

Insider/Outsider Methodological Problems with the Study of Astrology
Michael York
Bath Spa University College

British Association for the Study of Religion 50th
Anniversary Conference, Oxford (13-16 September 2004).

Bath Spa University College's Sophia Centre is the most recent attempt to re-develop the study of astrology from an academic perspective. Whilst there are related enterprises at other universities in Britain as well as the Seattle-based Kepler College, BSUC's is the first to offer a complete post-graduate programme in the study of cultural astronomy and astrology – thereby definitively closing a hiatus since the expulsion of astrological study from the University of Zaragoza in 1770. As is to be expected, the Sophia programme has, in its first two years, largely attracted a cohort of astrological practitioners. One of the core modules is designed on the sociological and phenomenological study of the subject. This paper discusses some of the difficulties BSUC's Sophia students have in developing a methodological grounding to a discipline that internally oscillates between the belief that it is an empirically-derived body of information and the consideration that it is a form of divination based on *a priori* Platonic/Neoplatonic principles.

Academic interest in the subject of astrology re-began in 1999 when the Sophia Trust in Britain sponsored the Research Group for the Critical Study of Astrology at Southampton University. The Trust subsequently has funded a Research Fellowship at the Warburg Institute in London and cosmology and divination modules as part of the M.A. programme in Mysticism and Religious Experience at the University of Kent, Canterbury. In 2002, the Sophia Trust launched a full post-graduate programme at Bath Spa University College with the establishment of the Sophia Centre for the Study of Cultural Astronomy and Astrology. The remit of this programme is objective investigation of the astrological discipline as a legitimate focus of research. The Sophia Centre's M.A. Programme is originally an initiative of Bath Spa's Study of Religions Department that follows in the line of phenomenological scholarship and comparative religion studies. This methodology has sought to distance value-neutral investigation of religion – any religion – from traditional, Christian theological-oriented religious studies that follow essentially an

apologetic approach incorporating religious bias. The Sophia Programme at Bath Spa, accordingly, endeavours to investigate the cultural aspects of astrology without passing judgment on the validity or invalidity of the subject itself.

In addition to the British initiatives – including the development of an M.A. in Archaeoastronomy at the University of Leicester, a B.A. programme has been authorised in July 2000 at Seattle's Kepler College in Astrology and the Liberal Arts (Washington State, USA). Under Professor Jesús Navarro-Artigas, in 2000, the University of Zaragoza (Spain) has developed a collaborative Research Project involving the departments of Philosophy, History of Art and Electronics and Communications Engineering into the History of Astrology. That same year, Zaragoza offered a course on Astrology and its History in Western Civilisation. In the academic year 2001-2002, the course was expanded from six credits to nine.

For the Sophia Centre in Britain, the interest remains with the culture and history of astrology or, more broadly, cultural astronomy in which astrology is one area along with archaeoastronomy, calendrical science, stellar religion and cosmology among others. The programme looks specifically at human behaviour as it is influenced by belief concerning the stars and heavens. Consequently, rather than understanding astrology as exclusively or even principally a matter of divination, the undertaking at the Bath Spa University College considers astrology as a cultural narrative that is concerned with the cosmos as a whole and dynamics of interaction that permeate this cosmos between all its various components – especially humanity. Astrology is simply a particular, traditionally established, mnemonic worldview that assumes the human being's micocosmic reflection in some form or another of the macrocosmic scope of the cosmos.

If there is a single area with which astrology in the twenty-first century is concerned, it would have to be with how and why people assign and determine value – perhaps in this case the projection of worth against the unavoidable awe concerning the firmament and our place within it. The relevance of any astrological contribution to axial study stands in contrast to the rising self-indulgence of our times that Justin Cartwright bemoaned in a recent article entitled the “Rise of the new infantilism” published in *The Guardian's Review* (05.07.03:7):

Fundamentalism ... is a kind of infantilism. Although it pretends to subsume the individual into a greater truth, it is in a sense the mirror image of the promotion of the self: it provides a simple, infantile, answer to the world's problems. Just as fairy tales simplify moral choices, and religions codify them, so fundamentalism discounts liberal democracy and human rights. In contemporary society it also provides an identity: look, I have discovered the truth and certainty, while you are still groping about in a kind of moral swamp. And from this certainty, as history has shown, consequences inevitably follow.

For Cartwright, the problem is not really the 'dumbing-down' that has been linked to television but is instead "a society that has no confidence in attributing value." From this follows both self-indulgence and infantile behaviour and, from these, childish political solutions and commercial promises. According to Cartwright, "It's a kind of make-believe because we don't know what our values are."

In astrology's pinning of the human enterprise to the full sweep of the cosmos, its thinking by default must question the attribution of significance and value at every turn. Confronted by the magnitude of the universe, the astrological inclination is almost invariably away from the elementary certainties of fundamentalism and toward the open-ended doubts and perpetual exchange embedded in cosmopolitanism. In the middle ages, someone like Trithemius of Würzburg, who was born in 1462, developed a complex system of astrological ciphers or encryptions to interact with astral intelligences or zodiacal archons. Today, astrological language is used and interpreted more in line with psychological understandings such as we see in the work of Liz Greene and Howard Sasportas.

But despite the current reinterpretation of astrological endeavour chiefly in terms of understanding personality and psychological dispositions, Sophia students have demonstrated an overt and frequently vociferous objection to the methodological study of the subject. Since most of the students are insiders, that is, practitioners who often earn their living through the casting and interpretation of natal charts for their clients, they tend to resist etic approaches to the subject and fail to see the relevancy

of developing an understanding of methodology to the pursuit of astrological interests. The BSUC remit for the establishment of its Sophia Centre, however, is expressly one that does not include the teaching of astrology *per se* but rather one that examines the *culture* of astrology. What this boils down to is that the essential focus of the Sophia Centre is on the sociology of astrology. In this, the Centre's origins in the University College's Department for the Study of Religions with its phenomenological study of religion is clear.

Until the advent of contemporary methodologies in which science became the *prima facie* only means to reliable knowledge, traditional didactic areas of focus included alchemy, the hermetic arts, numerology and astrology. In fact, originally astrology concerned the application of astronomy to human uses. As with the fluidity between alchemy and chemistry, the distinction between astrology and astronomy was nominal if it existed at all. Astronomy is simply the study of the stars, planets and other heavenly bodies and the phenomena that involve them; astrology is the practical application of astronomical knowledge to human concerns. Until the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century, astrology occupied a central place in the university curriculum.

As an astral form of divination, astrology is traced to the ancient Mesopotamians and Egyptians. We encounter little of the practice in Greece until after the time of Alexander the Great, but it flourished subsequently for irregular intervals under the Romans where professional astrologers were known as *chaldaei* or *mathematici*. As essentially a Hellenistic development, astrology came to combine Chaldean and Egyptian astral religions with Hellenic astronomy, mathematics and mythology. It was attributed to the Egyptian god Thoth, who was identified with the Greek Hermes and considered progenitor of the hermetic arts. During the Republic, respect for the Chaldaeans was considerably low, and they were expelled from the city and all of Italy in 139 BCE. Their fortunes reversed, however, during the civil wars and the Empire, though they were still subject to trials for treason and expulsion. Nevertheless, due to being increasingly consulted by the imperial family, eventually astrologers were only forbidden to consult the stars to determine the length of the emperor's life. Not until after the conversion of Constantine to Christianity did subsequent emperors issue various edicts forbidding all astrological consultation.

The Moors are credited with bringing astrology to Spain in the ninth century. The centrality of astrology to medieval epistemology is seen in the Faustian legend of Germany in which Faust is portrayed as an astrologer as well as a sorcerer. In France, astrology regained popularity during the reign of Catherine de Medici (1547-1559). English practitioners include Adelard of Bath (1075-1160), Michael Scot (c.1175-c.1232) and Roger Bacon (c.1214-1294). In the 16th century, John Dee used astrological symbols to construct his magical circle for the evocation of spirits. Consequently, even a superficial survey of the role of astrology in the history of Western culture indicates its pre-Enlightenment importance and the possibility if not likelihood of its function in shaping worldviews as well as views and memories of the past. From this perspective, it can be seen that astrology is a particular form of institutionalised collective memory that has played a significant part in the development of Western thought and, as is yet the case, a determinative function in the contemporary navigation of human life between the competing dimensions of the stellar, the psychological and the cyber.

In much of its Hellenistic origins, astrology is clearly a self-sufficient Platonic hermeneutic that has been systemically rather than empirically derived. With its Gnostic bias derived from Orphism, Plato, Plotinus and Hermeticism, astrology's revival in the Renaissance stressing a transcendental understanding of the cosmos and the idea of the inner divine core of each individual became seminal to the later theosophical theology of Helena Petrovna Blavatsky (1831-1891). Already before Blavatsky, in 1816, James Wilson published his *Complete Dictionary of Astrology* in England. Shortly afterwards, various astrological works appeared under the pseudonym of Raphael (Robert C. Smith, 1795-1832). By far, however, it was the theosophist Alan Leo (William Frederick Allen, 1860-1917) who laid the foundations for the present-day understanding of astrology as a 'science of the stars'. The current popularity of astrology finds its origins in the late 1930s with the emergence of daily horoscopes in newspapers. As a professional astrologer, Leo founded the journal *Modern Astrology* and authored numerous books on the subject. In the course of the 20th century, especially through its links with theosophy, astrology became the *lingua franca* of the 1960s counterculture as well as the New Age movements that have descended from it. Its use of the astronomical phenomenon of the precession of the

equinoxes has become the guiding framework within which the New Age of Aquarius has been heralded.

Consequently, astrology remains as a persistent tradition within the West, along with its post-Hellenistic offshoots in India and the Islamic world, that is part of the wider field of cultural astronomy, namely, the impact of beliefs and/or understandings of the heavens on human behaviour. As such, cultural astronomy includes such foci as astral divination beside astrology (e.g., making prognoses through the observation of eclipses, comets, meteors or weather patterns), stellar aspects of religion (e.g., basing festivals and/or agricultural enterprise on the appearance of particular constellations; the use of meteoritic 'stones from the sky' as objects of veneration; the intricacy of the Tibetan Buddhist Kalachakra ceremony), cosmology, calendrical development in general and archaeo-astronomy (e.g., concerning the decipherment of the purpose behind such megalithic sites as Stonehenge, Avebury, Newgrange, Loughcrew and so on). Among the Mesopotamians, Chinese, Indians and Mayans, in particular, ritual calendars emerged in order to keep terrestrial culture linked to the gods conceived primarily as dwellers in the sky above. Whilst all these and more constitute the proper objects of cultural astronomical study, understanding both the calendar and its nuanced legacy and the institutionalised astrological patterns of the heavens remain central features of Western cultural identity in that they are not only closely interconnected with its history but also still impact on its contemporary thought of today. This last, in the face of the prevailing scientific hegemony, is perhaps all the more paradoxical and, accordingly, merits particular attention by the academic community. In a world that is promoted as understood only through rational and empirical means, why do people remain fascinated with the paranormal of the occult? Along with religion itself for the most part, what are the dynamics of cognitive dissonance in relation to the discipline of astrology? As Michael Hill (1973:247) points out, "Interest in astrology seems to be an area of considerable importance even in the most technologically advanced areas of Western society."

It is easy – let alone relatively common – for the sceptic to be dismissive. But part of the dilemma for any academic investigation into the reception of astrology as a legitimate area of study comes from a narrow understanding of *astro-logos* itself. The

astronomer and mathematician Ptolemy (Claudius Ptolemeus, c. 100-178 CE) developed the astrological map that remained the geocentric model of understanding *terra firma*-based human endeavour vis-à-vis the heavenly bodies until the advances of knowledge in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In 1543, however, Nicholas Copernicus (1473-1543) proved that the sun is stationary in relation to the planets – including the earth – that revolve around it. With the recognition of the heliocentric structure of our universe and the further understandings contributed by Tycho Brahe (1546-1601) and Johannes Kepler (1571-1630), Ptolemaic astrology began its historic decline.

But of course, astrology has not only had to fend itself against the advances of modern science, it also fell under the anathema of Augustine who claimed all pagan divination to be the work of the devil. With the triumph of the Church, astrological practices, their treatises and use of the birth chart as a form of predicting the future were condemned. When Justinian closed the philosophical schools of Athens in 529, Hellenic scholars took shelter in the Pahlavi empire of Persia. There they translated Greek texts that eventually reached India but, more importantly for the West, became foundational for the subsequent development of Arabic astrology. Nevertheless, astrology also suffered further in the West through the polarisation between Catholics and Protestants during the Reformation and Enlightenment periods. But it was the advocacy of scientific methodology and modern philology that destroyed astrology as representing a *priscia theologia* or pure knowledge of God that reputedly stemmed from the origins of the world. Astrological interest survived only as a vernacular enterprise encapsulated in popular almanacs, textbooks and magazines until the ‘occult revival’ of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Inasmuch as contemporary astrology is a theosophical derivative, it follows a transcendental format, that is, it is essentially an *a priori* prognostic system developed out of its own internal logic and balancing of patterns. This does not preclude the possibility of subjecting astrology to empirical confirmation. But at the same time, it is important to recognise astrology as something more than merely a system of divination. In fact, Patrick Curry (Curry & Willis, 2004) argues that divination itself is less about telling us what will happen as it is about indicating to us what we *should* do. Metaphorically, as it has been traditionally, divination is the attempt by people to

discern the will of the gods or God in relation to a human desire. Instead of working with presentiments or standardised expectations, astrology as a comprehensive system is one that seeks its informing patterns among the planets, luminaries and constellations of the heavens.

Astrology has been an inevitable part of humanity's desire to know its place in the universe and understand macrocosmic/microcosmic connections. Overtime, and despite their being superseded by more sophisticated and predictable systems of explanation, the symbols and terms of astrology have entered into and become part of the cultural register. In the surfeit of choice that has come to characterize the contemporary West, the familiar and methodological are becoming supplemented and sometimes replaced by the exotic and superstitious. Many are turning to forgotten and discarded spiritual vernaculars in an attempt that might be interpreted as stemming from a desire for more colourful and mystically laden symbols and notions. Astrology is at the forefront of this popular interest – combining as it does the familiar with the obscure.

Nevertheless, the problem remains concerning the study of astrology – especially when that study is being conducted by astrologers themselves – over emic or empathetic understandings of the subject and critical, objective and even sceptical approaches. Whilst I have been long in agreement with Jeffrey Hadden (1977:308) who asked rhetorically, “Why shouldn't natives, compassionately committed to their culture, be trained to do sociological observation?” there is nonetheless a difficulty – as I have been learning with the Sophia students – when the natives resist that training. Whether astrology is to be understood as a form of religion or not, the academic study of astrology conforms to that of religion, and for this last McCutcheon (1999) has recognised that the ‘insider/outsider problem’ has persisted since the middle of the nineteenth century.

However, as Stringer (Arweck & Stringer, 2002:2) observes, it “is almost impossible ... to answer ... what ... makes a person an ‘insider’ or an ‘outsider’ in relation to religion.” If the “insider/outsider problem, as it has been traditionally defined, assumes that there is something specific about religion that makes the question of whether the researcher is an insider or an outsider fundamentally

important” (ibid. 3), the same would undoubtedly apply to the understanding of astrology. Stringer draws on William Cantwell Smith (1981) who considered faith as the distinguishing feature of religion that separates it from the rest of social activity. Whether this is a valid assertion or not, Stringer understands faith not as a theological abstract but as a social construct (be it some kind of experience or a particular language) that is shared between ‘insiders’ and becomes a means for excluding those who are not considered as ‘insiders’. Often, this exclusion specifically includes researchers themselves.

The Sophia situation is interesting because its initial attraction is to astrologers who have been seduced by the idea of re-gaining academic creditability and acceptance for their discipline. But in this case, that ‘carrot’ has been balanced by a ‘stick’ in the form of a rigorous methodology. ‘Insiders’ are being forced into becoming ‘outsiders’ to their own subject by acquiring a familiarity with scientific methodology, qualitative and quantitative research, interview techniques, use of questionnaires and surveys, the use of stories and storytelling in social research, and the nuances of participation/observation – including the ethics of research and awareness of Britain’s Data Protection Act.

More broadly, the required module in Astro-Methodology: Philosophy of History, Phenomenology and Sociology surveys the history of the academic study of astral hermeneutics and semiotics with particular reference to current debates about theory and method in the subject. The module begins with an introduction to semiotics as the study of human behaviour in communication in all its modes and to semiology as the science of signs and systems of signification. This includes a focus on the philosophical theory of perspectivism as well as discussion and criticism of contemporary perspectives in the Philosophy of History and History of Ideas, the Philosophy of Science, Phenomenology (as an approach considered appropriate to the subject) and Sociology (and how it differs from Phenomenology). After examining this selection of influential approaches including those drawn from sociology and other disciplines, the module then focuses on the techniques and problems involved in ethnography, fieldwork and research in cultural astronomy and astrology.

Stringer (*loc. cit.* 16) argues that reifying faith as a concept that is unknowable except through direct experience carries the danger of prioritising “religion over all other areas of social life [that] will only lead to its increasing marginalization within society.” If this kind of deliberate mystification is an attempt to avoid academic scrutiny, he claims, it becomes counterproductive for maintaining the valid integrity of religion as part of social life. This argument applies equally to the study of astrology as a social phenomenon.

Astrology rests in essence on the hermetic law of correspondence: *as above, so below; as below, so above*. This principle ultimately derives from Plato who considered the flawless mathematical order of the heavens as the visible manifestation of divine Reason and the embodiment of the *Anima Mundi*, the living soul of the universe. According to Tarnas (1991:83), “The astrological conception of the world closely [reflects] the essential Greek concept of the *kosmos* itself, the intelligibly ordered patterning and interconnected coherence of the universe, with man an integral part of the whole.” Even to our own times, astrology continues to hold that all numbers have a role and meaning in the symbolism of astrological relationships. In short, number is the key – or at least one of the keys – to the mysteries of the universe. The fascination with number and form is ancient and would appear to underlie much of the renewed interest in astrology that has occurred in the twentieth century. It is, however, when number and correspondence become *a priori* Platonic givens, that an astrology based on empirical observation is precluded. It is currently at Southampton University that the Research Group for the Critical Study of Astrology is endeavouring to test traditional astrological assertions as well as develop new, observable principles that may or may not, as the case may be, provide a valid basis for astrology itself. To date, the work of Gauquelin is the foremost achievement on this front.

For the Sophia Centre for the Study of Cultural Astronomy and Astrology, the emphasis is not on any attempt to prove astrology but rather to study the effect that people’s belief in stellar influence might have in their way of life, their decision-making and their ways of seeing the world in terms of value and meaning. The discipline of sociology affords the tools for this kind of endeavour. The challenge, however, is to persuade students – especially those who are astrologers themselves –

the merits and advantages of engaging in objective and value-neutral study of their field.

The difficulty herein lies with the consideration or belief of many if not most practitioners that the ability to interpret (or divine) the stellar configurations of an individual is in part an intuitive undertaking. Astrologers operate largely by spontaneous feel of the situation, through synchronicity and presentiments, that are often engendered as much by a subjective rapport the consultant has with the enquirer as it may by any rule book classification based on position and angles of the stars, planets and luminaries in the person's natal horoscope. To require astrologer-students to develop etic skills in order to explain their area to non-specialists and academic critics alike may appear to be a violation to the kind of sensitivity based on hunch and subjective insight that astrologers normally employ.

Virtually without exception, students enrolled in the first year of the Sophia programme complained about the astro-methodology course and questioned their need to take it. Whilst they questioned the relevancy of learning sociological and phenomenological methods of study to astrology itself, the real problem appeared to the Centre's staff to be one of encouraging 'insiders' into adopting an 'outsider' position. Students were mollified with the argument that they were being taught a 'new language' – one with which they could talk to critiques and non-astrological outsiders alike. To our surprise, and despite the 'ghetto-like' mentality that emerged in the unanimity of their complaints, there were no failures with this module and, in fact, a better-than-average success ratio – including a liberal number of firsts – as a result of their research projects for the course.

Any overlap between an academic (the outsider) account and the astrology (the insider) account that we were able to achieve with our students must, by default, be attributed to our students' grasp of the Weberian concept of *verstehen*. Arweck (Arweck & Stringer, 2002:122) describes this "as sympathetic empathy; it includes an attitude of openness ...; it also includes the ability to look at beliefs and practices as they are perceived by a practitioner and thus gain an understanding of them ...". Arweck adds to this last the proviso of not actually becoming a practitioner oneself. She notes that the concept of *verstehen* is "potentially problematic when sympathetic

empathy turns into empathetic sympathy, in cases where the academic observer gets so close to the representatives of the faith s/he studies that a certain amount of detachment is lost or – as the saying goes – that the researcher goes native.” But this brings us full circle back to Hadden’s implicit assumption that the ‘native’ can indeed be trained to study his/her own tradition.

With the Sophia students, our students are indeed ‘natives’. It was not a question of getting an etic approach to be balanced by an emic one, but, conversely, to balance the insider’s empathy with a position of external detachment – however *ad hoc* and temporary. A similar situation is to be witnessed in the study of contemporary Western paganism by pagan academics (e.g., Chas Clifton, Jo Pearson, Sarah Pike, Prudence Jones, Nigel Pennick and an increasing number of countless others). In many cases, the ‘insider’ researcher brings certain affinities to the subject. But as Arweck (ibid. 123) also points out, there are inherent dangers such as the need of the investigator to present a ‘corrective’ view. Astrologers, in particular, feel strongly that, apart from the daily horoscope column for largely entertainment purposes, astrology itself “is portrayed in a consistently negative way in the media,” the Church and the scientific establishment. The danger here is of course the possibility of presenting a biased or carefully edited version of one’s purported ethnographic investigation.

These possible pitfalls are always inevitably present, but, at the same time, since they are fundamentally only ‘possible’, it is also possible to avoid them. This last depends on the rigorousness and success of the methodological training. Perhaps ‘total objectivity’ is an impossible because even the researcher of any type is still an emotional, subjective person. But as Jo Pearson (Arweck & Stringer, 2002:97) argues, “rather than being essentially problematic, [the insider/outsider] position can in fact be advantageous to the researcher, the research, and the researched community.” Following Jacob Needleman who calls for the necessity of balancing the scholar’s subjective affinity with the external analysis of the critical mind, Pearson (ibid. 109) claims that the researching native “may be able not only to maintain a deep understanding of the community, but also to retain an ‘objective’ stance through the application of theory and the adoption of a relevant methodology which allows for both distance *and* involvement.” As both an insider and outsider, the researcher is in a

position of 'constant reflexivity' – one that traverses movement from inside the community to outside it, as well as from outside the community to its inside.

In the Sophia attempt to 'train astrologers in the phenomenological approach to an object on the part of a subject', the emphasis has been on familiarising our students with methodological fundamentals and having them apply this knowledge in ethnographic fieldwork. As Cipriano (1997:114) contends, "The first thing that a researcher of religious phenomena must do is feel empathy (*Einfühlung*) for the object in question." He continues: "This is a crucial and inescapable aspect for defining the research object itself. And it is the only way to resuscitate the object amidst the chaotic mass of data." Whilst Cipriano is referring explicitly to 'religious phenomena', the same equally applies to cultural phenomena. It is between the two that the domain of cultural astronomy and astrology is to be found. Training astrologers to be students of astrology from a sociological and cultural perspective may not be a situation without difficulties and problems, but it has the potential of producing an insider/outsider observer in the *verstehen* mode of sympathetic empathy and one with a greater degree of insight to the nuances of the astrological community's dynamics than might be gained from an investigator armed with an etic perspective alone.

References:

Arweck, Elisabeth & Martin D. Stringer, eds. *Theorizing Faith: The Insider/Outsider Problem in the Study of Ritual* (Birmingham: University Press, 2002).

Cantwell Smith, William. *Towards a World Theology: Faith and the Comparative History of Religion* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1981).

Cartwright, Justin. "Rise of the new infantilism." *The Guardian's Review* (5 May 2004:7).

Cipriano, Roberto. *Sociology of Religion: An Historical Introduction* (New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1997); tr. Laura Ferrarotti.

Curry, Patrick & Roy Willis. *Astrology, Science and Culture: Pulling Down the Moon* (Oxford: Berg, 2004).

Hadden, Jeffrey K., ed. "Review symposium: *The New Religious Consciousness*, edited by Charles Y. Glock and Robert N. Bellah." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 16.3 (1977:305-24).

Hill, Michael. *A Sociology of Religion* (London: Heinemann, 1973).

McCutcheon, Robert T., ed. *The Insider/Outsider Problem in the Study of Religion: A Reader* (London: Cassell, 1999).

Tarnas, Rick. *The Passion of the Western Mind* (New York: Harmony Books, 1991).

Tester, S.J. *A History of Western Astrology* (Woodbridge, Suffolk/Wolfeboro, NH: Boydell Press, 1987).