

Mariusz MISZTAL

## The Intimate Picture of Queen Victoria and her Household, 1840–1843. Extracts from the Diary of Dr Robert Ferguson, the Queen's Accoucheur

---

**Abstract:** *It is a critical edition of extracts from a virtually unknown diary of Dr Robert Ferguson, a physician and accoucheur to Queen Victoria. Acquired only in 2009, the diary is housed in the archives of the Royal College of Physicians in London. Its highlights include the details of royal arrangements for the birth of the Princess Royal, record of Ferguson's interview with the Queen regarding her mental health in 1841, and most intimate character sketches of the Queen, her husband, Prince Albert, their closest advisor Baron Christian Stockmar, or the Queen's former governess and confidante, Baroness Louise Lehzen.*

**Keywords:** *Queen Victoria – Prince Albert – Louise Lehzen – Christian Stockmar – Robert Ferguson's diary – Royal Household – royal physicians – royal accoucheurs*

---

Researching a monograph study on Queen Victoria's children, I have found in the Royal College of Physicians in London an extremely interesting diary of Dr Robert Ferguson (1799–1865). In 1840, Dr Ferguson was first appointed the Queen's physician-accoucheur and was present at all her confinements and then, in 1857, he became her physician extraordinary. His diary has been virtually unknown to historians and biographers of the Queen or her husband, Prince Albert,<sup>1</sup> and it should be of great interest as it reveals intimate details of the Queen's personal life and her mental health.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 I gratefully acknowledge the permission of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II to consult the Royal Archives in Windsor and to quote from the documents housed there.

I would like to thank the Royal College of Physicians in London for the permission to publish the extracts from Dr Robert Ferguson's Diary.

The only published reference to the diary is a short blog entry by Felix Lancashire, the assistant archivist at the Royal College of Physicians in London (later quoted as RCP). URL: <<https://www.rcplondon.ac.uk/news/royal-doctor-s-diaries-reveal-intimate-details-queen-victoria-s-personal-life-and-health>> [accessed 18. 3. 2018].

2 The Royal College of Physicians in London possesses also a diary by another physician of Queen Victoria, Sir James Clark (see footnote 24 below), but Clark's diary is much less intimate. Volume one (RCP MS30/1) covers only the Queen's visits in Scotland in 1847, 1848, 1849, and to Ireland

Robert Ferguson was born in 1799 in India, where his father was a civil servant.<sup>3</sup> Although he was thinking about a career in the army, eventually he started to study medicine in London, and then spent a few years at Heidelberg, where he learned German and studied literature. After a few more years of diligent medical studies in Edinburgh he graduated doctor of medicine in 1823. While in Scotland, he made many friends, among them Sir Walter Scott and his son-in-law, John Gibson Lockhart.<sup>4</sup>

In 1823 he returned to London. Letters of recommendation from Lockhart helped Ferguson to find new friends among the London literary circles, for example, William Wordsworth, Henry Taylor, Washington Irving, or the eminent publisher John Murray, as well as among the leading politicians of the day, Lord Palmerston<sup>5</sup> or Lord Derby. Working as a resident medical officer of the Marylebone infirmary, Ferguson gained experience as a practitioner under the guidance of the famous Dr Robert Hooper. In 1824 he was admitted a Licentiate of the College of Physicians and devoted himself to midwifery. Soon he made friends with Dr Gooch, the leading specialist on women's diseases,<sup>6</sup> by whom he was patronised, and with time took over most of his patients. Ferguson was also appointed physician to the Westminster Lying-in hospital, and when in 1831 the medical department was opened at King's College, he was nominated to the chair of midwifery and in 1837 he was admitted a Fellow of the College of Physicians.

The growing numbers of his patients, many of them from the aristocratic circles, lauded not only his skill and tact as an accoucheur, but also his courteous manner, "*a very powerful intellect, a highly cultivated mind, great literary taste and acquirements*".<sup>7</sup> All this led to his appointment in 1840 as one of the physician accoucheurs to Queen Victoria. When the Queen was not any longer in need of accoucheurs, in 1857 Ferguson was

---

in 1849, and volume two (RCP MS30/2) covers the period of 1848–1860. A copy of Clark's diary is housed in the Royal Archives (RA VIC/MAIN/Y/206).

- 3 There does not exist a detailed biography of Robert Ferguson. All the biographical details have been drawn from a few available sources, for example, the obituaries which appeared in *The Lancet*, 1. 7. 1865, p. 25, 3. 3. 1866, 31. 3. 1866, pp. 355–356; *The Medical Times and Gazette*, Vol. II, 1865, pp. 13–15, but mainly from William MUNK (ed.), *The Roll of the Royal College of Physicians of London*, London 1878, Vol. 3: 1801–1825, pp. 295–298, which has been the basis for the later entries in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, written by Charles Creighton (1899) and John Peel (2004), s. v. "Ferguson, Robert (1899–1865)"; and his "Identity statement" prepared in 2003 for the RCP archives online catalogue by Katharine Martin.
- 4 See John Gibson LOCKHART, *Memoirs of the life of Sir Walter Scott*, 10 vols., London 1839, vol. 10: pp. 112, 121, 201, and Ferguson's description of the last illness of Scott, pp. 204–206.
- 5 After Ferguson's death, Palmerston said "*I have lost in Ferguson not only an able physician, but a personal friend.*" Sir Thomas WATSON, *Address to the Royal College of Physicians*, *The Lancet*, 31. 3. 1866.
- 6 Ferguson edited his works: Robert FERGUSON (ed.), *Gooch on some of the most important diseases peculiar to women: with other papers*, London 1859.
- 7 T. WATSON, *Address*.

appointed her physician extraordinary. Soon afterwards his health started to deteriorate and he died in 1865.

Dr Ferguson was one of the founding fathers of the *London Medical Gazette*. He published several articles in the *Quarterly Review*,<sup>8</sup> not only on medical subjects but also on literature,<sup>9</sup> philosophy<sup>10</sup> or social matters.<sup>11</sup> His first publication, in 1825, was a letter to Sir Henry Hallford proposing a combination of the old inoculation of smallpox with vaccination, and two of his most distinguished obstetric contributions were on diseases of the uterus and ovaria<sup>12</sup> and puerperal fever.<sup>13</sup>

The archives of the Royal College of Physicians in London house 167 papers of Robert Ferguson from 1821–1864. These are mostly his notes and notes for lectures on gynaecology and obstetrics, illustrated sometimes with diagrams, sketches and watercolour drawings, but also notes on literature or philosophy.<sup>14</sup> The most interesting, however, seems to be his two volume diary. The diary was acquired by the Royal College of Physicians only in 2009.<sup>15</sup> It consists of two volumes. Volume one consists of 168 handwritten pages and covers the period from 3 December 1841 till 2 January 1852,<sup>16</sup> and volume two consists of 122 pages and covers the period from 2 February 1855 till 10 May 1860.<sup>17</sup> It is Ferguson’s personal journal, including detailed but very irregular entries. Volume One is of special interest as it covers the period when Ferguson was an obstetrician for Queen Victoria. Its highlights include the details of royal arrangements for the birth of the Queen’s first child, Victoria, the Princess Royal, record of Ferguson’s interview with the Queen regarding her mental health in 1841, and most intimate character sketches of the Queen, her husband, Prince Albert, their closest advisor Baron Christian Stockmar, or the Queen’s former governess and confidante, Baroness Louise Lehzen. The second

---

8 See *Medical Times and Gazette*, 15. 7. 1876, p. 79.

9 For example, *Sir Henry Hallford’s Essays and Orations*, *The Quarterly Review*, Vol. 49, 1833, pp. 175–198.

10 See his lecture, “On the Method of Induction and Its Results in Medical Science”, 1836, RCP MS416/19, attached also to his *Essays on the Most Important Diseases of Women*, London 1839.

11 For example, *Colliers and collieries*, *The Quarterly Review*, Vol. 70, 1842, pp. 158–195.

12 *Diseases of the Uterus and the Ovaria*, in: Alexander Tweedie (ed.), *A System of Practical Medicine*, Vol. IV, London 1840, pp. 300–317.

13 *An Essay on Puerperal Fever*, in: Robert Ferguson, *Essays on the Most Important Diseases of Women*, London 1839, pp. 1–274.

14 For example, RCP MS413/34 Notes on truth and logic, RCP MS413/56 Notes on literary men; mental labour; effects of over-wrought imagination on the body; RCP MS414/7 Note book on Leibnitz and Hegel, RCP MS417 Notes on philosophy and literature.

15 RCP MS4976, Catalogue for auction containing Robert Ferguson’s personal journal and *carte-de-visite* album.

16 RCP MS4973.

17 RCP MS4a974.

volume is perhaps a little less interesting as far as the royal Court is concerned, because apart from the details of his trip to France in 1856 to treat Napoleon III for suspected poisoning,<sup>18</sup> it deals mainly with Ferguson's reflections on the death of his first wife and meeting his second wife.

In the opening paragraphs of the diary, Ferguson writes that his main reason for starting the diary is "*the desire to preserve some account of the customs, habits, manners and sentiments*" of the Royal Family and the Court, but he assures he will not report "*the gossip of idle tatters* [sic]". Despite this assertion, he often relates in detail the stories he has heard from members of the Court about the Queen's troublesome childhood, her marital problems, or the conflict between Baroness Lehzen and Prince Albert.<sup>19</sup> And it is often thanks to these unique glimpses into everyday life of the Court which shed new light on some of the most heatedly discussed events in the early reign of the young queen, that Ferguson's diary is such a valuable document for the historians and biographers of Queen Victoria.<sup>20</sup>

## Notes on editing

Capital letters are used to begin each sentence. Random capitals and italics are removed except when they are evidently used by the author for emphasis. Periods are placed at the end of sentences instead of dashes, colons, or no punctuation at all. Punctuation is altered within sentences if needed to clarify meaning. Original spelling is retained and the obvious mistakes are indicated by [sic]. Abbreviations such as those for place names or surnames are spelled out in brackets, e.g. L[ocock]. Contractions, such as "thou" are retained, but superscripts are lowered to the line. Crossed-out words, if they are significant, are placed in footnotes, otherwise they are not reproduced. Omissions made by the editor

18 See also on this subject, RCP MS414/8, Note book with additional loose notes on the health of the Emperor Napoleon III, with description of symptoms and details of treatment. It comprised paper read by Dr Ferguson to the Emperor in the presence of his physician, Dr Conneau, 6. 5. 1856, giving detailed account of the Emperor's condition. Followed by notes on loss of nervous power in the Emperor, 9. 5. 1856. Also, RCP MS422 Miscellaneous note book including notes on Napoleon.

19 The best discussion of the period covered in the diary is still Cecil WOODHAM-SMITH, *Queen Victoria. Her Life and Times, 1819–1861*, London 1975, and Monica CHARLOT, *Victoria. The Young Queen*, London 1991.

20 In 1908, Ferguson's son approached the well-known publisher, Sir John Murray (1851–1928), about the possibilities of publishing the diary. Murray, however, declined, saying that although "*of the interest of this Diary there can be no doubt there are several passages, and those amongst the most interesting, which it would be undesirable to publish – now at any rate, as being too private or as referring to persons whose near relations are still living*". RCP MS4973 (insert), John Murray to Ferguson, 5. 8. 1908.

are indicated by [...]; pagination in the manuscript is indicated in brackets, e.g. [p. 5], as are the years when missing in the original text.

## Extracts from the Diary of Dr Robert Ferguson, Volume One

[p. 1] December 3<sup>rd</sup> 1841

*I have once more determined to write such facts and observations as the day brings before me, and yet not to note down the gossip of the idle tatters [sic], but to trace those emotions and thoughts, which have become inwoven with my own mental existence, that hereafter I may have on a retrospect, my own life in manhood, to stir up my feelings in old age, should indeed that gift of the Almighty be awarded to me.*

*Another motive has moreover acted as a powerful stimulus to my industry, namely a feeling of the importance of the position I hold near the highest persons of the realm, and the desire to preserve some account of the customs, habits, manners and sentiments of those who are secluded by their very position from casual observation. In all this there is the ordinary quantum of vanity; yet I do not desire to please others so much as to preserve those affections and impulses [sic] with which I have been of late moved, that I here may act as a leaven of reflection and kindle my mind in after years when my task of active duties shall have been performed and when I shall hope to live many a scene of memory over again.*

[p. 2] *I have this day (Dec[ember] 3<sup>rd</sup> 1841) seen both the Queen and Prince Albert and had with the latter a most intimate conversation, in which he informed me that her Majesty, to use his own expressions, “had been reared midst fears and quarrels so that from her very infancy her mind had ever been on the stretch, and had never known what was true repose”. Her favorite attendant was and is the Baroness Lehzen,<sup>21</sup> and her mortal aversion Sir John Conroy.<sup>22</sup> The ascendancy of the latter over the Duchess of Kent was such*

---

21 Louise Lehzen (1784–1870) was a daughter of a Lutheran pastor from Coburg, who came to England in 1819 to be a governess of Flora, the Duchess of Kent’s daughter from her first marriage. In 1824 she became the governess of young princess Victoria, and in 1827 was made a Hanoverian baroness by George IV. She devoted her life to bringing up and caring for the Princess, and Victoria repaid her devotion with trust and “*the greatest affection*”. See Royal Archives, Windsor Castle (afterwards quoted as RA) VIC/MAIN/Y203/79, 80, 81, Baroness Lehzen to the Queen, 20. 2., 6. 9., 2. 12. 1867. In 1835 Princess Victoria wrote about Lehzen: “*I never can sufficiently repay her for all she has borne and done for me. She is the most affectionate, devoted, attached, and disinterested friend I have.*” RA VIC/MAIN/QVJ (W) Queen Victoria’s Journals (quoted afterwards as QVJ; until 16. 2. 1840 quoting from Lord Esher’s typescripts, later – from Princess Beatrice’s copies). QVJ, 5. 11. 1835. Lehzen’s influence over Victoria continued after she became queen.

22 John Ponsonby Conroy (1786–1854), was personal equerry to Victoria’s father, the Duke of Kent, and after his death in 1818 became the influential comptroller of the Duchess of Kent’s household, and she came to regard him as her most reliable friend. The best study of Conroy is Katherine HUDSON, *A Royal Conflict. Sir John Conroy and the Young Victoria*, London 1994.

as to permit him to rule the whole household. Between these two, a most determined enmity arose and a series of premeditated insults were perpetrated on the Baroness with the hope that she would rather resign, than endure them. This was the main spring of the perpetual fear in which the mind of the Queen as a child was kept, and how terrible the consequences thence traceable may be, time with show.

I have never known a pressure of fear in infancy produce other than great tendency to gloom and vain terrors in after life. Even idle tales of the nursery will leave traces on the mind when they themselves are no longer remembered. Much of my own aptitudes for gloomy anticipations I now can [p. 3] attach to the perpetual horrors with which in my own infancy my imagination was drugged. But the Queen had one more element to act on her, beside fears [...] an early and assiduous cultivation of her hatreds in the coarse tyranny of Sir John Conroy,<sup>23</sup> and Sir James Clarke<sup>24</sup> in one of our Windsor visits characterised her well, as one who had had all her bad passions called out and her good dispositions suppressed.

On the 27<sup>th</sup> of November last, I was sent for to the [Buckingham] Palace and was ushered up to the room of Baron Stockmar,<sup>25</sup> who at once opened up the reason for my being thus selected from among my colleagues to see her Majesty. He told me that of late, she had been

23 Conroy established a plan called the “Kensington system”, which aimed at establishing the Duchess of Kent’s strict control over the Princess, and forcing Victoria to appoint him her Private Secretary or her Privy Purse. See RA VIC/MAIN/M/7/67, Charles, Prince of Leiningen, “A Complete History of the Policy followed at Kensington, under Sir John Conroy’s Guidance”, 1840 (transl.). In October 1836, supported by the Duchess of Kent, he tried to coerce Victoria, who was much weakened then by a serious illness, into signing a paper promising to make him her private secretary when she becomes queen: “*They (Mamma and John Conroy) attempted (for I was still very ill) to make me promise beforehand, which I resisted in spite of my illness and their harshness, my beloved Lehzen supporting me alone*”, she told Lord Melbourne. QVJ, 26. 2. 1838. In 1837, a few days before she assumed throne, Victoria answered angry letters from her mother in support of Conroy’s demands: “*I declare my firm resolution and determination not to fetter or bind myself by giving any premature promises.*” RA VIC/MAIN/M/7/46, the Duchess of Kent to Princess Victoria, 12. 6. 1837; RA VIC/MAIN/M/7/50 Princess Victoria to the Duchess of Kent, 14. 6. 1837.

24 Sir James Clark (1788–1870), after being the physician of Victoria’s uncle, Prince Leopold and her mother, the Duchess of Kent, was appointed Physician-in-Ordinary to Queen Victoria and received baronetcy in 1837. *The London Gazette*, 8. 8. 1837, No 19530, p. 2072. He became a trusted advisor on medical matters to the royal family, despite his often wrong diagnoses. See W. MUNK (ed.), *The Roll*, Vol. 3: 1801–1825, pp. 222–226; A. A. CORMACK, *Two Royal Physicians: Sir James Clark, bart., 1788–1870, Sir John Forbes, 1787–1861*, London 1965; George WHITFIELD, *Beloved Sir James, The Life of Sir James Clark, Bart, Physician to Queen Victoria, 1788–1870*, London 1982. Ferguson always writes his name as “Clarke”, so does Princess Victoria in her journals, at least until 1835, but then always “Clark”. See QVJ.

25 Dr Christian Friedrich Stockmar (1787–1863), Prince Leopold’s doctor and dearest friend, was instrumental in arranging the marriage between Victoria and Albert, and then became their most trusted advisor. The Queen wrote about him: “*We confided everything to Stockmar and he was adored in this house*”. Queen Victoria to the King of the Belgians, 9. 7. 1863, George Earle BUCKLE (ed.), *The Letters of Queen Victoria*, 2<sup>nd</sup> series, 2 vols., London 1926, Vol. 1, p. 100. See

gloomy and desponding.<sup>26</sup> *That there were illusions both of the eye and the ear. By the one sense she was deceived into a belief that she saw spots on peoples [sic] faces, which turned into worms, and that coffins floated before her, while with the other, she heard words, always the same and always German... While Baron Stockmar was in the very act of recounting these facts, the Prince suddenly and hurriedly rushed in, requesting me to descend at once to her Majesty, who hearing of my arrival at the Palace became impatient [p. 4] to see me. I pleaded for a little more delay that I might be put in possession of further details before I encountered her Majesty, but this request, though seconded by Baron Stockmar, was met by the Prince with the objection that her Majesty was too anxious not to be troubled by further delaying the interview. So he hurried me out of the room, with more than his usual rapid and abrupt pace into the lower rooms, and suddenly thrust me into his own dressing rooms and at once, approaching his face close to mine with pale and haggard looks, he broke out. “The Queen has heard that you have paid much attention to mental disease,<sup>27</sup> and is afraid she is about to lose her mind! She sees visions and hears sounds, and is much troubled as to what will become of her when she is dead. She thinks of worms eating her, and is weeping and wretched”. “Does her Majesty sleep”, I asked, “Does she dream much?” “She sleeps profoundly and without a dream”. “There is not much then to be feared”, I answered. He immediately brightened up and stumped off looking over his left shoulder at me as he bade me follow [p. 5] him, and in an instant I found myself before the Queen. She was lying down, and the tears were flowing fast over her cheek as she addressed me, overwhelmed with shame at the necessity of confessing her weakness and compelled by the very burden of her mind and her sorrows to seek relief. I soon quieted her apprehensions as to mental malady by being able to trace these aberrations of sensation and emotion, which were combined with a clear intellect, to the disorder of her digestive organs, made obvious by all I had already ascertained. She was immediately much comforted and then told me*

---

F. Max MÜLLER (ed.), *Memoirs of Baron Stockmar*, London 1872; Pierre CRABITES, *Victoria’s Guardian Angel. A Study of Baron Stockmar*, London 1938.

26 The Queen gave birth to her son on 9. 11. and then for quite some time was suffering from acute post-natal depression. On 15. 11. she complained of “*feeling rather weak & depressed*”, and on 27. 11. she admitted that she had “*felt rather weak & depressed these last days, but far better today*”, perhaps thanks to Ferguson’s visit. QVJ, 2. 12. 1841.

27 Among Ferguson’s papers there are, e.g., RCP MS413/48A, Abstract of cases of insanity with necroscopic appearances; RCP MS413/56, Notes on literary men; mental labour; effects of overwrought imagination on the body; RCP MS413/57 Notes on influences by which the mind is warped. Influence of professions; RCP MS413/60 Notes on the physiology of the nervous system. Ferguson published also a few articles on mental diseases, e.g., *Gooch on Insanity* and *Brodie’s Psychological Inquiries*, both in the *Quarterly Review*, Vol. 41, 1829, pp. 163–183, and Vol. 96, 1854, pp. 86–117.

that once before, when Clarke first saw her in 1832,<sup>28</sup> she had been similarly affected, and that it arose at once suddenly on reading, she added, a very foolish story. “Do not, Dearest”, she said turning to the Prince, “relate the story now to Dr Ferguson, but show him the book”. He subsequently informed me that the tale referred to was contained in the *Memoirs of St Simon*,<sup>29</sup> and referred to the death of a princess whose viscera were enclosed in a vase, but the vessel breaking the whole escaped and presented so disgusting an object to the Court, that the whole of the persons witnessing fled from the horrible sight and stench.<sup>30</sup>

[p. 6] My interview came to a close. I assured her Majesty that she would soon be well, but not suddenly; that her mind should be prepared against disappointment in the event of a recurrence, for the nature of these maladies was to assume an intermittent character. From that time to this day (about 10 days) the paroxysms have been fewer and slighter, but today I found her oppressed by her thoughts and weeping.<sup>31</sup>

The Prince said that since his marriage he had made great improvements in her condition, that he found her going to bed at three in the morning and not getting up till 11, while now

28 Dr Clark is mentioned in Princess Victoria’s Journals for the first time on 16. 12. 1833, when he was one of the dinner guests. On that day Victoria “awoke at 7 very unwell... I had such a violent headache that I remained in bed till ½ past 9. I then remained in my flannel dressing-gown till ½ past 11. I then dressed half and went downstairs and lay upon the sofa. I was sick soon after which greatly relieved me. At 1 came Doctor Maton”. From 1820 to 1835, Dr W. G. Mahon had been physician to both the Duchess of Kent and Princess Victoria, but he died on 30. 3. 1835. Dr Clark had been residing with uncle Leopold in Belgium since 1830, and was appointed physician to the Duchess and the Princess in April 1835. Princess Victoria noted in her journal: “I quite forgot to mention that poor Dr Maton died the day before yesterday, after an illness of rather more than a month, at the age of 61. At ½ past 1 came Dr Clarke, our new physician.” QVJ 1. 4. 1835.

29 Louis de Rouvroy, Duke of Saint-Simon (16 January 1675–2 March 1755), was a French soldier, diplomat and the author of famous *Memoirs*. In the Queen’s Journal the first mention of St Simon as the author of the *Memoirs* comes only from 1838: QVJ, 26. 10. 1838, then 14. 11. 1838, and 17. 12. 1838. But it does not seem that she read the *Memoirs* then, because on 29. 8. 1841 she relates her conversation with Lord Melbourne: “[we] talked of books & my wishing to get interesting ones to read. He mentioned St. Simon’s *Memoirs*, which he said were very curious & gave an excellent account of the times of Louis XIVth & Regent & his wife”. Prince Albert read the *Memoirs* to the Queen a few days before Ferguson’s visit. *Ibidem*, 18. 11. and 20. 11. 1841.

30 After death of Anne Marie Louise d’Orleans, Duchess of Montpensier (1627–1693), “her body was laid out with great state, watched for several days, two hours at a time, by a duchess or a princess, and by two ladies of quality.... A very ridiculous accident happened in the midst of this ceremony. The urn containing the entrails fell over, with a frightful noise and a stink sudden and intolerable. The ladies, the heralds, the psalmodists, everybody present fled, in confusion. Every one tried to gain the door first. The entrails had been badly embalmed, and it was their fermentation which caused the accident.” Bayle ST. JOHN (transl.), *The Memoirs of the Duke of Saint Simon on the Reign of Louis XIV, and the Regency*, 15 vols. New York 1901, here vol. 1, chap. 2, p. 30.

31 And on 26. 12., Anson noted that the Queen “was not at all well again yesterday, being again troubled with lowness”. RA VIC/MAIN/Y/54/100.



she is never out of bed at eleven and never in bed at 8 in the morning.<sup>32</sup> It costs the Queen, he said, more to renounce a trifling habit than to bear a great misfortune, and when I stated that she might be induced to abandon such courses of action as were still injurious by his persuasion and example, he shook his head not at me, but turning away, as if unconscious of any thing beyond his own strong convictions then working in his mind.

[p. 7] December 5 [1841]

This calm judgement implied in the doubt, seemed to me not to mark the blindness of a young husband as to the faults of a youthful wife and that wife a Queen! I asked Clarke who was present in the interview whether the Prince was in love. He said, he thought he liked her.<sup>33</sup> On her side, however, I have no doubts. She is dotingly attached to him, and cannot bear him out of her sight. And what woman would not be fond of such a husband possessing at once temper, talent, and beauty. His profile is cut in the grace of the Grecian art in its best age. The eye is bright and without fierceness and suits well with the calmness of his expression and the evenness of his colouring. His complexion is neither pale nor tinted, but of a clear white, thro’ which the red shines just strongly enough to save it from the charge of sickliness, while its character is that of a refined and delicate mind. He is nearly six feet high, wide shouldered, rather too short in the neck, well proportioned as to the length of his limbs, tho’ the knees are not quite well clearly knit. There is a singular sweetness of expression in his grave-hilarity, which it is impossible to resist. His chiefest [p. 8] mental characteristics are good sound common sense and a thoughtfulness quite unusual at so young age (22). Perhaps it is this, which makes him look older than he is. A sketch from a slight couver talion, which I had the other day with Baron Stockmar, when he was describing the various causes, which might agitate the Queen, will convey the liveliest picture of the Prince:

“Vell den. Dere is de Prince, who has also dat in his manner to make her nervous. He is yong and vill not wait jast to see weshur de papers he has jast received should be kept or not, but he goes wis-out ceremony and opens de door queekly to ask some quasetion, which need not have been ho-reed and den ven dat is over, he goes out as fast, stomping along the paasseges like a dragoon. Never ze less, he is queek of apprehension and has a sound jodgement”.

32 Cf. the Queen’s Memorandum, in: Charles GREY, *The Early Years of His Royal Highness, the Prince Consort*, New York 1867, pp. 276–277.

33 Greville recorded in his Memoirs the impression of the Duchess of Bedford, the Queen’s Lady of the Bedchamber, that a few days after their marriage the Queen was “*excessively in love*” with Prince Albert, “*but he not a bit with her*”. Philip WHITWELL WILSON (ed.), *The Greville Diary. Including Passages Hitherto Withheld from Publication*, 3 vols, London 1927, 26. 2. 1840.

*The Prince in one of his conversations with me last year at Windsor, told me that he had been a sickly youth, much subjected to croup. All his tastes are those of a student of elegant literature and art. He is a musician [p. 9] and, I believe, a draughtsman, talented rather than original and though devoid of intellectual genius, possessing in a very unusual degree tact both in discovering character, and in managing it.*

*The day before yesterday, when he was detailing to me the unnecessary references constantly made to the Queen by all her immediate attendants on every thing as a source of excitement, he added, "For my part I select my servants for their intelligence and give them much discretionary power, and then they do not forget nor act negligently, but when every thing is to be told and nothing is done without an order, then much must escape and more, be badly performed". His temper is sweetness itself.*

*The Queen is one of the most extraordinary young women I have ever seen, and this is at once visible in the play of her very mobile and finely chiselled features. No one would call her beautiful, few pretty, yet Leslie the artist, who painted her,<sup>34</sup> told me he could not catch her expression and that no one had yet succeeded in conveying it to canvass. She is singularly graceful for so short a figure, having such complete command of all her limbs, that every movement [p. 10] and action is natural, effortless and [? ...y].*

*The eye is prominent and light and full of a range of expression that strikes the observer. The skin is too fine, so that complexion looks, at times, slightly purple and when she lowers and is vexed, the contrast of the darkening countenance and the light rapid movements of her blue large eyes suggests the aspect of a stormy sky in [sic] a summer day lit up with flashes of lightening. There is force, character talent in her face, but no habitual repose or feminine gentleness, yet it cannot be said to be ill-tempered, and is the reverse certainly of the virago, being delicate in all its lines, save too great a roundness of the contour. It belongs to a fiery character and a nervous temperament.*

*I saw the Queen for the first time in May 1840 and then at short intervals during the whole of the summer previous to her first confinement. I was then told by Clarke that her assiduity to her "profession" of kingcraft was so intense as to make it incumbent on him to*

---

34 Charles Robert Leslie (1794–1859), painted "Queen Victoria Receiving the Sacrament at her Coronation, 28 June 1838". QVJ, 28. 7. 1838. Queen Victoria was delighted with the painting too. She thought "the group of my youthful trainbearers is excessively pretty [...]. I like it so much that I have said I will buy it." Ibidem, 27. 11. 1838. She wrote to her half sister, Princess Feodora, that it was "the loveliest picture of the coronation you can imagine; [...]. He has got me so like [...] and all the others, he has got so like, I am charmed with it." See Oliver MILLAR, *The Victorian Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty The Queen*, 2 vols, Cambridge 1992, OMV 642. He also painted *The Christening of the Princess Royal*, with a likeness of the Queen. Ibidem, OMV 463.

request the Melbourne ministers<sup>35</sup> to send her “pieces” of the dispatches instead [p. 11] of the originals. She reads all the best newspapers on either side of politics and is, I should say, the slave of public opinion. “Locock<sup>36</sup> just before her last confinement was imprudent enough to tell her one evening that a paragraph relating to her ailments had just appeared in the *Globe*. She immediately sent for it, read it, and then retired to her room and wept for two hours”. She is extremely punctual and methodical – writes her journal daily, at the same hour, and any interruption of her ordinary stated occupation, ruffles her temper or her feelings.

It certainly will demand the greatest circumspection and self command to prevent her tendencies and impetuositities from sporting a generous disposition. But Providence has shielded her in giving her a husband whose patience and example may perfect those good emotions which he has already called out. Nothing else will save her sooner or later from madness.

December 8 [1841]

I received a summons this day to proceed with Clarke to Windsor to see the Princess Royal,<sup>37</sup> who had been more than usually disordered.<sup>38</sup> [...] [p. 12]. I saw her Majesty and the Prince and discussed our plans of cure with him.<sup>39</sup> Clarke having heard that the Queen had taken a bath and afterwards complained of cold, said to the P., “Of course, it was attributed to the bath”. “Naturally”, he answered with his sweet smile. I mention this as an

35 William Lamb, 2<sup>nd</sup> viscount Melbourne (1779–1848), Prime Minister 1834, 1835–1841. The most important advisor of the young Queen.

36 Dr Charles Locock the Queen’s chief obstetrician was present (with Ferguson) at all her confinements, and also at the birth of the children of queen Victoria’s eldest daughter. See W. MUNK (ed.), *The Roll*, Vol. 3: 1801–1825, pp. 270–272; Charlie LUSH, *Lord Deliver Us. A Personal History of Sir Charles Lockock, Bt. Queen Victoria’s Favourite Physician an Celebrated Accoucheur*, Perth 2004.

37 Victoria, the eldest daughter of Queen Victoria was styled “Princess Royal”. QVJ, 22. 12. 1840, 10. 2. 1841. This purely honorary title is customarily given by the sovereign to his or her eldest daughter and was introduced by Henrietta Maria, consort of Charles I, for their eldest daughter, Princess Mary (b. 1631), imitating the French “*Madame Royal*”.

38 See QVJ, 8. 12. 1841: Pussy “has not been quite so well again”. For the first few months of her life, The Princess Royal, called by her parents “Pussy”, was in perfect health, but from the end of July, she started to have problems with digesting food and was losing weight, “is grown too thin & looks so peaked”. Ibidem, 6. 9. 1841. At the beginning of November the Queen wrote: “Till the end of August she was such a magnificent, strong, fat child, that it is a great grief to us to see her so thin, pale, & changed.” Clark and Ferguson saw the Princess regularly, sometimes joined by Locock. On 21. 10. Ferguson told the Queen, that “all her little ailments came from her teething, & that she was a perfectly healthy child, & that all would come [sic] right”. On 3. 11. he again assured her that there was “no cause for alarm, though there may be, for anxiety, & that it must take time to get her quite right”. Ibidem, 21. 10., 3. 11. 1841.

39 The new cure must have worked, as on 21. 12. the Queen was delighted to find “dear “Pussy” so much better today, in all essentials, — really better than she has been for weeks”. Ibidem, 21. 12. 1841.

instance of the sort of management under which her Majesty is, and how freely the Prince converses with us, as to these forbles.

Clarke told me that the current story as to C[onroy] and the D[utchess] of K[ent] was well founded, that the former was a foolish bad man, whose ambition was to make the D[utchess] regent by proclaiming her daughter an idiot!<sup>40</sup> I can scarcely credit such monstrous wickedness and folly, yet the insinuations from the Lady Stopford<sup>41</sup> were to the same effect.

To present a notion of the sort of waiting requisite: I was in the castle [at Windsor] by 31/4. The Queen had gone out, so we lounged in the beautiful galleries that wind around the quadrangle and examined the numerous pictures and busts which fill its niches and cover its walls. At 5 we [p. 13] had our interview, at half past five we went into Baron Stockmar's room and then walked to the station at Slough,<sup>42</sup> where we arrived at 25 minutes past 6.

December 9 [1841]

Baron Stockmar is now 53 years old and his position and influence are such as to make the following sketch of him requisite for understanding much, which without it would remain unintelligible. Perhaps the only true friend which the Royal Couple possess is this man, who to maintain his influence has declined place and salary,<sup>43</sup> though repeatedly offered both. He came over, I believe, with the King of the Belgians<sup>44</sup> prior to his marriage with the Princess Charlotte,<sup>45</sup> and has remained here ever since visiting occasionally one or other of the Royal Coburg family here and abroad. Clarke tells me that he lives only to do good. That he watched over the welfare, honor, and conduct of the Queen and the Prince with the anxious affection of a father, and not only does he prevent absolute faults of conduct, but

40 In 1837 John Conroy told Charles Jenkinson, 3<sup>rd</sup> Earl of Liverpool, that Victoria was “totally unfit by nature for the consideration of business, and was younger in intellect by some years than she was in age, that her tastes were light and frivolous and that she was easily caught by fashion and appearances...”. RA VIC/ADD/A/11/18 Memorandum Lord Liverpool, 17. 6. 1837.

41 Lady Mary Stopford was lady-in-waiting to the Duchess of Kent (alternating with Lady Flora Hastings). QVJ, 17. 2. 1837. She was said to be “a very nice amiable little person” and “universally liked in the house”. Ibidem, 1. 3. 1837, 25. 4. 1838. In 1839 the Queen wrote about her being very ill and “half of her lungs being destroyed”. Ibidem, 19. 1. 1839.

42 Slough was the closest railways station to the Castle until October 1849, when the Windsor Station was opened.

43 Cf. Baron Stockmar's undated letter to his brother Karl about his awkward position as unpaid mentor to Prince Albert, who married Queen Victoria. Landesbibliothek Coburg, MS 348/4.

44 Victoria's uncle, Leopold (1790–1865), prince of Saxe-Coburg-Saalfeld, in 1817 married Charlotte, Princess Royal. In 1830, following the country's independence, he became king of the Belgians. In 1835 Princess Victoria wrote: “I look up to him as a Father, with complete confidence, love and affection. He is the best and kindest adviser I have. He has always treated me as his child and I love him most dearly for it.” QVJ, 4. 10. 1835.

45 Charlotte (1796–1817), the Princess of Wales, the only child of George IV. In 1816 she married Prince Leopold, but died following childbirth.

so regulates it, that even the appearance of error is avoided. He has free access to both and confers with the utmost liberty and openness with them on all subjects.

Of this I had an instance, when it was [p. 14] deemed necessary to inform the Prince of the present state and future prospects of the Princess Royal, and nothing could have been more ably done than the delivery in English to a young father and a prince, of the causes and the dangers of his first born’s malady. It was fluent, lucid, uncompromising and yet feeling. Lord Ashley<sup>46</sup> told me that every one considered the influence of Stockmar as most beneficial. In person he is small, vivacious in movement. In mind quick and sagacious, a warm heart, perhaps a little vain, but a sharp judge of character.

Another of the palace “friends” is the Baroness Lehzen, who formerly came over with the Duchess of Kent as *gouvernante* to her daughter, the Princess Feodore, and so satisfied George the 4<sup>th</sup> of her fitness for her place, that she was entrusted with the care of the Princess Victoria, and elevated from Miss Lehzen to the title of “Baroness (of Hanover)”. Along with the rest of the public, I looked on this lady as the prime mover and director of all things respecting the Queen, and thought her either a paragon of prudence and virtue or of talent and mischief [p. 15] making. When therefore I saw her for the first time in the Queen’s first pregnancy, I was struck with the feebleness of her mental powers. She is obviously a common mind, and what there may be of talent is the “talent” which the minute attention to the humors of one or two persons gives. She can by long experience tell how the Queen will act or feel under any. Her “womans faculties” have been sharpened by the knowledge that all her existence hangs on the smiles and frowns of a girl of 22. So that even the modicum of mental light she possesses is concentrated into a focus by her fears and hopes, and enables her mind to apprehend minutiae, which a vision embracing more free and expansive scene, could never adjust itself to view. She is foolish and weak, but being filled with a strong instinctive affection for the Queen she has a guide in this, which directs her small logic with wonderful precision of prophecy.

There is a mortal hatred towards her on the part of the Prince,<sup>47</sup> for she never scruples to blame even him, if she imagines that any act or thought of his may obscure the blaze

---

46 Anthony Ashley Cooper, from 1851 7<sup>th</sup> Earl of Shaftesbury (1801–1885), politician and social reformer. In June 1842 Ferguson wrote an article *Colliers and Collieries* in support of Lord Ashley’s proposal for a bill to regulate the age and sex of children employed in mines and collieries. The *Quarterly Review*, Vol. 70, 1842, pp. 158–195. See Megan COYER, *Literature and Medicine in the Nineteenth-Century Periodical Press. Blackwood’s Edinburgh magazine, 1817–1858*, Edinburgh 2017, pp. 188–190.

47 Albert told his private secretary that “I give every person about me credit for the best intentions and honesty of purpose until they prove themselves unworthy of my confidence. I applied this my general rule to the Bs [Baroness]. She has lost it by repeated instances of animosity”. RA VIC/MAIN/Y/54/16, Prince Albert to George Anson, 24. 7. 1840. A few months later Albert was convinced that Baroness Lehzen was “a crazy, stupid intriguer, obsessed with the lust of power, who regards herself as a demi-

of virtues in her darling Victoria for whom she would lay down her life. It is curious that she is jealous if the papers note any [p. 16] thing creditable to the Prince, as if the fact was tantamount to abstracting so much credit from the wife. They tell me that her industry in prying out every thing is astonishing, both as an effort and as a mischief. [...]

It is clear then that the Royal Couple are surrounded by persons who under one name or other, whether affection, candour, sagacity, advisor, or nurse (or doctor), are aiming every one of them at influence, that is the magic, which attracts all the qualities which reside in a court. And it was only by being admitted into the penetration I saw the positive use of "Etiquette", which instead of being, as is every where represented, the mere hollow foolery of palaces, is really emphatically the "virtue" of the Court, without it these gaudy and decorated sepulchres of humanity would be filled with violence, and open to clamorous hatred. The smiles of "majesty" are substantial power and wealth [...]. When therefore we wonder at the formalities and observances which our noblest and richest, impose on themselves, in accepting the menial duties of court attendance – we really are inconsistent – for then we should equally wonder at the strife after wealth or power, by any other mode of acquiring it. It is to keep down the envy and hatred, which attempts to approach the source of political honours too near must generate, that the necessity of etiquette, or a rule of a reserve and indifference, arose. This imposes a bond of iron on the impudent and bold and makes an obvious and an easy rule of conduct for all. "It banishes all feeling", where feeling would be dangerous and guards not only those who would approach too near, but the source of honors from perplexing contacts and influence.

I find that the mutual jealousies which the striving to please "the one person" must necessarily engender are glossed over by Etiquette. The chief quality of mind which such a system must solicit is caution; it is not the circumspection of a gold heart and a wise head, but the "fear" which arises from feeling "that each is there dependant on the caprice of one individual – whose conduct regulates [p. 18] that of a million, whatever they may say to the contrary. Let the Queen dismiss any individual who may have once been her slave and the world will disgrace him". After the affair of Lady Flora Hastings<sup>48</sup> people would not visit

---

God and anyone who refuses to recognise her as such is a criminal". RA VIC/ADD/U/2/2, Prince Albert to Baron Stockmar, 16. 1. 1842 (in German).

48 Sir James Clarke's reputation was marred in 1839 by his role in the Lady Flora Hastings scandal. Lady Flora was a lady-in-waiting of the Duchess of Kent. Dr Clark, who was then the physician of the Duchess, mistakenly diagnosed Lady Flora's swollen abdomen as an illegitimate pregnancy, instead of the tumour which killed her a few months later. The public opinion blamed for the scandal the Queen and Lord Melbourne. In February, the Queen noted: "Lady Flora had not been above 2 days in the house, before Lehzen and I discovered how exceedingly suspicious her figure looked, – more have since observed this, and we have no doubt that she is – to use the plain words – with child!! Clark cannot deny the suspicion; the horrid cause of all this is the Monster and demon Incarnate, whose name I forbear to mention [i.e. Sir John Conroy]". QVJ, 2. 2. 1839. See also, for

*the family! To me therefore the Court is one of the most melancholy of places where I feel I am in danger of losing my liberty by my trammels of gold. Locock has followed the bent of his nature, a weak and vulgar one, and in spite of his usefulness to the Queen he is likely to be dropped, and if so he will in spite of all his successes be little considered by the public.<sup>49</sup> These considerations have determined me to hold myself aloof from seeking or asking any thing – and contenting myself with simply performing what is imposed on me as far as my powers admit with a wise, a patient, and a sober understanding. At least this is my prayer at night and in the early morning.*

Dec[ember] 15, 1841

*A few reminiscences of the actual scenes of the accouchement I will note, and merely such as may be told without infringing the sacred ties that bend together the minister to [p. 19] wants of the Body in Suffering – and his Patient.*

*We were informed about our respective appointments in May 1840, when it had been determined that her Majesty was pregnant.<sup>50</sup> The gazetting was put in an unusual mode, as instead of a simple statement of Dr L[ocock], Blagden<sup>51</sup> & myself being the attendants,<sup>52</sup> there was a ranking of us, in the order of first second and third, a trick as it afterwards turned out of L[ocock]’s which he played us by means of his friend, Mr George Anson, who*

---

the Queen’s point of view, Ibidem, 18. 1. 1839, 20., 21. and 23. 2., 9., 24. and 31. 3., 5. and 15. 4., 27. 6., 3. and 5. 7. 1839; and for Lady Flora’s and other statements, *The Late Lady Flora Hastings. Statements of the Marquis of Hastings, Marchioness of Tavistock, Lady Portman, Lord Portman, and Sir James Clark*. London 1839. Also, see, *Examiner*, 24. 3. 1839; *The Spectator*, 31. 3. 1839; *Morning Post*, 31. 3. 1839, 10. 8. 1839, 14. 9. 1839.

49 Dr Locock never lost the royal confidence and in 1857 he was made baronet. *The London Gazette*, 17. 4. 1857, No 21990, p. 1371.

50 Already at the beginning of April she gave up crazy gallops and waltzes and danced only slow quadrilles, “as I had not been feeling quite well”. QV], 2. 4. 1840.

51 Richard Blagden (1789–1861) was Surgeon Extraordinary to Princess Victoria’s father, the Duke of Kent, and, after his death, Surgeon Ordinary to the Duchess of Kent, and from 1837–1840, Surgeon-Extraordinary to the Queen. “*The special appointment held by Mr Blagden is that of Surgeon-Accoucheur to Her Majesty and since there are only two Fellows of the College of Surgeons who practise midwifery as a speciality, and physicians dare not perform operations, the appointment of Mr. Blagden became a necessity.*” *Medical Circular*, 1852, p. 282; *The Gentleman’s Magazine*, Vol. 211, 1861, pp. 207–208.

52 *St. James’s-Palace*, 16. 7. 1840: “*The Queen has been pleased to appoint Charles Locock, Esq. M. D. to be First Physician Accoucheur to Her Majesty; Robert Ferguson, Esq. M..D. to be Second Physician and Richard Blagden, Esq. to be Surgeon Accoucheur.*” *The London Gazette*, 17. 7. 1840, No 19875, p. 1679. In 1857, Ferguson resigned the position of the Queen’s physician accoucheur and was appointed her physician extraordinary.

was his patient and the Prince's Private Secretary.<sup>53</sup> This very exaltation afterwards became a mean of his abasement, and for this alone, as an instructive lesson, I have noted it here...

I continued to see her Majesty during the whole of the summer 1840 up to the time she was confined, at intervals of about 10 days. She came from Windsor to Buckingham Palace for the accouchement<sup>54</sup> a month nearly before the usual expected time, and after Locock had seen her,<sup>55</sup> I was also desired to wait on her and found such symptoms as made me suspect that labour would occur very shortly, and indeed so earnest was my conviction that on the day of my interview, I mentioned the fact [p. 20] to Mrs Villiers giving it as an excuse for my not accepting Lord Clarendon's<sup>56</sup> invitation to dinner at the Grove near Walford<sup>57</sup> on the Saturday. The event justified my surmises, for within three days after my refusal and on the very day of my invitation the Queen was confined.<sup>58</sup>

At six in the morning I arrived and found my colleagues<sup>59</sup> already there. We were ushered into the private apartments, which is the north wing of the Palace, into a little room, heated by insufferably hot air and gas. There we staid [sic] until labour advanced, when we were called to a room adjoining that in which the Queen was.

Believing that the case was one of perpetual consultation, and that the public thought it of sufficient importance to charge more than one with the superintendence, I had three months before written to Clarke to ascertain what was expected from each of us, but with no definite answer to guide us.

53 George Anson (1812–1849) was appointed by Queen Victoria her future husband's private secretary in 1840 despite Prince Albert's vehement protests, but they soon became close friends. Queen Victoria to Prince Albert, 29. 11., 8., 23. and 26. 12. 1839, Arthur Christopher BENSON and VISCOUNT ESHER (eds.), *The Letters of Queen Victoria*, 1<sup>st</sup> series, London 1907, Vol. 1: pp. 253–254, 260–262. See Prince Albert to Queen Victoria, 10., 15. and 18. 12. 1839, 3. 1. 1840 in Kurt JAGOW (ed.), *Letters of the Prince Consort, 1831–1861*, London 1938, pp. 37–38, 40–42, 47–48.

54 In the nineteenth century the aristocratic ladies would traditionally go to London to give birth to their children (especially the first born). See Judith SCHNEID LEWIS, *In the Family Way: Childbearing in the British Aristocracy, 1760–1860*, New Brunswick (New Jersey) 1986, pp. 155–161. In case of the Queen London was preferred also because the protocol demanded that the most important officers of state be witnesses to the birth of the royal heirs.

55 Dr Locock saw her on 15. 11., and found her "very well & thinks the event likely to come off the 1<sup>st</sup> days of next month". QVJ, 15. 11. 1840.

56 George William Frederick Villiers, 4<sup>th</sup> earl of Clarendon (1800–1870).

57 The Grove, on the outskirts of Watford, was Lord Clarendon's country house.

58 The Queen writes that already on 17. 11. she had "rather a restless night", and on 21. 11., "just before the early hours of the morning of the 21<sup>st</sup>, I felt very uncomfortable & with difficulty aroused Albert from his sleep, who after a while, got Clark sent for. He came at ½ p. 2, Albert bringing him into the Bedroom. Clark said he would go to Locock. Tried to get to sleep again, but by 4, I got very bad and both the Doctors arrived. My beloved Albert was so dear & kind. Locock said the Baby was on the way & everything was all right. We both expressed joy that the event was at hand, & I did not feel at all nervous." QVJ, 1. 12. 1840.

59 That is, Dr Locock, Mr Blagen, and Dr Clarke.



As the event took us by surprise we were left to make out our respective positions during the very brunt of attendance – a most unwise, and unsafe plan, as I felt sure [p. 21] that L[ocock] would if every thing went on smoothly keep all in his own hands. Both Blagden and myself spoke at first as the labour was advancing of the necessity of waiting in the room, but L[ocock] would not hear of it, and brought out a hurried message that the Queen desired that none but he should be in the room – that being determined on we knew that the sole responsibility fell on L[ocock].

Nothing could exceed the tender anxiety of the Prince to his wife. He sat by her bedside during the whole time, cheered and sustained her, and covered her face with kisses ‘in the acme’ of her sharpest throes.<sup>60</sup> He was pale and obviously very anxious, but this though apparent in his bloodshot eye, and haggard expression, did not render his conduct tumultuous and unsettled in the smallest degree.

From time to time we were informed of the actual progress of the labour till the last stage was at hand. In the interim the officers of state had assembled in their respective uniforms<sup>61</sup> in the room which we had reached, and which was three removed from that of her Majesty.<sup>62</sup> The whole communicating by a line of folding doors.

At last her Majesty bed room door was flung open [p. 22] and a common french [sic] bedstead was discovered right in the door way, consequently in the very centre of that line of folding doors by which the whole suit of apartments were connected, hence the ministers in the furthest extremity of the suite could see the actual bed, though not her Majesty, for a screen was elevated in that half of the foot board of the bed on which she lay. The nurse, Lilly and Dr L[ocock] were seen on the left, and a person within the room next the lying in chamber might also have had a view of the Prince on the right side. The Queen was quite

---

60 The Queen wrote: “Dearest Albert hardly left me at all, & was the greatest support & comfort”. QVJ, 1. 12. 1840.

61 Especially after the unexpected birth of James II’s son, James Francis Edward, the great officers of state were required to witness the birth of royal heirs. Wild rumours greeted the announcement of the birth of James II’s son in 1688, the most popular being that the new prince was a changeling, who had been secretly smuggled into the queen’s chambers in a warming-pan. Cf. *The Several Declarations together with the Several Depositions made in Council on Monday, 22 October 1688, concerning the Birth of the Prince of Wales*, London 1688. The last time a Home Secretary attended the birth of a future monarch was when Elizabeth II was born in 1926.

62 Also on the occasion of the birth of the royal child to queen Charlotte in 1762, although the officers of state were summoned to attend, only the Archbishop of Canterbury was admitted into the chamber, the others remaining in a room adjoining, from whence the door was left open into the Queen’s apartment. And “so strict was attention paid to delicacy, consistent with a due regard to forms, that although Dr William Hunter was in waiting, the necessary duties were performed by Mrs Draper”. John WATKINS, *Memoirs of Her Most Excellent Majesty Sophia-Charlotte: Queen of Great Britain, from Authentic Documents*, London 1819, vol. 1, p. 153.

*invisible and in spite of her unaccustomed pains, quite inaudible even to us who were near her – so firmly did she support her anguish.*<sup>63</sup>

*As soon as the doors were flung open, the medical men walked into the room and I came just within view & was seen by her Majesty, but Locock immediately vociferated that the Queen did not desire to have us – for some moments the child remained unborn. Meanwhile I began [p. 23] to believe that if not assisted it [the child] would be still born, however, its cries were soon heard and in an instant it was declared that a princess was ushered into the world. The very first words, which I heard were from the Queen: ‘I fear it will create great disappointment’.*<sup>64</sup>

*As soon as the child was removed from the bed it was carried by Mrs Pegley, the nurse for the infant,<sup>65</sup> naked and wrapped in a flannel, through our room, direct to the Ministers,*

63 “From those who had the best means of information, we learn that her Majesty evinced a firmness and composure almost incredible – at intervals exhibiting a cheerfulness and patient submission to her sufferings, in all respects consistent with the well-known attributes of her character.” *The Observer*, 23. 11. 1840, p. 2. *Particulars of the Accouchement of her Gracious Majesty Queen Victoria*, Nov 21, 1840.

64 It is usually stated (Elizabeth LONGFORD, *Victoria R. I.*, London 2000, p. 164; C. WOODHAM-SMITH, *Queen Victoria*, p. 278; Christopher HIBBERT, *Queen Victoria. A Personal History*, London 2000, p. 133; Hannah PAKULA, *An Uncommon Woman*, New York, 1995, p. 28; Stanley WEINTRAUB, *Victoria, An Intimate Biography*, New York 1988, p. 149; IDEM, *Albert. Uncrowned King*, London 1997, p. 113; Julia BAIRD, *Victoria The Queen. An Intimate Biography of the Woman who Ruled the World*, London 2016, p. 167), that Dr Locock seeing the sex of the child declared, “*Oh, Madam it is a princess*”, to which the Queen replied: “*Never mind, the next will be a prince*.” These statements are based on Grenville’s report of his dinner on 18. 12. with the Earl of Erroll, Lord Steward of the Household, who was one of the officials present at the accouchement. Sharing with Greville “*some gossiping details*”, he said that from the room (the third in the enfilade) where he and other officials were waiting, “*he could see the Queen plainly the whole time and hear what she said*”. This belies what Ferguson wrote that the officials could see the bed, but not the Queen because of the screen – and he even included in his report the drawing of the screen which sheltered her from the eyes of the ministers. Also, it is not very probable that Erroll could hear clearly the conversation between the Queen and Dr Locock. And if he did, why the words of the Queen were not heard by other officials, who would certainly share them with others? Ph. WHITWELL WILSON (ed.), *The Greville Diary*, Vol. 2, pp. 213–214, 19. 12. 1840. The Queen read *The Greville Memoirs* when they appeared for the first time in 1874, but they were much shortened and heavily edited by Henry Reeve, who completely omitted the entry of 19. 12. 1840 dealing with the birth of the Princess Royal, so the Queen could not comment on its veracity. Strangely enough in the list of contents of Chapter IX we find Birth of the Princess Royal, but there is not one word on this subject in the text. Generally, the Queen thought that publishing the Memoirs Reeve is guilty of an “*intense indiscretion*”, but admitted that “*the accounts in many ways are very full of truth [...], though exaggerated*”. Queen Victoria to Victoria, the Crown Princess, 25. 10. 1874, Roger FULFORD (ed.), *Darling Child. Private Correspondence of Queen Victoria and the Crown Princess of Prussia, 1871–1878*, London 1976, pp. 158–159.

65 So the Queen in the journal: “*the Baby was taken by Mrs Pegley (the monthly nurse for the Baby) into the room in which they [i.e. the Ministers] were assembled*”. QVJ, 1. 12. 1840. *The Observer* writes that it was Mrs Lilly, the monthly nurse for the Queen. *The Observer*, 23. 11. 1840, p. 2, *Particulars of the Accouchement of her Gracious Majesty Queen Victoria*, Nov 21, 1840.

who looked on it and then rapidly disappeared.<sup>66</sup> And so ended the first and important act of this great event. [...]

[p. 26] January 5 1842

*I received a note from Sir James Clarke requesting an interview with him. On calling I found he wished me to see the Princess Royal on alternate days with him, during the period that the Queen and Prince are to be at Claremont.*<sup>67</sup>

*After this was arranged he informed me that the hysteria of her Majesty,<sup>68</sup> and her anxieties, had a very natural cause her being once again pregnant. If this be true, there will be much joking scandal sufficiently annoying to her and him, for when the curious reckon the difference of age between the forthcoming infant and the last, they will discover it to be about nine months and six weeks.*<sup>69</sup>

[p. 28] January 16 1842, Sunday

*I have been thrice down to Windsor to see the poor little Princess Royal – twice during the absence of the parents at Claremont, the third visit was today, and what a scene have I witnessed! On going into the nursery Mrs Roberts, the under nurse, said she thought a greater variety in the child’s diet might be resorted to with benefit,<sup>70</sup> and mentioning a certain species of broth to which I assented, appealing at the same time to Clarke for his approval. He merely answered “that we could consider the subject”. In about an hour,*

---

66 The Observer adds: “Her Royal Highness was for a moment laid upon the table for the observation of the assembled authorities; but the loud tones in which she indicated her displeasure at such an exposure, while they proved the soundness of her lungs and the maturity of her frame, rendered it advisable that she should be returned to her chamber to receive her first attire.” Ibidem.

67 Claremont house in Surrey belonged to the Queen’s uncle, Leopold, but he lent it to the Queen when he became the king of the Belgians in 1831. The Queen and prince Albert planned to go to Claremont alone to cure the ongoing “lowless” (depression) of the Queen. They left Windsor on 11. 1. The children were left in the care of Lehzen and George Anson’s wife. Pussy was “not at all well, having been much disturbed in the night & early morning. She was still very uncomfortable when we saw her, poor dear. I grieve so that she is still bothered with these constant attacks, though she gets over them quicker & better, than she did”. QVJ, 11. 1. 1842.

68 On “female hysteria” as understood and treated in the nineteenth century see, e.g., Rachel P. MAINES, *The Technology of Orgasm: “Hysteria”, the Vibrator, and Women’s Sexual Satisfaction*, Baltimore 1998; Cecilia TASCIA et al., *Women and hysteria in the history of mental health*, Clinical Practice and Epidemiology in Mental Health 8, 2012, pp. 110–119.

69 The Queen’s third child, Princess Alice, was born on 25. 4. 1843, so she got pregnant only in September 1842.

70 The Princess, who was very weak as she could not keep the food in her stomach, was usually given “chicken broth with barley gruel, twice during the day, & tomorrow twice asses milk & gruel, etc.”. QVJ, 26. 9. 1841. As the diet did not improve her condition, in October she “put under a “régime” and given only asses milk. Ibidem, 1. 10., 31. 10. and 3. 11. 1841.

both Clarke and myself were sent for by the Prince who was pale and obviously suffering. “I wish to consult you”, he said, “in a family matter in which you are concerned. There is a conspiracy in the nursery against Sir James Clarke, and Mrs Roberts has just related to some one [meaning: Baroness Lehzen] who has told the Queen that Dr Ferguson made no objections to a proposal of changing the diet, but that Sir James Clarke, would not agree”, that the Child would be starved, and the Prince added: “The Queen says if the Princess dies, the responsibility will be mine”.<sup>71</sup> I was shocked to hear [p. 29] such a speech made by a wife to the father of her children,<sup>72</sup> more so at the possibility of any one daring to sow dissension between the two most exulted persons in the realm, on whose health and happiness the welfare of the nation depends.

These turmoils are acting most injuriously on the mind of her Majesty, she is still visited by fits of gloom and hypochondria, which threaten her intellect. The poor infant, I fear, must die ere long.

The Baron Stockmar confirms the miserable accounts of Clarke, that all the mischief now going on is produced by Madame Lehzen. The audacious folly exhibited by her in attempting to rival a young husband in the mind of her Majesty is to me quite inconceivable. Clarke really believes her mad. Yet his account shews method in her madness, for finding she has lost power with the Queen since her marriage, she appears to have clung the firmer to any straw that the fates wafted towards her. Hence, she is endeavouring to influence by obtaining the mastery in the Nursery and so gaining that ascendancy over the mother which she has lost in the wife.

Were the “acts” which set man and wife by the ears “not visible”, I confess, I [p. 30] should have doubted their existence and have utterly repudiated the possibility of such a being as Lehzen doing anything. The Prince is still the model of meek manly sense, a little more of the “Devil” in him might possibly be of advantage.

Madame Lezhen [sic] is ever calm, indefatigable, cool, full of smiles, never affected by any change, at least never showing that she is. She lavished large presents on the nurse, Ratsey,<sup>73</sup> to bribe her to bring Nursery news – 50 pounds worth said Clarke of the Queen’s

71 A detailed report of the quarrel during which the Queen accused Prince Albert of almost killing the Princess Royal is given in RA VIC/ADD/U/2/1, 2, 3, 4, Prince Albert to Stockmar, 16. 1. and 18. 1. 1842 (German), The Queen to Stockmar, 16. and 17. 1. 1842.

72 Actually, Prince Albert wrote to his wife an even more shocking note: “Dr Clark has mismanaged the child and poisoned her with calomel and you have starved her. I shall have nothing more to do with it; take the child away and do as you like and if she dies you will have it on your conscience.” RA VIC/ADD/U/2/4, Prince Albert to Stockmar, 18. 1. (an enclosed, undated note; German).

73 Mrs Jane Ratsey was originally employed as the wet nurse for the Princess Royal, but remained in the nursery as a permanent nurse till at least April 1842. QVJ, 1. 12. 1840, RA M12/5, Regulations for the Nursery, n.d.; Census, England and Wales, 1841; RA VIC/ADD U2/21, 1. 4. 1842, The Queen to Stockmar.

money at a time. The moment the Prince’s back is turned Madame Lezhen [sic] works on her to his prejudice, so that he never leaves home, but with misgivings during his absence and certainties of annoyance on his return. But why do I chronicle this most degrading tissue of intense littlenesses, this loathsome delineation of scenes and characters against which I never can feel but wonder and indignation. The misery is that I am involved and mixed up with it.

January 18 Tuesday [1842]

Once more down at Windsor, where I saw every one. The Queen. The Prince. The Children and [p. 31] Stockmar. The questions discussed were a lot. The removal to Brighton, which was affirmatively resolved the only difficulty being who should be the attendant there. Now it appears that Mr Blaker<sup>74</sup> (?) is at the Pavillion what Brown<sup>75</sup> is at the Castle, viz. the home apothecary, and he, I am told, is a sensible man. So he is to be the attendant and we the visiting physicians. The next question is as to the vaccination, which I proposed should be done before the child is exposed to the crowd of the christening. All this was kindly and thoughtfully received by the Prince but! (and what a but) I hear from Clarke that Stockmar disapproves of the same! Can it be that we had not first spoken to him on the matter? That the adviser in all thing was without his role? Oh, the Court, the Court which forces these mean suspicions on me even towards one who is surely a good man.

I saw her Majesty, receiving first a hint that I was not to question her too closely as to the possibility of pregnancy to account for all her symptoms. Indeed, I scarcely believe it possible. They would be surely vexed to think it, both on account of inconvenience to their plans for the summer and especially touching the publicity attendant the rapid succession of princes. Then [p. 32] came my interview with Stockmar, who was desirous of talking to me. It was about Clarke, whose character he fully fathomed and deeply commiserated his present position – employed, but not trusted, with a determination on the part of Lezhen to damage him. She has from the beginning wished for Locock and Blagden for the Nursery! Thus even in the very heart and core of a parent when that parent is royal, are there vermin

---

74 Harry (Miller) Blaker (1784–1846), he attended the Queen when in residence at Royal Pavilion in Brighton. He vaccinated the Princess Royal and the Prince of Wales. He was appointed apothecary in Brighton in 1837 (although his memorial calls him a “surgeon”) and is buried at St Nicolas Churchyard, Brighton. A. M. COOKE, *Queen Victoria’s Medical Household*, *Medical History* 26, 1982, pp. 305–320, at p. 315; URL:<[www.findagrave.com/memorial/70727494/harry-blaker](http://www.findagrave.com/memorial/70727494/harry-blaker)> [accessed 12. 3. 2018].

75 Mr Henry Brown (d. 1868) was apothecary (i.e. general practitioner) in Windsor. The Queen said she liked him “*the best of all the Doctors, for quietness of manners & reasonableness*”. QVJ, 8. 12. 1841. He looked after the Princess Royal, and then the other royal children, on daily basis, making sure that Dr Clark’s orders were followed by the nurses. See his reports to the Queen, e.g., RA VIC/MAIN/M/13/9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 22. A. M. COOKE, *Queen Victoria’s Medical Household*, p. 315, seems to be wrong in stating Brown was appointed only in 1859.

to dictate affection or pervert it. I expressed my views openly to Stockmar as to the proposing of a consultation, in which Chambers<sup>76</sup> and Locock should be called in to state their opinions prior to her removal to Brighton.

The Prince proposed horse exercise, which he wished could produce every good effect.

January 19 [1842]

[p. 33] [...] *The Town, or rather the "Ton", is full of that malicious history, which Madame Lezhen [sic] has set on foot against the Prince. Mrs Villiers whom I asked, as to whether the Princess Royal's illness is known, and what was said about it, told me that the cause of the poor child's present state was traced, first, to the ill treatment of the nurse Ratsey (who by the way has not eloped from her husband!);<sup>77</sup> 2ndly, to Clarke starving her;<sup>78</sup> 3<sup>rd</sup> [sic], to the Prince who took upon himself the whole responsibility and tried experiments on his own child! That this villainy should be uttered is only less astonishing than that it should be believed! And by whom is it credited and disseminated? Why, by the near relations of her Majesty – the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge<sup>79</sup> and Gloucester.<sup>80</sup>*

[p. 34] *I had a long discussion with Stockmar as to poor Clarke and learned that the person who had urged him on and made use of him in all the Flora Hastings affair was Lehzen<sup>81</sup> and now she is the first to drop him, or rather to fix on him another act of a tragedy of which the first was the death of an earl's daughter, the second that of a queen's. And all this without the intense malice which appears as the ordinary motive. It is nothing, but the desire of influence which once obtained would send her back to Clarke as readily as to her brother or any near relative. She has the greatest dread lest the Prince should be made a king. X says that some enemy has set all this rumor afloat.*

76 William Frederick Chambers (1786–1855), was appointed physician-in-ordinary to Queen Adelaide in 1836, to William IV in 1837, to Queen Victoria on 8. 8. 1837 and to the Duchess of Kent in 1839. He was the leading physician in London until 1848. W. MUNK (ed.), *Roll*, Vol. 3: 1801–1825, p. 196.

77 In January 1842 among the nursery staff there was Mrs Roberts, 34 years of age, recommended by Dr Locock, who writes that her husband proved "a very cruel and dissolute man, who so ill treated her", that after the birth of her son, she left him and she "has never seen him since". The husband does not know where she lives, and she has managed to bring up her son, who is now 12, "entirely by her own exertion". RA VIC/MAIN/M16/3, Memorandum by Dr Locock relative to the Nurse Mrs Roberts, 27. 11. 1840.

78 Lady Lytton, who in 1842 became responsible for the Nursery, thought that the Princess Royal was simply "over-watched and over-doctored... She now lives on asses' milk, and arrowroot and chicken broth, and they measure it out so carefully for fear of loading her stomach, that I fancy she always leaves off hungry".

79 Prince Adolphus (1774–1850), Duke of Cambridge, son of George III, Victoria's uncle.

80 Princess Mary (1776–1857), Duchess of Gloucester and Edinburgh, daughter of George III and sister of Victoria's father. She seems to have been Victoria's favourite aunt.

81 See QVJ, 4. and 18. 4. 1839.

*What a mixture of mischief has the Court made of this character. First she is without any real faith in high matters, then her affection for the Queen is that of a dog for its master, a devotion which is as deep and as lasting as her life, and so she resents every act which tends to raise the husband as an insult to the wife, and is blunt enough to think that she will [p. 35] not be crushed in the effort to brave the husband of the Queen.*

*February 2, 1842*

*Three days ago Chambers called on me, as pleased and as happy as a young elephant. He was mysterious [...], begged I would not tell Clarke he had seen me, in a word, I conjectured what had occurred and that he had seen the Princess! On that very evening (Sunday the 30<sup>th</sup> Jan[uary]) I received a summons to meet at Clarke’s to consult about a “royal personage” and there, shortly after my arrival, we were joined by Chambers and then by Locock, who appeared thunderstruck at the apparition of a new colleague [...]. Chambers was to make a report and after much consultation about trifles and a good set of sentences from Chambers as to the necessity of our pulling well together we separated.*

*On the 1<sup>st</sup> Feb[ruary] I received a summons to Windsor to see her Majesty. She was still nervous, but no longer melancholic, her immediate symptoms being those of slight febrile catarrh, a state caught from the Prince who is really unwell. After our visit we descended to the Baron Stockmar’s room, and there [p. 36] being a necessity to talk of Chamber’s visit I was amused to see how well Stockmar managed the “telling of the tale”. He said he took it all on himself, and advised them (Royalties) to send for the most employed physicians, if for no other purpose, still for that of stopping scandalous tongues. Clarke, who knew nothing of the matter, received it all as if it had been gospel. He, however, is undoubtedly saved by it, in as much as we now have it under Chamber’s own hand that up to the 20<sup>th</sup> January there was no organic disease developed in the Princess Royal, that her whole state hinged on “dentition”, and that the present medication was to be continued. [...]*

*[p. 37] Tuesday Feb[ruary] 16 1842*

*I went to Brighton to see the Royal Children and found the Princess still a sad invalid, thinner than ever, tho’ less suffering.<sup>82</sup> I saw the Pavillion [sic] for the first time, and inspite [sic] of all that is talked of its not being in good taste, am struck with its singularities. Every part of the inside is completely chinese [sic] – even the stairs are meant to imitate cane and bamboo basket work, tho’ the material is of stout brass and iron. The public rooms are amazingly lofty tents blazing in gold and varigated glass – some latern? – some lotus shaped*

---

<sup>82</sup> The Queen noted that “the poor little thing is still very thin, & she was not very well this morning”. QVJ, 15. 2. 1842.

*lamps – and the whole when lit must, I think, shed rays such as shone out in Aladdin’s [p. 38] garden, streaming from carbuncle amethysts [sic], the diamond and the [...] chrysolite. Certainly both for comfort and eastern gorgeousness I have never seen any thing more captivating for a Brighton sojourn than the Pavillion [sic].*

*They appear to me to live more comfortably there than amid the state of Buckingham and Windsor – more huddled together and not kept apart by “those incidental particles”, which Dr Prout says play such a part in the body natural by keeping and repelling the molecules of its component atoms from each other.<sup>83</sup> The said particles being gentlemen and ladies in waiting. How curious is the influence of a Palace. There was the stately Lord Liverpool,<sup>84</sup> tall as a Maypole,<sup>85</sup> stalking after the meal and precise Baron Stockmar anxious to shew him the wonders of the kitchen, which the other declined as peremptorily as would the English earl the civilities of his amanuensis.*

*When first ushered into the ante-room I saw the Prince in a few moments – handsome and fresh and much better already, still anxious without display both as a husband and a father and as mild and sweet as his own smile. [p. 39] The Queen, whose dressing room was adjoining, not knowing that any one was there, came tripping thro’ in a morning undress gown with hair placed for dressing rather than dressed, and on discovering “the stranger” blushed like a virgin and flew like a startled roe, forgetful in the woman the state of the queen.*

*The Prince complained much to me of the tiresome mobbing of the crowd who turn and follow and turn again with them, whenever the Royal Couple go out to walk, necessitating therefore a constant series of stratagems to stem this annoyance. Hence at one time, the specified time of outings is changed, at another the carriage, and at a third the intended drive. The delinquents are chiefly the girls schools, and boarding schools of the other sex. I am told that the total number of these seminaries at Brighton amounts to no less than 80. [...]*

[p. 40] Feb[ruary] 24 1842

*Two days ago I learned from Clarke that there was an absolute certainty of the Queen not being pregnant – a great relief to every body concerned. They talked of leaving Brighton in a week. [...]*

[p. 57] Dec[ember] 4 1842 Sunday Night

83 William Prout (1785–1850), chemist and physician, remembered today for “Prout’s hypothesis”. Cf. Robert HOOPER (ed.), *Lexicon Medicum: or, Medical Dictionary*, London 1839, p. 1153.

84 Charles Jenkinson, 3<sup>rd</sup> Earl of Liverpool (1784–1851), member of the Privy Council 1841, Lord Steward of the Household, 1841–1846.

85 Maypole is a painted pole, decorated with flowers, round which people traditionally dance on May Day holding long ribbons attached to the top.



The last week has developed nothing of moment. The Court have returned to Windsor – well – and I have a summons to attend her Majesty in her approaching confinement in the “month of April”. Blagden is not to be of the party.

[p. 50] November 17 1842

Madame Lezhen [sic] is gone.<sup>86</sup> This was at length brought about by Baron Stockmar who seeing the result of her remaining, told that broadly to the Queen. She might have departed when their Majesties were in Scotland, but was permitted to remain. I was present when the following colloquy took place, between Baron Stockmar, and Brown the surgeon of Windsor. “How is the Baroness?” “Why Sir, not at all well.” “Does she eat?” “No Sir” “Nor sleep?” “No, Sir”. I said she would die. “No, she is tough”, replied the Baron. Thus ends this domestic tragedy.<sup>87</sup>

The Town are engaged in discussing the supposed seduction of Lady Augusta Somerset,<sup>88</sup> maid of honor to the Duchess of Cambridge,<sup>89</sup> by Prince George of Cambridge.<sup>90</sup> The “Times” is authorised, most unfortunately, “on the highest authority” to contradict the scandal, thus giving it the most extensive circulation. I learnt from various sources that the seduction is a villainous falsehood, that the real history is that the prince desired to marry [sic] her and wrote to the Queen, who refused her consent, and on being in a 2<sup>nd</sup> letter from the Prince George asked the reason for [p. 51] such refusal, received for answer that it was at the earnest entreaties of the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge.<sup>91</sup> It was said that when after this the Lady Augusta was taken to Windsor, her conduct was very bald and presuming.<sup>92</sup> [...]

---

86 Greville noted: “The Baroness Lehzen has left Windsor Castle, and is gone abroad for her health (as she says), to stay five or six months, but it is supposed never to return. This woman, who is much beloved by the women and much esteemed and liked by all who frequent the Court, who is very intelligent, and has been a faithful and devoted servant to the Queen from her birth, has for some time been supposed to be obnoxious to the Prince, and as he is now all-powerful her retirement was not unexpected. I do not know the reason of it, nor how it has been brought about”. Ph. WHITWELL WILSON (ed.), *The Greville Diary*, 5. 10. 1843.

87 In July 1843 the Queen recorded in her journal how she and Prince Albert “talked much of former times & poor Lehzen, & how ill everything went, whilst she was there. I shudder to think what my beloved Albert had to go through & put up with!” QVJ, 13. 7. 1843.

88 Charlotte Augusta Somerset (1816–1850), the eldest daughter of Henry Somerset, 7. Duke of Bedford, by his first wife. In 1844 she married Baron Neumann, Austrian Ambassador in London.

89 “At 1 the Duchess of Cambridge came and presented Lady Augusta Somerset, as her lady in waiting.” QVJ, 7. 2. 1840.

90 Prince George William Frederick (1819–1904), son of Prince Adolphus, Duke of Cambridge, queen Victoria’s uncle.

91 Cf. Ph. WHITWELL WILSON (ed.), *The Greville Diary*, 7. 11. 1842.

92 After 1. 8. 1842 all references to Lady Augusta disappear from the surviving version of the Queen’s Journal, probably removed by Princess Beatrice.

[p. 57] November 25 1842

*The day before yesterday I went down to Widnsor [sic] for the purpose of seeing the Prince of Wales, who had been attacked on the lungs. But owing to my having been attending Sir James Graham's children,<sup>93</sup> in scarlet fever, I deemed it right to mention the same to Clarke, [p. 58] and thro' him to the Queen and Prince Albert, and was not surprised to find they declined letting me into the Castle. It was deemed prudent to run no risk at all since the Prince of Wales was better.<sup>94</sup> Had he not been so, I was to have seen him. [...]*

[p. 87] June 17 1843

*The Queen was confined (April 25) after a short and prosperous time of 6 hours of a princess<sup>95</sup> to whom she has appropriated 3 excellent names: Alice, Maud, Mary,<sup>96</sup> a spendthrift use of good English tokens. Lord Melbourne wrote a letter to Mr Geo[rge] Anson, the Prince's secretary, asking whence the precedent for Alice, since he knew but one such person attached to Royalty, Alice Pierce, Edward IV's Mistress.<sup>97</sup> [...]*

[p. 95] July 12 1843

*I had a most interesting conversation with Baron Stockmar about Prince Albert who (since the absence of Baroness Lehzen) has that influence which a husband should have. There is mutual trust and consultation in every thing. "He likes his position and", said the Baron, "he [p. 96] has but two faults: hurry and a very very little spice of vanity". "If," continued he, "asked: 'Where shall I find all the qualities of a good Prince?', I would point to him – he has no vices – of passion he has likewise none – avarice nothing: 'Keep me out of debt', he tells Anson, 'but then spend' – no love of gaming or any intemperance. He desires to govern with justice and affection and it will be the greatest loss that the nation can suffer if any thing should happen to him".*

93 Sir James Robert Graham, from 1824 2<sup>nd</sup> Baronet (of Netherby) (1792–1861), a statesman.

94 "After luncheon we went to see the poor Baby, who is looking quite ill, so oppressed, & quite reduced by his nasty cold [...]. The poor Baby was so very unwell, weak, restless & listless, that we sent to London for Clark [...] we found the Baby continuing to improve [...] The Baby's breathing, which had been so frequent & hard these last 2 nights, became nearly normal again, & he has much less cough." QVJ, 18., 21., 23. and 24. 11. 1843.

95 "On the 25th of April after getting hardly any sleep, soon after midnight, Dr Locock was sent for & at 5 minutes past 4, a fine, healthy girl was born, & all my sufferings had come to an end!" Ibidem, 25. 4. 1843.

96 "The following are to be the names: Alice, Maud, Mary, the latter being after Aunt Gloucester, & Maud being old English for Matilde. The child will be called Alice." Ibidem, 18. 5. 1843.

97 Actually Alice Pierce (or Perrers), was the mistress of Edward III. See James PETTIT ANDREWS, *The History of Great Britain*, London 1794, p. 388; Richard BAKER, *A Chronicle of the Kings of England*, London 1733, pp. 127, 133, 137, 167.