

Chapter Six

1846-1848: The Fifth Visit

ON THE DAY Napoleon was enshrined in Paris as a living god his imprisoned nephew put pen to paper in his cell and wrote a lengthy open letter to the newspapers of Europe, addressed to the shade of the new deity: ‘Sire, – you return to your capital, and the people in crowds welcome you back; but I, alas! from the depth of my dungeon can only catch a ray of that sun which illumines your funeral ... but the rulers of the day, while they render you homage, whisper to each other, “In God’s name, do not wake him!”’¹

It was a finely poetic lament calculated to stir up sympathy in his favour, but it was not a success. Although people all over Europe read his *mots tristes* while sipping their morning coffees within two weeks of his having written them, the sympathy many outside France had felt on his apprehension quickly turned to scorn as Orleanist propaganda took root. Louis Napoleon had been declared a hot-headed, harebrained buffoon once before, and now everybody was certain of it. Even in Paris, where he and Berryer had pricked the conscience of ten thousand, minds were suddenly occupied with glorifying Napoleon, insulting the English, and still gossiping about Marie Lafarge and the most sensational murder trial in French history. Napoleon’s irrepressible nephew rapidly became little more than a curious footnote in the annals of the day.

Louis Napoleon had been quite prepared for death in the event of failure – immediately by musket ball or the guillotine, or more slowly from a protracted imprisonment. Before he left for Boulogne he had written his will, leaving everything to his cousin Prince Napoleon, third child of Jérôme’s second marriage to Katerin von Württemberg. He confirmed this in a letter on 11 February 1841: ‘To prove to you ... how brotherly is my friendship for you, I will tell you that before leaving London, in my wish to provide for all eventualities, I made a will leaving to you, as sole heir, all I possess’.²

Louis Napoleon’s uncles deserted him again. Jérôme, who was still waiting for Thiers, as president of the council, to come through with his promise to lift the proscription, wrote to him condemning his nephew’s ‘unjustifiable attempt’ on Boulogne.³ If he thought this second attempted *coup* would jeopardize his chances of returning to France he was right, but in any case Thiers’s resignation in October put an end to such hopes; there was no ‘special relationship’ with his successor Soult.

Louis Napoleon’s father was no different. Louis wrote to Jérôme in August declaring that he no longer had a son, and then wrote to the French press that Louis Napoleon could blame nobody other than himself for his misfortune. Uncle Lucien did not survive to witness the *coup*, having died at Viterbo on 29 June 1840. Uncle Joseph remained outwardly composed but inwardly furious, and the effect on his health ‘in the autumn’ was noted by a rare report on his activities in *The Times* (18 January 1841). Joseph left England shortly afterwards and did not return, dying in Florence on 28 July 1844.

Ham, a medieval castle once known as Beaufevor, lay in the Vallé de Somme sited on a chalk spur surrounded by marshes that by 1840 had degenerated into a foetid swamp. For the first few weeks of his captivity, Louis Napoleon was kept in a small cell in the base of the *grosse tour* – the ‘depth’ of the ‘dungeon’. However, he was soon afterwards removed to his permanent quarters, three small rooms on the second floor of the main building. Three friends were lodged in smaller adjoining quarters,

either below or next to him: Conneau, Montholon, and Thélin. The Comte de Montholon had been chamberlain and aide-de-camp to Napoleon and had shared his captivity on St Helena; now he would share Louis Napoleon's captivity in Ham. There were no other prisoners in the castle.

Apart from the cold rooms – there was no heating – and the unhealthy miasma rising from the swamps, Louis Napoleon's conditions at Ham were not unreasonable. At first his mail was intercepted, with English letters being sent to Paris to be examined, and he was not permitted any visitors. But after a while he was allowed to correspond more freely and to receive books and other comforts, including 'Alexandrine' Veugeot-Camus, the daughter of one of the jailers, by whom he would have two sons. One of his small rooms became a tolerably equipped amateur laboratory in which he occupied his active mind with an astonishing number of peculiar experiments. A second room was turned into an adequate library and study, stocked largely through the help of Hortense Cornu, and this was, for a while, a dukedom large enough. He was eventually allowed to plant and work a small garden like Napoleon on St Helena – a parallel that of course did not escape him.

To begin with *The Times* confined itself to dispassionate reports on unusual incidents. On 6 February 1841, it noted that the garrison had been unexpectedly changed, not because two of its members had been caught shouting 'Vive Napoléon!' as had been rumoured but for the more serious reason that some of them had been allegedly planning to free their prisoner. On 19 April, it reproduced a letter published by Charles Lessep's political and business paper *Le Commerce*, which had supported Louis Napoleon on several occasions, in which he disclaimed any responsibility for having set up the new Bonapartist paper *L'Aigle*. In July, it casually noted that many members of the Bonaparte family had met in Genoa on Wednesday 7 for a 'family conference' to discuss their residencies and the future course of the dynasty now that its chief had been apparently written out of the active stage of history.

In May 1841, Louis Napoleon published *Fragments historique: 1688 et 1830*, an ingenious refutation in just over 100 pages of Guizot's highly contentious assertion that the 'Glorious Revolution' of 1688 in England had been reflected in the July Revolution of 1830.⁴ The Orleans Monarchy had in fact initially used Guizot's ideas as the ideological basis of their programme, seeing in the invitation by a representative selection of England's discontented to William of Orange a direct parallel with Louis Philippe's invitation to stand as liberal monarch by Lafayette and his supporters.

But this specious historical simile was too much for Louis Napoleon. He rather thought the July Monarchy owed its historical precedence to the Stuarts, who employed their qualities 'in opposing the wants of their people and against events', and who 'resisted where they should have yielded, and yielded where resistance was a duty', and who 'had perseverance only in their hate, never in their affections'. The Stuarts were 'the official representatives of Protestantism' but were in fact 'at the bottom of their hearts Catholics'. They were 'compelled to be the representatives of a system of liberty and toleration', but they were really 'absolutists by instinct'. William, on the other hand, 'was truly, by nature and by conviction, all he represented on the throne', was 'the founder of a new order ... hastened by his courage and his skill' who 'made all opinions and all individuals work to one end – the interest of the country'. Perceptively, and significantly, he also remarked that:

In general, revolutions brought about by one leader turn altogether to the profit of the masses, because to succeed the man must throw himself entirely on the national sentiments, and to maintain his success

must remain faithful to those interests: revolutions made by the masses, on the contrary, often profit the leaders only because the people think that their work is done on the morrow of victory.

Chateaubriand openly admired the book and wrote to Louis Napoleon telling him so, but he could still not abandon the Legitimism he felt honour-bound to support. The *Fragments historique* also escaped censure by the Government; having learned a very harsh lesson with Laity the authorities did not attempt to suppress it.

Curiously, it was not this Ham publication but Louis Napoleon's second work from prison that attracted some attention from the English press. In August 1842, he published the first edition of his *Analyse de la question des sucres*. This was an openly protectionist essay of 130 pages in which he advocated the use of beet sugar in France, and other countries capable of growing it, instead of their relying on the importation of cane sugar from the West Indies. Of course everybody knew that Napoleon had begun the beet-sugar industry in France after the English blockade had prevented him from obtaining imports, and that it had been his pioneering chemists who had made earlier experiments in Prussia feasible on a national industrial scale. This beet-sugar industry virtually collapsed after Waterloo, and Louis Napoleon was determined to rescue it from the squalid state into which it had fallen as a result of gross incompetence and mismanagement. However, Louis Napoleon denied that the industry's Napoleonic origin was his motive for supporting it. In the preface he stated: 'If I thought Achard's invention antagonistic to the welfare of the greater number, I would attack it in spite of its Imperial origin. I am a citizen before I am a Bonaparte'.

Again, Louis Napoleon managed to insult his favourite nation by supporting earlier claims of the empire that Franz Karl Achard – the Berlin chemist who had achieved the isolation of beet-sugar in 1801 – had twice been approached by the British Government who tried to bribe him into admitting that beet-sugar was bitter. Being unsuccessful, they then allegedly suborned the great chemist Sir Humphrey Davy into making a public declaration to this effect. Although these specific claims were false, it was of course true that Britain had defended its position as chief carrier and supplier of West Indian cane sugar to the world.

The book was nevertheless favourably – if unenthusiastically – received in England, which was still largely protectionist although the issue of free trade was beginning to become a central one. 'It is little more than a summary of the statistics already published on the same subject, and quite in favour of home-made sugar', noted *The Times* on 17 September. Louis Napoleon had in fact corrected some of the 'already published' statistics over the eight months he dedicated to this work. Although he was led into an economic view opposed to his later free trade policies, the protectionist attitude he expressed gained considerable support for him within the French business community, who were also still largely protectionists.

On 18 April, Louis Napoleon wrote to Vieillard that he would 'prefer imprisonment in France than liberty abroad'⁵ if any mooted amnesty did not allow him the freedom to return to Paris. When reporting on this, *The Times* (26 April) referred to his continued captivity as 'deplorable'. This independent judgement marked a turning point in the paper's attitude to Louis Napoleon away from indifference to something approaching sympathy. But Louis Napoleon did not need sympathy; he needed his ideas – and therefore his *raison d'être* – to be understood.

A meeting of *La Famille* on Corsica in October 1842 – given the rather grand title of a 'Council-General' – sent an official request to Louis Philippe to abrogate the Law of Proscription. Furthermore, it demanded that Louis Napoleon, as a sort of *primus inter pares*, should be released immediately, reversing the pessimistic attitude expressed in Genoa. Louis Napoleon was upset at this claim made on his behalf by

those who had never supported him before. Again, on 31 October, he saw published in *The Times* the following statement of his:

Never have I believed, never can I believe, France to be an appanage of any one man, any one family. Never have I claimed any other rights than those of a French citizen, and never shall I have any other desire than to see the whole people, legally convoked, freely choosing that form of government which it thinks most fitting.

On September 18, he contributed an article to the Republican journal *Progrès du Pas-de-Calais* on the political institutions of England, indicating that he had not been wasting his time during all those visits to the Public Gallery in the House of Commons:

In England most important questions have been previously discussed at public and private meetings ... before they pass through the great parliamentary machine. When a member of the House of Commons reaches Westminster he has a fair knowledge of the subjects that will be treated in the course of the session ... In France ... when the Deputy reaches the Chambers he has followed political controversies only in his newspaper ... Although the English are scrupulous observers of forms and ceremonies, they lose no time in preliminaries; nor do they use the vote on the Address as an opportunity for interminable discussions ... In order to prevent the ministry or the opposition from snatching a victory in a moment of excitement, custom commands that no proposition can have the force of law until it has been solemnly voted three times by Parliament. This condition is of the highest importance, since it not only gives the guarantee of a deliberate opinion, but it increases the influence of the legislative assembly considerably.⁶

The sober English Parliamentary system was outlined with a view to suggesting how France could benefit from modelling its own arrangement on it with profit. There was no question of simply grafting the concept of Parliamentary Monarchy onto France – and the House of Lords is never mentioned – since Louis Napoleon had already stated elsewhere that France was a different country with different traditions. Instead, its political infrastructure would have to evolve organically, through evolution rather than revolution, as he liked to say. That such an evolutionary process might have to originate in a revolution, however, was not a contradiction any more than was the burning of moribund shrubland to promote healthy new growth.

On 18 December *The Times*, still in its sympathetic mood, reported that ‘The Unfortunate Prince’ was preparing a work on the condition of the ‘labouring-classes of Europe’, and that he had written to ‘several eminent authors in London’ to obtain details of England’s working poor.

Louis Napoleon completed *L’Extinction du paupérisme* on 20 April 1844, and the following month it was published. At forty-three pages it was shorter than any of his previous works – disregarding the eleven-page *L’Idée napoléonienne*, a summary of the greater work of that name and published at the beginning of 1840 – but it became one of his most popular and influential literary products. This was particularly so in France to whose poor it was especially applicable by suggesting, among many other Utopian notions, that wild land should be given to them for nothing on the sole condition that they work it for profit. The concept of *droit au travail* was hardly new, and the tract had a certain amount in common with writings on the subject already published by the Comte de Saint-Simon. However, the work was ignored in England.

On 9 August, *The Times* ran its brief but respectful obituary of Joseph Bonaparte. Four months later, on 19 December, it printed a translation of a letter Louis Napoleon had first written to Émile de Girardin’s low-price high-circulation paper *La Presse* in which he had defended Montholon’s *Récits de la captivité de l’Empereur Napoléon*,⁷ recently savaged in France:

I am ignorant of the person, calling himself my friend, who has called at your office to attack the history, as yet unpublished, of the captivity of the Emperor which General Montholon has written under my eyes ... To suppose that a man who has shared the captivity of the Emperor, and now shares mine, could write by my side anything derogatory to the memory of the Martyr of St Helena, is to offer me a personal insult.

By December 1844 the authorities had relaxed their rule respecting Louis Napoleon's visitors, and he was even able to invite Republican activists such as Louis Blanc, Frédéric Degeorge of the *Progrès du Pas-de-Calais*, and Calixte Souplet of the *Guetteur de St Quentin* to see him. In January 1845, he sent Napoléon Ornano, an ex-cavalry commander who had just been released after his Boulogne sentence, to London to see his friend Lord Fitzharris, now the earl of Malmesbury, 'on a matter of vital importance'. At first, Malmesbury was unavoidably detained, but after obtaining permission from Guizot 'with some difficulty' he left for Ham on April 20. Malmesbury:

[Louis Napoleon] confessed that, although his confidence and courage remained unabated, he was weary of his prison, from which he saw no chance of escaping, as he knew that the French Government gave him opportunities of doing so that they might shoot him in the act. He stated that a deputation had arrived from Ecuador offering him the Presidency of that Republic if Louis Philippe would release him, and in that case he would give the King his parole never to return to Europe. He had, therefore, sent for me ... to urge Sir Robert [Peel] to intercede with Louis Philippe to comply with his wishes, promising every possible guarantee for his good faith. The Prince was full of a plan for a new canal in Nicaragua that promised every kind of advantage to British commerce. As a precedent for English official interference I was to quote Earl Grey's in favour of Prince Polignac's release in 1830. I assured the Prince that I would do my best; but added that Lord Aberdeen was our Foreign Secretary, and that there was nothing of romance in his character ... He then said, 'You see that sentry under my window? I do not know whether he is one of mine or not; if he is he will cross his arms, if not, he will do nothing when I make a sign'. He went to the window and stroked his moustache, but there was no response until three were relieved, when the soldier answered by crossing his arms over his musket. The Prince then said, 'You see that my partisans are unknown to me, and so am I to them. My power is in an immortal name, and in that only; but I have waited long enough, and cannot endure prison any longer' ... I returned to London deeply impressed with the calm resolution, or rather philosophy, of this man, but putting little faith as to his ever renouncing the throne of France. Very few in a miserable prison like this, isolated and quasi-forgotten, would have kept their intellect braced by constant day studies and original compositions ... I saw Sir Robert Peel [who] seemed to be greatly interested, and certainly not averse to apply to the French Government in the Prince's favour on his conditions, but he said he must consult Lord Aberdeen, which of course was inevitable. That evening he wrote to me to say that Lord Aberdeen 'would not hear of it'.⁸

If Malmesbury reported all this accurately, it is possible that Louis Napoleon's difficult captivity had compelled him to favour the assertion *credo quia absurdum est* regarding the stories he had come away with.

However, it is true that in 1842 influential Central Americans had written to Louis Napoleon inviting him to lend his name to their enterprises in the form of a mimicked 1830 revolution. In 1844, the states of Guatemala, St Salvador, and Honduras offered him a similar proposal on a more official level after having had their own project for a canal rejected by the French Government, who had their own ideas concerning the Isthmus of Panama. Francesco Castellon, the minister plenipotentiary who had spoken to Louis Napoleon, had been so impressed by him that in December he was instructed to officially invite Louis Napoleon to implement his own design for a canal and to arrive in Nicaragua by invitation like William of Orange. On 8 January 1846, the Nicaraguan minister of foreign affairs, José Montenegro, a former Provisional Director of Nicaragua in 1845, conferred on Louis Napoleon full authority to organize

the necessary company in Europe, also revealing that his Government had decided to call the future project the *Canale Napoleone de Nicaragua*. Louis Napoleon's last work written in Ham, the 69-page *Le Canal de Nicaragua, ou projet de jonction des Océans Atlantique et Pacifique au moyen d'un canal* was published shortly afterwards.

It is difficult to believe Louis Napoleon would have exchanged Paris for the *Costa de Mosquitos*, but he may have wanted to use this method of escape in the belief that the July Monarchy was moribund and his alleged *parôle* would be rendered academic. However, the French Government did not need to draw on Lord Aberdeen's attitude to formulate their policies, and this scheme was rejected in Paris just as it was in London. In fact, Louis Napoleon's imprisonment had become once again more severe towards the end of 1845. On December 25, he petitioned Rémusat, still minister of the interior, to allow him to leave Ham so that he could visit his father, whose health had taken a turn for the worse. The petition was ignored in a politely worded reply. Another attempt was made in January, this time directly to Louis Philippe. Even *The Times* ran a quote from the *Gazette de France* on the possibility of Louis Napoleon's temporary release to see his by now dying father, but this time the plea was openly rejected.

Given these circumstances, Louis Napoleon could hardly fail to want to escape, but it was to be no dramatic medieval costume drama; rather, it was all very polite and mundane. On 15 May, Louis Napoleon, Conneau, and Thélin made plans for the attempt when a party of workmen arrived to make necessary repairs on some of the shabby buildings; Montholon, who was ill, was kept out of it for his own sake. After several days of intensive planning, and several close calls, on the morning of Monday 25 May 1846 Louis Napoleon calmly walked out of his prison disguised as a labourer carrying a plank across his shoulder to hide his face, leaving Conneau in his room pretending to be attending to the sick prince. Thélin had walked out earlier with Louis Napoleon's dog 'Ham'.

Two days later, two men and a dog crossed the Channel from Ostend to London aboard the *Prince Triton*.

* * *

The odd couple and their four-legged companion moved into the Brunswick Hotel, 52 Jermyn Street, where the owner, Mary Anne Payne, was sympathetic to both Bonapartes and dogs.

Once again, Louis Napoleon arrived as the Comte d'Arenenberg and suite, and one of the first friends he happened to see was Lord Malmesbury:

On returning home from White's Club, a man ran over the street and stopped my horse, and at first I did not recognize him, but to my great surprise I saw Prince Louis Napoleon ... He had just landed in England after his escape, and was going into the Brunswick Hotel ... On the same day we dined with the Duke of Beaufort at Hamilton House, and as the party was sitting down to dinner I saw opposite me Louis de Noailles, who was one of the Attachés at the French Embassy, and said across the table to him, 'Have you seen him?' 'Who?' he asked. 'Louis Napoleon', I replied; 'he is in London, having just escaped'. De Noailles dropped the lady who was on his arm and made but one jump out of the room, for it seems that the news had not yet reached the French Embassy. I never saw a man look more frightened.⁹

That evening, Louis Napoleon was back in Gore House with Lady Blessington's two nieces, Marguerite and Ellen Power, and John Forster, the literary dilettante and future biographer of Landor and Dickens. Forster described in a letter to Landor how

Louis Napoleon gave an account of his escape ‘told in his usual un-French way, without warmth or excitement’. Forster also described how Louis Napoleon’s disguise had had unflattering consequences for his features: ‘Before or since I have never seen his face as it was then, for he had shaved his moustaches ... and his lower and least pleasing features were completely exposed under the straggling stubble of hair beginning to show itself’.¹⁰ If Louis Napoleon was not quite animated enough to suit Forster’s conception of a conventional *raconteur* this was because once again he found himself in England while one of his parents lay dying many hundreds of miles away. It would have been impossible for him to go anywhere else after Ham, except either Switzerland or Belgium. But he did not know the Belgian élite – who in any case later stated that they would arrest him if he ever set foot there – while the Swiss were too vulnerable for him to abuse them as a conspicuous refugee yet again. This, coupled with England geographical proximity, had made his choice an obvious one.

Anglo-French relations had continued to deteriorate while Louis Napoleon had been at Ham. On 29 June 1841, Palmerston, still foreign secretary, gave an election address to his constituents at Tiverton in which he severely criticized French brutality in Algeria, while at the same time contrasting it with the benign and paternalistic behaviour of the British in Bengal and Madras. The speech was absurd and vitriolic, generally untrue on both counts, and it naturally infuriated France. Palmerston was nevertheless returned at Tiverton in July, but the Whigs fared badly nationally with almost eighty fewer seats in the House of Commons than the recently invigorated Conservatives.

Lord Melbourne resigned in August and Aberdeen replaced Palmerston at the Foreign Office as the Conservatives assumed power under Sir Robert Peel in September. This time Louis Napoleon made sure to cement his stay in England by following procedure. Soon after his arrival, he sent a letter to Peel, who replied immediately stating that he had understood ‘the motives which induced you to repair to England, and of the course which it is your intention to pursue in respect to political matters during your residence here’.¹¹ Two days later, Louis Napoleon wrote to Aberdeen saying that since he had ‘touché le sol de l’Angleterre’ he was obliged to inform him ‘de mon invasion et de mon arrivée’. He wrote that he had that day sent the same message to the Comte de Saint-Aulaire, French ambassador in London since 1841, a copy of which he enclosed for Aberdeen’s own files. ‘Je regretterais vivement, my Lord, que ma présence en Angleterre peut être désagréable à la Reine et à son gouvernement’ he went on, stating that he would do everything in his power to earn the good wishes of the queen. He then asked Aberdeen whether he could do anything to influence the authorities preventing him from seeing his father.¹²

The two men Louis Napoleon had to deal with were very different. Peel was a Tory but not an aristocrat, his father having been a northern cotton magnate while his grandfather a small yeoman farmer. Although he would resign on 29 June following a defeat over the first reading of the Irish Bill, he would remain a force for Tory reform and free trade, and as such a considerable influence on Louis Napoleon. Aberdeen, on the other hand, was one of the last active men who had bitterly opposed Napoleon in his capacity as ambassador and congressional representative during Liverpool’s administration; he was also a personal friend to Guizot.

Nevertheless, Louis Napoleon responded to the man who had refused to help him escape from Ham in such a way as to defuse any resentment he may have had against him because of his name. It was probably more than Aberdeen deserved, but it worked. Aberdeen replied to Louis Napoleon’s letter forthwith: ‘I beg to assure you that, influenced by the motives which you profess, and acting in obedience to the

laws, your residence in this country cannot be disagreeable to the Queen, or to H.M's Govt.'¹³

These assurances of his innocence in any disturbances that had taken place while he had been in prison, and also of his peaceful intentions in England, settled the matter without further complication. Aberdeen was satisfied – he had of course no legal cause to be otherwise – and Louis Napoleon was able to publish his assurance to Saint-Aulaire of 29 May as an open letter, letting the nation know of his 'peaceable intentions' towards the 'French Government'. He was then free to apply for a passport from Moritz von Dietrichstein, the Austrian ambassador who had just replaced Baron Philipp von Neumann; but, as with Eszterházy in 1837, this was refused. An appeal was then made directly to Metternich and then to Leopold II of Tuscany, in whose territory Louis lay dying. Both men ignored the appeals, citing respect for the wishes of France as their excuse,¹⁴ and Louis died at Livorno on 25 July without a personal reconciliation with his son.

In spite of the impending tragedy, Louis Napoleon was naturally privately overjoyed at having escaped and thrilled to be in England again. On 31 May, he found himself once more at Craven Cottage at the invitation of Bulwer-Lytton. The unreality of the magical cottage – 'la plus délicieuse villa' – after Ham caused him to write to Vieillard the following day: 'I have been very well received here. One must really do justice to the English; they have great independence of character ... When I remember that eight days ago I was with Conneau on top of the ramparts, planning my escape, I think I am dreaming'.¹⁵ Aberdeen may not have encouraged his escape, but once in England his administration decided to leave Louis Napoleon alone. *The Times* noted on 6 June that 'A meeting of the foreign Ambassador [Saint-Aulaire] and Ministers has taken place, to consult on the line of policy to be adopted towards Prince Louis Napoleon, and it has been agreed that ... they will abstain from personal intercourse with the Prince'.

On Friday 12 June, Louis Napoleon attended a breakfast party given by Monckton Milnes, the poet and politician who would champion fellow poet Algernon Swinburne and amuse his fellow parliamentarians by joining in the warped poet's masochistic flagellation games. D'Orsay, Disraeli, and Richard Cobden were there as well as Alexander Kinglake, anonymous author of his own Levantine travels. For Disraeli 'the breakfast was brilliant',¹⁶ but he later confessed disappointment because he had asked to be invited on the understanding that Ibrahim, son of Muhammad 'Ali, was going to be there. But when he arrived, instead of Ibrahim he found Suleiman Pasha al-Faransawi, a French convert to Islam previously known as Colonel Sève, playing war-games with the crockery and cutlery, recreating the Battle of Konieh (21 December 1832):

I declined to sit down, but watched the battle, and was regretting I had come, when someone touched me on the back. I looked round: it was Prince Louis Napoleon. 'Are you very much interested in this?' he said. 'Not at all; for I am neither the Conqueror nor the Conquered'.

'Come here then', and he invited me to the recess of a window.

'Have you any news from Paris?' he asked me with earnest enquiry – excited.

'None, sir'.

'Then I tell you the most important. Two thousand Sous-Lieutenants have signed a document that they will not rest until the family of Buonaparte are restored to the throne'.

'That indeed, sir, is most important', and I thought I was talking to a madman. I believe it now to have been quite true.¹⁷

Cobden was unimpressed with the breakfast, which he thought was 'a queer party of odds and ends', describing Louis Napoleon as 'evidently a weak fellow, but mild

and amiable'.¹⁸ Cobden, the son of a Sussex farmer, remembered the Napoleonic Era as something that had damaged labourers throughout England. But he was also an ardent free trader who had entered parliamentary life in 1841 as a non-aligned member for Stockport, and doubtless he remembered Louis Napoleon's protectionist essay on beet-sugar as he judged the pre-imperial nephew by the standards of the post-imperial uncle.

* * *

Louis Napoleon spent six weeks in Bath, with Thélin, where he hoped to restore some of his physical and psychological health. Arriving at the beginning of August, he found that the best suite in the Sydney Hotel, Great Pulteney Street across the Avon in Bathwick, was still available so he took it. However, this was the favourite suite of the marchioness of Anglesey, second wife of Field-Marshal 'one-leg' Paget who had lost a limb at Waterloo while commanding the allied cavalry. Two days after Louis Napoleon installed himself in the hotel, the marchioness arrived unexpectedly on the advice of her physician, and the only room left in the building was a tiny one on the top floor. When Louis Napoleon learned of this, he gave up his suite and moved upstairs with Thélin, stoically enduring his discomfort for a week before renting a small terraced house at 55 Great Pulteney Street, where he stayed until returning to London.

Louis Napoleon was eager to show off the landscape of North Somerset to some of his friends. On August 17, he invited Hortense Cornu and her husband, the painter Sébastien Cornu, to come and visit him, explaining that they would 'see the finest country in England'. After a delay of two weeks he wrote again, confessing that seeing the sights 'would have no charm for me alone, but which in your company will be infinitely interesting to me. I am thinking of them as a child thinks of a holiday'.¹⁹ Prince Napoléon Bonaparte, Louis Napoleon's cousin who was universally known as Plon-Plon, met the couple at Paddington station and the three made their way to Bath towards the middle of September, whereupon the Cornus spent a happy week with their friend touring the country around Bath and Bristol.

While picnicking on the Clifton Downs overlooking the gorge with Brunel's stone pylons already in place waiting to support his pioneering suspension bridge design, Hortense Cornu noted that Louis Napoleon was so enthralled by the view that he wanted to pitch tents on the spot and 'live under the influence of this beauty'. Plon-Plon, on the other hand, merely grumbled that 'when you have once seen a thing it is enough'.²⁰ This exchange embodied the character of the two opposing Bonapartes who would become the central figures in France for the next two decades.

On August 28, Walter Landor left his card at the Sydney Hotel after learning that Louis Napoleon had been asking after him. A few days later, Louis Napoleon paid Landor a courtesy visit:

Yesterday I had a visit from Prince Louis Bonaparte, who told me he had completed his military work, and would give me a copy. In return for this civility I told him I should certainly have requested his acceptance of my works, only that they contained some severe strictures on his uncle the Emperor. He said he knew perfectly well my opinions, and admired the honesty with which I expressed them on all occasions ... I told him, in the course of our interview, that he had escaped two great curses – a prison and a throne. He smiled at this but made no remark.²¹

The first volume of *Études sur le passé et l'avenir de l'artillerie*, also written in Ham, had been published in August. True to his word, on 6 September he dropped off an

inscribed copy at Landor's house in Rivers Street, ten minutes walk from his address: 'À monsieur W. S. Landor: témoignage d'estime de la part du P^{ce} Napoléon-Louis B., qui apprécie le vrai mérite, quelque opposé qu'il soit à ses sentiments et à son opinion'.

Another interesting man Louis Napoleon met in Bath was Thomas 'Dandy' Raikes, the self-styled successor to 'Beau' Brummell (whom he had once met) and the loudest Tory of his generation. Since May, the 'Torified prig', as Lord William Pitt Lennox called him, had been in Bath for his rapidly declining health. Raikes wrote in his journal that 'The Prince Napoleon Louis Bonaparte ... has lived much with us here during his stay at Bath. He is of very simple and agreeable manners, striking in his character, and well-informed'.²² Raikes's political views were opposed to Louis Napoleon's, but the ageing Georgian dandy, who felt he no longer belonged in the world of Queen Victoria, was nevertheless drawn to him. Often in human relations, as in physics, opposites attract and similars repel.

Returning to London, on 19 January 1847, Louis Napoleon vacated the Brunswick Hotel and took out a one-year lease on the first floor of a recently built modest terraced house, 3^A King Street, St James's Square. Between leaving the hotel and taking up his lease, however, he spent two weeks with various friends, including Lord and Lady Londonderry at their new version of Wynyard Hall near Stockton-on-Tees, just finished after the original house had burned down in 1841. When he returned to London, on 3 February, he moved directly into King Street, and this was to be his last home as Prince-Pretender. The owner of this part of the house was Charles Phillips, the son of a councillor of Sligo in Ireland, a commissioner of the insolvent debtor's court of London and a Napoleonist who had written *Speech on the Dethronement of Napoleon* in 1816 and *Historical Character of Napoleon Buonaparte*. Uncle Joseph had introduced Phillips to Louis Napoleon in 1839 since when he had become an admirer, so much so that in 1854 this would result in a curious little apologia of his hero-tenant.

In the spring of 1847, Georgiana Dawson Damer married Viscount Ebrington, Whig member for Plymouth. She was the daughter of George Dawson Damer, Peelite member for Dorchester, privy councillor, and a colonel in the cavalry who had been badly wounded in the knee at Waterloo. His aunt, Anne Damer, was a sculptress and Napoleonist whose friendship with both Napoleon and Joséphine went beyond cordiality, and she had even presented the imperial couple with a bust of Charles James Fox. She died without issue, and when her sister also died childless their nephew grafted the additional family name to his own.

Although Colonel Dawson Damer had fought against Napoleon he was big enough not to object when Georgiana invited Louis Napoleon to Dorset for her wedding. Georgiana had met him at their London house on Tilney Street and liked him, and he – unaware that she was affianced – had allegedly pursued her until he discovered the facts. This was later attested to by her friend, Adeline de Horsey, who believed the two might even have married if Georgiana had not 'preferred love to ambition'.²³

Nevertheless, the two became friends and Louis Napoleon was happy to accept the invitation, arriving at Tiverton station in Devon – then the nearest stop on the Great Western Railway – at the beginning of March. Captain Dawson Damer, the colonel's son, collected him, and together they drove the long distance of over sixty miles to Came House at Winterborne Came, a small village south of Dorchester. This two-storeyed mansion of pale Portland stone set in elevated woodland near a tributary of the Frome in its own park of over 200 acres owed much to the Rococo fashion of the time. The central drawing-room plaster ceiling decorations included a centrepiece of a

large gilt eagle on a cloud with thunderbolts shooting out in all directions. This was a neo-Classical motif of Jupiter's eagle, the sky-god that became pre-eminent as the embodiment of Rome's imperial glory. As this had been appropriated as the symbol of the French Empire, Louis Napoleon – still wearing his imperial emblem – felt very much at home.

The wedding was celebrated on Thursday 11 March at the Elizabethan church of St Peter a short distance from the house. Eighteen guests signed the register as witnesses, an honour that was extended to Louis Napoleon who was the second to do so.²⁴ Afterwards, during the celebrations at the house, he returned the honour by giving Georgiana a hand-painted fan that had belonged to his mother. Most of the guests were much younger than Louis Napoleon and he felt apart from the majority of them, with the exception of Georgiana's younger sister Constance whom he showered with barley sugars and coins although she was nevertheless over sixteen. At one point he was found moping in the garden: 'It appears I bore these young people'.²⁵

But he did not bore those older than himself. One of these was Baron Alvanley, now approaching the end of a long and eventful life as an unsuccessful Tory politician, incisive wit, scoundrel, and quintessential repository of *l'esprit français*. One of these events had been a duel in April 1835 against Daniel O'Connell's son Morgan, also on Wimbledon Common, and perhaps the two men exchanged duelling stories. Towards the end of 1848 Captain Rees Howell Gronow, a veteran of Waterloo and another dandy and socialite, went to Brighton with a colleague to see Alvanley:

[he] informed us that ... he had never met with a more agreeable person; that the Prince was very communicative, and would sit up smoking cigarettes till two or three o'clock in the morning; and that upon one occasion, in a long political discussion, he had said, among other things –

'It is fated that ere long I shall become Emperor of France, avenge the defeat of Waterloo, and drive the Austrians out of Italy; and the time for this is not far distant'.

On the following morning, Lord Alvanley related what he had heard to Colonel Damer, who observed – 'Prince Louis is a charming person – so gentlemanlike and pleasing in manner, so accomplished and well-informed. He has a thousand good and agreeable qualities, but on the subject of politics, my dear Alvanley, he is as mad as a hatter!'²⁶

* * *

At almost thirty months the fifth English visit was by far Louis Napoleon's longest, and his absorption by the English way of life assumed a more serene and dignified level. On 26 December 1846, he was proposed and accepted as an honorary member of the Army & Navy Club by Major Henry Daniell of the Coldstream Regiment of Foot Guards, a regiment under the colonelcy of the sympathetic duke of Cambridge, cousin to Queen Victoria. In 1851, the club would move to Pall Mall, but before then it occupied the grand house on the corner of King Street and St James's Square, just a few yards from where Louis Napoleon would soon be living. On 6 October 1847, he was similarly inducted as an honorary member of the Junior United Service Club on the recommendation of Sir John Brackenbury, ex-consul for the province of Andalusia in Spain and a friend to Disraeli. This club was in its original building on Charles II Street, Haymarket, but eight years later it would be rebuilt on a larger site further up the road, by which time it would contain a faithful copy of Franz Winterhalter's well known portrait of Napoleon III.²⁷

The Athenæum had been founded as the literary and artistic companion to the United Service Club on Waterloo Place, the more exclusive version of the Junior extension founded three weeks before the Battle of Waterloo by officers who would participate in that battle. Louis Napoleon was elected an honorary member for his

scientific writing. One of the products of the ‘University of Ham’ – as he called his imprisonment – had been a paper on Volta’s theory of primary batteries read to the *Académie des sciences* in 1843 by the physicist, astronomer and republican deputy François Arago. How frequently he visited the Athenæum is not known, but as he enjoyed up to fifty cigarettes a day and smoking remained forbidden until 1866 it was probably not very often.

A more modest London club to which Louis Napoleon had been proposed by Disraeli and rejected – to Disraeli’s chagrin – was the Coventry Club. One French member was Rohan Chabot, now the Comte de Jarnac and first secretary at the embassy in London, who had made friends with Joinville on board *La Belle-Poule*. Jarnac was now a committed political Orleanist – in 1852 Joinville would travel from Claremont to Dublin to stay as a guest at his estate there – who succeeded in spreading so much ill feeling against Louis Napoleon and entertaining everyone with so many racy and spurious anecdotes about him that the electors unanimously rejected his application.

Nevertheless, Louis Napoleon’s Englishness did not pass unnoticed. Frederick Blackwood, son of Baron and Baroness Dufferin (the eldest of the ‘three Sheridan beauties’) had just graduated from Christ Church, Oxford, when he met Louis Napoleon in 1847:

His manner is very pleasant and soothing from its extreme composure. As he goes on, you can fancy yourself in an arm-chair watching magical wreathes of smoke turning into shape and form over some far-away dreamland. It is this tranquillity of manner which gives him such ascendancy over the volatile French.²⁸

In the summer of 1847, Louis Napoleon returned to the project of the canal across the Central American isthmus, which had occupied him for so long at the University of Ham. By this time it was clear to everybody that there were two routes for it: either across the Isthmus of Panama or through Nicaragua. The first was shorter but far more mountainous and was preferred by French and American agents. Louis Napoleon still favoured going across Nicaragua, a longer route but one that could usefully employ the vast Lago de Nicaragua and the navigable San Juan river, thereby reducing the need for cutting. He and D’Orsay engaged the services of Richard Haynes, a junior attorney of Hunter Street, Brunswick Square, to help float a company that might propose and build the *Canale Napoleone de Nicaragua* as an independent project. Haynes was persuaded to read Louis Napoleon’s book on the subject, finding it ‘clever’, full of ‘sheer hard work’, and thinking it ‘a grand conception and worthy the attention of a great mind’.²⁹ It had been estimated that £4,000,000 would be required to start the scheme, and Haynes persuaded Benjamin Oliveira to consider the proposal. Oliveira, who lived in Hyde Park Street, Bayswater, was the son of a wealthy Portuguese wine merchant and was himself involved in the trade as well as being connected with the directorships of several railway companies. Although he rejected the idea, he would later play a more active role in Louis Napoleon’s life as one of many free traders who helped smooth the passage for an Anglo/French commercial treaty.

Meanwhile, Louis Napoleon understood that no canal could be cut anywhere without a useful railway connection with either the northern or the southern Continent, or without one running alongside it. At one of the public meetings held by the proposed company, at which a number of engineers and financiers were present, he took the platform and impressed the assembled guests with his speech. Benjamin Ferrey, the young diocesan architect of Wells Cathedral, was one of these. He noted

that Louis Napoleon ‘displayed great ability, showing an amount of scientific knowledge which amazed everybody present; not only in stating his case with clearness, but combating all objections in a most masterly way’. Ferrey then revealed that William Brockedon, the painter, author, inventor, and founder member of the Royal Geographical Society, had also been one of those who had been present and amazed. Brockedon had said to him: ‘Mark my words, that man is not the fool people take him for; he only waits an opportunity to show himself one of the most able men in Europe’.³⁰ Unfortunately for Nicaragua, perhaps, events obliged the project to fade away.

Interests were always vying with one another in their attempts to occupy Louis Napoleon’s mind. He once wanted to see how his favourite newspaper was produced:

I remember being present in *The Times* offices ... one night in 1847, when the Prince came by appointment, and in company with Mr Forbes Campbell, to visit that establishment. On that occasion the Prince conversed most affably with the parliamentary reporters, and other gentlemen ‘on the papers’, in four languages, English, French, German, and Italian, and produced an extremely favourable impression upon all who heard him. We found him a man of very superior acquirement; in a word, quite a different person from what rumour then represented him to be – a frivolous man of pleasure.³¹

Since 1841, *The Times* had been under the directorship – some said dictatorship – of John Delane, given full editorial control in 1847 on the death of the manager, proprietor, and co-editor John Walter II. The paper had been very sympathetic at the time of Louis Bonaparte’s death, and also portrayed Metternich’s actions as callous (8 August 1846). On 23 April 1847, Delane, who wrote no material himself but reviewed every contribution submitted for printing, allowed Louis Napoleon to publicly refute – for the first time – the *canard* of 1836 concerning his alleged *parôle* after Strasbourg in an open letter addressed to him. This had followed the repetition of the lie in an early volume of *L’Europe depuis l’avènement de Louis Philippe* (1845-49) by the polymath Jean Baptiste Caefegue.

The truth, however, was not quite so straightforward; little with Louis Napoleon ever was. His relationship with his father was never very close – Louis had been the sort of man not to encourage emotional attachment – and there is no doubt that Louis Napoleon partially manipulated the timing of his pleas in order to put the July Monarchy in a bad light. On at least one occasion he sent *The Times* privileged information concerning political activity in Paris, which the paper was able to put to good use – a not unusual procedure for Delane and one that caused many criticisms from politicians over the ensuing years. There was no cynical duplicity in Louis Napoleon’s actions or emotional states, but he was already adept at turning an unfortunate circumstance to his advantage.

Forbes Campbell was the assistant-manager of the Colonial Bank in London, but he was also an expert French linguist – a requirement in his official position – who was then putting his talent to a severe test by translating Thiers’s monumental *Histoire de consulat et de l’empire*. It was also he who had been translating Louis Napoleon’s letters into English for *The Times*, beginning with the refutation of the *canard*. Campbell allowed him to examine the proofs of his translation, even flattering him by asking for comments. Once, Louis Napoleon returned a proof with a wistful letter, published some years later in the *Illustrated London News* (21 April 1855), asking prophetically:

Why was I not born to share in the glories of those heroic times? But on reflection it is better as it is. What a saddening spectacle to behold the two greatest and most civilized nations of the world

destroying one another – two nations that ought, in my opinion, to have been friends and allies, and rivals only in the arts of peace. Let us hope the day may yet come when I shall carry out the intentions of my uncle, by uniting the interests and policy of England and France in an indissoluble alliance. That hope cheers and encourages me. It forbids my repining at the altered fortunes of my family.

For a certain social class of woman who met Louis Napoleon, however, the rules and perceptions were very different, and he was still not regarded as quite respectable enough for them. During this visit, Louis Napoleon befriended Eliot Warburton, an Irish writer and barrister who had just published his most famous book *The Crescent and the Cross*, an account of his Levantine travels mainly through Greece, based on Kinglake's style. In 1846, he invited Louis Napoleon to a party that included the earl of Moreton, Paul Wilhelm von Löwenstein (Prince Albert's close student friend from the University of Bonn), and Viscount Goderich, now president of the board of control for Indian affairs. Also present was Lady Dorothy Walpole, who subsequently stated that:

Prince Louis Napoleon was not altogether to the taste of young ladies' mothers at that day, for they were rather afraid of him; nevertheless, to us he seemed very agreeable whenever we met ... He could when he chose be exceedingly amusing, and would frequently make my sister and myself laugh very much ... so much so, indeed, that we were often told to see less of him ... at that time society did not view the Prince with any too favourable an eye, nor consider him an ideal companion for young ladies.³²

* * *

The St James's Theatre, King Street, was reopened in 1842 by John Mitchell, an experienced theatre director who specialized in making foreign plays, artists, and musicians popular in London, and particularly those from France, and by this time the venue was billed as the *Théâtre Français, King Street à Londres*. The first of many of Louis Napoleon's visits was occasioned by Rachel, the most celebrated tragic actress of her day. Her arrival provided him with his first opportunity to see the tragedienne the whole of Europe was talking about, and the play he would see was Racine's *Phèdre*, a powerful and passionate tragedy based on the *Hippolytus* of Euripedes, in which Rachel had already established her pre-eminence. The performance took place on Wednesday 22 July 1846 in the presence of Victoria and Albert, who maintained a box at the theatre until the end of the 'French visits' in 1859.

The story of how Phèdre has to conceal her guilty passion for her stepson Hippolyte while her husband is away, and then see him destroyed on a false accusation before taking her own life before a death-bed confession, shocked Racine's audiences. Rachel, moreover, had an extraordinary ability to infuse a subtle malevolence into this character, which was to remain her greatest role. Like many women who were never described as beautiful, or even pretty, she managed to impress by her sheer personality, passion, and an ability to assume the depth of great character roles that bordered on genius. Louis Napoleon, who sat in an ordinary stall, was thunderstruck. He could not get her out of his mind, and four days later the spell had still not worn off, as he wrote to Hortense Cornu: 'I have seen Rachel, and have been enchanted with her. It is the first time I have heard a French tragedy'.³³

He would not have to wait long to hear it again. Rachel returned to London the following season when on 12 July she performed in Voltaire's *Tancredè*, a tragedy loosely based on the exploits of the Norman crusader Tancred of Sicily. Eleven days later he saw her again in Racine's *Andromaque*, based on the Greek tragedy of

Andromache after the fall of Troy, and once again Victoria and Albert had been present. In common with every second man in Europe, he had cultivated an irresistible attraction for the peculiar-looking actress; but unlike most of them he was to do something about it. In the autumn of 1847, Rachel became Louis Napoleon's *divertissement* after her recent separation (March) from Walewski, by whom she had had a son; Rachel's open profligacy was certainly something of an added attraction for Louis Napoleon's somewhat pathological sexuality.

Unfortunately, Plon-Plon was to become his principal rival. He had been in England from July 1846 to the following April when he left for Italy. On 7 June, Louis Napoleon wrote to him, in Livorno, a rather dull letter in which he claimed to have 'no other news of any interest to send to you. The French theatre stumbles along on one leg ... Let me know if you are still thinking of returning to England, so that I can arrange my travelling plans accordingly'.³⁴ Plon-Plon was indeed thinking about returning to England, and did so at the end of July, surprised to find that by the time he met his cousin Rachel was with him. Together they saw her last performance in London on 6 August in a production of *Paul et Virginie* by Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, a rare and unsuccessful Romantic departure for Rachel, but in the work of a playwright admired and decorated by Napoleon. Plon-Plon eagerly accepted an invitation to join the couple during Rachel's northern provincial tour at the beginning of August.

What happened in the train from London to Manchester is extant in anecdotal form alone, originally told to Empress Eugénie some time later by Augustin Filon, the Prince Imperial's tutor, but is so typical of each of the three characters involved that it is unlikely to be untrue in essence. Rachel and Louis Napoleon began the journey sitting next to each other with Plon-Plon sitting on the opposite bench, as at this time all carriages were still based on the designs of horse-drawn coaches. After a while Louis Napoleon was seen to fall asleep and Rachel, true to form, abandoned the lover who would become almost-Napoleon for the one who merely looked like him – almost. But, proving that he could indeed 'see through all things with his half-shut eyes', Louis Napoleon was in fact not asleep, remaining motionless as he observed his cousin and Rachel embracing and kissing. He did nothing, but when he pretended to begin the lengthy process of waking up he found Rachel beside him again and Plon-Plon looking out of the window and apparently admiring the countryside, even though he had seen trees before near Bristol. None of this would have shocked or surprised Louis Napoleon, but the tactless subterfuge Rachel and Plon-Plon had displayed sickened his curious sense of sexual honour. He made an excuse and returned to London the following day, leaving his cousin and the sexual *ingénue* in Manchester. Plon-Plon soon left for Belgium and then Paris, where he and his father had at last been given permission to live for a trial period of three months from September; Louis Napoleon did not see Rachel again in England.

On 13 May, Louis Napoleon saw Victor Hugo's Romantic poetic drama *Hernani*, the story of a middle-aged Spanish Grandee proposing to marry his ward, Doña Sol, who would rather run off with the bandit of the title. When it was first staged in 1830 at the *Comédie-Française*, the Jockey Club caused a riot due to its full-blooded break with the classical traditions of the day. The 1847 production was a benefit performance for the Potato Famine Relief in Ireland, performed entirely by English philanthropists and nobility with an English translation by the poet and statesman the Earl of Ellesmere. *Hernani* was followed by the one-act comedy *Faint Heart Never Won Fair Lady* by Planché, set in the rather tragic court of Carlos II of Spain, in which the part of the young king is taken by a female actor. Natural humanitarianism

apart, Louis Napoleon wanted to find out what all the fuss had been about at a time when he had been hiding out in Switzerland.

Louis Napoleon was closely associated with the St James's Theatre, but not every story can be believed. Albert Vandam, implying verisimilitude by grafting 10% fact onto 90% fiction, reproduced the story in his alleged notes that in 1844 the horn virtuoso Eugène Vivier had been taken to the 'French Theatre' by a friend in order to be introduced to Louis Napoleon.³⁵ Vivier immediately recognized the prince – a fact that astonished his friend – explaining that this was because of his close resemblance to Louis Bonaparte. When Louis Napoleon became aware of this 'evidence' of his legitimacy he made Vivier a favourite at the Tuileries. It is true that Vivier was in London in 1844 on his first tour, but of course Louis Napoleon was then studying the 'labouring-classes of Europe' at the University of Ham. Vivier made two further visits to London, in 1849 and 1850, but by then Louis Napoleon was president of the Second Republic and several years away from his next English visit. It is also true that Vivier became a favourite at the Tuileries; but he had also been a favourite with Louis Philippe, and in both cases this was due to his excellence as a horn player and not anything else. This misconception may well lie with Vivier, an acknowledged self-publicist whose Münchhausen-style autobiography, *La Vie et les aventures d'un corniste* (1900), is full of such absurd interpolations.

Louis Napoleon decorated his rooms in King Street with numerous 'artistic gems and family relics, which he highly prized',³⁶ some of them drawn by himself – he was a very passable draughtsman – and which he showed to Viscount and Viscountess Combermere, who were given some original drawings for the decorations at the Life Guards' bazaar in Regent's Park in aid of Irish Famine Relief; Lord Combermere, a Napoleonic veteran, had been a colonel of the 1st Life Guards. Among the paintings Lady Combermere saw was the famous portrait of Napoleon by Delaroche (1838), which had a curious history. It had originally been in the possession of Louisa Corry, daughter of an Irish peer, who married the Earl of Sandwich. In 1847, she donated it to Louis Napoleon: 'Good – [illegible] has sent me the portrait of the Emperor by Paul Delaroche, which is very fine. This generous gift has given me great pleasure, and is the chief ornament of my little salon'.³⁷ In 1838, the heir to the earldom of Sandwich had married the daughter of the Marquis of Anglesey, to whose estate at Beaudesert in Staffordshire Louis Napoleon had recently been, and where he had flattered a guest, the Countess of Desart, with the play on words 'J'aime beaucoup Beaudesert, mais encore plus la belle Desart'.³⁸ One of the countess's daughters had married Walewski in 1831, and although she died young shortly afterwards it can only have warmed the liberal old countess to have had a son of *Lui* as a son-in-law, and a nephew of his as the next guardian of her famous painting.

Plon-Plon was in Florence when he received a letter written by Louis Napoleon on 28 April: 'London is a very dreary place since you left. Whether it be due to the festival of Easter [April 4] or to poverty, I have not been to a single reception. Jenny Lind has arrived, and will make her *début* on Tuesday. They say that her voice is something surprising'.³⁹ The 'Swedish Nightingale' gave her *début* performance at Her Majesty's Theatre on 4 May in the title role (Alice) of Meyerbeer's *Robert le diable*, singing in Italian. This sinister and vigorous masterpiece, which had begun life as an *opéra comique*, was based on a medieval legend in which a childless woman obtains a son by making a pact with the devil, the 'new' version having been written by Eugène Scribe: it suited Lind's ability to sing with almost unnatural textures yet with a rare purity and penetrative force even when singing pianissimo. Once again,

both Louis Napoleon and Victoria were present among a distinguished audience, including the Dowager Queen Adelaide.

Lind sang the part of Amina in Bellini's *La sonnambula* at Her Majesty's Theatre on 13 May, Marie in *La fille du régiment* two weeks later, and the title role in *Norma* at Covent Garden on 12 June. She created the role of Amalia for the première of Verdi's *I masnadieri* on 22 July, and was Susanna in Mozart's *Le nozze de Figaro* on 17 August, both again at Her Majesty's Theatre. Louis Napoleon saw her first performance in all of these productions except *La sonnambula*, which he saw on 15 May as its première clashed with Hugo's *Hernani*. He was there again on Tuesday 18 in a performance seen by Mary Disraeli and Marcia Sheridan. Victoria saw Lind sixteen times before her obligatory provincial tour at the end of August; Louis Napoleon ran her a close second with thirteen. Lind was classically beautiful, but her private life was as impeccably decorous as Rachel's was licentious, and Louis Napoleon found her untouchable on her pedestal. His desire for her was that of a man unworthy before respectable femininity, able to respond only to courtesans and prostitutes, content to be possessed by her voice. Although by this time Louis Napoleon had seen Queen Victoria on nearly a dozen occasions, it would be several years before he would actually meet with her.

* * *

William 'Crocky' Crockford was a Fleet Street fishmonger who in 1827 founded a gentleman's club and gambling house on the west side of St James's Street. Crockford's Club soon became the most notorious and popular gambling house in London. The club had disappeared by the time Louis Napoleon arrived, having fallen victim to the puritanical Gaming Act that had received royal assent in 1845. By then Crockford had been dead for a year, and the property – struggling to survive as a 'Gentleman's Club' – was temporarily owned by Pierre Fraye, a French merchant and one of several caretaker-owners. Disraeli, a member since 1841, declared that it was the only gambling house in London where there had never been any cheating; this did not mean that it had never been full of cheats, only that the cheats were not on the staff but among the clientele.

One of these had been Charles Pollard, a known horse-better and trickster among the 'swell mob' who went by the sobriquet 'Pretty Charlie'. On the closure of Crockford's, Pollard suddenly found himself without a major source of income, and saw in Louis Napoleon an opportunity to rectify this sorry state of affairs. It is not known why or how he came to pick on him. Louis Napoleon's financial condition during the fifth visit has been the subject of much misinformation and propaganda, and this will be dealt with later on. Here it will suffice to state that Hortense's death had made him a wealthy man while from Louis he had inherited several million more francs and three further properties.

However, Louis Napoleon was known to be living often frugally through a combination of chronic generosity and over-indulgence in that habit known as 'playing the turf', which necessary vice for any Victorian gentleman served to deplete him of what ready cash he may have had at any one time. He purchased several excellent horses at Tattersall's and raced them, generally discovering, however, that his knowledge of breeding was keener than his racing instinct. Most of Louis Napoleon's wealth was not available to him as ready cash but invested in banks and property, and so if for whatever reason he ran short he would be forced to borrow or withdraw from his funds, and one of these occasions occurred at this time. The

Bonaparte family bankers in Florence, the Orsis, had sent Louis Napoleon a remittance for over £3,000 on the instruction of Count Giuseppe Orsi, also his private secretary, but this had been delayed and was not expected until August. Pollard somehow got to know about Louis Napoleon's financial situation and also the delayed Orsi money.

At any rate, on Friday 11 June, Pollard presented himself at King Street as the moneylender who had sent a letter of introduction a few days earlier. He then offered to obtain £2,000 for Louis Napoleon at 5% interest, without security, on the understanding that Orsi's money was on its way. All Louis Napoleon had to do was sign two bills of exchange for £1,000 each while leaving the drawee's name blank. At first he hesitated; in 1840, Orsi had obtained £10,000 from Beaumont Smith to fund the Boulogne *coup*, and it turned out that Smith, who had been speculating heavily for a fall in French funds on the European stock exchanges as a result, had also produced £350,000 of dud exchequer bonds, a great scandal that resulted in life transportation for him in 1841. Nevertheless, on Monday, Louis Napoleon 'signed the bills, and the prisoner went away. The prisoner called the next day to say he could not bring the money that day, but he would the day after. Since that period he had neither seen the bills nor the prisoner. The bills in question were drawn by the prisoner, who, at the first interview, was provided with stamps'.⁴⁰

On the Saturday following the last sighting of Pollard, Louis Napoleon and Orsi took a cab to his address, 10 Essex Street between the Thames and the Strand, a typical Victorian lodging house, run by Charlotte Lee who lived there with her son and daughter, two servants, and rarely fewer than three lodgers. One of the female servants was instructed by Pollard – who through his window had seen them arriving – to say that he was not at home, and the pair were obliged to leave. But they were not so easily deterred. Orsi, who lived nearby in Pimlico, came the following day, and then again on Monday and Tuesday when he saw Mrs Lee, only to be told again by her that Pollard was not in, although he was, occupying the front parlour and peering between the curtains. At this Louis Napoleon decided to act, and he and D'Orsay approached the offices of William Ballantine, the barrister who had just gained celebrity with a high profile murder trial at Chelmsford Assizes. However, Ballantine advised Louis Napoleon not to bring charges against Pollard, because although he had clearly been duped Pollard's actions had technically not breached the law. It turned out to have been excellent advice, but Louis Napoleon would have none of it:

I could not convince the Prince, who seemed quite unable to grasp the idea that the law of this country was not regulated by the *Code Napoléon*. They remained with me for some time, but my arguments had no effect. He reiterated his views with scarcely a change of expression, and seemingly could not get mine into his mind. Shortly after they had left, the count returned, and expressed himself thoroughly satisfied with the correctness and wisdom of the advice that I had given, but said that it was useless to argue with the Prince; that he was possessed with one idea upon the subject, and that nothing would remove it.⁴¹

This was undoubtedly so, but neither Ballantine nor D'Orsay had just lost £2,000, a large sum in 1847. Louis Napoleon then approached John Bush and Richard Mullens of St Mildred's Court in the City – solicitors to the Association of Bankers – to represent him, and took Pollard to court. At Marlborough Street Police Court he carefully explained the chain of events, which were, however, the reasons for eventually losing the case:

[Pollard] said he was willing to make the same engagement which he had offered before, and then produced two bills ... There was no name at the foot of the bills. The prisoner requested me to write

the word 'accepted', and to put my name across the bills. I did so, and I left the bills on my table. At this time there was no name written at the bottom of the bills. The prisoner afterwards put his name to the bills, and said to me, 'Now, you see, if you don't pay, I am responsible'. The prisoner asked me how I wished to be paid: I said £800 in cash, and the balance in a check on his banker ... The prisoner went away, promising to bring the money the next day, or certainly the day after. I asked him to write down that promise on paper. The prisoner copied a form which I gave him, and he signed the paper now produced. The prisoner on going away remarked that he was very sorry to disappoint me. In the form which I wrote for the prisoner to copy I used the word 'checks' instead of 'bills'. The prisoner, though I told him to correct any bad English, made an exact copy of the paper I gave him.⁴²

On cross-examination by Pollard's defence, Henry Hawkins, Louis Napoleon was forced to admit that he 'had never before accepted a bill, and was not acquainted with the distinction between a bill and a check'. Bush had to acknowledge this fact, but then declared that in spite of Louis Napoleon's technical error Pollard had gone about London openly boasting that he had 'got hold of a very good thing', and for which witnesses could be procured, and he would therefore prove felonious intent to commit larceny.

John Hardwick, magistrate at Marlborough Street Police Court, ruled in favour of Louis Napoleon insofar as he believed there might be a case to hear pending further cross-examination. On Tuesday 6 July, a second hearing took place and Hardwick ruled again in Louis Napoleon's favour, committing Pollard to trial and denying him bail. Although so far everything had gone Louis Napoleon's way, Hawkins later admitted that some shabby and unethical behaviour had taken place behind the scenes, but which he had been too morally scrupulous to observe:

Saul ... instructed me to make a few inquiries as to the Prince's private life, and so show him up in public. Saul loved that kind of persecution. ... I therefore ... asked old Saul what the uncle of the Prince and his voyage in the *Bellerophon*, etc., had to do with this man's stealing these two bills of exchange.

'Never mind, Mr Hawkins, you do it; it has a great deal to do with it'.

However, I made up my own mind as to the course I should pursue, and having carefully read my 'instructions', found the man had been unjustly accused by this Napoleon ... and every word of the whole accusation was false. So did some solicitors instruct young counsel in those days.⁴³

Hawkins also admitted in court that his case had been poorly prepared for him:

I had not much experience in cross-examination ... Napoleon gave me my first lesson in that department.

'I am afraid, sir', said His Highness, 'you have been sadly misinstructed in this case'.

'I am afraid, sir, I have', said I. 'One or the other of us must be very wrong, and I am much inclined to think it's my solicitor'.⁴⁴

The case went before Sir Edward Alderson at the Old Bailey with Hawkins retained as Pollard's defence. As everyone except Louis Napoleon realized, the case hinged on the technicality whereby the bills of exchange had not been defined as such at the time of the transaction. Inevitably, Pollard was discharged, a free man and richer by £2,000. 'Such was the law', Hawkins observed, 'I believe Napoleon said the devil must have made it, or worked it into that "tam shape"!'⁴⁵ Louis Napoleon was satisfied with this comment on English Common Law, but following the proceedings in court was Fraye, who because of Pollard's former association with Crockford's felt honour-bound to reimburse Louis Napoleon with funds resulting from the former earnings of the club, which he did in full.

* * *

After his recall from London, Guizot arrived in Paris on 26 October 1840 to assist in the formation of Soult's first ministry on the resignation of Thiers, taking his place as minister for foreign affairs. Eight years later he was still there, but – since the previous November – as president of the council. This elevation made little difference in practice, since Guizot had always been the driving force of the ministry, being a fervent supporter of Louis Philippe and the engineer of the 'Orleans-Guizot *entente*'. But his administration was seen as doctrinaire, reactionary, and without personality – a match, some said, for his king. When the Duc d'Orléans died following a riding accident on 13 July 1842, Lamartine drafted a letter to Louis Philippe in which he boldly declared 'You have lost a son; France has lost a reign'. He later confided that 'what little remained of the monarchy has fallen with this fine young man. The nation must assume the power to govern itself'.⁴⁶ These were prophetic words, and Lamartine added to the atmosphere of political, industrial, and agricultural unrest when in June 1847 the last parts of his eight-volume *Histoire des Girondins* appeared. The most popular historical read of the day provided a framework of Revolutionary history onto which thousands of French citizens pinned their hopes for a new future – or, rather, the same past over again for a new generation.

On 28 December, Louis Philippe effectively served notice on the 'Orleans-Guizot' Cabinet with a bitter speech – written by Guizot – against the opposition: 'In the midst of the agitation fermented by blind or hostile passions ... we possess in the constitutional monarchy ... the sure means of surmounting these obstacles and of satisfying all the moral and material interests of our dear country'.⁴⁷ It was a singularly unwise and naïve speech, by implication attacking everybody from Thiers's moderate coalition through Lamartine to the Radicals of the extreme Left. Moreover, this was at a time when most of the deputies were in the opposition. The entire Opposition united to remove the *status quo* – if not necessarily Louis Philippe, certainly Guizot.

A great revolutionary banquet and public demonstration were proposed and publicized for 22 February 1848. The day before they were due to take place, the prefect of police, Abraham Delessert, signed a decree prohibiting both events; the agitators abandoned only the banquet and went ahead with the demonstration. Unfortunately, the weather was foul and not more than a thousand students and workers turned up to sing outside the Tuileries. Meanwhile, in the Chamber of Deputies the Opposition benches remained empty as a gesture of solidarity and the business of government could not proceed.

The following day barricades went up and the National Guard was called in, at once siding with the demonstrators. A situation that might have been brought under control by their withdrawal and a parley worsened as Guizot called in the regular army. Louis Philippe, realizing how serious the situation had become, dismissed him, but instead of replacing him with Lamartine – or even Thiers – he appointed Molé; a worse choice could not have been made. During the evening, the tension between the soldiers, National Guard, and demonstrators – now numbering about 3,000 – increased. Guizot's dismissal introduced a measure of calm, but the news of Molé's appointment infuriated the opposition still further. A group of protestors decided to gather at the offices of the moderate Republican paper *Le National* and march to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the boulevard des Capucines, singing *La Marseillaise* and shouting the Republican slogan 'Vive la Réforme!' They were met by the 14th Regiment of the Line, who did not shoot or interfere but blocked their path and refused to give way.

It was a situation that had been common enough in French history, and one that would be several times repeated. A shot was fired by 'Anonymous' and a general conflict ensued in which more than one hundred people were killed; 250 more would die over the following twenty-four hours. At midnight, Molé at last resigned; but it was too little too late. Louis Philippe abdicated at the Tuileries in favour of his grandson, Louis, comte de Paris, and a regency, which would have been acceptable before the carnage, was now rejected and a moderate Republican Provisional Government under Lamartine took up office at the Hotel de Ville.

When Louis Napoleon learned of the moderate nature of Lamartine's administration he made preparations to leave for Paris, taking the boat train from Dover on Sunday 27 February with Orsi and Thélin. 'Louis Napoleon has, we believe, actually embarked for France and landed at Boulogne, the scene of his former foolish attempt ... He declares, however, that he goes to France merely as a citizen, to tender his services to his country', noted *The Times*.⁴⁸ The *Observer* was even more perfunctory: 'Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, the owner of the tame eagle captured at Boulogne, has proceeded to Paris'.⁴⁹ They arrived on Monday and installed themselves at the Hôtel de Castille in the rue Richelieu where Persigny met them, having been released from casual captivity in a hospital at Versailles to which he had been transferred from his prison in Doullens when his eyesight had been threatened by an illness. Louis Napoleon immediately composed a short letter addressed to the members of the Provisional Government:

The people of Paris having destroyed by their heroism the last vestiges of the foreign invasion, I hasten back from exile to place myself under the flag of the Republic which has just been proclaimed. Without other ambition than that of serving my country, I announce my arrival to the Provisional Government, and beg to assure them of my devotion to the cause which they represent, and of my sympathy for them personally ... Louis Napoleon Bonaparte.⁵⁰

Lamartine's administration had originally comprised François Arago (navy), Adolphe Crémieux (justice), Louis Garnier-Pagès (finance), Lamartine (foreign affairs), Armand Marrast (interior), Alexandre Marie (public works), and Jacques Dupont de l'Eure (without portfolio). However, shortly after they had assembled he was presented with a second list drawn up at the radical offices of *La Réforme*, and which was imposed on him. Crémieux was dropped, the revolutionary machinist Alexandre Albert inducted as the 'voice of the worker', Alexandre Ledru-Rollin replaced Marrast who became mayor of Paris with Athanase de Recurt as his deputy, *La Réforme*'s editor Ferdinand Flocon took the post of minister for agriculture and commerce, and Dupont de l'Eure was replaced by Louis Blanc. When Louis Napoleon arrived in Paris, further divisions in the Hôtel de Ville saw Ledru-Rollin and Blanc spearhead an attack against Lamartine, and the last thing he needed with this internal conflict was a Bonaparte in the mix, and Louis Napoleon was asked to withdraw for the good of the nation. He did so, after writing a second letter:

I thought that after thirty-three years of exile and persecution I had at length the right to find a home in my native land. You think that my presence in Paris at this time would be an embarrassment; I therefore retire for the present. You will see in this sacrifice the purity of my intentions and of my patriotism. Receive, gentlemen, the assurance of my sentiments of high esteem and of sympathy ... L. N. Bonaparte.⁵¹

Louis Napoleon and his friends left Paris on 28 February and landed at Folkestone aboard the *Lord Warden* on 2 March. The following day, he met Lord Malmesbury and told him that Lamartine 'had received him very civilly, said that his great name

might at this moment produce a commotion which it was desirable to avoid ... Prince Louis ... seems rather flattered than otherwise at being sent away'.⁵² So he ought to have been. Although Louis Napoleon had received many letters of support from individuals before his departure for Paris, and although a few cries of 'Vive l'Empereur!' had been heard in the streets – fewer, however, than in 1830 – there was no such thing as a 'Bonapartist Party' in France in any sense that could be understood as such. Whether Louis Napoleon really believed that he might have been taken on board by Lamartine in February, or whether the trip had been a brilliant way of exposing himself for nothing more than the price of a return fare and a hotel bill, can never be known. What is a fact, however, is that after his brief trip a Bonapartist Party – of a kind – began to coalesce within the embryonic swirl that had been the way of things since 1815. He had shown his face and at a stroke demonstrated the fact that he was both an able and willing Prince-Pretender, expelling for good the notion held in some quarters that he was a remote armchair exile confined to his new island home across the Channel.

Meanwhile, Jérôme and Plon-Plon suddenly found themselves in the Second Republic. When their trial period had expired in December, they were surprised to find that nothing was done to remove them so they stayed put. For Jérôme this meant little more than not having to get up and leave; for Plon-Plon it meant action, and he put his name forward as a Republican in the first election for a National Assembly. On 24 April, he was returned a deputy for Corsica as Citizen Napoléon Bonaparte; he was also an elected officer in the National Guard. During the same election, Pierre Bonaparte was also returned as a Republican deputy, and also for Corsica, as was Lucien Murat, Achille's younger brother. Nine days earlier Blanc had announced that Pierre had been given the rank of Battalion Commander in the *Légion Étrangère*.

In the meantime, a rumour had spread in the French Press, and through it to England, that Louis Napoleon had also put his name forward as a candidate for the April elections, causing him to write a private note to Delane: 'Will you be kind enough to contradict the report of my intention to become a candidate for a seat in the National Assembly of France ... I wish you would contradict the report without publishing this letter'.⁵³ The request was granted as the complaint was justified: any attempts to put Louis Napoleon's name forward were not sanctioned – or even welcomed – by him.

* * *

Within a few months of the abdication of Louis Philippe most major European countries experienced their own insurrections during the 'Spring of Nations' that had begun on 12 January 1848 when Sicilians in Palermo rose against the restored Bourbons in Naples. In Austria, the insane Ferdinand was forced to abdicate in favour of his nephew Franz Josef, and, more importantly, Metternich was forced to flee on 14 March, taking refuge, naturally, in England. In Bavaria, Ludwig, the king who had repelled his subjects by wrapping the Anglo-Irish adventuress calling herself Lola Montez around himself, was obliged to abdicate in favour of his son Maximilian. Venezia once again declared itself a Republic, defying the Austrians, and Friedrich Wilhelm IV of Prussia was publicly humiliated while his son Wilhelm fled to England. Meanwhile, Piedmont, Tuscany, and the Papal States had constitutional reform imposed on them, and Pio Nono's (Pius IX) new minister of state, Pellegrino Rossi, had his throat cut on the steps of the Quirinal.

In England, popular discontent was rooted in the disappointment over the emasculated Reform Bill. On 8 May 1838, members of the London Working Men's Association, in conjunction with Feargus O'Connor's influential weekly Radical paper the *Northern Star*, published a Bill to be presented to the House of Commons as an Act of Parliament. This 'People's Charter' of thirteen sections included definite provisions known as the 'six points' of the 'Chartists': universal male suffrage after residency of three months; voting by ballot; equal electoral districts of 300 constituencies after each census; annual summoning and election of parliament; abolition of property qualification for election of members; and payment for members. A petition with 1,280,000 signatures was presented to Parliament on 14 June 1839, but rejected a month later by a majority of 189 votes. After three more years of strikes, violent uprisings, mass arrests and trials of leading Chartists, a second national petition was submitted to Parliament on 2 May 1842, with a total of 3,317,702 signatures – one sixth of the entire population – and was again rejected.

Had the self-reforming process inherent in England's parliamentary system been allowed to continue, Chartism would certainly have faded away by 1848. The European uprisings gave sudden and immense impetus to the hopes of O'Connor and his lieutenants, who found themselves in the enviable position of having under their direction an existing movement able to absorb disaffection that might otherwise have been dissipated in ephemeral groups, fruitless demonstrations, or taverns. Instead of disappearing, then, Chartism peaked, while no other significant revolutionary movement materialized; it was these favourable circumstances that had been lacking in the disorganized European *mêlée* of the 'Revolution which failed to turn'. The irony for O'Connor was that he was dealing with Britain, whose traditional dissimilarity to the rest of Europe prevented a viable extension of the Continental revolutionary ideal taking root. Had he and a few others like him been in Vienna, Paris, and Berlin, it is quite probable that much of Continental Europe would have become a confederation of Republican states.

Queen Victoria's fears that 'evil-minded' revolutionists would attempt to topple the government was an exaggerated fear induced by her essentially Continental background and fulsome reports given her by Albert's Coburg associates. However deceptive the appearance of revolutionary activity in England in 1848 may seem in retrospect, at the time it represented itself as a potential threat. O'Connor, Radical member for Nottingham since 1847, was the nephew of the 'United Irishmen' Arthur O'Connor, who in 1797 went to France to persuade the Jacobin army under the Revolutionary general and minister of war Lazare Hoche to invade Ireland and liberate it from 'English oppression'. Perhaps only Hoche's premature death prevented the scheme from materializing, and in 1803 he settled in France where he was made a General of Division by Napoleon. Arthur O'Connor was very much alive in 1848, and fears that a Chartist success would open England up to armies of neo-Jacobins were very real if absurdly groundless.

The Chartists planned their greatest show of strength in ten years to take place in South London on 10 April. Feargus O'Connor announced that 300,000 supporters would mass for a rally on Kennington Common and then process to Westminster to deliver a monster petition of at least 6,000,000 signatures to the House of Commons. At the same time protests in Liverpool, Birmingham, Nottingham, and Loughborough would ensure national solidarity for the marchers, and within months there would be a total reform of Britain's political system; this is how the *Northern Star* reported the event beforehand. Certain of ultimate victory, the Chartists sent congratulatory messages to Lamartine in Paris, and the Continental Revolutions – at a time when

they were still perceived as successes – were openly held up as warnings to the British Government as the natural consequence of refusing to submit to the ‘will of the people’.

Disturbances in Glasgow, Edinburgh, Manchester, and Aberdeen throughout March encouraged the authorities to act with the full force of the nation’s peacekeeping reserve. On the evening of Thursday 6 April, a public notice was posted up all over London:

Whereas the assemblage of large numbers of people, accompanied with circumstances tending to excite terror and alarm ... is criminal and unlawful ... All persons are hereby cautioned and strictly enjoined not to attend or take part in, or be present at, any such assemblage or procession. And all well-disposed persons are hereby called upon and required to aid in enforcing the provisions of the law, and effectually to protect the public peace, and suppress any attempt at the disturbance thereof.⁵⁴

Over 1,700 such ‘well-disposed persons’ were sworn in as special constables. On Friday 7, Louis Napoleon signed up at Marlborough Street Police Court with Benjamin Lumley, director of Her Majesty’s Theatre; Georga Augustus Sala, editor of *Chat*, a halfpenny weekly satirical paper; Baron Stanley, heir to the earldom of Derby; George Berry, owner of the *Coffee Mill* on St James’s Street; and D’Orsay. All were issued with a piebald wristband, a tipstaff, a hat, and – as they had been produced at short notice with no time to stain and varnish them – raw truncheons that nevertheless ‘could be reckoned upon to administer the most sounding of thwacks to seditious pates had the occasion demanded’.⁵⁵

At Kennington Common, Christopher Doyle, a Manchester weaver, one of the directors of O’Connor’s National Land Company, and now president of the rally, announced: ‘Men of London, this is one of the most glorious sights I have ever had the pleasure of witnessing’.⁵⁶ But Doyle was easy to please: less than 20,000 people had turned up, fewer than had gone to see the aristocracy joust at Eglinton, and the unimpressive show was preserved for all time in the earliest photographs taken of a London crowd. O’Connor was informed by Richard Mayne, Commissioner of Police, that although the gathering would not be broken up the march to Westminster would be prevented by the full force of the law, and only a small deputation allowed to cross the Thames with the petition.

Measures to prevent a mob reaching Westminster were severe. In addition to the special constables, 3,970 regular policemen, 8,000 infantry, two squadrons of Life Guards, three cavalry regiments, forty-two artillery units with full infantry support, and three military steam ships had been set up to block the path across the river. There were 700 Chelsea Pensioners stationed at the four Westminster bridges and fifty policemen in the House of Lords under an inspector. Wellington, in his last act of public duty, was given special command over the rest of the regular army, which secreted itself at various strategic locations throughout the capital, as well as several other towns and cities.

The rally was an embarrassing fiasco for the violently unstable and already half-mad O’Connor and his fellow Chartists. In the morning, during the speeches, the sun shone; but, just like at Eglinton, by 3 o’clock it was raining hard and hundreds of the faithful scattered and went home, ankle-deep in the mud of a common that was not yet a manicured public park. The single cabriolet assigned to take the petition to Westminster was no longer sufficient, since the leaders who had at first intended to accompany it on foot changed their minds when the rain came and tried to squeeze into it. Two more, of poor quality, were immediately found, and the three carriages made their way to Westminster Bridge followed by numerous Chartists in defiance of

both the elements and Commissioner Mayne's edict. However, by the time they reached the Thames only a few tried to pay the toll or force their way across the water – a very unpleasant and dangerous undertaking in 1848 when the river was basically a sludgegutter; 'seditious pates' who refused to turn around were introduced to the 'thwacks' of the raw truncheons and sent back to Lambeth. When the wet, muddy, bedraggled deputation with its congealed mass of paper reached Westminster the House of Commons laughed. The '6,000,000' signatures then turned out to be fewer in number than in 1842, with thousands falsified: Wellington had left seventeen different signatures, Victoria and Albert several, and Mr Punch two.

According to the most commonly known account, the American publisher George Palmer Putnam met Louis Napoleon on London Bridge. Surprised and amused, Putnam exclaimed: 'Et que diable fait Monsieur Napoléon dans cette galère', to which Louis Napoleon, in a serious and dignified tone, replied that 'the peace of London must be preserved'.⁵⁷ The story in this form appeared in the first volume of the biography of Louis Napoleon by Frederick Simpson (1909), who claimed that Putnam's son George Haven told it to him. Louis Napoleon had met George Palmer Putnam in the first weeks of 1848 when he became a frequent guest at his house, *Knickerbocker Cottage*, on Mornington Street. But George Palmer Putnam, who 'was particularly interested in the events of Charter Day',⁵⁸ in fact told his son a rather less fulsome version: 'My father told me that he congratulated the Prince on his public-spirited readiness to serve the community in which he had made his home. "Yes, Mr Putnam," said Louis; "London is a great city, of value to the whole world. The peace of London must be preserved"'.⁵⁹

The facts speak for themselves: Louis Napoleon registered with 'A' Division, the part of the Metropolitan Police covering Westminster north of the river and east of the City of London. He was further restricted by being allocated a parish – his own – beyond which he was not authorized to patrol. The parish of St James was divided into four wards – A, B, C, D – and furnished the scheme with just under 400 volunteers. Each ward was further divided into two sections, of about twenty-five men each, under the command of first and second captains, while the parish was under the overall command of Earl Grey, secretary for war and the colonies. The ward units did not patrol together, and each member was given a slip of paper with his meeting times so that only one section within each ward was patrolling at any one time; if an emergency was declared the other would be called. Louis Napoleon was assigned to the northernmost ward beneath the parish of St Anne's, Soho, a restriction excluding London Bridge by over one mile. It is not possible that Louis Napoleon was 'off duty' at the time, as O'Connor did not declare the demonstration over until 9 o'clock in the evening, until which time everyone was expected to remain either on duty or at home ready to be called. As an American, George Haven Putnam, in saying London Bridge to Simpson, had confused his London bridges; whether the exchange with its French quotation ever took place is inconsequential.

On Louis Napoleon's dedication that night there is good testimony. Malmesbury stated that he and five armed 'keepers' went to the house of Lord Carrington 'to see what would happen', and noticed that 'among the special constables stationed round Trafalgar Square, Prince Louis Napoleon was on duty'.⁶⁰ Henry Wolff, a poet and future diplomat, remembered seeing Louis Napoleon marching proudly among a 'small detachment of specials' – his ward section,⁶¹ while Sala stated that not far from where he had been stationed, in St James's churchyard, Piccadilly, stood Louis Napoleon 'with a badge ... round his arm ... and his truncheon in one kid-gloved hand'.⁶²

The specials had been enrolled for the standard two-month term, but they could resign at any time with the permission of the police. Louis Napoleon, who did not want to be still enrolled when he might have to leave England for France, did so soon after the demonstration. This can be inferred from Thackeray, who met Louis Napoleon for the first time at Gore House shortly afterwards: ‘Monday [April 17]... At dinner at Lady Blessington’s, Prince Louis, who looks like a courier ... Dorsay always frank and pleasant; showed us his special constable’s wrist-badge and truncheon’.⁶³ Apart from the hat, the items issued to the specials had to be carried at all times until either resignation or discharge. The fact that Thackeray made no mention of Louis Napoleon’s wristband – which had to be exposed at all times – suggested that he did not have one and had therefore resigned. According to a witness, Louis Napoleon ‘discarded his staff for a light gold-headed cane’⁶⁴ at some point during the evening, realizing that soon he would not be requiring it. The subsequent history of this tipstaff provides evidence for this. Captain Charles Talbot, an officer in the navy, had also enrolled in the same section as Louis Napoleon after returning to England from active service the previous year. Louis Napoleon gave his tipstaff to Talbot as a memento, and after his death it passed on to his young grandson John Talbot-Ponsonby who almost immediately gave it to a friend, thus ensuring its survival.

In spite of this eccentric affectation, Louis Napoleon had done his duty with integrity for the nation that had sheltered him in the past and was doing so again, and on April 12 Home Secretary Sir George Grey conveyed Her Majesty’s acknowledgement of the role played by the specials in a letter published in *The Times*.

* * *

Louis Napoleon’s most prominent English paramour was ‘Miss Howard’, whose involvement with him constitutes the single most defamatory example of uncritical Romantic interventionism respecting an otherwise wholly mundane episode in his life. Virtually every secondary source repeats the facile gloss originally conjured out of the magicians’ hat of family tradition, largely gleaned from the ‘testimony’ of two of Miss Howard’s great-grandchildren, and which Second Empire gossips and Third Republic propagandists have consolidated. However, it is crucial to unravel the truth since Miss Howard’s name has been linked to the establishment of Louis Napoleon’s presidency and empire, an extremely serious accusation, and the essentials of the received view should be restated before proceeding with the facts.

Elizabeth Haryett was born in Brighton and baptized there on 13 August 1823, the daughter of Joseph Haryett, a local shoemaker, and Elizabeth Alderton. When Elizabeth was a girl, the family left Brighton and aspired to settle down to the life of the yeomanry class in Norfolk, just outside Great Yarmouth. Elizabeth’s great desire became to go on the stage but this was strongly opposed by her father, and instead her energy was dissipated in the more ladylike pursuit of riding. Towards the end of 1839, the Haryett family was visited by Thomas Mason, a horse-coper from London, and his son James ‘Jem’ Mason, a jockey who had just recently won the first steeplechase at Aintree on *Lottery*. They had met before, in Brighton, and Elizabeth seized the chance to fulfil her dream by latching onto Jem and running off with him to London. They arrived early in 1840 when Elizabeth dropped her surname, claimed herself to be an orphan, and began calling herself Harriet Howard. She then managed to insinuate herself onto the London stage to act several minor roles while living with Jem at 277 Oxford Street.

In 1841, she met Major Francis Mountjoy Martyn of the Life Guards, the wealthy son of Charles Fuller Martyn of the Honourable East India Company who was also a prominent civil servant in Calcutta – a nabob who had passed his great wealth onto his son. In 1842, Howard left Mason and was installed by Martyn at 23 Circus Road, St John's Wood, a mansion known as 'Rockingham House'. They lived there for four years during which, on 16 August 1842, Howard gave birth to Martyn's son, baptized Martin Constantine Haryett. Although they were financially legally bound, they could not marry because Martyn was already married, to Amelia Jenkins of Beachley on the Severn Estuary in Gloucestershire, who was barren and secured in some distant country retreat.

Martyn happened to be a cousin of the Earl of Blessington, and, in June 1846, he introduced Miss Howard to Louis Napoleon at Gore House, and they immediately began an affair that necessitated the ousting of Martyn and consequently her removal from Rockingham House. She moved into 9 Berkeley Street, Westminster, to be near Louis Napoleon in King Street, and they conducted an open relationship that involved his staying in her house. Miss Howard was by this time a very wealthy woman and financed the presidential campaign of 1848. After Louis Napoleon's election, she stayed behind in England until 1849, when she followed him to Paris, settling down near the Palais de l'Élysée and becoming first mistress and bank of France.

* * *

But the truth – particularly for the crucial years 1840 to 1848 – was very different indeed. It is certainly a fact that Elizabeth Haryett changed her name and went on the stage in 1840. She made a Christian name out of her surname, and took as a new one the family name of the premier dukedom and earldom of England, the Howards of Norfolk. Harriet Howard began a short run at the Haymarket Theatre, from 16 January 1840, as Constance, one of the principal characters in *The Love Chase* (1837) by James Sheridan Knowles. This was a five-act comedy that had been written for the Haymarket, and for the first three years Constance had been played by Louisa Nisbett, whose three-year contract expired in 1840 and was not renewed.

But it is not true that Miss Howard and Mason lived at 277 Oxford Street. This property was a pharmacy run by Peter Squire, soon to be appointed Chemist in Ordinary to the Queen. In addition to his wife and two sons there was a guest, three shop assistants, four servants, and a three-month-old baby, paternity unspecified.⁶⁵ The ratebooks reveal that these circumstances were the same either side of 1841, and the same documents show that neither Mason nor Miss Howard owned, tenanted, or occupied as guests any of the 439 properties on Oxford Street between 1840 and 1842.

On 24 February 1839, Mason did win the first properly constituted Grand Liverpool Steeplechase on one of the most famous horses of the day, *Lottery*, which entered the race with seventeen others. There was a twenty sovereign sweepstake, the total plus an extra 100 sovereigns to go to the owner of the winning horse, with ten sovereigns to be returned for expenses. Mason was the best and most famous steeplechaser of his time, and he won several meetings in the 1830s, but, like all sportsmen before the modern age, he was never a wealthy man. He was, for example, a noted dandy, but a Saville Row tailor provided his expensive clothes for him free of charge as a shrewd form of advertizing his stock. Mason entered the next four races at Aintree on *Lottery* but failed to win any of them, and although he continued to race until 1851 on other horses he never repeated his early success. After Mason retired, he

became a trainer and owner of only modest success, and when he contracted tuberculosis in July 1864 he had to be supported by charitable donations. Mason died a pauper and intestate, having squandered what money he had on gambling and drinking, and he and Miss Howard could not have afforded a property in Oxford Street, or anywhere else like it.

Miss Howard and Martyn certainly had a son – given according to convention the surname of the father as a Christian name when the mother assumed responsibility – and he was subsequently ennobled by Louis Napoleon, living his life as the Comte de Béchevêt. Just how many parts Miss Howard played on stage is difficult to determine, but her last performance was at the Theatre Royal in Drury Lane during the spring of 1842 when she played the part of the Third Apparition in *Macbeth*, a brief appearance in the first scene of the fourth act described by Shakespeare as ‘a Child crowned, with a tree in his hand’, in which the character spoke just thirty-three words. Drury Lane had been taken over the previous year by the noted tragedian William Macready, and Miss Howard worked with several of the great names of the English stage at that time, including of course Macready himself as *Macbeth*. How she might have gone on cannot be known, since it was her pregnancy during the performance that caused her to withdraw from it before the end of the run in May, and the stage altogether after two years of little critical success; she never returned to it.

Charles Fuller Martin was a barrister-at-law who arrived in Calcutta in 1785. On 2 November, he was established an advocate for the town, in 1791 becoming the seventeenth Sheriff of Calcutta – an annual position roughly equivalent to an English town mayor – and subsequently a justice of the peace. By 1813 he had changed the spelling of his name to Martyn in both the Bengal and Calcutta Directories for orthographic consistency with the rest of his family. At some point he met Marie Felix, the young French widow of William Felix, an English infantry private from Fort William killed in action in September 1797, and began an affair that lasted for a decade, resulting in the birth of two illegitimate male children. Charles Cecil Martin was born on 18 February 1808 and baptized on 8 October at Kidderpore School, Fort William, by the Chaplain at the Presidency; Francis Mountjoy Martin on 8 May 1809, baptized on 3 September, also at Fort William.⁶⁶ In 1816, Martyn took his sons with him to London where he lived in one of the bachelor apartments at the Albany; after making arrangements for their welfare he left for Paris where he remained until his death.

Charles Fuller Martin was not connected with the East India Company, and he has been confused with Charles Ray Martin (to whom he was not related) who was appointed by the Company to the judicial system in British India in 1801, becoming Assistant Register in the Zillah of Hoogley in 1805 and rising through the ranks of the Department of Justice to become Judge in the Zillah of Burdwan – northwest of Calcutta – from 1815. Between 1820 and 1826 he was a judge in the Provincial Court of Calcutta, and after further appointments retired in 1838. Further confusion has arisen from the fact that Charles Ray Martin had five children in India – in and out of wedlock – over a number of years, the first of whom, a son, was born twelve days before Francis⁶⁷.

Francis and Charles were made Wards of the Court of the Chancery and were raised by two friends of their father, Francis at the Albany and Charles in Bond Street. Francis entered the 2nd Life Guards by purchase, as was then customary in the cavalry and infantry, in 1827 at the lowest officer rank of sub-lieutenant and cornet.⁶⁸ He entered as ‘Martin’ but by 1831 had also changed his name to the older and more exclusive form, and was registered as such when he rose to the rank of full lieutenant,

by purchase, on 22 March that year. On 22 April 1836, he became a captain, by purchase, and on 9 November 1846 was created a brevet-major in the army but remained a captain in his regiment. On 20 June, he became a brevet-lieutenant-colonel in the army and on 14 July 1854 purchased the rank of major in his regiment. On 27 November 1857, he purchased the lieutenant-colonelcy of his regiment and was made a brevet-colonel in the army the following year. On 5 March 1863, he sold his commission and retired on half-pay.

Captain Francis Martyn, as he was during the years in question, was no relation of the Earl of Blessington. Charles Fuller Martyn's father was a London merchant, younger brother of London-born Thomas Martyn, a celebrated professor of botany in Cambridge who had been rector of Ludgershall in Buckinghamshire and whose half-brother would take over the rectorship in 1785; from that date the Martyns would hold the rectorship and lordship of the manor until 1911. With the exception of one French wife in the eighteenth century – who purchased the Manor in 1785 – the entire early history of the family, down to 1500, is to be found in London and central and Eastern England.

In the 1840s there were seven modest houses on Circus Road east of Wellington Road, and nineteen mansions with extensive grounds on the western part. From 1841 to 1848 the ratebooks for St Marylebone Parish show that No. 23 (later 52) was owned by Mary Edwards who occupied it with staff until 1843; in 1842, the well known surgeon Samuel Thomas Partridge lodged briefly with her before leaving the following year. For a little under two years the property was declared vacant – but still owned by Edwards – until 1845 when a financial speculator born in Madras briefly tenanted it with his wife; in 1851, he was still there with four servants.⁶⁹ Mary Edwards, known as the Comtesse d'Espel, was Louis Napoleon's close friend in 1840, having helped him lodge some of his Boulogne crew and whom the Press at the time claimed to be 'the prince's mistress'.⁷⁰ However, there is no trace of either Martyn or Miss Howard associated with any of the properties,⁷¹ and her involvement – apart from the confusion of women friends – was a retrospective association derived from her temporary home in Paris, where she did live in 'Circus Road' – 14 rue du Cirque – immediately west of Avenue Marigny joining Avenue Gabriel to the rue du Fauberg. Martyn's spurious association with Lady Blessington and Gore House – where neither he nor Miss Howard appears – derived from the English landscape painter John Martin, who was certainly a guest there and who was once visited at his studio – 5 Circus Road – by Lady Blessington, D'Orsay, and Louis Napoleon.

The ratebooks for Curzon Ward in the Parish of St George's, Hanover Square, reveal that it was only in the second rateable term of 1848 that 'Mrs Howard' took over the tenancy of 9 Berkeley Street, with the Dowager Countess of Sefton lodging in the stabling part of the property. This situation remained unchanged until 1852 when, following Lady Sefton's death, the stabling was taken over by Joshua Bates, the financier who had stood surety for Louis Napoleon after his duel on Wimbledon Common. Miss Howard continued to rent this property until 1856 – until her position in France as the Comtesse de Beauregarde had been safely established for three years – and, as the 1851 census suggests, maintained it with three household servants in case she should be obliged to return to England.

In addition to family fables, Louis Napoleon's association with Miss Howard has been derived from two French sources. Alexis de Valon was married to the daughter of Abraham Delessert, who in addition to being a prefect of police was a member of a fervent Orleanist family that included Baron Jules, a financier and vice-president of the Chamber of Deputies under Louis Philippe, and François, a long-sitting deputy.

Valon was known to share the political views of his in-laws; on 24 June 1848 he wrote:

I have the frequent happiness of meeting Prince Louis here, one of those names one invokes in the general penury of the times, one of those straws one clutches at when upon the point of drowning ... It is sufficient to see the little man, common and ill-famed as he is, to realise the vanity of the hopes placed in him! ... Imagine a little man, four and a half feet high, ugly and vulgar, with huge moustaches and pigs' eyes ... From the moral point of view, he lives publicly, to the great scandal of English propriety, with a tenth rate actress, who is however extremely beautiful, called Miss Howard. This behaviour, which has gradually closed every door to him in London, throws him back upon the society of actors ...⁷²

This ludicrous grotesquerie has been used as evidence to support a long-standing relationship between Louis Napoleon and Miss Howard, but the trustworthiness of Valon's statements can be gauged by demonstrating that Louis Napoleon, although a slim man, was in fact of average height if a little out of conventional proportion. On 13 August 1846, he purchased his first tailored outfit from Henry Poole of Saville Row, whose firm was subsequently issued with a Warrant of Appointment as tailors to the Emperor of the French. Louis Napoleon's measurements, held in the archives of the company, indicate that Louis Napoleon was slightly but not thinly built.⁷³

His weight at this time is also known. He befriended George Berry of *The Coffee Mill* behind whose ancient establishment lay the tiny Pickering Square where Louis Napoleon used to circulate and think. The shop was well known for employing a large set of scales for weighing coffee on which people amused themselves by also being weighed, entering the results into a set of registers. These show that Louis Napoleon weighed a little under eleven stones, healthy for a man his height but absurd for anyone a foot shorter.⁷⁴ According to Poole's leg measurements, Louis Napoleon should have been about five feet two inches in height. His physical abnormality rested in the fact that he was not, of course, five feet two but about four inches taller – a measurement known from the Ham prison admission records. This quite respectable height was therefore not proportionally spaced, and for the eye a discrepancy of a few inches was enough to leave observers with the impression that Louis Napoleon's legs were too short for his body, and that he was himself of short stature.

Unfortunately, it was not just Louis Napoleon's enemies who invented circumstances with such deplorable implications. The Comte de Fleury was at this time Louis Napoleon's aide-de-camp. In his memoirs he mentioned Miss Howard's association with 'the rich Mountjoy Martyn', but without giving details of locations or dates, stating that she 'gathered together the most significant men of the aristocracy; Count d'Orsay ... the Duke of Beaufort, Lord Chesterfield, and ten other gentlemen of fashion were also regulars of her circle'.⁷⁵

Fleury did not name these 'ten other gentlemen' because perhaps then his testimony could be put under some severe scrutiny. As it is the two he did name had acquired such reputations in their day that they could have been placed in almost any scandalous circumstance with few raised eyebrows. The Duke of Beaufort, Tory member for Monmouth and West Gloucestershire, ruled the Badminton Hunt (his seat) and married, as his second wife, Wellington's niece, ending his life as colonel of the Gloucestershire Yeomanry Cavalry, a *bon viveur*, and a patron of Her Majesty's Theatre. As the young Marquis of Worcester, he had been a notorious womanizer and loafer who had been sent to Spain in an attempt to cure him of both conditions, in particular to engineer an escape from the scandal of his association with Harriette Wilson, a 'lady of fashion' who had been the mistress of several high-profile men, and who in 1825 published her memoirs as an attack on Beaufort, whom she believed

had jilted her. The Earl of Chesterfield lightened the burdon of his aristocratic *ennui* by similar escapades and the refounding, in 1838, of the famous 'Four-in-Hand' equipage club from his home in Stanhope Street, where Palmerston was living at the time (1811-41). 'I like Ld Chesterfield very much', Palmerston wrote three years before becoming foreign secretary, 'he improves greatly upon acquaintance ... I think he will be something more than a dandy bye & bye'.⁷⁶ But Palmerston would be proved wrong, and Chesterfield would pass his life as an amiable sportsman, sometime Master of the Pytchley Hunt, and *habitué* at Newmarket.

According to Fleury, it was D'Orsay who introduced Miss Howard to Louis Napoleon, though where and when he forgot to say. He followed up this statement by telling his readers that 'the most intimate relationship existed between the Prince and miss Howard at the time of the breaking out of the February revolution and his nomination as a deputy'.⁷⁷ This was probably true, in that neither Valon nor Fleury said anything related to a period earlier than the first quarter of 1848, which is when Miss Howard first appeared in Berkeley Street. What Fleury tried to do in his memoirs was to 'improve' Miss Howard's status by inventing for her a social kudos she simply did not possess in order that Louis Napoleon's association with her would appear less uncongenial to his memory. The two unfortunate but colourful lords were just the kind of rakish peers who could have been placed in her company without searching questions being asked, but with a sense that Miss Howard was not as bad as the 'tenth rate actress' Valon had seen.

Popular gossip later claimed that Louis Napoleon met Miss Howard at the theatre, or in the Haymarket area where she was supplementing her meagre income as an actress by soliciting men in the streets. However, the evidence suggests they met either in the beginning of 1848 or just conceivably during the winter of 1847; if, as the popular Romance insists, Louis Napoleon had met the allegedly wealthy Miss Howard in the summer of 1846, why did he not approach her for the cash he needed the following year instead of risking it all with Charles Pollard?

Hortense had left Louis Napoleon funds amounting to 120,000 francs (almost £5,000) a year, and he was able to live in the vast properties in Carlton Gardens and Carlton House Terrace, renting the entire buildings, at a time when he had to think of his considerable retinue. During the fifth visit he was alone, and the complex arrangement at King Street is significant, since it was from Louis Napoleon's circumstances there that people reached their conclusions about his financial situation. The third house on the north side was the only property permanently separated into three rentable apartments, number 3 representing the ground floor, 3^A the first floor, and 3^B the second and third floors.⁷⁸ Both the ground floor and the top section were run as 'lodging houses' – the term used irrespective of whether a property was a house or maisonette – while Louis Napoleon's floor was all his own. The 1851 census shows that Baron Naas, Conservative member for Kildare, was living on the ground floor with his wife, daughter, brother, and butler and footman. The landlady, two daughters, a servant, and five male lodgers occupied the upper lodging house.⁷⁹

Louis Napoleon's floor had four rooms, two in front of respectable size and two behind, much smaller, used as a wash room and storage place. The house was of course communal, and the staircase and hall took up a large part of the rear of the house up to the top on the left-hand side. It was certainly cramped, but this should not be considered unusual in early Victorian England where the population growth in London far exceeded the city's ability to house it, and even many illustrious families shared their properties with others, or lived *en toute famille* with several children in one room and servants sleeping shoulder to shoulder in another.

The property was rated in the Poor Ratebooks at £13.10s.6d per quarter and in the Pavement Ratebooks at £4.1s.9d per quarter, as well as 9s 1d annually for watering the street. Louis Napoleon was recorded as being liable to pay these rates in addition to the rent payable to Charles Phillips, an amount that has not been reliably noted but would not have been much over the London average of £50 per annum for a section of a town house. Louis Napoleon's detractors rightly stated that he lived in a few rooms on King Street, but concluded wrongly from this that poverty was the cause; his admirers wrongly stated that he rented the entire house for the absurd sum of £300 per annum, but concluded rightly that his temporary financial embarrassments were due to chronic generosity and 'playing the turf'. It is known that he had to borrow 60,000 Roman ecus (324,000 francs; £13,000) from the Marchese di Pallavicino early in 1848, repaid after the *coup d'état*,⁸⁰ but also that he purchased a lucrative practice for Dr Conneau in 1846 for £900.⁸¹

The pay of any officer in the Guards was negligible other than the interest accrued on the price of entry, invested for him by the regiment. All officers, then, were expected to be of private means, and Captain Martyn was no exception. Charles Fuller Martyn's Will was proved in London on 10 March and 9 April 1823, having been drawn up on 14 July 1816 'to make a timely provision for my two sons born out of wedlock'. His principal beneficiaries were of course these sons, who were each to receive £150,000 worth of stocks held at the Bank of England, for which the interest had been accruing, by agreement, at the bank of Thomas Coutts. Small annuities were given to his aunt and celebrated uncle Thomas, £1,200 to Marie in Calcutta – who had since their affair married a clerk in the Police Department – and £10,000 in stocks for his godson (Marie's child by her new husband), while £1,000 was given to his sons' guardians – the executors – for what was euphemistically referred to as their 'little trouble'. Martyn made full arrangements for his sons' education (Eton) for which there was 'no expense [to] be spared'. The total value of his estate was £383,000 in stocks and £3,400 in cash. He owned property at Charlestown, South Carolina, 'a portion of which' was being realized and remitted to London, and also held £1,200 worth of stocks at the United Company of Merchants, Calcutta.⁸²

Although Francis Martyn had been given a considerable fortune, he might have easily gone through it in a decade of careless living. However, he used his inheritance to buy several leaseholds on properties that were then rented out to provide a steady income for life. The ratebooks for the Grosvenor Ward of the Parish of St George's, Hanover Square, show that Martyn moved into 17 Charles Street in the last quarter of 1846, although he had acquired it in 1841 and occasionally used it as a *pied-à-terre* from 1843, before which he had rented it out. Martyn was to live in Charles Street for the next twenty-seven years, alone except for a retinue of servants. In 1851, he had five – two footmen, two housemaids, and a kitchen maid.⁸³ In 1861, this had been reduced to three female servants, as well as the son of one of them,⁸⁴ but ten years later he was living with no fewer than seven domestics – two men and five women – and one nursemaid.⁸⁵

Martyn's own Will was proved on 1 May 1874, having been drawn up on 9 March 1869. His principal beneficiaries were his nephew Cecil and his married niece. They were to receive no cash but two-thirds and one-third equal shares respectively from an investment of £30,000 put in trust by Dr Robert Harling, Cecil Martyn, and Hester Hobhouse – widow of Sir John Cam's half-brother. Servants were given advanced wages, and friends £200 or £500. These were cash sums, but any amount over £1,000 was to be drawn out of his investments, including £5,000 to his illegitimate daughter 'commonly known' as Jeane Martyn,⁸⁶ then under the guardianship of Hester

Hobhouse and who may have been the mother. Cecil predeceased his uncle – dying unexpectedly in Algiers with a fortune of £90,000 – and a codicil was added on 6 August 1872 dividing his share equally between Dr Harling and Cecil's sister, whose husband then took over as third executor.

Military records already referred to show that in 1829 Martyn was not married, and the following year it became law for all officers in the British Army to register their marriages with the War Office – to which the cavalry and infantry were subject before the creation of one military department – within six months of the ceremony. Martyn had drawn up an Indenture of Settlement on 29 August 1837, at the time of marrying Amelia, which involved a curious pre-nuptial financial arrangement in the event of their not having issue. In 1869, Martyn described Amelia as 'my present wife', but stated that there had indeed been no issue from the marriage, and funds she had previously benefited from were withdrawn according to that settlement and redirected as stated. Neither Amelia nor Martyn's natural son by Miss Howard benefited from the Will.

It may then be supposed that Martyn broke military regulation, since his marriage to Amelia Jenkins, which took place at the parish church of Tidenham the day after the Indenture of Settlement, was not registered at the War Office.⁸⁷ If Martyn did not violate military law then he must have repudiated Amelia in all but name within six months of the marriage, and some four or five years before he allegedly met Miss Howard – the marriage was never officially registered outside what had been legally required in 1837, and even the Life Guards considered him to have died a bachelor.⁸⁸ On Amelia's marriage certificate she was described as 'under age',⁸⁹ and this meant between twelve and twenty-one, during which years marriage was legally possible but required parental or guardian consent, and in fact she was an adolescent when Martyn married her, while he was twenty-eight. Amelia's father Robert Jenkins, a 'landed proprietor' living in Beachley Lodge, married a woman who had been born in India, but neither parent witnessed the register; yet she cannot have married without their consent. The socially and legally extreme age difference, the pre-nuptial arrangement, the refusal to inform the military authorities, and the amicable repudiation suggest a clinical contract undertaken by the two families, whose causes are now lost but which probably originated in India.

When Martyn married Amelia he was living at 15 Waterloo Place with his old guardian, the official occupant and ratepayer. After their disastrous union, Amelia returned to Beachley Lodge and Martyn to Waterloo Place, where he stayed until 1839. Where Martyn lived in 1840 and 1841 has not been determined, but in 1842 he moved into Fern Cottage in the village of Winkfield, Berkshire, a few miles from Windsor. In spite of the homely name this was a large property with a lodge attached, and was one of Martyn's selected investments. However, he could not have moved in before 1842 because until then Baron Kinnaird – who lived there with his wife, son, and staff – was tenancing it from him.⁹⁰

Martyn lived at Fern Cottage from 1842 to 1846 and continued to own it after moving to London, periodically renting it out to others; it was there that the future Comte de Béchevét was born. His birth was not registered with the civil authorities to spare embarrassment – though this was of course illegal – and on 27 September Miss Howard presented her son to the high churchman Arthur Baker of Holy Trinity church in the old parish of Marylebone as her baby brother. At this time – perhaps in order to perpetrate the fraud – Joseph and Elizabeth Haryett were renting rooms at 6 Upper Fitzroy Street in the neighbouring parish of Pancras, and they were easily able to pass their grandson off as their son.⁹¹ Martyn and Miss Howard lived at Fern Cottage

between 1842 and their separation in 1846, with Martyn commuting between there and Charles Street until he no longer required his country retreat for his mistress, after which he settled down in London. Amelia's whereabouts between 1841 and 1860 are unknown, but she often stayed at Beachley Lodge and may have lived at Fern Cottage between 1852 and 1860. From late 1861 until 1870 she lived at 33 Berkeley Square as Mrs Mountjoy Martyn, a short walk from her estranged husband. She never remarried.

Waterloo Place was less than a hundred paces from where Louis Napoleon had stayed during the fourth visit, and therefore he and Martyn lived close to each other for the five months when the 2nd Life Guards were at their Hyde Park barracks prior to their return to Windsor on 1 July 1839. They were the same distance apart for another month when Martyn's regiment moved from Windsor to Regent's Park on 1 July 1840.⁹² It was during this period that Martyn and Louis Napoleon became acquainted. Martyn was involved with racing all his life, using the celebrated trainer William Goater and racing in conjunction with the Earl of Westmorland, son of Louis Napoleon's friend from the fourth visit. Like Louis Napoleon, more often than not he failed, but his colt *Westwick*, which he bought from the Earl of Stamford and Warrington at Tattersall's for just under 300 guineas, won the Royal Stakes at the Second October Meeting at Newmarket on 9 October 1866. Jem Mason often took Miss Howard to race meetings, and it was at Newmarket in 1841 that she and Martyn met. Once Martyn learned that Louis Napoleon had escaped from Ham and settled down in King Street, a short walk from Charles Street, he re-established contact, and it was Martyn himself who then introduced Miss Howard to Louis Napoleon in the winter of 1847. When the two became lovers is another matter, but clearly it could not have been before then.

Martyn was in much the same position as Louis Napoleon – plenty of fixed capital but relatively little cash. Moreover, the value of his estate at his death was approximately that of his inheritance and he never had the sums Miss Howard was supposed to have been given. Anti-Bonapartist material circulated during the Third Republic stated that Miss Howard helped Louis Napoleon set himself up first as president and then emperor by forwarding to him sums estimated to be, at the lowest, £80,000 in total, and at the highest 6,000,000 francs – about £400,000. These are not figures to be taken lightly even today, but in 1848 they were simply staggering; £80,000 would have kept an early Victorian family of four in good property in Westminster, with three servants and a coach, comfortably off for a century, without inflation, while £400,000 would have paid for the total cost of Brunel's *Great Eastern* – one of the most expensive single civil engineering projects of the age – from first sketch to last lick of paint.

Miss Howard's revisionist apologists have presented her as a perpetually jilted woman of basically good moral principles, but she was little more than an adventuress who steadily climbed the financial ladder with ever more useful men. Mason was her ticket to London, Martyn her source of modest security as her career failed, and Louis Napoleon her passage out of England and into a life of such status and wealth as she could only have dreamed about in London. It is true that she was created Comtesse de Beauregarde, given a large estate, and that Louis Napoleon paid her 5,449,000 francs in stages between March 1853 and January 1855.⁹³ Romantic and republican *a posteriori* reasoning claim this to have represented the clinical repayment of a debt, whereas it was simply the result of emotional blackmail. Louis Napoleon – affected by a pathological need to be charitable – could not refuse her demands, particularly when the sordid consequences of his sexuality affected that absurd sense of honour

compelling some men to compensate women for their avarice. It is revealing that after 1855 Miss Howard amused herself by publicly embarrassing Louis Napoleon at every possible opportunity until her death.⁹⁴

* * *

Although Louis Napoleon did not stand for the elections of Easter Sunday 1848, many thought that he ought to have, making their feelings clear by spoiling their ballot papers, writing his name across those of the official candidates. The Law of Proscription was still legally in force, but his cousins were allowed to take their seats as deputies in the National Assembly without objection. It was a ridiculous situation, and Pierre Piétri, another deputy for Corsica, moved that the law be abrogated at a sitting on 2 June in time for the supplementary elections to be held two days later. The debate was heated, but the motion was adjourned and the elections went ahead with the Bonapartes still technically in exile.

At the last possible moment Louis Napoleon allowed his name to be put forward as an official candidate, astonishing politicians and the Press by polling a plurality of votes in four of the twenty-three departments available – Seine, Yonne, Corsica, and Charente-Inférieure – acquiring a total of almost 200,000 votes. For the important seat of the Seine he was fifth in the poll with 84,420 votes, above Pierre Leroux but behind Hugo, Thiers, General Nicolas Changarnier, and Louis Caussidière. However, he did not cross to France but remained in London. Meanwhile, support in Paris was waxing. On June 10, two Bonapartist papers were founded, the *L'Aigle républicaine* and *La Constitution*. The following day the *Napoléon républicain* emerged, the *Napoléonien* followed it on 12, and before another week passed the *Petit caporal* and the *Radigote grise* had joined them. A few days after this, *The Times* reported that ‘a most serious demonstration was apprehended in Paris yesterday in favour of Prince Louis Bonaparte’,⁹⁵ while portraits of him began to circulate in the streets portraying him in military uniform above the single highly-charged word *Lui* – the Napoleonic euphemism that had gained even more popular currency after Hugo’s eulogistic poem (1828) had been published in *Les Chants du crépuscule* in 1835. However, the cautiously Bonapartist papers were just a few of the many ephemeral journals produced in 1848, while even Robespierre and Marat found their ghosts similarly lauded in broadsheets and pictures.

On 26 May, a new Law of Proscription had been passed against the recently ousted House of Orleans. Furious at the result of the recent elections, Lamartine proposed that a second similar law should be introduced (12 June) against Louis Napoleon in person, while many deputies called for his immediate arrest should he set foot in France to take up his seat. Two days later, this proposal was rejected and his election declared valid; but the 1832 law was not repealed, the Assembly considering it a sufficient measure to keep him out. At this juncture he was supported by the republican lawyer Jules Favre – who would become the principle spokesman of the irreconcilable opposition to Louis Napoleon but whose first duty was to legal integrity – who claimed that the Charente-Inférieure result alone – 23,000 votes – *de facto* annulled the proscription. But this became academic as Louis Napoleon then resigned all his possible seats in the Assembly other than Corsica, gaining immediate sympathy and shaming the Executive Commission – set up on 10 May under five men while the Constituent Assembly attempted to draft a new constitution – who then publicly appeared to have broken their own law in denying a deputy his choice of seat obtained legally in an election of their own making.

It was a wise and fortuitous retreat. The promises the Provisional Government had naïvely made to placate the Paris mobs – such as the idealistic National Workshops – were suddenly removed as impractical. They ought never to have been proposed, but because they had been, and were then seen to have been withdrawn, the people of Paris lost their patience and again the barricades went up. From 22 to 26 June protests and riots threatened the fledgling Second Republic in an unrestrained ‘class war’ contested and repressed with great ferocity. Although the ‘June Days’ had not been promoted by Lamartine as an excuse to annihilate the Radical Left, he never recovered from having been at the helm at the time; ‘M. Lamartine was considered to have deceived the people’,⁹⁶ a Paris worker later declared, and his view generally prevailed. But for most reasonable people, leftists had also undermined their own credibility by the callous murder of two men who had approached the barricades in two separate places on 25 June, unarmed, to plead for peace and order – General Jean Baptiste de Bréa of the National Guard and Archbishop Denis Auguste Affre of Paris. It was a political breach Bonapartist sympathizers were ready to step into.

On 8 July, Louis Napoleon cut himself off from Lamartine’s administration altogether by also resigning his seat for Corsica. He was once more Prince Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, an exile in London. On 17 and 18 September, further supplementary elections were held to help maintain the disorientated Assembly at full strength after fifteen deputies had resigned as a result of the ‘June Days’. Louis Napoleon again put his name forward, and, untainted by recent events, was returned in one third of the departments – the same ones as before and also Moselle in the northeast – with almost 250,000 votes cast in his favour. In the Seine he increased his previous poll by 26,332, acquiring one quarter of the electorate but almost half the votes cast; he also polled a total of 35,000 votes in the Nord, Orne, and Gironde, but this was not enough to secure a possible seat.

For the second time Louis Napoleon had been called, and now there was nothing to stand in his way. On the evening of 23 September 1848 – the very moment when in Paris security was increased after rumours of a Bonapartist *coup* circulated – Louis Napoleon left London for the last time as an exile to take his place in the National Assembly of the Second Republic as a deputy for Yonne; it was a minor *département* southeast of Paris, but it was enough. At 7 o’clock the following evening he arrived by train at the old *Paris Nord* station, taking up residence with the Duc de Bassano at 27 boulevard des Italiens. Bassano’s father, the first duke, had founded the moderate Revolutionary journal *Bulletin de l’assemblée nationale* in 1789 and had been expelled from the *Académie français* by the Bourbons in 1816. His son had had his ducal succession confirmed by Louis Philippe and then served him as secretary to the embassy in Brussels until February 1848, subsequently becoming as much a Louis Napoleonist as his father had been a Napoleonist. Paris was still in a state of siege since the June Days (until 19 October), there were 50,000 troops in the streets, workers continued to agitate against the Republic’s reforms, and the Assembly’s removal of political immunity from Blanc and Caussidière – prefect of police from February to May – in order for them to be tried (they were allowed to leave for England) was hugely unpopular and threatened a revolt. Nevertheless, Louis Napoleon was in France, in politics, and among friends.

Back in King Street, Charles Phillips and a friend went to Louis Napoleon’s rooms on the morning of the 24: ‘The bed had not been made, nor had the marble bath ... been emptied of its contents. In the room which he used as a study a book lay open on the desk, with its margin copiously annotated; it was a treatise in French on the use of artillery. A note-book and pencil lay beside it’.⁹⁷

NOTES

¹ *The Times* Monday 28.12.1840.

² *D'Hauterive* 19-20.

³ *Holt* 34.

⁴ The second expanded addition was longer by 27 pages. The parallel was dwelt on in Guizot's *Collection mémoires relatifs à la révolution d'Angleterre*, 25 volumes, 1823 *et seq.*, and the *Histoire de la révolution d'Angleterre*, two volumes, 1826/27. Sainte-Beuve had already ridiculed this idea in *Le Globe* in 1830.

⁵ *Jerrold* ii 468.

⁶ *Jerrold* ii 263-4.

⁷ *The Times* Thursday 19.12.1844. Montholon had prepared his *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de France sous Napoléon* (1823) on St Helena; he completed his second book of memoirs (1847) at Ham, also begun on St Helena. Until his release, shortly after the escape, he had spent 67 months with Napoleon at St Helena and 67 with Louis Napoleon at Ham. The captivity of both uncle and nephew were to be of almost exactly the same duration and at the same times of the year: 14 October 1815 to 5 May 1821; 7 October 1840 to 25 May 1846.

⁸ *Malmesbury* i 158-60. Jules de Polignac had been a diplomat and minister under the Second Restoration. As *par interim* minister of war in July 1830 he was arrested and sentenced to life imprisonment and 'civil death' by the Chamber of Peers in December. He was also imprisoned at Ham, and was released in 1837.

⁹ *Malmesbury* i 173.

¹⁰ *Forster* ii 469.

¹¹ *BL Ms Add.* 40592 f379 Sir Robert Peel to 'Monsieur le Comte d'Arenenberg' 28.5.1846.

¹² *BL Ms Add.* 43051 f326 Louis Napoleon to Aberdeen 30.5.1846.

¹³ *Ibid.* f329 Aberdeen to Louis Napoleon 1.6.1846.

¹⁴ Leopold was a member of the restored Habsburg-Lorraine dynasty that Napoleon had ousted. He refused because he felt that an appeal ought to have been made to him without involving Metternich, as he later publicly explained: 'I am as much the master in my dominions as the Emperor [Ferdinand] is in his own', *The Times* Monday 10.10.1846.

¹⁵ *Jerrold* ii 357.

¹⁶ *Disraeli: Letters IV* 233 (1494) 12.6.1846.

¹⁷ *Disraeli: M&B* iii 54.

¹⁸ *Morley: Cobden* 386.

¹⁹ *Jerrold* ii 374.

²⁰ *Ibid.* 375.

²¹ *Forster* ii 466-7 Landor to Forster 6.9.1846.

²² *Raikes* iv 435-6 *Journal* 24.9.1846.

²³ *Cardigan* 17. The future Countess of Cardigan referred to Georgiana as 'Maria', but in any event she does not strike one as Louis Napoleon's 'type'.

²⁴ Dorset County Record Office MU/R/825 PE/WCM/RE 3/2 (No.15 f.8).

²⁵ *Guest* 81.

²⁶ *Gronow I* 283-4.

²⁷ On 6 June 1855, the club agreed to commission Franz Winterhalter for a copy of his portrait of Louis Napoleon, well known through popular engravings both in England and France. Winterhalter explained that he was too preoccupied with other commissions to do this, but on 20 June agreed to allow another painter to take on the work for the sum of 100 guineas. In a request made on 27 June the club members had asked that Louis Napoleon be shown wearing the Insignia of the Garter with which he had recently been invested, but on 4 July they were informed by Winterhalter that this alteration to his original was out of the question. The copy was completed by August, and when the club reopened on 2 March 1857 the portrait was hung in a prominent location in the hall. *Guest Ms* Junior United Service Club to Ivor Guest 23.1.1947.

²⁸ *Guest* 83.

²⁹ *Jerrold* ii 329.

³⁰ *Notes & Queries* III i 88-9 1.2.1862.

³¹ *Ibid.* 334-5, 26.4.1862. The author signed himself 'W. B.' and cannot now be identified.

³² *Nevill* 50-51.

³³ *Jerrold* ii 373/460.

³⁴ *D'Hauterive* 46.

³⁵ *Vandam II* 230-31.

-
- ³⁶ *Jerrold* ii 388.
- ³⁷ *Ibid.* 382 Louis Napoleon to Vieillard 15.2.1847. In 1841, the engraver Aristide Louis made a copy of this painting, and a series of popular engravings were issued in London and Paris by Henry Graves & Co., 6 Pall Mall, and Rittner & Goupu, 15 boulevard Montmartre.
- ³⁸ *Cardigan* 59.
- ³⁹ *D'Hauterive* 44.
- ⁴⁰ *The Times* Saturday 3.7.1847.
- ⁴¹ *Ballantine* 194-95. Some years later Ballantine met Louis Napoleon at the races in Paris: 'He received me with great civility' and 'made no particular allusion to the circumstances of our former meeting, but desired that myself and my friends should be accommodated in ... the royal stand', *ibid.* 196.
- ⁴² *The Times* Monday 5.7.1847.
- ⁴³ *Hawkins* ii 223.
- ⁴⁴ *Ibid.* 224.
- ⁴⁵ *Ibid.* 226.
- ⁴⁶ *Fortescue* 97.
- ⁴⁷ *Whitridge* 28.
- ⁴⁸ *The Times* Monday 28.2.1848.
- ⁴⁹ *The Observer* Sunday 27.2.1848. The reference here was to one of the more absurdly theatrical elements of the Boulogne *coup*. Parquin purchased a tame vulture from a seller of birds at Gravesend for £1 and tethered it to the mainmast of the *Edinburgh Castle* where it remained throughout the event as a mascot.
- ⁵⁰ *Jerrold* ii 393.
- ⁵¹ *Ibid.* 393-4.
- ⁵² *Malmesbury* i 217.
- ⁵³ *BL Ms Add.* 22,723, f.32 Louis Napoleon to John Delane 20.3.1848.
- ⁵⁴ *The Times* Friday 7.4.1848.
- ⁵⁵ *Sala* i 220. The truncheons – 250 were issued to the parish of St James – were fifteen inches long, with a turned grip, and weighed twelve ounces.
- ⁵⁶ *The Times* Tuesday 11.4.1848.
- ⁵⁷ *Simpson: Rise* 278 n¹. A paraphrase of the best-known line by Molière: 'Que diable allait-il faire dans cette galère?' from *Les Fourberies de Scapin* (II: vii), although his usage expressed shock and despair.
- ⁵⁸ *Putnam I* 9.
- ⁵⁹ *Putnam II* 46.
- ⁶⁰ *Malmesbury* i 225.
- ⁶¹ *Wolff* i 121.
- ⁶² *Sala* i 220.
- ⁶³ *Ray* ii 362. Ray inserted his own date 'March 13', which is not correct.
- ⁶⁴ *Guest* 92
- ⁶⁵ PRO HO 107/733 (11/ff.7-8 pp.6-7).
- ⁶⁶ *Ecclesiastical Returns of Baptisms, Marriages, Burials 1808-11 for the Country of India and Presidency of Bengal* N/1/vol.8/ff.13 & 153.
- ⁶⁷ *Ibid.* N/2/vol.4/f.384.
- ⁶⁸ PRO WO 25/780 (f.22 p.127).
- ⁶⁹ PRO HO 107/1491 (ff. 782-83).
- ⁷⁰ *The Times* Tuesday 25.11.1840.
- ⁷¹ PRO HO 107/1476 (f.76 p.2).
- ⁷² *Maurois* 43.
- ⁷³ *Guest Ms*, private communication from Henry Poole & Co. to Ivor Guest. The measurements were:

Chest 36_
Waist 29
Seat 36
Thigh 24
Inside Leg 31_
Outside Leg 41_

⁷⁴ *Register* i 332 'Prince Louis Napoleon Bonaparte'. The entries read:

1846	Nov 7	10 [illegible]
1847	Feb 16	10 12
	March 12	10 9
	July 23	10 10
	Aug 10	10 10_
1848	March 11	10 12

⁷⁵ *Fleury* i 205.

⁷⁶ *Bourne* 201 Palmerston to Mrs Sullivan 21.9.1827.

⁷⁷ *Fleury* i 206.

⁷⁸ The Post Office Street Directory for 1848 had Cecil Lawless, member for Clonmell and resident of Cork, sharing 3^A with Louis Napoleon, but placed him in a separate flat the following year for his parliamentary visits to London. The Poor Ratebook for 1847 claimed that Louis Napoleon lived in 3^C. Numbering at this time was inconsistent, and some streets were numbered consecutively on *both* sides while others either alternated or ran up one side then down the other. With simultaneous numbering confusion arises from having different families in apparently the same address. King Street, however, was numbered alternately east to west, with one house for each number, either with theoretically partitioned housing or jointly occupied with separate directory listings.

⁷⁹ PRO HO 107/1484 (f.233).

⁸⁰ *Papiers et correspondance* xlix 203-6.

⁸¹ *Jerrold* ii 385.

⁸² PRO PROB 11/1668 (ff.60-61).

⁸³ PRO HO 107/1476 (f.359 p.8).

⁸⁴ PRO RG 9/46 (f.47 p.28).

⁸⁵ PRO RG 10/102 (f.79 p.39).

⁸⁶ First Avenue House, High Holborn (1874/P.R.9 f.374).

⁸⁷ PRO WO 25/3239 (all marriages 1830-43).

⁸⁸ HCM *Service Book* 101 f.24; *Journal of the Household Division 1874* (Obituary) 302.

⁸⁹ Registration District of Chepstow in the County of Monmouth xxvi [2] 51.

⁹⁰ PRO HO/107 26 ([10] f.6 p.6) 1841.

⁹¹ *Register of Baptisms* P89/TRI/001-002 (f.41 no.327).

⁹² HCM *Annual Change of Quarters Book* f.202-03.

⁹³ *Papiers et correspondance* xlv 171-3. The editors claim – without supplying any evidence – that this sum was paid to Miss Howard because ‘elle avait payé plusieurs fois les dettes du Prince Louis-Napoléon’. It should be borne in mind that this collection, while scrupulously edited, was a republican work issued within a few weeks of the fall of the empire, arranged in such a way as to discredit it.

⁹⁴ A more detailed analysis of this entire story may be found in the article ‘Romancing the Throne’ available on this website.

⁹⁵ *The Times* Saturday 17.6.1848.

⁹⁶ *Fortescue* 183.

⁹⁷ *Jerrold* ii 388.