

Jean M. Perreault
The University of Alabama in Huntsville, USA

An Essay on the Prehistory of General Categories (I): T. Jefferson

(Dedicated to Eric de Grolier on his 80th birthday)



Perreault, J.M.: An essay on the prehistory of general categories (I): T. Jefferson

Int. Classif. 18(1991)No.3, p. 134-142, 5 refs.

Predictable subarrangement of entries within a lowest-order class, or of canonically arranged (alphabetical, chronological,...) subclasses within a broader class, produce operational results similar to those aimed at by general-category theory. Most histories of classification ignore such detail. But such subarrangement may be visible (even though not discussed thematically) in older general classifications.

Discovery of a volume belonging to Thomas Jefferson led to examination of Jefferson's recently published catalogue "in his own order", in the hope of seeing in it the manifestation of awareness of the need for such subarrangement. Subclasses analyzed are "Africa", and "Asia" in his Chapter 29: "Geography". The results are at best mixed. Bibliographical details of the discovered Jefferson volume are given: two of the 14 items in it are unique, one of them of unknown authorship. Analysis of items within the mentioned subclasses was hampered by the loss (due to a fire at the Library of Congress in 1851) of many of them, and because of the inexactness of Jefferson's bibliographical descriptions (in some cases the only remaining trace of the works' existence). (Author)

1. Is there a History of Documentary-Classificational Subarrangement?

A documentary classification (it may be called, instead, a classification of the universe of knowledge or of subjects) is a sequence of concepts intended to be applied to the organizing of a body of documentary information so that information can be effectively and efficiently retrieved. The body of information can be in any of several forms: an encyclopedia, a catalogue, a bibliography, a library... But in each case the *universitas* is fragmented into "entries" that need (for the sake of eff./eff.) to be sequenced so that each entry's location in the string of entries can be predicted. Therefore there is some divergence between the entries of an encyclopedia, a catalogue, a bibliography (on the one hand), and the entries in a library (on the other): the first type consists of entries that are parts of a whole, a whole that must be exfoliated into those entries; the second type consists of separate wholes brought together so as to form a quasi-(super)-whole. The latter, the library, is the locus (in our time) of most of the discussion of theory-and-use of documentary classification -- though there have been cases, such as the

structure of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* in its recent editions, which have occasioned such discussion in one of the first-type bodies of information.

In any case (especially when, in dealing with the way things were prior to the day of domination by libraries, i.e., in the *history* of documentary classification), most talk about the documentary classifications that were in use prior to the first widely-adopted and -imitated and -varied-from documentary classification system, *Dewey's Decimal Classification*, manage to say very little or nothing beyond mention of their main classes. But documentary classifications (are we allowed to extend Ranganathan's dictum?) are *for use*. They are the means that make possible the retrieval of entries from the documentary universe that they organize, but that use seems (to one who wishes to know *how* that use comes about) next to impossible if there are no constituents of such systems of a finer-grained sort than the mentioned main classes.

How, in a word, are the main classes subarranged?

Use of a documentary collection is a function of the relation between memory and number of entries: if the collection consists of only 100 entries, the ten (say) classes into which it is divided will each contain (on average) ten entries, and each entry can be eff./eff. retrieved by remembering its position among its "class-mates", or (more commonly) by browsing. But if the collection consists of 1,000 entries, the ten classes will now have an average of 100 entries, and each entry becomes considerably more difficult to remember/browse without a plan of subarrangement.

This problem can be solved in one of two ways:

- (a) by the devising of a plan for subarrangement, or
- (b) by the division of the original main classes into smaller classes.

Plan a) can be expected to be relatively ad hoc (chronologically in one main class, geographically in another...), while plan b) means something such as the single class 'religion' coming to be divided by denomination, or the single class 'poetry' coming to be divided by genre.

The application of either of these plans can be manifested in one of two ways:

- (a) instructions to bibliographers/users, based on

thematic discussion (practice based on more-or-less explicit theory), or

(b) exemplification without thematic discussion. In our time the first is to be expected, since constant growth of collections is likely to result in disproportionate stress in some main classes compared to others, forcing constant reactive modification of the system: only thus will consistency be guaranteed over time and among bibliographers/users. But in a day when growth rates were far less harsh in their pressures upon bibliographers/users, arrangements already in place could be expected to be satisfactory for years or even decades: subarrangement, when forced, could easily enough be done where necessary but never thematized except in verbal instructions first to bibliographers and through them to users.

So the seeker for information as to subarrangement in the days before Dewey can expect less help from thematic/theoretical/ instructional pronouncements themselves enshrined in documents: the more likely source will be simply the encyclopedias/catalogues/etc. themselves.

But good examples of such (good, that is, in manifesting any main-class-subarranging ideas more sophisticated than alphabetical by author) classification-manifestations are not easy to find.

2. The Jefferson Volume and the Jefferson Catalogue

In late 1987 Mrs Ruth Weber of Monte Sano (Alabama) offered to Dr Delmus Williams, Director of the Library of the University of Alabama in Huntsville, a gift consisting of 194 volumes that had come into her possession partly through her relationship with the Burrows family of Buffalo (New York): many of these volumes had ownership marks referring back to one or another member of that family. One volume of that group came, in the end, to be identified as a volume from the library of Thomas Jefferson, whose library had been sold to the nation as the basis for the re-establishment of the Library of Congress.

2.1 The Volume's History

Jefferson decides between 1796 and 1814 to bind into one volume fourteen pamphlets on political economy published in the United States in 1793 and 1794, some reprinted in 1796. The binder's title (almost illegible because stamped into decomposing leather) is "Pamphlets / American". It is entered in Jefferson's catalogue as "Chapter 24, No. 263".

In the course of the War of 1812 the Capitol is burned by the British, destroying the Library of Congress. It is suggested that the library of the retired President/book-collector be purchased by the nation to form the basis of the resurgent Library. The 6,487 volumes are purchased for \$23,950. The whole sequence of events is rapid: the fire took place 24.Aug.1814; the

Senate voted in favor of the purchase 3.Dec.1814, the House of Representatives likewise 26.Jan.1815, and the President (James Madison) signed the bill into law 30.Jan.1815; the collection is moved from Virginia to the Capitol during April and May, and is in place by 8.May.1815.

Later that year the Librarian of Congress, George Watterston, issued a printed catalogue of the collection. Jefferson's "Chapters" (main classes) are retained, as were the shelf-marks of the volumes showing their size-group locations within those chapters. But the order of entries was changed from Jefferson's systematic order to alphabetical. Jefferson's descriptions of the entries are also retained, and his bibliographical style is (to say the least) whimsical, the lead-element of various entries being sometimes author, sometimes title (authors often enough being entered in a variety of forms or variably spelled; titles not always giving all the words in their title-page sequence, sometimes merely stating the subject.)

Thus, the alphabetical order that results from Watterston's alteration is even less efficient than it would have been had the lead-element in every case been its (established) author. Compare, for instance, the two sequences for the relatively small subclass (of chapter 29: "Geography"): Africa:

Jefferson's order

268. Shaw's Travels, fol.
154. Voyage en Syrie et en Egypte, par Volney, 2 v 8°
155. Lettres sur l'Egypte par Savary, 3 v 8°
43. Description de l'Egypte par Maillet, 2 v 12°
245. Voyage de Denon dans la basse et haute Egypte, 2 v 4° Lond. 1802
44. Voyage de Guinee, par Bosman, 12°
45. Description du Cap de Bonne Esperance, par Kolbe, 3 v 12°
156. Sparmann's Voyage to the Cape of Good Hope, from 1772 to 1776, 2 v 8°
157. Bruce's Travels, 6 v 8°
46. Relation de l'Afrique, par de La Croix, 4 v 12°
47. Histoire de l'Afrique Francaise, par l'abbé Demanet, 2 v 12°
48. Voyage de Dubois aus isles Dauphine, Bourbon, &c. 12°
49. Voyage de Madagascar, 12°

Watterston's order

157. Bruce's Travels, 6 v 8°
45. Description du Cap de Bonne Esperance, par Kolbe 3 v 12°
43. Description de l'Egypte, par Maillet, 2 v 12°
47. Histoire de l'Afrique Francaise, par l'Abbe Demanet, 2 v 12°
155. Lettres sur l'Egypte, par Savary, 3 v 8°
46. Relation de l'Afrique, par de la Croix, 4 v 12°
156. Sparmann's Voyage to the Cape of Good Hope, from 1772 to 1776, 2 v 8°
268. Shaw's Travels, fol.
154. Voyage en Syrie et en Egypte, par Volney, 2 v 8°
245. Voyage de Denon dans la basse et la haute Egypte, 2 v 4° Lond. 1802
44. Voiage de Guinee, par Bosman, 12°
48. Voiage de Dubois aux isles Dauphine, de Bourbon, &c. 12°
49. Voiage de Madagascar, 12°

Where Jefferson's order seems to proceed from general to special and groups several treatments of the same geographical sub-area together, Watterston's is almost perfectly random. That the last two entries are in the same relative positions in both orders is entirely accidental.

In 1826 Jared Sparks (man of letter, President of Harvard) commends the Library's collection in politics, partly because of Jefferson's volumes of bound pamphlets (the "siblings" of the 1793-1794 "Pamphlets / American".)

Jefferson was chagrined at Watterston's alteration of the order of entries within each Chapter, so much so that he deputed his grandson-in-law and amanuensis, Nicholas P. Trist, to make a copy of his original catalogue, now in the possession of Watterston (who refused to release it even to the Library when he left office, claiming it as personal property: it is now, apparently, lost), in his original order. It must be remembered that the typical organization of a library, before Dewey, was in two mutually exclusive structures: (a) the store of documents, arranged by storage-groupings; and (b) the catalogue, in which was invested whatever possibilities for retrieval the library's users could hope for.

Trist's MS copy of the original catalogue, along with a copy of the printed catalogue in alphabetical order, is bound up by persons unknown into a single volume. It eventually wanders into the library of Camp Wheeler, but it is effectively lost in that its identity is unknown. In 1917 it is given, misidentified as the catalogue of the library of the University of Virginia (another Jefferson foundation), to the Library of Congress. It is finally perceived to list (in the two different orders) the same set of entries, and is finally recognized for what it really is. It has been published as described in the bibliography s.v. Jefferson.

In 1851 (24.Dec.) there is another fire at the Library of Congress: it destroys about 2/3 of the whole maturing collection, including about the same proportion of the Jefferson nucleus (which has never been treated as a separate entity.) None of the "sibling" volumes of pamphlets praised by Sparks survive.

In 1849 Lorenzo Burrows is elected a member of the House of Representatives (through 1853). He is apparently less a book-collector than other Burrowses (there are no marks of his ownership on any of the Burrows-Weber gift books), but as a Member of Congress he was entitled to borrow from L C. It is hard to see how the volume being considered could have gotten to Buffalo except through his agency; and the fire could easily have destroyed the record of the transaction, which would explain the volume's remaining away even after the fire -- there may well be many others with similar provenances awaiting discovery in other attics.

2.2 History of the Identification

In June 1990, I, as Head of Special Collections at the U A H Library (University of Alabama in Huntsville), attended the Modern Archives Institute at the National Archives. There was a field trip to the Rare Books Division of the Library of Congress, where I saw a copy of the *Federalist* with Jeffersonian MS attributions of authorship on the flyleaf. I did not closely examine it, and thus did not become familiar with his hand; but I did come to realize that such inscriptions were his habit.

In October 1900 I finally began to process the Weber gift. The delay has been partly due to a misapprehension of the collection as consisting largely of materials relevant to Buffalo (N.Y.), because the few legible spines (cloth-bound) made such mention. The residue, leather-bound, was largely unreadable -- including this volume. But when title-pages were examined, works of Bolingbroke, Hume, Smollett, and the like emerged, testifying to an interest much broader than local history of an area of little interest to Northern Alabama.

Many of these volumes had to be re-bound to be usable. But they were at least easily identified, their usefulness easily assessed. The volume in question was quite otherwise. It could be re-bound as well, but its contents made it rather less appealing except from an almost purely antiquarian point of view. Would our students (or even our faculty) gain much from such a collection? Since it consists of fourteen separate works, perhaps it would become more useful if broken up into its constituents, each then re-bound and catalogues/classified separately --?

Bibliographical identification of the fourteen works produced the data as given in Table 1.

Twelve of the fourteen, therefore, are from relatively commonly to quite rarely held by American libraries: the volume, on that showing, is not extremely rare. But the two *not* listed as held in any other library (according either to Mansell's pre-1956 National Union Catalog, or to O C L C) are another matter, neither of them listed in the standard scholarly bibliographies, presumably because not available for inspection.

But (however interesting) this volume is already falling apart: to be used it must be rehabilitated. Only its historical *documentary* value had been taken into account up to this point, not its (possible, but highly uncertain, even unlikely) historic, *artifactual* value. Only one member of the U A H Library staff was concerned with this latter value, at least as a possibility that needed to be ruled out before proceeding to actions that would wholly destroy that value: Richard Gayton, a lover of old books, a prospective antiquarian bookman. I had to consider the chance that his desire to see this volume as such continue to live might be more than mere sentiment.

Short title	Sabin no.	Evans no.	held by n libraries (Mansell)	Ascription of authorship by Jefferson; Anomalies
1) A citizen of America to the citizens of Europe Phil., 1793. 7pp.	(none)	(none)	(none)	authorship printed at end of text as "A citizen of the United States"
2) Letters of Pacificus... publ. originally in the year 1793. Phil.: S. H. Smith, 1796. 60pp.	29967	30533	12	"by Alexander Hamilton"
3) Letters of Helvidius... publ. originally in the year 1793. Phil.: S.H. Smith, 1796. 48pp.	(none)	30734	15	"by James Madison"
4) A statement of facts, concerning Joseph Ravara, written by himself. Phil.: T. Dobson, 1793. 21pp.	67979	26053	3	Sabin describes as 81pp.
5) An appeal to the legislature of the U.S.... By Andrew G. Fraunces... [N.Y.?]: the author, 1793. 23pp.	25688	25504	2	
6) Letters addressed to the yeomanry of the U.S.... By an American farmer, Phil., 1793. 24pp.	(none) (see note)	25724	8	"by Doctr. Logan / by Doctor Logan"; Sabin 39242 and 39243 by (?) same author, but spelled Laughan; two copies bound consecutively in this volume
7) The speeches of Mr. Smith, of South Carolina ... on the subject of certain commercial regulations,... Phil., MDCCXCIV. 24pp.	84835	27714	16	"Wm" inserted between Mr. and Smith
8) Speech... by James Madison in support of his proposi- tions... N.Y.: Greenleaf, 1794. 69pp.	(none)	27248	14	identified in Mansell as Sabin 43721, but this number refers to a later- printed collection rather than to the 1794 imprint
9) An address from William Smith... Phil., 1794. 32pp.	84816	(none)	8	William Smith = W. Loughton S.
10) An enquiry into the principles and tendency of certain public measures. Phil.: T. Dobson, 1794, 130pp.	22647	27782	22	"by John Taylor"; entered in Sabin as anonymous

11) A definition of parties... Phil.: F. Bailey, 1793. 16pp.	94489	26861	12	"by I.[=J.] Taylor"
12) A review of the revenue system... By a citizen. Phil.: T. Dobson, 1794. 130pp.	24363	26973	12	"Mr. Findlay"; the author is spelled Findley by Library of Congress.
13) To the freeholders of Fairfax... [no imprint] [3]pp.	(none)	(none)	(none)	"R. Bland Lee" (in contents note); ascription printed at end to Richard B.L.
14) To the freeholders of the district of Fairfax... [no imprint] 22pp.	95923	(none)	3	"I. [=J.] Nicholas", but entered by L C under William A. Burwell, 1780(?)–1821, i.e., perhaps 16 years old when he published this pamphlet; entered in Sabin as anonymous

Table 1: Bibliographical identification of the 14 works

Could this volume be a duplicate of one held by the L C in the Rare Books Division? The idea did not persuade. Instead, I sought to find the series-identity of one of the constituent fourteen that I had somewhere (now forgotten) seen mentioned as "number 6" in some important series. No.6 is the Logan item (so numbered in handwriting at the top of its title-page); and many were the bibliographical tools ransacked in the hope of placing it. Mansell in particular was examined under all sorts of series-title possibilities (*American pamphlets...*, *American political pamphlets...*, *Pamphlets...*, *Political pamphlets...*), even under the owner-as-main-entry "Jefferson", in case the duplicate-theory might prove true (one should, in that case, find an entry with a contents note identical to the enumeration above...).

Failure in all these attempts somehow brought back to mind the recently published Jefferson catalogue. Examination of it was not facilitated: it has no index. So the list of Chapters was scanned to see which would most likely include such a volume, since such an approach would have been normal for a friend of Jefferson's, alone in the house, told by the master to use the library on his own (i.e., unable to ask "do you have work W? and in which Chapter is it kept?"). So I guessed Chapter 24 (correctly, as it turned out), one of the largest of the 44 Chapters: "Politics... Government..." In the recently published version it extends from p.79 to p.92; and since I was not sure of the nature of Jefferson's systematic intra-Chapter order, I simply scanned all entries, hoping to see something such as the first work in the volume, *A citizen of America...*, or something else that would establish the connection. But that did not happen, at least not by means of a match with any of the fourteen title-pages. What *did*

obtrude was something I had not previously noticed on the volume itself, i.e., the binder's title "Pamphlets/American", which I had not previously noticed on the spine because of the sad condition of the leather of the binding: split, hinges loose (one quite severed), the lettering almost wholly obliterated by wear and decomposition of the material itself. Even more important were the dates (which corresponded to what I already knew of the contents), and the size (octavo, which tallied).

This volume at U A H might therefore be in fact a duplicate of the (originally) Jefferson volumes, and might therefore have belonged to the President, and might therefore have an artifactual (historic) value far in excess of its scholarly (historical) value.

It had been noted that the volume contained various MS inscriptions: a table of contents on the flyleaf, attributions of authorship on title-pages where no such printed attributions were given. This in turn suggested a similarity to the practice noticed, at the Rare books Division of L C, in Jefferson's copy of the *Federalist*. The edition of the *Federalist* that came to U A H in the Burrows-Weber gift included the pamphlets in this volume whose authors were the pseudonymous "Helvidius" and "Pacificus", and on those pamphlets in this volume there were the same MS attribution as in the *Federalist* in Washington.

A piece of information of capital importance had been ignored up to the point of tentative identification of this volume with the entry in Jefferson's catalogue at precisely entry 263 of Chapter 24: the book-plate inside the front cover, which reads "Library of Congress, Chapter <24> No. <263>", with the numbers in brackets written in, the rest printed: all too manifestly a property label attached subsequent to the transfer of

ownership from the private collection (of Jefferson) to the public (of LC) -- but unfortunately not even noticed by me until thus forced upon my attention by correspondence.

If this was now clearly one of the 6,487 volumes sold in 1815, whose are the MS author-attributions? I was still unwilling to jump all the way to the conclusion that has since been established. I first thought (ignoring the MS attributions only vaguely recalled from Jefferson collection in LC's Rare Books Division) that there was a connection with the Trist task of copying out the catalogue in the original owner's own order: that these could be annotations carried out by that scribe. But to verify the handwriting of such a comparatively little known person would be difficult, to say the least. Therefore, putting into play the principle of the drunk who looks, during the night, for his lost keys under the lamppost ("I know this may not be where I lost them -- but if I look farther away, in the dark, I won't be able to see them"), I looked to see whether there were, in the little developed collection in this regard at U.A.H., samples of Trist's grandfather's-in-law orthography. And I not only found such a sample, but quickly realized that the unheard-of was true: that this volume was not only from the Jefferson collection sold to LC, but bore manifold holographic traces of the third President's original ownership and attention. (How, I reasoned at last, *could* Trist have thus annotated a volume already in use at LC? This conclusion, like the other, should have been made far earlier.)

Not only is the general style of the orthography strikingly similar to that of well attested Jeffersoniana, but certain mannerisms are conclusive: initial "b" (l.c.) never has a preparatory upstroke, "of" is always written in a very characteristic and recognizable way, the upstroke of the "f" forming not the usual loop at the top but a hairpin bend; "S" (u.c.) is very precisely drawn as two continuous C's, with a pronounced knob at each terminus.

But, all this evidence notwithstanding, all these conclusions were reached in a vacuum: this volume of pamphlets corresponds in several crucial bibliographical points to a description in a catalogue, a description not as precise as one might hope for; this handwriting matches that of Jefferson in form, but might there be material inadequacies, e.g., is the ink of the period? Is there already a copy of these pamphlets, bound so, at the Library of Congress?

All this evidence and the conclusions to which it leads -- all come to very little if (as had to remain a possibility, at least for the moment) there is another volume at LC that satisfies all the same bibliographical points. What, in that case, do we really have? a duplicate, somehow (after all, witness item 6 in this very volume)? a fraud? So James Gilreath (one of the editors of the Jefferson library catalogue) was contacted at the LC Rare Books Division; he reported that there was indeed no volume in the Jefferson collection

that agreed on the points: the volume in hand is at least not a duplicate. But more nearly direct comparison was necessary to fill the evidential vacuum: photocopies of the book-plate, of the flyleaf table of contents, and of several title pages with MS author-attributions were sent to Gilreath, who answered in a letter of 1.Nov.1990:

...There is no question in my mind that the pamphlets are from Thomas Jefferson's Library and were once part of the Library of Congress collection. The handwriting is Jefferson's; the bookplate is the original LC bookplate...

3. What is Jefferson's Mode of Subarrangement?

Jefferson was chagrined, as mentioned, so much so as to manage to get copied out his own catalogue of the collection, at the change from systematic to alphabetical order in its subarrangement of the entries in each Chapter. If it meant this much to Jefferson, it must (we presume) have been advantageous in its original order, disadvantageous in its altered order. As I put it above, the entries can be eff./eff. retrieved (= the collection can be eff./eff. used) only if "each entry's location in the string of entries can be predicted." But the retrieval of the Jefferson volume ("Chapter 24, No. 263") was *not* eff./eff. facilitated by the presence of the catalogue in Jefferson's own order of entries. What else could I have asked for?

Is it enough to have such a catalogue with entries in such an order? If not, what is necessary beyond the *facts*? Jefferson wrote to Watterston that the order of entries is "sometimes analytical, sometimes chronological, & sometimes a combination of both" (Jefferson, 1989: 3); what is needed, beyond this sort of meta-principle, is for the querist to know the *principle* that is being manifested in *this* case. It is of course true that such principles may never be thematized (at least in print), but may instead be taken by their originator to be either (a) obvious in some absolute sense, so as to need no explanation at all, or (b) not absolutely obvious but still such that examination of the entries arranged in conformity to them will allow the principles here manifested to emerge inductively (much as a librarian, familiar with the system of classification-on-the-shelves, is able to browse the store of books arranged on the shelves even though patrons, unfamiliar to that extent, cannot.)

Since a) is not the case here, induction -- b) -- is what is necessary. What is Jefferson's mode of subarrangement of the entries in his Chapters? Is there any prefiguration, in Jefferson's cataloguing practice, of the idea of general categories? (I take it as in principle true until proven false that the idea of general categories, in some inchoate form, is fundamental to *any* successful theory/practice of subarrangement.)

Dahlberg (1, p.70) reports that Konrad Gesner uses conceptual *Standard-Unterteilungen* in that the same geographical area is similarly divided in the main

classes Geography and History, but that since he does this by the use of Praekombinationen it somehow does not qualify as authentic general-categorization. But I would argue (a) that if a catalogue were to be issued once only (or if a library classification were to be applied to a collection of works that was not expected to grow) it would be foolish to set up an elaborate mechanism to guarantee uniform replication of the same principles in later (expanded) editions of the catalogue or in the case of additional works entering the library. But this lack of a mechanism for up-dating would not mean that the *conceptual* order of the enumerative classification did not manifest the general-categoric idea, however inchoately. I think this because (b) to argue that precombination somehow exiles the idea of general categories is perilously close to arguing that the enlivening idea of a classification is visible in its notation. It is possible to see, in C C or U D C, that they are general-categoric, but even if L C C is non-general-categoric that cannot be seen in its notation: one must examine the pattern of subdivision in its schedules along with examining its notation to come to such a (not entirely correct) conclusion -- ask anyone who has ever had to build numbers in the Social Sciences in L C C (class H).

Can we see such an inchoate idea in Jefferson's catalogue's entry-order? Let us examine the simple example given above where the order of entries for the sub-Chapter "Africa" (in the Chapter 29, "Geography") were shown to compare Jefferson's with Watterston's order:

Travels (by Shaw) -- far less general than the title leads one to expect: focuses on Barbary and Levant, i.e., the whole of North Africa, Egypt, and the eastern shore of the Mediterranean; if Levant = Syria, then this is appropriately first because it includes large territories (west from Egypt) not covered in the next entry; first published in the 1730's

Voyage in Syria and Egypt (by Volney) -- only a part of the continent, the part first encountered by Europeans, which probably means that other parts will be sequenced in the order of their historical relationship with Europe; that the work also deals with an adjacent extra-African area may justify its placement as second i.e., more general than those on Egypt alone

Letters on Egypt (by Savary) -- the same part-of-the-continent as subject, but clearly not sequenced alphabetically by author or title; perhaps chronologically by first publication? (See the note on the next entry)

Description of Egypt (by Maillet) -- like the preceding entry, less general than Syria Egypt, and therefore appropriate alongside Savary, but inappropriate since published earlier (1730's as against 1780's)

Voyage in lower and upper Egypt (by Denon) -- first published in the 1790's and thus appropriately last of its group

Voyage to Guinea (by Bosman) -- the direction of Jefferson's 'tour' of the continent seems set by this: counterclockwise; published in 1705

Description of the Cape of Good Hope (By Kolbe [a name controlled by LC in the form Kolb]) -- further on around the continent; first published in the 1740's

Voyage to the Cape of Good Hope (by Sparrmann [a

name controlled by L C in the form Sparrman]) -- first published in the 1780's, and in any case less general than the preceding because focusing on events of the 1770's

Travels (by Bruce) -- like Shaw, much less general than it appears to be: it covers only Abyssinia, again in line with the counterclockwise pattern set up earlier

Relation of Africa (by LaCroix) -- surprisingly, the only truly general work in the sub-Chapter, totally inexplicable in its placement here; also one of the earliest: 1688

History of French Africa (by Demanet) -- [listed neither in Mansell nor O C L C, a victim therefore of the fire of 1851, but the only one from among these 13, whereas in many other parts of the catalogue more are lost than are present] Mansell lists a *New history*... published in the 1760's, so this was probably earlier; the author has another title on parts of French Africa (Senegal and Gambia), and we thus encounter another example (like the preceding one) where the expected pattern is avoided: this, to fit the pattern, would have to be entered between Guinea and those on the Cape of Good Hope

Voyage to the islands of Dauphine and Bourbon (by Dubois) -- conforming to the pattern, these are actually about subsidiary parts of the continent (D. = Madagascar, B. = the Mascarenes); published in 1669

Voyage to Madagascar -- anonymous, but identifiable as published in 1722, later than the preceding one.

Rather than general-followed-by-special, then, we see (what might be called) a canonical order, or perhaps a quasi-chronological order, with periods of coverage and (occasionally) date of publication as the next level of subarrangement. But the presence of at least two foreign bodies in this small sequence is enough to convince us that even the systematic Mr. Jefferson had his quirks, or more likely his moments of inattention. Nor can we totally rule out error on the part of the copyist, Trist -- we do not know how carefully Jefferson, the only person who could have corrected such errors, examined the copy once it was finished: after all, how much use would it have been to him, with the collection miles away?

Is the part-pattern-part-whimsy we see in the Africa-sequence typical? Let us do a similar analysis on another sub-Chapter parallel to Africa: "Asia":

Voyages in the Levant (by Hasselquist) -- as against current usage of the name, this focuses not merely on Palestine and Lebanon, but on Egypt as well, and is thus almost identical in subject to the first entry in "Africa", and like it covers part of the appropriate continent and part of a contiguous continent; first published in the 1740's

Voyages in the Troade (by LeChevalier) -- another partially comprehensive focus, not merely the Greek parts (Troy, etc.) of Asia Minor, but Greece proper; published first in the 1780's

Discoveries of various learned travelers in Russia and Persia -- [lost, and not available through Mansell, but clearly sequential upon the two preceding entries, i.e., starting from the point of earliest contact with the 'oldest' part of Europe, Greece; there is even a link to the preceding sub-Chapter, "Europe", which ends with several works on Turkey, and last of all: *Travels into Italy, Greece, Turkey, and the Holy Land and Egypt (by Sandy)*; note also that "Asia" not only begins at the geographical point that links it with the preceding sub-Chapter, but ends in a similar way, with a work on India and Egypt -- followed by the first work on the sub-Chapter

"Africa", which we have already seen to be on Palestine and Egypt]

Voyages and discoveries in Russia (by Muller) [a name controlled by LC in the form Mueller] -- focuses not merely on Russia, but more particularly on the Northeast Passage, and thus clearly appropriate to follow the preceding entry, even had it been published earlier

Voyages (by Olearius and Mandeslo) -- on Russia and Persia, and thus appropriate here according to Jefferson's treatment of other partially comprehensive classes, but inappropriate in that the next-to-preceding one has the same double focus

Voyages in Persia and the East Indies (by Chardin) -- this follows the preceding entries appropriately (but see the note to the next entry)

Topographical and political tableau of Siberia, China, Asia, and America (by Cordier de Launay) -- Jefferson's approach to partially comprehensive classes gets him into trouble with this and the preceding entry: that one focused on Russia and its southern neighbor, this on Russia and its eastern neighbors -- which should come first? His answer suggests the weakness of his (unthematized) principles of subarrangement by a sort of circular pattern; such a pattern was clearly evident in the sub-Chapter "Africa" in the form of a counterclockwise 'flow', here (as becomes evident below and is already begun with his 'passage' from the Levant, northwest to the Aegean, thence northeast to Russia, etc., i.e., clockwise; I would argue that the reason Jefferson 'goes' from Russia to Persia, and then starts over from Russia to China etc., is that the latter flow will lead the entries on to Southeast Asia, Australia, and the Pacific islands -- whereas if that flow had come first the Russia + Persia entries would not 'attach' to anything, and would thus need to come last, which is both manifestly unsystematic and prevents the mentioned ending on the India + Egypt (which provides the link to the "Africa" sub-Chapter); published 1806

Memoirs on China (by LeCompte) -- [lost, but apparently an appropriate link between the preceding and the following entries]

Description of China (by Grosier) -- the title correctly gives the focus; first published in the 1780's

Compendium of the history of the East Indies (by Puente) -- [lost, but at least apparently an appropriate link between the preceding and the following entries; the author is possibly the learned Jesuit author of books of meditation, whose dates would place the publication of this around 1700]

Voyages in the seas of the Indies (by LeGentil) -- appropriately continues the flow; first published in the 1760's

Voyage in the East Indies (by Schouten) -- nearly identical in focus to the preceding entry, but first published in the 1650's, and thus chronological inappropriate after LeGentil

Travels (by Mackintosh) -- an entry even more general than Cordier de Launay (even more so that LaCroix [in "Africa"], and accordingly an embarrassment to one hoping, like myself, to see marks of systematicity in Jefferson's subarrangement: the focus is Europe, Asia, and Africa -- practically the whole 'olde' world: how can it come here, where it does, in the middle of the Asia sequence, and for that matter between the East Indies (general [Puente, LeGentil, Schouten]) and the East Indies (special: Celebes [cf Woodard, below]?) The only answer is one that allows, in a special collection, that each work be classed legitimately by whatever points in it are relevant to the collector's special interests: were I, with my personal interest in Siger de

Brabant, to buy a copy of T. K. Seung's (1976) *Cultural Thematics: the Formation of the Faustian Ethos*, I'd shelve it not as a general library does, with medieval Italian literature, but in my own "Chapter" PHILOSOPHY--CHRONOLOGICAL: MEDIEVAL--SIGER -- even though its treatment of him accounts for only three of its almost-300 pages. Similarly, Jefferson's catalogue is *not* (in origin) a public catalogue, but rather just an aide-memoire -- a point which is strongly reinforced by his style of bibliographical description, especially in such cases as Shaw's *Travels* or Bruce's *Travels*: this sort of shorthand description tells far less than is necessary to anyone who is not already familiar with the work to which it refers. Nor does Jefferson's idea of a subject catalogue conform to ours: it is far closer to Cutter's (still 80 or so years in Jefferson's future), in which to name the subject of a work is to place that work into a broad group (such as GEOGRAPHY--ASIA), even if its reason for acquisition was the fact that it was known to have a particular thorough treatment of theocracy in Tibet or burial customs in northern India: cf. Miksa (1983).

On the customs and arts of Africa, Asia, and America (by Poyvre [a name controlled by LC in the form of Poivre]), -- even more problematical than the geographical partial comprehensiveness of the focus of this work is its unnamed (in the title) conceptual focus: tropical agriculture; it might seem to fit better into Chapter 7, "Agriculture", except that most of the titles therein contained are far more down-to-business instructionalities, whereas Poivre embeds the conceptual point in anthropological generalities; but still, why here, between (as again, like Mackintosh) the East Indies (general) and the East Indies (special)?

Voyage to the Asiatic islands and Canton (by Mortimer) -- [lost, but at least apparently an appropriate link between the preceding (Schouten) and the following (Woodard) entries]

Narrative of the Malays (by Woodard) -- focuses on Celebes, part of the East Indies

Account of the Pelew islands (by Wilson) -- further east from Celebes

New Holland and Botany Bay (by Eden) -- [lost, but at least apparently an appropriate link between the preceding and following entries] the focus here, the whole continent of Australia and in particular one point on its eastern seacoast, appropriately follows Woodard, but the intervening entry, Wilson, might better be grouped with the following five on Oceania in general

Account of Byron's, Wallace's, Carteret's, and Cook's voyage (by Hawkesworth) -- this and the four following entries all focus on the travels (esp. the last voyage (1776-1779, following the first (1768-1771) and the second (1772-1775))) of Captain James Cook, and here on some of his predecessor's (which makes placement of this entry first-in-its-group appropriate) -- demonstrating Jefferson's concentration, in his book-collecting, on recent publications about recent topics (of those surveyed here on Asia and Africa, a total of 37 works, only six are surely or probably from earlier than 1700, and at least 17 (lost items are in principle of uncertain date!) are published from the 1770's to 1806)

Cook's last (3d) voyage (by Ellis) -- [apparently lost] *Journal of cook's last voyage* (by Ledyard) -- published 1783, and thus possibly in appropriate date-sequence with the preceding three entries and certainly so with the following one

Cook's last voyage (a British official publication) -- published last of this group, 1784, and therefore appropriately listed last

On the passage to India thro' Egypt (by Capper) -- [apparently lost] the completion, even if somewhat forced (note the reversal of the appropriate direction), of Jefferson's (typical?) pattern of more-or-less circular flow around the continent in hand; and surely the cleverly placed link with the subsequent sub-Chapter "Africa".

4. Some tentative Conclusions

An analysis of the mere 1/2 of 1% of the 6,487 entries in Jefferson's catalogue is clearly insufficient to provide the evidence for anything more than tentative conclusions about his attitudes and expectations as a librarian (admittedly a *private* librarian, indeed *his own* librarian.) But these implicit points are of some importance: Jefferson neither bought nor catalogued for anyone besides himself, nor did he even turn the task of arrangement of the catalogue of his library over to any hireling. From the hypothetical contrary of these point would have flowed usages possibly much different from those he actually put into play.

As it is (rather than had Jefferson been formulating an eff./eff. catalogue for the use of an indeterminately large number of querists), Jefferson's catalogue provides a sequence of entries that could stimulate the memory of that person who had selected each of the works held and catalogued in it, but gives too little information to be helpful to a querist not in that fortunate position prior to the attempted retrieval.

Would indexes provide the means to eliminate these deficits? (Would the index provided by Watterston to his alphabetically rearranged, printed, catalogue?) An index that analyzed the contents of such a document as is entered at Chapter 24, No.263, could have allowed me direct access, rather than browsing access as detailed above. But non-analytical indexing, listing this document as "Pamphlets / American" would not have, since I had not seen that binder's collective title. What I call "direct" access through an index would qualify for that adjective only to the extent that such an index gives reference-entries under entry-words that would occur to me to search. But as we have seen, bibliographical style has a profound effect upon findability, and once again Jefferson's very lack of consistency would be likely to make indexes less than eff./eff., since analytical entries would be likely to be (just like main entries) sometimes under author, sometimes under title, the former sometimes under unexpected spelling, the latter sometimes under catchword rather than first word...

So, with 0.6% of Jefferson's entries examined and less than satisfactory systematicity seen to enliven their sequence, one can look forward to an examination of larger sectors from the same point of view without expecting to find these tentative conclusions overturned. The point that keeps the present effort from coming to less tentative conclusions is simply that the only hope of understanding Jefferson more definitively rests with a similar patience and thoroughness of

analysis: a sampling, for instance, would yield no results at all in regard to the point we seek; and the bibliographical vagaries require that no entry be accepted in the form given by Jefferson as being sufficient for a determination of that work's actual subject.

One can look forward to "an examination of larger sectors", but that will not be my own attempt, until I have looked first at other possible manifestations of general-category prefiguration in subject retrieval. These other attempts will focus on two even earlier librarians who seem, from the secondary literature, to be likely loci of such prefiguration: G. W. Leibniz (1646-1716) and Konrad Gesner (1516-1565). And what can be hoped for from such a look is manifestation of what, by its very uncertainty of presence in Jefferson's catalogue, tells me is essential for the general-categoric attitude: the application not merely of principle of subarrangement a) in sub-Chapter 1), and of principle b) in sub-Chapter 2), but the availability of *both* principles to subarranged any Chapter or other sector where it can contribute to eff./eff. (For instance, geographical sequence within a continent, yielding a group of entries focused on a coherent geographical sub-area within that continent; and that group being subarranged consistently by chronology of coverage (i.e., not merely by chronology of publication.)

It may well be the very up-to-date-ness of Jefferson's collection that kept him from seeing this need: each sub-area in the sub-Chapters "Africa" and "Asia" consisted of only one to four entries, most of them published within thirty years of their being placed as they were in the President's catalogue: the issue of background (older works) versus foreground (current works) was not obtrusive enough to call for a systematic effort to deal with it. Only in a larger catalogue (where sub-Chapters have grown to 100 or so entries on average) will the need arise that could generate such solutions.

(My attempts to find more convincing prefigurations of the general-categoric attitude, i.e., in Leibniz and Gesner, will be reported in a contribution to the 1991 (Toronto) International Study Conference on Classification Research.).

References

- (1) Dahlberg, I.: *Grundlagen universaler Wissensordnung*. Pullach bei Munchen: Verl. Dokument., 1974. xviii, 366pp.
- (2) Thomas Jefferson's Library: a Catalog with the Entries in his own Order. Edited by James Gilreath, Douglas L. Wilson. Washington: Library of Congress, 1909. [x], 149pp.
- (3) The National Union Catalog, Pre-1956 Imprints... London: Mansell, 1968-1981. 754v.
- (4) Miksa, F.: *The Subject in the Dictionary Catalog from Cutter to the Present*. Chicago: American Library Association, 1983. xiv, 482pp.
- (5) Seung, T.K.: *Cultural Thematics: the Formation of the Faustian Ethos*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1976. xviii, 283pp.