Classified by their Classifications

DOI:

[10.1080/01916599.2021.1953561](https://doi.org/10.1080/01916599.2021.1953561)

Document Version

Accepted author manuscript

[Link to publication record in Manchester Research Explorer](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Hodgson, J. R. (2021). Classified by their Classifications: Nineteenth-Century Library Classifications in Context. *History of European Ideas*, 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01916599.2021.1953561>

Published in:

History of European Ideas

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on Manchester Research Explorer is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Proof version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Explorer are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Takedown policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please refer to the University of Manchester's Takedown Procedures [<http://man.ac.uk/04Y6Bo>] or contact uml.scholarlycommunications@manchester.ac.uk providing relevant details, so we can investigate your claim.

John R. Hodgson, 'Classified by their Classifications: Nineteenth-Century Library Classifications in Context'

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates influences upon the development of library classification systems in nineteenth-century Britain. Two case studies – Edward Edwards's 'scheme of classification for a town library' of 1859 and the Bibliotheca Lindesiana of the earls of Crawford who made a number of significant contributions to the development of library classification over a fifty-year period – are deployed to explore how classification schemes reflected the habituses of their creators and how they were shaped by their socio-economic, epistemological and geographical contexts. The paper also investigates the discourse of classification, examining authors' claims for the legitimacy, widespread applicability and superiority of their schemes, while revealing how these claims were compromised or modified by practical considerations. The case studies suggest that a modernizing narrative of a transition in the second half of the nineteenth century from an aristocratic, largely rural and amateur paradigm of knowledge formation to a bourgeois, urban and professional model requires significant modification: a more nuanced approach is required, which recognizes the permeability of geographic and social boundaries and the continued relevance of aristocratic libraries as key sites of knowledge formation until the end of the century.

Keywords: libraries; classification; organization of knowledge; epistemology; aristocracy

Taste classifies, and it classifies the classifier. Social subjects, classified by their classifications, distinguish themselves by the distinctions they make.

Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction*¹

1. Introduction

The history of library classification, which has often been approached from a narrow, technical perspective, may serve as a convenient lens through which to examine wider epistemological and societal trends. Library classification schemes do not operate in an ideological vacuum: despite their authors' invariable claims to objectivity, innateness and universal applicability, classifications reflect and corroborate the socio-cultural, epistemological, religious, racial and gendered outlooks of their creators and practitioners.² While Bourdieu's *Distinction* was

¹ Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, trans. Richard Nice (London: Routledge, 2010 [1984]), xxix.

² On the biases and limitations of Library of Congress Subject Headings and Dewey Decimal Classification, see Sanford Berman, *Prejudices and Antipathies: A Tract on the LC Subject Heads Concerning People*, 2nd ed. (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1993); Clare Beghtol, 'Knowledge Domains: Multidisciplinarity and Bibliographic Classification Systems', *Knowledge Organization* 25, no. 1–2 (1998); Hope A. Olson, 'Sameness and Difference: A Cultural Foundation of Classification', *Library Resources & Technical Services* 45, no. 3 (2001); Megan Fox, 'Tentative Supplement to (the History of) Classification:

primarily concerned with classifications of and by taste, the epigraph above applies equally to epistemological categorizations (which, of course, were not entirely unconnected with taste): library classification schemes, whether the product of individuals or institutions, are revealing of their creators' habituses, their socially constructed dispositions, assumptions and biases.

This paper investigates the influences upon the development of library classification systems in nineteenth-century Britain during a period of rapid urbanization and industrialization, the expansion and divarication of academic disciplines and professions, and wider social and political changes. Contrasting case studies are employed to explore how classification schemes reflected the habituses of their creators and how they were impacted by broader socio-economic, epistemological and geographical landscapes. I shall also investigate the discourse of classification, examining the claims made by authors for the legitimacy, widespread applicability and superiority of their schemes, while also revealing the ways in which these claims were compromised or modified by practical issues, such as the necessity to make library catalogues and the physical arrangement of books readily comprehensible to untrained staff and patrons. Finally, I shall consider whether these cases studies corroborate or challenge conventional accounts of the erosion of the aristocracy's cultural hegemony in the face of growing urban, bourgeois and professional interests in Victorian Britain.

The historiography of library classification has until recently been dominated by technical appraisals of classification systems and by taxonomic explorations of their genealogies, written by or primarily addressed to librarians. The mid-twentieth-century studies of Berwick Sayers and Jesse Shera were situated within a long tradition of such analyses reaching back to the work of J. W. Lubbock and Edward Edwards over a century earlier.³ Students of nineteenth- and twentieth-century library classification have rarely addressed its wider socio-cultural and epistemological ramifications, and much of the historiography is poorly theorized. In contrast, scholars of the early modern period have been more successful in contextualizing library classification within the wider epistemology of encyclopedias, the growth of secular learning and the development of natural history taxonomies. There is of course a vast literature on the organization of knowledge in the early modern period; seminal works include Roger Chartier's *The Order of Books* and Peter Burke's *A Social History of Knowledge*.⁴ David McKitterick's

Librarians of Color and Operationalizing Solutions to Deconstructionist Critique', *The iJournal: Graduate Student Journal of the Faculty of Information* 4, no. 3 (2019).

³ W. C. Berwick Sayers, *A Manual of Classification for Librarians and Bibliographers*, 2nd ed. (London: Grafton, 1944); Jesse H. Shera, *Libraries and the Organization of Knowledge*, ed. D. J. Foskett (London: Crosby Lockwood, 1965); J. W. Lubbock, *Remarks on the Classification of the Different Branches of Human Knowledge* (London: Charles Knight, 1838); Edward Edwards, *Libraries and Founders of Libraries* (London: Trübner, 1864).

⁴ Roger Chartier, *The Order of Books: Readers, Authors, and Libraries in Europe between the Fourteenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, trans. Lydia G. Cochrane (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994); Peter Burke, *A Social History of Knowledge: From Gutenberg to Diderot* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000), 81–115. See also

chapter on 'Libraries and the Organisation of Knowledge' in *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland: Volume I*, surveys the literature and issues specifically concerning early library classifications, while Alain Besson provides a more detailed analysis of Renaissance library classification schemes in his unpublished doctoral thesis.⁵

For the nineteenth century, Rodney Brunt's survey article in *The Cambridge History of Libraries: Volume III* remains a useful starting point, while John Bowman offers a fine-grained historical survey of classification systems in British public libraries. Catherine Minter's work on classification in nineteenth-century German libraries is a necessary counterbalance to the Anglo-American focus of most scholarship in English.⁶ Heather MacNeil is one of the few scholars to have contextualized debates around library classification in the nineteenth century within a wider discourse of collecting and the ordering of knowledge, in this case within Britain's national cultural institutions. She succeeds in her aim 'to provide a glimpse into some of the sociocultural forces that have helped to shape our modern understanding of catalogues and cataloguing practices'.⁷ The present article seeks to extend MacNeil's work, and to explore how these debates played out, not only in the national arena, but at the local level, in very specific socio-cultural contexts. I also build upon the work of Pauline Rafferty, one of the first scholars to apply cultural theory to library classification systems; Rafferty deployed Foucauldian discourse analysis to reveal the 'clearly identifiable systems of knowledge, epistemological assumptions', underlying all classifications.⁸

Ann Blair, 'Reading Strategies for Coping with Information Overload ca. 1550–1700', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 64, no. 1 (2003).

⁵ David McKitterick, 'Libraries and the Organisation of Knowledge', in *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland: Volume I: To 1640*, ed. Elisabeth Leedham-Green and Teresa Webber (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Alain Besson, 'Classification in Private Library Catalogues of the English Renaissance, 1500–1640' (PhD diss., University College London, 1988).

⁶ Rodney M. Brunt, 'Organising Knowledge: Cataloguing, Classification and Indexing in the Modern Library', in *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland. Volume III: 1850–2000*, ed. Alistair Black and Peter Hoare (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); J. H. Bowman, 'Classification in British Public Libraries: A Historical Perspective', *Library History* 21, no. 3 (2005); Catherine Minter, 'The Classification of Libraries and the Image of the Librarian in Nineteenth and Early Twentieth-Century Germany', *Library & Information History* 25, no. 1 (2009).

⁷ Heather MacNeil, 'Catalogues and the Collecting and Ordering of Knowledge (II): Debates about Cataloguing Practices in the British Museum and the Forebears of the Public Record Office of Great Britain, ca. 1750–1850', *Archivaria* 84 (2017): 33.

⁸ Pauline Rafferty, 'The Representation of Knowledge in Library Classification Schemes', *Knowledge Organization* 28, no. 4 (2001). Walter C. Koehler has also situated classifications within their socio-cultural contexts, albeit at a somewhat superficial level, in *Ethics and Values in Librarianship: A History* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), 43–78.

The influences on nineteenth-century library classification will be addressed through two case studies, which have been chosen to exemplify contrasting epistemological approaches and the divergent social backgrounds of their creators and intended audiences: first, Edward Edwards's 'scheme of classification for a town library' of 1859, which was informed by his own experience as one of Britain's first civic librarians; secondly, the Bibliotheca Lindesiana of the earls of Crawford, who established one of the largest and most important private libraries in Victorian Britain, and who made a number of notable contributions to the development of library classification over a fifty-year period. These cases studies also share an association with Manchester, the 'shock city' of the Industrial Revolution, which in the second half of the century constructed a cultural carapace of museums, galleries, orchestras and public and private libraries.⁹

It is important to situate nineteenth-century library classification in Britain within broader endeavours to categorize the natural and human worlds. Indeed, classification is a seemingly universal phenomenon, intrinsic to cognition and to the social structures of all cultures. Geoffrey Bowker and Susan Leigh Star assert that 'To classify is human', although William Stanley Jevons was making similarly universalist claims as early as the 1870s.¹⁰ While a full analysis of the history of classification lies beyond the scope of this paper, three aspects of Western traditions of classification are especially pertinent to the present discussion, namely their rhetorical freight, their inherent conservatism and the mediation between theoretical schemes and the practical requirements of organizing libraries.

A rhetoric of universality and objectivity has masked the social constructedness of every Western endeavour to develop classifications of knowledge. Classifications always involve choices, whether deliberate or unconscious – what is the same and what is different? – and the privileging of one set of characteristics or qualities over another.¹¹ Despite invariable avowals of the innateness of such categorization, classifications are socially situated and always import and refract the conditioning and preconceptions of their creators. Bowker and Star pointedly remark that '[t]here is no such thing as an unambiguous, uniform classification system. (Indeed, the deeper one goes into the spaces of classification expertise – for example, librarianship or botanical systematics – the more fervid one finds the debates between rival classificatory schools.)'¹² In this paper I shall argue that rhetorical contests over the alleged

⁹ On Victorian Manchester, see Alan Kidd, *Manchester: A History*, 4th ed. (Lancaster: Carnegie Publishing, 2006); Tristram Hunt, *Building Jerusalem: The Rise and Fall of the Victorian City* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 2004), 141–92.

¹⁰ Geoffrey C. Bowker and Susan Leigh Star, *Sorting Things Out: Classification and its Consequences* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000), 1. William Stanley Jevons, *The Principles of Science: A Treatise on Logic and Scientific Method*, 2 vols., vol. ii (London: Macmillan, 1874), 344: 'All logical inference involves classification, which is indeed the necessary accompaniment of the action of judgment.'

¹¹ Olson, 'Sameness and Difference', 115–16.

¹² Bowker and Star, *Sorting Things Out*, 322.

superiority and universal applicability of specific classification schemes persisted to the end of the nineteenth century and beyond.

Secondly, we should note the remarkable conservatism that inheres in library classification, and the persistence of ancient traditions of classification throughout the early modern period and later. Mary Slaughter has shown that Aristotelian classification had a pervasive influence until the seventeenth century, albeit mediated through Porphyry's dichotomous, hierarchical tree of genera and species.¹³ Likewise, the legacy of Bacon persisted into the nineteenth century, instantiated in the arrangements of Jacques-Charles Brunet and William Torrey Harris.¹⁴ It would of course be foolish to construct a teleological argument that the history of classification in the West was one of uninterrupted progress down the centuries. However, it is indubitably the case that this history was generally marked by long continuities rather than epistemological ruptures, and the authors of classificatory systems frequently appealed to tradition and precedent in order to reinforce the legitimacy of their schemes. While Foucault defined his Classical episteme – roughly coterminous with the long eighteenth century – as the era of classification, the case studies examined in this paper reveal that a preoccupation with classification endured to the end of the nineteenth century.¹⁵

Finally, library classification mediates between wider systems for the organization of knowledge, and the practical considerations of managing substantial collections of those material repositories of knowledge called books. Although Pauline Rafferty argues that the polarity between ideology and pragmatism is less real than librarians sometimes claim, there is always a tension between theoretic schemes for the organization of knowledge and the lived realities of actual libraries. Practical issues – space limitations, variations in the size of volumes, non-standard formats such as rolls and portfolios, the need to protect precious items from the curious and light-fingered, convenience of access to frequently consulted works, the requirement to accommodate continual accruals, and obligations to respect the integrity of discrete collections – intrude upon idealized notions of how a library ought to be arranged to reflect the organization of knowledge and the interests of the owner or custodian, and may frustrate the imposition of a single unified sequence upon a library.¹⁶ Similar practicalities also encourage stasis and archaism: it is no trivial matter to reorganize a large collection, especially

¹³ M. M. Slaughter, *Universal Languages and Scientific Taxonomy in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 3, 47–8. See also Blair, 'Reading Strategies', 288–91; James Franklin, 'Aristotle on Species Variation', *Philosophy* 61, no. 236 (1986): 251–2.

¹⁴ Rodrigo de Sales and Thiago Blanch Pires, 'The Classification of Harris: Influences of Bacon and Hegel in the Universe of Library Classification', *Proceedings from North American Symposium on Knowledge Organization* 6 (2017).

¹⁵ Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (London: Routledge, 1989), 63–4, 79–80.

¹⁶ James Thompson notes the importance of practical convenience for the organization of libraries in *A History of the Principles of Librarianship* (London: Clive Bingley, 1977), 146–61.

one with little or no empty shelving, while readers' intellectual and somatic familiarity with a library's layout may deter radical restructuring and preserve outmoded arrangements of books. The topic of how the layout of libraries and the bodily experience of using them have historically shaped knowledge formation demands further investigation, applying the methodologies that Gaston Bachelard, Pierre Nora and Mary Carruthers have deployed to explore how physical spaces generate and resonate with cognitive and memorative processes.¹⁷ Carruthers's work is especially pertinent: she argues that the physical configuration of a library not only influences but also instantiates the cognitive processes of those who study within it: the 'lay-out of the library and the scholars' memories imitate one another'.¹⁸

There is thus a perpetual negotiation between idealized library classification schemes and the material arrangement of books in an actual library. This divergence is mediated by means of a battery of finding aids, shelf guides and indices, as well as through the intellectual capital of librarians, custodians and practised users whose expertise enables them to navigate around the specificities and idiosyncrasies of a library's physical organization that may confound the uninitiated. Thus Alain Besson cautions against simplistic equivalences between bibliographical classifications and wider epistemological taxonomies in the early modern era, due to 'a fundamental difference of approach: a philosophic classification, in the period under consideration, was initiated by a desire to organize knowledge, but the prime intention of the compiler of a library catalogue was to record a collection of books; any thought about the arrangement of the catalogue came second.'¹⁹ The following case studies reveal a tension between idealized, theoretical classification schemes and the manifold practical constraints that compel their modification for use in particular circumstances.

2. Edward Edwards: Classification and Urbanization

Britain's leading authority on library classification in the mid-nineteenth century was Edward Edwards (1812–86), a Benthamite radical and nonconformist of humble origins; his father was a builder in London's East End who went bankrupt in 1832 and Edward seems to have received little formal education.²⁰ During the 1830s he was active in a number of metropolitan literary

¹⁷ Pierre Nora, 'Between Memory and History: *Les Lieux de Mémoire*', *Representations* 26 (1989); Gaston Bachelard, *The Poetics of Space*, trans. Maria Jolas (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1994), 8; Mary Carruthers, *The Craft of Thought: Meditation, Rhetoric, and the Making of Images, 400–1200*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature, 34 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 257. Caroline Steedman has applied Bachelard's concept of topoanalysis to the study of archives in 'The Space of Memory: In an Archive', *History of the Human Sciences* 11, no. 4 (1998), and *Dust* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), 79–81.

¹⁸ Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*, 2nd ed., Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature, 70 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 152.

¹⁹ Besson, 'Classification', 177.

²⁰ On Edwards, see William Arthur Munford, *Edward Edwards, 1812–1886: Portrait of a Librarian* (London: Library Association, 1963); Hugh Purcell McCartney, 'Edward Edwards: Man of Letters (First

and scientific societies and developed a utilitarian interest in education, libraries and industrial art. In 1836 he published *A Letter to Benjamin Hawes*, the radical MP who had been instrumental in the establishment of a Select Committee to enquire into the management of the British Museum.²¹ In this open letter Edwards offers an acerbic commentary on the evidence laid before the Select Committee, based upon his own experience as the holder of a reader's ticket. Amongst his many other recommendations for improving the Museum's administration, he advocates for a classified catalogue:

to the reader who wishes to *study* a subject, a classed catalogue is vitally important; for his object is to know what has been written on that subject. [...] *I know* I speak the sentiments of a great number of the constant frequenters of the Museum, when I say that a classed catalogue is, beyond comparison, more useful than an alphabetical one.'²²

In the mid-nineteenth century there were fierce debates about the nature and purpose of library catalogues. At the British Museum, Sir Henry Ellis (Principal Librarian) and Antonio Panizzi (then an assistant librarian, later to succeed Ellis), were sceptical of the benefits of a classed catalogue, advocating instead for a good subject index. In his evidence to the Select Committee in 1836, Panizzi asserted 'I have a great objection to what are called classed catalogues. I think it is impossible to make a good one; I never heard of any. I never heard of two men agreeing on the plan of a classed catalogue.'²³ Ellis and Panizzi argued that a classed catalogue would rapidly be made redundant by the expansion of scientific knowledge and, moreover, the considerable effort of producing a classed catalogue was unnecessary, since most readers at the British Museum were already familiar with the principal books written on their subjects. It was only the 'less informed' members of the public, according to Ellis, who were 'anxious to refer to a classed catalogue'.²⁴

Edwards' pamphleteering and his evidence before the Select Committee brought him to the attention of Panizzi. Notwithstanding their disagreements over the merits of classed catalogues, in 1839 Panizzi employed him as an assistant cataloguer in the department of printed books, where he remained until his dismissal in 1850. Six months later Edwards was

Public Librarian of Manchester)', *Papers of the Manchester Literary Club* 74 (1965–8); K. A. Manley, 'Edward Edwards: A Humble Librarian at Oxford', *Library History* 7, no. 3 (1985); Alistair Black, 'Edwards, Edward (1812–1886), Librarian and Writer', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2004). doi: 10.1093/ref:odnb/8535.

²¹ Edward Edwards, *A Letter to Benjamin Hawes, Esq. M.P.: Being Strictures on the 'Minutes of Evidence' Taken before the Select Committee on the British Museum* (London: Effingham Wilson, 1836).

²² *Ibid.*, 28–9. Quoted in part in Munford, *Edward Edwards*, 18.

²³ House of Commons, *Report from the Select Committee on British Museum; together with the minutes of evidence, appendix and index* (14 July 1836), 398.

²⁴ Quoted in MacNeil, 'Catalogues and the Collecting and Ordering of Knowledge', 10–11.

appointed Manchester's (indeed Britain's) first municipal librarian: Manchester was the first local authority in Britain to take advantage of the powers granted under the Public Libraries Act (1850) to raise a halfpenny on the rates to fund public libraries, legislation for which Edwards himself had assiduously campaigned.²⁵

In *Notes on the Classification of Human Knowledge* (1858), Edwards reviewed some three dozen classification schemes, ranging from the ninth century to the nineteenth.²⁶ He divided them into two categories: the first 'aims at the systematic and consecutive arrangement of all human knowledge', while the second, 'with far humbler pretensions, seeks but to assort after some convenient and manageable fashion the instruments of knowledge for ordinary employment and daily use'. He added:

The system-maker in the former case aspires to solve some of the problems which have occupied and divided metaphysicians in all ages; in the latter he is content if he be found to have facilitated the buying and selling, the shelving and the finding of books, by all who handle them or seek them.²⁷

Revealing his Benthamite leanings, Edwards concluded by advocating for simplicity and practicability in schemes for the classification of knowledge and of libraries:

many of those which have cost their authors much thought and labour, although they may indirectly render good service to the student, are ill suited for practical application to catalogues. For that purpose, it cannot be too much borne in mind that the requisite qualities are not logical concatenation, subtle analysis, or striking terminology; but simplicity, clear definition, and (as far as may be practicable) familiar and time-honoured names.²⁸

Edward applied these utilitarian principles to his own 'scheme of classification for a town library' containing upwards of 30,000 volumes. This appeared within his vast *Memoirs of Libraries*, published in 1859, three months after his dismissal from Manchester.²⁹ The scheme was informed by his experience in the city; indeed, there is strong evidence that the scheme

²⁵ Edward Edwards, *Memoirs of Libraries: Including a Handbook of Library Economy* (London: Trübner, 1859), 815–31. On the limitations of the Public Libraries Act, see Alistair Black, 'The People's University: Models of Public Library History', in *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland. Volume III: 1850–2000*, ed. Alistair Black and Peter Hoare (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 25–6.

²⁶ Edward Edwards, *Notes on the Classification of Human Knowledge, with Especial Reference to the Methods Which Have Been Adopted, or Proposed, for the Arrangement or Cataloguing of Libraries* (Liverpool: T. Brakell, 1858).

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 17.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 31.

²⁹ Edwards, *Memoirs*, 813–31.

reflected the actual classification that he had applied at Manchester Free Library.³⁰ He claimed that his system was founded upon 'broad principles [...] but modified with a view to the special characteristics and requirements' of the new municipal libraries, 'which I hold to be amongst the best results of recent legislation'. Acutely aware of the desirability of practical schemes of arrangement that were suited to parsimonious municipal budgets and the limited expertise of both staff and patrons, he wished to steer a 'middle course, clear alike of over elaboration on the one hand and of confusion on the other'.³¹ He thus proposed a 'simple and broadly-marked scheme of Classification, containing very little novelty', wherein town libraries would be arranged into six classes: Theology; Philosophy; History; Politics and Commerce; Sciences and Arts; and Literature and Polygraphy.³²

Significantly, Edwards accommodated his classification to the civic function of town libraries and to the priorities of their municipal sponsors and clientele. In particular, while ostensibly upholding medieval and early-modern precedents (and still pervasive Church influences in mid-century Britain) in preserving the privileged positions of Theology and Philosophy, he acknowledged that in a municipal context the contents of these classes would be smaller and therefore require less elaboration than History and the new category of Politics and Commerce. 'We may safely assume that in an average "Town Library", now to be formed, the books in the Classes "History" and "Politics and Commerce" will greatly exceed those in the Classes "Theology" and "Philosophy" and that consequently the former will need a much more detailed classification than the latter.'³³ Thus the fourteen primary divisions of Politics and Commerce included treatises on parliamentary and representative assemblies; treatises on the administration of civil government; and political economy. The latter included a subsection on 'Treatises on the Corn Laws in particular, and on Protective Laws and Free Trade generally', which would have had particular resonance in Manchester, the crucible of the Free Trade movement.

Edwards acknowledged that Sciences and Arts was the class that presented the most difficulties for adequate classification, due both to the rapid development of the sciences themselves in the nineteenth century, and to the challenge of making any arrangement of scientific works intelligible to both experts and laity. He thus furnished Sciences and Arts with up to four levels of subdivision (Theology had only two levels, Philosophy just one). While acknowledging that William Whewell's more comprehensive treatment of the sciences in *The History of the Inductive Sciences* and *The Philosophy of Inductive Sciences* might be 'the best that is extant', Edwards doubted 'whether its adoption in the Catalogue of a Library which [...]

³⁰ See Edward Edwards, *Free Town Libraries, their Formation, Management, and History; in Britain, France, Germany, & America* (London: Trübner, 1869), Table IV facing p. 193.

³¹ Edwards, *Memoirs*, 814.

³² *Ibid.*, 1067.

³³ *Ibid.*, 814.

is intended for, and is frequented by both the learned and the unlearned, would, on the whole, be productive of advantage'.³⁴ For Edwards, who was described by a contemporary as a 'radical of the Cobden school', utility took precedence over idealism.³⁵

Thus, as a pioneering civic librarian, Edwards can be observed adapting the conservative and elitist traditions of classification, such as the primacy of Theology and the prestige of Belles-lettres, to the functional requirements of the emergent municipal libraries, which were established to service the needs of bourgeois capitalism and an urban proletariat.

Edwards's scheme for civic libraries may reinforce an impression that advances in library classification and in wider organizations of knowledge, were an entirely urban and progressivist phenomenon in the nineteenth century, and that they were situated within wider trends of professionalization and democratization. In fact, as John Bowman has demonstrated, Edwards's pioneering work was not followed up: municipal libraries paid scant attention to classification until the 1890s, when the closed-access system began to be superseded by books on open shelves, which necessitated a subject arrangement to aid patrons' navigation through the stock.³⁶ There were several reasons for this indifference. Municipal libraries were often underfunded and their staff poorly trained; such conditions were not conducive to the deployment of complex classification schemes. A multiplicity of bespoke classification schemes militated against the widespread adoption of any particular scheme or the coalescing of consensus over their future development.³⁷ There was also widespread scepticism of the value of classified catalogues and of the specialist knowledge required to compile and interrogate them, reflecting the subordinate status of librarians and the slow rate of professionalization.

³⁴ Ibid., 815; William Whewell, *History of the Inductive Sciences: From the Earliest to the Present Times*, 3 vols. (London and Cambridge: John W. Parker, J. and J.J. Deighton, 1837), and *The Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences, Founded upon their History*, 2 vols. (London and Cambridge: John W. Parker, J. and J.J. Deighton, 1840). On Whewell's taxonomy of the sciences, see Geoffrey N. Cantor, 'Between Rationalism and Romanticism: Whewell's Historiography of the Inductive Sciences', in *William Whewell: A Composite Portrait*, ed. Menachem Fisch and Simon Schaffer (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991); Raphaël Sandoz, 'Whewell on the Classification of the Sciences', *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part A* 60 (2016); Aleta Quinn, 'Whewell on Classification and Consilience', *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part C: Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences* 64 (2017).

³⁵ Thomas Potter, mayor of Manchester; quoted in Munford, *Edward Edwards*, 100.

³⁶ Bowman, 'Classification', 143. By contrast, Catherine Minter argues that systematic classification and arrangement were the norm in German libraries in the nineteenth century, although 'catalogues [...] were often at a less advanced level of development than classification schemes.' Minter, 'Classification of Libraries', 9.

³⁷ Catherine Minter, 'Academic Library Reform and the Ideal of the Librarian in England, France, and Germany in the Long Nineteenth Century', *Library & Information History* 29, no. 1 (2013): 22.

There is an extensive historiography on professionalization during the nineteenth century. Scholars have identified trends during the second half of the century of increasing specialization and bureaucratization in the natural sciences, other intellectual disciplines and the professions, in response to the explosion of knowledge and the increasing complexity of capitalist society.³⁸ Key characteristics of professionalization can be defined as control of entry into a profession, by means of widely recognized qualifications and membership of a body representing the interests of the profession, patrolling its boundaries and fostering a shared sense of identity and common interest among its members; the establishment and enforcement of standards of conduct and expertise; and the formulation of a specialized vocabulary of professional discourse.³⁹ However, some critics have rejected functionalist approaches to the question of professionalization, adopting instead discourse analysis and examination of the rhetoric of professionalization to problematize the professional–amateur binary. Thus Ruth Barton claims that professionalization is a ‘slippery concept’; she shows ‘how little the language of professionalization was used in an exclusionary or hierarchical sense’.⁴⁰ Similarly, Heather Ellis argues that we should reject traditional functionalist interpretations of the professionalization of the sciences and instead adopt a broader Foucauldian analysis of scientific discourse in order to reveal the construction of a (masculine) scientific ‘character’.⁴¹

In the case of libraries, nascent professionalism developed in the last quarter of the century: the Library Association was founded in 1877, examinations were introduced in 1885, it obtained a Royal Charter in 1898, and the *Library Association Record* was first published in the following year. However, one should exaggerate neither the influence of the Association nor the speed and extent of the professionalization of libraries in this period: a rhetoric of professionalism belied the reality. In 1891 membership of the Association stood at 454, of whom only 187 were practising librarians; it would be another two decades before librarians comprised the majority of members; professional examinations were poorly attended; pay was generally low; and the first full-time training course for librarians was not established in

³⁸ On professionalization in the nineteenth century, see T. W. Heyck, *The Transformation of Intellectual Life in Victorian England* (London: Croom Helm, 1982); Amanda Anderson and Joseph Valente, eds., *Disciplinary at the Fin de Siècle* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002); Martin Daunt, ed. *The Organisation of Knowledge in Victorian Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 2005).

³⁹ Mike Saks argues that ‘the key to the definition of a profession remains the sheltered position of professions in the marketplace, with entry to the professions usually gained through obtaining relevant higher education credentials.’ Mike Saks, ‘Defining a Profession: The Role of Knowledge and Expertise’, *Professions and Professionalism* 2, no. 1 (2012): 4.

⁴⁰ Ruth Barton, ‘“Men of Science”: Language, Identity and Professionalization in the Mid-Victorian Scientific Community’, *History of Science* 41, no. 1 (2003): 76, 108.

⁴¹ Heather Ellis, ‘Knowledge, Character and Professionalisation in Nineteenth-Century British Science’, *History of Education* 43, no. 6 (2014).

Britain until 1919. The boundaries of the profession remained permeable and its status and self-confidence depressed well into the twentieth century.⁴²

Just as public libraries were slow to adopt detailed classification schemes, likewise most university and college libraries did not introduced them until the twentieth century.⁴³ The conservatism of library staff and their readers was a significant brake on innovation and in the ancient foundations ensured the perpetuation of obsolete arrangements of books rooted in the medieval programmes of the *trivium* and *quadrivium*.⁴⁴ University and college libraries were often poorly staffed, with few specialist cataloguers, while academics were generally familiar with the stock in their subject areas, especially in smaller institutions, and therefore had no requirement for a classed catalogue.⁴⁵ In larger academic libraries the effort involved in assembling classified catalogues from scratch was a deterrent to their production until the rapid growth in academic literature and the fragmentation of disciplines made them indispensable research tools.

In Manchester, Edwards fell out with his Library Committee, who saw no need for the expense and delay involved in publishing a classed catalogue; he offered to undertake the work in his own time but the enterprise remained unfinished when he was dismissed in 1858. The committee subsequently abandoned the scheme as too costly and time-consuming, instead appointing Andrea Crestadoro (1808–79) to compile a simple index catalogue, which was based upon the practices he had promulgated in *The Art of Making Catalogues of Libraries* (1856); he accomplished this impressive feat within only two years.⁴⁶ In the preface to his

⁴² See Alistair Black, *A New History of the English Public Library: Social and Intellectual Contexts, 1850–1914* (London: Leicester University Press, 1996), 193–224; David McKitterick, ‘Libraries, Knowledge and Public Identity’, in *The Organisation of Knowledge in Victorian Britain*, ed. Martin Daunt (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 2005), 298–9, 312; William Arthur Munford, *A History of the Library Association, 1877–1977* (London: Library Association, 1996). Munford (p. 43) and Black (pp. 195–6) note that in 1885, the first year in which the Library Association held examinations, only two second-class certificates were awarded; in some subsequent years there were no entrants at all.

⁴³ As late as 1938, it could be said of university and college libraries that ‘the value of subject and classified catalogues is commencing to be appreciated’. John L. Thornton, *Cataloguing in Special Libraries: A Survey of Methods*, with an introduction by Henry A. Sharp, (London: Grafton, 1938), 15.

⁴⁴ On the influence of medieval curricula on libraries, see Burke, *Knowledge*, 81–115; Besson, ‘Classification’, 191–232.

⁴⁵ Thornton, *Cataloguing in Special Libraries*, 15–17. In 1900 the library of Owens College, Manchester (later to become the University of Manchester), contained 70,000 books and employed just five members of staff including two boys. P. J. Hartog, ed. *The Owens College, Manchester: (Founded 1851): A Brief History of the College and Description of its Various Departments* (Manchester: J. E. Cornish, 1900), 117.

⁴⁶ Munford, *Edward Edwards*, 113–14, 26–8; Thomas Kelly, *A History of Public Libraries in Great Britain, 1845–1975*, 2nd ed. (London: Library Association, 1977), 93. Crestadoro was appointed librarian in May

catalogue, Crestadoro issued a thinly veiled censure of the complexity and impracticality of his predecessor's classed catalogue:

In the continuous march of human knowledge, almost every succeeding day brings to light new truths and new discoveries, having no place prepared for them in artificial and limited classifications, which, however learnedly designed they may be, have more often afforded matter for angry disputes, than answering the purpose for which they were intended.⁴⁷

Another of Edwards's successors in Manchester, W. E. A. Axon, expressed similar scepticism of a classified library catalogue: 'It has a scientific appearance, and it is only when the mazy intricacies of the classes have to be threaded that the fallacy of these appearances becomes evident. Each person has his own views as to the proper method of dividing human knowledge. There is obviously great difficulty in using classified catalogues from the causes mentioned.'⁴⁸

Thus utilitarian attitudes, lack of professional expertise and the financial constraints imposed by parsimonious municipal authorities prevented the full implementation of Edward Edwards' classification scheme for town libraries. Despite the high hopes of the promoters of the 1850 Public Libraries Act, municipal libraries were not in the vanguard of the development of classification or the professionalization of libraries until the end of the century. As late as 1897, with his tongue firmly in his cheek, James D. Brown complained:

There can hardly be a doubt that the weak points in the economy of most of the British public libraries are their classification and cataloguing. My study of the former has convinced me that the originator of the almost universal numerical system must have been an auctioneer, or a graduate from a Sunday School library. The charming simplicity of arithmetical progression could only possess fascination for one whose erstwhile daily practice in rudimentary classification was to stick consecutive numbers,

1864, after completion of his catalogue. Lucy M. Evans, 'Crestadoro, Andrea (1808–1879), Inventor and Librarian', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2004). doi: 10.1093/ref:odnb/6678.

⁴⁷ Andrea Crestadoro, ed. *Catalogue of the Books in the Manchester Free Library: Reference Department* (London: Sampson Low, Son, & Marston, 1864), vi. For his part, Edwards criticized his successor's catalogue: 'no competent critic can fail to see that while the honest and unsparing labour bestowed upon it is worthy of the highest praise, its unsystematic, confused, and awkward construction largely impedes its usefulness to readers. It is not a classed catalogue in any sense.' Edwards, *Free Town Libraries*, 96.

⁴⁸ William E. A. Axon, *Handbook of the Public Libraries of Manchester and Salford* (Manchester: Abel Heywood, 1877), 190–1.

first, on a water-colour drawing by David Cox; next, on a kitchen table; and next, perhaps, on a Crown-Derby chamber utensil.⁴⁹

The supposition of civic leadership in library classification is further problematized by my second case study, that of an aristocratic library which was responsible for several innovations in the practices of cataloguing and classifying large libraries. For, despite the expansion of municipal, college and specialist libraries in the second half of the nineteenth century, many private libraries of the nobility, gentry and clergy remained key sites of knowledge formation and management.⁵⁰

3. The Bibliotheca Lindesiana: Classification and Professionalization

The Bibliotheca Lindesiana, which was located at Haigh Hall near Wigan, fifteen miles north-west of Manchester, was essentially the creation of two men: Alexander Lindsay (1812–80), known for most of his life as Lord Lindsay, and his son (James) Ludovic Lindsay (1847–1913), respectively twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth earls of Crawford.⁵¹ In the years coterminous with Victoria's reign, they formed one of the largest and most significant private libraries ever assembled in Britain. By the end of the nineteenth century, the library comprised over 100,000 printed books, tens of thousands of documents and printed ephemera, and six thousand manuscript codices, scrolls and fragments. In 1901 the manuscripts were purchased for £155,000 by Enriqueta Rylands for her new foundation, the John Rylands Library.

Lord Lindsay was a gentleman-scholar who abjured public office, devoting himself instead to collecting, bibliographical pursuits and polymathic investigations into art history, comparative religion, philosophy, ethnology, linguistics and genealogy. The development of Christian thought and civilization, especially in trecento and quattrocento Italy, formed a lifelong obsession. He invested huge amounts of financial capital to expand the ancestral library into a catholic, panoptical repository of 'the best and most valuable books, landmarks of thought and progress, in all cultivated languages, Oriental as well as European'.⁵² As a collector Lindsay's

⁴⁹ James D. Brown, 'Classification and Cataloguing', *The Library* 51–9, no. 1 (1897): 146.

⁵⁰ For example, the catalogues of the libraries of Henry Huth (1884) and Sir William Osler (1929) have been cited as landmarks in bibliographic description. David Pearson, 'Private Libraries and the Collecting Instinct', in *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland. Volume III: 1850–2000*, ed. Alistair Black and Peter Hoare (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 199.

⁵¹ The best introductions to the Bibliotheca Lindesiana are: Nicolas Barker, *Bibliotheca Lindesiana: The Lives and Collections of Alexander William, 25th Earl of Crawford and 8th Earl of Balcarres, and James Ludovic, 26th Earl of Crawford and 9th Earl of Balcarres*, 2nd ed. (London: Bernard Quaritch for the Roxburghe Club, 1978); Nicolas Barker et al., eds., 'A Poet in Paradise': *Lord Lindsay and Christian Art* (Edinburgh: National Galleries of Scotland, 2000); and Nicolas Barker, 'Lord Lindsay: The Making of a Collector', in *Britannia, Italia, Germania: Taste and Travel in the Nineteenth Century: Conference Papers, Edinburgh, November 2000*, ed. Carol Richardson and Graham Smith (Edinburgh: VARIE, 2001).

⁵² Lord Lindsay's Library Report, 1861–5, Introduction, p. 16. See n. 55 below.

maxims were utility and discipline: the library was intended to service his and his family's literary requirements and he was determined to avoid the bibliomaniacal excess of the previous generation of aristocratic collectors, epitomized by George John, second earl Spencer (1758–1834), preferring textually superior editions to first editions.⁵³ He claimed not to be a collector of manuscripts per se, acquiring only representative examples of illuminated manuscripts and avoiding the obvious attractions of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Books of Hours and other bibliophilic baubles. Non-Western manuscripts, however, were one of the library's most noteworthy features: Lindsay assembled major collections of Middle Eastern manuscripts in Arabic, Persian, Turkish and Samaritan; South Asian manuscripts in Sanskrit and numerous modern Indian languages; Chinese and Japanese printed books and manuscripts; and Syriac, Armenian, Coptic and Ethiopic Christian codices.⁵⁴ Ludovic later supplemented these collections, but he differed markedly from Lindsay in his impulsive collecting practices and his eclectic tastes. He developed extensive holdings of South-East Asian manuscripts, fragments of ancient papyrus from Egypt, spectacular illuminated manuscripts and jewelled bindings, and a vast collection of proclamations, periodicals, newspapers and documents from the French Revolution and Napoleonic period.

Lindsay constructed the Bibliotheca Lindesiana to affirm and enhance his social and cultural distinction, at a time when the hegemony of the landed aristocracy seemed threatened by democracy and by an increasingly powerful bourgeoisie. Earlier in this paper I noted that taste and classification are not unconnected, and the Bibliotheca Lindesiana displays their intrication to a remarkable extent. In his unpublished Library Report of 1861–5 (the most detailed exposition by any nineteenth-century bibliophile of their collecting principles and ambitions), Lindsay makes explicit the connections between taste and classification, and between the proper ordering of a library and its function in consolidating social and cultural capital: 'a choice and well ordered ^private^ Library exercises a most ennobling influence upon the family which possesses it, and through such families upon society.'⁵⁵ Lindsay

⁵³ Letter from Lindsay to Colonel James Lindsay, 22 April 1849; National Library of Scotland, Acc. 9769, Crawford Papers, Crawford Personal Papers, 94/13, fols 1739–43. There is a vast literature on bibliomania: see, for example, Philip Connell, 'Bibliomania: Book Collecting, Cultural Politics, and the Rise of Literary Heritage in Romantic Britain', *Representations* 71 (2000); Arnold Hunt, 'Private Libraries in the Age of Bibliomania', in *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland. Volume II: 1640–1850*, ed. Giles Mandelbrote and K. A. Manley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); James Raven, 'Debating Bibliomania and the Collection of Books in the Eighteenth Century', *Library & Information History* 29, no. 3 (2013).

⁵⁴ On the non-Western collections, see John R. Hodgson, "'Spoils of Many a Distant Land': The Earls of Crawford and the Collecting of Oriental Manuscripts in the Nineteenth Century', *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 48, no. 6 (2020).

⁵⁵ Library Report, Introduction, p. 2. Lord Lindsay's Library Report, or 'Report on the present state and future prospects of the Crawford and Balcarres or Lindesian Library', composed between 1861 and 1865 and extending to almost 190,000 words, is unique in the annals of nineteenth-century book collecting.

believed that in order to confer distinction, both the selection *and* organization of a library's contents must be governed by taste and discrimination; a well-ordered library engenders a well-ordered society. The contrast with the vello-maniac Sir Thomas Phillipps's manuscript midden is striking: his library contained countless choice items but was notoriously disorganized and cannot be said to have exerted an ennobling influence upon its owner.⁵⁶

Lindsay had a life-long interest in the classification of knowledge and libraries: he claimed that 'I have for years been occupied at intervals in methodising and completing a system of classification which I think will be found to be more scientific and more practically useful than any hitherto proposed.'⁵⁷ An interest in classification may have been whetted during his student years at Cambridge, under the influence of William Whewell, then head tutor at Trinity.⁵⁸ His earliest extant classification scheme appeared in the treatise *Progression by Antagonism* (1846). Here, employing a Hegelian dialectic, he modified Bacon's tripartite classification of the human faculties – memory, reason and imagination, equating to history, philosophy and poesy – into imagination (producing poetry), reason (yielding science) and a synthesis of the two (generating philosophy).⁵⁹ He omitted memory and understanding on the grounds that they 'do not induce difference of pursuit or purpose, but are general in their character, and subsidiary to Imagination and Reason'. In actuality their exclusion was

No other nineteenth-century collector of books and manuscripts has left such a comprehensive description or justification of his collecting activities. It remains at Balcarres House, Fife, and is quoted by kind permission of Lord Crawford.

⁵⁶ On Phillipps, see A. N. L. Munby, *Portrait of an Obsession: The Life of Sir Thomas Phillipps, the World's Greatest Book Collector*, ed. Nicolas Barker (London: Constable, 1967). See also Toby Burrows, "'There never was such a collector since the world began": A New Look at Sir Thomas Phillipps', in *Collecting the Past: British Collectors and their Collections from the 18th to the 20th Centuries*, ed. Toby Burrows and Cynthia Johnston (London: Routledge, 2019).

⁵⁷ Library Report, p. 1.

⁵⁸ There is evidence that Lindsay socialized with Whewell at Cambridge on at least one occasion. On 25 May 1833, Joseph Romilly recorded in his diary that he dined with Lindsay and met Whewell amongst the company. John Patrick Tuer Bury, ed. *Romilly's Cambridge Diary, 1832–42: Selected Passages from the Diary of the Rev. Joseph Romilly, Fellow of Trinity College and Registrar of the University of Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 34. Lindsay cites Whewell's *Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences* in *Progression by Antagonism: A Theory, Involving Considerations Touching the Present Position, Duties, and Destiny of Great Britain* (London: John Murray, 1846), 8. On Whewell, see n. 34 above.

⁵⁹ Lindsay, *Progression by Antagonism*. On Bacon's classification, see Lisa Jardine, *Francis Bacon: Discovery and the Art of Discourse* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1974); Sachiko Kusukawa, 'Bacon's Classification of Knowledge', in *The Cambridge Companion to Bacon*, ed. Markku Peltonen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Peter Anstey, 'Francis Bacon and the Classification of Natural History', *Early Science and Medicine* 17, no. 1–2 (2012).

necessary to preserve the symmetry of his progressive dualism.⁶⁰ History was consequently relegated to a component of poetry. At the end of the essay, Lindsay presented a ‘Classification of Human Thought’ in the form of a dichotomous or bifurcated diagram, a format whose own family tree can be traced back through the *Encyclopédie* and the taxonomies of Linnaeus to Bacon and Ramus.⁶¹ In this visualization of knowledge, which superficially resembles the schema in the preface to Chambers’s *Cyclopædia* and Coleridge’s plan for the *Encyclopædia Metropolitana*,⁶² Lindsay proceeds from the general faculties on the left-hand side of the diagram, through a series of bifurcations or antagonisms, to a set of forty specific subjects on the right, some of which are further subdivided to produce fifty discrete categories.

In a footnote to this diagram, Lindsay claimed that ‘By associating several of the Sciences and Arts here separated in analysis [...] this might be made the basis and skeleton of an extended Classification for a Library’, in which case he proposes that a ‘supplementary class’ should be added, comprising miscellaneous collected works, encyclopedias, reviews, general literary history and general bibliography. However, because the classification was founded upon his theory of antagonism, Lindsay was impelled to create artificial oppositions between categories, resulting in a fragmented taxonomy wholly unsuitable for library classification. Thus ethics derives from *science > speculative or pure > physical or natural > matter*, whereas moral philosophy (which Melvil Dewey classed as synonymous with ethics) stems quite differently: *science > practical or applied > metaphysical > government of matter and mind by spirit*. It is hardly surprising that *Progression by Antagonism* incurred the ridicule of John Ruskin in his anonymous review, while Edward Edwards commented candidly that it was ‘open [...] to many

⁶⁰ Lindsay, *Progression by Antagonism*, 2. Hugh Brigstocke discusses Lindsay’s Hegelianism in ‘Sketches’, 54, claiming there is no evidence that he had read Hegel or A. W. Schlegel by 1846. However, Hegel is cited several times in *Progression by Antagonism* and his influence seems strong.

⁶¹ On the use of dichotomous diagrams, see Isabelle Charmantier, ‘Carl Linnaeus and the Visual Representation of Nature’, *Historical Studies in the Natural Sciences* 41, no. 4 (2011); Robert Darnton, *The Great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History* (New York: Basic Books, 1984), 194. Charmantier notes (p. 386) that they ‘were regularly used to convey classifications of the natural world throughout the early modern period’. On Ramist dichotomies, see Howard Hotson, *Commonplace Learning: Ramism and its German Ramifications, 1543–1630* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 46.

⁶² Ephraim Chambers, *Cyclopædia: or, an Universal Dictionary of Arts and Sciences*, 2nd ed., 2 vols., vol. i (London: printed for James and John Knapton [and others], 1728), ii. Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *General Introduction [to the Encyclopædia Metropolitana]; or, Preliminary Treatise on Method* (London: s.n., 1818), 44. On the *Encyclopædia Metropolitana*, see Richard Yeo, ‘Reading Encyclopedias: Science and the Organization of Knowledge in British Dictionaries of Arts and Sciences, 1730–1850’, *Isis* 82, no. 1 (1991); Neal L. Evenhuis, ‘Type Designations of Diptera (Insecta) in the Encyclopaedia Metropolitana’, *Zootaxa* 2653, no. 1 (2010).

of the objections which have been already urged against other schemes, similarly ambitious in their scope'.⁶³

During the 1860s Lindsay attempted a more functional classification, which could serve the practical needs of a library, including his own. This document survives as a substantial manuscript volume containing disjointed drafts of a detailed but never completed classification scheme.⁶⁴ That Lindsay intended the scheme to be applicable to libraries, rather than being a purely theoretical construct, is indicated by the arrangement of Belles-lettres, for example:

1. Introduction to Belles Lettres
2. Dictionaries
3. Rhetoric
4. Poetry
5. Romance
6. Collections, Miscellanies, Belles Lettres
7. General History, Belles Lettres
8. Philosophy of Belles Lettres
9. Miscellanies
10. Bibliography of Belles Lettres

In fact, this project was never completed: some sections, such as Belles-lettres, Theology and Language are highly developed, each running to scores of pages and containing up to *fifteen* levels of subdivision; other sections, such as Poesy and Logic, are merely outline sketches. Nor is there any indication of how Lindsay intended to link these broad subjects into an overarching framework, similar to the scheme in *Progression by Antagonism*. Perhaps he found it impossible to reconcile his propensities towards Baconian synthesis and balance with the contrary, centrifugal tendencies towards complication and atomization, which fatally compromised the practicability of the scheme for the organization of libraries. Tensions between classification and catholicity – between microscopic and macroscopic – remained

⁶³ 'It is generally easier to plan what is beyond the reach of others than to execute what is within our own; and it had been well if the range of this introductory essay had been something less extensive, and its reasoning more careful.' John Ruskin, (anon.), review of Lord Lindsay, 'Progression by Antagonism', and 'Sketches of the History of Christian Art', *Quarterly Review* 81, no. 161 (1847): 6. Edwards, *Notes on Classification*, 29.

⁶⁴ Alexander William Lindsay, 'Lord Lindsay's System of Classification', n.d. [c.1860–65]. Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, ACC 9769 Crawford Library Papers, 296.

largely unresolved in Lindsay's career, and point to wider nineteenth-century debates over the relative merits of generalism and specialization.⁶⁵

Thus, when it came to describing his own library in the monumental Library Report, Lindsay reverted to the structure of Jacques-Charles Brunet's *Manuel du libraire et de l'amateur de livres*, the most widely consulted guide to rare and antiquarian books in this period (first published in 1810 and expanded in subsequent editions down to the 1860s).⁶⁶ In fact, Lindsay adhered to Brunet's arrangement with remarkable fidelity. Brunet's categorization was entirely appropriate to an aristocratic library, since it privileged fields such as Christian theology, history and belles-lettres.⁶⁷

Despite Lindsay's abiding interest in the principles of classification and his quest for the ideal system of arrangement, the practicalities of managing the ever-expanding library sometimes defeated even his impressive organizational powers. He occasionally admitted that he had mislaid items, and other members of the family complained of a household overwhelmed with books. His daughter recalled: 'books were the passion of his life, and walls, tables, shelves, rooms, passages, and finally floors were covered with them at Haigh.'⁶⁸

Library classification schemes did not preoccupy Ludovic, twenty-sixth earl of Crawford, in the way that they absorbed his father's attention. However, they did appeal to his scientific mind: he was a keen astronomer in an era when amateurs could still make significant contributions to knowledge in this field.⁶⁹ He was responsible for one of the earliest applications in Britain

⁶⁵ On these debates, see Heyck, *Transformation*; Stefan Collini, *Public Moralists: Political Thought and Intellectual Life in Britain* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 199–250; Josephine M. Guy, 'Specialisation and Social Utility: Disciplining English Studies', in *The Organisation of Knowledge in Victorian Britain*, ed. Martin Daunt (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 2005); H. S. Jones, *Intellect and Character in Victorian England: Mark Pattison and the Invention of the Don* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 87–8, etc.

⁶⁶ On Brunet, see Jacques-Charles Brunet, *The Classification System of Jacques-Charles Brunet*, trans. Donald Bruce McKeon, Louisiana State University, Graduate School of Library Science, Occasional Papers, 1 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, Graduate School of Library Science, 1976), 22; Roger E. Stoddard, *Jacques-Charles Brunet, le grand bibliographe: A Guide to the Books He Wrote, Compiled, and Edited and to the Book-Auction Catalogues He Expertised* (London: Quaritch, 2007).

⁶⁷ According to John Guillory, Belles-lettres was 'a discourse of judgment or taste, designed to cultivate a faculty of discrimination, the ability to distinguish good writing ("fine letters") from bad'. John Guillory, 'Literary Study and the Modern System of the Disciplines', in *Disciplinarity at the Fin de Siècle*, ed. Amanda Anderson and Joseph Valente (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), 21.

⁶⁸ Lady Mary Susan Félicie Meynell, *Sunshine and Shadows over a Long Life* (London: John Murray, 1933), 28.

⁶⁹ John Lankford, 'Amateurs versus Professionals: The Controversy over Telescope Size in Late Victorian Science', *Isis* 72, no. 1 (1981); Marilyn Bailey Ogilvie, 'Obligatory Amateurs: Annie Maunder (1868–1947)

of Melvil Dewey's decimal classification system: only three years after Dewey published his scheme in 1876, and years before its widespread acceptance in Britain, Ludovic adapted and expanded it in order to classify his astronomical library at Dunecht Observatory in Aberdeenshire. Alert to the innovation of this modified Dewey scheme and its potential application in other scientific libraries, Ludovic printed and circulated a limited edition of his classification and index.⁷⁰ In the introduction he explains his adaptations to Dewey's basic scheme:

On examining the classes devoted to my special subjects in Mr. Dewey's arrangement, I found several points upon which I differed from him, notably in his arrangement of Astronomy. These I have altered without scruple, and, I venture to hope, without detriment. The original form of Mr. Dewey's Classing extends to three figures of decimals. My case being that of a Specialist, I have added a figure [decimal point], thereby increasing the field for work tenfold.⁷¹

It is as though Ludovic inverted his giant telescope to focus down on the microscopic gradations of classification.

When Ludovic inherited the Bibliotheca Lindesiana from his father in 1880, he instituted improvements to its organization, which appears to have been neglected during Lindsay's final years. However, Ludovic was unable or unwilling to devote sufficient attention to the management of the library and eventually he recognized the need for professional assistance. The appointment of John Philip Edmond (1850–1906) as full-time librarian in 1891 placed the library on a more professional footing, but it also had the effect of distancing Ludovic from its quotidian operations, freeing him to pursue other interests, in contrast to his father, for whom the library was his chief avocation.⁷² Edmond immediately set about imposing Walter

and British Women Astronomers at the Dawn of Professional Astronomy', *The British Journal for the History of Science* 33, no. 1 (2000).

⁷⁰ James Ludovic Lindsay, *Dun Echt Observatory Publications. Advance Sheets, Subject to Revision. Classification Scheme, and Index to the Same, of the Library of the Observatory* (Dunecht, Aberdeenshire: printed at the Aberdeen Journal Office, 1879). On the Dunecht Observatory Library, see also Mary F. I. Smyth and Michael J. Smyth, *Supplement to the Catalogue of the Crawford Library of the Royal Observatory Edinburgh* (Edinburgh: Royal Observatory, 1977).

⁷¹ Lindsay, *Dun Echt Classification Scheme*, [3]–4.

⁷² On Edmond, see John Webb, *John Philip Edmond: Bookbinder, Librarian and Bibliographer of Aberdeen 1850–1906: A Short Biography* (Aberdeen: Aberdeen & North-East Scotland Family History Society, 2011); Henry Guppy, 'Obituary: Edmond (John Philip)', *Library Association Record* 18 (1906). Edmond had made his reputation at Sion College in London, where he reorganized the library according to the classification schemes of Brunet and Dewey; Sion College was one of the first libraries in Britain to be classified.

Benjamin's 'mild boredom of order' upon the library.⁷³ He embarked upon a reclassification programme according to the Dewey system and he arranged the manuscripts by language. By 1900 Edmond had been joined by half a dozen members of staff who were engaged in accessioning, organizing, cataloguing and indexing vast quantities of books and other material pouring in from across the globe.

There was an obvious paradox in a family library organized along professional, managerial lines. Moreover, the professionalization of libraries, which Ludovic had promoted, both in his own collection and more widely as president of Britain's Library Association, collided with the economic and social decline of the aristocracy in the twentieth century. It was impossible for the Lindsays to compete with the larger municipal and university libraries in Britain, as well as the private libraries of American magnates such as Morgan and Henry Huntington, which were now in the forefront of the development of libraries and of library science. The days of the great private libraries were numbered, at least in Britain. Thus when Ludovic died in 1913 and his son David inherited the library as twenty-seventh earl of Crawford, the latter had no compunction in dismissing the staff and reverting to direct management of the library. He confided in his diary:

One thing is necessary, namely a dispersal of the Library staff. I confess my decision has caused no regrets in the family, because bibliography was carried to a point so close to the professional that sometimes it appeared as though Haigh existed for the Librarians and that nurses, children, perambulators etc. were interlopers [...]. The administrative cost apart from purchases and binding has amounted to something like £1,500 a year and the very fact of having from four to six men in the house is an infallible incentive to buying – I can't afford to buy [...].⁷⁴

In summary, Lindsay and Ludovic were not unique amongst aristocratic collectors in making contributions to the development of classification. Lord Spencer, the greatest English collector of printed books, developed an innovative sheaf catalogue housed in twin mahogany cabinets, and towards the end of his life he also produced a manuscript Class Catalogue, based on Brunet's *Manuel*, which was later adopted by his nephew and fellow bibliomaniac, the sixth duke of Devonshire.⁷⁵ However, the manifold engagements of the twenty-fifth and twenty-

⁷³ Walter Benjamin, 'Unpacking my Library: A Talk about Book Collecting', in *Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt (London: Pimlico, 1999), 61.

⁷⁴ Diary entry for 9 March 1913, in John Russell Vincent, ed. *The Crawford Papers: The Journals of David Lindsay, Twenty-Seventh Earl of Crawford and Tenth Earl of Balcarres, 1871–1940, during the Years 1892 to 1940* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984), 311.

⁷⁵ Larissa C. Brookes, 'The Sheaf Catalogs of George John Spencer' (master's thesis, San José State University, 2009), 90–1. Edwards, *Libraries and Founders of Libraries*, 444–5. The Class Catalogue is now Rylands English MS 65. William George Spencer Cavendish, sixth duke of Devonshire, *Handbook of Chatsworth and Hardwick* (London: privately printed, 1844), 73. Reference kindly supplied by Fran Baker, Archivist and Librarian at Chatsworth.

sixth earls of Crawford in the development of library classification schemes were unparalleled in the world of private libraries.

4. Conclusion

These case studies illuminate the discourse of library classification during the nineteenth century, which was characterized by protracted, sometimes intense debates over the relative merits of classed and alphabetical catalogues, and contests between proponents of idealized, philosophically based classifications and advocates of practical schemes that adjusted to the constraints of funding, accommodation and proficiency confronting actual libraries. Both Edward Edwards and Lord Lindsay espoused the conventional rhetoric of universality and objectivity for their classification schemes. Yet Edwards's claim to have adopted a 'middle course' in devising a scheme attuned to the requirements of town libraries was belied by its slow adoption by municipal authorities. Lord Lindsay likewise asserted that he had created a classification 'more scientific and more practically useful than any hitherto proposed'⁷⁶ (incidentally implying a degree of equivalence between science and utility), yet he struggled to reconcile his propensities towards synthesis and complication, and the proposal in *Progression by Antagonism* proved unworkable.

The examples of Edward Edwards and the earls of Crawford also illustrate some of the ways in which nineteenth-century library classification schemes were inflected by the socio-economic and epistemological contexts in which they were developed, and by the habituses of their creators. Edwards's scheme for town libraries reflected his radicalism and utilitarian principles and his career in metropolitan and municipal libraries, while the scheme's lack of adoption amongst public libraries mirrored his own precarity and lack of social capital: he was dismissed no less than four times in his career and died destitute.

Lord Lindsay's obsession with classification reflected his elite habitus and his polymathic intellectual interests as a gentleman-savant; he epitomized the lone scholar who was gradually marginalized during the nineteenth century as disciplines were institutionalized within the academy.⁷⁷ The classification schemes he espoused were rooted in the Ramist–Baconian tradition, while oscillating between synthesis and fragmentation in their degrees of complexity. His interest in library classification also intersected with his preoccupations with socio-cultural and racial distinctions. He developed the Bibliotheca Lindesiana as a universal, panoptical library containing 'the best that is known and thought in the world', in Matthew Arnold's famous phrase. The library was intended to reinforce his family's cultural capital, to prepare them for leadership of Britain and its global empire, and to serve as an aristocratic bastion against an increasingly dominant bourgeoisie and the threat of democracy. It was built to service the needs of his family and friends and of the wider scholarly community, in

⁷⁶ Library Report, p. 1.

⁷⁷ Collini, *Public Moralists*, 21–7; Frank M. Turner, *Contesting Cultural Authority: Essays in Victorian Intellectual Life* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 360.

emulation of the Renaissance libraries of Jean Grolier and Thomas Mahieu who opening their collections to their *amici*. Yet this comprehensive vision was challenged by the rapid expansion of knowledge and of print publications in the nineteenth century, and by the rapid divarication of academic, professional and technical disciplines, as well as the erosion of the aristocracy's political and economic influence. Moreover, Lindsay was only weakly intricately in the formal and informal networks of bibliophilic sociability, due to his innate shyness and his utilitarian principles of collecting, which disdained the formal accoutrements and rituals of bibliophily. Consequently, the library was little known outside bibliographical circles, and there is no evidence that it was extensively visited or used by researchers.⁷⁸

Ludovic forsook his father's anachronistic vision of a panoptic library and his endeavours to create a universal classification. A keen amateur astronomer, he focussed instead on the development of modern, scientific classification tailored to the specific requirements of an astronomical library, devising a more granular version of Dewey's scheme. This was a key component of his wider project to encourage professionalization, both in his own library and across the sector. Just as his classificatory activities were very specific, so he focused his collecting on discrete areas such as astronomical and mathematical texts, and French Revolutionary documents, where there were still opportunities to create world-class collections. Conversely, Ludovic was more thickly connected into the public and private networks of elite culture and bibliophily towards the close of the century. He thus came closer to the Grolieresque paradigm of encouraging friends and associates to engage with the library, through a generous loans policy and regular exhibitions at Haigh Hall and in London. Use of the library expanded around the turn of the century, thanks to Ludovic's extensive connections within the cultural and academic worlds, his concerted endeavours to catalogue the library, and the expansion and divarication of academic disciplines.

It is tempting to accommodate the history of the organization of knowledge in Victorian Britain within a broader narrative of the transition from a predominantly aristocratic, rural and amateur paradigm to one that was overwhelmingly bourgeois, urban (and specifically metropolitan) and professional.⁷⁹ Yet the foregoing case studies suggest that, at least in the particular field of library classification, a more nuanced model is required.

The cases examined in this paper do not suggest that there was any strong correlation between library classification schemes and their geographic contexts, nor do they corroborate an urbanizing shift in the sites of knowledge formation during the nineteenth century.⁸⁰ Edwards's 'scheme of classification for a town library' was heavily influenced by his experience

⁷⁸ On these themes, see John R. Hodgson, 'Class Acts: The Twenty-Fifth and Twenty-Sixth Earls of Crawford and their Manuscript Collections' (PhD diss., University of Manchester, 2017), 106–53.

⁷⁹ Sophisticated discussions of the topic are provided in Daunt, *Organisation*.

⁸⁰ On the nuanced realities (and fictions) which underlay the potent mythology of the country-city dichotomy, see Raymond Williams, *The Country and the City* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1973).

in Manchester, but it was also informed by his earlier work at the British Museum. Its specificities addressed a provincial audience, but it was also situated within national and pan-European traditions of classification. Moreover, Edwards's professed hope that 'for the Libraries of the Future we must mainly look to the local action of Towns' proved premature as far as classification was concerned.⁸¹ The classificatory activities of the earls of Crawford were similarly shaped by multiple geographic contexts. With mansions in industrial Lancashire and rural Scotland, a London town house, and a Renaissance villa overlooking Florence, the earls of Crawford were truly peripatetic, and all of these loci influenced their intellectual and cultural development. They were intricately in elite metropolitan social and cultural networks; they were situated at the nexus of traditional patronage systems on their country estates; and as majority shareholders in the Wigan Coal & Iron Company they were heavily implicated in industry, in common with a number of other aristocratic families such as the dukes of Devonshire, marquesses of Bute and earls Fitzwilliam.⁸² Like the Medici family of Renaissance Florence upon whom he overtly modelled himself, Lord Lindsay situated himself geographically and conceptually within liminal zones, both at his suburban Villa Palmieri overlooking Florence and at Haigh Hall on the outskirts of industrial Wigan.⁸³

Private libraries, created and maintained by a single individual or by successive generations of a family, reflected the wealth, tastes and interests of their owners; they served the intellectual and recreational needs of the individual or family and their select networks of relations, friends, associates and neighbours of suitable standing.⁸⁴ While the classification and

⁸¹ Edwards, *Memoirs*, 556–7.

⁸² John Bateman, *The Great Landowners of Great Britain and Ireland*, 4th ed. (London: Harrison, 1883) records that the earl of Crawford owned 13,480 acres, with a gross rental value of £39,252 (the vast majority of which derived from the Wigan estate). On aristocrats' involvement in industrial enterprises, see David Cannadine, 'Aristocratic Indebtedness in the Nineteenth Century: The Case Re-Opened', *Economic History Review* 30, no. 4 (1977); David Cannadine, 'The Landowner as Millionaire: The Finances of the Dukes of Devonshire, c.1800–c.1926', *Agricultural History Review* 25, no. 2 (1977); David Spring, 'Aristocratic Indebtedness in the Nineteenth Century: A Comment', *Economic History Review* 33, no. 4 (1980); David Cannadine, 'Aristocratic Indebtedness in the Nineteenth Century: A Restatement', *ibid.*; J. V. Beckett, *The Aristocracy in England, 1660–1914* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986), 206–37.

⁸³ Amanda Lillie, *Florentine Villas in the Fifteenth Century: An Architectural and Social History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Grazia Gobbi Sica, *The Florentine Villa: Architecture, History, Society* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2007).

⁸⁴ On the use of private libraries by those outside the immediate family circle, see Mark Towsey, *Reading the Scottish Enlightenment: Books and their Readers in Provincial Scotland, 1750–1820*, Library of the Written Word, 10 (Leiden: Brill, 2010); Mark Towsey, '“I can't resist sending you the book”: Private Libraries, Elite Women, and Shared Reading Practices in Georgian Britain', *Library & Information History* 29, no. 3 (2013); Abigail Williams, *The Social Life of Books: Reading Together in the Eighteenth-Century Home* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017); Mark Purcell, *The Country House Library* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017), 229–31.

arrangement of private libraries were necessarily inflected by wider socio-cultural and epistemological trends, their owners were at liberty to impose their own schemes of classification, whether traditional or innovative, conventional or idiosyncratic, in accordance with their elite tastes and habituses and the specific requirements of their libraries. By contrast, public libraries were obliged to make their contents accessible to a wide range of users, from the highly educated to the semi-literate, in a straightforward, comprehensible manner. There was therefore a strong deterrent against complexity and novelty. Thomas Kelly records that the systems of classification used in the period 1845–86 were generally ‘very simple, being based on broad subject-divisions, and the main differences between one system and another lay in the extent of the subject-breakdown’, while most public libraries adhered to ancient traditions in prioritizing theology in their arrangement.⁸⁵ Innovation was also inhibited by an array of stakeholders – library committees, ratepayers’ associations and public opinion articulated through newspapers and journals – who constrained the autonomy of public librarians. Consequently, wealthy and leisured men like Lord Lindsay had far greater liberty to innovate and devise complex classification schemes that were wholly impracticable in the straitened circumstances of public libraries. Conversely, some aristocratic owners encouraged professionalism within their libraries by delegating their management to full-time librarians, such as J. P. Edmond.⁸⁶ In the case of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana, by the beginning of the twentieth century it employed half a dozen staff, more than a leading red-brick university.⁸⁷

These case studies demonstrate that a straightforward modernizing narrative of a transition in the second half of the nineteenth century from an aristocratic, largely rural and amateur paradigm of knowledge formation to a bourgeois, urban and professional model requires significant modification. A more nuanced approach is required, which recognizes the permeability of geographic and social boundaries. The professionalization of libraries and the development of library classification schemes were inhibited by the low status of public libraries, by exiguous funding and the domination of municipal politics by parsimonious ratepayer interests, compounded by fiercely protected local autonomy.⁸⁸ We must also acknowledge both the cosmopolitan nature of the aristocracy and its fostering of professionalism in particular contexts (such as land management, the running of industrial enterprises, and the organization of large country-house libraries).⁸⁹ The Bibliotheca

⁸⁵ Kelly, *History of Public Libraries*, 91–2.

⁸⁶ On country house librarians, see Purcell, *Country House Library*, 180–5.

⁸⁷ It was noted above that in 1900 the library of Owens College, Manchester, employed just five members of staff including two boys (n. 45).

⁸⁸ Black, *New History*, 20.

⁸⁹ On land management, see Lowri Ann Rees, Ciarán Reilly, and Annie Tindley, eds., *The Land Agent, 1700–1920* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2018). On private libraries, see Purcell, *Country*

Lindesiana demonstrates the continued influence of the aristocracy on the intellectual and cultural life of Britain, at least in specific contexts, through the final decades of the nineteenth century.

It was only at the turn of the century that the aristocracy's diminishing economic and political capital combined with the rise of urban knowledge institutions, such as municipal libraries, universities, learned societies and specialist research institutes, to produce a decisive shift away from aristocratic libraries as key sites of knowledge formation.⁹⁰ This trend was epitomized by the transfer in 1901 of the Crawford Collection to the John Rylands Library, which was founded by the widow of Manchester's most successful cotton manufacturer. In a process of transculturation, Enriqueta Rylands appropriated and repurposed aristocratic collections, surpassing every elite (male) collector in Britain in the scale of her purchases and opening them to researchers under terms more liberal than were afforded within the conventions of gentlemanly patronage.⁹¹ The aristocracy was relegated to a decorative function, lending its residual lustre to libraries and their parent institutions as members of governing bodies or performing purely honorific roles as chancellors, patrons and benefactors.⁹²

The John Rylands Library exemplified this shift in leadership from aristocratic to institutional libraries. It was in the vanguard of developments in library science in the early twentieth century, under the leadership of Henry Guppy (1861–1948), first editor of the *Library Association Record*.⁹³ The new foundation adopted the Dewey system of shelf classification; it was in use by 1909, when Guppy and his sub-librarian edited a pioneering classified catalogue of works on architecture in the principal libraries of Manchester and Salford. This was claimed to be the first thematic union library catalogue produced in Britain or abroad. The editors explain that Dewey was adopted (with minor modifications) because of its ease of

House Library; Pearson, 'Private Libraries'. The management practices of the Wigan Coal & Iron Co. may have influenced the professionalization of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana.

⁹⁰ On the decline of aristocratic libraries, see Peter H. Reid, 'The Decline and Fall of the British Country House Library', *Libraries & Culture* 36, no. 2 (2001); Mark Purcell, 'Clumber, Nottinghamshire: The Rise and Fall of a Ducal Library', *Library & Information History* 32, no. 1–2 (2016).

⁹¹ John Hodgson, 'Lancashire Hodge-Podge: Reading the John Rylands Library through the Concept of Hybridity', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 91, no. 1 (2015). On transculturation see Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2008).

⁹² The fifth earl Spencer, whose outstanding library was purchased by Enriqueta Rylands in 1892, was appointed Chancellor of the Victoria University of Manchester in the same year. The chancellorship was assumed by David Lindsay, twenty-seventh earl of Crawford, in 1923. H. B. Charlton, *Portrait of a University, 1851–1951, to Commemorate the Centenary of Manchester University* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1951), 141.

⁹³ On Guppy, see H. B. Charlton, 'The John Rylands Librarian', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 25, no. 1 (1941).

comprehension, flexibility and existing employment at the Rylands and several other libraries.⁹⁴ This catalogue, a product of collaboration between twelve urban libraries and intended for a professional and academic audience, was quite distinct from the discrete endeavours of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana, and indeed the individualistic work of Edward Edwards. It thus instantiated trends towards professionalization, specialization and cooperation in library science – not least in library classification – which would accelerate in the first decades of the twentieth century, led by national, university and municipal libraries, and coordinated by national and international professional bodies.⁹⁵

Acknowledgements

Elements of this paper originated in a chapter of my PhD thesis, ‘Class Acts: The Twenty-Fifth and Twenty-Sixth Earls of Crawford and their Manuscript Collections’ (University of Manchester, 2017). I am grateful to my supervisors, Professor Stephen Milner, Dr Guyda Armstrong and Professor David Matthews, for their support and guidance throughout the course of my research. An early version of the paper was presented in February 2018 at the ‘Urban Knowledges: Making Knowledge in Urban Contexts, 1700-1925’ seminar series, convened by Professor Stuart Jones under the auspices of the John Rylands Research Institute at The University of Manchester, and I am grateful to the participants for their helpful suggestions. Subsequent drafts of the article greatly benefited from the detailed comments of Professor Jones and Dr Dorothy Clayton. Especial thanks are owed to this journal’s anonymous reviewers, whose incisive criticisms greatly improved the framing and presentation of my argument. I accept full responsible for all remaining errors and deficiencies.

The University of Manchester

⁹⁴ Henry Guppy and Guthrie Vine, eds., *A Classified Catalogue of the Works on Architecture and the Allied Arts in the Principal Libraries of Manchester and Salford, with Alphabetical Author List and Subject Index* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1909), x–xii.

⁹⁵ Ian Cornelius, ‘The Interpretation of Professional Development in Librarianship since 1850’, in *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland. Volume III: 1850–2000*, ed. Alistair Black and Peter Hoare (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Brunt, ‘Organising Knowledge’.