

Stirling Maxwell and the Legacy of Ceán Bermúdez in Scholarship of Spanish Art in Nineteenth-Century Britain¹

HILARY MACARTNEY

In Britain, as elsewhere, the full extent of the legacy of such a prolific and wide-ranging scholar of Spanish art as Juan Agustín Ceán Bermúdez is difficult to assess. His work provided access to such a wealth of tools and source material for those who followed him that he has never ceased to be a fundamental reference and starting-point. Yet, paradoxically, few scholars can have been so much taken for granted and, ultimately, underestimated. Here, we trace his presence in a number of key works on Spain and Spanish art published in Britain in the nineteenth century and focus, in particular, on his significance within the writings and collecting of Sir William Stirling Maxwell (1808-1878) (fig. 74).

Within Ceán's lifetime, his name and his scholarship were known in literary and politically liberal circles in Britain and Ireland, as well as in the Anglophone community in Spain. These included the circle of Lord and Lady Holland and the Spanish *émigré* community in London². His links to Gaspar Melchor de Jovellanos, as a leading figure of the Spanish Enlightenment, also served to increase Ceán's profile abroad, and were mentioned in most books and articles introducing him to the English-speaking world. With regard to his scholarship on art, in Britain as in Spain and elsewhere, it was, of course —and continues to be— for his *Diccionario histórico de los más ilustres profesores de las Bellas Artes en España* of 1800 that he became best known.

¹ I am most grateful to David García López, Elena M.^a Santiago Páez and Javier González Santos for their help and advice in the preparation of this chapter. My eternal thanks are also due to Sarah Symmons and the late Nigel Glendinning, who, as examiners of my doctoral dissertation on Sir William Stirling Maxwell, for the Courtauld Institute of Art, University of London, opened my eyes to the richness and value of Ceán Bermúdez's legacy, in Britain, as elsewhere.

² See GARCÍA LÓPEZ y CRESPO 2018; HOLLAND 1910; SYMMONS 2010, 28-29; LLORENS CASTILLO 1954.

Edward Davies and Mrs O'Neil

Nevertheless, just thirteen years after its publication, and whilst Ceán was still alive, an English translation appeared of his *Carta [...] sobre el estilo y gusto de la pintura de la Escuela Sevillana* of 1806, by Edward Davies, a former captain in the Life Guards. It remains the only translation of a work by Ceán to be published in English. The main title-page of Davies's book, *The Life of Bartolomé E. Murillo. Compiled from the Writings of Various Authors*, appears to promise a work of some scholarship, whilst an additional title-page, *The Life of B. E. Murillo, and the Style and Taste of the School of Seville*, confirms Ceán's *Carta* as the intended focus of the publication. Davies acknowledged in his preface that the book represented his «first labours» as an editor/compiler³, and his lack of clarity and experience created an often frustrating and confusing reader experience. *The Letter of Juan Agustín Ceán Bermúdez, to a Friend, upon the Style and Taste of the School of Seville, and upon the Degree of Perfection to which Bartolomé Esteban Murillo Elevated It* is the only work in the compilation that is translated and, indeed, it is only the main text of the *Letter* that is given in English, whilst its «Apéndice de documentos», containing the records of the Seville Academy founded by Murillo and other artists is left in Spanish, as is the entry on Murillo in Ceán's *Diccionario histórico* which is inserted at the end of the compilation. In fact, Davies claimed that he had «long ago meditated publishing a translation of C. Bermúdez's History of the Spanish Painters» (the *Diccionario histórico*) but had been deterred by «Opinion»⁴. The other texts that make up the 103 pages that precede the *Letter* contain extracts on Murillo, in English, French and Spanish, from many of the standard eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century sources on Spanish art, by Cumberland, Bourgoing, Jovellanos, D'Argenville, Palomino and Ponz⁵. Davies claimed he preferred to leave these in their original language, which was «easily comprehended», to avoid the possibility of mistakes in translation⁶. One of his aims was to point out the errors in some of these other texts, and to correct the notion that writers like Cumberland and D'Argenville were «incontrovertible»⁷. The mix of languages is problematic, however, and it is not always clear whether footnotes are by the original authors or by Davies. The fact that he did translate Ceán's *Carta* was an indication that he considered it superior to the other

³ DAVIES 1819, p. III.

⁴ DAVIES 1819, pp. IV-V.

⁵ Apart from the works by Ceán, the extracts are from the following: CUMBERLAND 1787; BOURGOING 1789; JOVELLANOS 1781; D'ARGENVILLE 1745; PALOMINO 1715-1724, v. III, *El Parnaso español pintoresco*; PONZ 1772-1794.

⁶ DAVIES 1819, pp. IX-X. Davies himself would, presumably, have been fluent enough in French, as well as Spanish. He described his work as «begotten in Spaine, and brought forth in great Brittain», *idem*, p. v.

⁷ DAVIES 1819, p. IX.

texts on Murillo, even though he risked falling into the translation errors he warned of and avoided in the other sources. Remarkably, his translation is largely clear and quite acceptable, except on one extraordinary occasion where, in the description of Murillo's paintings at the Franciscan convent, he suddenly intruded into Ceán's text to give his own explanation, excusing himself by claiming: «I think it as well to say in the text, instead of interrupting it by too long a note»⁸!

Over the years, Davies has not fared well with the «Opinion» he decried at various points in his book. It was clearly an overambitious project for such an inexperienced scholar and, in many ways, a missed opportunity. It was already «somewhat rare» when Stirling Maxwell read it during preparation of the *Annals of the Artists of Spain* in the 1840s, and considered its translation of Ceán's *Letter on Murillo* to be its «sole merit»⁹. Such selective praise invites speculation on how useful a well-edited English edition might have been. It is interesting that Davies's translation of Ceán's text was appreciated enough by a reader at the University of Glasgow to merit the comment in pencil, «very good», in 1853 (fig. 75)¹⁰.

In fact, an abridged English version of sorts of Ceán Bermúdez's *Diccionario histórico* was carried out by an Irish author, Mrs. A. O'Neil. Her two-volume *Dictionary of Spanish Painters* was published in London in 1833 by «C. O'Neil»¹¹, who was almost certainly the author's husband, Charles O'Neil, an Irish artist and dealer who settled in London. Her *Dictionary* was clearly based largely on Ceán's, and on information from Palomino. Unfortunately, though she claimed, in her opening Address, that her work was the result of «collecting and comparing modern documents with ancient memorials», she lacked any modern sense of the need to acknowledge sources or follow standard critical conventions, referring only to unspecified «unquestionable authorities»¹² and, in her entry on Murillo, she even mentioned that a painting by the artist was available for sale from Mr O'Neill¹³! The *Dictionary* was, no doubt, a response to the increased interest in Spanish art in Britain and Ireland by this date, and to the surge in visitors to Spain¹⁴. Despite

⁸ DAVIES 1819, p. 47.

⁹ STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. I, p. XII.

¹⁰ The shelfmark DL.11.15 indicates that it was acquired by Glasgow College Library soon after publication. There are no other annotations in the volume. The date of the comment might perhaps relate to topical interest in Spanish art in Britain, as a result of the sale of King Louis-Philippe's *Galerie espagnole* at Christie's London, in May, 1853.

¹¹ O'NEIL 1833.

¹² O'NEIL 1833, v. I, pp. V-VI.

¹³ This was the *St. Francis Xavier* from the Santiago collection (now Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford, CT), see SYMONS 2010, p. 30.

¹⁴ Well-known British visitors who helped to publicise interest in the new art tourism to the Peninsula at this time included, for example, the Scottish artists Sir David Wilkie and David Roberts, and the Romantic writer and later prime minister Benjamin Disraeli.

its shortcomings, Mrs O'Neil's publication, which included tables of the three geographical schools of painters in Valencia, Madrid and Seville¹⁵, might have provided a welcome new resource for prospective travellers. In his assessment of her work as «an abridgement of Cean Bermudez's excellent dictionary»¹⁶, however, Stirling Maxwell was irritated by her failure to name sources and, as a bibliophile, he concluded, not altogether dismissively, «I am sorry to be able to praise nothing in the book but the beauty of the paper and printing»¹⁷.

Edmund Head, Richard Ford and Stirling Maxwell

Reports of Ceán's death in 1829, and, in particular, the «Necrology» or obituary in English on him that appeared in *The Foreign Quarterly Review* in January 1831 would also have served to alert or remind potential scholars of Spanish art and architecture of the richness and range of information and research materials offered by his many publications¹⁸. Understandably, given the likely readership of *The Foreign Quarterly Review*, part of the article's focus was on the political relevance of Ceán's career and his association with Jovellanos, including his biography of his fellow Asturian, but it also provided a concise, rounded and useful summary, which both Sir Edmund Head and Stirling Maxwell went on to draw on for biographical context in their own writings.

In 1834, a 34-page article on Spanish artists by Sir Edmund Head (1805-1868), also in *The Foreign Quarterly Review*, offered the finest survey of the topic in English by that date. As was common at the time, it was untitled and unsigned, and was presented as a review article of relevant publications, in this instance the *Noticia de los Quadros [...] en la Galería del Rey* (or Museo Real, later the Museo del Prado, Madrid), by Luis Eusebi (also unsigned), 1828¹⁹; Frédéric Quilliet's *Dictionnaire des Peintres espagnols* (1816)²⁰; and Ceán's *Diccionario histórico*. In fact, the *Noticia* is not directly referred to in the text, though it was, presumably, included as a reference on the museum collections. The work by Quilliet was only referred to at the end of the article, as a foil to show how good Ceán's work was, and to emphasise the fact that the Frenchman had taken all his material from the Asturian²¹. Quilliet

¹⁵ O'NEIL 1833, v. I, pp. XIII-XV.

¹⁶ STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. I, p. VII.

¹⁷ STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. I, p. VII.

¹⁸ NECROLOGY 1831.

¹⁹ NOTICIA DE LOS QUADROS 1828.

²⁰ QUILLIET 1816.

²¹ HEAD 1834, p. 271.

was described as «bigoted to the glory of France», and ridiculed for having «ventured to name Lebrun as equivalent to Velasquez»²². In fact, though not technically under review, it was Palomino's «gossiping» work (the *Parnaso español*) that Head constantly criticised for inaccuracy in his article, by comparison with Ceán's *Diccionario histórico*.

Head's well-written article provided a model of intelligent use of the *Diccionario histórico*. The reader is given to understand that *Diccionario* is the source of information in most instances, and into this framework, Head's highly perceptive, direct observations are woven, such as on the brushwork technique of Velázquez or Murillo²³, or the remarkable use of colour by Navarrete²⁴, or the Parmagianino-like heads in the «very few authentic pictures» of Morales, in which «every hair is touched singly». For British readers who were eager to learn about Spanish art, Head's article would have provided an ideal introduction. They would probably have heard of these artists, notably in English translations of Palomino, but most would have had no previous, direct experience of their art.

Head got to know Richard Ford (1796-1858) when they were both in Spain in the early 1830s. On their return to England, the two men remained in correspondence about the «cosas de España». During the 1840s, Head expanded his article into a longer study, the *Hand-book of the History of the Spanish and French Schools of Painting*, published by John Murray in 1848²⁵. Once again, he followed a clear and concise plan, this time to provide a chronological survey of the history of art in Spain, which could also serve as a manual for travellers. The same publisher also commissioned Ford to compile a guidebook to Spain, the *Hand-book for Travellers to Spain, and Readers at Home* (1845). Both men struggled to update their information on the whereabouts of paintings, in the wake of the Dissolution of the Monasteries in Spain, which occurred soon after they left, and Ceán's publications could no longer be used as reference works in this respect. Ford, however, obtained a copy of the first report of the Comisión Central de Monumentos Históricos y Artísticos del Reino in 1845 from Valentín Carderera (1796-1880), who was one of his network of correspondents and, coincidentally, one of the Commissioners of the section on painting and sculpture, along with José de Madrazo. Ford shared the report with Head, who published a version of it in English in his book, as an Appendix «on the

²² HEAD 1834, p. 271. Quilliet had been artistic commissioner for Andalusia during the Peninsular War, and responsible for taking artworks to the Alcázar in Seville for selection for the proposed National Museum in Madrid, see GERARD POWELL and MACARTNEY 2019.

²³ HEAD 1834, p. 261 and p. 269 respectively.

²⁴ HEAD 1834, p. 247.

²⁵ HEAD 1848.

Measures Taken by the Spanish Government with Reference to the Works of Art Contained in the Suppressed Monasteries, etc.²⁶. In it, Head summarised the Commission's efforts to document the artworks in each region, including the setting up of the new regional museums. Nevertheless, he observed that «nothing can be more melancholy than the picture of Spain drawn by this Commission», and that «the plunder and destruction of pictures must have been enormous»²⁷.

Ford's *Hand-book for Spain* was much more wide-ranging, and reflected his extensive travels throughout many parts of the Peninsula in 1830-1833. Packed with information and erudition, it was and is also considered controversial. Today, its position of superiority with regard to Spain, its inhabitants and customs, and its attitude of anti-Catholicism, are quite shocking and hard to reconcile with any notions we might have of the definition of a Hispanophile (as the shorthand term frequently used to describe Ford). Likewise, although there is much coverage of art and architecture, reflective of a deep interest in these fields, the range of artists, styles, periods and tastes considered acceptable seems extraordinarily narrow by (post)modern standards, and makes Ceán Bermúdez and his neoclassicist contemporaries seem considerably more open and broadminded by comparison. For all that, the *Hand-book for Spain* remains an extraordinarily lively and useful reference work, even if only as a barometer of its time.

In Ford's Preliminary Remarks, Ceán is, not surprisingly, cited as «a diligent, accurate modern author» and the principal authority on arts and antiquities, «whose works, on the whole, are among the soundest and most critical produced by a Spaniard». In addition, Ford valued the fact that he sought «to omit much of the legendary, &c. in which his predecessors were so prone to indulge»²⁸. The *Diccionario histórico*, the *Noticias de los arquitectos* and the *Sumario de las antigüedades romanas* are all recommended. In the case of the *Diccionario histórico*, it is praised, a little grudgingly, as «one of the few methodical books ever published in Spain»²⁹. Ford also accepted, and helped to spread, the idea that the *Diccionario*

unintentionally occasioned the loss of much fine art, as it was used by the French invaders as a guide. Thus, on taking possession of any city, collecting generals knew at once what was most valuable, and where to go for it. Accordingly, at least half of the treasures indicated in the pages have disappeared³⁰.

²⁶ HEAD 1848, pp. 343-351. See also MACARTNEY 2010, pp. 87-94.

²⁷ HEAD 1848, pp. 343-344.

²⁸ FORD 1966, v. I, p. 202.

²⁹ FORD 1966, v. I, p. 202.

³⁰ FORD 1966, v. I, p. 202.

Interestingly, in his *Annals of the Artists of Spain*, Stirling Maxwell interpreted the role of Ceán's *Diccionario* in a rather more positive way:

If his labours were brought to maturity just in time to stimulate and guide the rapacity of Soult and Sebastiani, and their brother speculators in pictures, his book is invaluable as an authentic record, enabling the historian at once to track the course of their rapine, and to ascertain the value of their plunder. The ignorance of these men being equal to their avarice, but for this timely Dictionary, the history of their acquisitions would have been entirely lost, and the affiliation of Spanish pictures on this side the Pyrenees would have been even more erroneous and arbitrary than it now is. They have probably realised a large pecuniary profit, out of the increased value accruing to their stolen wares from the notice of Ceán Bermúdez, but it is gained by means which also perpetuate the best evidence of their infamy³¹.

Stirling Maxwell's *Annals of the Artists of Spain* was published in 1848 (fig. 76), the same year as Head's *Hand-book of the Spanish and French Schools of Painting*. Though different in character, each provided a valuable addition to the historiography of Spanish art in English. Stirling's was a much more comprehensive and ambitious work in its three volumes of text and a pioneering, limited-edition fourth volume of photographic illustrations. Like Head's book, Stirling's was arranged chronologically, but also offered a remarkably broad contextual framework. Nevertheless, both authors remained dependent on the biographical approach of Ceán's *Diccionario histórico* for their entries on specific artists³².

Stirling was younger than Ford and Head, and produced his *Annals* after just three short visits to Spain in the 1840s. His key research trip in preparation for his book occurred in 1845 and lasted just over two months³³. It is clear that he already knew Ceán's *Diccionario histórico* well by then, and probably both Palomino and Ponz too. His travel journal for the 1845 trip includes a list of books purchased in Spain, and shows that he added substantially to his library of publications by Ceán—and sources for his *Annals*—as follows³⁴:

Ceán Bermúdez, Descr. ⁿ Artist. de la Catedral de Sevilla, Sev., 1804, 12mo	44 reals
— D. ⁿ Art. del Hospital de la Sangre, Valencia, 1804, 12mo.	
— Noticias de los Arquitectos de España, 4 vols., Madrid, 1829, 8vo.	140
— Sumario de las Antigüedades Romanas, Mad., 1832, folio	50
— Arte de ver, translation fr. Mengs &c, Madrid, 1827, 8vo.	30

³¹ STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. III, p. 1329.

³² See HEAD 1848, p. vii, for his acknowledgement of Ceán's *Diccionario*, and below for similar acknowledgement by Stirling.

³³ See MACARTNEY 2003, ch. 2, pp. 16–27; and BRIGSTOCKE 2015, part 4C, pp. 241–280.

³⁴ STIRLING MAXWELL 1845. A copy of BOSARTE 1804 was also purchased on this trip.

___ Carta ... sobre la Escuela Sevillana, Cadiz, 1806, 12mo.	20
___ Memorias para la Vida de D. Gaspar de Jovellanos, sm. 8vo., Madrid, 1814	12
Dialogo sobre la pintura, Seville, 1819, 12mo.	4

He also purchased a large number of other books which were directly relevant to his studies, including Juan d'Arfe's *Quilatador de la Plata, Oro y Piedras* (1572) and probably his first copy of Goya's *Los Caprichos*, two plates from which were reproduced as wood engravings in the *Annals* text (fig. 77). He met the writer and bibliographer, Bartolomé José Gallardo (1776-1852) during this trip and the two men corresponded about books. It is likely that Gallardo was the source of the *Caprichos*, or was involved in the sale—in fact a page of Memoranda, initialled by Stirling and dated 6 March 1845 (ie. during his Spanish trip), provides interpretation by Gallardo of some of the prints, and is pasted into the front of the bound copy now in the University of Glasgow Library³⁵. From a letter of November that year, we know that Stirling had asked Gallardo to help him try to source copies of some of the most important Golden-Age treatises on art, including Pacheco and Carducho, but it may be that Gallardo was also advising more generally on bibliography for the *Annals*. The often harsh Gallardo was clearly impressed with the Scottish scholar (or perhaps believed it was in his interests to treat him courteously), and told him: «Celebro que la *Historia de la Pintura Española* haya caído en manos tan finas y cariñosas». He also proposed that they look out for books for each other: «Hagamos un trato amistoso: yo le mandaré a V. artículos de Bellas-Artes; y V. en recambio me mandará a mí artículos de Bellas-Letras (pero previo aviso siempre, para evitar duplicaciones)»³⁶.

Ceán in the *Annals* — Murillo

In Stirling's entry on Murillo, more than anywhere else in the *Annals*, we sense Ceán's guiding presence, almost like Dante's Virgil. Not surprisingly, given that they covered the two best-known Spanish artists in Britain, the entries on Murillo and Velázquez were by far the second longest in the book³⁷. In the case of the text on Murillo, the extent of Ceán's presence was, of course, due to the fact that not only was

³⁵ University of Glasgow Library, Special Collections, S.M. 1946.

³⁶ GALLARDO 1845. I am grateful to Javier González for discussion of Gallardo's often harsh words on Ceán's work. See GARCÍA LÓPEZ 2017-2018, p. 59.

³⁷ See STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. II, pp. 825-929 for the Murillo entry, which takes up almost all of Chapter XII; and v. II, pp. 575-688 for the Velázquez one, which forms Chapter IX. The latter entry was subsequently adapted and published as a monograph on Velázquez, STIRLING MAXWELL 1855, though a similar plan for the one on Murillo never came to fruition.

the *Diccionario histórico* cited but also the *Carta*, as the most exhaustive account of the Seville painter's life and works, as well as the *Diálogo sobre el arte de la pintura* of 1819, which developed the *Carta*'s other aspect as an intellectual discourse into «an imaginary conversation held in the other world by Murillo and Mengs»³⁸. Thus, in a sense, Ceán's presence in Stirling's chapter echoed the extensive presence of Murillo in the life and work of Ceán himself. Stirling relied on other sources too, including contemporary ones, both written and verbal, notably Richard Ford and the artist-dealer José María Escacena³⁹. However, it was to Ceán that he turned to add to, correct, or nuance Palomino's account of the artist, such as on Murillo's birth having taken place in Seville in 1617, rather than in the nearby village of Pilas in 1613⁴⁰.

He was likewise reliant on Ceán as he tried to imagine how Murillo's first major commission, the paintings for the small cloister of the Franciscan convent in Seville, would have looked as a series *in situ*, before they were taken by the French in 1809 during the Peninsular War, and the fire which destroyed most of the building the following year⁴¹. He sought similar help in relation to the paintings for the Hospital of Charity, noting that Ceán had «enjoyed the advantage of seeing them all together, each in the light and place for which Murillo painted it»⁴². There, he also looked to his Asturian guide as a source of validation of his own conclusions on the relative merits of individual works. Thus, Stirling found the angels in the *Abraham and the Angels* (Ottawa, National Gallery of Canada) to be «deficient in dignity and grace», citing Ceán as support for his view⁴³. Likewise, after venturing that the *Return of the Prodigal Son* (Washington DC, National Gallery) and *St Elizabeth of Hungary Nursing the Sick* were «more perfect as works of art, being composed with equal skill, and finished with greater care and higher technical excellence», he went on to note that Ceán also «seems to prefer these two to all the rest»⁴⁴.

Within the *Annals* entry on Murillo, Stirling devoted over five pages to the Academy founded by the Sevillian and fellow artists⁴⁵. His account was, of course, derived entirely from the information on it published in Ceán's *Carta*, and consisted of a translated digest of the latter's Chapter XII, with some details and examples

³⁸ STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. II, p. 826, n. 2.

³⁹ On their respective use as sources by Stirling, see MACARTNEY 2020.

⁴⁰ STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. II, pp. 825-826, where the archival research of the conde del Aguila is also acknowledged in this instance.

⁴¹ STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. II, pp. 834-837. For the removal of the paintings by Marshal Soult and quartermaster Mathieu-Faviers, see GERARD POWELL and MACARTNEY 2019. For the situation in Seville more generally during the Peninsular War, see CANO RIVERO 2003, pp. 93-114.

⁴² STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. II, p. 867.

⁴³ STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. II, p. 864.

⁴⁴ STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. II, p. 867.

⁴⁵ STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. II, pp. 847-852.

taken from the Academy records transcribed by Ceán in his Appendix⁴⁶. The topic of the Seville Academy clearly held considerable fascination for Stirling, not only for its importance for the history of art and artists in Spain but also in relation to his own scholarly collecting interests, as was attested by his acquisition in 1851, a few years after publication of the *Annals*, of the *Portrait of Philip IV* with the attributes of drawing and painting, painted for the Academy by one of its office-bearers Juan Martínez de Gradilla⁴⁷. Through his account of the Academy, Stirling engaged actively in Ceán's debate—with himself and his unnamed correspondent in the case of the *Carta*, and between Murillo and Mengs in the *Diálogo* on the nature and value of academies and academic training. Stirling's own views reflected the decline in respect for such institutions, and the rejection of neoclassical tastes and values by many by the mid-nineteenth century: «Like other and even royal academies, [the Seville Academy] never produced any painters of first-rate merit»⁴⁸. Nevertheless, he conceded that, in affording «asylum for traditions of the great masters»⁴⁹, the Seville Academy at least modified the decay in taste which Stirling saw as having occurred in the later seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries. And he acknowledged that, through the initiative of the Seville Academy, young artists were offered the kind of support that Murillo was said to have lacked in his youth⁵⁰.

Stirling's final point on the Academy harked back to one of the most romantic passages in the *Annals* a few pages earlier when, after the departure of Murillo's master Juan del Castillo, he described the young painter as «reduced to earn his daily bread by painting coarse and hasty pictures for the Feria»⁵¹. By the time Stirling visited the Thursday market in the calle Feria in the 1840s, he admitted that «few painters are now to be found there» but, like Ceán before him, he used his first-hand experience of the street and its market to evoke the colourful scene «when the unknown youth stood there amongst gipsies, muleteers, and mendicant friars, selling for a few reals those productions of his early pencil, for which royal collectors are now ready to contend»⁵². Here again, Stirling was inserting himself into the debate in the *Carta*, in addition to or as replacement for its unidentified addressee, providing a ready (and affirmative) answer to Ceán's question: «Creeria Vm. que en esta Feria pintando tan de priesa y sin ningun dibuxo, se pudieran formar artistas,

⁴⁶ CEÁN 1806a, Cap. XII, pp. 64-71, and 'Apéndice', pp. 137-165.

⁴⁷ For this portrait, see MACARTNEY 1999a.

⁴⁸ STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. II, p. 851.

⁴⁹ STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. II, p. 851.

⁵⁰ STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. II, pp. 851-852.

⁵¹ STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. II, p. 829.

⁵² STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. II, p. 829.

cuyas obras son ahora muy estimadas?»⁵³. Ceán himself had also answered in the affirmative, challenging his own neoclassical principles in this instance and, given the absence, in Murillo's youth, of the kind of drawing academy that the artist and his contemporaries went on to found, advocating «un rumbo enteramente opuesto al ordinario: que comenzaban pintando, y que acababan dibuxando»⁵⁴. Stirling likewise took up Ceán's analogy to «those intrepid students, who seek to acquire a foreign language by speaking it, regardless of blunders, and afterwards [...] improve their knowledge of the idiom by means of books», affirming that this alternative system had produced «both able painters, and excellent linguists»⁵⁵. Thus, in his reinterpretation of the notion of Murillo painting for the Feria, Stirling established himself as continuator of a tradition of historiography of the Seville painter that stretched back to Palomino⁵⁶ through Ceán.

Stirling's colourful passage also famously prompted further translation by the Scottish painter John Phillip, in his *Early Career of Murillo* (fig. 78), which was exhibited at the Royal Academy in London in 1856⁵⁷, following the second of three visits to Spain which earned him the nickname «Spanish Phillip». Phillip's early career included apprenticeships as tinsmith, glazier and house painter, before he stowed away on a ship to London to visit the annual exhibition at the Royal Academy in 1834, and was later sponsored to train at the Royal Academy Schools. His elaboration of the Murillo theme can, therefore, be considered a reflection on his own precarious journey as an artist⁵⁸.

Ceán in the Annals — Goya

The case of Goya in the *Annals* is somewhat different. Stirling's text showed no direct awareness of Ceán's links to the artist, nor indeed of the articles on him by Valentín Carderera, with whom Stirling did not establish regular contact until later⁵⁹. Instead, the entry was based largely on Théophile Gautier's account in his *Voyage*

⁵³ CEÁN 1806a, p. 37.

⁵⁴ CEÁN, 1806a, p. 37.

⁵⁵ STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. II, pp. 830-831.

⁵⁶ See PALOMINO 1715–24, v. III: *El Parnaso español pintoresco laureado*, no. 173, «Don Bartolomé Murillo, Pintor», p. 420.

⁵⁷ The quote from the *Annals* was included in the catalogue entry. See GRAVES 1905-1906, v. VI, no. 156.

⁵⁸ He was elected Associate of the Royal Academy in 1857 and full member in 1860. See MELVILLE 2005; and <https://www.royalacademy.org.uk/article/artist-of-the-month-september-2014-john-phillip-ra> (consulted 22nd June 2019).

⁵⁹ See STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. III, pp. 1260-1270. See also CARDERERA 1835; and CARDERERA 1838.

en Espagne (1845 edition)⁶⁰. Additional material was taken from the biographical sketch given by the artist's son Javier, at the prizegiving at the Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando in 1832⁶¹; first-hand, anecdotal information on Goya as satirist from the author of *El Crítico*, Bartolomé J. Gallardo⁶², and Stirling's own observations on the artist's work⁶³. Not surprisingly, much of the entry reflected stereotypes already established or in process of construction around the artist's image⁶⁴. Overall, however, the tone was measured, and Gautier's exuberance, in particular, was kept in check, in what became the fullest account of the artist in English by 1848, when Goya was still hardly a household name in Britain.

The tempering influence of some negative criticism was provided by Richard Ford, whose impact on the *Annals* in its final, published form was significant. His *Hand-book* was twice cited, most notably in relation to the *Santa Justa and Santa Rufina*, painted for Seville Cathedral in 1817⁶⁵. The original version of the *Hand-book* was suppressed just a few days before its planned publication in early 1845, due to the publisher's worries about the offence that might be caused by some of the undiplomatic language and attitudes expressed in it. In one of just a handful of references to Goya in his text, Ford had been characteristically frank in his distaste for this painting, claiming that «the fit models for this David-like abomination were two notorious strumpets of Madrid named Ramona and Sabina»⁶⁶. Stirling was given one of the few copies of the suppressed edition of the *Hand-book* by the publisher John Murray a few days before he set off for Spain on his main research trip for the *Annals* and consulted it —along with Ceán's *Diccionario*, of course— on his visits. On viewing Goya's painting, Stirling protested in his notebook that it was «much better than Handbook allows»⁶⁷. By the time of publication of the *Annals*, however, Stirling had moved closer to Ford's opinion. The painting was now an example of Goya's «more disagreeable manner», in which, instead of capturing «the poetical aspect» of the subject, the artist had been con-

⁶⁰ GAUTIER 1845, pp. 127-137.

⁶¹ [GOYA] 1832, pp. 91-93.

⁶² STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. III, p. 1266.

⁶³ The last reference in the «Additions and Corrections» at the end of the *Annals*, was to Nagler's *Künstler-Lexicon* though Stirling acknowledged that its entry and list of prints was incomplete and not entirely reliable. See STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. III, p. 1390; and NAGLER 1835-1845, v. V, p. 307.

⁶⁴ See especially the chapters on «Goya and his Contemporaries» and «Romantics and Realists» in GLENDINNING 1977, pp. 31-68 and 69-102 respectively.

⁶⁵ STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. III, p. 1263, and FORD 1845b, p. 254. The other reference was to the paintings in the convent of San Joaquín and Santa Ana, Valladolid (which Stirling had not seen), see STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. III, p. 1262, and FORD 1845, p. 638. A fuller account of Stirling, Ford and Ceán on the Seville painting is in MACARTNEY 2007, pp. 425-444.

⁶⁶ FORD 1845, p. 261.

⁶⁷ STIRLING MAXWELL 1845. For transcription of the travel journal, see BRIGSTOCKE 2015, Part 4C, p. 248.

tent with «meretriciously portraying» the virgin martyrs. Stirling even repeated the *Hand-book*'s claim about the models —albeit in milder terms— as «not very refined courtesans»⁶⁸.

There is no evidence that either Ford or Stirling was aware of Ceán's close involvement in the commission for the Seville painting⁶⁹, though it is possible that Ford might have heard something of it during his stay in the city in the 1830s. Coincidentally, however, an annotated copy of Ceán's rare pamphlet on the painting, *Análisis de un cuadro que pintó D. Francisco Goya para la catedral de Sevilla*, published anonymously in 1817, was presented to Stirling by the scholar Manuel Zarco del Valle (1833-1922) in 1870, with whom he was then in regular correspondence, mainly on books and illustrations (fig. 79). As his inscription to Stirling makes clear, Zarco believed that the few annotations were in Ceán's own hand⁷⁰. It reads as follows: «A M^r. W. Stirling./ Recuerdo de M. A. Zarco del Valle/ NB./ Este ejemplar está anotado de la propia mano del autor D. Juan Agustin Cean Bermudez —en cuya casa le compré en Madrid». Curiously, in his accompanying letter, the Spanish librarian made no reference to the pamphlet's Goya topic, mentioning only its authorship and rarity as giving it value: «Tambien vá con esta carta una plaguette —que no tiene otro mérito que ser de Cean Bermudez— y el corte número de ejemplares á que se ha tirado. Está épuisée!»⁷¹. Zarco purchased a number of publications and manuscripts from Ceán's daughter Beatriz in the 1860s, at a time when Carderera was buying prints and drawings from her, many of which were also being acquired by Stirling. Given that his collecting and connoisseurship of Goya's prints had grown considerably by then, compared with the 1840s, as is discussed below, one wonders whether Stirling's thoughts on the *Santa Justa and Santa Rufina* had also moved on.

If Ceán was present in the *Annals* text on Goya only by implication or association, Stirling's use of illustrations by the artist in his book chimed much more readily with Ceán's plans for illustrations to his *Diccionario*, which were to include prints by Goya, for which a number of drawings are known⁷². Remarkably, the illus-

⁶⁸ STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. III, pp. 1262-1263. Ford was persuaded to use the euphemism «frail ladies» in the published *Hand-book*, FORD 1845, p. 254.

⁶⁹ For Ceán's account of this in letters to Tomás de Verí, see GLENDINNING 1977, p. 56.

⁷⁰ See GARCÍA LÓPEZ 2019a, pp. 186-187. The amendments in pen were, presumably, related to adapting the text for publication in the periodical publication *Crónica científica y literaria* of December 1817. David García López has suggested they are not by Ceán (personal communication, 27th August 2015). It seems likely, therefore, that they were by the editor of the *Crónica*. Stirling had the pamphlet bound into a copy of Torre Farfán's *Fiestas de Sevilla* (1671), which he conserved according to the ideas of the day, and to which he added a bibliographical preface, printed in 1871. The volume was acquired by the University of Glasgow in 1967 as part of the bequest of Stirling's son, Sir John Stirling Maxwell (University of Glasgow, Special Collections, Sp. Coll., 1701).

⁷¹ See ZARCO DEL VALLE 1870.

⁷² See GARCÍA LÓPEZ 2016c, pp. 237-245, including portrait drawings of artists in red chalk, pp. 242-243 (no. 3.14-3.17), and of Ceán, p. 244 (no. 3.18).

trations of Goya in the *Annals* totalled no less than ten. These included an etching after Velázquez's *Los Borrachos*⁷³ and the two wood engravings after the *Caprichos* (mentioned above) in the volumes of text (fig. 77)⁷⁴. And in the experimental volume of *Talbotype illustrations* which made the *Annals* the first book on art history to be illustrated with photographs, there were four more of the prints after Velázquez (fig. 80) and three of the *Tauromaquia* series⁷⁵.

The photographic volume, of which 50 copies were produced as presents for friends, family, fellow scholars and libraries, contains 66 illustrations, plus a photographic title-page and dedication page. The photographs were taken, under Stirling's supervision, in 1847 by Nicolaas Henneman, formerly assistant to William Henry Fox Talbot, inventor of the Talbotype (or calotype) process. Indeed, if the chemistry of the new process had been more stable and results more reliable at the time, Stirling would probably also have included another couple of illustrations—this time of two of oil sketches of *Boys Playing*, which he mentioned in the *Annals* text⁷⁶ and are thought to have been purchased in Seville in 1842, making them his earliest acquisitions by (or attributed to) Goya⁷⁷.

The Goya illustrations in the *Annals* also differed from those of other artists in Stirling's book in that they were of works from his own collection, at a time when he was only beginning to build up his impressive collection of Spanish art, most of which was only formed after the book's publication. Goya's importance as a printmaker, coupled with the fact that his graphic output included etchings after Velázquez, gave his prints special relevance for some key aims of the *Annals*: to provide illustrations of Spanish art, which was less well known in Britain, and had been less frequently reproduced than some other schools; and to include coverage of the history of printmaking and printmakers in Spain⁷⁸. In following these aims, Stirling could be said to be carrying forward Ceán's legacy in Britain.

⁷³ STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. I, facing p. 59, Henry Adlard after Diego Velázquez, *Los borrachos*.

⁷⁴ See STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. III, pp. 1267, Walter George Mason after Francisco de Goya, *Caprichos*, no. 49, *Duendecitos*; and p. 1269, *Caprichos*, no. 1, *Self-portrait*. In the text below the *Self-portrait*, the claim that the *Desastres* scenes were exaggerated was made by Théophile Gautier, and is dismissed as «innocent», see STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. III, p. 1270.

⁷⁵ See MACARTNEY and MATILLA 2016, v. I, no. 26-29, pp. 186-195; and, for the digital reconstruction of the photographs, v. II, no. 26-29.

⁷⁶ STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. III, p. 1265.

⁷⁷ See MACARTNEY and MATILLA 2016, v. I, C-D, pp. 290-293. These are of *Boys Playing at See-saw* and *Boys Playing at Soldiers*, formerly attributed to Goya, in the Stirling Maxwell Collection, Glasgow Museums, PC 24 and PC 27. Two other oil sketches of *Boys Playing* have been dispersed from the collection.

⁷⁸ On Stirling's aims for the engraved illustrations to the *Annals* text volumes, see STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. I, p. viii; and for the photographic illustrations, STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. IV, pp. v-vii. See also MACARTNEY 2016, pp. 25-26; and MATILLA 2016, pp. 47-67.

Stirling was, of course, not the first British collector to recognise the importance and sensitivity of Goya's translation and interpretation of Velázquez's paintings in graphic media. Thomas Robinson, 2nd Lord Grantham, who was British ambassador in Madrid in the 1770s, was so taken with the etchings that he bought five copies of them⁷⁹. However, Stirling's experimentation with early photography and, later on, with photomechanical techniques, offered new possibilities for access to art, and in this case, the work of Velázquez and Goya, notably through reproduction in books, thus continuing and extending the Spanish Enlightenment ideal of promoting Spanish art abroad.

By good fortune, much of Henneman's stock of photographic prints that was not used for the bound copies of the Talbotypes volume remained in his studio and later formed part of the Talbot Collection given to the Science Museum, London and National Science and Media Museum, Bradford. Many of these are untrimmed and can be considered in much the same way as the trial or working proofs of the etchings themselves, which were preserved by Ceán and, like them, can often provide valuable insight into how they were produced, as in the case of an untrimmed proof of the etching of the *Portrait of Philip IV* (fig. 80)⁸⁰.

Stirling's collection of Goya prints increased greatly after publication of the *Annals*. In his landmark catalogue *Goya Engravings and Lithographs* (1964), Tomás Harris recognised the fundamental importance of Ceán, Valentín Carderera and Stirling in assuring Goya's legacy and recognition as one of the world's greatest printmakers. According to Harris:

That Goya's drawings and engravings were not lost or entirely scattered outside Spain is due to three facts: that Goya gave a vast number of his works to his great friend, the connoisseur and historian, Juan Agustín Ceán Bermúdez; that another large part of his production was stored away by his son Javier on his departure for France, and that these two groups were later united in the collection of Valentín Carderera y Solano⁸¹.

As Harris went on to observe, «An outstanding collection was also being formed in Scotland at the same time by Sir William Stirling-Maxwell»⁸². Stirling's appreciation of Goya developed independently, though direct, regular contact with Carderera, providing access to rare proofs from Ceán's collection, became the key route from the 1850s. These included a set of working proofs of the *Desastres de la Guerra*,

⁷⁹ See GLENDINNING 2010, p. 18; and GLENDINNING, FRANKFORT and RUSSELL 1999, p. 601.

⁸⁰ See MACARTNEY and MATILLA 2016, v. I, no. 26, pp. 186-188, and Appendices 3/1 and 5/4 for dates of photography, 28th April and 28th June, 1847, perhaps of the etching formerly in the Stirling Maxwell Collection, now in Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, 51.1705.

⁸¹ HARRIS 1964, v. I, p. 11.

⁸² HARRIS 1964, v. I, p. 16.

which was acquired by Stirling after its proposed sale by Carderera to the British Museum had failed⁸³. In the *Annals*, Stirling had already stated his belief that the Museum should collect prints by Goya —just as he had also called on the National Gallery in London to acquire more paintings by Spanish artists⁸⁴. In principle, the working proofs obtained by Stirling in this instance were a duplicate set, the other now forming part of the vast holdings from Carderera's collection in the Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid⁸⁵. Most of Stirling's Goya prints, many of which he had collected through Carderera, were purchased by the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston in 1951⁸⁶. The fact that his set of working proofs of the *Desastres* turned out to include a unique, unpublished print for the series serves to underline the value of what Ceán had preserved and was then passed on through two other scholar-collectors.

Tribute to Ceán

Stirling's entry on Goya is the last of any length on the artists of Spain in the *Annals*. The last entry of all offers a touching short biography and tribute to Ceán, which begins:

These Annals of the Artists of Spain cannot be more fitly closed than with a notice of the able and indefatigable historian of Spanish art, to whose rich harvest of valuable materials I have ventured to add the fruit of my own humble gleanings. Juan Agustín Ceán Bermúdez was born, in 1749, at Gijón, a sea-port of Asturias⁸⁷.

And includes the acknowledgement:

⁸³ Stirling acted as intermediary in the negotiations, which ultimately failed. He was a regular visitor to the Prints and Drawings Study Room at the British Museum, as is shown by its visitor books and request slips to consult items, and later became a Trustee of the Museum. As a condition of the proposed sale, Carderera had insisted that his name as seller (and thus, exporter of artworks) should not be publicised, beyond appearing in the Museum's register of acquisitions. See his correspondence with Stirling of 1857-1858 on this matter in CARDERERA 1857-1858. See also MACARTNEY 1999b, pp. 307-308.

⁸⁴ The text continues with shorter entries on other late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century artists and designers during the reigns of the Bourbons, and on two other important sources of information for the *Annals*, Antonio Ponz, see STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. III, pp. 1279-1288; and Isidoro Bosarte, see STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. III, pp. 1288-1290.

⁸⁵ On Carderera and the BNE, see especially the exhibition <http://www.bne.es/es/Actividades/Exposiciones/Exposiciones/Exposiciones2019/Valentin-Carderera.html> (accessed 15th July 2019), and LANZAROTE (2019).

⁸⁶ See HARRIS 1964, v. I, p. 16; and for the unique print, *Infame provecho*, HARRIS 1964, v. II, cat. no. 203. For Goya prints in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, including those from Stirling's collection, see <https://collections.mfa.org/collections/315210/dpdprints-by-goya/objects>; and for *Infame provecho*, see <https://collections.mfa.org/objects/159331/infame-provecho-vile-advantage-disasters-of-war-unpublis?ctx=d12f83fa-d8f4-49c7-8d79-of8024963e88&idx=65> (both accessed 22nd June 2019).

⁸⁷ STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. III, p. 1322.

To the labours of Ceán Bermúdez, these *Annals* are so deeply indebted, that, instead of acknowledging the obligation with that minute accuracy, which I have endeavoured to observe towards my other literary creditors, I have preferred to inform the reader, once for all, that every fact for which other evidence is not offered, must be understood to be advanced, either upon his authority, or at my own personal risk⁸⁸.

And just as the text of the *Annals* closed by paying tribute to Ceán, so too did the volume of *Talbotype Illustrations*, whose last photograph, no. 66, shows «A View of Gijón, the Birth-place of Don Juan Agustín Ceán Bermúdez» (fig. 81). The photograph was of a sketch by Richard Ford in pen and wash, with brown ink and gouache «made on the heights between Avilés and Oviedo, in 1832»⁸⁹. According to an inscription by Stirling, the sketch was given to him by Ford after the photography in June 1847⁹⁰.

Stirling's closing piece constituted the first substantial tribute by a scholar following in Ceán's footsteps. In its inclusion of both text and image, it was particularly fitting and, in making it, the Scottish scholar laid claim to his own place in the historiographical tradition he inherited from Ceán.

⁸⁸ STIRLING MAXWELL 1848, v. III, p. 1326.

⁸⁹ Ford travelled extensively throughout the Peninsula during his residence there in 1830-1833. Though he clearly did journey along the road from Avilés to Oviedo, from which this and another similar view in the Ford Collection, London are taken, he admitted in a letter of 1848 to another scholar Pascual de Gayangos, that «I have never been at Palencia, Gijon, Infiesto, Covadunga [*sic*] or Cangas de Onis», quoted in ROBERTSON 2004, p. 237. I am grateful to Javier González for discussion of this point.

⁹⁰ See MACARTNEY and MATILLA 2016, v. I, no. 66, pp. 264-265; and, for the digital reconstruction of the photograph, v. II, no. 66.