

## Romancing the Throne

*Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte, Francis Mountjoy Martyn, and Miss Howard*

### **Introduction**

IT IS NOT often given to a single author to form world opinion on a historical event, but Simone André-Maurois achieved this in 1956/57 with a biography of ‘Miss Howard’, Napoleon III’s most prominent English ‘mistress’ whom he met in London in exile while styled Prince Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte. This biography consolidated the uncritical romantic interventionism and vituperative slander previously prepared by Second Empire gossips and Third Republic propagandists. Maurois, intractable in her conviction that the ‘testimony’ of two of Howard’s great-grandchildren could not be in error, constructed a romance that has been followed by every authority, popular and academic, for the last fifty years. But this alleged ‘family history’ – a style of factual acquisition always seeking to make palatable the uneatable by grafting a high percentage of fiction onto a small percentage of fact – is demonstrably false in most of its particular claims for the period up to 1851, with which this paper is principally concerned. This matters because the biography is also demonstrably false in its general (now, through repetition, ‘venerable’) proposition that Howard promoted the establishment of Louis-Napoléon’s presidency and empire through lending him vast sums of money.

Maurois did not have to extract her romance entirely from imaginative gossip and family fiction: many of the central elements of the romance were already established, and she was able to draw on a truly tortuous, contradictory, and fragmented loose series of published statements on Howard and her relationship with Louis-Napoléon traceable throughout the seventy-five years following his death in 1873. (1) Her work certainly owed as much to these fragments as it did to her own research and the tales told her by Howard’s descendants. (2)

In order to reconstruct Howard’s genuine involvement with Louis-Napoléon, the existing romance must first be deconstructed; thus the essentials of the received view as put together by Maurois must first be restated before proceeding with the facts of the case.

### **I**

Elizabeth Haryett, the future ‘Miss Howard’, was born in Brighton in 1823, the daughter of Joseph Gawen Haryett, a local shoemaker, and Elizabeth Alderton. When she was still a girl, the family left Brighton, aspiring to settle down to the life of the yeomanry class in Norfolk, just outside Great Yarmouth. Soon, Elizabeth’s great desire was to go onto the stage, but this was strongly opposed by her father; instead, her energy was dissipated in the more ladylike pursuit of horse riding. Towards the end of 1839, James ‘Jem’ Mason, a jockey who had recently won the very first steeplechase at Aintree on *Lottery*, visited the Haryett family. They had all met before,

in Brighton, and Elizabeth now seized the chance to fulfil her real dream of becoming an actress by latching onto Mason and leaving with him to London, arriving early in 1840. There Elizabeth dropped her surname, claimed she was an orphan, and began calling herself Harriet Howard. She then managed to insinuate herself onto the London stage, acting several minor roles while living ‘luxuriously’ with Mason at 277 Oxford Street.

In 1841, Miss Howard met Major Francis Mountjoy Martyn of the Life Guards, the wealthy son of Charles Fuller Martyn of the Honourable East India Company and a prominent civil servant in Calcutta – a nabob who had passed his great wealth onto his son. Faced with this more lucrative prospect, Howard soon left Mason and was installed by Martyn at 23 Circus Road, St John’s Wood, a mansion known as ‘Rockingham House’ situated on the north side of the street, directly opposite Elm Tree Road. The happy couple lived there for four years, during which time Howard gave birth to Martyn’s son, baptised Martin Constantine Haryett. Martyn ‘immediately made generous and provident dispositions in her favour. He placed a capital sum to be administered by trustees, of which Miss Howard was to enjoy the income during the whole of her life, though without being able to dispose of the capital’. (3) This capital was subject to reinvestment through a contract signed as if it were a marriage settlement, but the couple was unable to marry because Martyn was already married, to Amelia Jenkins of Beachley in Gloucestershire, who was barren and secured by him in some distant and remote country retreat. This Martyn fortune consisted mainly in ‘houses on lease and building lots in London admirably situated for new development. The value of this real estate never ceased to increase throughout the whole of her life’. (4) The trustee was the financier Nathaniel William John Strode.

Martyn happened to be a cousin of Charles John Gardiner, 1<sup>st</sup> Earl of Blessington and 2<sup>nd</sup> Viscount Mountjoy in the Irish peerage. This enabled Martyn to become an *habitué* of Lady Marguerite Blessington’s celebrated literary salons at Gore House in Kensington. And there, in June 1846, Martyn introduced his lover to a poverty-stricken Prince Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte at a dinner. The supremely wealthy shoemaker’s daughter and the poor prince immediately began an affair that necessitated the ousting of Martyn from Howard’s life and consequently her removal from Rockingham House. She therefore moved into 9 Berkeley Street, Westminster, to be near Louis-Napoléon, who was lodged in King Street. The affair was conducted in the open and often involved his staying with her at her new home.

Howard was, by this time, a ‘millionairess’ (5) who ‘mortgaged her London houses, sold her saddle-horses and pawned all her jewels’ to finance her lover’s presidential campaign of 1848 and the *coup d’état* of 2 December 1851. She had ‘rights and interests in the domain of Civita Nova ... in the Papal States’ made over to Louis-Napoléon in 1848 ‘for 3 millions, payable in 1851 only’, for which Louis-Napoléon was able to raise 324,000 francs by mortgaging it to ‘the Marquis of Pallavicino ... [in 1851] Howard paid his debts without any further regard to appearances’. But how she obtained rights to this Italian property in the first place was admitted by Maurois to be ‘a mystery which has not been cleared up’. (6)

After Louis-Napoléon’s election to the presidency of the Second Republic, Howard remained in England until 1849 when she followed him to Paris, settling near the Palais de l’Elysée where

she became first mistress and premier bank of France: ‘a few days before the *coup d’état* ... it was again Miss Howard who gave the Prince two hundred thousand gold francs *in specie*’. (7) Howard was ‘a privileged creditor of the régime. The Emperor owed her five million gold francs ... [she] had in her possession receipts signed by his hand ... [he] was under an obligation towards her, since she had given him very considerable sums of money. She preserved ... irrefutable proofs of his being her debtor’. (8) This situation continued until Napoleon III’s marriage to Eugénie de Montijo on 30 January 1853. But before this, on 13 September 1852, her own stipulation in a ‘contract of separation’ enabled Howard to purchase the house and grounds – 460 acres – of the estate of Beauregarde outside Paris for 575,000 francs; the farm of Béchevêt for 530,000 francs; the stud-farm of Bel-Ebat for 345,000 francs; and, a little later, permission and funds to isolate herself behind a great wall at the cost of 800,000 gold francs. (9) She then arrogated for herself the grand title of ‘La Comtesse de Beauregarde’.

On 16 May 1854, Howard married Clarence Trelawny, an English officer serving in the Austrian army, having to revert to her maiden name but nonetheless insisting on the use of her new but illegal French title. (10) The day before the marriage, a deed issued by the solicitor William Mark Fladgate wrested Howard’s City of London properties on Mark Lane (rental) and Nag’s Head Court (freehold) from Strode and made them over directly to Trelawny, including an annuity of £500 from additional funds administered by Strode. (11)

Thus the essentials of the story as Maurois had concocted it and all but a very few have repeated it; now, however, for the facts.

## II

It is true that Elizabeth Haryett changed her name and went on the London stage in 1840. She had made a Christian name out of her surname and took as a new surname the family name of the premier Catholic 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 Cranstoun Nisbett, whose contract expired in 1840 and was not renewed.

Howard and Mason *may have* occupied a single room on Oxford Street very briefly, but it is not true that they lived for any length of time at No 277. In 1841, this property was a pharmacy run by Peter Squire, soon to be appointed Chemist-in-Ordinary to Queen Victoria. In addition to his wife and two sons, there were three shop assistants, four servants, a guest, and a baby at the property. (12) Nor is it possible that the house number was an error, as the same documents show that neither Mason nor Howard – nor anyone else with similar names – owned, tenanted, or occupied as guests, any of the other 439 properties on Oxford Street in 1841, while Ratebooks for the previous year suggest the same. (13) Where Howard and Mason did reside in 1840/41 – if indeed they are to be linked at all – has not been determined. While of little significance by

itself, such an error in a fact so assiduously maintained yet so easy to check sets the tone of the entire fabricated romance to follow.

On 24 February 1839, James 'Jem' Mason indeed won the first properly constituted Grand Liverpool Steeplechase – now the Grand National – on one of the most famous horses of the day, *Lottery*, which ran with seventeen others. There was a twenty-sovereign sweepstake, the total plus an additional 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 celebrated steeplechaser of his day and he won several meetings throughout the 1830s; but, like most sportsmen before the modern professional era, he was never a wealthy man. He was, for example, a noted dandy – but a Savile Row tailor provided him with his expensive outfits free of charge as a shrewd form of advertising his business. 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 he never repeated his early successes. After he retired he became a trainer and owner of only modest prosperity, and when he contracted tuberculosis in July 1864 he had to be supported by charitable donations. Mason died a pauper and intestate on the evening of Cesarewitch Day (8 October) 1866, during the Second October Meeting at Newmarket, having squandered what little money he had on gambling and drinking. (14) It is unlikely that he and Howard could have afforded more than a single room anywhere in London.

However, it must be restated that there is nothing in the record to link these two characters in the first place, and the Mason/Howard connection also may be entirely fantastic, a 'just so' fiction designed to explain away Howard's move from Norfolk to London. There is no corroborative evidence anywhere outside Maurois' book and the family 'sources' it was largely based on.

How many minor parts Howard played on stage cannot be determined, but her final performance was at the Theatre Royal, Drury Lane, when she played the part of the Third Apparition in *Macbeth*. This is 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 speaks just thirty-three words. Drury Lane (as it is better known) had been taken over in 1841 by the tragedian William Charles Macready, and Howard certainly worked with many of the great names of the English stage of her time, including of course Macready himself as Macbeth. The run began on Monday 28 March 1842 with seven further weekly performances until 16 May. How she might have gone on in her chosen profession cannot be known, since it was her pregnancy during *Macbeth* that caused her to retire from the stage after two years of little critical success, and she never returned to it.

Charles Fuller Martin was a barrister-at-law who arrived in Calcutta in the summer of 1786 and where, on 2 November, he was established an advocate for the town becoming, in 1791, the 17<sup>th</sup> Sheriff of Calcutta and subsequently a Justice of the Peace and Advocate of the Supreme Court of Calcutta. (15) By 1813, his last appearance in any Indian directory, he had fixed the spelling of his surname to 'Martyn' in Calcutta directories for orthographic consistency with other members of his family. (16) At some point Charles Martyn met Marie Felix, the young

‘native Christian widow’ (17) [*i.e.* Indian Hindu convert] of William Felix, an English infantry private from Fort William killed in action on 14 September 1797. (18) He began an affair with Marie that lasted for a decade and resulted in the birth of two illegitimate sons: Charles Cecil Martin on 18 February 1808, baptised 8 October at Kidderpore School, Fort William, by the Chaplain at the Presidency, the Reverend Dr James Ward; and Francis Mountjoy Martin on 8 May 1809, baptised 3 September, also at Fort William, by the Reverend Richard Jefferies. (19) Martyn took his sons with him to London in the winter of 1812, moving into one of the bachelor apartments at the Albany. After making arrangements for their future welfare, he left for Paris where he remained until his death in 1822.

Charles Fuller Martyn was not, in fact, connected with the East India Company. (20) If we are to be at all charitable to the romance, it may be conjectured that he has been honestly confused with Charles Ray Martin (to whom he was not related), 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. After further appointments he retired in 1838, dying at Southampton in 1839. (21) Further confusion may have arisen from the fact that Charles Ray Martin had five children in India – both in and out of wedlock – over a number of years, and that the first of whom, a son, was born twelve days before Francis Mountjoy Martin. (22)

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 with Andrew Macklen; Charles in Bond Street with the banker James Palmer Hobbs. Francis entered the 2<sup>nd</sup> 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. (23) He entered as ‘Martin’ but by 1831 had also fixed the spelling of 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 purchased the captaincy, and on 9 November 1846 he was created a brevet-major in the army but remained a captain in his regiment. On 20 June the following year he became a brevet-lieutenant-colonel in the army, and on 14 July 1854 he 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. (24)

Captain Francis Martyn – as he was during the years in question: not a major – was entirely unrelated to the Earl of Blessington. Charles Fuller Martyn’s uncle was London-born Thomas Martyn, a celebrated professor of botany at Cambridge University who had been rector of Ludgershall in Buckinghamshire, (25) clearly described by Charles Fuller Martyn in his will [see below] as ‘brother of my late father’. The Reverend Martyn’s half-brother, Claudius Martyn, would take over the rectorship in 1785, and from that date the family would hold the rectorship and lordship of the manor until 1911. (26) With the exception of one French wife who purchased the Manor in 1785, the entire history of the family up to the mid-nineteenth-century is to be found in London and central and eastern England. (27)

As with Oxford Street so with Circus Road. In the 1840s there were eight modest houses on Circus Road east of Wellington Road, which bisects it, and twenty two mansions with extensive grounds on the western section up to 1839, increased by four thereafter. From 1838 to 1848 the Ratebooks show that No. 23 – renumbered 52 in 1877 after further building work (28) – was owned by Mary Louisa Edwards. She occupied it with two servants until 1843, while in 1842 the surgeon Samuel Thomas Partridge lodged briefly with her before leaving the following year for Portman Square. For a little under two years the property was then declared vacant – but still owned by Edwards – until 1845, when a financial speculator born in Madras began his long tenancy of it with his wife. (29)

Mary Edwards, who liked to be known as the Comtesse d’Espel, was Louis-Napoléon’s close friend in 1840. She lodged some of his followers in Circus Road prior to the ill-fated attempt to land at Boulogne and march on Paris in order to persuade King Louis-Philippe to institute a national referendum on the form of French government. The press at the time claimed Edwards to be ‘the prince’s mistress’. (30) However, there is no trace whatever of either Martyn or Howard associated with any of the properties on Circus Road. Researchers will find that some local sources maintain that Mason and Howard lived in Lodge Road prior to Howard moving into Rockingham House with Martyn in 1841, but there is also no evidence for this. (32) It would seem that the real existence of Edwards at this property was the hook onto which to hang the fictional presence of Howard.

But to be charitable again, it may be that Howard’s presence in St John’s Wood was a genuine retrospective error 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. (33) This road had been opened in 1847 as the rue de Joinville but was renamed by the Second Republic in February 1848 to erase it’s Orleanist eponym. (34)

Ratebooks reveal that it was only in the second rateable term of 1848 that a ‘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 the Barings financier Joshua Bates, who administered Louis-Napoléon’s English account with the bank of Barings Brothers & Company and who had stood surety for him after a disastrous duel with a family member on Wimbledon Common in 1840. (35) Howard continued to rent this property until 1856 – in other words until her position in France 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. (36)

### III

Louis-Napoléon’s mother and father had died on 5 October 1837 and 25 July 1846 respectively. Since on the death of his mother he was the only living offspring of the marriage he became the principal beneficiary of both wills. Through his mother he was left funds amounting to 120,000

francs a year, as well as her exilic properties in Italy and Switzerland. Through his father he inherited all the remaining Bonaparte holdings in Italy. Louis-Napoléon was therefore able to rent large properties in Carlton Gardens and Carlton House Terrace during his fourth visit-in-exile to England from 24 October 1838 to 6 August 1840. At that time he had had a considerable retinue, but during his fifth and final visit-in-exile before his accession to power, from 27 May 1846 to 23 September 1848, he was alone, not because he was impecunious but because he had escaped from a French prison. Nevertheless, after spending eight months in the Brunswick Hotel on Jermyn Street, Louis-Napoléon took up residence in a property on King Street, St James's Square, on 3 February 1847.

The complex arrangement at King Street is important to understand, since it was from Louis-Napoléon's apparent circumstances there that observers reached their own conclusions about his financial situation. The highly amusing but frankly libellous co-production between the wayward publisher and pornographer John Camden Hotten and the journalist James Morgan Haswell, two Republicans, (37) erred in one direction when claiming that Louis-Napoléon, 'reduced to pecuniary shifts ... rented a couple of rooms' at King Street. (38) The Imperialist Blanchard Jerrold, (39) as Napoleon III's official biographer, working from imperial documents and personal interviews, maintained that Louis-Napoléon 'took one of a block of new houses just erected in King Street'. (40) All subsequent authorities have followed either one or the other claim, often according to their political bias. But it can be shown that Jerrold was in fact correct in his assertion that the solitary prince had a fine house all to himself, although he was incorrect over the rent (actually, a leasing fee) involved.

The architect and builder John Kelk, of Elger & Kelk, occupied 18 St James's Square on the corner of King Street, a site he was obliged to develop in 1845 as part of his lease agreement. Kelk's Georgian house had an extensive garden with a number of associated buildings extending along King Street, and these were all demolished in October 1845 and replaced by three uniform houses with stabling behind, accessed through Duke Street, in 1846.

The row was destroyed in 1940 and the present neo-Georgian replacement dates from 1954. (41) However, although the present numbering arrangement – 1a, 1b, and 1c – follows that of the original development, few contemporary documents were consistent in this: Pavement Rate assessors numbered the third house as 4c due to the incorporation of Kelk's end-house into King Street rather than St James's Square; Census enumerators and Poor Rate assessors as 3c; and the Post Office directories sometimes as 3a and sometimes 3c to distinguish this property from the true No. 3 next door, and also from the stabling, which included separate cellars beneath 1a. Louis-Napoléon also contributed to the confusion by incorrectly addressing his letters '3 King Street' even though this was clearly not the number on his door! This curious arrangement can be unravelled from sanitary drainage and lighting plans submitted to the local authority respecting the original properties as developed by Kelk. (42)

Number 1a King Street, then, was not an apartment but a rather fine house, and Louis-Napoléon's conditions there were clearly good. This is perhaps at least partly explained by the fact that the owner of the property was Charles Phillips, a commissioner of the insolvent debtor's

court of London. Phillips was a confirmed Napoleonist who had already written *Speech on the Dethronement of Napoleon* (1816) and *Historical Character of Napoleon Bonaparte* (1817) by the time he met Louis-Napoléon in 1839. Indeed, years later, writing as ‘A Man of the World’, Phillips would publish *Napoleon the Third* (1854), a sixpenny tract defending its subject during the opening phase of the Crimean War. (43)

Louis-Napoléon was of course recorded as being liable to pay all the rates associated with his house in addition to the ‘rent’ payable to Charles Phillips, since he had leased it from him and was not simply renting lodgings. (44) Louis-Napoléon’s admirers wrongly stated that he had leased the entire house for the sum of – as Jerrold put it – ‘300*l.* per annum’. (45) In fact, the leasing sum for the three houses, as a row, was £327, but of course Louis-Napoléon paid only one-third of this, or £109 a year. At over £2 a week this was nonetheless and expensive property to lease when working-class accommodation in that sector of London (if it could be found) was available for between two and eight shillings a week. (46)

Louis-Napoléon’s biographers concluded rightly that his temporary financial embarrassments were due to a combination of his chronic generosity and inability to resist ‘playing the turf’ at Newmarket and Cheltenham (and playing it poorly), and that it had been such fluctuations in his personal finances that had necessitated occasional loans.

This can be determined by examining his banking history for this period in England with Baring Brothers & Company, with whom he had banked since 1840. Between 1845 and 1849 his credit on each 31 December stood as follows:

1845	£5,119	2s	6d
1846	£4,204	5s	5d
1847	£9,984	6s	1d
1848	£10,806	3s	9d
1849	£8,799	13s	6d (47)

Joshua Bates had kept the account running smoothly throughout Louis-Napoléon’s 67-month captivity, and each year numerous friends, relatives, household servants, and political associates drew sums ranging from a few to several hundred pounds.

These accounts, which Barings maintained in French for all its customers, reveal a very active *Doit* column whereas the *Avoir* column was, by contrast, relatively inactive, with few large deposits. For the most part, Louis-Napoléon seemed to be feeding his Continental banking houses with sums from fifty to a few hundred pounds: Orsi in Florence and Hottinguer & Laffitte in Paris. There are no genuine surprises in these ledgers: they are full of names familiar to students of the Second Empire and the life of Napoleon III, and there are no payments to, or deposits from, Howard or anyone alleged to have been associated with her. Moreover, although Barings would continue to handle Napoleon III’s English finances even after Bates’s death in 1864, he never maintained an account valued at more than several thousand pounds. Indeed, to

counter posthumous accusations to the contrary, in 1885 Barings were obliged to state this publicly. (48)

Howard's complete absence from these records is made the more significant by an interesting, if unsurprising, deposit. On 9 March 1848, £5,000 was transferred to Barings from the bank of Glyn & Company in the name of Emily Rowles. Miss Rowles was also once linked romantically to Louis-Napoléon, and although of course nothing came of it she fell under the spell of his curious charm and is certainly known to have lent him money on several occasions. This was the first such occasion, and all sums were paid back in full after the *coup d'état*. This is the only single deposit of any substance in Louis-Napoléon's London account for this period, and if Howard had lent him a single penny it would have appeared in these records as openly as that by Emily Rowles. Once again, this is the tenuous link between an ex-lover lending Louis-Napoléon money and Howard doing so.

However, even if Louis-Napoléon had known Howard at this time – for it will be shown that he did not – she would have been neither wealthy nor close enough to him to be of any monetary assistance whatsoever, as an investigation into the financial and personal life of Francis Mountjoy Martyn reveals.

#### IV

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 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'. The principal beneficiaries were of course these two sons, who were each to receive £150,000 worth of Consolidated Annuities, or Consols. Charles Fuller Martyn had opened an account with Thomas Coutts on 11 February 1813, shortly after arriving in England, with a cash sum of £24,259. How he obtained his fortune in India we may leave to the historians of nabobs and their dubious practices, but in any event he gradually filled his Coutts account with ex-Indian funds before purchasing his Consols from the Bank of England.

Small annuities were given by Martyn to his aunt and also to his celebrated uncle; £1,200 was given to Marie Felix who since their affair had married (outside India) John Durup de Dombal, long-sitting Deputy Surveyor of the European Distilleries Licensing Bureau of the Calcutta Police Department. (49) The sum of £10,000 in stocks went to a godson, while £1,000 was given to each of his sons' guardians – also 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 also owned property at Charlestown, South Carolina, 'a portion of which' was being realised and remitted to London, and he also held £1,200 worth of stocks with the United Company of Merchants in Calcutta.

It is therefore not strictly true that Francis Martyn had been left a considerable fortune, since Government Consols were not easily redeemable. Instead, he used the interest accruing to buy several leaseholds on properties that were then rented out to provide a good steady income for life, having opened his own account with Coutts on 23 July 1830 with £1,000 received from Macklen, from whom a further £1,000 was received in December. Presumably, this was an agreement reached to tide Francis Martyn over until his first interest payment on his Consols, which came only in January 1831.

Kelly's Post Office London Directory suggests that Martyn first moved into 17 Charles Street, Berkeley Square, in 1843, before which he does not appear in any London directory. However, he did not begin to occupy this address until the last quarter of 1846, (50) after which he was to live there for the following 27 years, alone other than for a large and ever-changing retinue of servants. (51) Martyn died at Charles Street on 24 January 1874, and his will was proved on 1 May, having been drawn up on 9 March 1869, with effects under £160,000. (52) His principal beneficiaries were his nephew Cecil Edward Martyn and his married niece Maria Louisa Weatherley. 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 Dawson Harling, Cecil Edward Martyn, and Hester Charlotte Hobhouse – widow of Sir John Cam Hobhouse's half-brother Edward Isaac Hobhouse. (53) Servants were given advanced wages, and friends sums of £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 own illegitimate daughter 'commonly known' as Jeanne Martyn, then under the guardianship of Hester Hobhouse. Cecil predeceased his uncle – dying unexpectedly in Algiers with a fortune of £90,000 in 1870 (54) – and a codicil was added to Francis Martyn's will on 6 August 1872 dividing his nephew's share equally between Dr Harling and Cecil's sister, whose husband then took over as third executor. No older family relation other than those already mentioned were to gain from Martyn's will (even though they predeceased him), and all died in relative poverty. (55)

Amelia Jenkins was born at Beachley, Tidenham, the daughter of Richard Jenkins, a Calcutta merchant. He spent most of his time in India and she was raised by a relative, Robert Castle Jenkins, at Beachley Lodge, where the Jenkins family had been long established as local philanthropists and merchants. (56) British India played the key role in this part of the story and involved the Metcalfe, Hobhouse, Palmer, Jenkins, and Martyn families, who all knew each other in the closely-knit colonial administrative district of Bengal, with a number of marriages between them. Under what precise circumstances Amelia was affianced to Francis Martyn is unclear, but there is no doubt that Richard Jenkins and Charles Fuller Martyn had arranged the union in India when the two involved were children. On 29 August 1837, an Indenture of Settlement was drawn up involving a pre-nuptial financial arrangement in the event of their not having issue, and the following day the couple was married at the parish church of Tidenham. (57). In 1869, Martyn described Amelia as 'my present wife' but stated that there had been no children from the marriage and funds that she had previously benefited from were withdrawn according to the pre-nuptial settlement and were redirected as stated. Amelia did not therefore

benefit directly from the will but received instead £296 5s quarterly from Martyn's Coutts account.

In 1830, 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 did not do this. (58) The marriage was never officially registered beyond what was legally required in 1837, and even the Life Guards considered him to have died a bachelor. (59) But at the same time Martyn did not ever seem to press for an annulment; and nor for that matter did Amelia. It was clearly an amicable arrangement contrived to maintain Amelia's dignity without becoming an imposition for Martyn. The certificate of marriage described Amelia as 'under age', meaning that she was aged between 12 and 21, during which years marriage was perfectly legal but required parental or guardian consent; in fact, she was 18.

When Martyn married Amelia he was living at 15 Waterloo Place with his old guardian Andrew Macklen, the official occupant and ratepayer. (60) After their strange union, Amelia returned to Beachley Lodge while Martyn moved to Waterloo Place, where he stayed until 1839. Robert Castle Jenkins, head of R.C.Jenkins & Co., Merchants and Agents, and also Agent to the Oriental Insurance Company, (61) was still in India with Richard Jenkins, where he had married Anna Palmer in 1825, (62) daughter of John Palmer, who ran a formidable 'House of Agency' in Calcutta. Henry William Hobhouse, a Writer with the East India Company, who had married Anna's sister Mary in 1814, also witnessed the marriage at Tidenham. (63) Thus neither of Amelia's parents was in England to witness her marriage, and Robert Castle Jenkins did not return to Beachley Lodge until 1840, where soon afterwards a son was born to him, the last of a family of five, the other four having been born in India. (64)

These complicated colonial associations now played a further part in Martyn's life. Sir Charles Theophilus Metcalfe, the Calcutta-born former provisional governor-general of India and the son of an East India Company Director, returned to England in May 1838. (65) On 13 July, he moved into his parental estate of Fern Hill in the village of Winkfield, Berkshire, a few miles from Windsor. This was a substantial estate consisting of two mansions and their associated buildings, and Metcalfe, a man of comparatively modest means, found himself unable to maintain it, deciding to vacate the area in June 1839 and move into his town house on Portland Square. (66) The estate was divided, with Fern Hill remaining in Metcalfe's possession and the smaller Fern Cottage and its Lodge being sold off.

Metcalfe rented Fern Hill to Sir Felix Booth, the promoter of Arctic exploration who would soon move out and live the last years of his life in Brighton, and the Lodge to an estate labourer. (67) Since Metcalfe had been appointed a Writer on 13 October 1800, arriving at Calcutta on 3 January following, where he would remain for the next four years, it is likely that he knew Charles Fuller Martyn. In any event, Metcalfe sold Fern Cottage to Francis Martyn, who left Waterloo Place and moved to Winkfield directly. (68) Metcalfe retained some pastureland in Winkfield, however, which Martyn also rented from him, though for what purpose is unclear, unless he also became a 'gentleman farmer'. (69) Martyn stayed at Fern Cottage until the spring

of 1841 when he began to lease it out, his first lessee being George William Fox, the 9<sup>th</sup> Baron Kinnaird, who lived there with his family and 16 servants, with an estate labourer and his family tenanted the Lodge. (70)

The two halves of Metcalfe's original estate soon acquired different names as their histories diverged, but the mutual Indian connections remained. Metcalfe's commercial agent took over Booth's tenancy in 1842, (71) and in 1851 Fern Hill is unlisted save for a gardener and housekeeper. In that year, Martyn's half of the former estate, now known as Hill House, was occupied by Sir Peter Hesketh Fleetwood, deputy-lieutenant of Lancashire, whose first wife had been Eliza Theophilia Metcalfe, daughter of Sir Charles's elder brother. (72) Kelly's Post Office London Directories list 'Fern Cottage near Windsor' as Martyn's alternate address in the Court Directory sections from 1844 up to and including 1861. Martyn was also registered at 'Fern Cottage' for the elections of May 1859, (73) but by the spring of 1861 'Woodside Hill House', as the enumerator called it, was occupied by Lieutenant-General Sir Thomas Willshire, a distinguished soldier who had served for many years in India. (74)

Regrettably, this complex property history cannot establish conclusively when – or indeed whether – Martyn and Howard lived at Fern Cottage between 1842 and 1846, with or in between his lessees, but this appears very likely. On 16 August 1842, Howard gave birth to a boy, and Maurois assumed, on the strength of *one* Howard 'family tradition', that the father was Martyn. This is also likely, but it must be noted that there is no corroborative evidence for this because his birth was not registered with the civil authorities – a matter of free choice, if bad practice, since it was not then illegal to avoid registration. On 27 September 1842, Howard presented her son to the high churchman Arthur Baker of Holy Trinity Church in the old parish of Marylebone as her baby brother. In order to perpetrate the deception, her parents Joseph and Elizabeth Haryett were claimed to be renting rooms at 6 Upper Fitzroy street in the neighbouring parish of Pancras. If so there is no trace of them, (75) but either way, because of their relative youth – Joseph was 39 and Elizabeth 38 – they were able to pass their grandson off as their son. (77)

Also regrettably, Amelia Martyn's whereabouts between 1846 and 1858 are unknown, but presumably she stayed at Beachley Lodge and may have lived at Fern Cottage periodically until 1858 (she may have been in India during the Census of 1851). However, in 1859 she moved into 33 Berkeley Square as Mrs Mountjoy Martyn, a short walk from her estranged husband, releasing the property in 1875, these dates suggesting that Martyn had acquired the property on her behalf. (78) But it is clear that she did not long occupy it, as in 1861 it was being rented to William Green, rector of Penshurst, with his family and servants, and in 1871 to the lawyer Henry George Close, with his family and servants. (79)

At some point Amelia met Henry Savile, the second natural son of the Reverend John Lumley Savile, 8<sup>th</sup> Earl of Scarborough. (80) Savile had entered the 2<sup>nd</sup> Life Guards on 28 May 1842, aged 20, as sub-lieutenant and cornet, rising to the rank of captain and selling his commission in 1859. (81) When in London, he lived at 9 John Street, close to both Amelia and his Commanding Officer. (82) After a protracted quarrel between the legitimate and illegitimate heirs to the earldom of Scarborough, Rufford Abbey in Nottinghamshire was acquired by the illegitimate

branch, (83) and it was to there that Amelia repaired, living with Savile until Martyn's death. (84) This move took place in 1860, for which purpose Savile had sold his commission and retired early. As soon as Amelia was socially free to remarry she did so, and she and Henry Savile were married in London on 2 December 1874, witnessed by Richard Jenkins and members of the Scarborough natural family. (85) Amelia died on 22 November 1878, in London, from a combination of Bright's Disease and bronchitis. (86)

## V

The claim that Louis-Napoléon had been introduced to Howard at Gore House is also spurious. Apart from the fact that Martyn and the Blessingtons were not related to each other there is no mention of either Howard or Martyn at any Gore House social occasion, many of which were described in detail by the numerous guests who attended them. In fact, the evidence suggests that Howard and Louis-Napoléon were not on friendly terms until December 1847 at the earliest or, more likely, January 1848. In June 1847, Charles Pollard, a known trickster who moved with the 'swell mob' under the sobriquet 'Pretty Charlie', attempted to defraud Louis-Napoléon of £2,000 after learning that he had requested such a transfer from Orsi in Florence to Barings in London. It was a high-profile incident at the time, one ignored by many historians as it demonstrated once and for all that Louis-Napoléon's wealth at the time consisted for the most part in real estate and not specie. But the point here is that If Louis-Napoléon had met the allegedly wealthy Howard in the summer of 1846, as the romance claims, why did he not approach her rather than risk a large sum of money through a clumsy deal he did not fully understand with a stranger whom he suspected? (87)

Waterloo Place was less than a hundred paces from where Louis-Napoléon had stayed during his fourth exilic period. He and Martyn therefore lived close to each other for the five months when the 2<sup>nd</sup> Life Guards were at their Hyde Park barracks prior to their return to Windsor on 1 July 1839. They were the same little distance apart for another month when Martyn's regiment moved from Windsor to Regent's Park on 1 July 1840. (88) It is surely only common sense to suppose that it was during this period that Martyn and Louis-Napoléon met – though there is no good reason to suppose that they ever became close – and the mutual interest that drew them together would certainly have been horses.

Martyn, like Louis-Napoléon, was involved with racing all his life, using the trainer William Goater and racing in conjunction with Lt-Col. Francis Fane, the 12<sup>th</sup> Earl of Westmorland, who happened to be the son of Louis-Napoléon's good friend Baron Burghersh. (89) And just like Louis-Napoléon, Martyn usually failed at the races, his best success not coming until his colt *Westwick* won the Royal Stakes at the Second October Meeting at Newmarket on 9 October 1866. (90) It is some irony that this result took place so soon after Jem Mason's wretched death, for if it is true that Mason had often taken Howard to race meetings it may have been at Newmarket that Howard first met Martyn, although this also feels like a specious link contrived to explain a fabricated circumstance. In any event, once Martyn learned that Louis-Napoléon had

settled down in King Street, a short walk from Charles Street, he re-established contact, and it was therefore Martyn himself who introduced Howard to Louis-Napoléon, which he could not have done before the last quarter of 1846 when he moved in to his house there.

The question is not, of course, when and where Louis-Napoléon doffed his hat on being introduced to Howard on the street by Martyn for the very first time, but when they became close enough to be considered more than just acquaintances. The incident with Charles Pollard proves yet again only that Howard was not in a position to lend Louis-Napoléon money *even if* at that time they were already lovers. That they were so by 1848 is clear, and Maurois probably got it right when she declared that Martyn ‘was destined to become the expiatory victim, the burnt sacrifice, offered up to the jealous young god’ when Howard rejected him ‘with an impetuous haste’ for Louis-Napoléon. (91) This tells us a great deal about Howard’s mercenary character, but we should not feel too sorry for Martyn. He was that lifelong combination of confirmed bachelor and compulsive womaniser that obliged him to specialise in the pursuit of inappropriate women who would not threaten his freedom to continue with such a life, as a brief examination of his later years demonstrates.

On 21 July 1868, Martyn took out an annual lease of £650 on Broke Hall near Nacton in Suffolk to commence on 24 August. (92) This was a modest Tudor property, the lessor being Vice-Admiral Sir George Nathaniel Broke-Middleton, but it included all hunting, shooting and fishing rights in the surrounding countryside. Martyn would never live there, but he kept it fully staffed for hunting parties and – more often – amorous liaisons. (93) Martyn was almost 60 years old by now, but this made little difference to a long life of bedding the next female in his series of ever-changing conquests. Shortly afterwards, in December 1868, Martyn was in Paris with his daughter Jeanne where he met Frances Elizabeth Miles, the 40-year-old wife of Philip John Miles and mother of the extraordinary young diarist Alice Catherine Miles. When they returned to England, Martyn, with considerable low cunning, first invited Philip Miles to Broke Hall and then, almost as an afterthought, Alice and her mother so as not to raise suspicion that they were about to embark on an affair. Through Alice we learn that Martyn and her mother had a lengthy love affair, while she (Alice) and Jeanne became close friends. (94) Alice accepted the situation like the advanced soul that she was, after which the Miles family became part of the Martyn circle, friendly even with Mrs Hobhouse, with whom Martyn had also had a brief love affair, possibly immediately after ‘losing’ Howard to Louis-Napoléon. Also included in the extraordinary closed circle of friends peppering this paper were Sir Charles Metcalfe’s nephew Sir Theophilus John Metcalfe, who had distinguished himself at Delhi during the Indian Mutiny, and Augustus William Savile Lumley, third natural son of the 8<sup>th</sup> Earl of Scarborough. Meanwhile, the earl’s fourth natural son, the Reverend Frederick Savile Lumley, had married Mary Castle Jenkins, only daughter of Robert Castle Jenkins.

Two months after meeting Martyn, Alice Miles learned that Jeanne was illegitimate, somehow coming to believe that she was Martyn’s daughter by one of the actor sisters of Elisa Rachel Félix, the celebrated tragedienne better known simply as Rachel. In trying to work this out, however, Alice came to disregard this theory in favour of one that made the playwright Alexandre

Dumas *filis* the true father, since Martyn's 'intimacy' with the famous actress had lasted for just 'two weeks', (95) although what she was therefore doing posing as Martyn's daughter was a mystery Alice did not trouble herself to solve. Jeanne's birth in 1853 does not appear in the register and undoubtedly she had been born abroad, probably in France (where her grandfather had died in 1822 and where the Martyn family *may* have had a property). It is possible that Alice had confused Dumas's entirely legitimate daughter Jeanine, born 20 April 1867, with her new friend when questions about Jeannine's paternity began to be whispered.

Understanding Martyn's near-pathological sexual behaviour strongly suggests that he would not have batted an eyelid when dropped by Howard in favour of Louis-Napoléon, and he seems not to have considered either her or his son by her ever again. And certainly there was no question of the sort of guilt and maudlin hankering on his part, suggested by the Maurois romance, enabling supporters of the fiction to construe out of the situation vast sums of conscience money passing from Martyn to Howard.

Martyn did not, in any event, have any to give her, being in much the same financial position as Louis-Napoléon: plenty of fixed capital but relatively little cash. The total value of his estate at his death was approximately the same as his inheritance and he never had the huge sums Howard was supposed to have been given by him. In fact, by the time of Martyn's death his Coutts account had been broken up into numerous small bond investments all over the world: Mexico, Italy, Russia, Brazil, Turkey, Japan, Uruguay, Egypt, Danubia, North America, Portugal, and Austria, each realising small interests, and the account itself contained just £17, 252 13s 6d after his demise. Most importantly, Howard never appeared as a recipient of any money out of his account; and, in case the romancers suggest transactions made on her behalf, nor were there any large withdrawals made by or on behalf of anyone – not even Martyn himself.

## VI

Unquestionably, however, Howard did become hugely wealthy, although not at all for the reasons claimed by the Maurois fantasy, whose financial 'facts' will now be examined.

Documents show that Louis-Napoléon mortgaged part of his Italian estate for 60,000 Romanus (£13,000) to the Marchese di Pallavicino, a minor relative of the politician and patriot Giorgio Guido, marchese di Pallavicino-Trivulchio, early in 1848, repaid in full after the *coup d'état*. (96) On 25 March 1853, Howard received one million francs 'en plein acquit et décharge complète de tous mes droits et intérêts dans la domaine de Civita-Nova, dans la marche d'Ancône'. (97) These documents were discovered at the Tuileries after the fall of the empire and published within three months of Napoleon III's deposition. While unquestionably scrupulously edited, they were of course carefully arranged in such a way as to discredit the empire, containing much irrelevant editorial commentary that would not ordinarily have found its way into any scholarly edition of letters.

Thus it is above these entries concerning Howard that the Republican editors claimed, without evidence, that Napoleon III had been in financial debt to her. Moreover, writers without

historical acumen somehow assumed that it was Howard who had owned the Italian properties she first mortgaged to Louis-Napoléon! The truth is that a number of Napoleon I's Italian estates – some acquired through Empress Marie-Louise – were made over to Louis Bonaparte – specifically those in the papal states – on 27 August 1815 by the Allies, who permitted him to live there. (98) Louis-Napoléon inherited them, and this included the estate at what is more correctly known as Civitanova Marche, a small town in the province of Macerata on the Adriatic coast south of Ancona, and pertaining to the more substantial municipality of Porto di Citanova. It will be recalled that Maurois was herself unable to comprehend the details of this transaction; of course not, since it was Louis-Napoléon who made the portion of the vast estate over to Howard after retrieving it from Pallavicino, and which he was then obliged to buy back from Howard at her insistence after their separation.

What sort of sums were alleged to have been involved in the Howard/Louis-Napoléon romance? At the lowest, they have been estimated at £40,000 in total and at the highest more than 6,000,000 francs – about £400,000. These are not figures to be taken lightly even today, but it is worth emphasizing that in the 1840s they were simply staggering. Even the lower estimate would have kept an early Victorian family of four in a good property in Westminster, with three servants and a coach, comfortably off for half a century. (99) The higher estimate would have paid for the total cost of Brunel's *Great Eastern* – the single most expensive engineering project of the mid-nineteenth-century – from first sketch to last lick of paint. (100) Romantics, unfortunates who are rarely capable of rational thought, cannot reason that the higher estimate was a sum available to only kings, emperors, popes, and governments; even the lower estimate was one restricted to the higher aristocracy. The further logical step – that *all* the money involved in the Howard/Louis-Napoléon story went in *one* direction only: from him to her – is another piece of rational deduction alien to the misty swirl that is the mind of romantically-driven writers of 'history'.

The higher estimate is cited for a reason, of course, but is so cited again from a combination of romantic and republican *a posteriori* reasoning. Between March 1853 and January 1855, Louis-Napoléon did indeed pay Howard the total sum of 5,449,000 francs in a complex arrangement involving monthly payments, state bonds, and occasional lump sums in cash. Once again, without supplying any evidence (for naturally there was none to be supplied), the republican editors of the state papers found in the sacked Tuileries claimed that this sum had been paid to Howard because 'elle avait payé plusieurs fois les dettes du Prince Louis-Napoléon'. (102) Here the editors included a letter by Howard, dated 24 July 1855, in which she complained to Jean-Constant Mocquard, Napoleon III's *chéf du cabinet*, that 'je vois avec peine que les engagements pris envers moi ne sont pas accomplis ... Si les choses doivent en être ainsi, j'aurais mieux fait de garder les *six millions*, au lieu de trois millions cinq mille francs qui devaient sur ma demande être payés au bout de l'année 1853 ...' (103)

Maurois herself found this letter 'incoherent', stating that 'imperfection in a language sets traps for the unwary'. (104) Indeed, and so too does imperfection in historical methodology, for Maurois then assumed that Howard must have been referring to the alleged 6,000,000 francs *of*

*hers* before she had lent it to Louis-Napoléon according to the myth, whereas the date of the letter indicates that she was referring to the sum paid *to her* by him, which she believed she ought to have kept rather than spend on her estate of Beauregarde.

In her book, Maurois published only one original previously unpublished document bearing directly on this matter, an undated letter, written probably in late 1852, in which Howard admitted that Louis-Napoléon had just been to see her at the rue du Cirque ‘offering to pay me off; yes, an earldom in my own right, a castle, and a decent French husband into the bargain ...’ (105). It is astonishing that Howard’s own confession here did not affect the poor judgement of those who subsequently read it, for pay Howard off is precisely what Louis-Napoléon had been forced to do. On 24 January 1853, he drew up the draft of the letters patent according to which Howard would become the Comtesse de Beauregarde, then gave to her the eponymous estate near Versailles. This title was never officially recognised, however, due to vigorous objections from existing aristocratic families holding the same name and title – a situation that perhaps Louis-Napoléon knew would occur, to his silent amusement. Accordingly, Howard’s son Martin was created Comte de Béchevêt by imperial decree on 9 January 1864. (106)

The estate of Beauregarde was earning its own annual revenue of only 60,000 francs, (107) and Howard had been effectively cheated by her new husband, Clarence Trelawny, who speedily took what little wealth she had, leaving her virtually destitute apart from her French property over which he had no rights under English law, and it was for this reason that Howard was ‘faced with distressing financial difficulties’. (108) Maurois then referred to another document that had been uncovered by the republican editors of the Tuileries papers: the Civil List, which had finally been set at 25,000,000 francs. (109) According to this, Nathaniel Strode was paid 900,000 francs at the rate of 50,000 francs monthly during the second six months of the years 1862, 1863, and 1864. (110) The editors were unaware of the Strode/Howard connection, but Maurois, who was, assumed this to have been a covert means by which Napoleon III could pass money on to Howard after his marriage to the fiery Eugénie, ignoring the fact that Howard was already openly on the Civil List throughout 1853 for a further 400,000 francs monthly. (111)

Because the mythical ‘6,000,000’ francs had been taken care of, Maurois suggested that all these additional payments through Strode originated in Louis-Napoléon’s near-pathological generosity, a characteristic so universally acknowledged that even his enemies accepted it, and it is this that is the key to understanding the entire business between him and Howard. In January 1853, Howard was sent on a bogus trip to London with Mocquard, reaching Le Havre where she learned that it had been a ruse to get her away from Paris while her former lover was married to Eugénie. At the same time, the police entered and searched the estate of Beauregarde and all communications with the emperor were removed. (112)

It is absolutely clear by this action alone that had Napoleon III been in debt to Howard he need not have repaid any part of it to her had he not wished to do so. He received nothing from Howard other than a long headache and a very fat bill at the end of it, which he paid on account of his unusual benevolence, Howard squeezing every possible franc out of a man for whom the sordid consequences of his priapism affected that absurd sense of honour compelling him to

over-compensate a difficult ex-lover for her selfish avarice. In former times, Howard might have ended up at the bottom of the Seine, or with her head on a block.

Howard died at Beauregarde on 19 August 1865, an embittered recluse. By this time, Prime Minister Lord Palmerston had pushed through Parliament the Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Act vigorously promoted by Lord Lyndhurst and the famous divorcée Caroline Norton. Clause 25 had given married women the same right to inherit and bequeath property as single women. Consequently, Howard's own will was proved in London on 18 April 1866, and bore an effects value under £80,000. (113) Conspicuous by its absence is the name Martyn, (114) who was not therefore even partially reimbursed for the supposed fortune he had bestowed on her, even though it is claimed that such moral reimbursement is only what Howard had ever claimed from Napoleon III.

If Martyn had given any financial support to Howard what might it have been? The deed of transfer at the offices of William Fladgate, quoted by Maurois, is not listed in the appropriate archive and is either in private hands or no longer extant. However, it is safe to assume that whatever provision Martyn made for Howard was obtained by Trelawny on his marriage to her, but that this was considerably less than Maurois implied. In 1854, both Ecclesiastical and Common Law did not recognise the separate legal existence of a wife, and on marriage all that a woman owned became the legal property of her husband – everything from her smallest personal effects to her private funds. Only the Law of Equity, settled at the Court of Chancery, may have settled a woman's monetary and property rights in her favour *prior* to marriage. In practice, however, this process was rarely undertaken due to the expense and publicity incurred. (115) Howard did not pursue this course of action, and it is therefore not possible for her to have owned more than she had been obliged to transfer to Trelawny on her marriage. What might she ever have had that had been lost in this way? We now turn to the so-called City investments.

There were 85 properties on Mark Lane at this time, and eleven on Nag's Head Court (now Lombard Court). However, one third of Mark Lane belonged to the Corn Exchange and the London Commercial State Rooms while six properties were permanently associated with the Corporation of London. Several listed owners of the remaining properties remained unchanged throughout the time in question and none can be associated with any familiar names. Those properties 'disguised' (not included in lists) were few. On Nag's Head Court most of the properties were owned by the City Offices Company and two others belonged to a public house. A trustee held only one property while again the rest were held by names who remained unchanged and cannot be linked with any familiar persons. (116)

It is clear from this that even if Howard had received all the income from the 'hidden' rentals derived from the very few possible sources in these streets (two or three properties at the most, and not the most substantial either) – and it is therefore *possible* that Martyn held them, although quite why he needed to be so surreptitious about it is unclear – she could not have had more than a modest income from them. Moreover, this income, if it existed, would have naturally ceased when Howard and Martyn went their separate ways. And if Martyn had made over the hidden rentals to Howard, she would in any case have lost them to Trelawny on their marriage.

## VII

The republican – and through it the romantic – fantasy hinges on the alleged fact that Louis-Napoléon required vast sums of money to have himself elected to the presidency of the Second Republic in 1848. It was even assumed that his mortgaging of Civita-Nova had been effected for this purpose, although the Barings account reveals that Pallavicino made his first payment, of a mere £1,891 1s, on 18 September, and his second, of an equally insignificant £1,821 13s 4d, on 26 December – hardly useful for allegedly obtaining a presidency by purchase, quite apart from the fact that by the time of the second deposit Louis-Napoléon had already been elected.

The truth is that Louis-Napoléon required no funds whatever for his rise to power in France. The first draft of the republican constitution of 1848, completed on 19 June, was reworked and presented to the Assembly for debate on 30 August, accepted by an overwhelming majority on 4 November and promulgated at the Place de la Concorde eight days later. A ‘democratic, one and indivisible’ Republic was to have a president directly elected by the people under universal manhood suffrage. The president was to sanction ministerial appointments presented to him and retain the power of veto; but he could neither lead the army nor suspend or dissolve the Assembly. In addition to the traditional ‘Liberty, Equality, Fraternity’ it added ‘Family, Work, Property, Public Order’ to its slogan.

By and large these debates, beginning on 4 September, were not bitterly contested. An exception arose over the matter of the presidential term of office, as it was during these debates, commencing on 5 October, that Louis-Napoléon arrived in Paris as a legally-elected deputy, having been elected while still at King Street. Accordingly, an amendment was put forward by François-Jules Grévy, a lawyer and deputy hostile to Louis-Napoléon, to replace the notion of a popular president by a prime minister elected by the Assembly. The motion, clearly contrary to the spirit of a popular republic, was defeated by 643 votes to 158 on 7 October.

However, in order to prevent the presidential seat become a stepping-stone to empire, the committees of the Assembly agreed that the president should be elected for four years and could not be re-eligible for election until at least one term of office had been served by another candidate. On 9 October, the Assembly proposed another amendment by which members of quondam ruling families should be ineligible for the presidency. Louis-Napoléon then spoke for the first time as a deputy, carefully combining an inarticulate introduction with a disavowal of his former status as Prince-Pretender to the throne. The amendment was rejected, and two days later the 1832 law of proscription set by the Orleans monarchy was abrogated. The following day, a further amendment postponing the forthcoming presidential election, which had already been fixed, put forward by those wishing more time to see how Louis-Napoléon could be excluded from participating, was rejected by 587 votes to 232.

Accordingly, the elections were held on 10 and 11 December, with six principal candidates: Louis-Napoléon representing what had become known as the *Parti de l’Ordre*; General Eugène Cavaignac (the effective head of state at the time), Alexandre de Lamartine, and General Nicolas

Changarnier, all representing different shades of moderate republicanism; Alexandre Ledru-Rollin representing Democratic Socialism; and Vincent Raspail representing Pure Socialism. There were 7,449,471 votes cast in Metropolitan France (75.1 percent of the electorate) and Louis-Napoléon polled 5,534,520 of them (or 74.3 percent of the votes cast). Cavaignac took second place with 1,448,302 votes, and Lamartine third place with 17,914. When the returns for North Africa, Corsica, and the army were assessed, Louis-Napoléon's total rose by 38,314, Lamartine's by 3,024, and Cavaignac's by 2,854. Ten days later, Louis-Napoléon swore allegiance to the new constitution, and the man who three months earlier had stumbled through his inaugural speech as the Deputy for Yonne, enduring chuckles and sneers at his peculiar accent and curious appearance, took his seat at the head of the National Constituent Assembly. (117)

It is crucial to understand the process by which Louis-Napoléon became president of the Second Republic, and why the inability to understand it at the time – and subsequently – has obliged people to invent reasons why it happened, such as conjuring up vast sums of money with which we are to suppose Louis-Napoléon used to bribe his way into high office. No one understood it in England at the time, one newspaper stating caustically that the election result was 'extraordinary'. (118) Another also thought it 'extraordinary, to say the least of it', and could not get over the fact that at the time of the June Days Riots of 23 to 26 June 1848, when an insurrection of Parisian workers against the government of the Second Republic was crushed by the army in a bloody massacre, Louis-Napoléon had been in the St James's Theatre watching a play. That he should now be at the head of a country 'which he scarcely knows' and a people 'whose language he cannot speak with anything like propriety or perfection' it found 'suspending wonderful'. (119) Queen Victoria also thought the result 'really wonderful' and an 'extraordinary event'. (120) James Howard Harris, the 3<sup>rd</sup> Earl of Malmesbury and Tory member for Wilton, who had known Louis-Napoléon since 1829, could only explain the result by stating that 'his name has acted like magic on the nation'. (121) The political diarist Charles Greville observed that: 'The result ... has astonished the whole world'. (122)

It should be noted immediately that some of these oft-quoted words have undergone a dramatic semantic change since their use here: 'wonderful' was not then a term for wholehearted approbation as it is now, but rather closer to our use of 'bizarre'; 'extraordinary' then carried with it a sense of derogatory incomprehension mixed in with the utterly absurd.

So what had in fact happened? No presidential candidate would have won without the backing of some powerful, interested, and well organised group. The Orleanist Prince de Joinville and the Republican publicist Louis Blanc, for example, although both very well known, also entered but pulled just three and two votes in two and one *arrondissements* respectively, simply because they had no organised machinery pushing their candidature. (123) In contradistinction, following Louis-Napoléon's victories in the regional elections that had elected him a deputy, he began to gain the support of the powerful monarchist organisation known as the *Comité de la rue de Poitiers*, which had been founded in May 1848 by unaffiliated supporters of the concept of strong but benign constitutional monarchy. By July, the group's leaders realised that their

informal frontman at the time – Cavaignac, president of the Council of Ministers – had little chance of success as he had been severely tainted by his suppression of the June riots as dictatorial minister of war. In September, the party met at their headquarters on the rue de Poitiers and agreed not to have an official candidate from within their ranks.

Whom should they then select? By December, private meetings between Louis-Napoléon and significant members of the organisation had secured for him the personal support of Achille Baraguay d’Hilliers, a highly-decorated colonel who was also president of the *Comité*, which then changed its name to the *Parti de l’Ordre* for election purposes. Also behind Louis-Napoléon were prominent and respected monarchist statesmen such as Louis-Matthieu, comte de Molè, and Louis-Adolph Thiers, who were not Bonapartists but who realised that virtually every other candidate in the game had been discredited in one way or another.

The *Parti de l’Ordre*, then, unofficially (that is, not publicly) backed Louis-Napoléon as the candidate most likely to win, hoping through his victory to be represented in the Assembly under a Republic – for it had been they who had promoted the principal of a popular presidency – by a grateful and compliant president whom they could subsequently manipulate to suit their ideology. Thus it was largely their money that funded the campaign and Louis-Napoléon’s victory. But of course Louis-Napoléon had been no less clever than his would-be puppet-masters; by having presented himself – quite deliberately – to the Assembly as an oaf, meekly enduring the mockery of the deputies, he had obtained the necessary backing he wanted in order to become elected as a perceived puppet. (124)

As both Louis-Napoléon and his backers had secretly calculated, hundreds of thousands of moderates, radicals, and various monarchists had voted for Louis-Napoléon precisely because as an unknown quantity he potentially represented everything to all voters; and much of the reason for this conviction was precisely because Louis-Napoléon *had* been sitting in a theatre back in June, coming to France politically pure, untainted by any contact with the many discredited administrators of French politics. By exiling Louis-Napoléon years earlier, both the House of Orleans and the Radical Second Republic had made of him not only their principal but also their most powerful opponent.

\*

There is a Russian proverb that may be translated as ‘If one doesn’t lie, one doesn’t tell a good story’. Ironically, Maurois herself inadvertently suggested the identity of her liars when referring to Béchevêt’s long-standing belief – as transmitted to her by his deceitful, avaricious, jealous, and spiteful descendents – that his father was not Francis Martyn at all but Louis-Napoléon; ‘It became a family tradition which, transmitted from generation to generation, naturally acquired the strength of conviction’. (125) The sharp lesson to be drawn from this unpleasant story is that ‘family history’, when not corroborated by unimpeachable documentation, ought never to be employed in the composition of serious historical writing. The real tragedy for the sober study of the French Second Empire and Napoleon III is that it so often has.

## NOTES

I am grateful to Maggy Parsons for her permission to use extracts and information from the unpublished portion of the diary of Alice Catherine Miles; to the Theatre Museum, London, for aspects of Howard's stage career; to Sally Looker at the Ipswich Record Office; to Julian Hunt at Aylesbury County Records and Local Studies; to the Chairman and Directors of Coutts & Company for permission to use and quote from the Martyn accounts, work kindly undertaken on my behalf by Tracey Earl, the archivist; to the curators of the Baring Archives at ING Baring Holdings Limited, London; and to all the staff at the many libraries and archives used for the unravelling of this complex story.

I owe a special debt of gratitude to George Halifax Lumley-Savile, the 3<sup>rd</sup> Baron Savile of Rufford, for reading through this paper and not presenting any impediment to its publication, in spite of its *outré* revelations concerning past members of His Lordship's family, some of which were unknown even to him.

- (1) Edouard-Ferdinand, vicomte de Beaumont-Vassy, *Mémoires secrets du dix-neuvième siècle* (Paris 4<sup>th</sup> ed. 1874), pp.327, 331, 370; Horace de Viel-Castel, *Mémoires du Comte Horace du Viel Castel sur le règne de Napoleon III* (Paris 2 vols, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 1883-84), II pp.161ff.; Albert Dresden Vandam, *Undercurrents of the Second Empire* (London 1897), pp.111ff.; Emile-Félix, comte de Fleury, *Souvenir de Général Comte Fleury* (Paris 2 vols 1897-98), I pp.204ff.; Frédéric Loliée, *Women of the Second Empire* (London 1907), pp.93-95, 306; Francis Halliday Cheetham, *Louis Napoleon and the Genesis of the Second Empire* (London 1909), pp.230ff.; Alan Montgomery Eyre, *Saint John's Wood* (London 1913), pp.150ff.; Hector Fleischmann, *Napoleon III and the Women he Loved* (London 1915), pp.96ff.; Adrien Dansette, *Les amours de Napoléon III* (Paris 1938), pp.95-99; Cecil Smith, *A Short History of St John's Wood and some of its former inhabitants* (Shrewsbury 1942), pp.35-35; Léon Treich, *Les alcôves de Napoléon III* (Paris 1948), pp.48-63; Ivor Guest, *Napoleon III in England* (London 1952), pp.78ff., 99, 163.
- (2) Simone André-Maurois, *Miss Howard and the Emperor* (London 1957). This was originally published in French as *Miss Howard, la femme qui fit un empereur* in 1956 with its far more provocative title. All quotations in this paper are taken from the London edition.
- (3) Maurois *Miss Howard* p.26
- (4) Ibid. p.28
- (5) Ibid. p.37
- (6) Ibid. p.62
- (7) Ibid. p.62-63
- (8) Ibid. p.76
- (9) Ibid. pp.91, 135.
- (10) F[amily] R[ecord] C[entre], London, *Register of Marriages* Jun. 1854 H-J p.284 (St James) 1a 603

- (11) Maurois *Miss Howard* pp.118-19
- (12) Census Return 1841, HO 107/733, [11] ff.7-8 pp.6-7
- (13) Census Return 1841, HO 107/675, [10] ff.8-12 pp.10-18, [11] ff.6-8 pp.6-10, [12] ff.10-12 pp.11-15, [14] ff.20-22 pp.32-36; HO 107/676, [1] ff.10-17 pp.12-25; HO 107/679, [1] ff.16-20 pp.25-33; HO 107/680, [3] ff.14-18 pp.20-28, [9] ff.5-10 pp.1-11, [10] ff.6-7 pp.6-8; HO 107/730, [3] ff.5-14 pp.2-19; HO 107/733, [1] ff.5-8, [7] ff.5-7, [11] ff.5-9 pp.1-10; HO 107/735, [8] ff.22-28 pp.28-51. W[estminster] C[ity] A[rchives], London, *St Marylebone General Rates* (E Division) 1840, ff.162-78; North Side, pp.1-9 [St Marylebone], South Side, pp.10-15 [St George's Hanover Square], and pp.15-17 [St Anne Westminster]; *Poor Rates* Parish of St James (Great Marlborough Division) 1840, D 170, ff.50-53.
- (14) *Illustrated London News* 27 October 1866 (issue 1396 vol. xlix p.407)
- (15) See *The East India Kalendar* (London) 1791 p.46, 1793 p.58, 1799 p.58
- (16) See 'List of British Subjects' in *The Original Calcutta Annual Directory for Anno Domini 1813* (Calcutta), p.xii
- (17) FRC, Prerogative Court of Canterbury will (Middx vol. 86 p.156, Mar. 158, 1823), PROB 11 (Richards)/1668 ff.60-61
- (18) B[ritish] L[ibrary]: O[riental and] I[ndia] O[ffice] C[ollections], *Ecclesiastical Returns of Baptisms, Marriages, Burials for the Country of India and Presidency of Bengal* N/1/vol.5/f.77
- (19) Ibid. N/1/vol.8/ff.13, 153
- (20) *Kalendar* 1791 p.73
- (21) See *The East India Register and Directory* (London), 1803 p.12, 1806 p.16, 1817 p.18, and 1822 p.17; 'Retirement on the Annuity Fund' in *The Bengal Directory and Annual Register for the year 1840* (Calcutta) p.86; and *A General Register of the Hon'ble East India Company's Civil Servants of the Bengal Establishment from 1790 to 1842* (Calcutta) pp.232-33
- (22) BL: OIOC, *Ecclesiastical Returns* N/2/vol.4/f.384
- (23) P[ublic] R[ecord] O[ffice], WO 25/780 f.22 p.127
- (24) *A List of the Officers of the Army and Royal Marines* (London), 1832 p.114, 1837 p.110, 1847 pp.52 & 116, 1855-56 pp.39 & 154, 1858-59 pp.34 & 192, and 1863-64 p.731
- (25) D[ictionary of] N[ational] B[iography] (London 1917 *et seq.*) XII pp.1206-08
- (26) William Page, *A History of Buckinghamshire* (London 4 vols 1927), IV p.70
- (27) George Lipscombe, *The History and Antiquities of the County of Buckinghamshire* (London 4 vols 1847), I pp.309-11
- (28) *Names of Streets and Places in the Administrative County of London* (London 4<sup>th</sup> ed. 1955) p.171. The property is no longer extant.
- (29) Census Return 1841, HO 107/678, [11] f.25 p.7; WCA *St Marylebone General Rates* (G Ward) 1838 f.78, 1842-48 f.12 in all cases; Census Return 1851, HO 107/1491 ff.782-83
- (30) *The Times* 25 Nov. 1840. Here we may draw attention to the widely misused term 'mistress' when applied to Louis-Napoléon's particular women friends during this period. Since he did

not marry until 1853, they were *not* ‘mistresses’ but simply lovers; the same applies to Howard.

- (31) Census Return 1841, HO 107/1476 f.76 p.2
- (32) Census Return 1841, HO 107/678, [4] ff.6-8 pp.5-9; WCA *St Marylebone General Rates* (G Division) 1839 ff.74-75, and for 1840 ff.70-71
- (33) Jasper Ridley *Napoleon III and Eugénie* (New York 1977) p.238
- (34) Félix et Louis Lazarre, *Dictionnaire administratif et historique des rues et des monuments de Paris* (Paris 1855) p.278
- (35) DNB I pp.1318-19; *The Times* 4 Mar. 1840. Sir Francis Thornhill Baring, chancellor of the exchequer and grandson of the bank’s founder, stood surety for Comte d’Orsay, Louis-Napoléon’s second.
- (36) WCA *Poor Rates* Parish of St George’s Hanover Square (Curzon Ward) C 666 (1847) f.136 ‘Edward Harrison’, C 667 (1848) f.136 ‘Mrs Howard’, C 671 (1852) f.135 ‘Josiah Bates’, C 675 (1856) f.131 [vacant], and C 676 (1857) f.131 [untenanted]; Census Return 30 Mar. 1851, HO 107/1476 f.76 p.3 ‘The Head of [household?] abroad’.
- (37) For Hotten see DNB IX pp.1310-11; Haswell (1837-75?) is obscure.
- (38) James M. Haswell and J.C.Hotten, *The Story of the Life of Napoleon III* [Haswell] *and the Same Story as Told by Popular Caricaturists of the Last Thirty Years* [Hotten] (London 1871) p.163
- (39) DNB X pp.789-90
- (40) [William] Blanchard Jerrold, *The Life of Napoleon III* (London 4 vols 1874-82), II p.382
- (41) Nikolaus Pevsner and Bridget Cherry, ‘London Volume One’ in *The Buildings of England* (London 1973) p.593; Francis Sheppard, ‘The Parish of St James Westminster. Part One: South of Piccadilly’ in *Survey of London* vol. XXIX (London 1960) pp.295-96
- (42) WCA *Surveyor’s Department of the Vestry of St James, Westminster* 2 January 1900, ‘Application for Drains to House and Premises, No 3 King Street, St James’s Square’ [694]; *St James’ & Pall Mall Electric Light Company* 30 October 1897, ‘Proposed Main to 1c King Street [692]. Both of these documents provide accurate ground plans of the spacious house exactly as Louis-Napoléon would have known them.
- (43) DNB XV pp.1082-83
- (44) WCA *Poor Rates* Parish of St James (Pall Mall Division), D 195 (1847), D 199 (1848), f.20 in both; *Pavement Rates* D 1315, D 1316 (1847), f.16 in both, and D 1317, D 1318 (1848), f.16 in both.
- (45) Jerrold *Napoleon III* II p.382
- (46) See Cecilia Peel, ‘Homes and Habits; 7: The Poor’ in George Malcolm Young, *Early Victorian England, 1830-1865* (London 2 vols 1934), I pp.126-34
- (47) The Baring Archives at ING Baring Holdings Limited, London, MS 1001039 1 Jan. 1845 to 8 Oct. 1847 ff.71, 191, 213, 245; MS 1001040 1 Jan. 1848 to 31 Dec. 1849 ff.89-91.
- (48) Philip Ziegler, *The Sixth Great Power: Barings, 1762-1929* (London 1988), pp.176-78

- (49) See *Bengal Almanac and Annual Directory* (Calcutta 1818) p.192 and the same through to 1830 when Dombal retires to become an Indigo planter. He disappears by 1852.
- (50) WCA *Poor Rates* Parish of St George's Hanover Square (Grosvenor Ward), C 659 (1840) f.50 [no occupier], C 660 (1841) f.48 through to C 664 (1845) f.50 'William Beadon', and C 665 (1846) f.50 'William Beadon' [remarks: 'Francis Martyn']
- (51) Census Returns 30 Mar. 1851, HO 107/1476 f.359 p.8; 7-14 Apr. 1861, RG 9/46 f.47 p.28; 7 Apr. 1871, RG 10/102 f.79 p.39
- (52) *Calendar of the Grants of Probate and Letters of Administration made in the several district registries of Her Majesty's Court of Probate* P[robate] C[alendar] 1874 pp.92-93; London, First Avenue House, PR 9 ff.347ff
- (53) See Charles Parry Hobhouse, *Some Account of the Family of Hobhouse and Reminiscences* (London 1909), pp.27, 83
- (54) FRC *Index to Consular Deaths 1866-70*, f.30 (Algiers) vol 4 p.409; PC 1870 p.87
- (55) The Reverend Thomas Martyn, died 6 Oct. 1869, will proved 4 Feb. 1870 effects under £800, PC 1870 p.87; the Reverend Claudius Robert Martyn, died 27 Apr. 1873, will proved 17 May, effects under £800, PC 1873 p.84; and the second Reverend Thomas Martyn, died 4 Jun. 1877, will proved 24 Jul., effects under £800, PC 1877 p.95
- (56) C.R.Erlington and Nicholas Herbert, *A History of the County of Gloucester* (London 12 vols 1972), vol 10 pp.55-57, 64-65, 78-79
- (57) FRC *Registration of Marriages* Sep. 1837 (Chepstow) xxvi [2] 51
- (58) PRO WO 25/3239 'all marriages 1830-43'
- (59) H[ousehold] C[avalry] [M]useum, Windsor, *Service Book* 101 f.24; *Journal of the Household Division 1874* (Obituary) p.302
- (60) WCA *Poor Rates* Parish of St James Hanover Square (Pall Mall Ward), D 158 (1837) f.15
- (61) See 'Europeans Residing in Bengal' in *The Calcutta Annual Directory and Register* (Calcutta 1835) p.27
- (62) BL: OIOC *Ecclesiastical Returns* N/1/vol.13/f.533
- (63) Hobhouse *Family of Hobhouse* pp.19ff
- (64) Census Return 1841, HO 107/369 f.18 p.30
- (65) DNB XIII pp.303-06; *General Register 1790-1842* pp.238-39
- (66) John William Kaye, *The Life and Correspondence of Charles, Lord Metcalfe* (London 2 vols, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 1858), II pp.226-33
- (67) DNB II p.839; Census Return 1841, HO 107/26, [10] f.6 pp.5-6
- (68) B[erkshire] R[ecord] O[ffice], Reading, *Electoral Register 1839-1840* p.86 entry 4386
- (69) BRO D/P 151/2/27C, *Tithe Apportionment Map 1841*, 'Cap Fras Mountjoy Martin' plot no. 927, 'Sir Charles Metcalfe, baronet'.
- (70) Census return 1841, HO 107/26 [10] f.6 p.6
- (71) Kaye *Metcalfe* II p.308
- (72) DNB VII p.267; Census Return 30 Mar. 1851, HO 107/1694 f.554 p.7
- (73) BRO *Electoral Register 1859-1860* p.59 entry 2093

- (74) DNB XXI pp.522-24; Census Return 7-14 Apr. 1861, RG 9/756 ff.19-20 pp.8-9
- (75) Camden Local Studies Centre, London, *Poor Rates* Bloomsbury Ward, St Pancras West, UTAH 603 (March 1842) f.111 'Anne East' [occupier], UTAH 605 (September 1842) f.17 'Sophia Dudley' [occupier], 'Henry Charles Heather' [owner], and UTAH 606 (February 1843) f.17 [same].
- (76) FRC *Register of Deaths* Mar. 1871 p.148 (Brighton) 2b 152; Mar. 1880 p.154 (Lewes) 2b 115
- (77) London Metropolitan Archives *Register of Baptisms*, P89/TRI/001-002 [327] f.41
- (78) WCA *Poor Rates* Parish of St George's Hanover Square (Grosvenor Ward), C 679 (1859) f.51 'Mrs Martyn', C 701 (1875) f.71 'Mrs Mountjoy Martyn' replaced by 'Frederick Jones'.
- (79) Census Returns 7-14 Apr. 1861, RG 9/46 f.67 p.16; 7 Apr. 1871, RG 10/102 f.25 p.14
- (80) DNB XVII pp.862-63
- (81) *Army List* 1843 p.120; 1860-61 p.725
- (82) Census Return 3 Apr. 1871, RG 10/102 f.36 p.34, occupied at the time by a brother.
- (83) Edith Milner and Edith Benham, *Records of the Lumleys of Lumley Castle* (London 1904) pp.273-76, 296-98, 317
- (84) Census Returns 7-14 Apr. 1861, RG 9/2473 f.90 p.12; 7 Apr. 1871, RG 10/3536 f.24 p.9
- (85) FRC *Registration of Marriages*, Dec. 1874 p.187 (St George's Hanover Square) 1a 580
- (86) FRC *Registration of Deaths*, Dec. 1878 p.294 (St George's Hanover Square) 1a 256
- (87) For this incident see *The Times* 3 & 5 Jul. 1847; Serjeant Ballantine, *Some Experiences of a Barrister's Life* (London 1890) pp.194-95; and Henry Hawkins, *Reminiscences of Sir Henry Hawkins, Baron Brampton* (London 2 vols 1904) II pp.222-26
- (88) HCM *Annual Change of Quarters Book, 1839* ff.202-03
- (89) HCM *Journal of the Household Division 1874* (Obituary) p.302
- (90) *Illustrated London News* 13 Oct. 1866 (issue 1394 vol.xlix p.351)
- (91) Maurois *Miss Howard* p.38
- (92) Ipswich Record Office, *Lease Agreement* HA 93/3/71
- (93) Census Return 7 Apr. 1871, RG 10/1758 f.156 p.2
- (94) Maggy Parsons, *Every Girl's Duty – Alice Miles, the Diary of a Victorian Debutante* (London 1992) pp.95 *passim*.
- (95) Diary entry (unpublished) for January 1869
- (96) *Papiers et correspondance de la famille impériale* (Paris 3 vols 1870-72), I pp.203-06
- (97) *Ibid.* p.171
- (98) Ridley *Napoleon III* p.46
- (99) Peel, 'Homes and Habits; 3: Cost of Living', I pp.104-08
- (100) Lionel T.C. Rolt, *Isambard Kingdom Brunel* (London 1957) p.240
- (101) In this context it is worth noting that in 1840 the Legitimist press in Paris began to spread the rumour that Louis-Napoléon had had secret meetings with Lord Palmerston in London, an accusation the English press denied (*The Times* 8 Aug. 1840). From this baseless canard spread the even more absurd notion that Palmerston had financed Louis-Napoléon's ill-

fated expedition to Boulogne.

- (102) *Papiers et correspondance* I p.172
- (103) *Ibid*, pp. 172-73
- (104) Maurois *Miss Howard* p.125
- (105) *Ibid*. p.77
- (106) *Ibid*. pp. 101-02
- (107) *Ibid*. p.164
- (108) *Ibid*. pp.168-69
- (109) William Echard, *Historical Dictionary of the French Second Empire 1852-1870* (London 1985) p.477
- (110) *Papiers et correspondance* II p.156
- (111) *Ibid*. p.136
- (112) Maurois *Miss Howard* pp.89-92
- (113) PC 1866 pp.176-77
- (114) Maurois *Miss Howard* pp.146-50, 158-64
- (115) Lee Holcombe, *Wives and Property, Reform of the Married Woman's Property Law in Nineteenth-Century England* (Oxford 1983) pp.9-13
- (116) Guildhall Library Manuscripts Department, London, *Land Tax Assessment Registers*: Mark Lane 1842: (Aldgate Ward) 11316/424 f.28, (Langbourn and Tower Wards) 11316/425 ff.9-12, 15; 1848: 11316/436 f.28, 11316/437 ff.9-12, 17-18; 1850: (all wards) 11316/440 ff.9-12, 15, 33; 1854: 11316/444 ff.9-12, 17-18, 34; 1855: 11316/445 ff.9-12, 17-18, 34. Nag's Head Court (Bridge Ward): 11316/444 (1843), 11316/437 (1848), 11316/440 (1850), 11316/444 (1854), and 11316/445 (1855), f.4 in all documents; Nag's Head Court (St Clement near Eastcheap Ward), *Poor Rates* Mar./Aug. 1845 992/36 ff.1-2, 17-18, Mar. 1854 992/42 ff.1-2, Sep. 1855 992/43 f.1; Nag's Head Court (St Edmund the King and Martyr Ward) Jun. 1851-53 4288/5 ff.16, 40, 64; Census Return 1841, HO 107/719 [2] ff.26-27, [9] ff.7-10; HO 107/720 [12] f.5-7, [14] ff.18-23, [15] f.9; HO 107/723 [1] ff.18-19
- (117) Edgar Newman, *Historical Dictionary of France from the 1815 Restoration to the Second Empire* (New York 2 vols 1987), I p.389
- (118) *The Times* 14 Dec. 1848
- (119) *Observer* 17 Dec. 1848
- (120) Arthur Benson and Viscount Esher, *The Letters of Queen Victoria* (London 3 vols 1908), II pp.205-06
- (121) Earl of Malmesbury, *Memoirs of an Ex-Minister* (London 2 vols 1884), II p.237
- (122) Henry Reeve, *The Greville Memoirs (second part)* (London 3 vols 1885), III p.253
- (123) For a comprehensive breakdown of the results, see *The Times* 14 Dec. 1848
- (124) Theodore Zeldin, *The Political System of Napoleon III* (London 1958), pp.5-9
- (125) Maurois *Miss Howard* p.61