Journal Title: Repression and Expression: Literary and Social Coding in Nineteenth-Century France

Volume: 22
Issue:
Month/Year: 1996
Pages: 209-219

Article Author: Gretchen van Slyke

Article Title: Rebuilding the Bastille: Women's Dress-Code Legisation in the Nineteenth Century

Gretchen Van Slyke

REBUILDING THE BASTILLE: WOMEN'S DRESS-CODE LEGISLATION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

We all know that the Napoleonic Code drafted into law distinctly different and hierarchically ordered roles for men and women. Likewise, post-revolutionary fashion gave these inward, invisible notions of masculinity and femininity clear expression in the outward, visible realm of dress, which came to embody what many considered to be natural differences between men and women. This was an important turning point in fashion as a form of social communication, for in earlier centuries markers of rank and wealth had counted at least as much as markers of sex. At Versailles before the Revolution gentlemen and ladies alike sported powdered wigs, shimmering, brightly colored fabrics and lacy ruffles. Yet by the time of Napoleon III men and women donned such starkly different uniforms that there was no longer, not even for the untrained eye, any possible confusion about the person's sex: the first sex wore dark, tailored business suits and members of the second were stuffed and laced into elaborate crinolines with plunging necklines and cumbersome hoops. Likewise, interest in fashion had become associated with femininity.[1] Men who wore flamboyant or unusual dress were routinely criticized for being unmanly or effeminate, but for those eccentric, grotesque or even dangerous women who tried to escape the "Bastille" of the corset and the skirt—this analogy being a commonplace of the dress-reform movement—, it was not enough to call up the resources of ridicule, occasionally savage caricature and moral outrage.[2] Since the dictates of fashion also corresponded to prescriptive norms of gender, the police and the courts all over Europe kept an eye out for those deviations that might edge into offenses against public decency and morality.

One goal of dress-code legislation has been to enforce a fit between biological sex and culturally constructed, legally codified notions of gender. Of course, there have always been cases of 'misfit' for both men and women; but given the inequalities in the legal rights and professional opportunities available to the two sexes, a disparity which the Napoleonic code only exacerbated,[3] men and women had in most cases quite different reasons for cross-dressing in nineteenth-century France.[4] From a social point of view, cross-dressing men risked only a certain amount of ridicule. Cross-dressing women willfully risked fines and prison-terms because they had most everything to gain. Surprising numbers of them, including

humble working women, stealthily took advantage of the "blessings in disguise" that their younger sisters would later assume without trouble from the law.[5]

Theories of transvestism, despite their often unexamined and problematic debts to conservative ideologies of gender, sustain these differences in motivation between the sexes. Magnus Hirschfeld, the pioneering Berlin sexologist who coined the term "transvestism" in 1910, doubted that all cross-dressers represented clinical cases of transvestism. These, he argued, derived from an unconscious erotic compulsion, whereas the other cases, particularly among women, were socially motivated: an early formula of dressing for success. He noted other differences, too. The men's suicide rate was much higher than the women's. Also, men's cross-dressing tended to be clandestine and intermittent, whereas women often assumed professional masculine identities on a permanent basis.[6] Contemporary psychoanalytic theories generally define transvestism as a fetishistic behavior that occurs in men quite exclusively. Women now show up on occasion in clinical descriptions as transsexuals, but they have been dropped as transvestites for two main reasons, not unrelated. One has to do with the evolution of fashion: although skirts are still considered gender-specific, this is no longer the case for trousers. The other has to do with the evolution of psychosocial theory. Although women's desires to live more like men are rarely considered a malady these days, men who appear to emulate women and envy their apparel are treated like potential patients for gender-identity clinics and programs for sexual disorders.

Stepping outside of this clinical paradigm of control and enforcement of gender-norms, Marjorie Garber analyzes the fascination that transvestites exercise in culture and their ability to act "as an aesthetic and psychological agent of destabilization, desire and fantasy."[7] She objects to the notion that women's desires for male apparel may be socially, not sexually motivated and dismisses as unconvincing and problematic any attempts to explain female cross-dressing out of social or economic necessity, labelling these rationalizations "appropriations of transvestism in the service of a humanist 'progress narrative'" (70).

My approach is not Garber's, despite the debt that I acknowledge to her analyses. Most of the case studies that will be cited here seem to fit the pattern of Garber's "progress narrative," although I would not claim that socio-economic necessity entirely exhausts their signifying potential. My differences with Garber are largely a matter of focus. She is primarily interested in transvestism as a general phenomenon, its erotic and playful appeal and its power to confuse all sorts of cultural binarisms, sexual, national and racial. I am primarily interested in women's cross-dressing in the very particular context of nineteenth-century France, its dire social motivation and the legal attempts to contain and repress it. In her "Blessings in Disguise" Susan Gubar expressed the regret that back in 1981 there was no comprehensive history of the law and transvestism. It is my hope that these remarks may serve as an introduction to the history of the policing of women's dress in nineteenth-century France.

Women's dress-code legisation, as established by the police-regulation of 16 Brumaire Year IX (7 November 1800) stands utterly and aberrantly alone in

comparison with the laws of its closest neighbors.[8] English and German law prosecuted cross-dressing by both sexes as a crime under the vague rubrics of breach of the peace or gross indecency, with the harshest penalties reserved for male offenders. The French regulation, on the other hand, clearly and specifically prohibited cross-dressing, but only by women. In no way were the authorities concerned with men's cross-dressing, a practice which encountered their bemused indifference.[9] Although France could tolerate men in skirts, it took considerable pains to keep women out of men's pants, making this taboo garment a material sign and symbol of male prerogative. As I shall later argue, this odd dissymmetry in the cross-dressing regulation was an important part of the legacy of the Revolution of 1789. Finally, the police-regulation of 7 November 1800 established formal procedures by which a woman might obtain a cross-dressing permit, valid for periods of three or six months, with possible renewals. The only official reason for which a permit could be granted was medical necessity, certified by a health officer and demonstrated to the appropriate authorities. Once the permit was granted, certain restrictions still applied. As was clearly printed on the official form, a woman in men's clothes could not appear "aux Spectacles, Bals et autres lieux de réunion ouverts au public."

This police-regulation was enforced throughout the entire century, but with particular stringency when feminists began to find a militant voice in the Third Republic.[10] Not until World World I when women stepped forth to replace men in shops, offices and factories did the autorities give up enforcing the police-regulation of 7 November 1800. Yet the law is still on the books, despite attempts as recent as 1969 to remove it.

Some women, undeterred by the risk of fines and prison-terms, certainly cross-dressed without permits while the regulation was being enforced. George Sand did so during her early years in Paris. Although she claimed that no one ever penetrated her masculine disguise, she was recognized at least once but went unmolested by the authorities.[11] She was obviously far more fortunate than the trousered women that the caricaturist Gavarni (1840) portrayed lamenting their fate in a jail cell.[12] At the end of the century there were other notorious cases, such as Colette and her friend, the Marquise de Belbeuf, who were part of the upper-crust lesbian society that met in private salons well out of the sight of "le père Lépine qui n'eut jamais le goût de badiner avec le travesti."[13] Yet they ran into serious problems with that intolerant prefect during their 1907 performance of a cross-dressed love scene from *Le Rêve d'Egypte*.[14]

Magnus Hirschfeld has documented several less well-known cases of humbler women whose chosen mode of life and livelihood entirely depended upon their masculine disguise, whose sex was revealed only after death. Clothilde Filly died in an automobile accident in 1906. This "fille de bonne famille" left home after a quarrel with her parents and worked as a driver for the rest of her life, without anyone ever suspecting that their hot-tempered friend "Bras de fer" was a woman (309). Likewise, when a witty and well-known journalist known as "Marius" died in Paris in 1903, everyone was amazed to learn that this member of the editorial

board of the *Soir* and writer for the sports-paper *Auteuil-Longchamps* was a woman. Hirschfeld also mentions a wealthy and well-respected Breton fisherman and fleet-owner who was twice widowed before "his" death. "No one," says Hirschfeld quoting from the *Jahrbücher für sexuelle Zwischenstufen*, "ever imagined that he was a woman, not even the women he married" (312).

The fate of some less fortunate women illustrates the consequences of being caught redhanded in the act of cross-dressing: "Monsieur Paul," a 25 year-old driver who was discovered to be a woman when she was admitted to a Parisian hospital in 1902. Before that, she had been employed by one of the largest trucking firms in Paris; but, as Hirschfeld reports, "Since the time of the discovery of her true sex, she has been living in constant fear of losing her job" (313). Another potentially tragic case, recorded in DB58, concerns a Madame Libert in 1889. Until she was denounced by anonymous letter for usurping the role of a man, this woman had been managing a Parisian printing-press for some ten years. Summoned by the authorities after receipt of the incriminating letter, Madame Libert appeared in trousers before the examining magistrate. She readily admitted her masculine disguise, saying that it made things so much easier for a woman wanting to work in business. She was reprimanded and asked to come back before the court in a dress. When she replied that she did not own a dress, the judge retorted by offering her the address of a good shop. After she manifested her intention to apply for a permit to wear men's clothing, her request was apparently granted.

The case of Madame Astié de Valsayre[15] shows just how difficult it could be to obtain a cross-dressing permit. A notorious associate of Louise Michel and Hubertine Auclert in the 1880s and 1890s, she was also hailed by Grand-Carteret as the soul of the French dress-reform movement. When the *Ligue de l'affranchissement des Femmes* launched its 1886 campaign against corsets and skirts on behalf of working women, Madame Astié de Valsayre reportedly began her personal crusade against the regulations of 7 November 1800.[16] Dressed in trousers, she went to the Préfecture and asked for a permit to wear them. She received the reply that "on ne pouvait me le permettre, vu que ce n'était pas permis" (Grand-Carteret 194). When she tried to leave the Préfecture, she was arrested and taken before her neighborhood police-commissioner who repeated the letter of the law and gave her an official warning. Then she appealed to the Prefect, who did not even deign to reply. Undaunted, Madame Astié de Valsayre pursued the matter in a petition addressed to the Chamber of Deputies in July 1887. Citing many examples of women who risked life and limb when their dresses caught in passing trams, whose fancy gowns turned them into blazing torches during the dreadful fire at the Opera-Comique in 1887,[17] she argued that trousers were quite as decent as skirts, also considerably safer and called upon the legislators to lift the sanction against them. After the Chamber simply replied that no law required women to wear such complicated dresses, Madame Astié de Valsayre continued the fight. In the course of her lecture-circuit with Louise Michel in 1889, she grew weary of trailing skirts covered with mud up to the waist

and notified Prefect Lozé that she would henceforth wear trousers. "Je fis come je l'avais dit," she reported, "mais les vexations furent si insupportables qu'il me fallut totalement y renoncer" (Grand-Carteret 196). In 1897, when the Bazar de la Charité burned and once again made so many female victims, Madame Astié de Valsayre was still pleading—to no avail—for women's freedom of dress.

Madame Astié de Valsayre's hapless efforts prove just how difficult it could be to obtain a *permission de travestissement.* Yet in a few cases the petitioners' requests were granted. The exact number may not ever be known, but a clipping from *La Lanterne* of 9 November 1890 filed in DB58 states that there were then only ten French women with cross-dressing permits and lists a few others from earlier years. Among these lucky few were the director of a printing-press (probably our Madame Libert); a former actress from the *Comédie français* who wanted to go hunting; a female house-painter; a bearded woman; two deformed women; a woman with such a manly appearance that she would look ridiculous in women's dress; and finally celebrities such as Madame Dieulafoy,[18] the Middle-Eastern archeologist; Rosa Bonheur,[19] the first female artist named to the *Légion d'Honneur*; Marguerite Bellanger, one of Napoléon III's mistresses, who used masculine disguise to escape the jealous eye of the Empress while slipping in and out of the Tuileries.[20]

The fact that these permits were few in number is confirmed by another source. Laure-Paul Flobert reports in her 1911 monograph on trousered omen that no more than twelve women received *permissions de travestissement* in the 1850s.[21] She adds that these permits were reportedly granted for two main reasons: to allow women to work jobs ordinarily reserved to men, thereby earning higher wages, and to protect mannish-looking women from becoming public spectacles. A list of some of the women who obtained permits contains, in addition to the already familiar cases of Madame Libert and the bearded lady, some new and surprising ones: a woman who got a permit in order to work as a stone-cutter and another as a groom; a prostitute who, "lasse de la vie galante, demanda l'autorisation de porter le costume d'homme, afin de se faire embaucher dans un atelier de serrurerie où elle a travaillé pendant plusieurs années, et où, en femme elle n'aurait pu entrer" (Flobert 24).[22] Among the working women, the most telling case is probably that of Mademoiselle Foucaud. After arriving in Paris around 1830, she earned a pittance at various jobs and finally wound up working in a print-shop for 2.5 francs per day. After a while she noticed that the men earned 4 francs for doing the same work. She asked the boss for permission to transfer into the men's section. He replied that it was absolutely impossible to mix the sexes. She quit, cut her hair, put on men's clothes and a few days later got herself hired back with the men. Carefully investing that higher salary, she eventually left the printing trade and began a long and successful career in real estate.[23]

By the letter of the law, the French regulation of women's cross-dressing was the most rigorous of systems. Yet, as the above examples amply demonstrate, it was brought close to self-destruction by its inconsistent, frankly bizarre application.

The only official reason for which a permit could be granted was the woman's health. Indulging in some specious speculation about the health matters that would make it necessary for a woman to wear trousers, an 1882 newspaper article contained in DB58 offered this suggestion as a good joke: the fear of drafts. That the health requirement was in fact nothing but a bad joke on women is confirmed by another article in DB58, which asserts that the authorities made exceptions to this rule for celebrities like Madame Dieulafoy, Rosa Bonheur, Marguerite Bellanger and the former actress who liked hunting. Bearded ladies were virtually the only cases that fit the stated intentions of the law of 7 November 1800. While the exceptions made for erudite, professional women of international renown may be arbitary graces, it is certainly not surprising to see high-placed people getting special treatment from the government. Also, as Rosa Bonheur steadfastly maintained, trousers were helpful, even necessary for her unchaperoned work-sessions in slaughterhouses and horse-fairs. Yet the only reason for Marguerite Bellanger's trousers was to facilitate the legendary pleasures of the Emperor. Her permit cannot be viewed as anything more than self-serving indulgence on the part of Napoleon III. Still the most surprising thing here is the number of humble working women who, in utter disregard for the law and the established practice of sexual segregation in the work-place, were granted permits to dress and work as men in order to earn higher wages and gain positions of authority. Clearly the quarrel over trousers was no longer an old domestic dispute, but a highly charged social issue. Granted, cross-dressing permits given out for such reasons seem few and far between. However statistically insgnificant they may have been, their clear lack of legal principle is no less politically subversive, especially when this was widely disseminated in the press. If exceptions were made for Madame Libert and Mademoiselle Foucaud, why not for Madame Astié de Valsayre and women as a whole?

A final question: what can account for the aberration of French law with regard to cross-dressing? Why did it affect just women and not men? Reference to the Napoleonic Code is not the answer, for it was not completed until 1804. Yet the inspiration for the police-regulation of 7 November 1800 as well as the entire Napoleonic Code drew upon the same source, the participation of women in the Revolution and the first collective stirrings of feminism. Although many fine historians turn a blind eye to the question of women's dress, several of the most famous *militantes* of revolutionary France created striking images in their trousers, breeches or military uniforms: Théroigne de Méricourt striding about in riding clothes with pistols, daggers and perhaps even a false moustache,[24] Olympe de Gouges who appeared in uniform at the head of a fully armed regiment of women soldiers at the Fête de la Fédération in 1792,[25] Claire Lacombe and Pauline Léon, founders and presidents of the *Citoyennes Républicaines Révolutionnaires*, who sported the cockade, the liberty bonnet and men's trousers as proof of their patriotic fervor.[26] Add to this the women who took up trousers and arms in order to fight in the armies of the Revolution and the Empire. Several of them—now *illustres inconnues* such as Virginie Ghesquière, Marie Schellinck, Rose Barreau and

Marie-Thérèse Figueur—distinguished themselves on the battlefield, even to the point of winning the Legion of Honor from Napoléon I.[27] Even though the majority of the women who participated in the Revolution did not take up trousers in such literal fashion, they certainly did so symbolically. The collective action of women was encouraged and exploited by the Jacobins when it was to their advantage, but once that they had succeeded in eliminating the Girondists, women were crushed as a political force.

Ultimately the very question of women in trousers, literally and symbolically, provided the Convention with a convenient pretext for curbing women's power. In October 1793, the *Citoyennes Républicaines Révolutionnaires* caused a riot when they insisted that the market-women of the Halles prove their patriotic feeling by dressing up in cockade, bonnet and trousers just like them. After some of the market-women lodged a complaint about this infringement of their liberty of dress, the Convention concluded that women were morally unfit to take part in politics and decided to outlaw not only the offending group, but all women's clubs and societies.[28] This was just one of the first steps taken to exclude women as a whole from public and political life. On 20 May 1795 the Convention voted to exclude women from their meetings, according them the right to watch in silence if they were accompanied by a duly certified male citizen. Three days later the Convention placed all Parisian women under a kind of house arrest until further notice.

Claire Goldberg Moses has argued that the Revolution provided nineteenth-century women with an "invaluable legacy": the understanding of "the potential strength of collective female action."[29] Yet back in 1922, when French women's suffrage was still some twenty years off, Winifred Stephens underlined what women of that period ultimately lost in the Revolution: "The Revolution left Frenchwomen, as they have remained ever since, without votes for any governing body."[30] That was already bad enough, but by the end of the Revolution women were even worse off than before. This much, in any case, is perfectly clear. The latter phases of the Revolution witnessed a climactic reaction against women's involvement in the affairs of the nation and a subsequent redefinition of the norms of femininity. Whereas the *Citoyennes Républicaines Révolutionnaires* were once showered with compliments for breaking one of the many links in the chain of prejudice which confined women to the narrow sphere of their households, they were soon condemned by male legislators like Fabre d'Eglantine as "des filles émancipées, des grenadiers femelles." Women would no longer be allowed, in the words of Anaxagore Chaumette, to renounce their sex.[31]

Under the Directory changes in fashion signaled a new and distinctly different aesthetic definition of femininity. Soon thereafter the police-regulation of 7 November 1800 was decreed. The law against women's cross-dressing was undoubtedly convenient for sealing women into the new legal identity, clearly subordinate and rigidly differentiated, that was being drafted for that half of humanity in the Napoleonic Code. Like the Revolution, the Napoleonic Code certainly did not, as Moses has pointed out,[32] invent patriarchy, but it closed up

loopholes that had existed before this uniform set of laws was established.

Men and women together liberated the Bastille, but the law of 7 November 1800 pushed women back into the Bastille of skirts, and then the Napoleonic Code gave the key another turn. Anderson and Zinsser are right in their assessment of the short-term, even century-long effects of the Revolution: "But the very laws which gave men new rights upheld the most traditional and regressive views of female inferiority and incapacity. Perhaps in compensation for the loss of male hierarchy and differentiated status, all men now gained legal control over 'their' women."[33] Clearly the point of the law of 7 November 1800 was not to control individual sexual deviancy. It was meant to prevent and repress potential social deviancy, read influence, ambition and power, on the part of women as a whole.

NOTES

[1]See Bonnie Anderson and Judith Zinsser, *A History of Their Own: Women in Europe from Prehistory to the Present* (New York: Harper & Row, 1988), 2: 143–148.

[2]See, for example, John Grand-Carteret, *La Femme en culotte* (Paris: Flammarion, 1899), which includes a wonderful collection of cartoons drawn from newspapers and magazines in London, Paris, New York and Berlin.

[3]See Claire Goldberg Moses, *French Feminism in the Nineteenth Century* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984), 17–20.

[4]It is still not clear whether the perceived differences between male and female cross-dressers arise from different etiological factors in the two groups of individuals or from the patriarchal attitudes and anxieties of the ambient society. For discussions of this matter, see Deborah Heller Feinbloom, *Transvestites and Transsexuals: Mixed Views* (New York: Dell "Delta Books," 1976), 16, and Annie Woodhouse, *Fantastic Women: Sex, Gender and Transvestism* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1989), x; 6–16. It is also important to consider that not all cases of cross-dressing correspond to clinical definitions of transvestism. Magnus Hirschfeld, for example, an early twentieth-century German sexologist, attempted to draw a line between cases of "true" transvestism, by which he meant biologically determined compulsions, and cross-dressing for what he called "external," i.e. social motivations; see his book *Transvestites: The Erotic Drive to Cross-Dress*, trans. Michael E. Lombardi-Nash (Buffalo: Prometheus Books, 1991 [Berlin, 1910]).

Contemporary psychoanalytic and sociological theories define transvestism as a phenomenon that affects men almost exclusively, but earlier clinicians studied its occurrence in both sexes. Peter Ackroyd presents a useful introduction to the clinical history of transvestism in *Dressing Up. Transvestism and Drag: The History of an Obsession* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1979), 25–34. Woodhouse gives a good state-of-the-art summary of contemporary theory in *Fantastic Women*, 18: 65–76.

[5]See Susan Gubar, "Blessings in Disguise: Cross-Dressing as Re-dressing for Female Modernists," *The Massachusetts Review* 1981 Autumn, 477–508.

[6]Magnus Hirschfeld, *Transvestites: The Erotic Drive to Cross-Dress.* Trans. Michael E. Lombardi-Nash (Buffalo: Prometheus Books, 1991 [Berlin, 1910]).

[7]Marjorie Garber, *Vested Interests: Cross-dressing & Cultural Anxiety* (New York/London: Routledge, 1992), 71.

[8]Many thanks to my friends Léo and Elisabeth Jahiel whose astute inquiries led me to the Musée des Collections Historiques de la Préfecture de Police, located in the Commissariat of the Fifth Arrondissement, where my research received the benevolent and expert guidance of Madame Angèle Colonna. Much of the following material is drawn from the dossier DB58 contained in the archives of this museum. Further reference to these materials will be indicated by DB58.

Given the considerable difficulty I had getting my hands on the text of this law, I would like to reproduce it in two forms, (a) the brief manuscript copy contained in DB58 and b) a longer version in printed form which is drawn from the *Collection officielle des Ordonnances de Police depuis 1800 jusqu'à 1844* (Paris: Libraire Administrative de Paul Dupont, 1844), 1: 53–54.

(a) Hors les temps de Carnaval, les femmes ne peuvent s'habiller en homme sans une autorisation du préfet de police, délivrée sur le certificat d'un médecin et légalisée par le commissaire de police qui constate la nécessité du travestissement.

Ordonnance de police du 16 brumaire an IX (7 novembre 1800)
Les contraventions sont poursuivies par voie de simple police.

(b) *Ordonnance concernant le travestissement des femmes (Paris, le 16 brumaire an IX (7 novembre 1800)*

Le préfet de police,

Informé que beaucoup de femmes se travestissent; et persuadé qu'aucune d'elles ne quitte les habits de son sexe que pour cause de santé,

Considérant que les femmes travesties sont exposées à une infinité de désagréments, et même aux méprises des agents de la police, si elles ne sont pas munies d'une autorisation spéciale qu'elles puissent représenter au besoin;

Considérant que cette autorisation doit être uniforme, et que, jusqu'à ce jour, des permissions différentes ont été accordées par diverses autorités;

Considérant, enfin, que toute femme qui, après la publication de la présente ordonnane, s'habillerait en homme, sans avoir rempli les formalités préscrites, donnerait lieu de croire qu'elle aurait l'intention coupable d'abuser de son travestissement;

Ordonne ce qui suit:

1. Toutes les permissions de travestissement accordées jusqu'à ce jour, par les sous-préfets ou les maires du département de la Seine, et les maires des communes de Saint-Cloud, Sèvres et Meudon, et même celles accordées à la préfecture de police, sont et demeurent annulées.

2. Toute femme, désirant s'habiller en homme, devra se présenter à la préfecture de police pour en obtenir l'autorisation.

3. Cette autorisation ne sera donnée que sur le certificat d'un officier de santé, dont la signature sera dûment légalisée, et en outre sur l'attestation des maires ou commissaires de police, portant les noms et prénoms, profession et demeure de la requérante.

4. Toute femme trouvée travestie et qui ne se sera pas conformée aux dispositions des articles précédents, sera arrêtée et conduite à la préfecture de police.

5. La présente ordonnance sera imprimée, affichée dans toute l'étendue du département de la Seine et dans les communes de Saint-Cloud, Sèvres et Meudon, et envoyée au général commandant les 15e et 17e divisions militaires, au général commandant d'armes de la place de Paris, aux capitaines de la gendarmerie dans les départements de la Seine et de Seine-et-Oise, aux maires, aux commissaires de police et aux officiers de paix, pour que

chacun, en ce qui le concerne, en assure l'exécution.

Le préfet de police, DUBOIS

[9]Although other police-regulations, such as that of 31 May 1833, prohibited cross-dressed men from attending balls and other public assemblies except during Carnival, DB58 contains two items that document the authorities' general indifference toward men in skirts. One concerns a certain Claude Gibert who in July 1846 was brought before the police-court charged with public indecency for wearing women's clothes; the court found that no offense had been committed and dismissed the case. The other document is a letter from a French peer of illegible signature demanding that the authorities no longer bother one of his friends who was in the habit of wearing women's clothes. Only considerably later did French law show much concern with male cross-dressers, especially those suspected of prostitution.

[10]See Moses, *French Feminism in the Nineteenth Century*, 197–198.

[11]George Sand, *Histoire de ma vie* (Paris: Gallimard "Pléiade," 1971), 2: 116–117, 331. For evidence that Sand was in fact noticed in masculine disguise, see 2: 1375, n. 1.

[12]Part of the series entitled *Les Débardeurs*, this cartoon appeared in the Charivari on 25 June 1840. It is reproduced by Grand-Carteret, *La Femme en culotte*, 146.

[13]Colette, *Le Pur et l'impur* in *Oeuvres de Colette* (Paris: Flammarion, 1960), 3: 330.

[14]On the scandal created by this performance and its many ramifications, see Shari Benstock, *Women of the Left Bank: Paris, 1900–1940* (University of Texas Press, 1986), 49–50 and Hirschfeld, *Transvestites*, 355–356. Benstock's book also contains several interesting analyses of Colette and the lesbian salons she frequented in these years.

[15]See the article on Madame Astié de Valsayre in the *Grand Larousse Universel du XIX Siècle*, Second Supplement, t. 17, 1969–1970.

[16]Grand-Carteret, La Femme en culotte, 192. Grand-Carteret says that some of his information is based upon his personal survey of various trousered women. Although Astié de Valsayre may have reported *La Ligue de l'affranchissement des Femmes* as a fact, it is likely that the organization never emerged from the planning stage. See Steven C. Hause, *Hubertine Auclert: The French Suffragette* (Yale University Press, 1987), 138, 154.

[17]Similar concerns had surfaced across the Channel where the *Englishwoman's Domestic Magazine* of 1867 reported 3,000 women burned to death annually and another 20,000 injured because of their flammable crinolines. See Helene E. Roberts, "The Exquisitive Slave: The Role of Clothes in the Making of the Victorian Woman," *Signs* 1977 Spring; 2, 3: 557.

[18]For a brief sketch of her life, work and public image, see Hirschfeld, *Transvestites*, 274, 387; Grand-Carteret, *La Femme en culotte*, 112; and the article on her in the *Grand Larousse Universel du XIX Siècle*, Second Supplement, 1053.

[19]Some easily accessible references in English are Dore Ashton and Denise Browne Hare, *Rosa Bonheur: A Life and a Legend* (New York: Viking, 1981); Theodore Stanton, *Reminiscences of Rosa Bonheur* (New York: Hacker Art Books, 1976 [1910]); Karen Petersen and J. J. Wilson, *Women Artists: Recognition and Reappraisal From the Early Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century* (New York: Harper and Row, 1976). All three show reproductions of one of Bonheur's *permissions*

de travestissement. Stanton reports that Bonheur received her first permit in the 1850s with the help and support of a M. Monval, her neighborhood police-commissioner.

[20]See Hirschfeld, *Transvestites*, 275 and Grand-Carteret, *La Femme en culotte*, 127–128.

[21]Laure-Paul Flobert, La Femme et le costume masculin (Lille: Lefebvre-Ducrocq, 1911), 23.

[22]In the nineteenth century it was general practice to segregate the sexes in the workplace. Women's wages were roughly half that earned by men for the same kind and amount of work. As summed up by Grand-Carteret, "la question du salaire se trouve, toujours et partout, étoitement unie à la question du vêtement. Dans la plupart des ateliers, c'est un prix fait: quatre francs les hommes, c'est-à-dire les culottes, deux francs les femmes, c'est-à-dire les jupes" (*La Femme en Culotte*, 358–360). He also looks forward to the day when "les défenseurs de la suprématie masculine interdiront à toute femme, sous les peines les plus sévères, l'entrée des ateliers masculins" (364).

[23]For Mademoiselle Foucaud, see also Grand-Carteret, *La Femme en culotte*, 360-364.

[24]See Jane Abray, "Feminism in the French Revolution," *American Historical Review* 1975 Feb.; 80,1:51; Winifred Stephens, *Women of the French Revolution* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1922), 87, 178, 255.

[25]Stephens, *Women of the French Revolution*, 177.

[26]Margaret George, "The 'World Historical Defeat' of the *Républicaines-Révolutionnaires*," *Science and Society* 1976–77 Winter; 40,4: 422, 434; Stephens, *Women of the French Revolution*, 105.

[27]See Jean Alesson, *Les Femmes décorées de la Légion d'Honneur et les Femmes militaires* (Paris: G. Melet, 1886) and Raoul Brice, *La Femme et les armées de la Révolution et de l'Empire (1792–1815)* (Paris: L'Édition Moderne, Libraire Ampert, 1913).

[28]For more details on this incident, see Abray, "Feminism in the French Revolution," 56–58; George, "The 'World Historical Defeat' of the *Républicaines-Révolutionnaires*, 432–434; Stephens, *Women of the French Revolution*, 265–269.

[29]French Feminism in the Nineteenth Century, 15.

[30]*Women of the French Revolution*, 275. Frenchwomen were not granted the right to vote until 1944.

[31]See their remarks as quoted by Abray, "Feminism in the French Revolution," 52, 56, 57.

[32]*French Feminism in the Nineteenth Century*, 20.

[33]Anderson and Zinsser, *A History of Their Own*, 149.