



WARBURG
LIBRARY
COMMONS

SCHOOL OF
ADVANCED STUDY
UNIVERSITY
OF LONDON

[<https://commons.warburg.sas.ac.uk/downloads/g158bh30q>]

Minter, Catherine J. *'Liberating the responsibility to think for oneself' : The Warburg Institute library classification / Catherine Minter.*

2008

Article

To cite this version:

Minter, C. J. (2008). 'Liberating the responsibility to think for oneself' : The Warburg Institute library classification / Catherine Minter. *Knowledge Organization*, 35(4), 190–280 p.

<https://doi.org/https://www.nomos-elibrary.de/10.5771/0943-7444-2008-4-192/liberating-the-responsibility-to-think-for-oneself-the-warburg-library-classification-jahrgang-35-2008-heft-4>

Available at: https://commons.warburg.sas.ac.uk/concern/journal_articles/tq57nr01v

DOI: <https://www.nomos-elibrary.de/10.5771/0943-7444-2008-4-192/liberating-the-responsibility-to-think-for-oneself-the-warburg-library-classification-jahrgang-35-2008-heft-4>

Date submitted: 2021-04-13

"Liberating the Responsibility to Think for Oneself:" The Warburg Institute Library Classification

Catherine Minter

University of Cambridge, Modern & Medieval Languages Library, Sidgwick Avenue,
Cambridge, United Kingdom, CB3 9DA, <cjm91@cam.ac.uk>



After completing a PhD in eighteenth-century German literature and intellectual history at the University of Oxford, Catherine Minter trained as a librarian at the Warburg Institute Library in London, becoming qualified in June 2007. In March 2007, she took up her current post of Assistant Librarian with special responsibility for Germanic languages at the Modern and Medieval Languages Faculty Library of the University of Cambridge.

Minter, Catherine. "Liberating the Responsibility to Think for Oneself:" The Warburg Institute Library Classification. *Knowledge Organization*, 35(4), 192-208. 40 references.

Abstract: The unique classification of the library of the Warburg Institute in London is the subject of this article, with regard to the implications for the organization of knowledge in this library. To emphasize its underlying pedagogic ethos, which played an important role in shaping the classification's structure, the classification is analyzed in its appropriate library-historical context. The development of the classification in the early 1920s, the arrangement of the stock over four floors, and the classification's structure of and within classes; are related to the implications of this structure for the organization of knowledge in the library. Finally, discussion of the classification's structure and its implications is combined with discussion of its pedagogic "mission" with the aim of establishing how the classification and shelf arrangement are intended to have impact upon users of the library.

1. Introduction

The Warburg Institute Library, which has its origins in the collection of the Hamburg private scholar Aby Warburg (1866-1929), is a research library specializing in the history of the classical tradition. In 1933, the library was transferred to London to escape the National Socialist regime; it has been part of the University of London since 1944. The library has a unique system of classification which was developed in the early 1920s and survives to the present day; this classification is the subject of this article.

Review of the secondary literature on the Warburg Institute Library in Section 2 highlights gaps in research. In Section 3, an attempt is made to place the Warburg classification in its appropriate library-historical context in order to elucidate its underlying pedagogic ethos; awareness of the pedagogic principles informing the classification will be seen to be necessary to an appreciation of its overall achievement. Section 4 charts the development of the classification in the early 1920s and discusses the ar-

range of the stock over four thematically distinct floors with the aim of advancing on the findings of recent commentators writing on Warburg's library and its organization. In Section 5, the classification's structure is examined with reference to the order of and within classes, and the implications of this structure for our understanding of the organization of knowledge in the library are explored. In conclusion, consideration is given to the relationship between the implications of the classification's structure and its pedagogic "mission" as described in Section 3.

It is generally accepted that the arrangement of books in the Warburg Institute Library closely reflects the ideas of the library's founder (see e.g. Yates 2002, xiv). Although detailed consideration of Aby Warburg's ideas does not lie within the scope of this article, it is hoped that an enhanced appreciation of the Warburg Institute Library classification's significance will complement research carried out in other disciplines on Warburg's contribution as an intellectual historian.

2. Literature review

The first significant English-language source on the Warburg Institute Library was Gertrud Bing's article "The Warburg Institute" (1934), which remains one of the most authoritative contributions on the library and its organization. Bing, who joined the library in 1921, was intimately involved in the development of the classification during the 1920s. In her 1934 article, she in effect introduces the library to an English audience, discussing its beginnings, ethos, arrangement and—briefly—its classification. Bing's article was followed in May 1935 by Edgar Wind's "The Warburg Institute Classification Scheme"—a detailed, albeit succinct, account of the method of classification and system of notation adopted in the Warburg Institute Library. Wind, who himself classified large sections of the library, explains the principles that lie behind the stages of division in the classification: within each main class, the first stage of division follows one of three lines (branch of subject, period or country); the second then "specifies" the first "along the remaining two lines" (so, for example, if a class is first subdivided by country, it will be further subdivided by period and branch of subject) (1935, 193). This model is not applied systematically throughout the classification, but it nevertheless provides a key to an understanding of the order within classes.

The final important early source on the Warburg Institute Library is Fritz Saxl's "History of Warburg's Library," which was originally written around 1943, but published only in 1970 in E. H. Gombrich's *Aby Warburg: An Intellectual Biography*. Saxl's involvement with the library began in 1914 and ended with his death in 1948; perhaps more than any other individual, he was instrumental in giving the Institute and its library the shape they now possess. Accordingly, his "History of Warburg's Library" is first and foremost a study of the development of the library—in particular its institutionalization. It is also, however, one of the best accounts we have of the ethos underlying the library's arrangement and system of classification, and as such will be frequently referred to in this article.

These early sources in many ways remain unsurpassed by more recent contributions. Originally published in Italian in 1985, Salvatore Settis's article "Warburg *continuatus*" explores aspects of the library's organization over the three phases of its existence: Hamburg, pre-1933; London, in temporary accommodation, between 1934 and 1958; London, in its

permanent accommodation, from 1958 to the present day. Particular attention is paid to the method of distributing the stock over four floors, subsequently named "Image," "Word," "Orientation" and "Action," which was introduced in 1926 when the library moved to new premises in Hamburg. Settis posits three stages in the development of this arrangement:

Floor	Hamburg, 1926	London, 1934	London, 1958
4	Action	Action	Action
3	Word	Image	Orientation
2	Image	Word	Word
1	Orientation	Orientation	Image

Table 1. Settis's model of the Warburg Institute Library's four-floor arrangement (1996, 147)

This model is not, however, definitive, as will be shown in Section 4.2.

The main focus of Tilmann von Stockhausen's *Kulturwissenschaftliche Bibliothek Warburg* is the architecture of the Hamburg building that was home to the library between 1926 and 1933. However, he also discusses the organization of the library during these years, drawing on a range of important and in part previously unpublished archival sources. Particular attention is paid to the method adopted in the early 1920s (but subsequently abandoned) of using colours as a system of notation, and to the four-floor arrangement explored by Settis. Stockhausen challenges Settis's model as shown above, drawing attention to the unreliability of early reports of the arrangement (1992, 86-87). He also warns against over-emphasizing the importance of the four-floor system at the cost of other aspects of the classification such as the order within classes—without himself embarking on a detailed discussion of these other aspects.

At first sight, it seems that Stockhausen's call for a study of the Warburg Institute Library classification that advances beyond consideration of its basic features might be satisfied by the article "Chaos or order?" by Mari Friman, Päivi Jansson and Vesa Suominen: "Ours is the first major study on the classification of the Warburg Institute Library together with a presentation of Aby Warburg's life as a scholar and a history of his library." (1995, 23) After a brief account of Warburg's activity as a scholar and book-collector and an outline of practical aspects of the classification (mostly borrowed from Wind), the authors move on to a discussion of the classification from a more theoretical perspective. Their conclu-

sion is that the principle underlying the classification is one of association. The resultant observation that the Warburg classification possesses a shallow hierarchical structure, linking topics in an associative way at the same stage of division (Friman et al. 1995, 28) is a sound one; equally, the observation that the classification was developed with browsing in mind (1995, 29) is correct. As conclusions, however, these remarks are somewhat meagre; moreover, the reader senses that the authors are disappointed by their own conclusions, having approached their study with the expectation of finding a more systematic classification.

The most recent secondary source on the Warburg Institute Library is a German-language monograph: Hans-Michael Schäfer's *Kulturwissenschaftliche Bibliothek Warburg* (2003), which presents itself as a study of the library from a "library history" perspective. In the first two chapters, the author attempts to place the library in its appropriate social and cultural context—a potentially significant undertaking. Disappointingly, this endeavour is hampered by a tendency to dwell on historical minutiae and political and economic aspects of German library history that are not immediately relevant to the Warburg Institute Library, and which therefore prevent a clear picture from emerging of the appropriate background context to the library's formation and development. The brief discussion of the library's classification scheme in this study is largely derivative: Schäfer merely revisits the ground covered by Stockhausen, and shies away from theoretical discussion of the empirical data (2003, 220-33).

Review of the major secondary sources on the Warburg Institute Library thus reveals significant gaps in research. Where sources have focused on the classification at all, discussion has tended to gravitate around its most fundamental elements: notably, the use of colours as a system of notation and the method of distributing the books over four floors. Important as these elements are, other features of the scheme such as the order of and within classes also merit examination. Where an attempt has been made to study the classification in more detail—in the article by Friman, Jansson and Suominen—the results have been disappointing owing to an inappropriate line of approach: the Warburg Institute Library classification is an inherently unsystematic classification which inevitably does not fare well when normative standards of "order" or "chaos" are applied to it. Arguably, a more profitable approach to the classification is to take its unsystematic char-

acter as a given and to explore its significance and implications. This article is intended as a contribution in this direction.

3. The historical and intellectual context to the Warburg Institute Library classification

The following section aims to place the Warburg Institute Library and its system of classification in their appropriate historical and intellectual context in order to elucidate the pedagogic ethos underlying the method of arranging books in this library. Awareness of the pedagogic "mission" behind the classification will ultimately be seen to be necessary to an appreciation of its structure and overall achievement.

3.1. The origins of Warburg's library

In his "History of Warburg's Library," Fritz Saxl traces Warburg's idea of founding a library back to his experience of the seminar libraries in Strasbourg while he was a student there (1970, 326):

At that time the seminar building at Strasbourg consisted of a number of cells containing specialized libraries and the student was given freedom to use them all. Warburg ... went from one of these seminar libraries to another, pursuing his clues from art to religion, from religion to literature, from literature to philosophy. To give the student a library uniting the various branches of the history of human civilization where he could wander from shelf to shelf was his resolve.

Strasbourg, Warburg's source of inspiration, was in fact the first German university to offer its students a comprehensive model of seminar or institute instruction; it served as a model for many other institutions (Dziatzko 1893, 38). The majority of Germany's academic seminars and institutes were formed between 1870 and 1900. Their expansion was rapid: in a report from 1909, one commentator relates that "in my student days, the Philological Seminar in Bonn only had nine members.... Nowadays, things are quite different. In Leipzig, we have a range of seminars, each of which has well in excess of a hundred members ..." ["So erinnere ich mich aus meiner Studentenzeit, daß im Bonner philologischen Seminar nur 9 Mitgliederstellen bestanden.... Das ist heute ganz anders. Wir haben in Leipzig eine Reihe

von Seminaren, deren jedes weit über hundert Mitglieder zählt...."] (Bücher 1912, 153-54). The seminar libraries quickly grew into serious rivals to the university libraries: in Fritz Milkau's *Handbuch der Bibliothekswissenschaft*, it is estimated that, by 1926/27, Germany's seminar and institute libraries held a total of approximately five million volumes and the university libraries approximately 13.5 million (1933, 538).

Among those writing on the topic, the origins of seminar/institute instruction in Germany were seen to reside in a shift in teaching methods which took place in the nineteenth century away from a dogmatic style characterized by the use of lectures and the ethos of delivering knowledge up to students towards an heuristic approach intended to instruct students in research methods (see e.g. Milkau 1933, 525; Bücher 1912, 153). This shift was identified with a development towards a new, "workshop" type of university driven by a climate of practical, active research rather than by magisterial theoretical teaching (Milkau 1933, 525). Accordingly, the purpose of the seminar/institute libraries was to place all the relevant academic literature at students' disposal in order to encourage independent study and research. The core of the seminar libraries' collections was what we would nowadays call "prescribed texts," together with reference works and the most important academic journals in their respective disciplines. Almost without exception, these were reference collections, not least because they were intended to counteract a problem frequently faced by users of the university libraries, which were generally lending libraries—namely, that the required books were unavailable because already out on loan (Milkau 1933, 528).

Importantly in the present context, the seminar/institute libraries were—again almost without exception—libraries which allowed their users free access to the shelves. The practical advantage of this was quick and convenient access to the required literature: "Every need for further information that arises in the course of their [the students'] studies can be satisfied on the spot; every quotation can be looked up immediately. And the same book that serves one student one minute is available to another the minute after" ["Jeder im Verlaufe ihrer Arbeit entstehende Bedarf nach weiterer Information kann auf der Stelle befriedigt, jedes Zitat sofort nachgeschlagen werden. Und dasselbe Buch, das in dieser Minute dem einen gedient hat, kann in der nächsten für einen anderen verfügbar sein."] (Bücher 1912, 165). The open access system was also seen to con-

tain an important intellectual advantage: the easy familiarity with the literature on a subject that only immediate access to the relevant books and active, informal use of them can provide (Leyh 1957, 410). In addition to allowing their students free access to the shelves, the seminar/institute libraries placed emphasis on providing a congenial working environment: in the Philological Seminar and Germanic Institute in Leipzig, for example, separate work spaces were set aside for smokers and non-smokers (Milkau 1933, 539). These libraries also on the whole aimed to have longer opening hours than the university libraries.

In sum, all of these elements—the open access policy, the provision of a congenial working environment, the liberal conditions of use—were intended to encourage students to regard the seminar and institute libraries as a sort of "home from home" and to derive intellectual benefit from this relaxed relationship with the academic institution. This is also an accurate description of the role of the Warburg Institute Library as conceived by its founder and sustained up to the present day. In an unpublished report from February 1934, it is stated that the library's mission is to "get into our own rooms every book a student requires" and that "we want to extend our opening hours as far as possible so that the student shall not find himself restricted in his work" (WIA, Ia.2.1.1, [4]); users of the Warburg Institute Library as it exists today will appreciate just how much of this early spirit has been preserved.

3.2. Open access and shelf arrangement: the Warburg Institute Library

Describing the nature of Warburg's library in a paper from 1921/22, Saxl terms it a "Problembibliothek" (1923, 9), by which he means that it focuses on a specific problem, which he identifies in this same paper as "the question of the *extent and nature of the influence of antiquity on modern cultures*" ["die Frage nach *Ausbreitung und Wesen des Einflusses der Antike auf die nachantiken Kulturen*"] (1923, 1). The library's "problem," he continues, was posed by Warburg, who, however, recognized that the scope of the problem was too broad for an individual to be able to solve it, and who thus intended his library as a set of "tools" that future scholars might use to draw closer to a solution (Saxl 1923, 9-10). This idea of the library as a "tool" (or "instrument") reverberates through the earliest accounts of its purpose. For example, in the "Bericht über die Bibliothek Warburg

und ihre Entwicklung zu einem öffentlichen Forschungsinstitut," Saxl remarks on the library's dual function as Warburg's personal research tool and as a publicly accessible "research instrument" ([1921], 117-18). In an entry from the library journal dated 3 May 1927, Warburg reminds his colleagues that "until we have transferred the classmarks [to the catalogue], the library will remain a paltry tool; only after that will we be nimble. So all hands on deck!" ["Vor Uebertragung der Signaturen bleibt die K.B.W. ein kümmerliches Werkzeug; ist [sic] nachher sind wir wendig! Also alle Mann auf Deck!"] (Warburg 2001, 87).

The conception of the library as a research tool or instrument is based on an ideal of active use. Users should be allowed direct access to the shelves: "The student will only properly *use* the library when he is able to go straight to the shelves and learns to grasp the interconnections between problems by the manner of arrangement. No amount of borrowing from the library can possibly give him the same understanding of its intellectual universe" ["In rechter Weise wird ferner der Student erst dann die Bibliothek *benutzen*, wenn er selbst an die Schränke herangeht und so schon durch die Art der Aufstellung die Zusammenhänge der Probleme erfassen lernt. Durch keinen noch so intensiven Leihverkehr mit der Bibliothek könnte er in deren Gedankenwelt eindringen."] (Saxl [1921], 121). As this passage suggests, the library's open access system gains its meaning from the fact that the shelf arrangement is intended to serve an instructive function. Similarly, in her article "The Warburg Institute," Gertrud Bing writes (1934, 7):

The educational influence of a library which invites a student to adopt a special subject and method of research can only be effective if he is allowed to be guided by the books themselves. The scholar who is expected to penetrate into the borderlands of his special subject must find the new territory ready surveyed for him by the able planning of an expert.

In what ways, then, was the shelf arrangement in the Warburg Institute Library meant to be instructive? Firstly, the library's open shelves were intended to give users an overview of the literature on a topic or, in the words of J. B. Trapp, to serve as "selective running bibliographies" (1984, 198). The corollary of this aim was the ambition to collect as broadly as possible, avoiding narrow specialization. More im-

portantly, however, the shelf arrangement in Warburg's library was from the first intended to draw attention to interconnections between different areas of knowledge. This is clearly expressed in the unpublished report from February 1934, where it is stated that the collection was put together "with the special view to showing the inter-dependence of the different fields of research" (WIA, Ia.2.1.1, [4]).

The library's commitment to open access was thus underpinned by pedagogic considerations. It is, however, worth pausing at this point to note that it has not always been—or been able to be—an open access library. Notably, between 1926 and 1933, when Saxl and Bing were transforming it into a public institution in Hamburg, the stacks were not accessible to readers; one possible explanation for this is that the organization of the library at this time was not deemed efficient enough to merit an open access system. It was only in 1934, when the library took up residence in its first London home, Thames House, that the stack room was opened up to readers—with supervision from the porter (Bing 1934, 4). In July 1937, the library moved to the Imperial Institute Buildings at South Kensington, but the stock was not unpacked until January 1939. Later the same year, the library was evacuated at the request of the University of London (Bing 1998, 23); it was not until the beginning of 1946 that the books were reassembled on the open shelves (Warburg Institute 1946, 2). The shelf arrangement at this time was not felt to be ideal: "It proved impossible to keep to the pre-war arrangement of shelving, and a new system had to be worked out which is far from ideal but as satisfactory as present conditions of space permit" (Warburg Institute 1946, 2). In fact, it was only in 1958, when the library moved to new, purpose-built premises in Woburn Square, Bloomsbury, that the desired combination of open access and an ideal shelf arrangement could be achieved.

3.3. *Open access and shelf arrangement: the broader context*

Saxl, in his "History of Warburg's Library," situates the library's commitment to open access and a meaningful shelf arrangement in the context of a broader nineteenth- and early twentieth-century debate on library classification. The passage in question is worth quoting in full (Saxl 1970, 327):

Those were the decades when in many libraries, big and small, the old systematic arrangements

were thrown overboard since the old categories no longer corresponded to the requirements of the new age. The tendency was to arrange the books in a more "practical" way; standardization, alphabetical and arithmetical arrangements were favoured. The file cabinets of the systematic catalogue became the main guide to the student; access to the shelves and to the books themselves became very rare. Most libraries, even those which allowed the student open access (as for instance Cambridge University Library), had to make concessions to the machine age which increased book production from day to day and to give up grouping the books in a strictly systematic order. The book-title in the file catalogue replaced in most cases that other and much more scholarly familiarity which is gained by browsing.

Saxl is here describing a development which, in Germany, had received strong impetus from Martin Schrettinger's influential treatise on library science, the *Versuch eines vollständigen Lehrbuches der Bibliothek-Wissenschaft*. In this work, Schrettinger took a surprisingly modern, practical view of the library's function, stressing the importance of fast finding and accessibility of resources. To this end, he argued against wholly systematic shelf arrangement, instead advocating what Buzàs (1986, 270) calls "arrangement by open groups" (the use of broad classes, with arrangement in order of accession within these classes) and emphasizing the value of catalogues as finding tools. Although Schrettinger's position was challenged throughout the nineteenth century by authorities in the field of library science such as Ebert, Molbech and Petzholdt, it had found numerous supporters by the turn of twentieth century. Perhaps the most influential among these was Georg Leyh, who dismissed systematic arrangement as unhelpful in the context of academic libraries in an authoritative article from 1912, "Das Dogma von der systematischen Aufstellung."

The insistence on physical order as a mirror of conceptual order in Warburg's library may, as Saxl recognizes, thus be seen as anachronistic. However, one context in which the issue of the physical arrangement of library stock continued to retain significance at the turn of the twentieth century was that of the public library. In his 1912 article, Leyh makes the point that systematic arrangement is only meaningful in libraries whose physical layout is intended to serve an educational function—namely, in

public libraries (1912, 251). And indeed, the educational benefits of systematic shelf order had been discussed as part of a lively debate on open access in public libraries which took place in Britain during the 1890s. An 1899 pamphlet signed by twelve British public librarians and described by its authors as "the first [statement] to be publicly made by librarians having practical experience of safe-guarded open access libraries" (*Account* 1899, 5) sets out the reasons why systematic arrangement is particularly appropriate to open access libraries. The first reason given is a practical one. In open access libraries, systematic arrangement, and the method of ordering and marking books that it imposes, helps to prevent misplacements (*Account* 1899, 3):

In safe-guarded open access libraries, where the books are all closely and exactly classified by subjects, and so marked by means of distinctive labels as to clearly distinguish class from class, subject from subject, and book from book, misplacements are not only comparatively rare, but readily detected and set right when they do occur.

The second and more important reason is an intellectual one: open access and systematic arrangement give the public a "higher and more rational enjoyment of literature" (*Account* 1899, 1). Systematic shelf arrangement in open access public libraries makes it possible for users to survey a library's holdings in any given subject area, gain an overview of the literature on a topic, and make intelligent, informed choices about what they want to borrow based on examination and comparison of related items. Furthermore, direct contact with the shelves of a well-ordered library is seen to serve an instructive, pedagogic function per se: "Access to properly classified libraries is an education in itself ..." (*Account* 1899, 6). In contrast, the library in which the stock is not arranged systematically and in which, in the emphatic words of James Duff Brown, the books as they stand together on the shelves "have no more arrangement or relation to each other than have the contents of a dust-bin" (1898, 15) cannot help shape the minds of its users.

The affinity between the pedagogic ethos underlying the Warburg Institute Library and that behind the Anglo-American public library movement is an important one which has been overlooked in the secondary literature. In an entry from the library journal from March 1928, Gertrud Bing draws a parallel be-

tween the ideals of Warburg's library and those of the American public library as depicted in a recent article from the *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, one of the leading German library journals of the time: "Essay in the *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* on the position of the public library in America, which accords the librarian the same "missionary" role as we have in our minds as an ideal, is being photographed (for duplication)" ["Aufsatz im Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen über die Stellung der Public Library in Amerika, der dem Bibliothekar ganz ähnliche „missionarische“ Aufgaben zuweist, wie sie uns als Ideal vorschweben, wird fotografiert (zur Vervielfältigung)."] (Warburg 2001, 201). The article in question is Adolf Jürgens's "Die Stellung der Public Library im Bildungswesen der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika," which appeared in the *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* early in 1928. In this article, Jürgens contrasts the German ideal of the library as a storehouse of books and the librarian as keeper with the American ideal of the (public) library as an information provider and the librarian as mediator (1928, 26-29). He emphasizes the firmly pedagogic role of the American public library: "The public library occupies a central role in American life, educating and instructing.... A genuinely missionary spirit inspires the [public library] movement and its leaders ..." ["Erziehend und belehrend steht so die Public Library mitten im amerikanischen Leben.... Es ist ein wahrhafter Missionsgeist, der die Bewegung und ihre Führer be-seelt...."] (Jürgens 1928, 25).

4. The Warburg Institute Library classification: development and arrangement

The preceding section has suggested that the Warburg Institute Library, like the German seminar libraries of the late nineteenth century and the American and British public libraries of the time, was intended as a library that would facilitate access to knowledge and influence the minds of its users. The library was conceived as a "tool" or "instrument" which should be used in an active, practical way, and not as a storehouse of treasures. In order for it to fulfil these roles, readers were to be allowed free access to the shelves. This would enable them to acquire the "scholarly familiarity which is gained by browsing" (Saxl 1970, 327) and also, more importantly, to derive intellectual benefit from the shelf arrangement, which, as in the open access public libraries of the time, was shaped by strong pedagogic intentions.

The importance attached to open access and meaningful shelf order in Warburg's library is an indicator of the seriousness with which the business of classification was undertaken when it was systematically carried out in the 1920s. The following section looks in detail at the development of the Warburg Institute Library classification between 1921 and 1926. Section 4.2 explores the physical arrangement of the library, paying particular attention to the method of distributing the stock over four thematically distinct floors which was introduced in 1926 and continues up to the present day.

4.1. The development of the classification, 1921-1926

In 1921, Warburg, who had suffered a mental breakdown, was forced to leave Hamburg for the sanatorium of Ludwig Binswanger in Kreuzlingen, Switzerland. His absence—which looked like it might be permanent—gave rise to pressing questions about his library's future. Saxl, who was now in charge of the library, was convinced that the way to secure its existence was to develop it into a public institution. In this, he was pursuing earlier impulses: as early as 1914, he and Warburg had debated how best to turn the library into an institute (Saxl 1970, 329-30). Ultimately, the steps towards institutionalization taken by Saxl were twofold: he invited scholars to lecture and publish under the library's auspices; and—more importantly in the present context—he made the library available to a larger public (Bing 1998, 9).

Until this time, the library had had a homely, personal feel to it; the task now was to transform it into something more workmanlike and efficient which could be used as an instrument by a wider public (Bing 1998, 9). The arrangement of the books up until this point had reflected Warburg's system of thought and had tended to shift in tandem with his associations of ideas. If the library was to become an institute, granting a substantial number of readers free access to its shelves, a proper system for marking and placing the books was essential. In 1921, Saxl in collaboration with Bing thus set about inventing a "system of pressmarks which consisted of a combination of coloured paper strips on the spines with corresponding letters and numbers" (Bing 1998, 10).

An indication of the main sections of the library in the years leading up to this point is given by the "Jahrestabellen"—coloured charts and graphs showing the contents and growth of the library between 1886 and 1926—currently kept in the Warburg Institute Archive. The charts for the years 1886-1917 show the fol-

lowing sections: Festivals, History, Aesthetics, Philosophy, Cultural History, History of Literature, The Art of the Book, Art History, Periodicals, Philology, and Archaeology (see WIA, I.4.5.1–I.4.5.6). Between 1911 and 1915, three further sections were added: Natural History, The Occult and Astrology, and Hamburgiana; History of Literature and Philology were combined to form a single section. In 1916–17, the main sections of the library were thus: Philosophy and Theology, Cultural History, Natural History, The Occult and Astrology, Literature and Philology, Festivals, The Art of the Book, History, Aesthetics, Art History, Archaeology, Hamburgiana, and Periodicals (WIA, I.4.5.9).

In 1921, Bing joined the library; and overhaul of its main sections began. The accessions graph for 1921–22 reveals some significant changes in the organization of the library; its sections and subsections are now as follows: Philosophy (General, History of Philosophy, Aesthetics, Philosophy of History); History of Religion (Pre-Christian, Christianity–Reformation, Reformation, Astrology, Magic); World History (General, Antiquity and Middle Ages, Renaissance); Art History (General, Archaeology, Middle Ages, Renaissance); History of Science; Language and Literature; Folklore and Ethnology; History of Scholarship; History and Culture of the Orient; Hamburgiana; War and Politics; Periodicals (adapted from WIA, I.4.5.10). History of Religion (formerly Theology) has now branched off from Philosophy and embraces what was previously called The Occult and Astrology. Aesthetics is now a subsection within Philosophy, and Archaeology a subsection within Art History. Four entirely new sections have been added: Folklore and Ethnology, which we can assume embraces the earlier section Festivals; History of Scholarship, which presumably includes the earlier section The Art of the Book; History and Culture of the Orient; and War and Politics. Generally, it is possible to discern an upgrading of the vocabulary used to describe the collection: the main sections are now given broader but more scientific designations than before; and an attempt has been made to align the names of the main sections in order to emphasize the collection's historical component.

In 1921–22, Saxl and Bing not only overhauled the library's main sections; they also set about developing their system of pressmarks. The "Bericht über die Bibliothek Warburg für das Jahr 1922"—the annual report for 1922—explains that two factors in particular determined the type of notation chosen: firstly, the need for a flexible and expansible notation; and

secondly, the need for a system that would minimize a problem posed by the library's commitment to open access—namely, the problem of misplacements (WIA, Ia.1.2.1, [4–5]). The notational system chosen by Saxl and Bing was in the first instance a system of colours. Three coloured labels were to be affixed to the spine of each book—the top colour indicating the discipline, the middle the work's "methodological approach" (e.g. texts, handbooks, historical studies), and the bottom colour indicating branch of subject (WIA, Ia.1.2.1, [6]). The decision to use colours as a means of pressmarking the books proved an unwise one in several respects. Practical problems soon emerged: the coloured labels faded quickly, and easily became detached from the books. Furthermore, although the use of colours as pressmarks represented an effective means of preventing misplacements, it was ill-suited to help readers locate materials: a combination of colours is not a memorable notation, and it cannot easily be represented on a catalogue slip. The decision was thus taken to use not only colours, but also letters as notation; unfortunately, it is not possible to glean from the primary sources precisely when this occurred. We can, however, be confident that the use of letters was in place by 1926: the *Tagebuch der Kulturwissenschaftlichen Bibliothek Warburg*—the library journal between 1926 and 1929—from its outset reports on ongoing efforts to transfer classmarks to the card catalogue.

The final accessions graph—for the year 1926—shows that the sections and subsections of the library have remained substantially unchanged since 1921–22. However, War and Politics has now disappeared; and sections entitled Trade and Technology, Bibliography, Music and Theatre, and Americana have been added. The main sections (together with their corresponding colours) are thus now: Philosophy—dark green; Religion—light green; World History—brown; Art History—red; History of Science—yellow; Language and Literature—light blue; Folklore and Ethnology—dark blue; History of Scholarship—pink; History and Culture of the Orient—purple; Trade and Technology—black; Hamburgiana—light brown; Bibliography—pink; Music and Theatre—light green; Americana—light blue (adapted from WIA, I.4.5.13).

4.2. Physical arrangement

1926 was a critical year for the Warburg Institute Library, for this was when it moved to new premises in Hamburg. In his report on the year's activity, Saxl

remarks that, beneficial as the move has been, it has also highlighted "the chaos caused by the poor working conditions in the old house, and how much work remains to be done if the library is to become the useful instrument we hope to turn it into" [...welche Verwirrung durch die schlechten Arbeitsmöglichkeiten im alten Haus angerichtet war und wie viel Arbeit noch zu leisten wäre, sollte die Bibliothek zu dem nützlichen Instrument werden, zu dem wir sie machen zu können hoffen."] (WIA, Ia.1.6.1, [2]). It was with the move in 1926 that the system of distributing the stock over four thematically distinct floors was introduced. Looking back on the events of 1926 in his "History of Warburg's Library," Saxl gives the following account of the original four-floor arrangement (1970, 334):

The books were housed on four floors. The first began with books on the general problems of expression and on the nature of symbols. From here one was led to anthropology and religion and from religion to philosophy and the history of science. The second floor contained books on expression in art, its theory and history. The third was devoted to language and literature, and the fourth to the social forms of human life—history, law, folklore, and so forth.

However, as Stockhausen (1992, 86) highlights, the reliability of this account is open to question given that it conflicts with information given, again by Saxl, in his "Bericht über die Übersiedlung der Bibliothek Warburg aus dem Hause Heilwigstraße 114 in den Neubau Heilwigstraße 116," where the implied order is: first floor—fine arts; second floor—religion, philosophy and science; third floor—language and literature; fourth floor—social forms of human life (1926, 187). This latter account is strongly supported by evidence from the (unpublished) annual report for 1926: "The first floor contains everything related to the Image; the second Religion and Philosophy [Natural Sciences and History of Scholarship]; the third Language and Literature; the fourth Geography, [Transmission of Culture] History and War" ["Das erste Geschoss enthält alles auf das Bild Bezügliche; das zweite Religion und Philosophie [Naturwissenschaften u. Bildungsgeschichte]; das dritte Sprache und Literatur; das vierte Geographie, [Verkehrswissenschaft] Geschichtswissenschaft und Krieg."] (WIA, Ia.1.6.1, [3]; MS annotations in Gertrud Bing's hand).

In December 1933, the Warburg Institute Library was transferred to London to escape the rising tide of National Socialism. Between May 1934 and July 1937, it occupied rooms in Thames House, Westminster; between July 1937 and February 1958, it was housed in the Imperial Institute Buildings at South Kensington. The years in temporary accommodation were ones in which space considerations necessarily took precedence over physical arrangement: the prime concern was how to fit the library's growing stock into the space available, rather than how to arrange it in the ideal way. It was only in 1952, after additional space had been gained in the Imperial Institute Buildings, that thoughts turned again to the arrangement of the stock: the *Annual Report* for this year relates that "the attempt has been made, as far as the layout and equipment of the rooms permit, to re-shelve the Library in accordance with its original scheme which had become obscured by makeshifts imposed through lack of space" (Warburg Institute 1952, 1). The new arrangement took the following form:

Orientation by means of myth, magic and logic (Religion; Science; Philosophy):	Rooms 5 & 4
The Word as the vehicle of expression and tradition (Literature; Transmission of classical learning):	Room 3
The Image as the vehicle of expression and tradition (Archaeology and Art):	Room 2
The significant Act [<i>Dromenon</i>] (Political and Social History):	Room 1

Figure 1. *The Warburg Institute Library arrangement, 1952* (Warburg Institute 1952, 1)

With the exception of the use of the terms "Orientation," "Word," "Image" and "Dromenon" (from the Greek for "rite"), this model agrees with that described by Gertrud Bing in her article "The Warburg Institute," where the library's four main sections in the order in which the reader encounters them in the stack room are identified as: Religion, Natural Science and Philosophy; Language and Literature; Fine Arts; and Social and Political Life (1934, 4-5).

In 1958, the library moved to its purpose-built premises in Woburn Square, where it has remained to the present day. The limitations on space imposed by the temporary quarters were thus lifted, and renewed consideration could be given to the ideal arrangement of the stock. This is spelt out in the *Annual*

Report for 1957-58: "As it is no longer necessary to adapt it to existing and unsuitable rooms it has now been possible to arrange the Library in the very way in which it was conceived and first arranged by its founder" (Warburg Institute 1958, 6). The new arrangement—over four floors, a Reading Room and basement—was as follows:

Fourth floor— <i>Action</i> :	History Social Patterns
Third floor— <i>Orientation</i> :	Religion (Comparative, Greco-Roman, Christian, Eastern) Magic and Science Philosophy
Second floor— <i>Word</i> :	Literature Classical Studies
First floor— <i>Image</i> :	Archaeology Art
Ground floor:	Reading Room
Basement:	Periodicals

Figure 2. *The Warburg Institute Library arrangement, 1958* (Warburg Institute 1958, 6)

The 1958 arrangement restores the original four-floor order in all but one particular—the transposition of "Word" and "Orientation" –, as the following synoptic representation of the three stages in the development of the arrangement makes clear:

Section/ Floor	Hamburg 1926-33	London 1934-58	London 1958-
4	'Action'	Action	Action
3	'Word'	Image	Orientation
2	'Orientation'	Word	Word
1	'Image'	Orientation	Image

Table 2. *Revised model of the Warburg Institute Library's four-floor arrangement*

With some minor adjustments, the arrangement of 1958 has been retained to the present day. Thus, the first floor—and now also part of the basement—is still devoted to "everything related to the Image" (WIA, Ia.1.6.1, [3]): Pre-Classical and Classical Art (Class K), including Classical Archaeology; and Post-Classical and Modern Art (Class C), including History of Art, Art Interpretation and Aesthetics, Iconography, Art Collecting, Topography and Applied Arts. Floor 2 houses Language and Literature, classical and modern (Class E), and works on the history of scholarship (Class N). Floor 3 is devoted to Science (Class F), with emphasis on the history of magic and natural sciences, Religion (Classes B and

G), with emphasis on the great historical religions, and Philosophy (Class A), with emphasis on the history of philosophical ideas. Finally, Floor 4 is still given over to "the social forms of human life" (Saxl 1970, 334): Political History (Class H); and Cultural History (Class D), embracing Psychology, Anthropology, Music, Theatre, Festivals, Technology, Trade, Law and Sociology.

5. The structure of the Warburg Institute Library classification and its significance

Section 4 has examined practical aspects of the Warburg Institute Library classification: its early development; and the physical arrangement of the stock over four floors. In the following section, the attempt is made to explore the classification's structure with the aim of establishing what this structure seeks to convey to users of the library.

5.1. Order of classes

In the older secondary literature on the Warburg Institute Library, there was some discussion as to whether the library's four-floor arrangement might be seen to reveal a particular view of the organization of knowledge. One interpretation of the library's arrangement which has enjoyed some influence is that provided by Gertrud Bing in the "Historical Note" to the second edition of the *Catalog of the Warburg Institute Library* (Warburg Institute 1967, iii):

The library was to lead from the visual image (*Bild*), as the first stage in man's awareness, to language (*Wort*) and thence to religion, science and philosophy, all of them products of man's search for orientation (*Orientierung*) which influences his patterns of behaviour and his actions, the subject matter of history. Action, the performance of rites (*drōmena*), in its turn is superseded by reflection which leads back to linguistic formulation and the crystallization of image symbols that complete the cycle.

This interpretation is an appealing one because it suggests an evolutionary order to the classification's main sections which seems to accord well with some of Warburg's own ideas on cultural progress. These ideas find clear expression in the "Lecture on Serpent Ritual" which Warburg delivered to an audience of fellow psychiatric patients at the sanatorium in Kreuzlingen on 25 April 1923. With reference to the

snake cult of the Pueblo Indians, he here posits a development in symbolism from "real and substantial symbolism which appropriates by actual gestures" (e.g. the Pueblo Indians' masked dances) to "that symbolism which exists in thought alone"—a system of mythology (Warburg 1938-39, 291). He suggests that this second type of symbolism is in turn superseded by scientific argument, which ultimately leads to "emancipation from the mythological view" (Warburg 1938-39, 291). In Bing's interpretation of the library's four-floor system, it is possible to discern a reflection of the model of cultural progress described in this lecture: symbols and myths ("Image" and "Word") are supplanted by religious, scientific and philosophical argument ("Orientation"), culminating in a rational world view ("Action").

Attractive as this interpretation is, it does, however, conflict with that given by J. B. Trapp, former Librarian and Director of the Warburg Institute, in his publications on the library. In his article "The Warburg Institute," Trapp suggests that in order to understand the arrangement of the library as Warburg intended it, the student should progress through it in the opposite direction from that proposed by Bing in the "Historical Note" (1961, 745):

The library was to be arranged in such a way that the student of the activities of man would be led from the science of man as an individual (psychology) through the first main division. This was called *drömenon* (action, the performance of rites) and dealt with mankind's patterns of behaviour—folklore, anthropology, festivals, music, the theatre and, finally, political theory—and his actions, the subject matter of ancient and modern history. Thence the reader passed [onto?] the second division of the library, comprising the history of religion, science and philosophy, all of them products of man's search for orientation (*Orientierung*). The two last main divisions were devoted to man's expression of himself in language and literature (*Wort*) and art and archaeology (*Bild*).

In a later article, Trapp describes the library's arrangement in terms in which the idea of evolutionary cultural development is even less conspicuous; once again, he begins his description with the top floor (1986, 173):

The first main division of the Library comprises history and patterns of social behaviour; the se-

cond was named by Warburg Orientation (*Orientierung*)—the history of religion, of magic and science, and of philosophy, the history of human responses to, human attempts to explain and control the human condition, by appeal to the divine or by human reasoning; the third was called Words (*Wort*)—classical, humanist and vernacular, their preservation and transmission; the fourth Images (*Bild*)—classical, humanist and vernacular also, how and why they were created and copied, how they have survived, and in what often unexpected forms.

Here, the library's main sections are presented not as successive stages in a developmental cultural process which the user of the library may gain an insight into by moving through the collection in a particular direction, but simply as approaches to a set of broadly related intellectual problems.

Evidence presented in Section 3.2 lends support to Trapp's account of the organization of knowledge in the Warburg Institute Library. There, it was emphasized that Warburg himself reached no definitive answers to the questions he investigated, and that he therefore envisaged his library as a tool or instrument that future scholars might use to draw closer to solutions. In view of this, it seems inappropriate to regard the library as one whose arrangement is intended to disclose a particular view of the organization of knowledge. It better befits the explorative ethos behind the library to view its main sections as different approaches to a set of questions, all of which may be seen to relate to the broad problem of the classical tradition. Furthermore, the readiness with which whole sections of the library have been moved to new positions over the years also suggests that an overarching principle of order was never intended. More importance has always been attached in this classification to the dynamic relationships between neighbouring subjects than to the establishment of a stable order of classes.

5.2. Order within classes

The fullest account of the order within classes in the Warburg Institute Library classification is given by Edgar Wind in his article "The Warburg Institute Classification Scheme," in which the significance of each of the three letters that constitute a Warburg classmark is elucidated. The first letter "refers to the most general division of subjects (Art, Religion, etc.);" the second "specifies that general subject by

using either *systematic* or *historical* differentiations" (Wind 1935, 193). The "systematic" line leads to subdivisions by subject (e.g. to Sculpture within Art) and the historical to subdivisions by period or country; the second letter can thus mean (branch of) subject, period or country. The meaning of the third letter depends on that of the second or, to use Wind's rather cumbersome terminology, is a "specification of that meaning along the two remaining lines" (1935, 193). If the second letter indicates subject, the third will indicate period and country; if it indicates period, the third will indicate country and branch of subject; finally, if the second letter indicates country, the third will indicate period and branch of subject.

Class C, Post-Classical and Modern Art, is the class within which Wind's model is applied most systematically throughout, perhaps because he himself worked intensively on the reclassification of this section of the library during the 1920s (Warburg 2001, 233). Elsewhere, anomalies abound, particularly at the second stage of division. Within subclass DP, Political Theory, for example, we find the following order in array: General; Antiquity; Middle Ages; Renaissance; Italy; Spain; France; Low Countries; England; Germany; Russia; The Ideal Ruler; Utopias. This subclass is thus subdivided first by period, then by country, and then by branch of subject—all at the same stage of division. Similarly, DE, Theatre, is subdivided in the first instance by subject (Psychology of the Theatre), then by period (Primitive and Oriental, Classical, Medieval), and finally by country. These examples—which could be extended—show that the Warburg Institute Library classification repeatedly violates one of the cardinal principles of bibliographic classification: in order to avoid cross-classification, a class should be subdivided consistently by one characteristic only at the same stage of division (Sayers 1967, 46). Close study of the classification reveals that the risk of cross-classification is a persistent one in this scheme. Rather than subdivide classes hierarchically or "vertically" into discrete, mutually exclusive units, preference is consistently given to juxtaposition at the same stage of division—on the horizontal axis—of potentially overlapping subclasses.

The price paid for the shallow hierarchical structure of the classification is, then, the risk of cross-classification. At the same time, however, it is precisely its shallow hierarchical structure and tendency to juxtapose related subjects at the same stage of division which give the Warburg classification its unique significance, as the rest of this section aims to

show with reference to specific examples. The following discussion draws on the *Catalog of the Warburg Institute Library* (second edition, 1967), which represents the first authoritative statement of the classification and shows it in the form in which it has by and large remained up to the present day. References to the major bibliographic classification schemes which have passed through several editions are taken principally from earlier significant editions (wherever possible, contemporaneous with the *Catalog*) because these capture an earlier state of knowledge; where relevant, however, reference has also been made to the current editions of these schemes.

In Section 3.2, it was established that one of the main aims of the Warburg classification has always been to make interconnections between different areas of knowledge visible. A particularly good illustration of this aspect of the scheme is furnished by the classification of Class F, History of Science, which is divided into the following subclasses: Natural Sciences (FF); Magic (FB); Magical Objects (FC); Sorcery, Freemasonry and Rosicrucianism (FD); Zoology, Botany and Pharmacy (FO); Alchemy and Chemistry (FG); History of Medicine (FE); Mathematics (FN); Divination (FM); Prophecy (FH); Astrology and Astronomy (FA); Cosmology (FI); and Geography (FP). The most remarkable feature of this section of the classification is the connections which it establishes between the enlightened, "sophisticated" sphere of science and the unenlightened, "primitive" realm of magic—connections suggestive of a pre-Enlightenment world view within which science and magic were not yet polarized. Not only, however, does this section of the classification suggest interconnections between subjects which intellectual historians have come to regard as distinctly separate; it also posits a parity or equality between these subjects by placing them on the same horizontal axis.

The uniqueness of the classification's treatment of the History of Science emerges clearly when we compare the treatment of subjects such as magic and divination in other bibliographic classification schemes. A particularly illustrative counterexample is furnished by Brown's Subject Classification, which places Divination, Prophecies and Sorcery under Folklore and Occult Science (within Religion); neighbouring subjects are Demonology and Witchcraft, Fairies, Monsters, Dragons, Unicorns, Werewolves and Phantom Ships, all of which clearly belong in the realm of superstition rather than science. We find similar, if less extreme, arrangements in the

major schemes. The sixteenth edition of *DDC* (1958) places Divination and Astrology under Occult Sciences (within Philosophy) together with Apparitions, Hallucinations, Witchcraft, Palmistry, Charlatanry, Telepathy and Spiritualism; the most recent edition retains much the same subject arrangement, now under the heading Parapsychology and Occultism. Right up to the present day, LC similarly classes Magic and Astrology as Occult Sciences (within Psychology) alongside Ghosts, Demonology, Witchcraft, Seers and Fortune-Telling. The first edition of Bliss's Bibliographic Classification, notwithstanding the flexibility afforded by the provision of alternative locations, offers fundamentally conventional subject groupings within Pseudopsychology, which concentrates on clairvoyance and divination, and within Folklore, which deals with magical and superstitious beliefs and traditions.

All of these schemes, then, relegate subjects such as magic and divination to the realm of superstition. They do this in the first place by bringing these subjects into proximity with others which implicitly discredit them (such as fairies, apparitions and charlatanry). Furthermore, they achieve the same end through their hierarchies. In *DDC16*, for example, Occult Sciences occupy a position at the end or bottom of the Philosophy Class after Physiological and Abnormal Psychology, which follow Psychology and Pseudopsychology, which in turn come after Metaphysics and branches thereof; the more abstract, theoretical and "rational" aspects of the discipline thus precede the more physical, "non-rational" ones. Similarly, in LC, Occult Sciences are placed within Psychology after the cognitive (Consciousness, Cognition), affective (Affection, Feeling, Emotion) and applied (Applied Psychology; Developmental Psychology) aspects of the subject.

The eschewal of conventional classificatory hierarchies is one of the most remarkable features of the Warburg Institute Library classification. Following on from the above, we may take the classification of Psychology as a first example of this tendency. The majority of bibliographic classification schemes class Psychology under Philosophy, thereby underscoring its rational, "mental" component. They also tend to adopt an Aristotelian, mental faculty-based approach and—as was noted above—to progress from the higher, "rational" aspects of the discipline to the lower, "non-rational" ones. The Warburg classification, however, places Psychology (DA) at the beginning of Social Patterns (later Cultural History) and subdivides it in the following way:

General <i>Textbooks</i> History of Psychology Experimental Psychology Gestalt Psychology	DAF
Apperception <i>Sense Perception</i> <i>Imagination</i> <i>Emotion and Will</i> <i>Memory</i>	DAD
Symbol <i>Subconscious: Dreams</i>	DAA
Animal Psychology Child Psychology	DAN
Psychopathology <i>Psychoanalysis</i> <i>Schizophrenia</i> <i>Character</i> <i>Psychology of Genius</i> <i>Temperaments</i> <i>Physiognomy and Gestures</i> <i>Graphology</i> <i>Physiognomy in Art</i>	DAC

Figure 3. *The classification of Psychology (DA)*

Although it may be possible to discern hints of a conventional treatment here (in the faculty-based approach within Apperception; in the movement "downwards" from Apperception to Psychopathology), these are strongly counterbalanced by the emphasis that is placed throughout on non-rational psychology—the psychology of the lower mental faculties and "abnormal" psychology—which represents a significant departure from classificatory tradition.

Another good example of the Warburg Institute Library classification's non-normative approach to the organization of knowledge is furnished by the classification of Post-Classical and Modern Art (Class C), which is divided into the following subclasses: General; Topography; Iconography; Survival of Ancient Art; Early Christian Art; Illuminated Manuscripts; Italian, Spanish etc. Art (arranged by country); Applied Arts; Modern Art. The analogous classes within *DDC16* and early editions of LC (taken from the 1942 *Outline*) are subdivided as follows:

700	The arts	N	Fine arts
710	Landscape and civic art	N	General
720	Architecture	NA	Architecture
730	Sculpture	NB	Sculpture and related arts
740	Drawing and decorative arts	NC	Graphic arts in general; Drawing and design; Illustration

750	Painting	ND	Painting
760	Prints and print making	NE	Engraving; Prints
770	Photography		
780	Music		
790	Recreation		
		NK	Art applied to industry; Decoration and ornament
			DcD

Figure 4. *The classification of the arts in DDC16 and early editions of LC*

As this illustrates, *DDC* and *LC* broadly speaking adopt the same structure, beginning with the "useful" arts and moving thence to those which have pleasure rather than usefulness as their end; this sequence simultaneously runs from those arts which imitate nature most closely through to the least imitative. The system of the arts within the Warburg Institute Library classification is confined to the visual arts (in keeping with the "image"-centred focus of this part of the library); and the approach is topic-based and geographical. The classification hereby avoids separating the arts into the discrete classes of architecture, sculpture and painting or implying an hierarchical order of precedence.

6. Conclusion: the "mission" of the classification and shelf arrangement

Section 3 highlighted the importance attached to the pedagogic function of the shelf arrangement in the Warburg Institute Library, anchoring this in the context of a debate over open access in libraries at the turn of the twentieth century. In conclusion, it is appropriate to return to the question of just how the Warburg classification and shelf arrangement are intended to impact on users of the library.

In Section 5.1, it was suggested that the absence of an overarching principle of order in the Warburg classification befits the explorative ethos behind the library, whose main sections are best seen as approaches to a set of related intellectual problems rather than, as some commentators have supposed, as reflections of stages in a process of evolutionary cultural development which the user of the library may come to comprehend by moving through the collection in a particular direction. The discussion of the order within classes in Section 5.2 emphasized two aspects in particular of the classification: firstly, its

ability to establish interconnections and suggest equality between subjects which other bibliographic classification schemes separate and in some instances discriminate against; and secondly, its eschewal of conventional classificatory hierarchies.

These aspects of the Warburg Institute Library classification were also accorded significance by those most intimately connected with the library's development and organization. That the library's physical arrangement does not aim to impart a particular view of the organization of knowledge to the user, but instead to "train" him or her in a certain method of approaching intellectual problems is suggested by Saxl in his "Bericht über die Bibliothek Warburg und ihre Entwicklung zu einem öffentlichen Forschungsinstitut," in which he describes the library's distinctive character in the following terms ([1921], 117):

Its [the library's] significance rests above all on its manner of arrangement. The arrangement by "problems"—as conceived by Professor Warburg—inevitably confronts the user with the intellectual interconnections first perceived by Warburg between questions which academe has been accustomed to treat as separate, and it enables him [the user] ... to get to the very heart of intellectual problems, for Professor Warburg's genius resided in his ability always to see the part in terms of the whole.

[ihre Bedeutung beruht vor allem auf dem »Wie« ihrer Zusammenstellung. Die von Professor Warburg erdachte Aufstellung nach Problemen stößt den Besucher mit Naturnotwendigkeit auf die vom Gründer zuerst gesehenen geistigen Beziehungen zwischen bislang in der Forschung noch getrennt behandelten Fragen, und bringen ihn ... an das Wesentliche der wissenschaftlichen Probleme heran, da es Professor Warburg in genialer Weise verstanden hat, jede Einzelfrage unter universalem Aspekt zu sehen.]

As the user moves through the library, the revelation of often unexpected links between diverse subjects gives him or her a form of intellectual training: the act of becoming accustomed to perceiving interconnections between diverse subjects promotes a mental agility and open-mindedness that in turn constitute the ability to forge innovative intellectual links. Through experience of the Warburg Institute Library classification and shelf arrangement, the user may

thus acquire a facility akin to wit which can inject the spirit of invention into scholarly research. Section 3.3 highlighted the affinity between the pedagogic ethos behind the open access public library at the turn of the twentieth century and the Warburg Institute Library's original mission. It is now, however, possible to discern a subtle but important difference: whereas the early public libraries sought to *shape* the minds of their users by their classifications and shelf arrangements, the Warburg Institute Library has always attached more significance to *training* its users' minds by its manner of arrangement.

The challenge issued by the Warburg classification to conventional subject arrangements is emphasized by Warburg in a note on the role of the library jotted down on Christmas Day 1927 in preparation for a forthcoming meeting of the library committee (WIA, III.12.6.1, [25]):

The library conceived as a weapon of enlightenment against orthodox dogmatism: Luther
The French Revolution
Natural sciences
Liberating the responsibility to think for oneself
[Die Bibliothek als Aufklärungswaffe gegen die orthodoxe Dogmatik entstanden: Luther
Französische Revolution
Naturwissenschaften
Befreiung der denkenden Selbstverantwortlichkeit]

Although these gnomic remarks are probably intended to apply to libraries in general, they focus attention on the mission of the Warburg Institute Library in particular, which may be described as the pledge to oppose intellectual orthodoxy and thereby to function as an intellectual spur. Luther; the French Revolution; the natural sciences: all these have sought or achieved liberation from the strictures of intellectual convention. In so doing, all have inspired in others "the responsibility to think for oneself"—the duty of the individual to map out his or her own universe of knowledge instead of following in the well-beaten track. Analogously, it may be said that the aim of the Warburg Institute Library classification is to endow users of the library with the impulse and wherewithal to develop intellectual independence.

References

- Account of the safe-guarded open access system in public lending libraries: prepared and circulated by the librarians in charge of English open access public libraries.* 1899. London: n.p.
- Bing, Gertrud. 1934. The Warburg Institute. *Library Association record* 4th ser. 1: 262-66.
- Bing, Gertrud. 1998. *Fritz Saxl (1890-1944): A biographical memoir: reprinted in the fiftieth anniversary year of his death.* London: The Warburg Institute.
- Brown, James Duff. 1898. *Manual of library classification and shelf arrangement.* London: Library Supply Company.
- Brown, James Duff. 1906. *Subject classification.* London: Library Supply Co.
- Bücher, Karl. 1912. *Hochschulfragen: Vorträge und Aufsätze.* Leipzig: Wörner.
- Dewey decimal classification and relative index.* 1958. 16th ed. 2 vols. Lake Placid Club, NY: Forest Press.
- Buzàs, Ladizlaus. 1986. *German library history, 800-1945.* Jefferson, NC: McFarland.
- Dziatzko, Karl. 1893. *Entwicklung und gegenwärtiger Stand der wissenschaftlichen Bibliotheken Deutschlands unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Preussens.* Leipzig: Spirgatis.
- Ebert, Friedrich Adolf. 1820. *Die Bildung des Bibliothekars.* 2nd ed. Leipzig: Steinacker und Wagner.
- Friman, Mari et al. 1995. Chaos or order?: Aby Warburg's Library of Cultural History and its classification. *Knowledge organization* 22: 23-29.
- Jürgens, Adolf. 1928. Die Stellung der Public Library im Bildungswesen der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika. *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 45: 19-33.
- Leyh, Georg. 1912. Das Dogma von der systematischen Aufstellung. *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 29: 241-59.
- Leyh, Georg ed. 1957. *Handbuch der Bibliothekswissenschaft.* 2nd ed. Vol. 3.2. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Library of Congress Classification: B-BJ, Philosophy, Psychology.* 2000. Washington, DC: Library of Congress Cataloging Distribution Service.
- Milkau, Fritz ed. 1933. *Handbuch der Bibliothekswissenschaft.* Vol. 2. Leipzig: Harrassowitz.
- Mills, Jack and Broughton, Vanda. 1978. *Bliss bibliographic classification: Class I, Psychology & Psychiatry.* 2nd ed. London: Butterworth.
- Mitchell, Joan S. et al. ed. 2003. *Dewey decimal classification and relative index.* 22nd ed. 4 vols. Dublin, OH: OCLC Online Computer Library Center.

- Molbech, Christian. 1833. *Ueber Bibliothekwissenschaft oder Einrichtung und Verwaltung öffentlicher Bibliotheken*. Leipzig: Hinrich.
- Outline of the Library of Congress Classification*. 1942. Washington, DC: Library of Congress Processing Department.
- Petzholdt, Julius. 1856. *Katechismus der Bibliothekenlehre: Anleitung zur Einrichtung und Verwaltung von Bibliotheken*. Leipzig: Weber.
- Saxl, Fritz. [1921]. "Bericht über die Bibliothek Warburg und ihre Entwicklung zu einem öffentlichen Forschungsinstitut." In Stockhausen, *Kulturwissenschaftliche Bibliothek Warburg*, pp. 116-24.
- Saxl, Fritz. 1923. Die Bibliothek Warburg und ihr Ziel. In Saxl, Fritz ed., *Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg 1921-1922*. Leipzig: Teubner, pp. 1-10.
- Saxl, Fritz. 1926. Bericht über die Übersiedlung der Bibliothek Warburg aus dem Hause Heilwigstraße 114 in den Neubau Heilwigstraße 116. In Tilmann von Stockhausen. 1992. *Die Kulturwissenschaftliche Bibliothek Warburg: Architektur, Einrichtung und Organisation*. Hamburg: Dölling und Galitz, pp. 183-87.
- Saxl, Fritz. 1970. The History of Warburg's Library (1886-1944). In Gombrich, Ernst H., *Aby Warburg: an intellectual biography*. London: The Warburg Institute, pp. 325-38.
- Sayers, William Charles Berwick. 1967. *A manual of classification for librarians*. 4th ed. London: Deutsch.
- Schäfer, Hans-Michael. 2003. *Die Kulturwissenschaftliche Bibliothek Warburg: Geschichte und Persönlichkeiten der Bibliothek Warburg mit Berücksichtigung der Bibliothekslandschaft und der Stadtsituation der Freien und Hansestadt Hamburg zu Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Berlin: Logos.
- Schrettinger, Martin. 1808. *Versuch eines vollständigen Lehrbuches der Bibliothek-Wissenschaft oder Anleitung zur vollkommenen Geschäftsführung eines Bibliothekärs*. Vol. 1. Munich: Im Verlage des Verfassers.
- Settis, Salvatore. 1996. "Warburg continuatus: Description d'une Bibliothèque." In Baratin, Marc and Jacob, Christian ed., *Le Pouvoir des Bibliothèques: La Mémoire des Livres en Occident*. Paris: Albin Michel, pp. 122-69.
- Stockhausen, Tilmann von. 1992. *Die Kulturwissenschaftliche Bibliothek Warburg: Architektur, Einrichtung und Organisation*. Hamburg: Dölling und Galitz.
- Trapp, Joseph Burney. 1961. The Warburg Institute. *Studi medievali* 3rd ser. 2: 745-50.
- Trapp, Joseph Burney. 1984. The Warburg Institute and its Activities. *Kunstchronik* 37: 197-202.
- Trapp, Joseph Burney. 1986. Aby Warburg, his Library, and the Warburg Institute. *Theoretische Geschichte* 13.2: 169-86.
- Warburg, Aby. 1938-39. A lecture on serpent ritual. *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 2: 277-92.
- Warburg, Aby. 2001. *Tagebuch der Kulturwissenschaftlichen Bibliothek Warburg: Mit Einträgen von Gertrud Bing und Fritz Saxl*. Ed. Karen Michels and Charlotte Schoell-Glass. Berlin: Akademie.
- Warburg Institute. 1952. *Annual report 1951-1952*. London: The Warburg Institute.
- Warburg Institute. 1958. *Annual report 1957-1958*. London: The Warburg Institute.
- Warburg Institute. 1967. *Catalog of the Warburg Institute Library*. 2nd ed. Vol. 1. Boston: Hall.
- Wind, Edgar. 1935. The Warburg Institute classification scheme. *Library Association record* 4th ser. 2: 193-95.
- Yates, Frances. 2002. *Giordano Bruno and the hermetic tradition*. London: Routledge.
- Warburg Institute Archive.**
- The following sources are cited in accordance with Warburg Institute Archive (WIA) guidelines. TS = typescript; MS = manuscript.
- WIA, Ia.1. Annual Reports I: 1921-1932:**
- Ia.1.2.1. "Bericht über die Bibliothek Warburg für das Jahr 1922," TS, 18 fols.
- Ia.1.6.1. Annual Report 1926, TS carbon copy with MS corrections in Warburg's and Bing's hand; 23 fols. (fols. 1-13 by Saxl, fols. 14-23 by Warburg).
- WIA, Ia.2. Annual Reports II: 1933-1948:**
- Ia.2.1.1. "The Warburg Institute. Report—February 1934," TS carbon copy with MS notes in Bing's hand, 18 fols.
- WIA, I.4.5. Coloured charts and graphs showing the contents and growth of the library between 1886 and 1926:**
- I.4.5.1. "Bibliothek Warburg Jahrestabellen," 1886-1917, "Festwesen, Geschichte, Aestetik," 1 fol.
- I.4.5.2. "Bibliothek Warburg Jahrestabellen," 1886-1917, "Philosophie, Kulturgeschichte, Literaturgeschichte, Buchkunst," 1 fol.
- I.4.5.3. "Bibliothek Warburg Jahrestabellen," 1886-1917, "Kunstgeschichte, Zeitschriften, Philologie," 1 fol.

I.4.5.4. "Bibliothek Warburg Jahrestabellen," 1886-1917, "Archäologie, Zeitschriften," 1 fol.

I.4.5.5. "Bibliothek Warburg Wissenschafts-Tabellen," 1886-1910, 1 fol.

I.4.5.6. Accession graph 1886-1917, 1 fol.

I.4.5.8. "Jahrestabelle," annual book purchases, listed by subject, 1911-1915, 1 fol.

I.4.5.9. "Jahrestabelle," annual book purchases, listed by subject, 1916-1917, 1 fol.

I.4.5.10. "Neuanschaffungen" and "Vergleich des prozentuellen Zuwachses der einzelnen Abteilungen," 1921-1922, 1 fol., legend by Gertrud Bing.

I.4.5.13. "Neu-Erwerbungen," 1925-1926, 1 fol., legend by Gertrud Bing.

WIA, III.12.6.1. "Kuratorium, Sitzung 31.12.1927," MS.