Restoring the Biographical Portrait:
The Case of Mary Beale (1633-1699)

by

Kristin Erin Campbell
B.A., Queen's University, 1999

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of History in Art

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

Dr. C. Gibson-Wood, Supervisor (Department of History in Art)

Dr. J. Osborne, Departmental Member (Department of History in Art)

Dr. C. Carlin, Outside Member (Department of French)

Dr. T.R. Cleary, External Examiner (Department of English)

© Kristin Erin Campbell, 2001

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy or other means, without the permission of the author.

Supervisor: Dr. Carol Gibson-Wood.

Abstract

This thesis investigates the development of the biography of the Baroque portrait painter, Mary Beale (1633-1699), through historiography. The conventional gendered construction of Mary, primarily as a wife and mother, and secondarily as an artist, will be traced and examined, from the earliest art historical references to her, to the most recent.

The first chapter will introduce a survey of the biographical facts that are known about the life of Mary Beale, and present a sample of the literature written on Mary Beale, from 1658 to 1999/2000. These sources will be examined primarily for the role Charles Beale occupies in relation to that of his wife.

Chapter two will begin to examine how Charles Beale came to be included in accounts of Mary's life and career, by investigating the notebooks of George Vertue (1683-1757). By claiming an authorial presence for Vertue, it is possible to identify motivations for the choices he made regarding his references to Mary Beale.

Chapter three examines Horace Walpole (1717-1797), and his Anecdotes of Painting in England. The authorial voice and editorial choice exercised in the Anecdotes provides insight into decisions made by Walpole in his biographical sketch of Mary Beale.

Chapter four examines the degree to which Walpole's Anecdotes of Painting in England has become an authoritative source. The influence of Walpole's account of Mary Beale has had a significant effect on subsequent treatments of the artist's life and career, and the manner in which she has come to be characterised, that is, always in proximity to her husband.

The fifth and final chapter of this thesis attempts to situate the case of Mary Beale within a broader art historical context. After suggesting that the construction of Mary Beale first as wife and mother, and only then as artist, has become normalized, the chapter briefly examines how the reproduction of patterns of knowledge come to be understood as inevitable.

Examiners:

Dr. C. Gibson-Wood, Supervisor (Department of History in Art)

Dr. J. Osborne, Departmental Member (Department of History in Art)

Dr. C. Carlin, Outside Member (Department of French)

Dr. T.R. Cleary, External Examiner (Department of English)

Table of Contents

Abstract ii

Table of Contents iv

List of Figures vi

Acknowledgments vii

Dedication viii

Chapter 1: "Mrs. Mary Beale, Paintress" 1

Biographical Circumstances 3

Survey of Literature on Mary Beale 7

Chapter 2: "... the remarkables of their lives..." 28

George Vertue and his notebooks 28

References to Mary Beale 34

Chapter 3: "... our charming and opinionated cicerone..." 44

Horace Walpole and the Vertue notebooks 44

Walpole's Anecdotes of Painting in England 51

Treatment of Mary Beale 57

Chapter 4: The Origins of Tradition 64

Vertue, Walpole and authoritative voice 64

Walpole's Anecdotes as a canonical source 71

Chapter 5: The Appearance of Inevitability 87

Bibliography 98

Appendix A 104

Appendix B 124

Appendix C 127

Figures 137

List of Figures

Figure 1: Self Portrait of Mary Beale, c. 1675-80 137

Figure 2: Portrait of Charles Beale by Mary Beale, c. 1666 138

Figure 3: Portrait of Gilbert Burnet D.D. by Mary Beale, c. 1691 139

Acknowledgments

This thesis began as a term paper for a graduate-level seminar on artists and biography in the department of History in Art. I believe it is a reflection of all that I have learned during my time at the University of Victoria.

Thanks to my supervisor, Dr. Carol Gibson-Wood, without whom I would never have encountered Mary Beale. Her advice and encouragement have proven invaluable. Dr. Catherine Harding also engaged me in helpful discussions over the course of my studies in Victoria.

I would like to thank Professor J. Douglas Stewart, for the helpful suggestions he provided during the formative stages of this project.

Mr. Allan Scott-Davies of the Manor House Museum, Bury St. Edmonds, Suffolk, is also to be acknowledged for his assistance with regards to the images used in this thesis.

Angela Roberts, Kalan Brown and Victoria Pollard must also be thanked, for their friendship and the encouragement that accompanied it.

Dedication

This project could not have been completed without the encouragement of my family. It is dedicated to Mr. and Mrs. G.W. Campbell, and Lt. Col. and Mrs. W.B. Asbury, in recognition and appreciation of their love and unwavering support.

Chapter One: "Mrs. Mary Beale, Paintress"

This thesis will examine the biography of the English Baroque portrait painter, Mary Beale (1633-1699), as it has come to be constructed over the course of almost 350 years. Accounts of her life and career appear to have changed little since the earliest accounts were produced in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and this is what first attracted me to the topic: the possibility of taking what at first appears to be simple and problematizing it. It is not the function of this thesis to rewrite in any way the biography of Mary Beale. Rather, it is a historiographical study, designed to analyze the many authors who have addressed Mary Beale at various points in time by asking simple questions: Why do biographers make the choices they make? Can a careful reading of their texts provide the answers? An art historiographical study can reveal not only the many ways in which a story can be told, but also the voices engaged in the telling.

In the case of Mary Beale, the establishment of social context has become far more prominent than discussions of the art that was produced by her. Even a cursory glance at the many sources that have addressed the artist and her biography over the course of last 342 years, reveals that Mary Beale is discussed exclusively in terms of a social and familial framework, almost without exception. While other artists of her period have been discussed in terms of their artistic output, in both qualitative and quantitative capacities, accounts of Mary are consistently rooted in constructions of her family life, even at times when contextualization was not a popular avenue of investigation in art history. A primary source, in the form of journal extracts written by Mary's husband, Charles, has in many ways obstructed the full development of her biography as well as analysis of her paintings. While the source itself provides much

valuable information, it also presents a temptation that most authors on Mary Beale cannot resist—the over-development of the biography of Charles Beale, in immediate proximity with that of his wife.

Whether Mary Beale is invoked as a champion to be recovered for the feminist canon, or in the less-politicized arena of historical figures whose art and life should not be underestimated or forgotten, her biography is almost always developed in tandem with that of her husband. We might wonder: how did this come to be?

This thesis seeks to suggest possible answers, by examining the treatment of Mary in two texts that have come to be recognized as extremely significant for the development of art history in England: the notebooks of the engraver George Vertue (1683-1757), and the Anecdotes of Painting in England by Horace Walpole (1717-1797).

While the answer to the question "why do biographers make the choices they make?" can never be entirely determined, it is nonetheless a valuable exercise to identify the choices that are made by authors and editors, and attempt to investigate the possible reasons for them. Few still labour under the delusion that the documents of history are created objectively; accordingly, attempts may be made to identify the circumstances of subjectivity. Explorations of an author's possible aims, while they cannot determine our understanding of a project, should nonetheless be taken into account, and acknowledged as the means by which an author makes choices.

Choices and the authorial motivations behind them can shape subsequent treatments of the biographical subject. This is certainly the case with George Vertue and Horace Walpole, and their mutual subject, Mary Beale. Both men chose to make use of extracts from the journals of Mary's husband, Charles. I believe that the influence of this

choice and each author's respective treatment of Mary Beale as a biographical subject can be observed in the majority of subsequent treatments of Mary's biography.

* * *

This chapter will introduce a survey of the documented biographical circumstances that are known about the life of Mary Beale, in order to illustrate the information that her various biographers have had at their disposal. It will then present an account of some of the literature written on Mary Beale to date, including sources both academic and popular in nature.[1] The sources vary in length, in detail, and in focus, and cover a broad span of time. The great majority of them situate Mary within a domestic or social framework in order to capture the reader's interest in her life and work.

The circumstances of Mary Beale's life have been constructed around a series of dates summarized below. Records indicate that Mary was baptized in Suffolk, in March of 1632/3, the first child of John Cradock and his wife Dorothy. John Cradock was the Rector of the Church of All Saints in Barrow, Suffolk. Mary was married to Charles Beale in Barrow in March of 1651/2, immediately prior to the death of her father. (See Figures 1 and 2). Mary had two surviving children. The first, Bartholomew, was baptised at St. Paul's, Covent Garden in February 1655/6. In 1660, another child, Charles, was baptised at St. Dunstan-in-the-West, Fleet Street. Mary died in 1699 in Pall Mall, and was

[1] I have come across roughly twenty-six separate sources which make reference to Mary Beale, dating from her own lifetime up to the year 2000. Many of these reproduce the same information, and, because of this, have not been singled out for discussion in this thesis. However, all are listed in the bibliography.

buried in St. James Church, Piccadilly. The details of these events were gathered together and published by Elizabeth Walsh in her substantial contributions to the literature on Mary Beale.[2]

There is some indication that Mary's life as an artist began at an early stage—her father was himself an amateur painter as the records for the Painter Stainers' Company of July 1648 indicate.[3] Mary Edmond's study of Bury St. Edmunds indicates that the area around and including Barrow supported a substantial artistic circle, in which John Cradock seems to have played some role.[4] It is likely that Mary studied painting while still a young woman in her father's house. A local painter in Bury St. Edmunds, a Mr. Bremwell, was friendly with Sir Peter Lely who visited the area during Mary's childhood. It has been suggested that Mary had lessons from one or both artists.[5] More frequent contact with professional artists seems to have come with Mary's marriage in 1651/2—for instance, she was painted with her husband by Robert Walker shortly after their marriage.[6] It has been suggested less convincingly that Mary studied with Walker, based on a conjectured relationship between Walker and the Cradock family, resulting from the fact that Mary's father, as well as Mary and Charles, were painted by Walker.[7]

---

[2] Elizabeth Walsh and Richard Jeffree, " 'The Excellent Mrs. Mary Beale" (London 1975), 9-16. See also: Elizabeth Walsh " 'Mrs. Mary Beale, Paintress' " The Connoisseur, CXXXI (April 1953), 3-6.

[3] The record of July 7 1648 reads as follows: "Mr. John Cradock...presented a piece of painting of his owne makeing whc he gave into this company consisting of varieties of fruits, vizt. Apricocks, quinces ffilberts Grapes apls and other sorts of fruits...". The painting was destroyed in an air raid in 1940. Walsh and Jeffrees, "The Excellent Mrs. Mary Beale", 10.

[4] Mary Edmond, "Bury St Edmunds: A Seventeenth-Century Art Centre", Journal of the Walpole Society 53 (1987), 108.

[5] Bainbrigg Buckeridge, "An Essay towards an English School" in Roger de Piles' Art of Painting, (London 1706) 358. Elizabeth Walsh suggests that the local painter, Bremwell may have taught Mary, and also that he may have had a hand in introducing her to Lely. Walsh, " 'Mrs. Mary Beale...'," 3.

[6] Ibid., 3. Walsh states this on the basis of letters from this period from Thomas Flatman to Charles Beale, in which he refers to Mary as his "Scholar".

[7] John Cradock bequeathed portaits of himself by both Lely and Walker to his daughter upon his death. Tabitha Barber, "Mary Beale", (London 1999) 16. Whinney and Millar reject Walker as an instructor for

Between 1654 and 1656, while living at Covent Garden with her husband, Mary seems to have begun her life as a professional painter.[8] The sitters of the portraits produced by Mary in the early part of her career in the 1660's and 1670's indicate that her "reputation as an artist seems to have been established in ecclesiastical circles."[9] Early portraits of future Archbishop of Canterbury John Tillotson (St. Paul's Cathedral Library) and Alderman Mark Hildesley (private collection of David Richards Esq., as of 1976) for example, suggest this. In 1665 the Plague drove the Beales from Hind Court off Fleet Street in London, to a country home at Albrook in Hampshire, where the family lived for five years. Letters from her husband's correspondents indicate that Mary painted regularly during this period.[10] By 1670, the Beales returned to London to a house at Pall Mall, with the intention of establishing a commercial studio and practice for Mary.[11] She continued to paint portraits of the couple's friends, including John Wilkins (Bodleian Library, Oxford) and Hezekiah Burton (Magdalene College, Cambridge).[12]

Mary was involved in a variety of painterly activities during this period, painting portraits of London professionals as well as members of the nobility.[13] She engaged in copying portraits by Anthony Van Dyck and Sir Peter Lely, an activity which seems to have increased Mary's popularity by expanding the number of commissions she received. An entry in Charles Beale's Journal of 1672 testifies to Mary's skill in this area:

> Mr. Lely was here with Mr. Gibson and Mr. Skipworth to see us—And

---

Mary, on the basis of an absence of any stylistic or formal similarities between their respective works. Margaret Whinney and Oliver Millar, English Art 1625-1714 (Oxford, 1957) 180.

[8] Walsh " 'Mrs. Mary Beale…' " 3.

[9] Ibid, 3

[10] John Cooke, Secretary to Charles II's Secretary of State, offered the services of his tutor to transport Mary's paintings from Albrook into London in 1666. Walsh 4.

[11] Barber "Mary Beale", 19.

[12] Items 2 and 6 of Walsh and Jeffrees' 1975 exhibition " 'The Excellent Mrs. Mary Beale' ".

[13] Barber "Mary Beale", 19.

> commended very much on her [Mary's] coppy of Our Saviour in the Garden, after Anto. Da Corregio... Her coppy in little after Endimion Porter, his lady and three sons he [Lely] commended extraordinary, and said... it was painted like Van Dyke himself in little, and that it was the best coppy of he ever saw of Van Dyke. [14]

She continued to paint Anglican Divines and their associates, in addition to copies of Lely's portraits, closely modeled on his style, into the late 1670's and 1680's.[15]

Mary is known to have had at least three pupils and assistants in addition to her sons, whom she taught to paint and manage a studio. In 1681, it is noted that Keaty Trioche and one Mr. More were present in Mary's studio as students. By 1691, a third pupil, Sarah Curtis, had entered Mary's practice. Though her sons did not cultivate lasting careers as professional painters,[16] Sarah Curtis set up her own practice for a short time as a portrait painter and copyist.[17]

In the last decade of her life, Mary continued to supply the limited demand for portraits after the style of Sir Peter Lely, who had died in 1680. She continued to paint members of the Protestant Clergy after the Glorious Revolution of 1688, an event which improved the circumstances of many of her friends in the Anglican Church. Portraits such as that of Gilbert Burnet of 1691, are indicative of Mary's continued business painting clergymen during this period. (See Figure 3). Little documentation survives regarding the last years of Mary's life. She died at the family's home in the Pall Mall in 1699, and was buried on the eighth of October at St. James's Church, Piccadilly.[18]

---

[14] George Vertue, "NoteBook IV" as published by the Walpole Society, 1935-5, 24, 168.
[15] Christopher Reeve, "Mrs. Mary Beale, Paintress" Manor House Museum, 1994, 5-6.
[16] Charles Beale, Junior, showed much promise as a painter of miniatures, but failing eyesight seems to have hindered any hope of a career. Daphne Foskett, British Portrait Miniatures (London, 1963) 78.
[17] Lisa Heer, "Copyists", Dictionary of Women Artists, ed. Delia Gaze (London 1997) 57-8.
[18] Reeve "Mrs. Mary Beale...", 7.

* * *

The life and work of Mary Beale has been discussed in many sources, dating from her own lifetime, up to and including the present century. A sample of the sources will be examined below. Such an examination allows observations to be made about the way in which Mary's biography has developed, and how it has come to rely so heavily on social and familial contextualization.

William Sanderson's text, Graphice: The Use of Pen and Pensil. or, the Most Excellent art of Painting, of 1658 is the earliest extant source to treat Mary Beale in her capacity as an artist. Sanderson's text, which deals with artists and the practice of art, has been described as being based upon "a collection of technical details discovered in wide readings, and upon lessons given by painters in conversation".[19] Sanderson pieced together a variety of types of information copied indiscriminately from a range of previously published sources on art in England.[20]

No reference is made to Charles Beale, or to Mary's social circle in this source. The particular passage that refers to Mary Beale addresses women painters in London: "In oyl colours wee have a virtuous example in that worthy Artist Mrs. Carlisle: and others. Mr. Beale. Mrs. Brooman. Mrs. Weimes."[21] Given the context, the reference to "Mr. Beale" was clearly an error, and "Mrs. Beale" was the intended recipient of the honourable mention. It may be assumed that the author accepted the success of these

---

[19] Lawrence Lipking, The Ordering of the Arts in Eighteenth Century England (New Jersey 1970) 110.
[20] Ibid., 111.
[21] Sanderson, as copied by George Vertue in his notebooks. Vertue, "NoteBook IV", 31.

women painters in their chosen profession, and anticipated that his audience would recognize them, also.

Chronologically, the next reference to Mary Beale is the "Essay towards an English School of Painters" by Bainbrigg Buckeridge. Published as an addendum to the 1706 publication of Roger de Piles' Art of Painting, Buckeridge's essay presents brief biographical summaries of artists working in England, and Mary Beale is among those discussed. Buckeridge names Sir Peter Lely as Mary's teacher. He notes that those who patronized her were of high rank and were pleased with her work, and commends her skills as a copyist and as a portraitist. Buckeridge's account of Mary's life and work appears as follows:

> Mary Beale, was an English gentlewoman, born in Suffolk, who having learnt the rudiments of painting of Sir Peter Lely, drew after the life, and had a great number of persons of good rank sat to her, especially the greatest part of the dignify'd clergy of her time, an acquaintance she got by her husband, who was much in favour with that robe. She was little inferior to any of her contemporaries, either for colouring, strength, force or life, insomuch that Sir Peter was greatly taken with her performances, as he wou'd often acknowledge. She work'd with a wonderful body of colours, was exceedingly industrious, and her pictures are much after the Italian manner, which she learnt by having copied several of the great masters of that country, whose pictures she borrowed out of Sir Peter's collection. She died at her house in the Pall-Mall about six years ago, being 65 years old, and lies buried at St. James's.[22]

Only the briefest reference is made to Mary's husband, Charles. Buckeridge suggests that his only role in the career of his wife was to put Mary in contact with a number of the Anglican Divines who sat to her to have their portraits painted.

---

[22] Buckeridge "An Essay…", 358.

These two early sources, the first to address Mary Beale, focus exclusively on the subject as an artist. Her capacity as a wife and mother is not discussed in either account, and, specifically in the case of Buckeridge, her biographical sketch is constructed the same way as those of her contemporaries in that it is directed towards establishing a discussion of the style and quality of her work as an artist.

The manuscript notebooks of the eighteenth-century artist and engraver George Vertue represent the first source in which aspects of Mary Beale's family life are introduced into the mix, and because of this, represent an obvious turning point in the development of her biography. Published for the first time by the Walpole Society in the first half of the twentieth century, Vertue's notebooks represent a valuable source for the history of art in Britain. Throughout the thirty-nine notebooks produced by Vertue over the course of his lifetime on the subjects of artists and the production and collecting of art, there are several references to Mary Beale culled from a variety of sources to which Vertue had access. Vertue's notebooks mark the introduction of Charles Beale into discussions of his wife and her studio practice.

In addition to his familiarity with earlier sources that discuss Mary Beale, including the texts of Sanderson's Graphice and Buckeridge's "Essay" (both of which he quotes in his notebooks), Vertue had occasion to meet with members of the Beale household and studio practice, and, most significantly for the purposes of this thesis, he had access to writings by Mary's husband Charles.[23] These consist of notes and observations recorded by Charles about artist friends, work in which his wife was engaged, and many other things, in the blank pages at the end of yearly almanac books,

or "pocket- books".[24] For the remainder of this thesis, the "pocket-books" of Charles Beale will be referred to as his journals. Recognizing the contribution that the information in the journals could make to the study of Mary Beale, Vertue recorded extracts from several of them into his own notebooks. This will be addressed in greater detail in the second chapter of this thesis.

Horace Walpole's Anecdotes of Painting in England constitutes the second source from the eighteenth century to address Mary Beale.[25] Having purchased Vertue's many notebooks after Vertue's death in 1757, Walpole edited, organized and substantially augmented the information contained in the notebooks in order to facilitate the publication of his own account of the history of the arts in England, which will hereafter be referred to as the Anecdotes. Walpole's discussion of Mary Beale is almost completely restricted to recopying the excerpts of Charles Beale's Journals found in Vertue's notebooks. Charles Beale is also discussed in the section of the Anecdotes devoted to Mary. This source will be examined in more detail in chapter three.

The sources by both Vertue and Walpole have particular significance in the development of accounts of Mary Beale. By introducing Charles Beale, and reproducing extracts of his journals, Vertue and Walpole contribute to the reproduction of a certain kind of knowledge involving Mary Beale—that which is rooted in discussions of her role as a wife and mother.

The nineteenth century yielded Ellen C. Clayton's text English Female Artists of 1876. Clayton's study owes most of its information to the author's familiarity with

---

[23] Vertue, through the generosity of a friend, gained access to seven of a reported thirty Journals by Charles Beale, covering the years 1661, 1671, 1672, 1674, 1676, 1677 and 1681.
[24] Horace Walpole, letter to Thomas Wharton, of October 30, 1764, p. 367 Yale Correspondence vol. 40.

Walpole's Anecdotes. Although this little-known source is rarely acknowledged, it is particularly significant for the development of Mary Beale's biography. In addition to reflecting the influence of Walpole's account of the artist, it also represents a radical departure. Clayton gives an account of Mary Beale's life and work that seems at first to be a departure from previous studies, for the simple fact that it is included in a source which deals exclusively with the "native paintresses" of England, filling two volumes with accounts of their lives and works.[26] The book itself, English Female Artists, represents a new direction in art historical literature though it is frequently overlooked in the present age.

In the chapter devoted to Mary Beale, the biographical facts as they were known to the author are briefly recounted, but there are minor gaps and problems in the information. For instance, Clayton suggests that Mary Beale began painting around the year 1662, two years after the death of the artist Robert Walker, whom Clayton believes was Mary's instructor. Clayton could not have been aware of Sanderson's text, or at least his reference to Mary, for, writing in 1658, Sanderson mentions Mary with a number of other well known female painters, establishing that her career as an artist had already begun by the date of his publication.[27]

Discrepancies aside, Clayton's study introduces some new and interesting aspects to the study of Mary Beale; for instance, a self portrait of Mary is described in great

---

[25] Published by Walpole in five volumes between 1762 and 1780.
[26] Ellen C. Clayton, English Female Artists, (London, 1876), 2.
[27] Vertue also makes this mistake in one of his early references to Mary, as does Walpole. C.H. Collins Baker is the first to note this discrepancy in his discussion of Mary Beale. Collins Baker, Lely and the Stuart Portrait Painters, 1912, 35.

detail, in an attempt to cultivate a degree of immediacy between the reader and subject.[28] Also, Sir Peter Lely, who is frequently introduced as the master of the English portrait in the seventeenth century prior to any mention of Mary, appears as a very minor figure, an almost incidental example provided to situate Mary Beale in the appropriate artistic context.[29] In a third remarkable instance, though clearly prompted by what she finds in the Anecdotes, Clayton locates and makes use of an extant journal by Charles Beale that was not acknowledged in Walpole's account of Mary Beale.[30]

In spite of these developments, Clayton relied very heavily on Walpole, both for information and inspiration. Not only is Walpole's account of the Beale Journals reproduced, but Mary's husband, sons and social circle are examined in Clayton's study, expanded by the author from Walpole's brief references to them. With Walpole's installation of Charles as a dominant source of information, Clayton relies on Walpole's use of the journals as justification to cultivate the expansion of his role in the story of Mary's life as an artist.

By the middle of the study, it becomes apparent that Clayton was particularly drawn to Walpole's reproduction of the extracts of Charles Beale's journals. In his account of Mary in the Anecdotes, Walpole expresses the opinion that "when one writes on the lives of artists, who... were not very eminent, their pocket books are as important as any part of their history".[31] Clayton seems to extrapolate the intentions of this remark

---

[28] Clayton, English Female Artists, 41.
[29] Ibid., 42.
[30] Ibid., 47.
[31] Walpole, Anecdotes, 2, 154.

in the extreme, when she notes that, in the "tranquil, modest existence" of Mary Beale, "the slightest event was deemed worthy of record".[32] She continues later in the study:

> The most remarkable event [in Mary's life] is some new picture begun or "finisht". The "dearest heart" of her husband, the admired mother of her "boys" and...the centre of a large, appreciative circle of friends, she is only unlike thousands of other contented English wives and mothers in her distinguishing artistic talent.[33]

In short, while Clayton's account of Mary Beale's life and work begins to develop in new and significant ways by emphasizing Mary as a subject, and minimizing the presence of her more famous associate, Lely, her account of Mary Beale reverts in the end to the almost exclusively contextual discussion of Mary, set in motion by Vertue and reinforced by Walpole. By the end of Clayton's account of her life, Mary is swallowed up by the her role that the author understands her to play within her family. The attention paid to the specifics of her artistic production is minimized so that Mary may be assigned the role of the contented wife and mother.

From the time of the publication of Clayton's study, Mary Beale's biography appears to develop along two lines. Some authors attempt to cover new ground, pursuing stylistic analysis of her work or feminist analysis—these succeed to varying degrees in actually breaking any new ground. Many more authors openly continue in the vein of Walpole and Clayton, to pursue the discussion of Mary within the confines of her domestic and social situation.

One source which attempted to engage in a new stylistic analysis of Mary, is C.H. Collins Baker's text of 1912, Lely and the Stuart Portrait Painters. Unlike any earlier writers, Collins Baker examines at length some of the surviving works by Mary, and this

---

[32] Clayton, English Female Artists, 47.

is a noteworthy development. In conjunction with this, the author also privileges the significance of Charles Beale's journals not just for the study of Mary, but for insights into more general matters of art production, and the lives of other painters. In this respect, even though it ventures into new territory with stylistic assessment, Collins Baker's work still affords Charles Beale a prominent role in the story of his wife after the pattern established by Walpole.[34] Collins Baker mentions Mary in a later study he produced on British painting, where he discusses her briefly (and exclusively) as a disciple of Lely. He touches on Mary's technical abilities (or what he seems to perceive as a lack thereof) as a painter, stating that "Mrs. Beale produced a great number of portraits whose only recommendation is painstaking but undistinguished honesty."[35]

A number of feminist sources also sought out new ways to tell the story of the life of Mary Beale. The mid-to-late 1970's witnessed an increase in the development of survey texts which dealt exclusively with the often neglected histories of the lives and works of women artists.

In 1976, Karen Peterson and J.J. Wilson co-authored Women Artists: Recognition and Reappraisal from the Early Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century. The purpose of the project as outlined in the introduction, to retrieve and/or reconsider the lost histories of women in art, succeeds to a point. The exceptionally short entry on Mary Beale barely meets these aims, as it only discusses her popularity in proximity to Lely, and introduces Charles Beale by referring almost immediately to the journals.

---

[33] Ibid., 51.
[34] C.H. Collins Baker, Lely and the Stuart Portrait Painters, (London 1912) 2, 34-42.
[35] C.H. Collins Baker, British Painting, (Boston 1933) 57.

The title of the book and its introduction indicate that it will attempt to rediscover the lost histories of female artists and look at their lives and careers in new ways.[36] They claim that the book "seeks to stimulate general reconsideration of assumptions in art history".[37] The brief account of Mary Beale in this source ventures nowhere near this claim.

Noting at one point that the "almost total eclipse" of Mary Beale's reputation as a talented and successful artist is the fault of male chauvinism in art history, Peterson and Wilson nonetheless quote in full Walpole's remarks about the Beale Journals and Mary's status as an artist who was perhaps "not so eminent".[38] Even though Peterson's and Wilson's reference to Mary is barely 150 words in length, the influence of Walpole and the presence of Charles Beale and his journals are confirmed.

The Obstacle Race by Germaine Greer, written in 1979, is another feminist source which claims to examine the many obstacles female painters have encountered throughout the ages, and present them to the reader. Though the work aspires to examine the lives of women artists in a new way, it nonetheless adheres to what is central to Walpole's construction of Mary Beale. Charles Beale is lauded as a supportive husband, both emotionally and materially. Greer ventures into new ground with her somewhat vague assertion that Mary's portraits convey "an interesting dignity and reserve" that she finds wanting in Lely's work of the same period, but her account is surprisingly accepting of the information suggested by that of Walpole.

---

[36] Karen Petersen and J.J. Wilson, Women Artists (San Francisco 1976) 2.
[37] Ibid., 6.
[38] Ibid., 35.

The renewed attempt by many feminist authors to re-people the same chronological and geographically oriented structures of standard survey texts with female artists in the 1970's and 1980's did much to increase awareness and appreciation of art produced by women. However, many of them add little to the study of Mary Beale. With respect to her life and career, they rely almost exclusively upon a previously established social and familial framework. Mary is constructed as a devoted wife and mother whose art occupied a secondary role in her life.

Those sources which deliberately follow the contextual course set out by Walpole are numerous and varied—three examples will be addressed below.

Elizabeth Walsh produced the first important journal article to be devoted to Mary Beale, published in The Connoisseur in April of 1953, expanding the exposure ushered in by Collins Baker, but adopting a different focus.[39] Walsh brings together much new biographical information from many early documents on Mary Beale.[40] She attempts to create a fuller picture of Mary Beale than had ever been presented previously, by making use of letters and journals from members of Charles Beale's family and social circle which had never before been addressed, including those of the artist Thomas Flatman and Samuel Woodforde—the former was a close friend of both Mr. and Mrs. Beale, and the latter became a cousin by marriage. Both men, who at various times lived and worked in proximity to the Beale household, recorded information about the running of the household in their diaries and letters. The information provided by Flatman and

---

[39] Walsh, " 'Mrs. Mary Beale, Paintress' ", 3-9.

[40] In a letter to the editor of Burlington Magazine, Walsh published for the first time the accurate date of Mary Beale's death, recorded incorrectly in source after source from the time of Vertue. Walsh, 'Letters' Burlington Magazine XC, numbers 538-549,(January-December 1948), 209.

Woodforde is also used in Tabitha Barber's exhibition catalogue on Mary Beale, produced in conjunction with an exhibition which took place in 1999/2000.

The eighth volume of the Oxford History of English Art attempts to cover as comprehensively as was possible the arts in England between the years 1625 and 1714. It was produced in 1957 by Margaret Whinney and Oliver Millar. The source is of particular importance, as the judgements of Mary Beale's work presented in it are as closely tied to the contextualization of the artist as they are to the appearance of the works.

The eighth chapter of the volume, entitled "Lely and Kneller", is an obvious indication of its content: the careers of Sir Peter Lely (1618-1680) and Sir Godfrey Kneller (1646/9-1723) are arranged as though they are the magnificent bookends enclosing the discussion of what is presented as an otherwise unremarkable period. The introductory paragraph makes apparent the agenda of the authors: Kneller is clearly designated as Lely's immediate successor in the practice of English portraiture. Kneller did succeed Lely as a Principal Painter to the Crown.[41] But this transition is constructed so effortlessly by Whinney and Millar, that it appears as if no other artists worked in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century! The agenda of Millar and Whinney appears when they state that "[B]y 1654, Lely was justly described as the 'best artist in England'."[42] Their apparent agreement with this assessment results in a ringing endorsement that sets the tone for the remainder of the chapter.

---

[41] Kneller shared this post jointly with Riley, yet from Millar and Whinney's initial reference, one would never know. This apparent oversight is never openly acknowledged in the chapter. Ellis Waterhouse, Painting in Britain 1530-1790 (Great Britain, 1978), 135.

[42] James Waynwright to Mr. Bradshaw, 6 October 1654 (H.M.C. Sixth Report, i (1877), 437 *b*-38*a*, as cited in Millar and Whinney, English Art..., 172.

Following their discussion of Lely, Millar and Whinney proceed in an assessment of Lely's students and followers. William Wissing and John Greenhill are examined first, by virtue of their close proximity to Lely, both having worked in his studio. They are discussed largely in terms of their adherence in their respective work to the lessons of Lely, and their innovations to or deviations from his example.

The unfortunate Henry Tilson is given only a paragraph, his small oeuvre highly commended but ultimately overlooked in favour of a brief discussion of his melodramatic suicide. Tilson is paired with an artist who is constructed by the authors as the perfect foil for both his talent and his passion: Whinney and Millar assure the reader, "we are in calmer waters with the well-documented and tedious Mary Beale..."[43]

In their account of Mary Beale, the authors are immediately mindful of Charles Beale and his journals. This is revealed by their use of the term "well-documented" as it appears so prominently before they even begin their discussion of Mary Beale. Prior to their discussion, her husband is examined in a brief but efficient fashion. Charles Beale's post as a Deputy Clerk of the Patents, his considerable library of books on fine art, and his intentions to translate from the Italian the *vitae* of some Italian artists are all addressed, as is his "lucrative trade as an artist's colourman."[44] Also prior to any direct mention of his wife, Charles Beale's "lovingly conscientious notes" are praised for the "...unrivalled picture of life in the artistic circles which radiated from Lely's studio..." that they present.[45] After the importance of the Journals is acknowledged, a discussion of Mary's life and work ensues.

---

[43] Ibid., 180.
[44] Ibid., 180.
[45] Ibid., 180.

In the single page devoted to her in this chapter, Mary is indeed contextualized by those artists that are her peers, but to questionable ends. The point is made early in the discussion that both Charles and Mary Beale were intimates of Lely, "who bought colours from Charles Beale and was a patient and kindly critic of his wife's work."[46] This remark interprets references made in Charles' journals' to several occasions in which Lely complimented Mary on her painting.[47]

I believe that Whinney and Millar have interpreted the remarks in a manner intended to cast favourable light on *Lely*, but this interpretation is made most assuredly at the expense of Mary Beale and her work. To couch Charles Beale's opinions of Lely's remarks in such patronizing terms may not reflect Lely's actual opinion of her work at all. Within the context of Whinney and Millar's discussion, this interpretation reflects an unflattering and unfair assumption that Mary Beale's work as an artist is particularly uninspired and bland, and that Lely's observations of her work were made not out of regard for Mary Beale, but out of regard for his friendship or business relationship with Charles Beale.

Whinney and Millar do address the popularity of Mary Beale as a portrait painter among an affluent circle of Anglican Doctors of Divinity.[48] But after acknowledging the circle of patrons who not only sat for Mary, but recommended her to friends and

---

[46] Ibid., 181.

[47] For instance, on April 20th, 1672, Charles Beale noted that "Mr. Lely was here (meaning (I think) to see Mrs. Beal & her workes) with Mr. Gibson & Mr. Skipworth to see us. & commended very much her (Mrs. Beal) coppy she had after Sir Anthony Van Dyke own picture..." [parentheses and spelling are Vertue's]. As cited in Vertue "Notebook IV" 168.

[48] Whinney and Millar, English Art..., 181. Many of these divines were also close friends of the Beales, such as Tillotson and Stillingfleet. Barber, "Mary Beale" 12.

associates, Whinney and Millar levy a harsh judgment against her, based on what they perceive as the poor quality of her work as a portraitist.

> ...in spite of all her opportunities and Lely's polite comments about her progress, Mrs. Beale's work never rises above the quality of a hard-working amateur, with no sense of colour or feeling for texture, very limited knowledge of anatomy and an incurably commonplace understanding of character.[49]

Mary's employment of Lely's compositional types is interpreted by Whinney and Millar as a "reliance" on his example that she was incapable of progressing beyond.[50]

Their treatment of Mary Beale concludes with a discussion of the role of her sons, Bartholomew and Charles Jr., as studio assistants in her portrait painting practice. The two extant groups of drawings by Charles Jr. [some of which were included in exhibitions ostensibly devoted to Mary Beale in 1975 and 1999/2000] are acknowledged as an "interesting indication" of the lessons that could be learned in the artistic milieu of Lely and his followers. It is surprising that the work of Charles Beale, Jr. is acknowledged as such, when that of his mother is not. The same pattern may be observed in Walpole's account of Mary's son, which follows her own biographical sketch in the Anecdotes.

Given the seeming lack of construction of the role of Charles Beale, it seems all the more remarkable that the authors chose to discuss him before addressing the life and work of his wife. The prominence given to Charles in Whinney and Millar's discussion of Mary Beale—a discussion that one might suppose would situate her within an artistic milieu rather than a familial one—ensures her husband a focal place in her story. In this aspect, the source reflects the influence of Walpole's account of Mary Beale.

In 1986, Nancy Cato produced a novel on Mary Beale, entitled The Lady Lost in Time, which would hardly be worth noting if not for its remarkable adherence to various sources on Mary including Vertue and Walpole. Extracts from the Journal of Charles Beale and some of his extant correspondence is constructed in the novel as (rather wooden and stilted) dialogue. Cato's fiction is so closely constructed around interpretations of early sources on Mary Beale that its subject falls victim to the same overwhelming discussion of the Beale family that dominates the non-fiction sources. The development of roles for *Charles* Beale, the family and the social circle dwarf the characterization of *Mary*.

These three sources, while all very different, respond to the treatment Mary's biography received at the hands of Walpole in very similar ways. Walsh went in search of additional contextual sources in the forms of letters and diaries by *Charles* or his family. Whinney and Millar privileged Charles Beale and Lely in their discussion of Mary, and judged her work unfairly because of this. And Cato, in what one must assume was an effort to make her work "authentic", relied so heavily on Walpole's account of Mary Beale that the work has only the barest resemblance to fiction. These sources, and others like them, seem to extend Walpole's impressions of Mary Beale—that is, they avoid discussions of her paintings or her status as an artist in order to expand the social and familial dimensions of her life.

One might expect that this would not be the case with exhibitions of Mary Beale's work and the accompanying catalogues. It might reasonably be expected that the paintings would move to the foreground, and in keeping with this, that Mary's career

---

[49] Whinney and Millar, English Art..., 181.

would take precedence over her role as wife and mother. This has not proved to be the case.

Retrospective exhibitions, in purporting to reconstruct the life of the artist around the visual documents that he or she has produced over the course of a lifetime, are an important facet of the development of an artist's biography. The assembling of paintings, drawings or sculpture within the confines of an exhibition space is only part of this re-constitution of the life of the artist. That other part of the exhibition process—the accompanying catalogue—allows the life of the artist to be *re-written*, providing a different forum in which aspects of the artist's life which cannot be expressed in the format of the visual show may be presented. It is this aspect of the exhibition process that is closely related to ideas of biography and constructions of artist's lives.

The late twentieth century yielded three exhibitions which addressed the life and work of Mary Beale, and they make a necessary and interesting addition to the development of accounts of her life.

In 1975 the first major exhibition on the life and work of Mary Beale was launched at the Geffrye Museum. The accompanying catalogue, produced by Elizabeth Walsh and Richard Jeffree, brought together all the major sources which Walsh had examined in her earlier article and combined them with many examples of the paintings produced by Mary Beale and her circle of family and friends. Charles figures prominently in the catalogue's discussion of Mary—the development of his biography is as extensive as that of hers. Entitled "'The Excellent Mrs. Mary Beale'", it borrowed its title from a poem by Samuel Woodforde which was inspired by a self portrait by Mary Beale.

---

[50] Ibid., 181.

The introduction to the catalogue, written by Oliver Millar, while only a page in length, introduces the ideas that reappear throughout the catalogue in ways both subtle and distinct. Millar begins by establishing that, unlike Artemesia Gentileschi who was the "most distinguished female painter working in England in the Stuart Period,"[51] Mary Beale was "God-fearing and kindly".[52] Before any discussion of her work begins, the impression of Mary as a gentle and unassuming woman is established.

After this brief and arguably unnecessary assessment of Mrs. Beale's perceived temperament and personality, Millar deems it necessary to explain that "her husband took her art very seriously indeed", and laments that more artists did not have spouses equally eager to write "so much about... daily activities as he recorded about hers."[53] In the first few lines of the catalogue it is already apparent that the discussion of Mary Beale to follow will be heavily indebted to the journals of her husband.

Millar emphasizes the value of the journals of Charles Beale, and highlights the significance for providing invaluable information about the general studio practices of artists in the period, in addition to the insight provided into the production of paintings and Mary's clientele. Millar also finds noteworthy the glimpses of other personalities of the day, social and professional acquaintances of the Beales which include Sir Peter Lely, Adrian Hanneman and Thomas Manby, among others. The introduction concludes with a rather telling passage that begins as follows: "The historian of the arts in this country

---

[51] Millar's comment on Artemesia is problematic in its own way, but, due to necessary restrictions of this project, the implications will not be addressed at this point.
[52] Millar in Walsh and Jeffree, "The Excellent Mrs. Mary Beale", 5.
[53] Ibid., 5.

[Great Britain] will value no less highly than Mary Beale's own works the record which her husband...created of a particularly attractive and serious artistic circle..."[54]

A carefully researched history of the period by Margaret Toynbee serves as the backdrop for the biographical information on Mrs. Beale and her husband presented by Jeffree and Walsh. In this short section of the catalogue the agenda of the authors is made most plain. Mrs. Beale emerges as the 'breadwinner' of the family, supporting herself, her husband and two children almost entirely through her work as a portraitist.

The 1975 catalogue is devoted to presenting objects which clearly establish a familial and social context for Mary Beale. The paintings and drawings of her son, her student Sarah Curtis and several of her friends, and the journals of her husband are presented side by side with her paintings, forcing each item to help support the others. Only thirty-nine of the 102 itemized objects of the exhibition were the product of *Mary's* working life. This implies in the most subtle way that the works of Mrs. Beale are best presented in such a context, and suggests there is somehow less value in examining them independently.

The exhibition and catalogue of 1975 had a significant impact on the other two exhibitions mounted in honour of Mary Beale in the late twentieth century, in large part due to the thoroughness of its presentation of the domestic and social circumstances of Mary's life within the framework of her family.

The exhibition at the Manor House Museum in Bury St. Edmonds, Suffolk, entitled "Mrs. Mary Beale, Paintress" was produced in 1994, to celebrate a significant bequest of 14 paintings by Mary Beale and two by her son Charles. The newly- acquired

---

[54] Ibid., 5.

paintings are discussed, and the biographical text is notably similar to that of the catalogue of 1975. Although the journals are used to a lesser extent in this small catalogue, Mary's husband Charles figures significantly in the discussion of her career, to the point that his own biography is significantly developed.

Tabitha Barber's catalogue for an exhibition on Mary Beale in 1999/2000 focuses on issues of biography and social and familial context, as well as the production of Mary's paintings and the role of her husband in this process. Even in this most recent source on Mary Beale, Charles Beale occupies an extremely significant role. Barber devotes as much time to developing an account of Charles's life as she does to Mary's. One of the catalogue's three essays is devoted to establishing Charles' role in the studio, based upon a detailed study a never-before-studied treatise written by Charles. This catalogue will be discussed in greater detail in chapter four of this thesis.

The journals of Charles Beale have been interpreted and used to a significant extent in both the first and the most recent catalogues produced on Mary Beale. The journals are used to show Charles Beale as a kind of manager of the business of his wife's studio. Barber as well as Walsh and Jeffree clearly identify him as a spendthrift who may have had the best of intentions, but nonetheless squandered family resources by indulging in his own interests—the latter go so far as to call him a "compulsive spender".[55] Walsh and Jeffree suggest he was a supportive but rather secondary part of the business, almost there by default when his post as a clerk of the patents dissolved.[56] Barber suggests Charles Beale was a very active and integral part of the studio business of his wife. Regardless of how he is characterized, where he might have served as a

complementary background figure, he is in both cases wrenched into the foreground, because of his Journals and the value placed upon the information they contain.

The two earliest extant references to Mary Beale, in William Sanderson's Graphice of 1658 and Bainbrigg Buckeridge's "Essay Towards an English School of Painting" of 1706, make little or no reference to Charles Beale. His presence in his wife's biography was apparently thought not to be necessary. The first reference to Charles in relation to Mary's life and work is found in George Vertue's Notebooks, compiled between 1712 and 1756—here, he is introduced. The second reference to Charles appears in a source produced on the back of Vertue's labours, Walpole's Anecdotes of Painting in England, produced in five volumes between 1762 and 1780.

Of the sources produced on Mary Beale since the time of Vertue and Walpole, only two have followed the example of Sanderson and Buckeridge.[57] Many others end up reproducing the knowledge dictated by Walpole, and continued to restrict references to Mary to domestic circumstances.[58] Even those sources which attempt in some way to cover new ground, revert to the structure introduced by Vertue and enabled by Walpole.

This thesis seeks to analyze the phenomenon of the biographical constructions of Mary Beale up to and including this most recent exhibition of the year 2000. The choices made as writers and editors of art history reveal much about the development of subsequent treatments of Mary Beale. Though both Vertue and Walpole were subject to different motivations, both men chose to devote considerable attention to the Journals of

---

[55] Walsh and Jeffree, 'The Excellent Mrs. Mary Beale", 14.
[56] Ibid., 14.
[57] Walter Shaw Sparrow, Women Painters of the World (London 1905) 57-8. See also: Richard Wendorf, The Elements of Life, (Oxford 1990) 65-7.
[58] See Ellis K. Waterhouse, Elsa Honig Fine and Nancy Heller, as referenced in bibliography.

Mary's husband Charles, and the ramifications of this can be found even in the most recent references to Mary Beale.

There are two things at work in this thesis: the consistent, uncritical use of Vertue and Walpole [because of assumptions made about their respective texts], and the effects of this as evidenced in the case study of Mary Beale [and the near-constant presence of Charles]. It is hoped that by examining the development of Mary's biography it will become clear that it is not only important to recover the personalities of the past, but to recover the pattern of authorial choice. No biography is entirely objective; aspects of choice and selection are exercised by writers of any age, and this is something that must always be kept in mind. Choices made by earlier writers can determine in what manner, and even to what extent, the biographical subject will be treated in subsequent studies, and it will be shown that the case of Mary Beale reflects this.

Chapter Two: "*...the remarkables of their lives...*"[1]

George Vertue has been discussed in very few publications, although his notebooks constitute a resource frequently used by historians of British art and artists of the sixteenth, seventeenth and early to mid eighteenth centuries. Ilaria Bignamini's study of 1988 remains the most extensive account of his life and career, though it was only intended by its author to serve as a basis for further investigation into Vertue's life and work.[2] Bignamini deals primarily with the facts of Vertue's biography as they are laid out in early drafts of his autobiography, and his connections with early Academies and associations of artists in eighteenth-century London. Her article is a call for further investigation into other areas, primarily the extensive body of written work he produced. No one has as yet taken up the cause.

George Vertue was born in 1683, to parents he characterizes as "rather honest than opulent".[3] His apparently moderate circumstances were sufficient to allow him to enter an apprenticeship after he had received some education. An early, failed apprenticeship to a master silver engraver whose extravagant tastes led to insolvency and an untimely return to France, was followed by another more successful apprenticeship with another master.[4] His training suggested a career for Vertue based around adding decorative motives and flourishes to silver objects. However, by adapting his skills from the medium of silver to copper, Vertue was able to move into other areas of art production. He came to enjoy success in his lifetime primarily as a pictorial engraver. In

---

[1] Vertue "NoteBook 1", 3.
[2] Ilaria Bignamini, "George Vertue, Art Historian", Walpole Society, 54, 1988, 2-16.
[3] Vertue "NoteBook 1", 15.
[4] Ibid., 1.

addition to rendering images of famous portraits and monuments into prints,[5] Vertue was also involved in a number of literary projects for which he designed and executed both frontispieces and illustrations for a wide variety of texts.[6]

Vertue enjoyed the patronage and friendship of many affluent persons, including the Earl of Winchelsea (who obtained Vertue's services for the Society of Antiquaries),[7] Sir Robert Walpole,[8] and Frederick, Prince of Wales.[9] Vertue's patrons and acquaintances afforded him many opportunities to visit the great monuments and houses of the English countryside, where he examined collections of paintings, prints and curiosities. Such visits provided Vertue with the means to gather information for a project which was of great interest to him.

In addition to Vertue's primary employment as a skilled and successful engraver, he had a considerable interest in the historical development of the visual arts in England. This seems to have developed in tandem with his career as a practising artist, as he met with, worked for, and befriended other artists and patrons, and had access to various collectors and their collections.[10] Vertue devoted a great deal of time to making notes on anything of interest to him on the matters of art production and collecting in England, using anecdotal and biographical information on artists, patrons and collectors which he obtained from a variety of sources. These sources included conversations with living artists and studio assistants who had worked with artists of his own time or of the

---

[5] Walpole Society, Introduction to Index of Vertue Note Books, 1940-2, 29, xi.
[6] Stuart Piggot, "Antiquaries" Sale Catalogues of Libraries of Eminent Persons (London 1974) 10, 404.
[7] Stuart Piggot, "Antiquaries", 404.
[8] Horace Walpole, Anecdotes of Painting in England, (London, 1888) 3, 271.
[9] Vertue, "NoteBook 1", 8.
[10] Ilaria Bignamini, "George Vertue, Art Historian" Walpole Society LIV, 1988, 2-15.

previous century,[11] first-hand observations of paintings and engravings in private collections, published books on technical aspects of art production, and artist's biographies.

The information in the notebooks is presented in a seemingly haphazard fashion. A great variety of subjects and topics are discussed, often in a manner which lacked visible, identifiable order of any kind. Vertue used his own system of shorthand to record his findings, and followed no particular rules of punctuation, which resulted in a large and often complicated body of work. Over the course of forty-four years, Vertue compiled approximately thirty-nine notebooks, that were not intended by their author to be published before he had organized and assembled the information he had collected into what he conceived of as the final product. Vertue indicated in preliminary drafts of his autobiography, that he aspired to publish in print the *Musaeum pictoris Anglicanum,* or the History of the Art of Painting and Sculpture in England.[12] He died in 1757, without achieving his goal.

The notebooks, purchased from Vertue's widow in 1758 by Horace Walpole to be used as the source of his own Anecdotes of Painting in England, remained in the collection of Walpole's estate at his home, Strawberry Hill, until 1842. Thirty-eight separate folios, quartos and octavos by Vertue were purchased at that date by a Mr. Rodd, for 26 pounds. Rodd sold the volumes in turn to Thomas Thorpe, a bookseller of Piccadilly, who catalogued descriptions of the contents of Vertue's notebooks in 1842 and 1843. Thorpe's stock catalogue of 1848 indicates that several volumes had been

---

[11] Lionel Cust "George Vertue's Note-Books and Manuscripts relating to the History of Art in England," Walpole Society 1913-14, 3, 125.
[12] Vertue "NoteBook 1", 6.

sold, for he lists only thirty-one notebooks at that time. These thirty-one notebooks passed into the collection of Dawson Turner, who, along with his daughter, made summary notes additional to those of Thorpe. In 1859, all thirty-one volumes were purchased by British Museum, which had already acquired three other notebooks of those which had been sold by Thorpe.[13] They remain in the collection of the British Library.

Many art historians are familiar with the notebooks of George Vertue, through the editing and publication project undertaken by the Walpole Society in the first half of the twentieth century. In an article of 1913, Sir Lionel Cust charged the Walpole Society with this task, as he believed that facsimiles of the notebooks would make the wealth of information Vertue compiled available to students and scholars in the field of British art history.[14] By the late 1920's and early '30's, the project to print the manuscripts, "...to follow the form of the original (manuscripts) as far as possible and at the same time to make a generally readable text", had begun.[15]

Initially, the project attempted to reproduce the notebooks in a roughly chronological order, also allowing for a decision made at the time, that "not all [of the notebooks] were of equal importance".[16] With limited funds available in the early years of the project's inception, a necessary prioritization was applied to the selection of information to be published. It was decided that "the books containing notes on artists and private collections were of prime importance; and that the publication of these alone was the first necessity".[17]

---

[13] Ibid., xv.
[14] Lionel Cust, "George Vertue's Note-Books..." 121-8.
[15] Vertue "NoteBook 1" Introduction, ix.
[16] Ibid., ix.
[17] Ibid., ix-x.

Cust believed that, through examining the notebooks of George Vertue, the enormity of *Walpole's* achievement in the Anecdotes of Painting in England might be better understood and appreciated. Not only could the notebooks be used to trace the transition of information from Vertue to Walpole, but the notebooks could also be examined for the countless fragments of biography and anecdote neglected by Walpole in the Anecdotes.[18] The Walpole Society reproductions of Vertue's notebooks challenge the fact that Vertue never intended the notebooks to be published in the format they were left in at the time of his death, but nonetheless provide students and scholars with the opportunity to access the information they contain.

Vertue's autobiography exists in the form of two drafts, written in 1741. These drafts outline much of Vertue's life and work, as well as his desire to publish his *Musaeum pictoris Anglicanum*. Nowhere in Vertue's own writings does he indicate in what capacity his own autobiography might have functioned within the final project that he envisioned, but it is significant to note that these drafts are reproduced out of chronological sequence, at the beginning of the first volume of the Walpole Society edition of the notebooks.

By making the autobiography available at the beginning of the first volume of reproductions of the notebooks, the information it contains serves the same purpose as an Introduction from the author. It equips the reader with a kind of "mission statement" that may be applied more broadly to the body of information contained within the Notebooks, as it clearly states Vertue's impetus for the entirety of the project—the insufficiencies of

[18] Cust "George Vertue...", 123.

the documentation of art in Great Britain. It is in his autobiography that Vertue laments the "slow advances" of art, artists, and art literature in England.[19]

An obvious and logical extension of this is that Vertue's information is intended to rectify the problem he perceives. The first draft of the autobiography begins as follows:

> It has been customary in many ages to Observe the rise of Arts and Sciences, their degrees of perfection, how cultivated and how nourished in most parts of the polite World, also it has been the amusement or pleasure of the Curious to hand down to posterity some account of the most remarkable workes and the names of the professors of Art, how and in what manner distinguishable or excellent, as they were in the most Ancient times in Greece and Rome especially—and in Italy each branch of Science have had their writers, upon each Subject which are very copious and entertaining either on Painting Sculpture or Buildings of all kinds. This Nation being not so neare the central warmth of Arts. has been slower in the progress…[20]

Within the context of the autobiography, these observations on the production of art and art literature specifically serve to preface Vertue's perception that engravers and engraving are the most neglected in art literature of any kind. But in restructuring the order of Vertue's writings and placing these remarks at the beginning of the notebooks, justification is provided for all of the information that follows.

In the drafts of the autobiography, Vertue provides insight into the many opportunities that his work as an artist and antiquarian provided him, including his early associations with one of the first art academies in London, the Academy at Great Queen Street, established in 1711, and the many technical skills he acquired and friends he met

---

[19] Vertue "NoteBook 1", 15.
[20] Ibid., 15

there.[21] He makes note of many visits and tours to various important private collections in London and surrounding areas.[22] Of particular interest in terms of the larger project of the manuscript notebooks and the kind of information Vertue was interested in compiling, is a passage which occurs early in the first draft of the autobiography. Vertue explains it is his goal to discover and compile information

> ...relating to the Eminent Artists of all kinds relating to painting Sculpture &c in England that had been of any note in their workes for two hundred years past, the remarkables of their lives, time of their deaths &c... has been a work of great labour time and study, carry'd on successively near 30 years....[23]

As the autobiography was drafted in 1741, it does not account for Vertue's activities after that date. Vertue continued to amass a great variety of kinds of information from a wide array of sources until his death fifteen years later, in 1756.

References to Mary Beale in the Notebooks

Throughout Vertue's many Notebooks, the life and work of Mary Beale is referred to several times, in varying capacities. He addresses such issues as her popularity as an artist, her social and artistic proximity to a contemporary painter, Sir Peter Lely, and the biographical facts of her life as he understood them from his various sources.

The references to Mary Beale are widely dispersed in Vertue's writings, sprinkled throughout the broad span of time that his project encompassed. The earliest mention of Mary by Vertue has been located in a notebook dated tentatively by the present author to

---

[21] Acquaintances made within Academy circles include Sir Godfrey Kneller, Michael Dahl and Jonathan Richardson. Vertue 1, 2-3.
[22] Vertue "NoteBook 1" 3 and 17.
[23] Ibid., 2-3.

the year 1718.[24] The last reference appears in a notebook that is dated by the present author to the year 1742.[25] [See Appendix A for a chronological transcription of all references to Mary Beale].

The information Vertue obtained relating to Mary Beale may be grouped into three different categories: that for which the source is now unknown, that which was obtained by Vertue first-hand, either through conversation or visits to collections, and that which Vertue transcribed from written sources, both published and unpublished. The most significant[26] of these remarks will be discussed according to these categories.

Vertue's earliest reference to Mary Beale is brief, but illustrates that her work as an artist was of interest to him. According to Vertue's own records of his notebooks, the volume in which this first reference occurred dates from 1713 to 1721. Closer observation suggests that the remark was recorded around 1718. It is noted in Vertue's particular form of shorthand, that "Mrs. Mary Beal her picture in posses. of Dr. J. Harris F.R.S."[27] The specific source of the information is not provided by Vertue, but based on like opportunities described in Vertue's autobiography, it is possible that he had access to the collection of Dr. Harris at some point and observed the painting.

In another instance where the source of Vertue's information on Mary Beale cannot be firmly established, Vertue noted that his acquaintance, a Mr. Raynard, acquired a "fine original picture of Mrs. Beale" by Sir Peter Lely.[28] This leads to a brief

---

[24] The notebook in which this reference may be found was grouped by Vertue with others dating from between 1713 and 1721. Other information in the same notebook, though unrelated to Mary Beale, is firmly dated to the year 1718. Vertue "NoteBook 1", xvi, xvii and 54. Add. 21111, V.64, B.M. 37b.
[25] Vertue 1, xvi and 5, 14-15. Add. 23072, V. 90, B.M. 11b.
[26] There are several occasions throughout the notebooks where Mary Beale's name in mentioned in index lists of artists—it is not necessary to address this for the purposes of this thesis.
[27] Vertue "NoteBook 1", 54. Add. 21111, V. 64, B.M. 37b.
[28] Ibid., 108.

discussion on the possibility that Mary studied with Lely as a young unmarried woman. Vertue does not note who the source of this information might be, stating simply that "she was a great favourite of his [i.e. Lely's]. tis said that he first put his pencil in her hand. before she was married"[29], suggesting that the idea was generally accepted in Vertue's own time. This is the only reference to Mary addressed in this thesis where a specific source cannot be identified, although it is possible the source was Mr. Raynard himself. The remark is located in a notebook which dates from 1721-5.[30]

The first reference to Mary Beale where a verbal source can be firmly identified follows a short discussion of a "tollerable" portrait by Mary's son, Charles. In a notebook dating from 1731-36,[31] Vertue introduces a brief biographical discussion of Mary's son after his mother is identified. Vertue states that "Mrs. Mary Beal painted in oil very well. she dyd. 1697", before addressing the debt-riddled circumstances of the last years of her son's life. This suggests Vertue's opinion that the fame of the mother was more significant than that of the son, and that a reference to her would help to identify Charles Beale, Jr. by association. Of particular interest to Vertue was the fact that the man with whom Charles Jr. lodged, a banker by the name of Wilson, was left several of the family paintings at Charles' death, including a portrait of Mary Beale and her husband by Sir Peter Lely.[32] Vertue lists as his source for the information one Carter, a "colour man", or purveyor of paints and pigments, well known to the Beale family.

Another more lengthy discussion of Mary Beale which stems from Vertue's acquaintance with Mr. Carter may be dated to around 1742. It covers a wide range of

---

[29] Vertue "NoteBook 1", 108.
[30] Ibid., 108. Add. 23069, V. 16, B.M. 21.
[31] Ibid., xix and 4, 64-5. Add. 23071, V. 90, B.M. 54b.

information about Mary Beale, though this is expressed largely through references to members of her household. Accounts of the respective careers and deaths of Mary's two sons, Charles and Bartholomew, and her husband Charles are given. Aspects of her studio practice, such as Mary's student, Sarah Curtis are also mentioned.[33] Vertue then provides some context for the source of this information, Carter,

> ... whose father and himself were intimate in the Beals family and had from them at their deaths... most of ye papers and books etc, amongst them was Beales account books, and those particular book or almanack interleaved. of which I have extracts from seven.[34]

This reference not only clearly identifies Carter as a source of oral accounts of life in the Beale household, it also identifies the journals of Charles Beale and begins to suggest their value. The journals, as they relate to Vertue's Notebooks, will be discussed shortly.

A third reference to Mary may be traced to Carter, and this may be the last reference regarding Mary to be recorded by Vertue in his notebooks.[35] Dating from around 1743, this passage refers back to the one cited previously, indicating that Carter had drawn up an account of the basic facts of Mary Beale's life and that of her family, and also that he had in his possession several paintings produced by Mary and her son Charles, as well as "papers." Also mentioned are the poems written in praise of Mary and her artistic skills by Samuel Woodforde, incorrectly called "Dr. Woodfall" by Vertue.[36]

In spite of the fact that Carter's account of Mary Beale is not known to survive, it is nonetheless important to note that, during her own lifetime, a substantial biographical

---

[32] Vertue "NoteBook 4", 65.
[33] Vertue "NoteBook 5", 14-15. Add. 23073, V. 6b, B.M. 11b.
[34] Ibid., 15.
[35] Vertue "NoteBook 1", xix and 5, 20. Add. 23073, V.11, B.M. 16.
[36] Vertue "NoteBook 5", 20.

account of her was attempted. This suggests that Mary had a reputation as an artist during her own lifetime.

The information that Vertue gleaned from Carter predictably includes references to the members of her family and the circle that surrounded her studio practice—Carter's involvement was with the Beale family unit and not Mary exclusively. But it is noteworthy that, in his accounts of Carter's information when Vertue makes reference to Mary's sons and husband, he constantly restates their proximity to *her*: it as though Vertue doubts the ability of an eventual, prospective reader of the *finished* source to recognize them if their relationship to Mary as a professional artist is not identified. The oral accounts add an important dimension to Vertue's many references to Mary Beale.

In the introduction to the drafts of his autobiography, Vertue indicates that he was aware of much of the literature on art produced prior to and during his own lifetime. While recounting the efforts he has made to compile information on art in England, Vertue states about himself that "...he had read allmost all foreign authors that have writt on painting Sculpture etc. as well ancient as modern, in the Several original languages—all Manuscripts and English remarks on them, taking extracts..."[37]. This practice of "taking extracts" is particularly significant. Vertue indicates that, in addition to simply reading all manner of written material addressing issues of artists, art production and collecting, he transferred those parts which he found to be particularly significant into his own manuscript notebooks.

Records of the sale of Vertue's library after his death indicate that, over the course of his lifetime, he amassed a small but significant collection of books and treatises

on the theory and practice of art in several media, including painting, sculpture and engraving. The several volumes by French, Dutch and Italian authors are worth noting, including editions of texts by Felibien, Mignard, van Mander, Houbraken, Vasari and Baglione. Sources by English authors on the visual arts were also represented in his library, including works by William Aglionby, Jonathan Richardson and Horace Walpole.[38] However, Vertue did not restrict himself to published works—letters, diaries and other informal works were also of great interest.

The earliest instance of Vertue recording a reference to Mary from a published source dates from 1720-1, and it provides information on her life and her career as a professional artist.[39] Vertue transcribed the biographical sketch of Mary found in Bainbrigg Buckeridge's "Essay Towards an English School" of 1706.[40] The reference deals not only with aspects of her biography, including parentage and social status, but also addresses her social circle and the high rank of persons sitting to her for their portraits, the popularity of her work and its apparent high quality. Lely's high opinion of her work, and the special privileges she had in borrowing works from his substantial collection are also noted. Vertue exacts one small change on the information provided by Buckeridge, pertaining to the date of Mary Beale's death. While Buckeridge states that "...she died at her house in the Pall-Mall about six years ago, being 65 years old...",[41] Vertue tries to render the date more specific by stating that Mary "...died in her

---

[37] Vertue "NoteBook 1", 2-3.
[38] Piggot, "Antiquaries", 407-12. To be distinguished from Walpole's Anecdotes, which were not published until after Vertue's death—it was Walpole's catalogue of his father's art collection at Houghton, the *Aedes Walpolianae* published in 1743, which Vertue had in his library.
[39] Vertue "NoteBook 1", xviii. See also "NoteBook 2", 134. Add. 23075, V.61, B.M. 45.
[40] Buckeridge, "An Essay... " 357-8.
[41] Ibid., 358.

house in the Pall-Mall 1698 being 65 years old...".[42] Vertue's attempt to specify the date of Mary's death was incorrect, but is nonetheless important, as it is indicative of the aims he laid out for his project.

Another reference taken by Vertue from a published source is the brief mention of Mary Beale found in William Sanderson's Graphice: The Use of Pen and Pensil. or, The most excellent art of Painting. As was noted in chapter one of this thesis, Vertue transcribed Sanderson's passage into a notebook of 1731-6, amending the accidental reference to "Mr. Beale", where "Mrs. Beale" was clearly intended.[43]

Vertue's interest in unpublished works as source material is evident in the final reference to Mary Beale to be addressed in this chapter. As was noted within the context of his encounters with Carter the colour man, Vertue had access to extracts from seven of the journals of Mary's husband, Charles Beale. These extracts were transcribed into several notebooks of 1736-41.[44] Before he began to record the information, Vertue explains how he gained access to Charles' journals. An acquaintance bought seven of them at a book stall, and, aware of Vertue's interest in the "remarkables" of artists lives, lent him the books to copy.[45]

Vertue describes Charles' diligent recordings as follows:

> ...he daily writ many affairs of business and family accounts— &etc. but the most remarkableis the daily imployments of his ingenious wife Mrs. Beale concerning her painting and drawing from the life. or from famous paintings. he every day minutely mentions what she was imployed in and what parts a picture she

---

[42] Vertue "NoteBook 2", 134.
[43] Vertue "NoteBook 1", xix and 4, 31. Add. 23071, V. 42, B.M. 29b.
[44] Vertue "NoteBook 4", 168-171, 172-176. Add. 23072, V. 98, B.M.56; V.99, B.M.56b; V.100, B.M.57; V.101, B.M.57b; V.103, B.M.58b; V.104, B.M.59; V.105, B.M. 59b; V.106, B.M.60; V.107, B.M. 60b.
[45] Ibid., 168.

did daily…[46]

In the journals, Charles Beale detailed a wide range of activities and experiences, including the cost of buying and selling paints and pigments, the yearly income that the sale of Mary's paintings brought to the family, social and professional visits made to the studios of other artists, and progress reports on portraits or studies in which Mary was engaged. The couple's small but notable art collection (which included works by Van Dyck and Rubens), and their library are also briefly discussed by Charles in his Journals.

Vertue thoroughly engaged himself in the Journals—not only did he reproduce extracts from the Journals in his own notebooks, but he interjected his own thoughts into the record of their otherwise firsthand information. At various points in the transcription, it is exceedingly difficult to distinguish whose voice is being asserted, that of George Vertue or that of Charles Beale.

It is clear that the journals were greatly valued by Vertue. While it was common for Vertue to transcribe the writings of other men, it was much less common for him to identify so clearly the sources from which he copied. As both a practising artist as well as a writer and compiler of art history, Vertue was interested in many aspects of Mary Beale's life. Rather than simply paraphrase the information contained in the Journals of Charles Beale, the decision was made to meticulously copy extracts and to mingle his authorial voice with that of Charles Beale.

The journals reveal Charles' interest in the cost and production of paints and pigments, the value and appearance of frames, and an assessment of the style and quality of the paintings produced by Sir Peter Lely late in his career. Charles notes the deaths of

---

[46] Vertue "NoteBook 4", 168.

several painters and limners, including John Greenhill and Samuel Cooper. In a journal of 1676, Charles even declares his intention to translate into English the lives of several Italian painters from a volume of artist's biographies. Clearly Vertue recognized the value of the journals regarding the professional life of Mary Beale (and in some cases, Lely), but the journals also appealed to his own appreciation of incident and detail and the compulsion to record it, and this helped to determine his thorough treatment of them. I believe that Vertue found the journals of Charles Beale doubly compelling on levels both professional and personal.

Firstly, and most significantly, although it is never acknowledged or even suggested in the limited literature available on Mary Beale, I believe that Vertue's status as a practising artist informed his decision to reproduce the Beale Journals. Charles makes several references to the details of both Mary's and Sir Peter Lely's artistic practices, such as the "dead colouring" of pictures, and the number of times a patron had to "sit" for a portrait—these are the kinds of details that would likely have appealed to the artist in Vertue. The sheer variety of references that Vertue made to Mary Beale throughout the course of his lengthy project in the notebooks also supports this idea—the appearance of Mary's work, the persons who owned her paintings, as well as aspects of her biography were all relevant to Vertue's purpose in compiling information for his never-realized *Musaeum pictoris Anglicanum.* The journal extracts, which contain information relevent to each of these areas of interest, would have held great appeal for Vertue.

Secondly, I think that it may reasonably be argued that Vertue's choice regarding the Beale journals was based in part on a personal association Vertue felt with Charles

Beale. In addition to his proximity to the artist in question, Mary, Charles was a man who, like Vertue, appears to have been driven to record all manner of information, technical, professional and personal.

Though it cannot be fully determined in what way Vertue might have used the journal extracts had he lived to organize and publish his project—it is unlikely they would have remained the nearly fully intact, block of information in which they are presented in the notebooks. That is, they would have served as one of Vertue's primary sources for his study, the *Museum pictoris Anglicanum*, and this was the purpose for the full transcription of so many of the journal extracts.

Vertue's decision to reproduce extracts of the journals yields an interesting and likely unintended result. Charles' discussion of his wife, and many aspects of their life together, allows an account of *his* life to be at least partially constructed. As only two of the journals now survive,[47] it is largely through Vertue's decisions to copy the journals, that Mary's husband begins to emerge as a historical figure. Though Vertue did not take the opportunity to do so, the groundwork for later developments of Charles Beale's biography is clearly established, and the potential for accounts of his life to develop within studies ostensibly devoted to her is enabled.

[47] One journal is located in the archives of the National Portrait Gallery (MS. 9535); the other is located in the Bodleian Library at Oxford (MS. 80 Rawl. 572).

Chapter Three: "...*our charming and opinionated cicerone*..."[1]

Different bases of knowledge and experience inform the respective writings of Vertue and Walpole. Just as Vertue's status as a practising artist influenced decisions regarding the information he chose to record in his notebooks, I believe that Walpole's status helped to determine his choices. In order to better understand the particular circumstances which I believe conspired to enable Walpole to produce the Anecdotes of Painting in England, it is necessary to introduce, however briefly, some account of the facts of his life.

Horace Walpole was born in 1717, the youngest son of England's first Prime Minister, Sir Robert Walpole. His youth included, among other things, four years at Cambridge and a rather eventful Grand Tour.[2] In the late 1740's, Horace purchased a villa at Twickenham, which he remodeled over the course of twenty years to suit his gothic tastes, and christened Strawberry Hill. There he established a private printing press, where he brought out "books and ephemera" until 1789. His Anecdotes, just one of several literary endeavors, were published in five volumes between 1762 and 1780. In 1791 he succeeded his nephew and became the fourth Earl of Orford. He died at the age of eighty in 1797.[3]

Evidence suggests that Horace Walpole was familiar with Vertue and his projects prior to the death of the latter in June of 1756. It is likely that they met through the Society of Antiquaries, of which Walpole became a member in April of 1753. It will be remembered from the previous chapter that Vertue was the official engraver to the

---

[1] Lipking, Ordering the Arts..., 132.
[2] R.W. Ketton-Cremer, Horace Walpole, (London, 1946) 38-77.

Society, due to his professional and personal affiliation with Heneage Finch, fifth Earl of Winchelsea. In fact, Vertue is listed among four others as Walpole's sponsor in the election of his fellowship.[4]

At the official sale of Vertue's library and papers in March of 1757 at Mr. Ford's Great Room, St. James's, Haymarket, Walpole purchased three manuscripts by Vertue. These manuscripts catalogued the extensive art collections of King Charles I, King James II, the Duke of Buckingham, Queen Caroline, Sir Peter Paul Rubens and Sir Peter Lely, as "part of a programme of publications undertaken by Vertue under the patronage of Fredrick, Prince of Wales, between 1749 and the beginning of 1751."[5] Walpole edited and published these catalogues at the press at Strawberry Hill in 1757-8.

In 1758, Walpole purchased all of the manuscript notebooks that had not been included in the first sale—those which Vertue had intended for his *Museum pictoris Anglicanum*—from Vertue's widow.[6] From the moment of acquisition, Walpole began the processes of organizing and of whittling down the great stores of information which had taken forty years of Vertue's life to compile, and re-shaping that information into his own Anecdotes of Painting in England. This is revealed not only through the relatively short period of time it took him to produce the Anecdotes,[7] but also in many of Walpole's letters.

---

[3] W.S. Lewis, 'Introductory biographical sketch' The Castle of Otranto (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996) xxxvii.
[4] W.S. Lewis, ed. "Walpole's short notes of his life", Yale Correspondence 13-14, 28 ff. 188.
[5] Bignamini, "George Vertue...", 13.
[6] Letter to Henry Zouch, January 12 1759, Yale Correspondence 16, 26.
[7] In the letter to Zouch of March 1762, Walpole reveals that the first volume of the Anecdotes was completed in only four months. Ibid., 51.

A careful reading of Walpole's personal correspondence in the early to mid 1760's reveals much about his intentions for Vertue's manuscript Notebooks. Fluctuations between self deprecation in favour of Vertue's industry and assertions of Walpole's own goal for the project that would become the Anecdotes create rhythmic ripples in the body of letters to friends and acquaintances—Walpole regularly moves back and forth between the two. In a letter of January of 1759 to his antiquarian friend Dr. Henry Zouch, Walpole wrote of his intentions to edit and adjust Vertue's project. He explains that he:

> bought of Vertue's widow 40 volumes of his MS collections relating to English painters, sculptors, gravers and architects. He had actually begun their lives. Unluckily he had not got far and could not write grammar. I propose to digest and complete this work.[8]

As evidenced by this letter, as early as 1759, Walpole's intentions to edit and adjust Vertue's project emerge. It does seem at this point in the process of preparing to produce the Anecdotes that Walpole suggests he is merely bringing the information in Vertue's manuscripts to its natural and logical conclusion—he gives the impression that he plans only to complete what was begun by Vertue.

In a letter of April 1761 to another friend, Walpole indicates that he has begun the process of "completing" Vertue's efforts. He writes to Sir David Dalrymple:

> Next winter I hope to be able to send you Vertue's history of the arts, as I have put it together from his collections. Two volumes are finished, the first almost printed, and the third, begun. You will be surprised, Sir, how the industry of one man could at this late period amass so near a complete history of our artists. I have no share in it but ranging his materials.[9]

---

[8] Letter to Zouch 16, 26.
[9] Letter to Sir David Dalrymple, Yale Correspondence 15, 72.

The humble conceit employed by Walpole in this letter when he suggests that he is only organizing and arranging Vertue's material occupies a prominent role not only in many of his letters, but also in his Preface to the completed volumes of the Anecdotes. It has been observed that this is a tool employed by Walpole for the express purpose of distancing between Walpole and the labours of another.[10] In the letter to Dalrymple cited above, Walpole refers to the work as *Vertue's* history. However, less than a month divides the above-cited letter to Dalrymple and one to his friend Montagu, which expresses a different sentiment entirely; here Walpole seems no longer content to bow to the industry of Vertue and begins to claim the project for his own.

He recounts to George Montagu an encounter with the artist and engraver William Hogarth, who was contemplating the production of a sort of history of the arts in England at the same time in which Walpole was embarking on the Anecdotes. [See Appendix B for full a transcription]. Though Walpole gives the impression that Hogarth was the more agitated during the exchange, each man seems to have been concerned that the other's work would infringe on the essential nature and content of his own. In spite of Walpole's carefully presented dialogue, Walpole appears to become quite defensive of his project and his right to develop it from Vertue's manuscripts—and he puts the question to Hogarth: "Do you think nobody understands painting but painters?"[11] In the course of the discussion, Walpole reveals his intentions for the Anecdotes. For the sake of brevity in the letter, Walpole recounts the dialogue using the initials "H" for Hogarth and "W" for Walpole:

---

[10] Lawrence Lipking, The Ordering of the Arts..., 130.
[11] Letter to George Montagu, Yale Correspondence 9, 365.

> **H** I am told you are going to entertain the town with something in our way. **W** Not very soon, Mr. Hogarth. **H** I wish you would let me have it, to correct; I should be sorry to have you expose yourself to censure. We painters must know more of those things than other people…I have generally found that persons who had studied painting least were the best judges of it… **W** My work will go no lower than the year 1700… **H** I wish you would let me correct it—besides, I am writing something of the same kind myself, I should be sorry we should clash. **W** I believe it is not much known what my work is; very few persons have seen it. **H** Why, it is a critical history of painting, is it not? **W** No, it is an anti-quarian history of it in England; I bought Mr. Vertue's MSS, and I believe the work will not give much offence. Besides, if it does, I cannot help it: when I publish anything, I give it to the world to think of it as they please.[12]

Walpole's account of this incident reveals some important information. For instance, an element of defensiveness on the part of Walpole may be observed. In the recounting of this exchange with Hogarth, Walpole seems to be clearly aware of his own status as a collector and connoisseur, and not as a practising artist. It is to be expected that, in the course of this exchange, Walpole would acknowledge Vertue as the source of much of his information, as Hogarth had been acquainted with Vertue,[13] and may have known of his intended project and the manuscripts. Yet although Walpole acknowledges Vertue's manuscripts as the source of his project, it can be observed from this letter that Vertue's aims for that project are beginning to be subverted.

In spite of the cultured and cultivated dialogue which Walpole presents to Montagu, Walpole's defensiveness with Hogarth results in the revelation of things he

---

[12] Ibid., 366. Hogarth's "Apology for Painters" was not published during the course of his lifetime. It first appeared in print courtesy of Michael Kitson's "Hogarth's 'Apology for Painters'" Walpole Society XLI (1968) 46-111.

[13] Vertue's work as an engraver of illustrations appeared in several books alongside that of Hogarth. Also, Vertue signed the petition for the Engraver's Copyright Act, the movement towards which was spearheaded by Hogarth. Bignamini, "George Vertue…", 5.

hasn't stated so explicitly before: that the work would focus on art and artists up to the year 1700, and that it would be an antiquarian history. At once Walpole seems to be claiming the project as something that is new and entirely his own, as well as falling back on what he perceives to be Vertue's credibility as a practising artist.

By accident or design, Walpole misrepresented the nature of the Anecdotes to Hogarth. The project did not focus exclusively on artists working up to 1700—roughly a third of the Anecdotes is devoted to contemporary artists that Walpole and his father had collected and patronized. It also did not end up as the antiquarian project that Walpole suggested to Hogarth. Walpole implied that the Anecdotes would be developed in accordance with Vertue's own intentions, but instead they focused quite specifically on connoisseurship and social aspects of painting and collecting. Much of Vertue's varied information, compiled in the spirit of true antiquarianism, fell by the wayside in Walpole's final project. Walpole adjusted the nature of the project to suit his own interests and experiences.

Walpole seems to anticipate in Hogarth the feeling that he is not the right man to compose a history of painting in England, critical or otherwise. He introduces the fact that he purchased Vertue's notebooks almost in his own defense, after Hogarth has expressed that he was under the impression that Walpole's history of painting would be a critical one. It is one thing entirely when Walpole is writing to his antiquarian friends about the project of the Anecdotes—there he emphasised Vertue's labours, and minimizes his own role to that of editor and arranger. But Hogarth represents a different animal entirely, the practising artist, and the dialogue which Walpole recounts to his friend Montagu reflects this.

In a letter of 1764 to Arthur Onslow, Walpole finally acknowledges a more active role in the production of the Anecdotes, which will enable him to pursue his own aims entirely. Though Onslow's preceding letter to Walpole no longer survives, it can be deduced from Walpole's response that Onslow had inquired about the absence of certain artists from the initial volumes of the Anecdotes. Walpole responds as follows:

> All I can do, both to pay the debt of the arts and my own, is, to improve my next edition by your communications—at the same time I must do justice to Vertue, by taking from him to myself the many of the faults, at least, omissions that you blame. My fear of making so trifling and uninteresting a work too prolix, prevailed upon me to omit many stories that he had collected, especially on the less shining artists…[14]

Walpole expresses his opinion that Onslow "ascribes more merit" to many English painters than Walpole himself would.[15] Walpole had begun the process of editing out certain artists, according to his own interests and his own sense of their contributions to the history of English art.

His apparent opinion that Vertue had no real or precise aims beyond recording as much information as he could without a thought to an eventual published work rises to the fore in this letter. Walpole does not appear to be prepared to make room for the idea that Vertue exercised any choice when selecting information for the Notebooks, and styles himself as a kind of tasteful and necessary editor. Walpole's own high opinion of the value of the direction and shape he was providing for the material is also made clearer in this letter. Walpole explains to Onslow that:

> I do not grudge the pains this work has cost me, while you, Sir, and a few other curious and good-natured persons are pleased with it. Had I not undertaken it, Vertue's manuscripts might have perished, and the work have remained impracticable. Such as it is, there will always be

[14] Letter to Arthur Onslow, 31 March, 1764. Yale Correspondence 40, 309.
[15] Letter to Onslow, 309

> men glad of even such a history of the arts in their own country. They have flourished so little here, that I question whether any man who could have performed the task better, would have condescended to it.[16]

As he would do in many other instances, Walpole states in his roundabout manner the opinion that he is the man best suited for the task of refurbishing Vertue's "impracticable" work and bringing it up to meet suitable and appropriate standards set by himself. All this is clarified in the Preface to the Anecdotes of Painting in England.

* * *

"A genius is original, invents. Taste selects, perhaps copies with judgment."[17]

In the Preface to the Anecdotes, Walpole constructs Vertue as a well-intentioned, industrious man, who "left nothing unexplored that could illuminate his subject."[18] Walpole discusses at length the integrity of the research that went into Vertue's Notebooks, informing the reader that:

> (Mr. Vertue) conversed and corresponded with most of the virtuosi in England: he was personally acquainted with the oldest performers in the science; He minuted down everything he heard from them. He visited every collection, made catalogues of them, attended sales, copied every paper he could find relative to the art, searched offices, registers of parishes and registers of wills for births and deaths, turned over all our own authors, and translated those of other countries which related to his subject. He wrote down everything he heard, saw or read.[19]

---

[16] Letter to Onslow, 310-11.
[17] Letter to Christopher Wren, 9 August, 1764. Yale Correspondence 40 ,353.
[18] Walpole, Anecdotes... 1, x.
[19] Ibid., x

Walpole credited Vertue with an integrity that exceeded even his industry, and as we know, his industry was considerable, evidenced by the number of the manuscript notebooks.

Walpole then tempers his praise of Vertue by expressing what a considerable task it was for him to decipher and organize Vertue's mountains of information into manageable, readable text. Although he constantly employs the modest and humble conceit found in some of his letters, asserting that he did not enter into the task of "presenting Vertue's Labours" for fame and personal glory, several of Walpole's remarks serve to elevate his own role. He states in the Preface:

> The compiler had made several draughts of a beginning and several lives he had written out, but with no clear order, no connexion, no accuracy; nor was his style clear or correct enough to be offered to the reader in that unpolished form. I have been obliged to compose anew every article... The indigested method of his collections, registered occaisionally as he learned every circumstance, was an additional trouble, as I was forced to turn over every volume many and many times, as they lay in confusion, to collect the articles I wanted...[20]

By indulging in such extensive remarks on the disorder and complexity of Vertue's notebooks, Walpole constructs himself as the man best suited to the task of sorting out Vertue's undigested information and presenting it to the public. At the same time, Walpole seems to have worked through the defensiveness he exhibited in his account of the exchange with Hogarth by constantly invoking Vertue and the role of his many notebooks in the development of the Anecdotes. Walpole strikes a fine balance between acknowledging his debt to Vertue, and taking pride in his own role in refining the material and presenting it to the public.

Walpole constructs himself primarily as the editor of all this information rather than the author, but his role in the transition of Vertue's informal information into the printed, published Anecdotes, cannot be decided this simply.[21] Though he often claims to be little more than an arranger or organizer, Walpole occupies an uncertain area between the roles of author and editor, for his changes are often more than cosmetic. The "amusing particularities" compiled by Vertue, are frequently augmented by Walpole.[22] A comparison of the respective accounts of the artist John Greenhill by Vertue and Walpole is a primary example of this. Walpole strung together Vertue's several references to Greenhill's career and personal circumstances with narrative flourishes, which, although an improvement in terms of readability, often resulted in the placement of a distinctive Walpolian spin on the information presented.[23] This active role in changing the information Vertue compiled is often overlooked by subsequent authors making use of the works of Walpole or Vertue—at times it seems difficult for some to remember they are independent works, and not simply two parts of the same project.

In the Preface, Walpole also expounds on what he perceives to be the lack of art literature in England, establishing the necessity for his own project. On the subject of literature on the arts in Italy and in France, Walpole presents his views as follows:

> In Italy, where the art of painting has been carried to amazing degree of perfection, the lives of the painters have been written in numberless volumes, alone sufficient to compose a little library. Every picture of every considerable master is minutely described. Those biographers treat of the works of Raphael and Correggio with as much importance as the

---

[20] Ibid., xi
[21] Lipking, The Ordering of the Arts... 130.
[22] Walpole Anecdotes... 1, x.
[23] Cust "George Vertue", 125.

> commentators speak of Horace or Virgil; and indulging themselves in the inflated style of their language, they talk of pictures as works almost of a divinity, while at the same time, they lament them as perishing before their eyes. France, neither possessed of such masters, nor so hyperbolic in diction, contrives, however, to supply by vanity, what is wanting in either. Poussin is their miracle of genius; Le Brun would dispute precedence with half the Roman school. A whole volume is written even on the life and works of Mignard. Voltaire, who understands almost everything, and who does not suspect that judgment in painting is one of his deficiencies, speaks ridiculously in commendation of some of their performers.[24]

Though much longer, this passage echoes the very brief discussion of art and art literature that we find at the beginning of the drafts of Vertue's autobiography.[25]

Walpole's comments reveal quite a different sentiment than Vertue's, however, and introduce even at this early stage Walpole's propensity for discernment and evaluation: where Vertue makes no attempt to judge the *quality* of the literature produced by other men in other countries, Walpole states in no uncertain terms his disapproval of the excessive quantity of literature on Italian art, and the questionable quality of the literature on French art. Walpole clearly asserts a critically motivated, authorial voice. I feel that the key to discovering the impetus for this authorial voice is located in Walpole's status as a patron and collector. I think it is clear that Walpole's status as a collector of art who was *not* a practising artist, determines the carefully constructed voice he employs throughout the Anecdotes.

The essential difference between Vertue and Walpole, though often ignored and overlooked by art historians mining the texts of both for information, is readily apparent—the former was a practising artist, and the latter, a gentlemen connoisseur. I believe that this important distinction must be kept in mind when considering the

possible agenda of Walpole in constructing the Anecdotes. Just as Vertue's status as a practising artist likely informed the kinds of information he chose to gather and record, Walpole's status as a patron and collector of art informed his decisions regarding the editing of Vertue's information.

Walpole's role as patron and collector seems to have informed the format he chose for the Anecdotes. As mentioned briefly in chapter one, the Anecdotes organize artist's biographies chronologically, according to the reigns of the monarchs of England from King John to King George II. The monarchs are constructed and presented by Walpole as patrons and collectors themselves, and "the history of art seems reduced to a sort of fever chart of royal taste."[26] This is a somewhat limiting assessment, as there is far more at work in the Anecdotes than Lipking's succinct phrase suggests.

I would suggest it is more accurate to describe the Anecdotes as a fever chart of *Walpole's* taste. To describe the project in this way enables the acknowledgment of Walpole's interest in biography, anecdote and social successes and failures—Walpole's interest in all things social was an important part of his personality as the great body of his correspondence suggests, and I would argue that it is this element of his personality which plays the most important role in determining his authorial voice. The overarching structure of the monarchy serves as an ennobling (and extremely convenient) way in which to organize the material chosen by Walpole according to his own preferences. In arranging the Anecdotes this way, Walpole the connoisseur associates himself with royal connoisseurs, and in every instance, it is his own sense of taste which reigns supreme.

---

[24] Walpole, Anecdotes... 1, x.
[25] As discussed on page seven, ff. 19, in chapter two of this thesis.
[26] Lipking, Ordering of the Arts..., 135.

Lawrence Lipking has observed that "the Anecdotes patronize painters far more than they celebrate them"[27] and that Walpole chooses to focus on "episodes of social history" in the lives of artists, rather than the development of their art.[28] This is in keeping with his status as a gentleman connoisseur. A pattern which combines issues of patronage and connoisseurship, and Walpole's preference for anecdote and incident, can be observed throughout the course of the Anecdotes. Walpole evaluates the artists he discusses almost exclusively in terms of significant patronage and the potential for social interest. This can be observed in both "positive" and "negative" capacities. The former can be evidenced in Walpole's study of Vertue, and the latter in his sketch of Mary Beale. Walpole's treatment of Vertue will be examined first, followed by an examination of his study of Mary Beale.

Walpole's biographical sketch of Vertue is constructed primarily from Vertue's own drafts of his autobiography. As discussed in the previous chapter, these preliminary drafts survey Vertue's life from the years 1709 to 1741. As an artist and engraver, it is perhaps not surprising that in the drafts Vertue discusses many of his numerous patrons. By accident or design, this results in the double effect of establishing a list of the affluent men who appreciated and employed Vertue's skills as an artist, and also of illustrating Vertue's many opportunities for acquiring through these men the information that he would record in his Notebooks.

Walpole also constructs Vertue's life around encounters with affluent patrons, but not to the same double effect as that which was achieved in Vertue's autobiography. Walpole does not dwell on the simple fact that Vertue's friends and patrons constituted a

---

[27] Ibid., 135.

valuable source for information on the arts, but instead changes the focus to create for Vertue a series of steps on a ladder of significant social acquaintance. After a brief discussion of Vertue's early years and youthful apprenticeships as an engraver, Walpole explains that Vertue found his way to Sir Godfrey Kneller, "whose reputation, riches, parts, and acquaintance with the first men in England had supported what little taste was left in England for *virtu*"[29] Walpole then states that, once his early works were known, Vertue "found more illustrious patronage" than that of Kneller.[30] Walpole continues in this manner, constructing Vertue's movement up the social ladder, from one important patron to the next. The emphasis is not placed on Vertue's artistic skills or even his abilities to promote himself, but on those eminent collectors and patrons who were in possession of both good taste and good sense, and who had selected Vertue as a worthy candidate for their favour.

As a patron and collector himself and not an artist, Walpole privileges the information he sees as being the most worthy of recording for posterity, and this same pattern may be observed in his brief study of Mary Beale. The pattern has particularly important ramifications for subsequent studies of her as an artist.

Walpole's biographical sketch of Mary Beale at first appears to have been constructed after the same pattern which Walpole employed for his sketch of Vertue. [See Appendix C for a full transcription]. Walpole tells the reader of her status as the daughter of a minister from Suffolk. He next reveals that she "learned the rudiments of

---

[28] Ibid., 133.
[29] Walpole, Anecdotes 3, 269.
[30] Ibid., 269.

painting from Sir Peter Lely, and had some instructions... from [Robert] Walker."[31] From the outset he associates her with artists he understood to be more socially successful than Mary herself, determined on the basis of which persons of note they had worked for, and which persons collected their work.

Walpole's treatment of Mary Beale also reflects a very careful and selective editing of Vertue's several references to her. While he does not acknowledge either author, he does make use of some of the information from Buckeridge's account of Mary Beale. He abandons both the assertion that Mrs. Beale was a "worthy painter" derived by Vertue from William Sanderson's text of 1658, and also the praise and stylistic analysis originating with Bainbrigg Buckeridge. Of the several references he had at his disposal, Walpole is most interested in addressing the extracts from the Journals of Charles Beale.

Walpole explains that, during his lifetime, Vertue had been fortunate enough to gain access to several of these Journals. He states that:

> Most of his [Vertue's] extracts I shall now offer to the reader, without apprehension of their being condemned as trifling or tiresome. If they are so, how will this whole work escape? When one writes the lives of artists, who, in general were not very eminent, their pocket-books are as important as any part of their history—I shall use no further apology—even if those [Journals] that are lost should be regretted![32]

He proceeds to reprint those extracts from the Beale Journals that are found in Vertue's notebooks, removing the personal comments which Vertue sprinkled throughout and adding his own, more clearly differentiated ones. Though he became aware of an extant journal by Charles Beale, Walpole never references this in subsequent volumes or editions, in any way. He explained to his friend Thomas Warton, who brought the

---

[31] Walpole, Anecdotes..., 2, 154.
[32] Ibid., 154.

journal to his attention in 1764, that the second edition of the Anecdotes was on its way to press, and because of this, it was too late to include any reference to the surviving journal.[33] The extant journal was never referenced in subsequent editions.[34] Walpole confines himself to the extracts chosen by Vertue and reproduced in the notebooks.

The above-cited passage reveals two things. First, Walpole expresses his opinion that Mary Beale was "not very eminent", and proceeds to construct her as a 'negative' example of social success and, by extension artistic influence. Though the journal entries of Charles Beale indicate that Mrs. Beale had for her patrons a great number of socially respectable men and women, Walpole is not terribly interested in these Doctors of Divinity and their wives as patrons, and chooses not to address them directly. He plucks out the names of a few to list, but he does not afford them the status of *truly* affluent patrons, and thus he does not afford Mrs. Beale the status of a truly eminent artist. Secondly, Walpole's exclusive adherence to the Journals of Charles Beale results in Charles becoming the most important voice of his wife's life and work.

Like the drafts of Vertue's autobiography, the Journals of Charles Beale, as left to him in the Notebooks of Vertue, were simply too intriguing a source for Walpole to pass up. While Vertue may have introduced the possibility for Charles Beale to become a part of discussions on his wife Mary, it is with Walpole's exclusive use of his source that Charles becomes a dominant factor in accounts of Mary Beale's career. In the absence of what was to him suitable patronage, Walpole chooses to reprint the Journal entries of Charles Beale, bringing to the fore the possibility for the parallel construction of their

---

[33] Letter to Warton, Yale volume 40, p. 367.
[34] This seems to be the Journal of 1677 now in the Bodleian, but no indication is given of how Warton happened upon it.

biographies. It also allows the technical and stylistic merits of her work as a portraitist to be neglected in favour of the personal and anecdotal.

By focusing his attention almost completely on the journals of Charles Beale, and by engaging in only the barest of independent discussion of the technical or stylistic aspects of her work as an artist, Walpole never truly acknowledges that Mary Beale had any *social* relevance. Accordingly, Mary Beale was not truly *artistically* relevant to Walpole. She occupied a role of social interest, in that her status as a woman artist was unusual. But social *relevance* as Walpole understood it is another matter entirely.

One might wonder why Walpole bothered with Mrs. Beale at all, if he did not have an appreciation of her success as an artist. Though I do not wish to over-simplify the issue, I think it is clear that Walpole's decision to include a discussion of Mary Beale in the Anecdotes was determined in equal parts by her curious status as a female artist, and his irresistible attraction to things anecdotal. I believe that it is only Walpole's interest in the anecdotal source of the journals that prevents Mrs. Beale from being omitted with the other "less shining" artists referenced in his letter to Onslow of 1764! Had Vertue made the choice not to record the few available journals in his notebooks, Walpole would not have ventured any farther to find out more about her—without an awareness of that primary source it would not have occurred to Walpole to include Mary Beale in the Anecdotes.

R.W. Ketton-Cremer, a biographer of Walpole working in the mid-twentieth century, identified in Walpole

> ...a deep disdain, not for learning, but for the typical exponents of learning, not for letters, but for the average practitioner of letters. This brand of snobbery was part of his mental equipment...He wished

> to write books about antiquarian subjects without becoming associated with the pedantry and dinginess of antiquaries; he vaguely thought that his books, the productions of a gentleman's leisure, ought to be exempt from the searching criticisms of professionals.[35]

Although these remarks were made within the context of Walpole's book of 1757, A Catalogue of Royal and Noble Authors of England, it is one that is easily applied to the Anecdotes of Painting in England. Walpole's purpose with the latter was to entertain as much as to inform his reader on the collection of visual arts in England. The task of shaping and editing Vertue's notes for the finished project of the Anecdotes was in, many ways, the ideal project for Walpole—the research had already been done; it was organization and refinement that remained to be achieved.

As late as 1788, Walpole's correspondence reveals something of this, in a letter to Edward Gibbon, responding to Gibbon's request for some information about possible identities for the sitter of an unidentified portrait. After apologizing for a missed visit, Walpole explains:

> I am as sorry that I cannot satisfy you or Lord Sheffield about the portrait, whose face I do not know. Nor am I much wiser about the painter—most of the information I gave of our artists[36] was transcribed from Vertue's notes, and few of them deserved to have their manner studied, or remembered.[37]

This speaks volumes about Walpole's level of comfort in evaluating and discerning which pieces of information from Vertue's notebooks were most suitable for a finished, publishable work. Walpole could exercise the sense of taste which he spent his life cultivating, perusing the rows and lists of Vertue's references and pulling out only those to which he personally responded.

---

[35] Ketton-Cremer, Horace Walpole, 173.
[36] Referring to English artists, in the Anecdotes.

Many other authors throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have assumed that Walpole simply completed the project envisioned by Vertue. An awareness that much of Vertue's information was left out of Walpole's project coexists with an element of faith in Walpole's ability to select the most pertinent of Vertue's facts. This is evidenced by such authors as Laurence Binyon, Lionel Cust and Ellis Waterhouse, to varying degrees, at various points in time.[38] The trust placed in the constructions provided by Walpole is based on the idea that, by working with Vertue's "unfinished" notebooks, Walpole was using a kind of unadulterated source, not compromised in any way by authorial bias. Although other sources come to be used in conjunction with that of Walpole, his remains a canonical source.

The most significant indication that Walpole has become canonical is the continued presence of Charles Beale in accounts of Mary Beale after the publication of the Anecdotes. Walpole's source draws an element of authenticity from assumptions made about the honest truth Vertue's work affords—Walpole makes the choice not only to include the journals of Charles Beale in his account of Mary Beale, but to rely on them almost exclusively. Where Vertue introduces the potential for Charles Beale to become a factor by including him as one of several references to Mary, Walpole changes the dynamics significantly by focusing on Charles exclusively as a source of information. I believe that Walpole confirms and legitimates the dominant presence of Charles in discussion of Mary, and directly leads to the development of Charles as an historical figure in accounts of his wife's life and career. Though Walpole himself does not engage

---

[37] Letter to Gibbon, Yale volume 42, 206.
[38] See Laurence Binyon, "English Traditions in Art", The Quarterly Review, 235 (April 1921), 207-220. See also Waterhouse Dictionary of Sixteenth and Seventeenth century British Painters, 1988.

in a particularly lengthy discussion of Charles, many subsequent authors appear almost to take a cue from Walpole, increasing the role of Charles Beale, while leaving Mary's role the same.

The continued influence of Charles Beale and his source as a defining factor in the biography of his wife may be traced to the early emergence of Walpole's Anecdotes as a canonical source for the development of art historical literature in England. Once Charles Beale is introduced in the formal, published account of his wife's life in the Anecdotes, not only does his source become the dominant one, but he emerges as a historical figure to become the central feature of the biography of Mary Beale.

Chapter Four: The Origins of Tradition

This thesis is not the first to examine the art historical texts of George Vertue and Horace Walpole within the context of the same study. Although other writers have analyzed the relationship between Vertue's and Walpole's texts, the issue of authorial voice and editorial choice have never previously been addressed in relation to both sources. Two well known examples executed in the twentieth century are Lionel Cust's article of 1913, in which he proposed the reproduction of Vertue's manuscripts, and Lawrence Lipking's study of 1970, The Ordering of the Arts in Eighteenth-Century England. Both of these sources have definite value in that they draw attention to the importance of Vertue's source (in its proximity to that of Walpole) for the development of art history in England, and both seek to identify differences between Vertue's Notebooks and Walpole's Anecdotes using as case studies artists discussed by both Vertue and Walpole.

Both Cust and Lipking attempt to isolate *Walpole's* authorial voice, and his achievement in organizing the information compiled by Vertue. However, neither author seeks in any way to investigate the possible agenda of *Vertue* in his capacity as author and compiler. The authorial voice asserted by Walpole throughout the course of the formal, published source that the Anecdotes constitute is privileged by both Cust and Lipking. While issues of authorial voice and editorial choice are investigated, there is little if any attempt to relate them to Vertue or his project.

Because of its status as a complete and published text, emphasis is placed on the Anecdotes of Painting in England as *the* authority on the early development of the visual arts in England. Its proximity to Vertue's raw, unfinished notes, which are too often

understood to be entirely without bias, has only served to entrench the authority of the well-organized and easily readable Anecdotes.

After a discussion of the respective sources of Cust and Lipking, this chapter will address the ramifications of the ideas established and perpetuated about Vertue and Walpole and their respective sources as they apply to the development of the biography of Mary Beale.

Lionel Cust does not question Walpole's intention to "digest and complete" the project envisioned by Vertue and begun in his notebooks.[1] He asserts that Vertue's manuscripts "...could not have fallen into better hands" than those of Walpole, and reminds the reader that, in publishing the Anecdotes "Horace Walpole laid the foundations for an art historical study of the Fine Arts in England, which...has proved the chief authority for reference upon this subject".[2] Cust's article was designed to draw attention to the manuscript notebooks of George Vertue, and gain enough support to begin reproducing them. In order to make this as appealing a proposition as possible, he constantly asserts the value this will have for studies of Walpole. He maintains that

> It is only by a study of the original manuscripts that any real idea can be formed of the remarkable achievement by Walpole in digesting and rearranging the scattered notes of Vertue into the coherent and lucid form in which they appear in the *Anecdotes of Painting*. It must be added, however, that such a study of the original manuscripts reveals not only the merit of what Walpole did achieve, but the great amount of valuable material of which he made no use at all, or in a very perfunctory manner.[3]

---

[1] Cust "George Vertue...", 121. Cited from Walpole's Letter to Zouch, January 12, 1759, Yale volume 16, p. 26.
[2] Ibid., 122-3.
[3] Ibid., 123.

The primary aim of Cust's study is to salute Walpole's superior skills as an editor and organizer. The secondary aim is to draw attention to the valuable information Walpole had access to, but nonetheless chose to leave out of the Anecdotes.

Using as a case study the artist John Greenhill, Cust examines the accounts of Greenhill's life and career first as it appears in Vertue's manuscripts, and then as it appears in Walpole's Anecdotes. The comparison serves to illustrate Walpole's "skill in piecing Vertue's detached notes into a biographical statement".[4] Almost secondary is the acknowledgment that, "...by the alteration of a phrase", Walpole is able manipulate Vertue's remarks, and insert his own opinions.[5]

In spite of this acknowledgment of Walpole's manipulations, Cust asserts that "Generally speaking, Walpole's transcription in its rearranged form is so trustworthy that...it may be accepted as equally good authority with Vertue himself".[6] Cust characterizes Vertue as an authority largely because of his temporal proximity to an age of significant artistic production in England. For the sake of the reader, Cust emphasizes that

> ...Van Dyck had only been dead seventy-two years, and Vertue knew and spoke with artists who had themselves, or whose fathers had, known and worked under that great painter. Sir Peter Lely had only been dead four years when Vertue was born. Sir Godfrey Kneller was alive in 1713, and was one of Vertue's first patrons. Hogarth was only sixteen years of age. It is obvious that, except for matters earlier than the seventeenth century, Vertue was able to get at information in most cases at first hand.[7]

---

[4] Ibid., 126.
[5] Ibid., 126.
[6] Ibid., 126.
[7] Ibid., 125.

The idea that Vertue's text is completely "true" is made all the more convincing by the rough format of the unpublished manuscripts and by absence of a readily identifiable and consistent authorial voice. Cust's assumption of Vertue's authenticity because he introduces no obvious authorial voice into the material is of particular interest, and I will return to address this shortly.

Cust addresses two references to Greenhill recorded by Vertue that Walpole does not incorporate into his sketch in the Anecdotes. Both of these neglected references reveal valuable information to do with Vertue's personal encounters with works by Greenhill, and have significance for histories of the production of art in England.

Cust uses the examples of the respective discussions of Greenhill to illustrate the importance "...to students and historians of obtaining a printed transcript of Vertue's own commonplace books in his original words". The choice to describe Vertue's notebooks as "commonplace books" is perhaps the strongest indication of Cust's failure to recognize an authorial voice in Vertue's work. To describe the books as such reduces them to definition only by those portions that are copied from other texts, and leaves no room for those occasions in which Vertue does assert his presence as an antiquary and, more frequently, a practising artist. While it is true that no readily identifiable, consistent authorial voice can be identified in Vertue's informally compiled notebooks, his authorial presence as an artist *and* art historian is ignored.

Furthermore, the use of the word "original" also begs a broader application—the statement seems to confirm an assumption on the part of Cust that Vertue's manuscripts contain 'naked' information, truth unfettered by agenda or bias on the part of the compiler. The interpretation of Vertue's notebooks as a thoroughly unbiased source

provides Cust with a stick by which to measure the accuracy of Walpole's Anecdotes. Though Walpole clearly constructed his project to maximize social episodes and his understanding of them as a connoisseur and collector of art, clear associations with Vertue's so-called "commonplace books" and their unblemished facts seem to lend the Anecdotes an air of respectability. Walpole's obvious authorial voice, biased in favour of those aspects of art collection which interest him, is tempered by the relationship of his work to that of Vertue.

Lawrence Lipking's study of 1970 includes a chapter entitled "Horace Wapole's *Anecdotes* and the Sources of English History of Art". It is only in the first few pages of this chapter that Vertue is examined in relation to Walpole, before the bulk of the chapter is devoted to examining Walpole's source in comparison to other published texts on the arts in England. Like Cust more than fifty years earlier, Lipking also compares the writings of Vertue and Walpole using biographical sketches of artists as case studies.

Throughout the course of his study, Lipking tries not only to isolate Walpole's authorial voice, but to uncover the impetus for it. Lipking identifies in Walpole a need to entertain a very specific audience. He observes that "... Walpole selects choice morsels for the delectation of readers who would have accepted the company of most artists only while sitting for a portrait".[8] Lipking's entire discussion of Walpole hinges almost exclusively on the social dimension of the Anecdotes, and his brief comparison of the respective texts of Vertue and Walpole is designed to accommodate this.

Like Cust, Lipking remarks on how Vertue's references are often manipulated by Walpole with the slightest turns of phrase towards Walpole's own interests. Lipking's

first identification of what he sees as the neutrality of Vertue's information comes at the conclusion of a brief comparison of Vertue's and Walpole's respective treatments of the painter of miniatures, Samuel Cooper. Lipking states that

> Even the tiny truths of biographical fact which conclude Walpole's memoir [of Cooper] are made engaging by lively presentation and by frequent use of the first person singular. We never forget the presence of our charming and opinionated cicerone. In the Anecdotes, Vertue's neutral sprinklings of fact about Cooper are firmly put in their place.[9]

A second and more significant example of Lipking's perception of the lack of authorial voice in Vertue's text occurs in a second case study he presents, using Vertue's and Walpole's respective treatments of the artist Charles Jervas.

Lipking notes that Vertue's remarks about Jervas "are neither impersonal nor neutral", as the two men were direct contemporaries.[10] Vertue's disparate remarks about Jervas center around the fall of the latter from Royal favour, due to what Vertue describes as some unsuccessful portraits of the King and Queen. Vertue notes that Jervas "had the good fortune to marry a Gentlewoman" with a substantial income. He also criticizes harshly the appearance of Jervas' work.[11]

Lipking then introduces Walpole's account of Jervas, which is entirely different from that of Vertue. Lipking determines that Walpole focuses on Jervas as an "episode in social history", instead of as a painter. He notes that

> What Walpole chose to write about Jervas was not... an expansion of Vertue's attack so much as an elegant little essay on the ephemeral nature of the vogue in painting. To this general purpose he was willing to sacrifice particular information and criticism. Indeed, he was willing

---

[8] Lipking, Ordering of the Arts, 135.
[9] Ibid., 132.
[10] Ibid., 132
[11] Vertue's references as cited in Lipking, Ordering of the Arts, 132.

to sacrifice Vertue.[12]

Walpole concerns himself more with facts of social interest, such as the fact that Jervas was an intimate of the poet Alexander Pope, to whom he gave lessons in painting and drawing, rather than specific artistic criticisms. Lipking suggests that this willingness to skirt a discussion of what Vertue identifies as the questionable quality of Jervas' work may be attributed to the simple fact that Sir Robert Walpole had been a great patron of Jervas.[13] All this is in keeping with Walpole's preoccupation with patronage and taste, as well as his attraction to the social elements of painter's lives and careers.

In spite of his earlier remarks on the neutrality of Vertue's information, Lipking verges on acknowledging and claiming a presence for Vertue in his comparison of the respective treatments of Charles Jervas. However, he chooses instead to follow up the development of *Walpole's* more clearly asserted authorial voice. It is possible to infer from Vertue's references to Jervas that Vertue, personally, had no appreciation of the artist or his work, and Lipking begins to suggest as much, but he does not pursue this sufficiently to acknowledge any assertion of bias on the part of Vertue. Vertue and his source are abandoned after they serve Lipking's purpose in helping to identify and isolate *Walpole's* bias.

The conclusions drawn by both Cust and Lipking about the absence of authorial voice in Vertue's material are indicative of how the respective texts of Vertue and Walpole have been viewed by historians of British art for many years. Assumptions made about the informal presentation of Vertue's information and the absence of an easily identifiable, formal authorial voice have led many authors to ignore the simple fact that

---

[12] Ibid., 132.

Vertue's *presence* as a practising artist is made evident by his choices regarding the types of information he recorded. The refusal to recognize this has ensured that the role Walpole claimed for himself as early as 1759, as editor and organizer of Vertue's material, has long gone unquestioned.

Two related issues will be addressed for the purposes of exploring the ramifications of this assumption in the case of Mary Beale. The first issue is the continued uncritical use of Vertue as a source of information on Mary Beale. The second is the canonical proportions assumed by Walpole's source from the time of its publication in the late eighteenth century up to the present time, specifically in the development of the biography of Mary Beale.

* * *

It was noted in the second chapter of this thesis that George Vertue copied extracts from other sources into his own manuscript notebooks, and yet in the case of Mary Beale, his choice to do so is only identified or acknowledged as it relates to the journals of Charles Beale. Vertue's reproduction of extracts from several of the journals is recognized in almost every source produced subsequent to the Anecdotes. I would suggest this is primarily because in Walpole's account of Mary Beale, he makes a point of explaining the circumstances by which Vertue came to have the journals and copy from them. However, the sources of the information related to Mary Beale that Vertue

---

[13] Ibid., 134.

copied from William Sanderson and Bainbrigg Buckeridge are never recognized or acknowledged as such.[14]

A significant example may be found when examining Vertue's use of Buckeridge's "Essay towards an English School" of 1706. None of the three catalogues on Mary Beale produced in the twentieth century make any reference at all to Buckeridge's essay in any context, let alone recognize the origins of the passage Vertue copied into his notebooks. In all of the catalogues, Vertue is credited with a statement about Mrs. Beale's skill as an artist, and the statement goes as follows: "She was little inferior to any of her contemporaries, either for colouring, strength, force of life, insomuch that Sir Peter [Lely] was greatly taken with her performances, as he wou'd often acknowledge".[15] In Barber's catalogue, this quotation leads to the accusation that Vertue (however well-intentioned) unfairly isolated Mrs. Beale from her colleagues because the remark draws attention to her unusual status as a woman AND an artist.[16] In fact, the remark is not Vertue's at all, but is taken directly from Buckeridge's "Essay towards an English School of Painting", and this is never recognized. In my opinion, the failure of some authors to acknowledge the early sources on Mary Beale are related to Walpole's account of her, and the canonical proportions assumed by his text—while Walpole incorporates the information Vertue drew from Sanderson and Buckeridge, he never acknowledges them as sources.

---

[14] Exhibition catalogues of 1975 and 1999 indicate awareness of Sanderson's reference to Mary Beale, but only the latter acknowledges that Vertue recorded it in his notebooks. Barber, "Mary Beale", 21 ff.21.
[15] Walsh and Jeffree "The Excellent Mrs. Mary Beale", 16. See also Reeve, "Mrs. Mary Beale", 7, and Barber "Mary Beale", 7. Located in Vertue, "Notebook 2", 134.
[16] Barber "Mary Beale",8.

The privileged status of Walpole as a source of information is of enormous significance, creating a surprising uniformity in accounts of her life produced subsequent to the Anecdotes. The ramifications of this reach beyond the basic contextualization of the artist as a historical presence. This is suggested by several of the sources introduced in Chapter one. Charles Beale becomes the voice of Mary's life and career, *and* he emerges as a historic figure who competes with his wife for the attention of the author, and of the reader, within the confines of studies ostensibly devoted to Mary Beale. A pattern emerges in which Charles Beale grows to become a figure as significant as his wife.

In addition to Walpole's model being reflected by the continued dominant presence of Charles Beale in studies of his wife, it is worth stating specifically that the model is rarely if ever questioned. As the twentieth century progresses, and different kinds of authors explore new ways in which to discuss artist's biographies and art history, it might be expected that Walpole's account of the 1760's would begin to be challenged. However, this is not the case with studies of Mary Beale, as will be demonstrated by the following example.

From September of 1999 to January of 2000, a retrospective exhibition on the life and works of the Baroque portrait painter Mary Beale [1632/3-1699] was held at the Geffrye Museum in London to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the artist's death. The exhibition and accompanying catalogue, organized and executed by Tabitha Barber, were designed to firmly situate Mary Beale within the context of her family and social circle.

Barber's purpose, clearly stated in the introduction, is to illustrate an equal partnership between Mary Beale and her husband on levels both domestic and professional.[17] Even though the reader is alerted to the idea of an equal partnership between the Beales from the outset, it is not adequate preparation for the remarkably large portion of the catalogue that is devoted to the construction of the biography of Charles Beale. Barber explains that "Mary's skill was greatly admired by her husband... who keenly endorsed her activities" as an artist.[18] Barber also suggests that "Charles's role in the studio within the studio [of Mary] should be reassessed" as he "occupied a role of more far reaching significance..." than had previously been determined.[19] From the outset, Mary Beale becomes a platform from which the discussion of her husband can develop. Each aspect of Mary's life is related by Barber in some way to Charles Beale's opinions or actions. Barber's assertions are supported by the manner in which the evidence is presented in the catalogue. The interpretation of various sources is directed towards proving two things: Charles Beale's approval and promotion of his wife's work as an artist, and his integral role in the running of her studio practice.

The first essay in the catalogue, entitled "Mary Beale: the artist, her family and friends", pursues the aims of a thoroughly contextual biography which would situate Mary firmly within her various roles as artist, wife and mother. This is achieved through referencing the diaries and letters of family members, friends, and social and business acquaintances of both Mr. and Mrs. Beale, including Samuel Woodforde and Thomas

---

[17] Ibid., 8.
[18] Ibid., 8.
[19] Ibid., 8.

Flatman. The few extant journals of Charles Beale also constitute a particularly valuable source. Though Barber augments the information contained within the journals of Charles Beale with other sources, it is the journals themselves which figure most prominently in Barber's construction of the life of Mary Beale, and her husband's involvement in it.

The early life of Charles Beale, prior to his acquaintance with and subsequent marriage to Mary Cradock/ Beale is discussed at length in this first chapter—the space devoted to developing an account of his early life is equal to that which is devoted to hers.[20] The transition between Mary's early encouragement in the home of her father in Suffolk, and the various manifestations of Charles' vigorous continuation of this encouragement after his marriage to Mary, appears to be almost seamless. The various changes of address of the Beale family, for reasons including the cultivation of a larger and more affluent clientele, and avoidance of the Plague are addressed,[21] as well as Charles's job as a Clerk of Patents and his inability to keep it. These points consistently contribute to the development of an almost separate biography of Charles Beale, and are designed clearly designed to keep the presence of Charles Beale firmly in the foreground of the biographical portrait of his wife that is being constructed.

In this first essay of the catalogue, Barber makes use of a source that had not previously been examined to such an extent for information regarding the Beales. These are the journals of a cousin by marriage, the poet Samuel Woodforde.[22] His journals provide the most insight into their family life in the early 1660's, a time in which

---

[20] Ibid., 13.
[21] Ibid., 15 and 17.
[22] Woodforde was a cousin of Charles Beale by marriage, to Alice Beale. Barber, "Mary Beale", 11.

Woodforde lived in their home. The other important contemporary source on Mary Beale consists of the seven journals by Charles Beale.

Both sources contain valuable of information not only on Mary Beale's professional and family life, but also in more general terms, as artist friends and clients of the Beales are referenced, as well as fleeting insights into studio practices of the seventeenth century. However, the journals of Charles Beale are privileged, by virtue of the proximity of their author to Mary. They represent an invitation to explore the biography of their author that encroaches upon the analysis of Mary Beale.

Many aspects of the family life of Mary and Charles are addressed by Barber in order to present the most developed contextual treatment possible. Yet it falls short of attaining that to which it aspires, which is a kind of "biography of the family". What appears instead is the development of two biographies, that is, Mary Beale and Charles Beale, fighting for space within the same parameters. The other two essays in the catalogue also contribute to the establishment of this phenomenon.

The second essay, entitled "The Art of Friendship" addresses a treatise on the nature and benefits of friendship, written by Mary and dedicated to her friend Elizabeth Tillotson (wife of John Tillotson) in 1666/7.[23] Barber's essay explores Mary's status as both friend and marriage partner as this status relates to the ideas expressed in the treatise. Drawing on more well-known references to the ideas of John Evelyn and Mary Astell, Barber attempts to situate Mary's treatise within the confines of a recognizable type of literature which investigated the relationship between friendship and religion in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

In her treatise, Mary expands upon vaguely latitudinarian sentiments, in keeping with many of the close friends she and her husband had in common.[24] The focus of Mary's discourse is distilled by Barber and presented in the essay as a simple syllogism: it is reasoned that a husband and wife are best friends in marriage, and that friends are equal, therefore a husband and wife are equal. Barber understands this to be an accurate reflection not only of the way in which Mary wished her relationship with Charles to be, but of the *reality* of her life with Charles. Charles Beale refers to Mary as his "Dear Heart" in his journals and this is used by Barber to bolster her interpretation of the mutual feelings of respect and love between marriage partners expressed in Mary's treatise.[25] Some attention is also given to associations Mary forges between painting and friendship—in painting her friends and family, Mary may have sought to capture the beauty of virtuous friendships.[26]

In this second essay, Barber emphasizes the unparalleled value of Mary's *Discourse on Friendship* as a source, as it is the only extant written document by Mary herself. Barber pursues the idea that the discourse "...can be read as a Christian moral code by which she [Mary] conducted her daily life..."[27] Of course the treatise *can* be read this way, but *should* it be read this way? Barber cites a letter Mary wrote to her friend, Elizabeth Tillotson, to whom she dedicated the *Discourse on Friendship*, in which Mary explains: "In the following discourse I have endeavor'd to lay before you my heart,

---

[23] Two copies of Mary's manuscript survive, one in the British Library, MS Harley 6828 ff. 510-23, and the second in the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, MS.V.a.220.
[24] Barber, "Mary Beale", 24
[25] Ibid., 34.
[26] Ibid., 35.
[27] Ibid., 26.

if not what it is, yet what I desire it should be."[28] One must assume that this does give Barber pause, for she did choose to include this reference in her discussion of Mary's manuscript. However, it does not prevent her from using the discourse to further cement the conclusion she has reached about the true nature of Charles and Mary's relationship not only as partners in a marriage, but as partners in business. It is this last assessment that enables the presence of Charles Beale to dominate the biography of his wife.

Barber also takes the connection between Mary's portraits of her friends and family and her desire to depict virtuous friendships and relationships a step farther than the evidence perhaps supports. She interprets Mary's portraits of herself and her husband as seeming "to embody her concept of friend. They combine with ease the ethic of equality with her status as a female portraitist and her role as wife and mother."[29] Barber has done something valuable by introducing Mary Beale's consistently under-studied *Discourse on Friendship* into a discussion of her life, but she has employed it in such a way that it supports her dual constructions of Mary and Charles.

The third essay, contributed to the catalogue by Mary Bustin, is entitled "Experimental Secrets and Extraordinary Colours", and addresses a manuscript notebook by Charles Beale that has never previously been examined. This notebook, which Charles seems to have begun in 1647 as a young man of sixteen, is entitled *Experimental Secrets found out in the way of painting.*[30] The early date of the manuscript suggests that as a young man Charles may have had some training in an artist's studio.[31] In the manuscript he recorded the results of many and various experiments, such as his early attempts at

---

[28] Mary Beale, *Discourse*, as cited in Barber, "Mary Beale", 26.
[29] Ibid., 34.
[30] This manuscript is located at the Glasgow University Library, MS Ferguson 134.

still-life painting in which he tried to capture the glossy appearance of wet fruits and shiny metal plates,[32] and his experiments with the production of paints and pigments such as red "Lakes" and yellow "Pinkes."[33] Bustin examines Charles' observations on paintings executed by Mary using experimental grounds such as onion sacks and striped bed ticking. The sales, trades, and gifts he made of his pigments to such artists as Sir Peter Lely and Matthew Snelling are also examined.[34]

In this third essay, Bustin's study of the notebook, while very thorough and interesting on its own merits, is subsumed by the larger project envisioned by Barber—that of establishing the necessary presence of Mr. Beale in the study of Mrs. Beale. Bustin emphasizes that the issues addressed in Charles Beale's notebook were "...turned into a viable commercial enterprise..." by serving as the foundation of Mary Beale's studio production.[35] Above all, Bustin's essay supports the idea that Charles's experiments were vitally important for both for the efficient management of Mary Beale's studio operation and for the commercial potential they represented. For the third time in the catalogue, a construction of Charles Beale emerges to compete with that of his wife. And something altogether more significant emerges: that is, the impression that Charles' biography becomes necessary in order construct that of his wife.

The final section of the catalogue presents the visual components of this most recent exhibition on Mrs. Beale. It is divided into three categories. The first section, entitled 'Family and Friendship' covers eighteen items, including portraits by Mrs. Beale

---

[31] Mary Bustin, "Experimental Secrets and Experimental Colours" in Barber, "Mary Beale", 43.
[32] Ibid., 43.
[33] Ibid., 44-46.
[34] Ibid., 50.
[35] Ibid., 43.

of herself and her family, portraits of the Beale's and their circle by Flatman, Lely and Charles Beale, Jr., and the manuscripts of Mrs. Beale's *Discourse on Friendship*, and Samuel Woodforde's *Paraphrase upon the Psalms of David.* A second section includes the Drawings of Charles Beale Junior, consisting of eleven items in total. A third section, entitled "The Studio", highlights thirteen portraits that are clearly the product of Mary's professional life as a studio artist, the manuscript of Charles' experiments, and one of his journals.

All of these objects, presented in the same exhibition, do indeed prove valuable in situating Mary and her work within a social framework. However, the inclusion of items such as the drawings of her son and the writings of her husband also enable a secondary effect to be observed. Regardless of whether or not it was intentional, by presenting all of the visual documents of Mary's family and friends together, it is implied that works presented are of insufficient interest to be exhibited on their own. Mary Beale and her paintings are bound to her family, just as the work of her son and her husband are bound to Mrs. Beale.

The interpretations of the sources used in the three essays in Barber's catalogue, combined with the necessarily general and accessible nature of exhibition catalogues conspires to keep the biography of Mary Beale from breaking any truly new ground. Newly discovered documents are indeed used, but they are directed towards supporting a very familiar argument. The integral role Charles Beale in the work of his wife is clearly the focus and the sources (many of which lend themselves to speculation about the married life of the Beales) are interpreted and presented in ways which conform to this agenda.

The problematic reading of the various sources may be expressed in the following quotation by Barber, which directly addresses the central issue of the development of the biography of Charles Beale within the context of his wife's biography:

> It has to be stressed... that Mary never regarded herself as Charles' financial superior. She and her husband were equal working partners, the studio a family venture. New evidence suggests that Charles' role in the studio should be reassessed. Not only did he provide practical support for Mary, through priming canvases and providing the materials for portrait painting, but his various experimentations were geared towards the efficient economic functioning of the studio, producing the finest methods and materials at the lowest cost. Through pigment sales, rents and financial investments, he brought in ... 1/3 of their annual income.[36]

Taken from the introduction, this quotation clearly presents the author's intention to reassess Charles within the context of an exhibition and catalogue that, at least initially, purported to commemorate the life and work of his wife. This firmly entrenches him within the development of his wife's biography. The reference to Charles' contribution of a third of the family income is somewhat problematic—Charles may have contributed a third of the income, but how much did he *spend*? Charles's own Journals reveal he was feckless, and frequently had to borrow money from friends and family to support his desire for fine clothes, fine books and fine paintings.[37] Charles often sold or traded pigments to alleviate some of the debts he incurred, just as Mary was often forced to trade or give away paintings. The question that may rightly be asked is: Does Barber's interpretation of the sources really tell us anything? No. They are shaped to promote the agenda of the author, which, although it results in a comprehensive exhibition catalogue designed for a general audience, nonetheless presents a somewhat obscured account of the life of Mary Beale.

In the case of Mary Beale, the establishment of a social background for the artist has become far more prominent than the art that was produced by her, even in exhibitions of her work. Even a cursory glance at the several other sources that have addressed the artist and her biography over the course of the last 300 years reveals that Barber is not the first to treat Mary Beale exclusively in terms of a social and familial framework. Barber makes it apparent that her interests lie in establishing the idea of a mutually beneficial and agreeable professional relationship between Mary and her husband. But in attempting this, a codependent structure is reaffirmed, whereby the biography of one partner [Mary] appears to necessitate the biography of the other [Charles], thereby asserting a very conventional gendered construction. Enabled by Walpole, this has long been the primary motivation for discussions of Mary Beale.

Barber's catalogue of 1999 mimics the essential construction adopted by Walpole from Vertue. Given that Barber's exhibition and catalogue make use of new sources like Mary's treatise on Friendship and Charles's treatise on experiments, one might have expected that the biography of Mary Beale would take on a new dimension. This was not the case. The new sources are interpreted in accordance with the standard ushered in by Walpole. Barber's catalogue, like so many other recent sources on Mary Beale, depends upon the presence of Charles Beale to discuss the life and work of his wife.

An important indication of Walpole's influence is also reflected by the consistent reluctance of many authors to move outside of Walpole's accounts of the Beale journals. This also speaks to the emphasis on the perception of the authenticity of Vertue's copied extracts of the journals.

---

[36] Barber, "Mary Beale", 19.

In a letter to Thomas Warton in October of 1764 discussed in the previous chapter, Walpole regrets that he cannot incorporate information from an extant Beale journal that Warton has discovered into the sketch of Mary Beale, as the second edition of the Anecdotes had already gone to press.[38]

The existence of this journal is discussed in the first reference to Mary Beale published subsequent to Walpole's Anecdotes, Ellen C. Clayton's English Female Artists of 1876. It was stated in chapter one that Clayton relied heavily on Walpole's reference to Mary Beale in order to construct her own account. After citing Walpole's account of how Vertue came to have seven of the Beale journals, Clayton reports that one of the Journals, the first entry dating from April 21, 1677, survives. She notes as its location the Bodleian library, after being "sold from Lord Oxford's library in 1745."[39] This is the first occasion when the survival of a journal is mentioned in a published source.

As Walpole doesn't seem to have acknowledged the survival of this journal outside of his personal correspondence with Warton, there is some question as to how Clayton became aware of its existence. In a list of "the principal authorities consulted for the first volume" of her text,[40] Clayton indicates that she was working with a volume of Walpole's correspondence. It is possible that she had access to Peter Cunningham's edition of Walpole's correspondence, published in nine volumes in 1861. Walpole's letter to Warton is reproduced in this series.[41]

---

[37] Reeve, citing the extant Journal of 1681, "Mrs. Mary Beale", 6.
[38] Letter to Wharton, 30 October, 1764, Yale Correspondence 40, 367-8.
[39] Clayton, English Female Artist, 47.
[40] Ibid., viii.
[41] Horace Walpole Correspondence ed. Peter Cunningham (London, 1861) 5, 72. The letter is erroneously dated to 1767.

Regardless of how Clayton encountered the surviving document, her important discovery is quickly forgotten. The information about the extant journal in the Bodleian Library does not appear in accounts produced immediately subsequent to her text, and she is never acknowledged as the first person to mention the extant journal in a published source.

In 1912, in his lengthy discussion of Mary Beale in Lely and the Stuart Portrait Painters, C.H. Collins Baker discusses the significance of the extracts of the Beale journals as reproduced by Vertue and then Walpole, and notes the survival of a journal of 1681. The author notes that

> We have an unparalleled advantage in our study of Mrs. Beale, owing to the Beale Diaries that remain in one form or another. According to Walpole there were more than thirty to begin with; Vertue mentions one of 1661 and gives extracts from a number in the 1670's. The latest known to me is that of 1681, happily preserved in the National Portrait Gallery Library.[42]

Collins Baker makes significant use of the journal of 1681, devoting an Appendix to the reproduction of what he perceived to be the most significant extracts. He does not acknowledge the survival of the other extant Journal from 1677, indicating that he was not aware of its existence in the Bodleian Library. Collins Baker, while entering into new territory by engaging in the first detailed discussion of the work produced by Mary Beale throughout her career, also relies heavily on both Vertue's and Walpole's reproductions of the Journals to create an equally detailed account of Mary's familial context . He clearly did not think it necessary to employ any other accounts of Mary Beale and her

---

[42] Collins Baker, Lely and the Stuart Portrait, 37.

husband's journals beyond Vertue or Walpole, and the failure to even examine Clayton's account seems to explain his ignorance of the other extant journal.

Clayton's source and thus her discovery are also noticeably absent from the first major article to be devoted to Mary Beale, written by Elizabeth Walsh in 1953. Walsh discusses Mary's life, using the journal entries as produced by Vertue and Walpole, in addition to the letters and diaries of several of the Beale family friends and social acquaintances. Her awareness of Collins Baker's important article ensured her awareness of the extant journal of 1681. But Walsh's interest in finding previously unused documentary evidence related to the life of Mary and her family led her to the Bodleian library, where she encountered the journal of 1677. Unaware of Clayton's discovery nearly 75 years earlier, Walsh claims the find as her own.[43] From 1953 to the present, Walsh is credited with this fortuitous discovery.[44]

I believe that the near loss of Clayton's English Female Painters as a source for information on Mary Beale, is indicative in large part of the perception of Walpole's Anecdotes as a canonical source. The influence of Horace Walpole's Anecdotes on accounts of Mary Beale is so pervasive that even Germaine Greer, one of the few twentieth-century authors on Mary Beale who is clearly aware of Clayton and her source, does not incorporate Clayton's account in the brief treatment of Mary Beale.[45]

While Vertue may have introduced the possibility for development of an account of Charles Beale within the context of his wife's biography, it is Walpole's choice to

---

[43] Walsh "'Mrs. Mary Beale...'", 4.
[44] She is credited in Whinney and Millar's survey text (180), and the 1975 catalogue (16). Barber, with her acceptance of Walsh as the expert on Mary Beale biography also seems to support this (15).
[45] Greer references Clayton's source in a discussion of another artist, indicating her awareness of the source. Greer, The Obstacle Race, 131.

focus almost exclusively on the journals, which changes the path her biography would take from the eighteenth century on. Because of the canonical status of the Anecdotes, Walpole's installation of Charles as a permanent fixture in the story of Mary Beale has the appearance of being reliable and traditional. It also adopts the appearance of a certain inevitability.

Chapter Five: The Appearance of Inevitability

Historiographical studies can be particularly valuable in recovering not only the personalities of the past and the documents of visual culture produced by these personalities, but also the decisions that shape the accounts of both. In examining the written treatment of a subject, and attempting to identify authorial voice and editorial choice, it is possible to uncover a pattern by which certain kinds of knowledge are reproduced, from one source to the next over the course of time.

The study of Mary Beale reveals that knowledge of her as an historical personality and the almost overwhelming attention that is afforded her husband, can take on the appearance of a certain inevitability. By this I mean that the incorporation of Charles Beale is constructed as tradition, when in fact it is not. Consistently, in a wide range of art-historical sources, Mary Beale is measured and commemorated by way of familial context, and not artistic achievement. This has occurred to such an extent that even Mary's entry in the Dictionary of National Biography is invaded by that of her husband and a discussion of the incomparable value of the journals.[1] This is not so surprising, when one observes that the author of the entry lists as his chief source the entry on Mary Beale in Walpole's Anecdotes of Painting in England.

Due to its roots in the canonical source of Walpole's Anecdotes (which in turn gained much of its authority from its proximity to Vertue's "unadulterated facts"), the continued focus on the domestic situation of Mary Beale has become *the norm*. This is evidenced by the wide variety of sources that have continued to cultivate the

---

[1] R.E. Graves, Dictionary of National Biography (London, 1900) 2, 3.

development of a social context for Mary, often at the expense of her artistic achievements.

In the case of Mary Beale, in the wake of the respective decisions of Vertue and Walpole to include the journals of Charles Beale, it appears that every discussion of Mary is indebted to her husband. Does this mean that Charles should be discussed as a biographical subject within accounts of Mary's life, or have many authors consistently confused the issue? In the grand scheme of the art world of seventeenth-century London, Charles Beale is a far less significant figure than his wife, Mary. Though often treated as a necessary and equal part of accounts of Mary's life, Charles might just as easily be viewed as an obstacle in the development of Mary's history. Yet so many authors incorporate Charles to such a large extent, and reproduce only the most basic of interpretations, as found in Walpole's Anecdotes of Painting in England.

The nearly overwhelming presence of Charles Beale in the biography of his wife has come to be normalized. Grounding Mary firmly within the circumstances of her domestic situation appears to have been absorbed into the annals of art history as the "common sense" approach, the one that seems the most natural. But is this really the case, or has the prominent presence of Charles, constructed to appear in account after account like tradition, simply become habit? Is the over-contextualization of Mary Beale inevitable, as it often appears to be?

I would suggest that it is not inevitable at all. The early sources, by Sanderson and Buckeridge, prove that, in Mary's own time, it was possible to separate discussions

of her success from discussions of her husband. Yet only two twentieth-century sources suggest that, at opposite ends of the twentieth century, such a separation is still possible.[2]

Returning to the first turning point in the development of the biography of Mary Beale, identified in chapter one as Vertue's notebooks: we might ask how might things have been different if Vertue hadn't had access to the journals of Charles Beale? How would the kind of knowledge we have of Mary Beale be affected? Would Walpole have developed an interest in Mary as a painter in the absence of those journals? would he have taken an interest in the references of Sanderson and Buckeridge, and taken the opportunity to reproduce more thoroughly the knowledge that *their* sources produced? Perhaps he would not have noticed Mary at all.

The construction of stories of Mary's life might have moved in completely different directions without Walpole. The development of her story might have taken on totally different dimensions. Her *Discourse on Friendship* might have been discovered and interpreted much sooner; her paintings alone might have led authors to construct a different account of her life.

To venture down a more discursive path: what might have happened if Vertue's project had been left to us in a different state? There is every indication that Vertue would have organized and published the material he amassed. Ilaria Bignamini has suggested that, had his patron Edward Harley not died in 1741, the project might have been realized as early as the first half of the 1740's, and cites the drafts of the autobiography, which would likely have been included in the publication, as proof. Also, as Bignamini observes, Vertue produced an engraving of himself holding a portrait

---

[2] Sparrow 57-8, and Wendorf 65-7.

miniature of Harley early in 1740, and this could very likely have served as a frontispiece to the *Museaum pictoris Anglicanum*.[3]

In the second draft of the autobiography, Vertue explains that his work "when published, may at least be a large foundation, laid out for a more compleat work hereafter to be raisd up".[4] On the basis of this reference to the establishment of a "large foundation", as well as several other remarks by Vertue, Bignamini concludes that Vertue's programme for the finished project would have included "documentary material on art literature and techniques, on art collecting and patronage, on art institutions and the art market from academies to picture sales".[5] She continues on to state that, "though it is impossible to establish in how much detail Vertue would have discussed them, his work would have included a wider range of subjects than that to be found... even in Horace Walpole's Anecdotes themselves."[6]

What would the implications have been for studies of Mary Beale, if Vertue had lived to produce his "large foundation" for art historical literature in England? An account of the circumstances of Mary's life might have been attempted, as Vertue was in possession of approximate dates of significant events, but it wouldn't have stopped there. Vertue might have proceeded on to devote more discussion to her paintings –his notebooks suggest that he was familiar with several portraits and self-portraits by her. As with other artists, he most certainly encountered works painted by her or depicting her, through social acquaintances and through business travels. An in depth discussion of the

---

[3] Bignamini, 9-10.
[4] Vertue, 1, 20.
[5] Bignamini 10.
[6] Ibid.

appearance of specific paintings, and observations on the manner and technique in which she worked would have been a likely possibility.

In the hands of a practising artist who lived and worked so close to her own lifetime, a very different picture of Mary Beale, (one which depended more on the achievements of her career than on the activities of her husband,) might have emerged. Vertue might have created a biographical sketch of Mary in which Charles only figures as a footnote, directing his attention towards the fruits of her career, and creating a story for her that would have placed her, as an equal, among the other painters of her age. In fact, it is the journals that restrict the discussion of Mary to the limited terms of a 'wife and mother who happened to paint' to appear as an inevitability, when in fact it is not.

Although there is no way to determine what role the journals of Charles Beale might have played in Vertue's project had he lived to complete it, it might be reasonably suggested that the information contained in the extracts of the journals would have been divided and dispersed throughout the finished *Musaeum pictoris Anglicanum.* Vertue probably would have summarized or paraphrased the information contained in the journals: this would have lessened the concentrated impact of Charles Beale and his journals on the biography of his wife, and dispersed Charles' valuable observations among a wider range of subjects. As may be readily observed by reading the journal extracts, Charles recorded several references to meetings with various artists and colourmen, and these notations might have found their way into accounts of persons other than his wife; for instance, his observations on changes in the working methods of

Sir Peter Lely late in that artist's career would almost certainly have found their way into an account of *Lely*, instead of remaining in the section on Mary Beale.[7]

As it was, the information in the journals remained intact, because Vertue did not live long enough to arrange it in any other way. Because of this circumstance, Walpole is left with the opportunity to do very little with the information—accordingly, given his lukewarm interest in the artistic abilities of Mary Beale, the extracts of her husband's journals make a lateral move, nearly intact, from Vertue's notebooks into Walpole's Anecdotes.

In the cases of many other artists, Walpole paraphrased or synthesized original sources referenced in Vertue's notebooks—in this way, as demonstrated by Lionel Cust and Lawrence Lipking, Walpole was able to inject his own perspective into the information he chose to present, and thus direct it towards his own interests. But Walpole did not choose to do this with Charles Beale's journals in his account of Mary Beale, and because of this, he produced a specific kind of knowledge which affected the great majority of subsequent accounts of Mary Beale. The casting of Mary Beale in a role in which her success appears dependent on the presence of her husband is *not* inevitable, it has simply been confirmed as such by the continued influence of a source which has taken on canonical proportions.

Griselda Pollock, in her book Differencing the Canon of 1999, adds considerable insight into the appearance of "inevitability" as it relates to the production and reproduction of patterns of knowledge. She maintains that:

---

[7] Charles' important observation of the change in Lely's style appears to go virtually unnoticed until referenced by Sir Oliver Millar in the 1978 exhibition of Lely's works. Vertue 4, 170. Oliver Millar, Sir Peter Lely (NPG, 1978) 20.

> Tradition cultivates its own inevitability by erasing the facts of its selectivity in regard to practices, meanings, gender, 'races' and classes. What is thus obscured is the active process of exclusion or neglect operated by the present-day makers of tradition... Versions of the past ratify a present order...[8]

In the case of Mary Beale, the exclusive pattern of the dual biographies of Charles and Mary may be seen to represent the "present order" which is ratified by the continued employment of Walpole as a canonical source. The continued development of Charles Beale in accounts of his wife's life and career was enabled by the appearance of a certain inevitability fostered by the dominant account of Mary in Walpole's Anecdotes. But why is this construction introduced by Vertue and enabled by Walpole never questioned?

The monolithic source of information represented by the journals and their author has determined that Mary Beale will only be discussed in proximity to her marriage partner. The normalization of this pattern of discussion—of the husband-wife interrelationship—accordingly distorts the appearance of the success that was achieved by Mary in her lifetime, and insists upon denying that Mary was the more important figure, art historically, in the relationship.

In relying heavily on the construction of Charles Beale's biography within that of his wife, and constantly asserting their genteel status, Mary Beale is unfairly cast in the role of an "amateur" artist in many sources—her domestic life takes precedence over the work that she produced. It may be argued that, if Mary had been an unmarried woman, the development of accounts of her life would have taken a completely different path.

I would argue that, because of her status as a married gentlewoman, Mary appears to function on the margins of the realm of the "professional" female artist. From the time

of Vasari, professional female painters have occupied a conspicuous place in accounts of artist's lives, aberrant in that they occupied neither the traditional role of women nor that of artists.[9] In Ellen Clayton's English Female Artists in 1876, Mary already appears as a kind of foil for one of her contemporaries, the Italian painter Artemesia Gentileschi. Though I do not wish to oversimplify the issue, Artemesia's status as a single, "foreign" woman[10] enabled very different kinds of discussions of her life (and work) to emerge.

One hundred years after Clayton, Oliver Millar expresses the unusual and extremely limited manner in which female artists of the seventeenth century have come to be categorized in his introduction to the 1975 catalogue on Mary Beale.[11] He states that "The most distinguished female painter working in England in the Stuart period was Artemesia Gentileschi. Mary Beale was a very different character".[12] In spite of his later assertion that Mary should not be mistaken for an amateur,[13] the distinction could not be made more plainly.[14] Artemesia Gentileschi, as a historical subject, represents what is understood traditionally as the "aberrant" single woman—the professional artist—engaged in unconventional activities, and producing unconventional artwork. As a historical subject, Mary Beale represents what is "normal" for a woman of the period—

---

[8] Griselda Pollock, Differencing the Canon, (London 1999), 10.
[9] Pollock, Differencing…, 9, 97. See also Nanette Salomon, "The Art Historical Canon: Sins of Omission", 1995, 344-355.
[10] Artemesia Gentileschi was married to Antonio Schiattesi, but Clatyon is quick to remind the reader the pair separated early in their marriage. She traveled freely, and lived and work without him. Clayton 23.
[11] Of course, he does not acknowledge the unusualness himself.
[12] Walsh and Jeffree, "'The Excellent Mrs. Mary Beale'", 5.
[13] It is interesting to note that the quality of Mary's work had apparently risen in Millar's estimation by the time he contributed to the 1975 catalogue. In his 1957 effort with Margaret Whinney, it was stated that Mary's work never rose above the quality of a "hard-working amateur". Whinney and Millar, English Art…, 181.
[14] Ibid., 5.

her status as a married gentlewoman with children ensures that she is distinguished from the "professional" artist represented by Artemesia.

The continued discussion of Mary as devoted wife and mother, *then* artist, contributes to the appearance of a temperate, peaceful and seemingly uneventful life. Ellen Clayton gives a strong indication of this in her account of Mary Beale of 1876. As she concludes her discussion, Clayton tells the reader that the "unassuming, busy life" of the artist

> flowed on till Mary Beale was sixty-five. One of those happy lives, hers, full of dignity and matronly purity, which is next to impossible for a biographer to render 'interesting.' No pathos throws its romantic shadow over her—no gay humour or bright originality lights up her sober figure as she stands before her easel.[15]

I would suggest Clayton's remarks are borne out in many subsequent accounts of Mary Beale, in which a vague and unsettling impression is established, that there is nothing truly interesting to uncover should the conventional gendered construction which necessitates the discussion of Mary *and* Charles be abandoned. There is no great or obvious drama in the life of Mary Beale that signals one to take apart and examine the way in which that life has come to be constructed.

The perception of Mary's life as uneventful facilitates the insistence that Mary's success is dependent on Charles and their domestic situation—all three exhibitions on Mary Beale mounted in the twentieth century draw heavily upon the lives and works of her friends and family, giving the appearance that there is a lack of confidence in the woman or her work to generate interest independently. The Anecdotes, rendered authentic by many authors simple by virtue of their proximity to Vertue's notebooks,

enable subsequent authors to (mis)direct their effort towards cultivating the expansion of a role for Charles Beale in the story of his wife. Charles becomes the justification for dealing with Mary.

Those few sources that introduce something new or innovative appear infrequently and seem to fall by the wayside, consistently rejected in favour of the old standby, Walpole—this happens to such an extent that important discoveries, such as Clayton's identification of the extant Beale Journal, are often overlooked, only to be (re)discovered by subsequent authors.

The block of contextual knowledge that the journals constitute represents a kind of monolith on the biographical landscape of Mary Beale. Its towering presence has become a monument that writer after writer has consistently visited, and used as the armature around which new accounts are constructed.

It has been said that an accident of chance preserved the information contained in Charles Beale's Journals, first at the hands of George Vertue, and then at the hands of Horace Walpole. I would maintain that it was instead an accident of *choice*. It has been a remarkably interesting and informative exercise to trace the ramifications of this choice and its influence over the course of many years, and through a wide variety of different sources.

It is hoped that the case study of Mary Beale presented in this thesis has demonstrated that patterns of knowledge that appear to be steeped in tradition and, as such, appear to be almost inevitable, may be exposed through historiographical studies, as patterns of authorial choice and voice determined in equal parts by circumstance. By

---

[15] Clayton, English Female Artists, 51.

identifying turning points in the development of accounts of the lives of historical figures, different stories might emerge, those of the author and his or her subject.

References and Works Cited

Abbot, John L. and D.G.C. Allan. The Virtuoso Tribe of Arts and Sciences: Studies in the Eighteenth-Century Work and Membership of the London Society of Arts. Athens, University of Georgia Press. 1992.

Allen, B. Sprague. Tides in English Taste 1619- 1800. New York, Pageant Books, Inc., 2 vols., 1958.

Baker, C.H. Collins. Lely and the Stuart Portrait Painters. London, Medici Society, 2 vols., 1912.

Baker, C.H. Collins, and Montague R. James. British Painting. Boston, Hale, Cushman & Flint Publishers, 1933.

Barber, Tabitha. Mary Beale: Portrait of a Seventeenth-Century painter, her family and her studio. London, Geffrye Museum Trust, Ltd. 1999.

Bignamini, Ilaria. "George Vertue, Art Historian" Walpole Society vol. 54, 1988, pp. 2-16.

Binyon, Laurence. "English Traditions in Art", The Quarterly Review 235 nos. 466, 467 January and April 1921, pp. 207-220.

Buckeridge, Bainbrigg. "An Essay towards an English School", as printed in Roger De Piles' Art of Painting, London, Charles Marsh, 1706.

Calloway, Stephen, Michael Snodin and Clive Wainwright. Horace Walpole and Strawberry Hill. Twickenham, Orleans House Gallery, 1980.

Cato, Nancy. The Lady Lost in Time. Australia, Collins, 1986.

Clayton, Ellen C. English Female Artists. London, Tinsley Brothers, 2 vols., 1876.

Clayton, Timothy. The English Print 1688-1802. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1997.

Colley, Linda. Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837. New Haven, Yale University Press. 1992.

Cust, Sir Lionel. "George Vertue's Note-Books and Manuscripts relating to the History of Art in England. Proposals of a scheme for their publication", Walpole Society. vol. 3, 1913-4, pp. 121-128.

Cust, Sir Lionel. "Notes on Pictures in the Royal Collections—XXXIV—Anne Killigrew", The Burlington Magazine. vol. XXVIII, no. CLIII, December 1915, p. 112.

Dob're, Bonamy. "Horace Walpole", Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Literature. Chicago, Carroll Camden. 1963.

Dob're, Bonamy. Horace Walpole. Houston, Rice University Press. 1964.

Edmond, Mary. "Bury St. Edmunds: A Seventeenth-Century Art Centre", Walpole Society. vol. 53, 1987, pp. 106-118.

Fine, Elsa Honig. Women and Art: A History of Women Painters and Sculptors from the Renaissance to the 20th Century. New Jersey, Allanheld & Schram, 1978.

Foskett, Daphne. British Portrait Miniatures: A History. London, Metheun & Co., 1963.

Gaze, Delia. Dictionary of Women Artists. Chicago, Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 2 vols., 1997.

Gery Milner-Gibson-Cullum, George. "Mary Beale", Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology and Natural History. vol. XVI, 1918, 229-251.

Hazen, Allen T. Catalogue of Horace Walpole's Library. New Haven, Yale University Press, 3 vols., 1969.

Heller, Nancy. Women Artists. London, Abbeville Press, third edition 1997.

Henshall, John. "A canvas all her own (Exhibition Review)", Times Literary Supplement, May 13, 1994, p. 18.

Honour, Hugh. Horace Walpole. London, Longmans and Green for the British Council and National Book League, 1957.

Humphreys, A.R. The Augustan World: Society, Thought, Letters in Eighteenth Century England. New York, Harper and Row, 1963.

Kerslake, John. "The Beales at the Geffrye (Exhibition Review)", The Burlington Magazine Dec. 1975, pp. 820-823.

Ketton-Cremer, R.W. Horace Walpole: A Biography. London, Faber and Faber, 1946.

Langford, Paul. A Polite and Commercial People: England 1727-1783. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1989.

Lee, Sir Sidney and Sir Leslie Stephen. The Dictionary of National Biography. London, Oxford University Press, volume 2, 1917.

Lewis, W.S. Guide to the Life of Horace Walpole. New Haven, Yale University Press. 1973.

Lewis, W.S. Rescuing Horace Walpole. New Haven, Yale University Press. 1978.

Lewis, W.S., ed. The Yale edition of Horace Walpole's correspondence. New Haven, Yale University Press, vols. 1-48, c. 1937-1983.

Lipking, Lawrence. The Ordering of the Arts in Eighteenth-Century England. New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1970.

Mason, Alfred Bishop. Horace Walpole's England as his letters picture it. London, Constable and Co., 1930.

McEvansoneya, Philip. "Vertue, Walpole and the Documentation of the Buckingham Collection", Journal of the History of Collections vol. 8, no.1, 1996, pp. 1-14.

Millar, Sir Oliver. Sir Peter Lely, 1618-80. London, National Portrait Gallery, 1978.

Millar, Sir Oliver. "Mary Beale (Exhibition Review)", The Burlington Magazine. vol. CXLII, no. 1162, January 2000. pp. 48-9.

Ogden, Margaret, and Henry Ogden. "A Bibliography of Seventeenth-Century writings on the Pictorial Arts in English", Art Bulletin vol. 29, 1947. pp. 196-201.

Parry, Graham. The Trophies of Time: English Antiquarians of the Seventeenth Century. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1995.

Peterson, Karen and J.J. Wilson. Women Artists: Recognition and Reappraisal from the Early Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century. San Francisco, Harper Colophon Books, 1976.

Piggot, Stuart. "Antiquaries", Sale Catalogues of Libraries of Eminent Persons 10. Great Britain, Mansell Publishing, Ltd., 1974.

Pollock, Griselda. Differencing the Canon. London, Routledge, 1999.

Procter, Ida. "Woman Artist of the Restoration", Country Life 127, no. 3300, June 2, 1960. pp. 1242-1243.

Reeve, Christopher. "Mrs. Mary Beale, Paintress", Manor House Museum, St. Edmundsbury Borough Council, 1994.

Rogers, Pat. Eighteenth- Century Encounters: Studies in Literature and Society in the Age of Walpole. Sussex, Harvester Press, 1985.

Salerno, Luigi. "Seventeenth-Century English Literature on Painting", Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes vol. 14, 1951, pp. 234-258.

Smith, W.H. Horace Walpole: Writer, Politician, and Connoisseur. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1967.

Sparrow, Walter Shaw. Women Painters of the World. London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1905.

Steegman, John. The Rule of Taste from George I to George IV. London, MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1936.

Turberville, A.S. English Men and Manners in the Eighteenth Century. New York, Oxford University Press, 1957.

Vertue, George. The Notebooks (in six volumes). The Walpole Society, vols., 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 30. Reprinted for William Dawson and Sons, Ltd., 1968.

Walpole, Horace. Anecdotes of Painting in England, with additions by the Reverend James Dallaway. London: Swan Sonnenscheinn, Lowery and Co., 3 vols., 1888.

Walsh, Elizabeth. (Letter on Mary Beale). The Burlington Magazine. volume XC, numbers 538-549, January-December 1948. (reprinted 1968) p. 209.

Walsh, Elizabeth. "Mrs. Mary Beale, Paintress", The Connoisseur. vol. CXXXI, no. 530, April 1953. pp. 3-8.

Walsh, Elizabeth. "'Charles Beale 3d Book. 1680'" The Connoisseur. volume CXLIX, number 602, April 1962. pp. 248-252.

Walsh, Elizabeth, and Richard Jeffree. 'The Excellent Mrs. Mary Beale'. London, Inner London Education Society. 1975.

Waterhouse, Ellis K. Painting in Britain 1530 to 1790. London, Penguin Books, Ltd. 1978.

Waterhouse, Ellis K. Dictionary of Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century British Painters. Woodbridge, Antique Collectors' Club, 1988.

Wendorf, Richard. The Elements of Life: Biography and Portrait Painting in Stuart England. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1990

Whitely, W.T. Artists and their Friends in England 1700-1799. London, 1928, 2 vols.

Whinney, Margaret and Oliver Millar. English Art 1625-1714. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1957.

Appendix A

These references to Mary Beale are organized chronologically, according to what could be determined from the provenance lists which preface the first volume of the Walpole Society Vertue notebooks. Volumes and page numbers refer to the Walpole Society volumes of the Vertue notebooks. All spelling and punctuation is as transcribed from the original manuscripts by the Walpole Society, except the square brackets which are my own.

1) volume 1, p. 54—appears within a notebook dated somewhere between 1713 and 1721. By my estimation, this may be dated to around 1718.

"Mrs. Mary Beale her picture in posses. of Dr. J. Harris F.R.S."

2) volume 2, p. 134—appears with a number of other artist's biographies transcribed from Bainbrigg Buckeridge's "Essay towards an English School of Painting". Appears in a notebook dated to 1720-21.

Mrs. Mary Beal,

Was an English Gentlewoman, born in Suffolk who having learnt the Rudiments of Painting of Sr Peter Lely, drew after the Life, & had grate Numbers of Persons of Good Rank sat to her, especially the Greatest part of the dignify'd Clergy of her time, an Acquaintance she got by her Husband, who was much in Favour with that Robe. She was little inferiour to any of her contemporaris, either for Colouring, Strength, Force or Life, In so much that Sr Peter was grately taken with her performancies, as he would often acknowledge. She work'd with a wonderfull body of Colours, was exceeding

industrious, & her Pictures are much after the Italian manner, which she learnt by having Copy'd several of the Grate Masters of that Country, whose Pictures she Borrow'd outt of Sr Peters Collection. She died at her house in the Pall-Mall 1698 being 65 years old & lies buried at St. James's.

3) volume 1, p. 105—appears within a notebook dated to 1721-25. This is Vertue's first reference to the death of Mary Beale.

"Mr Minshull Lincolns Inn fields. Mrs Beals picture by herself. he had this at her death. She dyd in Pell-Mell about 1704."

4) volume 1, p. 108—appears within the context of Vertue's discussion of the sale of the collection of L. Crosse (Limner) of December 5, 1722. The notebook which contain this information has been dated to 1721-25.

"a fine original picture of Mrs. Beal a small half length. painted by Sr. P. Lilly in his best manner. she was a great favourite of his. tis said that he first put his pencil in her hand. before she was married. this picture bought by Mr. Raynard for 16.10.0."

5) volume 4, p.31—appears with a number of other quotations from William Sanderson's Graphice. The notebook has been dated to 1731-36.

"of Ladies.—in Oyl Colours wee have a virtuous example in that worthy Artist Mrs. Carlisle: and others. Mrs. Beale. Mrs. Brooman. Mrs. Weimes.—"

6) volume 4, 64-65—appears with several apparently unrelated references to other artists and collectors. Mr. Carter, the Colourman was the source. The notebook is dated to 1731-36.

Mrs. Beale 1679. a limning head by Charles Beale her Son who had some instruction in that Art. by Mr. Flatman. Limr. & Poet. Mr. Beal her husband ditto.

Dr. Tillotson from the life tollerable by Charles Beale Jun. who painted also in Oil Colours mostly in Water Colours he practizd not above 4 or five years. and his pictures are mark'd. ["CB"] his sight would not bear the practice.

Mrs. Mary Beal painted in oil very well. she dyd. 1697. Her son Char. Beal. livd and dyd against St. Clements Church in the Strand. at Mr. Wilsons a Banker. dying in his debt—a great many pictures remaind in his posses. now his Widow. in Ormond Street. a double ½ length of Mr. Beal & his wife Mrs. Mary Beale by Sr ["PL"].

Carter Colourm.

7) volume 4, 168-171, 172-176—a lengthy section, reproducing extracts of the Beale Journals and commenting on what is contained as he transcribes the information. Prefaced with a description of the nature of the Journals. This notebook is dated to 1736-41.

Mrs. Mary Beal paintress. daughter of Rev. Mr. Cradock— her husband Mr Charles Beal his books of memorands. were small Almanack pocket books—wherein he daily writ many affairs of business & family accounts--&c. but the most remarkable is the daily imployments of his ingenious wife Mrs. Beal concerning her painting & drawing from the life. or from famous paintings. he every day minutely mentions what she was

imployd in and what parts of a picture she did daily—likewise his accounts of his own affair and the sale and making of Ultramarine Colour to whom sold, what prices and degrees—also Lakes, pinkes <& pd for frames> his own & childrens accounts, rents, expenses, besides other occurrences so as yearly fill up mostly the blank leaves of one of each of these small books—of about 8 or ten, of these, seven were bought at a book stall by a Friend of mine who was so obliging to lend them to me.

the first I had is the Alma…of 1671/2. in the beginning of it as if it was a recapitulation of former remarks—

4th. March 1672/2 Mr Matthew Snelling <one Snelling a Limner Qu.> offerd me for my Venus and Cupid of Rottenhammer—30 guineas. (at 18 pence) above value) I refused it. and would have 40 guineas. I reckon it worth 50. a parcell of Pink made by Mr. Snelling of the weed before it flowerd. & sent my wife 7 July 1658. a small parcell sent by Mr Snelling. 13 Sept. 1654.[1]

20 Aprill 1672. Mr. Lely was here. (meaning (I think) to see Mrs. Beal & her workes) with Mr. Gibson & Mr Skipwith to see us. & commend her very much her (Mrs. Beal) coppy that she had made after Sir Anthony Van Dyke own picture, also her coppy after our Saviour praying in the Garden &c after Anto. Da Corregio. her coppy in little after Endimion Porter his Lady & 3 Son's he commended extraordinarily and sd. to use his own words) it was painted like Vandyke himself in little. and that it was the best coppy he ever saw after Vandyke— also he very well liked her two Coppyes in great of Mr Porters little son Phil. he commended her other workes. Coppyes & those from the life—both he & Mr Gibson both commended her workes—

Mr Lely told me at the same time as he was most studiously looking at my Bishops picture of Van Dykes—and I chanced to ask him how Sr. Anthony could possibly divise to finish in one day a face that was so exceeding full of work & wrought up to so extraordinary a pfection. I believe sd he) he painted it over fourteen times. and upon that he took occasion to speake of Mr Nicolas Lanieres picture of Sr. Anto. V.D. doing whc said he) Mr Laniere himself told me. he satt seaven entire days for it to Sr. Anto. & that he painted upon it of all those seaven dayes both morning & afternoon.& only intermitted the time they were at dinner. And he said likewise that tho Mr Laniere sat so often & so long for his picture, yt he was not permitted so much as once to see it. till he had pfectly finisht ye face to his own satisfaction— This was the picture wch being showed to King Charles ye first caused him give order that V. Dyck should be sent for over into England—

20 Feb. 1671/2 my worthy & kind Friend Dr. Belk. caused the excellent picture of Endimion Porter his Lady & 3 sonnes all together done by Sr. Anto: Vandyke to be brought to my house yt my deare heart might have the oppertunity to study it. & coppy wt. shee thought fitt of it. also at the same time wee returnd Mrs. Cheeks picture Mr. Lelys painting back to my Lord Chamberlain <Qu>

May 17. Mr. Porters family piece by V. Dyke returnd to ye Ld Chamberlain.[2]

Pink remaining in Stock. Sep. 1762. in poses Mr. Beal. some parcells containing some pounds wt. of tryalls made July 1663.—

19 Aprill 1672. My Dearest painted over ye 3d Time a side face. this Mr. Flatman liked very well

---

[1] V. 98, B.M. 56.

Mrs Beals price for pictures from the life a head 5. half len. 10—

24 April 1672. My most worthy Friend Dr. Tillotson sat to Mr. Lely for his picture for me—and another for Dr. Craddock. he drew them first in chalk rudely & afterwards in colours and rubd upon that a little colour very thin in places for the shadows & laid a touch of light upon the heightening of the forehead. he had done them both in an hours time—

it seems Mr. & Mrs. Beal got some of their Friends to sat for their pictures to Mr Lilly that she might have the oppertunity of seeing his manner of painting—

Lord Bp of Chesters picture painted by Mrs. Beale. for Ld. Geo. Berkley—afterwards—he dyd. 19 Novem. 1672. 12 Decembr. buried at St. laurence Jury.

Sunday 5th May 1672 . Mr. Samuel Cooper the most famous Limner of the World—for a face Dyed—

18 May 1672. Pd. Mr Tho. Burman in part due for my honourd Father & Mothers Monument set up for them at Walton in *Bucks* at the expence of my brother Henry Beale and my self—the whole cost pd. in full. 45 pounds—

July 1674. pd to Burmans widow.— he being dead— I suppose—

23rd Ld & Lady Cornburys picture lead coloured—

Dr Sidenhams picture began—

5 June. Dr Tillotson sat about 3 houres to Mr Lely for him to lay in a dead Colour of his picture for me. he apprehending the colour of the Cloth upon which he painted was too light. before he began to lay on the fleas colour he glazed the whole place where the

---

[2] V. 99, B.M. 56b.

face and haire were drawn in colour over thin with cullens earth & a little bonn black (as he told us) made very thin with varnish—

June 1672. Receivd for 3 pictures of Sr. Robt. Viner. his Lady his Daughter. H. len. 30.—0—0

20 June. my most worthy Friend Dr. Tillotson sat in the morning about 3 hours to Mr Lelly the picture he is doing for me. this is ye 3d setting.

Mr Fuller the Painter died 17 July 1672. as Mr Manby told me.

22d July Mrs. Beale painted her own picture. 2d setting—

23. July Received of Coll. Giles Strangwayes for Dr. Pierces Dr. Cradocks Dr Tillotson Dr. Stillingfleet Mr Crumholmes pictures 25.—0—0[3]

1 Aug. 1672 Dr Tillotson sat to Mr Lely about 3 houres for the picture he is doing for me. this is ye 4 time—and I believe he will paint it (at least touch it) over again.

his manner in the painting of this picture this time especially seemd strangely different both to my self and my dearest heart from his manner of painting the former pictures he did for us. this wee thought was a bit more conceiled misterious scanty way of painting then the way he used formerly, wch wee both thought was far more open & free & much more was to be observed and gained from the seeing him paint then— then my heart coud with her most carefull marking. learn from his painting either this or Dr. Cradocks picture of his doing—for Dr. Patrick—

deliverd to Mr Lely 1 ounce of Ultramarine at 2.10.0 p ounce. towards payment for Dr. Tillotsons picture—for me.

---

[3] V.100, B.M.57.

30 Sep. I carried my two Boys. Charles & Batt. to Mr Lely's & shewd them all his pictures—his rare Collections— 1 Octob. I went again to Mr Lelys. and shewd Mr Wm Bonett the same excellent pictures—the person was a learner there

I have paid Mr. Lely towards the pictures of Col. Brooke Bridges & Dr. Tillotson wch he is doing for me. by severall parcells of Lake of my own making wch he sent for. 17 Aug. 1671. and Ultramarine.— & money. 13.12.0

Receivd this year 1672. Moneys at Interest Rents. or for Colours upon Mr. Beals account 101.11.0

Recievd this year for Pictures done by my dearest hear 202.5.0

pictures done from the Life by Mrs. Beal since 1671/2

Feb Sr. R. Knight and his daughter

Apr. Mrs. Gibbs

May Mr Pheasant

June Sr Robt. Viners Lady & daughter both in a peice—

Coppy of Sr. Rob. Viners picture

Mrs. Parker

July Dr. Pierces picture copyd.

Dr. Cradocks

Dr. Tillotson

Aug. Dr. Stillingfleet

Mr Cromholmes

Mrs. Browns. H.L. 10—0—0

Mrs. Jones H.L

Decem. Coll. Strangeways H.L.

Mrs Long.

Coll Strangeways. a head

dito—

Dr. Patrick .

A coppy dito

Lady Cornbury. Lord Cornbury

a Magdalen—<(a Magdalen painted from Moll Trioche—

a young woman. she dyd

Dr. Outrams

Dr Patricks

Mr Wm. Wrens done formerly

Sep. Mr Crisps

Mr Mills Stuarts

dito—

Dr. Patricks

Nov. Mr Cox in blew drapery

Sr George Ents sonns picture

Sister Beals pictures

Bp Chesters picture

Miss Brown

Mr. Ents—

Mr Stewards

1672.)>

Mr Marklands picture

these were pd. for. many others

begun & done not pd. for.

Mrs. Hamonds picture

Dotr. Gardiner

Lady Cheeks

Dr. Bilks

Lady falconbridge

Lady Elis Howard

Lady Knights

Mrs. Beals own picture

Mr. Markland[4]

[At this point, Vertue's transcription of the Beale Journals gives way to a discussion of his own visit to Stafford House at the behest of the Duke of Norfolk. Following this, the transcription of the Beale Journals resumes.]

<January> another pocket book of Mr Beals: Almanack 1674 with memorand. her daily imployments what work Mrs Beal did.

1674 in August Mr Lely had 1 oun. Of Ultramarine the richest at 4—10. 0 p oun. in part of payments betwixt us. for Dean of Cant. Tillotson. Dr Ed. Stillingfleet which he

[4] V.101, B.M. 57b.

has done for me, and by Lakes and ultramarins. according to account of the particulars 1673.

ll

24. 9. 0

&4. 10. 0

28. 19. 0 so there is due to him 1.1.0 in full payment for the 2 forementiond pictures.

Aug 74. Mr Lely dead colourd. my son Charles picture took a drawing upon paper after an Indian gown he which he had put on his back, in order to the finishing of the Drapery of it.

Novem. borrowed of Wm. Chiffinch Esq. eleaven of his Majesties Italian drawings—

1674. Receivd this yeare for pictures done by my dearest 216.5.0

9 Feb 1673/4. for prints bought of Mr. Blootling. for my self. 0.2.0.

pictures formerly begun Lady Comptons H.L. Bp Chesters— this picture. Dr. Tillotsons. & Dr. Stillingfleets were engraved by Blootling. and very probably by Mrs. Beals desire—

account of pictures done. since 1 Jan. 1673/4

	9 Jan Mrs. Halworthys picture	Mrs. Townley
pd Lady Lucy	Mr. Lloydds picture	Mrs. Barkers. H.L
pd Mrs. Starkeys	Feb. Sr. Nicholas Crispes	Mr Dobsons
pd Mrs. Long. H.L.	Capt. Strangewayes	2 pictures Lady Mary Candish
Dr Burtons	Mr Sheepleys	blew scarf 22.0—
Capt. Ternes	Mr Silverlock	Bp Chester.

Lady Maidstones	Mr Pickering	Dr Blomer & his wife
Lord Asheley	Sr. Wm. Farmer	Mrs. Grigg—
Mrs. Foorth	Mrs. Turner	Mr. Bulteel.
Lady falconbridge	Lady Betty Percys. H.L.	Sr. Geo. Ent & Lady H.L.
	Mrs. Fran. Noels H.L.	Lady Knight HL
	Lady Comptons HL.	Lord Halifax. H.L.
		Mrs. Pickering
		Lady Falkonbridge

1674 this year receivd 206.5.0 for pictures done

1743. this book 1674 in posses of Dr. Rawlinson I see—

In these two pockett books is memorands of several original paintings of Italian Masters coppyd by Mrs. Beale. after old Palma. St. John. St. Katherine from Van Dyke family peice of Endymion Porter.[5]

From another pockett book. 1677. Of Mr. Beals accounts of Memorand.

4 June 1677. Mr. Comer ye Painter being at our house told my dearest as a Secret that he used black chalk ground in oil instead of blew black, and found it much better and more Innocent Colour.

22d May Mr Francis Knollys came himself and away the original picture of the old Earl of Strafford and Sr. Philip Manwaring wch had been left here for some years— Charles Beale

it was carried away bu two of Lord Hollis s servant whome Mr Knollys brought with him for that purpose.

April. 1677. I saw at Mr. Bab Mays Lodgings at Whitehall these pictures of Mr Lelys doeing—

1 the Kings picture in Buff. H.L. 2 first Dutches of Yorke H.L.

3. Dutches Portsmouth. H.L. 4 Mrs Gwin with a Lamb—H.L.

5 Mrs Davis with a gold pot. H.L. 6 Mrs Roberst H.L.

7 Dutches of Cleveland being as a Madonna & a babe. 8. Mrs. Mays sister H.L.

9Mr Wm. Wm. Finch a head by Mr. Hales—10 Dutches of Richmond H.L. by Mr Anderton—

Jan. 1676/7 Mr Lely came to see Mrs. Beale paintings several of them he much commended and upon observations said Mrs. Beale was much improvd in her painting. no doubt—much study & practice. & Lelys—besides the oppertunity of seeing Mr. Lely paint several pictures from the life— Both her sonnes—Batt. & Charles learnt to draw & paint.

Mrs. Beale painted Sr. Wm. Turners picture from head to foot for our worthy Friend Mr. Knollyes.—he gave it to be sett up in the hall at bridewell. Sr. Wm. Turner having been president in the year he was Lord Mayor of London—

16 Feb. 7 6/7—I gave Mr. Manby 2 ounces of very good Lake. of my makeing— & 1 oz ½ pink. in consideration of the Landskip he did in the Countess of Clares picture

--Feb. 7 6/7. borrowd 6 Italian drawings out of the Kings Collection for my sons to practice by

Monday 5th March I sent my son Charles to Mr. Flatmans in order to his beginning to learne to Limne of him— the same time I dent my sons Barth picture done by my dearest

---

[5] V.103, B.M. 58b.

for Charles to make an Essay in water colours sent by my son Charles 3. 0. 0 wch he is to work out.

Octob. Pd for a desk for limning for my son Charles. 1. 15. 0

nov. abortive skins bot for my son Charles to Limn on[6]

Moneys paid my Son Barth. For work laying in ye Draperys of his Mothers pictures—from the beginning of this year. 1676/7. about 25 H.L. and as many more heads—Layd in. The Father Mr Charles Beals it seems by these account books kept the accounts of all affairs. for the House. the paintings and payments and also made the colours of ultramarine pinks Lakes and also primed cloths for Mrs. Beal. &c.

<he had some imployment as a clerk to the board of green Cloth>

<1677> this year Mrs. Beal had great business—amongst people of Quality as well as of others. and the accoun cast up at the end of the year for her paintings done mostly from the Life money receivd 429. 0—0

pictures painted by Mrs. Beal persons of distinction 1676 and 7

Earle of Clarendon	Duke of Newcastle
Lord Cornbury	Countes of Scarsdale H.L
Bp Wilkins.	Earle of Bolingbroke
Lord falconbridge	Lady Dorchester. HL.
Dr James Gardiner	Countess of Stafford.
Coll. Strangewayes	Mr Thomas Thynne.
Lady Mary Cavendish H.L.	Lady Lowther.

[6] V.104, B.M. 59.

Sr. Henry Thyme

Countess of Clare. HL.

Countess of Darby.

Sr Stephen Fox son

Sr John Cropley

Lady Parsons

Lady Halifax

Lady Lowther

Sr John Lowther.

old Sr. John Lowther.

old Lady Lowther

Mr Secretary Coventry HL.

Earl of Clare

Mr Finch Chancellors son

Mrs. Masham

Mrs Charles Stanley Countes Darby son

Many pictures for Lowthers.

many others.

another pocket book for ye year 1661. and almanack. in the beginning of it—I believe is Mrs. Beals hand writeing.

Debts paid since 20 June 1660. many summs of money to the amount of 260 pounds or more. some for mourning &c to Mr. Lely. 15 pounds I suppose for her Fathers picture painted by him whose name was Craddock. Minister I think of Walton on Thames Bucks where afterwards was by Beale erected a Monument—

Mr Beal afterwards writ in the same book. The first account is in Jan—a Bill of expences for all sorts of painting tools pencills, brushes goose & swan fictches dozens. &c. pd. 5. 5. 0

August. & in Septembr. quantities of primed paper to paint on. prepared in this year no accounts of her works done or persons setting for their pictures. as if she yet had no imployment that way—but only studied.

an Inventory of what valuable paintings drawings then in their posesion to the amount of a good deal of money. By Rubens Vandyke several

3 pictures painted by Mr Walker . her Father Cradock. Mrs. & Mr Beale—18.0.0. I am apt to think she had some instructions by Walker at first in drawing & painting—[7]

several pictures of the Family of Beals by Mr, Lilly—Mr Beals picture HL. Mrs Beals HL Mr Lillys own picture HL. each 20 pound. Locks picture 12.

<Haneman> Mr Hannemans picture. & frame 18. several others.

<Flatman.> given several wages to Mr Flatman for Limning my own picture. My D. Malls father Cradock and the Boyes—30.0.0— then follows an valuation of their goods. Frames Cloths. &c utensils. colours &c plate wattches bookes. & furniture. All this in Mr. Beals hand writeing

another pocket book. 1676

<Greenhill> May 19. 1676. Mr. Greenhill the Painter dyed.

3d. of May I made an Exchange with Mr. Henny. (painter.) half an ounce of ultramarine. for 4 of his smalt. wch heresould at 8 shill. p pound being the best and the finest ground smalt that ever came into England.

Sep. sent to Mr Manby a little Italian book il partito di Donni. about Painting.

<Lely> 26. Sent Mr Lely one ounce of my richest Lake. in part of payment for Mr Dean of Cant. Dr Stillingfleets and my son Charles picture wch he did for me.

account of the Painters lives I think to Translate ["CB"]

Leonardo da Vinci

Francesco Parmigione

---

[7] V.105, B.M. 59b.

Antonio Corregio

Giorgone da Castel Franco.

Rafael Urbino.

Polidoro & Maturino

Marrietta Tintoretta

Andrea Schiavone

Michel Angelo da Caravagio

Jacopo Palma il vechio

some pictures began this year. 1676—

E of Athols. HL

Countess of Northumberland.

Lady Mary Cavendish HL.

Countess of Clare HL

Lord Charles Murreys

Mr Mathews HL

Miss Russel. HL

and many others. heads

Receivd this year 1676. for pictures done 134. 0. 0 other moneys Rcd. & spent—200 pounds more

pictures of Mr. Lelys coppyed by Mrs. Beal.

Dutches of Yorke

Countess of Cleveland

Lady Mary Cavendish

Lady Elis Piercy

Lady Vaughn

Lady Clare

Lady Powel—

Lady Halifax

Mrs. Grimes

Mrs. Trevor

Mrs. Cheeke

Mrs. Gwinn

Mrs. Abdy.

Mrs. Warcup &c.

many others the postures only others the postures only

Another book. for 1681—

13 Jan. 1680/1 the Kings half len picture wch I borrowd of Sr Peter Lely was sent back to his executors. to Sr. P. Lelys house—

March 1680/1. Dr Burnet presented the 2nd Vol history of reform—to Mrs. Beale as he had done the first Vol.

April—1681—lent Mr Tho. Manby my Leonardo da Vinci, trattato dello Pittura which I had from Mrs. Flatman—[8]

July 1681. my D. Ht & self and son Charles saw at Mr Waltons—the Lady Carnarvons picture H.L. by Vandyck. in blew satin. a most rare complexion exceeding fleshy done without any shadow. it was lately bought by Mr Riley for 35.— also. another Lady. in blew satin. another Lady black.— others and a rare head by Holben of ye Lord Cromwell Hen. 8 dayes.

<Soest> 11 Feb. 1680/1 Mr Soest the Painter died. Mr Flessiere the frame maker. said he believd he was near 80 years old when he died

<Barth.> April 1681 pd. by Mr. Hancocks order for 2 qrs. Expence at Clare hall for my son for half a years charges. ending at Lady day1—2—6.—dito due at Michlms. pd. the same sum at Clare hall.

Dean Tillotsons pictue 3 qrs. upon Sacking— extreamly like—colour'd forcibly and strongly—

<Charles> pd my son Charles for what he had done to the pictures of Ld & Lady Ogle. at Nescastle house after Sr. P. Lely

1681. our worthy Friend the Dean of Peterburgh. Moor. picture one of the best pictures for painting and likeness—my D. ever did

<Flatman> Mr. Flatmans picture finisht. Dec. 1681 lent Thomas Flatman Esq. my wives Coppy in Little HL. of the Countess of Northumberlands picture after Sr. P. Lely.—

pictures begun. in 1681.

Lady Dixwell	Mrs. Cropleys
Dr. Nicholas	Lady Bowyers. HL.
E of Shaftesbury. Hl. for Ld Paget	Lady Dorrels.
Dutches of Newcastle—H.L.	Pierpoints
Lady Peytons.	Mr. Watsons—
Lord and Lady Ogles	Lady Darby & others
Lord Downes s	Lady Dorchester.

all amounting this year 209. 17. 6

at the end of this book is some remarks by— shorthand characters. What moneys put into the poors box. for charitable uses—wch were punctually observd—and so disposed off. about 2 shill in the ll.[9]

8) volume 5, 14-15— Source is again, Mr. Carter the Colourman. Appears in a notebook dated to 1742-52. Likely 1742.

Mrs. Beal paintress dyd December 1697. aeta 73.4 <she was buried under the Communion Table in St. Jamess Church> Charles her son followed painting. and dyd in Longacre where he lodged. 1714— Bartolemew her other son did not care for painting but under Dr. Sydenham studied physick and became a tollerable Country Phisician—he

[8] V.106, B.M. 60.

dyd at Coventry where he lived much—and also his Father Old Beale Husband of Mrs. Beal dyd at Coventry—he was in several imployments or Clerkship. at once clerk of the bord. of green cloth— Mrs. Hoadley learnt to paint of Mrs. Beal and had been for her self set up in busines. near 7 years before Mrs. Beal dyd. (she happened to have a lodging in house near Covent Garden two pair of stair. and in one pair of stairs lodgd two sisters (of ye Rev Mr. Hoadly) they were mantua makers, by this means came their first acquaintance—and afterwards Marriage with Rev Mr. Hoadly. her Maiden names Sarah Curtis—her Father--- Mr. Flatman's picture done by Mrs. Beal. this account from Mr. Carter Colour man—whose father and himself were intimate in the Beals family and had from them. at their deaths. and left with him most of ye papers books &c. amongst them was Beals account books. and those particular book or almanacks interleavd. of which I have had extracts from seven. many others were at the same time sold to Mr. Brooke these Mr. Carter says, were all his, and had been in his Custody since from 1711— he lent them to a Scrub painter to read. who goods being seizd on. they were lost and sold away. he [Carter] had above 30 of those almanack books—.[10]

9) vol. 5, p. 20—based on proximity to Vertue's account of his employment at Kensington Palace in 1743, this reference may tentatively be dated to that year.

1660 May 28. Charles Beale painter born in London in 66. Mrs. Beale & her husband. were at Albroke in Hampshire

---

[9] V.107, B.M. 60b.
[10] Vol. 5, 14-15.

1679/80 in Feb. Sr. Peter Lely was Knighted—and dyd on St. Andrews day in 1680—Mr. Harry Tilson. painter. a scholar of Sr. P. Lilly. Was living with Sr. P. 1680. Till his Death— —

Mr. Charles Beale a Coppy in Water Colours of Dr. Tillotson ["CB"] 1680. his Mark. one of Mrs. Beale aftr. Sr. P. Lely. one after of Mr. Beale. the picture of Mr. Flatman the Poet. and of Mrs. Beale. by her self in poses Carter Colourman. Mrs. Beale. her maiden name was Craddack—several Poems wrote by Dr. Woodfall. in the name of—Belesia—in her praise or commendation— papers in poses of Carter Colourman who has a short account drawn up of the time name Birth desease &c of Mrs. Beale & her sons.

Appendix B

Letter to Montagu, Tuesday 5 May 1761

We have lost a young genius, Sir William Williams; an express from Belleisle, arrived this morning, brings nothing but his death. He was shot very unnecessarily, riding too near a battery. In sum, he is a sacrifice to his own rashness,—and to ours—for for what are we taking Belleisle? I rejoiced at the little loss we had on landing—for the glory, I leave it to the Common Council. I am very willing to leave London to them too, and do pass half the week at Strawberry, where my two passions, lilacs and nightingales are in full bloom. I spent Sunday as if it was Apollo's birthday; Gray and Mason were with me, and we listened to the nightingales till one o'clock in the morning. Gray has translated two noble incantations from the Lord knows who, a Danish Gray, who lived the Lord knows when. They are to be enchased in a history of English Bards, which Mason and he are writing, but of which the former has not writ a word yet, and of which the latter, if he rides Pegasus at this usual foot-pace, will finish the first page two years hence—but the true frantic *oestrus* resides at present with Mr Hogarth: I went t'other morning to see a portrait he is painting of Mr. Fox—Hogarth told me he had promised, if Mr. Fox would sit as he liked, to make as good a picture as Vandyke or Rubens could. I was silent—'Why now,' said he, 'You think this very vain, but why should not one speak the truth?' This *truth* was uttered in the face of his own Sigismonda, which is exactly a maudlin whore tearing off the trinkets her keeper had given her, to fling at his head. She has her father's picture in a bracelet on her arm, and her fingers are bloody with the heart, as if she had just bought a sheep's pluck in St. James's market. As I was going, Hogarth put on a very grave face, and said, 'Mr. Walpole, I want to speak to you'; I sat

down, and said, I was ready to receive his commands. For shortness I will mark this wonderful dialogue by initial letters.

H. I am told you are going to entertain the town with something in our way. **W**. Not very soon, Mr. Hogarth. **H**. I wish you would let me have it, to correct; I should be sorry to have you expose yourself to censure. We painters must know more of those things than other people. **W**. Do you think nobody understands painting but painters? **H**. Oh! So far from it, there's Reynolds, who certainly has genius; why but t'other day he offered *L*100 for a picture that I would not hang in my cellar; and indeed, to say truth, I have generally found that persons who had studied painting least, were the best judges of it—but what I particularly wanted to say to you was about Sir James Thornhill (you know he married Sir James's daughter) I would not have you say anything against him; there was a book published some time ago, abusing him, and it gave great offence—he was the first that attempted history in England, and I assure you some Germans have said he was a very great painter. **W**. My work will go no lower than the year 1700, and I really have not considered whether Sir J. Thornhill will come within my plan or not; if he does, I fear you and I shall not agree upon his merits. **H**. I wish you would let me correct it—besides, I am writing something of the same kind myself, I should be sorry we should clash. **W**. I believe it is not much known what my work is; very few persons have seen it. **H**. Why, it is a critical history of painting, is not it? **W**. No, it is an antiquarian history of it in England; I bought Mr. Vertue's MSS, and I believe the work will not give much offence. Besides, if it does, I cannot help it: when I publish anything, I give it to the world to think of as they please. **H**. Oh! If it is an antiquarian work, we shall not clash. Mine is a critical work; I don't know whether I shall ever publish it—it is rather an

apology for painters—I think it owing to the good sense of the English, that they haven't painted better. **W**. My dear Hogarth, I must take my leave of you, you now grow too wild—and I left him—if I had stayed, there remained nothing but for him to bite me. I give you my honour this conversation is literal, and perhaps, as long as you have known Englishmen and painters, you never met with anything so distracted. I had consecrated a line to his (I mean for wit) in my preface; I shall not erase it, but I hope nobody will ask me if he was not mad. Adieu!

Yours ever

H.W.

Appendix C

Mary Beale, (1632-1697), was daughter of Mr. Cradock, minister of Walton-upon-Thames, and learned the rudiments of painting from Sir Peter Lely, and had some instructions, as Vertue thought, from Walker. She painted in oil, water-colours and crayons, and had much business; her portraits were in the Italian style, which she acquired by copying several pictures and drawings from Sir Peter Lely's and the royal collections. Her master was supposed to have had a tender attachment to her, but as he was reserved in communicating to her all the resources of his pencil, it probably was a gallant passion rather than a successful one. Dr. Woodfall wrote several poems to her honour, under the name of Belesia; but the fullest account of her life and works was recorded by her own husband, who, in small almanac pocket-books, minuted down almost daily accounts of whatever related to himself, his business, and his wife's pictures. Of these almanacs there were above thirty, which, with most of Mr. Beale's papers, came into the hands of Carter, colourman, to whom Beale bequeathed them. Some were sold to Mr. Brooke, a clergyman. His share, Carter lent to a low painter, whose goods being seized, the pocket-books were lost, but seven of them a friend of Vertue's met with on a stall, bought, and lent to him. Most of his extracts, I shall now offer to the reader, without apprehension of their being condemned as trifling or tiresome. If they are so, how shall this whole work escape? When one writes the lives of artists, who in general were not very eminent, their pocket-books are as important as any part of their history—I shall use no further apology, even if those that are lost should be regretted!

The first is,

"1672, 20 April. Mr. Lely was here with Mr. Gibson and Mr. Skipwith, to see us, and commended very much her (Mrs Beale's) coppy after our Saviour praying in the garden, &c, after Anto. da Coreggio; her copy in little after Endimion Porter his Lady and three sons he commended extraordinarily, and said (to use his own words) it was painted like Vandyke himself in litte, and that it was the best coppy he ever saw of Vandyke. Also he well liked her two cppyes in great of Mr. Porter's little son Phil. He commended her other workes, coppyes and those from the life. Both he and Mr. Gibson both commended her works.

"Mr. Lely told me at the same time as he was most studiously looking at my Bishop's picture of Vandyke's, and I chanced to ask how Sir Anthony could possibly divise to finish in one day a face that was so exceeding full of work, and wrought up to so extraordinary a perfection.—I believe, said he, he painted it over fourteen times. And upon that he took occasion to speake of Mr. Nicholas Laniere's picture of Sr. Anto. V.D. doing, which, said he, Mr. Laniere himself, told me he satt seaven entire dayes for it to Sr. Anto, and that he painted upon it of all those seaven dayes both morning and afternoon, and only intermitted the time they were at dinner.And he said likewise that though Mr Laniere sat so often and so long for his picture, that he was not permitted so much as once to see it, till he had perfectly finished the face to his own satisfaction. This was the picture which being showed to King Charles the First, caused him give order that V. Dyck should be sent for over into England.

"20 Feb. 1671-2. My worthy and kind Friend Dr. Belk caused the excellent picture of Endimion Porter his lady and three sons altogether done by Sr. Anto. Vandyke,

to be brought to my house that my deare heart might have the opportunity to study it, and coppy whatt shee thought fitt of itt. Also at the same time wee returned Mrs. Cheeks picture Mr. Lelys painting back to my Lord Chamberlain.

"Pink remaining in stock Sept. 1672. Some parcells containing some pds weight of tryalls made July 1663.

"19 Aprill 1672. My dearest painted over the third time a side face. This Mr. Flatman liked very well.

"24 April 1672. My most worthy friend Dr. Tillotson sat to Mr. Lely for his picture for me, and another for Dr. Craddock. He drew them first in chalk rudely, and afterwards in colours and rubbed upon that a little colour very thin in places for the shadows, and laid a touch of light upon the heightening of the forehead. He had done them both in an hours time.

"Lord Bishop of Chester's picture painted by Mrs. Beale for Lord John Berkeley.

"Sunday 5th May 1672 . Mr. Samuel Cooper the most famous limner of the world for a face, dyed.

"18 May 1672. Pd. Mr. Thos. Burman in part, due for my honoured father and mother's monument set up for them at Walton in Bucks. at the expence of my brother Henry Beale and myself, the whole cost paid in full 45 pounds*l*.

"23. Ld. and Lady Cornbury's picture dead colour'd. Dr. Sidenham's picture began.

"5 June, Dr. Tillotson sat about 3 hours to Mr. Lely for him to lay in a dead colour of his picture for me. He apprehending the colour of the cloth upon which he painted was too light before he began to lay on the flesh colour, he glazed the whole place, where

the face and haire were drawn in colour over thin, with Cullen's earth, and a little bonn black (as he told us) made very thin with varnish.

"June 1672. Receivd for three pictures of Sr. Rob. Viner, his lady and his daughter. 30*l.*

"20 June. My most worthy friend Dr. Tillotson sat in the morning about three hours to Mr. Lely, the picture he is doing for me. This is the third setting.

"Mr Fuller the Painter died 17 July 1672, as Mr Manby told me.

"22 July. Mrs. Beale painted her own picture second setting.

"23 July. Received of Col. Giles Strangwayes for Dr. Pierce's, Dr. Cradock's, Dr Tillotson's, Dr. Stillingfleet's, Mr Crumholem's pictures 25*l.*

"1 Aug. 1672. Dr. Tillotson sat to Mr Lely about three hours for the picture he is doing for me, this is the forth time, and I believe he will paint it (at least touch it) over again. His manner in the painting of this picture, this time especially, seemed strangely different both to myself and my dearest heart from his manner of painting the former pictures he did for us. This wee thought was a more concealed mysterious scanty way of painting then the way he used formerly, which wee both thought was far more open and free, and much more was to be observed and gained from the seeing him paint then, than my heart could with her most careful marking learn from his painting either this, or Dr. Cradock's picture of his doing for Dr. Patrick.

"Delivered to Mr. Lely one ounce of Ultramarine at 2*l.* 10*s.* one ounce towards payment for Dr. Tillotson's picture for me.

"30 Sept. I carried my two boys Charles and Batt. to Mr. Lely's showed them all his pictures, his rare collection. 1 Octob. I went again to Mr. Lely's, and showed Mr. W. Bonest the same excellent pictures. This person was a learner then.

"I have paid Mr. Lely towards the pictures of Mr. Cos. Brooke Bridges and Dr. Tillotson which he is doing for me, by several parcells of Lake of my own making which he sent for 17 Aug. 1671, and Ultramarine and money, 13*l.*12*s.*

"Received this year 1672 moneys at interest, rents, or for colours, upon Mr. Beale's account, 101*l.* 11*s.* Received this year for pictures done by my dearest heart 202*l.* 5*s.*"

Then follows a list of pictures done from the life by Mrs. Beale since 1761-2, with the months in which they were painted. There were thirty-five paid for, besides several begun and not paid for; among the former were portraits of Sir. Rob. Viner and his daughter, in one piece, Dr. Tillotson, and Dr. Stillingfleet, Dr. Outram, Dr. Patrick, Col. Strangeways; and a Magdalen painted from Moll Trioche, a young woman who died in 1672. Among the latter, his sister's, his wife's own, Lady Falconberg, and Lady Eliz. Howard's pictures.

From the almanac of 1674 were the following memorandums:—

"In August Mr. Lely had one ounce of Ultramarine, the richest at 4*l.* 10*s.* per oz. in part of payments betwixt us for Dean of Cant. Tillotson, and Dr. Stillingfleet, which he has done for me, and by Lakes and Ultramarins, according to account of the particulars

1673. 24 9 0

4 9 0

28 19 0 So there is due to him 1*l.* 1*s.* in full payment for the two fore mentioned pictures.

"Aug 1674. Mr. Lely dead-colour'd my son Charles picture—took a drawing upon paper after an Indian gown he which he had put on his back, in order to the finishing the drapery of it.

"Nov. Borrowed of William Chiffinch, Esq., eleven of his Majesties Italian drawings.

"1674. Received this yeare for pictures done by my dearest 216*l.* 5*s.*"

At the end of this book are more lists of pictures begun or finished by Mrs. Beale. From an almanac of 1677:—

"4 June. Mr. Comer the painter being at our house told my dearest as a secret that he used black chalk ground in oil instead of blue black, and found it much better and more innocent colour.

"22 May. Mr. Francis Knollys came himself and away the original picture of the old Earl of Strafford, and Sr. Philip Manwaring which had been left here for some years. It was carried away by two of the Lord Hollis's servants whom Mr Knollys brought with him for that purpose.

"April. I saw at Mr. Bab Mays Lodgings at Whitehall these pictures of Mr. Lely's doeing; 1. the Kings picture, in buff half-lenghth. 2. First Dutches of York, h.l. 3. Dutches Portsmouth, h.l. 4. Mrs Gwin with a lamb, h.l. 5. Mrs. Davis with a gold pot, h.l. 6. Mrs Roberts, h.l. 7. Dutches of Cleveland being as a Madonna and a babe. 8. Mrs. Mays sister, h.l. 9. Mr. Wm. Finch, a head by Mr. Hales. 10. Dutches of Richmond, h.l., by Mr Anderton.

"Jan. 1676-7. Mr. Lely came to see Mrs. Beale paintings, several of them he much commended, and upon observations said Mrs. Beale was much improved in her painting.

"Mrs. Beale painted Sr. Wm. Turner's picture from head to foot for our worthy Friend Mr. Knollyes. He gave it to be sett up in the hall at Bridewell. Sr. Wm. Turner having been president in the year he was Lord Mayor of London.

"Feb. 16. I gave Mr. Manby two ounces of very good lake of my making, and one ounce and half of pink, in consideration of the Landskip he did in the Countess of Clare's picture

"Feb. Borrow'd 6 Italian drawings out of the King's Collection for my sons to practice by.

"Monday, 5th March. I sent my son Charles to Mr. Flatman's in order to his beginning to learne to limne of him. The same time I dent my son's Barth. picture done by my dearest, for Charles to make an essay in water-colours Lent by my son Charles 3*l.* which he is to work out.

"Moneys paid my son Barth. for work laying in the draperys of his mother's pictures, from the beginning of this year 1676-7. About 25 half-lengths and as many more heads layd in. Paid my son Charles upon the same account, near as many."

The father, Charles Beale, had some employment in the board of Green-cloth. This year Mrs. Beale had great business, and received for pictures 429*l.*; among others whose portraits she drew were, the Earl of Clarendon, Lord Cornbury, Bp. Wilkins, Countess of Derby, Sir Stephen Fox, Lord Halifax, Duke of Newcastle, Lady Scarsdale, Earl of Bolingbroke, Lady Dorchester, Lady Strafford, Mr. Th. Thynne, Mr. Secretary

Coventry, several of the family of Lowther, Earl of Clare, Mr. Finch, son of the Chancellor, and Mr. Charles Stanley, son of the Countess of Derby.

In the almanac of 1661, are no accounts of portraits painted by her, as if she had not yet got into business; but there are memorandums of debts paid, and of implements for painting bought, and an inventory of valuable pictures and drawings in their possession. Mention too is made of three portraits by Walker, her own, her husband's, and her father's; of Sir Peter Lely's by himself, half-length, price 20*l*. Hanneman's picture and frame, 18*l*.

It concludes with an inventory of their goods, furniture, colours, plate, watches, &c.

Another pocket-book:—

"May 19, 1676. Mr. Greenhill the painter dyed.

"3d. of May. I made an Exchange with Mr. Henny, half an ounce of Ultramarine for four pound of his Smalt which he valued at eight shillings a pound, being the best and the finest ground Smalt that ever came into England.

"Sept. Lent to Mr. Manby a little Italian book Il Partito di Donni about painting.

"26. Sent Mr. Lely one ounce of my richest Lake in part of payment for Mr. Dean of Cant. Dr Stillingfleet's and my son Charles picture which he did for me."

Then follows lists of lives of painters which he thought to translate, and of pictures begun that year, as the Earl of Athol's, Lady Northumberland's, &c., and of pictures copied from Sir Peter, as the Duchess of York, Lady Cleveland, Lady Mary Cavendish, Lady Eliz. Percy, Lady Clare, Lady Halifax, Mrs. Gwin, &c., and others, from which she only copied the postures.

Another book, 1681:—

"13 Jan. The Kings half-length picture which I borrowed of Sir Peter Lely was sent back to his executors, to Sr. Peter Lelys house.

"March. Dr. Burnet presented the second volume of the History of the Reform to Mrs. Beale as he had done the first volume.

"April. Lent Mr Tho. Manby my Leonardo da Vinci, which I had from Mr. Flatman.

"July. My dear heart finisht the first copy of the half-length of Lady Ogle's picture, after Sr. P. Lely at Newcastle House—3d painting, both Lord and Lady Ogle's pictures.

"Nov. My dear heart and self and son Charles saw at Mr Walton's the Lady Carnarvon's picture half-length by Vandyck in blew satin, a most rare complexion exceeding fleshy done without any shadow. It was lately bought by Mr Riley for 35*l.* also another lady in blue satin, another lady, black; others, and a rare head by Holben of the Lord Cromwell, Hen. VIII. dayes.

"Feb. 11 1680-1. Mr. Soest the painter died. Mr. Flessiere the frame maker said he believed he was near 80 years old when he died.

"April 1681. Paid by Mr. Hancock's order for two quarters expence at Clare-hall for my son for half a year's charges ending at Lady-day, 12*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.* paid the same sum at Clare-hall.

"Paid my son Charles for what he had done to the pictures of Lord and Lady Ogle at Nescastle house, after Sr. P. Lely

"Our worthy Friend the Dean of Peterburgh Moor's picture, one of the best pictures for painting and likeness my dearest ever did.

"Mr. Flatman's picture finisht. Lent Thomas Flatman, Esq. my wife's coppy in little half-length of the Countess of Northumberland's picture after Sr. P. Lely.

"Pictures begun in 1681. Lady Dixwell, Dr. Nicholas, Earl of Shaftesbury half-length for Lord Paget, Dutchess of Newcastle, h. l. Lord Downe, &c. in all amounting to 209*l.* 17*s.*"

At the end of this book some notes, in short characters, of moneys put into the poor's box for charitable uses, these good people bestowing this way about two shillings in the pound.

Mrs. Beale died in Pall-Mall at the age of sixty-five, Dec. 28, 1697, and was buried under the communion table in St. James's-church. Her son, Bartholomew, had no inclination for painting, and relinquishing it, studied physic under Dr. Sydenham, and practised at Coventry, where he and his father died. The other son,

Charles Beale, who was born May 28, 1660, painted both in oil and water-colours, but mostly in the latter, in which he copied the portrait of Dr. Tillotson. His cipher he wrote thus on his works, CB. The weakness in his eyes did not suffer him to continue his profession above four or five years. He lived and died over-against St. Clement's, at Mr. Wilson's, a banker, who became possessed of several of his pictures for debt; particularly of a double half-length of his father and mother, and a single one of his mother, all by Lely. I have Mrs. Beale's head and her son Charles's in crayons; they were Vertue's: and her own and her son's in water-colours, strongly painted, but not so free as the crayons.

Figure 1



Self Portrait of Mary Beale, c. 1675-80.
Used by permission of the St. Edmundsbury Borough Council, (Manor House).

Figure 2



Charles Beale by Mary Beale, c. 1666.
Used by permission of the St. Edmundsbury Borough Council, (Manor House).

Figure 3



Gilbert Burnet D.D. by Mary Beale, c. 1691.
Used by permission of the St. Edmundsbury Borough Council, (Manor House).

VITA

Surname: Campbell Given Names: Kristin Erin

Place of Birth: Mississauga, Ontario, Canada

Educational Institutions Attended:

University of Victoria	1999 to 2001
Queen's University	1995 to 1999

Degrees Awarded:

B.A. (Honours)	Queen's University	1999

Honours and Awards:

University of Victoria Teaching Fellowships, History in Art Department	1999-2001
Queen's University Cornett Scholarships, History Department	1997 and 1998

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant the right to lend my thesis to users of the University of Victoria Library, and to make single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the Library of any other university, or similar institution, on its behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or a member if the University designated by me. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain by the University of Victoria shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis:

Restoring the Biographical Portrait: the case of Mary Beale (1633-1699)

Author _____

Kristin Erin Campbell

June 20, 2001