

The Crimes of the Queen(s)

Dissimulation and the Diamond Necklace Affair by Mia Tikhonov

Mia Tikhonov is a fourth-year undergraduate student double concentrating in History and Modern Culture and Media. Within both of these fields, she is interested in how gender and sexuality function as ideologies that do significant political work, specifically how they are mobilized to both justify and shape political action, as well as to produce national and individual identities. In the future, she hopes to pursue history at the graduate level.



When reviewing the history of France while in exile on St. Helena, Napoleon commented that “the Queen’s [Marie Antoinette’s] death must be dated from the Diamond Necklace Trial.”¹ However, more than one woman’s political death can be dated back to this Affair. How was this event, a bizarre and theatrical orchestration that seems too absurd to be true, used to restrict all women from the public sphere in the transition to the French Republic? How can it be used as a lens to examine the formulation of the shift from dissimulating courtier to transparent Republican in pre-Revolutionary France? In a scandal and trial that involved three equally dissimulating public figures—Cardinal de Rohan, Jeanne de La Motte, and Marie Antoinette—the two women were brutally condemned for their actions while the man walked free. The judges who made this decision and celebrated Rohan were the same men who would go on to articulate the ideological underpinnings of the French Republic and extol transparency as an integral virtue of the “correct” type of citizen. By understanding how dissimulation and

The Crimes of the Queen(s)

secrecy were used and linguistically framed in each of the three actor's cases, as well as the conceptions of public and private identity they indicated, we see how the art of dissimulation was excused or condemned depending on the gender of the person using it.

All three of the central parties were spoken of as known dissimulators. All three had secrets and controversial methods of gaining power. Yet, the one most evidently “guilty” of *lèse-majesté* (insulting royal dignity), Rohan, was fully acquitted, and the one most “innocent” (and, really, completely absent from the event), Marie Antoinette, was judged the guiltiest of them all. However, this paper is not concerned with determining the “truth” of the trial or whether the rulings passed were unjust. Rather, it focuses on taking seriously the trial's outcome and its reception among the French public, and on understanding what these reactions can tell us about what identity and acceptable relation to the public sphere was delineated for men and women during a period of supposed social revolution. The questions at stake are about power and agency: who had the privilege to dissimulate? Who was allowed to maintain a protected, private inner self from which they could determine their outward expression, thus possessing a secrecy which was seen as a source of power? And whose physical bodies were ceaselessly read for their conformity to their public role, and in turn constructed as always speaking for them, and displaying their “true” inner intentions? For these individuals, any distinction between public and private identities was effaced, and their self was then owned by, and available to, the public at all times. The answer lies along the lines of gender.

Historian Carla Hesse notes the historical consensus that seems to exist about the French Revolution: the Revolution led to a “total reworking of public modes of representation and systems of signification . . . with transparency replacing dissimulation.”²² This essay is partly an attempt to complicate this supposed transition and schism between the dissimulating court culture of

the Old Regime and the culture of the French Republic, which valued transparency and condemned both secrecy and the private identity one could form through concealment. Rather than the Revolution producing a radically new ideology that necessitated a binary logic, there was more so a continuity between the two eras' philosophies. The Revolutionaries added their voices to the long line of political theorists trying to define, categorize, and justify the "art of dissimulation" discussed by academic Jon Snyder.³ It was not strictly dissimulation that Revolutionaries denounced. Rather, they condemned dissimulating women and the power and social mobility that these women could gain in the Old Regime.

After a brief overview of the *cause célèbre*, I will use Snyder's work to articulate the definition(s) of "dissimulation" in which I ground my discussion. This essay hopes to complicate Snyder's text by writing gender into it. While Snyder primarily looks at attitudes toward dissimulation in political instruction manuals, I will use this trial as an opportunity to see these approaches in action and the real life consequences they led to. I will then discuss Cardinal de Rohan's role in the scandal as an archetypal courtier, as well as his trial lawyer's strategy of calculated and controlled dissimulation (especially opposed to Jeanne de La Motte's emotional displays), which was the reason for his successful acquittal. I will continue on to discuss Jeanne de La Motte's role in the event and the constant emphasis on her seductive theatricality in trial briefs and newspapers—she is construed as an actress hiding her true intentions, and deemed particularly dangerous because of her femininity and sexuality. This type of female dissimulator—one who successfully navigates the public sphere and gains significant power—was the exact threat Revolutionaries hoped to dispel in the name of political "modernity." Thus, La Motte received a guilty sentence. I will then use the theme of interchangeable female identities to transition to a discussion about Marie Antoinette as the ultimate seductive dissimulator and "impostor" in French society. The French public

The Crimes of the Queen(s)

viewed her supposed power (and incessant attempts) to form a secretive sphere for herself outside of the public's gaze as an immediate threat to France—one that she ultimately paid for with her life.

ON THE DIAMOND NECKLACE AFFAIR

Cardinal de Rohan, the Grand Almoner of France and prince-bishop of Strasbourg, was known as the “golden boy” of the enormously powerful Rohan family in Louis XVI's court.⁴ He fashioned his public identity as a quintessential, charismatic, charming courtier. He was obsessed with rising in court and specifically in gaining the favor of Queen Marie Antoinette, who publicly despised him, as he was reportedly an active part of the court's vicious rumor mill. She repeatedly frustrated his political ambitions, and his desperation was reaching extreme levels by the time he met Jeanne de La Motte in 1782. Jeanne, a supposedly notorious fixture in Parisian socialite circles, claimed to be within the intimate, private circle of Marie Antoinette; for monetary compensation, she was willing to try to convince the Queen to forgive Rohan. Rohan exchanged hundreds of letters with “Marie Antoinette,” replies to which were forged by Jeanne and her accomplices. When Rohan grew suspicious after not seeing any public favors extended to him from the Queen, Jeanne orchestrated a grand scene of deception. A Parisian prostitute, Nicole Le Guay, impersonated Marie Antoinette, briefly and mysteriously meeting with Rohan in the Versailles gardens in the middle of the night. After luring Rohan in, Jeanne executed the final part of her scheme by convincing Rohan that the Queen wanted to purchase an outrageously expensive diamond necklace from the jewelers Boehmer and Bassenge—one that, in reality, Marie Antoinette had repeatedly refused to buy. However, the “Queen” needed Rohan to acquire the necklace for her, keeping everything secret and hidden from her husband. Rohan got the necklace, assured the jewelers that it would be paid for by the Crown in installments, and produced a

contract of purchase given to him by Jeanne and signed by “Marie Antoinette de France.” Rohan gave the necklace to an impostor acting as the Queen’s valet, and Jeanne’s husband immediately disassembled it, selling the diamonds on the black market. When the jewelers asked Marie Antoinette about the payment, she claimed that she had never ordered the purchase and was insulted at the suggestion that she would have directed a scheme with a courtier she hated and a known con-woman to squander France’s money on an ugly necklace behind her husband’s back. Louis XVI ordered Rohan and all others involved in the case to be arrested in a public, and thus humiliating, manner. The primary charge was the theft of a 2800-carat diamond necklace worth 1.6 million livres. However, this charge was not nearly as serious as the secondary charge of *lèse-majesté*, or insulting royal dignity. After an extremely publicized trial that consumed French society from 1785 to 1786, Cardinal de Rohan was acquitted and Jeanne de La Motte was sentenced to be physically branded and thrown in jail. Yet, the primary person found “guilty” was Marie Antoinette, whose reputation was irreparably destroyed. This event would continue to haunt her until her own trial and execution by a Revolutionary Tribunal in 1793.

ON DISSIMULATION

In his examination of treatises on dissimulation, Snyder speaks at length about the distinctions made by the majority of early modern texts between dissimulation and simulation (though both actions involved some level of deception). He claims that dissimulation could “possess a specific moral valence” and be justified in certain conditions, as opposed to its “evil twin,” simulation. As Snyder puts it, it “is one thing to keep a secret and another thing to lie.”⁵ He mentions the popular effort in political treatises to legitimize dissimulation, as there was a perceived need to “master appearances,” while hiding the “inner space of conscience” from the public sphere’s gaze.⁶ Snyder claims that dissimulation

The Crimes of the Queen(s)

was a process of self-representation, self-management, and self-censorship—it “involved first and foremost the exercise of strict self-control over the expression of thoughts, emotions, or passions.”⁷ Dissimulation was a way to “safeguard one’s secrets by rendering them unreadable or invisible to others” when one’s main goal was to “frustrate any outside attempts to connect their words and gestures to their true inner state.”⁸ Before the dissimulator could successfully navigate the public sphere, they had to undergo a rigorous process of self-analysis and subject “every word, gesture, and gaze to rigorous inner examination.”⁹ Above all, the dissimulators had to know themselves, as well as what was expected by those around them and the environment they were in. This methodical reflection often entailed an organized notion of identity that involved a divide between the private and public self. Most of the treatises on dissimulation that Snyder uses either explicitly mention or imply identities that have a duality within them. For example, there are the “true” intentions, thoughts, and passions of one’s mind and heart that one may express in the private sphere. However, these thoughts must often be hidden or masked for the individual’s performance of their social “role” and successful navigation of the public arena, especially in terms of language and the visual signs of physical gestures. A successful dissimulator is expressly aware of this distinction, and can thus exert “psychological and emotional self-control.”¹⁰ During the age of absolutism, and especially in the court culture of the Old Regime, there was a ceaseless emphasis on the visual—the “display and observation,” so to speak—with each courtier under the constant, watchful gaze of the monarch, themselves, other courtiers, and the public.¹¹ In an atmosphere of surveillance in which any minor misstep in representation could lead to serious consequences doled out by the King, a profound anxiety about identity, control, and power existed. The division within a single individual between private and public, interior and exterior, and being and appearance was in its own way an “antidote” for this

anxiety and a method of resistance—a way to retain some sense of liberty and agency over one’s “true” self, even if this self was only hypothetical.¹²

As dissimulation is integral to understanding how individuals understood and navigated the public sphere of the Old Regime, it is useful to analyze it during a moment historians consider a major boundary between what we call the early modern and modern periods—the French Revolution. (The Revolution presents an especially useful example as it is an event that both historians and the Revolutionaries themselves purported to represent a significant schism in the historical political narrative, as well as a shift in the notion of the “individual.”) The Revolution was a pivotal moment at which everything associated with the Ancien Régime was meant to be overturned. Dissimulation was repeatedly and explicitly “denounced as the chief characteristic of court life and aristocratic matters,” as the Republicans claimed they valued “*transparency . . . the unmediated expression of the heart . . . and perfect fit between public and private*” above all else.¹³ “*A body that told no lies and kept no secrets* [was] the definition of virtue,” and this body was absolutely critical to the future of the Republic.¹⁴ The Revolution was an attempt to re-draw (and efface) the boundary between public and private—to control the very physical *bodies* that could speak lies and hide secrets, and create the ideal male acting citizen whose exterior actions and words always corresponded with his interior thoughts. However, the Republicans’ engagement with dissimulation was more nuanced than a simple “denunciation,” and the French Revolution did not represent a clear schism between the rhetoric on the value of dissimulation and the value of transparency. The proto-Revolutionaries in the Parisian *parlement* presiding over the trial, as well as the public engaging with this case, added their voices to the long-standing and complex discourse on “acceptable” forms of dissimulation, now filtered through the lens of gender. In many of the treatises mentioned by Snyder, the authors explicitly use

The Crimes of the Queen(s)

the term “gentleman” to refer to the dissimulating “wise, discreet” individual, the “prudent *man*.”¹⁵ However, in pre-Revolutionary France, it seems that many of these lying, private bodies of the Old Regime that needed to be dispensed with were female; they were women who could gain power within the court by masking their ambition. It was powerful women present in the public sphere who were repeatedly accused of dissimulation and even of teaching their husbands to dissimulate—the most famous accusation being one levied at Marie Antoinette at her 1793 trial before her execution.¹⁶ Of the abundant examples Snyder provides, my application of his work will focus on dissimulation as closely linked to notions of secrecy, privacy, power, and social mobility. From Rohan, to Jeanne, to Marie Antoinette, this Affair involves three “dissimulators,” each trying to navigate the space of the court and public sphere. For Rohan and Jeanne, dissimulation, as well as the dual identity and hidden motives it necessitated, were ways to act on ambitious desires to move up in the hierarchical structure of the court and gain political and monetary power. For Marie Antoinette, maintaining a private sphere was a way to retain some sense of agency over her image. However, the public saw this maintainment as a dangerous attempt to gain power and rise above the King. Rohan’s dissimulation was excused, while those of Jeanne and Marie Antoinette were brutally condemned.

ROHAN’S CUNNING

If Snyder claims that there was a “common image of the courtier as a flatterer, sycophant, and hypocrite,” Cardinal de Rohan was the poster child for the archetypal courtier.¹⁷ He was from a rich, noble family, and was known to be “impeccably polite . . . charming everyone he met.”¹⁸ Madame de Genlis, a French aristocrat, remarked that “he was about as personable as it’s possible to be.”¹⁹ And Jean-François Marmontel said Rohan was “as quick-witted in competition with those of a station comparable to his.”²⁰ Even Maria

Mia Tikhonov

Theresa, Marie Antoinette's mother and Queen of Austria, said that Rohan (during his brief stint as ambassador in Vienna) had "an air of composure . . . his manners [were] utterly smooth and his appearance is extremely plain . . . he is very polite towards everyone."²¹ Beneath all of the charm and politeness was his active role in the rumor mill at court—he would say anything necessary to win the favor of anyone he spoke to. This politeness masked his incredibly ambitious desires—despite his prominent position, he always thought that he deserved more power and respect than he received.²² He continuously made efforts to rise above his rank in the court hierarchy and was willing to do and say anything to attain those ambitions.²³ His biggest blunder was gossiping about Maria Theresa: his words reached Marie Antoinette, who would never forgive him for insulting her mother. Marie Antoinette publicly hated Rohan, refused to speak to him, and repeatedly undermined his appointments—especially his ministerial ambitions.²⁴ It was this frustrated courtier's ambition, as well as his obsession with convincing Marie Antoinette to forgive him, that led to his involvement in the scandal.

Beckman repeatedly notes that, for Rohan, the only possible verdict he could expect was "guilty."²⁵ With the fifty judges sitting on the *parlement* easily susceptible to royal attention and bribery, the entire influence of the Crown was against him.²⁶ His case rested on "little more than yelps of innocence," and he had "no evidence to convince the court of his innocence, no independent witnesses, no proof of who wrote the forged sequences"—by absolutely all accounts and predictions, he should have lost the case.²⁷ Deputy Pierre Laurencel told Rohan's relatives that "they would have to accept that Rohan was a lost man."²⁸ However, against all odds and expectations, he was the only one fully acquitted, and a substantial part of this decision had to do with the court in which the verdict was decided.

Louis XVI allowed Rohan to choose whether he wanted the affair sent to the court (the Parisian *parlement*) or settled privately

The Crimes of the Queen(s)

through an extrajudicial route that would avoid a scandal. Rohan chose the court since he believed that “placing himself at the king’s mercy was a tacit admission of guilt.”²⁹ The King (who was certain that the verdict would be guilty either way) allowed this in what Abbé Georgel, a prominent French clergyman, called an act of great “political integrity.”³⁰ Georgel said the King believed this allowance could assuage some pre-Revolutionary tension by ceding some power to the *parlement*—and thus celebrating the “great influence of the laws which protect a citizen’s honor” in this “well-ordered monarchy.”³¹ Despite Louis XVI’s seemingly good intentions, throwing the case so completely into the public sphere was a grave mistake, especially given the history of the *parlements* in France. Paris’s *parlement* styled itself as “the custodian of France’s ancient constitution . . . the representative of the French people and guardian of their liberty against despotic incursions”; it was a “breeding ground for opposition.”³² Historian Sarah Maza notes that, in these legal and juridical professions, the political consciousness had been shaped in a particularly anti-royal and anti-Court vein: there was a “suspicion of royal and ministerial authority forged by decades of clashes with the monarchy,” and the *parlement’s* very “legitimacy derived from its perceived independence and willingness to defy the king.”³³ The majority of its men (particularly those involved in this case) went on to actively partake in the Revolution. This trial was judged by the same men who went on to conceptualize the ideal male, transparent French subject of the New Republic. These same men are those who excused and dramatically hailed a man who was the archetypal example of what they would later claim to hate.

However, to achieve this unlikely acquittal, Rohan and his Republican lawyers employed, rather ironically, a strategy of calculating and controlled dissimulation. Of the two charges, theft and *lèse-majesté*, the latter was emphasized since the evidence against Rohan was essentially indisputable. Joly de Fleury, the King’s legal representative, called the allegations “insurmountable.”³⁴

Mia Tikhonov

Because of his connections, Rohan was incredibly lucky in obtaining Guy-Jean-Baptiste Target, one of the nation's premier trial lawyers, known especially for the elegance and thoroughness of his briefs in the most famous *cause célèbres* of the time, as his attorney.³⁵ The involvement of Target, a known “advocate of firm liberal credential,” further politicized the trial—and thus the public would view his intervention as against the debauchery of absolute monarchy.³⁶ When the official interrogations started, Rohan was “petulant and uncooperative” according to court magistrates, either repeating that “everything [Jeanne] says is false,” or responding only with a “no.”³⁷ However, after he overheard a passing comment that “the investigation is not running in his favor,” Rohan realized he needed to abandon his insolence and get himself together to avoid punishment.³⁸ Target thus decided to take a much more active approach in preparing Rohan for his testimony and responses. Target writes,

It is greatly to be desired that the Cardinal does not wrap himself in the cloak of his innocence [i.e. avoid actively responding to inquiries], as he has done far too often . . . [the trial] is a battle and he must leap into combat in order to fight with success . . . he must be *persuasive*, for both hot heads and cool characters are won round only by firm *conviction*, a belief represented with the *appearance* of *confidence* in those whom one wants to persuade. *It is the cunning of the courtier that he needs to employ.*³⁹

In one of the political treatises on dissimulation that Snyder examines, he notes that it was believed that a courtier who completely drops out of a conversation arouses suspicion. Rohan needed to recover from his shock, come to terms with the situation, and become the charming dissimulator again—one willing to say or do anything despite his emotions, opinions, or the supposed truth. Target writes about the importance of giving “proactive answers”

The Crimes of the Queen(s)

(as opposed to Rohan's vague ramblings and continuous claims of "memory loss").⁴⁰ He writes that, for Rohan to succeed, "dates and locations need to be precisely remembered," so that Rohan "forcibly contests" the evidence against him.⁴¹ Target wrote out multiple strategies to "prevent Rohan from confusing facts" and going off on tangents (and thus accidentally revealing his private thoughts). Rohan successfully delivered the performance—he was energetic, straightforward, precise, and exhibited a "keen tactical awareness," even actively taking part in preparations with his lawyers, saying that "we must pick [the witnesses'] depositions to pieces to make them fail."⁴² Rohan was the most composed and imposing during his pre-trial interviews with Jeanne. His "calm, forensic demeanour" (as noted by the court clerk) was especially apparent next to Jeanne's emotional displays.⁴³ She repeatedly "broke down in tears," would "collapse in fits" to avoid answering questions, fought the guards at every turn, and screamed about the Devil.⁴⁴ While Rohan started out neurotic and senseless, as the trial went on, he was able to ramp up his rational and dissimulating personality successfully.

On the other hand, Jeanne, usually charming and good at getting exactly what she wanted while evading consequences, started off the trial strong (producing several savvy arguments that impressed even the magistrates), but started to physically and psychologically unravel the longer she spent at the Bastille. Rohan's accommodations were significantly better than average, and Jeanne thought herself to be particularly suffering in her cell, writing that she was "deprived of the pleasing variety so essential to my health, my countenance wore the sallow hue of languor, and my eyes were dimmed with weary watching."⁴⁵ In her last interrogation with Rohan, one of the magistrates noted that she "hid beneath her hat so that [he] would not see the tears flowing . . . her expressions of grief began again, and she replied, sobbing, that she had nothing to say."⁴⁶ In contrast, Rohan reportedly "flowered with confidence."⁴⁷ As her testimony fell apart as more accomplices and witnesses were

found, Jeanne's only recourse became making up stories about the Cardinal—what Beckman describes as “fantasias . . . ornamented with comical embellishments.”⁴⁸ Instead of attempting to respond to questions, she disengaged from the conversation and flamboyantly “simulated” (that is, lied), while the Cardinal perfunctorily and cleanly dismissed her stories, saying that “everything Madame de La Motte calls fact is actually a story made up on the spot.”⁴⁹ Given that the potential power of an untrustworthy woman was more dangerous and destabilizing than a dissimulating man, the judges eagerly believed Rohan's dismissals, especially as the tides of evidence turned against Jeanne.

Rohan and Target's most calculated move was the trial brief they released, which Rohan himself referred to as a “masterpiece.”⁵⁰ These *mémoire judiciaires* were usually spectacular and theatrical tales that gathered their inspiration from novels and plays, and were an incredibly popular genre (especially so in this case). Doillot, Jeanne's lawyer, published Jeanne's trial brief first. It was purposefully dramatic and vague, emphasizing Jeanne's supposed “marginality” in relation to the Court.⁵¹ In contrast, Target's brief was (as remarked by newspapers at the time), was “tightly reasoned,” but mostly “technical,” filled with “verbose eloquence”; its precise attacks (as opposed to Doillot's spectacular vagueness) “painstakingly demolished” Jeanne's brief.⁵² Target was doing everything possible to contrast Rohan with Jeanne's (feminine) theatricality and excess—her own brand of dissimulation.

During the actual public trial (which took place after the court magistrates' individual questioning of the accused as well as the release of the trial briefs), once again, contemporary onlookers reported that Rohan “carried himself with dignity,” answering questions “modestly, respectfully and to the point, never shirking a direct answer” and even courteously greeting bystanders after he was done.⁵³ In contrast, Jeanne screamed and cried, convulsing and rolling on the ground, yelling, “It is the blood of the Valois that

The Crimes of the Queen(s)

you outrage.”⁵⁴ When deciding the verdict, one magistrate tearfully remarked that “the cardinal was tricked, shamefully tricked . . . we should untie the irons that bind him and regard ourselves as lucky in saving the honor of the innocent, and through that, cementing our own.”⁵⁵ While Jeanne was punished with everything but execution (which was also briefly on the table), Rohan was absolved completely. He left the courtroom to a joyous, applauding crowd, crying, “Long live the *parlement*, long live the Cardinal.”⁵⁶ Despite his years of unpopularity among the public for his reputation as a dishonest, lapdog courtier, the popular support for him was now overwhelming—the man who had spent his entire life as a flatterer and doormat became a Republican symbol against Louis XVI’s (and much more specifically, Marie Antoinette’s) absolutist regime. When the King tried to do anything in his power to punish Rohan (including an attempt to strip him of his titles), the public reacted with outrage; as Beckman notes, “Liberals viewed Rohan’s continued punishment as an example of vengeful despotism, and campaigned [for him].”⁵⁷ The King gave up his attempts, and Rohan would eventually be offered a seat in the National Assembly. He ended up fleeing during the chaos of the Revolution, but he continued to be hailed as a figure that resisted the absolutist courtier culture.

JEANNE’S THEATER

Just like Rohan, Jeanne de Saint-Rémy, comtesse de La Motte-Valois, was an expert dissimulator and courtier in her own right. However, although both Rohan and Jeanne were trying to improve their position in court society through elaborate secrets and fake personas, only Rohan’s actions were justified by society. Although Jeanne’s family was extremely poor, she was descended from Henry II of Valois and thus distantly related to the royal family through a bastard line. In her memoirs, which are naturally biased and mainly display her self-cultivated image, she claims that her father’s last words to her were “to remember that [she] is a Valois”

Mia Tikhonov

and to “cherish the sentiments of that name, and never forget [her] birth.”⁵⁸ She would spend her entire life publicly using the Valois name and this connection to nobility to claim power and navigate the public sphere; she believed that she was owed a considerable amount of respect, money, and property from the Crown. Her memoirs reveal a woman plagued by a constant ambition to establish and prove herself, to do right by the “noble blood of the Valois flowing within [her] veins.”⁵⁹ She was referred to as an incredibly charming and “enrapturing” woman, a “seductress,” and was known to take advantage of men to get what she wanted.⁶⁰ When she met Rohan, she saw in him an opportunity: by agreeing to help him gain Marie Antoinette’s audience and producing forged letters from the Queen, she could get the money she desperately needed. Beckman notes that there were hundreds of these letters, many of which had “obscure acronyms, transparent ciphers, theatrical aliases,” as well as constant reminders by “Marie” that Rohan be “secretive” and “discreet” about their relationship.⁶¹ In describing the letter culture of the eighteenth century, Beckman writes that letters offered a “portrait of the heart . . . all of our emotions . . . transcripts of one’s soul.”⁶² Letters thus became the place where even the dissimulator could expose his true emotions to the right audience, and Jeanne did everything she could to amplify her scheme’s clandestine aspect in order to intensify Rohan’s elation upon having access to the private world of the Queen. When Jeanne’s fortunes began to improve with the regular checks Rohan sent her, she put on a show. She said that “a woman of her standing needed a country residence,” bought the biggest house in town, and covered her clothing and furniture in gemstones.⁶³ She was preoccupied with this theatrical appearance of wealth and royalty despite constantly putting herself into debt. Beckman notes that she “always had to wear a mask—of poverty to the cardinal, of carefree wealth to everyone else.”⁶⁴ She was accustomed to playing different roles for different audiences, all the while hiding her true intentions and secrets, and was very successful

The Crimes of the Queen(s)

given that she started with nothing but an altogether useless royal name.

The Diamond Necklace Affair was built on case after case of Jeanne's expert dissimulation. During the trial, a significant hindrance to her case occurred when Père Nicolas Loth, her confessor and factotum, came forward to tell the court everything he knew about the event. He pleaded that the "only reason he had acquiesced to this criminality was his *bewitchment* by Jeanne"—a common, and thus eagerly accepted, accusation against women in the early modern period.⁶⁵ Everyone around Jeanne attempted to use her dissimulation—her charisma and ability to act and lie to attain her desires while withholding information—to excuse their own role in the crime. In her own trial brief, Nicole Le Guay mentioned that when Jeanne first came to her, she started her pitch by claiming that she was a "respectable woman and well connected at Court." She sat down next to Nicole and, "smiling, simpering, caressing her hand," looked at her with "an air of both mystery and confidence . . . a look that seemed to suggest both the concern and intimacy of friendship." She then immediately brought up her connection to the Queen ("We are like two fingers on a hand"), seductively uttering in low tones, "Trust me, I am a lady of quality attached to the court" with the Queen's "total confidence."⁶⁶ In all of these witnesses' rhetoric, it was Jeanne's mystery and confidence that allowed her to conceal her motives, and apparently convince everyone to participate without knowing precisely what they were participating in.

In one of Jean-Jacques Rousseau's Enlightenment critiques of the theater (and, unsurprisingly for him, also a critique of women), he writes specifically about actresses, whose profession "violates the reserve and chastity 'natural' to the female sex," as any woman who shows herself in public and puts on another character than her own "disgraces herself."⁶⁷ He claims that the flawed and corrupt social world is like a stage, where "communication is laced with deceit . . . the beauty and desirability of women in such settings invests

them with unnatural amounts of authority . . . it is always a woman who knows everything, who teaches everything to men.”⁶⁸ He extensively developed the idea that absolute monarchy and the aristocratic court are “based on and promote the power of women, who in a system of personal and informal rule can freely exert their sexual and emotional power over men,” who are in turn emasculated.⁶⁹ And it was works like these, with their equations of feminine sexuality and theatricality (and, in turn, dissimulation and deceit), that formed the ideological underpinning of the 1780s and 90s. Thus, in this trial, Jeanne was not solely a courtier, but also an actress able to hide her true intentions, as her feminine brand of dissimulation was based on a seductive theatricality. Beyond the general spectacle of the entire event, and the fact that Beckman notes that Jeanne may have drawn inspiration for the scheme from a number of popular plays, the ultimate scene of theatricality remains the masquerade night in the gardens of Versailles, which even Jeanne referred to as an “extraordinary and deceitful performance” (while denying that it was orchestrated by her).⁷⁰ In Target’s discussion of this moment, he refers to it as the “criminal *scene* executed in the gardens of Versailles,” repeatedly using the terms “illusion” and “artifice” to emphasize Jeanne’s “diabolical cleverness as both an *actress* and *producer*.”⁷¹ Furthermore, Abbé Georgel recounts witnessing the “*theater* where the delivery [of the necklace] was to take place . . . it was truly a *scene*, a *performance*,” and he directly refers to Jeanne as a “clever *actress* who played to her spectator [Rohan].”⁷² This language of theatricality, all tinged by the supposedly inherent sexuality of the actress and the public woman (i.e. prostitute), made Jeanne’s brand of dissimulation particularly dangerous and destabilizing. It allowed her to successfully navigate the public sphere while keeping her secrets hidden and gaining power, all the while duping men who encountered her.

However, Jeanne was not the sole dangerous actress—all

The Crimes of the Queen(s)

women in public were suspicious. This concept leads us to Marie Antoinette as the ultimate (and most threatening) guilty party with whom the Revolutionaries needed to dispense. Although the Queen legally could not be written about directly, Maza argues that her presence was implicit in the briefs written for Jeanne de La Motte and Nicole Le Guay. There was a theme of “interchangeable female identity”: for instance, Doillot emphasized Jeanne’s royal descent (further strengthening her supposed connection to, and thus interchangeability, with Marie Antoinette) and implicitly maintained that the Queen’s alleged misbehavior “legitimated other forms of female misconduct,” rhetorically putting the Queen in the position of the con-woman.⁷³ This interchangeability culminates with the scene in the Versailles gardens, in which a prostitute successfully plays a queen. This interchangeability was also incredibly apparent in Nicole Le Guay’s brief, with Jeanne murmuring to her about the “intimacy of friendship” as well as claiming she was like “two fingers on a hand” with the Queen. As Beckman notes, Marie Antoinette existed as a “spectral presence” in these trial briefs, as both women were actively “transmitting to the Queen the stain of female deviousness through association.”⁷⁴ Even though Marie Antoinette was technically the least involved in the case, “in the eyes of the deliriously happy public—the queen was *the* guilty party.”⁷⁵

This deeply entrenched anxiety over women gaining power in the public and political space of the Court needs to be briefly contextualized. First of all, a law that prohibited women from being in power was considered fundamental to French society, with Jurist Le Bret claiming in 1610 that the Salic Law was “born with us” and “drawn from nature itself.”⁷⁶ However, the court of Versailles was a place where women could gain a significant amount of power, especially at this moment in history. With what Sarah Maza calls the “feminization, eroticization, and privatization of the public sphere under Louis XV,” along with the scandalous debauchery and power wielded by his mistresses Madame de Pompadour and Madame

du Barry, popular discourse maintained that “female sexuality had taken over the ‘sacred center’ of the kingdom.”⁷⁷ By keeping their ambitions hidden and using their sexuality to their advantage, Pompadour and Barry were able to achieve unprecedented social mobility and move from the lowest classes to the highest female position at court, all the while effeminizing the monarch, who retreated with them into their private (sexual), secretive sphere. Pamphlets and libelles constantly equated Marie Antoinette with Pompadour and Barry, although, as a Hapsburg with a long line of royal blood, she came from a completely different background and position than Louis XV’s mistresses did. However, as Louis XVI famously did not have a mistress of his own, the Queen became the most important woman at court by occupying the double role of both wife and royal mistress. Given the interchangeability of female identity accepted by the public through the briefs, as well as society’s assumption that potential untrustworthiness in women was universal, this case was meant to serve as an example for all women everywhere. Revolutionaries were prescribing a limited, acceptable role for them in the New Republic while showing them the consequences of stepping outside these boundaries. As Maza writes, “La Motte and Le Guay were simply acting out a script dictated by the sovereign herself, and by the Du Pompadours and Du Barrys who preceded her.”⁷⁸ This case was built on emphasizing and connecting the potential theatrical plots masterminded by women who were not put in line.

MARIE’S CRIME

From the moment she stepped into France at age fourteen, Marie Antoinette struggled with her representation, image, and what kind of woman and queen she ought to be. Historian Dena Goodman writes that “crucial political and cultural contests were enacted on the very body of the queen” and on her “complex identity,” an identity that had to be established in the public arena.⁷⁹ Especially due to

The Crimes of the Queen(s)

the suspicions and hatred aroused by her Austrian heritage, Marie was a woman under constant surveillance, walking a thin line not to overstep any boundaries. Maria Theresa warned her daughter in a letter that “all eyes will be fixed on you, so do not give any cause for a scandal.”⁸⁰ Marie Antoinette was reportedly unhappy at court, with all of its claustrophobic rituals, suspicion, and rumors—and this led to her desire to establish a private, personal sphere (and identity) for herself. However, as historian Jacques Revel notes, her main mistake was “forgetting the maxim that royalty has no right to private life.”⁸¹ If dissimulation was closely linked to aspirations for social mobility for Rohan and Jeanne, for Marie Antoinette the hidden private world was more of a protective gesture. She developed an “instinct for secrecy”—she had a hallway built between her and Louis XVI’s room, her papers and belongings were locked away in drawers, and she had exclusive dinners in her room.⁸² While visitors could walk in and out of Versailles, they could never see the interior of her personal palace, the Petit Trianon, which was a space of “privacy and friendship” for her. However, Trianon’s privacy, as well as all of the secrecy surrounding Marie Antoinette’s political power at court, became a subject of vicious gossip.⁸³ The entire story Jeanne crafted about her alleged close friendship with the Queen was only plausible because no one really knew with whom Marie spent her time: her private life was a source of rumors and secret. She continuously tried to take control of her image and identity, whether through her involvement in fashion or by attending operas in Paris; she was not only carving a private sphere for herself, but also a public role outside that of the delineated French Queen (that is—solely as a provider of male heirs). Snyder mentions the philosophy of Niccolò Machiavelli, who believed that “the prince’s prudent and secretive management of his own image” would be “the source of much of his political strength and legitimacy.”⁸⁴ However, whenever Marie Antoinette tried to take some control over her image, Goodman notes that the public was quick to remind her “it was not within

the power of the queen to define her role, her place, her self.”⁸⁵ She could not “call her body her own”; the public was meant to own her private self.⁸⁶ And it was the knowledge and possession of this private sphere that was at the core of the Diamond Necklace Affair.

The main, treasonous crime of *lèse-majesté* derived from the idea that Rohan and Jeanne had access to Marie Antoinette’s secret intentions and knew how far the Queen would supposedly go to maintain the private sphere she was not allowed to have in the first place. When the jeweler Boehmer asked Madame Campan, Marie Antoinette’s first lady-in-waiting, about the Queen wearing the necklace, he insisted that Madame Campan did not know about the purchase only because she was not “in on the *secret*.” When Campan maintained that Marie Antoinette does not speak to Rohan since there is “no man at court she looks less favorably upon,” Boehmer stated, “You are deceived . . . she sees him very much *in private*.”⁸⁷ Furthermore, in a 1786 letter from the jewelers to Marie Antoinette explaining the circumstances of the purchase of the necklace, they write that, when Rohan visited them, he insisted that he could only “negotiate with [them] if [they] would keep everything *secret*,” as Rohan claimed that he was acting on “her Majesty the Queen’s *intentions*.”⁸⁸ Madame Campan describes Marie Antoinette and Louis XVI’s confrontation with Rohan, in which the Queen, “visibly losing [her] patience,” said, “It is extraordinary, that you could have imagined for an instant that I would have charged an unknown person with a matter of this importance . . . you should have known that I would never have given you an order like this.”⁸⁹ Campan describes at length how the Queen “suffered,” especially at the “idea that anyone could have believed that such a man as the Cardinal possessed *her full confidence* . . . it drove her to desperation.”⁹⁰ Titon, one of the investigating magistrates, when questioning Rohan’s testimony, said that “you could not have flattered yourself that she chose you for a job that she would only give to someone honored with *her personal confidence*.”⁹¹ The entire

The Crimes of the Queen(s)

affair rested on the question of whether Rohan had “unallowed” access to Marie Antoinette’s “private” identity—her “true” desires and thoughts that she could only act on in secret, away from the gaze of the public court and King. Here, the supposed secret intention was the squander of France’s money on a necklace behind the King’s back, of which everyone eagerly believed the suspicious Queen to be capable. Beckman notes that the Affair offered the French public “backstage access to the Royal Court and invited [them] to judge for themselves whether the conduct of their betters was hypocritical.” Ultimately, what was exposed and judged was the private life that Marie Antoinette had tried so hard to maintain.⁹²

The public was already accustomed to constantly reading the Queen’s body for signs of her interior thoughts and motives: from the moment she entered the country as a young girl and was accused of being an Austrian spy to her last moments at the guillotine, she was under watch. When brought back to Paris after the royal family’s failed flight to Varennes in 1791, newspapers wrote that they could observe on the Queen’s face and body “the most marked desire for vengeance.”⁹³ When later incarcerated, her jailers could “always detect in Antoinette a tone of revolt against the sovereignty of her people,” and even on the road to the guillotine “one perceived neither despondency nor pride on her face.”⁹⁴ One newspaper, the *Revolutions of Paris*, claimed that, at the guillotine, she demonstrated her usual “character of *dissimulation* and pride up to the last moment.”⁹⁵ Up until that last moment, people believed she was always hiding her secrets and concealing her true emotions, somehow acting falsely.

The meaning behind Marie Antoinette’s physical gestures was actually a facet of the Diamond Necklace Affair in itself. When Rohan wanted more reassurance from Jeanne that the Queen was warming up to him, she improvised: “having noticed that the queen bobbed her head in a curious fashion each time she wandered through one of the doorways,” Jeanne told Rohan that the Queen would

“silently signal her good wishes” by nodding her head at him.⁹⁶ When Marie Antoinette walked past Rohan, the man standing next to him was planted to say, “I don’t know why they say there is bad blood between you and the queen, for she *appears* to be looking at you with great kindness.”⁹⁷ In this way, individuals relentlessly read and wrote over the Queen’s physical body to expose her supposed “true” intentions and identity based on the agenda or narrative that they hoped would be advanced. The only constant of her public image was the idea that everything she outwardly performed was somehow false, so much so that it fell to the French populace to arbitrate her identity and “reveal” her true inner core, which was posited as increasingly unfixed and flexible (as it transformed to the context and what she needed to symbolize).

Marie Antoinette, as a woman occupying a public, political role, was the ultimate dissimulator in French society—the one whose power was considered most dangerous to the future of France, the one whose secret motives needed to be read, and whose private identity needed to be eradicated. The discussed association between women and dissimulation has a long history (and we see its association with theatricality through Jeanne): as historian Lynn Hunt notes, in the eighteenth century, dissimulation was described as a specifically feminine quality, with Rousseau and Montesquieu writing that “women in public were synonymous with dissimulation, with the gap between public and private . . . virtue could only be restored if women returned to the private sphere.”⁹⁸ In her 1791 *Crimes of the Queens of France*, Louise de Keralio emphasizes the theme of dissimulation, speaking about “the dangerous art of *seducing* and betraying, perfidious and intoxicating caresses, freighted tears”—these were an aristocratic woman’s weapons.⁹⁹ It was not the general idea of dissimulation that was being discussed and vilified, but specific women dissimulators—and the private, secretive sphere they thus maintained. The idea that through this feminine dissimulation, which often had sexual overtones, women

The Crimes of the Queen(s)

could gain significant power in the public sphere, and thus take power away from men, was a defining characteristic of the Old Regime that, according to Revolutionaries, needed to be done away with. Sarah Maza mentions that characteristics associated with women such as “*deceit, seduction, and selfish pursuit of private interest*” were antithetical to the private sphere Republicans attempted to create.¹⁰⁰ Germaine de Stael, in her 1793 “Reflections on the Process Against the Queen,” notes that the former Queen’s trial and execution is significant for all women, since, “whereas the courtly code had maintained a semblance of social integration for the women of the privileged class, the new Republican code promises women honor only as mothers”—the one role Marie seemingly had the most trouble with throughout her queenship.¹⁰¹ While the court at Versailles represented a world of “familial and sexual bonds” in which both men and women could participate, the Revolution yearned to replace this political space with an “all-male contractual universe.”¹⁰² This desire was turned into a reality during the revolutionary period, as the new assembly passed provision after provision prohibiting women from active roles in the public sphere. After Marie Antoinette’s execution, when the Convention discussed the participation of women in politics, Jacobin deputy d’Eglantine said that “women’s clubs are not composed of mothers and families, daughters of families, sisters . . . but rather of *adventuresses* [a word that was repeatedly used to refer to women like Jeanne and Marie Antoinette].”¹⁰³ To reestablish the “natural order” and return women to the domestic sphere, the deputies outlawed all women’s clubs. The new female citizen was one withdrawn into the private sphere—but not into a secretive sphere of self-mastery and power from which one can dissimulate and gain control. Rather, it was a restrictive, maternal, domestic, and silent private sphere in which women would still remain strictly surveilled and curtailed by the public (male) gaze.

CONCLUSIONS

Snyder notes that for the dissimulating individual, the examination and management of one's thoughts and emotions, as well as the creation of a private sphere, were considered "defining trait[s] of subjectivity itself." Being a "master of oneself" thus led to being the "master of others," and this was precisely the power perceived as particularly threatening when wielded by women in the creation of the French Republic.¹⁰⁴ The political transition of the French Revolution is often spoken of through the dichotomy between the dissimulation of the Old Regime and the transparency of the Republic. However, Rohan's acquittal by the considerably anti-royal establishment of the Parisian *parlement*, and the ecstatic public support and reaction Rohan received, meant that his dissimulation, deceit, and secrets, both in his life as a courtier as well as in his trial, were excused rather than condemned. The problem was not so much the ethics or morality of dissimulation, but rather the significant power that an individual could arbitrarily attain through dissimulation—and, most problematically, the attainment of this power by women. Dissimulation was a way for people who were often barred from power in "official" channels to gain influence and a voice. In the Old Regime, women could possess social mobility and successfully navigate the public sphere by constructing private identities in which they could cultivate hidden motives and ambitious desires outside of the surveilling gaze of men. This privacy was the danger that the Queen and Jeanne represented and were punished for, all while the equally dissimulating Rohan walked away free and celebrated. Dissimulation only posed a real threat when it was in the hands of women, allowing them to become potentially powerful actors who could use dissimulation to undermine the world men created and the authority they held. In the creation of the New Republic, just like Marie Antoinette's identity was meant to belong to France, all women needed to belong to La Nation. The public needed to own the

The Crimes of the Queen(s)

female body, to write over it; it needed to be visible and controlled at all times, void of opaque, private inner selves that women could know, regulate, and use.

Senior Editors: Brigitte Dale and Nam Do

ENDNOTES

¹ Jonathan Beckman, “The Necklace that Cost Marie Antoinette her Head,” *The Telegraph*, June 7, 2014, <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/books/10880757/The-necklace-that-cost-Marie-Antoinette-her-head.html>.

² Carla Alison Hesse, *Publishing and Cultural Politics In Revolutionary Paris, 1789-1810* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 2.

³ Jon R. Snyder, *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy In Early Modern Europe* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009).

⁴ The absolute majority of background information throughout the paper is taken from Jonathan Beckman’s exhaustive presentation of this event in his *How to Ruin a Queen: Marie Antoinette and the Diamond Necklace Affair* (Boston: Da Capo Press, 2014).

⁵ Snyder, *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy*, xvi, xviii.

⁶ Snyder, *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy*, xvi.

⁷ Snyder, *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy*, 6.

⁸ Snyder, *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy*, 6.

⁹ Snyder, *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy*, 7.

¹⁰ Snyder, *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy*, 21.

¹¹ Snyder, *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy*, 8.

¹² Snyder, *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy*, 25.

¹³ Lynn Hunt, *The Family Romance of the French Revolution* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 96.

¹⁴ Hunt, *The Family Romance of the French Revolution*, 96.

¹⁵ Snyder, *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy*, 31; 37.

¹⁶ Dena Goodman, *Marie-Antoinette: Writings On the Body of a Queen*

Mia Tikhonov

(New York: Routledge, 2003), 120.

¹⁷ Snyder, *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy*, 73.

¹⁸ Jonathan Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen: Marie Antoinette and the Diamond Necklace Affair* (Boston: Da Capo Press, 2014), 26.

¹⁹ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 26.

²⁰ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 26.

²¹ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 27.

²² Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 25.

²³ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 25.

²⁴ The details of this are not particularly relevant to the paper but were too fascinating not to include. While ambassador in Vienna, Rohan wrote a letter that said that Maria Theresa was “experienced in the art of revealing nothing” and always had “tears at her command,” even when she did not feel genuinely upset. This was the letter that reached Versailles, where the “company chortled at the Empress’s sanctimonious hypocrisy.” Marie Antoinette never forgave Rohan for this slight toward her mother. So, even at the very root of the conflict between the two, there was an accusation of dissimulation (Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 27).

²⁵ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 167.

²⁶ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 171.

²⁷ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 163.

²⁸ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 179.

²⁹ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 162.

³⁰ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 163.

³¹ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 163.

³² Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 165.

³³ Sarah Maza, *Private Lives and Public Affairs: The Causes Célèbres of Prerevolutionary France* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 83.

³⁴ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 227.

³⁵ Goodman, *Writings on the Body of a Queen*, 83.

³⁶ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 162.

³⁷ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 199.

The Crimes of the Queen(s)

- ³⁸ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 201.
- ³⁹ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 202.
- ⁴⁰ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 202.
- ⁴¹ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 202.
- ⁴² Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 207.
- ⁴³ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 207.
- ⁴⁴ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 205.
- ⁴⁵ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 180.
- ⁴⁶ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 224.
- ⁴⁷ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 224.
- ⁴⁸ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 213.
- ⁴⁹ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 214.
- ⁵⁰ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 238.
- ⁵¹ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 234.
- ⁵² Maza, *Private Live and Public Affairs*, 195.
- ⁵³ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 229.
- ⁵⁴ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 249.
- ⁵⁵ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 242.
- ⁵⁶ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 244.
- ⁵⁷ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 265.
- ⁵⁸ Jeanne de Saint-Rémy de Valois de La Motte, *The Life of Jane De St. Remy De Valois, Heretofore Countess De La Motte* (London: Printed for J. Bew, 1791), 18.
- ⁵⁹ La Motte, *The Life of Jane De St. Remy De Valois*, 22.
- ⁶⁰ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 20.
- ⁶¹ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 72.
- ⁶² Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 79.
- ⁶³ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 99.
- ⁶⁴ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 100.
- ⁶⁵ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 173.
- ⁶⁶ Maza, *Private Lives and Public Affairs*, 86.
- ⁶⁷ Rousseau's 1758 essay, "Letter to M. D'Alembert on Spectacles" cited in Maza, *Private Lives and Public Affairs*, 168.
- ⁶⁸ Maza, *Private Lives and Public Affairs*, 169.

Mia Tikhonov

- ⁶⁹ Maza, *Private Lives and Public Affairs*, 170.
- ⁷⁰ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 193.
- ⁷¹ Maza, *Private Lives and Public Affairs*, 202.
- ⁷² Maza, *Private Lives and Public Affairs*, 202.
- ⁷³ Maza, *Private Lives and Public Affairs*, 86.
- ⁷⁴ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 236.
- ⁷⁵ Goodman, *Writings on the Body of a Queen*, 35.
- ⁷⁶ Goodman, *Writings on the Body of a Queen*, 47.
- ⁷⁷ Goodman, *Writings on the Body of a Queen*, 78.
- ⁷⁸ Maza, *Private Lives and Public Affairs*, 91.
- ⁷⁹ Goodman, *Writings on the Body of a Queen*, 2.
- ⁸⁰ Goodman, *Writings on the Body of a Queen*, 35.
- ⁸¹ Goodman, *Writings on the Body of a Queen*, 58.
- ⁸² Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 58.
- ⁸³ Goodman, *Writings on the Body of a Queen*, 5.
- ⁸⁴ Snyder, *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy*, 112.
- ⁸⁵ Goodman, *Writings on the Body of a Queen*, 6.
- ⁸⁶ Goodman, *Writings on the Body of a Queen*, 3.
- ⁸⁷ Jean Louise Henriette Campan, *Memoirs of the Private Life of Marie Antoinette, Queen of France and Navarre*. 3d. ed. (London: H. Colburn and co. and M. Bossange and co., 1824), 197.
- ⁸⁸ Boehmer and Bassenge, "Memorandum to Her Majesty the Queen Concerning the Diamond Necklace Affair (1786)," *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity: Exploring the French Revolution*, <http://chnm.gmu.edu/revolution/d/263>.
- ⁸⁹ Campan, *Memoirs of the Private Life of Marie Antoinette*, 200.
- ⁹⁰ Campan, *Memoirs of the Private Life of Marie Antoinette*, 199.
- ⁹¹ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 190.
- ⁹² Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 308.
- ⁹³ Goodman, *Writings on the Body of a Queen*, 120.
- ⁹⁴ Goodman, *Writings on the Body of a Queen*, 120.
- ⁹⁵ Goodman, *Writings on the Body of a Queen*, 120.
- ⁹⁶ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 96.

The Crimes of the Queen(s)

- ⁹⁷ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 96.
- ⁹⁸ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 121.
- ⁹⁹ Beckman, *How to Ruin a Queen*, 129.
- ¹⁰⁰ Goodman, *Writings on the Body of a Queen*, 13.
- ¹⁰¹ Goodman, *Writings on the Body of a Queen*, 62.
- ¹⁰² Goodman, *Writings on the Body of a Queen*, 74.
- ¹⁰³ Goodman, *Writings on the Body of a Queen*, 131.
- ¹⁰⁴ Snyder, *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy*, 42.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beckman, Jonathan. *How to Ruin a Queen: Marie Antoinette and the Diamond Necklace Affair*. Boston: Da Capo Press, 2014.
- Beckman, Jonathan. "The Necklace that Cost Marie Antoinette her Head." *The Telegraph*, June 7, 2014, <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/books/10880757/The-necklace-that-cost-Marie-Antoinette-her-head.html>.
- Boehmer and Bassenge. "Memorandum to Her Majesty the Queen Concerning the Diamond Necklace Affair (1786)." *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity: Exploring the French Revolution*. <http://libguides.marymede.vic.edu.au/french-revolution/primarysources>.
- Campan, Jean Louise Henriette. *Memoirs of the Private Life of Marie Antoinette, Queen of France and Navarre*. 3d. ed. London: H. Colburn and co. and M. Bossange and co., 1824.
- Goodman, Dena. *Marie-Antoinette: Writings On the Body of a Queen*. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Hesse, Carla Alison. *Publishing and Cultural Politics In Revolutionary Paris, 1789-1810*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
- Hunt, Lynn. *The Family Romance of the French Revolution*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.
- La Motte, Jeanne de Saint-Rémy de Valois. *The Life of Jane De St. Remy*

Mia Tikhonov

De Valois, Heretofore Countess De La Motte. London: Printed for J. Bew, 1791.

Maza, Sarah C. *Private Lives and Public Affairs: The Causes Célèbres of Prerevolutionary France.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Snyder, Jon R. *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy In Early Modern Europe.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009.