Romancing the Throne.

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

Ilmar Golicz

In Napoleonica® the journal 2022/2 No 2 , pages 117 to 153
Publisher La Fondation Napoléon

ISSN 2100-0123
DOI 10.3917/napoj.002.0117
Uploaded: 02/01/2023

ROMANCING THE THRONE.

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

Ilmar GOLICZ

Abstract

It is not often given to a single author to form world opinion on a historical event, but Simone André-Maurois achieved this in the 1950s with a widely-marketed biography of 'Miss Howard', Napoleon III's most prominent English 'mistress' whom he met in London in exile while styled Prince Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte. Consolidating 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 fantastical romance that has been followed by all authorities, popular and academic, ever since, including global Internet resources. However, close examination reveals that this alleged 'family history' is demonstrably false both in most of its particular claims for the period up to 1851, with which this paper is principally concerned, and its general claim that Howard promoted the establishment of Louis-Napoléon's presidency and empire through lending him vast sums of money.

ROMANCING THE THRONE.

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

In this paper, I shall systematically relate the version of the history according to Simone André-Maurois. I shall then show, adducing documents from public archives and other sources, how her conclusions are untenable and how the story Miss Howard and notably her relationship with Napoleon III needs to be entirely rewritten.

I

Elizabeth Ann Haryett, the future 'Miss Howard', was born in Brighton - where she was baptised in the Parish of St Nicholas on 13 August 1823 - to a local shoemaker whose family had been living in East Sussex for generations.[1] According to Maurois, the family left the south coast for Great Yarmouth in Norfolk when Elizabeth was a girl, settling down to the life of the yeomanry class. Maurois then goes onto recount Elizabeth's early years as follows: Elizabeth's great desire was to go on stage, and when in late 1839 the family was visited by James 'Jem' Mason, the celebrated jockey whom they had known in Brighton, Elizabeth became attached to him and returned to London early in 1840 to join the theatre. There she 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.[2]

1 Brighton History Centre Records, The Keep, Brighton, *Register of Baptisms January 1816 to November 1827*, BTNRP BHM30001 13 Aug. 1823.

2 Simone André-Maurois, *Miss Howard and the Emperor: The Story of*

It can be verified that Elizabeth Haryett changed her name and went on the London stage in 1840, her first appearance in any record since her parish baptism. 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* by James Sheridan Knowles, a five-act comedy that had been written for the Haymarket. Howard replaced the first Constance whose contract had expired and which was not renewed.

Whilst Howard and Mason *may* have occupied a single room on Oxford Street very briefly, they did not live 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.[3] Neither Mason nor Howard – nor anyone else with similar

Napoleon III and his Mistress (London: Collins, 1957),2 ff. This was originally published in French as *Miss Howard, la femme qui fit un Empereur* (Paris: Gallimard 1956), with its far more provocative title. All quotations in this paper are taken from the London edition. For the general story of Napoleon III and Miss Howard see also: Edouard-Ferdinand, vicomte de Beaumont-Vassy, *Mémoires secrets du dix-neuvième siècle* (Paris: F. Sartorius, 1874), 331-2, 370; Horace de Viel-Castel, *Mémoires du Comte Horace du Viel Castel sur le règne de Napoleon III* (Paris: "chez tous les libraires", 1883-84), vol. II, 161 ff.; Albert Dresden Vandam, *Undercurrents of the Second Empire* (London: William Heinemann, 1897), 111 ff.; Emile-Félix, comte de Fleury, *Souvenirs du Général Comte Fleury* (Paris: E. Plon, Nourrit et Cie, 1897-98), vol. I, 204 ff.; Frédéric Loliée, *Women of the Second Empire* (London: John Lane, The Bodley Head, 1907), 93-95, 306; Francis Halliday Cheetham, *Louis Napoleon and the Genesis of the Second Empire* (London: John Lane, The Bodley Head, 1909), 230 ff.; Alan Montgomery Eyre, *Saint John's Wood; its History, its Houses, its Haunts and its Celebrities* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1913), 150 ff.; Hector Fleischmann, *Napoleon III and the Women he loved* (London: Holden & Hardingham, 1915), 96 ff.; Adrien Dansette, *Les amours de Napoléon III* (Paris: Fayard, 1938), 95-99; Cecil Smith, *A Short History of St John's Wood and some of its former inhabitants* (Shrewsbury: Wilding & Son, 1942), 35-36; Léon Treich, *Les alcôves de Napoléon III* (Paris: Editions des Deux Syrènes, 1948), 48-63; Ivor Guest, *Napoleon III in England* (London: British Technical and General Press, 1952), 78 ff., 99, 163.

3 London, The National Archives, Census Office, *Census returns for Westminster, St. George Hanover Square, 1841-1891*, MS, Census Return 1841,

names – owned, tenanted, or occupied as guests, any of the other 439 properties on Oxford Street in 1841; evidence for the previous year suggest the same.[4]

On 24 February 1839, James 'Jem' Mason won the first properly constituted Grand Liverpool Steeplechase [Grand National] on one of the most famous horses of the day, *Lottery*. 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 steeplechaser of his day who won several meetings throughout the 1830s, but 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. 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 the great, Cesarewitch Race Day (8 October) 1866 during the Second October Meeting at Newmarket, having squandered what little money he had on gambling and drinking.[5] It is unlikely that he and Howard could have afforded more than a single room anywhere in London.

HO 107/733, [11] 7-8 pp. 6-7. Squire lived with his wife, two sons, three shop assistants, four servants, a guest, and a baby.

4 London, The National Archives, *Census returns cit.*, Census Return 1841, HO 107/675, [10] 8-12 pp. 10-18, [11] 6-8 pp. 6-10, [12] 10-12 pp. 11-15, [14] 20-22 pp. 32-36; HO 107/676, [1] 10-17 pp. 12-25; HO 107/679, [1] 16-20 pp. 25-33; HO 107/680, [3] 14-18 pp. 20-28, [9] 5-10 pp. 1-11, [10] 6-7 pp. 6-8; HO 107/730, [3] 5-14 pp. 2-19; HO 107/733, [1] 5-8, [7] 5-7, [11] 5-9 pp. 1-10; HO 107/735, [8] 22-28 pp. 28-51. W[estminster] C[ity] A[rchives], London, *St Marylebone General Rates* (E Division) 1840, fols 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, fols 50-53.

5 *Illustrated London News* 27 Oct. 1866.

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. According to Maurois, in 1841, Howard met Major Francis Mountjoy Martyn of the Life Guards, the wealthy son of Charles Fuller Martyn of the Honourable East India Company who had passed his great wealth onto his son. Faced with this more lucrative prospect, 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 time Howard gave birth to her son by Martyn, 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'.[6] 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 a woman who was barren and secured by him in some remote country retreat. This Martyn fortune consisted mainly in 'houses

6 Maurois, *Miss Howard cit.,* 26.

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'.[7]

How much of this 'rags-to-riches' story may be corroborated? Charles Fuller Martin was a barrister-at-law who arrived in Calcutta in the summer of 1786 where he was established as an advocate for the town becoming, in 1791, the 17th Sheriff of Calcutta and subsequently a Justice of the Peace and Advocate of the Supreme Court.[8] By 1813 he had fixed the spelling of his surname to 'Martyn' for orthographic consistency with other members of his family.[9] A long-standing relationship with the young widow of an English soldier[10] resulted in the birth of two sons: Charles Cecil Martin on 18 February 1808 and Francis Mountjoy Martin on 8 May 1809.[11] 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 never, in fact, connected with the East India Company.[12]

---

7 *Ibid*. 28.

8 *East India Kalendar* (London: J. Debrett, 1791), 46, *id.* (1793) 58, *id.* (1799) 58.

9 'List of British Subjects' in *The Original Calcutta Annual Directory for Anno Domini 1813* (Calcutta: Morning Post Press), xii.

10 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/fol.77. Marie, a 'native Christian widow' [Hindu convert] of Private William Felix of Fort William killed in action on 14 Sep. 1797.

11 *Ibid*. N/1/vol.8/fols 13, 153. Martyn was baptised on 3 September at Fort William by the Rev. Richard Jefferies.

12 *Kalendar cit.*, 1791, 73. He may have been 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 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 [see *The East India Register and Directory*, (London: W. H. Allen, 1803), 12, *id.* (1806) 16, *id.*

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.[13] 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.[14]

It was claimed by Maurois that Martyn happened to be a cousin of Charles John Gardiner, 1st Earl of Blessington and 2nd Viscount Mountjoy in the Irish peerage, which enabled Martyn to become an *habitué* of Lady Marguerite Blessington's celebrated literary salons at Gore House in Kensington. It was there, in June 1846, that Martyn introduced Howard to a poverty-stricken Prince Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte. He and Howard, by now a 'millionairess', began an affair that necessitated the ousting of Martyn from Howard's life. She

(1817) 18, and *id.* (1822) 17; 'Retirement on the Annuity Fund' in *The Bengal Directory and Annual Register for the year 1840* (Calcutta: Bengal Hurkaru Press), 86; and *A General Register of the Hon'ble East India Company's Civil Servants of the Bengal Establishment from 1790 to 1842* (Calcutta: Printed at the Baptist Mission Press), 232-33]. 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 [BL: OIOC *Ecclesiastical Returns* N/2/vol.4/fol.384].

13 National Archives, Kew, WO 25/780 fol. 22 p. 127.

14 *A List of the Officers of the Army and Royal Marines* (London: Printed by G.E. Eyre and W. Spottiswoode, for H.M. Stationery Off, 1832), 114, *id.* (1837) 110, *id.* (1847) 52 & 116, *id.* (1855-56) 39 & 154, *id.* (1858-59) 34 & 192, and *id.* (1863-64) 731.

then moved into 9 Berkeley Street, Westminster, to be near Louis-Napoléon, who was lodged in King Street.[15]

The fact is, Captain Francis Martyn – he was not a major during the years in question – was not related to the Earl of Blessington. Charles Fuller Martyn's uncle was London-born Thomas Martyn, a celebrated professor of botany at Cambridge who had been rector of Ludgershall in Buckinghamshire,[16] and whose half-brother, Claudius Martyn, would take over the rectorship in 1785, whence the family would hold the rectorship and lordship of the manor until 1911.[17] 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.[18]

Did Howard and Francis Mountjoy Martyn live in a grand house in Circus Road in St John's Wood, as Maurois claimed? 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 No. 23 – renumbered 52 in 1877 after further building work[19] – was owned by Mary Louisa Edwards who occupied it until 1843, while in 1842 a tenant lodged with her for a year. For a little under two years the property was then declared vacant – but still owned by Edwards – until 1845, when a financial speculator began his long tenancy of it.[20]

---

15 Maurois, *Miss Howard cit.,* p. 37.

16 *D[ictionary of] N[ational] B[iography]* (London: Smith, Elder & Co, 1917[...]), vol. XII, 1206-08.

17 William Page, *A History of Buckinghamshire* (London: St Catherine Press, 1927), vol. IV, 170.

18 George Lipscombe, *The History and Antiquities of the County of Buckinghamshire*, (London: J. & W. Robins, 1847), vol. I, 309-11.

19 *Names of Streets and Places in the Administrative County of London* (London: Greater London Council, 1955, 4th ed), 171. The property is no longer extant.

20 Census Return 1841, HO 107/678, [11] fol.25 p. 7; WCA *St Marylebone General Rates* (G Ward) 1838 fol. 78, 1842-48 fol. 12 in all cases; Census Return 1851, HO 107/1491 fols 782-83. The tenant was the surgeon Samuel Thomas Partridge.

Mary Edwards, 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. The press at the time claimed Edwards to be 'the prince's mistress'.[21] However, there is no trace of either Martyn or Howard associated with any of the properties on Circus Road.[22] Some local sources maintain that Mason and Howard lived in nearby Lodge Road prior to Howard moving into No 23 Circus Road or 'Rockingham House' with Martyn in 1841, but there is also no evidence for this.[23] Somehow, the real existence at this property of Mary Edwards, Louis-Napoleon's close friend, was the hook onto which the fictional presence of Howard was grafted.[24]

Did Howard subsequently move to Berkeley Street, as Maurois claimed? Yes, but 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.[25] Howard continued to

21 *The Times* 25 Nov. 1840. Of course, prior to 1853 and the imperial marriage there were no 'mistresses' strictly speaking.

22 Census Return 1841, HO 107/1476 fol. 76 p. 2.

23 Census Return 1841, HO 107/678, [4] fols 6-8 pp. 5-9; WCA *St Marylebone General Rates* (G Division) 1839 fols 74-75, and for 1840 fols 70-71.

24 Perhaps this placing of Howard in St John's Wood was a genuine retrospective error derived from her later 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 Faubourg, see Jasper Ridley *Napoleon III and Eugénie* (New York: Viking, 1979), 328. This road had been opened in 1847 as the rue de Joinville but was renamed by the Second Republic in February 1848 to erase its Orleanist eponym, see Félix et Louis Lazare, *Dictionnaire administratif et historique des rues et des monuments de Paris* (Paris: chez Félix Lazare, 1855), 278.

25 *DNB*, vol. I, 1318-19; *The Times* 4 Mar. 1840. Sir Francis Thornhill Baring,

rent this property until 1856 – in other words until her position in France had been safely established for three years – maintaining it with three household servants in case she should be obliged to return to England.[26]

Thus far it has been shown that even if Howard, the shoemaker's daughter, had been associated with the jockey Mason, he could not have been the source of her purported wealth, while the fictional addresses suggest, up to 1848, an impoverished lifestyle until her genuine involvement with Captain Mountjoy. This paper will now examine Louis-Napoléon's financial circumstances prior to his election in France to determine whether the accusation of virtual destitution is at all justified.

II

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

Chancellor of the Exchequer and grandson of the bank's founder, stood surety for Comte d'Orsay, Louis-Napoléon's second.

26 WCA *Poor Rates* Parish of St George's Hanover Square (Curzon Ward) C 666 (1847) fol. 136 'Edward Harrison', C 667 (1848) fol. 136 'Mrs Howard', C 671 (1852) fol. 135 'Josiah Bates', C 675 (1856) fol. 131 [vacant], and C 676 (1857) fol. 131 [untenanted]; Census Return 30 Mar. 1851, HO 107/1476 fol. 76 p. 3 'The Head of [Household] abroad'.

1848, he was alone, not because he was impecunious but because he had escaped somewhat dramatically 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 arrangement at King Street is important to unravel since it was from Louis-Napoléon's apparent circumstances there that observers reached their own conclusions about his financial situation. A highly amusing but frankly libellous co-production between the wayward publisher John Hotten and the journalist James Haswell, two Republicans,[27] claimed that Louis-Napoléon, 'reduced to pecuniary shifts … rented a couple of rooms' at King Street.[28] The Imperialist Blanchard Jerrold,[29] as Napoleon III's later official biographer, maintained that Louis-Napoléon 'took one of a block of new houses just erected in King Street'.[30] All subsequent authorities have followed either one or the other, 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 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. These were demolished in October 1845 and replaced by three uniform houses, 1a-1c, with stabling accessed

27 For Hotten see *DNB*, IX, pp. 1310-11; Haswell is obscure.

28 J. 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: J. C. Hotten, 1871), 163.

29 *DNB*, vol. X, 789-90.

30 [William] Blanchard Jerrold, *The Life of Napoleon III* (London: Longmans, Green, 1874-82), vol. II, 382.

through Duke Street, in 1846. Louis-Napoléon took on property 1a.[31] Few contemporary documents, however, 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 marking his return address on letters as '3 King Street' even though this was not the number on his door![32]

Number 1a King Street was not an apartment but a house, and Louis-Napoléon's conditions there were clearly good. This is perhaps at least partly explained by the fact that the owner 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.[33]

---

31 The row was destroyed in 1940 and the present neo-Georgian replacement dates from 1954. The present numbering arrangement – 1a, 1b, and 1c – follows that of the original development. See Francis Sheppard, 'The Parish of St James Westminster. Part One: South of Piccadilly' in *Survey of London* (London: London County Council, 1960), vol. XXIX, 295-96.

32 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] for the sanitary drainage and lighting plans submitted to the local authority respecting the original properties as developed by Kelk. Both provide accurate ground plans of the spacious house exactly as Louis-Napoléon would have known them.

33 *DNB*, vol. XV, 1082-83.

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.[34] 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'.[35] 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 an 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.[36]

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 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 [37]

34 WCA *Poor Rates* Parish of St James (Pall Mall Division), D 195 (1847), D 199 (1848), fol. 20 in both; *Pavement Rates* D 1315, D 1316 (1847), fol. 16 in both, and D 1317, D 1318 (1848), fol. 16 in both.

35 Jerrold *Napoleon III cit.,* vol. II, 382.

36 See Cecilia Peel, 'Homes and Habits; 7: The Poor' in G. M. Young (ed.), *Early Victorian England, 1830-1865*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1934), vol. I, 126-34.

37 The Baring Archives at ING Baring Holdings Limited, London, MS 1001039 1 Jan. 1845 to 8 Oct. 1847 fols 71, 191, 213, 245; MS 1001040 1 Jan. 1848 to 31 Dec. 1849 fols 89-91.

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

These accounts 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 (1864), he never maintained an account valued at more than several thousand pounds. To counter posthumous accusations to the contrary, in 1885 Barings were obliged to state this publicly.[38]

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 nothing came of it she too 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

38 Philip Ziegler, *The Sixth Great Power: Barings, 1762-1929* (London: Harper Collins, 1988), 176-78.

between an ex-lover lending Louis-Napoléon money and Howard doing so.

However, even if Louis-Napoléon had known Howard at this time – 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. Since the jockey Mason had died a pauper, this paper will now examine in detail whether Howard the 'millionairess' may have obtained her alleged wealth through Francis Martyn.

III

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'.[39] The principal beneficiaries were of course these two sons, who were each to receive £150,000 worth of Consolidated Annuities, or Consols. Charles Martyn had opened an account with Thomas Coutts on 11 February 1813, shortly after arriving in England, with a cash sum of £24,259, gradually filling his account with ex-Indian funds before purchasing his Consols from the Bank of England. 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

39 National Archives, Kew, Prerogative Court of Canterbury (Middx vol. 86 p. 156, Mar. 158, 1823), PROB 11 (Richards)/1668 fols 60-61. Small annuities were given by Martyn to his aunt and also to his celebrated uncle; £1.200 was given to his lover, 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. 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'.

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 his guardian, from whom a further £1,000 was received in December. Presumably, this was an agreement reached to tide him over until his first interest payment on his Consols, which came only in January 1831.

Francis Martyn moved into 17 Charles Street, Berkeley Square, in 1843, before which he does not appear in London. However, he did not begin to occupy this address until the last quarter of 1846,[40] after which he was to live there for the following 27 years, alone other than for a large and ever-changing retinue of servants.[41] 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

40 Kelly's Post Office London Directory 1838-1843; 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'].

41 Census Returns 30 Mar. 1851, HO 107/1476 fol. 359 p. 8; 7-14 Apr. 1861, RG 9/46 fol. 47 p. 28; 7 Apr. 1871, RG 10/102 fol. 79 p. 39.

£160,000.[42] All of Martyn's wider family members died in relative poverty, and none who survived him were beneficiaries of his will.[43]

Amelia Jenkins was born at Beachley, Tidenham, in 1819, the daughter of a Calcutta merchant who spent most of his time in India. She was raised by a relative at Beachley Lodge where the Jenkins family had been long established as local philanthropists and merchants.[44] Amelia was affianced to Francis Martyn in India when they were children, and 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. On the following day, they were married at the parish church of Tidenham.[45] 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

42 *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, 92-93; London, First Avenue House, PR 9 fols 347 ff. 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 [See Charles Parry Hobhouse, *Some Account of the Family of Hobhouse and Reminiscences*, (Leicester: Johnson, Wykes and co, [1909?]), 29, 83]. Servants were given advanced wages, and friends sums of £200 or £500. These were in cash 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 [see *Index to Consular Deaths 1866-70*, fol. 30 (Algiers) vol. 4, p. 409; PC 1870 p. 87]. 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.

43 The Rev. Thomas Martyn, died 6 Oct. 1869, will proved 4 Feb. 1870 with effects under £800, PC 1870 p. 87; the Rev. Claudius Robert Martyn, died 27 Apr. 1873, will proved 17 May with effects under £800, PC 1873 p. 84; and the second Rev. Thomas Martyn, died 4 Jun. 1877, will proved 24 July with effects under £800, PC 1877 p. 95.

44 C. R. Erlington and N. Herbert, *A History of the County of Gloucester* (London: Victoria County History, 1972), vol. 10, 55-57, 64-65, 78-79.

45 National Archive, Kew, *Registration of Marriages* Sep. 1837, Chepstow, pp. xxvi [2] 51.

previously benefited from were withdrawn according to the pre-nuptial settlement and were redirected as stated. Amelia did not therefore benefit directly from Martyn's will but received instead £296 5s quarterly from his Coutts account.

In 1830 it became law for all officers in the British Army to register their marriages with the War Office within six months of the ceremony; Martyn did not do this.[46] 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.[47] 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.

When Martyn married Amelia he was living at 15 Waterloo Place with his guardian, the official occupant and ratepayer.[48] After their strange union, Amelia returned to Beachley Lodge while Martyn moved to Waterloo Place, where he stayed until 1839.[49] Sir Charles Theophilus Metcalfe, the Calcutta-born former provisional governor-

46 PRO WO 25/3239 'all marriages 1830-43'.

47 H[ousehold] C[avalry] [M]useum, Windsor, *Service Book* 101 f.24; *Journal of the Household Division 1874* (Obituary) p. 302.

48 WCA *Poor Rates* Parish of St James Hanover Square (Pall Mall Ward), D 158 (1837) fol. 15. The guardian was Andrew Macklen.

49 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, dates suggesting that Martyn had acquired the property on her behalf [WCA *Poor Rates* Parish of St George's Hanover Square (Grosvenor Ward), C 679 (1859) fol. 51 'Mrs Martyn', C 701 (1875) fol. 71 'Mrs Mountjoy Martyn' replaced by 'Frederick Jones']. 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 [Census Returns 7-14 Apr. 1861, RG 9/46 fol. 67 p. 16; 7 Apr. 1871, RG 10/102 fol. 25 p. 14]. After remarrying, Amelia died on 22 November 1878, in London, from a combination of Bright's Disease and bronchitis [*Registration of Deaths*, Dec. 1878 p. 294 (St George's Hanover Square) 1a 256].

general of India and the son of an East India Company Director, returned to England in May 1838.[50] On 13 July, he moved into his parental estate of Fern Hill in the village of Winkfield, Berkshire, a few miles from Windsor, a substantial estate consisting of two mansions and their associated buildings. Metcalfe vacated the area in June 1839 and moved into his town house on Portland Square.[51] The estate was divided, with Fern Hill remaining in Metcalfe's possession while the smaller Fern Cottage and its Lodge were separated off.[52] Metcalfe subsequently sold Fern Cottage to Francis Martyn, who left Waterloo Place and moved to Winkfield directly.[53] 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'.[54] Martyn stayed at Fern Cottage until the spring of 1841 when he began to lease it out.[55]

The two halves of Metcalfe's original estate soon acquired different names as their histories diverged. Metcalfe's commercial agent took over Fern Hill in 1842,[56] and in 1851 Fern Hill is unlisted save for a gardener and housekeeper when Martyn's half of the former estate, now known as Hill House, was occupied by the deputy-lieutenant of Lancashire.[57] 'Fern Cottage near Windsor' is

50 *DNB*, XIII, pp. 303-06; *General Register 1790-1842*, pp. 238-39.

51 John William Kaye, *The Life and Correspondence of Charles, Lord Metcalfe* (London: R. Bentley, 1858), vol. II, 226-33.

52 Census Return 1841, HO 107/26, [10] fol. 6 pp. 5-6. The first rental was to Sir Felix Booth, promoter of Arctic exploration, at Fern Hill, and to an estate labourer at the Lodge.

53 B[erkshire] R[ecord] O[ffice], Reading, *Electoral Register 1839-1840* p. 86 entry 4386.

54 BRO D/P 151/2/27C, *Tithe Apportionment Map 1841*, 'Cap Fras Mountjoy Martin' plot no. 927, 'Sir Charles Metcalfe, baronet'.

55 Census Return 1841, HO 107/26 [10] fol. 6 p. 6. The first lessee was George William Fox, the 9th Baron Kinnaird, who lived there with his family and 16 servants; the estate labourer and his family continued tenanting the Lodge.

56 Kaye, *Metcalfe cit.*, II, p. 308.

57 Census Return 30 Mar. 1851, HO 107/1694 fol. 554 p. 7. Sir Peter Hesketh Fleetwood, whose first wife had been Eliza Theophilia Metcalfe, daughter of Sir Charles's elder brother; see *DNB*, VII, p. 267.

listed as Martyn's alternate address from 1844 up to and including 1861, and he was also registered at 'Fern Cottage' for the elections of May 1859,[58] but by the spring of 1861 'Woodside Hill House', as the enumerator called it, was occupied by a new tenant.[59]

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. It has been stated that, on 16 August 1842, Howard gave birth to a boy, and there is no doubt that the father was Francis Martyn. However, there is no corroborative evidence for this since the 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 said (recorded by Maurois) to be long-term tenants in rooms at 6 Upper Fitzroy Street in the neighbouring parish of Pancras. If so there is no trace of them,[60] but either way, because of their relative youth – Joseph was 39 and Elizabeth 38[61] – they were able to pass their grandson off as their son.[62]

The claim by Maurois that Louis-Napoléon had been introduced to Howard at Gore House is also spurious. Apart from the fact that

58 Kellys Post Office London Directory (Court Directory) 1844-61; BRO *Electoral Register 1859-1860* p. 59 entry 2093.

59 Census Return 7-14 Apr. 1861, RG 9/756 fols 19-20 pp. 8-9. Lieutenant-General Sir Thomas Willshire, a distinguished soldier who had served for many years in India; see *DNB*, XXI, pp. 522-24.

60 Camden Local Studies Centre, London, *Poor Rates* Bloomsbury Ward, St Pancras West, UTAH 603 (March 1842) fol. 111 'Anne East' [occupier], UTAH 605 (September 1842) fol. 17 'Sophia Dudley' [occupier], 'Henry Charles Heather' [owner], and UTAH 606 (February 1843) fol. 17 [same].

61 National Archive, Kew, *Register of Deaths* Mar. 1871 p. 148 (Brighton) 2b 152; Mar. 1880 p. 154 (Lewes) 2b 115.

62 London Metropolitan Archives *Register of Baptisms*, P89/TRI/001-002 [327] fol. 41.

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, even had they met in 1846, were not on friendly terms until December 1847 at the earliest or, more likely, January 1848. In June 1847, Charles Pollard, a 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 the transfer of such an amount from Orsi in Florence to Barings in London. It was a high-profile incident at the time, demonstrating again that Louis-Napoléon's wealth consisted for the most part in real estate and the conversion of collateral but not necessarily cash in his pocket. If Louis-Napoléon had begun an affair with the allegedly wealthy Howard in the summer of 1846, 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?[63]

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 2nd 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.[64] 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.

63 For this incident see *The Times* 3 & 5 Jul. 1847; Serjeant Ballantine, *Some Experiences of a Barrister's Life* (London: R. Bentley, 1882), vol. 1, 293-95; and Henry Hawkins, *Reminiscences of Sir Henry Hawkins, Baron Brampton* (London: E. Arnold, 1904), vol. II, 222-26.

64 HCM *Annual Change of Quarters Book*, 1839, fols 202-03.

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 12th Earl of Westmorland, who happened to be the son of Louis-Napoléon's good friend Baron Burghersh.[65] And just like Louis-Napoléon, Martyn usually failed, his best success not coming until his colt *Westwick* won the Royal Stakes at the Second October Meeting at Newmarket on 9 October 1866.[66] It is some irony that this result took place so soon after Jem Mason's death, for if it is true, as Maurois claimed, that Mason had often taken Howard to race meetings, it may have been at Newmarket that Howard first met Martyn. 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.

But the question is not, of course, when and where Louis-Napoléon was introduced to Howard by Martyn for the 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, though, 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.[67] This tells us a great deal about Howard's mercenary character, but we should not feel too sorry for Martyn who was that lifelong combination of confirmed bachelor and compulsive womaniser obliging him to specialise in the pursuit of inappropriate

65 HCM *Journal of the Household Division 1874* (Obituary), p. 302.

66 *Illustrated London News* 13 Oct. 1866.

67 Maurois *Miss Howard cit.*, p. 38.

women who would not threaten his freedom to pursue a life of casual sexual encounters.[68]

Martyn's near-pathological sexual behaviour – so similar to that of Louis-Napoléon himself – 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. 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 Howard fiction to construe out of the situation vast sums of conscience money passing from Martyn to her.

---

68 On 21 July 1868, Martyn took out an annual lease of £650 on Broke Hall near Nacton in Suffolk to commence on 24 August [Ipswich Record Office, *Lease Agreement* HA 93/3/71]. 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 [Census Return 7 Apr. 1871, RG 10/1758 fol. 156 p. 2] for hunting parties and amorous liaisons. Shortly afterwards, in December 1868, Martyn was in Paris with his daughter Jeanne where he met Frances Elizabeth Miles, the wife of Philip John Miles and mother of the extraordinary young diarist Alice Catherine Miles. When they returned to England, Martyn 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 [see M. Parsons, *Every Girl's Duty – Alice Miles, the Diary of a Victorian Debutante* (London: André Deutsch, 1992), 95 ff.]. Alice accepted the situation, 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. When Alice Miles learned that Jeanne was illegitimate she believed that Jeanne was daughter to one of the actor sisters of the tragedienne Elisa Rachel Félix (Rachel). Alice came to disregard this theory in favour of one that made the playwright Alexandre Dumas *fils* the true father, since Martyn's 'intimacy' with the famous actress had lasted for just 'two weeks' [Diary entry (unpublished) for January 1869]. 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 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.

It can now be appreciated that in any event Martyn did not have any real money to give to Howard, having 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. Howard never appeared as a recipient of any money out of Martyn's account, and nor could such payments have been made on her behalf for there were no large withdrawals made by or on behalf of anyone – not even Martyn himself.

Howard of course subsequently did become hugely wealthy, although not at all for the reasons claimed by the Maurois fantasy. It is now that Howard's genuine wealth will be examined, and its source revealed.

IV

Louis-Napoléon mortgaged part of his Italian estate for 60,000 Roman ecus (£13,000) to the Marchese di Pallavicino, a minor relative of the politician and patriot Giorgio Guido, marchese di Pallavicino-Trivulzio, early in 1848, repaid in full after the *coup d'état*.[69] 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'.[70] Documents establishing this were discovered at the Tuileries and published within three months of Napoleon III's deposition. While

69 *Papiers et correspondance de la famille impériale* (Paris: Garnier frères, 1870-72), vol. I, 203-06.

70 *Ibid*., 171.

unquestionably scrupulously edited, they were of course carefully arranged in such a way as to discredit the quondam empire, containing much irrelevant editorial commentary that would not ordinarily have found its way into a scholarly publication.

Thus, it was from these entries concerning Howard that the Republican editors claimed, without citing any evidence, that Napoleon III had been in financial debt to her, the editors somehow assuming that it was Howard who had owned the Italian properties she first mortgaged to Louis-Napoléon! As Maurois put it, 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 … Howard paid his debts [in 1851] 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'.[71]

The mystery is in fact easy to clear up for Howard never had any such rights. 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.[72] 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. Maurois admitted that she was unable to comprehend the details of this transaction; of course she could not, since it was Louis-Napoléon who had 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.

71 Maurois, *Miss Howard cit.*, 62.

72 Ridley, *Napoleon III cit*., 46.

Between March 1853 and January 1855, Louis-Napoléon did pay Howard the total sum of 5,449,000 francs (a little under £400,000) in a complex arrangement involving monthly payments, state bonds, and occasional lump sums in cash. Once again, without supplying any evidence, since of course there was none to be had, the republican editors of the state papers found in the Tuileries claimed that this sum had been paid to Howard because 'elle avait payé plusiers fois les dettes du Prince Louis-Napoléon'.[73] 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 …'.[74]

Maurois herself found this letter 'incoherent', stating that 'imperfection in a language sets traps for the unwary'.[75] 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 that she had just helped consolidate, 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 newly-acquired estate.

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 …'.[76] It is astonishing that Howard's

73 *Papiers et correspondence cit*., vol. I, 172.

74 *Ibid*., 172-73.

75 Maurois, *Miss Howard cit.,* 125.

76 *Ibid*., 77.

own confession here did not correct the poor judgement of those who subsequently read it, for pay Howard off is precisely what Louis-Napoléon had been forced to do. On 13 September 1852, Howard's own stipulation in a 'contract of separation' enabled her 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.[77] She then arrogated for herself the grand title of 'La Comtesse de Beauregarde'. On 24 January 1853, Louis-Napoléon drew up the draft of the letters patent according to which Howard would acquire her title, one 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 quiet amusement. Accordingly, Howard's son Martin was created Comte de Béchevêt by imperial decree on 9 January 1864.[78]

The estate of Beauregarde was earning its own annual revenue of only 60,000 francs,[79] and Howard had been effectively cheated by the husband she took after her separation from Napoleon III, a husband 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'.[80] 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.[81] According to this, the financier Nathaniel Strode was paid 900,000 francs at the rate of

77 *Ibid*., 91, 135.

78 *Ibid*., 101-02.

79 *Ibid*., 164.

80 Maurois, *Miss Howard cit.*, 168-69.

81 William Echard, *Historical Dictionary of the French Second Empire 1852-1870* (London: Aldwych Press, 1985), 477.

50,000 francs monthly during the second six months of the years 1862, 1863, and 1864.[82] 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, ignoring the fact that Howard was already openly on the Civil List throughout 1853 for a further 400,000 francs monthly.[83]

Because the mythical '6,000,000' francs supposedly 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. 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 married Eugénie de Montijo. At the same time, the police entered and searched the estate of Beauregarde and all communications with the emperor were removed.[84]

It is clear by this action alone that had Napoleon III been in debt to Howard he need not have repaid any part of it had he not wished to do so. He had 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, with Howard squeezing every possible franc out of a man for whom the consequences of his sexual appetite affected that absurd sense of honour compelling him to over-compensate a difficult ex-lover for her avarice.

---

82 *Papiers et correspondance* vol. II, p. 156. Nathaniel William John Strode was also cited by Maurois – or, rather, by her 'sources' – as the trustee to Howard for her supposed London properties allegedly passed on to her by Francis Martyn.

83 *Ibid*., 136.

84 Maurois, *Miss Howard cit.*, 89-92.

In former times Howard might have ended up at the bottom of the Seine, or with her head on a block; instead, she died at Beauregarde on 19 August 1865, an embittered recluse. By then Lord Palmerston had pushed through British Parliament the Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Act, in which Clause 25 had given married women the same right to inherit and bequeath property as single women. Consequently, Howard's will was proved in London on 18 April 1866 with an effects value under £80,000.[85] Absent is Francis Martyn,[86] 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? On 16 May 1854, Howard married Clarence Trelawny in London, 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.[87] The day before the marriage, a solicitor's deed wrested Howard's City of London properties on Mark Lane (rental) and Nag's Head Court (freehold) and made them over directly to Trelawny, including an annuity of £500 from additional funds.[88] Any provision Martyn may have made for Howard therefore would have been obtained by Trelawny on his marriage to her. 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

85 PC 1866, 176-77.

86 Maurois, *Miss Howard cit.*, 146-50, 158-64.

87 National Archive, Kew, *Register of Marriages* Jun 1854 H-J p. 284 (St James) 1a 603.

88 Maurois, *Miss Howard cit.*, 118-19.

due to the expense and publicity incurred.[89] 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.

So, what is to be made of the statement by Maurois that Howard '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[90] – the so-called City investments, properties supposedly owned by Martyn and made over to her? 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. An anonymous trustee held only one property while again the rest were held by names that remained unchanged and cannot be linked with any familiar persons.[91]

---

89 Lee Holcombe, *Wives and Property, Reform of the Married Woman's Property Law in Nineteenth-Century England,* (Oxford: Martin Robinson, 1983), 9-13.

90 Maurois, *Miss Howard cit.,* 62.

91 Guildhall Library Manuscripts Department, London, *Land Tax Assessment Registers:* Mark Lane 1842: (Aldgate Ward) 11316/424 fol. 28, (Langbourn and Tower Wards) 11316/425 fols 9-12, 15; 1848: 11316/436 fol. 28, 11316/437 fols 9-12, 17-18; 1850: (all wards) 11316/440 fols 9-12, 15, 33; 1854: 11316/444 fols 9-12, 17-18, 34; 1855: 11316/445 fols 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), fol. 4 in all documents; Nag's Head Court (St Clement near Eastcheap Ward), *Poor Rates* Mar./Aug. 1845 992/36 fols 1-2, 17-18, Mar. 1854 992/42 fols 1-2, Sep. 1855 992/43 fol. 1; Nag's Head Court (St Edmund the King and Martyr Ward) Jun. 1851-53 4288/5 fols 16, 40, 64; Census Return 1841, HO 107/719 [2] fols 26-27, [9] fols 7-10; HO 107/720 [12] fol. 5-7, [14]

It is clear from this that even if Howard had received all the income from the 'hidden' rentals derived from the few possible sources in these streets (perhaps two or three properties and not the most substantial) – 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. Thus it is very clear that Howard had no real funds of her own prior to extorting them from Louis-Napoléon.

As a final *coup de grâce* to the myth, the necessity of Louis-Napoléon needing to have independent funds in order to pursue political life in France needs to be assessed.

V

The republican/romantic fantasy has always hinged on the supposition that Louis-Napoléon required vast sums of money to be 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. Nor according to Maurois was it a single payment for the presidency alone: Howard followed him to Paris in 1849, 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

fols 18-23, [15] fol. 9; HO 107/723 [1] fols 18-19.

the Prince two hundred thousand gold francs *in specie*'.[92] 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'.[93]

But 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 not 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

92 Maurois, *Miss Howard cit.,* 62-3.

93 *Ibid*., 76.

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.[94]

It is vital to understand the process by which Louis-Napoléon became president of the Second Republic, and why the inability to do so has obliged commentators to invent reasons for it, such as conjuring up vast sums of money we are to suppose Louis-Napoléon used to bribe his way into high office. Few understood it in England at the time, one newspaper stating caustically that the election result was 'extraordinary'.[95] 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 (23-26 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 'surpassing wonderful'.[96] Queen Victoria also thought the result 'really wonderful' and an 'extraordinary event'.[97] James Harris, 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'.[98] The political diarist Charles Greville observed that: 'The result … has astonished the whole world'.[99]

---

94 E. Newman, *Historical Dictionary of France from the 1815 Restoration to the Second Empire* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1987), vol. I, 389.

95 *The Times* 14 Dec. 1848.

96 *Observer* 17 Dec. 1848.

97 A. Benson and Viscount Esher, *The Letters of Queen Victoria* (London: John Murray, 1908), vol. II, 205-06.

98 Earl of Malmesbury, *Memoirs of an Ex-Minister* (London: Longmans and Green, 1884), vol. II, 237.

99 H. Reeve, *The Greville Memoirs (second part)* (London: Longmans and Green, 1885), vol. III, 253. It should be noted that some of these oft-quoted words have undergone a dramatic semantic change since 1848: '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

So what had in fact happened? No presidential candidate would have won without the backing of some powerful, wealthy, and organised group. The Orleanist Prince de Joinville and the Republican publicist Louis Blanc, for example, although both very well known political figures, 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.[100] 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

derogatory incomprehension mixed in with the utterly absurd.

100 For a comprehensive breakdown of the results, see *The Times* 14 Dec. 1848.

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.[101]

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 London 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'. Maurois inadvertently suggested the identity of her liars when referring to Béchevêt's long-standing belief 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'.[102] But 'family history', when not corroborated by

101 Theodore Zeldin, *The Political System of Napoleon III* (London: Macmillan, 1958), 5-9.

102 Maurois, *Miss Howard cit.,* p. 61. Curiously, Maurois rightly rejected this 'family tradition' as absurd but nonetheless remained uncritical of almost all

unimpeachable documentation, ought never to be employed in the composition of serious historical writing. In this case, many elements of the lives of Howard and Martyn have been fabricated as has their relationship to one of the key figures of the nineteenth century. The story of the poor shoemaker's daughter who became a 'millionairess' and the financial power behind an imperial throne has been shown to be a fairytale romance. All Howard's wealth was in fact extorted from Louis-Napoléon after 1848, and he never required a Howard, or anyone like her, to engineer his rise to imperial status. Indeed Howard's presence in the empire became a hindrance, harming the reputation of an already tarnished regime, and whose sordid association with Napoleon III was twisted by her descendants in order to exonerate her and implicate him.

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.

the rest Howard's descendants had placed before her.