figures in relationship to the ‘agency v. communion’ dichotomy found in human nature as exemplified by Paglia and Wilber . Chapter 5 explores some of the implications of chapters three and four, namely the cultural significance of Joan

of Arc's androgyny, and how she exemplifies a possible answer to the challenges faced by Faust/Faustus and Don Juan.

APPROVAL PAGE

The faculty listed below, appointed by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences have examined a thesis titled “We are our Heroes: Understanding Western Culture through Faust, Don Juan, and Joan of Arc” presented by Ethan R. Zogg, candidate for the Master of Arts degree, and certify that in their opinion it is worthy of acceptance.

Supervisory Committee

Felicia Hardison Londré, Ph.D., Curators’ Distinguished Professor of Theatre,
Committee Chair
Department of Theatre

Tom Mardikes, Professor of Theatre-Sound Design
Department of Theatre, Chair

Gene Emerson Friedman, Associate Professor
Department of Theatre

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION: HEROES AND POPULISM.....	1
2. NATURE, SEX, AND POWER.....	10
3. AGENCY AND COMMUNION IN DON JUAN AND FAUST(US).....	28
4. AGENCY AND COMMUNION BALANCED IN JOAN OF ARC.....	47
5. IMPLICATIONS OF JOAN OF ARC’S ANDROGYNY.....	59
WORKS CONSULTED.....	69
VITA.....	72

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Chosen Case-Plays.....	4

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION: HEROES AND POPULISM

In Europe and parts of the Americas, what we know as the ‘West’, there have been figures, both historical and fictional, that have transcended national borders and linguistic barriers and entered into a sort of cultural pantheon. Characters like Don Quixote, Dr. Who, Hercules, Jesus Christ, The Beatles, Tupac Shakur, Alexander the Great: most literate westerners know of these characters, and almost all of us know at least one of them deeply. These are narratives, both true and fictional (and some a bit of both), that have survived generations upon generations, and some under extreme persecution.

It is that resonance with generations that gives the figures their power and their meaning. Any movement of cultural significance, whether literary, political, or otherwise, must have a significant group of the population behind it in order to get off the ground. For it to survive through generations, it must appeal not only to the circumstances of the first audience, the way a political satire or a popular fad might; it must appeal to a facet of the greater culture. To then transcend not only generation gaps, but national and regional differences, the narratives or movements must find resonance with something that is human, something that is in the psychological or emotional make-up of all people, not just those under the specific circumstances of the characters birth. Essentially, the narrative/character/movement/etc. must appeal to a popular audience and resonate with universal characteristics of their cultures. In this, there are no literary elite, no taste-makers, no impresarios. Though those groups can help to spread the narratives, the final judgement is left to the whole

audience; what survives is what audiences will pay to see and what resonates with the most people.

Wisdom traditions and modern psychology have both found that for an individual to identify something, to name it, they must have had prior experience with it. For example, one cannot call a four-legged feline in your house a 'cat' unless you've either been told "That is a cat" or named it "cat" yourself. Either way, prior experience is necessary. This is very simple for external things like animals, colors, or governments, since these are things that have what scientists and philosophers call "simple location." Something with "simple location" can be identified empirically: "That is a cat, that cloud is white, it is raining outside" are all examples. You have seen it before, you know what it is, and you can identify it. The same is true of personal behaviors: "I hate ice-cream, I always forget my keys, I love The Beatles." These are things that are external, they can be proven by patterns. I can point to fifty "have you seen my keys?" text-messages and say "I always forget my keys." This ability to identify a pattern requires experience.

When characters appear again and again and their narratives are repeated to and by generation after generation, something must be expressed in those narratives that we have experienced ourselves. This is what we generally are referring to when we talk about 'resonance' in a piece of creative-expression. For someone to say "I get that character, I know that feeling/experience," one must have experienced what they're experiencing, one must have some degree of empathy with their experience or personality. It is that sense of empathy that draws us to pieces of art and gives them personal meaning. That same empathy, when spread over a larger population for multiple generations, is the 'resonance' that allows

something to survive. There is no taste-maker, there is no literary elite, only what is human. These figures and narratives, the ones that have that resonance, tell us much about the audiences and cultures they resonate with. And when they resonate with such a large group as “The West” over hundreds of years, they must have characteristics that approach universality and can tell us a great deal about our culture and its history.

The significance of their narratives having a long and meaningful life in the theatre lies in the fact that theatre was a popular and relatively accessible entertainment form of the day. This means that not only could the upper classes go to an expensive opera and see *Don Giovanni* at its premiere, but the lower classes could go see an equally good *Don Juan Tenorio*, or any of the countless small productions looking to entertain and make a quick dime. To make a loose analogy, theatrical shows were the ‘Netflix’ of the day: cheap and accessible art and/or entertainment. Almost anyone could see a show, and after plays could be printed in-mass, copies could be read by any literate citizen.

Three figures that have attained mythic status, those that this work will explore, are Faust/Doctor Faustus, Don Juan/Don Giovanni, and Joan of Arc/St. Joan. These three have had many plays, films, television shows, and novels created about them, and have generated many scholarly works. For this work though, what is important is that there were hundreds of plays written about them, and that the birth and survival of the mythic-figure of each is largely due to their presence in the theatre.

The case-examples I have chosen are as follows:

Table 1: Chosen Case-Plays

Character/Myth	Work (Premier Date)	Playwright (Lifespan)
Faust	<i>The Tragical History of the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus</i> (1592) [referenced as <i>Doctor Faustus</i>]	Christopher Marlowe (1564-1593)
	<i>Faust, Part I</i> (1808)	Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832)
Don Juan	<i>Don Giovanni</i> (1787)	Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart (1756-1791)
	<i>Don Juan Tenorio</i> (1844)	José Zorilla (1817-1893)
Joan of Arc	<i>Saint Joan</i> (1923)	Bernard Shaw (1856-1950)
	<i>The Maid of Orleans</i> (1801)	Johann Christoph Friedrich von Schiller (1759-1805)

For the Faust myth, these two have been chosen as they are the best known, and are widely held as masterpieces. *Faust, Part I* is arguably Goethe’s best work, and Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus* is on par with Shakespeare when it comes to Elizabethan drama. In addition, Goethe is considered to be one of the greatest geniuses ever to live, giving even more importance to an already highly-esteemed work. These two are by far the most popular theatrical versions of the myth, and are only surpassed by *The Picture of Dorian Gray* when it comes to cross-genre popularity.

In this thesis, I will use three versions of the Faust characters name. “Faust” will refer to Goethe’s version, “Faustus” will refer to Marlowe’s, and Faust(us) will refer to the soul of the character, the essential mythic entity that Marlowe and Goethe both manifest.

I have chosen *Don Giovanni* and *Don Juan Tenorio* for the Don Juan myth, as they are the two most popular versions. Mozart’s *Don Giovanni* is an annual staple in the world of

opera. According to operabase.com, a website that has catalogued opera productions since 2009, *Don Giovanni* regularly figures in the top 10 most produced in the world 230 years after its premiere. *Don Juan Tenorio* is widely considered the best non-musical version of the myth, and is traditionally produced every year by Spanish theatres on All Saints Day, meaning there has been a production of the play at least once a year for 230 years (Mandrell 39). Though there have been countless versions of the myth, these are the most produced and esteemed. They are also heavily influenced by the first Don Juan narrative *The Trickster of Seville and the Stone Guest* by Tirso de Molina, a close third in popularity. Being the most popular, and drawing on the original yet less-popular version of the myth makes these two perfect cases. Though there is not an example like Faust(us) and Dorian Gray to point to for Don Juan, the character of James Bond bears a striking resemblance: He is the ultimate seducer, wins almost every duel, and has a taste for the finer things in life. Similarly, Don Juan and James Bond do not have a strong sense of communion, which will be explored in more detail later.

Joan of Arc is a more tricky case to select examples for. Shaw's *Saint Joan* is the most produced version of the play on the English stage, and is one of the few by a legendary playwright. The other case chosen for this work, *The Maid of Orleans*, is by Schiller, a major figure of the Romantic movement. Though Jean Anouilh's *The Lark* (1952) and Maxwell Anderson's *Joan of Lorraine* (1946) were very popular in their time, and Bertolt Brecht (who wrote *St. Joan of the Stockyards* (1929) is a huge figure in theatre history, *The Maid of Orleans* is a pre-twentieth century work. In this writer's opinion, it is useful to have great works by great playwrights from different eras, and it shows an interest in the mythical figure

outside of nationality and time-frame. Joan shows up in more contemporary culture as the strong woman, sacrificing for her people and leading when no one else will, often doing traditionally-male jobs. “Rosy the riveter” and the painting “Liberty Leading the People” are in part her cultural progeny.

Of the six works chosen, there are four that fall within the Romantic movement (which includes works written during the Enlightenment), one from the Elizabethan era, and one chronicle play from the 20th century. For each figure, I have included the most popular version of the play, as well as one from the Romantic period, one of the most significant movements in theatre history. The Romantic movement had a strong vein of individualism that focused on identity, which offers valuable insights into the psyche of the West. That focus on individualism will prove to be both a great strength and a great vulnerability.

This thesis draws heavily on the works of Camille Paglia and Ken Wilber. Paglia is a social and literary critic with a focus on Romantic studies, and the main text I will use is *Sexual Personae: Art and Decadence from Nefertiti to Emily Dickenson* (1990). Ken Wilber is a contemporary philosopher from the United States of America, and I will use three of his texts: *A Brief History of Everything* (1996), *Sex, Ecology, Spirituality* (1995), and *A Theory of Everything* (2000). This thesis is a work of synthesis, of drawing these three myths together, looking at different versions, and drawing what truths there are out of their significant similarities and differences. Paglia and Wilber work the same way. Paglia looks at sexuality and identity in the great works of the West, and Wilber looks at the spirit of evolution and wisdom in the great philosophical traditions of history. They are the ideal

authors to draw from for this topic, and the truths they found are evident in the great mythical figures of the West.

In order to establish a common groundwork for the characters, I rely heavily on Paglia's assertion that every human being is subject to Nature, the patterns and laws found natural world. This expresses a core value of humanity that the three characters share: they are all natural beings just like us. This means that they have a shared quality that binds them together and throws their differences into sharp relief. Their subjugation to Nature also sets up the part of this work that comes from Ken Wilber. Wilber's work is centered around tracing universal patterns, especially those of natural development, what he calls in his work "The Spirit of Evolution." One of the central, human themes he finds is a dichotomy between the impulses for agency and communion, which will be explained and explored in chapters 3 and 4. Coupled with Paglia's observations on the trajectory of Western Culture, the two create a tag-team of understanding that reveals truths not only about the characters and cultures these plays were written in, but elements of human nature as well. This not only unites them under a framework that they share, but one that all humans share as well.

Because of the nature of this work, I have limited my subject matter leaving room to explore only the above similarities. There are quite a few more. When I started my research, I found that all three share many traits:

- They are all insatiable in their quests
- They all confirm that we are ultimately limited and ultimately alone
- All three are the proverbial "Person goes into the forest and comes back changed"

narratives

- They usually do not survive their respective journeys
- All three support the Western ideal of individualism
- They are all deeply emotional characters
- All three are in a way androgynous (this work deals only with Joan's androgyny)
- They fit into a "Mind, Body, Spirit" framework

The list goes on. For this work, I had to limit the scope of my analysis, and I did so by focusing on what I judge to be the most significant: our heroes are human, and all humans share the impulses for agency and communion. These are internal similarities that have to do with the human nature, whereas some of the others are external similarities that, while interesting, are less applicable to the understanding of ourselves through what we choose to lift up as heroic. I wanted to find the core of what draws audiences and writers to these figures, and I found that it's the essential human characteristics, which they share or contrast in each other, to be the most revealing. Chapter 2 explores how every human is ultimately subject to Nature. Chapters 3 and 4 take one essential element of human nature (the impulses for agency and communion) and explore the three characters relationship with it. Chapter 5 addresses some of the implications of these differences and suggests why Joan of Arc is an answer to a problem experienced by Faust(us) and Don Juan, as well as exploring possible reasons for Joan's ultimate demise.

Because these three figures appealed to so many audiences over hundreds of years, they can tell us a lot about the greater Western culture. Understanding what we value in them can show us what we value in ourselves, and by understanding their challenges, and how

they attempted to solve them, we can shed light on the problems we face today because, in a way, we are our heroes.

CHAPTER 2

NATURE, SEX, AND POWER

I would like to introduce a concept that this work draws on heavily: the biological basis of human existence as laid down by Camille Paglia in her book *Sexual Personae: Art and Decadence from Nefertiti to Emily Dickinson* (1990). The goal of her work is to explore the sexual identities of humanity throughout Western literature and cultural history, and in the first chapter she asserts that humanity is biological; the only externally definable (or knowable without talking to the individual) characteristics when it comes to identity are governed by biology. Nature, what Paglia describes as a “hard taskmaster”, cares only about biology (Paglia 3). Since identity is a concept created by human thought, nature is not concerned with it, and this allows us to have a groundwork for the development of identity. When we were born, we first identified ourselves with our physical/biological bodies, since that was all we knew. As we developed as a species, both individually and as a group, and we grew in our abilities to think and creating greater socio-cultural groups, our identities developed to reflect the worldview we created for ourselves. But no matter how we identify, we are still biological, and thus still subject to nature.

One of the clear delineations Paglia makes is the biological difference between male and female impulses. She describes the male impulse, like the male body, as projection, exploration, and thrusting. She also equates Tragedy with the male sexual act: “Tragedy is a male paradigm of rise and fall, a graph in which dramatic and sexual climax are in shadowy analogy” (Paglia 7). Tragedy was a genre invented and dominated by male authors, and a

genre specific to the male-dominated West, not showing up in Japan until the late nineteenth century (Paglia 6). The male trajectory is a struggle for significance, and one of the male paradigm's greatest virtues is the idea of free-will, the ability to decide for oneself.

Paglia suggests that the opposing female impulse is to hold close, to nurture, to protect. The female relationship with nature is not one of opposition and domination, but one of co-existence: "She knows there is no free will, since she is not free" (Paglia 10). The female body, having its monthly appointment with nature, knows instinctively that nature cannot be escaped or overcome. One can see the conflicting world views already being shaped by nature, and the classic 'battle of the sexes' being informed from birth, and in this case ONLY by biology.

This creates in the male what Paglia describes as "Sexual exile" (Paglia 19). The biological value of the male is mostly finished after fertilization, and this creates angst in the male psyche. All humans instinctively know that they are in the natural world, and that to survive in that part of the world they must serve a function. In the fight for survival, the female body does the most work at creating new life, the male serves only a short stint in the reproductive process. The biological nature of the male body (the rise, climax, and deflation) defines the western male's psyche, and becomes a battle for meaning against chaotic Nature that suggests the male role is quite small and insignificant compared to the female. For a female human, nature is seen as a part of her, and the female body becomes nature's proxy, especially in the eyes of the male population (Paglia 16). Countless examples of Nature being associated with femaleness occur in Western mythology and culture; In *Sexual Personae*, Paglia illustrates example after example of the female-as-nature in art. The male battle to

dominate nature is then transferred to the female, and we see the beginnings of Western subjugation of the female population.

With this in mind, Paglia also asserts that “Sex is a subset to nature. Sex is the natural in man” (Paglia 1). Sex is an expression of nature in us. Sex/Nature is biological, visceral, instinctive. It is not something that can be altered by thought or reasoning, we are born with it. The three figures chosen for this work—Faust, Don Juan, and Joan of Arc—all express (across multiple versions of the legends) this truth. We are natural beings in a natural world, and since we are subject to Nature, which is strongly expressed in our sexuality, Nature/sex has the final say. In all three myths, sex is a pervasive force (whether motivator or governor), often deciding the fate of the three mythical figures.

Sex, Power, and the War Against Nature

In each of the three mythic narratives, sex and sexuality are a defining force that shapes the narrative of the figure. Sex is the factor that decides the fate of the character; it is the drive that fuels the character’s quest, or it stops the character from achieving his or her goals. For all three figures, sex is an inescapable force, and nature must be answered to. In the case of the male figures, sex/nature is something to be overcome, and they battle against nature in the way they know best. For Joan, nature/sex is what gives her power, but it ultimately causes her downfall.

Faust(us)

For Faust(us), his struggle is one of dominance, he seeks to conquer nature by learning and understanding. In the first scene of Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus*, Faustus describes his studies of philosophy, medicine, law, and theology. He has become a doctor,

and has exhausted every subject, but still feels unfulfilled. In his first monologue he lists his accomplishments, but ends in lament:

Yet level at the end of every art,
And live and die in Aristotle's works.
Sweet Analytics, 'tis thou hast ravished me!
Bene disserere est finis logics.
Is to dispute well logic's chiefest end?
Affords this art no greater miracle?
Then read no more thou has attained that end.
A greater subject fitteth Faustus' wit!
Bid *On cay mae on* farewell; Galen come
Seeing *ubi desinit philosophus ibi incipit medicus*,
Be a physician, Faustus; heap up gold,
And be eternize for some wondrous cure.
Summum bonum medicinae sanitas.
The end of physic is our body's health.
Why, Faustus, hast thou not attained that end?
Is not thy common talk sound aphorisms?
Are not thy bills hung up as monuments,
Whereby whole cities have escaped the plague,
And divers desperate maladies ben cured?
Yet art thou still but Faustus and a man (Marlowe I.i.4-24).

He goes on in this scene to speak the same of theology and law that he did of logic and medicine: He has reached the highest degree of understanding but it is not enough, Faustus is still confined by human limitations. Simply understanding nature is not enough for him, he wants to be able to control it:

O, what a world of profit and delight,
Of power, of honor, of omnipotence,
Is promised to the studious artisan! [of magic]
All things that move between the quiet poles
Shall be at my command. ...
...
A sound magician is a demi-god.
Here try thy brains to get a deity! (Marlowe I.i.54-64)

This is Faustus declaring war on Nature. If he is able to understand the elements, he can control them. This is precisely one of the things he asks of Mephistophilis in II.ii, to tell him of the movement of the planets, and in the prologue of act III we learn that Mephistophilis has taken Faustus, by dragon-drawn chariot, to see the entirety of the heavens and the natural world. The whole time Faustus questions Mephistophilis, who answers succinctly.

Faust in Goethe's version of the myth also seeks to dominate nature by knowledge and discovery. But even for him that is not enough to satisfy. In the prologue in heaven, Mephisto describes Faust's life: "From heaven he demands the fairest star, / And from the earth all joys that he thinks best; / And all that's near and all that's far / Cannot soothe the upheaval in his breast" (Goethe Prologue.ii.304-307). Faust says the same in his opening monologue that Marlowe's Faustus says in his; he describes the great knowledge he has gained, but laments his human limitations. As he begins to read a volume on magic, he is filled with fervor and even asks himself "Am I a god?" (Goethe I.i.439). Two lines later his goal is clearly stated: "In these pure lines my eye can see / Creative nature spread in front of me" Goethe I.i.441-442). In both versions, traditional learning has failed Faust(us), who craves supernatural knowledge and power. Paglia describes this pursuit of power as specific to the West: "Western science is a product of the Apollonian mind: its hope is that by naming and classification, by the cold light of intellect, archaic night can be pushed back and defeated. To name is to know; to know is to control" (Paglia 5). In this instance, archaic night is the great unknown chaotic Nature that humanity is subject to, and the Doctor sees knowledge as a weapon to fight back with.

However, Faust(us) cannot escape his sexuality, which Paglia describes as “the natural in man” (Paglia 1). It is nature in him that in Marlowe’s version keeps him from redemption, while in Goethe’s it saves him by distracting him from his ill-fated quest. In either case, his obsession with knowledge and power is superseded completely by one thing: Woman.

Faust(us)’s quest being de-railed by sexual impulses is strongest in Goethe’s version. In the sixth scene of *Faust, Part I*, Mephisto has brought Faust to a witch’s kitchen to receive a potion granting him renewed youth. Up to this point, Faust had only be concerned with his quest for knowledge and power. However, when he arrives at the kitchen he is distracted by an image in a mirror. After discussing the brewing of magic potions that grant eternal youth, something that Faust should be interested in, Faust, having stopped paying attention to the discussion, exclaims:

What blissful image is revealed
To me behind this magic glass!
Lend me your swiftest pinions, love, that I might pass
From here to her transfigured field!
When I don’t stay right on this spot, but, pining,
Dare to step forward and go near
Mists cloud her shape and let it disappear.
The fairest image of a woman!
Indeed, could woman be so fair?
Or is this body which I see reclining
Heaven’s quintessence from another sphere?
Is so much beauty found on earth? (Goethe I.vi.2429-2440)

and after Mephisto responds, the stage direction reads “Faust *gazes into the mirror all the time*” (Goethe I.vi.2448). Gone is Faust’s desire for knowledge of the supernatural; his only obsession is with this woman, who becomes Gretchen in the next scene. His obsession with

her is evident in the structure of the play: of the 25 scenes in the first part of *Faust*, 17 of them concern his relationship with her directly, while 2 more feature Mephisto attempting to distract him from her, bringing the ratio of scenes about knowledge to scenes about Gretchen at 19:6, or roughly 76% about Gretchen. In chapter 2, I'll explore that relationship and its implications in greater detail. Suffice it for now to say that Faust's sexual desires hold more sway over him than his desire for knowledge, which shows his subjugation to the nature he wishes to dominate.

Marlowe's Doctor Faustus is similarly manipulated by his sexual impulses. Early evidence of his sexual nature comes in II.i, where he asks Mephistophilis for a wife, to which Mephistophilis offers him a harem every morning:

Faustus: But leaving off this, let me have a wife,
The fairest maid in Germany,
For I am wanton and lascivious,
And cannot live without a wife.

Meph.: I prithee, Faustus, talk not of a wife.

Faustus: Nay, sweet Mephistophilis, fetch me one, for I will have one.

Meph.: Well, Faustus, thou shalt have a wife. Sit there till I come.

[Mephistophilis brings Faustus a devil in disguise, which Faust rejects thus]

Faustus: Here's a hot whore indeed! No, I'll no wife.

Meph.: Marriage is but a ceremonial toy,
And if thou lovest me, think no more of it.

I'll cull thee out the fairest courtesans

And bring them every morning to thy bed.

She whom thine eye shall like, thy heart shall have (Marlowe II.i.138-152)

Faustus quickly accepts his choice of women, showing that his sexual desire dominates any thought of morality, which no doubt was the intention of Marlowe when he wrote it. More importantly, this is the second thing that Faustus asks of Mephistophilis after signing the contract. The first is the location of Hell, the second is for sexual satisfaction. Faustus seems

the hypocrite after asking for knowledge and control of nature, easily succumbing to the nature in him.

Later, in act II scene II of *Doctor Faustus*, Faustus is shown a parade of the Seven Deadly Sins in order to settle the unrest in his soul. Lucifer, who is showing him the parade, saves Lechery/Lust for the last. This sin is the only one that Faustus does not respond to directly, as Lucifer sends it away quickly. There are no stage directions, but the reader could easily assume that Lucifer must send the Sins away, as Lust is such a strong influence on Faustus as seen in the scene in which he asks for a wife. Had Faustus responded directly, as he does to the other six, he would be showing power over those forces. But his lack of response to Lust suggests the Sin's power over him. This is not quite as significant as the first scene; however, it suggests the power of sexuality over Faustus.

A more telling sequence comes near the end of the play. In act V scene I, Faustus's assistant/apprentice Wagner opens the act with the line "I think my master means to die shortly, / He has made his will and given me his wealth" (Marlowe V.i.1-2). Faustus is aware that his time is almost up, and has begun to set his affairs in order. After being warned by an old man to repent, and threatened by Mephistophilis with dismemberment if he does not hold up his end of the original contract, Faustus asks for something to sooth his fear, Helen of Troy, whom Faustus calls "That heavenly Helen" (Marlowe V.i.95).

One thing, good servant, let me crave of the
To glut the longing of my heart's desire—
That I may have unto my paramour
That heavenly Helen which I saw of late,
Whose sweet embracings may extinguish clear
Those thoughts that do dissuade me from my vow,

And keep mine oath I made to Lucifer (Marlowe V.i.92-98).

Mephistophilis obliges, and the Old Man, who has been trying to convince Faustus to accept the grace of heaven to save his soul, is neglected. Faustus's sexual desires win out, and between the fear of Mephistophilis and the bliss of a kiss from Helene of Troy he neglects the Old Man's warnings. Mephistophilis uses his desire to distract him from those who are trying to save his soul, and Faustus too easily succumbs, having asked for it himself.

Goethe's Faust is just as easily distracted by sexual desire. However, instead of keeping him from certain doom, his obsession with Gretchen sets him on a path to redemption. Instead of saving him from the pain of seeing his death coming as Helen does for Faustus, Faust's obsession with Gretchen begins to change Faust for the better. Until Faust and Gretchen kiss, Faust has been only self-serving in his endeavors and possessive in his pursuit of Margaret. After the scene in "The Garden Bower" (which begins on line 3205), Faust flees in fear of ruining Margaret's life. This is the first time in the play Faust has thought of anyone other than himself. He claims his flight is to save Margaret from doom:

What are the joys of heaven in her arms?
Let me embrace her, feel her charms-
Do I not always sense her doom?
Am I not fugitive? without a home?
...
Raging with passion toward the abyss?
And nearby, she— with childlike blunt desires
Inside her cottage on the Alpine leas,
And everything that she requires
Was in her own small world at ease.
And I, whom the gods hate and mock,
Was not satisfied
That I seized the rock
And smashed the mountainside (Goethe I.xiv.3345-3360).

After achieving his goal of meeting and ‘winning’ Gretchen’s affections, Faust begins to think of the good of someone other than himself. He still treats her as an object and of less significance, but it is a step away from the possessive Faust seen at the time of their first meeting. He does not take into account that it is her choice to enter into relationship with him, only that he came and affected her life, which is an objectifying viewpoint. But he is concerned for her future, which begins to bring her out of object-territory. This does not justify his possessive behaviors, but it shows the beginning of a change in Faust. This change is what leads him to abandon his quest for the domination of nature in order to save her from certain death later in the play. Had he not seen the image in the mirror, and not met Gretchen, Faust might have continued in his quest for power and knowledge, and would have been damned according to the contract. It is his relationship with Gretchen that leads Faust to regret the contract and resist Mephisto in the final scene. Nature in him, the sexual side of Faust, begins to change him and he considers the effect his actions have on those around him. This change is characterized as the dichotomy between agency and communion and will be further explored in Chapter 3.

Don Juan

The dominant role of sex in Don Juan is much more obvious, as seduction of the female is the primary motivator of Don Juan. Paglia describes Don Juan as the cardinal myth that “...makes a war of pleasure and counts his conquests by Apollonian number” (Paglia 36). The war and the seduction extend beyond the female bedfellows of Don Juan. Though he primarily seeks to have sexual relations with every woman he comes across (what he will essentialize as pursuit of “Woman” in *Don Juan Tenorio*), he also makes a point of

dominating every male character he comes in contact with by either outwitting or killing them. This behavior is an extension of the fate endured by Sophocles' Oedipus in *Oedipus Rex* (429 b.c.e.), and what Freud describes as the "Oedipus Complex" in his great work *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1899):

[Oedipus'] fate moves us only because it might have been our own, because the oracle laid upon us before our birth the very curse which rested upon him. It may be that we were all destined to direct our first sexual impulses toward our mothers, and our first impulse of hatred and violence toward our fathers (Freud 276).

In both cases, the male child seeks to dominate the parent, by destroying the father and having a sexual relationship with the mother. Don Juan, in his Apollonian quest to be the greatest specimen of humanity, extends this to all male and female people around him.

In the first scene of *Don Juan Tenorio*, there is a literal breaking with the father. After the bet is made, Don Diego, Don Juan's father says "You lie. I never was your father" in response to hearing of the evils planned by Don Juan. Don Juan responds "Go to the devil!" and later "...take notice, I've never asked your pardon. Forget me. I have lived as I have lived, and I don't mean to change" (Zorilla I.i). In one move he has destroyed any hold his father has on him.

The extension of aggression from the father to the other males Don Juan encounters may come from the significance of surpassing one's parents. Paglia observes in the first chapter of *Sexual Personae* "Each generation drives its plow over the bones of the dead" (Paglia 2). It is natural for a child to attempt to surpass his or her parents. Greek and Roman mythology confirm this: when Zeus received a prophecy of a son who will supplant

him, he murders his wife and child. The struggle between ruling parent and rebellious child is a well-worn path of Western drama, and it is clearly linked to the Oedipus complex, which reveals that it is an unavoidable fate. This, coupled with Darwin's evolutionary concept of 'survival of the fittest' creates a competitive impulse in the male to out perform everyone around him. Now, not only will the male desire to surpass a resistant father, he will extend that dominance to anyone who might try and assert any similar authority over him.

The aggression toward the male is abundantly clear in the texts. In Zorilla's *Don Juan Tenorio*, the bet made between Don Juan Tenorio and Don Luis Mejia is "to see who could do more harm with more luck in the course of one year..." (Zorilla I.i). When they reconvene to measure their damage and luck, they list the number of woman they've conquered and the number of duels they've won, all in order to see who has done more. It is a show of dominance, as evident in Don Juan's challenge he posts in Naples:

Here lives Don Juan Tenorio. There's not a man that can touch him! From fishmonger to princess there's not a woman he won't love. There's not a scheme that he won't tackle if there's money in the plot. If you're a fighter, seek me out. If you're a gambler, fence me in. And if you've got an itchy sword, try and scratch me out. Come one, come all, you stupid fishes, and see if you can beat me at cards, or swords, or kisses (Zorilla I.i).

Not only is the challenge one of violence, it is also one of smarts. In addition, the challenge shows that he does not individuate among his challengers. They are all the same to him. A few lines later he brags: "I held nothing sacred, not was there a cause or place that I respected. Clergyman or layman was all the same to me" (Zorilla I.i). Don Juan does not care about identity, which objectifies all other people in his world-view. Everyone is a challenge to be taken until he meets Ines later in the play. By objectifying everyone else, Don Juan

expresses his egotistic narcissism, which to be maintained means he must conquer all those around him.

Don Juan's impulse to bed every woman he meets as analogous to the Oedipal desire for the mother is best seen in Mozart's *Don Giovanni* when the titular character tells his servant: "You know that I need [women] more than the food I eat, more than the very air I breath!...Whoever is faithful to one woman only betrays the rest. The bounty of my love embraces all womankind" (Mozart II.i). Once again there are no individuals in Don Juan's mind, and the Oedipal desire for the mother is extended to all women. The mother, who sets the precedent for female interaction in the child, stands as a symbol for all womankind. Don Juan's Oedipal urges are following that lead, being unable to individuate all other women.

But his objectifying, Oedipal impulses also create a positive change in him similar to that of Gretchen on Faust: her pure femininity begins him on a path that could redeem him. But Faust objectifies his Eternal Feminine. Zorilla's Don Juan is the same, he is not interested in an individual, but a symbol: the pure woman. He says in a confrontation with Don Gonzalo: "I worship Doña Ines. I'm convinced that Heaven has granted her to me to turn my steps in the paths of righteousness. [...]That which judges and bishops could not bring me to with threats of jail and sermons was accomplished by her purity" (Zorilla I.vi). Though we can assume that he is only manipulating Don Gonzalo, he returns to Doña Ines' grave in Act II and shows sorrow for her death: "Oh, Doña Ines, what I'd do to bring you back to life" and then later "From the morning that he left you he has thought of nothing else. Having fled from here his only thought was to return. Don Juan's hope for happiness was bound up in you..." (Zorilla II.i). This is a sharp contrast to the Don Juan of Zorilla's act I,

who expressed no regret in immediately leaving every woman he ever slept with. It is safe to assume that, though the act of begging and pleading with Don Gonzalo was a ruse, his words about his feelings for Doña Ines were rooted in truth. But even these words are self serving, “Don Juan’s hope for happiness was bound up in you”, and possessive, “Heaven has granted her to me...” (Zorilla I.iv, II.i). Neither of these statements show any type of equality between Don Juan and Ines, and in both cases Don Juan is the more important figure. Her death was a blow to his happiness, never mind hers.

What is truly significant though is that Doña Ines’s purity and intense femininity is the only thing that affects any sort of change in Don Juan. Doña Ines causes Don Juan to begin to commune and value other human beings outside of their service to him. Her pure femininity, in the eyes of the author, justifies the intense, destructive masculinity of the Don Juan.

In these two versions of the Don Juan myth, sex is the ultimate influence on the mythical figure. His natural Oedipal urges are the main motivation for all of his actions, and the sexual desire for pure-femininity affects the only change in his dominating behavior, something that not even threats of super-natural punishment could do.

Joan of Arc

The role of sex in the Joan of Arc narratives is complex, as it includes not only her sexuality but also her gender expression (where she is perceived on the gender continuum). Her sexuality gives her power and causes her downfall in the end. If she had been male with the same set of skills and the blessing of the Christian God, it is possible that she might have been able to unite France and drive the English out; but would she have been such a widely-

adopted cultural icon had she not been female? We cannot know. However, we can say with confidence that had she not been female, the Catholic Church might not have been so quick to execute her, if it would have executed her at all. Either way, in the theatrical narratives of Joan of Arc, sexuality plays a central role in shaping her fate.

The most obvious sexual influence in the narratives is in III.iii of Schiller's *The Maid of Orleans*. The scene begins enigmatically, with a spectral knight in black armor engaging Joan in combat and then disappearing with the line "Kill what can be killed" (Schiller III.iii). Up to this point in the story, Joan had developed relationships with the soldiers in her inner circle, and some of the soldiers had expressed romantic intentions. In addition, at the beginning of the play Joan's father urges her to marry, but she refuses. In his article *The Lionel-Scene in Schiller's Jungfrau Von Orleans: A Psychological Interpretation* (1977), Timothy Sellner argues that one of Joan's personal struggles is to suppress her sexuality, the way an adolescent generally does when going through puberty. Joan of Arc may have been doing so during the time of her narratives. She does this by avoiding sexual relationships and suppressing any sexual desire. I agree with his argument, and the Black Knight in III.iii can be seen as an expression of the unconscious, warning her that biology cannot be avoided. This is also supported by Paglia's assertion that "Sex is the natural in man" and that "Nature is a hard taskmaster. It is the hammer and the anvil, crushing individuality" (Paglia 1, 3). Nature in Joan leads to her downfall (shortly after her battle with the Black Knight) through the character of Lionel, as Sellner observes:

She is confronted by the last of the English leaders, Lionel, who swears to avenge the death of Talbot. Johanna skillfully battles the sword from his hand, and the two

begin to struggle. This makes the third time she has had bodily contact with a man since she undertook her commission (Montgomery and the King had both touched her hand). But instead of killing him as she had prepared to do, she yields momentarily to temptation and raises his visor, exposing his face. And at this precise instant, as Johanna once again stands face-to-face in the heat of battle with a man who is capable of arousing her feelings of sexuality, her weakened ego defenses finally yield and the forbidden desire forces its way into her conscious mind, an occurrence which she experiences as a sudden onrush of intense affection for the English commander (Sellner 276).

With all of her perceived supernatural power, even Joan of Arc cannot escape her sexuality, making it the superior influence on her choices. After this attraction is expressed in Joan's failure to execute Lionel, she feels her power leaving her: "JOAN: What have I done? My vow is broken!" (Schiller III.iii). She has lost her divine power and protection, but still calls out to heaven: "Oh! The choice—Not mine at all!" (Schiller IV.i). This is further evidence that she is subject to a power greater than herself, and that even the call of heaven was not powerful enough to suppress nature in her. In this event, sexuality decides her fate.

Another great influence of sex/gender in the Joan of Arc narratives is the crime that the Church eventually convicts her for: donning male attire, or cross-dressing, which is a problem of gender. During her trials, both the ecclesiastical and secular courts had a hard time convicting her of blasphemy, except for the fact that she was a cross-dresser, having worn male armor and passed herself off as a soldier. In Shaw's *Saint Joan*, her indictment reads thus:

LADVENU *reading quietly*: I, Joan, commonly called The Maid, a miserable sinner, do confess that I have most grievously sinned in the following articles. I have pretended to have revelations from God and the angels and the blessed saints, and perversely rejected the Church's warnings that these were temptations by demons.

[In a later chapter of this thesis, the condemnation of Joan for defying the Church will be explored as a problem of the Male/Female split, as the Church is a Male institution. For

now, suffice it to say that not only was the indictment unbiblical, it can also be perceived as Oedipal and a conflict of ‘agency vs. communion’, and not a truly ecclesiastical matter.] The indictment continues:

I [Joan] have blasphemed abominably by wearing an immodest dress, contrary to the Holy Scripture and the canons of the Church. Also I have clipped my hair in the style of a man, and, against all the duties which have made my sex specially acceptable in heaven, have taken up the sword, even to the shedding of human blood, inciting men to slay each other, invoking evil spirits to delude them, and stubbornly and most blasphemously imputing these sins to Almighty God (Shaw I.vi).

After the first indictment, the second and third are based solely on her sexual identity: being a woman. It does not matter that she had united France and driven out the English by this point. I again assert that had she been male, she would not have been indicted thus, and the Church would have had a harder time convicting Joan had they chosen to press charges. Her sex (and the presentation of her gender), not her choices, decides her fate as much as any other factor.

In the narratives of all three of these characters, sex and sexuality play a major part in shaping the pursuits and the final fate of our mythological figures. In each narrative, a decision is made with sexual motivation at a pivotal point in the character’s life. Whether that is to save them from the destructive path they have begun, or to stop them from achieving their goal for better or for worse, nature/sex is something that not even the greatest of wills can escape.

Conclusion

All three of these narratives show that as humans, there are some forces we cannot escape no matter how hard we try. Sex/biology is one of those things. In recent times, there have been great leaps forward in the understanding of sexuality and gender. Our conceptions of identity have been expanded, no longer governed solely by our biological bodies. What

these myths confirm, and what Paglia asserts, is that when it comes to human power, biology, which is part of nature, cannot be escaped. We are not defined by the body we have, but there are parts of our psyche that are shaped by our biology, and understanding this leads to a greater understanding of human behavior, both on an individual and socio-cultural plane.

CHAPTER 3

AGENCY AND COMMUNION IN DON JUAN AND FAUST(US)

Chapter 2 of this thesis explored the role of sex-as-nature in man. The next few chapters are concerned with a natural dichotomy found in human nature: Agency vs. Communion. Prominent American philosopher Ken Wilber, known for his work on Integral Theory, presents a model of understanding the natural world called a Holonic model, and in that model he explains roles of agency and communion. To better understand those two pervasive forces, it is valuable to explain the foundational principles of Holonics.

Ken Wilber asserts (primarily in his two books *Sex, Ecology, Spirituality* and *A Brief History of Everything*, though the principles are carried into his other work) that there are certain patterns that everything in the universe follow. He calls these the ‘twenty tenets’. These are observable patterns, and the first two are the significant concepts for the following chapters of this thesis. The first tenet is that everything in the universe is a ‘holon’, which Ken Wilber explains thus:

Arthur Koestler coined the term “holon” to refer to an entity that is itself a *whole* and simultaneously a *Part* of some other whole. And if you start to look closely at the things and processes that actually exist, it soon becomes obvious that they are not merely wholes, they are also parts of something else. They are whole/parts, they are holons (Wilber BHE 17).

The central idea of Holonics is that every single entity in the universe is a complete and individual whole, while simultaneously being a part of a larger whole. This means that the holon is made up of parts, and is also a part of a bigger holon, which is part of a bigger holon, etc. In this way, atoms are whole entities that are part of molecules, that make up organelles, that make up cells, that make up organs, that make up organisms, and on and on up the list.

You can also say that letters are parts of syllables, which are parts of words, which are parts of sentences, paragraphs, books, etc. Everything in the universe is both a whole and a part. Wilber also observes that there is, as of yet, no ultimate whole, and everything is a whole and a part. To survive, each holon must maintain its individual wholeness and continue to contribute to the holon it is a part of. The drives to do so are what make up tenet two.

The second tenet addresses a holon's impulse to maintain its 'wholeness' and its 'partness'. Wilber explains the first drive thus: "On the one hand, it has to maintain its own wholeness, its own identity, its own autonomy, its own *agency*. If it fails to maintain and preserve its own agency, then it simply ceases to exist" (Wilber BHE 19). Agency, the ability to act alone and to affect change on the world around you, is the drive to remain individual. A holon must remain individual, otherwise it will break down. If agency is not maintained, a holon will no longer be able to contribute to the whole it is a part of, which is the second drive of any holon.

But a holon is not only a whole that has to preserve its agency, it is also a part of some other system, some other wholeness. And so, in addition to having to maintain its own autonomy as a *whole*, it simultaneously has to fit in as a part of something else. Its own existence depends upon its capacity to fit into its environment, and this is true from atoms to molecules to animals to humans. (Wilber BHE 19)

It is the drive of every human to be a full individual, but also to be a part something greater than oneself. Communion is what happens when all of the parts of a holon work together.

The individual parts are transcended, and the whole emerges. The painting has more meaning than just colors on a canvas. A car has more agency as a whole than just its engine or the wheels would on their own. Community is teamwork. These drives apply to our three heroes

beautifully. Where they are unbalanced, they self-destruct. But when *agency* and *communion* are balanced, unbelievable feats are achieved.

It is also useful, though secondary, to note that in our natural world, maleness is often most associated with agency and femaleness with communion. When a holon over-values one drive or the other, the result is the creation of a pathology, as Ken Wilber observes: “And we will see that the typical “male pathology” tends to be hyper-agency, or fear of relationship[...]and the typical “female pathology” tends to be hyper-communion, or fear of autonomy” (Wilber SES 53). The tendency for a male or masculine-dominant person to favor agency is supported by Camille Paglia’s concept of the male-as-sexual-exile, as outlined in chapter 1. The female proclivity to communion may come from the same subjugation to nature. A female knows instinctually that we are ultimately at the mercy of nature, and our best chance of survival is to work as a group. In addition, since the female human does the heavy lifting of creating and protecting new life, she is naturally inclined to communion. But, when any holon does not balance these two primary forces it becomes vulnerable, as we see in our three heroes.

Agency Unleashed

‘Agency vs. Communion’ is a dichotomy that must be balanced by every holon in the universe. When they are not balanced, chaos and destruction reign. Faust(us) and Don Juan are near-perfect case studies of what happens when an individual overbalances towards agency. They are not strictly agency-oriented, as has been suggested in earlier chapters and will be shown in this one. But they are obsessed with agency, and they are destroyed for it (or nearly destroyed in Faust’s case).

Faust(us)

Faust(us)'s obsession with agency is very obvious. As seen in chapter 2, his war against nature is an attempt to gain agency over that which he is subject to. But Faust(us) is not only agency-minded, he also lacks a sense of communion. This is the cause of his downfall in both plays. Had he an equal sense of communion to balance out his strong sense of agency, he might have survived in Marlowe, and he might not have lost Gretchen in Goethe. In both cases, lack of communion brings him down in flames.

For communion to exist, all parts must serve the needs of the whole. This means the parts must recognize each other as equally necessary, or equally valued. No matter the individual agency of one individual, without all parts working together, communion cannot be achieved. Goethe's Faust fails to see others as equally important, and Marlowe's Faustus only serves his own ends. Both versions of the tragic doctor objectify those around them, but the stakes are higher for Faust, since relationship with Gretchen is the focus of most of the play.

Both doctors pursue learning and education, but it is only for selfish ends. Though agency is a natural impulse, when it is self-serving it leads to strife, as our doctors reveal in their opening monologues:

FAUST: I have, alas, studied philosophy,
Jurisprudence and medicine, too,
And, worst of all, theology
with keen endeavor, through and through—
And here I am, for all my lore,
The wretched fool I was before.
...
No scruples nor doubt could make me ill

I am not afraid of the devil or of hell.
But therefore I also lack all delight,
...
I also have neither money nor treasures,
Nor worldly honors or earthly pleasures;
No dog would want to live this way! (Goethe I.i.354-379)

Being a master of philosophy, law, and medicine do not satisfy Faust. All three of those disciplines are means of improving humanity, whether by better governance, healthcare, or understanding of how to treat each-other. But Faust complains that he has nothing to show for it, and that he is supremely unsatisfied. Marlowe's Faustus is the same in his monologue:

FAUSTUS: Sweet Analytics, tis thou hast ravished me!
...
Is to dispute well logic's chiefest end?
Affords this art no greater miracle?
Then read no more; Thou hast attained that end.
...
Be a physician Faustus, heap up gold,
And be eternized for some wondrous cure.
...
The end of physic is our body's health.
Why, Faustus, hast thou not attained that end?
Is not thy common talk sound aphorisms?
Are not thy bills hung up as monuments,
Whereby whole cities have escaped the plague,
And divers desperate maladies been cured?
Yet art thou still but Faustus and a man. (I.i.5-24)

Faustus is not content to do great works for others, he only seeks to transcend his humanity. His war against nature, coupled with the dream of ultimate agency, blind him to the values of communion, even though he has saved countless lives. Both doctors are ultimately selfish in their endeavors, valuing their own agency more than their contributions to any type of communion. This is a foundational weakness in both doctors, though it is expressed differently for each.

Faust's lack of communion is apparent in the setting of the first few scenes. In Kaufman's translation, his study is "a high-vaulted, narrow Gothic den..." (Goethe I.i.353). Immediately, Faust's study is that of the hermit. Traditional images of his study show that he is surrounded by books and instruments, and there is no room for more than one person. Camille Paglia describes Faust as he "...who locks himself in his study to read books and crack the code of nature" (Paglia 36). His is a lonely existence, but one that he chose. One could argue that since he works at a university, he is in a place of communion. However, this is only a potential of his. He says in the first few pages that "For ten years almost I confute / And up and down, wherever it goes, / I drag my students by the nose—" (Goethe I.i. 361-363). This is not communion, but an application of agency to another individual, like trying to herd sheep by force (though in Faust's case it may be cats). As true communion recognizes equal value in all the parts, Faust is not in communion with his students.

The only person Faust has any semblance of communion with, before Mephisto and Gretchen, is Wagner, his protégé. The two of them do chose to spend time with each other, and Faust shares some of his innermost thoughts with Wagner. However, their conversations are marked by two things: Wagner asking questions of Faust, and Faust using Wagner as a sounding board, unloading his problems as Wagner listens patiently. Though there is some communion between the two, it is very exploitative. Wagner, who can be read as a 'pre-Faust' ("Though I know much, I should like to know all" (Goethe I.i.601)), hero-worships the doctor: "To take a walk with you, good sir, / Is a great honor and reward" (Goethe I.ii. 941-942). This is a hint of communion, but not true communion.

It is also evident that Faust has no interest in communion in an exchange during his first conversation with Mephisto. Faust's relationship with Mephisto is even more problematic. Their relationship is fraught with clashing agency, both parties seeking to affect the other. Faust wants to use Mephisto for power: "MEPHISTO: *Here* you shall be the master, I be bond, / And at your nod I'll work incessantly; / but when we meet again *Beyond*, / Then you shall do the same for me." (Goethe I.iv.1656-1659). Mephisto in return, gains a soul in the eternal war with Heaven. This is an exchange of service, and though the bond is eternal and mutually beneficial, it is not for the good of the relationship, and thus a weak form of communion.

In this same scene, there is another beautiful example of Faust's lack of interest in communion at all. Faust having finished expressing his disdain for earthly life, curses all the heavenly virtues, and Mephisto responds thus: "Stop playing with your melancholy / That, like a vulture, ravages your breast; / The worst of company still cures this folly, / For you are human with the rest" (Goethe I.iv.1635-1638). Faust must truly be blind to the value of communion, because Mephisto prescribes to him exactly that to cure him of his unrest! But Faust has such contempt for the rest of humanity, which he sees as inferior to himself, that this is not possible.

Faust's relationship with Margaret is as close to a true communion as he gets, and in the end it is this relationship that sets him on the path to true communion and redemption. However, in the beginning she is an object to him, not an individual. When Faust first sees Gretchen he says to Mephisto "Get me that girl," and immediately seeks to possess her. He also doesn't seem to care about her desires, evident in Mephisto's response a few lines later:

“He would like to have every flower, / And thinks each prize or pretty trick / Just waits around for him to pick; / But sometimes that just doesn’t go” (Goethe I.vii.2628). Faust doesn’t see her as an equal, calling her in a few lines “such a little thing” in reference to her age and stature. She is a prize to be won by seduction, and object to be manipulated. In their first scene, she shuns him, but he does not listen. He has Mephisto take him straight to her room, and there he invades her privacy, using magic to manipulate her to get what he wants. This is agency, affecting change to get what you want, having more weight than communion, or building a healthy relationship for the benefit of all.

Faust’s lack of communion is evident in his inability to commune with himself as well. After first meeting Margaret, Faust and Mephisto invade her room while she is away (an example of what Paglia calls “the male thrust”). While there, Faust waxes about the intoxication of being so near to Margaret, but the end of his speech includes this stanza: “And you! [referring to himself] Alas, what brought you here? / I feel so deeply moved, so queer! / What do you seek? Why is your heart so sore? / Poor Faust! I do not know you anymore” (Goethe I.viii.2715-2719). Faust does not commune with himself! He is so focused on attaining what he wants (agency) that he does not know himself (communion). This manipulation will get him into trouble. In his quest to seduce Margaret, he gives her mother a sleeping potion that kills her. Later, Faust duels with Gretchen’s brother, who is killed by Mephisto’s magic. Both of these are agency moves, and they drive Gretchen to despair. Later, even while trying to rescue Gretchen, Faust is still pursuing agency, trying to make amends for what he has done wrong. Had he thought of her needs, or nurtured a sense of communion

at all, he may have avoided the collateral damage that unbalanced Gretchen's mind and drove her mad.

Marlowe's Faustus is even less interested in communion than Faust. As stated in chapter 2, when Faustus asks for a wife, he only wants one to satisfy his sexual appetite, and when a harem is offered to him, he gladly accepts. There are no relationships in the play that Faustus values, and at no time does he seek the companionship of an equal. While his obsession with agency is more extreme than Faust's, it tends to paint him as more of a caricature, while Faust's struggle is more subtle.

Gretchen does begin Faust on the path to balancing agency and communion. After their relationship begins, Faust begins to think of her needs as well as his. After the death of Gretchen's mother and Faust killing her brother, Gretchen kills her child in despair. This is the first time Faust thinks of someone other than himself. In the scene mentioned in chapter 2 where Faust flees to a cave lest he ruins Gretchen's life, he is not only preserving his own independence, he is also trying to prevent his quest for agency from destroying another individual. Though it is not yet communion, or working for the good of the whole, it is a step in that direction. But it takes an impossibly pure, feminine character to bring about this change in Faust.

By contrast, Faustus never makes any progress towards balancing agency and communion. The closer he gets to destruction, the more he struggles to maintain his independence. When asked by his students if he is all right, he tells them that his destruction is imminent and to stay away: "Second Scholar: O, what must we do to save Faustus?

Faustus: Talk not of me, but save yourselves and depart" (Marlowe V.ii.81-82). Faustus has

followers, but not a community. He has not used his power to help anyone, only to gain fame and enjoy himself, and nothing is able to save him from his fate. His agency has not gained him any lasting progress in his quest to conquer nature.

Don Juan

If one tenet of agency is the drive to maintain one's autonomy (Wilber BHE 19), then Don Juan is the most aggressively agent being there has ever been. Don Juan's challenge in *Don Juan Tenorio*, to see who is the best at causing trouble, winning games and duels, and seducing the most women, is a game of autonomy. He moves in and out of interactions with fervor. This requires that he does not consider the needs of any other individual, unless they are of use to him. This lack of seeing others as equals is necessary for Don Juan; if he were to consider anyone an equal then he would be limited in his autonomy. I believe this drive for the preservation of his autonomy (a key component of agency) comes from a fear that Paglia asserts is a major part of the western male psyche: "Man justifiably fears being devoured by woman, who is nature's proxy" (Paglia 16). The male psyche is afraid of nature, since his place in it is so small compared to woman. Because of this, in the western-male mind (and in other cultures as well; i.e., the *juni-hitoe*, or 12-layer kimono) woman becomes equated to nature, since both sustain life. Don Juan's quest to preserve his autonomy/agency, when it comes to the seduction of women, comes from this fear.

The outwitting of the male half of our species comes not only from his Oedipal urges, as seen in chapter 2, but also from his quest to be the ultimate being, which is similar to Darwin's theory of the survival of the fittest. In nature, those who are most adept survive, and if Don Juan is able to outwit all other males, then he has succeeded in nature's game. The

other characters play into that quest as well, showing that it is part of their society, as seen in the innkeeper's line in I.i: "There's no doubt about it. They're [Don Juan and Don Mejia] the finest men in Spain" (Zorilla I.i). Don Giovanni is the same.

In Mozart's *Don Giovanni*, the first signal that Don Juan (called Giovanni in this work) has no regard for others unless they're useful is Leporello's first line: "I must work night and day for someone who doesn't appreciate me" (Mozart I.i). If there were communion between the two, Don Giovanni would value Leporello and instead of neglecting him, meet his needs. But Don Giovanni uses Leporello, later risking Leporello's life as a decoy in act II. This shows that the only time that Don Giovanni has any impulse of communion, the only whole he sees is his own goals, and the people who contribute to it are tools for him.

Later in the first scene, Don Giovanni is foiled in an attempt to seduce Donna Anna by the commendatore, her father. In the ensuing fight, he is willing to kill the Commendatore to survive. This is clearly him preserving his autonomy, even though he is breaking social rules in trying to have a sexual relationship with Donna Anna outside of marriage. Don Giovanni has no concern for anything that gets in the way of him getting what he wants. If he had an impulse for communion, he would see that his actions are damaging to Anna, her family, and the society that they are a part of. If male people were allowed to lie and seduce whomever they pleased, society would break down into chaos. But Don Giovanni is a pathologically agent figure, so he goes to great lengths to preserve his autonomy from the whole, which upsets society until Giovanni is stopped.

As the play moves on, Don Giovanni is stopped by women from his past whom he has seduced, and men who seek to bring him to justice for it. One by one, he outwits them all, adding new seductions along the way. The conflict of the play is Don Giovanni vs. Everyone, but the conflict is created by Don Giovanni himself. His *quest* to maintain agency prolongs his *need* to maintain agency. This tells us that an imbalance of agency and communion tends to sustain itself, and unless Don Giovanni makes an effort to re-integrate back into the community, he will continue to need to maintain autonomy. But he doesn't, and since prison is the most limiting institution there is, Don Giovanni escapes the grasps of the other characters.

Since Giovanni's obsession cannot be stopped by his undeveloped sense of communion or the other people who are part of the same society, nature must step in, and the ghost of the commendatore is allowed to intervene. Generally, a holon (in this case Spanish society), once de-stabilized, looks to right itself. But Don Giovanni is so pathologically agent that a greater force must intervene: nature. In the holonic model of the universe, every whole is a part of a larger whole. Don Giovanni is part of Spanish Society, which is part of humanity, which is part of nature, which in the worldview of the author is part of a bigger holon ruled by supernatural forces. The law could not stop him. Other people could not stop him. The part of his humanity that seeks to contribute to something bigger than himself could not stop him, so the powers of heaven and hell had to intervene in the form of the ghost of the commendatore possessing the statue. This shows how strong his sense of agency is, that supernatural forces had to intervene to re-stabilize the society he had upset.

The moment the statue intervenes is also significant in expressing Don Giovanni's disregard for communion. His drive to be the ultimate being, as stated in chapter 2, shows in a conversation he has with Leporello in II.ii. Giovanni has finished telling Leporello how he almost seduced one of Leporello's mistresses, then:

Giovanni: ...I heard footsteps, and I fled and quickly leaped over this wall

Leporello: And you can tell me that with such indifference?

Giovanni: Why not?

Leporello: What if she had been my wife?

Giovanni: Better still!

The Statue: By dawn your laughter will be ended.

Over the course of the play, Leporello has been the only character who cared at all for Don Giovanni, and this is primarily because Don Giovanni is his master. But, in this scene, Don Giovanni shows that even the only person who cares for him does not have more value in his eyes than his own agency. Giovanni would be happy to make a cuckold of Leporello, arguably the greatest insult he could make. This is confirmation that Don Giovanni has no care for others, and no sense of communion. This is the moment that the supernatural forces intervene, the moment of no return for Don Giovanni. His inability to balance agency and communion has damned him.

Of course, agency and communion are at play in other characters as well, and Don Giovanni finds a foil in Don Ottavio. Where Giovanni is pathologically agent, Ottavio is mostly balanced, and depending on the critic somewhat emotionally dependant, or 'fused', with Donna Anna. His is an example of a communion-based relationship, and in an aria in act I he sings: "My peace depends on her peace. Everything that pleases her gives new life to me. When she is injured, it brings me pain. If she sighs, then I sigh as well. I share her wrath

and her tears, and while she is sad, I can have no happiness!” (Mozart I.i). Though Ottavio gives up much of his agency in the relationship, depending on Donna Anna’s emotions to inform his own, he is communing, or working for the good of the whole, which is the relationship they share.

However, this does not only provide a foil for Don Giovanni, it also shows that male-agency is not specific to Don Giovanni. Rather, the culture/society Ottavio and Giovanni share is a male-dominant culture. Both Paglia and Wilber assert this in their books; it is common knowledge that the west is male/masculine dominant, and *Don Giovanni* shows this as well.

In the same scene in which we see Don Ottavio give his “My peace depends on her peace” speech, we see that virtually all social-agency, or the ability to move freely in society and affect change, belongs to the male population. When Donna Anna is wronged, she must turn to her father and her lover to avenge her. She cannot avenge herself.

The same lack of female social agency is evident in the character of Donna Elvira. Many times she accuses Don Giovanni of abusing her, and each time Don Giovanni responds by attempting to convince the others that she is not of sound mind. Each time, instead of listening to Elvira and believing her, the characters give the benefit of the doubt to Don Giovanni. This is best seen in act I. After Elvira barely rescues Zerlina from Don Giovanni, she returns to find Don Ottavio and Donna Anna asking Giovanni to help them avenge the death of Anna’s father. Elvira immediately accuses Don Giovanni:

Elvira: Ah, here you are again, perfidious monster! Unhappy girl, don't trust in this barbarous man's ribald heart! He has betrayed me already—and he'll betray you as well.

Anna and Ottavio: Heavens! What a noble manner! What sweet majesty! Her grief and her tears move me to pity.

Don Giovanni: This poor girl is crazy, my friends! Leave me alone with her, and perhaps I can persuade her to calm herself.

Donna Elvira: Ah, don't believe this traitor!

Don Giovanni: She's crazy; don't listen to her!

Donna Elvira: Stay with me—O God! Stay with me!

Donna Anna and Don Ottavio: Whom can we believe? (Mozart I.ii)

So far, an angry woman has accused a man of being a liar, and his only response is that she is crazy. Though it is clearly for comic effect, Anna and Ottavio's response also shows that in this society, the male has more social agency than the female, as he is given equal weight in the argument, even though he has been accused of being a liar. This goes on for the rest of the scene, and it takes a lot of convincing for Anna and Ottavio to begin to believe Elvira. If Giovanni and Elvira had equal agency in this case, Giovanni would have been forced to defend himself with more than suggestions that she is not well.

Don Juan in *Don Juan Tenorio* has many of these same traits. As stated above, his need to maintain autonomy is his greatest need. There is also the presence of the stone guest, who intervenes to stop his pathological quest for agency.

There are smaller examples of his ultimate agency as well. Don Juan, like Don Giovanni, spends money as often as he likes: "**Ciutti:** [Don Juan] Spends money like confetti" (Zorilla I.i). In a capitalistic society, money often equals agency, and the reckless spending of money can be seen as an expression of personal agency.

Don Juan's confidence in his own agency is staggering. As he and Don Luis Mejia settle their bet, he tells of his adventures, and during the story he says "I fought anyone who

wished, and I never, for a moment, thought that the man that I was killing could possibly kill me” (Zorilla I.i). This is supreme agency, by placing no limits on whom he competes with and no doubts about his ability to win a battle to the death with them, he has asserted his supremacy over all men! However, this superiority is questioned, and at the end of the bet each man names one type of woman left un-seduced by the other: “a novice on the eve of taking her vows” and “the bride of a friends who’s about to marry” (Zorilla I.i). Don Luis believes this is too far, but takes the bet anyway. This, like Don Giovanni’s assertion that he would gladly seduce Leporello’s wife, is the strike against humanity that will trigger the supernatural force’s intervention.

In an effort to maintain his agency, he even goes so far as to publicly threaten to seduce/rape the women whom he had been arranged to marry if the father does not go through with the wedding. Don Gonzalo, father of Doña Ines, threatens to break off the marriage, and Don Juan responds: “...I warn you, either you give your daughter to me, or, by God I’ll come and take her” (Zorilla I.i). This is completely uncalled for, but for Don Juan to maintain his superiority, he cannot let another person make decisions for him. His agency is clearly out of control.

Don Juan even makes a similar power play with his own father, as seen in chapter 2. In the first scene of *Don Juan Tenorio*, after the bet is made, Don Diego, Don Juan’s father says “You lie. I never was your father” in response to hearing of the evils planned by Don Juan. Don Juan responds “Go to the devil!” and later “take notice, I’ve never asked your pardon. Forget me. I have lived as I have lived, and I don’t mean to change” (Zorilla I.i). Not

only is the Oedipal complex expressed again, but Don Juan also maintains his agency by denying the power his father has over him.

Don Juan Tenorio values communion more than Giovanni, as seen in the end of act II. Having both pursued Donna Anna, Don Luis and Don Juan meet in the street and begin to fight. But Don Juan has foreseen this, and has hired a group of men to back him up. Though ultimately self-centered and focused on his own agency, he uses communion to achieve it, something Giovanni does not. At the end of the scene, Don Juan's disregard for society is re-affirmed in his line "What if the means are fair or foul—just so long as I win" (Zorilla I.ii). Again, his individual needs are superior to any other factor.

Agency comes into play for Doña Ines as well. Her duenna, Brigida, describes her as "some poor bird in a cage, born in a cage, she doesn't know that there's more life and more space in which to fly" (Zorilla I.ii). The life of a nun is similar to what Ken Wilber describes as pathological communion, or fusion. All of the parts of a holon, thinking only of the whole they are a part of, cease to have individuality. In this way, once they discover that they do in fact have agency, they tend to overbalance towards it, like a teenager discovering personal identity. Don Juan is aware of this, and when he goes to seduce Ines, will use it to his advantage. This is why agency must be balanced with communion, an over balance of one, once discovered, will cause an overbalance of the other is attention is not paid.

Doña Ines's 'fusion' is shown in her first appearance. Once her duenna, Brigida, appears, Ines is flustered by her denial of the rules:

Duenna: Let me close the door.

Ines: It's against the rule.

Duenna: That's all very well for the other little novices who are going to take their vows, but not, Doña Ines, for you.

Ines: Brigida, you're breaking the rules of the convent; they won't let us—
(Zorilla I.iii.)

Ines insistence on the rules is a sign that she doesn't have any agency: everything is decided for her, even down to whether or not her door can be open. This means that Ines is used to giving her agency to others, and Don Juan, as the ultimate-agency seeking man that he is, is very attracted to her for this reason.

In *Don Giovanni*, the statue speaks directly after Don Giovanni suggests that he would be happy seducing the wife of the only friend he has. However, in *Don Juan Tenorio* the first intervention of the supernatural comes on the part of Doña Ines. Her ghost comes to Don Juan with an ultimatum from the Christian God: “**Ines:**...if he should in his hardhearted madness cruelly disown the love you bear him and pursue his barbarous ways—let him claim your soul forever” (Zorilla II.i). Ines has pled to God for the soul of Don Juan, and he has tied her fate to his because of it. This is the ultimate test of Don Juan's agency. Before, whenever someone suggested limiting him he resisted. Now his soul and the soul of Ines depend on his choice, but it means a limiting of his agency.

Don Juan Tenorio's ultimate fate is a testament to his beginning to have communion with Ines. Being saved by her love, and willing to accept the mercy of the Christian God. However, this is only at the last moment of his life when his soul is at stake. The play omits the pain and suffering he caused others, for obvious reasons.

Like Faust(us), Don Juan's quest for agency destroys him. Where Faust(us) sought to conquer nature, Don Juan sought to conquer all of humanity. To gain more agency, they

asserted the agency they already had. But failing to balance agency with communion has a price, and for both it is a fiery death in hell in one version. In the other, even the slightest bit of communion is enough to save them from damnation.

CHAPTER 4

AGENCY AND COMMUNION BALANCED IN JOAN OF ARC

Like Faust(us) and Don Juan, Joan of Arc pursues agency as well. But, the purpose she has and methods she uses for attaining that agency are based in communion, which creates a balance between the two forces. For her to gain agency, she must use the little agency she has to unite the French forces, who seek agency as well. This results in a pattern that agency, used for communion, leads to agency, which leads to communion, which leads to agency, etc. This is clear in Shaw's play, and present in Schiller's as well.

Joan is also a great example of a human as a holon. A holon always seeks to be both agent (independent, its own whole) and communing (part of something greater, a functioning part). Unlike Faust(us) and Don Juan, Joan is naturally aware of her holon-ness, and because of this she is able to achieve her goals. Her awareness is invaluable, and the danger of lacking this awareness is also very clear in the plays.

Before Joan was visited by messengers from God, she was a shepherdess and content to be so. Even during the time before her quest starts, she inherently recognizes that she is a holon, and always serves the whole. In Schiller, this can be seen in the prologue, where she is described thus:

RAIMOND: Who is more modest, or more virtuous than
this child of yours? Has she not made herself
the willing servant of her elder sisters?
Her qualities would raise her far above
all others, yet you see her, like a maid,
performing the most menial tasks in quiet
humility. The livestock and the planting
thrive on her management: whatever she

sets her hand to is rewarded with
amazing, inexplicable good fortune (Schiller Prologue).
Joan is a willing part of her family, which shows a natural talent for communion. This family
was the 'whole' that she was a part of, and because she she fulfilled her part in it they thrived.
But a few lines later in the scene, Joan begins serving a bigger whole, France through the
commands of God. Her first major lines in Schiller are grand prophecies about the
redemption of France and the defeat of the English. Gone is the Joan who serves her family,
she has been activated to serve France:

Before Orleans the enemy's luck will founder:
his cup is full, now it is harvest time.
The virgin with the sickle in her hand
will mow him down in his pride, and snatch his glory
back down from the stars where he had lodged it.
No weakening! No retreat! Before the crops
have turned to gold, before the moon is full,
no English horse shall water at the Loire (Schiller Prologue).

This is Joan's first major chunk of speech. She says this to a large crowd after denying the
marriage proposition her father brings to her. This is a shift from serving the family to
serving France, and Joan has accepted her role as it is given to her. This speech hints at one
of Joan's tools for communion: uniting people under a common purpose. In Shaw's *Saint
Joan*, when Joan goes to Baudricourt to ask for men and supplies, she is met with immediate
resistance. But later, as she begins to win soldiers to her cause, she gives a speech that shows
this tool at work:

Robert [Baudricourt]: And you cannot stop them, nor ten thousand like you.

Joan: One thousand like me can stop them. Ten like me can stop them with God
on our side. You do not understand, squire. Our soldiers are always beaten because
they are fighting only to save their skins; and the shortest way to save your skin is to

run away. Our knights are thinking only of the money they will make in ransoms: it is not kill or be killed with them, but pay or be paid. But I will teach them all to fight that the will of God may be done in France; and then they will drive the poor goddams before them like sheep (Shaw I.i).

Joan is giving a lesson in communion. The soldiers of France, who are fighting only for themselves, cannot win. The greatest reward they can possibly gain is money, but they risk their lives. This makes individual agency their sole concern (getting money and staying alive). They lack something greater than themselves to make that risk worth it. But if they fight under a common goal, in which they are one part of the whole, then risking one life for the good of many becomes an option, and the soldiers are less likely to run away. This is one power of communion; being a part of something larger can take the focus off of the individual, which can eliminate selfish objectives. One of the tricks of this is that what or whoever leads the community also serves something greater than themselves; otherwise they will take advantage of those who follow them and use them for self-serving gains. This is true of Joan, as seen in this speech. She serves her God and France, which allows her to lead the soldiers who also seek to serve God/France.

This same scene between Baudricourt and Joan throws her communion-based leadership into sharp contrast with his agency-based leadership. Baudricourt, the first character we meet, is pathologically agent and a bully; he works only on his terms and represses any agency that his underlings may have. In the first exchange of the play, he bullies his servant ferociously. When his servant reports that there aren't any eggs, Baudricourt asks who stole them. The Steward responds that the hens aren't laying, but Baudricourt responds thus:

That story is not good enough for me. Robert de Baudricourt burns witches and hangs thieves. Go. Bring me four dozen eggs and two gallons of milk here in this room before noon, or Heaven have mercy on your bones! I will teach you to make a fool of me (Shaw I.i).

Robert is so focused on preserving his own power, that he is blind to reason. In addition, instead of working with the Steward, he orders him to do the impossible, hoping that the fear of him will achieve miracles. This is characteristic of Baudricourt's operation: he is dominating and repressive. The Steward, more politely, points out that difference between Baudricourt and Joan later in the scene:

Baudricourt: I did not tell you to tell her to go: I told you to throw her out. You have fifty men-at-arms and a dozen lumps of able bodied servants to carry out my orders. Are they afraid of her?

Steward: She is so positive, sir.

Baudricourt: Positive! Now see here. I am going to throw you downstairs. and a little further into the same conversation:

Steward: You see, sir, you are much more positive than I am. But so is she.

Baudricourt: I am stronger than you are, you fool.

Steward: No, sire: it isn't that: it's your strong character, sir. She is weaker than we are: she is only a slip of a girl; but we cannot make her go.

Baudricourt: You parcel of curs: you are afraid of her.

Steward: No sir: we are afraid of you; but she puts courage into us (Shaw I.i.).

The Steward says it best: Joan's ability to uplift the soldiers is more powerful than Baudricourt's fear-based leadership. Joan communes with the soldiers, even if she wants something from them, she asks for it:

Robert: Where is she now?

Steward: Down in the courtyard sir, talking to the soldiers as usual. She is always talking to the soldiers except when she is praying (Shaw I.i.).

This is the perfect case for communion. Joan has a need: to gain a horse and soldiers to go to the Dauphin and crown him king. This is a lack of agency that needs to be fulfilled. She gains

that agency by uniting a small group of soldiers into a communal group, and by doing so gives them agency as a whole. This is a pattern that she will follow throughout her narrative.

The principle of the power of communion is repeated in Schiller, though not directly by Joan of Arc. Queen Isabeau, while talking to the English, speaks of French power: “IF every man in England landed on / our coast, they could not overcome this country / if ever it agreed to band together: / no power can conquer France, but France herself” (Schiller II.i). Like the soldiers Joan describes in act I of Shaw, Isabeau knows that all France needs in order to gain power (agency) is to unite (communion). It will take a leader to make it happen, and that leader is Joan.

Joan's power of communion is uncanny in this play, and evidence is provided in the scene in which she brings the traitor Burgundy back to France. Instead of punishing/ destroying him she re-integrates him back into the country:

Come over to us! An honourable flight!
Come over to the side of right and victory.
I, who am sent by God, I offer you
a sister's hand to draw you over to
the side of justice...

Burgundy responds:

The tangled web of lies snares and deceives,
but her speech is just as artless as a child's.
If evil spirits prompt her, they have done
a wonderful counterfeit of innocence.
I will not listen any more. To arms!
I feel my ear is weaker than my hand.

Burgundy, like his other male counterparts, has only lived in a worldview of agency, he only knows power and domination. But Joan offers him something more powerful:

Joan: You say I am a sorceress, and accuse me
of devil's tricks - is making peace a trick?
disarming hatred an affair of Hell?
Does harmony rise from the infernal regions?

Joan's response is to continue to push for communion, and offers him a place in something greater! Burgundy, though he resists the pull of communion, says this in response:

What's happening to me? Is it a god
that brings about this change of heart in me?
She is not false, if she can move me so.
No! No! If it is magic works on me,
it is the working of a heavenly power;
my heart tells me - she has been sent from God (Schiller II.ii).

Even though Burgundy was ready to fight to the death, Joan has moved him with the power of communion, uniting under a common belief. Her agency, though given from God, lies in her ability to create communion, which heals the broken relationship between Burgundy, a powerful French Duke, and his country of France. The fruits of this healing are seen directly in the next scene.

Charles, who is now King of France, receives a messenger from Burgundy who says that the Duke is coming to recognize Charles as his King (Schiller III.i). The King and his mistress are overjoyed: "**Sorel:** He's coming! Oh, the brightness of this day / that brings joy, peace, and reconciliation" and Charles a few lines later says "My heart burns to beat in time with his" (Schiller III.i). This is the doing of Joan: had she not re-integrated Burgundy back, and instead would have killed him, then the power of his forces would not have been brought back to France, but lost and scattered. In addition, the positive inertia created by the reunion of Charles and Burgundy would have been lost, something that becomes key to France's victory later. Joan, by valuing community over agency, creates a stronger France.

It is valuable in this instance to think about France as a holon, which all the characters in the play are parts of. If Joan eliminates a part of the Holon (France), then it is weakened and has less chance of driving out the enemy. But if she heals the broken parts (Burgundy) and helps them contribute to the whole (France), the whole is much stronger, and happier too. The positive emotions of Charles, Sorel, and Burgundy upon their reunion are significantly motivating and morale-boosting in the war between France and England. Again, Joan has increased agency by using communion.

Joan's power as a unifying force is strong in Shaw's play as well. In scene II, it is clear that the French leaders have no communion, but are only a collection of agency-minded individuals. As soon as Charles, the uncrowned King, enters the room, the noblemen of France are distrustful and manipulative, bullying him. They do not function as a group, and the only thing that matters to them is agency. As the King enters, he has just received a message from Baudricourt, and La Trémouille, another nobleman, accosts him:

Trémouille: What have you got there?

Charles: What is that to you?

Trémouille: It is my business to know what is passing between you and the garrison at Vaucouleurs. (*He snatches the paper from [Charles] hands...*) (Shaw I.ii.).

This is quite disrespectful, and shows that there is no communion in the highest circle of France. If there were, Trémouille would know his place as part of the court. Charles's response reveals that there is only agency in the court: "**Charles:** You all think you can treat me as you please because I owe you money, and because I am no good at fighting. But I have the blood royal in my veins" (Shaw I.ii). Money is power/agency, and there is no common goal among the nobles, even for Charles. They are the soldiers Joan described in scene I, only

fighting for themselves and their own agency. If they are to unite, they need a common purpose, and this is where Joan comes into play. After correctly identifying the disguised king, she begins to convince the court, one by one, that she is sent by God to save France. She unites them under Charles, even changing his mind:

Joan: If the English win, it is they that will make the treaty: and then God help poor France! Thou must fight, Charlie, whether thou will or no. I will go first to hearten thee. We must take our courage in both hands: aye, and pray for it with both hands too (Shaw I.ii).

She uses words like ‘we’ and talks of ‘France’, instead of making it about only one person. This kind of unifying language gives her and Charles the same goal: it is no longer about selfish desires but the good of the nation. Charles continues to doubt both himself and her, but she puts courage into him:

Charles: Oh, if I only dare!

Joan: I shall dare, dare, and dare again, in God’s name! Art for or against me?

Charles: I’ll risk it, I warn you I shant be able to keep it up; but I’ll risk it. You shall see (Shaw I.ii).

Joan again claims a higher good as the goal and invites Charles to serve that power too. By winning him to her side, she is able to unite the rest of the court present, and the final lines of the scene are “For God and His Maid! To Orleans!”, repeated by those present (Shaw I.ii). Joan in Shaw, like Joan in Schiller, unites the soldiers under a common goal, and elevates those who have doubts instead of eliminating them. Her natural ability to create communion gives her great agency!

The idea of “putting courage” into people and delivering men from fear is one that is repeated in these plays. This makes Joan a great answer to Don Juan and Faust(us), who both fear that they may be insignificant, what Paglia describes as the great male angst of being

consumed by nature as explored in earlier chapters. As Joan offers hope instead of fear, as seen in the comparison to Baudricourt's leadership, she is able to free those around her from fear, as she does for Charles in I.ii of Shaw. In Schiller, the redemption of Burgundy can also be read as a shedding of fear; Burgundy is defensive, as if he is afraid of revenge from the French factions or possibly of Joan being sent by the devil. But she calms that fear as she calms the fear in Charles (in both plays), one of her great abilities.

Another tool in Joan's agency/communion balance is her natural ability to speak to every person she meets on their level and in a way they understand. She does not bully, she does not seek to undermine. Joan treats others as either equals or greater than herself, creating communion through communication. She speaks their language and works within the social-structures they have set up.

Along her journey, Joan is met with resistance, almost always by people who value only agency or are at least agency-minded, as Don Juan and Faust(us) are. As we saw in the first scene of Shaw's play, Baudricourt is clearly, pathologically agent. But Joan does not defy him with rebellion, she politely passes on the order for what she needs: "**Joan:** (*bobbing a curtsey*) Good morning, captain squire. Captain: you are to give me a horse and armor and some soldiers, and send me to the Dauphin. Those are your orders from my Lord" (Shaw I.i). She respects the authority of his position, both as a squire and as the one who has what she needs. She sees her place in the social structure of the interaction, but does not let that overshadow her greater place as God's messenger. This is a natural awareness of her holonic place: she is part of the French social structure that puts Baudricourt in a place of superiority, but she is also under her God, who has given her a mission. Her ability to balance the two is

essential to her success. In her interaction with Baudricourt, she meets him at his level, speaking to him in a way he can understand: through reason and political discourse. “Those are your orders from [the King of Heaven]” is an example: Baudricourt knows only political and military power, so she claims the authority of a higher King in his presence. Even though she has already recruited several soldiers to her cause, she still asks Baudricourt for his permission to take them: “I think John Godsave will come, and Dick the Archer, and their servants John of Honecourt and Julian. There will be no trouble for you, squire: I have arranged it all: you have only to give the order” (Shaw I.i). She is not rebellious and she does not undermine Baudricourt’s agency in his own castle; she only uses her own as far as it can take her and works with Baudricourt to do the rest. Had Faust(us) or Don Juan been in her place, they would have most likely resorted to magic or force to get what they wanted. But Joan, using communion to unite the few soldiers she needs, gains agency without damaging the social structures present. Instead of destroying Baudricourt, she leaves him behind.

She also treats the soldiers she recruits not as underlings, but as equals. Upon re-entering Baudricourt’s chamber, she speaks to Poulengy as a friend: “Will he let us go, Polly?” and then later “Jack will go halves for the horse” (Shaw I.i). Calling him by a common name and talking about letting them go as a unit is communion building, and by not using condescending language like Baudricourt, Joan shows that she is meeting the soldier on his level.

Later, in act I scene ii, Joan treats both the King and the Archbishop with the respect that their stations merit, even though she debates with them. She is so confident in her mission that she does not need to resort to force or aggression to convince them. When she

first meets Charles, even though she is a messenger of God she still “*falls on both knees before him, with bowed head, not daring to look up*” and asks for the Archbishop's blessing (Shaw I.ii). In the same scene, but in Schiller's version, Joan treats Charles and the Archbishop with the same respect. Not only does this show her greater purpose and build communion as stated above, it also serves a more practical purpose in taking away any easy target for those who resist her. If she were rebellious, the noblemen would naturally become defensive. But Joan demonstrates that she is on their side, and they are more open to discussion because of it. This in turn builds communion, which grows the agency of France. Because of Joan's natural ability to do this, France is eventually victorious. Even though Joan is ultimately executed, her mission was successful in that respect: God's will as it was spoken to her was carried out, Joan worked miracles where all those who came before her had failed.

This balance of agency and communion that Joan has gives her great power. And as agency is often associated with masculinity and communion with femininity, Joan also has something of the Amazon in her. The Amazon, originally introduced in ancient Greek mythology, was at once a woman and a warrior. She is double-sexed, having both traditional masculine and feminine traits. Joan has often been compared to Amazons, even by Camille Paglia who says in *Sexual Personae* “Judeo-Christianity has nothing like [the amazon] except Joan of Arc” (Paglia 78). Joan is androgynous not only in her psychological make-up, as we have seen, but also in more obvious ways. She dresses as a man, wearing short haircuts and armor, often to the scorn of others (Shaw I.ii). In my research, she is almost always pictured wearing armor, often with a dress underneath. It is even this cross-dressing that has her damned by the Church in the historical record of her trials. She does what was considered a

man's job, leading war parties and orchestrating political moves. She is double-sexed, able to fulfill the roles of both men and women. This is something that draws us to her. Where Don Juan and Faust(us) intrigue us because of their extreme desires and behaviors, Joan's attraction is her fluidity. This fluidity, which is her power, will lead to her downfall as well, which will be the subject of the next chapter. For now, suffice it to say that her balance of agency and communion are expressed not only in her behaviors but in her dress and the roles that she fulfills. She is outwardly and inwardly androgynous.

Joan shows us that in order for meaningful human progress to be made, agency and communion must be balanced. When they are, they build upon each other; when agency is used for communion, agency can be gained by the community, which will start a cycle of increased communion increasing agency, so on and so forth. Don Juan and Faust(us), who sought only agency and only for themselves, perished unfulfilled, but Joan, though she was executed, saw her mission completed. The difference in their attitudes towards their death is also revealing: Faust(us) and Don Juan face death in agony and fear, barely being saved from the flames of hell, if they are saved at all. Joan faces death, the greatest mystery, with courage, because she does not serve only herself. The value of her life is not measured in how much agency she has amassed, but in what she has accomplished for the greater good. Because she had united and freed France, and fulfilled her mission from her God, she was able to face death, one of nature's greatest and most unforgiving forces.

CHAPTER 5

IMPLICATIONS OF JOAN OF ARC'S ANDROGYNY

As stated in Chapter 4, Joan of Arc, as she is portrayed in dramatic literature, possesses an androgynous spirit, similar to the Amazons of European legend. Like the Amazons, Joan is both feminine and masculine, and by using the power of communion to create agency, fulfills both female and male social roles. This androgyny of self as well as social roles gives her power, and in part lead to her death at the hands of the Church.

As Camille Paglia says in her book *Sexual Personae*, Joan is the only figure in the Judeo-Christian world with any resemblance to the great Amazons of legend, who derived the name from the greek word *amazos*, or “breast-less” (Paglia 77-78). If the western female person has been associated with nature and the earth, as suggested by Paglia and discussed in Chapter 1 of this work, then the Amazon, shedding one or both breasts for mobility and physical dexterity, gives up a part of the extreme-feminine, which is supporting human life with her body, for the ability to use tools more effectively, usually a male attribute. Amazons were usually warriors, strong women who shunned men and survived on their own. They are independent of the male half of our species, no longer needing the male’s physical strength or social agency since they have it for themselves. Physically, Joan’s shedding of the female body is seen in the images and descriptions of her costume: “*Dressed as a soldier, with her hair bobbed and hanging thickly around her face*” (Shaw I.ii) and in Schiller “*JOAN enters with her flag, wearing helmet and breastplate but otherwise dressed as a woman*” (Schiller II.ii). This is the external expression of her fluid, masculine and feminine nature, similar the

Amazons. In many other expressions of Joan of Arc, the pairing of feminine dress with masculine armor is common. She is almost always shown in androgynous attire.

This can be seen not only as androgyny, but as gender-transcendence. Her ability to mix masculine and feminine tactics and roles is astonishing, as we have seen. She goes beyond her biological sex, and beyond the gender-expressions traditional to her time. In Joan's mind, they do not limit her as she has a higher calling. The only ones who see her female body and androgynous gender-expression as limiting are those around her. Joan has transcended the body and gender, even though her sexuality holds her back.

Being like these Amazons, then to a male-dominant organization like the church Joan is terrifying; She does not need guidance or protection, since she has that in herself. She hears directly from God, and has the power/social-agency to obtain what she needs. She is powerful and self-sustaining. This is similar to what Paglia describes as the power of the Greek goddess Artemis, another androgyne of legend: "She cannot be psychologically, much less physically, invaded. Artemis is unfeminine because she is uninfluenced by the environment, which she surmounts. She is pristine. She never learns. In her blankness and coldness, she is a perfect selfhood, a sublime energy" (Paglia 81). Joan is the same: she does not learn from the Church, and has an answer for every accusation or question. The following exchange is characteristic of Joan's attitude and way of speaking during her trial:

D'Estivet: Then your voices command you not to submit yourself to the Church Militant?

Joan: My voices do not tell me to disobey the Church; but God must be served first.

Cauchon: And you, and not the Church, are to be the judge?

Joan: What other judgement can I judge by but my own? (Shaw I.vi)

Joan is untouchable by logic or reasoning. Her conviction is internal, but the court attempts to convict her with logic, which is impossible to do when she does not believe in the laws that their logic is built on. She is out of their jurisdiction, since her authority comes from her own interpretations of what her voices tell her.

She also “surmounts nature” like Artemis; Joan has supernatural knowledge. Whether it comes from within her (like the woman’s understanding of nature because it is repeated in her) or from God is unimportant. She is unstoppable, complete in herself. The only factors limiting Joan of Arc are obtaining the materials she needs (men, weapons, armor) and her submission to her mission. Though she is independent of the government and the Catholic Church, she is not independent of her humanity and her God, which as we see in Schiller lead to her downfall.

To any outside force, such as the French authorities or the Catholic Church, this power is dangerous; Joan is chaotic, and, as is seen in the plays and accounts of her life, subject only to what she interprets from her voices. For example, in scene vi of Shaw’s *Saint Joan*, she states that “I cannot tell you the whole truth: God does not allow the whole truth to be told” and “in case the Church should bid me do anything contrary to the command I have from God, I will not consent to it, no matter what it may be” (Shaw I.vi). She is not subject to the Church, since she claims the same authority of a direct link to God as the Catholic Church does. Her link is natural, not derived from any writings, holy or otherwise. Her understanding is internal and personal; the Church has volumes of theology and liturgy, as well as Ecclesiastical law to govern their relationship with God. Joan bypasses that and goes straight to the source. This may motivate the church’s desire to execute her: the blasphemy

charges are only the tools to do so. The authorities, political or religious are threatened by her, afraid of her, the same way man fears being devoured by nature, as Paglia observes “Man justifiably fears being devoured by woman, who is nature’s proxy” (Paglia 16). The pre-occupation of the male/masculine psyche with order and artifice is a defense against the chaos of nature. Joan, who is a master of both female chaotic power and male structural power, is a super hero then, and to an organization that relies on knowledge and order such as the Catholic Church she is unacceptable.

Another possibility for the rejection of Joan by the French authorities comes from what Paglia describes as “The female superstar [as] a goddess, a universal mother-father” (Paglia 54). Joan, especially among her circle of followers, fits the description perfectly. In both Shaw and Schiller she is followed by a devoted group of men, and hailed by the greater public as a hero. This is her strength (communion power) leading to her weakness: She becomes the mother-father of France. We have seen where she takes agency (traditionally masculine) and communion (traditionally feminine) and uses the two forces to complement each other. She is fluid between the two, just as she is fluid between the shepherdess and the commander, sitting astride a horse as the armies of France thrust from her like children. She paternalistically leads the armies of France, which is social agency, and unites/nurtures the nation, which is communion or group maintenance. She is the mother and the father. This leads to her death at the hands of her child; it is an Oedipal act carried out on a grand, national, maybe international scale.

As Freud describes it in *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1899), the Oedipal impulse is to “to direct our first sexual impulses toward our mothers, and our first impulse of hatred and

violence toward our fathers” (Freud 276). If Joan is the mother-father of France, then the violence shown to her may be Oedipal in nature. Part of her Amazonian nature as well as her direction from her God is to be chaste, which would frustrate the Oedipal child (in this case the French authorities). This would multiply the impulse for violence directed toward the father, as seen in the sexually frustrated male who lashes out at those around him. Both impulses toward the parents are those of dominance, either sexually or physically. The child will always seek to surpass the parent, and in this case France is no different. Once Joan has fulfilled her role, she is destroyed. The Church can resume its throne as the principal spiritual entity, and France can breathe easy, independent of its parent(s).

Another possibility for Joan’s downfall is the location or source of her power. Before she was called by God, she was content to be a shepherdess, and willing to go back to being so once her role is played out: “**Joan:** Sire: I have made you king: my work is done. I am going back to my father’s farm” (Shaw I.v). In Schiller she only responds to the call of God to leave her shepherding ways behind, saying a sad farewell to her old life: “Mountains, much-loved meadows, dear, quiet valleys, / Joan bids you all a long, a last farewell!” (This goes on for a few stanzas) (Schiller Prologue). But after she is called, her power comes from God. Before, she was perfectly capable of balancing agency and communion, as seen in Chapter 3. After she was called, her power only grew, but it didn’t change her ability to commune. Her growing power/authority came from God: if it weren’t for his call/mission, she would not have achieved what she did, and she might not have been listened too had she not claimed to be sent by him. As we have seen, her ability to claim a higher-good was essential to her achieving her goals. That higher-good was derived from the shared spiritual

worldview of France, that of the Catholic God. At the time, who controlled the people's relationship with God? The male-dominant church. And, if the church did have Oedipal urges towards Joan, then she is doomed, as she is in history. But what if that power, the ability to use communion and agency to complement each other, didn't come from God, and instead came from within her? What if Joan didn't rely on God to give her agency? We cannot know. I believe that if she found that power within herself, or if the people's relationship with God was not governed by the Church, Joan would have survived, and others like her would have surfaced at a higher rate. This would have led to what Ken Wilber sees as a possible step towards social progress in our modern society: Female social-agency, for which Joan is the prototype.

In his book *Sex, Ecology, Spirituality*, Ken Wilber explores, by way of many historians, philosophers, and anthropologists, the development of the male-dominated society we have today. He explains it in great detail in Chapter 5 of that book, but for our purposes I will give a summarization.

When humanity began, in the hunter/gatherer phase of our existence, the male and female populations experienced relative equity: everyone could gather food, and while the men would hunt, the women would garden and make sure the children survived, a difficult task. Both roles were balanced, and humanity thrived. The male sphere was concerned with social production (agency), or what you could produce for the group. The female sphere was primarily concerned with re-production, or growing/maintaining the population of the collective (communion). However, the male population began to develop a meritocracy of strength, and since the males began to function independently of the females, the male and

female spheres began to grow apart. To re-integrate the spheres, anthropologists observe that the family unit was created by the birth of the 'father' role, or that the male was integrated into the female value-sphere of re-production, and everything was balanced for a while.

As technology advanced, however, the male value-sphere began to pull away from the female value-sphere with the invention of heavy farm equipment. Before, everyone grew crops for themselves: if there were ten families in the group, each male grew crops to feed his family. With the invention of heavy equipment came the ability to produce an abundance, and now 3 farmers could feed all ten families. What about the other seven male farmers? They were free to pursue art, law, science, religion, etc. But this did not change anything in the female value sphere: a pregnant woman could not use heavy farm equipment or she would miscarry, and the group needed to maintain population numbers to survive. So the male value-sphere, now free to pursue higher things like architecture and advances in technology, began to pull away from the female value-sphere, which was left to raise the children and run the home. The two were not integrated, and this is one of the social ills we suffer from today and one which most branches of feminism are concerned with remedying. Because the male half of the population was free to move about in society, they had social agency which was superior to the female population, who as we see in history are socially/legally tied to their male guardians. What Wilber and others assert is that for the two halves to be re-integrated, female people must have equal social agency to the male half, just as the males had to have equal presence in the re-productive sphere in the first 're-integration'. This is seen today in a number of ways, each of which deserves its own volume of research.

If Wilber is correct, then the cure for the disassociation of male and female value-spheres is to reintegrate the female person into the male ‘social-production’ half of our society by attributing the same amount of social-agency to the female as to her male counterparts. Equal pay is a prime example, since money is the definition of social agency in the U.S. Thus, Joan is a prototype of the prescribed re-integration. She takes on that same social-agency that Wilber describes! She is able to move about in society and affect change as she wants, even if all of her peers are male. More importantly, she does not abandon the communion-based re-productive/group-maintenance of the female value sphere. She is balanced, integrated, and a prototype for the future. The image of a female taking traditionally male social-agency is one repeated, and Joan was the prototype. The World War II figure “Rosie the Riveter” is a direct descendant of Joan, just as is “Liberty Leading the People” by Eugène Delacroix. These woman are balanced in their masculinity and femininity, unlike the heroes before, who like Don Juan and Faust(us) were dominated by their masculinity and obsession with agency. Those two were the warning, Joan was the solution.

Interestingly, Joan is not the only figure to take male social-agency for herself in popular theatre. Lady Macbeth, of Shakespeare’s *Macbeth* (1606) did the same. However, in one of her more famous speeches she cries:

Come, you spirits
That tend on mortal thoughts, unsex me here;
And fill me, from the crown to the toe, top-full
Of direst cruelty! make thick my blood,
Stop up th’access and passage to remorse,
That no compunctious visitings of nature

Shake my fell purpose, nor keep peace between
Th'effect and it! Come to my woman's breasts,
And take my milk for gall, you murd'ring ministers,
Wherever in you sightless substances
You wait on nature's mischeif! (I.v.37-49)

Though she takes upon herself male social-agency in order to get what she wants (the crown for herself and her husband), she abandons the female value-sphere completely, and that unbalance becomes her downfall in the end. She is in contrast to Joan, who balances the two to great affect, as seen in Chapter 3. This paints Joan as the prototype of the woman of the future, who is able to move about in society without sacrificing the strengths of the female value sphere. We have seen in history the slow movement towards the realization of Joan's example, and though we are not there, the rewards of following her example have been quite positive for both the male and female halves of Western society. Joan illustrates that balance is attainable, and that it is powerful in its ability to create progress for the group.

Concluding Thoughts

Since Faust(us), Don Juan, and Joan of Arc are the three most popular figures in western theatre, their relationship to the human struggle of balancing the natural impulses for Agency and Communion can tell us so much about the trajectory of the western meta-culture. Faust(us) and Don Juan show us the natural outcome of our obsession with agency, just as the Catholic Church in Joan of Arc's time destroyed her in order to preserve its own power. Joan of Arc reveals that balancing the two impulses yields great progress. In Paglia's frame of 'man as subject to nature', we see the limits, strengths, and weaknesses of our species, since all of our actions are shaped by our relationship to nature. That relationship to nature, as expressed in the agency/communion dichotomy that Ken Wilber lays out, is the same

relationship all humans have. We are not so different from those three great figures of the past, and by understanding their problems and strengths, downfalls and triumphs, we can learn about ourselves and solve the problems we have today, whether personal and internal or societal and external. We are not so different from our heroes; what we see in them is present in all of us.

WORKS CONSULTED

- Astell, Ann W., and Bonnie Wheeler. *Joan of Arc and Spirituality*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003. Print.
- Bentley, Eric. *The Great Playwrights; Twenty-five Plays with Commentaries by Critics and Scholars*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1970. Print.
- Boas, Frederick S. "Joan of Arc in Shakespeare, Schiller, and Shaw." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 2.1 (1951): 35-45. Web.
- Blankenagel, John C. "Shaw's "Saint Joan" and Schiller's "Jungfrau Von Orleans"" *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 25.3 (1926): 379-92. Web.
- Cutler, Bruce, Mandel Oscar, Carter Boyd, Roberts James, and Crompton Louis. "The Don Juan Story: A Symposium." *Prairie Schooner* 39.2 (1965): 176-85. Web.
- Denslow, Stewart. "Don Juan and Faust." *Hispanic Review* 10.3 (1942): 215-22. Web.
- Dolgin, Ellen Ecker. *Modernizing Joan of Arc: Conceptions, Costumes, and Canonization*. Jefferson: McFarland, 2008. Print.
- Freud, Sigmund. *The Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud*; tr. and ed., with an introduction. Ed. A. A. Brill. 1995 ed. New York: Modern Library, 1938. Print.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang Von. *Faust: A Tragedy in Two Parts*. London: Oxford UP, 1932. Print.
- Krumpelmann, John T. *Schiller and Saint Joan of Arc*. Monatshefte Für Deutschen Unterricht, vol. 34, no. 4, 1942, pp. 159–168. www.jstor.org/stable/30192009.

- Mandrell, James. "Nostalgia and the Popularity of Don Juan Tenorio: Reading Zorrilla through Clarín." *Hispanic Review*, vol. 59, no. 1, 1991, pp. 37–55. www.jstor.org/stable/473872.
- Marlowe, Christopher. edited by Sylvan Barnet. *Doctor Faustus*. New York: New American Library, 1969. Print.
- Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus. *Three Mozart Libretti*. New York: Dover. 1993. Print.
- Paine, Albert Bigelow, and Joe Isom. *The Girl in White Armor: The Story of Joan of Arc*. New York: Macmillan, 1967. Print.
- Paglia, Camille. *Sexual Personae: Art and Decadence from Nefertiti to Emily Dickinson*. New York: Vintage , 1991. Print.
- Peters, Julie Stone. "Joan of Arc Internationale: Shaw, Brecht, and the Law of Nations." *Comparative Drama* 38.4 (2004): 355-77. Web.
- Raknem, Ingvald. *Joan of Arc in History, Legend and Literature*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1971. Print.
- Russell, Charles C. *The Don Juan Legend Before Mozart*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan, 1993. Print.
- Schiller, Friedrich, and John Elliot Drinkwater Bethune. *The Maid of Orleans*. London. 1835. Print.
- Sellner, Timothy F. "The Lionel-Scene in Schiller's Jungfrau Von Orleans: A Psychological Interpretation". *The German Quarterly*, vol. 50, no. 3, 1977, pp. 264–282.
- Shaw, Bernard. *St. Joan*. Baltimore: Penguin, 1900. Print.

Sender, Ramón. "Three Centuries of Don Juan." *Books Abroad*, vol. 23, no. 3, 1949, pp. 227–232. www.jstor.org/stable/40086977.

Sullivan, Karen. *The Interrogation of Joan of Arc*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota, 1999. Print.

Taylor, Larissa. *The Virgin Warrior: The Life and Death of Joan of Arc*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2009. Print.

Treitler, Leo. "History and Archetypes." *Perspectives of New Music* 35.1 (1997): 115-27. Web.

Watt, Ian. *Myths of Modern Individualism: Faust, Don Quixote, Don Juan, Robinson Crusoe*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. Print.

Wilber, Ken. *A Brief History of Everything*. Boston: Shambhala, 2000. Print.

Wilber, Ken. *Sex, Ecology, Spirituality: The Spirit of Evolution*. Revised ed. Boston: Shambhala, 2000. Print.

Wilber, Ken. *A Theory of Everything: An Integral Vision for Business, Politics, Science, and Spirituality*. Boston: Shambhala, 2000. Print.

Yurick, Sol. "Faust's Stages of Spiritual/Economic Growth and Takeoff into Transcendence". *Social Text*, no. 17, 1987, pp. 67–95. www.jstor.org/stable/466479.

Zorilla, José. Edited by Mandel, Oscar. *The Theatre of Don Juan: A Collection of Plays and Views, 1630-1963*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1963. Print.

VITA

Ethan Royce Zogg was born in Indianapolis, Indiana, on January 15th, 1993. He graduated from Kansas City Christian High School in May 2011 as part of the National Honors Society. He attended the University of Missouri-Kansas City as an undergraduate, where he received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Theatre in 2015. Following his undergraduate education he enrolled at the University of Missouri-Kansas City in the Master of Arts program in Theatre under Dr. Felicia Hardison Londré. While there Ethan participated in the 3-Minute Thesis competition, of which he won the Master's division. He was dramaturg of *Roof of the World* and *Evita* at the KCRep Theatre, while serving as dramaturg for several UMKC productions, including Theresa Rebeck's *O, Beautiful*. In Spring of 2016, Ethan directed *Gunplay* by Frank Higgins at The Fishtank Performance Studio. While teaching at UMKC during his time in the M.A. program, Ethan invented the "Figure Drawing" technique of teaching students physical theatre, as well as the "image project", which is designed to teach students about visual communication and emotional space.

Ethan is a member of the Ibsen Society of America and the Eugene O'Neill Society.