

# DIASPORIC LITERARY ARCHIVES: QUESTIONS OF LOCATION, OWNERSHIP & INTERPRETATION

## Keynote address, Silences of Archives conference, Helsinki, 6 November 2014

### David C. Sutton

#### Introduction: literary manuscripts and the word “diaspora”

Good morning everyone. I would like to begin by thanking the Finnish Literature Society and the University of Turku for inviting me to give this keynote address. I will be speaking this morning principally about the diasporic nature of literary archives and manuscripts, but I intend to link some of my themes to the subject of minority languages which is your principal concern today.

In other papers and publications, I have identified a number of key characteristics of literary manuscripts which sets them apart from other types of archival materials. If we start from the categories which are represented by Sections within the International Council on Archives, and then add some categories for which future Sections have been proposed, the principal non-literary types of archives might be these:

- archaeological archives
- architectural archives
- business archives
- educational and university archives
- archives of international organisations
- labour and trade union archives
- local, municipal and territorial archives
- medical archives
- military archives
- notarial and legal archives
- political and parliamentary archives
- religious archives
- sports archives
- *and*
- archives and papers of various other clubs, organisations and individuals

I am interested in the ways in which literary papers differ from the other archival categories, and in the characteristics which make literary manuscripts unique.

Literary manuscripts are not like other manuscripts. Their importance lies in who made them and how they were made, the unique relationship between author and evolving text, the insights they give into the act of creation. One supreme example of this magical combination of form and content is provided by the manuscripts of Marcel Proust, lovingly preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, 171 volumes of cross-hatched text, with later additions on small pieces of paper - the famous

*paperoles* - glued onto almost every page: an extraordinary conservation challenge. Literary archives often have a higher financial value than other archives, and I will talk more about some of the problems which this causes. They are more likely to be found in libraries than in archives offices. In many countries of the world literary archives are housed in private foundations (such as the Fundação Casa de Rui Barbosa in Rio de Janeiro), in literary museums (such as the Museum of Japanese Modern Literature in Tokyo), or in literary houses (such as the Maison de Balzac in Paris). In countries such as the USA, Canada and the UK, university libraries play the leading role, but this is by no means true in all countries. In France, for example, public libraries (often in the author's home town) are the principal repositories, together with the Bibliothèque Nationale.

In contrast with most other types of archives, literary archives are often scattered in diverse locations without any sense of appropriateness or “spirit of place”. Whilst they are sometimes donated or deposited, they are often sold - and competition between collecting institutions at auction has been another strong (and many would say regrettable) characteristic of the world of literary manuscripts over the past 50 years.

In some cases the literary archives will have gone to another country and caused some controversy in the home country – as with the Carlos Fuentes papers in Princeton or the literary papers of Leopold Sédar Senghor in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France (his political papers, however, remain in the Archives Nationales du Sénégal). In other cases serendipitous acquisition or purchase has led to locations that could never have been guessed. There are curious tales to be told about how the Ernest Hemingway Archives ended up in the John F. Kennedy Presidential Library or the J. R. R. Tolkien Archive in the Marquette University in Milwaukee, and one of my favourite literary curiosities is the fact that one of the finest collections of literary manuscripts in Australia is to be found amongst the military training resources of the Australian Defence Force Academy. The examples abound of literary papers in locations a long way from home: papers of Franz Kafka owned by Oxford University; papers of Paul Claudel owned by Cambridge University; Jean Anouilh and Yehuda Amichai in the Beinecke Library at Yale University; Raymond Queneau and Wilson Harris in the Harry Ransom Center in Austin; Chinua Achebe and Wole Soyinka in Harvard; Mario Vargas Llosa and Giorgos Seferis in Princeton; for John Betjeman, whose papers are in the University of Victoria, British Columbia, it would be difficult to be very much further from home. There are hundreds of other examples.

In addition to their tendency to end up very far from home, literary papers are often found, for any one author, to be divided between several collecting institutions. This phenomenon of “split collections” will be familiar to most literary researchers. My own university in Reading has an outstanding collection of papers of Samuel Beckett, but it is a collection which can only make archival sense by constant cross-referencing to the Beckett collections in Trinity College Dublin and the Harry Ransom Center in Austin. Last year at a literary manuscripts workshop in Pavia, Italy, I heard Michael Forstrom of the Beinecke Library give a very complete description of the ways in which literary collections can be “split”. Michael identified for us no fewer than fourteen ways in which literary fonds might be divided:

- Split between different collecting repositories
- Split between fonds and what survives

- Split by collecting strategy or agreement
- Split between early portion of papers and [living] creator
- Split by relocation and change in custody
- Split between portion of papers and component in private hands
- Split by provenance: papers versus artificial collection
- Split by accession(s)
- Split within institutions
- Split between personal, professional, and family papers
- Split between papers and media
- Split between papers and born-digital
- Split by reproduction
- Split between collection(s) and national interest

“Split collections” seem to be an essential part of the world of literary manuscripts. We are starting to see a small number of digitisation projects which bring split collections back together again (such as the online Shelley-Godwin archive), but these remain rare and special (well-funded) cases.

The word “diaspora” is usually used about the scattering of peoples, races or linguistic groups, but more recently it has begun to be used also about literary manuscripts. For the period from January 2012 to February 2015 a new initiative known as the Diasporic Literary Archives Network has been generously funded by a British charity called the Leverhulme Trust and has enabled a six-partner team from the UK, France, Italy, Namibia, Trinidad and the USA to explore both general and specific issues concerning literary manuscripts. The work of the Diasporic Literary Archives Network over the past three years informs most of the ideas which I am presenting to you this morning.

## Before 1700 AD

Let us first consider, however, the age of literary manuscripts. As regards literature in English, such manuscripts are documents which began to be actively preserved and conserved from the eighteenth century onwards, and whose survival before the year 1700 is rare, occasional and generally attributable to special circumstances.

I shall return to the example of Shakespeare, to consider why no part of any of his plays survives in his hand. All that we have for Shakespeare are six signatures (three of them on his will) and a probable identification of his writing as Hand D on two folios of *The booke of Sir Thomas Moore* by Anthony Munday, which can be found among the Harley Manuscripts in the British Library.

Much more survives for John Donne (1572-1631), without our being able, in any meaningful way, to talk about a manuscript collection. A good number of his letters are extant, at least 38 of them in his hand and others in the form of contemporary transcripts. One of the autograph letters (now in the Bodleian Library, Oxford) contains his verse epistle to Lady Carey, written about 1611. We have other examples of Donne’s hand in a few marginal annotations and signed documents, and in an autograph copy of his Latin epitaph on his wife Ann (1617) in the Folger Shakespeare Library. Donne is also represented by a greater number of contemporary poetry transcripts than any other poet of the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries, and he is thus more of a subject for archival study than any of his contemporaries.

These very limited survivals for Donne (including the verse epistle which survived perhaps more because of its status as a letter to a lady than its status as a poetry manuscript) in fact mark him out as one of the best-represented British authors of the seventeenth century in respect of manuscripts.

For students of Andrew Marvell (1621-1678), for many critics the greatest English poet of that century, it is astonishing to read the stark words of the manuscripts scholar Peter Beal: “No autograph literary manuscripts by Marvell are known to survive”. Similarly for Nathaniel Lee, who died in 1692: “Nat Lee – the extravagant, brain-sick tragic dramatist whom Allardyce Nicoll regarded as, next to Dryden, possibly ‘the most influential man of his age’ – has left not a single known example of his handwriting, let alone any literary papers.” To take one more example, that of the popular Cavalier poet Robert Herrick (1591-1674): “Only one undisputed literary autograph of Robert Herrick is known to survive. It is an early elegy written by Herrick as a student in 1619 on the death of one of his contemporaries at Cambridge, John Browne” (and it is also to be found among the Harley Manuscripts in the British Library).

Pre-1700 British authors for whom autograph literary manuscripts do survive appear to fall mostly into two categories: members of the aristocracy, and authors with a highly developed sense of their own self-worth and importance to posterity. For the aristocrats, the papers will often have survived within the grand libraries of the “stately homes” of England. An excellent example of a non-aristocratic author who never undervalued his own importance would be Ben Jonson. Not only do a small number of literary manuscripts in Jonson’s hand remain extant – including the opening speech of an “entertainment” in the Archives at Hatfield House and the *Masque of Queens* among the Royal Manuscripts at the British Library – but he seems to have been familiar also with the modern celebrity idea of “autographs”, and a good number of his presentations and inscriptions have survived.

The contrast between Dryden and Pope, however, provides strong support for the case that the date from which British literary manuscripts began to survive in numbers was around 1700. Although many of us find John Dryden (1631-1700) turgid reading today, he was almost universally seen as the great poet of his age and the heir to Marvell; and yet hardly any of his literary manuscripts survived him. We have one autograph fair copy of his *Heroique stanzas* on Cromwell; one dedication; and one scribal copy of his abandoned opera *The state of innocence*, with a few revisions in Dryden’s hand. And that is all. A reasonable number of letters in his hand exist, one of which, to his cousin Honor Dryden, includes some verses; but it is a remarkably small archival return for the work of such a major author.

This choice of 1700 as the key date for survival of literary manuscripts must not, of course, be regarded as categorical or universal. We have seen some of the British exceptions. The datings in other European countries are similar but not identical. In 2012, the *Harvard Gazette* published an account of a presentation by the French literary scholar Roger Chartier describing and reflecting upon “the appearance in the 1750s of authorial manuscripts”. The *Gazette* really should have made it clear that this dating applies only to France.

For Italian literature, there is a wonderful survival of literary manuscripts exactly as we understand and enjoy them today, from as early as the fourteenth century. These

are the manuscripts of Petrarch in the Vatican Library, and some of them can be definitely dated, such as the writings after Laura's death in the plague of 1348. What is most striking about Petrarch's manuscripts, however, is that they include alterations, amendments, rewritings, cancellations and different variants - all the features which make literary manuscripts most valuable for academic study today.

With the examples of Petrarch from the 1340s, and Ben Jonson in English Literature, and with later date given for French literature, we will approach the idea of the 1700 watershed with some caution, but with some confident justification too.

## After 1700 AD

The paucity of Dryden's archival survival becomes even more apparent when we contrast him with Alexander Pope (1688-1744). For a cataloguer creating a location register of the whereabouts of literary manuscripts, as I have been doing for three decades, it sometimes seems that there are Pope manuscripts everywhere.

The abundance of Alexander Pope manuscripts in twenty or thirty repositories in the UK and the USA indicates the emergence of a new attitude to literary manuscripts, and perhaps at this stage we should be more specific and say poetry manuscripts - because the widespread survival of literary manuscripts of poetry most definitely pre-dates the survival of literary manuscripts of fiction.

None of the fiction manuscripts of Defoe, Swift or Fielding have come down to us, so sadly we have no autograph versions of *Robinson Crusoe* or *Gulliver's travels* or *Tom Jones*. It is indicative of the greater value which was attached to poetry in the eighteenth century that the finest literary manuscript of Daniel Defoe, now in the Huntington Library, is an early notebook containing mostly poetry, with some notes on sermons. Similarly for Henry Fielding, we have very few literary manuscripts indeed and the best manuscripts are probably the autograph poems held by the Harrowby Manuscripts Trust in Staffordshire.

Another example which shows extensive survival of early poetry manuscripts is Pope's contemporary Allan Ramsay (1684-1758), for whom there are autograph papers in the Huntington Library, the National Library of Scotland, the National Archives of Scotland, Edinburgh University Library, Huntly House Museum in Edinburgh, the Mitchell Library in Glasgow, the British Library and others.

After Pope and Ramsay, the extensive survival of poetry manuscripts becomes the norm, with excellent examples provided by William Cowper (1731-1800), George Crabbe (1754-1832), William Blake (1757-1827) and Robert Burns (1759-1796).

Laurence Sterne is perhaps the first great English fiction writer for whom we have some good prose manuscripts. Too little survives of *Tristram Shandy*, only the well-known manuscript of "the Le Fever episode" among the Althorp Papers in the British Library; but for *A sentimental journey* the British Library holds the autograph printer's copy of Volume I; and autograph versions of memoirs, memoranda and two sermons are also extant, notably in the Pierpont Morgan Library.

After Sterne, fiction manuscripts begin to survive more extensively. When we come to the generations of Dickens, the Brontë sisters, George Eliot and Thackeray, and then

George Meredith and Thomas Hardy, we find that there are extant manuscripts for almost every novel. This then continues as a normal expectation for the major authors of English Literature throughout the age of handwriting, and typewriting too, from, say, Virginia Woolf to Doris Lessing.

## Teaching literary manuscripts

When I teach postgraduate classes on literary manuscripts, I sometimes begin by posing six questions for the class to discuss. My questions are:

- What are literary manuscripts like?
- What are literary manuscripts for?
- What is a good literary manuscript?
- What is a bad literary manuscript?
- When did literary manuscripts start?
- When will literary manuscripts end?

In response to the first question, we start with handwritten, typewritten and computer-created papers. I especially enjoy the disbelief on young people's faces when I outline the way in which typescript carbon copies used to be created. Then we review correspondence, personal and legal documents, annotated books, photocopies, floppy disks and memory sticks, before having a little fun with "accompanying materials", where we discuss poets' bedsocks and the presence of Walt Whitman's stuffed canary in a collection assembled by his admirers in the north of England. We usually agree that we might extend the classification of literary manuscripts so far as to include Virginia Woolf's shopping lists, but that bedsocks and stuffed canaries would be a classification too far.

Good literature students always know what literary manuscripts are for. They will have worked on the revisions and changing versions of an emerging poem. And they will have experienced that shiver down the spine at seeing the writing and the crossings-out of a loved but dead writer.

The questions about good and bad literary manuscripts introduce the paradox that the most valued papers will be the scruffiest and most amended, whilst nice clean copies are of the least use. We do, though, pause to note that even a clean copy can be instructive if it differs from the final published version. Whilst on "bad" literary manuscripts, I usually venture onto the difficult territory (for a trained librarian) of vandalised books - even, in the case of Joe Orton, vandalised library books - very revealing of our author, but we hope nobody else does it!

The question "When did literary manuscripts start?" returns us to the 1700 milestone. What *did* change at around that time? My own explanation is based principally on two factors: the change in the status of the author, and the change in the nature of publishing.

The change in the status of the author around that time is epitomised by the world's first copyright act, passed in England in 1709. Daniel Defoe was one of the first to advocate author's rights, and he and others stressed that the creation of intellectual content was analogous to the creation of, say, a piece of furniture or fine jewellery.

The creator's distinctive mark was there in the "intellectual property" and deserved to be recognised. From 1709 onwards the idea of copyright begins to enhance the status of authors creating copyrightable works.

The contrast with the time of Shakespeare is very strong. England's greatest dramatist became a very rich man, although it has recently been revealed that this was principally because of his activities as a food-hoarder and tax-avoider. As a playwright, however, he was seen as a journeyman employee, working under commission, who turned out a piece of work which immediately became the property of the commissioner, the theatre-owner.

Ownership of property was paramount. In the Elizabethan and Jacobean theatre, authors had almost no rights: the theatre-owner came first, the actor second, and the playwright a poor third. When the great actor Ned Alleyn moved from the Lord Admiral's Company to Lord Strange's Men, he was prevented from taking his great *Tamburlaine* with him not by Marlowe (who had sold the play and was therefore uninvolved) but by the theatre company who owned *Tamburlaine* as their property.

Similarly in 1603 Shakespeare was powerless to prevent second-rate shorthand note-takers from coming into the theatre, copying down their hearing of his *Hamlet* and then publishing it in the well-named "bad quarto". The publication of the "good folio", the play as Shakespeare wrote it, the following year, was principally a definition by the theatre company of their property.

For poets the situation was even worse. The publication of Shakespeare's *Sonnets* in 1609 by Thomas Thorpe was done without Shakespeare's consent and entirely for Thorpe's profit. Thorpe had acquired fair copies of the sonnets as they circulated from hand to hand in London, and the fair copies were Thorpe's property. Only in the age of the Internet do we see occasional signs of a return to this pre-copyright situation.

The other big change which occurred around 1700 was the emergence of the publishing industry in its modern form. Previously work had been placed before the public by jobbing printers on behalf of money-makers like Thomas Thorpe. The rise of publishing moves us far beyond mere printing and leads to publishing houses elevating the status of "their" authors with the public, and working in partnership with authors on the production of publications. In the nineteenth century in particular, the survival of literary manuscripts is often attributable to the activities of publishers, working closely with their authors.

To return to M. Roger Chantier, in discussing the absence of French literary manuscripts before 1750, he talks about early printing practices: "Once the scribal copy of the autograph manuscript entered the printing shop, it was further prepared by the corrector, who added accents, capital letters, punctuation, and casting-off marks. ... Thus prepared and corrected, the manuscript copy was composed and printed. After these textual interventions made by the copyist, the censor, the copy editor, and the compositors, the autograph manuscript lost all importance." That is well put, even if for literature in the English language we need to change the date.

## Owning literary manuscripts

Many archival collections are deposited, usually by organisations, in their “normal” archival repository as a matter of course. The great majority of collections, certainly by shelf-mileage, find their homes in this way. The principal exception is provided by personal papers, and the most volatile and unpredictable type within that principal exception comprises literary papers. Literary papers, when they are the right papers at the right time, can have an extraordinary financial value. A single love letter by one of the great English Romantic poets will easily go past 100,000 euros or pounds at auction. The greatest collections, like those of the succession of publishers all called John Murray, can be valued in the tens of millions.

There have always been private collectors, whose motives I have never found easy to understand, and whose activities on occasion force the prices of literary papers still higher. Private collectors tend to have little interest in administrative or medical or religious or business archives, but literary collecting can become an obsession for some very wealthy individuals.

The market in literary manuscripts follows fashion to a considerable extent, and it is part of the skill of the new generation of literary archivists to anticipate fashion and make early acquisitions. Acquiring the papers of out-of-favour authors can significantly enhance a literary archivist’s reputation if the author returns to popular or curricular esteem. In cases where the reputation is clear and the papers have a clear and well understood value, then the richest institutions will normally prevail.

In very few countries, however, is the market permitted to follow its own financial course. Most European countries have some form of state involvement in heritage sales, whether through export licences, requirements to give first refusal within the country, or various forms of incentives. Some countries have favourable tax regimes for donation or bequest, and other original incentives to donate have been devised. In Spain, for example, donation of the whole *Nachlass* to a recognised foundation can be rewarded with an extension of the copyright duration - which is why Federico García Lorca (who was killed in 1936) remains in copyright in Spain.

## The diaspora of literary manuscripts

We noted that the locations of literary manuscripts often lack any sense of appropriateness or “spirit of place”, and that in this they differ from most other types of archives. Colleagues have recently begun to apply the striking word “diasporic” to this characteristic of literary papers and our Diasporic Literary Archives Network has been named accordingly - with a remit to study questions of location, ownership and interpretation.

In funding the Diasporic Literary Archives Network for three years, the Leverhulme Trust has, wonderfully, given us a primary remit which is ... to network - to talk to each other, to compare experiences and to share best practice.

This has been one example among many of the growing propensity of literary archivists to work together and synergise their activities. Just to give a sense of the



range of the new Network, I will give the themes of the five workshops that it has prepared during 2012-2014.

1. Questions informing scattered legacies: an introduction to the ideas of diasporic literary manuscripts (Reading, June 2012).
2. Examining split collections (Pavia, February-March 2013).
3. The stakes of public/private ownership: including the ways in which literary manuscripts are represented in business, publishing and other non-literary collections (Caen, May 2013).
4. The politics of location: a workshop on sensitive issues of acquisition, including the “loss” by less wealthy countries of their literary heritage (Trinidad, March 2014).
5. Diaspora and possibilities for digitization (at the Beinecke Library, October 2014, within the last fortnight). This was a meeting which covered some of the exciting new initiatives which are opening up in respect of born-digital and digitised archives, especially in richer countries, but also explored some of the more sensitive areas for poorer countries - not only as regards technological problems, but also issues relating to equalities, human rights and the politics of purchasing power.

As we near the end of our three years’ work, we have created a rich dialogue on the world of literary manuscripts, and some parts of our work will certainly continue beyond 2015, hosted either at the University of Reading or through the Section for Literary Archives of the International Council on Archives, or both.

\*

One aspect of the diaspora which has become clear during the work of the Network, and on which I first wrote after the archive of Jose Saramago found a home in Lisbon, is that there are really only four countries in the world which regularly and systematically collect the papers of non-nationals, namely the USA, the UK, Canada and France.

As the Network members have seen in visits to Pavia and Venice, there is a striking contrast with literary archival activity in Italy, where they have been diligently collecting their own literary papers since Petrarch, nearly 700 years ago, but have no mandate to collect papers from other countries – although of course authors from other countries do find their way into Italian archival collections.

I have reflected upon what the four-country model meant for the papers of some of the greatest late twentieth-century authors. My own list would start with Saramago and would always include Margaret Atwood, Samuel Beckett, Carlos Fuentes, Gabriel Garcia Marquez, Elfriede Jelinek, Doris Lessing, Naguib Mahfouz and Orhan Pamuk. That personal list provides some interesting stories and some telling controversies from the world of modern literary manuscripts. As I mentioned at the start, the purchase by Princeton University of the Carlos Fuentes Archive provoked front-page outrage in Mexico. Similarly, the proposed Sotheby’s sale of Naguib Mahfouz’s papers in December 2011 caused controversy in Egypt, and the sale was abandoned. It seems that at least some of the family now want these papers to go to the American University in Cairo, or to another Cairo library. Meanwhile the archive of Margaret Atwood is arriving in regular instalments at the University of Toronto, and Elfriede

Jelinek has a similar arrangement with the University of Vienna. Samuel Beckett's papers present a classic example of a "split collection" – being divided between the Universities of Reading and Texas and Trinity College Dublin. Similarly, although some Doris Lessing papers have recently gone to the University of East Anglia and more will be going there soon, the bulk are presently split between the Universities of Texas and Tulsa.

Given that there is almost no interest in Turkish language and literature in the four big purchasing countries, there is every chance that the Orhan Pamuk Archive will stay in Istanbul, where it so obviously belongs. It could be said that Pamuk is to Istanbul what Saramago is to Lisbon and Mahfouz to Cairo. With a self-referential appropriateness, in 2012 Pamuk himself established a museum in Istanbul displaying his own novel 'The Museum of Innocence'.

That leaves Gabriel García Márquez. He is clearly a highly marketable author-commodity, and Spanish-language manuscripts are actively collected in the USA, not only by Princeton. In November 2012, the first García Márquez manuscript to go on sale was auctioned at Christie's, with a price guide between \$80,000 and \$127,000. I don't know what arrangements García Márquez may have written into his will, but it certainly seems unlikely that the main García Márquez Archive will end up in his native Colombia. *[Note: on 24 November 2014, three weeks after this paper was presented, it was announced that the García Márquez Archive had been purchased by the Harry Ransom Center at the University of Texas].*

My conclusion, in an international context, is that the language used by an author is a major factor in the eventual destination of his or her literary archive. One very positive example of this which the Network has considered in some detail concerns the collecting of literary manuscripts in Brazil. It is another example which starts from the non-collectability of Portuguese-language manuscripts in the USA, Canada, the UK or France.

We have identified thirteen major Brazilian collecting institutions for literary manuscripts:

- Acervo dos Escritores Mineiros (AEM), UFMG
- Arquivo da Academia Brasileira de Letras
- Arquivo da Fundação Casa de Jorge Amado
- Arquivo do Museu Casa Guimarães Rosa
- Casa de Memória Edmundo Cardoso, Santa Maria
- Casa Guilherme de Almeida
- Fundação Casa de Rui Barbosa
- Fundação Cultural Cassiano Ricardo
- Fundação Darcy Ribeiro
- Instituto de Estudos Brasileiros (IEB-USP)
- Instituto de Estudos da Linguagem (IEL-Unicamp)
- Instituto de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas (IFCH-Unicamp)
- Instituto Moreira Salles

Brazil combines several features which contribute to its excellent achievement in collecting literary manuscripts: a literary language which is not widely known or studied by the wealthy collecting countries, certainly; but also a pride in its literary

culture; a good number of collecting institutions, public and private, which are disposed to cooperate with each other; a former colonial power which (unlike France or Britain) does not use its language to claim some archival sovereignty over its former colonies (there is no lusophone equivalent to the much-debated idea of *francophonie*); and a good understanding by literary authors and their heirs of the potential importance of literary manuscripts. It may also be a factor that Brazil, despite its deep literary culture, has produced no global literary super-stars, no Nobel Prizewinners.

I used Brazil as an example of a country whose literary papers were for these reasons much less “diasporic” than those of many other countries in the world, especially in post-colonial situations. I look forward, however, to discussing with members of my audience later today the possibility that literary manuscripts written in Finnish are even less diasporic than those of Brazil.

In the future, we see great prospects for some of the key projects of the Diasporic Literary Archives Network to be continued, some as academic research projects, some as ongoing international solidarity.

Examples of such future activities would include:

- “Archives at risk”: new protocols for collaboration on endangered collections worldwide (with a first meeting of up to forty potential partners planned for early 2015 under the auspices of UNESCO).
- The dispersal of literary papers through publishing and business archives.
- Protocols for collaboration between repositories with “split collections”.
- Mapping split collections: a cartographic approach.
- The diaspora of digital literary archives: best practice and digital solutions.
- The literary archives of Namibia: a case study and model.
- Caribbean archives in Caribbean institutions: a new future.
- “Hidden archives”: the uncatalogued troves: locating uncatalogued collections and finding shared solutions.
- The creation of a guidance document for authors considering placing their papers in an archival institution (a joint project with the Society of Authors and the Group for Literary Archives and Manuscripts - GLAM)
- Locations of literary collections: creation of a world-wide list (joint work with ICA’s Section for Literary Archives).
- Examples of diasporic literary collections: maintenance of an online database.

This exciting and diverse range of ongoing and future projects will keep the Diasporic Literary Archives Network active long beyond its official finish, and I hope that a good number of them will be adopted by other funders or consortia, by some or all of the existing six partners, or by the Section for Archives of Literature and Art (SLA) within the International Council on Archives.

## The future of literary manuscripts

Finally, I will try to bring together some thoughts about twenty-first century literary manuscripts - both those created in the early years of the new century and those still to be created.

From 2011 to 2013, the British Location Register project conducted a new survey of recent acquisitions of literary manuscripts, with a special focus on authors born in the 1960s and 1970s. We even found that both the John Rylands University Library of Manchester and the Brotherton Collection at the University of Leeds already have papers of the poet Caroline Bird, who was born in 1986, some years after we first started locating and registering.

Many of the letters, emails and manuscripts which have been recently added to the British Location Register themselves date from the twenty-first century. This reflects a major shift in attitude by British literary archivists towards collecting modern papers. When the Location Register project began in 1982, there were still vestiges of some old and entrenched attitudes: above all, there was a belief that authors' papers should not be collected until they were safely dead and their reputations established. Now literary archivists are happy to collect papers which were created only months earlier, even though this brings with it difficult issues of data protection and privacy. The manuscripts of *The Greek anthology, book XVII* by Greg Delanty and *The choir outing* by Nigel Forde, both published in 2012, for example, were already found to be in the John Rylands Library, with the probability that the manuscripts had arrived in the Library before the books which derived from them. Discussions, under Chatham House rules, amongst members of the Group for Literary Archives and Manuscripts (GLAM) have revealed the widest possible range of approaches to access to these very recently created manuscripts. The unifying source of comfort for British literary archivists is that the forms of access chosen have led to almost no challenges - legal or otherwise. One occasional new solution (being explored by the British Library for its 2014 Hanif Kureishi accession) is the digitisation of some of the most sensitive notebooks and diaries, with redaction of libellous, personal or offensive passages.

The nature of literary manuscripts is changing (as most authors use computers for at least part of their work) but for the first decade of the new century the majority still appeared to be on paper. The computer print-out with handwritten annotations is perhaps the most typical form of manuscript for the period 1990-2010. Archivists expect this to change and are ready to receive more and more manuscripts in the form of memory sticks, hard disks and other electronic media; but, so far, this is happening rather less than would have been predicted ten years ago.

Colleagues confirm that archivists are still unsure about how to come to terms with the prospect of acquiring significant numbers of digital archives, and that some recent acquisitions are in fact partly experimental in purpose – in other words, archivists are acquiring a few digital archives partly in order to test themselves, their cataloguers and their users. Archivists have very little confidence that, for digital collections, the model entitled “*If we build it they will come*” will work, and report that “it is not yet clear just how much scholars are using available digital collections”.

One of the unresolved issues which presently adds great uncertainty to our consideration of born-digital archives is that of value. Most born-digital materials presently in archival collections have been either donated, or purchased as part of a hybrid archive with a substantial paper component, or purchased as a test-case. No systematic set of terms of reference for valuation of born-digital archival collections has yet been established. There is an absence, firstly of a market of private collectors setting benchmark prices; secondly of precedents among collecting institutions; and

thirdly of information about users and likely users. There is a natural concern that users of a costly digital manuscript collection may turn out to be very few.

Emails are much safer to collect. In fact emails are often more revealing than collections of letters. This is both because of the typical two-way nature of email threads and because of the lack of restraint which the email format often appears to generate in its users. Emails are certain to provide a highly-valued future trove for biographers.

But literary manuscripts in digital formats remain fraught with uncertainties. If the study of literary manuscripts is in large part a study of variants, versions and progress of composition, how can scholars be certain of the authenticity of the variants within digital media? And even if technology does provide such certainty (through very sophisticated hardware and software) will scholars want to use media of this sort which they cannot pick up and hold in their hands? It is widely perceived that there is little of the “magic” of paper manuscripts in digital materials, and that therefore digital study may hold less attraction, allure or prestige.

Moreover, the digital literary manuscript of ten years ago is already slipping away from us. Composition on smart phones and storage in various forms of cloud present different challenges, and archivists are having to open urgent discussions about the implications of Google and Microsoft Cloud Storage and similar platforms. At the fifth workshop of the Diasporic Literary Archives Network, for example, the possibility was raised of future acquisition of a digital literary archive stored in the cloud by several institutions collectively, with the possibility of the archive’s then being available simultaneously in different places, on different continents.

In 2014 the status and nature of literary manuscripts ten years hence (at least in the richer countries of the world) is probably more uncertain than for any ten-year period since 1700, and the longer-term future similarly more difficult to predict. Very few specialists doubt that literary manuscripts have a fascinating and exciting future, but even fewer are prepared to forecast, between 2015 and 2025, exactly what form that future will take.