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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to examine the career of Lola Montez [Marie Dolores Eliza Gilbert] (c. 1818-1861) in the American theatre between 1851 and 1857 in order to provide her with an appropriate position in American theatre history. The primary sources of information for the study were contemporary newspapers from the various cities she toured in the United States as well as newspapers from London and Paris.

Prior to her American tour, Lola Montez established a European reputation as an eccentric femme fatale and performer. Due to her European publicity, Montez arrived in America with audiences clamoring to see her perform. Her beauty, notoriety, exotic biography, and performances established phenomenal popularity from coast-to-coast. Despite such popularity, theatrical histories contain cursory, scattered and conflicting reports of her career. Consequently, her place in American theatre history has not been established.

The findings of the study reveal that throughout her remarkable tour of the United States, Lola Montez established an unqualified popular success. Although curiosity attracted crowds initially, Montez habitually sustained popular engagements in major theatres that typically lasted from one week to one month. Her exotic appeal managed to satisfy the appetite for novelty among
the politicians in Washington, the B'hoys in New York, the literary elite in Boston, the gold-miners in California, and the French and Spanish aristocrats as well as the rough and ready of New Orleans. Packing houses wherever she performed as a dancer and/or actress, she filled major theatres with audiences from all walks of life, eager to see the lover of artists and kings, and the cause of a democratic revolution in Bavaria.

The Montez phenomenon, the mania that attended her performances, the critical success and the logic behind such have been overlooked. In the long view of American theatre history, Lola Montez, the Countess of Landsfeldt is an original: her American career stands alone.
Chapter 1. Introduction

Marie Dolores Eliza Rosanna Gilbert (c. 1818-1861) achieved international fame as well as notoriety under the stage name of Lola Montez. A dancer and actress, she also has been called "one of the world's great celebrities . . . the favorite of monarchs, of Patrician and Plebeian." She established a European reputation as an eccentric femme fatale and performer through a liaison with Franz Liszt, horse-whipping an officer who attempted to quiet her mount, packing pistols against the agents of a Polish Prince whose romantic inquiries had been rebuffed, inspiring King Ludwig I to seek democratic reform for the people of Bavaria, and dancing at theatres in the major capitals of Europe. When Montez came to the United States in 1851, audiences clamored to see her perform. Although she was not a great artist, Montez provided unique theatrical allure through her beauty, notoriety, exotic and political biography, as well as her performing abilities, and established phenomenal popularity from coast-to-coast. Despite such popularity, theatrical histories contain cursory, scattered and conflicting reports of her career. This study examines the career of Lola Montez in the American theatre between 1851 and 1857 in order to provide her appropriate position in American theatre history.

In tracing and analyzing Montez's American career, her memoirs provide interesting personal information about her
early life, but little concerning her American tour, and often prove untrustworthy. Several full-length biographies concentrate on her eccentric personality and the eventful story of her life, but none of them fully investigate her European and American tours, her repertoire, or her critical reception. Montez occasionally appears in the writings of contemporary theatrical figures. Manager Benjamin Lumley, and playwright Edward Fitzball note her London experiences. Actor/managers Noah Ludlow and M. B. Leavitt record various incidents in Montez's American career. And, dancer/teacher/historian Charles Durang supplies first-hand criticism of her dance appearances in Philadelphia. Other citizens' memoirs also provide commentary concerning Montez. Newspapers from London, Paris, and all of the American cities Montez visited, provide listings of her appearances and, often, critical commentary as well as interviews. Boston's Public Library is an excellent source of mid-nineteenth century newspapers; however, the most fruitful source of newspaper information concerning Montez, beyond individual cities, is the newspaper archives at the Library of Congress in Washington, D. C. Special collections that contain Montez information include the British Library, London; the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas, Austin; the Harvard Theatre Collection, Pusey/Houghton Library, Cambridge, MA;
the Hill Memorial Library, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge; the New York Public Library Theatrical and Dance Collection, Lincoln Center; the San Francisco Performing Arts Library and Museum; the Theatre Arts Museum, London; and the Yale University Library (Manuscripts & Archives and the Beinecke Rare Books Collection), New Haven, CT. Other historical societies and libraries hold newspapers and information concerning theatrical conditions that Montez experienced in the mid-1850s: the Baudelaire Collection, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN; the Charleston Library Society, SC; the Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore, MD; the Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore, MD; the Milton S. Eisenhower Library, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD; the Mobile Municipal Archives, AL; the Valentine Museum, Richmond, VA; the Virginia State Library, Richmond, VA; and the Washington D. C. Historical Society.

Organized chronologically, the study traces Montez's performance career in detail across the United States between December 1851 and August 1857. Chapter one provides an introduction to the study. Chapter two deals with the problematic myth concerning Montez, and the known information concerning her life and career in Europe. Chapter three discusses her life after Bavaria and considerations for an American tour. Chapters four through eight deal with her stage career in American cities.
throughout the North, Northeast and South. Chapter nine deals with her California experience, and the remainder of her stage appearances until her death. The final chapter summarizes Montez's American performance career and places her in perspective in the history of theatre in the United States.

Notes--Chapter 1


2 Daily Alta California 22 May 1853.

3 For a complete list and discussion of Montez's memoirs see Chapter 2, endnote 7.

4 The following is a chronological list of twentieth century biographies concerning Montez in English:
1) Edmund B. D'Auvergne, Lola Montez: An Adventuress of the Forties (New York: John Lane Co., 1909). D'Auvergne's text is the first full-length biography of Montez published in English and was based on Boase's initial study included in the Dictionary of National Biography. Relatively objective, D'Auvergne occasionally cites sources of information and provides a limited bibliography; however, concentrating on her personality, he barely considers Montez's American tour.
4) Isaac Goldberg, Queen of Hearts: The Passionate Pilgrimage of Lola Montez (New York: John Day Co., 1936). Goldberg provides a good bibliography, but, like some other
biographers, is most interested in writing a popular account of Montez's life rather than her career.


6) Ishbel Ross, The Uncrowned Queen: The Life of Lola Montez (New York: Harper and Row, 1972). The most objective Montez biographer, Ross attempts to deal with the complexities of Montez's life in a thorough manner. A news writer and reporter at the New York Tribune for the majority of her life, Ross undertook extensive research and provided an excellent bibliography for her book. Her treatment of Montez's American career is more thorough than any other biographer's account, but still incomplete.

Numerous problems exist concerning Montez biographies. While their authors provide bibliographies, they do not document their sources of information consistently. They often rely upon past biographers' works, or the Montez autobiography, so that a loop is created that does not provide much new information, or clarify sources of evidence. Some authors, even Ross, include inaccurate citations, and some, if not all, treat doubtful evidence about Montez as fact.
Chapter 2. The Creation of Lola Montez: Fact or Myth?

One has to milk a hundred cows to get even a pint of Lola Montez cream. ¹

No one writes an untainted biography. Witnesses to a person's life cannot be found; they clam up; they lie; they die. Sometimes the biographer asks the wrong questions, or wounds the feelings of witnesses— who then won't speak to subsequent researchers. Later writers also dwell, inevitably, in the shadow of the first biographer. Did the first one ask the right questions, and get the facts right? If not, why not? Can the truth be found? Is there a truth?²

Such remarks aptly summarize the challenging task one faces when investigating the American theatrical career of Marie Dolores Rosanna Eliza Gilbert, known as Lola Montez, who toured the United States between 1851 and 1855. Alluring, as a result of her widely publicized and tumultuous life as a dancer, politician and intimate to famous and powerful men, Montez has been the subject of numerous biographies, novels, newspaper and magazine articles, ballets, and a movie.³ Montez's enduring attraction for generations beyond her own seems rooted in the mythology that has attended her life.

Contradictory reports concerning Montez were recorded both during and after her lifetime, not the least of which came from Montez herself. In a letter to the London Era of June 18, 1843, Montez maintained that she was a native of Seville, born in 1823;⁴ yet, she later claimed in her 1858 Autobiography that she was born in Limerick, Ireland,
in 1824, 5 perhaps subtracting six years from her actual age.

Gossip surrounded Montez during her lifetime; especially her origins. The Charleston Evening News of December 9, 1852, recorded that she was "born in Seville, in the year 1823; that her father was a Spanish officer in the service of Don Carlos, and her mother a lady of Irish extraction, born at Havana, and married for the second time to an Irish gentleman." 6 In her 1858 Autobiography, curiously written in the third person, Montez encouraged the confusion of her birthplace: "One makes her born in Spain, another in Geneva, another in Cuba, another in India, another in Turkey . . . ." Equally mysterious about her parentage, Montez stated that "one author makes her the child of a Spanish gipsy; another, the daughter of Lord Byron; another, of a native prince of India . . . . " 7

Amidst contradictory reports, a popular mythology developed around Montez during her lifetime and has continued after her death. Montez's twentieth century biographers, depending on her nineteenth century biographers, often repeat questionable information concerning her life and career. Highly dependant upon her autobiographical information, her biographers write of happenings that cannot be corroborated. At the same time, important events concerning the life of Lola Montez, the
stage name created by Marie Dolores Eliza Rosanna Gilbert, have not been recorded. No birth certificate for Montez, or, a death certificate are extant. New York archives merely indicate that an Eliza Gilbert, age 43, apparently born in England, died of pneumonia on January 17, 1861, and was buried in Greenwood Cemetery, New York. Perhaps an impossible task, little has been done to separate the myth of Montez from the verifiable facts concerning her life.

Even contemporary accounts of her physical appearance vary widely. M. B. Leavitt, who claimed to have witnessed a lecture by Montez on "Handsome Women" in Hartford, Connecticut, (no date) described her as a "splendid woman to look at; a golden blonde with a superb figure." The Richmond Enquirer of February 1852 considered her eyes "blue by day, but dark by gaslight." Yet, The New York Herald of December 1851 described her hair, like her eyebrows, a "jet-black . . . . [which] flows in a natural wave, is worn over the ear like that of the Venus of Milo, and is of an incredible length and thickness." The same paper described her as "of medium height" with a "slight figure;" but, a New Orleans critic was surprised by her lack of "Amazonian aspect and manner" which had been "attributed to her by Northern and European letter writers." Amelia Ransome Neville, a resident of San Francisco where Montez toured, recalled that others described her as a "startling beauty; a perfect figure,
smooth brown hair, magnolia skin, and large grey eyes filled with expression." Fortunately, Montez's image is available in black-and-white photography, as well as in idealized lithographs, etchings, and exaggerated representations in cartoons. (See plates 4-9, and 11). Photography corroborates testimonies to her beautiful face and handsome figure, but is not conclusive as to whether her hair was dark brown or black, or her eyes, grey or blue.

Nineteenth century journalism added to the mythology concerning Montez. Although newspapers often reported her arrivals and departures, along with some idea of her reception in the cities she visited, they also enjoyed burlesquing her reputation, which added to her celebrity and to confusion about her real persona. For example, the New York Evening Mirror of May 18, 1852, reprinted an article from The New York Herald that included the following apocrypha:

During her visit to western New York, she has performed 11 times and danced 30 pas, made 8 speeches, smoked 55 cigarettes, astonished 6 railroad conductors, blown up 6 hotel keepers for bad fare, denounced the Jesuits 40 times, quarrelled with 2 managers, lectured 4 love-stricken youths. Similar narratives were reprinted in several newspapers across the United States.

Mythology aside, prior to her arrival in the United States in December of 1851, Lola Montez had
experienced an eventful personal life and a career as a Spanish dancer on European stages. Despite the ambiguities concerning her origins, biographers agree that Montez, christened Marie Dolores Eliza Rosanna Gilbert, was born in either the city of Limerick, or, in Limerick County, Ireland, to Edward and Elizabeth Gilbert, probably in the year 1818. Montez consistently maintained that her father was an Irishman who became an officer in the British military and that her mother was of Spanish descent. According to Montez, her mother was "an Oliver, of Castle Oliver, and her family name was of the Spanish noble family of Montalvo," that was "originally of Moorish blood." Biographer Edmund B. D'Auvergne confirmed that Edward Gilbert was an Irishman who attained the rank of Ensign in the British military. The lineage of her mother remains ambiguous; some biographers believe that Montez's mother was Irish by birth, others believe she may have been Spanish.

In 1822, when Ensign Gilbert was transferred to the 44th Foot, an infantry regiment due for a foreign tour of duty, the young officer moved his wife and four-year-old daughter with him to Calcutta, India, where they lived for approximately one year before being transferred to Dinapore. Soon after the Gilbert's arrival in Dinapore, an outbreak of cholera occurred that proved fatal for Montez's father.
His death probably occurred in 1825, and her handsome young mother, finding herself with a seven-year-old child to support, did not remain single for long. Shortly before his death, Gilbert had entrusted his wife and daughter to the care of Captain John Craigie, a close friend and fellow officer, who married Elizabeth six months after the death of Gilbert.

By 1826, Montez, or, Lola, as she was familiarly called, had developed a troubled relationship with her mother as well as her new step-father. Montez believed that from the day of her birth, her mother was "too young, too wild, too childlike to amuse herself in the tender but rude duties of a mother of a family. She was not at all disposed to make a nurse of herself." Montez never enjoyed a "reciprocal exchange of intimate relations, and those daily caresses and kindnesses which alone create affections," and, her step-father became uneasy with her "irregular savage life."

After her mother's remarriage the family relocated in Calcutta with Captain Craigie's regiment. Subsequently, Captain Craigie was promoted to the post of Deputy General Adjutant of the army in India. In Calcutta, Montez remembered that even as an eight-year-old, she enjoyed dancing. "My days ... were spent in jumping and gamboling to the applause of strangers. ... I executed by instinct the expressive dances of my native country, the
Spanish boleras . . . ." She took opportunities to observe women performing native Indian dance, to which she kept time with her hands, legs and head; and, she "passed entire hours before jugglers performing tricks, and playing with serpents as if they were flowers." Perhaps as a result of the dis-affection between mother and daughter, along with Captain Craigie's concern over the lack of control he and his wife seemed to exert over the young girl, the parents sent Lola to England to begin her formal education.  

Lola left India at the age of nine, chaperoned by her Hindu nurse and a Colonel James and his wife, family friends. Upon their arrival in London, Lola and her nurse settled in the house of Sir Jasper and Lady Nicholls, friends of Captain Craigie, with whom arrangements had been made to secure an education for Lola. Parents of nine daughters and one son, the Nicholls warmly welcomed Lola as the "eleventh" addition to their family. Soon, however, Lola was turning "the house upside down," and inciting "revolution" in the servants. Displeased by her "uncivilized" behavior, Sir Jasper sent Lola to Perth, Scotland, for a few weeks, to the home of General Craigie's brother. During Lola's stay in Perth, the decision was made to separate her from her nurse, who spoiled the child, and place her in boarding school in Bath, England.  

Lola appears to have spent the next several years of her life primarily in Bath gaining an education. According
to her own account, Montez arrived at age ten. The time spent at Bath during her adolescence seems to have had a positive effect upon her. The school was run by an acquaintance of Lady Nicholls, Mrs. Oldridge, a woman "of good birth, of a good position in English society, whom the reverse of fortune had forced to consecrate her honorable resources to the education of the young." Montez recalled that after a few months with Mrs. Oldridge, she was: "less savage, and commenced becoming more European. . . . My bad habits disappeared little by little. I spoke less the language of the animals of India, and more correctly Spanish and English, my two family languages." 

Two of the Nicholls' children, Fanny and Valeria, also enrolled at the school, and Fanny became Montez's special friend. Together the girls took classes in Latin, piano, and French, the only language in which students were allowed to converse on weekdays. Between school terms the two girls vacationed together at the Nicholls's home in London. However, their spiritual education was conducted separately. Like the rest of the school's population, Fanny was a Protestant and educated in the principles of the same faith, but, Lola at the specific request of her mother received instruction in the Catholic faith.

Although Montez later experienced great conflict with Jesuits in Bavaria and elsewhere, she appears to have embraced fully the Catholic faith at this stage in her
life. According to Montez, "Mrs. Oldridge fulfilled to the letter the wishes of my mother. She confided my religious education to an old priest of the order of Jesuit fathers, who have at Bath a large establishment." The Catholic ritual, full of "church chants, harmonious canticles and lights and flowers on the altar of the good God," appealed to Montez. After her first confession, she "sought every opportunity to escape from the school, to be present at the ceremonies of the church." She was taken by spiritual fervor as she prepared for her first communion under the guidance of a Jesuit priest, and remembered that "when I heard the clock of the convent chime the 'angelus' I was a prey to the most lively emotion." 37

When Lola had completed her formal education, her mother arrived in London to wed her to an elderly judicial official. 38 Opposed to the marriage, Lola "cried and stormed," but could not change her mother's determination. Lola resolved to elope with her mother's young chaperone, "Captain" Thomas James, and the pair went to the home of James's family in Ireland where they were married. 39 According to Montez, she was only fourteen when she left to elope with "Captain" Thomas James. 40 However, according to Ishbel Ross's 1972 biography, the record of her marriage to "Lieutenant" Thomas James, at the parish church of Rathbiggen in Meath County, Ireland, is dated July 23, 1837, 41 which would have made Montez nineteen at the
time of her first marriage. Mrs. Craigie did not attend the ceremony and never gave her personal blessing to the marriage. 

Approximately eight months after their marriage, Lola and her husband returned to Calcutta, India. Montez enjoyed her early married life in the "gay and fashionable" city of Calcutta; but, when her husband's regiment was transferred to Kurwal, their marriage disintegrated, and she separated from her husband after discovering that he had been unfaithful to her. Out of "bitter necessity," she stayed with her mother and General Craigie until a doctor's certificate was procured that allowed her to return to Europe on the basis of ill-health.

Early in 1842 Montez returned to England; and in December her husband brought suit for divorce against her on the basis of adultery. James charged that on her passage to England aboard The Larkins, "she became acquainted with a Mr. Lennox, with whom she co-habited at the Imperial Hotel, Covent-garden, and in lodgings in St. James." Montez, named as "Rosanna Gilbert" in the suit, did not appear in court to contest the divorce which was officially granted, according to The Times.

The divorce marks the end of a major chapter in Montez's life and any movement toward a traditional domestic life, the destiny of most daughters of military families in early Victorian England. Her marriage and the
subsequent circumstances surrounding her divorce from Lieutenant James strained the relationship with her immediate family. According to Montez, she had squandered the funds her family had provided her and was "left in London sole mistress of her own fate." Approximately twenty-four years old, divorced, alienated from her mother and step-father, Montez turned to the stage.

Although a stage career was a gamble for anyone, the theatre offered Montez an arena in which she could compete with men as an equal on the basis of talent. Unlike many other occupations, the theatre occasionally offered women the opportunity to advance to management positions. According to historian, Tracy C. Davis, "the stage provided better wages than any other legitimate occupation freely available to a woman." In the theatre, women could travel as members of touring companies, and, "the stage could be used as a springboard into marriage; this could either serve to eclipse women's original class and provide an exit to the leisure classes, or it could enhance women's stability within the trade." Coming from a middle-class background, the fiercely independent Montez might have anticipated that she could support herself in an exciting and competitive life, free from the drudgery of a job with regular hours. She might also have the opportunity to meet a prosperous male who might marry and retire her from the stage.
To prepare herself for performance, Montez went to live and study acting with Fanny Kelly (1790-1882), a well respected, retired actress who had performed with many of the great actors of her time, including Sarah Siddons, John and Charles Kemble, Charles Matthews, Sr., and Edmund Kean, to whose Hamlet she often played Ophelia. According to Montez, Kelly indicated that "deficient English was a bar to her immediate appearance, so it was settled that she should be a danseuse." Subsequently, Montez studied with a Spanish dance teacher in London for four months and then, "after a brief visit to the Montalvos in Spain . . . came back to London." Montez suggests that she stayed with the Montalvos, her real or invented Spanish relatives, to polish her Spanish dance skills.

When she returned to London, Lola marketed herself as a dancer of Spanish origin and, adapting "Doña Lola Montez" as her stage name, secured an engagement at Her Majesty's Theatre. Managed by Benjamin Lumley, a leading producer of the day, Her Majesty's was "the most fashionable theatre in London," and, until 1843, was the sole licensed theatre in the city for the production of grand opera. Lumley assumed its control in 1842, and recognizing the public's growing enthusiasm for ballet, began to shift the theatre's focus to ballet. Under his guidance Her Majesty's Theatre eventually set the standard for the production of romantic
ballet in the 1840s, overtaking the lead from the Paris Opéra. 

Montez's audition was sufficiently successful to convince Lumley to engage her. Billed as "Doña Lola Montez," of the prestigious, "Teatro Real, Seville," she made her debut in an "Original Spanish Dance, 'El Olano'" between acts of Rossini's opera, The Barber of Seville, on June 3, 1843. The evening's entertainment was completed by the grand ballet, Alma; or La Fille du Feu, in which the famous ballet dancer, Fanny Cerrito performed.

Adding the title of "Doña" to her assumed name added special lustre to a performer making her London debut. In the late 18th century when the Spanish crown became desperate for funds, it practiced the sale of titles to the middle class. The official title of "Doña" is lower than that of an English "Duchess," but higher than a mere upper-middle class social rank. By entitling herself "Doña," Montez suggested social respectability and a noble background which could prove difficult to trace.

The origins of the rest of her assumed name are almost as problematic. Lola, the shortened version of Dolores, was the nickname that her family had given her early in life. However, her choice of Montez, is not clear. It may be connected to the Montalvo name to which she claimed relation in most, if not all, of her memoirs. Montez is a common Spanish name that could prove difficult to trace.
By March of 1847, a rumor had been recorded, and subsequently denied, that she was the daughter of the famous Spanish toreador, Francisco Montez. Possibly, Lola was the source of this rumor.

In her debut, Montez probably performed in El Olano, a variation of one of two Spanish dances, either the cachucha, or the olé. The Herald critic termed her dance "a sort of cachucha;" yet, the title of the dance appears closer to El Olé, or L'Ollia" the dance that Montez performed in France and often in America. A cachucha is an Andalusian dance in rapid 3/4 time, the rhythm being accented by castanets. Likewise, the olé is a woman's solo dance with castanets, "similar to the ancient Romalis gypsy dance . . . with movements of the body rather than the feet . . . accompanied by rapid vocal acrobatics . . . to the syllables 'aye' or 'olé.'" A Romalis is an Andalusian female's solo dance, closely related to the Hindu Nautch, accompanied by music that is "Arabic in character and [which] has been described as 'low and melancholy . . . and full of sudden pauses.'" Montez probably was aware of the precedent set by other performers of the cachucha, and, may have been influenced by her childhood witness of native Indian dance. Perhaps, her El Olano was a combination of the two dances.

Critical descriptions of El Olano provide some clues to Montez's presentation of herself and the dance. The
Times noted that "There was a solemnity in the whole affair. . . . The few bars that preceded the rising of the curtain sounded forebodingly." The Morning Herald critic described a "Moorish chamber," with an opening at the rear of the stage "curiously shrouded by folds of drapery," and flanked by young women on either side, "turning their eyes in obvious expectancy towards the mysterious curtain." When the curtain opened, Montez, "enveloped in a mantilla of figured lace," stepped forward, and an attendant quickly drew away the "sable scarf from her head." She wore "the brightest of colors," her petticoat "dappled with flaunting tints of red, yellow, and violet. . . . " The Times described her manner:

In the most stately fashion she wound round the stage, executing all her movements with the utmost deliberation . . . . there was the bending forward and drawing back, the feat of dropping on the knees, the haughty march forward. But in the style in which Doña Montez went through these movements there was something entirely different from all that we have seen.

The Morning Herald related that Montez

is haughty, scornful, and assuming, with her figure erect and majestic--now does she stoop on one knee and curve her arms in laughing mockery over her head. She stamps pettishly with her foot, advances eagerly, then recoils--describes quaint half circles with her toes, and archly salutes the house by tapping her castanets merrily together.

El Olano may have been her most visually and emotionally impressive vehicle. Ultimately, her repertoire included nine dances from different countries: La
Sevilliana, or La Sevigliana; El Olé, El Olle, or L'Ollia; the Pas de Matelot, or the Sailor's Hornpipe; La Zapateado, or The Shoemaker's Dance; La Grand Pas Hongrois, or a Hungarian dance; cachuchas; polkas; boleras; and her famous Spider Dance, or La Tarantule. Each of these dances appears to have been a divertissement, or a short, entertaining dance, that could be performed as a solo, or with one to two partners, and which occasionally—as was customary—was inserted into a full length ballet when performed with a full company. At the start of her career, Montez appears to have taken full advantage of the popularity of exotic character, or national, dance and her dark features, which could be attributed to a Latin background.

Mid-nineteenth century dance reflected a transition from the classical to the romantic period. In the early nineteenth century the Paris Opéra, which virtually established fashion for the rest of the dance world, presented ballets based on Greek mythology. Choreography, described as "dignified, calculated and cold," most likely satisfied many purists; but, such restricted fare became increasingly unpopular with the rising middle class. Instead, the burgeoning middle class, which frequented the growing "boulevard" or "popular" theatres, embraced the liberation of the Romantic movement and began to support dance with stories that dealt
with the supernatural, mystery, fantasy, romantic love and folklore. Soon, the Paris Opéra and the rest of the dance world provided audiences with ballets that dealt with the preferred romantic subjects.

Romantic ballet reached a peak in artistry and popularity in Europe between 1830 and 1850. New subject matter resulted in new techniques that gave primacy to the role of women in ballet. Ballerinas became the focal point of productions and fascinated audiences by dancing en pointe, on the tips of their toes; in arabesque, protracted balance where the back leg extends waist high; and, bourée, rapid little steps en pointe. Males were relegated to supporting roles as a result of the emphasis placed on new female techniques in dance.

The introduction of new subjects for dance narratives resulted in two lines of development within romantic ballet: the ethereal and the exotic. The first line dealt with an otherworldly aspect of spirituality. Movement was "extrovert, light and outgoing, covering a wide space. . . geared to lift the [dancer's] weight upwards." Marie Taglioni (1804-1884) personified and popularized ethereal style in movement through her performances in La Sylphide. The eponymous sylph was "the ideal but unattainable woman" who moved like an unearthly creature as she lured the "Scotsman James away from his pleasant sweetheart and off into the misty highlands, where he [sought] in vain to tame
her elusive flights." 76 In our contemporary terms, Taglioni's style of movement is considered classical ballet.

The second strain of the Romantic ballet featured movement of a more earthly and earthy nature. What modern critics term "character dance"--or the national dance of individual countries--provided a contrast to the ethereal ballet through its robust and passionate nature and style. Movement in character dance, especially those of Spanish origin, was more introverted than that of the ethereal Romantic ballet and required less space. Typically, even today, arm movements are directed "inwards and downwards;" and performers utilize a lower center of gravity which forces the dancer's weight to the floor. 77 The Viennese dancer, Fanny Elssler (1810-1884), respected for her "elegance, grace and lightness" in ethereal ballets, also specialized in ballets that helped to popularize character dance of the Romantic period. Her Spanish cachucha was the mainstay of her repertoire. 78 Further contrast between the two styles of ballet may be found in the remarks of the famous French critic, Théophile Gautier, who "characterized Taglioni as a Christian dancer [and] Fanny Elssler as a pagan;" Gautier found the sensuous passion of Elssler's cachucha more appealing than the chaste movement of La Sylphide. 79
Solo, and/or multiply-partnered, character dance still exists today in the form of polkas, waltzes and mazurkas, among many others. As in the mid-nineteenth century, it often provides the basis of full-length ballets organized around a country's myth and folklore, as in the Russian Swan Lake or Sleeping Beauty. Character dance consists of steps unique to a particular country, and within full-length ballets, solos, or partnered dances reflects some sense of personality. Performer and teacher, Jurgen Pagels explains that eccentricities often are displayed, but character dance often reveals a totality, "a range of national attributes."

Often the body displays a highly individual personification: an old, funny, miserly, or eccentric man; or perhaps a robust, seductive, but good humored woman. The characterization is used in a broad sense to cover not the individual but an entire range of national attributes.

In the mid-nineteenth century Spanish character dance did not always enjoy the respect that the "Classical Spanish Dance" has been afforded today. When Montez made her debut, London critics who wrote about her seemed to write from a classical, French ballet perspective, clearly noting the difference between Montez's character dance and that of the classical French ballet. The Era critic explained that the Spanish dance Montez executed is a style widely different from what forms the French school. To attain any celebrity as a dancer on the French stage, long training, and practice, and perseverance, are indispensable, and the rigorous French critic has
principally to pronounce on the progress of the legs and the feet. But in the Spanish genre the feet have little to do; they merely slide over the ground and are ignorant of bounds and pirouettes. The dance in Spain requires mind and intelligence, for it represents a scene, an action, a pantomime, where each movement expresses a sentiment. 82

The critic for The Morning Herald noted that El Olano was "essentially a pas de caractère, and its requisitions are of the body rather than of the feet; but it may be presumed that the Doña has accomplishments even in this direction worth looking at." 83 The Era suggested that Montez "enchanted everyone; there was, throughout, a graceful flowing of the arms, not an angle discernable, an indescribable softness in her attitudes . . . . She was rapturously encored, and the stage strewn with bouquets." 84

The critics for The Times and The Morning Herald did not consider her the artistic equivalent of Fanny Elssler, or Fanny Cerrito (1817-1909), 85 the two significant stars of the international ballet; but, they noted that the beauty, authority and grace of her movement revealed immense potential. The Times commented that there was "a kind of national reality about her which was most impressive. The haughtiness with which she stepped, the slow play of the arms, the air of authority with which she once stepped with the hands resting on the hips--all gave an air of grandeur to the dance." 86 The Morning Herald described Montez as a "superior pantomimist;" and noted
that "We have yet to see whether the comparison may be continued as regards the solemnities and activities of a 'pas seul'—whether the two Fannys, Elssler and Cerrito, are to be eclipsed. . . ." 87

All reports agree that Montez was young, beautiful and possessed a great deal of ability. She was "the perfection of Spanish beauty— the tall handsome person, the full lustrous eye, the joyous animated face, and the intensely raven hair." 88 Montez seemed to be on her way to an enviable career. However, by identifying herself as "Doña Lola Montez," she unwittingly created a situation that made her first professional appearance a debacle. Lord Ranelagh, an older gentleman and unrequited lover to Montez, attended her debut. He created such a stir in the audience after her performance that he caught the manager's attention. Compelled by Ranelagh's assertion that the woman known as "Betty Gilbert" had appeared fraudulently as "Doña Lola Montez," Lumley cancelled her future appearances 89 without providing an explanation to the press.

Montez challenged the private accusation made against her in a letter that appeared in The Era, June 18, 1843. In it she maintained that she was a native of Seville who had never been to London before. She also claimed that she spoke imperfect English, principally, because of an Irish nanny; and, had sought a stage career in England because
political controversy had driven her from her own country. Montez concluded by asking the press to remove the "cruel, calumny" against her name, and threatened legal action against those who persisted in slander. 90

The threat of legal action may have caused Lumley to refrain from providing a public explanation for her cancelled appearances. One member of the popular press wondered why the

new 'danseuse' named Donna Lolah Montez . . . [who] created a most novel and delightful sensation, . . . has not been heard of since . . . . She was decidedly successful; but perhaps the votaries of what may be called classical dance, have set their faces against national [dance], just in the same fashion as an exclusive devotionalist to the Italian Opera would turn away with disgust from a melody of Ireland or Scotland . . . . 91

Perhaps, maintaining the facade of a generous and forgiving, "Spanish lady," Montez performed again in London before departing. Approached by Edward Fitzball, a resident playwright of the Theatre Royal, Covent Garden, she donated performances of El Olano and La Sevilliana for his benefit on July 10, 1843. 92 La Sevilliana appears to have been a variation of the Spanish-Moorish dance, La Seguidilla. A Spanish dance performed with the accompaniment of guitar and castanets, the seguidilla's most famous form is the sevillana of Seville, danced in heeled shoes and often distinguished by the "beauty and elegance of the movements of arms, shoulders and
Despite its Moorish origin, the seguidilla is primarily considered an Andalusian dance, but practiced throughout Spain. Each region has a variation named after its particular district, which includes its own version of steps, rhythm and music. However, music is often played in 3/4 or 3/8 time, usually in a minor key and played on guitar. Often a flute or violin is added for accompaniment.

Following her performances for Fitzball, Montez decided to pursue a dance career on the continent. She explained that after her "successful" debut "the engagement was broken off immediately by a difficulty as to terms between her and the director . . . . she refused to go on for the terms offered." On a personal level, Montez's stage debut cut the remaining ties to her family, for after her first appearance her mother "put on mourning as though her child was dead, and sent out to all her friends the customary funeral letters."

Mrs. Craigie's behavior was not unusual for the time; other actresses and dancers experienced similar negative family reactions to stage careers. Female actors and dancers often were considered little better than prostitutes, and "respectable" families did not approve of their relatives appearing on the stage. The popular stage career of American actress Mary Ann Duff (1794-1857) prompted her relatives to bury her in a common grave with
her grand-daughter without a name on her tombstone. A seventeen-year-old girl was thrown out of her home into the London streets by her father when he discovered that she had participated in amateur theatricals:

His face was pale with rage, and, in spite of my dear mother's tearful entreaties, he thrust me from the door, and locked it upon me, leaving me, long after midnight, alone and unprotected in the street. My distress was fearful, and my situation shocking. I . . . had not proceeded many paces before my grief overpowered me, and I despairingly rested on the steps of a door.

Nineteenth century theatre may have provided a few women with professional and financial security, but it could exact substantial emotional toll.

Between her benefit appearance for Fitzball in July, 1843, and her appearance in Paris at the Opéra in March, 1844, biographers have had difficulty chronicling Montez's itinerary. Montez may have travelled first to Brussels, Belgium, with no dance success; but, she soon found fame in Berlin. Here, Montez danced at an entertainment organized by Frederick William IV (1795-1861), King of Prussia, in honor of his son-in-law, the Czar Nicholas. "The autocrat of all the Russias expressed himself as highly pleased with the newcomer's efforts." Subsequently, "Berliners followed suit. . . . every night for a month on end she was booked up to dance somewhere." Although biographers have not established the date of the incident, Ishbel Ross suggested that Montez ended one of her stays in Berlin by
establishing a reputation for the use of a horse-whip when opposed. 103

At some point in her early career, perhaps, prior to her first trip to Berlin, Montez visited Dresden where she met Franz Liszt (1811-1886), one of the foremost pianists and composers of the nineteenth century (see Plate 1). According to Montez, their meeting occurred almost immediately after her London debut. 104 Performing at Dresden's Royal Theatre, Montez reported that the furore she created was "quite as great among the gentlemen as was Lizst's among the ladies." King Charles XIV (1764-1844), and his wife Queen Frederika, (1780-18??) invited her "to visit them at their summer palace, and when she left . . . the queen, who was the sister to the King of Bavaria, gave her a letter to the Queen of Prussia, another sister to King Louis [Ludwig I of Bavaria], which opened the way for an immense triumph at Berlin." 105 Her visit to Dresden proved significant, for she eventually became one of Liszt's lovers. 106 Their liaison undoubtedly publicized her name and aided Montez in securing professional commitments. 107

After her appearances in Dresden and Berlin, Montez turned to Warsaw. 108 Her performances and beauty "enraptured the Poles, and drew from one of their dramatic critics" a physical description that helped establish her fame as a great beauty of the day.
Plate 1. Franz Liszt (unattributed print of Lizst in D'Auvergne's *Lola Montez*).
Lola possesses twenty-six of the twenty-seven points on which a Spanish writer insists as essential to feminine beauty—and the real connoisseurs among my readers will agree with me when I confess that blue eyes and black hair appear to me more ravishing than black eyes and black hair. The points enumerated by the Spanish writer are: three white—the skin, the teeth, the hands; three black—the eyes, eyelashes, and eyebrows; three red—the lips, the cheeks, the nails; three long—the body, the hair, the hands; three short—the ears, the teeth, the legs; three broad—the bosom, the forehead, the space between the eyebrows; three full—the lips, the arms, the calves; three small—the waist, the hands, the feet; three thin—the fingers, the hair, the lips. All these perfections are Lola's, except as regards the color of her eyes which . . . combine the varying shades of the sixteen varieties of forget-me-not. . . ." 109

Apparently, Montez's beauty not only seduced a dramatic critic, but also the sixty-year-old Viceroy of Poland, Prince Paskewich (1782-1856), 110 who "fell in love with her," offering her land and jewels. Finding him physically unappealing, and a tyrant to his people, Montez refused his offers. 111 After a series of disruptions during performances, which she attributed to the influence of the Prince, Montez took action. She approached the audience "in a rage," announcing that she had been "hissed" at the instigation of the director of the theatre, because "she had refused certain gifts from the old prince his master." 112

Montez claimed that her public announcement of her predicament resulted in little less than a revolution. "An immense crowd of Poles, who hated both the prince and the
director, escorted her to her lodgings," and began rioting against Paskewich in the streets. \(^{113}\) An arrest order was issued for Montez; but, barricaded behind her hotel-room door, with a pistol in hand, she threatened to shoot the first man to enter. Although saved by the French consul from formal arrest, Montez received orders to leave Poland. \(^{114}\)

From Poland Montez travelled to St. Petersburg, Russia, where despite news of the incident in Warsaw, she "was welcomed with many peculiar and flattering attentions." A letter of introduction to the Empress of Russia, Aleksandra Fedorovna, from Queen Amelia of Prussia, provided her with the "kindest reception and . . . many delicate attentions." \(^{115}\) Montez may have performed in St. Petersburg, but she made no record of it.

After her stay in St. Petersburg, Montez eventually arrived in Paris where she attracted the attention of the famous and popular author, Alexander Dumas, \(\text{père, (1802-1870)}\) \(^{116}\) who became charmed by her looks and fascinated by her reputation (see Plate 2). \(^{117}\) Through Dumas, Montez met several literary and artistic figures, and secured an engagement at the prestigious Paris Opéra. Dumas, \(\text{père, Joseph Méry, (1798-1865)}\) \(^{118}\) the celebrated French poet, and Rosina Stoltz, a dancer/lover to Léon Pillet, all recommended Montez to Léon Pillet, the director of the Paris Opéra. \(^{119}\)
Between 1820 and 1847 thirteen Parisian theatres featured dance on a regular, or occasional, basis. At the time of Montez's engagement, the Paris Opéra was the city's leading ballet house. It specialized in ballet and opera and, with the exception of the Porte-Saint-Martin, had no competitors that could approach the quality of its productions.

Montez's engagement at the Opéra seems to have been a remarkable feat. Usually, the Opéra recruited principal company members from the School of Dance, established by Louis XIV in 1713. Students at the school, admitted between the ages of six and ten, studied under the watchful eye of rigorous ballet masters until the age of eighteen. Even if trained dancers were admitted to the lesser ranks of the Paris Opéra company, usual procedure, as everywhere, required neophytes to work their way up the dance hierarchy from figurants, to the corps de ballet, to coryphées, and ultimately ballerina positions. Figurants, and members of the corps de ballet, were often "trained on the job," but coryphées, typically possessed training that could prepare them for the star position of ballerina. Montez lacked the benefit of early training that would have prepared her for a successful career in dance; but, as in London, Montez once again had the opportunity to establish herself at a significant
Plate 2. Alexandre Dumas, père, (unattributed engraving of Dumas, in D'Auvergne's *Lola Montez*).
ballet theatre. If her debut went well she might be invited to join the Opéra's company and develop her fame as a star of the ballet.

Montez made her Paris debut on March 27, 1844. She performed two Spanish divertissements, L'Ollia and Las Boleras de Cadiz, in Mozart's opera/ballet, Le Bal de Don Juan, which provided the principal entertainment following the opera of Le Freyschütz/Freichütz by a Webber. Originally choreographed for the Opéra by Jean Coralli in 1834, Don Juan featured seven dances: L'Ecossaise, L'Ollia, Valse de Giselle, La Polka, Pas de Sylphide, Las Boleras de Cadiz, and Le Geiop de Gusteve. Billed as a star performer, Montez performed two of these dances; the rest were performed by the leading dancers of the Opéra, including one of the Coralli's (probably Eugene), one of the Petipa brothers, one of the Mabille brothers, and, ballerina, Adèle Dumilâtre. A description of L'Ollia was not recorded; similarly, the variation of the bolero that Montez performed can be given only a general description. Typically, the bolero is a "dance of courtship" between two partners, "without the sensual challenge of the Fandango . . . . " The arm posture is similar to that of the Fandango, in which arms are carried with elbows at shoulder height; in both dances, castanets are used. Unlike the fandango, the bolero incorporates certain elevations, turns and pirouettes,
among other steps, which make its leg-work unique, but similar to the entrechat quatre of the classical French ballet.  Generally, the bolero is danced in "heelless slippers. Very rarely it is danced on point." Composed of three stanzas, its second verse may be danced as a solo. Montez probably performed a solo of the bolero, since her newspaper billing and criticism do not feature a partner; however, Guest mentioned that she studied with the French dancer and ballet-master, Barrez, in preparation for her Paris debut.

Her debut at the Opéra "astonished and charmed the public," but critics were more cautious. Le Corsaire-Satan reported that her debut "dignified the brilliant and multifarious reputation which has preceded this remarkable dancer at our theatre. . . . we reserve our appraisal of her talent, in greater detail, until tomorrow." Montez performed her dances again on Friday, March 29, 1844; but, the Corsaire-Satan critic never provided the more detailed account promised. However, the critic for La Presse, perhaps the most influential dance critic of the age, Théophile Gautier, challenged her origins and referred to her well-publicized past in Germany, and compared her to Dolores Serral, an accomplished and popular Spanish ballerina who was one of four Spanish dancers who had introduced Spanish classical dance to Parisians in 1834.
There is nothing Andalusian about Montez except a pair of magnificent dark eyes. She 'habla' very mediocre Spanish, and speaks hardly any French and only passable English. So from what country does she really come? That is the question. We can say that Mlle. Lola has tiny feet and pretty legs, but as for the way she uses them, that is quite another matter. We must confess we were unimpressed by the curiosity aroused by Mlle. Lola's various brushes with the police forces of the North and her attack on Prussian gendarmes with her riding crop. Mlle. Lola is much inferior to Dolores Serral, who at least has the advantage of being genuine, and who makes up for her imperfections as a dancer by a sensual abandon, a passion, a fire, and a rhythmical precision that command admiration. We suspect, after hearing about her equestrian exploits, that Mlle. Lola Montez is more at home on a horse than on the boards. 135

In addition to this harsh criticism, Montez allegedly created an incident during her debut. Biographer Wyndham claimed that Montez "made a 'moue'[a pout, or wry face] at the audience and . . . pulled off her garters (a second authority says a more intimate item of attire) and flung them with a gesture of contempt among the jeering crowd in the first row of stalls." 136 Wyndham also included an account of the incident from an undocumented source:

'After her first leap, she stopped short on the tips of her toes, and, by a movement of prodigious rapidity, detached one of her garters from a lissome limb adjacent to her quivering thigh (innocent of lingerie) and flung it to the occupants of the front row of the orchestra.' 137

D'Auvergne provided another version of the incident: "her beauty ravished" the audience; but, after they "saw little merit" in her dance, she made a "characteristic bid for their favour. Her satin shoe had slipped off. Seizing it,
she threw it with one of her superb gestures into the boxes, where it was pounced upon and brandished as a precious relic by a gentleman of fashion." 138 Dance historian Ivor Guest expressed similar confusion concerning the piece of apparel that Montez threw to the audience, but concluded: "Whatever it was, the Opéra could not tolerate such a scandal, and two days later, when she was to have appeared again, slips of paper were pasted over her name on the bills." 139 Whatever the truth of the incident, the Paris Opéra cancelled her engagement. Beauty, charm and, influential connections could not overcome a flagrant act of indiscretion.

Montez may have remained in Paris until the following year, but another incident concerning Montez occurred in the fall. While Montez was working in a studio, preparing for public performance, the French ballet star, Jean Petipa appeared. "Seized with an indescribable outburst of rage," Montez "threw herself on the young man and delivered an attack which he at first countered with but a meek defense. His very gentleness, however, encouraged his adversary, and forced to change his tactics, M. Jean Petipa managed to reconcile what was necessary for his safety with the respect that was due to a lady." 140 It appears that Montez had become "infatuated" with one of the Petipa brothers, probably Lucien, 141 and physically assaulted Jean Petipa for his opposition to the relationship.
Following her infatuation with Lucien Petipa, Montez became the mistress of the young and gifted editor of La Presse, Alexandre Henri Dujarier (1816-1845), a popular leader of the Republican party. Montez may have sought association with the influential Dujarier to help counter poor press and aid her in procuring new professional engagements. La Presse, arguably, was the most influential arts newspaper in Paris because of the writings of its gifted critic, Théophile Gautier. Like Alexander Dumas, père, Dujarier moved in artistic circles which included some of the most famous literary figures of the day including Victor Hugo, Alfred de Musset, and George Sand. Association with these artists and their ideas concerning the nature and value of art provided a stimulating and challenging atmosphere for a developing performer. Also, by this time, Montez professed a "natural" interest in politics, "for ever since she left London she had spent her time almost exclusively in diplomatic circles, at the Courts of Saxony, Prussia, Poland, and St. Petersburg." Montez could hardly avoid local political affairs with the young Republican leader.

Through one means or another, almost one year after her initial appearance in Paris, Montez acquired a principal engagement at the Porte-Saint-Martin Theatre. A multitude of carriages" gathered outside the theatre,
while inside an "atmosphere of festivity and animation reigned. White gloves and bouquets rested on the ledges of the proscenium." Parisians may have been curious to witness her dance abilities as well as to see the person of such notorious reputation. Gautier remarked, "Sometime ago the newspapers were full of the adventures of this beautiful Bradamante who nimbly horsewhipped policemen, rode like Caroline, and could bisect a ball on a knife-point at twenty-five paces."

Both friendly and hostile audience members gathered. The proscenium seats were "filled with . . . hardcore lions with yellow claws, the first gallery peopled as though by enchantment with wrinkled gentlemen and princes, . . . and the mass of critics . . . invaded the balcony." During the opening moments of her dance, an "avalanche of bouquets" covered the stage in praise of Montez; but, simultaneously, someone tossed "an enormous bouquet of greenery and flowers, a sort of infernal machine, evidently directed against the life of Mlle. Montes by an evil hand."

Nonetheless, Montez, "continued most beautifully across this pyramid of flowers, her dance alert and light, as though her days had not been seriously menaced."

Montez danced the role of Seraphine, a part that provided two character dances in the one-act ballet, La Dansomanie, "arranged expressly for her debut," at the Porte-Saint-Martin. In La Dansomanie, Montez performed a
cachucha and a polka following the five-act drama *Lady Seymour* (no author) and the vaudeville, *Cabrion*, by a Delaporte. 152

With the exception of an anonymous individual, critics and audience members appeared to enjoy Montez's performance. Her cachucha and polka were "among the most authentic, and Mlle. Montes was not any less charming, nor any less applauded in her second test." She performed at least one dance with a partner who was described as "an excessively ill-mannered boor." 153 Amending his opinion of her dance abilities, Gautier wrote that she performed with "uninhibited boldness, a furious ardor and a fantastic vivacity which must shock all classical lovers of pirouettes and 'ronds de jambe.'" This time, Montez's cachucha, if compared to the most "furious pas" of Dolores Serral, would make Serral's look like "minuets and gavottes." Taken by her beauty, Gautier questioned keeping "rigidly to the rules? Is it not enough for a woman to be beautiful, young, light and graceful? . . . Severe judges will say that she lacks good training, and that she does things in breach of the rules, but does that matter?" 154

Montez repeated her performance as Seraphine in *La Dansomanie* on March 8, 1845, 155 when it was announced that she would soon be "charged with an important role in the magnificent ballet which M.M. [Messieurs] Cognard and brothers are preparing," *La Biche au Bois*. 156 The
critic for *Le Corsaire-Satan* was so taken by Montez's performance that he urged the habituées of the Paris Opéra to attend the Porte-Saint-Martin instead. 157

Circumstances, however, prevented Montez from fulfilling her new engagement. Highly unlikely, her refusal to wear tights beneath her skirt may have caused her dismissal. 158 Montez's lack of immediate re-engagement at the Porte-Saint-Martin might be attributed to her grief over the death of her lover, Dujarier, on March 12, 1845.

Their relationship appears to have been one of deep attachment. Through her association with Dujarier, Montez became immersed in the political affairs of the day, and a "good and confirmed hater of tyranny and oppression . . . . She soon became familiar with the state of politics throughout Europe, and became . . . [an] enthusiastic . . . Republican." While she and Dujarier were "plotting and scheming politics, they both fell in love," and made plans to marry, sometime in the spring of 1845. 159

But, on the morning of March 12, 1845, Rosemond de Beauvallon, a literary and dramatic critic for a rival newspaper, killed Dujarier in a duel, 160 a result of a dispute concerning personal and professional issues unrelated to Montez. 161 Devastated, Montez "made such preparations, with the help of his friends, for the funeral, as she could, under the crushing load of sorrow
and despair which weighed upon her heart." 162 Dujarier was buried March 14, 1845. Emile de Girardin, Alexandre Dumas, père, Balzac and Méry "held the sides of the funeral pall." 163

Dujarier left Montez well provided. He bequeathed to her eighteen shares in the Palais-Royale theatre, 164 as well as 20,000 francs, according to de Mirecourt, 165 although, newspapers examined make no reference to such a sum. Perhaps, Montez sold the shares for 20,000 francs. Montez claimed that she donated her inheritance of $100,000.00, to Dujarier's remaining relatives; 166 but, she may have retained a portion of it to support herself.

Montez soon left Paris to rid herself of "the sights that reminded her perpetually of the loss which could never be made up to her in this world." 167 In spite of star billing at the two major theatres in Paris, good critical commentary and association with some of the most significant literary and political figures of the day, she chose to leave France. The beauty and keen mind that Dujarier found so compelling soon "made a rapid conquest of the King of Bavaria." 168

The chronology of her movements prior to her arrival in Bavaria are difficult to document. She may have been in Bonn for the unveiling of the Beethoven memorial statue on August 12, 1845, 169 "at the invitation of Franz Liszt," who had helped organize the erection of the statue for the
festival. 170 By March 28, 1846, Montez was in Rouen at the trial of de Beauvallon for the murder of Dujarier the year before. 171 She testified that she was not aware of the duel until it was too late to act; however, she claimed she was "a better shot than Dujarier, and if Beauvallon wanted satisfaction I would have fought him myself." 172 A United States newspaper of that year reported that the court awarded Montez the eighteen shares in the Palais-Royale left her by Dujarier after a delay "in consequence of some legal informality in the deed of succession." 173

Edmund D'Auvergne discovered a book by Albert Dresden Vandam entitled *An Englishman in Paris: Notes and Recollections* (1892). D'Auvergne warned his readers that the book is full of inaccuracies and is at best "hearsay evidence transcribed by Vandam." 174 The book, however, appears to be the source of two often repeated quotations concerning Montez. The first was attributed to Alexandre Dumas, père,:

> Though far from superstitious, Dumas, who had been as much smitten with her as most of her admirers, avowed that he was glad she had disappeared. 'She has the evil eye,' he said, 'and is sure to bring bad luck to any one who closely links his destiny with hers, for however short a time. 175

The second quote was attributed to Montez herself. According to Vandam, Montez confessed: "'The moment I get a nice, round, lump sum of money, I am going to try to hook a prince.' 176
Whether factual or not, both of the quotations seem prophetic. Biographers indicate that after Beauvallon's trial, and apparently in receipt of funds, Montez travelled to spas in Wiesbaden, Hamburg and finally, in the summer of 1846, in Baden-Baden where she briefly dallied with Prince Henry LXXII of Reuss-Lobenstein-Ebersdorf (no dates), before she arrived in Bavaria in autumn of 1846. Here, Montez hooked her prince.

Montez secured a dance engagement at the Royal Theatre in Munich, Bavaria, in October, 1846. Luise von Kobell, then a "child," remembered two intermissions in a three-act play, Der verwunschene Prinz while attending Montez's first Munich appearance: "In the pit they clapped and hissed; the last, explained my neighbor, because of the rumours abroad that Lola was an emissary of the English Freemasons, an enemy of the Jesuits--a coquette, too, who had amourous adventures in all parts of the world, according to the newspapers." Von Kobell recorded that Montez took center stage, "clothed not in the usual tights and short skirts of the ballet girl, but in a Spanish costume of silk and lace, with here and there a glittering diamond." She wrote that

Fire seemed to shoot from her wonderful blue eyes, and she bowed like one of the Graces before the King, who occupied the royal box. Then she danced after the fashion of her country, swaying on her hips, and changing from one posture to another, each excelling the former in beauty. . . . [S]he riveted the attention of all the spectators, their gaze followed the sin-
uous swayings of her body, in their expression now of glowing passion, now of lightsome playfulness. Not till she ceased her rhythmic movements was the spell broken . . . . \textsuperscript{182}

If Kobell's account may be trusted, the spellbinding performer already had acquired admirers by her appearance in Munich. Kobell saw Montez perform a second and final time at the Royal Court Theatre: "She danced the 'Cachucha' in the comedy, \textit{Der Weiberfeind von Benedix}, and danced the 'Fandango' with Herr Opfermann in the \textit{entr'acte} of the play \textit{Müller und Miller}" on October 14, 1846. By the date of her second performance, Montez had secured the favor of Ludwig I, King of Bavaria. He had received her in a formal audience and found himself captivated by her "beauty and stimulating conversation." For her second performance, Ludwig ordered policemen in plain clothes and theatre attendants to occupy the pit to help maintain order. \textsuperscript{183}

Ludwig I, or Louis Wittelsbach, (1786-1868) King of Bavaria, was sixty years old by the time he encountered Montez (see Plate 3). Perhaps remembered more for his relationship with Montez than his statesmanship, Ludwig has been recorded as a dreamer and a liberal for his time. He sought to reform his nation's system of government, but was more effective as a patron of arts, and one devoted to the advancement of education and science. \textsuperscript{184} "An ardent admirer of England and her theory of government," Ludwig had almost given his people a constitutional monarchy when the revolutionary movements of 1830 frightened the
prospect. 185 Subsequently, conservative Catholic elements opposed to democratic reform, gradually assumed control of the King and the government. The Bavarian aristocracy had long been predominantly Catholic, and by 1846 the court system had come under the rigid control of the Jesuits as well. 186 Protestants were harassed and prosecuted, and strict censorship denied free discussion of internal politics. 187 By 1846, the government had "degenerated into a low, petty, grinding tyranny—a system of exclusion to all who did not bow down before the priesthood—a system devised with devilish ingenuity—until, at last, it became intolerable to all but the favored few." 188 This political climate surrounded Montez and Ludwig I when they first met.

The English periodical, Fraser's Magazine, concluded that Ludwig, "first struck" by Montez's "personal attractions, soon became still more enamored of her originality of character, her mental powers, and, above all, of those bold and novel political views which she fearlessly and frankly laid before him." 189 Montez soon became Ludwig's intimate friend and political advisor. 190 Montez probably became Ludwig's mistress, but the truth has remained a "boudoir secret." 191 Even if their relationship was not sexual, popular opinion believed that it was according to the American Law Journal: "It is alleged that relations other than political exist
between this extraordinary female and the King of Bavaria. The fact is too notorious to be denied; and the conduct of the parties in this respect must receive the condemnation of every friend to morality." 192

Whatever Montez's relationship to Ludwig may have been, the Jesuit administration that controlled Bavaria disapproved of it. 193 Alarmed by her growing power over the King, and aware of her anti-Catholic and liberal political views, the Jesuits urged Ludwig to end his relationship with Montez, but to no avail. Intimidated by the greater political freedom for Bavarians that Montez urged on Ludwig, 194 the Jesuits campaigned at home and abroad to inflame public opinion against the dancer and King. Montez was lampooned as a dancer and the King's mistress; the sixty-year-old Ludwig was ridiculed for his devotion to the twenty-eight-year-old Montez. 195 When the press campaign failed to end the relationship, the Jesuits attempted to bribe Montez to leave the country. 196

Undeterred by his ministry's opposition to Montez, Ludwig worked to provide her with position and money. Early in 1847, Ludwig requested that Montez become a naturalized citizen of Bavaria, 197 in an apparent effort to provide her with formal titles. Eventually, he entitled her the Baroness Rosenthal and Countess of Landsfelt, and made her a Canoness of the Order of Saint Theresa—"an
Plate 3. Ludwig I of Bavaria (Perhaps idealized, this engraving from The Illustrated London News 3 April 1847, was rendered by an artist known as Baugniet).
Plate 4. Montez in Spanish dance costume; no artist. (This idealized engraving of Montez appeared in The Illustrated London News 20 March 1847.)
honour custom rigorously reserved for Bavarian Princesses, and ladies of the highest birth and most exemplary life." The title of Countess was accompanied "by an estate of the same name with certain feudal privileges and rights over some two thousand souls." Ludwig also provided Montez an income estimated at five thousand pounds per year. 

The King's generosity had enormous repercussions for Montez, Ludwig and Bavaria. Entitling Montez "Countess of Landsfelt" alienated many of her "liberal supporters, who wished her still to continue, in rank as well as in purposes, one of the people." The request for naturalization and entitlement resulted in the resignation of Karl D'Abel, the Bavarian Minister of the Interior, as well as the Ministers of War, Justice and Finance. According to The Times of March 1847, "a Ministry which had directed the Bavarian councils for ten years has been shattered to pieces by the destructive effects of this new Spanish match." D'Abel was replaced by the Protestant professor and historian, Ludwig von Maurer, who quickly granted Montez's naturalization and entitlement. Citizens of Munich were not entirely sympathetic to the change in government; riots broke out in the streets between University student supporters of Montez and "Ultramontane," or Jesuit students who supported the fallen regime. As a result, "The Ultramontane
professors were dismissed; parliament was dissolved; the [old] Ministry fell."  

By January of 1848, Montez had played the role of "chief councillor" to Ludwig for approximately one year. Through her influence the former Minister of Foreign Affairs had been replaced by a Prince Wallenstein, and a Mr. Berx had been appointed as Minister of the Interior. A liberal sympathizer, Fraser's Magazine defended Montez by pointing out that she did not make political decisions based on her own judgment alone, but consulted "those whose studies and occupations qualify them to afford information." The writer also championed Montez's prudent use of her influence over the King and the reforms Ludwig initiated.

Montez was fortunate to have a liberal ally in Fraser's Magazine, for the Jesuit press campaign against her was effective. Numerous scandalous reports concerning her public and personal actions in Bavaria had reached England and America. Fraser's Magazine dismissed the following newspaper reports as "monstrous and ridiculous" because of the "intangibility about all the charges that are made against her."  

[I]t is supposed that she walks about Munich with a large and ferocious bull-dog, whom she deliberately sets upon those persons who she has not the physical power to beat. This dog, it seems, has a peculiar instinct for worrying Jesuit priests; . . . she seizes every occasion to outrage public decency . . . spitting in the face of a bishop, thrashing a coalheaver, smash-
ing shop windows, or breaking her parasol over the head and shoulders of some nobleman adverse to her party. 210

Other rumors attributed to Montez by her political enemies, the Jesuits, accused her of "constantly deceiving the king. . . . she beats her domestics and friends, or occasionally amuses herself by tearing with her nails the flesh of some one or other of those cavaliers who number themselves in her train of admirers." 211

*Fraser's Magazine* may have been an ardent supporter of Montez as a politician because of shared democratic ideals; however, its sympathy for her did not extend beyond the political realm. The magazine expressed its disapproval of her past personal and public escapades, and characterized Montez as a person who "has led a very scandalous and dissipated life; who has been mixed up with English roues and French literateurs; who has figured in public trials; and who has altogether denuded herself of the privileges of her sex, by having lived the life more of a man than of a woman." 212

Jesuit press attacks on Montez reached America as well as Europe. Two cartoons that appear to date from this period were reprinted in a pamphlet written in defense of Montez, and published in New York. 213 They provide an indication of the kind of ridicule Montez and Ludwig received from the Jesuits. Plate 5 portrays Montez as buxom with her leg extended upward toward the audience.
The pose allows the audience to look up her dress, and two older men in the audience peer intently. One man points to the area beneath her skirt, and another appears to use some device to magnify his ability to view her through his monocle. Flowers shower the stage. The cartoon suggests that inappropriate exposure contributed to her dance popularity. Plate 6 portrays Montez as the defiant, dominating mistress of her pet dog, King Ludwig. Dressed in Spanish dance costume, Montez also wears a crown on her head as if she is the real Queen of Bavaria. She aggressively raises a parasol with her right hand and holds a dog or horsewhip in her left hand, which also contains a leash by which she leads Ludwig. A pistol and, perhaps, a scepter are tucked in her belt. The cartoon implies that Montez is the real power behind the throne of Bavaria and alludes to her use of pistols and a horsewhip in past confrontations, as well as accusations (real or fictitious) of her attacking opponents with her parasol.

The Jesuit press campaign was effective for with the same rapidity with which it came to power, the "Lolamistereume"—the facetious name given to the ministry Montez had appointed and empowered— was stripped of power and influence over Ludwig I. A public riot forced a challenge to her influence. A student party known as the Alemannen that Montez had organized and who were given special privileges by the King, were opposed by the
Plate 5. Montez dance cartoon reproduced from Lola Montes, or, A Reply to the "Private History and Memoirs" ..., by John Richardson, privately printed in New York, 1851. (Courtesy of the Pennsylvania State University Libraries.)
Plate 6. Montez and Ludwig I cartoon reproduced from Lola Montes, or, A Reply to the "Private History and Memoirs" . . . , by John Richardson, privately printed, New York, 1851. (Courtesy of Pennsylvania State University Libraries.)
Ultramontane student party. Jealous of the special rights given to the Alemannen and spurred by the "priests and agents of the ejected nobility," the Ultramontanes began a demonstration against the Alemannen on February 8, 1848. Alone, Montez foolishly went to the rescue of her students and rioting broke out. Her life in danger, Montez barricaded herself inside the Theatiner Church until Ludwig called out troops to quell the revolt.

In the aftermath, Ludwig was forced to renounce Montez's citizenship and, eventually, abdicate in favor of his two-and-a-half year son, Maxmillian II, on March 20, 1848. When banished, Montez fled Munich; but, she attempted a secret return disguised as a male in order to counsel Ludwig. Ultimately, Montez found refuge in Berne, Switzerland.

Montez's experience on the political stage in Bavaria added to her notoriety. But, despite her questionable relationship with Ludwig, Montez found favor with advocates of democracy. Montez was proclaimed across Germany as "the heroine of liberalism, the champion of modern ideals;" however, she probably functioned more as a catalyst for an inevitable Bavarian revolution against the powerful Catholic clergy and aristocracy. Historians report that a revolutionary fervor appeared to sweep Europe at the time; liberal ideas concerning freedom spurred unrest that marked the fall of an old world order in several countries.
Chapman-Huston commented that the upheaval that Montez provoked in Munich was "but one reverberation of the Revolutionary storm that spread like wild-fire throughout Europe in 1848." Democratic revolt occurred in Prussia, Austria, Hungary, and Italy; only England avoided revolution. 220

After her exile from Bavaria Montez appears to have lived comfortably for a time in Switzerland. An unattributed newspaper clipping dated 1848 records a stay of several months at Pregny in a chateau on the north shore of Lake Geneva where she awaited the arrival of the King. She "fitted up the chateau with exquisite taste, and . . . passed her days in quiet and happy contrast with the strange scenes of her eventful life." 221

The beauty of the Alps and a quiet life did not hold her attention for long. Early in 1849 Montez returned to England, where, perhaps, she lived on funds sent to her by Ludwig. 222 Although Montez maintained limited contact with Ludwig through correspondence for the remainder of her life, her exile from Bavaria marked the end of their personal contact.
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Chapter 3. Life after Bavaria and Considerations for an American Tour

When Montez returned to England in early 1849, a Countess exiled for her political beliefs and free of the necessity of performing, she might have planned a less controversial life. Approximately thirty-one years old, she had not made a professional stage appearance for almost three years, ever since she began her relationship with King Ludwig I of Bavaria. Evidently, the deposed sovereign had made her financially independent, making it possible for Montez to settle in rooms at 27 Halfmoon Street, Piccadilly. ¹ There she entertained "young men of fashion," titled nobility, and liberal political figures, causing a greater sensation in social circles than "that inspired by the Swedish nightingale Madame Jenny Lind." ²

Montez's name soon appeared in theatre bills, this time as the subject of a play. Between her exile from Bavaria and her arrival in England, a popular London playwright, Joseph Stirling Coyne (1803-1868), dramatized Montez's life in a theatrical farce. On April 15, 1848, Lola Montes was registered with the Lord Chamberlain's office. ³ Less than a month later, on May 8, 1848, another version of the farce was licensed by the Lord Chamberlain and performed at the Theatre Royal, Haymarket, on May 13, 1848. ⁴ The tentative titles of the second
play reflected Montez's experience in Bavaria and elsewhere; it was to be entitled The Pas de Fascination, or, The Price of Hops, or; The Pas de Fascination, or, Catching a Governor, or; The Catching Cachuca, or, A Step From the Sublime. Ultimately, Coyne published his third and final version of the play under the title of Pas de Fascination, or, Catching a Governor.

The Lord Chamberlain's office records no author for the first two scripts, and has none for the third version. However, a comparison of the three scripts reveals that they are virtually identical versions of the same play with slight variations. In Lola Montes, the Montez figure is called Lola Montes; her female accomplice is Nettchin Nickell. Perhaps fearful of a lawsuit, in the Pas de Fascination scripts Coyne renamed his Montez figure, Zepherine Jolijambe; her accomplice became known as Katherine Kloper. Other character names differ, but all three plays tell the story of a laundress who poses as Montez, so that Montez can escape the local authorities who hound her. In his final edition, Coyne polished his farce with sharper dialogue and songs, but basic settings and action remained the same. In the first scene, set in the laundress's cottage, the Montez figure convinces the laundress that her (Montez's) life is in danger; she explains that she is a danseuse forced to escape St. Petersburg disguised in male clothing because she drew her
horse-whip and pistols—"wonderful persuaders when other arguments fail"—on an officer sent to bring her to an elderly Prince who finds her attractive. The laundress agrees to impersonate Montez for the local officials who soon arrive and take the laundress to the Governor's court. After dressing in the laundress's brother's military uniform, and with pistols in hand, Montez confronts the laundress's fiance before attempting to escape to the border.

The second scene takes place at the Governor's Court of Neveraskwher. The common laundress deceives the court officials and the Ludwig figure into believing that she is Lola Montez through her fresh, assertive behavior. Bored with court life, the Ludwig character is so charmed by her personality and reputation that he makes her a Countess within an hour of their meeting. After court officials discover the imposter in the arms of the court wigmaker, the laundress's fiance, the play ends with the news that the real Montez has been captured at the border attempting escape in male attire.

The farce depicts Montez as a daring, resourceful individual, with equal fondness for male attire and pistols. It also implies that Montez was a commoner since a laundress could successfully impersonate Montez and charm a bored monarch with her forthright manner. Unsuccessful in England, the play caused one critic to remark, "We
cannot applaud the motives that governed the production of a farce introducing a mock sovereign and his mistress. In our opinion the piece is extremely objectionable."  

Although denied future production by the Lord Chamberlain's office after its second performance, the play signifies the fame that Montez had created by the time she arrived in London.

Like Montez herself, the play repelled some people and attracted others. One person attracted to her remarkable past and personal charm attended her salons and eventually became her husband. On July 19, 1849, Montez married George Trafford Heald, a wealthy young man who had come of legal age on January 21 of the same year. Heald's aunt and former legal guardian, however, brought charges of bigamy against Montez less than three weeks later. On August 7, 1849, Montez found herself in court. The prosecutor read a decree of separation, stating that "Thomas James and Eliza Rose Anna James be separated" on December 15, 1842, but, that neither party could contract another marriage during each other's lifetime. In her defense Montez claimed that an influential friend, Lord Brougham, had secured an act of parliament to divorce her from her first husband, Captain James; however, her lawyer apparently was unable to produce either the document, or Lord Brougham.  

Afraid of the judgement of the court, Montez and her young husband fled to the continent; but, newspapers
soon circulated stories of a turbulent married life. An article reprinted from the Assemblée Nationale reported that Heald, in Barcelona, was considering abandoning Montez because he was afraid of being "assassinated, or poisoned" and because Montez had "stabbed him with a small dagger." The New York Herald dismissed the stabbing incident as "invention;" but, whatever the truth concerning their troubled marriage, it did not last long. On January 28, 1850, Heald returned to London without Montez, and at some point in 1850 had his marriage to her annulled.

In early October 1850, Montez returned to Paris in a destitute financial condition. In an attempt to support herself, she published her memoirs, but they sold poorly. The New York Herald's Paris correspondent suggested that poor sales resulted from knowledge of blackmail threatened by Montez: "her object, in writing this work, [was] the extortion of money from all those who had been connected with her," and that those mentioned, who had received letters from Lola, acted as a group to refuse any connection to her. Since no names and/or specific motives were mentioned, it is difficult to judge if the charge of blackmail is accurate. However, the poor sale of her memoirs forced Montez back to the stage in 1851. This time, Montez turned to the United States.
The decision to perform again, and in America, seems a desperate move. Five years had passed since Montez had performed in Bavaria, and she was in poor physical condition because of a recent bout of influenza. Montez may have hoped never to support herself again through dance, for she later wrote in a letter to an American newspaper that her return to the stage in 1851 had cost her "scalding tears." However, once she made the decision to dance, Montez determined that she would pursue her profession "as an artiste."  

Despite the prospect of arduous ocean travel and the uncertainty of success, Montez must have been inspired by the vast American theatrical market. The population and territory of the United States had expanded greatly during the early to mid-nineteenth century. As a result of the Mexican-American War (1846-1848), the United States extended from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast, and the discovery of gold in 1848 had attracted hundreds-of-thousands to California. Immigration had increased the population of the United States to thirteen million by 1830; by 1860 the population would number over thirty-one million. Simultaneously, the nation's urban areas increased dramatically. By mid-century, 516 cities in the United States had a population of 50,000 or more. By 1850, New York contained over one-half million residents,
and New Orleans' fluctuating population could range from 25,000 to 50,000 in the winter of 1853. 

In order to meet audience demand for entertainment, theatres had sprung up across the United States in every major city and in minor ones as well. Many offered regular seasons maintained by resident or stock companies that performed a repertoire of plays, and often featured individual company member's performances of song and dance. A typical company's bill might present a popular full-length play, like Sheridan's *School for Scandal*, for its main attraction and conclude with a popular farce, dance, and/or other novelty act.

As in Europe, theatre across antebellum America was a gigantic umbrella that covered a wide variety of entertainments. A single evening's bill could combine selections from tragedies, comedies, melodramas, farces, opera, pantomimes, minstrel shows, song and dance, exhibits of curious and/or grotesque oddities of nature, acrobats, dioramas, panoramas, and performing animals.

In some large cities, a few theatres had begun to specialize in particular types of entertainment by the time Montez visited America. In New Orleans, Thomas Danforth Rice's Amphitheatre presented mainly variety and circus acts by 1850. The Broadway theatre, where Montez would debut in New York, had earned the name of "the house of stars" because its manager, E. A. Marshall, dedicated
himself to a "stars-only" policy. Generally speaking, however, individual American theatres offered a wide variety of entertainments. It was not until after mid-century that theatres began to develop specialty houses for foreign-language drama, farce, vaudeville, circus, burlesque, minstrelsy, opera, and symphony.

Antebellum American theatre met a wide variety of tastes at ticket prices accessible to a wide variety of economic levels. Typical mid-nineteenth century theatres possessed a three-part seating arrangement: the pit (the ground floor level, often called a parquette), the boxes, and the gallery (balcony). Blacks were forced to sit in the gallery that also held prostitutes; however, ticket prices for each area generally segregated remaining audience members by socio-economic status. Wealthy patrons occupied box seats that typically ranged between $2.00 and $5.00. Servants and the poorest of the working class could purchase tickets in the gallery from about twelve-and-one-half cents to twenty-five cents. The large middle-class gravitated to the pit area where tickets often sold for twenty-five to fifty cents.

At the time that Lola Montez made plans to come to America the combination "stock-star" system was at its height, whereby native and foreign "star" performers toured theatres across the land playing limited engagements in a variety of personal vehicles supported by resident company
members. Between 1820 and 1860, Edwin Forrest (1806-1872) and Charlotte Cushman (1816-1876) were two popular American stars that satisfied audience hunger for both novelty and quality. Generally acknowledged as the first great native tragedian of the American stage, Edwin Forrest occasionally played Shakespeare, but his greatest successes came in American Indian roles in such plays as John A. Stone's Metamora. The first great American-born tragedienne, Charlotte Cushman, played Shakespearean roles, but gained more fame and popularity from her portrayal of Meg Merrilies in Guy Mannering, and from "breeches parts" or roles intended for males but performed by women.

Foreign stars had visited American theatres much earlier. The English actress, Anne Brunton Merry, made her American debut in her most celebrated role, Juliet, in Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet as early as 1796. By the mid-nineteenth century, despite anti-foreign sentiment and class rivalry that resulted in the Astor Place Riots of 1849, European stars frequently discovered popular and critical favor in America.

The success of foreign star tours of America could not have escaped Montez's attention, especially those made by dancers Fanny Elssler and Madame Celeste, and the famous opera singer, Jenny Lind. Generally considered the greatest soprano of her day, the Swedish Nightingale, Jenny Lind (1820-1887), had just ended a critically and popularly
successful American singing tour as Montez considered a tour of the United States. Between 1850 and 1851, "Lindomania" had swept the land as she had performed in American theaters on a tour organized by P. T. Barnum (1810-1891), the famous American showman. The management of such a renowned and gifted artist was unusual for Barnum who typically presented novelties such as the Fejee Mermaid [actually, the head and torso of a monkey sewn to the body of a fish] and a talkative, elderly, black woman, Joyce Heth, advertised as the 161-year-old nurse of George Washington.

Less celebrated than Lind, the formally trained French dancer and actress, Madame Celine Celeste (c. 1814-1882) was touring the United States as Montez considered her own professional journey, and continued to perform in America after Montez arrived. Dividing much of her career between America and England, Celeste gained fame as a performer in pantomimes. Although she later became a theatrical manager, her early success came from appearances in vehicles such as the cachucha, the ballet La Bayadère (by a Deshayes?), and the spectacle, The French Spy, by J. T. Haines. Celeste also performed in Edward Stirling's The Cabin Boy, at the Broadway Theatre in New York, on September 20, 1851. Perhaps, coincidentally, Montez added this popular drama to her repertoire in 1857.
Although Montez would be compared to both Celeste and Elssler, Elssler's American career was probably more meaningful to Montez than any other touring star's success because her dance repertoire also suited Montez's abilities. Classically trained from childhood in Vienna and successful with ethereal ballet roles, Elssler became the foremost representative of the earthy, robust side of the Romantic Ballet, performing solos and full length ballets based on national dances. Appearing at major theatres all over the world, Elssler especially gained note for her Spanish cachucha, Hungarian cracovienne and a full-length ballet, La Tarantule.  

A star of the Paris Opéra by 1836, Elssler disappointed London audiences by leaving Her Majesty's Theatre for America early in 1840. By the end of 1842, she had conquered the United States with her great artistry and in spite of her notorious personal life involving a lover, the famous French diplomat, Marquis Charles Jean Marie Felix de La Valette (1806-1881). When she appeared in Washington, D. C., in 1840, Congress adjourned early to attend her performance at the National Theatre and President Martin Van Buren received her at the White House. In Baltimore, after her appearance at the Holliday Street Theatre, crowds unharnessed the horses from her carriage, put themselves in their places, and pulled her slowly through the streets thronged with fans.
Through her fiery and passionate rendition of character dance, Elssler provoked hysterical critical and popular acclaim, or "Fannyelsslermaniaphobia." 41

Elssler's sensational American success in the early 1840s may have contributed to Montez's decision to become a dancer, for numerous parallels exist between each dancer's life and repertoire. Montez also abandoned conventional mores, enjoying well known affairs with famous men. Montez had seen Elssler perform and, undoubtedly, found inspiration in her fiery and passionate dances, for when Montez attempted a stage career, she concentrated on national dance, not ethereal ballet vehicles. Also, Montez's style of performance greatly resembled that of Elssler's. 42 Never an established classical dancer, and lacking the years of rigorous training, technical skills, and performance experience that Elssler possessed, Montez nevertheless eventually developed a repertoire similar to Elssler's by including Hungarian, Spanish and Italian dance. Montez also performed in many of the same theatres in America and Europe where the Viennese star appeared.

Whether or not Montez actually identified with Elssler on a personal and professional level, her preparation for an American tour established a tentative dance connection to Elssler. Prior to her tour, Montez readied herself to resume the strenuous demands of professional dance by studying with one, or both, of the Mabille brothers,
Charles (1817-1858), or Auguste (1815-unknown), at the Jardin Mabille studio. Principal dancers at the Paris Opéra for several years between the mid-1830s and mid-1840s, one or both, partnered Fanny Elssler during her time at the Opéra between 1834 and 1840. One of them was on the same bill as Montez when she danced at the Opéra in 1844. Charles Mabille had partnered and married Augusta Maywood (1825-1876), generally considered America's first great prima ballerina. Charles may have helped Montez select her dance repertoire for the United States. Either he, or Auguste, taught Montez six new character dances, one of which appears to have been what became known as Montez's star vehicle, the Spider Dance, which may have been influenced directly by Elssler's La Tarantule.

From her training with the Mabilles Montez gained new choreography and technique, but an American correspondent wrote of her dances that

their grace, their originality; their character and nationality, are her own. And in this character and nationality . . . lie their chief charm. They belong as evidently and irreparably to Spain as ever did its . . . bull-fights, its dark eyes.

The same correspondent commented that Montez had lost none of her attraction since she had been away from the stage:

"Her eye has lost nothing of its strange and startling brilliancy, her form of its harmony and proportion, her motions of their grace. Above all, she is still young and still enthusiastic."
If Charles Mabille provided Montez with information concerning the current American theatrical climate, Montez probably considered the attempt of an American tour a reasonable risk. With a potential place for herself on varied playbills and possible audiences numbering in the millions, Montez could aim for a successful tour.

As in Europe, Montez could bank on her physical attractiveness to draw American audiences. She exemplified the nineteenth century ideal as reflected in the illustrations of fashion magazines, like Godey's Lady's Book, and in lithographs, mass produced by firms like Currier and Ives, that used a steel-engraving process. The "steel-engraving lady" became a term for a beauty-ideal that referred not only to the process by which fashion plates were produced, but also to the "element of moral rectitude" in such ladies' characters. 49

While Montez may not have been noted for her "moral rectitude," her handsome looks closely approximated those of the ideal beauty:

Her face is oval or heart-shaped. Her eyes gaze into the distance or are downcast. Her chin is soft and retreating. Her mouth is tiny, resembling a 'beestung cupid bow' or a 'rosebud.' Her body is short and slight, rounded and curved. Her shoulders slope; her arms are rounded; a small waist lies between a rounded bosom and a bell-shaped lower torso. . . . Her hands are small, her fingers tapering. Her feet, when they protrude, are tiny and delicate. When her pictorial representation is colored, her complexion is white, with a blush of pink in her cheeks. 50
Noted for her small waist, the beauty of her hands and feet, white skin and teeth, red lips and cheeks, and broad bosom, Montez embodied the characteristics of the ideal beauty of her time. Her "tiny feet and pretty legs," along with her "magnificent dark eyes," found favor with the critic, Théophile Gautier.

A color lithograph of Montez, (Plate 7) presents an oval face, a soft chin, pale skin, slightly blushed cheeks, eyes directed to the side, a tiny mouth, rounded shoulders and arms, and a rounded bosom. An engraving of her performance of Marquita in Un Jour de Carneval à Séville, (Plate 8) one of her American ballets, displays Montez in theatrical costume with castanets in hand. Her dance pose and costume provide a rounded line for her shoulders and arms; her rounded bosom, narrow waist and full skirt mimic the ideal silhouette, and her large dark eyes gaze off into the distance. Combined with her great beauty, Montez's notorious reputation as a *femme fatale*, Spanish dancer and political figure created an exotic and erotic allure.

Montez claimed that once her plans for an American tour became known, her old enemies, the Jesuits, attempted to discredit her with the American public. She accused the Jesuits of flooding journals from Canada to Mexico naming her every "blackguard epithet" possible, and circulating
Plate 7. Lithograph of Montez, circa early to mid-1840s, by Emile Lassalle. (Courtesy of the San Francisco Performing Arts Library and Museum.)
Plate 8. Montez as Marquita in Un Jour de Carneval à Séville, no artist. (Boston's Gleason's Pictorial Drawing-Room Companion 17 April 1852.)
vile rumors about her. Periodicals allegedly reported that she "tamed wild horses, horse-whipped gendarmes, knocked flies with a pistol ball off the bald heads of aldermen, fought duels, threw people overboard for the sake of saving them from drowning, and a multitude of other similar feats." 55

Montez's charges indicate the kind of negative commentary some New York papers published prior to her arrival. Never a friendly source of information concerning Montez, The New York Times, in September 1851, commented that if "this creature" had any success in the United States the paper would be "sadly disappointed," because she had "no special reputation as a dancer," and was known to the world "only as a shameless and abandoned woman." It concluded that Montez would prove a failure, successful only if the paper had "greatly mistaken" the "character" of the country. 56

The New York Times continued its negative press toward Montez in the following month by providing its translation and interpretation--not a reprint--of an article, originally published in the Courrier Des États Unis, a New York paper published in French. The translation described slovenly types, "with dirty linen and hands," attracted to her Paris salons, and Montez's ability as a dancer:

After . . . [keeping] the anxious spectators waiting for a couple of hours, the danseuse made her appearance, finely dressed and dancing badly. The only tolerable performance appeared to be a
'Sicilienne,' scraped out from intolerable catgut, [?] and the circulation of a certain proportion of 'raffraichissments' [refreshments] which were monopolized by the aforesaid dirty shirts. . . . 57

Outside of New York, Americans probably read similar newspaper reports concerning Montez; however, notoriety in the United States came not only from the press, but from dramatized accounts of her life, in New York, Philadelphia, Charleston, and New Orleans between 1848 and 1858. 58

Auguste Papon's attack on Montez in _Lola Montès Mémoirs accopagnés de lettres intime de S. M. Le Roi de Bavière, et de Lola Montès_, [The Memoirs of Lola Montes Accompanied by Intimate Letters from His Majesty the King, and Lola Montes] (1849) had reached the United States prior to her arrival in December 1851. On January 3, 1852, _The New York Herald_ advertised a work by John Richardson as "JUST PUBLISHED, the Scorching 'Reply' to the Marquis Papon's scurrilous attack on the Countess of Landsfeldt . . . Sold by booksellers generally, and wholesale by STRONG, 98 Nassau street." 59 Eventually imprisoned for swindling and impersonating a priest, Papon (no dates) had been Montez's secretary in Bavaria. He had attempted to blackmail Montez and Ludwig by threatening to publish a scandalous account of Montez's life with the King if not given money. Montez and Ludwig denied his request; and, despite attempts to suppress it, the book was published at Nyon, France in 1849. A _success de scandale_ in Europe,
allegedly full of intimate secrets about the King and Lola, Papon's book called Montez a "prostitute." 60

Canada's first novelist, Major John Richardson (1797-1852), admired Montez's spirit and resourcefulness. When he learned that Montez was coming to America he privately published a booklet in her defense, at personal expense, in December, 1851: *Lola Montes; or, A Reply to the "Private History and Memoirs" of That Celebrated Lady, Recently Published by the Marquis Papon, Formerly Secretary to the King of Bavaria, and for a Period the Professed Friend and Attendant of the Countess of Lansfeldt.* 61 Richardson's booklet characterized Papon as a lying opportunist who sought to destroy Montez and embarrass Ludwig once Papon had been dismissed from royal employment. Richardson defended "Lola's right to be a courtesan, naming several that he knew in his youth who were celebrated rather than scorned by society." 62 Richardson invested in its publication, but it sold poorly since Papon's Memoir had not been translated into English. 63 Also, The New York *Day Book*, a popular journal, provided substantial competition since its serialized version of *The Memoirs of Lola Montez* started in July and ran through September of 1852.

With a fresh tabloid reputation as a "shameless and abandoned woman," Montez prepared a tour of the United States. After dance training at the *Jardin Mabille*, Montez
engaged a Monsieur Roux as her agent, and briefly toured theatres in France, Belgium and Germany. The arrangement with the agent apparently was not a successful one. They returned to Paris where Monsieur Roux learned that Montez had decided to tour America under the guidance of Edward P. Willis. Subsequently, Roux brought suit against Montez for breach of contract in November 1851. The court decided in favor of Montez, and she sailed for New York on November 20, 1851.

With her beauty, compelling personality, her title of Countess, her intellect and charm, not to mention her talents as a dancer, Montez looked to the United States not only for a renewed career and financial security, but also for an opportunity to interact with other Republican sympathizers. As Montez wrote later, she

> came with curiosity and reviving hope, to the shores of the New World; this stupendous asylum of the world's unfortunate, and last refuge of the victims of the tyranny and wrongs of the Old World! God grant that it may ever stand as it is now, the noblest column of liberty that was ever reared beneath the arch of heaven!
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Chapter 4. Facing a New World, New York
December 1851 to January 1852

On December 5, 1851, at nearly two o'clock in the morning, Lola Montez disembarked from the steamship The Humbolt in New York city, accompanied by her American "traveling agent," Edward P. Willis, and several servants. Heavy gales created a rough Atlantic crossing that began fifteen days earlier at L'Harve, France, but Montez soon discovered that her life within the United States could prove equally as turbulent.

Ironically, Louis Kossuth, the Hungarian exile and patriot, sailed on the same ship with Montez. In the conservative New York Tribune, edited by Horace Greeley, Kossuth stole the bold headline with Montez's arrival announced directly below. Greeley focused on her private life, calling her a "woman who has obtained an unenviable notoriety throughout the world on account of her romantic disposition and singular conduct." James Gordon Bennett's The New York Herald labeled her "one of the feminine glories of the continent . . . a great female republican," and "the celebrated danseuse, Bavarian exile and European political reformer." In The New York Times, editor Henry Raymond also called attention to her political interests by asserting that Montez probably sought the company of Kossuth to share the acclaim of his
reception, although Montez could not have known that she and Kossuth would travel to America on the same ship.  

Following a twenty-one gun salute returned by The Humbolt, a committee welcomed Kossuth who offered a speech of appreciation. In contrast, Montez received no special fanfare when she left The Humbolt, having declined the offer of a special welcome from "TOM TEMPLE SMITH" and his friends from Richmond County on Staten Island. Smith, Good Looking Porgee, Ben Lightly, Phil Rooney, Dutch Pete, E. Smooth, and One-Eyed Riley had planned an elaborate schedule of welcoming activities to honor Montez as a political figure, beginning with a public reception in the Seaman's Retreat. If their names may serve as a reliable index, then Smith and his friends probably were a group of local "mechanics"--the common term at the time for the average working man--who like "B'hoys," or Bowery Boys, often were members of neighborhood volunteer fire companies.  

Montez also declined a greeting that mimicked that of Fanny Elssler's earlier reception in Baltimore: "Triumphant [articles?] were offered to be erected for me on the pier, garlands to be hung across my way, flowers spread over my track, and my carriage drawn to my hotel by human hands, amidst showers of bouquets and vivas." Although she never identified the source, the offer sounds similar to the greeting that New York's working men would have
provided. Montez chose to keep her arrival low key, only participating in a press conference before retiring to rooms at the New York Hotel. Unsure of the potential reception that might greet her in America because of the Jesuit report, Montez no doubt considered a low profile arrival more advantageous than any form of elaborate welcome.

During her initial press conference Montez defended herself against the "many bad things . . . said about her by the American press." Montez asked, "If I was a woman of that description which I am represented, would I be compelled to go on the stage to earn a livelihood?" 12 She told the New York Tribune that she was "fearful that she [would] not be properly considered in New York, but hop[ed] that a discriminating public will judge of her after seeing her, and not before." 13

The press called attention to her beauty immediately. Expecting a large and "masculine woman," reporters expressed surprise over her diminutive proportions: "She is much lighter in her form, and more refined in her features, than she is represented in the paintings. She has a remarkably fine pair of eyes. No doubt she will create a furore . . . ." 14 Another newswriter recorded his vivid impression:

She has a face of great beauty, and a pair of black Spanish eyes, which flash fire when she is speaking, and make her, with the sparkling wit of her conversation, a great favorite in company.
She has black hair, which curls in ringlets by the sides of the face, and her nose is of a pure Grecian cast, while her cheekbones are high, and give a Moorish appearance to her face. 15

Initially, Montez did not create the furor predicted by The New York Herald; she delayed her American debut until December 29, 1851, 16 after Kossuth, her chief rival for political popularity, had departed New York city on December 23, 1851 for Philadelphia. 17 However, prior to her arrival she had impressed the stage manager of the Broadway Theatre, Thomas Barry, who had reserved a private box for her on the date she arrived. Although Montez was too tired and excited to utilize his offer, she eventually selected him as her theatrical counselor, and The New York Herald approved. Barry's "high position in the profession--his private character, and his universal reputation as a gentleman and a manager, will ensure to the fair Countess not only good counsel, but judicious direction of her movements throughout the United States." 18

Nevertheless, before and after she selected Barry as her theatrical counselor, Montez encountered a great deal of controversy concerning agent representation in the United States. The New York Herald of November 1, 1851, reported that Montez had been approached by Le Grand Smith, P. T. Barnum's principal agent in Europe, in the previous summer. James Gordon Bennett, the liberal editor of The New York Herald, had been in Europe at the time and claimed
"on the best authority" that Le Grand Smith and Montez had entered into negotiations, but that Montez declared that Barnum "should not have her services, for he was too much of a humbug." Barnum had a different version of the story: he swore out an affidavit which alleged that a Montez agent approached him for American representation, an offer he "instantly and unqualifiedly refused," and claimed that Bennett knew the truth when he published contradictory information. 19

Bennett maintained that he had acted in good faith, based on information provided to him by Edward P. Willis, Montez's agent and private secretary. 20 Bennett also published a letter from Thomas Barry who also had been in Europe that summer—securing attractions for the up-coming theatrical season at the Broadway Theatre—that confirmed Le Grand Smith's offer to Montez, and substantiated Montez's refusal. 21 Bennett wrote that Montez said that "she was 'humbug enough herself, without uniting her fortunes with the Prince of Humbugs,'" and suggested that the whole affair merely "increased the public anxiety to see her, and witness what this extraordinary woman is capable of doing." 22

Once Barry's letter was published Barnum altered his account of the matter. "Cheerfully" retracting the portion of the affidavit that asserted Bennett knew the "truth" when he asserted otherwise, Barnum contended that Le Grand
Smith was his agent, but "it does not follow that every step he takes in Europe is as my agent; and neither my friend, Mr. Barry, or any other person, seems to pretend that he acted as such in Paris." Barnum also noted, "Lola, if rightly managed, will draw immensely here; but I am not the right man for her." 23

As Barnum awkwardly eased himself out of the situation, Bennett's final comments seemed to end the controversy while confirming Montez's standing as a lucrative managerial property.

At all events, Lola now prefers to come out to this country on her own hook. . . and intends to enjoy the fruits of her own popularity, without the intervention of agents. Many of the managers in France, and in other countries of Europe, have been contending for her, and trying to engage her; and we understand that several of the managers in this and other American cities have been struggling in the same business; but thus far without success, or any favorable result. According to all accounts, she is to be her own manager--will take care of her own affairs--make her own engagements--dispose of her own abilities. . . . 24

Actually, only the agent controversy with Barnum had ended. Montez initially appears to have decided to arrange her tour personally; but, she endured protracted problems concerning agent representation that must have been a debilitating drain on her energies as she launched her American tour.

The contractual issue between Montez and Roux, her former European agent, had been settled in a French court but Monsieur Roux still hoped to organize Montez's American
tour and had followed her to America. Roux engaged an American law firm, threatened legal action and sent a copy of his contract with Montez to the legal representatives of Montez and E. A. Marshall when he learned that Montez had secured an engagement at Thomas Barry's and E. A. Marshall's Broadway Theatre. Problems with Roux ended after the legal advisor to Montez and Marshall, Benjamin Galbraith, examined the contract and published a letter to M. Roux that threatened firm legal action if he attempted to deter Montez from completing her engagement. 25

However, as soon as one agent controversy ended, another seemed to begin. Montez's so-called traveling agent and secretary, Edward P. Willis, was the brother of the highly respected, Nathaniel P. Willis, co-editor of the New York Home Journal with George P. Morris. 26 Apparently the black-sheep of the Willis family, Edward persuaded Montez that he was penniless, but important. Willis introduced himself to Montez in Paris where he convinced her that he "controlled the press of New York . . . corresponded with a large number of the leading papers in various parts of the country," that his brother's paper "made public opinion . . . controlled it after it was made, and that if he was employed," her success would be guaranteed "beyond a possibility of a doubt." 27 In Paris, Montez literally "replenished" his wardrobe, "redeemed" his watch, and replaced his "wretched garret"
with more pleasant accommodations. After receiving the approval of her friends, Montez hired Willis as her traveling agent to accompany her to the United States; but, his claims of influence never seemed to appear. His name never figured in negotiations with Thomas Barry, and his brother's minor paper seldom mentioned Montez.

Willis published a card/notice in The New York Herald explaining that he was never Montez's "business agent," but had labored for ten months "to secure her a successful reception in America." Since Montez's explanation of the conditions under which she met and employed Willis had not been published yet, James Gordon Bennett was mystified and tantalized. In an editorial post-script attached to Willis's letter he asked: "If E. P. Willis was not the agent of Lola Montes, what was he? What does he call 'laboring for ten months to secure her a favorable reception?' . . . What does the chap mean? Give us the facts, romance, or something." Bennett may have identified the basis of Montez's relationship with Edward Willis by asking for romance. Evidently, Willis possessed personal charms as persuasive as those of Montez, for she only later discovered the error of her misplaced confidence in him.

Although the exact date of his dismissal cannot be specified, Montez officially fired Edward P. Willis just before, or just after, her New York debut. In his position of traveling agent, Willis handled money matters for
Montez. Relatively early, Montez discovered that Willis was untrustworthy in financial affairs, but based on his "representations, or rather misrepresentations" she found herself forced to depend upon him until she "could find friends upon whom [she] could rely with safety." Montez also maintained that Willis had intruded upon her boudoir. The New York Herald's account of his simultaneous firing and the hiring of a new money manager suggests financial mismanagement. Whatever the complexities of the case, "his accounts were not satisfactory to the noble Countess," and she dismissed him by December 31, 1851, appointing the Reverend Joseph A. Scoville (1815-1864) as her "agent in money affairs." A southerner by politics and the past private secretary of the late American statesman, John C. Calhoun, Scoville was the present editor of the New York Picayune. Early in 1852, nearly coinciding with his relationship to Montez, Scoville created a new, amusing and gossipy paper known as The Pick, that often included reports on Montez after April of 1852. The New York Herald commented that "The reverend gentleman possesses talents and honesty, and as long as he sticks to the pledge, he will manage her affairs with unrivalled skill and undoubted honor." Despite the problems concerning her agents, Montez proceeded with preparation for her first appearance in the United States.
New York city had replaced Philadelphia as the center of American theatre by 1825, a result of massive growth in population from immigration, and its centrality of American business interests. 34 By 1850, New York city contained a population of over one-half million and hosted over twenty-four theatres that mainly attracted audiences from surrounding neighborhoods. Although managers had attempted to specialize in particular types of performance, most mid-nineteenth century New York theatres provided a varied menu. 35 Like today, New York city was crucial to the establishment of a theatrical reputation in the United States.

No doubt aware of Kossuth's competitive political fame and the anticipation that mystery concerning her movements could provide, Montez delayed her first appearance in New York social circles and her stage debut for three-and-one-half weeks. During this time she lived quietly in rooms in New York's Waverley Place, disappointing a "great many notabilities," including the Governor of Rhode Island, a Mr. Anthony, who hoped to meet her in a social atmosphere. 36 Montez's delay proved valuable in several ways: first, it allowed Kossuth publicity in New York papers without upstaging Montez politically or theatrically. It also heightened the sense of anticipation in the theatre-going public for the debut of the notorious and mysterious Montez. At the same time, Montez could
rehearse with George Washington Smith, her dance master and partner for her upcoming New York appearance at the Broadway Theatre. Smith, E. A. Marshall and his potential company of ballet dancers may have welcomed the unexpected time since most theatrical artists typically began performing a few days after arrival.

George Washington Smith (1827-1899) called "America's first native premier danseur," enjoyed a long and distinguished career in ballet, opera and circus acts. He danced with almost every great ballerina who visited the United States— including Fanny Elssler— staged almost all of the well-known romantic ballets, and choreographed many of his own, in addition to teaching social dance. Smith arranged three full-length ballets for Montez's first appearances in New York: Betley, the Tyrolean, Un Jour de Carneval à Séville, and Diana and Her Nymphs. He also arranged a few divertissements that may have included a pas de matelot, or Sailor's Hornpipe; a Tyrolienne; and a duet adaptation of La Tarantule, or Montez's Spider Dance.

How Montez established a connection with G. W. Smith remains unclear. Her original contract with Monsieur Roux had stipulated that if her French dance master, Mons. Mabille, could not accompany her, Montez would accept another qualified partner. Her contract with E. A. Marshall is not extant; but, her requirement of a dance
partner may have been a part of her regular procedure at European dance theatres. 40

Smith appeared with Montez from her debut in New York until the end of her Baltimore engagement in June of 1852. 41 Because the dances Mabille choreographed for Montez were never named in reports, and no dance notebooks are available for comparison, it is difficult to discern how Mabille's choreography differed from Smith's in Montez's American repertoire. Nonetheless, Elssler seems to have influenced both choreographers.

Montez's American debut in Betley the Tyrolean occurred on December 29, 1851, at the Broadway Theatre. 42 Built only four years earlier, and one of New York's most prestigious playhouses, the Broadway was the largest theatre in America at the time, seating 4,500 people. 43 The sole manager and lessee of the Broadway since 1847, E. A. Marshall seems to have been a shrewd, perhaps rapacious, theatrical entrepreneur committed to a star policy. He attempted to engage nearly "any actor who had appeared on the London stage," 44 in order to fill his mammoth house with novel performers. Until mid-June of 1852, Montez often performed in his large theatres in several different cities. 45

Surprisingly, New York papers displayed little enthusiasm for Montez's debut. The New York Times and the
New York Tribune carried theatrical advertisements for the Broadway theatre; but, neither paper expressed great curiosity concerning her abilities as a danseuse as her debut approached. The New York Herald believed that "The novelty of dancing is worn away. Fanny Elssler succeeded, just because the thing was then new. But we have had an abundance of good dancing since, and the artists have not met with very brilliant success."  

Bennett predicted that Montez would "draw well, and make money for the proprietor and herself, provided the prices are low." Similarly, the New York Evening Mirror commented that Montez would make money by attracting large audiences through the public's curiosity concerning her notoriety. The writer mentioned that he had seen her years ago in London, and expected some improvement from her.

Unlike James Gordon Bennett, E. A. Marshall anticipated a demand for seats, and auctioned tickets for the best box and parquette/pit seats on the day before Montez's debut. One box seat sold for $24.00; but, all seating garnered an extremely wide range of prices, from $11.00 for a single box ticket to $1.25 for six box tickets. Auctioned seats in the parquette ranged from $1.75 for four tickets to $1.00 for one to two tickets. Un-sold seats were advertised at doubled prices, and un-sold private boxes went for $13.00 and $10.00. The New York Herald predicted that ticket
buyers would offer pseudonyms since some purchasers preferred not to have themselves identified as they did when purchasing Jenny Lind tickets. The prediction proved accurate as many "Smiths" and "Jones" purchased several blocks of tickets. Nevertheless, Marshall reaped great profit from his ticket auction, even discounting production expenditures.

Marshall probably supported Montez's debut with new scenery and costumes, since he later advertised "New Scenery, Costumes and Appointments" when Montez appeared in Betley at his Philadelphia Walnut Street Theatre, immediately following her New York engagement. Although Montez probably brought her costumes with her from Europe, she may have used Marshall's costumes when she danced in his theatres. Economically, it would have made sense for Marshall to require his Philadelphia staff to compose a fully integrated visual design that could be used in any of the numerous theatres he controlled, and in which Montez would perform.

Montez's debut in the title role of Betley the Tyrolean, a full-length ballet, provided the main event (forty minutes) for Marshall's bill-of-fare on December 29, 1851. Performed between two company farces, The Village Doctor, perhaps by J. C. Cross, and J. B. Buckstone's Shocking Events, Betley's story-line is unknown. Moore speculated that the story (and probably the music) of
this ballet were drawn from an opera comique, Le Chalet, by Adolphe Adam, first performed at the Paris Opéra in 1834. Contemporary reports indicate that the ballet was composed of Hungarian, Polish and Austrian (Tyrolean) dances. Approximately twenty dancers composed the corps de ballet of male and female peasants that supported the principal dancers. A Signor Neri assisted Montez by performing the role of Daniel, and, G. W. Smith, the role of Max Starner.

Only The New York Herald provided a physical description of Montez's performance in Betley. The audience greeted her with "tremendous applause" as she made her appearance in Tyrolean dress on a staircase representing a winding path down a mountain. Bowing to the audience, Montez received applause for several minutes, and even after she reached the stage floor, she received another burst of applause which she acknowledged with another curtsey. She appeared "thin and girlish--far younger than she is; in fact not more than sixteen years." Her first dance, a Tyrolienne, warmly applauded throughout, received several bouquets thrown by females in boxes. At the end of her next dance, a "pas de deux," her partner, Signor Neri, received more applause than Montez, perhaps because she made a mis-step which resulted in a "slight hiss" from some of the audience. In her next appearance, attractively dressed in a "Hungarian satin skirt, striped
with white and red, with a military black-velvet jacket faced with gold, and a pretty red hat with a feather," Montez danced to greater success than that of her other two. Her finale "was a sort of war dance in which she exhibited the martial bearing and military tread remarkably well. She led a company of soldiers off the stage in a sort of dancing step, and was enthusiastically applauded."

When the curtain fell she was called for with "great vehemence," and thanked her auditors in a "weak voice and rather foreign accent," saying: "Ladies and gentlemen--I thank you from the bottom of my heart for the very kind reception you have given me, a poor stranger in your noble land." 59

"Crowded from the ceiling to the stage, . . . Some three thousand 'men about town' attended Montez's opening performance. No more than a dozen women, "except in the 'colored row,' relieved the dark mass of humanity . . . . The few bonnets scattered through the house . . . and the thousand lorgnettes levelled at the wearers, brought a very 'becoming color' to the cheeks of such as were not already too highly colored to blush at the attention they received." 60 Only a few "ladies . . . [who] appeared to be all women of respectability," 61 were willing to give visible sanction to the event.

Ironically, a cartoon of one of Montez's appearances in the United States depicted a bare house (Plate 9). 62
It may have come from a New York newspaper since its caption suggests her arrival in the United States, and the title of The Herald is prominently displayed by the newspaper reader. Montez appears light and girlish, on the tips of her toes, yet coy, with the tilt of her head and backstage gaze. Nonetheless, the cartoon appears hostile to Montez. The lack of audience members denies the popular success that newspapers reported concerning her initial appearances. The sole "common man" in the pit peeks and grins behind his fingers to view Montez as he holds a book, entitled Sober Thoughts, an attempt to hide his curiosity about Montez. Similarly, the Herald newspaper reader appears to signify wealthy male patrons attracted to Montez, since he occupies a box seat. The figure, possibly representing James Gordon Bennett, sneaks a peek at Montez from behind the New York paper. The manager, with a contract for half of the house receipts in his hip pocket, appears at ease in his fashionable striped-pants, large jacket and relaxed pose. He may be a caricature of E. A. Marshall. Complex in its implications, the cartoon seems to suggest that theatre managers welcomed the alluring Montez, even if she required one-half of their house receipts, and that, audience members from a range of economic levels would be attracted to her performances, as a result of half-suppressed curiosity.
Plate 9. "Lola Has Come! Enthusiastic Reception of Lola by an American Audience." (Unidentified cartoon courtesy of the San Francisco Performing Arts Library and Museum.)
New York critics acknowledged Montez's beauty and grace, but many expressed reservations about her ability as a dancer. The New York Evening Mirror commented that her "movements are graceful, her time perfect, her smile bewitching; but she was never made for a mere dancing girl." The critic added that "As a notoriety, a beauty, a feminine phenomenon she is worth seeing. But Barnum's Museum would be quite as appropriate a place for the exhibition as the boards of the Ballet." 63

Describing her dances as "short and simple... nothing that could be called a feat," The New York Herald noted that Montez had not yet performed any of her "Spanish dances, in which she excels." The same critic commented that while she was "decidedly inferior" when compared to "Madame Augusta, 64 and others," Montez possessed a "nameless grace of nature about her person and movements, which, with her history, gives her an attraction that a better artist could not command, but which, however, is not destined to be very lasting." In the editorial column of The New York Herald, Bennett concluded that Montez, "did not excel as an artist... but was regarded rather as a graceful, girlish, pretty, piquant, lady-like woman, moving with great natural ease, and presenting some beautiful attitudes. This was just as we anticipated." 65

Bennett's anticipation aside, a few critics perhaps expected a more provocative performance from Montez. The
New York Herald critic remarked that her dancing was "the most modest performance of public dancers we have seen for a length of time. She has a guileless, innocent look that seems at variance with her reputation."  

Similarly, the New York Evening Mirror reported that "Lola's style of dancing is rigidly modest—her greatest angles not exceeding forty-five degrees." However, the critic also noted that "nothing in the shape of narrow 'obsolete ideas,' covered the upward continuations of her ankles, yet lots of Tawny, cloudy muslin somewhat mystified her motions . . . ." 

Like Wyndham's earlier undocumented report at the Paris Opéra, the New York Evening Mirror suggested that Montez lacked coverings for her legs. However, the report is not clear and the implications are puzzling since it is probable Montez would have difficulty capturing large audiences by displaying bare legs in the mid-nineteenth century. No other papers made the same observation and Montez did not encounter the charge again. Perhaps, the critic did not recognize the flesh colored tights that Montez no doubt wore. A popular New York minister, Charles B. Smythe, complained about the "immodest dress" of dancers, "short skirts and undergarments of thin gauze like material," and commented that the flesh colored tights used by dancers in the 1866 production of The Black Crook, "imitat[ed] nature so well that the illusion is
complete." The numerous fallacious commentary about Montez's personal and professional habits only added to the mythology about her.

Montez performed Betley between December 29, 1851, and January 3, 1852. Many more females attended her second night of performance, "presenting quite a contrast" to her debut, and by the 3rd of January, 1852, Montez had succeeded in attracting large numbers of females. By this time, The New York Herald opined that Montez lacked the necessary stamina and physical development for great dancing. The paper believed that Montez would improve with time and practice, but cautioned: "it rarely, if ever, happens that any danseuse is eminently successful who does not commence to learn the art when a child, and cultivate it continuously till riper years."

In a summary of her first week of appearances in Betley, the New York Evening Mirror considered her engagement a popular and financial success only because of audience curiosity about her, despite doubled ticket prices. The writer described her style as "peculiar," "unprofessional" and lacking vigorous practice under a ballet master. He concluded that "Betley the Tyrolean had nothing in it to gratify the audience: it lacked incident and action, and therefore the lady appeared to great disadvantage, as she was really the only feature of
interest in it, and more was expected of her than she could fulfill." 72

Similarly, the Albion predicted that Montez had little chance of achieving eminence as a dancer. "She possesses no qualifications for it—neither grace of movement, or flexibility of limb, nor even the acquired mastery of the rudiments of the art, without which she must remain a tyro [novice]." 73

The first week of Montez's engagement proved to be a popular and financial, if not a critical, success. Audiences received her with overwhelming enthusiasm. From her first week's engagement, Montez alone earned "about $3400.00," according to The New York Herald. 74 If accurate, Montez earned the modern equivalent of $53,754.00 for her first week's performances.

Her success with audiences appears more impressive when one considers the wide variety of theatrical attractions with which she competed. Metropolitan Hall featured the star soprano, Catharine Hayes, on Montez's opening night. Hayes' appearance was supplanted by Jenny Lind's farewell performance on December 30, 1851; but Hayes was re-engaged by December 31, 1851. Niblo's Garden provided the popular French family of dancers and actors, the Ravels, as its star performers in ballets and short farces until January 8, 1852. 75 P. T. Barnum supplied audiences with curiosities that ranged from a "CHINESE
BEAUTY and CHINESE FAMILY" at his American Museum to a panoramic display of "THE WORLD'S FAIR" at his Stoppani Hall. A singular commodity, Montez evidently attracted numerous patrons, but the opportunity to witness a performance by Jenny Lind must have provided the greatest single competitive threat to Montez performances.

Re-engaged for a second week, Montez made her debut in the ballet Un Jour de Carneval à Séville at the Broadway on January 5, 1852. 76 Playbills announced her limited re-engagement and proclaimed her enthusiastic reception by "Crowded and Fashionable Audiences" 77 (see Plate 10). Initially, Montez advertised her role as "Donna Inez;" 78 later, her character's name was known as "Marquita." 79 As in Betley the Tyrolean, Montez provided the main event, performing Carneval between two company productions, (Naval Engagements, by Charles Dance, and J. M. Morton's The Two Bonnycastles); 80 thus, Carneval may have been similar in length to Betley. Carneval also resembled Betley in that it was a full-length ballet divertissement 81 in which Montez performed character dances, supported by the Broadway's company of dancers. G. W. Smith appeared as "Marco" in the ballet he had choreographed. 82 A scenic designer, George Heister, employed by Marshall at both of his New York and Philadelphia theatres, designed new scenery and a Mrs. Wallis provided costumes. 83
A ballet without a plot, Carneval celebrated dances from several different countries. Within the ballet

There were many of the characteristic dances of the day introduced; which may be said to be the new era of stage and ballroom dancing. These Germanic character pas, with the sprightly melodies of the polka and mazourka strains blended with the Spanish, are certainly not only pleasing to the ear, but the novel, vivid steps and allemande figures are pleasing to the eye, and especially fascinating to partners gracefully revolving in each other's arms. To the moralist this conjunction of the sexes may seem indelicate; but, to the dancers, it is pleasant.

In Carneval Montez performed three character dances, perhaps from her repertoire, but influenced by G. W. Smith's arrangement: a Pas de Andalusia, a Pas de Sivigliana and a Pas de Matelot. Her Pas de Andalusia may have resembled either the Andalusian cachucha, or olé. However, very likely it was her Spider Dance, derived from the Italian Tarantelle, since newspapers elsewhere often mis-labeled the Spider Dance, a Pas D'Andalusia. A courting dance, the Tarantelle typically involves music in 3/8 or 6/8 time, gradually increasing in speed while partners mime a sequence of pursuit, retreat, persuasion and final surrender. Usually danced by a man and woman to accompaniment of mandolins, guitars, and a drum, it is sometimes performed solo, the dancer playing castanets or tambourine. It is to this high-speed solo dance that has become attached the legend of the tarantula spider, for whose bite the dance was said to be a cure. The supposed victims of the spider's bite were made to dance until they dropped, exhausted.
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Although Montez would later perform the Spider Dance as a solo, she probably performed it as a duet with G. W. Smith in New York.

Spanish in nature, Montez's Sivigliana, or, Sevilliana, may have displayed her talent for "earthy and robust" dance better than her performance in Betley. Her third dance, the Pas de Matelot, the French term for a Sailor's Hornpipe, was a version of the Sailor's Dance which became popular in the 1840s and was often danced between the acts and scenes of a play. Originally a "step dance," the Sailor's Hornpipe, emphasized movement of the feet and legs; but, its popular theatrical version used "the arms in a series of movements descriptive of shipboard tasks." Montez's version displayed "the vicissitudes of a sailor's life—The storm; the shipwreck; the rescue to the flag of liberty. . . . in sailor costume," dancing the hornpipe as she dealt with the events of the narrative.

Montez performed Carneval at the Broadway between January 5 and January 8, 1852. For her benefit on January 9, she performed Betley and made her first appearance in the new ballet, Diana and Her Nymphs. The evening's bill was completed with three short company plays.

Although New York papers recorded Montez's appearance in Diana, the only available critique of the ballet comes
from an unidentified "feminine critic," in Wyndham's biography, whose response concerned her opinion of the indecent exposure manifested by dancers.

When a certain piece first presented a partly unclothed woman to the gaze of a crowded auditory, she was met with a gasp of astonishment at the effrontery which dared so much. Men actually grew pale at the boldness of the thing; young girls hung their heads; a death-like silence fell over the house. But it passed; and, in view of the fact that these women were French ballet-dancers, they were tolerated. 93

Wyndham's report may be apocryphal; but if accurate, it provides a index to the conservative element that attended Montez performances. Diana and Her Nymphs has never been described; but, its title suggests that it was more closely aligned to the ethereal side of the romantic ballet than other Montez vehicles. Diana may have been shorter in length than Carneval and Betley (less than 40 minutes) since it was often paired with one of them during Montez's third week's engagement.

By the end of her second week's engagement, Montez had earned "equally" as much as she had in her first week, and was drawing numerous female theatre-goers. Discovering that Montez was "the most modest danseuse that ever appeared on the stage," ladies attended her performances "as rapidly as they did [those of] Fanny Elssler." 94

Re-engaged for a third week, Montez performed Diana along with one of her other two ballets nightly. 95 Her final January performance at the Broadway occurred on the
sixteenth when Montez appeared in all three of her ballets for a benefit for the Benevolent Fund of the Fire Department. 96

Until municipal service was established in 1865, the New York Fire Department consisted of neighborhood organizations from the Bowery area manned by volunteers from the working class, typically called, "B'Hoys," or "Bowery Boys." 97 Since Montez had a reputation for championing the rights of the people it is not surprising that she donated her services to a benefit for these heroes of the proletariat.

Montez's crowded farewell performance was a great success for herself and the Fire-fighters. Loudly applauded and called before the curtain at the end of each ballet, Montez received showers of bouquets. At the conclusion of her performance, she saluted her audience: "Gallant Firemen, God bless you and your noble institution. Farewell. God bless you!" 98 In The New York Herald, the Fire Department's Board of Trustees thanked Montez for her assistance that aided widows, orphans and the sick of New York. They hoped that her life would be "strewn with flowers," and her "passage to that 'bourne of happiness from whence no traveller returns,' quiet and happy." 99

Such elaborate public expressions of appreciation must provided a gratifying conclusion for Montez as she ended her first professional engagement in the theatre capital of
the United States. The weeks of rehearsal with George Washington Smith had prepared her sufficiently to win public favor, and extensions of her initial engagement with E. A. Marshall. Despite competition from other theatres that featured notable artists such as Jenny Lind, Montez drew crowded houses. Even if she lacked classic dance training and skills, she was able to capitalize on her beauty and graceful dancing. As she gained confidence in her renewed dance career, she also must have become more astute in judging how to manage her business arrangements and who she could trust to help her. She never again seems to have encountered so many difficulties with her agents as she did when she first arrived in New York.

By the end of her first six weeks in New York, Montez also had managed to replace her European tabloid image as a lurid dancer of Amazonian proportions who viciously attacked opponents, with that of an articulate, beautiful, slender woman who performed with intelligence and grace both on and off stage. Her American tour successfully launched, she faced the new challenge of audiences outside of New York.
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Marshall managed two other theatres in which Montez performed: Philadelphia's Walnut Street Theatre and Washington D. C.'s National Theatre. He may have had some connection with Wyzeman Marshall's management of Boston's Howard Athenaeum.
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Nineteenth century critics often apply the term *divertissement* to short entertaining dances outside the realm of serious ballet, as well as to full-length ballets composed of character or folk dances loosely strung together which lack an organic plot.


A Wallis provided set decorations, and a Speyers created machinery for the ballet, perhaps used to change scenery, or provide special effects.
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Chapter 5. Beyond New York
January to Early March 1852

Once Montez left New York she met a demanding schedule for the next two months performing in the middle-Atlantic area. Between mid-January and early March of 1852, Montez appeared in Philadelphia, Washington D. C., Richmond, Norfolk, and Baltimore. With the possible exception of Washington, these cities were regular stops for stars on tour. Scarcely an evening passed when Montez was not performing.

Montez made her first appearance outside New York on January 19, 1852 at E. A. Marshall’s Walnut Street Theatre, Philadelphia’s leading theatre by 1850. Marshall had assumed control of the Walnut in 1840; under his management the theatre primarily provided tragedies, comedies, and melodramas by its resident company, but also frequently entertained star performers such as the American tragedian, Edwin Forrest. Occasionally, Marshall rented the theatre to opera, or, foreign-language companies.

The early center of American theatre, Philadelphia supported three major playhouses by the time Montez arrived: the Walnut Street, the Chestnut Street and the Arch Street Theatres. In addition to numerous other Philadelphia halls, the Chestnut Street Theatre and the Arch Street Theatre supplied Montez with a challenging contest for audiences during her two-week engagement. The
senior member of the American family of tragedians, Junius Brutus Booth, was in the midst of an engagement at the Chestnut Street Theatre on January 23, 1852, playing the title role in Shakespeare's Richard III, and Sir Giles Overreach in Philip Massinger's A New Way to Pay Old Debts. The "GREATEST WIZARD OF THE AGE," the magician, Macallister, performed at the Arch Street Theatre, as Rufus Welch's equestrian troupe performed "Gymnastic Feats" atop horses at his National Circus Theatre.

Despite such competition, Marshall gambled that Montez would draw large audiences eager to satisfy their curiosity about the dancer. "New Scenery, Costumes and Appointments," allegedly forced Marshall to raise ticket prices to meet expenses for Betley, and "except for the Press," he eliminated his "free list" during Montez's engagement. The new scenery, costumes and appointments, however, may have been the same as those used at Marshall's New York theatre for Montez's original appearances; he frequently used members of his New York staff to fill vacancies, or design for his Walnut Street Theatre Company, and vice versa.

One Philadelphia newspaper exhibited great interest in Montez's New York experience. Fitzgerald's City Item, a source of theatrical news across the United States, stated that Montez had played to "remarkably fashionable and very dressy audiences" in New York that resulted in the
"largest" receipts the Broadway had ever known. The Item also announced that Montez was considering "a play introducing the most startling incidents of her political life, in which she is to perform her own role; the terms for the piece to be one thousand dollars and a percentage." That Montez would perform in a dramatic role beyond dance had been reported earlier by a correspondent in Paris who wrote that Montez would debut "in English comedy" in America; but, the writer did not suggest that the play would be autobiographical.

If Philadelphians hesitated to attend Montez performances because of her notorious reputation, the Philadelphia Public Ledger attempted to alleviate reservations. On the day of her debut, the paper endorsed Montez by encouraging the support of performers on the basis of artistic merit, rather than moral texts: "scandal is always busy with the reputation of women who assume so bold an attitude in public," and despite available rumor concerning her past, Montez had "deported herself correctly in this country." Spectators attended theatre "to see the exhibition, not to endorse the moral character of the performer." According to the Ledger, if morality was used as a criterion for performance, "many a fine talent would lie useless," and the public would miss numerous "enjoyments which are in themselves innocent, if not refining and elevating. . . . It is one thing to live by
vicious practices and another to support oneself honorably by exercising a profession that is considered legitimate, and in which excellence calls forth so much public admiration." 12

Many Philadelphians must have agreed with the Ledger, for Montez performed before a crowded house when she appeared in Betley the Tyrolean. As in her New York debut, the house contained more males than females, including "a remarkable number of older gentlemen." 13

Philadelphia critics commended Montez's dance abilities, but found little merit in Betley. Fitzgerald's City Item recorded Betley as a "very short and particularly stupid ballet," but noted that Montez possessed a style "extremely chaste and original, which if it does not astonish by its brilliancy, will captivate by its piquancy and grace." 14 According to the Item Montez's movement was "the perfection of grace, and her taste in dressing exquisite;" Montez was "the most novel card of the season." 15 The Ledger found Montez "pretty, and full of grace in her movements" possessing a "lady-like carriage;" but, "not very remarkable--astonishes no one with the splendor of her feats and yet, is decidedly pleasing." 16

Montez performed six nights a week during her run in Philadelphia. Typically, as in New York and elsewhere, she presented the ballets, and the company performed the farces. "There was a perceptible falling off in the
audiences" after her first night performance; but, the
decline "must be attributed in a great measure to the very
cold weather, which keeps theatre-goers within doors." 17
For the first week she performed only Betley; but, during
her second week Montez performed Carneval, 18 which
displayed her "to greater advantage than anything we have
seen her in. Her characteristic dances were graceful and
pleasing." 19

It is difficult to estimate how much money Montez
earned from her Philadelphia engagement. A newspaper
report suggests that financial arrangements included
personal benefits, as well as a percentage of each night's
earnings. 20 She probably secured such an arrangement
for all of her engagements at Marshall theatres.

In her final Philadelphia appearance, Montez performed
in a benefit devoted to the Association for the Relief of
Disabled Firemen. 21 After the performance, the Board of
Trustees led Montez onto the stage to thank her for her
"unsolicited offer" of her services. The group's
spokesman, Colonel Wallace, presented Montez with a
medallion to commemorate the occasion:

M'lle. Lola Montez, I address you by the name
you have made renowned as an artist, in prefer­
ence to the title of nobility, which is your due.
... I hereby present you a medallion likeness
of George Washington. ... To a lady of known
liberal and republican principles and sentiments
like yourself, I feel that nothing could be more
acceptable. May you wear it long and happily
Montez replied in kind:

Oh, sir! What can I say to you and your brave associates for this inestimable gift. You could not have conferred upon me a greater honor, a more real pleasure—the image of one known all over the world as the father of this glorious country. May all his sons emulate the example of the patriotic firemen! Sir, I thank you, and wish you and your association all prosperity. Ladies and Gentlemen, good night.  

Through such speeches at benefits for Firemen and other charitable organizations, Montez enhanced her image as an ardent supporter of democracy, and public benefactress. Although Montez's personal and professional life had become the subject of speculation in newspapers, Colonel Wallace's speech and gift to Montez indicates that this group of Philadelphians accepted her as both an artist and political figure. Her true test of acceptance as a legitimate political figure came in her visit to Washington.

After having danced nearly every night for a month, Montez arrived by train in Washington D. C. on February 5, 1852. In anticipation of her debut, Washington papers reported her effort on behalf of the firemen of Philadelphia and announced her one-week engagement at Marshall's National Theatre, scheduled to begin on February 9, 1852. Foreign ministers, senators and representatives acknowledged her political identity by calling on her at her Irving House lodgings. As many as
"fifty to seventy-five callers" visited her daily; "most of the Foreign Ministers and Chargés, with their ladies," attended her opening night performance.  

By 1850, Washington, D. C., had a population of 50,000, attracted to the city primarily for political and business reasons. Nonetheless, the arts had not thrived, and Washington remained a city of little cultural importance. By the time Montez arrived, Washington supported one theatre on a regular basis, the National Theatre. Marshall had gained control of the National only recently, and added technical innovations such as steam-heat and gas-lighting. He also created a resident troupe, but featured star performers as much as possible. Between its opening on December 15, 1851, and the time Montez arrived, the National had featured the star engagements of actresses Matilda Herron and Julia Dean, and the dancer-actress, Madame Celeste.  

Washington newspapers predicted popular success for Montez based on her varied reputation. The Daily American Telegraph's striking description of her past must have heightened anticipation for her opening night:

Lola Montez, the Countess of Lansfeldt, the enigma of the 19th century; the dancing girl of Bavaria; the female politician and knight; the greatest wit, beauty and celebrity of Europe; the favorite topic of European journalism; the subject of history, fiction, poetry and the drama,—appears tonight, in her original profession of danseuse, at the National Theatre ....
For her debut, Marshall again doubled the price of admission to his theatre, and eliminated his "Free List with the exception of the Press." Montez performed Marquita in *Un Jour de Carneval à Séville* for her debut and through the 11th of February. All of her performances provided the main attraction for the National and were accompanied each night by two minor farces performed by the National's stock company. G. W. Smith was still appearing with Montez; but, the choreography of the ballet changed significantly. A Monsieur Cane, who performed "gymnastic feats" within the ballet, was added. Not mentioned in New York or Philadelphia press releases, Cane may have been added to the ballet in order to provide comic variety. Also, newspaper reports confirmed that *Carneval* included Montez's *Spider Dance*, as well as a Spanish dance and her *Pas de Matelot*.

Montez filled much of the three-thousand seat theatre. The "dress circle, the private boxes, and the stages boxes presented a brilliant array of female beauty and fashion; the orchestra, which had been fitted up with reserved seats, was fully occupied; while the parquette and the other parts of the building were about three-fourths filled." For the first time in a debut performance, Montez appears to have drawn a large number of females.

Many Washington papers did not respond to Montez's initial performance; however, the *Republic* described
Carneval as "a succession of pantomimic scenes," and complained that the antics of Monsieur Cane should be eliminated. Aware that Montez admitted the lack of lifelong formal training, the paper defended her abilities and provided an index to her position in the dance world:

She makes no attempt to stand on the toes of a single foot; performs no marvellous pirouettes; achieves no prodigious bounds. . . . [B]y quietly conceding the palm to others; she . . . appears desirous of winning favor by the gracefulness of her steps and attitudes, added to the thousand charms which a beautiful and educated woman never fails to inspire. 39

The Republic's identification of Montez as a skillful performer in her interpretation of national dances, but not among the ranks of the ethereal ballet corroborates the judgement of her New York critics. Because of her lack of advanced technique Montez concentrated on unique and graceful movement that she could execute, and which would contribute to the "character" dance and "scene" she performed with "exquisite good taste." 40

Although the Republic critic preferred Montez's "Spanish pas," Washington audiences responded enthusiastically to all of her dances in Carneval. An appeal to patriotism "elicited for the hornpipe the largest share of applause," when Montez waved a miniature American flag "over her head amidst thunders of applause." At the end of the evening's performance, Montez reappeared before the curtain to a "renewed and prolonged outburst of cheering and clapping of hands." 41
Montez performed *Betley* from the 12th to the 14th of February, 1852. On the 12th, the house of approximately one-thousand "respectable, orderly [and] cheerful" people received Montez with "rapturous applause." Her bare arms drew criticism from the *Telegraph*, but, also admiration for her gracefulness, her "magnificent" eyes, "mischief-doers! They are large, dark and very expressive." For the *Republic*, *Betley* "exhibited" Montez "to greater advantage" since the ballet appeared more "sprightly than the *Carneval*, more picturesque and embody[ied] a greater display of terpsichorean skill." Perhaps, referring to Elssler's and other's portrayals of Tyrolean steps, the *Republic* commented that "WE have seen many versions of Tyrolean dances, but none more worthy of praise, if the exhibition of national character and a felicitous combination of agility and womanly ease" were critical criteria. The *Telegraph* noted that Montez "danced beautifully . . . and was greatly admired." Montez performed *Betley* and her *Spider Dance/Pas de Andalusia* for her final Washington appearance and benefit on February 14, 1852, to a house "about half full . . . [including] a large number of ladies." "Highly applauded" by the audience, Montez came before the curtain at the end of each dance. During one of her curtain calls, an individual in the audience thumbed his nose at Montez,
who noticing it, "in an instant . . . stayed her curtseying, and, with her eyes fixed intently on the person, advanced to the footlights and said, 'Sir, I did not come here to be insulted.'" She then disappeared behind the curtain, while the audience immediately cheered her, and called for the expulsion of the offender. 47 Eventually, order was restored in the theatre, and Montez resumed her performance which concluded with a short speech, expressing her "grateful thanks" for the kindness shown to her during her stay in Washington; she "retired amid prolonged clapping and cheering." 48

Despite the "worst cold snap in 12 years," 49 Montez consistently attracted large and enthusiastic audiences composed of powerful politicians and fashionable females in Washington. Even if she did not halt the business of Congress--like her predecessor, Fanny Elssler--her engagement in the nation's capitol was a success.

In the next three-weeks Montez and company performed in Richmond, Norfolk and Baltimore, cities that did not contain theatres managed by E. A. Marshall. However, Montez apparently separated from Marshall on friendly terms; when she returned to New York, Marshall re-engaged her at the Broadway. In the interim, Montez travelled with the ballet company that Marshall organized for her initial appearances at his New York theatre. Since Montez required scenery and costumes for her tour, she may have purchased,
or rented, the costumes and scenery Marshall originally provided.

After she left Washington and before she returned to Marshall's Broadway theatre, Montez did not arrange her engagements entirely independently. The Richmond Daily Dispatch had learned of her upcoming performance from her "gentleman of business." The gentleman may have been her financial agent, Reverend Scoville; however, the Norfolk and Portsmouth Herald recorded a telegram sent by a "C. S. Marshall, Agent," inquiring about the cost of renting Mechanics' Hall for Montez's performance in Norfolk, Virginia. Possibly, Montez contacted local individuals to act as representatives for her when she arrived in each city; or, perhaps as Boston's Daily Bee later recorded, E. A. Marshall served as her agent.

Early in the morning of February 18, 1852, Lola Montez and her ballet company arrived in Richmond, Virginia, and took rooms at the American Hotel, where Smith's Armory Brass Band welcomed her with a serenade including, "God Save the Queen." In response, Montez appeared on her balcony and "bowed her thanks to the company."

On the evening of the day she arrived, Montez appeared at the Richmond Theatre, leased and managed by William L. Maule. A stunning piece of theatrical architecture after its 1838 renovation, the Richmond Theatre was said to
"rank for beauty, and for the system of its arrangements, with the first theatres in the Union." Marble, Italianate paintings and statues decorated the interior, and "cushioned crimson damask" upholstered its box seats. "Bronze rosette panels" adorned the 32-foot-wide proscenium, and its dome, 120 feet in circumference, was "said to exceed in beauty the elegant dome of the National Theatre, New York." Seating approximately one thousand people, the playhouse became "one of the major southern theatres of the ante-bellum period." Maule provided a resident company for his Richmond audiences, but was eager to provide star attractions. The month before he had engaged Charlotte Cushman in a "range of her most celebrated characters," supported by his stock company.

With a population of 27,570 in 1850, Richmond was the second largest city in the southeast. However, only the Odd Fellow's Hall appears to have provided Montez with competition for audiences, when it featured a Mr. Whitney's "SCIENTIFIC AND EXPERIMENTAL LECTURES," on her opening night.

Montez appeared as Marquita in Carneval for all three of her Richmond performances, February 18-20, 1852. Apparently, as requested by Montez, tickets for box, pit and gallery seats were doubled and cost $1.00, $.50, and $.25 respectively. Undeterred by the rise in ticket
prices, the citizens and critics of Richmond filled the theatre. Her first night audience was "one of the most crowded audiences of the season—comprising many ladies and a large proportion of the members of the two Houses of the Legislature, . . . . " It welcomed Montez with great applause. The Richmond Daily Whig had "never seen a more modest and pleasing [danseuse] than Lola Montez. Her exceeding personal beauty which shook the equilibrium of the European continent, add[ed] greatly to the charm of her performance." The Richmond Daily Dispatch was "most agreeably disappointed" by her debut, since it had been prepared by Northern papers to "expect a perfect failure." Montez was not only pretty, but, "very graceful, and a danseuse of a very high order . . . worthy of the high artistic reputation which she brought with her to this country, and which certain critics have endeavored to destroy."  

The Richmond Daily Enquirer described her energetic dances as "peculiarly Spanish and novel, and her style entirely original. Unlike most . . . she throws passion and eloquence into her beautiful feet and they certainly twinkle with exquisite grace, energy and expression," with a rapid "pit-pat on the floor." The newspaper particularly admired her dance and costuming for the Sailor's Hornpipe, noting that among her rich and elegant costumes her
"delicate beauty was admirably set off," by the beautiful boy dress. 66

Following her success in Richmond, Montez performed a single engagement in Norfolk, Virginia, at Mechanics' Hall, which could hold, approximately, 700 spectators. 67 The Hall typically sold tickets for $.25; 68 however, for Montez's performance tickets sold for $1.00, and a few seats were made available in the orchestra for $1.50. 69

Montez performed "selections from her . . . ballets" and Carneval, with her company, 70 for "quite a large and very respectable audience" on February 21, 1852. 71 The American Beacon witnessed that Montez performed "very gracefully . . . with fine effect . . . to the general satisfaction" of the crowd, but noted that some "confessed to disappointment," since her performance was "marred by evidences of fatigue . . . . In fact she looked too delicate for her profession. It seemed to us, too, that she was not well." 72

A report of Montez's fatigue is not surprising: for two months she had endured arduous travel conditions, performing almost nightly. Despite the physical toll of a hectic performance schedule, Montez departed for Baltimore, where she began performing the day after she arrived.

In Baltimore, Montez and company took rooms at Barnum's Hotel, 73 who frequently housed entertaining celebrities ever since its construction in 1826. 74
Montez stayed in the same suite of apartments Jenny Lind occupied when she sang in Baltimore.  

Montez appeared at the Holliday Street Theatre that had achieved national fame in the year it was built (1813) when the Durang brothers first sang "The Star Spangled Banner" from its stage shortly after the siege of Fort McHenry.  

Affectionately termed the "Old Drury" of Baltimore, it hosted numerous famous international actors, singers and dancers. The Holliday was open only sporadically between the 1830s and 1854 when John Ford acquired the property, and newspaper report does not indicate who managed the theatre during Montez's first appearance in Baltimore; presumably, the theatre was controlled by T. J. Barton, the manager of the Holliday when Montez returned to Baltimore in June of 1852.  

During her stay in Baltimore, between February 25 and March 5, 1852, Montez primarily performed Un Jour de Carneval à Séville, but often included Betley, the Tyrolean.  

Although Montez appeared "before an audience which crowded the Theatre from pit to dome," she elicited little response from Baltimore newspapers. The Clipper could not provide "unqualified approval," since Montez possessed "a certain stiffness about her motions," that she had to overcome before she could "be pronounced a prima donna of the first grade." Nonetheless, the paper
considered her "an excellent dancer," and recommended her to audiences. 81

Montez concluded her first series of performances at theatres outside of New York city before crowded and appreciative audiences. Philadelphians honored her as an artist and a heroine of democracy. Even though she did not match the artistic brilliance of Fanny Elssler's success in Washington or Baltimore, she achieved immense social and critical success by comparison. Although Washington was not a significant theatrical center, Montez's engagement there proved especially important at this early point in her tour, for her successful social reception from the diplomatic corps of Washington, legitimized her political standing. Subsequently, Montez gained respect from critics as a unique, graceful, and entertaining dancer whose beauty and political reputation enhanced her stage charisma. Gradually, the scandalous reports concerning her personal and professional reputation in Europe and the negative commentary supplied by some New York papers were being replaced by positive social and artistic feedback from surprised and delighted critics. If she occasionally became exhausted from the heavy demands of her touring schedule, the excitement of her accomplishments must have renewed her stamina. Montez had discovered critical, popular and social success in the first three months of her
tour of the United States. Perhaps, she faced her greatest

test of acceptance in Boston.
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Chapter 6. 'Enchantress of the . . . New World'  
Conquering New England on Her Spring Tour

For the next two-and-one-half months, following her last appearance in Baltimore, Montez travelled the theatrical touring circuit, appearing in Boston, Lowell and Salem, Massachusetts; Providence, Rhode Island; Hartford, Connecticut; and Albany, Troy, Syracuse, Buffalo and Rochester, New York. When Montez and company arrived in Boston by train on March 13, 1852, 1 the Boston Evening Herald discovered that Montez was "more afraid of visiting Boston than any other city in the Union," since she "had heard so much of its piety and its strictness that she feared the reminiscences of her former-life would prepare the way for a terrible outburst of indignant morality." 2

The open welcome in Boston papers may have allayed her fears. The Boston Daily Bee commented that "Lola was lied about most desperately in Europe, but the Americans are apt to judge for themselves, and as long as she maintains the high position she has taken since she came here, she will be able to baffle her enemies and make money in her profession." 3 Throughout her three-week series of engagements in Boston and her single appearance in Providence, Rhode Island, Montez appears, indeed, to have baffled enemies and enjoyed a good box-office income.

Between March 15, 1852, and April 3, 1852, Montez performed five nights a week, and two Saturday matinees, at
Boston's Howard Athenaeum, managed by Wyzeman Marshall. Large and elegant, the Athenaeum could seat between 1800 and 2000 audience members. From its establishment in 1846, until the end of its 1867-1868 season, the Athenaeum functioned as a star-stock house, frequently described as the best in Boston.

A major tour stop for visiting performers, Boston theatres supplied Montez with varied competition. Her first week of appearances coincided with the end of Charlotte Cushman's two-week engagement at the National Theatre, where the American star performed Romeo, as a breeches role in Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet, Meg Merrilies in Guy Mannering, and Augusta in a new play by an unknown author, The Banker's Wife. The Boston Museum featured the unique "Peruvian pageant entitled the Enchanted Harp," along with company farces, and Ordway Hall provided minstrel entertainment from its stock company.

P. T. Barnum's Amory Hall supplied spectators with a "moving mirror," a panorama, of the "World's Fair, including the Crystal Palace!"

Despite the lure of other varied attractions, Montez's debut, announced for March 15, 1852, created such anticipation that Wyzeman Marshall auctioned reserved seats. Parquette boxes sold for "from $5.00 to $10.00, parquette seats 12 1/2 to 75 cents; boxes $3.00 to $12.00;" the auction marked "a pretty fair beginning," since
Marshall garnered $220.00 more than he usually did for choice seats. 9

Providing the main event for the Howard's entertainment, Montez made her Boston debut in Carneval on March 15, 1852; two company plays, J. M. Field's Artful Dodger, and The Lottery Ticket, by S. Beazley, Jr., completed the evening's bill. 10 "Half an hour after the doors were opened, there was hardly a nook or cranny from which to obtain a view of the stage. Several hundred persons were compelled to leave, unable to procure even a standing place." 11 The capacity house, including some of the "first citizens" of Boston, but only thirty-four ladies, greeted Montez with "overwhelming applause." 12 "Much applauded during the performance. . . . [and] In reply to the bouquets and bravos . . . she said her 'heart was overflowing.'" During her Pas de Matelot, Montez kissed a small American flag, "much to the edification and delight of Messieurs, the people." 13

Critics unanimously praised her performance, some ecstatically. In a paean to Montez, The Boston Post commented that "Justice has not been done to Lola Montez as an artiste. . . . [F]or modesty, grace and ingenious combination, [she is] unequalled by that of any of her predecessors." 14 Similarly defending her dance reputation, The Boston Times remarked that Montez danced "with more grace and spirit than we calculated upon after
reading some of the cynical criticisms of a few of the New York press;" the critic held that Montez "threw more poetry and effect" into her Tarantella "than the famed Elssler." The Daily Bee appeared to give the most impartial account:

[Her dancing] is quite charming. She is not a great danseuse. . . . But for all this, there is an attractiveness in her movements which even surpasses those who in many respects excel her. She cannot leap quite so high, nor jump so far as Fanny Elssler, but she yet moves with a bewitching grace, and an airy step none can fail to notice and admire. . . .

Montez took Boston "by storm," and by March 19, 1852, had drawn numerous Boston ladies to her performances. (See Plates 11 and 12.) The earlier "prudery and hypocrisy" that had prevented Boston females from attending her performances had disappeared and "ladies [came] forward cheerfully and gladly, to show, by their presence, that they are as ready to sanction the merits of a celebrity of their own sex as they always are the celebrities among men." Furthermore, Montez compared favorably with Elssler: "her appearance . . . created more enthusiasm and excitement than any other danseuse since Fanny Elssler, and whose artistic skill compares favorably with that divinity . . . ."

Following the conclusion of her first benefit performance, Montez thanked her audience for their generosity and expressed her hope, forever, to merit the approval of the populace of "the cradle of Liberty, the Athens of America."
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Initially committed to a single week's engagement, Marshall re-engaged Montez for two more, and Montez continued her success, performing her entire American repertoire of dances. Ticket auctions for her performances continued, which probably helped make Marshall's 1851-1852 season one of his most profitable. Wyzeman Marshall "accumulated the nucleus of a fortune that season;" not the least of which, may have come from Montez's engagement.

Following her first week's engagement in Boston, Montez made a one-night appearance, March 20, 1852, at the Providence Museum, managed by William C. Forbes, in Providence, Rhode Island. Apparently, the only functioning theatre in Providence at the time, the Museum had its own company of actors and often hosted touring stars. Large enough to accommodate equestrian drama, it featured a gallery and a few converted boxes in the parquette.

Demand for tickets to see Montez required an auction, at which a gentleman paid $23.00 for a box and remaining seats sold at three times their normal rate. Montez and her company performed Carneval to a densely packed house, "every seat and standing place being occupied by ladies and gentlemen comprising an audience of respectability and character rarely exceeded in the city. Even Jenny Lind created no such sensation."
Although *The Boston Daily Bee* considered Providence the "hardest place in the country to excite enthusiasm," Montez triumphed. Described as "half-mad with delight," the audience consisted of men and women who "received Montez with deafening plaudits." Montez was "the cynosure--the bright star. Her dancing was exquisite and fascinating, there was poetry, sentiment, mind, intelligence, even eloquence in her movements. The audience was lost in admiration and wonder--in emotions of pleasure--in intoxication of delight . . . ." At the close of the performance, Montez thanked her audience, waving her miniature American flag. The next day, she returned to Boston to begin her second week's engagement at the Howard Athenaeum.

During her stay in Boston, Montez charmed citizens on and off-stage. On-stage, on March 31, 1852, Montez entertained a house, "three times larger than any other in the city." Off-stage, she captivated several of the "literati" of Boston in her lodgings at the Tremont Hotel with wisdom, wit and political discourse. A newspaper interview reported her "keen, comprehensive, grasping, persistent, bold and grand" intellect, and described her attitudes toward American politicians and political issues: "Daniel Webster she regards as the greatest man in America, though she is rather of the opinion . . . that were she votable, she would ballot Buchanan into the
Presidential chair. . . . The word Democrat, however, has a music to her ears." She also impressed her interviewer with her knowledge of literature, art, and half a dozen languages, including Latin and Greek. And, although she had enjoyed the "favor and companionship of the crowned heads of Europe," displayed "a deep love for, and a vital sympathy with the people." 33

Montez even managed to fascinate numerous Boston clergymen who were "filled with astonishment and admiration at her great knowledge of theology, and the acuteness with which she discusses religion, the church, and the clergy." They found "no subject on which she [could not] converse with intelligence and fluency." 34 Bostonians took her on a tour of homes, suburbs, Harvard University and the Bunker Hill Memorial where she learned that Fanny Elssler had contributed funds for its completion and had laid the capstone on the monument. 35 Additionally, Montez was invited to tour three of Boston's public schools where she observed French and Latin classes and exchanged a few pleasantries with instructors concerning her knowledge of French and Latin. 36

Pleased by Montez's artistic and popular acceptance by the theatre going public, The Boston Daily Bee questioned the hypocritical response of those who objected to her performances on the basis of her reputation, yet, who apparently attended performances by others with similar,
but un-publicized personal lives: "There are very many stiff-necked hypocrites, in our midst, who clasp their hands in holy horror and look heavenward at the very mention of her name; and why it is so they cannot tell. Simply . . . because she is Lola Montez, and we have heard that she was not a good woman!" The Bee wondered if "they" really knew about the "private, (or public) life of all the artists who have not only received the patronage and applause of the very elite [including the clergy] of Boston society?" Until managers were required to supply a "certificate" of moral validity for any artist, The Bee cautioned its readers to "not draw the line of good or bad, among artists . . . ." 37

The Bee's comments proved prophetic, for despite the gracious acceptance that Montez discovered in some Boston social circles, she did not escape controversy. Conservative Bostonians took exception to Montez's visit to public schools, suggesting that her well-rumored "immoral" background disqualified her as a proper role-model to display before their children. 38 Several Boston and New York papers took up the issue, calling her a "'rake,' an 'Aspasia,' 39 a 'cast-off mistress," . . . and a 'bigamist,'" 40 while publishing various accounts of her behavior at the schools which, according to her tour guide and Boston school official, Mr. Emerson, had "no foundation in truth." 41
Outraged, Montez did not hesitate to respond by letter to Epes Sargent, editor of the Boston Daily Evening Transcript, who had offended Montez with his remarks on the subject.

Sir---... you saw fit to take exception to a visit paid by me to several of your public schools... This exception was based on reports spread to my detriment by my jesuitic enemies, and as to the truth or falsehood of which, you assert you know nothing... You think it improper, sir, for a danseuse to visit one of your public institutions! Did your fellow citizens think it improper to accept the capstone of the Bunker Hill Monument from Fanny Elssler? Do you think it improper for your public institutions daily to receive willing contributions from the hard-earned salary of artists?... I saw my pilgrimage to America... like that a lover would make to the mistress of his heart, a disciple of Mahomet to his long dreamed of Mecca... And now, when I as a stranger, wish to pay a visit to those nurseries of your noble statesmen--your Websters, your Calhouns, your Clays--you cry out against me as an intruder! Fie on you sir! For an ill bred snarling cur, unworthy to stand at the portal of public opinion. I had been told that you were a good little fellow and published a good little paper, though you did fail as a playwriter. Stick to your new trade, sir, if it suits you... but do not interfere with me in my innocent amusements...  

Sargent may have considered himself lucky since he merely received a public scolding from Montez. By April 1, 1852, in response to their report concerning her life and career in Europe, Montez threatened a libel-suit of thirty-thousand dollars each against three New York papers: The New York Times, the New York Tribune, and Les Courrier des États Unis.  

Boston papers rose to Montez's defense and reproached their fellow journalists for their lack of chivalry towards such a "talented lady." Notably, The Boston Daily Bee attempted to explain why newspapers had reacted in such a drastic manner.

The journals thus libeling and assailing the unhappy Countess are well known for their extravagant idolatry of Kossuth. Perhaps it is a dread of the rising popularity of the Countess de Landsfeldt, as a politician ... and the declining reputation of Kossuth, their idol, which may have caused the present outburst of indignation.

The newspaper controversy finally ended without harmful effect. Montez toured other public institutions with notable citizens without dispute, and her critical and popular triumph in Boston continued through her third week's engagement. On March 31, 1852, Montez was received with "enthusiasm even beyond that of any preceding night," and "honored with a splendid wreath of flowers." Her engagement ended on April 3, 1852, when Montez "danced with consummate grace and spirit" to a large audience, two-thirds of them female, who thus demonstrated visible feminine support for the star.

Montez's triumph in Boston may be attributed to a number of factors, not the least of which was her ability to provide audiences with performances that several Boston critics considered comparable to those of Fanny Elssler, and superior to the numerous stars of the ballet they had previously witnessed. Another factor that may have
contributed to her great success in Boston was its large Irish population; the liberal Bostonians who embraced her, perhaps, considered the Irish-born beauty as one of their own. Also, Montez could charm clergy and lay-people alike with her keen mind, her mastery of languages and literature, her democratic, patriotic political attitudes, and spirited defense when under fire from the press. Although William Clapp, a contemporary and historian of Boston theatre, witnessed that her Boston dance appearances were "a mockery of that art which has been cultivated by Taglioni, Cerrito, Elssler and Grisi," some of the greatest ballerinas of the day, many Bostonians thought otherwise; and, Montez left Boston with the personal and professional respect and esteem of many of its finest citizens.

In the early hours of March 31, 1852, Boston's Tremont Temple burned to the ground. The residence of several local artists, the Temple housed numerous valuable and irreplaceable art collections. Completing an engagement in Lowell, Massachusetts, on April 1 and 2, 1852, Montez returned to Boston to aid the displaced artists and help raise money for a new theatre to be erected on the site. Forgoing other engagements, she made a benefit performance at the Howard on April 10, 1852, raising several hundred dollars. Montez not only performed Carneval with her company, but, also sang, for the first time in America, two Spanish ballads.
After the Tremont benefit, Montez and company departed for Salem, Massachusetts, and Hartford, Connecticut, where they performed Carneval in one night engagements in each city on their way to Albany, New York. A longtime theatrical center, Albany had hosted touring stars and companies from the time of the Hallams, the first professional troupe in America, who came to the colonies in the 1750s. By the time Montez arrived, it appears to have supported at least two theatres on an occasional basis: the Albany Museum and Association Hall. Enlarged in 1848 to hold 1,500 spectators, the Museum was "the leading place of amusement in Albany . . . . its stock company was at times as good as the country offered." Association Hall operated on a less consistent basis, but featured a variety act, the "Peak Family, As Vocalists and Swiss Bell Ringers" during Montez's appearances in Albany.

Montez and her twelve-member company performed Carneval at the Albany Museum for two nights. Although Montez provided the main draw, the famous acting couple, Mr. and Mrs. John Drew were Museum company members and acted in a play by an unknown author, My Daughter, Sir, each night of Montez's engagement.

Montez's first two performances in Albany were sufficiently successful for the Museum's manager, Charles T. Smith, to re-engage her for another appearance on May 6, 1852, which became her benefit performance. The Daily
Albany Argus admired Montez's style of dancing as "dashing, original and brilliant, and a reflex of her past career. In this lies the secret of her extraordinary success."  

The critic seems to have considered Montez's style in performance equally as compelling as her European personal reputation, both of which helped account for her popularity with American audiences. Following performances in Albany, Montez and company traveled to Troy and Syracuse.  

Even in her absence, Montez remained newsworthy in New York city papers. The New York Evening Mirror reported that Montez had signed a new contract with E. A. Marshall for the production of a play concerning her life. Based on the paper's examination of the contract, Montez was prohibited from causing "explosion, revolution, or volcanic eruption in the politics, or religion, of this country," in the interval before her appearance at the Broadway.  

Perhaps such a report intrigued audiences for Montez's next appearance in Buffalo, New York, on May 10, 1852, at the Eagle Street Buffalo Theatre. A minor stop on the theatrical circuit, Buffalo provided two amusement centers when Montez performed: Eagle Street's Buffalo Theatre and the Buffalo Academy of Music. The Buffalo Theatre, the more prominent of the two, managed by Thomas Carr and H. Warren, evidently had a stock company, and hosted Montez's appearance in Carneval. Expecting an unprecedented rush of patrons, The Commercial Advertiser
described Montez as one of the "curiosities of the age," who had, "far less 'bogus' about her than any of the foreign celebrities by whom we have lately been visited." 

Montez's original engagement of two nights was quickly changed by necessity. Following her first performance of Carneval before a large house on May 10, 1852, Buffalo's Eagle Street Theatre burned. Everything was lost with the exception of "a small portion of the wardrobe of some of the actors and the library." Montez, who stored her wardrobe at her lodgings, suffered no loss in the fire.

The management transferred her engagement to the Buffalo Museum, where Montez and company performed May 11 and 12, 1852, the latter date a benefit performance for Montez. Montez may not have been inclined to perform a benefit for the burned theatre. Prior to the conflagration, Montez, somehow displeased with her first night's reception in Buffalo, demanded her pay and refused to appear again. The catastrophic fire may have tempered her initial reaction; papers indicate that Carr and Warren lost approximately thirty-thousand dollars, including the building and its contents, none of which was insured. Nonetheless, Montez's Buffalo performances were "remarkably successful--her last appearance being more warmly greeted than any of her previous ones."
Perhaps, as a result of the fire, and the inadequacy of the new Buffalo playing space, Carr and Warren transferred Montez's engagement to a Rochester theatre, which does not appear to have been one of their regularly operated performance sites. Rochester contained three performance halls when Montez appeared between May 13 and 15, 1852. Beyond Warren and Carr's perhaps hastily arranged Rochester Theatre, the city supported the Theatre and Museum, managed by Bradley and Angle, which presented company performances in addition to the touring "star" contortionist, D. B. Booth. Corinthian Hall invited audiences to view a panorama of the "Battlefields of the American Revolution," along with exhibitions of Glass Spinning, Working and Blowing. In the Rochester Theatre where Montez performed, ticket prices were raised, undoubtedly to insure the greatest profit for Montez, Carr and Warren in light of the recent fire. Box seats sold for $1.00 and those in the pit, $.50.

Montez and company performed Carneval for the first two nights of their engagement in Rochester, adding Betley to the bill for their third, and benefit, performance. Thrilled with the first night's performance of Carneval, the Daily Advertiser identified the key reasons for Montez's success thus far in the United States: "She is the most extraordinary woman, not alone of this continent, but of the world;" a "great historical character... one of
the best artists in America, and is considered to be the most perfectly formed woman now in existence."

Her final performances in Rochester elicited "excitement and enthusiasm . . . to see this enchantress of the old and new worlds. Her style of dancing is peculiar to herself--it is singular and unique. . . . We advise our friends to go early and secure seats." 74

Montez reaped great popular, critical and, undoubtedly, financial success on her New England tour. After numerous critics compared her to Fanny Elssler and audiences jammed the theatres where she performed, however, Boston's National theatre presented a farce, The Enchanted Jackass, Or, Lola Montez in the Moon, April 19, 1852. 75 No longer extant, the comedy was probably a satirical treatment of the controversy over her European reputation stirred in Boston and New York papers. 76 The play's production demonstrates the popular interest that her tour provoked, as well as the eagerness of others to capitalize on it.

Nevertheless, Montez must have amazed her detractors at this point in her tour. American audiences and many critics had welcomed her with open minds, admiring a beautiful and intelligent politician whose ability to manage public relations added to her on-stage appeal. Montez's acceptance as a political figure in Washington, Boston, and several other cities across the Northeast and
mid-Atlantic areas moved her to another level of approval in society. Moreover, her letters to the press, waving the American flag as she danced, and speeches at fundraisers enhanced the image of a public benefactress devoted to democratic ideals. Montez fascinated members of Boston's religious, literary and journalistic ranks by revealing her knowledge and understanding of politics, religious issues, literature, languages, and the arts. When other Bostonians took Montez on city tours, including a visit to a Boston school, conservatives voiced scathing criticism. Montez's firm response quickly ended the controversy and made her critics appear petty.

As her tour progressed, as critical notices improved and social acceptance increased, Montez began to emerge from her low public profile. Boston proved to be an important engagement, for by the time she completed her Boston performances, Montez had created not only a reputation for artistry comparable to the famed Fanny Elssler, but also a strong and dignified public persona. Having re-discovered herself as a danseuse and a person in the New World, Montez returned to the critical waters of New York city to explore another facet of her theatrical career.
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Chapter 7. The Danseuse turns Actress, a Re-visit to the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic Areas
Mid-May to November 1852

Following performances in Rochester, New York, Montez and company returned to New York city on May 17, 1852. \(^1\) Earlier in the year, Montez had contacted a New York dramatist, C. P. T. Ware, to write a play of her life—probably planning to present a dramatic version of her European political and dance career that would deflect negative Jesuit and American reports, as well as capitalize on her public popularity. Her critical and popular success as a dancer, and her public recognition as a political figure and social charmer, primed Americans for a sympathetic dramatization. She could not have chosen a better time or vehicle in which to debut as an actress.

Scheduled to open within a week of her return to E. A. Marshall's Broadway theatre, Lola Montez in Bavaria was allegedly "dictated by Lola herself, although written out and adapted to the stage" by Ware, the resident playwright for the Broadway and Astor Place theatres. \(^2\) As Marshall organized new scenery and costumes, Montez rehearsed the title role with the cast of Marshall's stock company, danced in a benefit for Kate Horn, a member of the Broadway Theatre company, and gave performances of Carneval to large houses with G. W. Smith and company, between May 18 and 24, 1852. \(^3\) Evidently, Montez had decided that Carneval, which contained her Spider Dance, was her most popular and
critically successful ballet, for she chose to perform it more often than any of her other full length pieces. 4

Montez made her international acting debut in the title role of Lola Montez in Bavaria, on May 25, 1852; an afterpiece by J. B. Buckstone, Popping the Question, completed the evening's bill. 5 With low expectations of the production's success, Marshall gave it little promotional publicity, kept ticket prices at regular rates, and readied a ballet to replace it. 6 He may have been skeptical about his playwright's adaptation. According to the producer and director, Augustin Daly, Ware was "a poor little hack . . . who wrote anything for anybody." 7 Nevertheless, popular curiosity concerning her past was bound to attract audiences.

Montez's keen mind and dramatic flare, successfully combined with Ware's experience in dramatizing her Bavarian career. No longer extant, the play was described in newspaper articles. Encompassing a time period of three years, and performed against a backdrop of the palace Ludwig provided for Montez, the play depicted five phases of her life in Bavaria: "Era, 1st--Lola Montez, The Danseuse; Era 2nd, Lola Montez, the Politician; Era 3rd, Lola Montez, the Countess; Era 4th, Lola Montez, the Revolutionist; Era 5th, Lola Montez, the Fugitive." 8 (See Plate 13.) The play opens with discussion among Opera fans of the "witchery" of Montez's beauty. Ludwig I, who
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"can think of nothing . . . but the beautiful dancing girl," sends for her despite the objections of D'Abel, his Jesuit Prime Minister. Montez receives the invitation, surrounded by students, artists and Bavarian nobility, as she expounds her opinions on politics, fashion, the aristocracy, and other matters—"the champion of liberal sentiments . . . a sort of Goddess of Liberty." When Montez appears before the King, she "treats him as a man, and boldly points out the dangers that surround him—calls him the amiable tool in the hands of his Jesuit ministry; and implores him to give liberty and happiness to his people." Ludwig I promises to follow her advice, and agrees to free a poor artist, imprisoned "for some trifling offense," if Ludwig "may kiss her hand." Subsequently, she is made a Countess, housed in a royal palace, presented at Court, and made the companion of the Queen. In addition, "She kicks out the ministry, fans the flame of the revolution, writes proclamations, mingles in the fight like another Maid of Orleans, and finally becomes a fugitive . . . from the tyranny of the Jesuits." 9

Among the thirty-four characters in the historical drama, 10 some were drawn from life including Montez, Ludwig/Louis I of Bavaria, and the Prime Minister D'Abel. Fictitious characters were provided for comic variety. Baron von Poppeheim humorously encapsulated "the insolent pomposity and ignorance of the German aristocracy." The
noble, but fortuneless painter, Baron Ludwig von Schootenbottom, provided puns and a joke concerning "artistic" managers. He spoke to his wife about their poor financial situation:

Ludwig: I shall establish an Art Union Association.
Frau.: And what's that, I should like to know?
Ludwig: What's that? Ask any free country. Why it's a kind of pitch and toss game between the public and the managers, as to whether the managers shall get your money for nothing, or whether you shall get nothing for your money. 11

The joke may have been Montez's thinly veiled criticism of the managers with whom she had dealt, perhaps, including E. A. Marshall.

Surprised at discovering speeches "remarkable for their dignity and beauty," and "some very laughable characters" in Lola Montez in Bavaria, one critic explained that, "The public, instead of damning the piece, and the actors and actresses, were very much pleased with it." He judged that the play "possesses merit and great interest from beginning to end." Montez impressed him as, "a novice acting the part with all the coolness of a veteran actress. . . . she [made her role] very effective by her clever acting, which is perfectly natural and unstudied." 12

The New York Evening Mirror confessed that it witnessed the performance "with unexpected satisfaction. The piece was entirely successful." The audience, crowded
from pit to ceiling, cheered Montez at every entrance, and clamoured for a special curtain call at the end of the fourth act for ten minutes: "Lola's triumph was complete." Critics anticipated that the production would play to full houses for the remainder of Montez's one-week engagement. Reviews encouraged Montez to abandon dance in favor of a dramatic career: the re-enactment of her life not only displayed greater ability than her dancing skills, but also allowed her to reveal the "capabilities, advantages, lady-like qualities, genius and intellect which have bewildered so many wise heads in European life." 

Undeniably, Montez scored a "hit" in a work that demanded less training than her dance vehicles. Montez commented that "It [acting] gives me no trouble at all; I merely do and say precisely what I did and said when all those things in the drama occurred." Her forceful actions in the play must have held democratic appeal for many Americans. Also, the novelty of witnessing a person enact events from her own life, combined with the public's insatiable curiosity about the notorious and beautiful Countess, a political figure, created powerful theatrical allure.

However, instead of continuing Montez's engagement at the Broadway, Marshall inexplicably transferred the production to his Philadelphia theatre. Subsequently,
between June and November of 1852, Montez toured cities in the northeastern and middle-Atlantic States, acting in her new vehicle and occasionally dancing. In Philadelphia, between May 31 and June 5, 1852, Montez performed *Lola Montez in Bavaria* at Marshall's Walnut Street Theatre, with at least two principal roles, Ludwig and D'Abel, recast from Marshall's Philadelphia company. 17

Montez's professional relationship with Marshall was deteriorating. During the run of the play in Philadelphia, The New York Herald warned its readers to expect a terrible blow-up between Montez and Marshall over her share of proceeds. Performances to crowded houses brought in about $500.00 a night and Montez only received about one-fifth of the total. According to the Herald's report, Montez said that "the Jesuits have ruined her dancing--and now they are determined to cheat her out of her money." 18 She believed that the Jesuits had "corrupted" Marshall against her, 19 and that he was cheating her financially. After a triumphant benefit, attended by "vociferous" applause, June 5, 1852, Montez negotiated "better terms" from Marshall that temporarily settled their dispute. 20

From Philadelphia, Montez travelled to Washington D. C., where she provided the major attraction for the last week of Marshall's National Theatre season. She performed in *Lola Montez in Bavaria* with a supporting cast from the Washington theatre's company, June 7 through June 12, 1852.
However, for three of her engagements, Marshall supplemented the play with female solo dances by a Miss A. Walters and a M'lle Theodore, apparently two members of his Washington company. Montez may have perceived their inclusion as a challenge to her dancing; for the remainder of her National engagement, she completed the evening's bill with either a solo dance, La Zapateado, or a Pas de Deux with George Washington Smith.

Only the Republic provided specific feedback after the play opened. The newspaper found minor "diverse incongruities in action—such as entering the court attended by four maids of honor, while the Queen had none." It found Montez's voice "thin and weak," and that "her desire to be the actress frequently led her to spoil a point by overdoing it," particularly in the revolutionary period of her life.

The Republic reported that Montez played to an "audience of either sex—much more numerous than could have been anticipated," since Washingtonians were preoccupied with the presidential race between the Democrat, Franklin Pierce, and the Whig candidate, Winfield Scott. Considering the "attractions of the electioneering dramas that were being enacted," or, the presidential campaigns then in full swing, Montez scored a remarkable popular success with Washington D. C. audiences. The Metropolitan concluded that Montez was an extraordinary
woman, "gifted and beautiful," who would inevitably be
criticised as a result of her life and profession.  

The end of Montez's one-week engagement in Washington
D. C. marked major changes in her procedure. Montez never
again performed at a theatre managed by E. A. Marshall.
Also, on her return to northeastern theatres, Montez did
not appear immediately at Wyzeman Marshall's Howard
Athenaeum in Boston. When she did return to the Howard
Athenaeum in October of 1852, the theatre had new
management. Neither E. A., nor Wyzeman Marshall documented
why Montez no longer appeared at their theatres; but,
Montez wrote in the New York Day Book that her benefits,
"while performing at the theatre in New York, Philadelphia,
Washington, etc., under the control of the Marshalls, were
humbugs," and that she "received no more benefit from them
than any other night of her performance." 

The end of her association with the Marshalls did not
harm Montez's tour in Lola Montez in Bavaria. She
continued to secure engagements at major theatres.
Apparently, Montez supplied her own costumes, but depended
on individual theatres for additional costumes, scenery and
company members.

In her initial tour as a dancer, Montez had stopped
in Richmond and Baltimore after her Washington engagement
before appearing at the Howard Athenaeum in Boston.
However, this time, Montez skirted Richmond, perhaps
initially saving it for her larger Southern tour in the winter. Also, theatres in the north and south often remained dark during the summer months because of the heat and humidity. Heading north, in mid-June of 1852, Montez returned to T. J. Barton's Holliday Street Theatre in Baltimore.

Her appearances in *Lola Montez in Bavaria* replaced "MacAllister's . . . Surgical Feat of Nose Amputation!" at the Holliday Street Theatre. Ironically, at the same time that Montez performed her autobiographical play, another Baltimore theatre produced J. S. Coyne's *Lola Montez*. In addition to performing the title role in *Lola Montez in Bavaria* between June 14 and June 19, 1852, Montez added dance performances to the appeal of her bill. During the week, she performed the *Spider Dance*, alternately termed *La Zapateado*, assisted by G. W. Smith; a solo Hungarian Dance, and an apparent solo version of the *Spider Dance*.

Baltimore appearances terminated the relationship between Montez and G. W. Smith as dance partners. According to newspaper sources, Montez, offended by personal remarks made by G. W. Smith, either threatened, or actually slapped him. The separation may have been the conclusion of a turbulent relationship. Unsubstantiated reports indicate that at some unspecified time in Philadelphia, when Montez threw a tantrum at a
rehearsal, Smith placed her over his knee and spanked her in front of the company. Whether mythical or factual, the stories about her relationship with Smith added to the legend of her tempestuous temperament and, perhaps, contributed to her box-office appeal.  

For the remainder of her American tour Montez performed solo character dances without the benefit of a partner or ballet company.

After her Baltimore appearances, Montez secured a two-week engagement at Thomas Sowerby Hamblin's Bowery Theatre in New York city. The Bowery, situated in a working man's neighborhood, had gained fame during the 1830s and 1840s for its large immigrant audiences composed of "B'hoys and B'gals," or Bowery boys and girls. The management, catering to the desires of its working class audience, produced a wide variety of entertainments: operas, ballets, melodramas, equestrian and canine drama. Built in 1845, after the previous Bowery Theatre burned, the new Bowery could seat four thousand spectators, with ample room for others in its aisles.

Just prior to Montez's engagement, the Bowery had been closed for extensive renovation. Manager, T. S. Hamblin re-modelled the theatre, adding, among other things, velvet cushions to all the seats in a plan to place the Bowery "in rank, talent and fashion" above any other theatre in the city. He featured Montez as the first artist to perform in
the refurbished theatre. Appearing in *Lola Montez in Bavaria* June 28 through July 10, 1852, she later added *La Zapateado*, also known as *The Shoemaker's Dance*, and the *Sailor's Hornpipe* to her performances.

Despite the intense summer heat, Montez's run at the Bowery attracted audiences that filled the massive house to overflowing. On her opening night "five thousand souls" greeted Montez, and both she and the play "were most triumphant in their success." She continued to draw huge audiences not only composed of B'hoys and B'gals, but also "fashion, loveliness, grace and jewelry"--from all classes and all parts of the city. Between Hamblin's efforts to revitalize the theatre and Montez's powerful attraction, the Bowery rapidly attained the rank of the most fashionable theatre in the city. "Uppertendom [the upper class audience] is being transferred from the boxes of the Astor Opera House to those of the Bowery, and the amalgamation of the Fifth Avenue exquisites with the Bowery belles promises soon to be an accomplished fact."

The overwhelming popular response to Montez's engagement realized great financial success for Hamblin and Montez. Prior to her appearance, typical receipts ranged between one hundred and twenty, to one hundred and thirty dollars a night. However, during the first week of Montez's engagement, nightly earnings averaged between five and six hundred dollars, an amazing accomplishment when box
tickets sold for twenty-five cents, and pit tickets, half as much. During the week, Montez "cleared from a thousand to twelve-hundred dollars" on her own, and Hamblin, "as much, with all the expenses besides." 38 One critic did not "remember when the Bowery has been better filled at any season than during the popular engagement of Lola Montez;" 39 according to another, her benefit performance, "was one of the most wonderful triumphs in the histrionic and terpsichorean line that ever took place in this city." 40 The same critic noted that competing theatres, the Broadway, Burton's and the Lyceum "have been compelled to close," while "Niblo has scarce enough nightly to be called an audience, and the Roussets are losing at Castle Garden all the money they have made during the summer." Refering to her as the "Grand Squaw" of the democratic party of Tammany Hall, the critic reported that Montez "has swept everything before her, and played and danced to more crowded houses than the Bowery ever before contained;" he concluded that her "triumphs at the Bowery in the month of July, constitute one of the most remarkable incidents in the history of that theatre." 41 Her engagements at the Bowery mark the crest of Montez's popularity on the east coast of the United States. She attracted phenomenally large audiences composed of the elite and working class, no doubt, securing another small fortune. Perhaps, only an Elssler or a Lind could have
attracted such numbers; even so, neither of the two artists held the multi-faceted appeal of Lola Montez.

Perhaps, overconfident with her success at the Bowery, Montez began rehearsals at the theatre for a local farce to be entitled either, Life in New York, or, Lola Montez in New York, which lampooned Horace Greeley of The Tribune, Henry Raymond of The Times, Louis Kossuth, and a host of other New York celebrities. Since her threatened lawsuit against Greeley and Raymond over the Boston controversy never went to court, Montez may have considered a theatrical burlesque of her enemies an effective means of revenge. The Pick noted that Montez would "find difficulty in getting an actor" to portray The New York Times editor, Henry Raymond, and that if she consulted The Pick, it would advise her to "save all trouble, by buying and putting upon the stage, for that particular part, an animal known vulgarly as an--ass."  

Apparently completed, the script is no longer extant. The New York Herald had heard that the play was as "lively, brilliant and witty" as Lola Montez in Bavaria. However, plans for the production apparently fell through after the New York Evening Mirror reported that a witness to a rehearsal considered the "new local farce . . . insufferable trash." Objecting to the inclusion of Greeley's and Raymond's wives, the Evening Mirror declared that "Such an outrage will not be tolerated in New York. We advise
both Mr. Hamblin and Mme. the Countess to burn the farce and save their characters." 44 Such a report probably convinced Hamblin that if he intended to maintain the favor of the press in his plans for the Bowery, then he could not afford to alienate them, or his newly acquired elite audiences.

Montez prudently set the play aside. Instead, following her triumphant engagement at the Bowery, she lived quietly in New York and began work on the title roles in two plays that she added to her repertoire, Charlotte Corday and Maritana, Maid of Saragossa, allegedly written for her by H. J. Conway, a popular New York dramatist. 45 Both Maritana and Charlotte Corday provided Montez with portrayals of strong females who, like herself, actively worked toward democratic rights for the populace.

However, Montez never remained free of controversy for very long. In July of 1852, the press accused New York's Common Council of unethical and criminal activities in its management of city government. Instead of simply denying the charges, the Council called upon the press to identify and prove the alleged offenses. Never a friend to Montez, The New York Times editor, Henry Raymond, noted that Montez had responded to allegations about her past in a similar manner. Instead of merely denying castigations, Montez, like the Common Council, demanded that her enemies identify and prove the charges brought against her. Raymond drew a
parallel between Montez's response and that of the Common Council in the following analogy:

When a brazen prostitute, whose virtue has ceased to be saleable, crawling out from the hiding places of her shame takes an appeal to public charity and, instead of denying anything, calls upon her accusers to specify and prove her alleged offenses, she is not generally supposed to establish thereby any very strong claim upon public confidence and favor.

The next day, Montez penned a lengthy and angry letter to Henry Raymond, published in *The New York Times* and other papers, that expressed her outrage over the comparison, and threatened a lawsuit if he did not issue an immediate public retraction of "every calumny and slander" that he had ever made about her. She admitted that her career had been "wild, eccentric and unfortunate--but not guilty in the light you pretend to show it, and which you would convey to others for my detriment, so unjustly and unmanly." Montez pointed out that she had not been abused by some New York papers, but

> from others I have received the most cruel, uncalled for and constant abuse and, foremost among them has been your 'Daily Times.' You, sir, call upon me, a helpless woman, to make my enemies prove that I am 'a brazen prostitute.' . . . I will appeal to a jury of American men, your own citizens, to make you prove your words, or make you and your press compensate me so far as a deep wrong to a woman can be compensated for . . . .

Sir, you may find to your cost, that American law and an American jury will protect me from the vile slanders of an American paper and an American gentleman!!" 46

Raymond defended himself in *The New York Times*, explaining that he had never "designedly" attacked Montez's
character; but, admitted that "incidentally and in connection with other topics we have made allusions to her, which good taste and, perhaps, strict justice should have been excluded." The statement concerning a brazen prostitute was never "designed to be applied to her at all:--it was entirely general in its terms and was intended to be so understood;" Raymond claimed he was merely drawing a parallel between the mode of defense Montez adopted in her published letters, and the defense made by the Common Council. Furthermore, the statements made about Montez, in conjunction with her visit to the Boston public schools, were "intended to rebuke" the school officials for their gross violations of propriety [their allowing Montez to visit the schools?], and not to hold Montez "up to public odium." Raymond indicated that he had published what he had heard about Montez from "public rumor" and the European press, and was "not prepared to question" Montez's denial of such. He concluded that the publication of her letter to him in his paper established his support for her denial of spurious rumors, despite prefatory remarks which may have cast doubt on the contents of her letter. 47

His convoluted and patently disingenuous response dissatisfied Montez. Through her lawyers John and James T. Brady, she initiated a libel suit against Raymond and the owners of The New York Times for $60,000.00. 48 Eventually, the case was settled out of court in some way,
for New York papers do not continue a discussion of the controversy.

Following the episode with Raymond, Montez joined friends who had arrived from Paris in July, for a prairie excursion and buffalo hunt in the West. She returned to New York by September, just in time to participate in New York's Great Dramatic Festival. Held on September 6, 1852, at New York's Castle Garden Theatre—an outdoor pleasure garden that featured a stage—the Great Dramatic Festival celebrated the centennial of the introduction of theatre to America at Fredricksburg, Virginia. Organized by H. J. Conway, the festival contributed to the American Dramatic Fund, which provided support for aged, destitute, or, otherwise needy actors. Conway pulled together native and foreign actors, managers, dancers and musicians from all of the theatres in New York, and advertised them as "the First Talent in the United States." In addition to numerous songs, dances and farces, the evening's performance included a four-act version of Shakespeare's The Merchant of Venice. Named first on the bill, Montez performed an un-identified solo dance, along with her Sailor's Hornpipe, which received tremendous applause along with numerous bouquets from an audience estimated as between seven and eight thousand. If the audience truly numbered seven thousand, Conway and company raised
around $3500.00 for the American Dramatic Fund, since all tickets sold for $.50 each.

Soon after the festival, Montez left New York for Boston where she appeared as an actress only, at the Howard Athenaeum between September 20 and October 2, 1852. Her opening night in *Lola Montez in Bavaria* inaugurated the theatre's 1852-1853 season and marked the Howard's new management under Henry Willard. After he secured the lease from Wyzeman Marshall, Willard thoroughly re-decorated and re-furnished the theatre's interior. He also organized a powerful new stock company said to embrace artists of celebrity and superior talent, and touted as "the most efficient *corps dramatique* that has ever appeared in Boston."  

The timing of her engagement coincided with new management at the Howard, proving mutually beneficial to Montez and Willard. With Montez, the new manager offered a star of proven artistic and popular success in Boston. She enjoyed the benefit of new scenery, an experienced supporting cast and public interest in the renovated theatre, as well as curiosity about the story of her life. Beyond the novelties of magicians at the Melodeon and Barnum's Armory Hall, the greatest competition Montez faced for her two-week engagement came from the remainder of Julia Bennett's four-week engagement at the Boston Museum. Principally a comedienne, Bennett had been billed as a
"star" when she made her American debut at E. A. Marshall's Broadway theatre in New York in 1851; now her comic talents had to compete with Montez's star appeal in the play about her life. 52

On September 20, 1852, with the Mayor and city Aldermen attending in special seats provided by Willard, a crowded house enthusiastically cheered Montez's Boston debut in Lola Montez in Bavaria. She "played her part with exceedingly good taste in the new play," assisted by a company described as "the best that ever appeared upon the boards of the Howard." 53

In her first trip to Boston Montez had earned greater critical and popular response than she had in New York city. Accordingly, she may have decided that Boston provided the most receptive environment for her debut in dramatic roles beyond her personal experience. Throughout her second week's engagement at the Howard, instead of continuing Lola Montez in Bavaria, Montez performed the title roles in two new melodramas, Maritana, Maid of Saragossa and Charlotte Corday. Allegedly written by H. J. Conway, the plays are not extant; but, newspapers have provided some indication of their content.

Maritana is based on imaginary incidents connected with the celebrated siege of the Spanish city, Saragossa, by the French in 1808. The first act introduces Montez in the title role disguised as a Gipsey girl. When Maritana
enters the French camp outside the city, she predicts the failure of their plan to defeat Saragossa, and is rescued by newly arrived Spanish forces. When Maritana's love, Alphonse, is chosen to fill slots in the Spanish forces, his fear prevents him from taking the "prescribed oath." Unresponsive to Maritana's attempts to inspire his courage the night preceding the battle, Alphonse attempts suicide, but is saved by Maritana. In an effort to "shield him from dishonor," Maritana disguises herself in his uniform, participates in the battle and performs heroic "exploits" which are credited to Alphonse. "Fear for her safety inspires him with courage." Subsequently, he rescues her, and "is rewarded for her feats of valor." 54

Much like Lola Montez in Bavaria, the play depicts Montez's character, Maritana, as a noble, self-sacrificing heroine, willing to risk her life for freedom and the honor of her lover. In a few remarkable aspects, the relationship of Maritana and Alphonse roughly parallels that of Montez's with Ludwig I of Bavaria. Although she never admitted that she was Ludwig's lover, Montez gave Ludwig the courage to pursue democratic reform in Bavaria, and when Montez found herself barricaded in the Theatiner Church by the Ultramontane student party, Ludwig came to her rescue. Informed audience members undoubtedly noted the parallels between Montez's life with Ludwig and Maritana's with Alphonse. Audiences also may have noticed
that as Maritana, Montez impersonated a male, as she might have if she secretly returned to Bavaria to consult with Ludwig after her banishment. Similarly, J. Stirling Coyne's play about Montez featured the Montez figure, Zepherine Jolijambe, impersonating a male and using pistols to her advantage.

Mid-nineteenth century theatre featured the novelty of females in "breeches parts," roles originally written for men but played by women. Charlotte Cushman, for example, created unique interpretations of Romeo, Hamlet, and the part of Cardinal Wolsey in Henry VIII. The practice received criticism from some who considered it unnatural, immodest and unwomanly. But, for many it was an appealing novelty, providing a titillating display of legs and ankles when an actress wore breeches and tights. While Montez had yet to perform an authentic breeches part, she took advantage of the opportunity to wear male disguise.

Charlotte Corday presented Montez's title character as a romanticized, noble heroine of revolution. In real life, Charlotte Corday, a descendant of Pierre Corneille, murdered Jean Paul Marat in his bathtub in 1793, in an effort to further the French revolution against the monarchy. Expecting death and martyrdom, Corday pinned her baptismal certificate to her dress, along with a note that explained that she believed herself the saviour of France,
or, an eighteenth century Joan of Arc. The scene of this bathtub assassination became the subject of numerous artists, sculptors and dramatists. Aware of popular imagery, and the noble intent of Corday, Montez commissioned a script from H. J. Conway to complement her American republican sentiment.

Essentially a melodrama, the play opens with Corday brooding in her native village over the "sad condition of France." Fired with a desire to rid France of the "monster Marat," Corday finds him in Paris, where she stabs him. Arrested, she is tried as a "being of angelic beauty and accomplishments," but she is convicted and quickly guillotined. 57

Unlike the work-a-day actress, Montez had the power to commission plays that portrayed her in consistently strong female roles, like Charlotte Corday and Maritana, that complemented her real-life identity. By contrast, the typical working actress could mainly expect to play the roles of "vaporous heroines who fainted and shrieked with regularity." 58 However, Montez's star power allowed her to arrange for specific texts that reinforced her reputation as a strong female representative of democratic rights.

Montez drew crowded houses during her stay in Boston, but little else is known concerning the reception of her debut appearances in Charlotte Corday, and Maritana at
Boston's Howard Athenaeum. Typically, each play formed a bill completed by a short afterpiece, but on October 1, 1852, the two melodramas constituted the full bill for Montez's second benefit at the Howard.

When Montez returned to Philadelphia, newspapers offered responses to the new plays in her repertoire. On this visit she performed for the first time at the Chestnut Street Theatre, managed by W. S. Fredericks. With a capacity for 2000 spectators, the Chestnut Street Theatre competed with the Walnut Street Theatre, and the Arch Street Theatre. By the time Montez appeared, Fredericks' new management had re-established the Chestnut as a first class theatre with extraordinary success.

Montez performed *Lola Montez in Bavaria* for the first three nights of her two-week engagement at the Chestnut, along with the *Spider Dance* on her opening night, October 11, 1852. She appeared in *Charlotte Corday* for her next four appearances, and *Maritana* in her next two. *Lola Montez in Bavaria*, *Charlotte Corday*, and *Maritana* were alternately coupled for her performances on October 21 through 23, 1852. Although company farces typically completed the evening's bill, Montez also performed in *Lola Montez in New York*, on October 21, 1852. The farce, originally planned for New York audiences, apparently, achieved only this single performance, its humor, perhaps,
lost on audiences unaware of the New York references in the script.

Although she scored a popular success, neither Montez, nor her repertoire of roles, succeeded with Philadelphia critics. Fitzgerald's City Item commented that Lola Montez in Bavaria was "a production entitled to the highest prize for stupidity and insufferable nonsense. . . . There is nothing in the piece or the performance to provoke the slightest mention." The paper suggested that Montez would continue to draw large audiences; but, if she hoped to establish a reputation as an actress, she had to provide critics with pieces that possessed merit, and, ones by which her ability could be judged. In a similar manner, Charles Durang recorded Montez's popular success; but, of the play, observed that "We do not deny the author's ingenuity in its construction and piquant dialogue, but it was in its theme in harmony with the stupendous humbuggery of the heroine." 64

Fitzgerald's advised that in Charlotte Corday, "Some of the language is quite respectable, but there are numerous absurdities, and the plot does not conform to history." Greatly impressed by Montez, however, the paper declared that her performance in the title role was an unexpected "triumph." Although he found fault with her "pronunciation and emphasis," the critic considered Montez's understanding of the role "chaste and just. . . .
She presented a faithful and beautiful picture of the youthful enthusiast—engrossed by one great thought—the desire to free her country from a tyrant." 65

Durang also criticized the play—the subject was "hackneyed and revolting"—and Montez, as well. In Durang's opinion, she "lacked most woefully dramatic ability and declamatory powers to render the fiery and spirited patriotic appeals of the inspired Charlotte in any way acceptable to intelligence." Describing her energy as "namby-pamby," and her style "bizarre," Durang called her performance, the "decollation [beheading] of the Countess of Lansfeldt." 66 He dismissed Maritana as "another clap-trap drama." 67 Fitzgerald's, also unimpressed with the play, considered Maritana a weaker character than Charlotte. "There is nothing in the part, and the greatest credit we can award her is that she made the most of it." 68

It is difficult to measure the taste and sophistication of Montez's American reviewers; however, knowledge about her Philadelphia critics qualifies their remarks. Charles Durang (1796-1870) was an experienced theatre-goer who, as the son of the famous early American dancer/actor John Durang (1768-1822), grew up in the theatre and established himself in New York and Philadelphia as an actor, dancer and choreographer. 69 Although the identity of the critic for Fitzgerald's City
Item remains unknown, the paper was dedicated to the arts. A national theatre newspaper, it chronicled and evaluated theatrical efforts from coast-to-coast.

By the end of October 1852, Montez could take some measure of her decision to turn to acting, and the three plays in her repertoire. *Lola Montez in Bavaria* drew large audiences, although the play encountered mixed critical response. In New York city, the largest and most active theatrical city in the United States, Montez scored popular and critical success at two different theatres as a result of her life-like performance in what many considered a witty autobiographical play. Her Bowery Theatre performances mark the high point of her popularity in the northeast. Boston and Philadelphia audiences enthusiastically greeted her in *Lola Montez in Bavaria*; but Philadelphia critics found the play lacking in merit. The city's critics had few favorable comments for Montez's new acting vehicles, *Maritana* and *Charlotte Corday*; however, one critic was greatly impressed by her natural acting abilities.

While the American public was drawn to anything concerning Montez, at this early point in her acting career reviewers clearly favored her eponymous play above her two other dramatic vehicles. Also, despite the fact that Montez had maintained a lady-like composure--her one instance with Smith perhaps justified--some critics still
seemed influenced by reports of Montez's character when evaluating her performance.

As the end of her first year in the United States approached, Montez undoubtedly had exhausted her audiences in the northeastern and mid-Atlantic areas. Having succeeded as a dancer, and as an actress who attracted large houses in the play of her life, she was in a position to search for new audiences. No doubt, like many other touring stars who viewed the United States as a market to explore, she turned to the nearby South where she could anticipate warmer winter weather, as well as new and profitable audiences.

Notes—Chapter 7

1 New York Evening Mirror 18 May 1852.

2 The New York Herald 27 May 1852; the life and career of C. P. T. Ware has never been chronicled.

3 The New York Herald 18, 20, 22, 23, 24, 26 May 1852; New York Evening Mirror 19 May 1852.

4 Of her eighty-four performances in the United States, Montez had appeared in Carneval fifty times.

5 The New York Herald 25 May 1852.

6 The New York Herald 27 May 1852.

7 Joseph Francis Daly, The Life of Augustin Daly (New York: Macmillan Co., 1917) 20.

Members of Marshall's Broadway Theatre stock company portrayed the principal roles that supported Montez; other minor parts were completed by members of Marshall's stock company. Thomas Barry played the role of Ludwig; a Mr. Conway, probably Frederick Conway, played the role of Ludwig's Jesuit Prime Minister, D'Abel; a Mr. Fenno, perhaps Augustus William Fenno, created the part of Poppenheim; and, a Mr. Davidge, perhaps William Pleater Davidge, enacted the role of von Schootenbottem. See Plate 13.

Numerous New York theatres provided various popular acts and staple productions when Montez made her acting debut; however, none could match her timely and novel appeal. See The New York Herald 25 May 1852.

Charles Durang, "The Philadelphia Stage from the Year 1749 to the Year 1855. Partly Compiled from the Papers of His Father, the Late John Durang with Notes by the Editors [of the Philadelphia Sunday Dispatch.]" Philadelphia Sunday Dispatch 11 October 1852. Hereinafter cited as Durang.

La Zapateado may have been Montez's Spider Dance. Apparently ignorant of national character dance distinctions, mid-nineteenth century newspapers variously advertised her Spider Dance as a Pas d'Andalusia, or La Zapateado. (See Mobile Daily Register 22 December 1852; and, Rochester Daily Advertiser 12 May 1852.)
22 Republic 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 June 1852.
23 Republic 9 June 1852.
24 Republic 9 June 1852.
25 Metropolitan 12 June 1852.
26 New York Day Book 7 July 1852.
27 Baltimore American and Commercial Daily Advertiser 11 June 1852.
29 The Baltimore Sun 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 June 1852.
30 Baltimore American and Commercial Daily Advertiser 17, 18, 19 June 1852.
34 The New York Herald 12 June 1852.
35 New York Day Book 29 June 1852.
36 New York Day Book 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 July 1852.
37 The New York Herald 8 July 1852.
38 The New York Herald 6 July 1852.
39 New York Evening Mirror 8 July 1852.
40 New York Day Book 9 July 1852.
41 New York Day Book 9 July 1852.
42 The New York Herald 6 July 1852.
43 The Pick 12 June 1852.
44 New York Evening Mirror 10 July 1852.
45 The Pick 7 August 1852; Mobile Daily Register 25 December 1852. The Mobile paper, perhaps mistakenly, identified the author as J. S. Conway; but, unless two New York playwrights shared an initial and the same last name the dramatist in question must be H. J. Conway. No J. S. Conway appears in Wemyss' Chronology of the Stage, or in T. Allston Brown's History of the American Stage.
46 New York Evening Mirror 16, 17 1852.
48 New York Evening Mirror 17 July 1852; The Pick 7 August 1852.
49 New York Day Book 22 July 1852.
50 The Pick 11 September 1852; The New York Herald 6, 7 September 1852; Francis C. Wemyss, Wemyss' Chronology of the American Stage, From 1752 To 1852 (1852; New York: Benjamin Blom, 1968) 186.
51 The Boston Post 20 September 1852.
52 Boston Daily Evening Transcript 20 September 1852; The Boston Post 28 September 1852; Wemyss 32.
53 The Boston Post 20, 21 September 1852. As a likely result of her earlier controversy with its editor, Epes Sargent, the Boston Daily Evening Transcript provided no commentary, beyond theatrical advertisements, concerning Montez's return to Boston.
54 Fitzgerald's City Item 23 October 1852.
55 Noah M. Ludlow, Dramatic Life As I Found It (1880; New York: Benjamin Blom, 1966) 463; Ludlow considered breeches parts "a series of monstrosities . . . objects of disgust."

57 Fitzgerald's City Item 23 October 1852.

58 Johnson 59.

59 Fitzgerald's City Item 2 October 1852.

60 The Boston Post 1 October 1852.

61 Fitzgerald's City Item 23 October 1852.

62 The Pennsylvania Enquirer 19-21 October 1852.

63 The Pennsylvania Enquirer 21 October 1852.

64 Fitzgerald's City Item 16 October 1852; Durang 347.

65 Fitzgerald's City Item 23 October 1852.

66 Durang, 11 October 1852.

67 Durang, 11 October 1852.

68 Fitzgerald's City Item 23 October 1852.

Chapter 8. The 'Cynosure of All [Southern] Eyes'
December 1852 to February 1853

In the early 1840s, Fanny Elssler had created a furor among Charlestonians when she performed La Sylphide and other dances; her success had been eclipsed only by that of Jenny Lind's concert appearances in 1850.¹ In the light of such successful figures Montez made her first appearance in the South at the Charleston Theatre in Charleston, South Carolina.² Managed by John Sloman, a comic actor who had "appeared infrequently in Charleston for more than twenty years,"³ the Charleston Theatre could seat 1200 spectators, and functioned as a stock house that welcomed stellar attractions. In the month that preceded Montez's engagement, the American star, Julia Dean appeared in mid-century favorites such as John Sheridan Knowles' The Hunchback, Edward Bulwer-Lytton's The Lady of Lyons,⁴ and the bard's Romeo and Juliet.⁵

Between 1850 and 1860, Charleston's caucasian population numbered 23,000.⁶ By the time that Montez arrived, Charleston's population supported only one theatre on a regular basis.⁷ However, often attended by Charleston's fashionable society, Hibernian Hall provided competition by presenting the "Unequalled Musical Wonder, The Infant Drummer,"⁸ a child prodigy who played in many of the cities Montez visited during her southern tour.
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Billed as the "CELEBRATED M'LE LOLA MONTEZ, COUNTESS OF LANDSFELT," Montez played a five-night star engagement at Sloman's theatre, December 6 to 10, 1852. Each of her performances provided the evening's main event, supplemented by a company farce. During her stay in Charleston, Montez performed Maritana, Maid of Saragossa, her Spider Dance, and Lola Montez in Bavaria.

Theatre-goers filled the house "from Parquette to Gallery" for her first night performance of Maritana. The critic for the Charleston Evening News, considered Montez beautiful, with "expressive features, a faultless figure, and a lustrous eye." However, he found her lacking in vocal skill and appropriate physical stature for the role: "The purpose was to exhibit the grand and heroic in the character of Maritana . . . [Montez's] voice and figure are not suited to this class of characters, the former exhibiting a species of falsetto in passion, although her action and utterance are sufficiently energetic as well as graceful."

From Charleston Montez traveled by steamer to another popular stop on the star circuit, Joseph Field's Mobile Theatre in Mobile, Alabama. The same kind of mania that attended Fanny Elssler's tour of America in the 1840s, and Jenny Lind's recent 1850 appearances in the United States, greeted Montez in Mobile. Several articles in Mobile papers expressed interest and concern about how her past
exploits might affect her reception, as well as eager anticipation for her performances. "Downeast some of the saints have been investigating her private character, but as yet without proving anything very terrible about it," commented the Alabama Planter; "[w]e hope our people will let it alone. Most folks have enough to do to take care of their own characters, and they should apply to them what time they can spare from other more pressing matters." 14

The Mobile Daily Register of December 19, 1852, announced that "The danseuse, the politician, and theologian; the terror of the Jesuits, the favorite of an Emperor, and the cynosure of all eyes; will make her first appearance on the Mobile stage tomorrow evening. . . . already we are impatient. 15

Perhaps, part of those equally impatient included patrons of J. B. Fellows & Co. Clothing Emporium in Mobile. The establishment had run an ad on December 17, 1852 for a "Gents Super Black Cloth Lola Montes Negligée," a male's dressing gown [?], also available in several different shades. 16 Earlier, Fanny Elssler had inspired New York clothiers to name hats, boots and cuffs in her honor; 17 Montez did the same with dressing gowns in Mobile.

Originally expected on Saturday, December 18, 1852, accidents and poor travel conditions delayed her arrival aboard the steamer Louisa, until Monday, and increased anticipation. The Mobile Daily Register reported "The
excitement . . . was tremendous! The epidemic was universal. Not a seat was disengaged . . . . Every hour of yesterday, the constant inquiry was--"Has Lola arrived?"--yet not until ten minutes until the Theatre was opened had the **Louisa** and the **Lola** arrived."  

When the crowd learned that Montez could not perform immediately, it stormed the theatre, and "In a few minutes Mr. Field brought word that the fair lady was too fatigued to appear."  

Montez satisfied demands with six performances, between December 21 and 28, 1852, in the Mobile Theatre.  

Built in 1841 by the famous theatrical entrepreneur, James H. Caldwell, the large and elegant theatre could hold 1,878 spectators.  

The powerful theatre managers, Sol Smith and Noah Ludlow had acquired the Theatre in 1843; but, after several profitless seasons they transferred its management to Joseph M. Field in 1850.  

A protege of Smith and Ludlow, Field (1810-1856) had risen to the rank of star in their Mobile, St. Louis and New Orleans companies. Under his "able and aggressive" management, the Mobile Theatre was regaining the success that had eluded it earlier--perhaps, because Field created a strong stock company and engaged popular stars like Montez.  

A small port city, Mobile was a popular stop on the southern theatrical circuit, although not as important as
New Orleans or St. Louis. By the time that Montez arrived the Mobile Theatre was, perhaps, the leading site of entertainment in the city. Beyond horse-races at the Mobile Trotting club, little other organized social activities competed with theatrical interests. Montez's primary competition for audiences came from Dan (Thomas Dartmouth) Rice's Hippodrome which featured minstrel shows, circus acts and Dan Rice in a parody of Shakespeare's Hamlet, which played throughout her run at the Mobile Theatre. The St. Charles Theatre remained dark until December 27, 1852, when Julia Dean began a star engagement.

Montez made her greatly anticipated Mobile debut on December 21, 1852, to a house that was "running over from parquette to gallery," that included a large number of highly enthusiastic ladies. A considerable number of patrons "never got more than a glimpse" of Montez, including the critic, when Montez appeared in two "GRAND CHARACTERISTIC DANCES," (the Sailor's Dance and the Spider Dance) interspersed between the company farces of Wife for Half an Hour, Cool as a Cucumber, by M. W. B. Jerrold, and Buckstone's Shocking Events. "Boisterous" audience response called Montez "before the curtain" at the end of each of her dances; and, on her "last call," she made a "brief expression of her thanks,
which was exceedingly elegant and touching, and delivered
in very choice language.--This was the hit of the
evening."  

An equally crowded house greeted Montez's second
night's performance, Wednesday, December 22, 1852.
Noting that "the beauty and fashion of the city" filled the
dress circle to study Montez, a local critic described her
dancing as "all vigor, energy and expression, . . .
characterized by the same strong features that have
rendered her career, as a woman, so remarkable."  
The critic preferred Montez's Spider Dance over her Sailor's
Dance, and found her "animation and flexibility of
countenance and frame of motion" especially impressive.
While he did not consider Montez an artist of the "first
class," he considered her style so unique that he could not
compare her to any other dancer he had witnessed.  

Having won an enthusiastic response from Mobilians for
her two nights of dance, Montez turned to her acting
repertoire, beginning with Lola Montez in Bavaria.  
The drama concerning a "remarkable" period in Montez's
life, as well as the promise of "new and beautiful"
scenery helped build audience anticipation.
Advertisements promised that "the residence of Lola Montez
in Munich, one of the royal palaces, is a faithful copy of
a very fine engraving, representing that building; the
royal library is also given."
Beginning December 23, 1852, Montez appeared in *Lola Montez in Bavaria*, for two consecutive evenings, adding her *Sailor's Dance* on the second night. On the first night, Montez attracted a "jammed" house "with every seat and standing place" occupied. The "dress circle presented quite a brilliant appearance, from the number of the fair sex who graced the house on this occasion by their presence." The theatre was "again crowded" on December 24, but "not so uncomfortably" as the night before.

Both Montez and her play delighted Mobile critics and audience members. Montez was "perfect. . . . Her whole appearance and manner were charmingly natural." The same critic considered *Lola Montez in Bavaria* interesting in a "political sense," and theatrically pleasing since its "merits" included sharp dialogue that resulted in effective scenes, and characters that encapsulated "perfect gems . . . as representatives of society." At the end of the play's first performance, the house called for Montez to "receive the plaudits of the most enthusiastic audience ever assembled."

On Christmas Day, 1852, Montez performed the title role in *Maritana*, along with an unspecified "Grand Characteristic Dance." Manager Joseph Field appeared in the play with Montez, probably playing Alphonse, the male lead to Montez's Maritana.
In a benefit performance of Lola Montez in Bavaria, Montez made her final appearance on the Mobile stage, December 28, 1852; she also danced La Sevilliana. 

Performed by popular demand, Montez's autobiographical play had proved the most popular with audiences because of its foreign setting, political intrigue and support of "republican principles;" it drew the "greatest house of the season." 

The enthusiasm of the fashionable audience at her benefit was so great that it insisted that she repeat La Sevilliana. Although Montez often made curtain speeches, her address to the Mobilians seemed especially earnest and complimentary. "Laboring under considerable agitation," Montez remarked:

Ladies and Gentlemen: I must say a few words before I leave you. Mobile is the first city in the South I have visited, and your kind and generous support will, probably, give me a great success in your glorious South. I now say farewell to you. In a short time, when over the wide waters, far distant away, (for I know not soon where I may be), when you have, perhaps, forgotten me, believe me, I shall recollect you and your kindness with heartfelt gratitude and pleasure. Farewell.

Amidst a "tumult of applause" Montez bowed and left the stage. Mobile was not the first city in the south that Montez had visited, but it was the first recorded ['deep' South] city, where audiences expressed unreserved enthusiasm. Montez may have been reluctant to leave such adulation; but, the Mobile Daily Advertiser predicted that
she would soon discover a similar, if not greater reception in New Orleans. 45

On the heels of a reported "immense success" in Mobile, Montez arrived by mailboat on New Year's Eve of 1852, 46 in New Orleans, the hub of the southern touring circuit. The timing of her arrival aided Montez. She reached New Orleans in the winter season when the port city's fluctuating French, Spanish and frontier population could fluctuate from between twenty-five and fifty-thousand. Providing perceptive insight into the refined as well as the rough and ready appetite of the audience at hand, the editor of the New Orleans Daily Crescent commented that

They wish to see novel sights, to crowd a year into a few months. . . . Notorieties and novelties are absolute necessities to the excitable populations of cities. . . . It matters little what the novelty or notoriety may be--a gifted opera singer or a learned pig . . . trained dogs and monkies or a splendid Shakespearian actor, a clown ready in grotesque act or a danseuse graceful or eccentric in evolutions. It is only necessary that it should be a novelty or philosophy of human nature, the curious desire for what is new, because it--is new. 47

Lola Montez suited such a theatrical climate, but she also faced competition.

Throughout her four week engagement, audiences could choose from a wide variety of entertainments. Managers Sol Smith and Noah Ludlow, at the St. Charles Theatre, offered melodramas, comedies and farces, with Julia Dean as their star attraction. The Orleans theatre, the home of
America's first permanent opera company, provided operas that ranged from Rossini's *Semiramide* and *Othello* to Bellini's *Norma*. The American Theatre billed amusements that varied from Donetti's "wonderful TROUPE of . . . Acting MONKEYS, DOGS, and GOATS" to Kunkel's Nightengale Opera Troupe which performed "ETHIOPIAN MINSTRELSY." Dan Rice's Hippodrome Theatre opened January 13th, providing New Orleanians with equestrian entertainment along with other menagerie acts.

The wide variety of attractions in the Crescent City provided a challenge for Montez in drawing audiences consistently large enough to insure her success at Thomas Placide's Varieties Theatre. With her talent, title, reputation, Spanish dancing, and beautiful, Latin appearance Montez was an ideal "novelty" for a port city known for its mix of the refined as well as the rough and ready.

New Orleans reporters aided Montez in creating anticipation of her imminent arrival and announced her establishment of lodgings at the Verandah Hotel. Several articles referred to her sensational past and expressed great curiosity concerning her talents as a performer. The *New Orleans Daily Picayune* predicted she would "fill the house to overflowing," in "an event of no mean importance to theatrical circles. There will be as much curiosity to see her, as an artist, as to see one whose name has created
such a sensation in the highest circles of fashion, in other areas and adventures."  

Montez made her New Orleans debut at the Varieties Theatre, typically called, Placide's Varieties, since its manager, Thomas Placide, initiated its construction in 1849. The theatre held approximately 1200 spectators, and specialized in light amusements: vaudeville, farce, burlesque and ballet. By 1853, Placide had created one of the finest stock companies in the country, but Montez's debut at the Varieties marked the first time that a star, who had appeared in so many different countries, performed at the theatre.  

On the day of her debut the New Orleans Commercial Bulletin expressed the usual challenge Montez faced with new audiences: "Expectation is on tip toe to see LOLA MONTEZ, whose chequered career has been for some years past the theme of universal wonderment. . . . Whether she has genius, talent and accomplishments, as an actress and danseuse--for she is both--the audience tonight will be able to judge."  

For her debut, Montez selected only her popular Lola Montez in Bavaria, followed by a company farce, The Family Jars, by Joseph Lunn. Opening night proved to be an unqualified success. In spite of raised ticket prices, the public flocked to the theatre: From parquette to gallery the house was full, crammed, jammed, with as tough a looking crowd of
hard-fisted Republicans as you could see on a general election day. No white cravats and stiff shirt collars . . . no rose scented scarfs, nor any of the frippery that belongs to uppertendom; but a good hard set instead . . . . The attendance of ladies was sparse, some two dozen, perhaps, being present. 57

Although the beaux and belles of New Orleans did not attend Montez's debut performance in great number, they witnessed her later performances in full force. When Montez first appeared, "it was with such a mild effulgence—such a deprivation of all that glare and glitter which her distant reputation had led many to expect, that much disappointment was evinced by the audience." 58 Instead of playing off of her "glittering" reputation, Montez concentrated on establishing herself as a serious performer. The New Orleans Daily Crescent noted that "the rising of the curtain revealed her without extraneous adornment, sitting at a table, putting on no extraordinary airs, and seemingly intending no display." 59

Apparently disgruntled by a lack of spectacle, an audience member, in the parquette, tried to raise a "hiss" against Montez, but "With consummate assurance," Montez stepped out of the scene, came down to the footlights and spoke: "Ladies and Gentlemen. If you wish me to perform I shall be very happy to gratify you; but if an attempt is made to get up a cabal against me, I must retire." 60 Montez then bowed, began to leave and "was only prevented from leaving the stage by a loud and unanimous burst of
applause. This was a masterstroke . . . her prompt resistance to the supposed insult developed her 'spunk' and turned the tide of popular feeling in her favor." The remainder of the evening "went off quietly save when interrupted by laughter or applause which was frequent and hearty. At the end of the play she was warmly called out, and expressed her thanks in a neat and brief address." Critic response to Montez's debut as an actress was largely supportive, but, clearly, most critics were waiting for her upcoming performance of the Spider Dance at the end of the week. Nonetheless, the New Orleans Daily Picayune found "not much of the legitimate actress about [her, yet] she has a free and easy style of her own, which appears to be perfectly natural." The writer noted that Montez was vivacious, piquant, possessed of a "good command of a voice [that was] weak and sharp," as well as a "thin face, spirited and expressive, with big, flashing black eyes." Another critic found that she "acted out her part in a very piquant and effective manner." The writer for the Daily Crescent described her as "of ordinary size [and] sufficiently stout. . . . She has none of that Amazonian aspect and manner attributed to her by northern and European letter writers." He admitted "We thought at first she was over-rated and we think so yet. . . . That she is no actress is perfectly clear. . . ." While the same critic's later comments indicate that his opinion
of her performance was affected by his distaste for the "interminable piece" she was performing, his remarks had no effect on the popular success of Montez's engagement at the Varieties.

New Orleans critics reacted negatively to Montez's play. The New Orleans Daily Picayune remarked that "the dramatist certainly had a subject full of interest and variety; but though the piece is by no means dull, yet it lacks vivacity and drags somewhat," and suggested that the dramatist should have given Montez an opportunity to display her dance ability in the play. The New Orleans Daily Crescent was also unenthusiastic.

Whether or not Lola Montez in Bavaria possessed literary or dramatic merit, however, was almost irrelevant, for, as in Mobile, New Orleans audiences became "Montez mad." Of her twenty-eight performances at Placide's Varieties, Montez performed Lola Montez in Bavaria eleven times. Out of her four benefit performances on January 8, 15, 22, and 29, 1853, the play made the bill three times.

Following her debut and for the next three evenings, Montez performed only Lola Montez in Bavaria; each night a company farce completed the bill. Montez consistently played to large houses, composed of both males and females, and drawn from the rougher, "hard fisted" elements of society, as well as the upper classes. By her second night, there was a "much larger number of ladies present
than on the evening previous, all of whom seemed highly pleased: the gentlemen were prepared with bouquets and dispensed them liberally to the fine actress." 72 By January 6, 1853, newspapers announced that "the house was nearly filled with ladies last evening and we suppose it will be so on this and succeeding evenings." 73 By the end of her first week's engagement, it was estimated that "at one time or another, nearly all [the] playgoing masculines and many of [the] city ladies" had attended one of her performances. 74

Well satisfied with Montez's initial performance as an actress, New Orleans audiences eagerly anticipated her dance debut, in the Spider Dance on January 7, 1853, 75 an event that created even more excitement than had her acting debut. The largely female audience that filled the theatre, eager to see "her novel and eccentric 'Spider Dance,'" composed "as fine an attendance of the fair and fashionable as has graced the . . . Varieties since the good times past 'of glorious memory.'" 76

Montez defied the audience's expectation of "bursting" into view with "torturing attitudes." Attired in an Andalusian-style, long skirted dress, with "lady-like chasteness in all the details" Montez "stepped out upon the boards--easy and graceful, and displaying cruralities [i.e. limbs] of matchless symmetry." 77 The New Orleans Daily Picayune described her dance as "not precisely a copy, or
servile imitation of 'La Tarantule' [Elssler's famous rendition of the Tarantella], but—possess[ing] many traits in common with it." 78 The New Orleans Commercial Bulletin found her dancing unique, passionate and beautiful: "We never saw anything like it, and never expect to again from any other person. The danseuse was graceful and spirited . . . and gave way to abandon seldom seen . . . she is attractive as an original, and which cannot be disputed as a woman of genius." 79 Spectators "clapped their gloved and jeweled fingers, demanding its repetition;" and, although Montez declined the invitation, the "pleased auditors applauded again 'till echo answered it. . . . '" 80

After such an auspicious series of first week performances, Placide re-engaged Montez for three more weeks, each re-engagement announced weekly in the newspapers. Montez selected Charlotte Corday as the primary vehicle for her second week's run, January 10-14, adding a "Spanish Dance" on January 12, and her Sailor's Dance on January 13, 1853. Company farces concluded each evening's bill. 81 The republican virtues contained in Charlotte Corday no doubt especially appealed to the public's sense of patriotism, since it was produced two days after the national holiday, the "Eighth of January," which celebrated the Battle of New Orleans.
In *Charlotte Corday*, critics thought that Montez "appeared to better advantage . . . than in the Bavarian drama. She was spirited, piquant, and patriotic, if the applause of the audience constitutes a reliable criterion—and no better one can be found, we opine, in this land of immense republicanism." The *New Orleans Daily Picayune* considered the play a great success, and witnessed that Montez played with "much spirit . . . a perfect conception of the character. . . in good accordance with nature and history . . . ." During the last two weeks of her engagement at Placide's Varieties, between January 16 and 30, 1852, Montez performed her character dances, along with *Lola Montez in Bavaria, Charlotte Corday*, and *Maritana*: a company farce always completed each evening's entertainment. Perhaps as a result of her great success in New Orleans, and since she had an excellent supporting company, Montez also introduced two new plays to her dramatic repertoire: Richard Brinsley Sheridan's *The School for Scandal*, and a new play, *Clarissa Harlowe, or The Fatal Choice*, adapted from a French drama, based on Samuel Richardson's sentimental, epistolary novel, *Clarissa* (1748). The former, a staple comedy in nineteenth century theatre, offered Montez the opportunity to play a comic role as the attractive Lady Teazle.
The latter, a scarcely produced sentimental melodrama, provided her with another strong female character. Montez performed *Clarissa Harlowe, or The Fatal Choice* on January 17, 18, 28, and 30, 1853. The version Montez used may have been translated and adapted by herself. Her script is not extant, but Richardson's two-thousand-page novel concerns the intelligent and rigidly virtuous Clarissa Harlowe, an unselfish and dutiful daughter to her upper-middle class parents. When Clarissa learns of her parents' plan to marry her to a wealthy fop whom she detests, she stubbornly refuses. Lovelace, a dangerous rake and a past suitor of Clarissa's sister, Arabella, offers Clarissa sympathy, and tricks her into running off with him. Although Clarissa refuses Lovelace's passionate advances, he eventually rapes her. Clarissa slowly pines away and is returned to her family after death.

The *New Orleans Daily Picayune* commented that the plot was "an old one, a very old one, a remarkably venerable and antiquated one; but none the worse for that." Grateful that Montez's version was considerably "shortened" from the original novel, the critic found the play "heightened in incident and otherwise improved." Unlike some un-named company members, Montez played her part "with much fluency and readiness," before good houses.

Montez performed Lady Teazle in *The School for Scandal* only twice in New Orleans. Her first performance occurred
on one of her benefit nights, January 22, and her second on January 26, 1853. Montez created the role of the extravagant, headstrong, beautiful and youthful wife who confesses her folly to her husband, the much older Sir Peter Teazle in the famous "closet scene." Audiences may have noticed the similar dominant characteristics of Lady Teazle and Lola Montez, as well as the difference in age between Lady Teazle and her husband, and that of Montez and Ludwig I of Bavaria.

Montez found some success with Lady Teazle. The Daily Picayune reported that she had a good understanding of the character, unique, and "commendable," and "appeared to a better advantage in our eyes than in any other play in which we have seen her, with the possible exception of Lola Montez in Bavaria." However, on the same evening, Montez had difficulty with her Spider Dance. Because of the "dry and unwatered condition of the stage," she fell, and, evidently, displayed her great temper (perhaps swearing) since the Daily Picayune recorded that her fall produced "to some extent . . . those characteristics for which she has been so famed." 

In comparison to her acting, Montez's dancing evoked little newspaper report, although it was popularly received. Beyond her Spider Dance, Montez performed the Sailor's Dance and El Olé throughout her run at the Varieties. Her performance of El Olé was so successful on
the evening of January 21st that the audience demanded and received an encore performance. 93

After she completed her appearance at the Varieties, Montez secured an engagement at the Orleans Theatre—the home of New Orleans grand opera—for two performances of Spanish dance. On February 2nd, she performed La Zapateado, or her Spider Dance, and El Olé. On February 4th, she performed La Zapateado and a dance entitled La Grand Pas Hongrois, apparently a character dance of Hungarian origin.

Montez performed a grueling schedule in New Orleans, appearing seven nights a week, often in both a play and a specialty dance. For the first time Montez may have appreciated the difficulties of working as a full-time performer. For four consecutive weeks, she played featured roles, and in some plays that were new to her. 94 Company interactions may have benefitted her dancing and acting. A member of the Varieties company, Señor de Vegas, influenced her dance when he re-arranged her El Olé. 95 And, Montez met and worked with Sir William Don, 96 a talented comedian and, perhaps, the only other titled individual who attempted a stage career in the mid-nineteenth century.

Clearly, audiences in Mobile and New Orleans intoxicated with Montez mania, not only provided Montez with popular support, but also with courage to expand her
dramatic repertoire. Increased financial security netted Montez new artistic confidence and additional energy to continue her tour up-river to Ohio.

Arriving by steamboat, Telegraph # 3, on February 26, 1853, Montez took rooms at Cincinnati's Broadway Hotel. She faced the daunting task of filling the huge National Theatre for a two-week engagement. Owned by John Bates, the National Theatre could hold at least 5000 spectators, and functioned as a stock-star house—Charlotte Cushman having performed there in 1850.

The Cincinnati public thronged to her opening, on March 1, 1853, and experienced "ecstacies with the fair debutante." When Montez opened with her popular success in Lola Montez in Bavaria, she again surprised critics with her acting ability. Following her second night in the play, the Daily Cincinnati Commercial reported "acclamations of rapture," and urged the public to attend. The Enquirer found little "dramatic merit" in the play beyond Montez's role and the comic part of Baron von Poppenheim, played by Harry Eytinge. However, the critic considered Lola's acting "the most natural and life-like we have ever witnessed. It is free from that stiff and automaton expression so common on the stage." Another critic admitted he attended Lola Montez in Bavaria "much prejudiced against" Montez the actress, but by the end of the first act, found himself
applauding the "most naive, natural, and graceful actress that has ever adorned the boards of the National." Full of "life and animation" Montez "threw life and spirit into the play," using a "feminine, and exquisitely musical" voice. The critic described her reading as "sans reproche [without reproach]," her pronunciation "strictly correct," and added that her slight accent only served to make her reading "more bewitchingly fascinating." 103

Montez's popularity with Cincinnati audiences and critics continued throughout her run at the National. Critics found her dancing "the very personification of the poetry of motion." 104 Her performance in Maritana drew the largest audience the Commercial had ever seen; the critic believed that her Maritana was "so entirely different and distinct" from her autobiographical role, that Montez had "established beyond cavil her claims as an actress of great versatility." 105 Montez's performance of Lady Teazle was "an admirable picture of high life." Received with "tumults of applause" on March 7, it was repeated on March 8, 1853, to allow the "hundreds who were unable to gain admission" another opportunity to see it. 106

Nothing is known of how audiences and critics responded to Clarissa Harlowe, allegedly written by Montez herself. The Enquirer noted that "much interest will be manifested by her many admirers to witness a piece from her
own pen, and as a matter of course the house will be crowded;" however, no critical commentary was recorded. Not as popular as her other dramatic vehicles, Montez only performed the play twice in Cincinnati, and did perform it again elsewhere.

For her final performance in Cincinnati, March 15, 1853, Montez introduced a new work, Yelva! The Dumb Girl, and performed Zapateado, at a benefit for Harry Eytinge, an actor and the stage manager of the National Theatre. The play was probably a version of Yelva, or, the Orphan of Russia. Set in Paris and Russia, the play tells the story of a humble, mute, Russian orphan, Yelva, adopted by a French Count Gesanne, who took her to Paris to live with him, his wife, and his young son, Alfred. Alfred and Yelva eventually fall in love, and plan to marry, but on the day before her wedding Yelva learns from the Countess that the Count has lost his fortune, and verges on suicide. At the request of the Countess, Yelva agrees to leave the Gesanne family and never speak to Alfred again so that Alfred can marry Count Orloff's daughter, whose dowry will reinstate the family fortune. When the Countess sends Yelva to live with friends in Russia, her traveling party is attacked by bandits. Yelva barely survives, and endures great hardship in Russia before her wanderings bring her to the doorstep of Count Lovinsky, who has offered his home for Alfred's marriage.
Yelva soon discovers that the Count is really her brother, but when she embraces him, Alfred enters and suspects villainy. The shock of a potential duel between Alfred and Count Lovinsky restores Yelva's voice. The play ends on the suggestion that Yelva's newly discovered identity will allow her to marry Alfred and re-establish the Gesanne family fortune. Although not widely produced, the role of Yelva offered appeal for dancers who relied upon their pantomimic skills to convey Yelva's dumb-show.

The play was new to her American repertoire, but Montez indicated that she had previously performed it in Europe. Montez sent a letter to Harry Eytinge, published by the *Enquirer*, in which she stated *Yelva, or the Dumb Girl* was a play in which she performed "with ultra success in Europe, after my banishment from Bavaria." Whether or not her statement was true has never been verified. After its Cincinnati "debut," the play became a frequently produced portion of Montez's dramatic repertoire.

In Cincinnati, Montez scored another frenzied success, thrilling its "beauty and fashionables," especially its large German population who could appreciate her Bavarian democratic experience, as well as her beauty and ability. With overwhelming success in three cities in a row, Montez could hope for a fourth in St. Louis, where she arrived five days after her final appearance in Cincinnati.
Known as the "River Queen," the greatest inland port in the United States, St. Louis was already a bustling metropolis when Montez arrived on the steamship, Reindeer, March 20, 1853. A major center for trade and commerce up and down the Mississippi, St. Louis also marked the terminus of the eastern railroad and the beginning of the western railway system. In 1848, when the California Gold Rush started and land became available in the new western territories, St. Louis became the gateway to the west. An important location for trade, business and travel, St. Louis had a large multi-cultural population composed of French, German, Irish, English and Jewish immigrants. The St. Louis of the 1850s was a "little Europe," full of "throngs of immigrants, from foreign lands, from New England," who came to the city in search of "homes or employment or business opportunities." During the 1850s, St. Louis achieved a population of 77,860. Such a large and diverse populace supported three major theatres by 1853, and acted as the northern terminus of the Southern theatrical circuit.

Montez performed at the theatre managed by Joseph Field, the heir apparent to the Ludlow-Smith partnership that had controlled significant theatres up and down the Mississippi since 1837. Montez had appeared at Field's Mobile Theatre, inherited from Ludlow and Smith, and Field
had re-opened their St. Louis Theatre under the name of Field's Varieties in May of 1852, only ten months prior to Montez's visit. He inherited the scenery, sets, stage machinery, and wardrobe that Smith and Ludlow sold to the Varieties Association when they dissolved their St. Louis partnership. Field's Varieties easily accommodated 1600 spectators, and functioned as a stock-star house. A contemporary actor, Charles A. Krone, remembered that, "true to its name," the theatre "began with a variety of dramatic entertainments, and a host of artists whose efficiency in their several departments have never been surpassed." However, Field's initial management of the Varieties proved dismal, apparently because he catered to "fashionable audiences," and "'did not care to have a man who wore a check shirt inside'" his theatre. After such a failure for his first season, Field might have welcomed a Montez engagement for several weeks, since she had proven her appeal for all classes--especially the working class. Unfortunately for Field, he only engaged Montez for one week, March 21-26, 1853.

Two other major theatres operated in St. Louis in 1853, Bates' Theatre, and the People's Theatre. The former was managed by John Bates, who controlled Cincinnati's National Theatre, where Montez had just performed. Bates was in the process of selling his Cincinnati, Louisville and St. Louis theatres; and, although Montez had
enjoyed great success, and created friends, at Bates' Cincinnati theatre, she evidently thought it more advantageous to perform at a theatre that was not about to close, and which was managed by the aggressive successor to Solomon Smith and Noah Ludlow.

Managed by Julia Bennett, The People's Theatre also provided audiences with a visiting star, English actor, Gustavus Vaughan Brooke. As Montez performed at the Varieties, Brooke appeared in Shakespeare's Othello and Rob Roy MacGregor by Isaac Pocock. No comparisons of artist draws are available.

Montez opened at Field's Varieties on Monday, March 21, 1853, billed to perform in Lola Montez in Bavaria, followed by a company farce, J. B. Buckstone's Mischief Making. Montez actually appears to have performed Yelva, since the next day's advertisement recorded that Montez was to appear in Yelva for the second time, along with her El Olé. The Missouri Republican reported that her first two nights attracted crowded houses, but offered no commentary on the play or her performances.

Montez performed Lola Montez in Bavaria on March 23, and the same play, along with El Olé on March 24, 1853. Her performances in Maritana and her Spider Dance became her benefit on March 25, and she performed the last two acts of Lola Montez in Bavaria, along with Maritana and her
Spider Dance on March 26, 1853. Between March 22 and 25, 1853, company farces completed the evening's bill.

St. Louis newspapers supplied few responses to Montez's engagement. Beyond the "novelty" of witnessing Montez enact events from her own life, one critic discovered "an ease and piquancy" in her acting, but was displeased by the play itself. The Republican called the public's attention to Montez's final performance at the Varieties, remarking that "it is the best that has been put forth during the engagement of LOLA MONTEZ, and, as it is the last, it will, we presume, attract."

Montez appears to have scored another success with audiences and critics in St. Louis. She must have held immense appeal for the varied immigrant population since she was Irish-born, a champion of the rights of the "people" in Bavaria, and a heroine who charted her own course in life.

Her relations with others behind the scenes, however, were not as successful. Her delay in arriving in St. Louis initiated what became a rocky relationship between Montez and the manager. Joseph Field's daughter, Kate Field recounted that Montez was "'trying to trouble father as much as possible,'" during her appearances at his theatre. Also, Field inserted a card beneath his theatrical advertisements, between March 21-26, 1853, which specifically indicated that the increase in ticket prices
for the Dress Circle, from $.75 to $1.00, was made by the "imperative demand" of Montez, "that lady." 133

Despite any problems with Joseph Field, the full-blown stardom Montez achieved during her Southern tour no doubt spurred her to conquer new territory. From St. Louis, the gateway to America's wild west, Montez headed for theatres on the frontier in California.
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Chapter 9. The Golden West and Beyond
May 1853 to January 1861

Following her successful appearances in St. Louis, Montez travelled to Louisville where she took rooms at the Galt House, March 31, 1853. Either before she arrived in Louisville, or immediately thereafter, Montez met a former employee of the Louisville Telegraph office, John C. Henning, whom she engaged as her agent. On April 1, 1853, Henning and Montez embarked for California, by way of New Orleans.

Montez's difficulties with Joseph Field in St. Louis foreshadowed future controversy. She may have presumed that her tremendous popularity allowed her to act with impunity towards others, for during her stopover in the Crescent City Montez created a public incident during another's performance at the Varieties Theatre. The New Orleans Daily Crescent described the event in detail, and telegraphed its report across the country: the "renowned virago," intruded upon George T. Rowe in his prompter's box [evidently located in one of the side-wings] and up-staged the dancer, Ducy Barre, "in full view of the audience" by "telegraphing some of the kid-glove beaux in the boxes, and flourishing a bouquet, in a manner calculated to draw the attention of many." When Rowe objected to Montez's distractions, she screamed, kicked and swore at him, attracting the attention of the audience. Her
twenty-five-year-old agent, Henning, came to her rescue, attempting to choke the seventy-year-old stage manager. ³

George Rowe brought suit for assault and battery against Lola Montez and George Henning on the following day, and the case was presented before the court Recorder, Mr. Winter, on April 13, 1853. The public examination of charges attracted such a large, curious audience that when Montez entered the courtroom she remarked that "the law had made a great mistake in not having tickets of admission at two dollars a head." Her comment amused the court's audience, and set the stage for popular opinion in her favor. ⁴

George Rowe testified that Montez had entered his box on the evening in question, refused to go away upon request, then struck and kicked him. He also described Henning's assault on him, indicating that at some [unknown] point the scuffle was taken outside into the alley--where Varieties manager, Thomas Placide, advised him to have Montez and Henning arrested.

Montez countered with charges that Rowe had kicked her when he told her to go away. An anonymous female witness corroborated that Montez, on the night in question, had told her that she (Montez) had been kicked by Rowe, and "showed her the mark of the blow above her ankle. There was a red spot on the limb larger than a dollar, which appeared to have been made by the heel of a boot. The spot
was considerably inflamed, and remained there the next day and afterwards." Company member, Sir William Don, also testified in support of Montez, noting that he "had seen Lola on the prompter's stand many times during her engagement, and [had] been there many times [him]self," although Placide did not approve of the policy. 

Montez also charged that Rowe had made indecent proposals to her at an earlier time, and she had lectured that "a man of his age should be ashamed of his conduct." She alleged Rowe passed off his inquiries as jokes, and quoted him, "At any rate, don't tell the old woman [Mrs. Rowe]."

Thomas Placide testified on the behalf of George Rowe, but since he had no relevant eye-witness information and insulted Montez in his testimony, the defendant left the examination, "bearing with her the sympathies of the larger portion of the audience." The case was recommended for trial, but Rowe never pursued the issue. Whoever struck the other first may never be known, but the report of the public scuffle indicates that Montez was losing concern for the public, ladylike behavior in the United States that she had exhibited earlier.

Newspapers across the country quickly reported the incident. The New York Times published a partial transcript of the examination prefaced by hostile commentary. Noting that Montez had first been introduced
to New Orleans' audiences as the "'Countess of LANSFELDT,'" a danseuse, whose native odors had been somewhat tainted by the corrupt breathings of a sickly royalty," The New York Times commented that the "story of her life is as rich in incident as a compost heap is in fertilizing qualities, and both alike hold a fitting place in the economy of the world." Editor Henry Raymond had never approved of Montez, morally or artistically, and took the opportunity to call attention to reports of her injudicious behavior.

On the heels of the incident, Montez left New Orleans for the land of gold and sunshine. Her journey entailed crossing the Gulf of Mexico to Chagres, Panama, traveling across the Isthmus of Panama to Panama City, where a ship was available for northern passage to San Francisco.

By the mid-1850s, California had lured hundreds-of-thousands to her cities and frontier regions. The discovery of gold at Sutter's Mill in 1848 had been announced throughout the world, and newcomers seeking mere employment and/or fortunes flocked to San Francisco and Sacramento. Smaller "tent cities" also emerged where gold miners often camped, exchanging their gold dust for the basic necessities of life. Composed of tents or rough wooden structures, these smaller communities had little communication with the rest of the world, since muddy paths often were their only means of access.
Although California's ratio of women to men had changed greatly between 1848 and 1853, the sight of a woman, or child, remained rare in frontier areas. By 1853, the overall male/female ratio in California equalled 6 to 1 and, women proved scarce in rustic areas. Only by 1852 were women "numerous enough in Placer County that balls could be given;" similar gender statistics exist for all California counties at the time, and the typical ball—a major source of social entertainment—often had "so few ladies in attendance that those present were danced to exhaustion." The beautiful Montez could hope for great success in an environment so hungry for female charms.

San Francisco expanded from a tent village in 1849 to a major metropolis in 1853. It possessed a population of approximately 40,000, nearly twenty fine stores that carried luxurious clothing and other items, and nearly six theatres. However, when Montez arrived on May 21, 1853, only two San Francisco theatres were in regular operation, the San Francisco Theatre, managed by Tom Maguire, and the American Theatre managed by John Lewis Baker. Other theatres existed, but newspapers recorded little about their activities.

Few theatrical events vied with Montez during her San Francisco engagement. The Adelphi Theatre featured a concert by a Monsieur Chenal, accompanied by the Austrian
violin virtuoso and composer, Miska Hauser, on June 4, 17 and a Madame Adalbert, in French drama, on June 5, 1853. Other San Francisco theatres may have presented occasional, but minimal, competition for Montez.

Both the San Francisco Theatre and the American Theatre possessed strong resident companies, and attracted touring stars. The English actress and ex-wife of Edwin Forrest, Catherine Sinclair (1817-1891), was in the middle of her final week's engagement at the San Francisco Theatre when Montez arrived. A recent arrival to California, Sinclair was supported by a company of popular local stars like the Chapman family, Junius Brutus Booth, Jr. and his younger, largely inexperienced brother Edwin.

Montez had her choice of the two managers and their theatres, and eventually decided upon the American Theatre, since Baker promised "an extravagant salary." Built in the fall of 1851, the theatre originally held 2000 spectators, but renovations completed within the two months prior to Montez's arrival had increased its seating capacity to 3000; its already elegant interior was enhanced "without regard to the expense--the Proprietor being determined that this shall be the most beautiful Theatre in California." 23

John Lewis Baker (1828-1873) had established a strong local reputation as an actor and manager. He and his wife,
the actress, Alexina Fisher Baker (1822-18?), had arrived in San Francisco in 1852. Popular as a "minor performer," John Lewis Baker discovered more fame as a manager who organized a fine company, insisted on accurate and detailed designs, along with ample rehearsal. Cost aside, Baker created a new standard for California theater. 24

San Francisco newspapers greeted Montez with tantalizing descriptions that increased public curiosity about her. The Daily Alta California announced "This lady, one of the world's celebrities, the Duchess of Landsfeldt, the favorite of monarchs, of Patrician and Plebeian, the phases of whose life make the creations of the novelist seem dim, the fearless, the eccentric Lola, is among us." 25 Another newspaper observed that her arrival "acted like the application of fire to the combustible matter that creates public curiosity, excitement, or furore. . . . Everybody is in a fever to catch a glimpse of the lioness. . . . she is welcomed. . . and gone mad over here as elsewhere." 26

Montez provided an explosion as soon as she arrived. The "fiery artist" argued with her agent as soon as she disembarked from the steamship, Northerner. Swearing at him, Montez "knocked him down and destroyed two hundred dollars' worth of checks to show that filthy lucre was no object to her." 27 Undoubtedly, the incident fired the public interest in Montez; San Franciscans, hoping to see
her, clogged the street in front of the Russ Hotel where she took rooms. 28

Baker held a ticket auction for her debut performance, May 26, 1853, and raised ticket prices. Attracting a large crowd of spirited bidders, the ticket auction sold the first seat for $65.00, and the second for $25.00. 29 Nonetheless, the auction was not entirely successful, for The Golden Era reported that "The complete failure which attended the sale of tickets by auction for Lola's first night at the American would lead us to believe that our good citizens are coming to their senses again . . . . 'Fair wages for a fair day's work, in amusements as in everything else, say we.'" 30 Even so, Baker maintained inflated ticket prices throughout Montez's engagement. Dress Circle and Parquette seats that usually sold for $2.00, went for $5.00; 2nd Tier, or Family Circle seats were raised from $1.00 to $3.00; and Private Boxes typically priced at $15.00 sold for $25.00. Only the Third Tier, or Gallery seats remained at the usual $.50. 31

If Baker's ticket prices seem unusually high it must be remembered that San Francisco was a "gold boom" town, and its gold economy inflated the price of everything. When Montez made her dance debut at the Broadway theatre in New York, private boxes, un-sold at auction, went for $10.00 and $13.00; other seats were doubled in price. Baker's regular prices were higher than those of many of
the other theatres where Montez performed, and Baker more than doubled admission for the Dress and Family Circles.

Lola Montez made her San Francisco debut as Lady Teazle in School for Scandal, "supported by the whole strength" of Baker's "unrivalled company" before a packed audience. Spectators who could not get a seat, stood in the aisles and greeted Montez with a thunderstorm of applause. The evening's box office receipts totalled $4,500.00. Even for a house that held 3000 spectators, the figure is phenomenal. By contrast, New York's Broadway Theatre held 4500, and newspapers estimated that Montez alone drew about $3,400.00 for her first week's performances before good houses.

Although the public may not have cared about what she performed, Montez's decision to perform Lady Teazle for her first appearance seems a curious choice. San Franciscans had been charmed by Catherine Sinclair's portrayal of the role, and Montez had received only moderate praise in the role elsewhere. Nevertheless, no critics compared Montez's portrayal of the role to Sinclair's, and Montez won praise. One critic found that Montez performed Lady Teazle with "all that grace and vitality that might be expected," and, especially, admired the scene "where Lady Teazle makes up with Sir Peter and wheedles his money from him," as well as the famous screen scene.
On Friday, May 27, and Saturday, May 28, 1853, the American Theatre featured identical bills. On both evenings, after a company farce, Montez performed *Yelva*, and after another company play, Montez performed her long awaited *Spider Dance*. Both evenings provided full and appreciative houses that impatiently awaited her appearance, especially in the *Spider Dance*. In *Yelva*, Montez "won over her democratic audience by storm," but it was the *Spider Dance* "all had come to see and there was an anxious flutter and an intense interest as the moment approached." "Heartily applauded" following her first night's performance in her famous dance, Montez offered her "profound gratitude" for the warm reception in a curtain speech. On the second evening she performed before "the most brilliant and overflowing audiences ever witnessed in this city, and who have given her talent an unequivocal endorsement." Critics also admired Montez's appearances both in *Yelva* and her *Spider Dance*. Through her pantomime, she related "a more thrilling scene of suffering than perhaps language could express." Other newspapers called her dancing "remarkable" and "'heavenly.'" Montez's *Spider Dance* provoked varied descriptions. San Francisco sources suggest that Montez may have performed three different versions of the dance in California. In one, Montez may have used replicas of
spiders made of cork, whalebone, or rubber, which she shook out of her dress and killed as she danced. In another, the spiders were left to the imagination of the audience. A third description, implies that Montez actually impersonated a spider in a "strange and wonderful performance. Her make-up caused one to shiver, and when she spread out on her feet and hands à la tarantula, and bounced from one side of the stage to the other with spider-like celerity, she was grotesquely and amazingly interesting." A reminiscence published in the San Francisco Bulletin in 1916 provides another varied description of her Spider Dance: After entering in a costume compared to Joseph's "coat of many colors," Montez stood "for an instant, full of fire, action and abandon." Unknowingly crossing a spider's nest, she began to dance, becoming entangled in cobwebs that included "a long radius of leading spires and fibres stretching away into an infinity of space," which also entwined her ankles. "The spiders accumulate and the danseuse stamps. They appear in myriads. . . . After a series of examinations and shaking of dresses, she succeeds in getting the imaginary intruders away . . . and does it with so much naivete that we feel a sort of satisfaction at the triumph." Whatever version Montez danced, she left memorable impressions.

Montez next began rehearsals for Lola Montez in Bavaria. The play's large cast required Baker to hire a
great number of auxiliaries in addition to the strength of his regular company. With little time to mount the production, tension may have developed between Montez and the company. One company member complained of Montez's penchant for cigarettes; and Montez argued with Liam Beattie, cast as King Ludwig of Bavaria, when he referred to the King as an "old duffer." Infuriated by Beattie's lack of respect for Ludwig, Montez threatened to horsewhip him. Unintimidated, Beattie "aimed a finger warningly at Montez," and said: "I advise you not to attempt it or it may cost you--well don't do it, please. I hate to quarrel with a woman; so let's go on. It's getting late." 

The strain and lack of rehearsal time appeared evident when Lola Montez in Bavaria opened on May 30, 1853. Except for Montez and another company member, "most of the stock were woefully deficient in their parts." Nonetheless, the production received a "storm of applause" from its massive audience, since the "chief actors removed every obstacle to its success and covered a multitude of imperfections." Montez, especially, "was there with her energy and ready wit to compensate for the short comings of all the others," and allowed the production to become a "complete triumph."

Critics held varied responses to the presentation. The Evening Journal found that the play, "though . . . diversified with sudden surprises and thrilling scenes, is
somewhat too long and loose in its construction," and that even in other hands could not hold the stage. However, the paper remarked that Montez appeared "affectionate, considerate, noble and true, and in every phase the same enchanting, wonderful Lola." 53

The Daily Alta California believed that the play, "in the hands of anybody else would have been a failure." However, it faulted the play for the way in which it depicted Montez, and held that "History pays her a higher compliment than her own play." The play presented Montez as "a coquettish, wayward, reckless, woman intent on good, it is true; but not the wily diplomatist, the able leader which she is represented in history." The writer acknowledged that Montez defied "some of the rules of fashion," that she had "her faults," but also "merits," and defended her right to be an individual. 54 His defense of her indecorous and eccentric behavior represents a marked contrast to those whose criticism focused mainly on personal behavior and reputation.

Montez's popular run of Lola Montez in Bavaria over the next few nights provided the principal event at the American. On June 2 and 3, Montez's performance of the Spider Dance completed the evening's bill, and on June 4, 1853, her Sailor's Hornpipe. 55 Although Lola Montez in Bavaria continued to attract large audiences, the play seemed to wear on critics. One critic advised Montez to
apply her "unquestioned histrionic talent" to "better pieces." 56

If San Francisco critics had tired of her life story, Montez regained their interest through her Sailor's Hornpipe. Dressed in a blue sailor's jacket, broad collar and tarpaulin pants, Montez provided a rendition that surprised and charmed critics and audiences alike through novelty in "changing scenery, nautical properties . . . the roar of an angry ocean, the howling of the storm and a variety of accessories, not usually introduced with a terpsichorean exhibition." 57 This performance may mark the first time that Montez offered her Sailor's Hornpipe with such spectacular staging, for critics elsewhere never mentioned the use of scenery or sound effects when Montez executed the dance.

Montez made her next appearance in Maritana, or, the Maid of Saragossa, followed by the farce of The Family Jars and the Spider Dance. 58 Critics expressed surprise and disappointment that the play had attracted only a "meagre" audience, since it was a new vehicle, and one which was "in some respects far superior to that of Lola Montez in Bavaria." 59 Albeit smaller than usual, the audience received the play well. 60

Montez and the American company had started rehearsals for Maritana by June 2, 1853, 61 and critics' notices indicate that the company was better prepared for its
appearance in *Maritana* than it had been for *Lola Montez in Bavaria*. The *San Francisco Herald* admired Montez's "forcible and natural" acting, and her appearance as Alphonse, in "the short jacket, loose trousers and broad sash of the Spanish mountaineer."  

Monday's bill-of-fare was repeated for the first evening of Montez's two benefit performances that marked the end of her first engagement at the American Theatre. San Franciscans clogged the theatre to honor the "brilliant engagement" of Lola Montez, and following her "spirited" performances in both the play and dance, flooded the stage with bouquets. On June 8, 1853, her second benefit night, her *El Olé* proved so successful, the massive audience demanded and received an encore performance.

On the following evening, Montez gave a benefit for a charitable organization, the First Hebrew Benevolent Society, sharing the bill with some of the most popular performers of the day in San Francisco. Hosted by the American Theatre, the event included the talented Baker duo, Miska Hauser, and Caroline and William B. Chapman, Jr. Descendants of the famous English actor, William Chapman, Sr., who initiated the first American showboat, Caroline and William were popular stars in the California scene.
Following the immensely successful benefit for the Hebrew Benevolent Society, Montez played for five more evenings at the American Theatre. Appearing in two performances of Charlotte Corday, Montez reinforced her reputation as a champion of republican virtues. She then organized and performed in a benefit for the charitable fund of the San Francisco Fire Department on June 13, 1853. Through her "persuasive generalship," her "tact and savoir faire" Montez marshaled an impressive array of international talents available in San Francisco, including a French troupe, a German troupe, a violin solo by Miska Hauser, as well as her own El Olé and Spider Dance. The crowded audience flooded the stage with bouquets following the Spider Dance and provided $4000.00 for the San Francisco Fire Department.

Following her fund-raising efforts, Montez concluded her engagement at the American Theatre on June 14 and 15, 1853, with Yelva, her Olé and Spider Dance. On her benefit night, Montez scarcely had appeared on stage when members of the fire department tossed their helmets to her as tokens of their appreciation. Following her performance, Montez appeared amidst tumultuous applause, holding a fireman's helmet filled with flowers. She addressed the firemen saying, "San Francisco could only become the great city it was destined to be," through their
protection, and that she "would always remember them with 
pleasure and speak of them with praise in whatever land she 
might be." After asking the ladies in attendance to favor 
such brave men, Montez "withdrew amid universal applause, 
and three cheers from the firemen." 79

Montez's financial success in San Francisco may have 
surpassed that in other American cities, earning as much as 
"$16,000" in one week, according to her fellow artist, 
Miska Hauser. 80 No doubt inflated because of the San 
Francisco economy, the amount is impressive when compared 
to the figures of weekly receipts in various New York 
theatres the same year reported by the San Francisco 
Herald: the Italian opera, $2500 per week; the Broadway 
Theater, $3000; the National, $3000; the Bowery, $2600; 
Wallach's, $2200; Burton's, $2200; the Hippodrome, $3300; 
Barnum's Museum, $1500; and Jullien's $1500. 81 The 
Broadway could hold 4500, the Bowery, 4000, and San 
Francisco's American Theatre sat 3000 after its 
remodelling. The combination of raised ticket prices and 
Montez's sensational allure may have broken all box-office 
records at the American Theatre.

Montez not only earned a substantial income through 
her San Francisco appearances, but also charmed all levels 
of society, attracting "the most brilliant and overflowing 
audiences ever witnessed" in San Francisco. 82 If 
audiences crammed the American Theatre out of curiosity
initially, they continued to crowd the house throughout her engagements, especially after critical notices praised her abilities. Her popularity even inspired a San Francisco stable to name a prize-winning horse after her, an echo of the response in Mobile where clothiers had advertised dressing gowns in her name.

Her eccentricity and popularity with the public and critics made Montez an ideal topic for local parody. On June 19, 1853, the San Francisco Theatre featured Coyne's *Lola Montez*; but, more importantly, on June 20, 1853, the same theatre featured a new play, based on Montez's San Francisco experience, entitled *Who's Got the Countess* by "Doc" Robinson. Allegedly a real physician with an "acid wit," "Doc," David G. Robinson (fl. mid-19th cent.) enjoyed writing satires of contemporary issues and subjects, in this case concerning Lola Montez.

Robinson's satire evidently dealt primarily with Montez's San Francisco experience, but also included figures from Montez's past, along with local personalities, like the American Theatre manager, John Lewis Baker. The roles and cast members were as follows: Mula, Countess of Bohemia [the Montez figure], Caroline Chapman; Louis Buggins, a manager [the Baker figure], William B. Chapman; Plunkite, J. B. Booth; King of Bohemia [the King Ludwig figure], Hamilton; Prompter, "who's engaged for this particular part expressly," Dr. Robinson.
The San Francisco Theatre presented the burlesque from June 20 through 25, and 27, 1853, to full and happy houses, despite occasional negative commentary in newspapers. The *Daily Alta California*’s response sheds a little light on the production:

It ... contains a few clever allusions. The chief merit consists in the admirable personation by Mr. and Miss Chapman of a prominent theatrical gentleman and the notable in question. The plot ... is very miserably arranged, and the dialogue lacking in wit, point, appropriateness, and even common sense, and is ... bunglingly arranged in bad rhyme. There are one or two very happy hits, however, and ludicrous surprises, which ... redeem the piece ... .

*Whose Got the Countess* featured songs and dance that parodied and/or commented on Montez performances and events since her arrival in San Francisco. Robinson's parody of Montez's *Spider Dance* in a comic *Spy-Dear* dance may have been one of the "happy hits" of the production. A song used in the burlesque, "Buggins and the Countess," changed nightly as Robinson ad-libbed lyrics. One of the versions that has survived provides an indication of the tone of the play and the local rumors circulated about Montez.

Some weeks ago the Countess came to fill us with delight,  
And drew admiring throngs to see her spider dance each night;  
The nice young men in tender strains impressions tried to make,  
And tho' they sighed and threw bouquets, she didn't seem to take;  
But these gallants determined each that he'd not quit his hold,  

And tho' she could not take them all, she kindly took their gold. She took herself out to a race and there she took the purse; . . .

Now after all these takes, I'd say that some are taken in,
Who think that she won't take a joke whenever she can win;
And while she's in this taking way, she's causing great distress
In some young men who fear she'll take some member of our press;
Tho' Democrat she long has been, 'tis thought by some she'll dig
And leave her party in the lurch and fasten to the Whig. . . .

Montez probably welcomed the additional attention that D. G. Robinson's comic antics provided. On June 23, 1853, Montez danced in a benefit for an actor, C. G. Bingham, at the Adelphi Theatre, along with Mme. Celeste, and D. G. Robinson, who "promis[ed] to give correct information" concerning "who has got the Countess." Montez must have enjoyed the satire to have shared the same bill with its author.

The last few lines of "Buggins and the Countess," and Robinson's later promise to identify "who has got the Countess," refer to Montez's relationship with Patrick Purdy Hull (1824-1858), the editor of the San Francisco Whig. Hull met Montez aboard the Northerner, the ship that brought both of them to San Francisco in May of 1853. Irish by birth, Hull had campaigned for Zachary Taylor in his successful 1848 bid for the presidency; as a reward, Taylor gave Hull the task of compiling the 1850 census of California. Hull was an intelligent journalist; it is
not surprising that his mind and politics attracted Montez. But in a marriage that surprised a few papers, the two were united in a Catholic ceremony on July 2, 1853, at the Holy Church of the Mission Dolores, surrounded by distinguished San Francisco citizens and friends.

Taking no time for a private wedding trip, the newlyweds departed San Francisco for Sacramento on the afternoon of their marriage accompanied by Montez's new agent, a Mr. Adams, as well as Miska Hauser, and a Mons. Charles Chenal. They embarked on a concert tour "throughout the interior, stopping at Sacramento, Marysville and all the principal localities."

Declared the permanent state capital in 1854, Sacramento could boast a population over ten thousand since it was the gateway to California's mining area on the Sacramento, American, Yuba, Feather, and Bear Rivers and their tributaries. Despite the "Great Fire" of November 2, 1852, that destroyed seven-eighths of the city, the hard work of the populace had created a new theatre to replace the three theatres lost in the conflagration. The Sacramento Theatre, managed by Charles A. King, opened on May 9, 1853, with a capacity for 800 spectators. In a state of flux at the time Montez arrived, the Sacramento Theatre did not have a regular company members, an established reputation, or competition with other theatres. However, Sacramento had enjoyed
resident companies and numerous popular performers, like the Booth family, the Chapmans, and Madame Celeste at the three theatres (Tehama, Pacific, American) that had been destroyed in the fire of 1852. 98

The newspapers of Sacramento welcomed Montez, and Sacramento fire companies greeted her with a serenade at her hotel on the afternoon before her first appearance; in response, Montez appeared at her window, "kissed her hand gracefully bowing low at the same time, and retired." 99

Montez performed with Hauser and Chenal at the Sacramento Theatre between July 5 and 14, 1853. 100 Two days after her marriage, Montez and company performed a bill that was repeated for a second night on, July 6, 1853. Each evening's bill featured two parts. The first part included an overture by an orchestra, Miska Hauser on the violin, Chenal on the flute, and El Olé by Montez. The second part included another overture by the orchestra, Hauser, Chenal, and Montez's Spider Dance. 101

Before an "overflowing house," composed of "quite a number of ladies," Montez and company made their Sacramento debut on July 5, 1853. The Sacramento Union considered her dancing, "the poetry of motion," and remarked that "The discovery of the imaginary spider in folds of the dress, and the movements which follow . . . are as natural as if the whole scene were real." Received with "heartiest applause," Montez returned to the stage, strewn with
bouquets, pressing a fireman's belt to her lips in gratitude for her kind reception. 102

Unexpectedly, on July 6, 1853, Montez encountered a problem from the large working class audience that marred her otherwise successful Sacramento engagement. While performing her El Olé, Montez perceived that a few people down front had treated her with disrespect, [apparently jeering and laughing at her first few moments onstage]. She announced that "'If her dancing did not please the audience, she would retire from the stage,' which she accordingly did. . . . By this unexpected movement the audience was left in quite a quandary. Some left, some applauded, while others hissed." 103 However, when the audience did not respond with sufficient applause, Montez did not return to the stage. Discontents pelted the stage with rotten fruit and vegetables, and only left after a short speech from Miska Hauser, who calmed the crowd by improvising a number of songs on his violin. 104

Eventually, Montez returned and "pettishly" performed a portion of Olé and her Spider Dance. Some of the audience greeted Montez with bouquets, 105 but the earlier interruptions diminished her usual opening-night triumph.

The evening's incidents did not end at the theatre. Some two hours after the completion of the concert, a crowd charivari ed 106 Montez outside Sacramento's New Orleans Hotel. Equipped with bells, gongs, drums, whistles, pots,
and pans, the crowd created a noisy disturbance below Montez's balcony in celebration of her marriage to Patrick Hull. Complimented by the attention paid to her recent nuptials, Montez promised a benefit for the Sacramento Firemen for the following Friday evening. Her serenaders left, but soon returned with another charivari, supplemented by "three groans," which Montez found offensive. She "declar[ed] herself as good a republican as any of them," and could not imagine the Sacramento public "would be so guilty of so vile, so mean, so dirty a trick as to insult her in such a manner. . . . If they would only come to the noble firemen's benefit, with plenty of money, they might laugh at her as much as they pleased." 108

Miska Hauser was among the 300 to 400 people who witnessed the evening's proceedings. He reported that Montez swore at the crowd, and "shrilly cried, 'You cowards and bastards--I despise you more than stinking dogs!' Her words were interrupted by applause and shouts of anger." 109 Although the apparent insult of the "three groans" remains unclear, the evening's events ended when an armed guard dispersed the crowd.

Following the incidents of July 6, 1853, some newspapers suggested that Montez had lost her popular status with the public, and doubted if the Fire Department would accept her proffered benefit. 110 Time would tell, for on the next night, Montez selected a bill that differed
from the previous evening's performance only by her first
dance. Instead of El Olé, the dance that initiated her
problems the night before, Montez performed a "Swiss dance
from the opera William Tell." 111

No doubt curious to see if another row would ensue,
crowds packed the theatre for Montez's third concert
appearance. Although several ladies filled the house,
police walked the aisles to insure order; and, the first
man to discover gold in California, John A. Sutter,
occupied a box seat with his wife and friends. After
welcoming California's distinguished citizen to the
theatre, manager King announced Montez and led her to
the stage.

In an apologetic, graceful, humble and complimentary
speech, Montez explained her behavior in the theatre on the
previous night.

Ladies and Gentlemen: Last evening there was an
occurrence in this theatre which I regret. It is
a small theatre; it is more like a drawing room.
I am close to you . . . and the sound is not
always distinctly understood. I am subject to a
palpitation of the heart, and since I have been
in Sacramento, I have suffered with it very much,
which makes me at times feel very bad. While I
was dancing I stamped my foot several times upon
the stage, and someone laughed, as I supposed to
insult me. I have many enemies . . . and I
supposed it might be some of these who had
followed me with that intention. I knew it was
no American, for I have been loved and cherished
by the Americans, wherever I went. And, now
could I come to Sacramento to offer the Americans
an insult, after loving them so much and
receiving so many marks of kindness from their
hands? I have traveled Europe, and danced the
Spider Dance . . . but have never met with so
much kindness and fame as in America; particularly in California. . . . I will wipe out from my memory what occurred. It was unworthy of me, . . . if you wish me to go on with my dance you have only to say the word. 112

Hailed by thunderous applause, Montez retired from the stage. Audience demand following her first dance prompted Montez to make another speech that indicated her knowledge of the city's battles with disasters, and her own personal reputation: "I came to this city impressed with the belief that I should meet men--noble men--who had worked hard, and twice built up a city; once from ruin by a flood, and once from fire; and now you have redeemed the character of Lola Montez." Audience response to the rest of her evening's performance "made the Theatre tremble to its deep foundations with the delirium of . . . applause." 113

A brilliant politician, Montez's graceful and complimentary speeches not only excused personal actions, but also told her audience what they wanted to hear about themselves. Her beauty and grace in dance reinforced her reputation as a unique performer, and her rhetoric testified to a heart and mind dedicated to American ideals. Off-stage, Montez may have been more cynical about the affair, for Hauser recorded that she ran to him, laughing and saying: "Believe me, dear Hauser, last night was worth a thousand dollars. It was gloriously entertaining, and another adventure has been added to my list." 114
Although Montez recouped popular theatrical success in Sacramento in her third evening's performance, a newspaper's commentary prompted Montez to challenge its editor. The Daily Californian reported that Montez played to large audiences because of the liberal use of free tickets. Insulted by such an "extraordinary . . . lie," Montez challenged the editor of the Daily Californian in a letter: "You may choose between my duelling pistols, or take your choice of a pill out of a pill-box. One shall be poison and the other not, and the chances are even." The editor never responded to the challenge; but the term "pistols or pizen" soon became a familiar California catchphrase whenever fights brewed.

On July 8, 9, 11 and 14, 1853, Montez made her final appearances at the Sacramento Theatre. In her promised benefit appearance for the Fire Department, July 8, 1853, she performed her "Swiss dance" and her Spider Dance before a smaller than usual audience that again included John Sutter. Although she slipped several times during her first dance, the audience found her delightful, for the "war tomahawk" had been "buried" between Montez and those that had objected to her earlier performances.

Before a full house, on July 9, 1853, Montez performed her Sailor's Hornpipe and Spider Dance. "Her pantomimic ascension of an imaginary vessel's rigging, her shipwreck
and struggles in the ocean, her safe arrival on shore, and her appearance in the concluding portion of the hornpipe, with the star-spangled banner . . . pressed fervently to her lips, were all brilliantly enacted." Amidst numerous rounds of applause, Montez told her audience "I look upon you as old friends now; peace is restored, and sunshine again appears in Sacramento. It will always be in my heart when I think of your noble city." 119

On the last night of her engagement at the Sacramento Theatre, Montez performed her Sailor's Hornpipe and the Spider Dance to a crowded house. Three Sacramento fire companies greeted her in "full uniform," accompanied by band music. Three "hearty cheers" followed each of her dances, and Montez responded with brief and sentimental speeches. The evening's events ended at the Orleans Hotel where the firemen serenaded Montez below her balcony. She responded with a short speech, and tossed a "small national banner to the firemen (which she had carried with her all through the United States) as a souvenir of her affection." 120

Following her sensational appearances in Sacramento, Montez and Patrick Hull briefly returned to San Francisco, where Hull relinquished interest in his newspaper, the Whig. 121 Hull may have hoped to devote himself to their marriage fulltime by supporting her career, for after a successful benefit for Charles King, manager of the
Sacramento Theatre, on July 14, 1853, Hull, Montez and company proceeded to such minor towns as Marysville and Grass Valley, California. Scanty newspaper coverage reveals little about her performances in these and other small cities; but, in Marysville, Montez is alleged to have thrown a tantrum against Hauser and her husband, which resulted in Hauser's departure from her company, and her husband's temporary alienation. Appearing in Grass Valley, by July 20, 1853, Montez and the remainder of her concert company performed for miners in the Alta Theatre, a room located over a saloon by the same name, but equipped with a drop curtain, scenery and footlights. Between July 25 and 30, 1853, Montez and company performed in Nevada City, California, often called the biggest mining camp in the state. But in early August, Montez returned to Grass Valley and performed her Spider Dance for a few "admiring friends."

Soon it became clear that Montez and Hull planned to establish a home in Grass Valley. Although Montez enjoyed success in Sacramento and the mining camps of California just as she had in San Francisco, the strain of touring seemed to be taking a toll on Montez's ability to govern her temper. The reports of problems with audiences and company personnel had become more frequent. No doubt tired of the difficult travel and performance conditions when visiting mining camps, and, perhaps, interested in
salvaging her marriage, Montez decided to retire from the stage in California with her popularity intact.

Montez selected the remote settlement of Grass Valley as the setting for her stage retirement. Approximately thirty-five years old, newlywed to a distinguished California citizen devoted to her, Montez had amassed a small fortune in the United States that could sustain an extravagant lifestyle over a long time. But after such an adventurous life, performing and living in the major cities of the world, Grass Valley seems an odd choice for a permanent residence. Bucolic, unconcerned with political matters, far from the spotlight of major newspapers, Grass Valley occupied the end of a muddy path from the larger cities of San Francisco and Sacramento. It possessed, however, the richest mines in the state and had more than one hundred mines operating within a six-mile radius by the time Montez settled there with Patrick Hull. With a population of four thousand by 1853, including less than three hundred females, the city's riches attracted people from diverse cultures and economic backgrounds. Its population included wealthy Europeans and Americans, poor Chinese and Mexican laborers, as well as criminals from Australia. The town's attractiveness for fortune hunters, must have intrigued Montez for the next two years of her life.
Montez and Hull roomed in a boarding house until a suitable residence became available. The locally famous home of "Jennie-on-the-Green" had functioned as a gambling hall, and Montez turned it into her own personal pleasure palace. Through an investment of almost $5000.00, Greek Revival pillars replaced plain pillars on its front porch; small-paned French glass replaced coarse windows; gold-leaf decorations, fine paneling, delicate European wallpaper, rich carpets and lace curtains graced its interior; and, a wing was built to house a kitchen, wine cellar and, bathroom. 129

As she rebuilt and redecorated her new home, Montez entertained salons for local citizens, visiting artists and European nobles. At these soirées Montez remained the center of attention, playing the piano, singing, dancing, smoking a cigar or cigarette, relating racy stories, and enjoying the attention of male guests. 130

Montez's independent lifestyle may have attracted Patrick Hull during their courtship but overly zealous admirers at numerous salons, and a newly acquired menagerie of pets that included a bear, goats, a parrot and two dogs, may have been more that Hull could countenance. 131 Soon after the two had settled in Grass Valley, both parties realized that their marriage had no future. By October 7, 1853, the Nevada Journal reported that Montez had applied for a divorce from Hull. 132
Undeterred by her failed marriage, Montez enjoyed her retirement in Grass Valley "by hunting, riding, exploring the mines, entertaining her many visitors, reading and writing up the notes of her singularly eventful life." During her retirement, Montez met and coached six-year-old Charlotte Crabtree (1847-1924). Drawn to the child's precocious abilities by Lotta's mother, Mary Ann Crabtree, Montez taught the red-haired, dark-eyed child several dances, a few songs, and coached her in riding horseback. Known as Lotta Crabtree when she initiated her theatrical career as a child star in San Francisco in 1858, Crabtree enjoyed a long and popular American career as a dancer, musician and actress in melodramas that allowed her to capitalize on her perennial youthful looks and musical abilities.

Although some witnessed that the females of Grass Valley shunned Montez, newspaper stories circulated about her involvement in the community. She showed concern for children in need, dressed the wounds of those injured in mining accidents, and traveled to the cabins of the indigent. A reminiscence by a Matilda Uphoff suggests that Montez found acceptance by females in Grass Valley despite her often unconventional behavior:

There were only a few girls in Grass Valley, and I was five when Lola Montez gave us little ones a Christmas party at her home. We were all excited about it. If Lola had been the woman some say she was . . . our mothers would never have let us visit her. She met us at the door as we arrived
and gave each of us a merry welcome. I don't remember much about her looks, except that she seemed to me the most beautiful woman in the world . . . she had a tree . . . gifts for us . . . games and had good things to eat . . . . Lola Montez was very kind. 137

For almost two years Montez enjoyed her stage retirement in Grass Valley. Devoting her time to creating a beautiful home, entertaining salons composed of European and American visitors, performing charitable works, and mentoring a future star of the American theatre, Montez seemed happy in retirement. However, by the winter of 1854, life in a remote city was beginning to lose its appeal. A contemporary, Lemuel Snow, wondered if Montez pined "in Grass Valley for the glories of her former years. . . . there were times when she did long to be back in Paris. . . . She had occasional fits of blues, but she never let anyone know their cause. She was intensely proud." 138

By late February, 1855, rumors circulated in San Francisco papers that Montez had received offers, and was considering a return to the stage. 139 In May, the San Francisco Chronicle announced that Montez, personally directing a company organized by Noel Folland [Follin], 140 would proceed on a tour of Australia, possibly stopping in Hong Kong and Calcutta. 141 On June 6, 1855, Montez and company departed California for Australia aboard the Fanny Major. 142
Departure from California marked the end of Montez's major touring of the United States. Her appearances in America's key theatrical centers had given Montez artistic power, prestige and money. Her success across the United States, especially that in California, may have supplied Montez with hopes of a similar reception in Australia. However, when she performed as a dancer and actress in Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide, Geelong and Ballarat, Australia, Montez often encountered difficulty with company members, and poor reviews—often clouded by judgement of Montez's past personal behavior. 143

Following a disappointing and costly tour of Australia, Montez sailed for San Francisco. The mysterious drowning of Noel Follin marred the return trip, and had a profound effect on Montez's immediate future. 144 Evidently, Montez somehow blamed herself for her agent's death; she quickly sought funds to support his widow and educate his children. 145 After her return to San Francisco in July or August of 1856, Montez played popular engagements at the (new) American Theatre in San Francisco, the Forrest and Metropolitan Theatres in Sacramento, 146 and sold her Grass Valley home as well as possessions that included her costly jewel collection. 147 She sailed for New York, November 20, 1856, to offer her help to the Follin family. 148
Although Follin's widow refused her offer of financial aid, Montez quickly convinced his mother that Noel's half-sister, Miriam, would profit from a stage career under her experienced tutelage. Miriam Follin (1836-1914), the future wife of Frank Leslie—publisher of Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper—would become an important newspaper woman in her own right, but for the moment began a brief stage career, advertised as Lola's sister, Minnie Montez.  

Although Minnie's name is not listed in theatrical advertisements, between February 2 and 7, 1857, the Montez "sisters" played their first engagement at the Green Street Theatre in Albany, managed by William Henderson and O. H. Losee.  Minnie probably played additional roles, but she certainly played the part of Jenny in the drama, The Cabin Boy, by Edward Stirling, to Montez's breeches role of Julian.  Dancing only once in her Spider Dance, Montez organized a comic repertoire of plays for the engagement that included The Follies of a Night, by J. R. Planché; The Eton Boy, by Thomas Morton; Maidens Beware, by John Thomas Haines; and, Margot, or the Poultry Dealer, by an unknown author. She also presented Lola Montez in Bavaria.  The engagement elicited no critical commentary but it was popular, proving that Montez had not lost her star appeal. Crowds filled the theatre each night, prompting a newspaper to predict "this week will be
set down as one of the most successful in the history of the . . . management."

From Albany, Montez and Follin proceeded to Providence, Rhode Island, where they played at Forbes' Theatre, between February 12 and 17, 1857. Lola Montez in Bavaria provided the staple of the engagement, but The Cabin Boy was also presented in which Montez danced her Sailor's Dance. Newspapers noted that Montez played to full houses in the nearly 2000 seat theatre, and found that her "attractive" sister performed well, "for a novice."

Montez kept to herself during the day, "reading religious works . . . [S]he spoke freely of her past life, and, though she acknowledged grave faults . . . she characterized as baseless slanders the aspersions so lavishly bestowed on her character."

Montez had changed greatly from her Boston days when she spent time socializing and touring famous landmarks.

After the Providence engagement, Montez, and probably Miriam, traveled to theatres in Pittsburgh, St. Louis and Chicago, appearing at the Pittsburgh Theatre, managed by Joseph C. Foster, between February 23 and March 7, 1857. Montez secured an engagement at the St. Louis Theatre between March 12 and 21, 1857, followed by one at the Chicago Theatre, April 28 through May 2, 1857. At all of these theatres, Montez danced and performed in the dramatic vehicles she organized for her
tour with Follin, but, primarily, relied on staples from her personal repertoire, including *Lola Montez in Bavaria*, the *Spider Dance* and *El Olé*. Montez consistently played to full houses in all of these cities, her St. Louis performances proving especially popular but, received little critical feedback. ¹⁶⁰

In June of 1857, Montez and Follin separated when "Minnie Montez" left to take the lead in a drama, *Plot and Passion*, by Tom Taylor in Albany. ¹⁶¹ Montez's 1857 tour had proved that she was still a box-office draw, but some thought that time had taken a toll on her performing abilities: "It is very plain . . . 'her dancing days are over.' Though yet graceful in her posturing she does not display, nor is it to be expected at her age, that degree of elasticity and life which is required to maintain a high position as a danseuse." ¹⁶²

After her 1857 tour of the United States, Montez surrendered the stage for the lecture platform, a career less dependent on physical agility. Other females were enjoying popular careers on the lecture circuit: Elizabeth Blackwell advocated sex hygiene; Frances Wright backed free love colonies; Lucretia Mott and the Grimke sisters advanced the anti-slavery cause; and, Lucy Stone was beginning to lecture on women's rights. ¹⁶³ Although Montez did not consider herself an advocate of women's rights, she possessed ideas concerning "Strong Minded
Turning to the platform stage, Montez delivered original lectures on several topics. In "Wits and Women of Paris," Montez discussed famous literary figures she knew, such as Alexandre Dumas, père, George Sand, and Eugene Sue. In "Romanism" she discussed the history and "brutalizing effects" of Catholicism. In "Gallantry" she provided a brief overview of the history of male and female relations, drawing from Christian beliefs, Greek mythology, and historical figures, such as the French Louis XIV, (a gallant) and the English Charles II (a roué). She published an expanded version of her ideas concerning the romantic history of famous men and women in Anecdotes of Love (1858), and shared her witty, yet serious female beauty advice, along with facetious courtship tips for men, in The Arts of Beauty; or, Secrets of a Lady's Toilet. With Hints to Gentlemen on the Art of Fascinating (1858).

Montez's lecture tours took her to "the principal towns of England," New York, Boston, Buffalo, Hartford, and other cities where she often appeared before enthusiastic houses. Her lectures must have been successful on the whole, for Henry Raymond, never one to willingly praise Montez, acknowledged that they were "regarded as brilliant efforts and were well patronised."
Consumed by mysticism and religious fanaticism in the last days of her life, Montez seems to have suffered from an overwhelming sense of guilt for her past personal behavior. One of her biographers discovered that close to the time of her death she lived in a New York boarding house under the name of "Fanny Gibbons," perhaps hoping a change of name would deny her notorious past. There, she found particular solace in playing "Nearer My God to Thee," and "Rock of Ages," on the parlor piano. 171 Another found that she wandered the streets of New York, "talking to herself, singing snatches of hymns . . . and feverishly reading the scriptures." 172

Despite her life long connections to wealthy and influential people, Montez died in humble circumstances, having spent, or donated, the majority of her money, excepting a small fund for burial purposes, and a $300 donation to the Magadalen Asylum for "fallen women." 173 Following a stroke sometime in 1860 that resulted in partial paralysis, Montez died of pneumonia in New York city, January 17, 1861, approximately forty-three years old. 174

In life, Montez attracted multitudes that included the famous and fortunate; in death, she attracted very few to her bedside and grave. According to an unidentified article in the New York Public Library clipping file, Mrs. Craigie, informed of her daughter's imminent death,
attempted to see Lola in the summer of 1860, hoping to inherit a portion of her daughter's assumed accumulated wealth. When she discovered that her child had nothing to give her, she returned to Europe. With the exception of a Mrs. Margaret Buchanan, a childhood friend who introduced Montez to the Rev. Francis Lister Hawks, a deathbed confessor, Montez died without a loving family at her bedside.
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"Lola Montez is dead! Take the civilized world through, there is in it probably no woman whose decease would excite so much interest as will be awakened by those four words. . . . par eminence . . . a puzzle and a grief to the disbelievers in a woman's capacity for bold thought and free action." 1 Frank Leslie's parting comments provide a fitting epitaph for one of the most exciting, dynamic and popular performers of mid-nineteenth century America, Lola Montez.

Throughout her remarkable 1851-1855 tour of the United States, Lola Montez established an unqualified popular success. Packing houses wherever she performed as a dancer and/or as an actress, she filled major theatres with audiences from all walks of life, eager to see the exotic dancer, the lover of artists and kings, and the cause of a democratic revolution in Bavaria. Although simple curiosity attracted crowds initially, Montez habitually sustained engagements that typically lasted from one week to one month, earning her a large fortune in her tour of America. In her New York city debut alone, despite competition from popular performers at the city's numerous theatres, Montez garnered approximately $6800.00 from her share in the proceeds from her first two weeks at the Broadway. 2 In today's dollars, such earnings are...
equivalent to $107,508.00. Few financial figures have been recorded, but the New York Evening Mirror conservatively estimated that Montez had earned $10,000.00 by the end of her first four months in America, and hoped to earn $40,000.00 more before she returned to New York in the fall. The fact that she drew $16,000.00 in one week in San Francisco, probably indicates that she enjoyed large profit wherever she went in America.

Part of Montez's success was her ability to fit into mid-nineteenth century bills that called for a variety of performers and performances to satisfy a heterogenous audience. Her exotic appeal managed to satisfy the appetite for novelty among the politicians in Washington, the B'hoys in New York, the literary in Boston, the gold-miners in California, and the French and Spanish elite as well as the rough and ready of New Orleans. In the 1850s, star-performers and novelty (child actors, animals, speciality performers, and breeches roles) were keys to drawing a wide spectrum of audience members to fill cavernous theatres. Although many stars or novelty acts created attraction and adulation as did Montez, none combined the qualities she possessed that were so compelling: beauty and allure, exotic and political biography, both dance and acting vehicles, and notoriety.

Typically appearing at the most prestigious theatre in each city she visited, Montez created a sensation among
critics as well as audiences in the United States. Although initial New York reviews found her lacking in dance skill, others across the country frequently described a graceful, poetic, chaste, and yet, passionate and fiery character dance style, far different from the "voluptuous, dreamy, or shadowy" style that others "generally" presented. A Boston critic remarked that "her role of characters is by no means limited, and she has as excellent a variety of pieces as any danseuse that has been among us since the early and successful career of Fanny Elssler, whose style of performance Lola's much resembles." Montez appeared in the ethereal ballet vehicle, Diana and Her Nymphs, but discovered her greatest dance triumphs through her character dances, especially her most exotic, Spider Dance, which she performed more often than any other vehicle in her entire repertoire.

When she originally embarked on her American dance tour, Montez soon discovered that her personal background held great appeal for American audiences and critics, and thus commissioned C. P. T. Ware to dramatize episodes from her life. Her first performance as an actress at the Broadway Theatre in mid-May of 1852, in Lola Montez in Bavaria, marked a major turning point in her career by providing Montez with a new avenue to explore with American audiences. She surprised New York critics with her natural acting ability, and some advised her to devote her efforts
to acting alone. Such advice, and the kudos that came from subsequent performances at the Bowery Theatre, prompted Montez to expand her dramatic repertoire. By adding the eponymous roles in *Maritana* and *Charlotte Corday*, she played strong heroines who possessed rebellious leadership qualities, underscoring her real life identity as a courageous political revolutionary.

Montez's later addition of the title roles in *Yelva* and *Clarissa Harlowe*, along with the part of Lady Teazle in *The School for Scandal*, enabled her to capitalize on the parallels to her personal life story. The mute role of Yelva not only displayed her dance talent for pantomime, but also provided a virtuous, self-sacrificing and courageous heroine. Perhaps, Montez viewed herself as a self-sacrificing heroine who accepted banishment from Bavaria out of love for Ludwig and the Bavarian people. Clarissa Harlowe was another virtuous female character whose circumstances betrayed her original plans for life. Both Harlowe's and Montez's parents tried to force their daughters into an unhappy marriage; but both Harlowe and Montez discovered another means of escape. Montez may have identified with the sense of misplaced trust that Clarissa found in her attraction to Lovelace, just as Montez had become attracted to, and betrayed by, the young and dashing Lt. Thomas James. In *The School For Scandal*, Montez might have identified with the love relationship between the
young and witty Lady Teazle and the older Sir Peter Teazle, a relationship similar to hers with King Ludwig I, of Bavaria.

Montez performed *Lola Montez in Bavaria* more often than any other dramatic role in her repertoire, \(^8\) to popular and critical success. A play of doubtful literary merit, it, nevertheless, earned some positive comments for its dialogue and characters. At the same time, although some critics found her lacking in acting skills, many others considered her expressive face, flashing eyes, passionate energy, and natural manner effective.

Montez usually earned critical approval of her acting within the narrow range of roles that directly, or indirectly, reflected her own life story—as well as her abilities as a dancer. But, the predominance of performances as herself in *Lola Montez in Bavaria* suggests that much of her acting success relied on her appearances in her own adventurous life experiences. Nonetheless, her dramatic vehicles, combined with her powerful stage presence, enabled her to sustain her successful tours. The negative response she received in a few cities, often was the result of reservations about her past personal life, her outspokenness, and willful manner when others opposed her. Notorious for her swearing, kicking and horsewhipping of opponents in Europe, Montez seemed to work to maintain a decorous ladylike image for American critics and audiences.
Early in her tour her emotional outbursts were infrequent, but once empowered by phenomenal popularity, and unquestionable financial security, bold, tempestuous public behavior occurred more often.

Conflicting critical reports make it difficult to estimate the level of Montez's artistic abilities; nonetheless, she could not have equalled the great dancers and actresses of the day. She lacked the training from childhood to become as accomplished as Fanny Elssler, who was equipped to perform in a much greater range of dance vehicles; however, critics often found Montez as pleasing and skillful as Elssler in the small number of dances she executed. Many critics considered Montez credible and interesting as an actress, but Montez lacked the wealth of acting experience and range of roles that developed and tested great actresses.

In comparison to Madame Celeste, a lesser known star of dance and drama, Montez never dedicated herself to a continuous career within the theatre, but rather discovered an occasional means by which she could support herself in a comfortable style. Long before her American tour she admitted that she never presumed to have qualifications for the stage, and that circumstances had forced her to adopt a theatrical career early in life. 9

Once Montez decided upon an American tour, however, she declared that she aimed for legitimate success as an
"artiste." Through dedicated practice with ballet masters, Montez honed her dance abilities. Working with the best acting companies in each city she visited, undoubtedly improved her acting. Hard work and steely determination enabled her to succeed in most of her small range of roles. Her American tour suggests that Montez was a minor artist of dance with a limited repertoire, and, an interesting but, merely passable actress.

In spite of modest artistic skills, Montez's sensational popular appeal compares to that of the finest artists of the day such as Fanny Elssler and Jenny Lind. She, too, established a nationwide mania. Unlike those two artists, however, Montez possessed a unique and multi­faceted public persona that added to her attractiveness. Throughout her American career, Montez reinforced her European reputation as an intelligent, outspoken female politician, a benevolent public figure and, at times, a physically combative opponent. In Boston, the stronghold of conservative American Puritanism, Montez fascinated religious leaders, literary figures, and prominent citizens through her religious and political ideas, and her knowledge of languages and literature. When her visit to the Boston public schools resulted in a heated debate between Montez and New York and Boston newspapers, Boston citizens and other newspaper editors quickly rallied to her support.
In several cities, Montez took advantage of her political reputation as a champion of the working classes and democracy by praising democratic ideals at every opportunity, performing benefits for New York, Philadelphia and California firemen, and waving the American flag following many of her performances. The numerous politicians that visited Montez during her stay in Washington, strengthened her image as an acceptable political figure.

From New York to California, Montez frequently found opportunities to help organize benefits for fellow artists and charitable organizations. When Boston's Tremont Temple burned, Montez canceled her scheduled engagements and performed in a benefit that raised money for a new theatre. As an indication of her accepted position in the United States by New York actor and stage manager, H. J. Conway, she was invited to perform with the first talent in the United States in New York's Great Dramatic Festival. It celebrated the centennial of the introduction of theatre to America, and provided funds for elderly and needy actors. In San Francisco, Montez performed in a charity fundraiser for the First Hebrew Benevolent Society, and, on her own, organized and performed in a benefit for the charitable fund of the San Francisco Fire Department. Although these benefits could also help her public image and therefore
box-office receipts, the events also suggest a generous nature.

Nonetheless, Montez tarnished her public charisma when her temper flared, and she could not refrain from uncontrolled and coarse behavior. In Baltimore, her professional relationship with dance master, George Washington Smith, ended with a physical altercation. In New Orleans, Montez engaged in a scuffle with the stage manager of the Varieties theatre that resulted in a widely publicized lawsuit. In Sacramento, she not only hurled epithets at a crowd that ridiculed her initial performance and marriage to Hull, but also challenged a newspaper editor to a duel when he implied that audiences attended her performances because of free tickets. If the typical nineteenth century woman would not have reacted in such a forceful manner, the fact that no critic, crowd, or judge could intimidate Montez seemed to add to her enigmatic reputation and attraction.

Historian Barbara Welter indicates that nineteenth century American society judged women according to four ideal virtues: "piety, purity, submissiveness and domesticity." Piety for women meant that they dedicated much of their lives to the pursuit of religious/Christian principles, to which they were "naturally" suited. Purity referred to their virginal status, without which a woman became a "fallen angel"
unworthy of her sex, driven to death or madness. Submissiveness required women to remain passive, allowing men to perform the important active roles in society. Domesticity provided a stable core for the family's values and a protective hearth that provided such cheer that brothers, husbands, sons [and daughters?] would not venture elsewhere for better times. 12

If Welter is correct about how nineteenth century society judged women, then Montez could hardly have been judged positively. Even if Montez considered herself a Christian, she hardly would have been considered pure, submissive or domestic. Yet, from coast-to-coast, both male and female Americans often paid inflated prices to attend Montez performances. The editors of The Popular Culture Reader indicate that the needs, wishes and desires of a population are reflected by the products that they purchase. 13 The difference between American female social ideals and Montez's remarkable popularity and critical success provides a paradox. If American society admired the ideals that Welter identified, why would it support the notorious Montez?

Montez's popularity may provide a revealing index to the real needs, wishes and desires of mid-nineteenth century American society, despite socially acceptable ideals. Through her performances, Montez seems to have fulfilled the audience's basic human need for escape from
the pressures and routine of everyday life. Her tour allowed Americans to satisfy their curiosity concerning a subject of scandalous newspaper report, and provided audiences with a new, bright and beautiful star whose repertoire often differed from the regular fare of the theatrical circuit. Montez's unique style in character dance and her acting in plays that directly, or indirectly, reflected her fascinating life story, allowed audiences an imaginative escape from the cares and worries of everyday life.

Montez performances drew males from every walk of life. An ideal beauty of the day, she was highly desirable, especially since powerful men such as Franz Liszt and, perhaps, King Ludwig had been her lovers. The "bold thought and free action" that Frank Leslie identified as "grief" to some, perhaps, made Montez even more appealing to American men who admired her sensual character dance and dramatic roles. If she was not the pure, submissive or domestic ideal that most men would choose for a wife, she epitomized, perhaps unfulfilled desires for the erotic in their lives.

Female support for Montez performances seems especially paradoxical in the light of Welter's feminine ideals. Montez attracted small and large numbers of females from all social ranks through her chaste, yet passionate dance, despite the fact that her performances
and reputation represented total defiance of societal ideals for women. Like her sister performers, Montez forfeited the domestic sphere by taking a stage career; but she often defied conventional female behavior in several other ways: smoking in public; physically attacking males when offended; providing her political and professional opinions in newspaper report; interacting with political figures; and, having the financial independence to insist on her own lifestyle rather than that of her husband. Some women probably attended her performances out of curiosity, and to see and, perhaps, admire a great beauty. However, others may have discovered a kind of surreptitious empowerment through Montez's forthright actions and financial independence. Her personal and professional example may have served as a fantasy life for many females who could not express directly their needs, wishes and desires. Frustrated females may not have had the power to express their discontent openly; but female attendance at the theatre, especially Montez performances, indirectly may have provided a kind of secret rebellion.

Montez lived in America, on and off, between her arrival in December of 1851 and the remainder of her life. In this time period, she performed as an actress and dancer for a total of only two and one-half-years—between December of 1851 and August of 1853, and again between August of 1856 and May of 1857. Even so, her life and
career influenced the stage careers of notable American women. She gave perennial child star "Lotta" Crabtree some of her earliest training and provided a theatrical start for Miriam Follin who later became a famous newspaper woman. Also, Adah Isaacs Menken's biographer, Wolf Mankowitz, discovered that the flamboyant and controversial actress who gained fame for her nude appearance atop a horse in Mazeppa considered Montez her alter ego, and emulated her onstage and in life. 

Dangerous, unpredictable, clever, and caring, Lola Montez performed across the United States to great success. Conservative newspapers, like The New York Times, objected to her personal background and attempted to downplay her successes and play-up potential problems. However, operating within the whirlpool of ideas concerning women, power, and their place, Montez emerged triumphant.

The Montez phenomenon, the mania that attended her performances, the critical success and the logic behind such have been overlooked to date. In the long view of American theatre history, Lola Montez, the Countess of Landsfeldt is an original: her American career stands alone. She was not a great artist, but no other male or female, titled or not, possessed a combined theatrical ability, political significance and popularity that she enjoyed as a performer in the nineteenth century. Montez has no equals in the twentieth century either; the closest
comparison might be a combination of the popular rock star Madonna and the politically active Vanessa Redgrave. Lola Montez was a household name in the nineteenth century, but many in the twentieth century have yet to appreciate the fascinating star who experienced her nova touring mid-nineteenth century America.

Notes--Chapter 10

1 Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper 2 February 1861.

2 The New York Herald 4, 13 January 1852; in today's dollars such a figure equals $107,508.00.


4 New York Evening Mirror 27 April 1852.


6 Mobile Daily Advertiser 23 December 1852.

7 Gleason's Pictorial Drawing-Room Companion 17 April 1852.

8 Montez performed Lola Montez in Bavaria approximately 70 times across the United States. When Montez began performing Lola Montez in Bavaria it was the only dramatic role she possessed. In September 1852 she added Charlotte Corday and Maritana, but by that time she had already performed Lola Montez in Bavaria 33 times. Even after she began fleshing out her array of dramatic roles, Lola Montez in Bavaria appeared more often than any other. She appeared in Charlotte Corday approximately 20 times; Maritana approximately 20 times; Yelva approximately 8 times; Clarissa Harlowe approximately 7 times; and, Lady Teazle, in The School For Scandal, approximately 7 times.
9 The Times 9 April 1847.

10 The Boston Daily Bee 30 March 1852.


12 Welter 21-31.


LIST OF WORKS CITED

Books


Coyne, Joseph Stirling. *Pas de Fascination, or, Catching a Governor*. Webster's National Acting Drama. No date.


Richardson, John. Lola Montes; or, a Reply to the "Private History and Memoirs" of That Celebrated Lady, Recently Published by the Marquis Papon, Formerly Secretary to
the King of Bavaria, and for a Period the Professed Friend and Attendant of the Countess of Landsfeldt. New York: Privately printed, 1851.

Robinson, D. G. Comic Songs, or, Hits at San Francisco. San Francisco: Commercial Book and Job Office, 1853.


Articles


Newspapers

Alabama Planter
Albany Atlas and Argus
Albany Journal
Albion (New York)
American Beacon (Norfolk, VA)
Baltimore American and Commercial Daily Advertiser
Baltimore Clipper
The Baltimore Sun
The Boston Daily Bee
The Boston Daily Courier
Boston Daily Evening Transcript
The Boston Evening Herald
Boston Herald
The Boston Post
Buffalo Commercial Advertiser
Charleston Daily Courier
Charleston Evening News
Chicago Daily Journal
Cincinnati Daily Enquirer
Le Corsaire-Satan (Paris)
Courrier des États Unis (New York)
Le Coureur des Spectacles (Paris)
Daily Albany Argus
Daily Alta California (San Francisco)
Daily American Telegraph (Washington, D. C.)
Daily Cincinnati Commercial
Daily Evenig Bulletin (San Francisco)
Daily Louisville Democrat
Daily National Intelligencer (Washington, D. C.)
The Era (London)
Fitzgerald's City Item (Philadelphia)
Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper (New York)
Gleason's Pictorial Drawing Room Companion (Boston)
The Golden Era (San Francisco)
Home Journal (New York)
The Illustrated London News
Illustrated News of the World (London)
Metropolitan (Washington, D. C.)
The Missouri Republican (St. Louis)
Mobile Daily Advertiser
Mobile Daily Register
The Morning Herald (London)
Nevada Journal
New Orleans Commercial Bulletin
New Orleans Daily Crescent
New Orleans Daily Picayune
New York Day Book
New York Evening Mirror
The New York Herald
The New York Times
New York Tribune
Norfolk and Portsmouth Herald
Philadelphia Public Ledger
The Pick (New York)
Pittsburgh Daily Union
The Present and the Future (San Francisco)
La Presse (Paris)
Providence Daily Post
Providence Journal
Republic (Washington, D. C.)
Richmond Daily Dispatch
Richmond Daily Republican
Richmond Daily Whig
Richmond Enquirer
Rochester Daily Advertiser
Rochester Democrat
Sacramento Union
San Francisco Bulletin
San Francisco Chronicle
San Francisco Herald
San Francisco Sun
San Francisco Town Talk
Southern Press (Washington, D. C.)
The Times (London)
Vox Populi (Lowell, MA)

Manuscripts and Collections


Durang, Charles. "The Philadelphia Stage, from the Year 1749 to the Year 1855. Partly Compiled from the Papers of his Father, the Late John Durang, with Notes by the Editors [of the Philadelphia Sunday Dispatch]. January 15, 1852 to October 11, 1852. The complete file is in six bound volumes in the library of the University of Pennsylvania.


Lola Montez Collection. San Francisco Performing Arts Museum.


Magrans, Dr. Ramon. Telephone Interview. 13 January 1993.

Theses and Dissertations


VITA

Sara Elizabeth Gotcher was born September 27, 1958 in Clarksville, Tennessee where she attended high school and graduated from Austin Peay State University with a Bachelor of Arts in Speech, Communication and Theatre in 1981. Married for one year to James Micheal Gotcher, she began graduate school at the University of Florida, Gainesville, in the Fall of 1981 where she completed the Master of Fine Arts degree in Acting/Directing through a graduate assistantship in 1983. She earned her Equity card at the Hippodrome Theatre, Gainesville, by performing during and after her university studies. Following appearances at Miami, Florida's "South of Broadway Theatre," Gotcher returned to APSU to teach acting courses on a part-time basis. Work on an original production with playwright, Arthur Kopit, inspired her to return to graduate school. Awarded with a teaching assistantship from Louisiana State University in 1987, Gotcher taught and performed, as she pursued the Doctor of Philosophy degree in theatre studies. She completed her course-work at LSU in 1990, and returned to APSU as the Guest-Artist-in-Theatre through the Center for the Creative Arts. Since 1990, Gotcher has taught, acted, directed, and extensively traveled to research the tour of Lola Montez in the United States, but life with her husband and daughter, Jessie Elizabeth Gotcher, born May 12, 1992, has proven her greatest exploration to date.
DOCTORAL EXAMINATION AND DISSERTATION REPORT

Candidate:    Sara Elizabeth Gotcher

Major Field:  Theatre

Title of Dissertation:  The Career of Lola Montez in the American Theatre

Approved:

[Signatures]

Major Professor and Chairman

Dean of the Graduate School

EXAMINING COMMITTEE:

[Signatures]

Date of Examination:  March 7, 1994