



University
of Glasgow

Macartney, H. (2007) *Stirling, Ford, and nineteenth-century reception of Goya: The case of the Santa Justa and Santa Rufina: 'abomination' or 'appropriate composition'?* *Hispanic Research Journal*, 8 (5). pp. 425-444. ISSN 1468-2737

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/49689/>

Deposited on: 23 March 2011

Stirling, Ford and Nineteenth-Century Reception of Goya: The Case of the *Sta. Justa and Sta. Rufina* – ‘Abomination’ or ‘Appropriate Composition’?

Hilary Macartney, University of Glasgow

Abstract:

This article considers an aspect of the complex relationship between the two best-known British Hispanophiles, Richard Ford and William Stirling, as the starting point for an examination of their response to Goya’s art, in particular, his *Sta. Justa and Sta. Rufina*, 1817 (Seville Cathedral). In February 1845, William Stirling went to Spain to carry out further research for his *Annals of the Artists of Spain* (1848), taking with him one of the very few copies of the suppressed edition of Ford’s *Hand-book for Spain* (1845). Among the paintings he made notes on was Goya’s *Sta. Justa and Sta. Rufina*, which Ford had attacked as a ‘David-like abomination’, claiming also that the models for the virgin martyrs were strumpets. Stirling disagreed with Ford’s assessment but, by the time his *Annals* were published in 1848, he had come much closer to Ford’s view. The article ponders the reasons for Ford’s attack on this work by Goya, and for Stirling’s change of mind. Their assessment of the painting is also considered in the context of how much each knew about Goya’s art at this time, including other examples of his works they saw or wrote about. Both writers reacted against the Neoclassical aspects of the painting, and the article considers this in the light of Ceán Bermúdez’s close involvement in this commission for Seville Cathedral, and his publication of a pamphlet on the painting in 1817. Stirling, however, became an important collector of Goya’s works, some of which were illustrated or referred to in the *Annals*. His entry on the artist also incorporated other myths, in addition to that supplied by Ford, notably provided by Bartolomé José Gallardo and Théophile Gautier. Nevertheless, it was surprisingly balanced, and provided the most extensive and appreciative account of the artist in English by 1848.

Resumen:

Este artículo comienza esbozando un aspecto de la complicada relación entre los dos hispanófilos británicos más emblemáticos, Richard Ford y William Stirling, como prólogo a un análisis de la reacción de cada uno de ellos hacia el arte de Goya, en especial, a su cuadro de *Sta. Justa y Sta. Rufina*, 1817, (Catedral de Sevilla). En febrero de 1845, Stirling viajó a España para seguir investigando con destino a sus *Annals of the Artists of Spain* (1848), y llevó consigo uno de los escasísimos ejemplares de la edición suprimida del *Hand-book for Spain* (1845) de Ford. *Sta. Justa y Sta. Rufina* de Goya fue uno de los cuadros sobre los cuales Stirling apuntó comentarios. Ford había atacado dicho cuadro como ‘una abominación próxima a David’, insistiendo además en que las modelos para las santas vírgenes habían sido dos ramerías. Stirling no coincidía con la valoración de Ford, pero cuando publicó los *Annals* en 1848, se había aproximado bastante al punto de vista de Ford. El presente artículo trata las razones del antagonismo de Ford hacia ese cuadro de Goya, junto a las del cambio de opinión por parte de Stirling. También se examina su evaluación del cuadro dentro del contexto del conocimiento de ambos de la obra de Goya en ese momento, incluso los ejemplos de su arte que habían visto, o sobre que habían escrito. Ford, igual que (más tarde) Stirling, había reaccionado contra las características neoclásicas de la pintura, factor que se considera aquí a la luz de la participación estrecha de Ceán Bermúdez en el encargo del cuadro para la Catedral de Sevilla, y su publicación de un panfleto sobre el mismo en 1817. Stirling, no obstante, llegó a ser un coleccionista importante de obras de Goya, algunas de las cuales ilustró o mencionó en los *Annals*. En esta entrada entretejió también otros mitos, además de los de Ford, especialmente algunos procedentes de Bartolomé José Gallardo y Théophile Gautier. Pero, con todo, era una entrada equilibrada que constituía la relación más extensa y aprobatoria del artista en inglés hasta 1848.

In Britain in the 1840s, two landmark publications on Spain and Spanish art appeared: the *Hand-book for Travellers in Spain, and Readers at Home* (1845), by Richard Ford (1796-1858), the first comprehensive guidebook to that country in English, with substantial coverage of Spanish art; and the *Annals of the Artists of Spain* (1848), by William Stirling (1818-1878), later Sir William Stirling Maxwell, which was the first scholarly history of Spanish art in English.¹ These two works provide important early indicators of the reception of the art of Francisco de Goya y Lucientes (1746-1828) in nineteenth-century Britain. During the difficult gestation and birth of these pioneering British works on Spain, a curious set of circumstances, which offers a fascinating insight into the complex relationship between Ford and Stirling, led to Stirling becoming the first person to use Ford's *Hand-book* in Spain, and prompted a difference of opinion between the two great Hispanophiles in response to Goya's painting, *Sta. Justa and Sta. Rufina* (fig. 1).

Early in 1845, Stirling sent a draft of the book that was to become the *Annals* to John Murray, the publisher. Murray in turn sent it for an opinion to Richard Ford, whose *Hand-book* he was in the process of publishing. Stirling's draft has not survived, and Ford's reply to Murray of 11 February 1845 provides the only information about this early stage of Stirling's book.² Ford, who was in the throes of pruning his own book, was less than impressed with the younger man's work, dismissing it as 'dross & commonplace' and as 'a jejune extract from Spanish works'. His own *Hand-book*, he believed, was more accurate and informative on Spanish art: 'What you have in Handbook, although I say it who ought not, is worth double this MS'. Ford's statement was perhaps also a defence of his own book, about which Murray was having severe reservations, as much as an attack on Stirling's. Ford may have been a little hurt that Stirling had not contacted him for advice on the book, as the two men had met in Rome in early 1840 and had clearly got on well together. Ford was then already committed to the *Hand-book* (Robertson, 2004, pp. 171-2) and is likely to have helped to fire Stirling's interest in Spain.³

By the beginning of 1845, Stirling had still seen remarkably little of Spain and its art, having made only two short trips to Spain in 1841 and 1842, although he was familiar

with the Galerie Espagnole at the Louvre and with examples of Spanish art in Britain and elsewhere. Thus, Ford's most damning criticisms of Stirling's draft, that 'there is no attempt to touch the philosophy of Spanish art, its character or the peculiarities of its artists' and that 'it will tell scarcely anything that is not known', were probably largely merited. John Murray acted on Ford's opinion of Stirling's draft and, on 12 February 1845, he wrote a short, courteous letter to Stirling to say he was unable to publish his book, pointing out that, as he was already committed to publishing Sir Edmund Head's *Handbook of the History of the Spanish and French Schools of Painting*, which he described as 'a condensed view of the Spanish School', he could 'scarcely do justice to another, though more detailed and elaborate work, on the same subject' (T-SK 29/4/92, Murray to Stirling, 12 February 1845). Murray's contrast between Head's and Stirling's works suggests that the ambitious scope of the published *Annals* was already in evidence in the draft, even though Stirling had perhaps only submitted an outline, with one or two chapters written up. Stirling's itinerary and notes on his subsequent trip to Spain in 1845, and the list of books he purchased there, show that he was aware of the gaps in his knowledge and was attempting to fill them.

On the same day that Murray wrote his rejection letter, Stirling arrived in London to make preparations for his visit to Spain, and set off eight days later (T-SK 28/11, Stirling, 1845-9). Lasting a little over two months, it was an intensive research trip which must have been carefully planned weeks, if not months, before he set out. He would have received Murray's rejection letter before he left, though neither his research trip, nor his book can have depended on a favourable reply, and he must have decided to go ahead with both, whatever Murray's opinion of his manuscript.

A more immediate concern for both Murray and Ford than Stirling's draft of the *Annals* was the *Hand-book*, whose publication Ford had eventually decided to suppress by 19 February 1845, after 768 pages had been printed, because of worries expressed by Murray's readers that the book would cause offence to the Spaniards and the French (Bean 1996, 11).⁴ Ford then set about excising or toning down many of his comments for the first published edition of the *Hand-book* which finally appeared on 25 July 1845

(Bean 1996, 13). On 20 February, the day after Ford had announced the definitive suppression to one of the book's principal critics, the diplomat Henry Unwin Addington, and admitted to George Borrow, author of the *Bible in Spain* (1842), that he thought the *Hand-book* might be prohibited entry to Spain (Bean 1996, 11; Robertson 2004, 205), John Murray nevertheless provided Stirling with a 'complete copy in cloth' of Ford's suppressed work (Murray, 1844-5). Stirling must have contacted Murray, following the publisher's rejection of his draft of the *Annals*, no doubt to request more information about Sir Edmund Head's book on Spanish art, which he seems to have been unaware of before Murray's letter, and would also have been updated on Ford's *Hand-book*. Presumably he was made aware of the concerns about the book and the decision to suppress, though Murray may have been keen to have it put to the test as a guidebook.⁵

Stirling made two references to the *Hand-book* in his travel notes. The first concerned the sculptor Juan Martínez Montañés (c. 1568-1649). At Alcalá de Guadaira, near Seville, Stirling noted a 'Xt bearing the Cross by Montañés & some small bas-relief-gilt hardly worthy of the praise of the "Handbook"'. Ford had admired the 'Retablo with six small bas-reliefs by Montañés'. It seems, however, that Stirling was looking at a different work, since he named only the 'Parroquia' or parish church of Santiago in his notes, whereas Ford was referring to the Convent of Sta. Clara (Stirling, 1845-9, T-SK 28/11; Ford, 1966, p. 357; suppressed 1845, p. 243).⁶

The second mention of the *Hand-book* is of special interest, since it was Stirling's first reference to a Goya painting in his notes. The *Sta. Justa and Sta. Rufina* (fig. 1) in Seville Cathedral, he thought, was 'much better than Handbook allows' (T-SK 28/11, Stirling, 1845-9). Ford had been unequivocal in his disapproval: 'The patronesses, santas Rufina and Justina, were painted in 1817 by Goya: the fit models for this David-like abomination were two notorious strumpets of Madrid named Ramona and Sabina.' In the published text, 'strumpets' was changed to 'frail ladies' (Ford, suppressed 1845 p. 261; and 1966, p. 383; Bean, 1996, p. 12; Robertson, 2004, p. 57). Ford's source for this claim is untraced, despite his reference to the models' names, though it is possible that these were common names given to or used by prostitutes in Spain at the time, or that the myth of Goya's use

of 'frail ladies' as models, with or without names, derived from a popular rumour when the picture was first unveiled. Certainly Goya's friend Nicolás Fernández de Moratín (1737-80) mentioned a prostitute in Madrid named Ramona in his mock didactic poem, *Arte de putear* (Moratín, 1995, II:342-3), while the Sabine connotations of the name Sabina could well have meant it was nickname given to prostitutes.⁷ Ford went on to suggest a parallel between Goya and classical artists in their choice of models: 'Thus the mistresses of painters and great men were the models of the pagan pictures of Venus; particularly Flora, the chère amie of Pompey, and Phyrne and Campaspe, the beloved of Alexander. Arellius (Plin. "N.H." xxxv. 10) was remarkable, like Goya, for painting goddesses from improper models' (Ford, 1966, pp. 383-4). As his examples make clear, however, these were mistresses rather than prostitutes, and it is certainly possible that Ford knew that Goya was living with Leocadia Weiss, a relative of his son's wife and almost certainly Goya's mistress, when the *Sta. Justa and Sta. Rufina* was painted, and he perhaps even heard gossip that she was the model for the saints. As Juliet Wilson-Bareau has noted, the calm, oval faces that occur in so many of the Black Border album drawings, c. 1816-20, are close to those of the two saints, and Leocadia may have been the inspiration for all of these (Wilson-Bareau & Mena, 1994, pp. 312, 323; Wilson-Bareau, 2001, pp. 113-34; Gassier, 1973, vol. I, no. 126). Whoever the models for the saints were, it is unlikely that, if the painting was done in Madrid, Leocadia would have permitted prostitutes in the studio, or that the art historian Juan Agustín Ceán Bermúdez (1749-1829), who was closely involved with the *Sta. Justa and Sta. Rufina* commission, would have accepted prostitutes as the models.

The two figures in the painting are shown in modest dress, with faces upturned. Their pious attitudes are emphasised by the clever lighting, which implies both divine irradiation, as well as an actual light source high up in the Sacristy of the Chalice, for which the picture was painted. The award of the commission by the cathedral chapter of Seville to Goya appears to have owed much to Ceán, and the painting's favourable reception when it was unveiled made it Goya's greatest public success (Symmons, 1988, p. 55). In many ways, it is hard to understand Ford's attack. However, he was certainly not alone in finding the devotional character of this and other religious paintings by Goya

unsatisfactory. Much of the debate centred on whether the figures in his religious works were ‘appropriate’ as models expressing piety and decorum. In 1880, for example, Pedro de Madrazo exclaimed that nothing could be ‘less appropriate’ than the facial expressions in the *Sta. Justa and Sta. Rufina* and, more understandably, he described the angels in the frescoes in San Antonio de la Florida in Madrid as ‘more like handsome harlots than heavenly spirits’ (Madrazo, 1880, in Glendinning, 1977, p. 108).

Through his reference to ‘fit models’ in his criticism of the *Sta. Justa and Sta. Rufina*, Ford linked the alleged loose morals of Goya’s models for the virgin martyrs to the other target of his disapproval in the painting: its Neoclassicism. For Ford, Neoclassical style was associated principally with Jacques-Louis David (1748-1825) and with revolutionary ideas. Thus, in the space of just one sentence, Ford conflated notions of lack of decorum in religious compositions, Neoclassicism in art, and political revolution, expressing his distaste for all three. He described David as ‘fit painter of the Revolution, who trampled on the fine arts of cowed Europe’ and, in the suppressed edition, added that what David did to the arts, ‘his bosom friends Robespierre and Buonaparte did on life and liberty, England happily excepted’ (Ford, 1966, p. 1113; suppressed 1845, p. 722). In making a link between Neoclassicism and revolution, Ford suggested they were two aspects of a dangerous movement, which had spread throughout Europe, due to the French, threatening the survival of distinct national characteristics which he believed were otherwise permanent and unchangeable. Ford believed that the crucial role of the British, and especially the Duke of Wellington, in combatting the Napoleonic threat in Spain, and thereby helping to preserve distinctive Spanish culture, had not been sufficiently acknowledged in accounts of the Peninsular War (*Guerra de Independencia*), especially in Spain itself, and his concern to tell ‘the whole truth’ about this became one of the recurring themes of the *Hand-book*.

Stirling, on the other hand, was more than 20 years Ford’s junior, and the emotions of the Napoleonic campaigns were not felt by him in such a direct and personal way. He had shown no aversion to Neoclassical style by 1845, and though he was no supporter of Napoleon, he was interested in the cult of the Emperor. He had been much impressed by

the pomp and ceremony of the state funeral of Napoleon I in Paris in 1840 (T-SK 29/1/43, William Stirling to Hannah-Ann Stirling, 19 Dec. 1840), when the Emperor's remains were returned for burial, and later the same year, had bought one of his first large paintings, a version of the *Portrait of Napoleon I in Coronation Robes* by Baron Gérard (1770-1837), now Deutsches Historisches Museum, Berlin, a remarkable image of power (fig. 2). In 1842, he had also admired paintings by Vicente López (T-SK 28/9, Stirling, 1839-42, Valencia, 5-7 Nov.; and Madrid, 16 Nov. 1842), one of the members of the Real Academia de San Fernando whose style was called by Ford 'a bad Mengs style run mad' (Ford, 1966, p. 1095).

Later on in Stirling's 1845 tour, however, an antipathy to David's style surfaced unexpectedly when he described the colouring of El Greco's *Disrobing of Christ* as 'in general unpleasantly livid, almost anticipating the absurd style of David & the French Empire' (T-SK 28/11, Stirling, 1845-9). By the time the *Annals* were published, Stirling combined further objections to David with a revised opinion of the *Sta. Justa and Sta. Rufina* which was clearly influenced by that of Ford. Thus, he now regretted that Goya had adopted in it 'that hard sculptural style in which David and his French followers painted their wearisome delineations of Greek and Roman story' (Stirling, 1891, vol. IV, p. 1477). He considered the painting an example of Goya's 'more disagreeable manner' and found that, instead of capturing 'the poetical aspect' of the subject, the artist had been content with 'meretriciously pourtraying' the virgin martyrs (Stirling, 1891, vol. IV, p. 1474). He also repeated the *Hand-book's* claim about the models, referring to them rather more mildly, however, as 'not very refined courtesans'.⁸

Ford had shown considerable perceptiveness in noting the more Neoclassical and academic aspects of Goya's style in the *Sta. Justa and Sta. Rufina*, though whether he was aware that this was connected with the involvement of Ceán in the commission is not clear. In a letter to a friend, Tomás de Verí, in September 1817, Ceán claimed credit for many of the decisions about the painting, including opting for a composition which showed the saints in devotional attitude, instead of a narrative scene depicting their lives or martyrdom. According to Ceán, he had given Goya written instructions on the painting

and had required him to do three or four sketches. He admitted that it was difficult ‘to instil into Goya the requisite decorum, humility and devotion’ but hoped that the painting would turn out to his (Ceán’s) taste.⁹ When he wrote again to Verí in January 1818, he was convinced that the painting had turned out ‘marvellously well’.¹⁰

Ford would not have known Ceán’s letters to de Verí but it is not impossible that he could have known Ceán’s article and pamphlet in praise of the painting, *Análisis de un cuadro que pintó D. Francisco Goya para la Catedral de Sevilla*, published anonymously in 1817. Whether Stirling was aware of this rare publication by the time the *Annals* were published in 1848 is likewise not clear, though he certainly owned a special copy of the pamphlet later on. This had been bought from Ceán’s heirs by the art historian and archival scholar Manuel Zarco del Valle (1833-1922) and was given by him to Stirling, perhaps in the 1860s.¹¹ It contains corrections by Ceán in pen, apparently for its publication in the *Crónica científica y literaria* in December 1817. Stirling bound it into one of the copies, now in Glasgow University Library, of the facsimile edition of Torre Farfán’s *Fiestas de Sevilla* (1671) which he published privately in 1871.

If Ford and Stirling did know Ceán’s publication by 1845 and 1848 respectively, then their criticisms of the *Sta. Justa and Sta. Rufina* in the *Hand-book* and the *Annals* were a rejection of Ceán’s defence of the painting as an ‘appropriate composition’ which followed academic, Neoclassical principles. Ceán pointed out that Goya had first studied the works painted by the the great Andalucian artists for Seville Cathedral, then stressed the care and thought which Goya had applied to the composition and the resolution of its problems, including reading St. Isidore of Seville’s account of the saints’ martyrdom, studying Greek or Roman models on which to base the head and fragments of the smashed pagan idol, and balancing historical correctness with idealisation, for example, in the dress of the two saints, so that verisimilitude and accuracy were greater even than in Raphael, while proportions and postures were ‘mid way between nature and the figures of classical antiquity, in the manner of Guido Reni’. The facial expressions were, Ceán insisted, the ‘most philosophical part of the painting’, in which Goya expressed *Sta.*

Justa's 'desire to see and join her maker' and Sta. Rufina's 'unprotesting acceptance of the will of her Redeemer' (Ceán, 1817, in Glendinning, 1977, pp. 287-289).

According to hagiographical tradition, Sts. Justa and Rufina were potters who were martyred in Seville in 287, for opposing the pagan cult of Salambo, to whom their pots were offered as gifts, and whose idol they were said to have destroyed. A later tradition linked these two patron saints of Seville to another symbol of the city, the twelfth-century Giralda tower, originally the minaret of the main mosque, which became the belltower of the cathedral: during an earthquake in 1504, the virgin martyrs were said to have appeared to support the tower, preventing its collapse. The iconography of most representations of the saints combines these two traditions (Angulo, 1981, vol. I, p. 361). The earliest such depiction is the painting which forms part of the altarpiece, dated 1555, of the Chapel of the Evangelists in Seville Cathedral, by the Dutch painter Hernando de Esturmio (Valdivieso, 1986, p. 77). His composition of half-length figures shows the saints as richly dressed and jewelled, holding their pots and martyrs' palms, with, in the background, classical idols and the Giralda tower, before its additions of 1568 by the architect, Hernán Ruiz II. As part of the programme of additions to the tower, Luis de Vargas is known to have represented the saints in his series of now-disappeared frescoes on the Giralda in 1558 (Valdivieso, 1986, p. 84). According to Ceán's *Descripción artística de la Catedral de Sevilla* of 1804 (p. 10), the depiction of the saints was among those which were still visible, and it was, presumably, still discernible when Goya visited in 1817. Another painting of *Sta. Justa and Sta. Rufina* in Seville Cathedral is the only surviving work by Miguel de Esquivel (c. 1620) (Valdivieso, 1986, no. 152), and depicts the virgin martyrs as full-length figures, on either side of a large image of the Giralda, showing its architectural additions and frescoes.

However, the canonical representation of the subject was by Bartolomé Esteban Murillo (1617-82), in his painting of c. 1665-6 (fig. 3), now in the Museo de Bellas Artes, Seville, which formed part of the Porciuncula altarpiece of the Capuchin church in Seville (Angulo, 1981 vol II, no. 64; Mena & Valdivieso, 1982, no. 41). Ceán, as a well-known advocate of the Sevillian painter's art, in his *Carta [...] sobre el estilo y gusto en la*

pintura de la escuela sevillana (1806), would certainly have urged Goya to study this picture well, for its outstanding naturalism and the sensitivity with which the exceptional devotion of the martyrs is depicted. Goya's composition clearly pays tribute to Murillo's work, although the anachronistic device of showing the saints holding the Giralda tower was not followed, and instead the tower now forms a more plausible backdrop, whilst the saints hold examples of their skill as potters, as in the *Esturmio*.¹² One of Goya's iconographical innovations, vigorously defended by Ceán, in his *Análisis*, as 'factually connected with the martyrdom of the saint', was the lion licking the foot of St. Rufina (Ceán, 1817, in Glendinning, 1977, p. 288).

Murillo's *Sts. Justa and Rufina* was obviously the work against which Goya's composition was constantly measured, and often found wanting, including by Ford and later, Stirling. In Ford's case, Goya's *Sta. Justa and Sta. Rufina* was probably the painting he knew best by the artist, since it was in Seville, where Ford spent most of his stay in Spain, but he made similar, unfavourable comments in passing about other religious paintings by Goya, such as those in Valencia Cathedral, in San Francisco el Grande, Madrid (Ford, 1966, pp. 659 & 1174). What is equally significant, however, is that Ford did reserve some praise for the artist. Interestingly, much of what Ford admired in these instances appears to have been Goya's lack of adherence to Neoclassical precepts. According to Ford, much of the blame for the popularity of Neoclassicism in the Spanish Academy lay with Anton Rafael Mengs, who had been one of its Directors of Painting. Mengs, he claimed, had been 'the incarnation of the academical mediocre' and had 'led the way' for David. Modern Spanish art, therefore, was, according to Ford, 'the child of corrupt parents' (Ford, 1966, p. 1113). In his account of the Prado Museum (then Museo Real), after ridiculing the Spanish Neoclassicists, he singled out Goya as the only modern Spanish artist worthy of any praise: 'Goya alone [...] shows talent', before going on to laud 'the old masters of Spain, good men and true, free from all infidel and foreign taint' (Ford, 1966, p. 1114). For Ford, then, Goya was perhaps, after all, the last survivor of a distinctive Spanish school of art.¹³

Ford was also complimentary about a group of paintings by Goya in the Royal Academy in Madrid: ‘Some little pictures by Goya are among the best productions of modern Spanish art’ (Ford, 1966, p. 1096). The ‘little pictures’ must have been *The Madhouse* (fig. 4), the *Auto de Fe of the Inquisition*, the *Procession of Flagellants*, the *Bullfight in a Village*, and perhaps also the *Burial of the Sardine*. Ford would surely have appreciated these, not only as an exploration of distinctive Spanish character, but also as a critique of the Spanish institutions, notably the church and the state, which both he and Goya believed had impeded progress and reform in Spain. However, it is unlikely that Ford himself had seen these paintings, since his stay in Spain had lasted from 1830 to 1833, whereas these paintings did not enter the Academy collection until 1839, as the bequest of Don Manuel García de la Prada who had died in 1836 (Ascárate y Ristori (ed.), 1998, nos. 672-676). The first four are thought to have been the group described in the inventory of Goya’s effects in 1823 as ‘Quatro cuadritos fiestas y costumbres’. If so, García de la Prada may have acquired them from the painter himself, or from his son, Javier (Wilson-Bareau & Mena, 1994, nos. 95-98). Ford does not appear to have had any direct contact with Goya’s son, either during his stay in Spain or afterwards during preparation of the *Hand-book*, though he did mention him in the third edition of 1855, when he noted that Javier Goya had many of his father’s sketches and paintings. Interestingly, his source of information in that case appears to have been Stirling, who had visited Goya’s son in 1849 (Ford, 1855, p. 686).¹⁴ Similarly, there does not seem to be any evidence that Ford knew García de la Prada or his collection, but the pictures were well known and, according to the latter’s will, ‘muy alabados de los Profesores’ (Wilson-Bareau & Mena, 1994, p. 371).

As is well known, Ford had faced very considerable difficulties in trying to ensure that the *Hand-book*’s information was accurate and up to date, given the enormous changes, including in the whereabouts of pictures and the contents of museums, that had occurred in Spain between his return to Britain in 1833 and the book’s publication in 1845. Ford often had to rely on information from friends such as the Arabist Pascual de Gayangos (1809-1897), and on publications such as other guidebooks and travellers’ accounts. Perhaps Ford’s most likely published source of information on the little Goyas in the

Academy was Louis Viardot's *Musées d'Espagne, d'Angleterre, et de Belgique* (1843) which he described in the suppressed edition of the *Handbook* as containing 'many lively, clever, *intuitive*, and superficial criticisms', adding by way of explanation: 'It is very French' (Ford, suppressed 1845, p. 722). A copy of Viardot's book which once belonged to Ford contains some marginal comments by the latter, at times expressing his impatience with the Frenchman.¹⁵ Nevertheless, Viardot's book would have given him as much information as he needed for his brief reference to the Goyas in the *Hand-book*. Viardot's description of the four little pictures as 'pendants' to the clothed *Maja* presumably reflected the hanging arrangement at the time (the *Naked Maja* was kept in a private room and was not referred to by Viardot):

Goya ... a cinq ouvrages à l'Académie: Une *Dame* (que l'on croit la duchesse d'Albe) en habits de *maja* andalouse, étendue sur un lit, et quatre petits pendants, un *Auto-da-Fé*, une *Procession du Vendredi-Saint*, une *Course de Taureaux*, une *Maison de Fous* ... les quatres pendants sont des fantaisies charmantes, spirituelles, animées, de sa meilleure époque, et surpassant ses eaux-fortes elles-mêmes de toute la supériorité de la peinture (Viardot, 1843, p. 179).

Viardot did not mention the *Burial of the Sardine*, which may mean it was not on display when he visited, while Ford, curiously, did not mention the clothed or naked *Majas* (now in the Prado), though they had been in the Academy since 1815-16 (Glendinning, 1977, p. 11).

Stirling, on the other hand, did see the 'little pictures' at the Academy in 1845, perhaps prompted by Ford's text, though he was also familiar with Viardot.¹⁶ He referred to the paintings in his travel journal as: 'Goya. Two sketches of bullfights & some clever caricatures of religious processions' (T-SK 28/11, Stirling, 1845-9). Viewing conditions were not ideal, however: he complained that the 'Rooms at back' were 'very ill lighted' and seems to have mistaken *The Madhouse* for a bullfighting scene!¹⁷ Nevertheless, he may have had the little Academy pictures in mind when he wrote in the *Annals* that 'the *Autos-de-fé* of times past, or the processional pageants of his own days, [Goya] parodied without mercy' (Stirling, 1891, vol. 4, p. 1476).

Why did Stirling change his opinion of the *Sta. Justa and Sta. Rufina* and its 'David-like' Neoclassicism between 1845 and 1848? Was it simply a measure of Ford's influence on

him, or did he feel he should publicly defer to Ford as the most respected authority on all things Spanish? Both of these explanations may go part of the way towards the truth, as by the time the *Annals* appeared in 1848, Ford and Stirling had become close friends. They were brought together again in 1846 by Ralph W. Grey, who had been Stirling's companion during part of his 1845 trip to Spain, and to whom the volume of Talbotype photographic illustrations to the *Annals* was dedicated. Whether Stirling or Grey knew of Ford's involvement in Murray's rejection of the draft of the *Annals* in 1845 is not clear. However, in October 1846, Grey told Stirling that Ford was aware that Stirling was preparing a book on Spanish art, and advised him that it would be courteous to write to Ford directly to tell him about the book, 'as he is rather touchy & would not like others to know of it before himself' (T-SK 29/4/136, Grey to Stirling, [Oct./Nov. 1846]).¹⁸ Stirling followed Grey's advice, and Ford replied, inviting Stirling to Exeter and showing great interest in helping his younger colleague, as well as relishing the opportunity to show off some of his most prized treasures to someone who would appreciate them (T-SK 29/4/128, Ford to Stirling, 7 Nov. 1846). Ford eventually agreed to review the *Annals*, and praised Stirling's ability to convey the authentic flavour of Spanish art in his review of the books by both Head and Stirling in the *Quarterly Review*, summing up the *Annals* as 'an *olla podrida* ..., stuffed with savouries, the national garlic not omitted' (Ford, 1848, p. 11). Ford's enthusiasm and hospitality, as well as his practical help in the editing of the *Annals*, no doubt had an influence on Stirling during the final stages of the book, which may well have resulted in a number of shifts in his views, consciously or unconsciously, to accommodate those of Ford.

Despite Ford's praise of Goya in the Academia and the Prado, it could hardly be claimed that he had shown a great deal of interest in Goya's art in the *Hand-book*.¹⁹ For Stirling, on the other hand, his disagreement with Ford's response to the *Sta. Justa and Sta. Rufina* signalled the start of a substantial development in his interest in this artist in 1845, as he made contacts and collected material for a sizable and considered entry on Goya in the *Annals*. Ford's *Hand-book* was Stirling's main source in the *Annals* for his low opinion of Goya's religious pictures, which were 'either commonplace or feeble, or [...] coarse and revolting', but importantly, Stirling cautioned that such pictures 'must not be taken as

the measure of his powers' (Stirling, 1891, vol. IV, p. 1474). Stirling's opinion of Goya as a printmaker who was 'highly skilled in the use of the graver' was a point of even greater disagreement with Ford, who had commented that Goya's 'unmechanical countrymen' had made 'a slight mistake' in thinking him 'a combination of Hogarth, Rembrandt, and Callot' (Stirling, 1891, vol. IV, p. 1478; Ford, 1966, p. 1114).²⁰

Stirling's interest in Goya appears to have begun in 1842, when he is believed to have purchased four oil sketches of boys playing (fig. 5) in Seville, his first known purchases of Spanish art.²¹ In 1844 or 1845, he also bought some Goya etchings after equestrian portraits by Velázquez. These are likely to have been acquired primarily as illustrations, and were photographed for the volume of Talbotype illustrations which accompanied the *Annals*, along with three of the etchings from the *Tauromaquia* (fig. 6), a copy of which Stirling appears to have acquired in Spain in 1845.²² He also sought out copies of the *Caprichos* on his 1845 visit to Spain. They were among Stirling's list of 'Things to get in Spain', where Pascual de Gayangos was noted as a possible contact in obtaining them; and a set is indeed entered in a list of 'Books and Pictures Bought in Spain in 1845'.²³ This is the copy now in Glasgow University Library, which according to Stirling's note on the flyleaf, he bought in Seville 'for 10 or 12 dollars'. He perhaps purchased it by or through the writer and bibliographer, Bartolomé José Gallardo (1776-1852), whom he met in Seville, and who provided him with memoranda, which he pasted into the front of the copy, of the type which had been circulated with a number of the early copies of the *Caprichos* (Glendinning, 1977, pp. 61-2), interpreting some of the plates as satires of Queen María Luisa, Godoy, the Duchess of Alba and her companion Dona Catalina. Stirling had also been commissioned by Charles A. Murray, a former Master of the Royal Household, to buy a copy of the *Caprichos* for Prince Albert, and had advised Murray where a copy of Goya's *Tauromaquia* etchings could be purchased in Madrid.²⁴

The entry on Goya in the *Annals* was the only one in which many of the works discussed were already owned by Stirling, whereas most of his collection of Spanish art was acquired after publication of the *Annals*. Remarkably, there were also a total of nine illustrations of Goya's works, a significant number for an artist who was still little known

in Britain, though most of these were in the volume of Talbotype illustrations, which had a very limited circulation.²⁵ The text entry on Goya contained two illustrations in wood engraving, after the *Self Portrait* and *Duendecitos* (Plates 1 & 49) in the copy of the *Caprichos* Stirling had bought in Spain in 1845 (Stirling, 1848, pp. 1269 & 1267) (figs. 7-8).

In addition to Ford's, two other assessments of Goya in 1845 had a major impact on the image of the artist which Stirling presented in the *Annals*.²⁶ The first was that of Gallardo, whom, as we have seen, he met in Spain that year (T-SK 29/55/10 and T-SK 29/5/115, Gallardo to Stirling, 9 November 1845 and 15 August 1849).²⁷ Myths and anecdotes about artists, whether literally true or not, were an important element in the mix of information provided by Stirling in the *Annals*, in the belief that 'every relic of the personal history of a man of genius' was of some value (Stirling, 1891, vol. I, p. xxxi). Thus, he would have been especially interested in Gallardo's personal reminiscences of Goya, including the famous anecdote about the artist drawing caricatures in sand which he recounted in the *Annals*:

[...] during morning visits to his friends, he would take the sandbox from the inkstand, and, strewing the contents on the table, amuse them with caricatures, traced in an instant by his ready finger. The great subject, repeated with ever new variations in these sand-sketches, was Godoy, to whom he cherished an especial antipathy, and whose face he was never weary of depicting with every ludicrous exaggeration of its peculiarities that quick wit and ill-will could supply (Stirling, 1891, vol. IV, p. 1478).

It is not surprising that Gallardo, himself a major critic and satirist of corruption and hypocrisy in the Spanish establishment, should have recalled such a scene, and it is noticeable that his image of Goya, as having used spontaneity and satire to convey truth in art, was largely that presented by Stirling in the *Annals*. This, in addition to the memoranda given by Gallardo to Stirling, claiming some of the plates to be satires of public figures, informed Stirling's assessment of the *Caprichos* as 'clever etchings', touched 'now with bitter satire, now with ghastly humour'. Thus, Stirling read *Duendecitos* (fig. 7), as a satire on friars as 'a breed who drained the cream-bowl without threshing the corn' (Stirling, 1891, vol. IV, pp. 1479-80); and Gallardo's view of Goya as

spontaneous satirist would also have informed Stirling's interpretation of the paintings he owned of *Boys Playing* (fig. 5):

I possess four of his hasty sketches of children at play, in which are introduced some small urchins, equipped as miniature friars and pummelling one another with all the ardour of Dominicans and Capuchins bickering about the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, or the right of vending indulgences (Stirling, 1891, vol. IV, pp. 1476-7).

The other major influence on Stirling's entry on Goya was Théophile Gautier (1811-1872), whose *Voyage en Espagne* was published in 1845. Stirling acknowledged that he had drawn from Gautier's account 'several facts relating to Goya's life', and it was also the source he most frequently cited in the footnotes (Stirling, 1891, vol. IV, pp. 1473, note 1). His notes on the flyleaf of the copy of the *Caprichos* he purchased in 1845 also cite Gautier's 1842 article on Goya in the *Cabinet de l'Amateur et de l'Antiquaire*. The most significant of Gautier's 'facts', which influenced Stirling's interpretation of Goya, was the description of the artist's bold and spontaneous method of painting. Stirling therefore contrasted the style of Goya's more Neoclassical paintings such as the *Sta. Justa and Sta. Rufina* with 'those more congenial works in which his hand spoke as his fancy prompted, and in which he poured forth the gaiety of his wit, or the gall of his sarcasm', quoting Gautier on the technique of the latter works: "'Smearing his canvas with paint," says a French writer, "as a mason plasters a wall, he would add the delicate touches of sentiment with a dash of his thumb"' (Stirling, 1891, vol. IV, pp. 1473, p. 1477). Whether Stirling thought Gautier's account exaggerated is not clear, but he is likely to have thought there was some truth in it, especially as it was similar to another account he had read of the artist's technique, written by Javier Goya, for the prizegiving at the Academia de San Fernando in 1832, which referred to the artist painting with a palette knife.²⁸ Thus, Stirling seems to have accepted much of the modern construct which Gallardo and Gautier had helped create of Goya as an artist for whom the activity of painting was an expression of personal feelings and beliefs.

Both Gallardo and Gautier also contributed to Stirling's appreciation of Goya as an artist of fantasy and the grotesque, even though Stirling was critical of Gautier's 'fondness for gloom and melodramatic horror' (Stirling, 1891, vol. IV, p. 1480, note 4).²⁹ Perhaps

prompted by the *Hand-book*, Stirling's impression of Goya's paintings in Valencia Cathedral on his visit in 1845 was unfavourable (T-SK 28/11, Stirling, 1845-9). Later, in the *Annals*, these paintings, like the *Sta. Justa and Sta. Rufina*, were criticised for following David's style (Ford, 1966, p. 659; Stirling, 1891, vol. IV, p. 1477). In the case of the *St. Francis Borgia Attending a Dying Impenitent*, however, a Gautier-like fascination for the scene, in which 'the soul of a dying sinner [is] seized in its flight from the body by three hideous demons, who are discovered by a supernatural light flashing from the crucifix of the ministering Jesuit', competes with, and wins out against Fordian objections (Stirling, 1891, vol. IV, p. 1474). But where Gautier tended to enjoy such Gothic horror for its own sake, Stirling appears to have regarded it, like Gallardo and the satire of human failings, as part of the moral purpose of Goya's art. The *Annals* entry on Goya was the most extensive and appreciative account of the artist in English by 1848, even though it by no means reflected the whole range of published opinion at that date. But considering the differing views it incorporated, not least the myths promoted by Ford, Gallardo and Gautier, perhaps the most surprising thing about it is the balance of its assessments.

Illustrations

Fig. 1 Francisco de Goya y Lucientes (1746-1828), *Sta. Justa and Sta. Rufina*, 1817, oil on canvas. © Seville Cathedral/The Bridgeman Library.

Fig. 2 François Pascal Simon, Baron Gérard (1770-1837), *Portrait of Napoleon I in Coronation Robes*, c. 1806-10. © Deutsches Historisches Museum, Berlin.

Fig. 3 Bartolomé Esteban Murillo (1617-82), *Sts. Justa and Rufina*, c. 1665-6. © Museo de Bellas Artes, Seville.

Fig. 4 Francisco de Goya y Lucientes (1746-1828), *The Madhouse*, oil on canvas. © Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando, Madrid.

Fig. 5 Francisco de Goya y Lucientes (1746-1828), *Boys Playing at See-saw*. © Glasgow Museums, Stirling Maxwell Collection, Pollok House.

Fig. 6 Francisco de Goya y Lucientes (1746-1828), Plates 19, 21 and 24, *Tauromaquia*, 1816, etching and aquatint, reproduced as Talbotype illustrations nos. 63-65 to William Stirling, *Annals of the Artists of Spain* (1848).

Fig. 7 Francisco de Goya y Lucientes (1746-1828), *Duendecitos*, Plate 49, *Caprichos*, 1799, etching and aquatint, purchased by William Stirling, Seville, 1845. © Glasgow University Library.

Fig. 8 W. C. Mason after Francisco de Goya, *Duendecitos*, Plate 49, *Caprichos*, wood engraving illustration for William Stirling, *Annals of the Artists of Spain*, 1848, pasted into Stirling's copy of the *Caprichos*. © Glasgow University Library.

LIST OF SOURCES CITED

Documents

Archives of John Murray, Publishers, National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh. Day-book, 1844-5.

Stirlings of Keir Papers, on deposit at Glasgow Archives: T-SK 29, Correspondence of William Stirling; T-SK 28, Travel Journals of William Stirling. The author is grateful to Archie Stirling of Keir for permission to quote from these papers.

Publications

Diego Angulo Iníguez, *Murillo. Su vida, su arte, su obra*, 3 vols., Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1981.

José María de Ascárate y Ristori (ed.), *Guía del Museo de la Real Academia de San Fernando*, Madrid: Comunidad de Madrid, 1998.

Thomas Bean, 'From Collector to Hand-book Author: Richard Ford's Literary Progress, 1830-1845', unpublished paper, *Richard Ford Bicentenary Conference*, Exeter 1996.

- Thomas Bean, 'Richard Ford – Andalucía for the Collector, Connoisseur and Amateur Artist', in *Viajeros británicos, irlandeses y norteamericanos en España: Escritores, pintores y músicos*, ed. María Antonia López-Burgos and José Ruiz Mas, Granada: Editorial Universidad de Granada, 2005, unpaginated.
- Thomas Bean, 'Richard Ford y su colección de cuadros en Sevilla', in *La Sevilla de Richard Ford, 1830-1833*, ed. Francisco Javier Rodríguez Barberán, Seville: Fundación El Monte, 2007, pp. 73-85.
- Hugh Brigstocke, 'El descubrimiento del arte español en Gran Bretaña', in *En torno a Velázquez*, Oviedo, 1999, pp. 5-25.
- Sir James L. Caw, *Pictures at Pollok House*, Glasgow: private publication, 1936.
- Juan Agustín Ceán Bermúdez (unsigned), *Análisis de un cuadro que pintó D. Francisco Goya para la Catedral de Sevilla*, Madrid, 1817; also published in *Crónica científica y literaria*, no. 73, 9 December, 1817; English translation in Glendinning, 1977, Appendix I, pp. 287-90.
- Juan Agustín Ceán Bermúdez, *Carta a un amigo suyo sobre el estilo y gusto en la pintura de la escuela sevillana y sobre el grado de perfección a que la elevó Bartolomé Esteban Murillo*, Cadiz: Casa de Misericordia, 1806.
- Juan Agustín Ceán Bermúdez, *Descripción artística de la Catedral de Sevilla*, Seville: Viuda de Hidalgo y Sobrino, 1804.
- Juan Agustín Ceán Bermúdez, *Diccionario histórico de los más ilustres profesores de las Bellas Artes en España*, 6 vols., Madrid: Real Academia de San Fernando, 1800; facsimile edn., Madrid: Real Academia de San Fernando, 1965.
- Valentín Carderera, 'Biografía de D. Francisco de Goya, pintor', *El Artista*, 1835; reprinted in Valentín Carderera, *Estudios sobre Goya (1835-1885)*, ed. Ricardo Centellas, Zaragoza, 1996.
- Valentín Carderera, 'Goya', *Semanario Pintoresco*, no. 120, 1838; reprinted in Valentín Carderera, *Estudios sobre Goya (1835-1885)*, ed. Ricardo Centellas, Zaragoza, 1996.
- R. Langton Douglas, *Catalogue of Pictures at Keir House*, unpublished typescript, n.d. (early twentieth century).
- Richard Ford, *Hand-book for Travellers to Spain, and Readers at Home*, London: John Murray, 1845, reprint, ed. Ian Robertson, Arundel & London: Centaur Press, 1966;

- suppressed edn., 768 pp., London: John Murray, 1845; 3rd edn., London: John Murray, 1855.
- Richard Ford (unsigned), 'Head and Stirling on Spanish Art', *Quarterly Review*, vol. 83, June-Sept. 1848, pp. 1-37.
- Bartolomé José Gallardo, 'El Verde gabán o el rey en berlina', *O Portuguez*, London, 1815, vol. III, no. 17, pp. 492-500.
- Pierre Gassier, *The Drawings of Goya*, 2 vols., London: Thames & Hudson, 1973.
- Theophile Gautier. 'Francisco Goya', *Cabinet de l'Amateur et de l'Antiquaire*, vol. 1, 1842, pp. 336-366.
- Théophile Gautier, *Voyage en Espagne*, Paris: Charpentier, 1845.
- Nigel Glendinning, *Goya and his Critics*, *Goya and his Critics*, New Haven and London: Yale, 1977.
- Javier Goya (unsigned), *Distribución de los premios [...] hecha por la Real Acad. de S. Fernando*, Madrid, 1832
- Sir Edmund Head, *Handbook of the History of the Spanish and French Schools of Painting*, in *Kugler's Handbook of Painting: The German, Flemish, Dutch, Spanish and French School*, 2 vols., London: John Murray, 1848, vol. II.
- Hilary Macartney, *Sir William Stirling Maxwell as Historian of Spanish Art*, doctoral thesis, Courtauld Institute of Art, 2003.
- Hilary Macartney, 'Sir William Stirling Maxwell: Scholar of Spanish Art', *Espacio, Tiempo y Forma*, Serie VII, no. 12, 1999, 287-316.
- Hilary Macartney, 'Ut pictura poesis. Dialéctica entre palabra e imagen en Sir William Stirling Maxwell', *Espacio, Tiempo y Forma*, serie VII, vol. 15, 2002.
- Hilary Macartney, 'William Stirling and the Talbotype Volume of the *Annals of the Artists of Spain*', *History of Photography*, vol. 30, no. 4, Winter 2006, pp. 291-308.
- Pedro de Madrazo, 'D. Francisco Goya y Lucientes', *Almanaque de la ilustración española y americana para 1880*, año VII, pp. 16ff.
- Manuela Mena Marqués & Enrique Valdivieso, *Bartolomé Esteban Murillo, 1617-1682*, London: Royal Academy of Arts, 1982.
- Nicolás Fernández de Moratín, *Arte de putear*, ed. Isabel Colón Calderón & Gaspar Garrote Bernal, Málaga: Aljibe, 1995.

Richard Ford in Spain, London: Wildenstein, 1974.

Ian Robertson, *Richard Ford, 1796-1858: Hispanophile, Connoisseur and Critic*, Wilby: Michael Russell, 2004.

Isadora Rose-de Viejo, 'También en Goya, niños y problemas van juntos', in *Goya y lo goyesco en la Fundación Lázaro Galdiano*, ed. Mercedes Águeda Villar, Segovia: Segovia, 2003, pp. 99-123.

William Stirling, *Annals of the Artists of Spain*, 3 vols., London: John Olliver, 1848; vol. IV, Talbotype photographic illustrations, published in a limited edition of 50; 2nd edn. in *Works of Sir William Stirling-Maxwell, Bart.*, 6 vols., London: John Nimmo, 1891, vols. I-IV, with no photographic illustrations volume.

William Stirling, *Essay towards a Collection of Books Relating to the Arts of Design, Being a Catalogue of those at Keir*, London: private publication, 1850.

William Stirling, *Napoleon's Bequest to Cantillon: A Fragment of International History*, London: private publication, 1858.

William Stirling, 'The Fall of Two Empires: 1814 and 1870', Address to the School of Arts in Stirling, 1870, in Stirling, 1891, vol. VI, pp. 337-381.

Sarah Symmons, *Goya: In Pursuit of Patronage*, London: Fraser, 1988.

Isidore-Justin-Sévérin Taylor, *Voyage pittoresque en Espagne, en Portugal et sur la côte d'Afrique, de Tanger a Tétuan*, 3 vols., Paris: Libraire de Gide fils, 1826-c.1838.

Fernando de la Torre Farfán, *Fiestas de la S. Iglesia metropolitana y patriarchal de Sevilla, al nuevo culto del señor Rey S. Fernando*, Seville, 1671-2; facsimile reprint with an Introduction and Table of Contents by Sir William Stirling Maxwell, 12 copies, [London?]: private publication, 1871.

Enrique Valdivieso, *Historia de la pintura sevillana*, Sevilla: Guadaquivir, 1986.

Louis Viardot, *Musées d'Espagne, d'Angleterre, et de Belgique*, Paris: Paulin, 1843.

Juliet Wilson-Bareau, *Goya: Drawings from his Private Albums*, London: Hayward Gallery, 2001.

Juliet Wilson-Bareau & Manuela Mena, *Goya, Truth and Fantasy: The Small Paintings*, New Haven & London: Yale, 1994.

¹ This article is partly based on my paper, 'Richard Ford and the British Love-Hate Relationship with Spain', given at the conference *Unparalleled Works: Spanish Art and the Problems of Understanding*, King

Juan Carlos I Center, University of New York, 19-22 April 2001; and on part of the second chapter of my doctoral thesis (Macartney 2003, pp. 49-79). I am grateful to Thomas Bean, Nigel Glendinning and Juliet Wilson-Bareau for their help in preparing this article.

² Archives of John Murray, Ford to Murray, 11 February 1845. I am grateful to Thomas Bean for first drawing my attention to this letter. The content of Ford's letter and Murray's rejection of Stirling's draft are discussed in Macartney 2003, pp. 61-64, and Appendix 4; and Macartney 1999, pp. 292-6.

³ Stirling described Ford in a letter to his sister as a man 'of great talent and much apparent disposition to be agreeable', T-SK 29/1/39, William Stirling to Hannah-Ann Stirling, 14-17 February 1840. See also T-SK 29/3/125, Ford to Stirling, 24 February 1840; and T-SK 28/7, Stirling, 1839-42, for a note of Stirling's letters to Ford, 19 February and 4 March 1840.

⁴ Ford gave an account of the suppression in his inscription in another copy (now owned by Ian Robertson) of the suppressed edition which he gave to Stirling (Brinsley Ford, in *Richard Ford in Spain*, 1974, cat. 172; and Robertson 2004, pp. 202-8).

⁵ The list of recipients of the 'early Fair Sheets' of Ford's *Hand-book* in 1844 consists of only six names (Murray, 1844-5). Although it includes that of Addington, the names of many other readers and advisors on the text are missing. Copies of other early sheets may, therefore, have been given to others not listed here, before the text was tested in Spain by Stirling. Robertson suggests that 'perhaps not more than twenty copies' were later bound and presented to Ford's friends (Robertson, 2004, p. 205).

⁶ The only work mentioned by Ford in the church of Santiago was a *Purgatory* by Pacheco. Stirling would also have consulted Ceán on works by the sculptor, where, as in Stirling's notes, only the works by Montañés in the Parroquia de Santiago in Alcalá were mentioned (Ceán Bermúdez, 1965, vol. III, p. 94; and vol. VI, p. 192).

⁷ I am grateful to Philip Leakin for these suggestions.

⁸ Charles Yriarte also repeated the claim about the models in 1867, see Glendinning, 1977, p. 91.

⁹ Ceán to Verí, 27 September 1817, in Glendinning, 1977, p. 56.

¹⁰ Ceán to Verí, 14 January 1818, in Glendinning, 1977, p. 56.

¹¹ The pamphlet is inscribed: 'A Mr. W. Stirling/ Recuerdo de M.A. Zarco del Valle/ NB./ Este ejemplar está anotado de la propia mano del autor D. Juan Agustin Cean Bernudez – en cuya casa le compré en Madrid.'

¹² Goya's attempts to find the most satisfactory position for the Giralda are shown in an oil sketch in the Museo del Prado (Wilson-Bareau & Mena, 1994, no. 94).

¹³ See, however, Bean, 2007, p. 85, who argues that Ford 'no imaginó a Goya como partícipe de una tradición española duradera'.

¹⁴ For Stirling's visit, see T-SK 29/5/117, Javier Goya to Stirling, n.d. [1849]; T-SK 28/11, Stirling, 1845-9, for Stirling's notes on the visit; and Brigstocke, 1999, pp. 13-14 and note 57, for a transcription.

¹⁵ I am most grateful to the present owner of this book, Nigel Glendinning, for drawing my attention to Ford's ownership and comments.

¹⁶ See Stirling, 1891, vol. I, p. 80, note 2, for Stirling's praise of Viardot's series on museums, as 'an excellent cicerone for all the great galleries of Europe' and its author as 'a warm admirer of Spanish art'.

¹⁷ He perhaps included the *Burial of the Sardine* in his reference to religious processions. It does, however, include a picador, whilst the *Madhouse* contains a horned figure, perhaps playing at bullfighting or a reference to cuckoldry.

¹⁸ Grey (1819-69) was at Trinity College, Cambridge with Stirling in the 1830s, and shared Stirling's and Ford's passion for book collecting.

¹⁹ See Bean, 2007, pp. 84-85; and Bean, 2005, unpaginated, for the suggestion that Ford failed to appreciate Goya mainly because he saw him as a follower of David, and perhaps also because of the satirical and sexual connotations in the etchings. See also, however, Robertson, 2004, p. 57, who rejects the idea that 'Ford did not sufficiently appreciate Goya'.

²⁰ Ford's comment was removed in the 1855 edition of the *Handbook*. He appears to have been remembering Viardot's comments on Goya as printmaker (Viardot, 1843, p. 169), which may in turn have been a response to Baron Taylor's earlier praise of the artist (Taylor, 1826-c. 1838, vol. 3, p. 115).

²¹ See Caw, 1936, nos. 11 & 12; and Douglas, n.d., nos. 7 & 8. See Rose-de Viejo, 2003, for an assessment of the issues of attribution surrounding these and other versions of compositions of boys playing.

²² T-SK 28/11, Stirling, 1845-9: Goya after Velázquez, *Philip IV* and *Isabella of Bourbon* were noted below a list of ‘Drawings ordered in Paris 1844’, which were likewise used as illustrations. Stirling presumably also acquired copies of the etchings after the portraits of *Infante Baltasar Carlos* and *Count Duke Olivares*, as all four were illustrated as *Annals* Talbotypes 26-29. *Tauromaquia* nos. 19, 21 and 24 were reproduced in *Annals* Talbotypes, nos. 63-65.

²³ T-SK 28/11, Stirling, 1845-9: ‘Goya’s *Caprichos* – if not at Valencia, others known or Gazengos [sic]?’ Stirling did meet Gayangos in Madrid in 1845. For a transcription of the list of purchases, see Macartney, 2002, Appendix, p. 294.

²⁴ See T-SK 29/4/91, Murray to Stirling, 22 May 1845, in which Murray thanked Stirling for ‘remembering the commission’ for the “*Caprichos de Goya*” and requested him to ‘send the book with your card’ to Buckingham Palace, where the Prince’s Secretary, G.E. Anson, would ‘cause the amount to be paid’. There are no sets of either the *Caprichos* or the *Tauromaquia* now in the Royal Collection (personal communication from Christopher Lloyd, former Keeper of the Royal Collections). The copies of the *Caprichos* and the *Tauromaquia*, if they were acquired, may have been dispersed after the Prince’s death. Pamela Clark of the Royal Archives (personal communication 17/4/00) has found no letters relating to them but noted that many of the Prince’s private papers seem to have been destroyed after his death.

²⁵ Talbotypes were also made of two of the oil sketches of *Boys Playing*, owned by Stirling, though these were not included in the published volume, see Macartney, 2006, pp. 300-3.

²⁶ Valentín Carderera (1796-1880) later became an important source, through whom Stirling obtained prints and other Goya material. There is no evidence of close contact in 1845-8, nor even that Stirling knew Carderera’s articles, published in 1835 and 1838, (Carderera, 1996).

²⁷ T-SK 29/55/10 and T-SK 29/5/115, Gallardo to Stirling, 9 November 1845 and 15 August 1849.

²⁸ Javier Goya, 1832, pp. 91-3, in Stirling, 1891, vol. IV, p. 1473, note 3. Stirling was perhaps unaware that this information came from Goya’s son.

²⁹ For Gallardo’s taste for literary fantasy, see his poem *El Verde gabán o el rey en berlina* (Gallardo, 1815).