another Hebrew collection from Hamburg, the library of Heimann Joseph Michael, in 1848 (£1,030).

Much the poorer of the two ancient universities of England, by the 1820s Cambridge had to resort to increasing its purchasing funds, as Oxford and the Scottish universities had done, by a levy on its users. John Lodge's term of office as *bibliothecarius* was marked by a vigorous increase in the availability of funds for the purchase of books and for binding them. No vast large collections were purchased, but the library's holdings were extended by many significant items bought at auction sales, locally as well as in London.[30]

Edinburgh University Library had no funds with which to purchase specifically antiquarian and scholarly collections until 1841, when the Senatus allocated £400 per annum from the bequest to the university by General John Reid. By this time the university's legal deposit status had been withdrawn and replaced by an annual Treasury grant for library purchases of £575; this was, however, a welcome and significant addition to the annual purchasing grant of some £350 from the insolvent City Council in 1838. The grants to the other Scottish universities greatly increased their purchasing powers too.

Cabinets of curiosities

Such museums as had been established in the universities were mostly of natural history specimens. Edinburgh had an early one, established by Sir Andrew Balfour some time before 1689 and supplemented by Sir Robert Sibbald in 1697, which survived with occasional lapses until its remaining collections were transferred to the new Museum of Science and Art (later the Royal Scottish Museum) in 1861. However, the cabinet of curiosities was still accepted as a normal integral part of a well-found private or college library in the late eighteenth century, and was held to be a study resource which supplemented the collections of books and manuscripts. Most university and college libraries thus assumed a museum role until well into the nineteenth century. Collections of curiosities consisted especially of pictures (paintings, drawings and prints), antiquities (mostly coins and sculpted and engraved stones) and scientific instruments, but extended to skeletons and other anatomical specimens, skulls and other relics of the famous and infamous, and ethnological collections brought back by explorers and travellers. Indeed, these collections tended to draw visitors to libraries, and to remain more vividly in their memories as well

30 McKitterick, *Cambridge University Library*, vol. 2, 457.

as their memoirs than the finest manuscripts or printed books.[31] The opening of the remodelled library at St Andrews in the 1760s provided the opportunity to create a university museum within it. This lasted until the museum collection was transferred to the St Andrews Literary and Philosophical Society in 1838.[32]

The Hunterian Museum at the University of Glasgow was opened in 1807 to house Dr William Hunter's anatomical and antiquarian collections, his collections of manuscripts being deposited in the University Library.[33]

Arrangement of collections

Even in 1850 modern library classification was still some twenty years in the future, but the formal classification of knowledge was well under way; classification is, after all, an innate human activity. The science of taxonomy as a branch of natural philosophy was just beginning in earnest in 1750. Linnaeus had set out his order of natural genera in 1739. Denis Diderot published his *Encyclopédie* in Paris between 1751 and 1780 with subjects arranged in a carefully classified order. The Edinburgh printer William Smellie, however, organised his *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1768–71) in alphabetical order.

Most libraries were shelved in some kind of subject arrangement, but most locations were fixed and related to the cases and rooms in which the books were housed. The rational expansion of any subject sequence required extensive physical rearrangement. Many, if not all, volumes in the expanded sections needed to be given new shelf-marks or press-marks, and catalogues, be they printed or manuscript, laboriously updated. However, early attempts at classified arrangements of collections, with related subdivisions of basic divisions, can be found in libraries like that of Anderson's University, divided into four divisions of theology, philosophy, literature and history which were themselves subdivided and further subdivided again; philosophy included what later generations would call the social sciences, physical and natural sciences, and the arts.[34] These four divisions correspond closely to the five divisions set out by Revd Thomas Hartwell Horne for the British Museum library in 1824 – theology and religion, philosophy, arts and trades, history, and literature – with

31 P. B. Freshwater, 'Collecting beyond the book: Edinburgh University Library and the earliest university museums', *University of Edinburgh Journal* 39 (1999/2000), 237–42.
32 M. Simpson, '"You have not seen such a one in England": St Andrews University Library as an eighteenth-century mission statement', *Library History* 17 (2001), 41–56.
33 Until recently the full title of the director of university libraries at Glasgow was 'University Librarian and Keeper of the Hunterian Manuscripts'.
34 Tse, 'Radical Clydeside', 178–83.