

This text, Kate Loveman's 'Samuel Pepys's First Portrait Painter: Daniel Saville and Portraiture for the Middling Sort in Restoration London', was submitted to the *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes (JWCI)* on 13 Sept 2018 in the version archived here. The paper was formally accepted for publication by the *JWCI* on 19 November 2018. It is anticipated that a final version of the paper will be published in volume LXXXI (2018) of the *JWCI*, on completion of the *JWCI*'s editorial and production procedures.

Samuel Pepys's first portrait painter:

Daniel Saville and portraiture for the middling sort in Restoration London

Dr Kate Loveman

In the early 1660s Samuel Pepys discovered that commissioning portraits could be an enjoyable and highly rewarding experience. As a result, between 1661 and 1668 he ordered three portraits of himself, arranged for three more of his wife, one of his father, at least two of friends, and – an unexpected bonus – an image of his wife's dog.<sup>1</sup> Of these, only one is known to survive, a portrait by John Hayls from 1666 that shows Pepys in a hired 'Indian gown' and holding music of his own composing.<sup>2</sup> Portrait commissioning became a lifetime pursuit for Pepys: another five portraits survive from between 1670 and his death in 1703, along with contemporary copies of those portraits and others of less certain identification.<sup>3</sup> Versions of his portraits were given to commemorate his

---

I would like to thank the anonymous readers of the *Journal* for their comments, and Corinne Harrison and Carys Lewis at the National Portrait Gallery for their assistance in identifying potential sources.

<sup>1</sup> *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, ed. R. Latham and W. Matthews, 11 vols, 1st pub. London 1970–83; repr. London, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 2000 (hereafter *Diary*). Pictures of Samuel Pepys: II, 221; III, 33; VII, 74. Elizabeth Pepys: II, 233; VII, 44; IX, 256. John Pepys: VII, 151. Thomas Hill: VII, 125 (a copy of Hayls's portrait of Hill). Henry Harris: IX, 175. The dog: II, 241 (Pepys leaves it open as to whether the dog was included in Elizabeth's picture or drawn separately).

<sup>2</sup> *Diary*, VII, 85; National Portrait Gallery 211, online catalogue

<<https://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw04948/Samuel-Pepys>> [accessed 29.1.18]

<sup>3</sup> The main source for Pepys's iconography is J. Ingamells, *National Portrait Gallery: Later Stuart Portraits 1685–1714* (London 2009), pp. 212–14. See also *Samuel Pepys: Plague, Fire, Revolution*, ed. M. Lincoln (London 2015), which provides reproductions of many images. Together with R. Barber's *Samuel Pepys Esquire* (London 1970), these indicate the following list of post-diary portraits: (1) attrib. to John Greenhill (c. 1670), Magdalene College, Cambridge (among the 'doubtful' portraits according to Ingamells); (2) Pepys in his study, by unknown artist, c. 1673 (private collection, owned by Mrs R. Crichton in 1970), along with a smaller picture on copper derived from this; (3) "The Harwich portrait" by unknown artist c. 1685, Magdalene College,

links to institutions such as the Royal Society or travelled with friends across the sea.<sup>4</sup> Pepys also continued to pay for portraits of his friends and family, and decorated his library walls with pictures of learned acquaintances.<sup>5</sup>

Pepys's first portrait painter, the man responsible for sparking his love of portrait commissioning, has so far remained unidentified. Despite Pepys recording many visits to this painter in the winter of 1661–62, the diary provides few identifying details. The man is named only as 'Savill a painter' and it is apparent that visiting his premises involved travel to Cheapside in the City of London.<sup>6</sup> In the early 1960s, it was argued that one of the surviving portraits of Pepys was executed by Savile, but this case is now discredited: the portrait as described in the diary does not match the surviving picture.<sup>7</sup> Speculation about Savile's identity has included the possibility that he was the Mr Savile found in the Painter-Stainers' Company records in 1677. This Savile was later identified as Daniel Savile, onetime master of the Company, though the link to Pepys's portrait artist could not be demonstrated.<sup>8</sup> The painter-stainers pursued a range of trades, from painting walls in one colour to supplying heraldic images for funerals; only a few specialised as portrait painters. 'Savill' has thus

---

Cambridge ('doubtful' according to Ingamells); (4) by Godfrey Kneller, 1689, National Maritime Museum, London; (5) attrib. to John Riley c. 1690, Clothworkers' Company, London, with a similar version National Portrait Gallery 2100.

<sup>4</sup> The Royal Society's copy of Kneller's portrait of Pepys is, by tradition, a presentation copy. See *The Royal Society Picture Library* <<https://pictures.royalsociety.org/image-rs-9613>> [accessed 29.1.18]. Thomas Hill had a copy of one of Pepys's portraits with him in Portugal. Hill to Pepys, [21 June]/[1 July 1675, in *Letters and Second Diary of Samuel Pepys*, ed. R.G. Howarth, London, Toronto, New York 1932, p. 50.

<sup>5</sup> See Loveman, 'Pepys's "Retirement"', in *Samuel Pepys: Plague, Fire, Revolution* pp. 240–47 (pp. 244–45).

<sup>6</sup> *Diary*, II, 218. 'Cheapside' appears again at II, 227.

<sup>7</sup> The argument that Savile painted the portrait of Pepys in his study (private collection, now dated to c. 1673) is made in D. Pepys Whiteley, 'Problems of Pepys Portraits', *Country Life*, 129, 6 Apr. 1961, pp. 778–80 (780). For decisive arguments against see Barber, *Samuel Pepys Esquire*, p. 4.

<sup>8</sup> In 1970, in the complete edition of Pepys's diary, O. Millar reported 'nothing is known of the oeuvre of Savill', but suggested he might be a Mr Savile mentioned in the Painter-Stainers Company court minutes in 1677 (*Diary*, II, 218, n. 4). R. Johns spotted that the Company's 'Mr Savile' was Daniel Savile, the former master. See 'Framing Robert Aggas: The Painter-Stainers' Company and the "English School of Painters"', *Art History*, 31, 2008, 322–41 (340, n. 42). Another potential candidate, Henry Savill, was proposed in E. G. O'Donoghue, *Bridewell Hospital*, II, London 1929, p. 163. This turns out to be the same man; see below, note 38.

remained elusive because of a lack of identifying detail in the diary and because of an apparent absence of surviving portraits attributable to him (including Pepys's portrait itself). Nonetheless, there are other records that confirm that Pepys's 'Mr Savill' is indeed Daniel Savile of the Painter-Stainers' Company.<sup>9</sup> When combined with Pepys's diary, these records are revealing about Savile's long career and about the business – and pleasure – of portrait commissioning in the Restoration.

Throughout 1661 Pepys had been accustoming himself to his new role as Clerk of the Acts to the Navy Board, the body charged with maintaining and supplying the King's ships. This job brought with it the status of 'esquire', a considerable net wage of £250 p.a., and a fine new home in Seething Lane near the Tower. That home needed furnishing to a high standard if Pepys was to impress his worth upon his navy colleagues, who lived in the surrounding houses. Pepys's acquisition of the first portraits of himself and his wife was part of his home improvements and coincided with decoration of the dining room, where the pictures were to be hung.<sup>10</sup> He does not explain exactly how he identified an artist, but he had rejected at least one prospective painter before determining on Savile. A friend, a 'Mr Salsbury', had taken up portrait-painting and, as Pepys reported in July 1661, Salsbury developed in less than two years into 'so great a limner that he is become excellent, and gets a great deal of money at it'.<sup>11</sup> Salsbury seems to have been angling for Pepys's business: in January 1661 he arrived unannounced at Seething Lane to show Pepys his picture of their patron Lord Sandwich and, in March, turned up again with 'a face or two of his paynting; and ended, I perceive that he will be a great master'.<sup>12</sup> When Pepys did decide to commission portraits, however, he chose a safer pair of hands. On 23 November 1661 he went 'by coach with Commissioner Pett to Cheapeside to one Savill a painter, who I entend shall do my picture and my wife's' (II, 218). Tax and parish records show that

---

<sup>9</sup> The surname is spelt in variously in early records, but 'Savile' was how Daniel signed his name and is the most common spelling in family wills. See, for example, *The Vestry Minute Book of the Parish of St. Margaret Lothbury ... 1571–1677*, ed. E. Freshfield, London, 1887, pp. 138, 141.

<sup>10</sup> *Diary*, III, 25, 34.

<sup>11</sup> *Diary*, II, 145. Pepys perhaps met him in the 1650s, when a 'Salisbury' was a quartermaster for Pepys's patron, Edward Mountagu, later Lord Sandwich. See *Diary*, II, 23, n. 2.

<sup>12</sup> *Diary*, II, 23, 59.

Daniel Savile (c. 1609–94) had premises in Bell Alley, off Foster Lane, close to the main thoroughfare of Cheapside.<sup>13</sup> Tellingly in terms of Savile's professional aspirations and target clientele, he was based in the heart of the City, as opposed to Covent Garden where more fashionable and prestigious artists such as John Hayls, Samuel Cooper, and Peter Lely resided. Pepys, as a government administrator making his first foray into portrait commissioning, could afford to employ an established professional, but not yet to commission a celebrated painter to the court.

Visiting Savile's home was a means to assess the man's skill, for a painter's home was also his gallery, with works on display. A social assessment was also tacitly underway: Pepys had to decide whether or not this was a suitable environment for him and his wife to spend time without harming their status, and – better yet – if time spent in Savile's company would prove enjoyable. Savile evidently met these requirements. Far from operating out of a garret, he was a man of substance in the parish of St Vedast, with a home taxed on six hearths. His background indicates he was equipped to project not just the confidence of a skilled craftsman, but the wealth and manners that were attributes of a gentleman. He had been born in the nearby parish of Christ Church, Newgate, and made an advantageous match to Martha Gomond, daughter of a local gentleman. When Martha's dying father made his will in 1639, he left Savile the majority of his goods and property, including a house in Richmond, Yorkshire, and land in Somersetshire.<sup>14</sup> In 1651 Savile became a senior member of the Painter-Stainers' Company, paying a hefty £10 fee to join the livery. By the time Savile painted Pepys in 1661 he was one of the Court of Assistants, the Painter-Stainers' governing body.<sup>15</sup> He also advanced himself in other ways. After his first wife's death in 1652, Savile made another advantageous match – at least in terms of its potential to secure him wealthy, art-loving patrons. In

<sup>13</sup> 'Hearth Tax: City of London 1666, St Vedast, Foster Lane', in *London Hearth Tax: City of London and Middlesex, 1666*, 2011, *British History Online* <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/london-hearth-tax/london-mddx/1666/st-vedast-foster-lane>> [accessed 29 Jan. 2018]. Year of birth calculated from *Reports of Heraldic Cases in the Court of Chivalry, 1623–1732*, prepared by G. D. Squibb, Publications of the Harleian Society 107, London 1956, p. 50.

<sup>14</sup> Birth parish from Squibb, *Reports of Heraldic Cases*, p. 50. The National Archives, PROB 11/183/279, Will of Edmond Gomond, 3 Sept. 1639, proved 9 June 1640.

<sup>15</sup> London, Guildhall Library, CLC/L/PA/B/001/MS05667/002/001, Court Minute Book of the Painter-Stainers, fols 14v (20 Aug. 1651), 68r (15 Aug. 1661).

December 1655 the banns were read for his marriage to Dorothy Povey (d. 1722) of St Martin-in-the-Fields, the daughter of John Povey of Woodseaves, near Drayton in Shropshire.<sup>16</sup> Dorothy was part of a family that prospered under the Stuarts, establishing themselves in colonial administration and in influential roles in the British Isles. She was related to the administrator and colonial entrepreneur Thomas Povey – soon to be a colleague of Pepys's. Thomas Povey was known for his fine picture collection: Pepys later admired his well-furnished home and, in particular, his perspective pictures.<sup>17</sup> Dorothy's exact blood relationship to Thomas is unclear, but her brother John (c. 1621–79) – who became a Lord Chief Justice of the Kings Bench in 1673 – described Thomas as his 'worthy Good Friend'. He named both Thomas and his 'Brother Savill' (i.e. brother-in-law) among the overseers of his will in 1677.<sup>18</sup> Thomas Povey in turn bred a love of picture collecting in his nephew, William Blathwayt. Blathwayt's collection, which includes parts of Povey's, survives at Dyrham Park today in the hands of the National Trust.<sup>19</sup>

Povey came into Pepys's life too late to be his connection to Savile, making it most likely that the recommendation came from Peter Pett (1610–c. 1672), the navy's Commissioner at Chatham. Pett, as noted above, accompanied Pepys on his preliminary reconnoitre of Savile's studio and subsequently went back when the portrait was completed in early February to duly admire it.<sup>20</sup> This fits a pattern,

---

<sup>16</sup> *Registers of St Vedast, Foster Lane and of St Michael le Quern, London*, ed. W. A. Littledale, 2 vols, Publications of the Harleian Society 29–30, London 1902–3, II, 177, 20. Confirmation of Dorothy's father's identity comes via her brother's will and a drawing of her father's grave: The National Archives, Kew, PROB 11/360/476, Will of Sir John Povey, proved 20 Aug. 1679; Shropshire Archives, Shrewsbury, Collection of William Mytton, X7381/78/399.

<sup>17</sup> *Diary*, IV, 18; V, 161–62.

<sup>18</sup> *Alumni Oxonienses: The Members of the University of Oxford, 1500–1714*, ed. J. Foster, Oxford 1891, III, 1189; London, The National Archives, Kew, PROB 11/260/476, Will of Sir John Povey, Lord Chief Justice of His Majesty's Court of the Kings Bench in Ireland, proved 20 Aug. 1679. John and Thomas are described in some secondary sources as cousins, but this appears to be speculation. John's father John is not among the children named in the will of John Povey (d. 1611) who, via Justinian Povey, was Thomas's grandfather.

<sup>19</sup> B. C. Murison, 'Blathwayt, William (bap. 1650, d. 1717), government official' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-2626>> [accessed 12 June 2018]

<sup>20</sup> *Diary*, III, 21.

clear in later years, which saw Pepys first visiting an artist's premises with the acquaintance who knew and had recommended the man. It was a trip with Thomas Hill to 'his painter, Mr Hales' in February 1666 that introduced Pepys to Hayls and set Pepys on his second round of portrait commissioning. In early 1668 another friend, the actor Henry Harris, persuaded Pepys have his wife's miniature painted by 'the great painter' Samuel Cooper. After introducing the pair at a coffeehouse, Harris accompanied Pepys and Hayls to Cooper's house to view his work.<sup>21</sup> That Peter Pett was Pepys's introduction to Savile is also suggested by Pett's familiarity with the London art world. A picture in the National Maritime Museum depicts Pett alongside the ship *Sovereign of the Seas* that he had built in 1637. The painting dates to roughly 1645–50 and Pett's portrait within it is now attributed to Peter Lely.<sup>22</sup> Twice in 1662, Pett went with Pepys to Lely's house in Covent Garden to view his portraits of courtiers. They also visited John Michael Wright's studio together – whose works Pepys judged much inferior to Lely's.<sup>23</sup> The pictures that Pepys saw on his first trip to Savile's in November 1661, together with Pett's voucher, were evidently good enough to persuade him to risk a double commission.

Only two of what must have been a wealth of Savile's paintings are identifiable today, and both survive only as engravings.<sup>24</sup> The first is an engraving by Wenceslaus Hollar of the Independent preacher John Rogers; it is inscribed 'Sauill pinxit' and dated, next to Hollar's name, 1653 (Fig. 1).<sup>25</sup> Rogers had been appointed to work as preacher in Dublin by the Council of State in the early 1650s. By 1653 he was back in London, where he held a lectureship at St Thomas the Apostle, a short walk

---

<sup>21</sup> *Diary*, VII, 42–43; IX, 138, 139.

<sup>22</sup> 'Peter Pett and the "Sovereign of the Seas"', National Maritime Museum, Greenwich, London, BHC2949 <<http://collections.rmg.co.uk/collections/objects/14422.html>> [accessed 9 Sept. 2018].

<sup>23</sup> *Diary*, III, 112–13, 230.

<sup>24</sup> Checks have included National Portrait Gallery, Heinz Archive, Artist files for Savill and Sitter files for Samuel and Elizabeth Pepys, John Rogers, and Lambrock Thomas.

<sup>25</sup> 'John Rogers', engraving by Wenceslaus Hollar, after Savill, 1653. Further description at The British Museum online collection <[http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection\\_online/collection\\_object\\_details.aspx?objectId=3495764&partId=1&searchText=john+rogers&from=ad&fromDate=1600&toDate=1750&page=1](http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=3495764&partId=1&searchText=john+rogers&from=ad&fromDate=1600&toDate=1750&page=1)> [accessed 9 Sept. 2018].

from Savile's home.<sup>26</sup> The engraving is linked to Rogers's political and religious campaigning in this year. During 1653 his works included two versions of a defence of Independency and in some copies of the second, expanded version, the engraving was used as a frontispiece.<sup>27</sup> The second survival by Savile is also a clerical portrait: an undated engraving depicts Lambrock (or Lambrocus) Thomas who became the vicar of Pevensey, Sussex in 1642 (Fig. 2). Thomas was made Chancellor of Chichester Cathedral in 1660 and became Dean of Chichester in the year of his death, 1672. The engraving records 'D: Savil fecit' and gives the engraver's name as 'T. Cross'. Thomas Cross was a prolific, if not particularly talented, engraver active from 1644 until around 1682.<sup>28</sup> However, the examples of Savile's skill that most caught Pepys's eye were not pictures of clergymen: while Elizabeth Pepys sat for Savile, her husband 'all the while stood looking on a pretty lady's picture whose face did please me extremely' (II, 233).

A senior member of his livery company, Savile established himself as worthy of Pepys's patronage through specimens of his art, his genteel credentials, and through ownership of a pleasing, spacious property where Pepys was prepared to spend time – and spend time he did. Work began in earnest on 27 November 1661 when Pepys 'sat the first time for my face with him' (II, 221). By 6 December he had sat four times, although the portrait 'doth not yet please me, which doth much trouble me' (II, 227). Whatever concerns he had were not enough to prevent Elizabeth from sitting for the first time on 13 December. On at least one occasion Elizabeth arrived at the painter's before her husband did –

<sup>26</sup> R. L. Greaves, 'Rogers, John (b. 1627), Fifth Monarchist writer', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*

<<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-23983>> [accessed 12 June 2018]

<sup>27</sup> The copies are Rogers, *Dod, or Chatan. The Beloved* (1653), Huntington Library, CA, item 437386 and Oxford, Regents' Park College, Angus Library, Bed 172. The bibliography of this work is complicated. Both of these copies begin with the title-page for Roger's *Ohel Ohel or Beth-shemesh* (1653).

<sup>28</sup> *The Correspondence of Bishop Brian Duppa and Sir Justinian Isham 1650–1660*, ed. Gyles Isham, Publications of the Northampton Record Society 17, Lamport Hall 1955, p. 195; A. Griffiths, 'Cross, Thomas (fl. 1644–1682), engraver', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy4.lib.le.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-6798>> [accessed 9 Sept. 2018].

this was evidently a respectable establishment into which (unlike many places in London) she could go without a chaperone (II, 227). While watching his wife being painted, Pepys amused himself by looking at Savile's collection of prints – for Pepys himself was a budding print collector.<sup>29</sup> There were also pleasures in watching the painter at work and in passing judgement on each stage. Unlike Pepys's own portrait, Elizabeth's pleased him at the first draft: 'I find that the dead colour of my wife is good, above what I expected', he commented on the initial sitting (II, 233). In later years, he became increasingly interested in the different speeds at which resemblances could develop or, indeed, deteriorate. When watching Hayls work in 1666, for example, Pepys was intrigued by the fact that Hayls's first and second 'pass' at the portrait of Elizabeth Pearse, a family friend, looked more like her than the finished version, whereas Pepys's own portrait by Hayls improved after the third pass – this suspense was part of the enjoyment.<sup>30</sup>

Pepys took an active role in crafting his portrait and Savile proved accommodating. At Elizabeth's final sitting on 31 December 1661, Pepys 'stood by and did tell him some little things to do, that now her picture I think will please me very well'. Entertainment followed: 'And after her, her little black dogg sat in her lap and was drawn, which made us very merry' (II, 241). Both paintings were now nearing completion and, on 6 January 1662, Pepys oversaw the addition of his lute to his portrait. He stayed 'all morning' to see Savile paint the lute's neck 'which I was not much pleased with after it was done' (III, 4). On 28 January Pepys was again monitoring and instructing Savile: Elizabeth's picture needed to be 'mended' (improved) but, after these final changes, 'at last is come to be very like her, and I think well done. But the paynter, though a very honest man, I find to be very silly as to matter of skill in shadowes – for we were long in discourse, till I was almost angry to hear him talk so simply' (III, 19). This was an early manifestation of Pepys's habit of out-experting craftsmen, at least when it came to mastering the theory behind their techniques.<sup>31</sup> The painter, however, continued to accommodate Pepys, even at what must have been inopportune moments. When Pepys and Pett dropped in to view the pictures on Saturday 1 February, they had turned up on the same day that Savile's third son

---

<sup>29</sup> *Diary*, II, 233, 235.

<sup>30</sup> *Diary*, VII, 97, 170–71.

<sup>31</sup> cf. *Diary*, on musical theory III, 36–37; on the principles of a slide rule IV, 180, 266.

Samuel was christened – although Pepys apparently remained unaware of this.<sup>32</sup> Pepys was satisfied with, rather than delighted by, the final pictures. He paid for his paintings on 16 January 1662, giving £6 for the pair and '36s for the two frames' (III, 10). Savile provided a comprehensive service, delivering the pictures himself on 22 February and helping Pepys hang them in the dining room. This room had just had been decorated with a new 'chimney-piece' (ornamentation around a fireplace which incorporated a painting). With the addition of the portraits the room was a source of pride: 'it comes now to appear very handsome with all my pictures'.<sup>33</sup>

This could have been end of the relationship, but Pepys wanted to continue what had proved a rewarding experience and Savile evidently recognised a potential repeat customer when he saw one. He persuaded Pepys to have a new portrait painted 'in little'. Whether this painting was simply small or, as has been suggested, a miniature, it was a new depiction of Pepys for it required additional sittings. Pepys returned 'by promise to Mr. Savills' and began the new set of sittings on 20 February, ending on 14 April 1662.<sup>34</sup> The portrait was finished by 3 May when Pepys took it from 'the goldsmiths', where it was presumably being framed. This time the picture was a great success: it 'pleases me exceedingly and my wife' (III, 76). Savile's final visit came on 11 June when he arrived at Seething Lane to collect his payment of £3 (the same price as a the larger portrait). He also supplied one final service – a layer of varnish was added to the two dining room pictures (III, 106).

Pepys's next round of portrait commissioning was less than four years away. This time he chose a leading painter in John Hayls, who charged £14 each to paint Samuel and Elizabeth, as opposed to Savile's £3 each.<sup>35</sup> Savile, like Pepys, went onto greater things. After weathering the destruction of his premises during the Great Fire, he moved to St Margaret Lothbury, a parish that was a little further

---

<sup>32</sup> *Diary*, III, 21; *The Registers of St. Vedast, Foster Lane*, I, 73.

<sup>33</sup> *Diary*, III, 25, 34.

<sup>34</sup> *Diary*, III, 33, 39 n. 2, 65.

<sup>35</sup> *Diary*, VI, 73, 125.

east in the City and convenient for the merchants and wealthy shoppers visiting the Royal Exchange.<sup>36</sup> Though never famous, he continued to rise in his profession. In October 1668 the Painter-Stainers elected him to the office of warden and in 1669 he was chosen Master. This was at a fraught time for the Company, as the Painter-Stainers' Hall in Little Trinity Lane had been destroyed in Fire. Savile was active in the committee for rebuilding. The committee came up with some resourceful ways to raise funds, including mortgaging the Company's plate and renting out the new hall on Sundays for meetings of 'the German Protestants' whose nearby meeting house had been burnt. Savile had the reward of overseeing the first meeting in the hall in July 1670.<sup>37</sup> Two years later he was elected one of the governors of Bridewell, an institution that was both a charity for care of the City's poor children and a house of correction. In 1674 Savile was commissioned to produce a chimney-piece for the dining room depicting Bridewell's founder, Edward VI. The proposed price was £30, but Savile generously agreed to take 'so much money' as the governors deemed it to be worth once it was completed.<sup>38</sup> At this time his own business appears to have been flourishing, for he continued to take on apprentices – in a distinctive and revealing pattern. The Company's apprenticeship records begin in 1666, with Savile's first recorded apprentice bound to him in April 1669. Between that date and

---

<sup>36</sup> *The Vestry Minute Book of St. Margaret Lothbury*, p.129. The location was close to Royal Exchange's permanent home and to Gresham College, the Exchange's temporary location in the years after the fire.

<sup>37</sup> London, Guildhall Library, CLC/L/PA/B/001/MS05667/002/001, fols 89, 107a, 111, 116, 122, 321. A. Borg, *The History of the Worshipful Company of Painters otherwise Painter-Stainers*, Huddersfield 2005, p. 75.

<sup>38</sup> London, Bethlem Museum of the Mind, Bridewell and Bethlem Hospitals, Minutes of the Court of Governors, Bcb-12 Series Box Number C04/3, pp. 420, 421, 605. Images reproduced at [http://archives.museumofthemind.org.uk/image\\_viewer.htm?Bcb-12,712](http://archives.museumofthemind.org.uk/image_viewer.htm?Bcb-12,712) [accessed 12.9.18]. The Minutes are confused when it comes to Savile's first name. 'Mr Daniel Savill Paintersteynor dwelling in Lothbury' was nominated as a governor on 2 Aug. 1672. The clerk then wrongly recorded Savile's name on his election as 'Mr Henry Sawell Paintersteynor' which led to the same mistake about his first name when his offer of a painting was recorded; the man was normally referred to as 'Mr Savill' or 'Mr Sawell'. I have found no records of a Henry Savill/Sawell, painter-stainer, elsewhere. O'Donoghue, who stated 'Henry Savill' was Pepys's painter did not realise the confusion, nor that Savile was a governor prior to offering the painting. His suggestion that Pepys (who became a governor in 1675) recommended Savile for the chimney-piece commission is not plausible. *Bridewell Hospital*, II, London 1929, p. 163. What became of the chimney-piece is unknown: Bridewell's buildings were demolished in the nineteenth century.

1689, he took on eight apprentices: the first was male, the remaining seven were female.<sup>39</sup> Analysis of the Painter-Stainer records from 1666 to 1740 has shown that some 3% of apprentices were women, seventy-nine in all.<sup>40</sup> With seven girls as apprentices, Savile's business thus accounted for a significant proportion of the women indentured. In the decades following 1666, female apprentices tended to be concentrated among certain members, of whom he was one. It has been argued that apprenticeship to a painter-stainer was socially acceptable for women whose fathers were gentlemen, professionals, or prosperous yeoman, with over 40% of female apprentices falling into this groups.<sup>41</sup> Savile's recruitment bears this out: four of the girls were daughters of a 'gentleman', an 'esquire' or a 'clerk', while two were daughters of London citizens (a turner and a painter-stainer), and another was a merchant's daughter. Notably, four of the seven had come from outside London to be apprenticed, suggesting the appeal of Savile's workshop as a training place for young women was geographically wide as well as enduring. After completing their terms, apprentices were entitled to become members of the Painter Stainers' Company (freedom of the Company) and, through that, to claim the right to trade within the City of London (freedom of the City). Two of Savile's apprentices were admitted to freedom of the Company: Mary Smithson, daughter of a painter-stainer, in 1680 and Elizabeth Calverly, daughter of a London merchant, in 1697. Calverly went on to apply for freedom of the City.<sup>42</sup> Membership of a company did not mean a woman was confined to working in the profession in which she had been apprenticed and, usefully, the advantages of company membership could also be transferred to her husband.<sup>43</sup> There is no evidence that Savile's female apprentices were

<sup>39</sup> Guildhall Library, CLC/L/PA/C/003/MS05669/001, Painter-Stainers' Company, Register of Apprenticeship Bindings 1666–1795, fols 30v, 31v, 34v, 40r, 51v, 56v, 68v, 71v.

<sup>40</sup> H. Draper, 'Mary Beale and Art's Lost Laborers: Women Painter Stainers', *Early Modern Women*, 10, 2015, pp. 141–51 (149). Draper's figures are based on C. Webb's transcripts in 'The Art World in Britain 1660 to 1735' database, University of York, <<http://artworld.york.ac.uk>>.

<sup>41</sup> Draper, 'Mary Beale', p. 148.

<sup>42</sup> Guildhall Library, Register of Freedom Admissions, Company of Painter-Stainers, CLC/L/PA/C/001/MS05668, fols 21v, 92v; London Metropolitan Archives, Freedom of the City Admissions Papers, COL/CHD/FR/02/0122-0128, accessed via Ancestry.com <<https://search.ancestry.co.uk/search/db.aspx?dbid=2052>> [9 Sept. 2018].

<sup>43</sup> On the status and motives for female apprenticeships within London companies see A. L. Erickson, 'Eleanor Mosley and Other Milliners in the City of London Companies 1700–1750', *History Workshop Journal*, 71, 2011, pp. 147–72.

bound to learn any other trade than painting, indicating that their families were investing in their future in multiple respects. A daughter apprenticed to a painter acquired skills that might support her economically. If she became free of the company, she could claim trading rights within the City – which might also appeal to potential husbands. Finally, in the later seventeenth century painting was among the accomplishments that might form part of a gentlewoman's education and so, economic benefits aside, such expertise had the potential to be cast as the kind of accomplishment that could bolster a girl's status and aid her marriage prospects.

Pepys's diary in turn implies the advantages for a portrait studio of taking on female apprentices. When gentlewomen, such as Elizabeth Pepys, were visiting on a regular basis – and perhaps wanting to do so without male relatives – the presence of other women in the studio would lend respectability, especially if these were young women from genteel or otherwise reputable backgrounds. In 1661 Elizabeth was able to hire a chambermaid as an upper servant, but the household budget did not yet stretch to employing a waiting gentlewoman to accompany her around town. In contrast, by the time Elizabeth sat for Hayls in 1666, a waiting gentlewoman had been recruited and Elizabeth also chose to bring female friends to her sittings. Pepys discovered her there on one occasion with her paid companion Mary Mercer, the actress Mrs Knepp, and Elizabeth Pearse – a singing session ensued. Another time, Elizabeth took Mercer and a friend, Barbara Sheldon, with her.<sup>44</sup> The presence of amenable, well-bred women was evidently valued by female sitters and, for those who were not able to afford their own retinue, female apprentices might help create a similarly respectable, yet convivial atmosphere. A cynic might also note that the presence of amenable, well-bred young women was also likely to be an asset as far as many male sitters were concerned – Pepys included. In 1661 he had to content himself with eyeing a portrait of a 'pretty lady' as entertainment; given that he sometimes frequented booksellers and other businesses on the grounds of those establishments being overseen by an attractive woman, it is not hard to see how female apprentices might add to a business's appeal.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> *Diary*, VII, 53, 73.

<sup>45</sup> Attractive women, whose looks helped win Pepys's custom, included a linen-draper at the Royal Exchange (VI, 73) and Mary Shrewsbury, a bookseller (IX, 260–61).

Around 1679, Savile moved to the parish of St Peter le Poer. Here he continued to take on apprentices, his last being Elizabeth Calverly who was apprenticed for seven years in January 1689.<sup>46</sup> Savile did not live to see out this apprenticeship and was buried on 16 February 1694. It is not clear what became of his business in the long term: his estate was left to his wife Dorothy and there is no record of his surviving son, Richard, taking up the trade.<sup>47</sup> In verifying his father's will, Richard described himself as a 'gentleman' rather than a 'citizen' or as being of a trade – the implication is that Daniel Savile had been successful enough, through the wealth he had acquired via marriages and through his own labour, to raise his son as a gentleman.

Savile worked as a painter for at least four decades, yet from what must have been a flourishing business only two images, and no original pictures, have been identified. Savile's family connection to the collectors Thomas Povey and William Blathwayt raises the prospect that more of his work may yet be discovered. While only traces of his pictures remain, from the surviving records of his life and Pepys's diary, we can deduce how he, and other portrait artists who catered to the middling sort, won and maintained clients. Savile provided a welcoming, respectable establishment where male and female clients were content to spend time – and he was aided for much of his career by female apprentices. His method made the client a party to the work: he took close guidance from Pepys on the details of the portrait, bore with Pepys's criticisms of his method, and put up with Pepys's arriving without notice to show the work-in-progress to friends. Savile provided a comprehensive service, arranging for the framing of the portraits, overseeing their delivery and hanging, and later varnishing them *in situ*. For Pepys, at the start of his career and mindful of his budget, Savile was a prudent and

---

<sup>46</sup> Squibb, *Reports of Heraldic Cases*, p. 50; Guildhall Library, MS05669/001, fol. 71v. When Calverly became a member of the Painter-Stainers' Company in Dec. 1697, she cited her apprenticeship under Daniel Savile, suggesting she continued to work in the household for the remainder of her term after his death (Guildhall Library, CLC/L/PA/C/001/MS05668, fol. 21v).

<sup>47</sup> Guildhall Library, P69/PET2/A/001/MS04093/001, Parish Registers of St Peter le Poer, 16 Feb. 1693/4. Savile's unwitnessed will was verified as legitimate on 26 May 1694 by Richard (The National Archives, Kew, PROB 11/420/234). Richard gave his age as 36, which helps to confirm that this Daniel Savile is the same painter who was in Cheapside in the 1660s. Richard had in fact just turned 37, having been born on 21 April 1657 (*Registers of St. Vedast, Foster Lane*, I, 68).

competent choice, much cheaper than the 'great' painters, such as Cooper, whom he would later patronise. Moreover, the commissioner of a portrait was not just paying for the material product, but for the joys of being painted. Pepys, making his first commission, learned that these delights included making oneself or another sitter the centre of attention; succumbing to enforced leisure time; the chance to gain, and to display, expertise in art; and the mild thrills (which included suspense and risk) involved in seeing how well the painting would develop and if it would please 'exceedingly'. Arranging to have a relative or friend painted was not just a deepening of a bond through the creation of a luxury good which honoured and flattered the sitter; the process itself was an invitation to further friendship since it could mean the commissioner and sitter spending considerable time in each others' company, working closely with the painter to ensure a satisfactory image. A successful painting pleased the sitter and client; but for sitters and clients the pleasures of working with a skilled painter could lie as much in the process as the end result.