

The Default Art of Classifying the Occult

by

Brett B. Bodemer

2016

Introduction

In browsing stacks organized by Library of Congress Classification it is not entirely uncommon to discover oneself drifting into surprising neighborhoods. Perhaps one of the most unexpected of these neighborhoods lies in the latter ranges of BF, the subclass for Psychology. The drift in this case is not initially abrupt, but gradual. Titles such as *Death and Dying* and *Psyche and Death* are soon followed by *Physique and Character* and *Reading Faces*, and then the likes of *Your Personality in Handwriting* and *Chiaro's Complete Palmistry*. A browser attuned to call numbers would have noted this progress so far as a transit from the BF 700s to the BF 900s. After *Chiaro's Complete Palmistry* appear titles such as *The Psychic Force* and the *ESP Reader*. A *Dictionary of Spiritualism* rubs shoulders with the *Biographical Dictionary of Parapsychology* and soon the browser sees *Varieties of Anomalous Experience* and *Science and the Paranormal*. The previously gradual drift, however, suddenly gains strength, and like a whorl in a funnel, the browser then plunges headlong into books on dreams, hypnosis, spiritualism, ghosts, witchcraft, magic, cabbala, number symbolism, astrology, divination, and Tarot. The browser attentive to call numbers would realize that he was still in BF (Psychology), having moved from BF 1000 to BF 2000. But at some point the question simply *has* to arise: what coherence, if any, subsists between the widely diverse contents denoted by these titles? More specifically, one might wonder: how did they come to be collocated in this manner according to the Library of Congress Classification?

The first of these questions regarding the relation of the contents to each other is clearly the most interesting and will receive a partial answer in this essay. That partial answer, however, will come by means of an initial focus on the more specific question of classification; as it turns

out, a concentrated look at early iterations of the Library of Congress Classification and other systems of the late 19th and early 20th century, opens vistas both backward to antecedent practices and forward to current cultural history. By investigating groupings of these phenomena over several centuries, not only in formal classification systems, but in booksellers' catalogs and even literary works, we can gain insight into the historical construction of this neighborhood in the last ranges of BF. We will not only look at schematics for where things should be put (classification), but at what has been put there (titles) in specific cases, and by whom (authors, librarians, booksellers.) This will allow us to then to make conjectures as to why. This stroll through BF, shifting from innocuous to perspicacious, in fact reveals longstanding patterns of content clustering that seem largely impervious to overhead shifts in nomenclature, displaying an inertia that exemplifies both the conservative impact of formal practices and the grass-roots negligence of hierarchical structures. One can imagine this range as a series of contiguous census tracts whose boundary lines are unstable and tenuous, but whose demographic constituents remain essentially the same. There are exceptions of course, and we will examine a rare example where one previously bivalent denizen has been permanently consigned to the last alley in this neighborhood. This relegation is in fact related to historical trends and conceptions of knowledge mirrored by the Library of Congress when it abandoned the subject heading "Occult Sciences" in the late 1980s - an abandonment quickly mimicked by other indexing entities. Thus, this extended stroll through BF is an exemplary testimony to the fact that when you walk through books arranged by any system, you are experiencing (whether consciously or not) the physical instantiation of intellectual and cultural history.

Classification Schemes of the late 19th Century and early 20th Century

The Library of Congress's first full class schedule for B (Philosophy) including the subclass BF (Psychology) was published in 1910, authored by Edwin Wiley, the "classifier in charge of Philosophy and Political Science."¹ Wiley's three major groupings within BF are: 1) "Psychology"; 2) "Metapsychology. Psychic Research. Psychology of the Unconscious, etc."; and 3) "Occult Sciences."² In his admirably brief preface to the schedule, Wiley admitted that the "group Occult Sciences has been appended to the literature of Psychology, owing to the difficulty of clearly separating the same from the literature of Metapsychology or Psychic

Research, the one shading into the other without presenting any marked line of cleavage.”³ An application of Wiley’s class synopsis to our “browsing” tour equally mirrors the unclear demarcation between Psychology and Metapsychology, for *Physique and Character* and *Chiario’s Complete Palmistry* remain in the first division, Psychology, where among the last headings we find “Physiognomy” “Phrenology” and “The Hand.”⁴ The second and third divisions also attest to Wiley’s admission of porosity, as the last headings “Spiritism” and “Communication with discarnate spirits” seem equally well suited to the third division, Occult Sciences, populated by such headings as ghosts, demonology, witchcraft, magic, astrology, and divination.⁵ As such porosity positively thwarts the feasibility of tight definitions, in this paper when I refer to “our content” I will be referring to either or both of two rather fuzzy and not entirely distinct sets, the larger set (A) being the “content” ranged from BF 700 – BF 1999 and the more specific subset (a) of content found between BF 1400 and BF 1999, the subset assigned the heading of Occult Sciences by Wiley. For the most part, I will be focusing on this last subset.

Wiley’s 1910 classification finds parallels and contrasts in other attempts of the era to classify many of the same topics. In 1894, James Rowell, of the University of California, authored his *Classification of Books in the Library*. He positions the heading “Psychology; Mental Science” under Philosophy (similarly to the positioning of Psychology by the Library of Congress) and his subheadings are ordered: “Phrenology” “Physiognomy” “‘Psychic’ (extraordinary, obscure) Phenomena” “Dreams, Sleep, Somnambulism” “Apparitions, Illusions, Hallucinations” “Mesmerism, Hypnotism, Animal Magnetism” “Mind-reading, Telepathy, Thought-transference” and “Spiritualism.”⁶ The final subheading is “Occult Philosophy or Sciences: Magic, Supernaturalism, Witchcraft.”⁷ Although not classed here, indicators in a marginal column direct the reader to other parts of the classification scheme for alchemy and astrology; alchemy being ranged under chemistry and astrology under astronomy. The perceived necessity for such cross-referencing suggests an anticipation that people might expect to find these subjects located in this part of the scheme rather than the distant part to which he had assigned them.

Other interesting comparisons are provided by early iterations of Melvil Dewey’s Decimal Classification System, a published proof of which predates the work of Rowell by nearly twenty years. Dewey also places much of our content under Philosophy, but does not use Psychology at the next level. The 1876 proof ranges the content under “Anthropology,”⁸ a

heading he expanded in 1899 to “Mind and Body. Anthropology.”⁹ The subheadings in the 1876 proof are: “Mental physiology and hygiene” “Mental derangements” “Delusions, witchcraft, magic” “Mesmerism” “Sleep, dreams, somnambulism” “Sexes” “Temperaments” “Physiognomy” and “Phrenology.”¹⁰ A granular examination of the proof’s index reveals that the lion’s share of our topics are assigned to the numerical range 133, titled “Delusions, witchcraft, magic.”¹¹ Here he assigns astrology, apparitions, demonology, fortune-telling, ghosts, magic, mysteries, necromancers, oracles, specters, second sight, sorcery, spiritualism, and witchcraft. Also present is an additional complement of somewhat disparate company: delusions, fanaticism, legerdemain, and superstition.¹²

Dewey’s early schedules raise some issues pertinent to our exploration. First, his initial choice of Anthropology as a major heading and its retention in later expanding it to “Mind and Body. Anthropology” reveals the fluidity of academic disciplines in the late 19th century. Second, his specific batching of witchcraft and magic with delusions, superstition and legerdemain sets him apart from our other taxonomists, and begs the question, “why?” Third, his choice of “Delusions, witchcraft, magic” where Wiley uses “Occult Sciences” and Rowell “Occult Philosophy or Sciences: Magic, Supernaturalism, Witchcraft,” suggests the need for a closer look at the similar but variant terms in the last two heading choices, “Occult Philosophy” and “Occult Sciences.” A brief digression into these terms will help us lay groundwork for exploring not simply nomenclature but the wider historical and cultural context.

An entertaining way to discern the chief distinctions and relations between the terms Occult Philosophy and Occult Sciences, along with a third, historically antecedent compound, Occult Qualities, is provided by the *Encyclopédie* of Diderot and d’Alembert. The article titled “Occulte” is doubly relevant to our exploration on account of its overt, multi-directional critique. It reads:

“OCCULT, said of something secret, hidden, or invisible. The *occult* sciences are comprised of Magic, Necromancy, & all such frivolous sciences lacking real objects. *See* MAGIC, CABALA, NECROMANCY, etc.

Agrippa wrote several books on *occult* philosophy, full of foolishness and dreams; and Fludd wrote nine volumes on the cabala, or occult sciences, where nearly all is a labyrinth of figures and Hebrew characters. *See* ROSICRUCIANS.

The ancient philosophers attributed to occult powers, causes and qualities the phenomena for which they could not discover an explanation.

If by this term “occult quality” these philosophers meant nothing other than “a cause whose nature and manner of action is unknown” then it must be admitted that their philosophy is in many respects wiser than our own. *See* ATTRACTION & NEWTONIANISME.”¹³ [My translation]

After providing synonyms for the adjective occult (secret, hidden, invisible) the article then characterizes the three compound terms in an order that reverses their historical precedence. It makes a final rhetorical jab by linking the most ancient of the excoriated terms directly to Newton and the study of “attraction.” For our purposes, I will describe the three compound terms in order of historical appearance.

The first compound term, Occult Qualities, derived from the tradition of Aristotelian science, which distinguished between manifest qualities, directly perceived, and occult qualities, which were insensible and known only through effects. The status of knowledge could only be applied to explications of the sensible, while action detected only through effects lay beyond causal explanations, and must be attributed to occult properties. Medieval Aristotelianism, following in this vein, cast the insensible as unintelligible; by this token, the varied behavior of quicklime when subjected to different mixtures, or the action of magnetism, were thought to lie beyond human understanding, and could only be attributed to occult qualities.¹⁴ Keith Hutchison makes a convincing case in his article, “What Happened to Occult Qualities in the Scientific Revolution” that in the early modern period thinkers such as Descartes, Charleton and Boyle sought conceptual ways of voiding the insensible/unintelligible divide, encouraging the investigation in things of what could not be directly sensed through the application of reason and experiment, thus vastly expanding what might lay claim to the status of knowledge.¹⁵

The second compound term, Occult Philosophy, was first prominently used in 1510 in Henry Cornelius Agrippa’s *De occulta philosophia*. Agrippa used the term essentially as a less offensive term for “magic” but his conception of magic, which he genealogically traced to Zoaster and a tradition of ancient wisdom, frames natural magic, astrology, and elements of the Cabala in the context of a neoplatonic, hermetic cosmology and philosophy.¹⁶

Blaise de Vigenère (1532-1596) may have been the first author to employ the third compound term, “sciences occultes.”¹⁷ Vigenère employed it throughout many of his works and it encompasses a range of interests consistent with Agrippa’s *De Occulta Philosophia*. This is highly evident in his 1587 *Traicté des Chiffres, ou Secretes Manieres d’Ecrire*, a lengthy work brimming with information about magic, ancient philosophy and theology. He alludes to the “secrete theologie” of the Hebrews and the cabalists and labors the trope that practices of secret writing currently used for important affairs, negotiations and the business of princes, had previously been employed by Chaldeans, Egyptians, Ethiopians, and Indians to hide “the sacred secrets of their theology and philosophy.”¹⁸ Not entirely unlike the *Encyclopédie*’s jibing at Newton and *attraction* in the 18th century, Vigenère points out the shortcomings of Aristotelian investigators, who, although they “profess to reason about everything, know nothing of the most occult and intimate secrets of nature” and still find themselves unable to explain the magnetic action of a compass.¹⁹ For Vigenère, however, it is not to things or intermediaries but to the prophets that one must go to “find the true forces of all philosophy and occult sciences.”²⁰ [My translation]

In looking at the historical origins of the terms chosen by Wiley (Occult Sciences) and Rowell (Occult Philosophy or Sciences) to classify their sets of content, there seems to be little to choose between the two terms. Another available heading they might have chosen was a term with similar valences, prevalent in their day, and one that was created at the beginning of the nineteenth century: Occultism.²¹ That they chose terms with longer chronological shadows may have been less critical to their choice than the fact that they both employed compounds with the noun Sciences. In this period when academic disciplines were ambiguous and emergent, and a view of what constituted normative scientific epistemology based on models such as physics and chemistry was gaining further ascendancy, it was still unclear which disciplines would or would not be deemed “true” sciences. Even the discipline of Psychology was liminal at this time, as witnessed by the philosopher John Dewey in 1902 when he wrote, “There is another group of sciences which, from the standpoint of definitive method and a clearly accepted body of verified fact, are more remote from a scientific status. I refer especially to the social and psychological disciplines As compared with mathematics and physics we can employ the term “science” only in a tentative and somewhat prophetic sense – the aspirations, the tendencies, the movement are scientific.”²² Trying to view this in the light of the time, when scientific status was less

determined, some contents of the latter ranges of BF do not seem so out of place; for example, publications of the Society for Psychical Research can be found there, produced by an organization whose president in 1896 was no less a luminary than the psychologist William James, and whose address to the society was published in the journal *Science*.²³

Before leaving the specific headings “Occult Sciences” and “Occult Philosophy and Sciences” behind, it is instructive to take a brief glimpse into historical precedents for the placement of some of their “signifieds” by other “signifiers” in overall classificatory schemes. In Conrad Gesner’s prescriptive scheme of 1548, the headings “Astrologia” and “De Divinatione et Magia” appear as the ninth and tenth positions under “Philosophia.”²⁴ Francis Bacon in his 1623 *Novum Organum* places Magic immediately after Metaphysics under the heading Science of Nature, ranged below Class II/Philosophy.²⁵ D’Alembert, in the visual scheme for human knowledge closing the preliminary discourse to the *Encyclopédie*, places “Science des esprits bien et mal faisant” “Divination” and “Magie Noire” under Philosophy - but more specifically under “Science de Dieu.”²⁶ Interestingly, in a close parallel to Dewey, we also find “superstitions” in immediate adjacency to these.²⁷

Clearly our classifiers were roughly following a general pattern set by tradition, but schematic outlines can only take us so far. So putting our considerations of categorical headings aside for a time and focusing instead on the other half of the equation – the content units captured beneath the headings – we can try to see at a more granular level how antecedents ranged and/or informally grouped titles indicative of such content.

17th and 18th Century Sale Catalogs

Sale catalogs of the 17th and 18th centuries are perfect artifacts for identifying patterns of similarity and deviation in the grouping of our late “BF” content. Although the heterogeneity of these catalogs, both in regard to advertised content and organization, precludes any universal claim, clustering of our content is often observable both in conjunction with headings and when headings are absent.

Early 17th century sale catalogs have been ably described as a “a perfect anarchy” that present “all combinations of matter, format, and alphabetic order.”²⁸ A typically atypical example, though lacking any alphabetic component, is the estate sale catalog of Mr. Galland

printed in Paris in 1653. Its subject headings precede title listings further partitioned by the format parameters, “Quarto” and “Octavo.” This particular catalog stands out for its unique heading: “*Des sibiles, demons, apparitions, divinations, conivratons, phisionomie, chiromantie, & c,*” a litany that accurately characterizes the twenty titles listed below it, including works by Agrippa and a compendium of Cabalistic Arts.²⁹ By conveniently demarcating much of our content, this heading offers an easy tool for comparison provided by few other sale catalogs.

The 1666 *Catalogue des Livres de la Bibliotheque du feu Monsieur Gallemant* has little ostensible structure to make its contents known to potential buyers. It has spare subject headings, an absence of alphabetical order, and provides format information with each title. Following in venerable scholastic tradition, it first lists works relating to Christianity, the Church and the Church fathers. The second heading, “Philosophy, Mathematics, Astrology, Geography, Geometry, Jurisprudence” precedes a list that in no way mirrors the order of the list, yet nonetheless exhibits a tendency to cluster content.³⁰ One instance where this proves strongest lies near the end of the catalog, where fourteen of the last twenty titles pertain to dreams, demons, chiromancy, ghosts, and include works by Jerome Cardan and Raymond Lull.³¹ Definitely worth noting here is not simply the grouping of the content, but the grouping of such content at the tail end of a list.

A 1725 sale catalog for books once owned by Charles Jerome de Cisterney Dufay also exhibits similar clustering and a penchant for listing our content at the end of a section – in this case at the end of multiple sections. This catalog was the work of a major Parisian bookseller, Gabriel Martin, who not only produced a wealth of sale catalogs in the eighteenth century, but through the repeated use of a set of subject divisions, helped to establish what became known informally as the “system of the Paris booksellers.”³² Martin first deployed this system in 1711 and over the century the usage spread through France and Europe.³³ Similar to the classification of knowledge set forth by Francis Bacon, Philosophy is the major class, with Metaphysics as a subheading thereof. At the very end of the latter we find two further subheadings: “*Tractatus singulares de Spiritibus, & eorum operationibus*” [Singular Treatises on Spirits and their Operations] and “*Tractatus singulares de Arte Cabalistica, & de Magicis Operationibus*” [Singular Treatises on Cabalistic Arts and the Operations of Magic.]³⁴ Under the first subheading are books with titles such as “*Le Monde enchanté, or examen des communs sentiments touchant les Esprits ...*” “*Discours & histories des Spectres, visions & apparitions des Esprits, Anges ...*”

and “Cento Secreti Agrippina”, while under the second heading we find “Artis Cabalisticae Scriptores ...” “Henr. Corn. Agrippa de occulta Philosophia ...” “De la Demonomanie des Sorciers ...” “Discours des Sorciers ...” and “Discours des Diables de Loudun ...”³⁵ While these titles clearly map to content that Dewey, Rowell and Wiley similarly collocated, certain other titles are grouped elsewhere – but again we find them at the *end* of a range. The fifth and final heading under Medicine is “Philosophia & Medicina Hermetico-Paracelsica sue Alchemia” and here we find works attributed to Raymond Lull and titles pertaining to alchemy, the philosopher’s stone, and the Rosicrucians.³⁶ Similarly under the heading Mathematics and following the subheading of “Astronomia” we find the subheading “Astrologia,” below which we find a cluster of titles on astrology, dreams, geomancy and prophecy.³⁷

Though classed sale catalogs increased in frequency over the eighteenth century, many still relied on impromptu blending of other organizational tools. The 1791 catalog for the antiquarian Francis Grose, quite rich with titles relevant to our content, has as its primary organizing tool the day the books were available for sale by lot. Each day’s offerings were subdivided by format: “Octavo & Infra,” “Quarto,” and “Folio.”³⁸ Implicit content parameters are still in play, however, for items related to our content are concentrated in the listing for the sale’s second day. There, they are found in two clusters. The first lies under the “Octavo & Infra” grouping, titles 301-324, leading off with “Aubrey’s Miscellanies on Dreams, Local Fatalities, &c.” and ending with “A Treatise on Geomancy and Physiognomy.”³⁹ Between are titles on witchcraft, magic, physiology and astrology. The second cluster lies under the “Quarto” heading for the same sale day. This cluster, comprising titles 402-412, leads off with “Wonderful Relations and Views Beyond Death” and ends with “Lilly’s *Merlinus Anglicus Junior*, the English Merlin Revived.”⁴⁰ Between are titles about witches, sorcery, ghosts and astrology, all fitting topically with the earlier cluster.⁴¹ Although this catalog does not place our content at the end of sections as in the other examples, the clustering on a specific day of the sale by lot speaks to the shrewd understanding of the merchandisers.

That many people in fact thought of this content as connected is tellingly revealed by two works of fiction listed in our last two sale catalogs. The first is *Le Comte de Gabalis, ou Entretiens sur les sciences secretes* by Henri de Monfaucon de Villars, published in 1670, and listed in the Dufay catalog under the heading “Philosophia & Medicina Hermetico-Paracelsica sue Alchemia.”⁴² The second is Laurent Bordelon’s *L’histoire des imaginations extravagantes*

de Monsieur Oufle, published in 1710, and appearing under the “Octavo & Infra” heading for day two of the sale.⁴³ These two satires make it clear that the booksellers were not operating in a vacuum but were mirroring the conceptual collocation of extant interests.

Le Comte de Gabalis, published in 1670, has had a longstanding impact on fantastic literature across the centuries.⁴⁴ For our purposes it is enough to note two features: 1) the book itself comprises a batching of our topics; and 2) it facetiously characterizes those who take an interest in them. In the following passage, Villars’ narrator tells us how he insinuates himself into the company of men avidly given to exploring “les sciences secretes”:

“Common sense having always made me suspect that there is a lot of emptiness in what people call the Secret Sciences, I have never been tempted to waste my time flipping through books about them; but also finding it less than reasonable to condemn without knowing why the people who are given over to them, men who are otherwise smart, many of them scholars, and estimable figures in the law and the military, I decided (to avoid being unjust, and also so as not to wear myself out with tiresome reading) to pretend to be enamored of all these Sciences with everyone I could find who had an avid interest in them. I immediately had more success than I could have hoped for. As all these gentlemen, however mysterious and reserved they prided themselves on being, asked for nothing better than to exhibit their knowledge and the new discoveries they claimed to have wrested from Nature, I was in a few days the confidant of the most respected among them. I entertained at all hours one or another of them in my study, which I had deliberately filled with the most fantastic of their authors; and there was no foreign savant upon whom I did not have an opinion; in short, I soon passed for a great person in these sciences. My companions were princes, great lords, lawyers, beautiful ladies (and ugly ones too), doctors, prelates, monks, nuns, in fact people of all sorts. Some sought Angels, others the Devil, some their guardian spirit, some incubi, some a cure for every ill, others a knowledge of the stars, some the secrets of the Divine Essence, and almost all the philosopher's stone.”⁴⁵ [My translation]

This selection imputes a blending of interests to the narrator’s interlocutors that places incubi, astrology, demonology, and the philosopher’s stone into a single grab bag. For Villars’

narrator, the chief coherence of these topics is not extrinsic but instead resides in the shared interests and motives ascribed to the characters. Villars is mirroring in a satiric vein a collocation of interests assembled forty years earlier in two works by the important librarian and *libertin* thinker, Gabriel Naudé. In his erudite 1625 work, *Apologie des grands hommes qui ont esté faussement soupçonnez de magie*, Naudé lumps together the “lies of Charlatans, the dreams of Alchemists, the idiocy of Magicians, the mysteries of Cabalistes, the conjunctions of Lullistes, and similar follies ...”⁴⁶ [My translation] In his influential but less daunting 1627 work, *Advice on Establishing on a Library*, Naudé again speaks of these in one breath while discussing the books appropriate for inclusion in a library. He writes:

“We should open our libraries to receive ... all worthwhile and less usual books, such as the writings of Cardan, Pomponazzi, Bruno, and all those who have written concerning the Cabbala, mnemonic devices, the Lullian art, the philosopher’s stone, and the like matters. For, though most of them teach only hollow and unprofitable things, and though I hold them but as stumbling blocks to all who amuse themselves with them, nevertheless, to have something with which to please the weaker wits as well as the strong and at the least to satisfy those who desire to see them in order to refute them, one should collect the books on these subjects, although they ought to be considered among the rest of the volumes in the library like serpents and vipers among the other living creatures ...”⁴⁷

We see here not only the batching of topics found in Villars, but a similar attitude toward those who take an interest in them. Laurent Bordelon’s *L’histoire des imaginations extravagantes de Monsieur Oufle*, written forty years after *Le Comte de Gabalis*, follows in the same vein. It satirizes an uncritical interest in a cluster of topics whose coherence seems chiefly determined by the interests of the eponymous character. The name of the protagonist is itself an anagram for *le fou* or “the fool” that lets us know exactly where the author stands. The 1711 translation of the title page sets the tone and exhibits the scope of Bordelon’s clustering. It reads:

“A HISTORY of the Ridiculous Extravagancies of *Monsieur OUFLE*; Occasion’d by his reading Books treating of *Magick*, the *Black-Art*, *Daemoniacks*, *Conjurers*, *Witches*,

Hobgoblins, Incubus's, Succubus's, and the Diabolical-Sabbath; of Elves, Fairies, Wonton Spirits, Genius's, Spectres and Ghosts; of Dreams, the Philosopher's-Stone, Judicial Astrology, Horoscopes, Talismans, Lucky and Unlucky Days, Eclipses, Comets, and all sorts of Apparitions, Divinations, Charms, Enchantments, and other Superstitious Practices."⁴⁸

This welter of topics maps cogently to the classification schemas of Dewey, Rowell and Wiley some two hundred years later, both for the narrower subset "occult sciences" and the larger set that includes "superstitious practices." In regard to the latter it is worth noting that Sir Thomas Browne's *Vulgar Errors* (a work dedicated to popular superstitions) is the first work listed in Grose's catalog immediately following the more "occult" Quarto cluster – in fact, one could plausibly argue for it as rounding that cluster off.⁴⁹ Not only the clustering of content but the porosity of borders between the larger set and smaller subset are both in evidence in bookseller catalogs. These were clearly mirroring effects, not inventions, and via commercial tools the booksellers acted as agents in reinforcing and perpetuating extant perceptions of connectedness.

Our regressive tour of collocation so far (via classification, sale catalogs and literature) naturally prompts the question: how far back does such grouping of this content go? A blatant example drawn from classification schemes is found in the *Didascalicon*, an influential twelfth century work on reading and the organization of knowledge by Hugh of St. Victor. Hugh was an important scholastic figure for many reasons, and even contributed to information science through his exposition of faceted classification. Of particular relevance here, however, is a concluding section of the entire *Didascalicon* titled, "Concerning Magic and its Parts."⁵⁰ Where previously we saw Gabriel Naudé arguing for the inclusion of books related to our content in an ideal library, here we find Hugh of St. Victor arguing for the exclusion of such content from the classification of knowledge altogether. "Magic," he writes "is not accepted as a part of philosophy, but stands with a false claim outside it ..." ⁵¹ His analysis of the parts of magic brings to light much of our content, as he enumerates the eleven parts subsumed under five kinds: divination, false mathematics, fortune-telling, sorcery and performing illusions. His further dissection includes necromancy, geomancy, hydromancy, pyromancy, soothsaying, augury, and horoscopy.⁵² Clearly such grouping of content was not the invention of the

seventeenth century or even the renaissance. Neither, apparently, was a penchant for placing it at the end of things.⁵³

Leaping even farther back, a quick peek into roman antiquity gives us two ready examples of such grouping. One is Cicero's *De Divinatione*. This work in dialog form touches on apparitions, dreams, prophecy, omens, augery, sibyls, oracles, astronomy, astrology and various prognostications from nature, including those drawn from birds, entrails, lightning, prodigies and comets.⁵⁴ As the dialog winds to its leisurely close, Cicero directly names the true target of the work: superstition.⁵⁵ So even here, with this broader class name, we see the porous bounding of our content. Another prominent example from roman antiquity is The *Metamorphosis* or *Golden Ass* of Apuleius of Madaura. This second-century novel embeds a series of stories full of witches, magic, spells and transformations, and describes the narrator's "accidental transformation into an ass, his trials and tribulations in this form, and his eventual restoration to human shape by the goddess Isis."⁵⁶ It is also worth mentioning that another surviving work by the author is an *Apology* that serves as a self-defense against charges of magical practices.⁵⁷

One might even push the wall farther back. The historian of science Brian Vickers asserts that the occult sciences formed a unified system, following their importation from eastern cultures and codification in Hellenistic Greece, and makes the further claim that humans have an abiding "occult" mentality.⁵⁸ Such unity, historic continuity, and "mentality" would all help account for some of the grouping we have observed. Yet other scholars, including William Newman, Lawrence Principe and Wouter Hanegraaff, challenge the validity of such an historic unity and question the grounds for claiming a universal "occult" mentality. Newman and Hanegraaff both trace the supposition of an "occult mentality" to the discredited theorizing of the proto-anthropologist Edward Burnett Tyler and both question the notions of unity and historical continuity as posited by Vickers, especially in regard to alchemy and astrology.⁵⁹ Hanegraaff argues for the view that "occult sciences" be rejected as a scholarly term because it forces very different historical phenomena into a false constraint that masks individual histories and complexities."⁶⁰

Rather than weigh in on such contested issues I propose to go in a third direction. I suggest that we honor the primary sources we have examined and give them proper due for what they *can* tell us. Library arrangements and classification schemes are devised so patrons can find

books;⁶¹ similarly, book sale catalogs are made so consumers can identify and buy books. People make them; people use them: creating in different times and places different communities of reading and practice. These are simple but crucially important points because so easily and often overlooked. And here I think it is highly relevant to take a cue from the historian and classicist Daniel Ogden, who argues that ancient narratives about magic do not so much “report or manipulate beliefs about magic, but instead are fundamentally constitutive of them.”⁶² The ancients’ knowledge of magic was due less to direct observation and more “to hearing such good tales of witches and sorcerers putting it into practice.”⁶³ The narrative tales of magic that he analyzes in his book *Night’s Black Witches*, “in one sense describe the making of magic in antiquity, but in another sense it is they themselves that made the magic, or at any rate the system of beliefs about it and its thought-world.”⁶⁴ Texts in our content area, including of course writings in the “occult sciences” had the same double effect; and library classifications schemes and sale catalogs collocating such items were an auxiliary support in mirroring, perpetuating and reinforcing “the system of beliefs about it and its thought-world.”

The Parting of Astronomy and Astrology

In light of the above claim, that classification systems and sale catalogs mirror, perpetuate and reinforce extant conceptions, there is a specific example related to this inquiry that exhibits all three traits. Prior to the eighteenth century, Astronomy and Astrology were integrally related and even pivotal figures in early modern astronomy such as Tycho Brahe and Johannes Kepler engaged in predictive astrology.⁶⁵ Hugh of St. Victor in the twelfth century found it necessary to distinguish the two, with astronomy treating “the law of the stars and the revolution of the heaven” and “investigating the regions, orbits, courses, risings, and settings of stars...”⁶⁶ while astrology, on the other hand, “considers the stars in their bearing upon birth, death, and all other events, and is only partly natural, and for the rest superstitious; ...”⁶⁷ Astrology, and its practice of horoscopy, were assigned to the category of false mathematics in his analysis of the parts of magic, and were concomitantly denied any legitimate place in his classification of knowledge.⁶⁸ Hugh was not a trend-setter in this regard. Conrad Gesner’s proposed classification scheme of 1548 ranged Astronomy and Astrology one after the other under the wider heading Mathematics and so in fact do our three classed sale catalogs.⁶⁹ The

1653 Galland catalog places “Astrologues” right after “Mathematiciens” and under this heading we find Ptolemy, Copernicus, Kepler, various ephemerides, astronomical tables, and more obviously astrological titles such as “de Astrologia Iudiciaria” and “Magia Astrologica.”⁷⁰ The 1666 Gallemant catalog provides the broad listing “Philosophy, Mathematics, Astrology, Geography, Geometry, Jurisprudence” but as for astronomy/astrology titles there is but a sprinkling, but including Ptolemy and Copernicus.⁷¹ The 1725 Dufay catalog provides an arrangement directly mirroring Gesner’s, with Astronomy and Astrology one after another under the wider heading Mathematics. Under Astrology, astrological titles are blended with books pertaining to dreams, spirits and ghosts; while Ptolemy, Kepler, and two works of the new century are ranged under the Astronomy heading.⁷² The Grose catalog, with no astronomical titles, tells us little, although its single astrological title *is* grouped under the “Quarto” with our other content.⁷³

Jumping ahead to our late 19th and early 20th century taxonomists, how do we find Astrology and Astronomy ranged? Rowell, the least influential of our three, follows the formal classification tradition quite closely: keeping the order Science/Mathematics/Astronomy/Astrology. Notably, however, he provides a marginal “see-also” for astrology by “Occult Philosophy or Sciences.”⁷⁴ Dewey and Wiley (the latter in conjunction with the broader Library of Congress scheme) both make one departure from the formal tradition and in their manner of doing so exactly mirror the informal tradition of clustering. Both Dewey and Wiley leave Astronomy in place along traditional, formal lines below Science/Mathematics. They concomitantly reassign Astrology to the similar neighborhoods they have established, “Occult Sciences” for Wiley and “Delusions, Witchcraft, Magic” for Dewey.⁷⁵

In their joint relegation of Astrology, Wiley and Dewey are following the pattern we have noted in the informal tradition grouping of this content. Wiley, moreover, is mirroring another aspect of the informal tradition that we have observed on several occasions in our sale catalogs: assigning such content to the very end of a series. Even accepting Wiley at his word when he admitted that he really couldn’t think of where else to put “Occult Sciences” we can see that he was operating on an established if unexpressed precedent.⁷⁶ In reassigning Astronomy, both Dewey and Wiley were mirroring and reinforcing epistemic traditions of the past but were also implementing a change to reflect the dominant contemporary view of an astronomy untethered from astrology, the former clearly ranged with the physical sciences. Wiley, however, created an

interesting situation, siting it below a heading that still nominally claimed a scientific status. Which begs the question: were Occult Sciences *Sciences*?

The Attempt to Make Occult Sciences Scientific

In light of being called Occult Sciences, and in light of the changing notion of what constituted science, one approach to legitimization in the 19th and early 20th centuries was to endeavor to attain for Occult Sciences the credibility, status and success accorded to a physical science such as physics. Examples abound, but I will limit myself to three. Eusèbe Salverte, in his two-volume 1829 compendium, *Des Sciences Occultes, ou essai sur la magie, les prodiges et les miracles*, repeatedly labors the trope that the occult sciences had been kept deliberately arcane for political reasons, but in the most positivistic vein possible, effuses that there is no reason why the incorporation of occult sciences might not catalyze many fields in the way that alchemy had fostered the development of chemistry.⁷⁷ Although Salverte makes this claim with substantial enthusiasm he offers no program for such assimilation. Another tack for legitimation was taken by The Society for Psychical Research, founded in Britain in 1882, with an American counterpart being founded three years later.⁷⁸ These societies engaged in efforts to gather solid empirical evidence pertaining to survival after death, apparitions, thought reading, clairvoyance and hypnotism.⁷⁹ One former President of the organization characterized the founders as hoping “that if the material were treated rigorously, and, as far as possible, experimentally, objective truth would be elicited ...”⁸⁰ In his 1911 paper “Final Impressions of a Psychical Researcher,” the same past president, William James, expressed being totally baffled by the slow progress in tangible results since the Society’s founding.⁸¹ Undeterred by the lack of conclusive evidence, however, he asserts that “the greatest scientific conquests of the coming generations” will derive from further such research.⁸² An extension of such research was begun in the Psychology Department of Duke University in the late 1920s, when the British Psychologist, William McDougall, formerly at Harvard, and an active figure in the Society for Psychical Research, started working with two young students J. B. and Louisa Rhine, who were investigating the question of spirit survival through mediumistic communication.⁸³ The 1934 publication of the Rhines’s’ book on their research, *Extrasensory Perception*, created tension within the Psychology Department, and Duke assented to creating a separate unit, the Parapsychology

Laboratory. At this lab experiments were conducted on precognition, psychokinesis, telepathy, and clairvoyance, and within ten years advocates could claim that Parapsychology had begun to look like a science, with a dedicated journal, a distinctive field with a classifiable range of phenomena, and operating along the “methods of natural science in general.”⁸⁴ However, although Rhine claimed statistical and methodological rigor for his experimental methods and results, multiple attempts to replicate Rhine’s results proved negative.⁸⁵ The Parapsychology Laboratory remained active on the Duke campus until 1962 when both Rhine and the lab moved off-campus to the new Foundation for Research on the Nature of Man. One can take Salverte, James and Rhine as exemplars of many who hoped, endeavored, and failed to bring methods to bear on subjects within our purview to gain the respectable scientific credentials demanded by epistemological norms of the 19th and 20th centuries.

One New Label, One Old Label ... Same Wine?

In the *Cataloging Service Bulletin* for Fall 1987, the Library of Congress announced a change in its official subject heading from Occult Sciences to Occultism.⁸⁶ The major indexer H.H. Wilson quickly followed suit, with *The Reader’s Guide to Periodical Literature* adopting Occultism in 1988, and the *Essay and General Literature Index* doing so by 1990.⁸⁷ But why bother, one wonders? The Library of Congress Subject Headings have been characterized as a “mausoleum of language” whose inherent structure inhibits systematic revision, and which is “rarely revised except by the most adventurous of catalogers and virtually never by the library itself.”⁸⁸ The process for official changes involves editorial meetings for review of proposed changes submitted by catalogers.⁸⁹ So far as I can determine, no records of these meetings are kept. We can only speculate, then, about the perceived need and rationale for changing the official subject heading to Occultism.

One way to proceed is to consider the new preferred term, Occultism. This term had been available since the early 19th century, so the choice was not driven by the radical appearance of some new and improved term. What then, did the new term offer that the incumbent did not? The suffix: “-ism.” Somewhat nebulous by nature, was it adopted in this instance to denote a “system of theory or practice” in the manner of Puritanism or Buddhism? Or was it intended as a broadly descriptive term in the manner of imperialism or romanticism?⁹⁰ Regardless of intent, the choice

of a formation with “-ism” eliminated any need to declare specifically for one meaning or the other, and the new heading permitted broad applicability by subsuming both. Perhaps that flexibility contributed to the choice.

Another way to proceed is to look at the part of the incumbent term that was amputated: sciences. Did many catalogers or perhaps even just *one* cataloger somewhere question the applicability of the term *science* to the topics ranged under this heading? Though by no means undisputed, some historians of science claim that the “occult” and “occult sciences” were initially and then progressively marginalized from the seventeenth century on, with particular strength and effectiveness beginning in the 19th century.⁹¹ Whether or not this claim is entirely warranted, even in our narrow scope we have seen that new rules were being applied to what did and did not constitute science during this chronological window. The issue was by no means limited to historians of science. In the mid-1970s Marcello Truzzi, a sociologist, described the occult as a “residual category” or more unkindly, as a “wastebasket” for deviant knowledge claims that “do not fit the established claims of science or religion.”⁹² In 1987, then, with the issue raised by at least one cataloger (who is now long since anonymous) it appears that a committee of catalogers (comprised of people equally unknown to us) were convinced that occult sciences were definitely not *science* or even *sciences*.

Though the official subject heading changed, little else did. A core of narrower terms ranged beneath the new heading remained firmly anchored. A comparison of the 1980 Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH) to the 1990 and 2009 iterations reveals eleven terms in common: Alchemy, Astrology, Divination, Fortune-telling, Kundalini, Magic, Oracles, Prophecies, Satanism, Spiritualism and Witchcraft. It is true that thirteen terms in the 1980 iteration were dropped, but the 1990 LCSH lists seven additions (Bodies of man, Crystal Skulls, Hermetism, National socialism and occultism, Numerology, Seven rays, Stock-exchange and occultism) and 2009 brought its own contingent (Ariosophy, Ascended masters, Fourth way, Haunted places, Music and occultism, Sigils, and Vril.) By 2009 the narrower terms had swelled to one shy of the original twenty-seven. With some shifting for popular novelty (e.g., Crystal Skulls, Vril) and fashion senescence (e.g., Gematria, Second sight,) the neighborhood has not really changed much. One sees a similar persistence with additions and changes in the H.W. Wilson indexes.⁹³

But if there has been some limited but mostly inconsequential shifting at the level below the new subject heading Occultism, there has been absolutely no parallel shift at the higher level: in the Library of Congress Classification. For if the cataloging committee saw fit to change the subject heading, no one has dared to trouble the Classification itself. Here, Occult Sciences is still the official moniker for the last ranges of BF. The only change has been a miniscule backward extension in the range: in 2015 it is listed as running from BF 1403.2-1999, whereas in 1982 it ran from 1405-1999.⁹⁴ If the Library of Congress Subject Headings is a kind of “mausoleum of language” then the Library of Congress Classification matches this and perhaps even trumps it, in a strange and sedimentary way, by providing in library stacks a visual “fossilization” of knowledge practices.

Conclusion

Our initial tour of the latter ranges of BF prompted two questions, one very broad and the other much narrower: 1) what coherence, if any, subsists between the content denoted by the titles; and 2) how did these contents come to be collocated in the end ranges of BF according to the Library of Congress system? The approach here has been to broach a partial answer to the first question by making a very specific inquiry into the second.

The simple answer to the second question is that such contents were assembled and sited in BF by default. The default patterns, however, were of different vintages. As we have seen, ancient varieties of the content were assembled in a pattern that extends at least as far as Cicero in his *De Divinatione*. An examination of current and past artifacts demonstrates that such grouping has persisted through the ages while flexibly admitting new varieties. As for assigning this assembly to the latter ranges of BF, other defaults were in play. For the formal placement of the content under Philosophy, precedents were operative as early as Gesner and Bacon in the renaissance, and gained strength in succeeding centuries. In regard to the specific placement of the subset of Occult Sciences, bookseller catalogs provide multiple instances of informally placing titles related to such content at the *ends* of lists. The Library of Congress system still mirrors this informal practice through the positioning of its classification Occult Sciences in the last reaches of BF.

Wiley and the Library of Congress were not inventing, but mirroring, established practices. Some one hundred years on, a by-product of their creation of this system that is exceedingly difficult to change are the tall canyons where one can variously glimpse the tension between titles and purported containers, the dependence of hierarchical structure on past traditions, and the imperative to place items where readers have some expectation of finding them. Such canyons not only reinforce those expectations but also the sense that the contents to be found there somehow cohere.

I promised a partial answer to the question regarding the coherence of the variety of content found from BF 700 to BF 1999. The partial answer generated by this exploration points away from the contents and points instead to the actors involved. Our materials allow us to safely posit a perception of coherence. Whether or not Wiley personally entertained such a perception of coherence, his schedule is clear evidence that he imputed it to library users. In this, he stood in relation to the imagined patrons much as Laurent Bordelon stood to his creation Mr. Oufle, without, however, the overt derision. The fact that his schedule B was accepted and implemented without argument suggests that this perception of coherence was anodyne, and that his imputation was not far off the mark.

As we have seen, such a perception of coherence had long historical legs. My guess is that a cuneiform scholar, through an examination of scribal curricular lists and the interpretation of the physical arrangements of Mesopotamian libraries, can provide more insight into the longevity of that perception. Yet that will still only provide the same partial and limited answer. A full answer would require delving into other parameters and would necessarily engage philosophers, psychologists, social scientists, and historians.

Many fine articles and books on classification and libraries have been written, among which one of the most justly famous is Roger Chartier's *The Order of Books*. The scale and erudition of such works exceed my present effort. What I have attempted here is to simply visit one neighborhood of books in a library and then present what I have learned about how and why such titles came to be there. One might apply this strategy with equally interesting results to other ranges in any academic or public library, to bookstore layouts, or even online book shopping. In the latter case it may be that Amazon has already monetized "the perception of coherence" through its helpful advisories that tell us, "*People who bought this book, also bought this.*"

Most likely a small smile will come to our lips if we imagine the titles that are suggested when Mr. Oufle is that other reader.

Appendix:

Anonymous Peer Review Comments on “The Default Art of Classifying the Occult.”

Provided as food for thought and in the interest of full disclosure, this appendix contains comments of three anonymous reviewers of the manuscript. I have opted not to alter the manuscript save for correcting one typo (as recommended) – and to add my name.

Reviewer 1.

“This submission is a bibliographic study or examination of nomenclature/etymology surrounding "occult." The literature review is almost too focused, without a lot of context or attention to other than a few main sources. The research questions are not explored in the depth that I would expect of a bibliographic study. The narrative is mainly descriptive and, while addressing a compelling subject area, there is not a lot of analysis or methodology. There are minimal findings and there are no takeaways that contribute to either literature or practice. A broader examination of how this topic has evolved and what the implications are would make it more compelling.”

Author's response: This is not a bibliographic study.

Reviewer 2.

“There is a wealth of literature criticizing both LCC and DDC, *especially* LCC. Since this manuscript deals with the Occult, which is a subclass of Psychology (LC Class **BF**), which in turn is a subclass of Philosophy (LC Class **B**), I think the author would benefit from consulting two articles written by Miluse Soudek that are highly critical of the way that LC handles Psychology, and which *may* also help the author further explain why both Psychology and the Occult are subdivisions of **B** (Philosophy):

Soudek, M. (1980, Spring). On the classification of psychology in general library classification schemes. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 24, 114-128.

Soudek, M. (1983, July). The inadequate treatment of psychology in general library classification schemes. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie canadienne*, 24(3), Jul, 181-189.

Another (much longer) study of the classification of Psychology in libraries is:

Hjørland, B. (1998). The classification of psychology: A case study in the classification of a knowledge field. *Knowledge Organization*, 25(4), 162-201. Retrieved from http://arizona.openrepository.com/arizona/bitstream/10150/105294/1/the_classification_of_psychology.pdf

Also, although the author has limited him-/herself to the Library of Congress Classification (LCC) and Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC), I suggest that the author also say something about the Bibliographic Classification (BC) system of Henry Bliss, which was developed in the early Twentieth Century around the same time as LC's **B-BJ** classification schedule. Not only does Bliss separate Psychology from Philosophy (which as the author shows had been the prevailing belief since the Middle Ages), but Bliss also did *not* place the Occult in *either* Philosophy *or* Psychology, but rather in: **P** - Religion, Occult, Morals and ethics

Since the author also discusses how LC will sometimes (slowly, if not *agonizingly* slowly) change its subject headings (**Occult Sciences** was eventually changed to **Occultism**), the author might want to also mention some *other* examples when LC changed its headings, either because of criticism or because of evolving language. Sanford Berman has spent decades petitioning LC to change subject headings which have been seen as biased or racist – see Berman's 1971 book, *Prejudices and Antipathies: A Tract on the LC Subject Heads Concerning People* (online at <http://www.sanfordberman.org/prejant.htm>). LC finally removed **Jewish Question** as a subject heading in 1984(!). Other less offensive changes that immediately come to mind are: **Cookery** was finally changed to **Cookbooks**; and **Afro Americans** became **African Americans**. (Confusingly, **Blacks** is supposed to be used to refer to people of African descent in countries *other* than America.)

I also spotted what I *believe* are two typos:

Page 4: “The 1876 proof ranges the content...” – I think that should be “The 1876 proof *arranges* the content”.

Page 19: “One sees a similar persistence with additions and changes in the H.H. Wilson indexes” – I believe that should be “H.W. Wilson indexes...”

*Author's response: I would like to thank this reviewer for pointing out the relevant works on psychology classification by Soudek and Hjørland. Readers of this essay may well want to investigate. Also, your belief is correct: that **was** a typo on page 19, but I have corrected it, so thanks again.*

Reviewer 3.

“I very much like the conceit of this article—to explain the origins of a particular section of the LOC classification scheme, and focusing on the topics placed at the end of the BF range is

especially appropriate as it engages the important question of the validity of such categories as “esotericism” and “the occult.” But I found the execution very disappointing.

The conclusions, such as they are, are unconvincing. The formulation, that topics were grouped together “by default,” which is the main thesis, is vague and unhelpful. The claim that “such grouping has persisted through the ages while flexibly admitting new varieties” is highly unconvincing. The ancient, medieval and early modern examples adduced to back up this claim are too arbitrary and tendentiously interpreted to be persuasive. (For example, on p. 13, Cicero is misused. His categorization scheme is narrower and more coherent than the examples with which he is equated. For Cicero, “divination” refers to arts of predicting the future or determining the will of the gods. In the same paragraph, the example of Apuleius seems misplaced as it is not at all evident that he employs a category similar to “occult sciences.”) Much more relevant is the period immediately preceding the development of the LOC classification scheme, which does not receive sufficient attention.

The question that this article unsuccessfully tries to illuminate by focusing on the history of library classifications has been dealt with magisterially by Wouter Hanegraaff in his recent book *Esotericism and the Academy*. The author cites it, but does not seriously engage it. (In fact, she/he mentions it alongside the work of Newman and Principe as examples of scholars who challenge the validity of the historical unity of material classified as “occult.” Unfortunately, she/he does not take this critique more seriously. Although she/he announces that they will not “weigh in” on the debate, implicitly she/he accepts the validity of the category.) The development of the LOC classification schemes for “occult sciences” in fact seems to fit perfectly into Hanegraaff’s argument as a product of a period (the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries) in which the scholarly study of the topics categorized as esoteric or occult reached was dominated by amateurs and consequently reached its nadir. Thus, even if the article were drastically revised, I don’t see how it would add much if anything to our understanding of the topic.

The writing style and argumentation are very uneven. For example: What is an “informal default pattern”? (p. 1) Why is it a “sudden plunge” to move from palmistry to hypnosis and astrology? I don’t see the acceleration that the author describes. (p. 1) What are “overhead shifts in nomenclature” and “grass-roots negligence of hierarchical structures”? (p. 2)”

Author’s response: It is true that Wouter Hanegraaf claims a great deal, and in very magisterial tones. Had reviewer 3 engaged more genuinely with this essay, he/she may have had less trouble in grasping how “grass-roots negligence of hierarchical structures” through the centuries has generally ignored “overhead shifts in nomenclature” as exemplified by the category (yes, a category is a kind of name) “Occult.” But I do thank the reviewer for laboring through an article he/she clearly did not enjoy.

¹ Edwin Wiley and Charles Martel, Library of Congress Corporate Authors, *Classification Class B Part 1 B-BJ Philosophy* (Washington, D.C: Government Printing Office, 1910), 4.

² Ibid., 73-81.

³ Ibid., 3.

⁴ Ibid., 16.

⁵ Ibid., 16-17.

⁶ Joseph Rowell, *Classification of Books in the Library* (Berkeley: University of California, 1894), 4.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Melvil Dewey, *A Classification and Subject Index for Cataloguing and Arranging the Books and Pamphlets of a Library* (Hartford: Case, Lockwood & Brainerd, 1876), 14. Note: the proof version I consulted online was gifted by Joseph Rowell to the Library of the University of California in 1905. <https://archive.org/details/classificationan00dewerich> Accessed 8/16/2015.

⁹ Melvil Dewey, *Decimal Classification and Relative Index*, 6th ed. (Boston: Library Bureau, 1899), Complete Tables.

¹⁰ Dewey, *Classification and Subject Index*, 14.

¹¹ Ibid., 23-40 passim.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Denis Diderot and Jean-le-Rond d'Alembert, *Encyclopédie, ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers* (Paris, Neuchâtel, 1751-1765; New York: Readex Microprint Co., 1969), 2: 1077. Citations refer to the Readex edition.

¹⁴ Keith Hutchison, "What Happened to Occult Qualities in the Scientific Revolution?," *ISIS* 73 (1982): 236-238.

¹⁵ Ibid., 233-253.

¹⁶ Wouter J. Hanegraaff, ed., *Dictionary of Gnosis & Western Esotericism* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 2: 886.

¹⁷ François Secret, "Du 'De occulta philosophia' à l'occultisme du XIXe siècle," *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 186, 1 (1974): 57.

¹⁸ Blaise de Vigenère, *Traicté des chiffres, ou secretes manieres d'escrire* (Paris: Abel l'Angelier, 1587), 3.

¹⁹ Ibid., 17.

²⁰ Ibid., 112.

²¹ Secret, 55.

²² John Dewey, "Academic Freedom," *Educational Review* 23 (1902): 4-5.

²³ William James, "Address of the President Before the Society for Psychical Research," *Science* New Series 3, 77 (1896): 881-888.

²⁴ Edward Edwards, *Memoirs of Libraries: Including a Handbook of Library Economy* (London, Trubner & Co., 1859), 2: fold-out facing page 811.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Diderot and d'Alembert, *Encyclopédie*, 1: 22.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Nicole Masson, "Les catalogues de ventes," in *Histoire des bibliothèques françaises: les bibliothèques sous l'Ancien Régime 1530-1789* ed. Claude Jolly (Paris: Promodis Editions du Cercle de la Librairie, 1988), 41.

²⁹ Antoine Galland, *Catalogue des liures qui sont dans la bibliotheque de feu Mr. Galland* (Paris: Pierre Des-Hayes, 1653), 72.

³⁰ Placide Gallemant, *Catalogue des liures de la bibliothèque de feu Monsieur Gallemant* (Rouen, 1666), 13.

³¹ Ibid., 15.

³² Edwards, *Memoirs*, 781.

³³ Jean Viardot, "Livres rares et pratiques bibliographiques," in *Histoire des bibliothèques françaises: le livre triomphant 1660-1830* ed. Roger Chartier et Henri-Jean Martin (Paris: Fayard/Promodis Editions du Cercle de la Librairie, 1990), 592.

³⁴ Gabriel Martin, *Bibliotheca Fayana, sue Catalogus Librorum Bibliothecae ...* (Paris: Gabriel Martin, 1725), vij [sic].

³⁵ Ibid., 147-149.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid., 176.

³⁸ A. N. L. Munby, *Sale Catalogues of Libraries of Eminent Persons*, ed. Stuart Piggott (London: Mansell Information, 1974), 10: 469-494 passim.

³⁹ Ibid., 479-480.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 484.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Martin, *Bibliotheca*, 167.

⁴³ Munby, *Sale Catalogues*, 479.

⁴⁴ Henri de Montfaucon de Villars, *Le Comte de Gabalis, ou Entretiens sur les sciences secretes*, edition présentée et annotée par Didier Kahn (Paris: Editions Champion, 2010), 117-36.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 157.

⁴⁶ Gabriel Naudé, *Apologie pour tous les grands personnages qui ont esté faussement soupçonnez de magie* (Paris: François Targa, 1625; Westmead, UK: Gregg International Publishers 1972), 14-15. Citations refer to the Gregg edition.

⁴⁷ Gabriel Naudé, *Advice on Establishing a Library*, trans. by Archer Taylor (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1950), 26.

⁴⁸ Laurent Bordelon, *A History of the Ridiculous Extravagancies of Monsieur Oufle* (London: J. Morphew, 1711; New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1973), 11. Citations refer to the Garland edition.

⁴⁹ Munby, *Sale Catalogues*, 484.

⁵⁰ Hugh of St. Victor, *Didascalicon of Hugh of St. Victor*, trans. and ed. by Jerome Taylor (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961), 154.

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Ibid, 154-55.

⁵³ Taylor's 1961 English translation of the *Didascalicon* includes this section as an appendix, but a critical edition in Latin makes the point that it appears at the end of the work in the best manuscript copies, if not the most numerous, and conjectures that it represents Hugh's "revised" edition. If this is the case, not only has it been placed at the end, but, as with our 20th century classifier, Wiley, it seems to be in the nature of an afterthought. For details, see Charles Henry Buttimer, *Hugonis de Sancto Victore, Didascalicon de Studio Legendi* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University Press, 1939), xv, xvi, xix.

⁵⁴ Cicero, *De Senectute, De Amicitia, De Divinatione*, trans. and ed. by William A. Falconer (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1923), 214-540 passim.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 537.

⁵⁶ David Ogden, *Night's Black Agents: Witches, Wizards and the Dead in the Ancient World* (London: Hambledon Continuum, 2008), 61.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 60.

⁵⁸ Brian Vickers, "On the Function of Analogy in the Occult," in *Hermeticism and the Renaissance* ed. Ingrid Merkel and Allen G. Debus (Cranbury: Associated University Presses, 1988), 265; Wouter Hanegraaff, *Esotericism and the Academy: Rejected Knowledge in Western Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 185.

⁵⁹ William R. Newman, "Brian Vickers on Alchemy and the Occult: A Response," *Perspectives on Science* 17, 4 (Winter 2009): 492-93; Hanegraaf, *Esotericism and the Academy*, 187.

⁶⁰ Hanegraaff, *Esotericism and the Academy*, 187.

⁶¹ Naudé, *Advice on Establishing a Library*, 65; Dewey, *Classification and Subject Index*, 6; Sanford Berman, *Prejudices and Antipathies: A Tract on the LC Subject Heads Concerning People* (North Carolina: McFarland & Company, Inc., 1993), 18.

⁶² Ogden, *Night's Black Agents*, 2.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 3.

⁶⁵ Nicolas Campion, *History of Western Astrology* (New York: Continuum, 2009), vol 2, chap. 10.

⁶⁶ Hugh of St. Victor, *Didascalicon*, 68.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 154.

⁶⁹ Edwards, *Memoirs*, 2: fold-out facing page 811.

⁷⁰ Galland, *Catalogue*, 70-71.

⁷¹ Gallemant, *Catalogue*, 14-15.

⁷² Martin, *Bibliotheca*, 175.

⁷³ Munby, *Sale Catalogues*, 484.

⁷⁴ Rowell, *Classification of Books*, p. 4, and pp. 18-19.

⁷⁵ Dewey, *Decimal Classification*, 1899, Complete Tables; Wiley, *Classification Part B*, p. 1779; Library of Congress *Classification Outline Scheme of Classes* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1917), 19.

⁷⁶ Wiley, *Classification Part B*, p. 4.

⁷⁷ Eusèbe Salverte, *Des Sciences Occultes ou Essai sur la magie, les prodiges et les miracles*, (Paris: Sedillot, Libraire-Editeur, 1829), 2: 264.

⁷⁸ Paul Kurtz, *Skepticism and Humanism: The New Paradigm* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2001), 48.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 49.

⁸⁰ William James, "Final Impressions of a Psychical Researcher," in *Philosophy and Parapsychology*, ed. Jan Ludwig (Buffalo: Prometheus Books, 1978), 407.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 416.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 420.

⁸³ J. B. Rhine and Associates, *Parapsychology from Duke to FRNM* (Durham: The Parapsychology Press, 1965), 5-6.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 25.

⁸⁵ Kurtz, *Skepticism and Humanism*, 50.

⁸⁶ Library of Congress, *Cataloging Service Bulletin* 38 (Fall 1987), 67. This bulletin series became the official means of notification for Subject Heading changes after the cessation of supplements in 1985; see Teresa Burgett and Catherine Roberts, *Library of Congress Subject Headings Significant Changes 1974-1988* (Lake Crystal, MN: Soldier Creek Press, 1988), Introduction.

⁸⁷ Jean M. Marra, ed., *Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature 1987* (New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1988), p. 1389; Jean M. Marra, ed., *Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature 1988* (New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1989), p. 1342; *Essay and General Literature Index* vol. 9 1975-1979 (New York: H.W. Wilson Co., 1980), p. 1088; *Essay and General Literature Index* vol. 11 1985-1989 (New York: H.W. Wilson Co., 1990), p. 1256.

⁸⁸ James Williams, Martha Manheimer, and Jay Daly eds., *Classified Library of Congress Subject Headings Part A*, 2nd ed. (New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc., 1982), viii.

⁸⁹ *Library of Congress Subject Headings* 15th Edition (Washington: Cataloging Distribution Services, 1992), vii.

⁹⁰ *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd ed., s.v. “-ism.”

⁹¹ Lawrence Principe and William Newman, “Some Problems with the Historiography of Alchemy,” in *Secrets of Nature: Astrology and Alchemy in Early Modern Europe*, ed. William Newman and Anthony Grafton (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2001), 385-87.

⁹² Marcello Truzzi, “Definition and Dimensions of the Occult: Towards a Sociological Perspective,” in *On the Margins of the Visible: Sociology, the Esoteric, and the Occult*, ed. Edward A. Tiryakian (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1974), 245.

⁹³ *Library of Congress Subject Headings*, Ninth Edition (Washington: Library of Congress, 1980), p. 1635; *Library of Congress Subject Headings*, 13th Edition (Washington: Library of Congress, 1990), p. 2995; *Library of Congress Subject Headings*, 31st Edition (Washington: Cataloging Distribution Services, 2009), p. 5529.

⁹⁴ For 1982, see Williams, *Classified*, 1982, p. 6; For 2015, Library of Congress, *Library of Congress Classification*, Occult Sciences

<http://id.loc.gov/authorities/classification/cf94114914.html> Accessed 8/14/2015