

William Topley's Fancy Dress Ball Portraits

Fabricating Identity in Victorian Canada

By: Emma Hamilton-Hobbs, MA Art History

"Yet it is not (it seems to me) by Painting that Photography touches art, but by Theater".¹

There has always been a strong correlation between photography and the practice of staging. Unfortunately, the study of the latter has more often been confined to an examination of painting and sculpture.² Many photographers, both early and contemporary, have played with theatricality and narrative in their work; creating 'staged' photographs that invariably place the "actors" in a fabricated, illusionary space. Early nineteenth-century photographic studios aided in creating a unique world for their clients, who were essentially transported from their exterior, secular world into a sacred world of representations. This was no doubt the case for the esteemed clients of Canadian photographer William James Topley (1845-1930), who owned and operated his own photographic studio in Ottawa from 1872-1926.

The Topley studio, which provides us with an extensive documentation of Canadian people and events during the years after Confederation, also produced some fascinating composite photographs of both 'real' and fictional occurrences. One of these fascinating composite photographs, titled *Fancy ball given by the Governor General Lord Dufferin at Rideau Hall*

on February 23, 1876 (Figure 1), recreates a moment from the widely reported fancy dress ball hosted by the former Governor General of Canada and his wife. This photograph illustrates how the event allowed guests to assume, albeit temporarily, a fictitious identity, and although this persona often confirmed and subsequently perpetuated Victorian values and norms relating to class, gender, and race, it also permitted them a certain degree of transgression and freedom in a rigidly controlled heteronormative society. In this paper, I will explore notions of class structure and unity within this composite image, and the ways in which it creates an ideal realm removed from everyday life during the post-Confederation era. I will discuss the role of gender in the portraits of both women and men, and how the fancy-dress costumes both reinforced and subverted Victorian gendered dichotomies. Finally, I will be analyzing a few portraits of individuals who assumed an identity of the Other at the fancy dress ball, often reflecting imperialist views held by Victorians in nineteenth-century North America and Europe.

Setting the Stage: William Topley and his Photographic Studio

William James Topley was born on February 13 or 27, 1845, in Montréal. It was probably his mother, Anna Delia Harrison, who introduced him to photography. In the late 1850s, she purchased photographic equipment in Montréal and was using it in Aylmer, a town just outside Ottawa in modern-day Québec. Topley began his career as a tintypist and was listed in a directory as a photographer in Upper Canada in 1863. By 1864, he was working at apprentice wages for photographer William Notman in Montréal after having moved there a year earlier after his father's death. Three of William Topley's brothers, John, Horatio, and Robert, were also employed at the Notman Studio, no doubt in light of the death of their "financial and legal head."³ In 1868, when Topley was only 22 years old, he was put in charge of Notman's new photographic studio in Ottawa at 90 Wellington St., which was strategically situated across from the Parliament buildings.⁴ By 1872, he became proprietor of the studio and was attracting more than 2,300 sitters each year. Topley severed his relations with Notman in 1875 to open a studio under his own name in an Italianate-style building he had constructed two blocks away.

The portraits for the Fancy Ball composite were photographed a year after opening his new studio. Topley proposed his idea for the composite to the hosts and their invitees on the day of the grand event, with the hope that ultimately "his work would be rewarded financially and would increase his clientele."⁵ Topley clearly had a good understanding of the elite crowd to whom he catered, and wanted to fulfill their fantastical desires to the best of his technical and artistic abilities. As he himself once said: "If I can see beauty in the human face, and reproduce it, I can command three times the reward for my work than he who simply shoots a plate at his patron. True, in a small city, such a course limits trade, but one-half of the business with three times the prices is much better for

mind and body and pocketbook."⁶ The task, however, was no small feat. In order to create the composite image, Topley took over three hundred individual portraits over the months following the ball, pasted them onto a painting of the ballroom (possibly by Frederic Marlett Bell Smith, a well-known Canadian painter and a friend of Topley), and then re-photographed the entire scene to create the finished product.⁷ It is likely that he learned this technique from William Notman, who became very well known for his own composite creations.⁸

The composite photograph solved many problems that were inherent in early photographic group portraits. Group portraits were often unsuccessful due to long exposures and slow emulsion speeds – there were often several people who moved during the exposure, had an unpleasant expression on their face, or were partially hidden behind the person in front of them. With the introduction of composite photography, portraits could be taken indoors in the photographer's studio at one's own convenience. Once the individual portrait had been taken, it had to be developed, washed and dried, then passed on to the art department where figures were cut out with fine scissors and pasted onto a painted background. A close co-operation between the photographer and the artists creating the scene was essential. The photographer had to make sure that the individual was positioned correctly in relation to the camera; if the camera distance were even slightly off, the figure in the composite would look too big or too large. The artist could then add elements to the scene to make it appear more realistic – for example, by adding shadows to the figures and furniture, by applying colour, or by placing a few highlights on chandeliers, mirrors, and polished surfaces. The final framed image would have made quite an impression on its Victorian viewer, and its convincing illusionism would have undoubtedly tricked quite a few.

Art Meets Theater: Amateur Theater, Tableaux Vivants and the Fancy Dress Ball

The Victorians certainly had a passion for different forms of the performing arts, most notably amateur theater and *tableaux vivants*. Emma Hamilton is often credited with introducing the *tableau vivant* to European society in the late eighteenth century, which requires “performers to arrange themselves into a picture, sometimes after a well-known work of art, and hold their positions for several minutes.”⁹ During her performances, she would imitate figures in Classical sculpture and vases that her husband, Lord Hamilton, had collected while he was the British ambassador in Naples.¹⁰ These *tableaux vivants* allowed the participants, especially women, to indulge in their vanity and to temporarily disregard convention. While bare feet, loose hair and slightly revealing clothing would have been frowned upon in a conventional Victorian context, they were overlooked by the spectators due to the “artistic nature of such performances.”¹¹ We will see similar allowances with the development of the fancy-dress balls in the nineteenth century.

Amateur theater also provided women, and men, with the opportunity to assume a persona different from their own. According to Cynthia Cooper, Lady Dufferin, with her reserved nature and plain, sensible dress, embodied the “Victorian idea of True Womanhood.”¹² However, she also enjoyed amateur theatricals and *tableaux vivants*, and had a theatrical bent herself having performed lead roles in many plays. Her nephew, Harold Nicholson, once commented on his aunt’s transformation in a performance context: “she would discard her stateliness and appear wholly different...such moments were always connected with some form of travesty, whether charades, dumbo-crambo, or merely dressing up.”¹³ It is important to note that these contexts allowed Lady Dufferin

to shed her exemplary Victorian exterior, and to temporarily break the repetitive acts of respectable femininity.

By the time that photography was first introduced by Daguerre in 1839, *tableaux vivants* had already been well established in Europe, and quickly became a photographic subject in its own right. Lewis Carroll, author of the popular children’s book *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* and its sequel *Through the Looking-Glass*, was an amateur photographer who, inspired by *tableaux vivants* performances, decided to create and photograph his own narrative scenes using children as his actors. In one of these photographs, titled *Saint George and the Dragon* (1875), Xie Kitchin and her brothers stage an allegory of the triumph of good over evil, however, there is no real sense of movement in the image – the staged photograph has restored stillness to a picture that had once been animated by living models.¹⁴ It isn’t until the invention of the movie camera in the late 1890s that we have a medium capable of recording a narrative in a fluid, believable manner.

Attending a costumed event, including skating carnivals and fancy dress balls, was yet another Victorian passion that was often photographed and sometimes made into a composite image. The fancy dress ball was a private costumed party, where no masks were worn, that grew over the course of the nineteenth century after a social shift at the end of the eighteenth century had made masquerades and parties seem licentious.¹⁵ Popular ideas for costumes at these lavish events included: characters from literature (especially those of Sir Walter Scott); Shakespearean characters; characters from mythology, legends, nursery rhymes and fairy tales; and finally, characters from exotic lands (these costumes were sometimes collected or acquired from other countries). The first fancy dress ball in Canada was held in Toronto in 1838 at Rosedale, the

home of Sherriff William Botsford Jarvis, and the first one to be held in Ottawa was in 1869 by the Desbarats family.¹⁶ Fancy dress balls, like other Victorian sanctioned activities and events, followed a specific etiquette, and both the hosts and their attendees were expected to conduct themselves in a proper manner. At the same time, these social occasions did provide Victorians with a sense of “ephemeral freedom” that allowed them a fleeting escape from their rigidly conventional lives.¹⁷ In fact, many guests dreaded returning home once their evening had come to an end as they were forced to return to the monotonous and grimness of their daily nineteenth century lives. This is likely why many of them wanted to preserve a moment of this fantastical experience in the form of a portrait photograph; serving as a fetish object that acted like a substitute for their transient escapade. Topley’s portrait of architect Walter Chesterton as “Lyconides, an Athenian” was apparently one of Chesterton’s most prized possessions when he died half a century later.¹⁸

On February 23rd, 1876, the Dufferins hosted their Grand Fancy Ball, which was widely reported all over North America and Europe, and it became the paradigm of all subsequent fancy dress balls held in Canada. Lord Dufferin and his young wife, Lady Dufferin, arrived at Rideau Hall in June of 1872, shortly after Lord Dufferin had been appointed the new Governor General of Canada. The Earl had come into power shortly after Confederation in 1867, when Canada was still a very young nation and facing some very serious problems, particularly national division and a deteriorating economy. Lord Dufferin sought to unite Canadians who were separated both geographically and ideologically (the French and the English); he and his wife traveled extensively all over the country to try and meet as many Canadians as possible.¹⁹ However, the couple also indulged in vain pursuits, and spent copiously to reflect both their elevated social

status and their national prestige. Shortly after arriving in Ottawa, they began to transform their residence bit by bit to reflect the newly appointed Governor General’s vice-regal role. To add luster to their personal and social lives, they added a tennis court, new ballroom, indoor curling rink and a monumental toboggan slide, using both public and private funds to finance these costly renovations.²⁰ They hosted and attended many social events in the city, hoping to bolster its appeal and to prove that life in Ottawa could be as attractive as life in any other capital city.

Composite Photograph: Reaffirming Social Identity and Hierarchy

Topley’s composite photograph successfully establishes the hosts and their guests as an elite and exclusive group of individuals, while also constructing an internal hierarchy that is signified by a number of art historical and portrait conventions. Richard Brilliant has astutely noted that:

Group portraits are not random collections of persons but deliberate constructions of the significant relations among them...[they] make ideological statements about the values, attitudes, and practices shared by their members, and by the portrait painter as well...that shared ideology binds the individuals together in some transcendent association, while also constituting each of them as the ‘concrete subject’ – in Althusser’s sense – who holds these values and attitudes.²¹

This portrait thus served to confirm Dufferin’s political and social mandate; on the one hand, to construct a representation of national unity and pride, and on the other, to distinguish himself

and his guests as those who possessed the time, means and intellect to attend such a prestigious event. Once invited to a fancy dress ball, guests would begin to prepare for the grand event by arranging costumes, practicing dances, and conducting research; all of which required a significant amount of time and energy. Magazine and book publications featuring fancy dress designs and articles provided advice on costume selection to avoid minor discrepancies and potential ridicule if one were to choose unwisely.²² The most prolific writer on fancy dress costumes was Arden Holt, a British authority on the subject, who published six editions of *Fancy Dresses Described, or What to Wear at Fancy Balls* between 1879 and 1896 for women, and another six editions of her companion book for men titled *Gentleman's Fancy Dress: How to Choose It*, published between 1882-1905. These books provided very specific guidelines for men and women, and thus encouraged conformity and a shared ideology. Although there were a few exceptions to the rules, the majority of Dufferin's guests selected conventional costumes that create an overarching cohesiveness and solidarity in the composite image.

Topley's Fancy Dress Ball composite image and the accompanying portrait photographs reveal certain art historical conventions that have been continuously employed to establish social hierarchies. For instance, there is one portrait in particular that stands out from the crowd, that of William Campbell, who was Lord Dufferin's private secretary and a "favourite staff member." Campbell, who dressed as a "Court Jester" (Figure 2) for the fancy dress ball, provides a sharp contrast with the Dufferin group (Figure 3), who came dressed as the Court of King James V of Scotland, a conscious choice that re-asserts their power, authority and esteem. Topley has photographed Campbell as a slightly hunched

figure holding a puppet on a stick and wearing a comical jester's hat. He faces the camera in a frontal pose with a full, open-mouthed grin. The reserved, composed portraits of Lord and Lady Dufferin with their children are highly conventional, whereas Campbell's lower social status allowed him to display a greater degree of personal expression and emotion in his own photographic portrait. In the composite photograph, Campbell is actually sitting in a child-like pose at the base of the platform upon which Lord and Lady Dufferin are seated. Even all three of the Dufferin children are elevated in relation to him – either seated above him, or standing slightly behind him. Interestingly, Joanna Woodall has commented on the positioning of figures within group portraits and has observed the following: "subordinate figures such as dogs, dwarfs, servants, jesters and black attendants were strategically placed to render the sitter's elevated status and natural authority clearly apparent."²³ Here, the arrangement of the figures was no accident on Topley's part. As previously discussed, all of the figures in a composite image are carefully positioned well in advance.

The elevated status of the Dufferins is echoed in their elevated position on their throne chairs in relation to the guests below them, again to signify their majesty and power. This is emphasized by the physical separation between them and their guests, indicated by the empty space at the platform's base. Additionally, Topley has organized his figures to create the illusion of linear perspective; leading one's eye to the focal point of the photograph - the Dufferins. In the foreground of the photograph, a female figure stands out quite independently from the crowded group, and the diagonal flow of her gown both draws our attention upward and echoes the staircase leading up to the main platform where the Dufferins are seated. These are conventional formal devices that can be

traced back to the ancient art of Egypt and Rome, which were often employed to create a “hierarchy of scale,” quite simply, the manipulation of size and space in an image to emphasize the importance of a specific figure or object. Topley was no doubt aware of these conventions, and utilized them to his advantage to arrange an image that communicates a sense of unity, but a unity that is also divided to highlight the ultimate authority: the vice-regal party.

(De)Constructing Gender: Dualities of Femininity and Masculinity

While most of Topley’s fancy dress ball portraits of both women and men are fairly conventional, many of them illustrate how dressing up could allow one to temporarily subvert Victorian gender norms and identities. Judith Butler has argued that gender is not a stable identity, nor is it seemingly essential or innate; rather, gender identity is a social construction, a “stylized repetition of acts” over time. Consequently, she has proposed that gender transformation is possible through the breaking or subversion of such acts. She argues that social context can determine the degree to which one may safely bend or subvert these acts:

...it seems clear that, although theatrical performances can meet with political censorship and scathing criticism, gender performances in non-theatrical contexts are governed by more clearly punitive and regulatory conventions...in the theatre, one can say ‘this is just an act,’ and de-realize the act...[whereas] on the street or on the bus, this act becomes dangerous...precisely because there are no theatrical conventions to delimit the purely imaginary character of the act...²⁴

For women, the fancy dress ball allowed them an opportunity to “perform their gender” in a slightly less conventional manner that would have been considered unacceptable in an ordinary social context. For women, Cooper has stressed that loose, flowing hair and shortened hemlines (that revealed more of one’s legs and calves than an ordinary ball dress) were tolerated in the context of a fancy dress ball, and that consequently many women used these loopholes to their advantage.²⁵ For example, Miss Cockburn and Miss Jones, each dressed as the “Bonne Fishwife from New Haven,” were apparently almost as popular as the “royals,” and this is undoubtedly due to their short hemlines, which would have normally signified sexual permissiveness (Figure 4).²⁶ In the portrait, their poses are somewhat less refined, and arguably more casual, than some of the other female portraits in the collection. It is likely that they are assuming a “peasant girl” identity that they consider less elegant and polished. According to Cooper, women in particular loved peasant or pastoral dress, particularly Italian and French peasant dress, and these costumes, based on imagery of Dresden china shepherdesses, were often highly romanticized.²⁷ As we will see in the third section of my analysis on the Other, the link between romanticism and the mysterious, distant or ‘otherness’ is one that becomes apparent in a few of these portraits.

The fancy dress ball also provided men with an occasion to break out from their standard somber Victorian dress. Wearing period costumes often brought them closer to the ‘feminine realm’ for many of these outfits were brightly coloured and richly textured with ribbons, satin, lace, and other fine materials. While some men embraced these new possibilities, others believed that this ‘act’ was overstepping a boundary, and that taking time and effort on one’s dress and feeling enjoyment in one’s own appearance was a woman’s

prerogative.²⁸ Cooper has commented on this strange predicament that men found themselves in: “under ordinary circumstances, dress enforced the ideology of separate spheres through the sober colours and straight lines worn by men, juxtaposed with the rich colours, texture, and elaborate details of women’s clothing...yet at a fancy ball, for once men were called on to embrace sartorial magnificence.”²⁹ Woodall has also commented on the relationship between colour and gender in nineteenth-century painted portraiture, which ties into essentialist views on gender dichotomies. She notes that:

Except for ceremonial and unorthodox figures, an authoritative palette of black, white and neutral shades dominated masculine imagery. The shimmering colour which had previously become associated with aristocratic portrayal was now largely restricted to images of women...it can be associated with the authority of *disegno* over *colore* in academic art theory, which was in turn based upon a distinction between the certain, immutable qualities attributed to the mind and the deceptive, transient, changeable body.³⁰

Unfortunately, we are unable to get a sense of the brilliant colouring of men’s costumes at this fancy dress ball due to the nature of Topley’s black-and-white photographs. At the same time, many reporters who covered the event wrote detailed descriptions of the costumes that were worn at the ball, which allow us to visualize more clearly what they would have originally looked like. Cooper has also observed that a fancy ball would have brought men “a new consciousness of their bodies,” for many of their pieces required tight leggings, which could expose unattractive ‘slender calves,’ and some costumes drew unwanted attention to rotund midriffs, which

were normally hidden by the conventional dark suit.³¹ In the past, an artist might have chosen to conceal some of his patron’s apparent physical “flaws” in a conventional painted portrait, however, the early photographer had more difficulty in altering certain aspects of his sitter’s appearance, especially in a full-body format. Interestingly the majority of the bodies in the composite photograph are concealed due to constrained space, and one wonders if the sitter had any say in his or her placement in the photograph.

While the fancy dress ball context allowed for a certain degree of transgression for both men and women, there were a few areas that could not be breached. For instance, dressing as the opposite sex was taboo in a formal ballroom setting. Miss White, who came dressed in a uniform as “Daughter of the Regiment,” was indeed one of the few guests who dared to subvert gender boundaries at the Dufferins’ Grand Fancy Ball. However, while her costume did include scarlet trousers, they were well hidden under her skirt.³² On the other hand, Cooper indicates that men were at least tempted to dress up as women. At an Ottawa skating carnival in 1894, Lady Aberdeen’s male staff dressed up as “village schoolgirls” and was photographed by Topley with their employer’s approval. Normally skating carnival invitations would have carried warnings such as: “No gentleman to appear in Female Attire,” or “No gentleman will be allowed to personate a female character” (interestingly these cautions were directed toward men only). However, it is important to note that this striking group is the exception, not the rule, for costumed events in the Victorian era, and that men never dressed as women for any of Lady Aberdeen’s fancy dress ball events.³³

Portraying the ‘Other’: The Native and the Oriental

Some portraits show costumed representations of the Aboriginal or Oriental Other, which were often portrayed as both highly romantic and fictive. Dr. Edward Malloch was one of two guests to represent Aboriginal characters at the fancy dress ball. In his portrait, he is dressed as a “North American Trapper” (Figure 5) who wore a “long black wig and a caribou skin garment of Native manufacture, and he carried a fire bag, a knife, a tomahawk, a short rifle and some pelts.”³⁴ The other guest was Miss Archibald, the daughter of the Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia, who appeared in full Micmac regalia. Dr. Malloch’s portrait emphasizes his rugged appearance with his straggly, ungroomed hair (a western artistic device that was often employed to signify the ‘barbaric other’). Additionally, Dr. Malloch is represented as the ‘Noble Savage’ in his portrait; with his arms crossed in a defiant stance and his gaze looking heroically into the distance, his pose is both highly conventional and romantic in nature.

Fanciful exotics at the Dufferins’ fancy ball included “Ali Buck of the Dhurumtollah Bazaar, Calcutta” and “Nourshadene, a Cabul Woman”; Mr. Cowper Cox of the Department of the Interior as “A Mohammedan Zeminder” accompanied by his wife, “A Madrassee Ayah”; and Mrs. R.E. O’Connor garbed in an exquisite costume as “A Turkish Lady.” One of the “fanciful exotics” that stood out from a different land is Mr. William Allan, owner of a mining company, who came dressed in a “Chinese costume” (Figure 6). Although Mr. Allan claimed that his costume was a “real Chinese nobleman’s costume imported from that country,” Cooper has brought to light that it is, in fact, a Cantonese theater costume associated with female roles.³⁵ Thus Mr. Allan’s ‘inauthentic costume’ reflects the Victorian fascination with all things ‘oriental,’ whether they are ‘true’ or not. Edward Said has explored the development of an Orientalist

discourse that has perpetuated stereotypical visions of the Orient by circulating ‘truthful’ representations of its exotic and mysterious nature. According to Said, “the imaginative examination of things Oriental was based more or less exclusively upon a sovereign Western consciousness out of whose unchallenged centrality an Oriental world emerged, first according to general ideas about who or what was an Oriental, then according to a detailed logic governed not simply by empirical reality but by a battery of desires, repressions, investments, and projections.”³⁶ In this case, Mr. Allan’s portrait may be simply a projection of his own private fantasy, that is, to temporarily assume the identity of the exotic Other.

Conclusion

Topley’s composite photograph, *Fancy ball given by the Governor General Lord Dufferin at Rideau Hall on February 23, 1876*, and the individual fancy ball portraits that were photographed to create the composite, provide us with rich, ‘documentary’ imagery that reflects many facets of Victorian values and norms during the post-Confederation era in Canada. The composite image is an ideological construction that, in Althusser’s words, ‘interpellates’ subjects who hold similar aristocratic beliefs and values. Topley utilizes formal elements including juxtaposition, space, and scale to emphasize a hierarchical formation in place. These portraits also reveal to us the ways in which men and women could exercise certain liberties in the context of the fancy dress ball, and how the rigorous Victorian male/female dichotomy could be temporarily destabilized. Both sexes also had the option to assume an identity of the Oriental or Native Other, which often mirrored an imperialist and racist nineteenth-century discourse. At the same time, those who selected a fantasy persona radically different from their

own, or wore a costume that did not compliment their figure, were often ridiculed and judged rather cruelly by the press.³⁷ Therefore, there were always certain boundaries that could not be overstepped.

The composite photograph and accompanying individual portraits allowed the hosts and their guests to relive the fancy dress ball experience again and again long after it had ended. For many, it probably served as proof of a shared, surreal experience; one that would have been very far removed from their everyday lives. It is important that we continue to investigate these fascinating costumed photographic portraits in a Canadian historical context, and to discover what they can communicate to us about both the (de)construction of Canadian Victorian identities.

¹ Roland Barthes, *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1980), 31.

² Lori Pauli, "Setting the Scene" in *Acting the Part: Photography as Theater*, edited by Lori Pauli (New York: Merrell Publishers Limited, 2006), 15.

³ Colleen Marie Skidmore, "Women in Photography at the Notman Studio, Montreal, 1856-1881" (PhD dissertation, University of Alberta, 1999), 182.

⁴ Stanley G. Triggs, *William Notman: The Stamp of a Studio* (Toronto: The Coach House Press, 1985), 29.

⁵ Library and Archives Canada, *The Studio: Composite Photographs*, by Andrew Rodger (2008), <http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/topley/045001-2050-e.html> (accessed November 18th, 2012).

⁶ Gawain Weaver, *Capital Portraits: Conservation of the Topley Studio Index*, presented at the 2005 annual student conference of the Association of North American Graduate Programs in the Conservation of Cultural Property (ANAGPIC), Buffalo State College Art Conservation Program, New York (www.ischool.utexas.edu/~anagpic/pdfs/Weaver.pdf) (accessed November 15th, 2012)

⁷ Note that the majority of the dates for the Topley fancy dress ball portraits are February and March.

⁸ See William Notman's renowned composite photograph of the Skating Carnival at Victoria Rink in Montréal (photographed in 1870).

⁹ Marta Weiss, "Staged Photography in the Victorian Album," in *Acting the Part: Photography as Theater*, edited by Lori Pauli (London/New York: Merrell Publishers Limited, 2006), 84.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Cynthia Cooper, *Magnificent Entertainments: Fancy Dress Balls of Canada's Governors General, 1876-1898* (Fredericton, NB: Goose Lane Editions, 1997), 40.

¹³ Ibid., 41.

¹⁴ Weiss, 86.

¹⁵ Ibid., 21.

¹⁶ Ibid., 23-4.

¹⁷ Ibid., 37.

¹⁸ Ibid., 63.

¹⁹ Ibid., 39.

²⁰ Ibid., 39-40.

²¹ Richard Brilliant, *Portraiture* (London : Reaktion Books, 1991), 92-3, 96.

²² Cooper, 28.

²³ Joanna Woodall, "Introduction: facing the subject," in *Portraiture: Facing the Subject*, edited by Joanna Woodall (Manchester/New York: Manchester University Press, 1997), 2.

²⁴ Judith Butler, "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory," in *Theater Journal* (40, 1, 1988), 527.

²⁵ Cynthia Cooper, "Dressing Up: A Consuming Passion," in *Fashion: A Canadian Perspective*, edited by Alexandra Palmer (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 44.

²⁶ Cooper, *Magnificent Entertainments*, 55.

²⁷ Ibid., 26.

²⁸ Ibid., 30.

²⁹ Cooper, "Dressing Up: A Consuming Passion," 44.

³⁰ Woodall, 3.

³¹ Cooper, *Magnificent Entertainments*, 31.

³² Ibid., 51.

³³ Ibid., 33.

³⁴ Ibid., 58.

³⁵ Ibid., 48.

³⁶ Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Random House, 1978), 8.

³⁷ Cooper, *Magnificent Entertainments*, 30.

References

- Barthes, Roland. *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography*. Translated by Richard Howard. New York: Hill and Wang, 1980.
- Brilliant, Richard. *Portraiture*. London: Reaktion Books, 1991.
- Butler, Judith. "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory." In *Theater Journal*, 40, 1, 1988. pp. 519-531.
- Cooper, Cynthia. "Dressing Up: A Consuming Passion." In *Fashion: A Canadian Perspective*, edited by Alexandra Palmer. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004, pp 41-67.
- Cooper, Cynthia. *Magnificent Entertainments: Fancy Dress Balls of Canada's Governors General, 1876-1898*. Fredericton, NB: Goose Lane Editions, 1997.
- Library and Archives Canada. *The Studio: Composite Photographs*, by Andrew Rodger (2008). <http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/topley/045001-2050-e.html> (accessed November 18th, 2012)
- Pauli, Lori. "Setting the Scene." In *Acting the Part: Photography as Theater*, edited by Lori Pauli. London/New York: Merrell Publishers Limited, 2006, pp 13-80.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Random House, 1978.
- Skidmore, Colleen Marie. "Women in Photography at the Notman Studio, Montreal, 1856-1881." PhD dissertation, University of Alberta, 1999.
- Triggs, Stanley. *William Notman: The Stamp of a Studio*. Toronto: Coach House Press, 1985.
- Weaver, Gawain. *Capital Portraits: Conservation of the Topley Studio Index*. Presented at the 2005 annual student conference of the Association of North American Graduate Programs in the Conservation of Cultural Property (ANAGPIC), Buffalo State College Art Conservation Program, New York. www.ischool.utexas.edu/~anagpic/pdfs/Weaver.pdf (accessed November 15th, 2012)
- Weiss, Marta. "Staged Photography in the Victorian Album." In *Acting the Part: Photography as Theater*, edited by Lori Pauli. London/New York: Merrell Publishers Limited, 2006, pp 81-100.
- Woodall, Joanna. "Introduction: Facing the Subject." In *Portraiture: Facing the Subject*, edited by Joanna Woodall. Manchester/New York: Manchester University Press, 1997, pp 1-25.

Images

Figure 1. Topley, William James. *Fancy ball given by the Governor General Lord Dufferin at Rideau Hall on February 23, 1876.* Library and Archives Canada. Source:

http://data2.collectionscanada.gc.ca/e/e332/e008295343_s1-v8.jpg (accessed November 25, 2012).

Figure 2. Topley, William James. *Mr. Campbell in court jester costume worn at the fancy dress ball given by Governor General Lord Dufferin.* Library and Archives Canada. Source:

<http://data2.collectionscanada.gc.ca/ap/a/a138393-v6.jpg> (accessed November 25, 2012).

Figure 3. Topley, William James. *Lord and Lady Dufferin and their children dressed as the Court of King James V of Scotland from Princess Louise's album.* Library and Archives Canada. Source:

<http://data2.collectionscanada.gc.ca/e/e333/e008311399-v8.jpg> (accessed November 25, 2012).

Figure 4. Topley, William James. *Jones and Cockburn Misses dressed as bonnie fishwives from New Haven.* Library and Archives Canada. Source:

<http://data2.collectionscanada.ca/ap/a/a193681-v6.jpg> (accessed November 25, 2012).

Figure 5. Topley, William James. *Dr. Malloch dressed as a North American Trapper.* Library and Archives Canada. Source:

<http://data2.collectionscanada.gc.ca/ap/a/a139846-v6.jpg> (accessed November 25, 2012).

Figure 6. Topley, William James. *Mr. William Allan dressed in a Chinese costume.* Library and Archives Canada. Source:

<http://data2.collectionscanada.gc.ca/ap/a/a189667-v6.jpg> (accessed November 25, 2012).