

The Pourtraiture of John Bunyan' revisited: Robert White and Images of the Author

Anne Dunan-Page

▶ **To cite this version:**

Anne Dunan-Page. The Pourtraiture of John Bunyan' revisited: Robert White and Images of the Author. Bunyan Studies : A Journal of Reformation and Nonconformist Culture, 2008, 13, pp.7-39. halshs-00838501

HAL Id: halshs-00838501
https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00838501

Submitted on 25 Jun 2013

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

‘The Portraiture of John Bunyan’ Revisited: Robert White and Images of the Author

The Prints and Drawings Room of the British Museum houses an item of vital historical importance for Bunyan scholars: the wonderfully accomplished head-and-shoulders drawing of Bunyan, executed *ad vivum* by the London engraver Robert White sometime in 1678 or 1679 (Gg.1.493). The sketch was bequeathed to the Museum in 1799 by the Rev. Clayton Mordaunt Cracherode as part of a collection numbering 662 portraits, some of which had previously been owned by the collector James West, formerly President of the Royal Society.[1] In his *Catalogue of Engravers* (1763), Horace Walpole confirmed that ‘Many of [White’s] heads were taken by himself with a black lead pencil on velom: Mr West has several, particularly his own head at the age of sixteen’.[2] For anyone who handles the Bunyan portrait, the tiny face (the drawing measures only 122mm x 90mm) traced in graphite and metal point has a particular poignancy, for this is perhaps the only seventeenth-century artefact that we know for certain the ageing John Bunyan must have seen and handled, some time in the late 1670s.

No Bunyan enthusiast can ignore the portrait, at least in its printed form, for it had an extraordinary afterlife. It was the basis of the oval portrait of ‘*John Bunnyon*’ (inscribed ‘R White Sculp’) and of the allegorical folding plate of Bunyan (full length) included in the first edition of *The Holy War* in 1682. More importantly, it is generally assumed to have been the basis for the so-called ‘Sleeping Portrait’ in the third edition of *The Pilgrim’s Progress* (1679). Bunyan’s posture in this, his head resting on his hand, is reminiscent of Biblical dreamers but also of inspired melancholics, men of great talent and ability. The dream, the lion and the den (that also appears in the opening of the text) immediately evoke Daniel but also Saint Jerome in the wilderness, establishing a visually powerful compound of biblical tradition and legend.[3]

This article focuses on aspects of the work and career of Robert White in the late 1670s which are virtually unknown to Bunyan scholars, including his involvement with Nathaniel Ponder, the publisher of *The Pilgrim’s Progress*. Following Gordon Roe who, in 1945, gave the most comprehensive (if in places mistaken) account of Bunyan’s ‘effigies’, I will argue that poor derivatives of White’s frontispiece have prevented us from seeing it for what it was: the work of a fashionable society engraver and miniaturist whose attention to Bunyan, on Ponder’s behalf, was a striking oddity that deserves a closer look.[4] A consideration of Robert White’s *œuvre* and working practices will illustrate the need to reassess the nature and use of the Bunyan graphite, and I will propose fresh ways to approach the early illustrations of Bunyan’s allegories—from the sleeping portrait to the oval frontispieces engraved by White, by his pupil John Sturt, by Thomas Burnford and Fredrick van Hove. In doing so, I will suggest ways in which early representations of Bunyan may have shaped his reception and reputation in the seventeenth century.

*****

‘The Portraiture of John Bunyan’

The reception of Bunyan’s works illustrated in Roger Sharrock’s 1976 *Casebook* has recently been given fresh critical attention in the 2006 volume of essays edited by W. R. Owens and Stuart Sim, *Reception, Appropriation, Recollection: Bunyan’s Pilgrim’s Progress*.[5] The whole matter is linked to the issue of Bunyan’s ‘canonisation’ both as a literary artist and as a ‘serious’ divine. Prior to Nathaniel Ponder’s publication of the first part of *The Pilgrim’s Progress* in February 1678, there is little evidence that Bunyan was

known beyond a limited circle of Dissenters, despite being admired as a preacher and feared as a controversialist. With the first edition of the allegory, however, everything was about to change. In the telling phrase of Charles Doe in 1692, '*the Author become famous*'.[6]

The Pilgrim's Progress was entered in the Stationers' Register on 22 December 1677 and advertised in the Term Catalogue for Hilary term (18 February) 1678 in the 'Divinity' section. Ponder took the precaution of having it licensed, because he knew all too well the effects (and side-effects) of the licensing system, having dealt with Roger L'Estrange over Marvell's *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* and *Mr Smirke*.[7] Sensing a publishing *coup* with *The Pilgrim's Progress*, Ponder probably also thought (wrongly, as it turned out) that a license would keep the pirates at bay. The book's success was instantaneous. Five editions appeared within two years and Ponder was soon able to boast that it had 'sold several Impressions, and with good Acceptation among the People'.[8] Plate 3 is a Victorian depiction of Ponder's shop at the sign of the Peacock, recently moved to the Poultry: rich and poor, men, women, and children are crowding the street outside the shop, eager to turn the pages of the allegory as soon as they have a copy in their hands.

Ponder soon faced competition from pirated editions issued by Thomas Bradyll. As it turned out, the legal wrangling over this lasted for many years (although it did not prevent Ponder from subsequently working with Bradyll) and greatly impoverished Ponder.[9] In 1680, he inserted an advertisement in copies of the fourth edition of *The Pilgrim's Progress* to warn readers about forgeries and to show them how to distinguish his own copies from Bradyll's: 'this Fourth Edition hath as the third had, The Authors Picture before the Title, and hath more then 22 passages of Additions, pertinently placed quite thorow the Book, which the Counterfeit hath not. N.P.'[10]

So 'The Authors Picture before the Title' was not an ornament to make the already successful allegory more attractive: it was a way to distinguish Ponder's 'true' copies from Bradyll's. Almost at the very beginning of Bunyan's fame, therefore, his image was an important and contentious issue. It remained important in various ways for centuries. In the eighteenth century, following in the footsteps of Elias Ashmole, John Evelyn and Samuel Pepys, men such as Joseph Ames and Horace Walpole, but especially James Granger and Henry Bromley launched the fashion for collecting British engraved portraits, or 'old heads', as they were called. In 1769, Granger prepared his *Biographical History of England*, the first methodical catalogue, arranged chronologically and by 'classes', which almost instantly made engraved portraits much in demand among British collectors.[11] By the middle of the eighteenth century, Bunyan already featured prominently in private collections.[12] In Ames's catalogue (1748), for instance, one learns that John Nickolls possessed in his collection the engraved frontispiece to the Bunyan folio of 1692, an engraving by Robert White catalogued thus: '*Oval frame, own Hair, Whiskers, laced Band*' (which might have been White's oval frontispiece for *The Holy War*). Nickolls also possessed the 1728 frontispiece by Sturt that was engraved after White's sleeping portrait.[13] In the second, revised edition of Granger (1775) the total of Bunyan prints found in the collections of William Musgrave, Horace Walpole and James West has risen to eight (for the reign of Charles II): an engraving in 12° for *Grace Abounding* by John Sturt, another one by Sturt for *The Pilgrim's Progress* (8°), a 12° by Robert White, one by Thomas Burnford, one by P. Bouche, a print of Bunyan, aged 57 '*in a round*', an anonymous etching in 4° and an etching '*by Mr. John Holland, late of Peter-house in Cambridge, from a drawing, supposed to be by Faithorne, in the possession of the Reverend Mr. Lort*', dated 1756.[14] For the reign of James II, Granger mentions the Jonathan Spilsbury mezzotint of the Thomas Sadler portrait.[15] The process of illustrating the *Biographical History* with culled prints is infamously referred to as 'Grangerization'. It

is therefore possible, since Bunyan features so prominently in Granger, that the remarkable *engouement* for print collecting was responsible for the defacing of many of his frontispieces, which would explain why there are scarcely two identical copies of the early editions of *The Pilgrim's Progress* now in existence. Interestingly, Granger does not list Bunyan in the 'Nonconformists' section, but gives him special importance by devising a separate class, simply entitled 'A Lay Preacher'.

Some thirty years later, in Henry Bromley's 1793 catalogue, the gentlemen whom Bromley wishes to assist in their collections were now informed that twelve engraved prints of John Bunyan existed: the previous ones mentioned by Granger plus Richard Houston's mezzotint of the Sadler, a folio engraving 'prefixed to a late ed. of his "Works"... by Kitchin (?)' and another one, in folio, for Bunyan's *Works* (most probably the Sturt frontispiece which Granger had overlooked).[16] Some of these are well known to Bunyan scholars, such as Sturt's folio engraving or the mezzotints of the Sadler, and some I shall return to below, but some are lost or as yet unknown. In 1793 it was nevertheless already highly desirable for the enlightened connoisseur to acquire small or large prints (some used as frontispieces), mezzotints or etchings of the author of *The Pilgrim's Progress*.

The Victorian era released what can only be described as a whole attic of Bunyan memorabilia including busts, medallions, statues, prints and facsimiles, presenting the author in many different lights. The distinction between Victorian artefacts and seventeenth-century representations became increasingly important, and therefore the desire to see or to possess an *authentic* image of Bunyan surfaced constantly. As Frank Mott Harrison has shown, there were many claims in the nineteenth and indeed in the early twentieth centuries that Bunyan was represented and painted in his lifetime.[17] We possess reproductions of the so-called Plimpton portrait, supposedly executed in 1673.[18] Regent's Park Baptist College, Oxford, has an anonymous painting, claimed for the seventeenth century, but actually of uncertain date, that was engraved by Herbert Bourne. The painting was presented to the College by John Fenwick of Newcastle in 1866, and has been reproduced many times.[19] A newspaper article mentioned that 'Many portraits exist said to represent Bunyan, probably the most interesting being that in the Stationers' Hall. It is a small painting on a panel of a man in a high black hat, but it has been stated to be John Bunyan upon insufficient authority'.[20] There are many more but known to us only from passing references, such as 'a painting belonging to George Phillips' (the Fenwick's portrait or a variant?); an 'original painting by John Fountain'; 'an authentic portrait. 1671',[21] an oil painting 'in the possession of Mr. John Beagarie of Hitchin'[22] and 'an original portrait painted in the year 1665 by Mr. Edward Costwold'.[23]

Throughout the twentieth century, various people claimed to possess seventeenth-century portraits of John Bunyan. One was advertised in *The Times* of 1909 as 'a very interesting contemporary portrait, painted by J. K., 100 guineas'. In 1921, Stapleton Martin inquired whether the oil portrait discovered in 'a shop near Frome' and reported by the Somerset *Standard* in 1909 was genuine.[24] In 1937, there was an advertisement placed in a bookseller's catalogue for 'a seventeenth-century portrait, in allegorical style, in oils on copper, half length, seated at a table'.[25] Perhaps most intriguing of all, in 1932, there appeared in the author's home town of Bedford two small Indian ink sketches inscribed 'Mr and Mrs Bunyan. Fecit anno 1675', that were said to have been in the possession of George Offor, together with a portrait of Bunyan as a tinker. They were briefly exhibited at Shire Hall.[26]

Even such a brief description as this suggests that there is a great deal still to be pursued regarding Bunyan's representations. At present, one can only say that there are just two authenticated seventeenth-century images. The first one is the British Museum

graphite previously mentioned; the second is the half-length portrait in oil by Thomas Sadler, executed around 1685 and acquired in 1902 by the trustees of the National Portrait Gallery from Mary, Countess of Cavan, who had inherited it from her father, the Rev. John Olive, rector of Ayott St Lawrence in Hertfordshire. The portrait was apparently bought in 1854 from an old woman called Sarah Clark who claimed that it was bequeathed to her by a Baptist ironmonger named Thomas Caporn who had heard Bunyan preach.[27] The 1775 edition of James Granger's *Biographical History* mentions that 'The painting ... which appears to be an original, is now in the possession of Mr. Field, a watchmaker at Bath'.[28]

White's effort is a small graphite head-and-shoulders, and Sadler's a half-length oil, but there is no denying that both portraits are rather similar. At the beginning of the twentieth century this led George Williamson to surmise that the portrait in the National Portrait Gallery was in fact executed after White's drawing:

> Thomas Sadler is another man of whom little can be said. He was the son of a Master in Chancery ... who was greatly esteemed by Cromwell, and educated for the law. He received some instruction from Lely, and having lost a fortune devoted himself to art, and is said to have practiced engraving as well as portraiture. He is best remembered by a portrait he did of John Bunyan, which was engraved in mezzotint, and the drawing for which is in the British Museum.[29]

Given the undoubted similarity between these two images, it is sometimes difficult to determine which one is the model for later engravings such as John Sturt's frontispiece for the Bunyan folio in 1692. Charles Doe records it was engraved from a painting of Bunyan by *'his very good Friend a Limner*', a term that might refer to either Sadler or to an unknown artist.[30] This particular frontispiece was worth collecting; Doe takes care to mention that the potential buyers can obtain it unframed at the shop of William Marshall. In the 'Advertisement' we learn that it cost 6*d*., and that it could be bought with similar prints of Joseph Caryl, Matthew Mead, John Owen and Tobias Crisp.[31] Sturt's engraving seems roughly based on the Sadler, but it also incorporates elements of White's drawing, most notably Bunyan's habit. This, I will argue below, is hardly surprising since Sturt was apprenticed to White and had already executed an engraving of Bunyan as early as 1680.

White's original drawing, for obvious reasons, had a very limited circulation, if any at all. However, the success of *The Pilgrim's Progress* meant that the 1679 sleeping portrait that White engraved, perhaps using his previous drawing to guide him, was to be many times drawn, redrawn and imitated by many artists, some of them unskilled. It rapidly lost its original quality, almost to the point of caricature and gave its original engraver a very poor reputation, especially among the Romantics. Plate 4 shows a striking corruption of White's original from a 1789 edition of *The Pilgrim's Progress*.

It is therefore hardly surprising that what began as Ponder's picture of the author did not fare too well with the critics. In 1830, Robert Southey asked Bernard Barton to compose a poem, on the *new* engraving of Bunyan for his luxury edition. Derivatives of White were replaced by an engraving of the Sadler portrait, accompanied by two further engravings, one of the Valley of the Shadow of Death, the other of the Celestial City, executed after paintings by John Martin. These are Barton's reflections upon the degraded versions of White's image and his relief at seeing Bunyan engraved again from Sadler:

> And this is BUNYAN! How unlike the dull
> Unmeaning visage which was wont to stand
> His PILGRIM's Frontispiece,—its pond'rous skull

> Propp'd gracelessly on an enormous hand;—
> A countenance one vainly might have scann'd
> For one bright ray of genius or of sense;
> Much less the mental power of him who plann'd
> This fabric quaint of rare intelligence,
> And, having rear'd its pile, became immortal thence.[32]

The irony, of course, is that so little is known about Thomas Sadler that we can hardly pass a judgement upon his art, but that we do know a great deal about the extraordinary talent of Robert White.

Nathaniel Ponder, John Owen and Robert White

Even though there is unmistakable evidence of the popularity of *The Pilgrim's Progress*, those who read it most eagerly were not those who could, or indeed would, express their views. We are therefore left to construe the early reception of *The Pilgrim's Progress* with little more than fragmented evidence. For instance, John Owen seems to have been a great admirer of Bunyan's preaching, even though his reference to Bunyan does not seem to appear before the nineteenth century. Owen had reportedly answered Charles II (who wondered why a man of such learning as Owen would go and hear a tinker preach): 'Had I the tinker's abilities, please your Majesty, I would most gladly relinquish my learning.'[33]

There is evidence that Owen took an interest not only in Bunyan's preaching but also in his writings. If one examines the catalogue prepared for the sale of Owen's books in 1684, one finds that Owen possessed three volumes by Bunyan: *A Doctrine of Justification by Faith in Jesus Christ* (1672), *Light for them that sit in Darkness*, called by its subtitle 'Discourse on Jesus Christ' (1675), and *The Pilgrims's Progress* (1678). In addition, Owen possessed '*T.P*'s Serious Reflections in *M. Bunyan*'s Confession of Faith' (1673), Thomas Paul's answer to Bunyan's 1672 treatise on baptism and open communion.[34] Owen had a particular interest in the baptismal controversy, having been persuaded by Bunyan to write a prefatory epistle to his *Differences in Judgment* (1673) before retracting.[35] Had he wished to write in support of Bunyan, Owen needed to be *au fait* with the printed controversy. Owen's copy of *The Pilgrim's Progress* was included by the compiler of the sales catalogue in the 'Divinity' section (rather than the broader 'Miscellanies' which contains literary works), suggesting that its contents in 1684 were still deemed essentially theological. This mirrors the initial 1678 classification of *The Pilgrim's Progress* in the Term Catalogues under 'Divinity'.

The relationship between reading and book-owning is a delicate issue and one should resist the temptation to draw hasty conclusions, but in the absence of material about Bunyan and his books in the seventeenth century Owen's choices deserve some attention. Owen must have heard Bunyan preach and was impressed enough to purchase texts that were not printed versions of Bunyan's sermons. As far as we know, however, when he passed a judgement on Bunyan, he did so on the charismatic qualities of the preacher, not on the literary merit of the allegorist, although he did acquire a copy of *The Pilgrim's Progress* very early on. Indeed we know that he possessed the first 1678 edition because the copy is listed in the 'octavo' section of the sales catalogue and from the second (1678) edition onwards, *The Pilgrim's Progress* appeared as a small duodecimo. Owen must therefore have acquired a copy of the allegory within a few months of its publication, which is hardly surprising since both he and Bunyan had Nathaniel Ponder as publisher.

In 1934, Mott Harrison suggested that Owen was responsible from Bunyan's switch from Benjamin Harris and Francis Smith, who had so far published Bunyan's works, to Nathaniel Ponder. We know that Bunyan was released from his last imprisonment by the

bishop of Lincoln, Thomas Barlow, Owen's old Oxford tutor. Owen had not acted on his own initiative but had been persuaded by one of Bunyan's friends, whose identity is still unknown, to intervene on Bunyan's behalf. W. G. Thorpe has argued it might have been Ichabod Chauncy, while Richard Greaves proposes George Cockayne, because the two sureties mentioned on the bond for the release were Thomas Kelsey and Robert Blaney, both possible members of Cokayne's congregation in Red Cross Street.[36] However, since Nathaniel Ponder had connections in Bedfordshire, most notably through his in-laws, it is also possible he came to know Bunyan independently. In 1672, he had secured licences for nonconformist preachers, one in particular for John Whitman to preach in the house of Cockayne, in Bedfordshire.[37]

Evidence of a connection between Ponder, Owen and Bunyan presents a strong case for suggesting that Owen might have introduced Bunyan to Ponder. However, we should not overlook the link between Ponder and another Bedfordshire man who was much closer to Bunyan than Owen had ever been, namely the Baptist Nehemiah Coxe. A year before the publication of *The Pilgrim's Progress* Coxe, a prominent member of the Bedford congregation, had published his very first work with Ponder, a refutation of Jeremy Collier entitled *Vindiciae Veritatis* (London, 1677). He had been a major actor with Bunyan in the organisation of Bedfordshire nonconformity before removing to a Baptist congregation in London and there is evidence of close friendship between Bunyan and Coxe.[38] It is therefore not impossible that Coxe might have been one of the famous 'friends' mentioned by Bunyan in the 'Apology' to the allegory who advised him to publish the book. If he was indeed privy to Bunyan's manuscript then perhaps he also suggested that Bunyan should turn to his own publisher.

The partnership between Ponder and White did not begin with the frontispiece to *The Pilgrim's Progress*; it started earlier on when White engraved Owen. Ponder's earliest publication was a folio edition of the first volume of Owen's *Exercitations on the Epistle to the Hebrews* in 1668. By 1676, however, if not before, Ponder had commissioned White to produce an elaborate oval frontispiece portrait of Owen, completed with a top ribbon banner (inscribed 'Quæramus Superna') and a coat of arms (inscribed 'R: White sculpsit' and 'Nath: Ponder exc').[39] This (*excudit*) indicates that Ponder was the publisher and probably sold the prints separately. The bottom of the engraving reads in elegiac couplets, 'Umbra refert fragiles dederint quas cura Dolorque/Reliquias, studiis assiduusque Labor' and 'Mentem humilem Sacri servantem limina veri/Votis supplicibus. Qui dedit ille videt'.

This frontispiece was in fact the second stage of an earlier engraving by White (and a half-length, rather than a head and shoulders). The first, much more modest state, was commissioned for Owen's *Exercitations Concerning the . . . Day of Sacred Rest* (London, 1671). This is much simpler that the engraving for the *Hebrews* volume (it is inscribed 'r.w.s'); Owen appears in an unadorned oval (the hand is not shown), resting on a pedestal engraved 'John Owen D.D.' (Wing 0751). Finally, in 1680, the engraving was used again in its third and last stage (again inscribed 'r.w.s'), this time for *A Practical Exposition on the CXXXth. Psalm* (Wing O795) and sold separately by John Marshall. The pedestal has reappeared, although the elegiac couplets have been dropped and replaced by an inscription in the oval: 'Ioannes Owenus. D.D. quondam vice cancellarius oxionensis'.

Very early in his career, then, with the publication of folio editions of the leading independent divine, Nathaniel Ponder commissioned an oval frontispiece of his author, which by then had become *de rigueur* in works of divinity. Ponder turned to Robert White, which is hardly surprising since White was the foremost collaborator with the book trade. This, however, raises questions as to Ponder's further collaboration with White on *The Pilgrim's Progress*. First of all, White's talent turned him into the leading society engraver of Restoration London, meaning that he commanded fees for even the simplest engraved

frontispieces that were by no means modest. Second, we should acknowledge, with W. R. Owens, that Bunyan's fame as a divine never reached that of Owen in his lifetime, and perhaps dates only from the publication of his works in folio in 1692.[40] The decision to choose Robert White as the engraver for the image in *The Pilgrim's Progress*, but to make him depart from his traditional mode of engraving frontispieces, needs to be reassessed, by a careful examination of White's *œuvre* and his reputation in the late 1670s.

Drawing and engraving

Robert White (1645–1703) was a line engraver who briefly took up mezzotint in the 1680s. A pupil of David Loggan (1635–1692), he specialised in almanacs, architectural engravings and portraits of noblemen and royals. Like most engravers, he worked closely with the book trade, hence his numerous frontispieces showing divines. He is said to have engraved some 400 plates between 1666 and 1702, 275 of which were recorded by George Vertue and transcribed by Horace Walpole.[41] White flourished at a time when engravers were able to rely less and less on printsellers in order to distribute their material.[42] He would work for a fixed fee, and then sell his prints at his house in Bloomsbury Market. He advertises, for instance, in Roger L'Estrange's *Observator*.[43]

However, like Loggan himself, Thomas Faithorne (c.1616–1691) and later John Faber (c.1660–1721), White was also known as a miniaturist, although the domination of such men as Samuel Cooper, Thomas Flatman, Richard Gibson and Nicholas Dixon at the Restoration eclipsed artists who did not produce *painted* miniatures. Colding, for instance, defined miniatures in the seventeenth century as 'pictures, painted on parchment or card with precious, or, at least, minute brushwork' and is reluctant to apply the term to anything else: 'In the 17th century, a certain form of drawing on parchment, in silver point, lead or Indian ink, became popular. These works, which were executed with finely pointed pencils or pens, are often called miniatures, but it would be more correct to term them drawings; they appear to have been directly influenced by the graphic arts'.[44] For George Williamson, on the other hand, 'The exquisite quality of such work ... its perfection of drawing, accuracy and tenderness of lines, and its minute size and charming fascination, render it very dear to the eye of the collector of miniatures, and there are few collections of any moment in which examples of this special art are not to be found'.[45] White is therefore sometimes mentioned by art historians as a miniaturist, sometimes not.[46] He was working in a medium that enjoyed a brief vogue between 1660–1720: what used to be called 'plumbago'—that is graphite, when it was still believed to contain lead, hence the use of the Latin term *plumbum*—on vellum, but not pasted on to a support like watercolour miniatures. The art of plumbago miniature seems to have been quite a lucrative one and was closely associated with engraving.[47] Undoubtedly, some of White's drawings were not meant to be studies for plates, but to stand as works of art in their own right.

White's *œuvre* (his drawings and his prints) remains uncatalogued to this day and he has not been the subject of a major study. There are, however, a few lists or catalogues of his work from which one can draw a fairly accurate, if incomplete, sense of his output. Horace Walpole compiled a first list of White's plates from Vertue in 1763 in his *Catalogue of Engravers*, later used again in his *Anecdotes of Painting*.[48] In 1926, for the *Walpole Society*, C. F. Bell and R. Poole prepared a list of plates *and* drawings, although, by their own admission, it is far from complete as 'the abundance of material . . . makes anything beyond a tentative scheme impracticable'.[49] Today, the National Portrait Gallery associates White with more than 200 engraved portraits on its website, most of which are not on display. A list of his drawings only (and their location) was established by J. J. Forster. It can be supplemented by information from Poole and Bell, Basil Long and, more recently, Daphne Foskett.[50] In addition, information about White's work is given in the

respective catalogues of private collections or library or museum holdings, such as Goulding, Binyon, Croft-Murray and Hutton.[51]

First of all, we need to assert the importance and nature of White's *ad vivum* drawings such as the one of Bunyan, especially since there are no modern studies of his art and the locations of his surviving portraits are in a large measure still unknown. One is generally left to surmise their nature, intended use, and indeed even their number. For instance, Forster in 1916 listed only fifteen portraits by White, but Bell and Poole in 1926 gave thirty. References given in scattered but more recent volumes take the total to thirty-two ; there are five in the Victoria and Albert Museum, thirteen (including Bunyan, see below) in the British Museum, one in the Ashmolean Museum (John Scott, D.D., the rector of White's parish, St-Giles-in-the Fields), three in the Duke of Portland collection (a self portrait from 1679, a portrait of James Scott, Duke of Monmouth, and one of Charles II from 1684, all signed)[52] and ten in the Huntington Library (including an earlier self-portrait executed while he was still an apprentice in 1661).

The following remarks are based on my examination of the drawings in the British Museum, but much more work on White needs to be undertaken by art historians before any definite conclusion can be drawn.[53] Bunyan scholars have always assumed, due to a general similarity of traits, that the sketch of the author by Robert White was the direct model for the subsequent frontispieces of *The Pilgrim's Progress* and *The Holy War*, but there are reasons to believe this was not necessarily so. Moreover, the translation of a portrait into a print deserves much more consideration; it seems, for instance, that White was generally thought to be better than Loggan at drawing, but inferior to his master when it came to translating the drawings to plates.[54] His engraved frontispieces were the lowest in a chain of descent from drawing to engravings to engraved frontispieces. In his entry on White, in his 1786 dictionary, Joseph Strutt declares that:

> His drawings, indeed, were certainly much superior to his prints ... He engraved several *frontispieces* and other *book plates*, and scraped some few heads in mezzotinto; but they are much inferior to his engraved portraits. The prints by this artist would look infinitely better, if they were not so disguised, as they are, in general, by large, tasteless borders; which, though intended for ornament, certainly are none.[55]

The point is made more forcefully when we compare, for instance, the quality of the original drawings of John Edward, John Scott, Nathaniel Vincent or indeed John Bunyan with their printed versions.

In trying to assess the nature of the Bunyan portrait in the context of other drawings by Robert White one therefore faces a challenge: should one regard the drawing as a mere preliminary study for a plate, or are there grounds for arguing that it was in fact a miniature that should be assessed independently? Are we even right to maintain such a distinction, since the size, technique and medium of White's studies and miniatures are so similar? There seems to be no right or simple answer. The terminology ('drawing', 'miniature') is already slippery; there is no precise research available on the translation from graphites to plates and the way in which White intended to use his own drawings remains largely unknown. Moreover, few art historians can agree upon what constitutes a miniature as opposed to a drawing, and even on how a drawing should be defined. In 1915, for instance, in the first part of the catalogue of drawings in Oxford collections, Bell classifies drawings into three major categories: sketches by painters, finished drawings (meant to stand either on their own or to be engraved) and engravers' drawings made from existing paintings as a foundation for the work on the copper plate.[56] This leaves little place for most of White's

drawings, which are intended for plates but are done from the life rather than from a painting, and are unfinished. In any case, it seems prudent, to say the least, not to assume a systematic correlation between a drawing and an engraving, since White seems to have gathered a vast number of portraits, finished or not, and then used them very loosely. The drawings by White that have been examined fall into three categories: those (unfinished) of royal sitters or noblemen intended for engravings; those (finished) intended to stand on their own as miniatures or to be engraved; those (unfinished) of divines, that were intended to be engraved for frontispieces to their works.

Notwithstanding these qualifications, there is little doubt that the drawing of Bunyan was never intended as a miniature but was prepared for a frontispiece. First of all, it is clearly unfinished. Great draughtsmanship is always visible in the faces of White's sitters, but their habits are more negligently drawn, indeed sometimes even barely sketched. This is because White was used to finishing the habits only when engraving the plates, as we know from George Vertue, a point on which he compares (unfavourably) the technique of White with those of Loggan and Faithorne.[57] This is not always the case, of course (John Scott, for instance, is entirely drawn, both on the vellum and the engraving), but it should alert us to the fact that when the surviving drawing is incomplete, it was obviously intended as a study for a later plate. This first consideration aside, there is one particular piece of evidence that seems to confirm the original intentions of White.

Engravers had two ways of preparing their plates; either they executed an *ad vivum* sketch of their subject or they engraved after an existing painting, as indeed White often did (one thinks for instance of his engravings of Roger l'Estrange and Samuel Pepys after Godfrey Kneller, Charles II after van Dyck, Charles of Sweden after Michael Dahl). This was also the technique used by John Sturt when he engraved the fronstispiece to Bunyan's folio in 1692, most probably after Thomas Sadler. Conversely, oil portraits and even drawings could be executed from pre-existing engravings (see for example the portrait of Richard Baxter, in the National Portrait Gallery, done after his engraving by White).

Fortunately, we possess a fairly precise reference to White's preferred mode of engraving. In 1688, John Locke wrote to Edward Clarke asking him to solicit from Thomas Stringer, once secretary to the Earl of Shaftesbury, the return of a portrait; it was probably the one by John Greenhill, now in the National Portrait Gallery. Locke had deposited it at Stringer's estate when he went to France in 1675: 'When I print my book [the first edition of the *Essay*], as I think now I shall, I would have my picture before it; therefore, pray get the picture they have of mine up to town whilst you are there, that I may take order to have a plate graved from it'.[58] Stringer firmly refused, considering the picture a present from Locke to his wife. Several angry letters passed between the former friends who wrangled like children (their word) for months, either directly or *via* Clarke, Stringer at one point even intimating he might destroy the portrait.[59] In the process, we learn that Locke 'sat for [the picture] and paid 15 pounds for it'[60] but also that Stringer considered the painted portrait far too large and totally unsuitable to be used for an engraving:

> What you write of engraving a Plate from it, I take it to be but a Colourable Excuse ... Besides such plates are always engraven not from paynt but draughts in black and white, and those draughts might be truer taken from the life, then any Picture, and more Exactly and advantagiously done in holland, (there being better Artists) then in England.[61]

Later, Locke made fun of Stringer for such 'skilfull' knowledge of print making,[62] but where did Stringer get his information about the appropriate models for engraved plates

(and, supposedly, for his commendation of Dutch artists)? The answer is that he derived them from Robert White:

> The skilfull discourse you mention about Pictures and draughts is what I learned from mr White when my late Lord [Shaftesbury] sate to him to draw his Face in black and white in order to ingrave a plate for a print of him, and he being a man of that Enimency [*sic*] and Reputation in that art, I thought he might have soe much skill to know which way was best in his own Trade.[63]

Part of this letter is sometimes quoted by art historians as one of the many favourable judgements of White's talent, but the context of Stringer's remark is systematically omitted. Indeed, nobody seems to have noticed that Locke, having done a little research of his own, had taken upon himself to correct both White and Stringer on the matter of engravings:

> But give me leave to tell you that your information wherever you had it was a litle out concerning draught for graveing. There is not one of an hundred of the gravers that can draw from the life though copy well enough from a picture what they would grave, and by Mr Whites takeing the other course one may see what a print he made of it. But if an old Batchelor had a minde to appear in a peruke and 20 years yonger in print, by haveing a plate copyd from a picture drawn soe long agon. me thinks an old freind should have found some other way to expresse his complaisance then to have sent him to another picture or his own old countenance [i.e. his portrait at a later age] neither of which he liked soe well.[64]

As far as I am aware, this is the only disparaging remark on Robert White in contemporary literature, perhaps written by Locke in a fit of anger at not having his picture returned. Locke, however, shifts quite quickly from technicalities to vanity: White was wrong in his choice of models, but even if he had been right, Stringer should not have questioned Locke's desire to use a painting of his youthful self as a frontispiece for a mature work. The whole exchange, besides affording a precious insight into the 'civil' circulation of images within a network of friends, provides valuable information about the passage from painted or graphite portraits to prints in the seventeenth century, of which remarkably little is as yet known. It also reveals that, rightly or wrongly, Robert White seemed to consider that small *ad vivum* graphites like the one he executed for Shaftesbury, and indeed for Bunyan, were much more suitable models for engraved plates than any other portraits on a larger scale, in particular for frontispieces. This would explain why he made so many of his patrons sit for him. With such knowledge in mind, it is possible to infer that the portrait of John Bunyan was specifically considered as a study for an engraved frontispiece, and not as an independent miniature portrait.

From drawing to prints

This line of reasoning is strikingly confirmed by an aspect of White's portrait that seems to have generally gone unnoticed. The multi-generation copying of images by photographic means, with their end results in monographs, has often obliterated the finer lines on the vellum. Hence most of the reproductions of the White portrait in modern studies conceal a *vital* detail of the original: White drew an oval around Bunyan's head and shoulders. This means that he intended the drawing to serve sooner or later as a model for an oval frontispiece, which he will indeed engrave for *The Holy War*. Hence it no longer seems

that White's image was designed to be anything like the sleeping portrait. Yet the two are so often associated that even commentators with an interest in Bunyan's representations, such as Roe, link them together. This, however, seems to be essentially a legacy of John Brown who, as far as I am aware, was the first one to maintain that there was a direct link between the two.[65] Even in Brown's time, however, when the portrait was mentioned, it was generally assumed to be a study for *The Holy War*, not *The Pilgrim's Progress*.[66] Art historians seem to have been more cautious. In their 1987 catalogue Lindsay Stainton and Christopher White assume that the portrait was the model for the oval frontispiece to *The Holy War*, although are still reluctant to abandon entirely the link between White's drawing and the sleeping portrait.[67]

Author, publisher and engraver do indeed seem to have shown some hesitation as to how Bunyan should be represented at the beginning of his major allegory. As we have noted, *The Pilgrim's Progress* was classified in the 'Divinity' section of the *Term Catalogues*, and once again as 'Divinity' in the catalogue of Owen's library. Seventeenth-century readers regarded Bunyan as a preacher and/or a religious controversialist and they admired him or vilified him depending on their own side on the religious divide. *The Pilgrim's Progress* seems to have provoked a shock precisely because it traversed generic boundaries. If an image of John Bunyan was to appear at the beginning of the allegory, therefore, it could hardly be as an 'author', but hardly as a professional divine either, given that Bunyan was seen by many of his contemporaries as an uneducated member of an Anabaptist sect. On the one hand, one can argue that the sleeping portrait resolves the contradiction magnificently: the dreamer is precisely not an *author* (there is no book in sight, not even the Bible that appears in the Sadler and in later versions of the sleeping portrait), but not exactly a divine either if we bear in mind that thanks to the almost single-handed efforts of Robert White divines were recognised through oval frontispieces.

On the other hand, few commentators seem to have noticed that the sleeping portrait did not immediately present itself as the best way to illustrate *The Pilgrim's Progress*, even in Bunyan's lifetime. It was soon supplemented by an oval ('divine-like') frontispiece, a device that will be repeated for *The Holy War* where Bunyan is seen first as the serious divine writing a religious treatise, and then as part of his own allegorical creation, in the middle of Mansoul. If we follow historians of the book, such as Roger Chartier, in believing that 'the function of the author's portrait is to reinforce the notion that the writing is the expression of an individuality that gives authenticity to the work',[68] then these early Bunyan frontispieces need to be examined in a more systematic way.

I would argue that most of the early representations of Bunyan do descend from the original drawing by White, but in a much more loose and indirect way than has generally been recognised. Nathaniel Ponder had an oval frontispiece prepared fairly early on for his copies of *The Pilgrim's Progress*. The Huntington Library copy of the fifth edition (1680, Wing B5562) is prefaced not with the sleeping portrait but with an oval frontispiece of Bunyan. This portrait is perfectly in the line of work by White, with a pedestal under the oval marked 'John Bunyan' and 'Printed for nath: Ponder in the Poultrey'. (This appears twice, at the base of the engraving and on the page. The address of the bookseller, in this case replacing the more cursory *excudit*, supposedly facilitated the separate sale of the print.) However, it was not engraved by White himself but by John Sturt (the plate is signed 'I. Sturt. Sc:', contrary to its description on EEBO). It will be used again in some copies of the sixth edition a year later. This is an important detail, overlooked by Brown, for instance, who does not seem aware of its existence.[69]

It first suggests that if White had already executed the *ad vivum* drawing of Bunyan which he intended to use later, he was pleased for Sturt to engrave it and, which was even more uncommon, to leave Sturt to sign it. In 1680, Sturt was an experienced apprentice,

but he had served only six years with White. Although terms could vary greatly, a period of apprenticeship was generally no less than seven years, suggesting he was still working under White when his name was put below the image.[70] There are two ways of understanding the plate being signed by Sturt while still an apprentice: either we can see it as a rare (though not unheard of) sign of his master's generosity (the reverse was far more common, with masters signing plates engraved almost entirely by an assistant); or the plate was considered so minor, especially since it was destined for a bookseller, that the work could be delegated with not much damage to the master's reputation, while providing good training for Sturt.

A year later, in 1681, Ponder used a similar portrait as a frontispiece, but in a much debased form which does not bear much resemblance to either White's drawing or Sturt's plate (this is a half-length with Bunyan's left hand appearing on his chest), done by 'Burnford'. This was for the seventh edition (Wing B5565), which also has the sleeping portrait facing the opening page of the allegory and Faithful's martyrdom. This means that, at least in some of the earlier editions, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, just like *The Holy War*, could be purchased with two frontispieces: an allegorical *and* an oval one, reflecting once more the generic ambiguity of the work. Finally, White of course did engrave—and sign—the oval frontispiece of *The Holy War* in 1682 (inscribed, 'John Bunnyon' and 'R. White sculp.'), but this time not for Ponder but for Dorman Newman and Benjamin Alsop. By that time, he evidently thought the plate worth signing. This engraving was used again by Nathaniel's son Robert for the eighth edition of *Grace Abounding* (1692, Wing B5528), and by Newman for the 1688 *The Work of Jesus Christ as an Advocate* (Wing B5608), hence the loose circulation of plates between the booksellers. The latter, however, was the work of Fredrick van Hove, using White's earlier plate. John Sturt's elaborate frontispiece to the works in folio (for William Marshall) is the last in line of those seventeenth-century oval portraits.

The similarity of all these oval variants ensured that Bunyan, at least until his death, was portrayed with very homogenous traits, and there is little reason to doubt that most of them were derived from the original drawing of White. But even a cursory examination reveals that the trajectory from drawing to engraved frontispieces is far from straightforward and that we should be wary of claiming unproven lines of descent. If we are to believe that Bunyan sat for White around 1678 or 1679, then evidently White did not think at first he was going to engrave anything else than an oval; perhaps Bunyan insisted on an image that revealed more about his allegory; perhaps Ponder thought that something more intriguing was required; perhaps White himself read the book and realised that it was not quite right to place Bunyan within the conventional oval frame like a divine. Whatever the truth of the matter, the first 1679 frontispiece of *The Pilgrim's Progress* does not look like the oval, conventional, authoritative portraits of nonconformist divines that White was engraving, but is altogether much more interesting and enigmatic.[71]

Within a few years of its execution, therefore, the original drawing of Robert White was engraved by four different artists, used by four publishers and had appeared in four different works. Although more needs to be done on individual copies of *The Pilgrim's Progress*, the fact that only a few are illustrated seems to indicate that booksellers sold Bunyan's portraits separately, the buyer deciding whether to have it bound with the text as a frontispiece or mounted separately. We know that this is precisely what happened with the folio, but there are reasons to believe this was also a much earlier practice with Bunyan's oval portraits, John Marshall profiting from this well-established habit of book buyers. I would argue that this was not only a testimony to the remarkable fame of the tinker, but also to that of the limner.

Robert White and his clients

It is now possible to reconstruct a picture of Robert White as a society engraver with a considerable fame in Restoration London. I have already mentioned the commendation by Thomas Stringer, but there are many more. In his famous *Life and Errors*, John Dunton maintains that White 'exceeds all I have ever met with, in taking the *Air of a Face* ... He takes Faces so much to the life, that the Real Person may be said to be where-ever you see a Face of his doing'.[72] For Dunton, White's craftmanship can be seen at his best in his engraved frontispiece of Thomas Doolittle and in his 'Seven Bishops'. This latter is the print now in the National Portrait Gallery (NPG D1333) of the seven bishops who petitioned James II in 1688 in protest against his Declaration of Indulgence and were subsequently held in prison before being acquitted. The engraving represents the busts of the bishops in a circle around William Sancroft. Dunton also confirms that White was more famous for his *ad vivum* drawings than for his engravings. When talking about Frederick van Hove, Dunton remarks that he 'can't Rank him with Mr *White*, for he seldom draws from the Living Original'.[73] This is indeed confirmed, as shown above, as Hove engraved the frontispiece to *The Work of Jesus Christ as an Advocate* after White.

The most comprehensive assessment of Robert White's work is undoubtedly by George Vertue, whose diaries were published for *The Walpole Society* in the 1920s. This is Vertue's account of White's death:

> November. 1703. Mr Robert White the Engraver departed this Life. He ought to be rememberd as being a Singular Artist in his way. having so vast a Genius in Drawing and Engraving a Face, and he made the picture so like the original which is indeed the end of this Noble Art, that, perhaps he has not left his equal in Europe behind him.[74]

Later, Vertue concludes 'I think, besides him, cou[l]d not be found any Master in London, as one may call so in London. because none of the others had any talent in drawing'.[75]

Such a reputation did ensure White an eminent clientele, even though his numerous engraved frontispieces attract occasionally unsympathetic comments from scholars because they are evidently not as polished as his miniatures or his more ambitious engravings. There was such a vogue for engraved frontispieces at the Restoration that it led Bell and Poole to conclude that, by the end of the seventeenth century, this art form was cheap and debased:

> No doubt the subjects of the 'ad vivum' portraits belonged to widespread classes. The fashion of prefixing engraved heads of authors of all ranks to their books accounts for this, and many obscure persons, who even in the succeeding age of abundant portraiture would scarcely have risen to the honour of a sheet-print, figure in the frontispieces to tracts and sermons issued during the second half of the sevententh century.[76]

They could have had Bunyan in mind. Such generalisations on the 'classes' of the sitters are however entirely unfounded in the case of White. Among the sitters for the British Museum drawings (not all of them are identifiable) are the divines John Edwards and Nathaniel Vincent, Sir John Vaughan, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas,[77] James II, William, Duke of Gloucester (as a child), Henry Howard, 7th Duke of Bedford, Thomas Osborne, 1st Duke of Leeds, Kenneth Mackenzie, 4th Earl of Seaforth and – John Bunyan, tinker of Bedford. In contrast to what Bell and Poole seem to assume, White's sitters did *not* belong to a wide social spectrum: Bunyan clearly stands out in such distinguished company.

If we now turn from White's drawings to his prints, his output was vast indeed, and yet hardly more democratic. He engraved famous Presbyterian and Congregationalist divines; bishops; authors (John Milton, Aphra Behn, George Herbert) and of course a vast number of noblemen and royal sitters. He also had an important clientele of judges and lawyers, but above all of MDs. White's engravings could fetch spectacular sums. When he was asked to engrave Charles XI of Sweden after his friend Michael Dahl, he was able to charge his patron thirty pounds.[78] But White, of course, did not do portraits only. He was also a skilled architectural engraver. Indeed, at about the time Bunyan is supposed to have sat for him, White gained his most lucrative commission. On 29 August 1676, Charles II inaugurated the new Bedlam building in Moorfields, on plans by Robert Hooke that alledgedly imitated the Château des Tuileries. Bedlam was a civic jewel, the pride and joy of Londoners and an amazement to foreign visitors. In order to commemorate the event and to seize the building in all its glory, the hospital governors commissioned in 1677 a huge engraving of the new buildings in three parts, for which they paid the hefty sum of forty pounds to Robert White, even though they seem to have considered David Loggan. This means that if White were to be commissioned around that time for a large engraving, one would expect to pay around thirty to forty pounds. If he were to execute even a very small one, it would earn him around four pounds.[79] Nathaniel Ponder had therefore enough funds to commission such an engraving and White accepted the commission to draw Bunyan, presumably thinking the subject worthwhile, while he was busy engraving the King and the duke of York in the late 1670s. Given White's fees, however, there is no reason to think that such partnership would have been financially rewarding before it became obvious that *The Pilgrim's Progress* was to become a bestseller.

Nobody has successfully explained why we have only *one* copy of the first edition of *The Pilgrim's Progress* with the sleeping portrait. Wharey and Sharrock have suggested that it was most probably inserted later and that we should trust Ponder's advertisement in the fourth edition when he mentioned that it has the portrait 'as the third did'.[80] Nathalie Collé-Bak, on the other hand, suggests that the illustration was meant for the first edition, but, like the oval portraits examined above, was not bound with the volume.[81] I would now suggest that it is equally possible that some volumes were defaced in the middle of the eighteenth century when 'old heads' print-collecting was at its height thanks to James Granger. It is doubtful whether the question will ever be resolved, but by examining the fees and the career of Robert White, one can argue that it would have been a considerable risk for Ponder to commission White for the first edition of an allegory, all the more so since the engraver was doing something so utterly different from his current line of work.

*****

The above remarks have barely scratched the surface of an enticing and enigmatic collaboration between author, publisher, engraver and bookseller but I hope they will prepare the way for further investigation of the early printing history of *The Pilgrim's Progress*. Nathaniel Ponder's collaboration with Robert White in the late 1670s is much more significant for our understanding of the reception of *The Pilgrim's Progress* than has previously been acknowledged. Bunyan sat for an expensive engraver and miniaturist of considerable fame and fashion in the highest Restoration circles. White drew frontispieces for university-educated divines, not for uneducated Baptist preachers. When we put aside the poor derivatives of his engravings, begin gathering information about the artist who stands at the beginning of the tradition, and appreciate his stature, we can say that it was a monument to the extraordinary success of *The Pilgrim's Progress* and the wholly unexpected fame of its author who was, and who remained, an artisan from Bedford.

Oval frontispieces of eminent nonconformist divines were White's standard fare for many years, and since he preferred engraving from life to using earlier portraits, he made his subjects sit in rapid succession in his studio, amassing sketches that were later used as he was commissioned for more work, making it difficult to establish a direct line of filiation between his drawings and his plates. When he came to sketch Bunyan, White evidently thought that he was supposed to execute a conventional oval portrait, very similar to the ones he had previously done of John Owen on Ponder's behalf. Plans were changed. The frontispiece of *The Pilgrim's Progress*, and later the allegorical frontispiece to *The Holy War*, stand out in White's *oeuvre* as the only examples, with the almanacs, of him departing from portraits or buildings. Whoever commissioned these frontispieces asked White to experiment with a genre with which he was unfamiliar, and that he would never again repeat for any other author or divine—again a powerful testimony to the originality of the sitter and of his works.

Both for *The Pilgrim's Progress* and *The Holy War*, the frontispieces announce the allegorical style of Bunyan's texts and offer visual riddles for the reader to interpret as a prelude for a textual experience of the same kind. We should not regard them as mere illustrations to make the religious allegories more palatable to readers that might otherwise be deterred by Bunyan's text. However, it is perhaps time we recognise that as soon as Nathaniel Ponder had the funds to collaborate once again with Robert White—and hesitated between presenting Bunyan as allegorical dreamer or established divine—Bunyan was already *en route* to achieving a status as an author *and* a divine, a process that we have so far regarded as a much more protracted—and certainly posthumous—one.

Anne Dunan-Page
Université de Provence, Aix-Marseille I

Notes

A version of this article was originally given in 2007 at the biennial Restoration conference, Bangor University, Wales. I am particularly grateful to Antony Griffiths, Keeper of Prints at the British Museum; Angela Roche, of the Prints and Drawings Room of the British Museum; Jennifer B. Lee of the Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University; and Larry Kreitzer of Regent's Park Baptist College, Oxford for communications about Bunyan and White.

---

[1] For Cracherode's collection, see Antony Griffiths, 'The Reverend Clayton Mordaunt Cracherode (1730–99)', in *Landmarks in Print Collecting: Connoisseurs and Donors at the British Museum Since 1753*, ed. Antony Griffiths (London: British Museum, 1996), pp. 43–64.

[2] Horace Walpole, *A Catalogue of Engravers* (Strawberry-Hill, 1763), p. 92.

[3] See Anne Dunan-Page, *Grace Overwhelming: John Bunyan, The Pilgrim's Progress and the Extremes of the Baptist Mind* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2006), pp. 128–41.

[4] F. Gordon Roe, 'The Face of Bunyan and a Great Literary Forgery', *Connoisseur*, 115 (1945), pp. 10–15. On illustrations, see also, Bernard Barton, *Illustrations of The Pilgrim's Progress* (London, n.d.); John Brown, *John Bunyan (1628–1688): His Life, Times and Work*, second edn rev. by Frank Mott Harrison (London, London: The Hultbert Publishing Company, 1928), pp. 384–87, 412–14; 439 and ff.; Frank Mott Harrison, 'Some Illustrators of *The Pilgrim's Progress* (Part I): John Bunyan', *The Library*, fourth ser., 17 (1936), pp. 241–63 and 'The Portraiture of John Bunyan', *Baptist Quarterly*, 11 (1945), pp. 337–342; Gerda Norvig, *Dark Figures in the Desired Country: Blake's Illustrations to* The Pilgrim's Progress (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993); Nathalie Collé-Bak, 'La destinée éditoriale et iconographique de *The Pilgrim's Progress* de John Bunyan, de 1678 à 1850: les enjeux d'une mise en images' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Nancy 2, 2002) and her 'The Role of Illustrations in the Reception of *The Pilgrim's Progress*', in *Reception, Appropriation, Recollection: Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress*, ed. W. R. Owens and Stuart Sim (Bern: Peter Lang, 2007), pp. 81–97.

[5] See *The Pilgrim's Progress: A Casebook*, ed. Roger Sharrock (London: Macmillan, 1976); *Reception, Appropriation, Recollection: Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress*, ed. W. R. Owens and Stuart Sim (Bern: Peter Lang, 2007).
[6] Charles Doe, *The Struggler*, in *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan*, 13 vols, gen. ed. Roger Sharrock (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976–1994), vol. 12, ed. W. R. Owens (1994), pp. 453–60 (p. 456). See also Anne Dunan-Page, 'Posthumous Bunyan: Early lives and the Development of the Canon', in *The Cambridge Companion to John Bunyan*, ed. Anne Dunan-Page (forthcoming).
[7] Frank Mott Harrison, 'Nathaniel Ponder: The Publisher of *The Pilgrim's Progress*, *The Library*, fourth ser., 15 (1934), pp. 257–94 (p. 261); Beth Lynch, '*Mr. Smirke* and "Mr Filth" : A Bibliographic Case Study in Nonconformist Printing', *The Library*, seventh ser., 1 (2000), pp. 46–71.
[8] '*Advertisement from the Bookseller*', sig. A1^{r}, taken from British Library copy C.37.f.24. For a study of the early editions, see *The Pilgrim's Progress*, ed. James Blanton Wharey, revised by Roger Sharrock (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960), pp. xxxvi–cxi.
[9] See Henry R. Plomer, 'A Lawsuit as to an Early Edition of "The Pilgrim's Progress"', *The Library*, third ser., 5 (1914), pp. 60–9; Harrison, 'Nathaniel Ponder'; and David Stocker, 'William Proctor, Nathaniel Ponder, and the Financing of *The Pilgrim's Progress*', *The Library*, seventh ser., 4 (2003), pp. 64–9.
[10] Ponder, '*Advertisement*', sig. A1^{r}.
[11] Lucy Peltz, 'Engraved Portrait Heads and the Rise of Extra-illustration: the Eton Correspondence of the Revd James Granger and Richard Bull, 1769–1774', *Walpole Society*, 66 (2004), pp. 1–161; see also her *Oxford DNB* entry for James Granger.
[12] See the list of 19 portraits in Freeman O'Donoghue, *Catalogue of Engraved British Portraits preserved in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum*, 6 vols (London, 1908-1925), I, 286–87; VI, 65.
[13] William Ames, *A Catalogue of English Heads* (London, 1748), pp. 13, 21.
[14] James Granger, *A Biographical History of England*, second edn, 4 vols (London, 1775), III, 346–8 (pp. 346–7).
[15] Ibid., IV, 307. Jonathan Spilsbury engraved the portrait c.1763. The fifth edition supplements this list with 'J. Staid''s engraving of the Sadler portrait (1782), perhaps a misprint for Haid; *A Biographical History of England*, 5th edn, 6 vols (London, 1824), V, 97–101, VI, 110. The Sadler portrait was in fact first engraved by Simpson in 1767, for a folio edition.
[16] Henry Bromley, *A Catalogue of Engraved British Portraits* (London, 1793), p. 179. Bunyan now appears in the section on 'inferior clergy'.
[17] Harrison, 'Portraiture', pp. 337–42.
[18] The portrait itself has not been bequeathed to Columbia University Library, with other portraits in Henry C. Plimpton's collection.
[19] Gordon Roe does not seem to be aware of the existence of the Regent's Park College portrait: he therefore wrongly assumes that Bourne's engraving is incomplete because a book seems to be wanting beneath Bunyan's left hand (Roe, p. 14). O'Donoghue's *Catalogue of Engraved British Portraits* says that Sharp engraved the picture from the portrait belonging to G. Phillips, 'a fabrication' (I, 287). Brown mentions another engraving by S. Freeman (Brown, *John Bunyan*, p. 414).
[20] See George Potter's scrapbook, British Library RB.31.C.52. See also *Notes and Queries*, second ser., 12 (1861), p. 216.
[21] This 'drawn by Derby' and 'engraved by W. Holl' serves as the frontispiece to Bernard Barton, *Illustrations of The Pilgrim's Progress*.
[22] Brown, *John Bunyan*, p. 413.
[23] *Notes and Queries*, seventh ser., 8 (1889), p. 508.
[24] *Notes and Queries*, twelfth ser., 9 (1921), p. 211.
[25] I owe these references to Harrison, 'Portraiture' and Potter's scrapbook.
[26] Harrison, 'Portraiture', p. 341–2.
[27] Brown, *John Bunyan*, p. 413 and David Piper, *Catalogue of Seventeenth-Century Portraits in the National Portrait Gallery, 1625–1714* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), pp. 44–5. Earlier owners were Henry Stimson (as indicated on the engraving of the portrait by Simpson for the 1767 folio prefaced by George Whitefield) and Lord Kilcoursie; Roe, p. 13.
[28] See Granger, *A Biographical History* (1775), IV, 307.
[29] George C. Williamson, *The History of Portrait Miniatures*, 2 vols (London: Bell, 1904), I, 46–7.
[30] Doe, *The Struggler*, p. 458.
[31] *The Works of that Eminent Servant of Christ, Mr. John Bunyan* (London, 1692), p. 868.
[32] 'Lines on Seeing the Portrait of John Bunyan, engraved for this work', *The Pilgrim's Progress*, ed. Robert Southey (London, 1830), pp. ci–cii. Reviews of the edition were written by Scott and Macaulay. On these,

see David Walker, 'Bunyan's Reception in the Romantic Period', in *Reception, Appropriation, Recollection*, ed. Owens and Sim, pp. 49–67.
[33] Joseph Ivimey, *History of the English Baptists*, 4 vols (London, 1811–1830), II, 41, also reproduced in 'Memoirs of Dr Owen', *The Works of John Owen, D.D.*, ed. Thomas Russell, 21 vols (London, 1826), I, 305.
[34] *Bibliotheca Oweniana, sive Catalogus Librorum*, ed. Edward Millington (London, 1684), pp. 43, 45–6.
[35] See Richard L. Greaves, *Glimpses of Glory: John Bunyan and English Dissent* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002), p. 297; Anne Dunan-Page, 'John Bunyan's *A Confession of my Faith* and Restoration Anabaptism', *Prose Studies*, 28 (2006), pp. 19–40.
[36] For a full account, see Greaves, *Glimpses*, pp. 344–6. The information was first given by John Asty in his 'Memoirs of the Life of John Owen' appended to the 1721 edition of Owen's sermons. For the Chauncy reference, see 'Introduction', *The Miscellaneous Works of John Bunyan*, vol. 8, ed Richard L. Greaves (1979), p. xxiv.
[37] Harrison, 'Nathaniel Ponder', pp. 261–3.
[38] Richard L. Greaves, 'The Organizational Response of Nonconformity to Repression and Indulgence: The Case of Bedfordshire', *Church History*, 44 (1975), pp. 472–84. See also Dunan-Page, *Grace Overwhelming*, pp. 73–6.
[39] John Owen, *Exercitations on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (London, 1676), Wing 0753A.
[40] See W. R. Owens, 'Reading the Bibliographical Codes: Bunyan's Publication in Folio', in *John Bunyan: Reading Dissenting Writing*, ed. N. H. Keeble (Bern: Peter Lang, 2002), pp. 59–77.
[41] Horace Walpole (ed.) *Anecdotes of Painting in England*, rev. and suppl. by James Dallaway and Ralph Wornum, sixth edn, 3 vols (London, 1862), III, 947–53. On Vertue and engravings, see Martin Myrone, 'Graphic antiquarianism in eighteenth-century Britain: the career and reputation of George Vertue (1684–1756)', in *Producing the Past: Aspects of Antiquarian Culture and Practice, 1700–1850*, ed. Martin Myrone and Lucy Peltz (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), pp. 36–54.
[42] See Antony Griffiths, *The Print in Stuart Britain, 1683–1689* (London: British Museum, 1998) and Timothy Clayton, *The English Print, 1688–1802* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), pp. 3–24.
[43] *The Observator*, vol. II, issues 147 (9 October 1684) and 173 (26 November 1684). White had engraved L'Estrange (after Geoffrey Kneller) and White and L'Estrange might have communicated side by side in their parish of St Giles-in-the Fields. For full biographical information, see Anthony Griffiths, 'White, Robert', *Oxford DNB* and *Print in Stuart Britain*, pp. 203 and ff.
[44] Torben Holck Colding, *Aspects of Miniature Painting. Its Origins and Development* (Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1953), pp. 107, 110.
[45] Williamson, *History of Portrait Miniatures*, p. 58.
[46] White is mentioned in Basil S. Long, *British Miniaturists working between 1520 and 1860* (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1929); J. J. Forster, *A List Alphabetically Arranged of Works of English Miniature Painters of the XVIIth Century* (London: Dickinsons, 1914–1916); Williamson, *History of Portrait Miniatures*; and Daphne Foskett, *Miniatures: Dictionary and Guide* (Woodbridge: Antique Collectors' Club, 1987), but not in John Murdoch, Jim Murrell et al., *The English Miniature* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981); Graham Reynold, *English Portrait Miniatures*, 1952, second rev. edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), and Mary Edmond, 'Limners and picturemakers: new light on the lives of miniaturists and large-scale portrait-painters working in London in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries', *Walpole Society*, 47 (1978–1980), pp. 60–242.
[47] See J. L Porpert, *A History of Miniature Art* (London, 1887), p. 87. Forster, *A List*, pp. 155–7; *Dictionary of Painters of Miniatures, 1525–1850* (London: Philip Allan, 1927); Murdoch et al., *The English Miniature*, p. 166; Daphne Foskett, *A Dictionary of British Miniature Painters* (London: Faber, 1972) and her *Miniatures*, pp. 134–41. The most extended account is C. F. Bell and Rachel Poole, 'English Seventeenth-Century Portrait Drawings in Oxford Collections, Part II', *Walpole Society*, 14 (1926), pp. 43–80.
[48] Walpole, *Catalogue*, pp. 92–100.
[49] Bell and Poole, 'English Seventeenth-Century Portrait Drawings', p. 53.
[50] See Forster, *A List*, pp. 155–7 and his *Samuel Cooper and the English Miniature Painters of the XVII Century* (London: Dickinson, 1914–1916), pp. 77–8; Long, *British Miniaturists*, p. 460; Foskett, *Miniatures*, pp. 135, 141.
[51] Richard W. Goulding, 'The Welbeck Abbey Miniatures belonging to his Grace the Duke of Portland: Catalogue Raisonné', *Walpole Society*, 4 (1916); Laurence Binyon, *Catalogue of Drawings by British Artists* (London, 1898–1904); Edward Croft-Murray and Paul Hutton, *A Catalogue of British Drawings* (London: British Museum, 1960).
[52] Goulding, pp. 121, 205 and plate xxi.
[53] The British Museum drawings are conviently reproduced in Croft-Murray and Hutton, *Catalogue of British Drawings*.

[54] Bell and Poole, 'English Seventeenth-Century Portrait Drawings', p. 55. 'What distinguished him was his admirable success in likenesses, a merit that would give value to his prints, though they were not so well performed...Vertue thought [the drawings] superior to the prints'; Walpole, *Catalogue*, p. 92.
[55] John Strutt, *A Biographical Dictionary...of all the Engravers from the Earliest Period...to the Present Time*, 2 vols (London, 1786), II, 416.
[56] C. F. Bell, 'English Seventeenth-Century Portrait Drawings in Oxford Collections', *Walpole Society*, 5 (1915–1917), pp. 1–18 (p. 2).
[57] See 'The Note-books of George Vertue Relating to Artists and Collections in England', *The Walpole Society*, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 30 (1930–1955), III, 121. White was particularly careless with his work: 'He made no regular collection of his works. but as he had done a plate he always had two or three prints rol'd up. & threwn in a Closett where they lay in heaps', ibid., I, 131.
[58] *The Correspondence of John Locke*, ed. E. S. de Beer, 8 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), III, 388 (letter 1020). See also, pp. 660–2 (letter 1665). Eventually, the first edition of the *Essay* was printed without a portrait.
[59] Ibid., pp. 454–9 (letter 1050), for Locke's point of view.
[60] Ibid., p. 445 (letter 1046) and p. 456 (letter 1050).
[61] Ibid., p. 411 (letter 1028). See also pp. 413–15 (letter 1030).
[62] Ibid., p. 429 (letter 1038).
[63] Ibid., p. 443 (letter 1044).
[64] Ibid., pp. 447–8 (letter 1046).
[65] Brown, *John Bunyan*, pp. 385–6.
[66] See for instance the article in *The Daily Chronicle* for 3 February 1902 (on the occasion of the acquisition of the Sadler portrait by the National Portrait Gallery) that was collected by George Potter in his scrapbook.
[67] Lindsay Stainton and Christopher White, *Drawing in England from Hilliard to Hogarth* (London: British Museum, 1987), p. 180.
[68] Roger Chartier, *The Order of Books: Readers, Authors, and Libraries in Europe between the Fourteenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, trans. Lydia G. Cochrane (1992; Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994), p. 52.
[69] Brown, *John Bunyan*, p. 441, mentions that this edition has only the sleeping portrait and Faithful's martyrdom. The seventh has a 'new but poor' portrait.
[70] On Sturt, see Richard Sharp's entry in the *Oxford DNB*.
[71] White was not a complete stranger to allegorical engravings, having prepared both the frontispiece of *Historia et Antiquitates Universitatis Oxoniensis* (Oxford, 1674) and the splendid *Oxford Almanack* the same year, and yet these highly elaborate compositions bear little resemblances to the simplicity of his sleeping portrait; see Helen Mary Petter, *The Oxford Almanacks* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974), p. 28.
[72] John Dunton, *The Life and Errors of John Dunton* (London, 1705), p. 346.
[73] Ibid., pp. 346–7.
[74] 'The Note-books of George Vertue', IV, 108.
[75] Ibid., III, 7.
[76] Bell and Poole, 'English Seventeenth-Century Portrait Drawings', p. 47.
[77] Mistaken for Matthew Hale in Binyon's *Catalogue*.
[78] 'The Note-books of George Vertue', I, 33.
[79] Bell and Poole, 'English Seventeenth-Century Portrait Drawings', p. 65.
[80] Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, p. xxxix. See also Brown, *John Bunyan*, p. 440.
[81] Collé-Bak, 'La destinée éditoriale', chapters 2 and 3, pp. 78–174.