



University
of Glasgow

Macartney, H. *William Stirling and the talbotype volume of the Annals of the Artists of Spain*. *History of Photography*, 30 (4). pp. 291-308. ISSN 0308-7298

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/49690/>

Deposited on: 10 March 2011

William Stirling and the Talbotype Volume of the *Annals of the Artists of Spain*

Hilary Macartney

In 1848, William Stirling, later Sir William Stirling Maxwell (1818-1878), published his three-volume *Annals of the Artists of Spain*, the first scholarly history of Spanish art in English, as well as the first contextual history of Spanish art in any language.¹ Another pioneering feature of this work was that the three text volumes were accompanied by a limited edition fourth volume of Talbotype illustrations. The existence of this fourth volume of Talbotypes has enabled the *Annals of the Artists of Spain* to be hailed as the first art history book to be illustrated with photographs.² Despite the Talbotypes' shortcomings as reproductions of works of art, this volume marked the beginning of a revolution in the methodology of art history, in which photographs and photographically illustrated books would become essential tools.³ To date, however, discussion of the significance of the Talbotypes volume has concentrated on their context within the history of photography, rather than on their relevance to the historiography of art generally, and of Spanish art in particular, or to Stirling's contribution to these fields. Stirling's role in commissioning and paying for the Talbotypes; in collecting, commissioning or borrowing the works to be photographed; and in the quality control of

the results deserves greater examination. Stirling himself alluded to his directorial role in his Preface to the Talbotypes, when he stated that '[t]hey were executed ... under my superintendence'.⁴ This article attempts to redress this imbalance, and also considers the Talbotypes in relation to the other illustrations to the *Annals*. Space does not permit the exploration here of the context of the Talbotypes within Stirling's many related interests, beyond listing the following key concerns: a fascination for the relationship between words and images, as demonstrated by his interest in illustrated books, notably his extensive collection of emblem books now in Glasgow University library, as well as in the concept of illustrated histories; the use of pictures as visual documents; and an interest in the functions of prints and printmaking, including the possibility of a true facsimile, which would replicate an image without loss of quality or integrity of the original.⁵

This article also draws for the first time on primary sources on Stirling, such as his papers, as well as presenting the results of study of a number of the surviving copies of the Talbotypes, and enables some of the numerous questions, speculations and previous assumptions about the Talbotypes to be resolved, discounted or challenged, though the new information also raises fresh questions, and much remains to be clarified about the production of the Talbotypes volume. It also considers some of the technical problems raised, and not always entirely resolved, during this pioneering project to photograph Spanish art. Around sixteen copies of the Talbotypes volume of the *Annals* are currently known in public and private collections, including examples in the British Library (London), Hispanic Society of America (New York), Musée Condé (Chantilly),

Museo del Prado (Madrid), National Library of Scotland (Edinburgh), Pollok House (Glasgow), Universidad de Navarra (Pamplona) and University of Leeds.⁶ Additional, unbound copies of most of the Talbotype illustrations also form part of the Fox Talbot Collection now at the National Museum of Photography, Film and Television, Bradford. Many are also included in an album which belonged to one of the most important figures in early photography in Scotland, Sir David Brewster; and in another album presented to the British Museum in 1857.⁷

One of the questions raised by study of new material on Stirling and the Talbotypes concerns the number of copies issued. The volume itself states: ‘ONLY TWENTY-FIVE COPIES PRINTED’, and this figure has been accepted without question until now. The Talbotypes were carried out by Nicolaas Henneman, who was assistant, or as Stirling called him ‘the intelligent agent of the inventor’ of the process, William Fox Talbot.⁸ Henneman’s accounts for the Talbotypes survive (Appendix 1), and apart from showing that, in 1847, he supplied Stirling with a number of Talbotypes unrelated to the *Annals* project and carried out other services, including cleaning and varnishing paintings, they reveal that, in June 1848, he supplied Stirling with ‘50 volumes each containing 68 Talbotypes’, the latter figure being indeed the number of Talbotypes contained in the extra volume of the *Annals*. Confusingly, however, the account also shows that many of the Talbotypes of individual subjects were supplied in twenty-five copies.⁹ In 1872, in his Preface to *Examples of Engraved Portraiture of the Sixteenth Century*, Stirling made another statement about the Talbotypes volume which appears to confirm that there were fifty copies. He recalled that he had ‘sought to illustrate 50 copies

[of the *Annals*] with photographic copies of prints, drawings, and a few pictures'.¹⁰ So, if fifty copies were produced, were all fifty distributed, or only twenty-five? In his Preface to the Talbotypes, Stirling explained that the volume was for his friends, whilst Richard Ford, in his review of the *Annals*, said that the extra volume was 'for private circulation'. It is possible, then, that Stirling had extra copies made because he was unsure of the consistent quality or durability of the results.¹¹ However, as copies of the extra volume survive in two different page sizes, viz. 225 x 135mm and 280 x 180mm approximately, it seems more likely that twenty-five copies of each size were produced. The bill for the printing from the publisher, John Olliver, also survives, and confirms that 750 copies of the three text volumes were printed in octavo and twenty-five in large-paper format.¹² Of the 750 octavo copies, twenty-five were printed in best ink and bound in higher-quality bindings. These special octavo copies were probably presentation copies, like the large-paper ones, and the other twenty-five copies of the Talbotypes volume may have been printed to accompany these octavo text volumes.

What exactly prompted Stirling to experiment with photographic illustrations to his book on Spanish art is difficult to pinpoint with certainty. However, like many British tourists in the first half of the nineteenth century, Stirling purchased a *camera lucida* for his travels in Spain and the Middle East in 1841-42. Before he set off, he wrote from London to his sister back home in Keir House in Perthshire: 'My camera-lucida, but especially the table for drawing upon with it, cost me much time & hunting. The table is a piece of elaborate mechanism for getting an exactly level surface, a thing absolutely requisite to the making of good sound drawings.'¹³ He told his sister that he intended to

use it primarily to draw ‘temples and tombs’ in the Middle East, though it is possible he also used it to make sketches in Spain both then and on his visit of 1845.¹⁴ His interest in the *camera lucida*, then, perhaps heralded his interest in photography, in addition to reflecting his own interest in art. He may have become aware of Talbot’s process through his contacts in London, though of course there was also much interest in the process in Scotland, through Sir David Brewster, as well as D.O. Hill and Robert Adamson.¹⁵ Talbot’s *The Pencil of Nature* appeared in 1844-46, at exactly the period when Stirling was gathering the illustrations for the *Annals*, while Talbot’s next book of photographs, *Sun Pictures in Scotland*, 1845, consisting mainly of ‘scenes connected with the life and writings of Sir Walter Scott’, would have been of especial interest to Stirling, who was a great admirer of Scott.¹⁶

Some of the imagery Stirling used in his writings suggests a predisposition towards an interest in photography, including, in particular, its concerns with light and with capturing and preserving the living moment. For example, as a historian as well as an art historian, he was inspired by Scott’s vivid characterisation of historical figures, through which, Stirling wrote, ‘the delighted reader [finds] himself brought face to face with personages whom he [has] before seen only as in a glass darkly’; and he also described ‘the pen of [Thomas] Carlyle’ as an ‘electric light flashed over many famous men and into many dark places’.¹⁷ Both these images also suggest portraiture, which Stirling described in the *Annals* as ‘the most useful and valuable department of painting, which lightens the labour and points the tale of the historian and the biographer, embalms beyond the arts of Egypt and gives to beauty centuries instead of years of triumph’, and

his special interest in Spanish art had much to do with its 'proud eminence in this genre'.¹⁸

Stirling appears to have been attracted to qualities which he saw as shared by both photography and painting, and by Spanish painting in particular. It is, therefore, highly appropriate that, because of him, much of the earliest fine art photography in Britain was concerned with Spanish art, which was then one of the least known schools in this country. Nineteenth-century critics and art historians generally considered Spanish art, both its portraiture and its religious art, inferior to Italian art, because of its realism and lack of idealisation.¹⁹ Stirling admired it for precisely these qualities, including its 'faithful and forceful fac-similes' of nature.²⁰ The seventeenth-century Spanish painter Velázquez had come to be considered the supreme realist, especially in his masterpiece *Las Meninas* (figure 1).²¹ In one of the most memorable observations in the *Annals*, Stirling compared *Las Meninas* to a Daguerrotype: 'Velazquez seems to have anticipated the discovery of Daguerre, and taking a real room and real chance-grouped people, to have fixed them ... for all time on canvas'. However, Stirling would certainly have known that a Daguerrotype, like a painted scene, did not literally represent 'chance-grouped people', even if it gave that impression, and he went on to acknowledge that 'the perfection of art which conceals art was never better attained than in this picture'.²²

The Neoclassical historian of Spanish art, Ceán Bermúdez had perhaps influenced Stirling's thoughts about the apparent photographic realism of this picture. Ceán was generally a great advocate of idealisation in art, but in his dictionary of Spanish artists of 1800, he forgave Velázquez his lack of it because of his achievement instead of an 'exact

imitation of nature' in *Las Meninas*, and of 'the inimitable art with which he represented the air between the figures, giving an illusion of distances'.²³ Ceán was convinced that this could only have been achieved with the aid of a camera obscura, which 'transforms nature into painting ... and whoever has compared the style and principles of Velázquez with the effect which this simple machine produces must be convinced of this'. Stirling's Daguerrotype analogy was in turn picked up and developed by several other writers, including the French Hispanophile Prosper Mérimée, in his review of the *Annals*, and by the British connoisseur and diplomat Sir Austin Henry Layard, who published an article on Spanish art in 1872.²⁴

But apart from comparisons between Spanish art and photography, the main reasons for Stirling's attraction to the new process would undoubtedly have been the same as those for which James Ward suggested Talbot also valued it, as 'a working tool, an invaluable means of duplicating and multiplying images, and a unique recording system'.²⁵ Stirling had been concerned to obtain copies of Spanish paintings since his very first visit to Spain in 1841, before he declared any intention of preparing a history of Spanish art. This first visit lasted only seven days, only one of which was spent exploring Seville when, after visiting the fine art museum there, he commissioned a copy of Murillo's *Sta. Justa and Sta. Rufina* (figure 2) in Seville Museum, which was to be copied by a local painter, José Roldán (1808-71), in time for Stirling's next visit in 1842.²⁶ Stirling's enchantment with Seville and his admiration for the art of Murillo on his first visit were stock reactions echoed by most British visitors of the time – after all Murillo was practically the only Spanish artist they had heard of. However, Stirling's

reasons for wanting a copy of the picture were already more complex than a mere desire for a souvenir of the most popular Spanish artist, for he explained to his sister in a letter that he believed that Murillo had used the same model for one of the saints as he had used for the Virgin in the picture in the Corsini Gallery in Rome. Stirling had seen the Corsini picture when he visited Rome in 1839-40, and a copy of it (figure 3), which might have been brought back by Stirling's father or his uncle, Charles Stirling, was already in the family's collection at Keir. The copy of the Seville picture then, when compared with the Keir copy of the Corsini Virgin, was intended to provide visual evidence of Stirling's point, or at least to show that Murillo used similar facial types in each of the paintings, provided of course that both copies were sufficiently faithful to the originals. When the Corsini Virgin, or even the copy of it is compared with the original of *Sta. Justa and Sta. Rufina*, Stirling's point can be understood, and he remained confident enough about his observation to repeat it in the *Annals* seven years later.²⁷ His ability to make this comparison was probably due more to his familiarity with the reasonable copy of the Corsini Virgin at Keir, rather than with the original in Rome which he perhaps had seen only two or three times at the most, possibly in poor light.²⁸ Thus, as early as 1841, Stirling was already using copies as art historical tools. Whether Roldán's copy of the *Sta. Justa and Sta. Rufina* was good enough to prove Stirling's point is highly doubtful, judging by the Talbotype after it (figure 4). Nevertheless, Stirling not only accepted it but used it as an illustration to the *Annals* and also commissioned many other copies from the same artist.

Unlike the copy of *Sta. Justa and Sta. Rufina*, many of the copies Stirling subsequently bought or commissioned from Roldán were wanted primarily for illustrations, and became the ‘versions’ from which many of the conventional illustrations and the Talbotypes were made for the *Annals*. When he ordered more copies from Roldán in March 1847, he told the artist: ‘Take your time about them, & let them be very accurate, as I want them for engraving’.²⁹ Thus, accuracy was indeed the most important consideration for Stirling in the copying of paintings, even if he often accepted painted copies, prints and Talbotypes which seem to the present-day viewer to be poor likenesses of the originals. Including the *Sta. Justa and Sta. Rufina*, four copies after Murillo by Roldán were photographed as nos. 44-47 of the *Annals* Talbotypes. The copies cannot be identified in surviving catalogues and inventories of Stirling’s collection, and their size is unknown, although the Talbotypes caption states that all four were ‘reduced copies in oil’. Other copies by Roldán which were used for engravings by Stirling can, however, be identified and seem also to have been intended to be suitable for display on Stirling’s walls, especially as some of them were as large as a metre and a half tall.³⁰ The colour and tonality of Roldán’s copies were presumably also important, and the multi-purpose situations in which Stirling utilised painted copies means that it is perhaps unlikely that any of those photographed for the Talbotypes volume these were commissioned in black and white to facilitate photography, as Anthony Hamber has suggested.³¹ Other painted or drawn copies or sketches of Spanish paintings, including copies of details, which were used for the *Annals* Talbotypes were by M. Tessin (no. 12), James Rannie Swinton (1816-1888) (nos. 32 & 55) and William Barclay (1797-1859) (nos. 10 & 11).

At what stage during the preparation of the *Annals* Stirling decided to experiment with photographic illustrations is not clear, although Henneman's involvement does not appear to be documented until 1847. From 1844 onwards, however, Stirling was commissioning drawings and small watercolour copies of Spanish paintings in the Galerie Espagnole at the Louvre in Paris, notably from William Barclay, many of which were used for the 'conventional' print illustrations in the text volumes of the *Annals*.³² One of the watercolours by Barclay, of El Greco's *Lady in a Fur Wrap* (figure 5; now Glasgow Museums, Stirling Maxwell Collection, Pollok House), was used by Stirling for *Annals* Talbotype no. 10 (figure 6), even though, like Roldán's *Sta. Justa and Sta. Rufina*, the copy is not entirely successful. The original was one of the star attractions of the Galerie Espagnole and was later bought by Stirling.³³

Some of the materials for illustrations were also collected or commissioned during Stirling's 1845 visit to Spain, including 'a full-size drawing, executed at Seville by Don Salvador Gutiérrez', after a detail of a cherub with a mitre in Murillo's painting of *Sts. Leander and Buenaventura* in Seville Museum, which was illustrated as no. 49 in the Talbotypes volume. Although Gutiérrez's drawing cannot be identified in surviving catalogues and inventories of Stirling's collection, it was almost certainly commissioned and owned by Stirling, and if so, it would have been unnecessary to have it photographed in Seville in 1845, as Lee Fontanella has suggested.³⁴ Instead, as Nicolaas Henneman's accounts (see Appendix 1) show that he supplied 25 Talbotypes of 'Child Holding Mitre' on 28 June 1847, it is likely that he had photographed the drawing shortly before that date.

It seems unlikely that a coherent programme of illustrations was worked out until after rejection of the first draft of the *Annals* by the publisher John Murray in 1845. Following this rejection, Stirling decided to press ahead with publication largely or wholly at his own expense.³⁵ Since the Talbotypes were printed in a separate volume, the decision to include them could have been taken at a late stage of preparation of the text. As regards the ‘conventional’ illustrations to the *Annals*, which consisted of engravings, lithographs and woodcuts, it is worth bearing in mind that in 1848, illustrations were by no means standard in books on art, though they were becoming much more common. The relationship between the text and the conventional illustrations to the *Annals* was close: they were integrated with the entries on particular artists and typically consisted of a portrait (or supposed portrait) of the artist in question if such existed and, in the case of major artists, one or more important examples of their work. Another important factor influencing the choice of textual illustrations was mentioned by Stirling in his Preface: namely, the fact that many of the works had never been illustrated before and were therefore new visual records.³⁶

Stirling’s decision to illustrate the *Annals* was part of his wider belief in the need for illustrated histories which was given its most elaborate expression in his historical study, *Don John of Austria or Passages from the History of the Sixteenth Century*, published posthumously in 1883. It also reflected an antiquarian collecting interest in illustrated books and a commitment to the revival of the arts of the book. However, these concerns often conflicted with his aim to provide his readers with good illustrations of the Spanish pictures he was writing about, and he instead recreated something like the

appearance and quality of the books of the age he was writing about, by imitating their design, typography, decoration and illustrations. Lord Macaulay, who appears to have been unaware of the additional Talbotypes volume, put his finger on the problem in his perceptive but not altogether favourable review of the *Annals* in *The Spectator*. He noted that Stirling's 'handsome volumes' were 'enriched with engravings and wood-cuts after specimens of the Spanish masters' but complained that 'though numerous, they are rather enrichments to the volume than illustrations of the subject'.³⁷

Stirling's openness to new technology through his inclusion of photographic illustrations, and his concern to revive the traditional arts of the book were not necessarily conflicting aims, but he obviously understood the difficulties of combining them, and the presentation of the Talbotypes in a separate volume in a very limited edition underlines the experimental nature of the latter. There were no cross references between the text and the Talbotypes, and their selection and arrangement appears almost random at first sight. In a letter of 1856 (Appendix 3), concerning the binding or rebinding of the copy of the *Annals* which Stirling had given to fellow Hispanophile and art collector, William Wells, Stirling strongly advised against binding the Talbotypes in with the text, due to the problem of fading which the Talbotypes already exhibited.³⁸ In the Preface to the Talbotypes volume, he had explained that they were arranged in chronological order and could be 'easily consulted' by means of the index and table of contents of the text volumes.³⁹ Nevertheless, he admitted in his letter of 1856 that 'the Illustrations in Photography are not all mentioned in the Text of the Annals; tho' most are'.

In fact much of the choice of Talbotypes was governed by the limitations of the new process, notably the availability and suitability of pictures that could be photographed in daylight. The pieces photographed were thus generally small in size, and belonged either to Stirling himself, or to his friends and fellow-Hispanophiles Richard Ford (1796-1858) or Ralph W. Grey (1819-69), to the latter of whom the Talbotypes volume was dedicated.⁴⁰ Most were of prints, though there were also two of small bas-reliefs by Martínez Montañés (nos. 13 & 14; Figure 7; see also below and Appendix 2) from Ford's collection which were 'perhaps the sole specimens of the national Spanish sculpture in England' and 'probably the first which have as yet been reproduced by a mechanical process'; as well as two drawings by Murillo (nos. 56 & 57) and one by Alonso Cano of Mary Magdalene (no. 41) which, he believed, were 'the only original works of these masters ever copied by the sun' (ie. photographed). Of the prints, a few were original etchings, including one of *Don John of Austria* (no. 37) described by Stirling as 'the finest and most valuable of the etchings of Ribera', and three of Goya's *Tauromaquia* series of 1816 (no. 63-65).⁴¹ Most of the Talbotypes, however, were of prints after paintings, including some Goya etchings after Velázquez paintings (nos. 26-29). A number were French lithographs after Spanish paintings, though Stirling was particularly keen to illustrate Spanish prints, wherever possible, noting in his Preface that he was 'guided by a desire to exhibit, as far as possible, the genius both of the Spanish pencil, and of the less known Spanish graver' and therefore, where there was a choice, he had preferred the Spanish print in each case 'even to a better work produced on this side of the Pyrenees'.⁴²

The most significant limitation of the Talbotypes illustrations was the absence of any which directly reproduced original paintings. Instead, as we have seen, copies in oils or watercopies by Roldán and Barclay were used, such as those. Amongst the Talbotypes left out of the volume, however, were Talbotypes of two of the four Goya oil sketches of *Boys playing* (Figs. 8-9), apparently bought by Stirling in Seville in 1842 and his first known purchases of Spanish paintings. The Talbotype of *Boys playing at Soldiers* is certainly rather dark, and the features of the central figure are almost indecipherable. Also, in both illustrations, the light reflections from the thickly applied paint surface interfere somewhat with the reading of the image as a whole.⁴³ Nevertheless, these are extremely interesting as examples of the kind of problems that would have to be overcome in photography of original paintings. They are almost certainly the first photographs of Goya paintings and they may have been the ‘two oil paintings’ referred to by Henneman in a letter to Talbot of May 1847, when he explained that Stirling had wanted him to do these ‘to see how we could do oil painting, as he has a great many to do’.⁴⁴ Their inclusion in the Talbotypes volume would also have provided one of the few direct links between the text and the Talbotypes illustrations, as, in his notice on Goya, Stirling had mentioned these ‘hasty sketches of children at play’.⁴⁵

The fact that these two Talbotypes were not included in the finished volume provides a hint of the kind of difficulties experienced during this photography project. Three untrimmed examples of Talbotype no. 44, *St. Thomas of Villanueva giving Alms*, by Roldán after Murillo (Figure 10), appear to provide further insight into the ingenious attempts made by Henneman to overcome problems.⁴⁶ After the *St. Justa and St. Rufina*

by Murillo, the *St. Thomas of Villanueva* was the painting most admired by Stirling in Seville Museum on his first visit in 1841, and it is possible that he bought or commissioned the copy from Roldán then, along with the *Justa and Rufina*.⁴⁷ Like other copies painted by Roldán for Stirling in 1845-7, the canvases are likely to have been transported to Britain rolled up in tin cylinders.⁴⁸ Stirling perhaps did not get round to having a stretcher made for the copy of Murillo's *St. Thomas*, as the raw edge of the canvas appears to be visible in the untrimmed Talbotypes, particularly at the right-hand side. These untrimmed images show the canvas apparently pinned to a wall, with string or rope hanging below the canvas. The string or rope device was perhaps attached to a weight, in an attempt to compensate for the lack of a stretcher by flattening the canvas sufficiently to prevent light reflections from marring the Talbotype image. The horizontal line below the canvas might be a dado on the wall.

Photography of larger works was also a problem for Henneman. In his letter to Talbot of 5 May 1847, he asked for advice on how to photograph a painting measuring 4 foot 6 inches by 2 feet 2 inches, which Stirling wanted reduced to a Talbotype image of 3 inches by 1½ inches, adding his own suggestion that it be done in two stages: 'I think the best way to get it *distinct* is to take a large one first *and then* a small one from that'.⁴⁹ It is not clear whether Henneman was referring to one of the Roldán copies for the *Annals* illustrations or to the project, mentioned above, to photograph paintings in Stirling's collection. Photography of the copy of Murillo's *St. Thomas* was obviously achieved without resort to this method, which would have meant that Talbotype illustrations of copy paintings were at three, rather than two removes from the originals.

During photography of other types of artworks for the *Annals*, Henneman had already faced the opposite challenge of trying to obtain results which were sufficiently large, as he revealed in a letter to Stirling dated 17 March 1847 (Appendix 2). In it, he apologised that in two different types of situation, he had been forced to make the photographs smaller than he knew Stirling would want. In the case of the two little relief sculptures by Martínez Montañés which Stirling had borrowed from Richard Ford, representing the *Christ Child and Infant St. John*, and *St. Catherine of Siena receiving the Rosary from the Virgin and Child* (figure 7), he explained to Stirling: ‘the relief pictures I could not separate the inside frame it being glued so fast to the picture that I was afraid to separate it for fear of injuring it. You will perceive by the shadow on the top, that had I taken it larger it would of course show worse.’ It is fortunate that Henneman did not succeed in separating the reliefs from their unusual carved, pine frames, although these appear to be later than the reliefs and to have been adapted, probably from a piece of furniture, perhaps shortly before Ford purchased the reliefs in Seville in 1832.⁵⁰

Henneman’s problem with the shadow cast by the frame can be seen in many of the extra Talbotypes of individual subjects now in the National Museum of Photography, Film and Television, Bradford. The originals, measuring approximately 12.75 x 10.25 cm. (5 x 4 in.), were illustrated as nos. 13 and 14 in the *Annals* volume. The seventeen Talbotypes of *St. Catherine*, measuring 7.8 x 6.3 cm. (3.3 x 2.7 in.), and seven of the *Christ Child and Infant St. John*, measuring and 7 at 7.6 x 6 cm. (3.1 x 2.5 in.), in Bradford show Henneman experimenting with a range of lighting and tone, in an attempt to achieve

satisfactory results and, although he does not say so in his letter, they reveal that he clearly also had difficulties with the shadows cast by the relief technique itself.⁵¹

Henneman's other comment to Stirling is equally revealing of the limitations of the new medium: 'I am sorry I could not get the Talbotypes larger than the inclosed [sic], owing ... that there was writing on the back of the two little prints, and was therefore obliged to take them with the Camera.' He thus confirmed not only that there was at the time no practical system for enlarging negatives, but also that, wherever possible, he had not used a camera to obtain the Talbotypes. In the case of suitable works, such as works on paper without writing or other images on the reverse, he would instead have made a contact print, by placing chemically sensitised paper in direct contact with the original print or drawing and exposing it to sunlight. The resulting paper negative would then have been used to make the Talbotype prints, by in turn placing the negative in contact with another sheet of sensitised paper to make a positive.⁵² Because the Talbotypes taken with the camera were so small, Henneman offered them to Stirling at half price, ie. a shilling instead of two shillings per copy. Quite possibly there were also other cases in which Stirling was dissatisfied with the results, as one entry in Henneman's account credited Stirling for £33.15.0 for the 'return of part of goods' on 28 June 1847.

Not surprisingly, the project seems to have taken longer than Henneman anticipated. Despite his claim in his letter to Talbot of May 1847 that 'the principal order' for Stirling was finished, and the fact that the date on the titlepage of the Talbotypes volume is 1847, Henneman's bill shows that he did not supply the final bound copies until June 1848. The printing of the text took even longer, as it appears to have been

started in 1846 but was not finished until June 1848! However, the Talbotypes volume seems to have missed even that deadline for the publication of the work as a whole, as Stirling wrote to one of the recipients of a presentation copy, William Wells on 21 June 1848, that 'I hope to add to these volumes (which belong to a small set) a fourth of Talbotype illustrations, which is not yet quite ready.'⁵³

Appendix 1

Bill from Nicolaas Henneman for Talbotypes, etc., supplied to William Stirling⁵⁴

Statement of Account for 1847-8:

SUN PICTURE ROOMS 122 Regent Street, London 1849

Wm. Stirling Esq:

Bought of Nicolaas Henneman

Instructions, cameras, chemicals, prepared paper & every requisite for the Talbotype supplied.

1847

March	17	To	8	Talbotypes	@	1/-	£	: 8: 0
	23		24	do.		1/-		1: 4: 0
	29		3	do. (mounted on cartridge paper)		5/-		15: 0
			17	do. do.		3/6		2:19: 6
			3	do. do.		3/-		9: 0
			1	do. (Unmounted to order)		2/-		2: 0
			1	do. (Mounted on cartridge paper – Mrs. Ogilvy)				3: 0
			4	do. (Small – mounted to order)	1/-			4: 0
			68	do. (“ – unmounted “ “)		1/-		3: 8: 0
April	19		74	do. (to order)		2/-		7: 8: 0
			121	do. (“)		1/-		6: 1: 0
June	28		25	do. (Unmounted)		1/-		1: 5: 0
			25	do. (“)	1/-			1: 5: 0
			25	do. (“)	1/-			1: 5: 0
			25	do. (“)	2/-			2:10: 0
			25	do. (“)	2/-			2:10: 0
			25	do. (“)	2/-			2:10: 0
			25	do. (“)	1/-			1: 5: 0
			25	do. (“)	1/-			1: 5: 0
			25	do. (“)	1/-			1: 5: 0
			25	do. (“)	1/-			1: 5: 0
			25	do. (“)	2/-			2:10: 0
			25	do. (“)	2/-			2:10: 0
			25	do. (“)	1/-			1: 5: 0
			25	do. (“)	1/-			1: 5: 0
			25	do. (“)	1/-			1: 5: 0
			25	do. (“)	1/-			1: 5: 0
			25	do. (“)	1/-			1: 5: 0
			25	do. (“)	1/-			1: 5: 0
			25	do. (“)	1/-			1: 5: 0
			1	do. (Touched)	1/1/-			1: 1: 0
			25	do. (Unmounted)		1/-		1: 5: 0
			25	do. (“)	1/-			1: 5: 0
			25	do. (“)	2/-			2:10: 0
			25	do. (“)	2/-			2:10: 0

		1 do. (Touched)	1/1/-	1: 1: 0
		25 do. (Unmounted)	3/-	3:15: 0
	29	Varnishing portrait		3: 0
July	22	Touching 1 picture of 'Christ on the Cross'		10: 6
		“ 1 copy of oil painting		1:11: 6
Aug ^t .	10	Cleaning & varnishing 1 oil painting		<u>7: 6</u>
		Carried forward		£65: 6: 0
1847		Brought forward		£65: 6: 0
Aug.	13 To	1 portfolio		5: 0
		1 Talbotype (2 fruit baskets)		3: 0
		1 do. (Snow Scene)		5: 0
		1 do. (Singleton Farm Yard)		5: 0
		1 do. (Currant leaf)		3: 0
		1 do. (do.)		3: 0
		1 do. (Cherry)		3: 0
		1 do. (Lace)		3: 0
		1 do. (Cloisters)		5: 0
		1 do. (Benedictine Convent)		5: 0
		1 do. (do.)		3: 6
		1 do. (Mrs. Ogilvy – Exchanged)		
	31	2 Portraits		2: 2: 0
		1 Magnifying Glass		1: 0: 0
1848				
April	4	2 Copies of Lace (Unmounted)		5: 0
June	To	50 volumes each containing 68 Talbotypes		
		viz: 39 @ 1/- + 29 @ 2/- = £4:17: 0		
		50 vols. @ £4:17/-		£242:10: 0
		Binding & Mounting do.		<u>10:12: 6</u>
				£323:18: 6

Cr.

1847

July 9 – By Cash per Cheque £49: 0: 0

1848

Feb. 9 do. do. 50: 0: 0

By return of post

of goods del^d. June 28/47 33:15: 0

Aug. 5 By Cash per Cheque 100: 0: 0

£232:15: 0

Bal^{ce} due

£91: 3: 6

Feb. 9 Paid by Bk order from Stirling

Itemised Supply of Talbotypes:

Reading

March 29/47

& April 19

W. Stirling, Esq

To N. Henneman

			£.	S.	D.
To 25 Talbotypes		St. John	1/-	1:	5: 0
25 do.		St. Francis	1/-	1:	5: 0
25 do.		St. Teresa	1/-	1:	5: 0
25 do.		Christ & St. John	1/-	1:	5: 0
25 do.		Christ on Calvary	1/-	1:	5: 0
25 do.		Magdalen	1/-	1:	5: 0
25 do.		Don John	2/-	2:	10: 0
25 do.		St. Anthony & St. Paul	2/-	2:	10: 0
25 do.		Front of Escorial	1/-	1:	5: 0
25 do.		Back of do.	1/-	1:	5: 0
					<u>£15: 0: 0</u>

122 Regent Street

London June 28/47

W. Stirling, Esq

To Nicolaas Henneman

To 25 Talbotypes		Back of Escorial	1/-	1:	5: 0
25 do.		Front of do.	1/-	1:	5: 0
25 do.		La Virgen adorante	1/-	1:	5: 0
25 do.		Sacra Familia	2/-	2:	10: 0
25 do.		La Divina Pastora	2/-	2:	10: 0
25 do.		Spinning Women	2/-	2:	10: 0
25 do.		Phillip [sic] the 4th	1/-	1:	5: 0
25 do.		Queen Isabel	1/-	1:	5: 0
25 do.		Olivarez	1/-	1:	5: 0
25 do.		Escorial General View	2/-	2:	10: 0
25 do.		Do. High Altar	2/-	2:	10: 0
25 do.		Our Lord & Disciples	1/-	1:	5: 0
25 do.		Monk kneeling	1/-	1:	5: 0
25 do.		Bull Fight 1	1/-	1:	5: 0
25 do.		do. do. 2	1/-	1:	5: 0
25 do.		do. do. 3	1/-	1:	5: 0
1 Pedro Orrente Touched			1/1/-	1:	1: 0
25 Talbotypes		Child Holding Mitre	1/-	1:	5: 0
25 do.		Landscape	1/-	1:	5: 0
25 do.		Boys at Play 1	2/-	2:	10: 0
25 do.		do. do. 2	2/-	2:	10: 0

Appendix 2

Letter from Nicolaas Henneman to William Stirling, 17 March, 1847⁵⁵

Sir

I am sorry I could not get the Talbotypes larger than the inclosed, owing in one case, that there was writing on the back of the two little prints, and was therefore obliged to take them with the Camera, the relief pictures I could not separate the inside frame it being glued so fast to the picture that I was afraid to separate it for fear of injuring it. You will perceive by the shadow on the top, that had I taken it larger it would of course show worse. If you like them, mounted, let me know if on cardboard, or on paper. I shall only charge you half of what I told you on account of there [sic] being so small that is 1/- each unmounted. If you send me Mr. Ford's address I will forward him the originals.

Your Obedient Servant,

N. Henneman

8 Russell Terrace

Reading

Appendix 3

Letter from William Stirling to Messrs. T.& W. Boone, 29 Jan. 1856⁵⁶

128 Park Street Grosvenor Square

Jan.^y 29 1856

Gentlemen

I strongly recommend Mr Wells not to bind the Talbotype Illustrations to Annals of the Artists of Spain, otherwise than they were intended to be bound, i.e. separately. He is lucky if his set is not fading, or faded; & this tendency, w^h. I fear all have, is further increased, according to some people's opinion, if the plates are faced by paper of some particular quality – a quality w^h. may perhaps exist in the paper of the work. If the Illustrations fade, Mr Well's book will be spoiled – by the interpolation of a much discoloured paper, & in any case the very carefully drawn up Table of Contents of the Talbotypes volume will be rendered useless.

The Illustrations in Photography are not all mentioned in the Text of the Annals; tho' most are. If Goya is by accident omitted in Index, you will find him in the Table of Contents at p 1260, & Perete is the same as Perret, P. who is in Index.

Your obedt. Servant

William Stirling

Messrs. T.&W. Boone

29 New Bond S^t.

Notes

This article developed out of a chapter in the author's PhD thesis, *Sir William Stirling Maxwell as Historian of Spanish Art*, London: Courtauld Institute of Art 2003. A preliminary version was presented as a research paper at the Dept. of History of Art, University of Glasgow, in November 2003. A great many people have helped in the preparation of the article. Special thanks are due to Professor Larry Schaaf and Anthony Hamber who have patiently answered queries at every stage. I am also grateful to Brian Liddy and Toni Booth (National Museum of Photography, Film and Television, Bradford), Sara Stevenson (Scottish National Portrait Gallery, Edinburgh), Patrick Lenaghan and John O'Neill (Hispanic Society of New York), Mercedes Mutiloa (Universidad de Navarra) and José Manuel Matilla (Prado) for their help.

1. William Stirling, *Annals of the Artists of Spain* (hereafter *Annals*), 3 vols., London: John Olliver 1848. Unless otherwise specified, all references are to the second edition, in *The Works of Sir William Stirling-Maxwell, Baronet* (hereafter *Works*) ed. Robert Guy, London: John C. Nimmo 1891, I-IV. For Stirling's importance as historian of Spanish art, see Hilary Macartney, 'Sir William Stirling Maxwell: Scholar of Spanish Art', *Espacio, Tiempo y Forma*, Serie VII, Historia del Arte, 12 (1999), 287-316; Enriqueta Harris, 'Sir William Stirling-Maxwell and the History of Spanish Art', *Apollo*, LXXIX:23 (1964), 73-77. For his biography, see Hilary Macartney, 'Maxwell, Sir William Stirling', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

2. See, for example, Anthony Hamber, 'A Higher Branch of the Art': *Photographing the Fine Arts in England, 1839-1880*, Amsterdam: Gordon and Breach 1996, 74; Susan Lambert, *The*

Image Multiplied, London: Victoria & Albert Museum 1987, 107; Christopher Lloyd and T. Ledger, *Art and its Images: An Exhibition of Printed Books containing Engraved Illustrations after Italian Paintings*, Oxford: Ashmolean Museum, 1975, cat. 2.

3. For the impact of photography on the study of art generally in nineteenth-century Britain, see Hamber, 'A Higher Branch of the Art', 4-5.

4. Stirling, *Annals*, IV: Talbotype Illustrations (hereafter *Annals* Talbotypes), 1848, v.

5. For the collection of emblem books, see David Weston, *Sir William Stirling Maxwell and the European Emblem*, Glasgow: Glasgow University Library, 1987; Hester Black, *Short Title Catalogue of the Emblem Books and Related Works in the Stirling Maxwell Collection of Glasgow University Library (1499-1917)*, Aldershot: Scolar Press 1988. For Stirling's interest in the relationship between word and image, including illustrated books and histories, see Hilary Macartney, 'Ut pictura poesis. Dialéctica entre palabra e imagen en Sir William Stirling Maxwell', *Espacio, Tiempo y Forma*, Serie VII, Historia del Arte, 15 (2002), 255-296.

6. I am grateful to Anthony Hamber for help in locating surviving copies of the Talbotypes volume.

7. See J.P. Ward, 'The Fox Talbot Collection at the Science Museum', *History of Photography*, 1:4 (October 1977), 275-287; Graham Smith, *Disciples of Light: Photographs in the Brewster Album*, Malibu: The Getty Museum 1990, esp. 121, nos. 151-4; and British Museum, Dept. of Prints and Drawings, 165*c.7.

8. Stirling, *Annals* Talbotypes, v.

9. The date on the titlepage, however, is 1847.

10. William Stirling Maxwell, *Examples of the Engraved Portraiture of the Sixteenth Century*, London and Edinburgh: private publication 1872, v.
11. Richard Ford (unsigned), Review of Sir Edmund Head, *A Handbook of the History of the Spanish and French Schools of Painting*, 1847, and William Stirling, *Annals of Spanish Painters* [sic], London, 1848, *Quarterly Review*, LXXXIII (June-Sept. 1848), 11, note.
12. J. Ollivier, 59 Pall Mall, Statement of Account for *Annals of the Artists of Spain*, 1846-1848; T-PM, Box 130, Maxwells of Pollok Papers, on deposit at Glasgow City Archives (hereafter T-PM followed by catalogue number). I am grateful to the Maxwell Macdonald family for permission to quote and reproduce material from these.
13. Letter from William Stirling to his sister, Hannah-Ann, 7 Nov. 1841 T-SK/29/1/50, Stirlings of Keir Papers, on deposit at Glasgow City Archives (hereafter T-SK followed by catalogue number). I am grateful to Archie Stirling of Keir for permission to quote from this material.
14. According to the list of illustrations in Stirling, *Annals*, 1848, xliii, any illustrations where the artist was not specified were made by Stirling himself in 1845.
15. For Brewster and Talbot, see Smith, *Disciples of Light*, 13. There is no evidence of regular correspondence between Brewster and Stirling in the Stirling of Keir archives, but Brewster's letter to Stirling of 12 Oct. 1848 (T-SK29/5/15), in which he accepted Stirling's invitation to visit Keir, suggests that they had been in contact at the time of publication of the *Annals* and the Talbotypes volume.
16. For *The Pencil of Nature*, see William Henry Fox Talbot, *The Pencil of Nature*, Anniversary Facsimile, ed. Larry J. Schaaf, New York: Hans P. Kraus Jr. Inc. 1989, with an additional introductory volume by Schaaf, containing a Historical Sketch, Notes on the Plates, and a Census

of surviving examples; and Larry J. Schaaf, 'Notes on the Photographs in *The Pencil of Nature*', in Mike Weaver (ed.), *Henry Fox Talbot: Selected Texts and Bibliography*, Oxford: Clio Press 1992, 105-115. On Talbot's *Sun Pictures in Scotland*, see Larry J. Schaaf, 'Sun Pictures in Scotland', in Talbot, *The Pencil of Nature*, Anniversary Facsimile, introductory volume, 29; and Graham Smith, 'Views of Scotland', in Weaver (ed.), *Henry Fox Talbot*, 117-124. For Stirling's admiration for Scott, see W. Stirling Maxwell, D. Laing and J. Drummond, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Portraits, Busts, Published Writings and Manuscripts of Sir Walter Scott, Bart., collected and exhibited at the Scott Exhibition, Edinburgh*, Edinburgh, 1874, vii; and William Stirling Maxwell, 'Sir Walter Scott', in *Works*, VI: Miscellaneous Essays and Addresses, 383-406.

17. Ibid, 398-9. The biblical image is *Corinthians* I:13:12.

18. Stirling, *Annals*, 40-41.

19. See, for example, John Ruskin's famous attack on Murillo's paintings of urchins in the Dulwich Picture Gallery, as 'mere delight in foulness', see John Ruskin, *The Stones of Venice*, London 1853, II:228-9; and Sir Austin Henry Layard (unsigned), 'Velasquez', *Quarterly Review*, 133:266 (1872), 451-487, which was also largely dismissive of the Spanish school.

20. Stirling, *Annals*, 919, referring to Francisco de Zurbarán.

21. See Xanthe Brooke, 'A Masterpiece in Waiting: The Response to *Las Meninas* in Nineteenth-Century Britain', in Susanne Stratton-Pruitt (ed.), *Masterpieces of Western Painting: Velázquez's Las Meninas*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2003, 47-79.

22. Stirling, *Annals*, 771.

23. Juan Agustín Ceán Bermúdez, *Diccionario histórico de los más ilustres profesores de las bellas artes en España*, Madrid: Reales Academias de Bellas Artes de San Fernando y de la Historia 1965 (facsimile reprint), 175.
24. Prosper Mérimée (unsigned), 'Annals of the Artists in Spain', *Revue des deux mondes*, 24 (1848) 639; Layard, 'Velasquez', 477.
25. James Ward and Sara Stevenson, *Printed Light: The Scientific Art of William Henry Fox Talbot and David Octavius Hill with Robert Adamson*, Edinburgh: Scottish National Portrait Gallery 1986, 26.
26. Letter from Stirling to Hannah-Ann, Valetta, Malta, 2 Dec. 1841, T-SK 29/1/52. On José Roldán, see Enrique Valdivieso, *Historia de la pintura sevillana. Siglos XIII al XX*, Seville: Ediciones Guadalquivir 1986, 379-382.
27. See Stirling, *Annals*, 1848, 916; and a slightly modified claim in Stirling, *Annals*, 1891, 1087-8 and note 1. Whether or not Murillo actually used the same models, Stirling rightly observed the use of two distinct, recurring facial types.
28. For the Corsini *Virgin and Child*, see Diego Angulo Iníguez, *Murillo. Su vida, su arte, su obra*, Madrid 1981, III: no. 170; for the copy at Keir, see T-SK 29/1/52; and *List of Pictures photographed at Keir, Dunblane* (hereafter *Keir List*) Edinburgh: National Galleries of Scotland 1977, KS H2902.
29. Letter from Stirling to Roldán, 4 Mar. 1847, T-SK 29/55/15A.
30. Seven copies in oil by Roldán were listed in the *Keir List*. Sizes ranged from 62.2 x 62.2cm to 167.6 x 126.3cm.
31. Hamber, 'A Higher Branch of the Art', 75-6.

32. See Stirling's travel notebook, T-SK 29/11, for 'Drawings ordered in Paris 1844'.
33. Christie & Manson, *Catalogue of the Pictures forming the Celebrated Spanish Gallery of ... King Louis Philippe*, London, 6-7, 13-14, 20-21 May 1853, lot 82. Barclay's copy is in Glasgow Museums (bt. Christie's, *Sale of Objects of Art, Furniture, Pictures ... the Property of Archibald Stirling of Keir*, Dunblane, 22-24 May 1995, lots 435-6).
34. Lee Fontanella, *La historia de la fotografía en España desde sus orígenes hasta 1900*, Madrid 1981, 57; and Lee Fontanella, 'The Calotype in Seville', *Photovisión*, 12, Madrid 1981, 9.
35. For rejection of the first draft, see Macartney, 'Sir William Stirling Maxwell: Scholar of Spanish Art', 295-6.
36. Stirling, *Annals*, xxxii.
37. Lord Thomas Babington Macaulay (unsigned), 'Stirling's Annals of the Artists of Spain', *Spectator*, 24 June 1848, 313-4.
38. On Stirling and Wells, see also Letter from William Stirling to William Wells, 21 June 1848, and inscription by Stirling on copies of the text volumes given to Wells, all now in the Hispanic Society of America, New York; and William Stirling, travel notebook, T-SK 28/9, for his visit to Wells's collection at Redleaf, Kent in 1843.
39. *Annals* Talbotypes, v.
40. On Ford, see Ian Robertson, *Richard Ford: Hispanophile, Connoisseur and Critic*, Wilby, 2004; on Grey, see F. Boase, *Modern English Biographies*, Truro, 1892, I:1242.
41. *Annals* Talbotypes, vii.

42. *Annals* Talbotypes, v. Likewise, in his later catalogues of prints after Velázquez, in William Stirling, *Velazquez*, London 1856; and after Velázquez and Murillo, in *Essay towards a Catalogue of Prints engraved from the Works of Diego Rodriguez de Silva y Velazquez and Bartolomé Esteban Murillo*, London: privately published, 1873, he devoted most attention to Spanish prints.

43. Talbotypes of the two *Boys playing* are now in the National Museum of Photography, Film and Television, Bradford (hereafter NMPFT). According to Henneman's account (Appendix 1), twenty-five copies of each of these were supplied on 28 June 1847.

44. Letter from Henneman to Talbot, Reading, 5 May 1847, quoted in V.F. Snow and D.B. Thomas, 'The Talbotype Establishment at Reading – 1844 to 1847', *Photographic Journal*, 106:2 (1966), 62. The four paintings of boys playing, of which only two appear to have been photographed, are said to have been bought by Stirling in Seville in 1842 (see Sir James L. Caw, *Catalogue of Pictures at Pollok House*, Glasgow: private publication, 1936, nos. 11-12). The other two are no longer in the Stirling Maxwell collection. Recent doubts about attribution are summarised in Hilary Macartney, 'ARTES Visit to Pollok House', *InformARTES*, 3 (2003), 9.

45. Stirling, *Annals*, 1476-7.

46. NMPFT, 1937-3430/1-3, of which 3430/2 is illustrated here.

47. According to the caption for the Talbotypes of copies by Roldán after Murillo, the copies were executed in 1840 and 1845. The former date may be a mistake for 1841, when Stirling first visited Seville and commissioned the copy of *St. Justa and St. Rufina*. See also William Stirling, *Travel Notes*, 1841: Seville, T-SK 28/9.

48. For this method of packing, see Letter from Roldán to J.A. Bailly, 19 June 1845, T-SK29/55/14; Roldán to Stirling, n.d., T-SK29/55/18; and J.A. Bailly to Stirling, 30 Jan. 1846, T-SK29/55/2.
49. Henneman to Talbot, 5 May 1847, quoted in Snow and Thomas, 'The Talbotype Establishment', 62.
50. See Marjorie Trusted, 'Two Spanish Terracotta Reliefs in the Collection of Sir Brinsley Ford', *Cuadernos de Arte de la Universidad de Granada*, 28 (1997), 77-85. Stirling's caption in the Talbotypes volume identified the female saint in no. 14 as St. Teresa of Jesus. On the identity of the saint, see Trusted, 'Two Spanish Terracotta Reliefs', note 4. I am also grateful to Francis Ford for information on these reliefs.
51. Talbotypes of *St. Catherine* are NMPGT, 1937-3395/1-17; and of the *Christ Child and St. John*, 1937-3391/1-7.
52. I am grateful to Larry Schaaf and Anthony Hamber for details of this process, and of the problems of enlargements. See also Larry Schaaf, in William Fox Talbot, *The Pencil of Nature*, 1989, ???; and Hamber, 'A Higher Branch of the Art', 67.
53. Stirling to Wells, 21 June 1848, Hispanic Society of America, New York.
54. Maxwells of Pollok Papers, Glasgow City Archives, T-PM Box 130. I am grateful to the Maxwell Macdonald family for permission to reproduce this material.
55. Maxwells of Pollok Papers, Glasgow City Archives, T-PM Box 130.
56. Letter inserted in the copy of the Talbotypes given to William Wells and now in the Hispanic Society of America, New York. I am grateful to the Hispanic Society for permission to reproduce this letter.

