

## Books in Pieces: Granger, History, and the Collection

*Michael Macovski*

---

This article analyzes the influence of James Granger's *Biographical History of England* (1769), a volume that spearheaded a remarkable praxis of collecting, interleaving, and rebinding during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. This praxis reflects not only radical changes in concepts of collecting during this period, but also three central dimensions of book history. These include the era's passion for artefactual collections; its propensity for annotative forms, such as marginalia and prefaces; and its burgeoning publication of compilatory, systematized texts—such as catalogues, almanacs, encyclopedias, and other compendium forms. The article goes on to suggest that grangerized texts extend beyond simple, stochastic gatherings to reveal key precepts of historiographic continuity, serialized succession, ekphrastic reproduction, and synoptic collectivity.

---

### I.

The general outlines of the remarkable James Granger story are, in some respects, familiar: in 1769, the provincial parson publishes his *Biographical History of England*—a single volume that lists many portraits but contains not a single illustration. Almost immediately, the book spearheads one of the most curious movements in eighteenth-century history—a practice in which collectors acquire many prints listed by Granger, and many additional ones as well. The praxis also encompasses a veritable maelstrom of interleaving—which in turn gives rise to, among other terms, the verb “to grangerize,” though this term does not emerge until 1882.<sup>1</sup>

Yet such a praxis also extends beyond the initial act of interleaving. At certain points in the collecting process, the interleaved pages would usually be re-framed (or matted) to fit the size of the newly-compiled, recipient volume. This matting would ensure that the interleaved insertions matched the dimensions of the original pages—and would thus facilitate the later re-binding of the entire compilation into a codex with uniformly sized pages. In this context, grangerization should also be distinguished from other re-constitutive book practices of the era—including scrapbooking, which often posits the collection of memorial

---

1. In this article, I will also be using the term “extra-illustration” interchangeably with “grangerization,” since the former has also come to designate the general practice of such pictorial interleaving.

documents that are neither uniformly sized nor ultimately rebound—as well as commonplacing, in which selected quotations are copied onto blank pages in the form of (normally unattributed) fragments, without any physical reconstruction.

## II.

One can thus trace the material vestiges of the practice. Yet studies of grangerization tend to leave one question unaddressed—and it is a foundational one, at least as curious as the initial phenomenon. And that is the question of why.

Why would Granger's simple volume spawn what critics have termed the “‘craze’ of extra-illustrating”—a craze that expands well into the next century? (Shaddy 535, Wark 154). Why the intense desire essentially to adulterate books in this fashion? Romanticists know, of course, of isolated efforts to counteract the rigid standardization of print.<sup>2</sup> In what follows, though, I offer another hypothesis: I suggest that the Romantic fascination with extra-illustration is, in fact, part of the period's larger preoccupation with book history—and, specifically, with three key dimensions of the latter field. These include, first, the era's passion for collecting in general—and for book-collecting in particular; secondly, its propensity for annotative forms, such as marginalia and prefaces; and, lastly, its increasing publication of compilatory, systematized texts—such as catalogues, almanacs, encyclopedias, and other compendium forms.

Each of these three dimensions illuminates the praxis of grangerization, albeit in different ways. The first one—the era's proclivity for collecting—comprises part of the eighteenth-century movement toward increasingly expansive, comprehensive collections: including the burgeoning acquisition of books known as “Bibliomania.”<sup>3</sup> In the context of grangerization, we might say that readers come to interact with these extra-illustrated texts in much the same way that they would interact with the actual, physical collections that proliferate during the eighteenth century.<sup>4</sup> This tendency also manifests itself in the expanding praxis of compiling scrapbooks, giftbooks, keepsakes, annuals, forget-me-nots—as well as the commonplace books, miscellanies, and other collective forms that define this era.<sup>5</sup>

Generally speaking, then, the act of grangerization both reflects and re-contextualizes the Romantic desire for collecting. Furthermore, I would suggest that

---

2. See, for instance, Jones (2006, 1999) and Viscomi. Blake's endeavors to counter to an overweening print culture—including his individualized coloring of many copper plate impressions, his representations of manuscript handwriting, and his variable ordering of plate sequences—have been widely discussed.

3. For a discussion of the Bibliomania phenomenon—as advanced by Dibdin (1809)—see Connell.

4. On the history of Romantic collecting, collections, and museums, see Pascoe and Gidal.

5. For astute discussions of each of these genres, see Darnton, Benedict, Piper, and Rajan. On the annual, the giftbook, the keepsake, and the forget-me-not, see Harris and Hoagwood.

the second dimension of Romantic book history that underlies grangerization is the increasingly dialogic and overtly *interactive* nature of textual praxis during this era. That is, we can say that eighteenth-century readers (and writers) effect an increasingly annotative (and aggregative) relation to print. Indeed, we will see that Romantic grangerization is itself a form of annotation or commentary—and that, in this context, it arises in conjunction with the increasing practice of marginalia writing during the period.<sup>6</sup> (This annotative praxis also emerges in the form of the many prefaces, dedications, and other ancillary materials that characterize this era.)

Finally, I would suggest that grangerization also partakes of a third dimension of Romantic book history: namely, the era's desire to compile encyclopedic, comprehensive, and totalized compendia. In this context, we can say that the Romantic reader comes to see certain print forms as textual representations of a canonical, universal knowledge. As we have begun to suggest, moreover, such a development is particularly evident in the expanding publication of miscellanies, almanacs, catalogues, and encyclopedias during this period.<sup>7</sup>

We shall also find that—in contrast to the idiosyncratic, minimally organized, and even stochastic curiosity cabinets of the preceding era—many grangerized texts are surprisingly ordered: that is, organized according to precise structural and conceptual parameters.<sup>8</sup> Instead of the more random gatherings of those cabinets, Granger envisions a form both coordinated and codified. His seminal volume is, as we shall see, interconnected, integrated—what he terms (in the *History's* subtitle) a “system,” a “methodical catalogue.”

Indeed, we shall see that grangerized texts—as well as the compendia associated with them—demonstrate what has become known as Romantic systematization: a structural concept first formulated by philosophers such as Hegel and Schlegel (Rajan, “System,” “Philosophy”; Siskin, “System”). Such systemization emerges on several levels, but particularly in terms of temporal progression, development, and sequence. More specifically, texts such as codicil compendia, annotative commentaries, and other collective forms register a pervasive eighteenth-century concern with historical succession and diachronic causality.

We shall also find that this idea of systemization—manifested in terms of

---

6. Marginalia writing—especially in its uniquely eighteenth-century forms—is best defined in Jackson. See also Piper, *Dreaming in Books*.

7. Critical discussions of Romantic encyclopedism, classification, and the miscellany have burgeoned during the last decade. After Darnton, see, for instance, Piper, Benedict, Macovski, and Rajan. As we shall see, moreover, some of these compilatory forms proliferate in conjunction with the same motivations that inspire the foregoing, physical collections. In this sense, such compendiums come to resemble collections in themselves. (On the relation between artefactual collections and periodical forms, see Pascoe.)

8. For a discussion of this distinction between the stochastic arrangement of the private curiosity cabinet and the more organizational, categorized structure of the public museum, see Crane.

history, social class, and pictorial reproduction—is textually represented as a comprehensive, unified, holistic entity. It stands as a synoptic whole—what Hegel terms a “circle of totality.” Applied to grangerized works, this synoptic vision suggests that the form’s seemingly random interleavings, pictorial gatherings, and resultant assemblages actually effect a kind of textual unity and inclusion. That is, when individual compilers rebind various interleaved assemblages of engravings, prints, and drawings, they are enacting a systematized model, a methodical coverage. The grangerized text thus delineates a codicil organization that is both classificatory and taxonomic.

Here again, such synoptic comprehensiveness parallels the many encyclopedias, almanacs, and other collective forms that characterize this era. It is no coincidence, moreover, that extra-illustration emerges at much the same time as these other compilatory texts. As we have suggested, one key explanation for the burgeoning praxis of grangerization during this era arises from its linkage to these classificatory, collective forms.

As far as the individual examples discussed here are concerned, most of them derive from Granger’s *History*. Yet long after the publication of this seminal publication, the practice of interleaving continues to expand exponentially. I will accordingly be discussing instances in which Shakespearean collections and other edited works further demonstrate the concepts that underlie the grangerization phenomenon.

### III.

With the foregoing summary in mind, we can now begin to look more closely at the three dimensions of book history that underlie the phenomenon of extra-illustration. As I have begun to suggest, the first concept that aligns with grangerization praxis concerns the eighteenth-century tendency toward collecting in general and book collecting in particular.<sup>9</sup> Specifically, extra-illustrated volumes operate as “collections” on two levels; first, when an individual volume functions as a collection in itself; and secondly, when a group of volumes comes to constitute a distinct set—a contained, organizational collection. In fact, many grangerized works ultimately become self-generative, in that they eventually comprise multi-volume sets with numerous ancillary documents and illustrations.

This collective impulse inspires much of Granger’s own career; indeed, Granger himself is quintessentially a collector. When, two years after his death, his print collection is dispersed at auction, it includes more than 14,000 engraved portraits. What is more, both Granger and his friend, Lord Mountstuart, begin to collect widely in Holland during the 1770s, eventually amassing a highly influential collection.

The second concept underlying grangerization is, as we have suggested, the Romantic era’s propensity for annotative forms and commentary, including ex-

---

9. See Dibdin and Connell.

plicatory introductions, heuristic prefaces, and—most saliently—the proliferating practice of marginalia writing. Such marginal forms have not heretofore been compared to grangerization praxis—yet the examples are telling. One instance of this would be extra-illustrated Granger volumes compiled by Richard Bull, in which Bull meticulously annotates many prints in the collection. Such annotations often comment on the auction where he purchased a given print, the price he paid, and a comparative discussion of other impressions. What is more, many such annotations also include letters from other collectors. Indeed, as Heather Jackson has suggested, marginalia during this period often takes on a dialogic character—and we can now add that Bull’s correspondence with his peers, as recorded in the margins of his volumes, extends this dialogic nature of Romantic texts to grangerized editions as well.

Another example of how extra-illustration can double as a form of marginal commentary occurs in a particular Shakespeare edition owned by the Huntington Library. In this edition, originally published in the mid-nineteenth century, the artist C. Arthur Le Boutillier comments in the ample margins of the text with a series of watercolor vignettes. This same edition is also annotated with notes by one J. O. Halliwell. Generally, in the commentary section, the place where one would normally expect only such notes, we find many illustrations—as if the drawings themselves were a form of added commentary. In both cases, we can say that such drawings operate as a form of marginalia. And though pictorial commentary is not extra-illustration in the strictest sense of the term, it nevertheless links the Romantic practice of marginal annotation with particular grangerized texts (cf. Wark 161-62).

The third concept undergirding the praxis of extra-illustration concerns the era’s propensity for compiling encyclopedic, totalized compendia. Indeed, I would suggest that grangerization provides key evidence for this encyclopedic desire. Here again, such a proclivity also gives rise to the burgeoning publication of—among other forms—catalogues, almanacs, miscellanies, and encyclopedias themselves during this time. At the same time, moreover, such compilatory forms also partake of the collective desire we have discussed, insofar as the foregoing compendia often become collective in themselves. What such collective, encyclopedic texts have most in common, though, is a synoptic vision of knowledge—comprehensive knowledge as a universalized, archived whole. Whether this holistic concept entails a comprehensive collection of objects or a repository codex of universal ideas, it nevertheless posits what Hegel terms, again, a “philosophical whole, a circle of totality” (51).<sup>10</sup>

The Romantic era bears witness to several key examples of this synoptic vision. It is evident, for instance, in the eighteenth-century notion of a summative, complete collection of canonical knowledge—as Hegel suggests in his landmark discussions of encyclopedic form (45-263). It is also evident in Diderot’s

---

10. On the encyclopedic dimensions of this compendia phenomenon, see especially Hegel’s 1817 Introduction to his *Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences in Outline*.

formulations regarding his own seminal encyclopedia<sup>11</sup>—as well as in Charles Panckoucke’s later re-constitutive project, the *Encyclopedie methodique* (cf. Diderot; Darnton 416-23).<sup>12</sup> And finally, this synoptic impulse also manifests itself in emergent visions of what is now referred to as the conceptual “organization of knowledge.” For instance, the frontispieces of several late eighteenth-century encyclopedias (including Chambers’) editions feature a tree diagram that essentially divides knowledge into literalized “branches” (Yeo 178; Hegel 52). They thereby promulgate a particular precept—in this case, a specific categorization and hierarchy of epistemic, comprehensive knowledge.<sup>13</sup>

As we have suggested, these organizational, encyclopedic texts express, in Judith Pascoe’s terms, the Romantic era’s “passion” for and “popularization of collecting” (5). It is this collective desire—expressed in both museological and codical forms—that underlies the parallel “passion” for Romantic grangerization. It is telling, for instance, that Granger’s *History* is “adapted”—as his subtitle announces—“to a methodical catalogue of engraved British heads.” Such a “methodical catalogue” represents the categorical, taxonomic, and comprehensive aspects of the Romantic predilection for collecting. (By the same token, we should also note that the very concept of a Romantic collection—whether it be literally artefactual or indirectly extra-illustrated—prompts the proliferation of published catalogues during the era.)

- 
11. Diderot writes: “The goal of an Encyclopédie is to assemble all the knowledge scattered on the surface of the earth, to demonstrate the general system to the people with whom we live, & to transmit it to the people who will come after us, so that the works of centuries past is [sic] not useless to the centuries which follow, that our descendants, by becoming more learned, may become more virtuous & happier, & that we do not die without having merited being part of the human race” (qtd. in Blom). Further support for what I am calling this synoptic impulse can be found in Burke, Kramnick, and Brewer.
  12. The synoptic scope discussed here manifests itself repeatedly in Panckoucke’s re-envisioning of Diderot’s work. As Darnton’s magisterial study points out, this late eighteenth-century project (the *Encyclopedie methodique*) seeks to create “une bibliotheque complete et universelle de toutes les connaissances humaines” (430). Darnton further demonstrates how Panckoucke’s encyclopedic vision is both “taxonomic and organizational”—seeking to “organize the material systematically” (420, 419; cf. 395-400). The plan includes a “*Vocabulaire universel*, which not only would serve as an index to the entire work but also would be a dictionary of dictionaries—a supreme repertory of every idea and every word in the French language, each defined and classified according to its place in the structure of knowledge” (420). As we shall see, Panckoucke’s “*universel*” intention is evident in several grangerized works of the same era (albeit in a less formal manner). In particular, his use of the terms “systematic,” “organizational,” “knowledge,” and “index” invokes many key concepts of what today would be called the “organization of knowledge.” Finally, although Diderot’s intentions are not as grandiose, he nevertheless espouses similarly universalist (and encyclopedist principles) (cf. Yeo).
  13. Phillips and Yeo discuss these branched schematics as archetypal representations of the eighteenth-century method of both classifying and canonizing knowledge. See also the foregoing discussion of Hegel’s encyclopedic vision, categorized according to “branches of one and the same whole.”

We can thus trace a generic, formal connection among the following: i) actual, museological collections; ii) their representative, synecdochic catalogues; and iii) the inherently collective, comprehensive nature of grangerization. Such a linkage extends, moreover, beyond the example of Granger's seminal volume. For instance, one of the most impressive extra-illustrated sets at the Huntington Library uses as its base text not Granger's work but Boydell's 1802 edition of illustrated Shakespeare plays—which is itself based on a physical collection of prints in an actual gallery.<sup>14</sup> This edition—compiled, beginning in 1835, by Thomas Turner—is also the one that Robert Wark refers to as an actual “compendium”: a compilation “containing nearly all the book-size printed illustrations to Shakespeare that had appeared down to the early nineteenth century and a large portion of the related preparatory drawings” (161). In claiming that it “contain[s] nearly all” such prints, the Turner edition thus highlights its broadly comprehensive, all-embracing objective. And in listing all such portraits, it also becomes inherently catalogic. It accordingly parallels, here again, the museum collection.

Such forms—whether they consist of exhibits or interleavings—present a kind of chronological trajectory. In the present context, though, we should recognize that they also encompass a complete historical arc: a synoptic whole. Even earlier re-compilations—such as William Richardson's 1790 re-collection of Granger's volume—strive to become an all-inclusive, ongoing, and updated compendium. Richardson accordingly seeks out the “most distinguished Collectors of English Portraits, requesting their assistance in the undertaking [of a new edition] by giving information of such Portraits as had *escaped the Author's [Granger's] notice.*”<sup>15</sup> This sense of a newly updated, complete collection of portraits again suggests that the extra-illustrated text partakes of an ideal that is at once all-encompassing, encyclopedic, catalogic, and collective.

Hence the impulse to extra-illustrate, to grangerize a text, looks beyond simple assemblage. The desire for extra-illustration—and indeed, for Romantic collecting in general—is in fact a longing for integral compilation: for universalization, completeness, and what Coleridge terms “unity in multiteity” (*Biographia Literaria* II).<sup>16</sup> Indeed, the “initial idea of extra-illustrating” emphasized such com-

14. It is crucial to recognize that Boydell's first Shakespeare edition was a kind of grangerized form itself, in that the associated illustrations were printed separately so that purchasers could interleave them as they wished. Although these interleaved illustrations were not initially selected by purchasers, they nevertheless demonstrate the linkage between the collected plays, their interleaved illustrations, and the physical collection in Boydell's actual gallery. In this sense, moreover, these codex illustrations also operate as a kind of catalogue of the physical exhibit itself. For more on the linkages between Boydell's edition and his gallery, see Pape and Burwick (1996).

15. This designation—from the 1824 advertisement to the fourth edition of Granger's volume (emphasis added)—demonstrates the ongoing impulse to keep the “information of such Portraits” complete. (Wark, too, cites this phrase, albeit in another context [154]).

16. In “On Poesy or Art” (*BL* II), Coleridge elaborates on this concept of “unity in multiteity”—extending the definition of his earlier, pendant reference to “Multiteity in Unity,” from “On the Principles of Genial Criticism” (1814).

prehensiveness: the practice normally entailed “collecting” material “in different media, from different sources, and by different artists” (Wark 163). It is this sense of collecting in many “different” arenas—this contained diversity—that constitutes the synoptic vision of the Romantic collection. And it is this synoptic coverage that brings out, once again, the era’s pronounced encyclopedism: that is, the parallel desire to compile, aggregate, and classify an organization of knowledge.

#### IV.

In this context, the Romantic compendium again contrasts markedly with the more random assemblage that characterizes the curiosity cabinets of the preceding era. Instead, Granger envisions his volume as both ordered and organized; as we have suggested, it comprises what he refers to as a “system.” His *Biographical History* is “intended,” he tells us, “as an essay towards reducing our biography to system.” Throughout the volume, Granger actually lays out such a biographical “system”: he constructs a kind of a hierarchical matrix—a categorization of biographical subjects into “different classes.” His title page reads: “*A Biographical History of England: From Egbert the Great to the revolution: consisting of characters disposed in different classes, and adapted to a methodical catalogue of engraved British heads: intended as an essay towards reducing our biography to system . . .*” Granger thus presents his system as social, class-bound, and inherently palimpsestic.

In defining these various classes, Granger’s schema privileges the royal category: the volume’s overarching organization divides portraits according to the particular reign with which they are associated, thereby constructing a royalistic ordering of knowledge. Within this order, he presents his listing as broadly inclusive and collective—embracing a “great number of persons, not to be found in any other biographical work.” He strives, again, for synoptic integration—for the consummate vision that epitomizes Romantic compilation.<sup>17</sup>

That Granger’s title page would highlight this royalistic, hierarchical matrix again reveals the underlying “system” of his biographical history. It is telling, moreover, that the primary philosopher behind such systems—particularly as they underlie the nascent encyclopedism of the period—stresses the same concept within his own theory of knowledge. I refer again to Hegel, and to his focus on what he calls the “systematic” dimension of the Romantic-era encyclopedia (51-52; cf. 45-263).

---

17. This synoptic vision thus accords with another Coleridgean concept: the vision of the “organic whole” (*BL* I: 96). At the same time, such synoptic thought differs markedly from the kind of reductive totalization discussed by Hegel (cf. Rajan 2004, 2007). For while the former strives for a sense of integral comprehensiveness, it is never utterly finished (what Mikhail Bakhtin would call “finalized” [76-77]). On the contrary, the synoptic epistemology we have discussed is ongoing and continually evolving. It partakes of the Romantic idea of continual “becoming,” as promulgated by Friedrich Schlegel (Mellor 89). Hence the operative term here is not totalization but methodization: a striving for textual comprehensiveness that is both systematic and systemic, yet never fully realized.

I have written elsewhere on this Hegelian concept of systematic, collective texts—as well as on the encyclopedic motive that undergirds them (Macovski). Here I will only note that Hegel’s vision applies to many forms of Romantic compendia, including their grangerized manifestations. In Hegel’s terms, such texts are, again, both “systematic” and “unified”—in the sense that discrete divisions are fundamentally “branches of one and the same whole” (Hegel 52; cf. Diderot, Yeo 178).<sup>18</sup> In this sense, Hegel’s discussion of a “branched” “system” again supports the idea of a compilatory text that is both organizational and ordered (branched). At the same time, such a linked, systematic branching is also both comprehensive and unified—“of one and the same whole.” In this context, then, Hegel’s formulation can be said to support the concept of an ordered, synoptic construct—the kind of holistic, systematic compilation we have discussed.

Similarly, both Tilottama Rajan (2000) and Clifford Siskin (1998, 2010) have discussed the development of this construct throughout the Romantic era. Siskin, for instance, analyzes the idea in terms of systematic institutions of knowledge. For him, the increased specialization and narrowing range of educational disciplines comes to characterize many epistemological (and taxonomic) discussions during this period. Such a narrowing involves both new classification systems and a divided concept of the production of knowledge. For our purposes, though, we should recognize that the foregoing sense of systematic knowledge—categorically divided and branched—also characterizes the kind of organized, comprehensive, and synoptic compendia that emerge during the eighteenth century.

As we have suggested, both physical collections—and the synecdochic catalogues that represent them—partake of this eighteenth-century vision of systemization. That is, they reflect the same emphasis on catalogic organization, comprehensiveness, and the Hegelian “philosophical whole.” In the end, it is this view of compendia—quintessentially systematic and inclusive—that buttresses the praxis of grangerization. In this sense, the compilers of a grangerized text enact a vision that is not only collective but also ordered, organizational, systematized—as well as, again, textually synoptic.

## V.

This vision of a comprehensive “system”—“unified” in the Hegelian sense—thus accords with our foregoing discussion of texts that are comprehensive, integrated, and synoptic. At the same time, such systemization also

---

18. It is no coincidence that Hegel deploys that same “branch” metaphor that characterizes the many tree diagrams within encyclopedias of this era. Such figures demonstrate the widespread impulse not only to organize and categorize knowledge but also to show the linkages and continuities among disparate categories. They illustrate, here again, a connective, comprehensive whole. For more on these epistemological diagrams—especially as they occur in encyclopedic frontispieces—see Yeo and Diderot.

manifests itself in what I would term the *successive* aspect of grangerized texts. That is, the foregoing sense of a systematized, all-encompassing, and holistic collection is further developed in textual representations of ongoing succession—including the successive interleaving and diachronic additions that characterize the grangerized text. Indeed, the idea of a book *intended* to be extra-illustrated—one meant to extend a successive, aggregative process over time—continues to manifest itself in many later editions of Granger’s *History*. This successive process undergirds the many editions that specifically include blank pages for readers’ ongoing additions.<sup>19</sup>

Generally speaking, we tend to find such forms throughout the latter half of the eighteenth century, when the concept of an open text influences not only grangerized texts but also inscribed miscellanies—replete with blank dedicatory pages. As Andrew Piper has suggested, “Numerous miscellanies contained a printed space or even a special leaf designed to allow givers to dedicate these books to their recipients. Whether it was ornamental presentation leaves . . . or dedicatory poems that included a blank space to write in the dedicatee’s name, . . . miscellanies consistently used white space to encourage their users to write within them” (*Dreaming in Books* 129). In this instance, the miscellany comes to parallel the grangerized text, in that both envision a process that is potentially diachronic, ongoing, and successive.

The expectation that a particular book would be added to, especially through extra-illustration, extends not only to the blank pages of the text itself, but also to the source of the illustrations to be added. As Stuart Sillars has noted, “One of the most celebrated collections was *A series of four hundred and six historical portraits to illustrate Granger’s Biographical History of England*. With reproductions of the engravings mentioned by Granger, it was clearly intended to be broken so that individual plates could be inserted in Granger’s text” (216). Similarly, one of the most famous editions of Shakespeare—*The Whole Historical Dramas of William Shakespeare, Illustrated*—is intended “either to be bound as the purchaser wished or broken to illustrate the plays. The ‘Advertisement’ makes plain its approach” (Sillars 216). In both cases, individual compilers become part of the textual process: in fact, it is the reader who enacts the text.

Such enacting also partakes, moreover, of a larger textual process—one that, here too, foregrounds a readerly vision. For instance, Sillars writes that extra-illustrated “editions often included images of actual historical figures and places [which] disclosed the subtle amalgamation of the nation’s dramatic and national history” (215). In the present context, though, we can now say that this vision of “national history”—based upon initially unbound portraits of historical figures—is a readerly construct. In fact, that such portraits are often intended for extra-illustration suggests that they can be organized according to a specific historical vision—a specific arrangement and ordering, conveying a given collector’s revision (and literal re-“framing”) of “national history.” In practice, various extra-

---

19. On this point, see Sillars 216.

illustrated compilations tend to enact different historical visions—each one highlighting different reigns, kings, queens, and (as we have noted) diverse social classes. (Sillars 216).<sup>20</sup> Much as the museum curators of this era tend to re-organize the order of exhibits according to a particular historical schema, each collector and compiler of extra-illustrated histories (Shakespearean and otherwise) crafts a particular historical perspective. In this sense, grangerization becomes a kind of redaction. By re-ordering “genuine” historical portraits, each collector actually reinterprets history.<sup>21</sup>

## VI.

Such examples also suggest that the extra-illustrated text emerges out of a practice that is essentially proleptic—one that is additive, aggregative, and again, successive. We find such prolepsis in textual representations of several particular successions: historical, hierarchical, class-based—and, as we have begun to suggest, royalistic.

Indeed, this royalistic aspect of extra-illustration manifests itself in a variety of texts, which in turn instantiates their temporal, historical dimension. We should recall, for instance, that Granger grounds his entire volume on a listed succession of royal reigns. That is, he actually segments his original *History* into separate royal periods—followed by lower rankings—and then divides each category according to a descending social order. His “Plan of the Catalogue” begins with the following categories:

- Class I. Kings, Queens, Princes, Princesses, &c. of the Royal Family.
- Class II. Great Officers of State, and of the Household.
- Class III. Peers, ranked according to their Precedence, and such Commoners as have Titles of Peerage: namely, Sons of Dukes, &c. and Irish Nobility.<sup>22</sup>

In this sense, Granger’s volume again stands not just as a random collection of biographical sketches and portraits, but as a bona fide *History*, a chronological linkage—and an exact record of kings, queens, members of court, and their respective reigns. It records not only a history of particular prints, engravings, and interleavings—but a royal history as well. It traces an ongoing chain of royal succession.

20. Sillars notes that the title page to this first, amply-illustrated edition of Shakespeare announces, “Price Six Guineas in Boards.” Here again, then, the grangerized text limns a reader-centered (and redactive) process, since the option of binding in “Boards” further emphasizes that the text can be “either . . . bound as the purchaser wished or broken to illustrate the plays” (216).

21. For more on such historical reinterpretations—especially in regard to specific reigns—see Nenner.

22. The “Plan” goes on to stratify the rest of the social order into a total of eleven classes, moving down from “Archbishops and Bishops,” to “Men of the Sword,” to “Sons of Peers without Titles,” and so on through the rankings. Here again, Granger’s systematic structure manifests itself as not only royalistic and successive but also hierarchical, social, and class-bound.

This emphasis on an ongoing, successive trajectory—on a continuous linkage of chronological kingdoms—also manifests itself in one of the most celebrated and elaborate reincarnations of Granger’s work: namely, the thirty-five volumes compiled by his friend and contemporary, Richard Bull. For Bull not only extra-illustrates the reigns listed in the first edition of Granger’s *History*; he actually extends the trajectory to include those reigns that occur after Granger’s volume leaves off. That is, while Granger’s chronology stops at 1688, Bull brings his own record up to the reign of George III. In fact, the number of volumes covering the original volume’s timeline not only swells to nineteen in Richard Bull’s compilation—but the same collector actually adds sixteen more volumes in order to complete his view of royal history. We can say, then, that Bull’s edition stands not just as an instance of indefatigable versioning, but as an example of how extra-illustration can reveal a vision of history that is, again, both synoptic and successive. The desire to illustrate (quite literally) the full scope of royal succession—to extend Granger’s chronology into the future—bespeaks a concept of history that is at once proleptic, ongoing, and all-encompassing.

Grangerization can thus support a Janus-faced history—simultaneously nostalgic and forward-looking—as exemplified by Bull’s desire both to record and complete the trajectory of royal succession. What is more, the particular reigns emphasized in such projects are highly significant. It is no accident, for instance, that Bull’s project includes over eighty portraits of William III, more than one hundred portraits of Charles I, and two volumes—fully 584 pages—devoted to the reign of James I. In many cases, such copiousness reflects more than just the availability of particular portraits. The choice of William III, for instance—especially in texts that highlight generational relationships in general and royal succession in particular—is not surprising. For when the Bill of Rights (1689) ultimately fails to enact a viable succession, both the dynastic and the religious dimensions of succession come under fire. Indeed, the entire lineage, sequence, and foundation for royal power begin to break down, especially before the Act of Settlement is signed. Yet, in a sense, the grangerized text represents a re-instantiation of this generational succession and lineage, as manifested in the political choices and historical layering of prints selected.

Charles I, too, stands out within the history of challenges to royal power—and royal succession—during the mid-seventeenth century. The civil wars of the era—first with the Scots from 1637, and later in England (1642-46 and 1648)—marks his reign as at best problematic, and his conflict with Parliament only exacerbates the situation.

Finally, we might also examine the case of James I. (Even Granger’s first edition of the *History* [1769] contains 121 pages covering this reign.) As far as the historical context is concerned, we might recall that James’s reign is haunted throughout by the specter of the proposed “Great Contract” (1610), the Addled Parliament of 1614, and the Thirty Years War (1618-48) in Europe. In this context, the grangerized emphasis on James I’s royal status—including the depiction

of his apotheosis—becomes a way of supporting royal succession, especially in the face of his inability to unite Scotland and England within a single, governmental union. For our purposes, moreover, the prints selected also represent a more general, generational (genealogical) succession and progression, not only from ruler to ruler but also from historical period to historical period.<sup>23</sup>

It is not surprising, then, that Bull would compile prints of James that highlight his claims of royal legitimacy. Such kingly poses include James on the throne, replete with orb and scepter, as well as James surrounded by high-ranking figures associated with the court—including nobles, courtiers, clergy, and Parliamentary officials. Other portraits feature emblematic symbols of royalty—as well as, again, James’s apotheosis, as originally depicted in Rubens’s Whitehall ceiling (Wark 156). (In contrast, James’s eldest son Henry—who dies young and never takes his place in the royal succession—is represented in Bull’s massive edition by a paltry sixteen images.<sup>24</sup>)

Such copious reproduction thus addresses the royal succession controversies that surround these rulers throughout their reigns. In the end, several compilers actually seek to buttress the claims of these vexed figures, thereby linking them within an ongoing, connective, and historical chain. The ultimate effect is, here again, systematic—in that the listed portraits comprise an organizational succession, a comprehensive perspective, and a synoptic vision.

## VII.

Again, then, the grangerized work is far from a stochastic gathering of clippings, mementos, and other textual ephemera. It represents Romantic systemization on several levels, insofar as it is comprehensively collective, chronologically successive, and even historically archival. Such a collective impulse—proleptic, systematic, and all-encompassing—also emerges in another, remarkably curious designation within Granger’s subtitle. He stresses there that his work comes “With a Preface, shewing the utility of a collection of engraved portraits to supply the defect, and answer the various purposes, of Medals.” In this context, one should bear in mind that, throughout the eighteenth century, the term “Medals” normally referred to ancient coins. Yet the actual importance of these coins—what Granger calls the “purpose of Medals”—is that they nearly always reside in collections. As a result, the term “Medals” also becomes an emblem for the collective impulse of the era (as well as for the many numismatic catalogues compiled by antiquarian collectors during the period).

It is not surprising, then, that Granger would compare his codicil collection of portrait descriptions to its numismatic equivalent. By invoking the coin collections of this period, he again suggests that his *Biographical History* is itself an Ur-collection—a comprehensive listing of portraits that, if they were brought

---

23. We might also note how fitting it is that prints of James come into relief within a grangerized Shakespearean text, given the king’s well-known support of theater during his reign.

24. See Wark 157 and Nenner.

together, would constitute a complete, comprehensive collection. As we shall see, the volume also takes pains both to point out that the portraits listed are part of actual collections and, at the same time, to name and locate these collections with precision. In this sense, Granger's first edition reflects the collective, synoptic vision that structures many actual "Medal" collections of the era.

Hence Granger's seminal volume is not only collective and holistic; it is, as we have suggested, overtly systematic, successive, and sequential. Both his seminal volume—as well as the subsequent interleaving praxis it spawns—trace an ongoing, chronological series. Yet what is remarkable here is that Granger's successive portraits also mirror the historical images and trajectories depicted on the numismatic "Medals" invoked in his subtitle. Indeed, I would suggest that the central organizing principle of Granger's volume—namely, the succession of royal reigns—re-enacts the numismatic representations of kingly dynasties in many coin collections of the era. Much as Granger's volume is structured around a series of royal reigns, so too these artefactual collections highlight a progressive series of coins—one that often traces a royal (or imperial) succession, history, or career. For instance, one of the most prized series (even today) traces the twelve Caesars—a fact that Pope memorializes in his "Moral Essays, Epistle V (To Mr. Addison, Occasioned by His Dialogue on Medals)."<sup>25</sup>

We can say, then, that the successive, sequential structure of these collections—whether they are numismatic or extra-illustrated—also emphasizes their status as comprehensive, fully integrated forms. That is, the successive content of both artefactual and codex collections tends to highlight their comprehensive scope. By highlighting their status as a complete, chronological series—as an ongoing royal succession—they exemplify the systematic, comprehensive, historical, and successive dimensions of the collective genre. Such collections, in either material or codex form, represent an associative linkage—a historical sequence that underscores its own prolepsis. In presenting a full, temporal arc, such collective forms encompass a synoptic entity.

### VIII.

These precepts—historical continuity, serialized succession, and comprehensive collectivity—underlie the organizational framework of Granger's landmark volume. Yet Granger's work stands not only as a representation of serial reigns but as a sequence of actual portraits as well. It demonstrates a collectivity that is not only systematic, historical, and royalistic—but ekphrastic as well.

This visual collectivity is, again, both all-encompassing and inherently connective. Much as the royal successions we have noted embody a complete progression, so Granger's listed portraits form an ongoing, inter-connective trajectory. Similarly, much as royal successions derive from an originary sovereign, so too the listed prints invoke original drawings or depictions. In this sense, many

---

25. In that poem, Pope refers specifically to the coin known as "an Otho," one of the rarest in the Caesar series (l. 44). On this point, see Mabbott 39.

grangerized editions illustrate not only a historical lineage, but an iconographic one as well. In practice, Granger explicitly tracks the pictorial ancestry of many prints listed in his volume. He delineates a pictorial provenance from originary drawing to engraving to re-engraving. Such lineal tracings continually harken back to what Leslie Brisman terms a “Romantic origin” (29).<sup>26</sup> As Brisman shows, this view of origins posits a Rousseauian source that, while often projected and even fictionalized, nevertheless stands as an object of longing and nostalgic desire. In the case of Granger’s listings, we can say that many of them reference an originary portrait—one that is both re-copied and reinterpreted in subsequent re-engravings. Such a trajectory is, here again, successive and sequential—as well as comprehensive and synoptic. Taken together, the chain of listed portraits—re-imagined, re-engraved, and redacted—constitute a holistic collectivity.

Granger registers this ekphrastic succession by stressing specific, pictorial linkages. From the very first edition of his *History*, he repeatedly highlights the graphic relations between the prints he lists, taking pains to show the trajectory from original source (and venue) to the reproductions he has identified. If a given portrait is in a particular collector’s possession, Granger identifies name and place. If the print is taken from a particular book or catalogue or library, Granger records that, too. What is more, he often describes printed portraits as “copied from the above,” “copied from the next above” or “Copied from the original” drawing listed among his earlier entries. In one such representative example, the prints listed under “THOMAS CANDYSSH” identify one portrait as belonging to the original “Heroologia” publication—and then trace another, four entries later, as “Copied from the Heroologia.” (Another citation even lists a print copied “from his statue by Cibber.”) In each case, the listings comprise an ekphrastic collectivity, headed by a visual original. They trace, again, a comprehensive, pictorial trajectory—successively interlinked and broadly synoptic.

As we have noted, this combination of pictorial succession and collective comprehensiveness can also be established institutionally, based upon extant portraits in actual collections, galleries, and museums. Decades after Granger’s volume catalyzes the general phenomenon of extra-illustration, we find a similar desire to trace a complete, pictorial progression: a collective iconography that is often grounded in bona fide collections. Hence a work like *The Whole Historical Dramas of William Shakespeare, Illustrated* (1789-93) explicitly links its soon-to-be extra-illustrated prints with their sources, their originary “Collections”—or with the originary collectors themselves. The *Historical Dramas* volumes accordingly highlight images “copied from old Engravings in the Collections of our first Antiquaries, many of whom have given their assistance to this undertaking” (Sillars 216). In such descriptions, the compiler emphasizes the holistic or synoptic aspect of “The *Whole Historical Dramas*” by announcing a repro-

---

26. For a discussion of the Rousseauian foundations of such originary concepts, see Brisman (1978).

ductive succession—as well as its implications for comprehensive collectivity. Much like Granger’s volume, the *Historical Dramas* seeks to represent the entire trajectory of this diachronic process, beginning with the first incarnation of a seminal portrait. The edition accordingly proclaims that its prints are “copied from Original Pictures hitherto unengraved.” It thereby re-enacts a complete, ekphrastic progression, from original drawing to derivational engraving to echoic reproduction. In the end, it reiterates the organization of Romantic grangerization: systematic, historical, successive, royalistic, ekphrastic—as well as collective, holistic, and synoptic.

Georgetown University  
USA

### Works Cited

- Bakhtin, M. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Ed. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Trans. Vern W. McGee. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1986. Print.
- Benedict, Barbara M. *Curiosity: A Cultural History Of Early Modern Inquiry*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2001. Print.
- Blom, Philipp. *Enlightening the World: Encyclopédie, the Book that Changed the Course of History*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. Print.
- Brewer, Daniel. “The Encyclopédie: Innovation and Legacy.” *New Essays on Diderot*. Ed. James Fowler. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011. Print.
- Brisman, Leslie. *Romantic Origins*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978. Print.
- Burke, Peter. *A Social History of Knowledge: from Gutenberg to Diderot*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers Inc., 2000. Print.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. “On the Principles of Genial Criticism.” 1814. *The Collected Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*. Ed. J. C. C. Mays. 16 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001. Print.
- . “On Poesy or Art.” *The Collected Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*. Ed. J. C. C. Mays. 16 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001. Print.
- Connell, Philip. “Bibliomania: Book Collecting, Cultural Politics, and the Rise of Literary Heritage in Romantic Britain.” *Representations* 71 (2000): 24-47. Print.
- Crane, Susan A. “Curious Cabinets and Imaginary Museums.” *Museums and Memory*. Ed. Susan A. Crane. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000. 60-80. Print.
- Darnton, Robert. *The Business Of Enlightenment: A Publishing History of the Encyclopédie, 1775-1800*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 1979. Print.
- Dibdin, Thomas Frognall. *The Bibliomania; or, Book-Madness; Containing some account of the History, Symptoms, and Cure of this Fatal Disease. In an Epistle addressed to Richard Heber, Esq.* London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme, 1809. Print.
- Diderot, Denis. *Encyclopedia: or a Systematic Dictionary of the Sciences, Arts, and Crafts, by a Company of Men of Letters, arranged by M. Diderot of the Academy of Sciences and Belles-lettres of Prussia: as to the Mathematical Portion, arranged by M. d’Alembert of the Royal Academy of Sciences of Paris, to the*

- Academy of Sciences in Prussia and to the Royal Society of London*. 17 vols. 1751-1772. Print.
- Ferris, Ina, and Paul Keen, eds. *Bookish Histories: Books, Literature, and Commercial Modernity, 1700-1900*. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. Print.
- Gidal, Eric. *Poetic Exhibitions: Romantic Aesthetics and the Pleasures of the British Museum*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2001. Print.
- Granger, James. *Biographical History of England from Egbert the Great to the Revolution, from Egbert the Great to the Revolution, consisting of Characters dispersed in different Classes, and adapted to a Methodical Catalogue of Engraved British Heads*. Intended as an Essay towards reducing our Biography to System, and a help to the knowledge of Portraits; with a variety of Anecdotes and Memoirs of a great number of persons not to be found in any other Biographical Work. With a preface, showing the utility of a collection of Engraved Portraits to supply the defect, and answer the various purposes of Medals. London: William Baynes and Son. 1769; 1824. Print.
- Harris, Katherine D. "Borrowing, Altering, and Perfecting the Literary Annual Form—Or What it is Not: Emblems, Almanacs, Pocket-Books, Albums, Scrapbooks And Gifts Books." *Poetess Archive Journal* 1.1 (2007): 1-30. Print.
- Hegel, G.W.F. *Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences in Outline*. Trans. Stephen A. Taubeneck. *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences in Outline and Critical Writings*. Ed. Ernst Behler. New York: Continuum, 1990. Print.
- Hoagwood, Terence Allan, and Kathryn Ledbetter. *'Colour'd Shadows': Contexts in Publishing, Printing, and Reading Nineteenth-Century British Women Writers*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. Print.
- Jackson, Heather. *Marginalia: Readers Writing in Books*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001. Print.
- Jones, John H. "Blake's Production Methods." *Palgrave Advances in William Blake Studies*. Ed. Nicholas M. Williams. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006. 25-41. Print.
- . "Printed Performance and Reading The Book[s] of Urizen: Blake's Bookmaking Process and the Transformation of Late Eighteenth-Century Print Culture." *Colby Quarterly* 35 (1999): 73-89. Print.
- Kramnick, Isaac. "Encyclopédie." *The Portable Enlightenment Reader*. Ed. Isaac Kramnick. Toronto: Penguin Books, 1995. Print.
- Mabbott, Thomas O. "Pope's Moral Essays, Epistle V ('To Mr. Addison, Occasioned By His Dialogue On Medals')." *Explicator* 10: 2 (1951). Print.
- Macovski, Michael. "Imagining Hegel: Bookish Form and the Romantic Synopticon." *Bookish Histories: Books, Literature, and Commercial Modernity, 1700-1900*. Ed. Ina Ferris and Paul Keen. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. 196-212. Print.
- Mellor, Anne K. *English Romantic Irony*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1980. Print.
- Nenner, Howard. *The Right to be King: the Succession to the Crown of England, 1603-1714*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1995. Print.
- Pape, Walter, and Frederick Burwick, eds. *The Boydell Shakespeare Gallery*. Bottrop, Essen: Verlag Peter Pomp, 1996. Print.

- Pascoe, Judith. *The Hummingbird Cabinet: A Rare And Curious History Of Romantic Collectors*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006. Print.
- Phillips, Mark Salber. *Society and Sentiment: Genres of Historical Writing in Britain, 1740-1820*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000. Print.
- Piper, Andrew. "The Art of Sharing: Reading in the Romantic Miscellany." *Bookish Histories: Books, Literature, and Commercial Modernity, 1700-1900*. Ed. Ina Ferris and Paul Keen. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. 126-47. Print.
- . *Dreaming in Books: The Making of the Bibliographic Imagination in the Romantic Age*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2009. Print.
- Rajan, Tilottama. "The Encyclopedia and the University of Theory: Idealism and the Organization of Knowledge." *Textual Practice* 21.2 (2007): 335-58. Print.
- . "Philosophy as Encyclopedia: Hegel, Schelling, and the Organization of Knowledge." *Wordsworth Circle* 35.1 (2004): 6-11. Print.
- . "System and Singularity from Herder to Hegel." *European Romantic Review* 11.2 (2000): 137-49. Print.
- Shaddy, Robert A. "Grangerizing: 'One of the Unfortunate Stages of Bibliomania.'" *Book Collector* 49.4 (2000): 535-46. Print.
- Sillars, Stuart. *The Illustrated Shakespeare, 1709-1875*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2008. Print.
- Siskin, Clifford. "Mediated Enlightenment: The System of the World." *This is Enlightenment*. Ed. Clifford Siskin and Mark Warner. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2010. 164-72. Print.
- . *The Work of Writing: Literature and Social Change in Britain, 1700-1830*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998. Print.
- Viscomi, Joseph. *Blake and the Idea of the Book*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993. Print.
- Wark, Robert R. "The Gentle Pastime of Extra-Illustrating Books." *Huntington Library Quarterly: A Journal for the History and Interpretation of English and American Civilization* 56.2 (1993): 151-65. Print.
- Yeo, Richard. *Encyclopaedic Visions: Scientific Dictionaries and Enlightenment Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. Print.