

## DECLARATION

This work has not previously been accepted in substance for any degree and is not being concurrently submitted in candidature for any degree.

Signed ..... (candidate)

Date .....

## STATEMENT 1

This work is the result of my own investigations, except where otherwise stated. Where **\*correction services** have been used, the extent and nature of the correction is clearly marked in a footnote(s).

Other sources are acknowledged (e.g. by footnotes giving explicit references).

A bibliography is appended.

Signed ..... (candidate)

Date .....

[\*this refers to the extent to which the text has been corrected by others]

## STATEMENT 2

I hereby give consent for my work, if accepted, to be available for photocopying and for inter-library loan, and for the title and summary to be made available to outside organisations.

Signed ..... (candidate)

Date .....

I hereby give consent for my work, if accepted, to be available for photocopying and for inter-library loans after expiry of a bar on access approved by Aberystwyth University.

Signed ..... (candidate)

Date .....

# An Exploration of the Contents and Uses of Literary Archives in the UK

A dissertation submitted by David Fitzpatrick, in pursuit of an MScEcon in Archive  
Administration, at Aberystwyth University, September 2012.

Contents

Acknowledgements	4
Introduction	5
Aims and Objectives	6
Methodology	7
Chapter One: Literature Review	11
Chapter Two: An Overview of Literary Archives in the UK	21
Chapter Three: The Orwell Archive (Data Analysis)	37
Conclusion	51
Appendix I: A List of the 70 Repositories Included in a Survey of UK Literary Archives	54
Appendix II: The Orwell Archive (Data Collection)	57
Bibliography	69

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Jennie Hill for supervising the writing of this dissertation. I would also like to thank my parents for their support over the past two years.

## Introduction

The purpose of this dissertation is to study the contents and uses of literary archives in the UK. The dissertation will begin with a literature review that will examine how literary archives have been defined and valued by archivists and literary scholars. The review will aim to establish whether there is a common consensus as to what constitutes a literary archive; it will also discuss contrasting views on the potential uses of these constituents.

The literature review will reveal what are thought to be the main characteristics of a literary archive. The second chapter will investigate this aspect further by exploring in detail the various elements that are considered to make up a typical literary archive. In order to do this, it will draw on evidence both from the literature review and from a survey of the literary holdings of 70 UK repositories. This chapter will also look at how a number of these repositories have sought to exploit their holdings for educational, promotional, or other purposes.

Chapter three will use the evidence found in chapter two to examine the contents of one archive in particular: the George Orwell archive, at University College London. It will discuss the various ways in which the archive could be (or has been) used by scholars, biographers, students, and casual Orwell readers. This chapter will evaluate a number of publications that have reproduced large parts of the archive; in addition, it will measure the success of two projects that have sought to widen access to the archive.

It is hoped that the combination of a literature review, a survey of the holdings of 70 UK repositories, and an in-depth study of a single literary archive will produce an accurate representation of the diverse range of literary archives that can be found in the UK.

## Aims and Objectives

### **Aims**

The aim of this dissertation is to explore the contents and uses of literary archives in the UK.

### **Objectives**

- To produce a literature review that examines what has been written about the value and potential uses of literary archives. The review will critically consider contrasting views from within the archive and literary professions.
- To carry out a survey of literary archives in the UK. The survey will examine both the range of material that exists within UK literary archives, and the various ways in which this material has been (or is being) used for purposes such as academic research, teaching, outreach, and promotion.
- To produce a case study of the George Orwell archive, a collection held at University College London (UCL). This study will assess the value and uses of the archive, and in so doing will evaluate a number of publications and projects that have used material from it.

## Methodology

### Chapter One: Literature Review

For this chapter, it was necessary to accumulate as comprehensive a list as possible of available literature on the subject of literary archives. The author began by searching the University library's catalogue, using the key words, "literary archives". Of the numerous results yielded, one of these was a postgraduate dissertation, which was concerned with the appraisal of literary archives. The author examined the dissertation's bibliography, and noted the titles that appeared relevant to this study. Other relevant titles among the search results were noted for future reference.

The author then searched Google using the term "literary archives". One of the results was a bibliography of titles on the subject of literary archives, which can be found on the Group for Literary Archives and Manuscripts' (North America) website ("Bibliography", 2012). After noting down relevant titles, the author carried out another search of the University library's catalogue, this time for publications by two writers who had been recommended by the author's supervisor. In order to find further reading material, the author conducted a search for relevant academic articles using Google Scholar, and carried out searches on the websites of various newspapers on a regular basis. The end result was a long list of titles, ranging in date from the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century to the present day.

This study is primarily concerned with the contents and uses of literary archives in the UK. However, for the purposes of this chapter, it was necessarily to consult material from within the UK and beyond, especially since a great number of contributions to the debate on the characteristics and values of literary archives have been made by writers from outside the UK (particularly from Canada and the United States).

### Chapter Two: An Overview of Literary Archives in the UK

It has been estimated that there are around 400-450 institutions in the UK and Ireland that possess some measure of literary archives (D. Sutton, personal communication, December 6, 2011). Due to the limited scope of this study, this chapter will focus on

literary collections held by 70 UK repositories. (A list of the repositories is included as an appendix.)

The 70 institutions were chosen using various methods. One of the items consulted for chapter one was Sheppard's account of the findings of the Group for Literary Archives and Manuscripts' (GLAM) survey of collecting policy and practice. Naturally, this led to the author visiting the GLAM website, in order to study the results of this survey ("Survey of collecting policy and practice", 2012).

The GLAM website presents these results as being "a high level overview of literary holdings in a range of repositories across the UK and Ireland" ("Survey of collecting policy and practice", 2012). Most of the 56 repositories listed are universities; the three national libraries also participated in the survey, as did a number of other institutions, businesses, and government authorities, including: the BBC; the Imperial War Museum; the publishers, Faber and Faber; Gloucestershire Archives; and Lincolnshire County Council. As the profile of each participating repository offers only a brief summary of its holdings, it was necessary to visit the website of each in turn, and if possible, to obtain descriptions of its literary collections.

The GLAM survey was a good starting point; however, 56 repositories represented only a small selection of the UK's literary archives. Information about other literary holdings had to be obtained by other means. It was anticipated that the most efficient way of doing this would be to search one or more of the UK's archive networks. The author decided to begin with the London-based network, AIM25 ("About AIM25", 2012), simply because its website was found to be more user-friendly than that of the Archives Hub ("Welcome", 2012). The author carried out advanced searches by selecting a repository and searching its listed collections using three key terms: "novelist", "poet", and "playwright" ("AIM25: Advanced search", 2012). The resulting collection descriptions were inspected, and those that included literary material were added to the author's notes.

In order to prevent the survey from becoming too London-centric, further repositories from around the UK were chosen by consulting the list of nearly 200 repositories that

appears on the Archives Hub website; the author then selected a sample of these, and visited their respective websites in turn (“Archives Hub contributors”, 2012).

The decision to survey exactly 70 repositories was not made arbitrarily; as the author began to gather together the repositories’ collection descriptions, it became clear that whilst 56 would have been too few, 70 repositories were approximately the most that could be studied, given the number of collections that this included, and the time constraints that were placed on this study.

Other approaches to collecting catalogue descriptions could have been taken. One method would have been to search the aforementioned UK archive networks using the names of authors as keywords. However, in this scenario, the names searched would have been dependent upon the author’s own personal tastes and prejudices; there was a danger that the resulting summary would not have reflected the diverse range of literary material held in the UK. Searching by repositories was deemed to be the most effective and impartial way of discovering the many different kinds of literary archives that exist across the UK.

It is clear that online searching is not without its limitations. As Bryman has noted, the transient nature of the Web means that analysis of online content is quickly rendered out of date as websites are changed, updated, or even removed (2012, p. 655). As a result, other researchers wishing to replicate or follow on from a particular study may have difficulties tracing the cited sources (Bryman, 2012, p. 656).

Another limitation of online searching is that of representativeness. It is impossible to determine the extent to which the online descriptions included in this study are truly representative of the entirety of the UK’s literary archives. In the majority of cases, the author was able to obtain detailed collection descriptions for all of the literary archives held by a particular repository. In a few cases, however, descriptions of individual collections either were not available, or would have been too time-consuming to obtain. For instance, a search of the British Library’s catalogue, using the keyword, “literary”, yielded 1070 results. In such cases, the author has relied upon summaries of

institutions' literary holdings, which were found on their respective websites.

This method is also limited in that it does not account for uncatalogued collections that have not been described online in any form.

Despite these disadvantages, it was clear that a survey of online catalogues was the most suitable way of presenting an overview of the contents of literary archives in the UK. A survey of UK literary archivists, regarding the contents of their respective holdings, might have been a viable alternative, if it were not for the time constraints placed on this study.

### Chapter Three: The Orwell Archive (Data Analysis)

Because of time constraints, the author was able to spend only one day consulting the Orwell papers in person. However, limited access to the collection did not prove to be a hindrance: for the purpose of collecting data, it was very nearly possible to rely solely on online resources, although inevitably, some details about certain sources had to be obtained either by consulting the documents themselves, or by studying published reproductions.

All of the data regarding the contents of the Orwell papers was retrieved from the online catalogue, which descends from collection level to item level ("Orwell papers", 2012). (A survey of the contents of the Orwell archive has been included as an appendix.)

For the purposes of data analysis, judgements regarding the value and potential uses of the papers were formed using the following methods: reading sub-fonds, file, and item descriptions ("Orwell", 2012); studying published reproductions; and where possible, consulting items in person.

## Chapter One: Literature Review

This chapter will review the existing published material on the subject of literary archives. It will compare and contrast the different ways in which literary archives have been defined, and it will critically discuss the continuing debate about the potential uses of literary collections for scholars, students, and archivists alike.

Perhaps the most memorable (certainly the most cited) attempt to elucidate the value of literary manuscripts is Philip Larkin's, which suggests that all literary manuscripts, in whatever form, possess at least one of two distinct qualities: a "magical value" and a "meaningful value" (1983, p. 99). The magical value, Larkin writes, is the older and more universal of the two, and relates to the tangibility of the manuscript: "this is the paper he wrote on, these are the words as he wrote them" (1983, p. 99).

According to Larkin, the meaningful value is that which increases our understanding of the author's life and work (Larkin, 1983, p. 99). Larkin notes that "not every manuscript has meaningful value", though he does state that every manuscript that is worth keeping will have some magical value (1983, p. 99-100).

Enniss supports Larkin's estimation that the notion of magical value is an old one, suggesting that the appeal of literary papers has its roots in the Romantic period, when the autographed manuscript came to be regarded as "evidence of an author's inner character and traces of his or her genius" (Enniss, 2001, p. 108).

Whilst the magical value is considered old and universal, the meaningful value appears to be a more recent phenomenon, which is generally thought to concern scholars, and the ways in which the study of manuscripts may aid academic research. Enniss suggests that the collecting practices of American institutions during the early 20th century directly contributed to the professionalisation of literary studies, in that they "promoted specific forms of scholarship based, in large part, in our libraries' rare book and manuscript reading rooms" (Enniss, 2001, p. 110).

As noted by Larkin and many others, some meaningful value can be found in most

types of documents held in a literary archive: surviving drafts may be used by scholars to chart the development of literary texts from first drafts to published works (Hill and Slocombe, 2010, p. 8); notebooks, if they are dated, may be used to provide evidence of chronology (Larkin, 1983, p. 99); letters, journals, and diaries may provide some context for the written works (Larkin, 1983, p. 98-99) while also offering a wealth of information to biographers (Bossis, 1986, p. 65); and books once belonging to a writer may reveal his/her literary tastes and influences, thus forming “a kind of intellectual biography” (Fehrman, “Lost libraries”, 2010).

Larkin’s concept of magical and meaningful values has been borrowed on many occasions, and other writers have expressed similar sentiments in different ways. Cowton specifies the values of literary manuscripts as being both their “internalness” (meaning their content), and their “externalness” (i.e., their appearance) (Cowton, 2010, p. 35-36).

Enniss’s claim that a sudden surge in the acquisition of literary manuscripts laid the foundations of literary scholarship appears to be supported by other sources. Altlick, writing in the mid-20th century, sees the study of literary manuscripts as essential to what he considers to be the two main aims of literary research:

[F]irst, to discover facts which previously have been unknown; second, to check the statements and quotations of earlier biographers and editors by going back to the original sources.

(Altlick, 1950, p. 87)

As Altlick points out, publishing editors, during the course of preparing reissues of literary texts, have often returned to original manuscripts in order to correct previous editing errors, and establish an authoritative text (1950, p. 87). As Dicken states, this process has continued, and in the last thirty years it has become increasingly more sophisticated, resulting in comprehensive publications such as the critical and synoptic edition of James Joyce’s *Ulysses*, which not only restores Joyce’s novel as he wrote it, but also presents a detailed chronology of the progression of his manuscripts, providing the dates when certain words or phrases first appeared in the

text (2000, p. 72).

It has been noted that in addition to aiding publishers, the contents of literary archives have continued to influence literary scholarship in another important way: as Dicken explains, it is through studying original manuscripts that scholars come to assess and re-assess writers, to such an extent that the “literary canon is coloured ... by decisions arrived at inside the archive repository” (Dicken, 2000, p. 57).

By consulting manuscripts, scholars may gain a greater understanding of how a piece of writing came to be: namely, how it evolved through successive drafts, due to various decisions that were made along the way. As Hobbs states, collected drafts reveal “the painful amount of work which goes into making really good literature” (2001, p. 128).

Others have misgivings about studying manuscripts. Chen, whilst acknowledging that the close examination of a sequence of drafts can reveal a great deal about the author’s deliberations over style and content - such as how certain words or phrases are rarely accidental or arbitrary - wonders whether the reading of an author’s manuscripts might be an intrusive act, revealing personal struggles that should remain private:

Because drafts ... [are] where petty, raw, immature things sit loudly on the page; things that need to be expurgated or transformed before ... [they] can become something beautiful.

(Chen, “Crafty David Foster Wallace”, 2011)

Gekoski voices similar doubts, although he is concerned not with intrusion, but rather with the possibility that a preoccupation with the compositional process is likely to undermine the finished work (“Why literary archives are like monkfish”, 2011). In his view, the cost of any insight gained into a text’s genesis is that “the special status of the final form of the text is mitigated” (“Why literary archives are like monkfish”, 2011).

Gekoski's concerns do not appear to be shared among archivists. Dicken, echoing the views of Altlick, argues that in order to unearth the original text of a published work, one must consult the original manuscript (2000, p. 69). Dicken appears to suggest that even if they do distract readers from the published work, the surviving manuscripts are very often likely to offer a more complete picture of the author's vision, as well as revealing the full extent of the creative process:

The literary work ... is not a miraculous production whose value and study are limited to the finished work. The finished book emerges as the shrunken product of [an] intricate and extensive compositional process which took place before the manuscript was sent to the typesetter.

(Dicken, 2000, p. 69)

However, Dicken does issue a note of caution, which is that scholars should not expect to retrieve from drafts the secrets to the compositional process (2000, p. 70). Surviving drafts cannot account for why a writer chose to use certain words or phrases, though they can provide clues, particularly if they reveal some of the alternatives that were considered (Dicken, 2000, p. 70).

As well as aiding the study of textual genetics, literary archives are vital sources for literary biographies. The benefits for biographers have been well documented: Hobbs states that the literary fonds, in addition to shedding light on literary matters "uncovers much about the evolving personality and character of the author" (2001, p. 128).

As Dicken notes, literary biographers are increasingly reliant on the personal papers found in literary archives, particularly letters, which are expected to show writers at their most candid (2000, p. 73). Received letters and e-mails (and copies of sent letters and e-mails) may reveal details about writers' relations with their editors, publishers, and agents, as well as offering information about their private lives (Hill and Slocombe, 2010, p. 8).

The boundary between literary criticism and literary biography can often appear

undefined, and many literary scholars hold the view that all written material belonging to a writer (including personal papers) has the potential to shed some light on the literary texts, either by revealing specific influences, or by providing context for the published works:

In literary research, all written products are potentially related to the evolution of the texts that define an author's canon.

(Overbeck, 1993, p. 64)

There is certainly support for this approach from within the archive profession. According to Kelliher and Brown, "anything which adds to the knowledge of a writer's life and the circumstances in which he wrote is of value" (1986, p. 63).

Hobbs argues that in most cases, literary scholars and literary biographers are primarily concerned not with verifying details about an author's life (which may already be known), but rather with developing a sense of the writer's character (2001, p. 133). In this respect, personal papers are invaluable, for they record not only facts, but also the writer's views, opinions, and in the cases of diaries and personal letters, the writer's emotional reactions to particular events (Hobbs, 2001, p. 127-128).

Much that has been written about using literary archives for research has also been concerned with examining a number of potential problems, of which it is suggested scholars should be wary. Such accounts have tended to focus on personal papers rather than on literary drafts, and have attempted to alert readers to a number of issues that could affect how they interpret material.

One such issue is the inevitable incompleteness of literary archives, the fact that "there is no such thing as an even 'reasonably' complete manuscript collection relating to a single author" (Altlick, 1950, p. 87). The danger is that if a certain amount of a writer's literary papers has been lost or destroyed, then that which has survived will be subject to greater scrutiny than would otherwise have been the case, potentially resulting in a distorted account of the writer's life and work. To take the example of correspondence (which does not always have a good survival rate), as

Dicken points out, if out of all of a writer's letters, only the love letters survive then "the writer's life shrinks to the size of a love-letter" (2000, p. 74).

Partiality is also considered to be a problem in the other sense of the word. Various writers have questioned the extent to which it is possible to understand an author's character through the study of his/her papers, on the basis that writers are possibly the most self-aware of all record creators, and are experts at constructing narratives through their writing.

The problem stems from the fact that literary archives are, in the Jenkinsonian sense, artificial collections: in most cases the majority of the material is not an "unintentional but fortuitous by-product" of an author's work (Tschan, 2002, p. 187) - it *is* the author's work. Nor are literary collections compiled in order to maintain evidential and informational values (Tener, 1984, p. 228). As Hobbs states, the personal records found in a literary archive form a series of constructs rather than straightforward evidence; they are the remnants of their creator's "rationalizations and romanticizations" (2001, p. 132). Dicken supports this view by suggesting that it is usually the case that the author has selected and edited his/her letters, diaries and other personal papers "with the public as much in mind as if it were a book for publication" (2000, p. 74).

According to Douglas and MacNeil, the writer's alterations limit the amount that can be learned about his/her character:

The capacity of a writer's archive to reveal character and intention, inevitably, is constrained by the writer's own efforts to conceal and edit the self...

(Douglas and MacNeil, 2009, p. 25)

Douglas and MacNeil appear to echo the sentiments expressed by Bossis, who in addressing the subject of literary correspondence, urges literary scholars to "accept that the writer will always be to a large degree opaque as an individual" (Bossis, 1986, p. 69). This view is also held by Dever, who argues that literary correspondence comprises "discrete instances of self-representation ... masks adopted according to the

demands of recipient and circumstance” (Dever, 1996, p. 120).

Those papers that were once regarded as the most unvarnished items of a literary archive - diaries, journals, personal letters - are now considered to be almost as stylised as literary drafts. Scholars have been warned, when studying a writer’s personal papers, not to expect to discover the “true” writer, but rather a series of glimpses of how the writer has adopted certain voices according to particular circumstances (Douglas and MacNeil, 2009, p. 39).

Within the archive community, it has been suggested that there are other factors concerning partiality, which may impact on the research value of *all kinds* of literary papers. Douglas and MacNeil state that archivists, when choosing certain physical and intellectual arrangements, also impose narratives on the material (Douglas and MacNeil, 2009, p. 30). How prominent these narratives appear to readers may depend on how much work the archivists have been required to carry out, but nevertheless, “the archivists’ reconstruction and representation of a writer’s archive inevitably introduce new layers of narrative into the writer’s archive” (Douglas and MacNeil, 2009, p. 31). It has been suggested that even the simple process of re-packaging recently deposited collections elevates them to a new monumental status (Douglas and MacNeil, 2009, p. 31).

Another factor relating to partiality is that of the role of the reader, which has been discussed by various writers. This issue concerns scholars who may be all too aware of the author’s role in constructing the archive, to the extent that they (the scholars) might over-interpret certain sources (Hill and Slocombe, 2010, p. 8). If scholars studying the contents of a literary archive believe that everything has been retained for a specific reason, then they will attempt to extract some meaning from even the most trivial of items (Hill and Slocombe, 2010, p. 8). By raising this issue, Hill and Slocombe question the wisdom of the aforementioned approach whereby every piece of written material is viewed as a potential influencing factor on a literary work; they fear that this may lead to scholars ascribing value to items that in fact did not inform any kind of creative process (Hill and Slocombe, 2010, p. 8). The act of over-interpreting sources might be recognised as a failure to take heed of Larkin’s advice: namely, that not all items in a literary archive are of meaningful value (1983, p. 99-

100).

None of the writers cited thus far suggest that partiality might diminish the value of consulting literary archives; it would seem to be the case that the actions of writers, archivists, and readers have been discussed in an attempt to formulate a deeper understanding of the nature of literary archives so that they may be used to greater effect.

However, the importance of literary archives has been questioned, albeit indirectly, by followers of certain trends within the field of literary studies. During the last century, a number of different schools of thought challenged the worth of searching for authorial intent: the New Criticism movement promoted the text as its own entity, separate from both author and reader (Eagleton, 1983, p. 44-53); Barthes, a post-structuralist, famously proclaimed the death of the author (Hill and Slocombe, 2010, p. 8); while those with a Freudian perspective have suggested that much of the author's inspiration is derived from the unconscious (Hill and Slocombe, 2010, p. 8).

Exponents of such views might be expected to argue that everything that can be known about a literary work can be found within the published text, thereby casting doubts on the merits of studying literary manuscripts. However, those working with literary archives would most likely insist that such arguments do not detract from the value of studying original manuscripts (Enniss, 2001, p. 115). In Enniss's view, the appeal of literary archives "has little to do with the artist's personality, skill, or genius, or even the intricacies of textual production" and rather more to do with a sense of mystery (2001, p. 115). This notion of the literary manuscript as first and foremost a mysterious artefact, the sole evidence of that first spark of inspiration (Enniss, 2001, p. 118), reaffirms Larkin's idea of magical value (1983, p. 99).

Comparatively little has been written about how literary archives may be used for reasons other than academic research. In 2006, the Group for Literary Archives and Manuscripts (GLAM) carried out a survey of its member institutions, and the results revealed that UK literary collections are being used for a number of reasons besides research (Gardner, 2006, p. 2). Chief among these was the use of literary archives for "teaching and learning activities", particularly at universities, where the study of

literary manuscripts has been incorporated into modules on literary criticism, life writing, textual editing, and creative writing (Gardner, 2006, p. 2).

The use of literary drafts as teaching aids for creative writing courses appears to be a relatively recent development, and one that is still more common in American institutions. Pavelich advocates the study of manuscripts as a way to show students “evidence of the labour of craftsmanship” (“Lighting fires in creative minds”, 2010). He also suggests that it can prepare creative writing students in other ways, such as by revealing how other parties, including editors, can influence a writer’s work (“Lighting fires in creative minds”, 2010).

Literary collections may also inspire new creative writing (Gardner, 2006, p. 4). According to Gardner, the writers Sarah Waters, Andrea Levy, and Margaret Forster have all consulted papers at Sussex University as part of their research for new works (Gardner, 2006, p. 4).

The GLAM survey also revealed that national libraries, museums, author houses, and independent libraries have taken great steps towards making literary archives relevant to a wider audience, particularly by reaching out to schoolchildren and adult learners (Gardner, 2006, p. 3). Examples cited include workshops for schoolchildren visiting Keats House, and a workshop for the builders who were working on the construction of a new site for the Roald Dahl Museum (Gardner, 2006, p. 3).

Gardner states that nearly half of the respondents gave examples of their material being used for both physical and virtual exhibitions (2006, p. 4). Again, national libraries, museums, author houses, and independent libraries have taken advantage of their exhibition spaces by displaying selections from their literary archives, and a small number of university libraries have begun to showcase their collections also (Gardner, 2006, p. 3).

There are very few in-depth accounts of the ways in which digitised images have been, or may be used to expose literary archives to a wider audience. Digitisation is widely recognised as the most effective way of reaching a large number of people who would not otherwise encounter literary archives. However, it has been noted that

the contents of many collections cannot be reproduced due to copyright restrictions (Gardner, 2006, p. 4). Furthermore, even when copyright is not an issue, many institutions do not have the financial resources to digitise vast amounts of literary papers and make them available online for free.

However, there are some exemplary projects, which due to generous funding, have been able to make digital content freely available online. The First World War Poetry Digital Archive, which was launched by the University of Oxford in 2008, is available for free. Visitors to the Archive website are able to view over 7,000 images, among which are the drafts of poems by Robert Graves, Edward Thomas, Siegfried Sassoon, and Wilfred Owen (“About the First World War Poetry Digital Archive”, 2012).

Taken as a whole, the available literature on the subject of literary archives appears to suggest that the benefits of studying literary manuscripts, in spite of popular trends within literary studies, remain undiminished. It is almost undisputed that literary archives serve as essential sources for literary research, albeit with several caveats borne in mind. Less documented is the use of literary archives for other ends, such as teaching, exhibitions, and new creative works (Gardner, 2006, p. 4).

According to the cited writings, it would seem that the responsibility of ensuring both that literary collections are not misinterpreted, and that they are used to their full potential, rests primarily with literary archivists. In this respect, the literary archivist is not only a custodian of material, but also a “curator, collector, gatekeeper and promoter” (Fauch, 2010, p. 29).

## Chapter Two: An Overview of Literary Archives in the UK

The purpose of this chapter is to survey both the contents of literary archives in the UK, and the different types of projects that have been undertaken in order to encourage their use.

### Types of records found in literary archives in the UK

As was touched upon in the previous chapter, literary archives, when they have not been sold into private hands, have traditionally been bequeathed to and/or acquired by university and national libraries, both in the UK and in the US. However, as this chapter will show, literary archives can be found in other repositories too, such as museums, publishing houses, and county record offices.

Due to the limited scope of this dissertation, it is not possible for this chapter to look at each literary collection in turn, nor is it feasible to mention each of the 70 UK institutions that were studied. Instead, this chapter will draw on examples from the 70 institutions in order to identify the documents, items, or artefacts (both physical and digital) that make up a typical literary archive.

From the evidence consulted, one could make the claim that in almost every writer's archive there are examples of one if not both of the following: literary drafts (either in manuscript, typescript, or digital form), and literary correspondence (letters, postcards, or e-mails). Not so ubiquitous, though still quite common, are items such as diaries, journals, and notebooks. Audio-visual material features in several literary archives (in the case of one particular archive, its entire holdings are comprised of audio material). Press cuttings of reviews, and remains of personal libraries occasionally feature, as does a range of non-literary items, from photographs to pipes. Additional material, i.e., items that have been acquired in order to enhance an existing literary archive, can be found in many collections.

In addition to writer's archives, there are a small number of literary archives that are devoted to publishing houses. Such collections are likely to be more business-

oriented, though they may also include manuscripts, typescripts, proofs, and first editions of literary works, as well as correspondence between publishers and writers.

### **Literary drafts, notebooks, and working notes**

Literary drafts exist as manuscripts, typescripts, and digital files of published or unpublished texts. Judging from the repositories studied, it would appear that manuscripts and typescripts are equally abundant in literary archives, and that the vast majority of literary drafts exist in one form or the other. This fact reflects the working habits of writers throughout the 20th century (from which the majority of collections date). More recent acquisitions include a mixture of manuscript, typescript, and digital drafts. For instance, the papers of the poet, Wendy Cope, which were acquired by the British Library in April 2011, include Microsoft Word files as well as paper drafts (British Library, 2011).

In addition to manuscripts and typescripts, notebooks and loose working notes are sometimes classed as drafts, as they often contain either early versions or fragments of literary works. It seems that notebooks have been used more frequently by poets than by novelists, perhaps because poems are usually more concise, and so can be drafted and re-drafted within one notebook. For example, the papers of the poet, Geoffrey Hill, which are held at the University of Leeds, include 69 poetry notebooks, containing drafts of poems, workings, and background research (“Literary papers and correspondence of Geoffrey Hill”, 2012).

Novelists’ notebooks, though less common, can be found in literary archives. The Peake papers, held by University College London, include (in addition to manuscripts and typescripts of chapters of *Titus Groan*, *Gormenghast*, and *Titus Alone*) notebooks on *Titus IV* and *Mr Pye*, many of which contain illustrations by Peake of characters from the novels (“Peake papers”, 2012).

The survival and extent of literary drafts vary enormously, often according to how organised and/or possessive writers were in regard to their papers. In some cases, writers may have kept the drafts of all of their writings, whilst in other cases the drafts may have been routinely destroyed.

The evidence suggests that the existence of variant drafts is more common in poets' archives than it is in those of novelists. For instance, the University of Hull holds the complete typescript of Stevie Smith's *Novel On Yellow Paper*, but has only 32 pages of an earlier version ("Stevie Smith", 2012). There are some exceptions, such as the papers of the novelist, David Lodge, which can be found at the University of Birmingham. Lodge's papers include both first and final typescripts of works of fiction ("The David Lodge papers", 2012). The University also holds a separate fonds consisting of manuscript, typescript, and printed versions of Lodge's short story, *The Man Who Wouldn't Get Up* ("Short story by David Lodge", 2012).

However, in most poets' archives, when drafts are present, the survival rates of different stages of drafts, and of notebooks, appear to be considerably higher. The papers of Philip Larkin, which are held at the University of Hull, include poetry workbooks, notebooks, typescripts and worksheets that feature "early and variant drafts of poems and plays" ("Philip Arthur Larkin", 2012).

Judging by the collection descriptions consulted, it appears to be more common for poets' drafts to be found across various archives than it is for novelists' drafts to become separated and dispersed. Although variant drafts of works of fiction are not as common, it would seem that those manuscripts and typescripts of novels or short stories that have survived are more likely to remain in a self-contained state, whereas the drafts of individual poems quite often are found scattered either across a collection, or across several collections in different parts of the UK.

This distinction may be due to the differences in the ways in which prose and poetry are composed and prepared for publication: novels are conceived as one piece of work; poems are usually created as individual texts, which later on may be gathered together to form a collection. Another reason may be the fact that a draft of a poem can exist on one single piece of paper, whereas the draft of a novel can run to several hundred pages, making it less likely that it will be removed from the rest of the writer's papers and sold as a single item.

Drafts of plays, which can often be quite lengthy, nevertheless appear to be vulnerable to dispersal in much the same way as poems are. For instance, those who are

interested in studying the literary drafts of the author and playwright, George Bernard Shaw, can find examples at twelve different repositories, both in the UK, and in the US (“Shaw, George Bernard”, 2012).

However, cases of dispersed poems are far more numerous. Indeed, a number of the institutions included in this study own “collections” of one or a few poems. Either these poems became, at some point or another, separated from the rest of the poets’ papers, or they were never part of their papers in the first place, which is to say they may have been enclosed with letters, handed to friends as gifts, or simply misplaced by their creators. University College London holds a manuscript transcript of Percy Bysshe Shelley’s *Ode to Naples*, written by Mary Shelley (“Shelley manuscript”, 2012); the University of Birmingham holds a signed transcript of Louis MacNeice’s poem, *Prayer Before Birth* (“MS561”, 2012).

### **Correspondence**

As has already been established, it is likely that some kind of correspondence can be found in the majority of UK literary archives. Indeed, there are some literary collections, such as the Doris Lessing archive, at the University of East Anglia, which consist solely of correspondence (“Doris Lessing Archive”, 2012).

Writers’ archives tend to contain mostly received correspondence. Due to the nature of written correspondence, it is inevitable that sent letters will survive in a multitude of locations, and so their final destinations will depend on whether their recipients chose to keep them, bequeath them, or sell them to the highest bidder.

So whilst a writer’s archive may contain an impressive amount of received correspondence, his/her own letters are more likely to be found within a number of other writers’ archives across the UK, and perhaps across the US as well. For instance, whilst the University of Hull holds the bulk of existing material relating to Philip Larkin - including a significant number of sent letters - its collection of correspondence is by no means complete, as letters from the poet can be found at the Bodleian Library, at the National Library of Wales, and at the University of Leeds (“Larkin, Philip Arthur”, 2012).

Some writers may have taken the trouble to make copies of letters they have written, but in most cases, sent letters are likely to exist elsewhere, unless the repository has acquired them separately. This appears to have been the case with some of the letters written by Siegfried Sassoon: the existing archive at Cambridge University Library was formed from various collections, which were purchased over a number of years (“Papers of Siegfried Sassoon”, 2012). The Library now holds letters both from and to Sassoon (“Papers of Siegfried Sassoon”, 2012).

Conversely, there have been cases of institutions having had to acquire received letters. In 1998, the University of Hull purchased a number of letters written to Philip Larkin from his old school friend, James Sutton, thus adding to a collection that already included Larkin’s side of the correspondence (“Philip Larkin subject guide”, 2012).

A writer’s correspondents may include professional contacts such as agents, editors, and publishers, as well as personal contacts such as friends, fellow writers, lovers, and family members. Letters from the 20th century are likely to be in manuscript or typescript form. More recent collections may include correspondence in the form of e-mails. The aforementioned Wendy Cope archive contains around 40,000 e-mails, dating from 2004 onwards (British Library, 2011).

Writers’ correspondence may provide further details about the literary circles that they moved in. For instance, University College London holds a collection of papers of the novelist, Arnold Bennett, which includes letters from writers such as Joseph Conrad, Dorothy L Sayers, and Virginia Woolf (“Bennett papers”, 2012).

Literary scholars are likely to be drawn to exchanges between writers for what they might reveal about the writers’ views on literature, and the progression of their respective works. Literary biographers may be drawn to correspondence that reveals details about a writer’s personal life. For example, John Keats’s letters are celebrated as literary texts in their own right, and the letters he wrote to his fiancée, Fanny Brawne - some of which are held at Keats House - have been studied at great length by his biographers (“Collection”, 2012). For those who believe that personal papers can reveal a sense of a writer’s character, personal letters, alongside diaries, are an

essential source (Hobbs, 2001, p. 133).

In the case of many writers, it may not be possible to study more than a few of their letters in any one place. Like poems, letters have been, and continue to be, sold as individual items, often into private hands, but also to university libraries. Just as there are numerous holdings consisting of one or a few poems, it is equally common to find institutions that hold either one or a bundle of letters written by a famous author or poet. King's College, Cambridge holds single letters from various writers, including Jane Austen ("Jane Austen", 2012), Charles Dickens ("Charles Dickens", 2012), and Christina Rossetti ("Christina Georgina Rossetti", 2012).

The often scattered existence of literary correspondence may make researchers' lives difficult, but as was discussed in the previous chapter, failure to take account of all of a writer's known correspondence may result in a rather narrow account of that writer's life, in much the same way as it would if only a small amount of a writer's correspondence had survived; in either event, the biographer would have emphasised the importance of certain relationships at the expense of others (Dicken, 2000, p. 74).

### **Diaries and journals**

The contents of writers' diaries and journals vary considerably. Some writers may have kept diaries for professional purposes only, such as scheduling meetings with agents and publishers. Other writers may have used diaries to reflect on matters in their personal lives. Personal diaries are much less common in archives than drafts or correspondence, perhaps because many writers have been reluctant to bequeath their most private papers; some writers may have decided instead to have their diaries destroyed (as Larkin did) (Motion, 1993, p. 522). Still, a significant number of the available collection descriptions mention diaries. Indeed, some writers have kept every piece of documentary evidence relating to their life and work; readers of the Muriel Spark archive, which is held at the National Library of Scotland, are able to study her diaries dating from 1929 to 1992 ("Muriel Spark Archive", 2012).

The contents of journals appear to be more varied; they are often used in a similar way to personal diaries, though they tend to contain a greater amount of notes relating

to literary works. The aforementioned Sassoon archive, in addition to poetry notebooks and drafts, also includes poems written in journals (“Papers of Siegfried Sassoon”, 2012).

### **Press cuttings**

Press cuttings occasionally feature in literary archives. Publishing houses often make a habit of collecting reviews of their books, and writers may also collect press cuttings for themselves.

It would seem that press cuttings, where they can be found, form a very small part of a literary collection; such is the case with the papers of John Cowper Powys (Churchill Archives Centre) (“The papers of John Cowper Powys”, 2012), and the papers of Roger McGough (University of Liverpool) (“The papers of Roger McGough”, 2012).

However, there are collections that contain a more significant amount of press cuttings. The papers of Harold Blundell, which are housed in the John Rylands Library, at the University of Manchester, include a range of press cuttings dating from 1929 to 1966, containing profiles of Blundell, reviews of his works, and articles submitted by him to the *Manchester Guardian* (“Papers of Harold Blundell”, 2012).

### **Personal libraries**

In the past, writers’ personal book collections were not as highly sought after as their professional and private papers, and in most cases, personal libraries were broken up and sold into private hands. Today, whilst personal libraries are rightly recognised as valuable evidence of writers’ tastes and influences, many repositories are unable to accept them, due to limitations of space. Some institutions, such as university and national libraries, may choose to incorporate personal libraries into their library stock. As a result, personal libraries rarely feature in UK literary archives.

However, there are examples of writers’ personal libraries being kept alongside acquired papers. The Tennyson Research Centre, in Lincoln, holds over 3,000 of

Alfred Tennyson's books; some of the books are annotated, and some of them are gift books from famous Victorian figures such as Queen Victoria, William Gladstone, and Robert Browning ("Tennyson resources", 2012).

Other personal libraries exist as unique collections in their own right. Among Swansea University's special collections is a collection of books that was donated by the poet, short story writer, and novelist, Glyn Jones ("Special Collections", 2012). According to the University's website, the books - many of which contain annotations - will remain separate from the library stock, and will be catalogued as the Glyn Jones collection ("Special Collections", 2012).

Of the institutions that have not been able to retain writers' personal libraries, some have had the foresight to make a record of the libraries' contents prior to their dispersals. The papers of E M Forster, at King's College, Cambridge, include "photocopies of several bookplates, date inscriptions to be found among the books that were in E M Forster's personal library and an alphabetical list of volumes" ("Forster's library and music collection", 2012).

### **Audio-visual material**

Audio and video recordings are a common feature of UK literary archives from the 20th century onwards, and a rather unique one too. Film and video footage, and audio recordings of long-deceased writers allow users to bring their subjects back to life. Whether they are radio interviews, television documentaries, or home movies, these recordings often reveal details that cannot be found in manuscripts. Hearing a writer speak, and observing his/her mannerisms and facial expressions, may help scholars to develop a deeper understanding of that writer's character.

In certain cases, audio-visual material may help either to reinforce, or to contradict details found in writers' papers. For instance, recorded interviews with writers are likely to include their views on a range of subjects, and there may well be disparities between what is said in public, and what is written in personal correspondence. Philip Larkin is an example of a writer whose public and private personas proved to be quite different from one another. The Philip Larkin book collection, which is held at the

University of Hull, includes a recording of the poet's appearance on the BBC radio programme, *Desert Island Discs*, and a recording of an episode of the BBC television programme, *Monitor*, entitled *Philip Larkin meets John Betjeman* ("Philip Larkin subject guide", 2012). Visitors to the University of Hull archives can compare the Larkin they encounter in these programmes with the Larkin who is revealed in private correspondence.

Other kinds of audio-visual material may inform users about how writers regarded and/or performed their own work. A number of collections include recordings of public readings. The respective papers of the poets, Brian Patten ("The papers of Brian Patten", 2012), and Roger McGough ("The papers of Roger McGough", 2012), both of which can be found at the University of Liverpool, include audio and video recordings of poetry readings.

There is one literary archive, based in the UK, which is concerned entirely with recordings of poets reading their poems. The Poetry Archive is, in its own words, "the world's premier online collection of recordings of poets reading their work" ("An introduction to the archive", 2012). It is, in the Jenkinsonian sense, an artificial archive, in that the majority of its material has not been inherited organically, but has been purposely created so that "everyone has a chance to hear major poets reading their work" ("About us", 2012).

However, in addition to recording contemporary poets, the Poetry Archive has made available online recordings of deceased poets, which have been reproduced from other sources. Researchers, teachers, and students alike are able to listen to a range of poets from the past 120 years or so, from Alfred Tennyson to Alice Oswald ("The poets", 2012).

According to one of the archive's directors, the poet, Andrew Motion, the greatest benefit to be gained from hearing poets recite their own work is that their own intimate relationships with the poems are revealed: the stressing of certain words may provide "tacit explanations", and the tone adopted by the poet should suggest the mood that was intended ("Listening to poetry", 2012). It may be argued that such recordings possess magical value, in that they preserve the sound of the poet's voice,

and meaningful value, in that they reveal the poet's intentions. As Motion suggests, through their performances, the poets disclose how their poems sound inside their own heads ("Listening to poetry", 2012).

### **Photographs and personal effects**

Photographs appear to be present in quite a number of 20th century literary archives. For many collections, photographs are listed as ephemera, alongside press cuttings. However, there are at least a couple of UK literary archives that include quite substantial collections of photographs. The papers of E M Forster, at King's College, Cambridge, include a collection of photographs and prints ("The papers of Edward Morgan Forster", 2012). The J B Priestley archive, which is held at the University of Bradford, contains "a huge collection of photographs" ("The J B Priestley archive", 2012).

Personal items once belonging to a writer can be an attractive feature of a literary archive: they can reveal details about a writer's non-literary life, and they may be used to great effect either in exhibitions or in promotional material. The J B Priestley archive includes some of the writer's paintings, and a selection of his pipes ("The J B Priestley archive", 2012). The archive of the poet, Adam Johnson, which is held at the John Rylands Library, University of Manchester, includes his typewriter, and his baby shoes ("Adam Johnson papers", 2012).

Personal items possess little literary value, and are usually retained for their magical value. McCrum has suggested that as digital files begin to replace their paper equivalents as the most common feature of literary archives, archivists might seek to acquire more "non-literary artefacts" in order to compensate for the comparatively dull "discarded hard drives" ("What writers leave behind in a digital age", 2011). This statement seems to imply that most non-academic users of literary archives are interested solely in magical value, a quality that digital files plainly lack.

### **Additional material**

Institutions often seek to enhance a writer's archive with additional material: items

that did not belong to the writer, but which relate to his/her life and work. The papers of Julian Bell, which are held at King's College, Cambridge, include a significant amount of "secondary material": letters, obituaries, and news cuttings, which have been assembled since Bell's death by his brother, Quentin Bell ("The papers of Julian Heward Bell", 2012).

Much of the aforementioned audio-visual material may also be classed as additional material: items that did not belong to the writers, but which were acquired subsequently. The audio-visual material in the Philip Larkin book collection appears to have been acquired by the University of Hull, rather than received as part of Larkin's original bequest ("Philip Larkin subject guide", 2012).

### **Publishers' archives**

A number of long-established publishing houses either have created their own archives, or have deposited material at other institutions. The University of Bristol holds the Penguin Archive, which documents the history of Penguin Books ("University of Bristol library and theatre archive", 2012). The collection includes: the papers of one of Penguin's founders, Allen Lane ("Allen Lane files", 2012); editorial files, some of which contain correspondence with authors, cover designs, and illustrations ("Penguin editorial files" 2012); papers relating to the *Lady Chatterley's Lover* trial ("Lady Chatterley's Lover trial papers", 2012); and an ongoing collection of books published by Penguin ("Penguin book collection", 2012).

### Projects undertaken by institutions in order to promote their literary collections

The second half of this chapter will attempt to summarise the ways in which literary archives are being, or have recently been promoted by their custodians. In so doing, it will highlight a number of interesting examples ranging from traditional initiatives such as in-house exhibitions, to more innovative projects such as online exhibitions, and commemorative blogs.

As was stated in the previous chapter, relatively little has been written about the use

of literary archives for non-academic purposes, although it was noted that nearly half of the respondents to the GLAM survey of 2006 stated that items from their literary collections had been used both in physical and in virtual exhibitions (Gardner, 2006, p. 4). Based on online evidence only, it would appear that comparatively few repositories have held physical exhibitions. Virtual exhibitions, and other forms of online exposure, such as slideshows and blogs, are more common. However, there may be a number of physical exhibitions, both past and present, which have not been promoted online. Indeed, many institutions, particularly universities, have permanent displays of archival material, which are intended for visitors, but which are not considered to be “events” that warrant online promotion (this is another limitation of online searching, which in this case cannot be overcome).

### **Physical exhibitions**

Traditionally, institutions have promoted their literary archives by putting selected items on display. It has usually been the case that only those organisations with sufficient space and staff have been able to support permanent displays of literary artefacts. The British Library’s *Treasures of the British Library* exhibition is a rare example of a permanent exhibition; it displays a great amount of literary material, such as: the manuscripts of Charlotte Brontë’s novel, *Jane Eyre*; Lewis Carroll’s diary; the manuscript of Thomas Hardy’s novel, *Tess of the d’Urbervilles*; and the manuscript of Virginia Woolf’s novel, *Mrs. Dalloway* (“Literary manuscripts and printed books”, 2012).

Lincoln Central Library maintains a permanent exhibition of a sample of the holdings of the Tennyson Research Centre, and lists the contents of current displays online (“Current display of holdings of the Tennyson Research Centre”, 2012).

More common are those exhibitions that run for a limited period, either to commemorate an anniversary, or to promote a recent acquisition. *The Worlds of Mervyn Peake*, an exhibition curated by the British Library, ran from the 5th July to the 2nd October 2011, and marked the centenary of Peake’s birth by displaying items from his archive, which the British Library acquired in 2010 (“The worlds of Mervyn

Peake”, 2012). Among the documents exhibited was an unpublished draft of the sequel to the *Gormenghast* trilogy, which was completed by Peake’s widow, Maeve (British Library, 2010).

In 2011, Durham University held an exhibition that celebrated the return of one of its most prized literary artefacts; *Shakespeare: The Return of the First Folio* told the story of the theft and eventual recovery of the University’s copy of the famous book (“Shakespeare: The return of the first folio”, 2012).

### **Joint physical and virtual exhibitions**

A number of institutions have curated exhibitions that have existed both in a physical space and online. In many cases, the virtual aspect of the exhibition has continued long after the physical version has ended.

Perhaps the most ambitious exhibition of this kind is *Shelley’s Ghost: Reshaping the Image of a Literary Family*, a collaboration between the Bodleian Library, at University of Oxford, and the New York Public Library, which explores the lives and works of William Godwin and his wife, Mary Wollstonecraft, their daughter, Mary Shelley, and their son-in-law, Percy Bysshe Shelley (“Shelley’s ghost: Reshaping the image of a literary family”, 2012). Physical exhibitions ran for limited periods at the Bodleian Library and at the Wordsworth Museum, in Cumbria, in 2011. The virtual exhibition, which can still be accessed online, includes a video introduction from the curator, brief histories of the four subjects (including their achievements, and the tragedies that befell them), and a range of digital images of selected material (“Shelley’s ghost: Reshaping the image of a literary family”, 2012).

Whilst the physical versions of the exhibition may have been well attended, the virtual version allows anyone with online access to learn more about the Godwin and Shelley families, and to discover an array of literary artefacts. It is also interactive: for instance, visitors to the website are able to turn the pages of the two notebooks that Mary Shelley used to draft her novel, *Frankenstein* (“Shelley’s ghost: Reshaping the image of a literary family”, 2012).

For those researching the lives and works of the four subjects in considerable depth, it would be necessary to view the collections in person, as the online images are just a representative sample. However, overall, as the number of effusive tweets would appear to attest, the online exhibition has succeeded in capturing people's imagination; it has made (and continues to make) accessible to the public in digital form a large selection of literary manuscripts, letters, and assorted items that would otherwise have remained known to only a small number of people.

### **Virtual exhibitions/digital galleries**

It would appear that joint physical-virtual exhibitions such as the one mentioned above are quite rare; in most cases, it seems that institutions opt for one or the other. Virtual exhibitions, or digital galleries, as they are sometimes described, allow literary archives to be given permanent exposure online, without risking long-term damage to their contents. They reach a far bigger audience, and may well encourage more people to view the collections in person.

The University of Glasgow has produced a virtual exhibition and an accompanying Flickr slideshow in order to promote a number of scrapbooks belonging to the poet, Edwin Morgan ("Edwin Morgan scrapbooks", 2012). A series of Web pages, illustrated with images from the scrapbooks, explain the origins and motives behind the books, which Morgan compiled over a period of thirty years ("Edwin Morgan scrapbooks", 2012). The pages of the scrapbooks resemble collages: newspaper cuttings, photographs, and other printed material arranged alongside each other ("Edwin Morgan scrapbooks", 2012). Together, the online exhibition and slideshow provide an insight into the poet's world view during that period of his life, reflecting his interest in a range of different subjects, from Chinese mythology to Surrealist art ("Edwin Morgan scrapbooks", 2012).

### **Blogs**

For the custodians of literary archives, maintaining a blog is a cheap and cheerful way of keeping the public informed about any news relating to a repository's holdings, such as recent acquisitions and forthcoming events. A blog may also be used to shine

a spotlight on specific collections. Additional devices such as tagging allow readers to find blog posts relating to subjects that interest them.

There appear to be very few blogs that focus on one particular collection. *The Sassoon Project Blog*, which is run by staff at Cambridge University Library, documents the cataloguing of the recently acquired Sassoon archive (“Sassoon project blog”, 2012). The blog, which began in May 2010, promoted the exhibition, *Dream Voices: Siegfried Sassoon, Memory and War*, and continued after the exhibition had ended (“Sassoon project blog”, 2012). The blog posts reveal interesting details about the collection, and are often timed to commemorate important dates in the poet’s life. Some of the posts include images: a post commenting on the trench mud found on Sassoon’s journal features photographic evidence (“Sassoon project blog”, 2012).

### Conclusions

Having surveyed the literary material that exists across 70 UK repositories, it is safe to say that whilst no two literary archives are alike, there are clearly a number of typical elements, some of which are more common than others. The most prominent types of records are literary drafts and correspondence; indeed, it could be said that they are the defining features of a writer’s archive. Diaries, journals, press cuttings, and personal libraries are far less abundant, but do appear in a number of collections. Audio-visual recordings are quite common, particularly in poets’ archives. Personal effects are listed in quite a few collection descriptions (especially those of the larger literary archives), as are additional items. Finally, there are a small number of publishers’ archives, which despite being focused more on the business of editing and publishing may still include a great amount that is of interest to literary scholars.

From the institutions studied, it would appear that online projects are being favoured over physical exhibitions. Compared with their physical equivalents, online exhibitions, once established, require very little ongoing work; moreover, they remove the need to subject fragile items to long-term exposure. Online exhibitions also enable curators to reach a much wider audience than would otherwise have been possible, particularly in the cases of those repositories that either are unable to receive a large number of visitors, or are located in remote areas of the UK.

Having described the most common elements that are to be found in UK literary collections, and the methods by which literary archives have been promoted, the next step will be to focus on the contents and uses of one literary archive in particular.

### Chapter Three: The Orwell Papers (Data Analysis)

This chapter will examine the various ways in which the Orwell archive has been used since its formation in 1960.

A survey of the contents of the Orwell archive has been included as an appendix. As the survey shows, whilst the archive is relatively short on literary drafts, and lacks a personal library, it is abundant in its representation of the other elements (identified in chapter two) that constitute a typical literary archive.

The first part of this chapter will examine more closely the value of the Orwell papers as primary sources, both by discussing items from the archive, and by highlighting how they have been interpreted in certain publications.

The second part will look at how items from the archive have been reproduced in print. Much of this section will focus on the two editions that have done the most to draw attention to the Orwell papers: *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell*, which reproduces a selection of material from the Orwell archive, and *The Complete Works of George Orwell*, which, as its title suggests, aims to reproduce all available material written by Orwell, including that which can be found in the Orwell archive.

The final part of the chapter will discuss two projects - one past and one ongoing - that have used material from the archive.

Throughout the chapter, the significance of the publications and projects will be assessed, in terms of both how they increase awareness of the Orwell papers, and how they contribute to the study of George Orwell's life and work generally. Finally, having discussed how the Orwell papers have been or may be used, this chapter will conclude by evaluating the overall value of the Orwell archive.

#### Assessing the value of the Orwell papers

Beginning with the sub-fonds, "Literary manuscripts" and "Literary notebooks", in

comparison with other literary archives, there is little material here that might be used for the study of textual genetics. Orwell appears to have habitually destroyed his literary drafts, and Davison suggests that the typescripts of *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* survive only because Orwell did not live long enough to destroy them (2010, p. vii).

However, the manuscripts and typescripts that do survive offer some valuable insights. Literary scholars can examine Orwell's early writings in order to gain a better understanding of how he developed his craft. Orwell himself wrote: "I do not think one can assess a writer's motives without knowing something of his early development" (1979, pp. 182). In light of this statement, scholars may speculate as to whether Orwell destroyed the great majority of his drafts in order to conceal his own early development.

The so-called early drafts of *Burmese Days* ("Orwell/A/1/U", 2012) tempt scholars into assessing how they relate to the finished novel. Davison points out that the drafts bear no relation to the novel in terms of storyline, and prefers to consider the drafts as "trial runs for *Burmese Days*" (1996, p. 21). Bowker appears to value the drafts more for what they might reveal about Orwell's own experiences in Burma (2003, p. 88).

*The Road to Wigan Pier* diary ("Orwell/A/3/A", 2012) allows readers an insight into the compositional process of the book of the same name. As Davison points out, there is a particular passage in *The Road to Wigan Pier* that differs slightly from the diary version: in the diary, when describing his impressions upon seeing a woman clearing a blocked drain, Orwell states that he was quite near to the woman and that they exchanged eye contact; in the book, Orwell describes the scene as seen from a train window (Davison, 1996, p. 73-74).

Some aspects of the literary notebooks may be of value to literary scholars. As Crick states, the first notebook contains "an early but clear outline of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*" under the working title, *The Last Man in Europe* (1980, p. 262). Crick cites this outline in order to refute the claims of "morbid critics" who have claimed that *Nineteen Eighty-Four* was conceived quite quickly following the sudden decline of its author's health (1980, p. 407). The third notebook offers scholars a glimpse of

Orwell's intentions for the unfinished work, *A Smoking-room Story* ("Orwell/B/3", 2012).

Furthermore, the literary notebooks shed light both on Orwell's health problems during the last few years of his life, and on certain matters that occupied his mind while he was receiving treatment. The second literary notebook in particular includes two thought-provoking passages which might appeal to those interested in studying the "character of the author" (Hobbs, 2001, p. 128): one on the elusiveness of memory, and another on the effects that illness has on the ability to write or even form intelligent thoughts ("Orwell/B/2", 2012).

The sub-fonds, "Spanish Civil War material", contains a significant amount of interesting ephemera, which would be of interest to any Orwell biographer; the various handbills and newspaper cuttings, if studied alongside Orwell's own notes, would make useful sources for those interested in Orwell's political development during the late 1930s ("Orwell/C", 2012).

General notebooks are the kinds of items that can be subjected to over-interpretation; as was touched upon in the literature review, researchers must be careful not to ascribe value where there is none (Hill and Slocombe, 2010, p. 8). However, in this particular case, although Orwell's general notebooks may appear quite mundane, they do in fact contain some important details.

The payment notebook for 1943-1945 shows how much Orwell was paid for his work as a journalist ("Orwell/D/1", 2012). The index of re-printable essays ("Orwell/D/3", 2012) gives the impression that Orwell considered those pieces to be among his finest work; it also suggests that those essays that are not listed were not very highly valued by their author.

The political diaries ("Orwell/E", 2012) are excellent sources for studying both Orwell's reactions to the events leading up to the Second World War, and his impressions of the first few years of the conflict. Readers are able to gain a glimpse of Orwell's state of mind as London was torn apart by the Blitz. One particular entry

from October 1940 succinctly captures his despair:

The unspeakable depression of lighting fires every morning with papers of a year ago, and getting glimpses of optimistic headlines as they go up in smoke.

(Davison, 2010, pp. 285)

In many of the entries, Orwell discusses the government's use of propaganda; it is in these passages that Orwell scholars may be able to detect sources of inspiration for aspects of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Those with a particular interest in Orwell's life-long love of poetry may be amused by an entry, dated the 8th December 1940, where Orwell describes how during recent bombing raids "scraps of nonsense poetry were constantly coming into my mind" (Davison, 2010, pp. 289).

Like the political diaries, Orwell's domestic diaries ("Orwell/F", 2012) are a rich source for biographers; they do not offer the same level of insight into Orwell's state of mind as the political volumes do, but they do provide an impeccable record of where Orwell was at a particular time, and what domestic tasks he was attending to. One entry from 1947 recounts a near drowning in the Gulf of Corryvreckan (Davison, 2010, pp. 461); another entry reveals the inspiration for the title of the novel, *Coming Up for Air* (Davison, 2010, pp. 109).

Although some of his diary entries reveal Orwell at his most frank, readers should not mistake these writings as being entirely unself-conscious. As was noted in the literature review, even in their private papers, writers always retain a certain degree of self-awareness. These diaries bear the same style of restraint as Orwell's published work; indeed, the wartime diaries were composed with the notion of publishing them at a later date, as "a record of the times" (Davison, 2010, p. 244).

Orwell's letters ("Orwell/G", 2012) allow readers to trace his development from boyhood to fatherhood; from schoolboy to acclaimed novelist. Through reading his letters, Orwell scholars are able to study his personal and professional relationships, while also learning about his approach to writing. In one letter to a friend, Orwell

writes quite frankly about how his latest novel (*Keep the Aspidistra Flying*) is progressing: “I want this one to be a work of art, & that can’t be done without much bloody sweat” (Davison, 2010, p. 50). In a letter to his publisher, Orwell requests some last minute adjustments to *Animal Farm* before it goes to press (Davison, 2010, p. 246).

The letters that make up the sub-fonds, “Letters to Orwell” (“Orwell/H”, 2012), must also be counted as essential sources for Orwell scholars. Like Orwell’s own letters, they show the struggles Orwell faced to establish himself as a writer. In one letter, T S Eliot, on behalf of Faber & Faber, rejects *Animal Farm* on the grounds that “we have no conviction ... that this is the right point of view from which to criticise the political situation at the present time” (“Orwell/H/1”, 2012). Most poignantly, this sub-fonds contains Eileen Blair’s final, unfinished letter to Orwell, written shortly before she underwent an operation that she would not survive (Davison, 2010, p. 260-261).

The sub-fonds, “Associated papers” (“Orwell/I”, 2012), contains a variety of useful items. The statement on *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (“Orwell/I/2/C”, 2012) provides an unequivocal account of the author’s intentions for a book that has been widely misinterpreted. The preface to the Ukrainian edition of *Animal Farm* (“Orwell/I/2/E”, 2012) performs a similar service for that book, for as Davison suggests, it makes the book’s origins abundantly clear (1996, p. 125).

As can be seen in the appendix, the sub-fonds, “Personalia” (“Orwell/J”, 2012), contains a mixture of legal documents and ephemera. The legal documents are useful sources for biographers in that they provide indisputable proof of the essential facts of Orwell’s life, such as his dates of birth and death (“Orwell/J/1” and “Orwell/J/4”, 2012). Ephemera can often reflect important aspects of a person’s life that would otherwise go undocumented, and there are a number of items here that biographers would find useful for that reason. For instance, an Eton alumni dinner menu from 1938 (“Orwell/J/11”, 2012), which is signed by those in attendance, shows the extent to which Orwell maintained his Eton connections.

The papers of Eileen Blair (“Orwell/K”, 2012) may not appear to be essential reading

material for Orwell scholars, as many of the items date from the period before Eileen knew Orwell. However, several of the letters addressed to Eileen date from the summer of 1937, when she and Orwell were in Barcelona (“Orwell/K”, 2012); these letters may give biographers a greater understanding of the events of this time, and their effects on Orwell and Eileen.

Orwell’s family papers (“Orwell/L”, 2012) contain some useful sources for biographers. The legal documents (“Orwell/L/1”, 2012) and news cuttings (“Orwell/L/4”, 2012) relating to various family members provide information about the history of the Blair family. The letters from Orwell to his mother, Ida Blair (“Orwell/L/5”, 2012), offer some insights into their relationship. The diary kept by Orwell’s mother during 1905 is a brief but nonetheless useful source (“Orwell/L/2”, 2012). Crick notes that the diary sheds some light both on Ida Blair’s character and on her son’s health (1980, p. 7); Davison remarks on how it reveals that Orwell’s mother led a very active social life, in spite of having to manage the children on her own while her husband was away in India (1996, p. 6).

The sub-fonds, “Posthumous material” (“Orwell/M/23”, 2012), contains a wealth of information for Orwell biographers. Some of the reminiscences of Orwell cover particular stages of his life such as his school years (“Orwell/M/14”, 2012), his time as a schoolmaster (“Orwell/M/20”, 2012), and the period he spent in Catalonia (“Orwell/M/24”, 2012); others appear to be less tied down to a specific period. Together, these accounts help to build up a picture of what Orwell was like as a person.

Proofs are usually considered to be among the least exciting elements of a literary archive, unless it is the case that a book underwent drastic changes prior to being published. In the case of the Orwell papers, the page proofs of what would become *Down and Out in Paris and London* (“Orwell/N/1”, 2012) are interesting for two reasons: one, they reveal that the decision to give the book that name was made rather late, as the proof bears the title, *Confessions of a Down and Out in London and Paris*; and two, they show that the pseudonym, “Orwell”, had not yet been chosen, as the work is credited to “X” (Davison, 1996, p. 33).

The radio scripts (“Orwell/O”, 2012) reveal another side to Orwell as a writer, which is his ability to produce adaptations both of his own work, and of the work of others. As Davison points out, the *Animal Farm* script (“Orwell/O/5”, 2012) is particularly interesting, as it includes four lines of dialogue that Orwell inserted in order to clarify what he regarded as the turning point of the story: the moment when the pigs decided to keep the milk and apples for themselves (1996, p. 128).

The sub-fonds, “Adaptations and screenplays” (“Orwell/P”, 2012), is useful for those with an interest in how Orwell’s fiction has been adapted for different media; it also serves as a testament both to the power of Orwell’s storytelling, and to the lasting popularity of his two most successful works, *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

The selection of documentary scripts (“Orwell/Q”, 2012) is a valuable source for biographers. Like much of the aforementioned posthumous material, these scripts record the views of a number of Orwell’s relatives, friends, and acquaintances. It may be the case that some of these scripts are more revealing than the various written reminiscences.

The audio-visual cassettes (“Orwell/R”, 2012) hold little of value for the serious Orwell scholar. It is possible (though doubtful) that the various television documentaries collected here shed new light on Orwell’s life and work. These documentaries may be of interest to the casual Orwell reader, although it is unlikely that such a person would make a special visit to the archive in order to watch them, particularly as these recordings are likely to be available elsewhere.

Orwell biographers are likely to find only some of Sonia Orwell’s papers useful (“Orwell/S”, 2012): namely, the correspondence relating to Orwell and his estate. However, anyone studying the life of Sonia Orwell, or indeed the life of any one of her many correspondents, would no doubt find valuable information among these papers.

A selection of photographs can bring a person to life far more effectively than even the most dazzling piece of descriptive prose, which is why so few biographies are without them. The sub-fonds, “Photographs”, contains images of Orwell throughout

his life: there are pictures of him as a baby, as an adolescent, as a soldier (both in Spain, and in England, as a member of the Home Guard), as a writer (stationed behind his typewriter), and as a father (holding his baby adopted son, Richard) (“Orwell/T”, 2012).

Moreover, as is noted in the appendix, many of the photographs document the lives of Orwell’s family and friends. In this respect, these photographs are vital sources for helping biographers to put faces to names.

It has been shown that the Orwell archive is a very important resource to literary scholars, biographers, and casual Orwell readers alike. However, as was discussed in the literature review, there is no such thing as a complete literary archive (Atlick, 1950, p. 87), and the Orwell archive is no different, as is clearly indicated by its comparative paucity of literary drafts. Prospective researchers are encouraged to also seek out Orwell-related material elsewhere, in order to avoid the pitfall of distorting the significance of certain elements of this collection.

These caveats aside, the Orwell papers possess tremendous value; collectively, they shed light on every stage of Orwell’s life, even his time in Burma, for which there is relatively little written or pictorial evidence. The following section will discuss how much of this archival material has been reproduced in print.

#### Published reproductions of items from the Orwell archive

The first notable use of the Orwell archive was the inclusion of certain items from it in *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell*, which was first published in 1968. Edited by Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus, *The Collected Essays* reproduces a selection of Orwell’s essays, articles, letters, and diaries, as well as the odd piece of prose and poetry. Of an estimated 226 letters across four volumes (Davison, 1998, p. xxii), 93 are held in the Orwell archive at UCL.

According to Sonia Orwell, the motivation for publishing *The Collected Essays* was not to create an “academic monument”, but rather to complement Orwell’s novels and books (Orwell & Angus, 1982, pp. 15). It was intended that these four volumes,

together with Orwell's published texts, would amount to a collected works (Orwell & Angus, 1982, pp. 15).

The material in *The Collected Essays* is presented in chronological order, for two reasons, according to the editors: one, because much of Orwell's essays and journalism cannot be separated and pigeonholed very easily (a problem that archivists sometimes encounter when cataloguing literary fonds); and two, so that readers may view a "continuous picture of Orwell's life as well as of his work" (Orwell & Angus, 1982, pp. 17). The advantage of this arrangement is that it may be possible to trace an idea or an argument from its initial expression in a letter to its appearance in a published essay or article. A disadvantage may be that readers could lose the thread of a conversation that is sustained over two or three letters if those letters are separated by a long piece of journalism.

*The Collected Essays*, though far from exhaustive, nonetheless had the effect of widening access to some of Orwell's unpublished work: the selected letters gave early biographers of Orwell an insight into his professional and personal relationships; the two wartime diaries revealed Orwell's private views on the Second World War; the excerpt from a supposed early draft of *Burmese Days* allowed literary scholars the opportunity of exploring its relationship with the finished novel; and by keeping the edition to four compact volumes, the editors appealed to every-day readers of Orwell who might be interested in viewing a "continuous picture" of his life and work.

As Davison points out, at the time of its publication, *The Collected Essays* offered "an adventurously large choice" of material (1998, p. xix). However, in the years that followed, Orwell's reputation as a writer grew considerably (thanks in no small part to *The Collected Essays*), and it became clear that "something much fuller" was required to satisfy the interest in Orwell's life and work (Davison, 1998, p. xix). This is a prime example of how archives can influence literary scholarship: the study of previously restricted material can result in writers' reputations being enhanced, through a reassessment of their works (Dicken, 2000, p. 57).

The most ambitious use of the Orwell archive to date is *The Complete Works of George Orwell*. Edited by Peter Davison and spanning twenty volumes, it could be

described as an “academic monument”. Volumes one to nine, first published in 1986-1987, comprise the “authoritative editions” of each of Orwell’s nine books (Davison, 1998, p. xix). Volumes ten to twenty, which were published in 1998, gather together (in chronological order) everything else that Orwell wrote: every available essay, article, letter, diary entry, and literary draft. *The Complete Works* also include the letters of Orwell’s first wife, Eileen Blair, and a selection of letters written by Orwell’s sisters, Marjorie and Avril, some of which are in the Orwell archive (Davison, 1998, p. xxii).

*The Complete Works* may be too extensive for the casual reader of Orwell, but it is an essential source for those who wish to study Orwell in more depth. Whilst *The Collected Essays* merely hinted at the wealth of material that exists in the Orwell archive and beyond, *The Complete Works* has granted its readers access to material from fifteen of the twenty sub-fonds that make up the Orwell papers.

As Davison states, *The Complete Works* cannot be regarded as a “diplomatic edition” of the original material, for a number of typographical errors and other “deformities” have been removed (1998, pp. xli). Nevertheless, the edition succeeds in conveying the meaningful value of the original papers by reproducing their contents in a clear and precise way.

Indeed, it could be argued that the meaningful value of the Orwell papers - and of the other collections represented in *The Complete Works* - is enhanced by the inclusion of annotations, textual explanations, and a certain degree of historical context (Davison, 1998, pp. xx). On a number of occasions, Davison speculates on the dates of particular items, and gives his reasons. For instance, the UCL catalogue estimates that an undated letter from Orwell to his mother was written some time during 1914 (“Orwell/G/1”, 2012); Davison, having made certain deductions, suggests that a more likely date is mid-July, 1916 (1998, pp. 21-22). Davison’s estimations are well informed; they would be useful additions to the archive’s catalogue.

*The Complete Works* is no replacement for consulting the Orwell archive in person; it cannot convey the tangible quality of the papers themselves. However, by reproducing Orwell’s illustrations from his diaries and letters, it does give readers a

hint of the magical value of those items (Davison, 1998, pp. xxiii).

Davison is responsible for two more recent publications, *George Orwell: Diaries*, and *George Orwell: A Life in Letters*, both of which are partly derived from *The Complete Works*. The diaries volume reproduces all of Orwell's surviving diaries from the Orwell archive (including Orwell's illustrations), as well as some related entries from Orwell's second and last literary notebooks. *A Life in Letters* comprises 297 letters, of which 90 are taken from the Orwell archive. Of these 90 letters, 82 are from Orwell, seven are from Eileen Blair, and one is a letter from Ihor Szewczenko to Orwell, requesting Orwell's permission to publish a Ukrainian edition of *Animal Farm* (Davison, 2010, p. 302). Like the diaries volume, *A Life in Letters* reproduces some of the illustrations Orwell included with his letters; unlike the diaries volume, this selection of letters also includes twelve photographs from the Orwell archive.

These two volumes complement *The Complete Works* to a certain extent: they each reproduce the preliminary notes and annotations that accompanied the diary entries and letters in *The Complete Works*. It may be argued that the diaries and letters volumes are more suited to the casual Orwell reader than to the Orwell scholar. This is certainly the case for *A Life in Letters*, which offers only a selection of correspondence. The diaries edition, on the other hand, is a useful book for students and academics in that it allows for an uninterrupted, sequential reading of Orwell's diaries. Together these two volumes provide a fascinating insight into Orwell's professional and personal life; Davison suggests that they "go some way to offering the autobiography that Orwell did not write" (2010, p. xv).

So far, this chapter has assessed the intrinsic value of the Orwell papers; it has also evaluated a number of books that have reproduced material from the Orwell archive. The next part of this chapter will discuss two important projects that have used items from the archive.

#### Projects that have used the Orwell archive

Before discussing these two projects, it is worth noting that the very fact that they have been undertaken - both with the aim of increasing access to the Orwell archive -

is a further testament to the value of the archive as a resource.

### **Orwell Diaries**

On the 9th August 2008, the people behind The Orwell Prize embarked on an intriguing project. They began to blog Orwell's domestic and political diaries in real time, 70 years to the day after each entry was written ("Orwell diaries 1938-1942: About", 2012). The diaries began in 1938 and ended in 1942, which meant that the bloggers had committed themselves to a four year long project ("Orwell diaries 1938-1942: About", 2012). The blog was a great success, and it inspired two further blogs, which appeared in 2011. In January 2011, The Orwell Prize began posting - again, in real time - entries from Orwell's Wigan Pier diary, 75 years after they were written ("The Road to Wigan Pier: About", 2012). Then, in August 2011, the blog, *Hop-Picking Diary*, appeared; this blog would go on to post entries from Orwell's hop-picking diary, 80 years to the day after he wrote them ("Hop-Picking diary: About", 2012).

The diary texts, along with Orwell's illustrations, have been taken from *The Complete Works*. Davison's introductory notes - which preface each diary in *George Orwell: Diaries* - have also been included. The first blog, *Orwell's Diaries 1938-1942*, is enhanced by the inclusion of an image gallery, which contains images of items from the Orwell archive that relate to the time Orwell and Eileen spent in Morocco ("Orwell diaries 1938-1942: Image gallery", 2012). There are three images of entries from the first domestic diary (Orwell/F/1); the remaining images are of items from the sub-fonds, "Personalia" ("Orwell diaries 1938-1942: Image gallery", 2012). Among the items included are: identity cards for Orwell and Eileen (Orwell/J/12); a list of local prices made by Orwell (Orwell/J/16); various ephemera such as postcards, travel guides, and Moroccan newspaper cuttings (Orwell/J/17); and photographs taken by Orwell in Morocco (Orwell/J/18) ("Orwell diaries 1938-1942: Image gallery", 2012).

This blog also contains links to Google Maps, which allow readers to pinpoint where Orwell was when he was writing the diary entries ("Orwell diaries 1938-1942: Image gallery", 2012).

As well as aiding Orwell scholars, these blogs bring Orwell's diaries to the wider public. By presenting the diaries in this way, they enable the entries to be read as they were written: day-by-day, month-by-month, and year after year. Moreover, the publishing of the diaries as blogs introduces an interactive aspect to the reading experience, as readers are able to comment on individual entries. Judging from the comments displayed, these blogs have been very well received.

### **Orwell Online Project**

UCL are in the process of digitising the entire Orwell archive (L. McNamee, personal communication, May 21, 2012). At the time of writing, a selection of images has been made available on the UCL website ("Collections: George Orwell archive", 2012).

In the literature review, it was noted that very few institutions are able to digitise whole collections, or large selections from collections, due to issues of copyright and financial resources. The fact, then, that the Orwell Online Project has been made possible is something to be celebrated.

This project will enable free online access to all of the Orwell archive; it may even succeed in conveying some degree of magical value, that is, if one accepts the suggestion that viewing high-resolution digital images of Orwell's papers is almost as good as inspecting the papers in person.

### Case study conclusions

The Orwell archive contains a wealth of material that is useful both to the Orwell scholar and to the more casual Orwell reader. Much of the material from the archive has been published in book form, and an ongoing digitisation project aims to provide universal access to its contents. The meaningful value of the archive is beyond doubt: the editions discussed in section two of this chapter testify to this fact, as do the numerous biographies that have relied on the archive for primary source material. The archive also possesses magical value, containing as it does examples of Orwell's handwriting, as well as many of his personal possessions. It may be considered unusual that the initial fonds has been added to over time; indeed some archivists may

question whether these items - many of which have no shared provenance - should be regarded as one fonds. However, this decision is consistent with the aims of the trustees of the archive, which is stated as being:

[T]o make a research centre for Orwell studies, by bringing together all [Orwell's] printed works, including newspaper items; private correspondence; other private papers in the possession of his widow; printed matter other than his own which will help later generations to understand the controversies in which he was involved; and tape recordings or written statements by all with first-hand experience of him of any consequence.

(“The George Orwell archive”, 2012)

## Conclusion

As the literature review has shown, most attempts at defining the common characteristics of literary archives have focused on literary drafts (traditionally manuscripts, but also typescripts), and writers' personal papers (correspondence, diaries, and journals). These are the elements of literary archives that have tended to be the most rich in meaningful value, and so it is understandable that they have received the most attention (Larkin, 1983, p. 99). There has been some disagreement as to how meaningful literary drafts or personal papers can be: some argue that they are unnecessary distractions from the published works, whilst others believe they are the key to understanding the published works. This debate is likely to go on and on. Few archivists or literary scholars would deny, however, that certain literary artefacts possess a special quality, which has been most memorably described as "magical" (Larkin, 1983, p. 99).

Chapter two offers just a glimpse of the literary material that exists in UK repositories. Nevertheless, it is enough to validate the idea of a typical literary archive that is formed of a number of elements, with literary drafts and correspondence being the most common. Chapter two has also revealed how, in spite of a scarcity of financial resources, many repositories are embracing digital technology in order to increase public access to their literary holdings. Perhaps, if a similar study is undertaken in four or five years time, it will reveal an even greater number of virtual exhibitions showcasing literary material.

The notion of a typical literary archive - the idea that is possible to anticipate the kinds of records that will be found among a writer's papers - is supported by the findings of chapter three. The Orwell archive lacks a personal library, and it suffers from a relative paucity of literary drafts that date from the most successful period of Orwell's career; however, overall, it contains an abundance of the most common elements of a literary archive. In addition, the Orwell archive includes certain literary items that were not mentioned either in the literature review, or in chapter two: namely, proofs of published works.

The investigation into the uses and overall value of the Orwell archive reaffirms what

was discussed in chapters one and two: i.e., that the contents of literary archives - especially drafts and personal papers - are of great value to scholars and biographers. Chapter three reveals how the Orwell papers can be (and have been) used for the study of textual genetics and for biographical research; indeed, the publication of *The Complete Works* confirms that the material found in the Orwell archive has tremendous value for academics, biographers, students and anyone else who wishes to study in depth the life and work of George Orwell. The success of the Orwell blogs, and UCL's undertaking of an ambitious digitisation project, suggest that the Orwell papers could be used and enjoyed by an even greater number of people.

This exploration of the contents and uses of literary archives in the UK has revealed that whilst the contents of literary holdings may vary, they often share the same values and uses. Moreover, the uses of these holdings have by no means been exhausted; indeed, this study has shown that the future of UK literary archives looks bright, as literary archivists are only just beginning to take advantage of new ways in which to engage with the public.

Some of the issues touched upon in this study are ripe for further investigation. For instance, whilst chapters one and two allude to the fact that an increasing number of literary archives contain digital files of drafts and e-mail correspondence, the survey of UK literary archives shows that most collections reflect the writing technologies of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Subsequent studies may wish to speculate on how this is likely to change, as the contents of 21<sup>st</sup> century collections begin to challenge this study's conception of the typical literary archive. Such studies might also discuss the effect that these developments could have on how literary archives are regarded: for instance, whether the magical appeal of literary drafts will become diminished as more and more of them are composed on digital hard drives rather than on paper ("What writers leave behind in a digital age", 2011).

The notion of the magical value of literary artefacts in the digital era could be explored in another way, also. As was discussed in chapter three, the growing number of digitisation projects raises the question of whether the magical value of manuscripts can be successfully conveyed in high-resolution images. Digital

technology allows a closer inspection of a manuscript than is possible through the glass of a display cabinet; still, there is an interesting discussion to be had about whether this is enough, or whether being in the presence of a literary artefact - and on those rare occasions, being able to handle it - is the only way to appreciate this elusive quality.

Appendix I: A List of the 70 Repositories Included in a Survey of UK Literary Archives

Aberystwyth University Archives

BBC Written Archives Centre

Bishopsgate Institute, Library and Archive Collections

Bodleian Library, University of Oxford

British Library

Cambridge University Library, Manuscripts Department

Cardiff University, Archives and Manuscript Collections

Christ's College Archives, University of Cambridge

Churchill Archives Centre, Churchill College, University of Cambridge

Dulwich College Archive

Durham University Library, Special Collections

Faber & Faber Archive

Girton College, University of Cambridge, Library and Archive

Gloucestershire Archives

Imperial War Museum, Department of Documents

Jesus College, University of Cambridge, Old Library and Archives

Keats House, City of London

Keele University Library, Special Collections and Archives

King's College London, College Archives

King's College, University of Cambridge, Modern Archives

King's School, Canterbury, Library and Archives

Kingston University, Special Collections

Kipling Library

London Metropolitan Archives

Lucy Cavendish College, University of Cambridge, Archive

Magdalen College, University of Oxford, Archives

Magdalene College, University of Cambridge, College Library

Murray Edwards College, University of Cambridge, Rosemary Murray Library

National Library of Scotland

National Library of Wales

Newcastle University Library, Special Collections

Poetry Archive

Public Record Office of Northern Ireland

Queen Mary, University of London, Archives

Queen's College, University of Cambridge, Libraries and Archive

Queen's University, Belfast, Manuscript Collection

Royal Holloway, University of London, Library, Collections

Ruskin Library and Research Centre, Lancaster University

Senate House Library, University of London

Seven Stories Collection, Newcastle

Somerville College, University of Oxford, Special Collections

St. John's College, University of Cambridge, Library, Special Collections

Swansea University, Information Services and Systems, Special Collections

Tennyson Research Centre, Lincolnshire County Council

University College London Library, Special Collections

University College, Oxford

University of Aberdeen Library, Manuscript & Archive Collections

University of Birmingham, Special Collections

University of Bradford Library, Special Collections

University of Bristol Library, Special Collections

University of Bristol Theatre Collection

University of Dundee, Special Collections

University of East Anglia, Archives

University of Exeter Library, Special Collections

University of Glasgow, Special Collections

University of Greenwich

University of Hull Archives

University of Leeds Library, Special Collections

University of Leicester Library, Special Collections

University of Liverpool, Special Collections and Archives

University of Manchester, John Rylands Library, Special Collections

University of Nottingham, Department of Manuscripts and Special Collections

University of Reading, Special Collections

University of Sheffield Library, Special Collections

University of Southampton Library, Archive and Manuscript Collections

University of St. Andrews Library, Special Collections

University of Sussex Library, Special Collections

University of Warwick Modern Records Centre

University of York Library and Archives

Women's Library

Wiener Library

## Appendix II: The Orwell Archive (Data Collection)

This appendix consists of a summary of the papers of the author and journalist, George Orwell, which are held at University College London (UCL).

The purpose of this appendix is one of data collection - the data being information about the contents of the Orwell papers. It should be read in conjunction with chapter three - an in-depth analysis of the papers, which looks at how they have been (or could be) used for academic and other purposes, using specific items from the collection as examples.

It is not within the scope of this study to list every item contained within the Orwell archive, nor would it be sufficient merely to summarise its contents as a whole. Instead, this appendix will provide a detailed summary of the contents of each sub-fonds within the collection, which will include examples of specific files and items.

As each sub-fonds is described, it will become apparent that much of the material within the collection bears more relation to Orwell's journalistic and essayistic writing than it does to his literary works. Indeed, there are certain sub-fonds (e.g. the sub-fonds, "Spanish Civil War material") that appear to be concerned wholly with Orwell's non-fiction works ("Orwell/C", 2012). There may have been some temptation to set aside these sub-fonds as ones that do not relate to Orwell's literary pursuits, and which therefore do not qualify as elements of a literary archive. However, it would be a mistake to exclude these sub-fonds, particularly because Orwell was a writer who valued the literary qualities that are to be found in all good writing, and who in his own words sought "to make political writing into an art" (1979, p. 186).

Moreover, as chapter two showed, literary archives typically consist of a whole range of material, of which only a small proportion may be said to relate specifically to literary works. Therefore, these "non-literary" sub-fonds must be included as part of

this case study. As was discussed in the literature review, many people working with literary archives today consider all of a writer's papers to be worthy of study, taking the view that a writer's life cannot be so easily compartmentalised. This appendix, then, will address each sub-fonds in turn; in addition, it will refer to the various components of literary archives that were outlined in chapter two, by making suggestions as to which category of the typical literary archive each sub-fonds belongs.

### The Orwell Archive, University College London

The collection comprises 16 boxes of material, ranging in date from 1875 to around 1997 ("Orwell", 2012). According to the collection level description, the main creator is Eric Arthur Blair, otherwise known as George Orwell ("Orwell", 2012). An inspection of the sub-fonds descriptions reveals that there is also a significant amount of additional material, i.e., items that were acquired after the initial papers had been deposited. When Sonia Orwell presented the archive to UCL on permanent loan in 1960, it consisted of manuscripts, notebooks, and personalia ("Orwell", 2012). Since then, the papers have been supplemented by various donations and purchases ("Orwell", 2012).

#### **GB 0103 ORWELL (A): manuscripts and typescripts**

This sub-fonds gathers together nine volumes of material from across the whole of Orwell's writing life ("Orwell/A", 2012). There are manuscripts of unpublished short stories, plays, and poems dating from the writer's youth ("Orwell/A/1/M", 2012). There are also manuscripts and typescripts dating from the late 1920s, including several poems, a play, and a short story ("Orwell/A", 2012).

The first item relating to Orwell's published works is described as an early draft of his first novel, *Burmese Days*, and is dated 1929-33 ("Orwell/A/1/U", 2012). Other items dating from the 1930s include notes of Orwell's travels in the north of England

(“Orwell/A/2/A”, 2012), and *The Road to Wigan Pier* diary (“Orwell/A/3/A”, 2012), which inform the book of the same name. The items dating from the last decade of Orwell’s life are more varied. These include: drafts of review articles; drafts of essays (such as the autobiographical *Such, Such Were the Joys*) (“Orwell/A/5/B” and “Orwell/A/5/D”, 2012); typescript drafts of *Animal Farm* (“Orwell/A/4/B”, 2012) and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (“Orwell/A/6/A” and “Orwell/A/7”, 2012); and a manuscript of *A Smoking-room Story*, an unfinished draft of a short story, which dates from around 1949 (“Orwell/A/9”, 2012).

Most of the material in this sub-fonds could be placed in the category identified in chapter two as “literary drafts, notebooks, and working notes”. However, there are one or two exceptions, such as a letter of rejection that Orwell received from the British Council’s Publications Department in 1946 (“Orwell/A/4/E”, 2012). The letter has been placed here because it relates directly to another item found in the sub-fonds: a pamphlet Orwell wrote on British cookery (“Orwell/A/4/F”, 2012).

### **GB 0103 ORWELL (B): literary notebooks**

This sub-fonds comprises three literary notebooks (“Orwell/B”, 2012), which fall rather easily into the aforementioned category, “literary drafts, notebooks, and working notes”. The first notebook covers the years 1939-40 and 1946-47, whilst the other two notebooks cover 1947-48 and 1949 respectively (“Orwell/B”, 2012). The first notebook (“Orwell/B/1”, 2012) contains notes for *The Quick and the Dead* (an abandoned novel), and notes for the *Last Man in Europe* (a working title for *Nineteen Eighty-Four*) (Crick, 1980, p. 262). The second notebook contains notes for articles, and diary entries relating to Orwell’s treatment at Hairmyres Hospital, near Glasgow, including a passage that reflects on the effects of illness on the ability to write (“Orwell/B/2”, 2012). The third notebook includes: notes for an essay on the novelist, Evelyn Waugh; notes on the layout of the aforementioned *A Smoking-room Story*; diary entries relating to Orwell’s time both at Cranham Sanatorium, near Stroud, in Gloucestershire, and at University College Hospital, London (“Orwell/B/3”, 2012);

and on the final page, a statement of Orwell's assets (Davison, 1998, p. 217).

### **GB 0103 ORWELL (C): Spanish Civil War material**

This sub-fonds contains five volumes of material (either created or collected by Orwell) that relate to the Spanish Civil War (1936-39) ("Orwell/C", 2012). Most of the items in this section are contemporaneous cuttings and extracts from various publications reporting or commenting on events; some of these extracts are placed alongside notes made by Orwell ("Orwell/C", 2012). There are also handbills advertising appeals for aid to the Spanish cause ("Orwell/C", 2012), and a number of personal items, such as a medical certificate issued to Orwell by a Spanish hospital ("Orwell/C/5/A", 2012), and a membership card for the Independent Labour Party (ILP) ("Orwell/C/5/F", 2012). This sub-fonds, then, contains a mixture of various elements commonly found in literary archives: press-cuttings (although in this case, the cuttings consist of news items or press statements rather than reviews of the writer's work); working notes (in so far as it may be suggested that Orwell's notes informed his book about his Spanish Civil War experiences, *Homage to Catalonia*); and personal items.

### **GB 0103 ORWELL (D): general notebooks**

This section amounts to five volumes, which date from 1943 to 1950 ("Orwell/D", 2012). It includes: a payment notebook (1943-1945), which records payments received for various articles; a pamphlet notebook (1945-1946), which contains an index to Orwell's pamphlet collection (which is held at the British Library); an essay notebook (1947-1949), containing an index of re-printable essays; a notebook (1949), which contains a list of names with comments; and an address book (1950) ("Orwell/D", 2012).

### **GB 0103 ORWELL (E): political diaries**

Comprising four volumes, this section gathers together Orwell's political diaries, which range in date from 1938 to 1942 ("Orwell/E", 2012). The first diary (September 1938-March 1939), which is typewritten, covers the period Orwell spent convalescing in Morocco ("Orwell/E/1", 2012). The second diary (July-September 1939), a manuscript volume, records Orwell's reactions to the events leading up to the outbreak of the Second World War ("Orwell/E/2", 2012). The third volume, the first of two wartime diaries, which is typewritten, covers the years 1940-1941 ("Orwell/E/3/A", 2012), while the fourth volume, Orwell's second wartime diary (1942), exists in both manuscript ("Orwell/E/4", 2012) and typescript form ("Orwell/E/3/B", 2012), the latter of which contains additional entries.

### **GB 0103 ORWELL (F): domestic diaries**

This sub-fonds contains five volumes of Orwell's surviving domestic diaries ("Orwell/F", 2012), some of which were written concurrently alongside his political diaries. The volumes are written in manuscript, and they cover the following periods: 1938-1939; 1939-1940; 1946-1947; 1947 and 1947-1948 ("Orwell/F", 2012). The diaries document the time Orwell spent in Gibraltar, Tangier and Marrakech, London, Edinburgh, and on the island of Jura, Scotland ("Orwell/F", 2012). They record his day-to-day activities, and his observations of the weather and vegetation ("Orwell/F", 2012).

### **GB 0103 ORWELL (G): letters from Orwell**

As was noted in chapter two, correspondence, alongside literary drafts, is the most common component of a writer's papers. This section is the first of two that contain correspondence only; it consists of two files of letters written by Orwell, ranging in date from 1911 to 1949 ("Orwell/G", 2012). The letters are listed in alphabetical order, according to the surnames of the recipients. The earliest letters are those written

by Orwell to his mother while he was at boarding school; the later letters are addressed to a number of friends, family members, and acquaintances (“Orwell/G”, 2012). The letters document Orwell’s literary activities, as well as his reactions to political events (“Orwell/G”, 2012). Recipients in the first file include Eileen Blair (Orwell’s first wife), Sonia Brownell (Orwell’s second wife), and Cyril Connolly (fellow St. Cyprian’s and Eton alumnus, and literary acquaintance) (“Orwell/G/1”, 2012). Correspondents found in the second file include Anthony Powell (novelist), Sir Herbert Read (poet and critic), and Fredric Warburg (Orwell’s second publisher) (“Orwell/G/2”, 2012).

### **GB 0103 ORWELL (H): letters to Orwell**

This sub-fonds forms the second section of correspondence, comprising letters written to Orwell between 1928 and 1950 (“Orwell/H”, 2012). There are two files of letters (again, arranged alphabetically) from various correspondents, including a number of literary figures, such as T S Eliot, E M Forster (“Orwell/H/1”, 2012), Henry Miller, and Evelyn Waugh (“Orwell/H/2”, 2012), and a few other notable writers or academics, such as Basil Liddell-Hart (“Orwell/H/1”, 2012), and Bertrand Russell (“Orwell/H/2”, 2012).

### **GB 0103 ORWELL (I): associated papers**

This section consists of one box, which contains a variety of material relating to Orwell, the majority of which was not created by him (“Orwell/I”, 2012). Covering the period 1935-1949, it includes letters about Orwell, papers relating to Orwell’s time at the BBC (such as minutes of meetings), and an analysis of foreign broadcasts (“Orwell/I”, 2012). Items created by Orwell include a preface to the Ukrainian edition of *Animal Farm* (“Orwell/I/2/E”, 2012), and a copy of a statement on *Nineteen-Eighty Four*, which was made by Orwell, and issued by his publisher (“Orwell/I/2/C”, 2012).

Some of these associated papers could be categorised as additional material, in that

Orwell did not create them. However, these associated papers, unlike much so-called additional material, were not acquired at a later date in order to enhance the collection, but were in fact part of the original deposit, which was made by Orwell's widow, Sonia Brownell, on behalf of the George Orwell Archive Trust ("Orwell papers: associated papers", 2012).

### **GB 0103 ORWELL (J): personalia**

This section consists of both personal material (items that belonged to Orwell), and additional material (items that were created after Orwell's death) ("Orwell/J", 2012). The sub-fonds is formed of ten files, which cover the years 1903-1971 ("Orwell/J", 2012). There are legal documents such as Orwell's baptism certificate (the original, plus two copies); there are also certified copies: one of the certificate of Orwell's marriage to Sonia Brownell, one of Orwell's death certificate, and one of his will ("Orwell/J", 2012). There are personal items such as Orwell's membership card for the National Union of Journalists ("Orwell/J/26", 2012), and a Christmas card from Orwell's adopted son, Richard ("Orwell/J/40/A", 2012). There are also items dating from after Orwell's death such as papers relating to his funeral service, and correspondence about Orwell ("Orwell/J", 2012).

### **GB 0103 ORWELL (K): Eileen Blair papers**

This section of the collection comprises one box of additional material: items that did not belong to the writer, but which relate to him in some way. It contains material created by, or relating to Orwell's first wife, Eileen Blair ("Orwell/K", 2012). Items include: certified copies of the certificates of Eileen's birth and death, and a certified copy of her will ("Orwell/K", 2012); personal papers, such as notes made by Eileen while a student at St. Hugh's College, Oxford ("Orwell/K/4/A", 2012); and various letters of correspondence, many of which cover the time Eileen spent with her husband in Barcelona, during the Spanish Civil War ("Orwell/K", 2012).

**GB 0103 ORWELL (L): family papers**

This sub-fonds contains further additional material: one box of papers relating to the Blair family, covering the period 1857-1968 (“Orwell/L”, 2012). Items include: various legal documents, such as certified copies of family members’ birth and marriage certificates (“Orwell/L/1”, 2012), and certified copies of the wills of Orwell’s parents (“Orwell/L”, 2012); personal papers, such as a manuscript diary that belonged to Orwell’s mother, Ida Blair (“Orwell/L/2”, 2012); and various letters of correspondence between members of the Blair family (“Orwell/L”, 2012).

**GB 0103 ORWELL (M): posthumous material**

This section consists of one box of papers, which range in date from 1950 to 1972 (“Orwell/M”, 2012). The papers could be classed as additional material, in that they did not belong to Orwell, but nevertheless relate to his life and work. Much of the material here consists of drafts of various published and unpublished accounts, written about Orwell by people who knew him either personally or professionally. Such items include a typewritten account of Orwell by one of his former school pupils, R S Peters (“Orwell/M/20”, 2012), and a typewritten reminiscence of Orwell by his former typist, Miranda Wood (“Orwell/M/23” 2012). Other items include two letters from Orwell’s widow, Sonia Orwell (“Orwell/M/4/C” and “Orwell/M/4/D”, 2012), and numerous other letters of correspondence written by Orwell’s friends and acquaintances (“Orwell/M”, 2012).

**GB 0103 ORWELL (N): proofs**

This sub-fonds is formed of fourteen volumes of various proofs of Orwell’s works from across the whole of his career (“Orwell/N”, 2012). The earliest item is an uncorrected proof of *Confessions of a Down and Out in London and Paris* (1932) (which was published as *Down and Out in Paris and London*) (“Orwell/N/1”, 2012); the latest item is an uncorrected proof of the essay, *England Your England* (1953)

(“Orwell/N/13”, 2012). Other proofs include an uncorrected proof of Orwell’s first novel, *Burmese Days* (“Orwell/N/8”, 2012), and a loose proof of the novella, *Animal Farm* (“Orwell/N/14/A”, 2012). *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is also well represented: there is an uncorrected proof (“Orwell/N/9”, 2012), two corrected proofs (“Orwell/N/10” and “Orwell/N/11”, 2012), and one advanced review copy of Orwell’s final novel (“Orwell/N/12”, 2012).

### **GB 0103 ORWELL (O): radio scripts**

This sub-fonds consists of one box of what is rather unusual material for a literary collection: BBC copies of radio scripts, which were written, adapted, or arranged by Orwell (“Orwell/O”, 2012). The items compiled here could tentatively be classed as literary drafts; however, unlike most kinds of drafts, these scripts were not part of Orwell’s original papers, but were in fact owned by the BBC (“Orwell/O”, 2012).

Included here are two scripts of *Animal Farm*: the first, dated 1947 (“Orwell/O/5”, 2012), was arranged by Orwell himself; the second is a revision of the first by Rayner Heppenstall, for a new production in 1957 (“Orwell/O/6”, 2012). The other original work is a script of a play by Orwell, entitled *The Voyage of the Beagle* (“Orwell/O/3”, 2012). Adaptations of other works include a script for a production of Hans Anderson’s *The Emperor’s New Clothes* (“Orwell/O/2”, 2012), and an adaptation of the fairy tale, *Little Red Riding Hood* (“Orwell/O/4”, 2012).

### **GB 0103 ORWELL (P): adaptation scripts and screenplays**

Ranging in date from 1952 to 1986, this relatively small sub-fonds gathers together in one box a number of adaptation scripts and screenplays of Orwell’s novels (“Orwell/P”, 2012). Out of eight files, five relate to *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: there are three stage adaptations (one in Yugoslavian), one screenplay, and one script of the dystopian novel (“Orwell/P/1”, “Orwell/P/2”, “Orwell/P/3”, “Orwell/P/4”, and “Orwell/P/5”, 2012). The other three files are: a radio adaptation of *Animal Farm*

(“Orwell/P/6” 2012); a stage adaptation of *Animal Farm* (“Orwell/P/7”, 2012); and a radio adaptation of *Coming Up for Air* (“Orwell/P/8”, 2012). It is thought that Orwell may have begun the radio adaptation of *Animal Farm*, which was completed by Peter Duval Smith (“Orwell/P/6”, 2012). The rest of the files have been attributed to different creators; therefore, with the exception of the aforementioned item, this sub-fonds constitutes another example of additional material.

### **GB 0103 ORWELL (Q): documentary scripts**

This sub-fonds consists entirely of additional material: one box of seventeen files, containing scripts of recorded interviews about Orwell (“Orwell/Q”, 2012). Among the listed interviewees are: Orwell’s adopted son, Richard Blair; his widow, Sonia Orwell; his second publisher, Fredric Warburg; a number of his literary friends and acquaintances, including Rayner Heppenstall and Arthur Koestler; and experts on Orwell’s life and work, such as his biographer, Bernard Crick (“Orwell/Q”, 2012).

The scripts cover the years 1946-1983, although only those found in the first two files (“Orwell/Q/1” and “Orwell/Q/2”, 2012) were created in Orwell’s lifetime. Most of the files contain scripts of interviews for radio productions. However, there are also three files that consist of scripts of interviews for television productions. The first of these relates to an Orwell-themed edition of the BBC’s *Omnibus* programme (1971) (“Orwell/Q/13”, 2012); the second contains scripts of interviews for a BBC *Arena* documentary about Orwell (1983) (“Orwell/Q/15”, 2012); the third file relates to a Granada Television documentary entitled *Orwell: The Road to 1984* (1983) (“Orwell/Q/16”, 2012).

### **GB 0103 ORWELL (R): audio-visual cassettes**

This section comprises one box of videos dating from 1983 to around 1997 (“Orwell/R”, 2012). There is a private recording, which documents the unveiling of a plaque on the building of a former school in Hayes, London, where Orwell lived and

worked as a schoolmaster (“Orwell/R/4”, 2012). The remaining videos are of various television productions, including the aforementioned BBC *Arena* programme (“Orwell/R/1”, 2012), a Japanese documentary about Orwell (1995) (“Orwell/R/7”, 2012), and a Channel 4 production, entitled *Down and Out in Paris and London* (1996) (“Orwell/R/8”, 2012).

The items in this sub-fonds clearly fall into the category, “audio-visual material”, while at the same time qualifying as additional material, since they were never part of the writer’s professional or personal possessions.

### **GB 0103 ORWELL (S): Sonia Orwell (Blair) papers**

This is a sub-fonds of eight boxes, containing further additional material: the papers of Sonia Orwell (“Orwell/S”, 2012). Ranging in date from 1937 to 1977, the papers include a great amount of received correspondence, along with some personal items (“Orwell/S”, 2012). There are letters from various literary correspondents, including Cyril Connolly and Anthony Powell (“Orwell/S”, 2012). Papers concerning Orwell, his estate, and his son, Richard, include: letters from Orwell’s executor, Sir Richard Rees (1950-1955); letters from Orwell’s younger sister, Avril Dunn (1950-1962); copies of letters from Dwight Macdonald regarding an Orwell biography (1956-1964); and correspondence with Orwell’s agents and publishers, regarding publications, royalties, and film rights (1950-1963) (“Orwell/S”, 2012).

### **GB 0103 ORWELL (T): photographs**

The final sub-fonds of the collection consists of around 200 photographs relating to Orwell and his family (“Orwell/T”, 2012). As was noted in chapter two, photographs form an integral part of many literary collections; judging from their range and number, it would seem that the photographs in the Orwell archive are no exception. The photographs range in date from 1893 to 1984, and include copies and original prints (“Orwell/T”, 2012). Most of the photographs (from 1903 to 1945) are of Orwell

himself (“Orwell/T”, 2012). However, there are also photographs of figures from Orwell’s life including: his parents; his sisters; his first wife, Eileen, their son, Richard; Orwell’s second wife, Sonia, and various friends and acquaintances (“Orwell/T”, 2012).

### Bibliography

*About AIM25.* (2012). Retrieved from the AIM25 website:  
<http://www.aim25.ac.uk/index.stm>

*About the First World War Poetry Digital Archive.* (2012). Retrieved from:  
<http://www.oucs.ox.ac.uk/ww1lit/about>

*About us.* (2012). Retrieved from the Poetry Archive website:  
<http://www.poetryarchive.org/poetryarchive/aboutus.do>

*Adam Johnson papers.* (2012). Retrieved from the University of Manchester website:  
<http://www.library.manchester.ac.uk/searchresources/guidetospecialcollections/atoz/johnsonadampapers/>

*AIM25: Advanced search.* (2012). Retrieved from the AIM25 website:  
<http://www.aim25.ac.uk/cgi-bin/vcdf/asearch0>

*Allen Lane files.* (2012). Retrieved from the University of Bristol website:  
<http://www.bris.ac.uk/library/resources/specialcollections/archives/penguin/allenlane.html>

Altlick, R.D. (1950). *The scholar adventurers*. London: Collier-Macmillan.

*An introduction to the archive.* (2012). Retrieved from the Poetry Archive website:  
<http://www.poetryarchive.org/poetryarchive/home.do>

Andrews, J. (2010). 'Laid aside'? *Collecting contemporary literary archives and manuscripts*. *Archives*, 35 (122), 11-20.

Andrews, J. (2008). *What will survive of us are manuscripts: Collecting the papers of living British writers*. *Journal of the History of Collections*, 20 (2), 259-271.

*Archives Hub contributors.* (2012). Retrieved from the Archives Hub website:  
<http://archiveshub.ac.uk/contributors/#a-e>

*Bennett papers.* (2012). Retrieved from the AIM25 website:  
[http://www.aim25.ac.uk/cgi-bin/vcdf/detail?coll\\_id=3360&inst\\_id=13&nv1=search&nv2=advanced](http://www.aim25.ac.uk/cgi-bin/vcdf/detail?coll_id=3360&inst_id=13&nv1=search&nv2=advanced)

*Bibliography.* (2012). Retrieved from the Group for Literary Archives and Manuscripts (North America) website:  
<http://glamna.org/literary-archives-and-manuscripts-bibliography/>

Bossis, M. (1986). *Methodological journeys through correspondences*. *Yale French Studies*, 71, 63-75.

Bowker, G. (2003). *George Orwell*. London: Little, Brown.

Bradshaw, D. (2003, June 14). Later, she would subject her own bigotry to painful scrutiny. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from the Guardian website:  
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/books/2003/jun/14/classics.virginiawoolf1>

British Library. (April 4, 2010). A press release, retrieved from the British Library website:  
<http://pressandpolicy.bl.uk/Press-Releases/-A-craftsman-with-the-imagination-of-a-novelist-277.aspx>

British Library. (April 20, 2011). A press release, retrieved from the British Library website:  
<http://pressandpolicy.bl.uk/Press-Releases/-Some-sort-of-record-seemed-vital-British-Library-acquires-the-archive-of-Wendy-Cope-4e6.aspx>

Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

*Charles Dickens*. (2012). Retrieved from the University of Cambridge website:  
<http://janus.lib.cam.ac.uk/db/node.xsp?id=EAD%2FGBR%2F0272%2FPP%2FNM%2FDickens>

Chen, A. (2011, April 24). *Crafty David Foster Wallace*. Hydra Magazine. Retrieved from <http://www.hydramag.com/2011/04/24/crafty-david-foster-wallace/>

*Christina Georgina Rossetti*. (2012). Retrieved from the University of Cambridge website:  
<http://janus.lib.cam.ac.uk/db/node.xsp?id=EAD%2FGBR%2F0272%2FPP%2FNM%2FRossetti>

*Collection*. (2012). Retrieved from the Keats House website:  
<http://www.keatshouse.cityoflondon.gov.uk/225/Collection.html>

*Collections: George Orwell archive*. (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
[http://digitool-b.lib.ucl.ac.uk:8881/R/ABJPKMQ6E4MYYQPQ6LMB5BCPB YUHTQGDEH95HB6NXYXIKPNVJS-01977?func=collections&collection\\_id=2422&local\\_base=ORWELL](http://digitool-b.lib.ucl.ac.uk:8881/R/ABJPKMQ6E4MYYQPQ6LMB5BCPB YUHTQGDEH95HB6NXYXIKPNVJS-01977?func=collections&collection_id=2422&local_base=ORWELL)

Cowton, J. (2010). 'Telling our own story': *Interpreting literary archives for a wider audience*. *Archives*, 35 (122), 35-44.

*Current display of holdings of the Tennyson Research Centre*. (2012). Retrieved from the Lincolnshire County Council website:  
<http://www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/residents/leisure-culture-and-heritage/heritage/tennyson-research-centre/current-display-of-holdings-of-the-tennyson-research-centre/100904.article>

Crick, B. (1980). *George Orwell: A life*. London: Secker & Warburg.

- Davison, P. (Ed.). (2010). *George Orwell: Diaries*. London: Penguin.
- Davison, P. (Ed.). (2010). *George Orwell: A life in letters*. London: Penguin.
- Davison, P. (1996). *George Orwell: A literary life*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Davison, P. (Ed.). (1998). *The complete works of George Orwell. Eighteen: Smothered under journalism*. London: Secker & Warburg.
- Davison, P. (Ed.). (1998). *The complete works of George Orwell. Eleven: Facing unpleasant facts*. London: Secker & Warburg.
- Davison, P. (Ed.). (1998). *The complete works of George Orwell. Fifteen: Two wasted years*. London: Secker & Warburg.
- Davison, P. (Ed.). (1998). *The complete works of George Orwell. Fourteen: Keeping our little corner clean*. London: Secker & Warburg.
- Davison, P. (Ed.). (1998). *The complete works of George Orwell. Nineteen: It is what I think*. London: Secker & Warburg.
- Davison, P. (Ed.). (1998). *The complete works of George Orwell. Seventeen: I belong to the left*. London: Secker & Warburg.
- Davison, P. (Ed.). (1998). *The complete works of George Orwell. Sixteen: I have tried to tell the truth*. London: Secker & Warburg.
- Davison, P. (Ed.). (1998). *The complete works of George Orwell. Ten: A kind of compulsion*. London: Secker & Warburg.
- Davison, P. (Ed.). (1998). *The complete works of George Orwell. Thirteen: All propaganda is lies*. London: Secker & Warburg.
- Davison, P. (Ed.). (1998). *The complete works of George Orwell. Twelve: A patriot after all*. London: Secker & Warburg.
- Davison, P. (Ed.). (1998). *The complete works of George Orwell. Twenty: Our job is to make life worth living*. London: Secker & Warburg.
- Davison, P. (Ed.). (2006). *The lost Orwell*. London: Timewell Press.
- Dever, M. (1996). *Reading other people's mail*. Archives and Manuscripts, 24 (1), 116-129.
- Dicken, J. (2000). Twentieth century literary archives: Collecting policies and research initiatives. In Proctor, M. and Lewis, C.P. (Eds.), *New directions in archival research* (pp. 49-82). Liverpool: Liverpool University Centre for Archive Studies.

Donadio, R. (2005, September 4). *Literary letters, lost in cyberspace*. Retrieved from the New York Times website:  
<http://www.nytimes.com/2005/09/04/books/review/04DONADIO.html>

*Doris Lessing Archive*. (2012). Retrieved from the University of East Anglia website:  
<http://www.uea.ac.uk/is/archives/lessing>

Douglas, J. and MacNeil, H. (2009). *Arranging the self: Literary and archival perspectives on writers' lives*. *Archivaria*, 67, 25-39.

Eagleton, T. (1983). *Literary theory: An introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

*Edwin Morgan scrapbooks*. (2012). Retrieved from the University of Glasgow website:  
<http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/specialcollections/virtualexhibitions/edwinmorganscrapbooks/>

Enniss, S. (2001). *In the author's hand: Artifacts of origin and twentieth-century reading practices*. *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts and Cultural Heritage*, 2, 106-120.

*Faber and Faber archive*. (2012). Retrieved from the Group for Literary Archives & Manuscripts website:  
[http://glam-archives.org.uk/?page\\_id=926](http://glam-archives.org.uk/?page_id=926)

Faunch, C. (2010). *Archives of written lives: A case study of Daphne du Maurier and her biographer, Margaret Forster*. *Archives*, 35 (122), 28-34.

Fehrman, C. (2010, September 19). Lost libraries. *Boston Globe*. Retrieved from:  
[http://articles.boston.com/2010-09-19/bostonglobe/29314795\\_1\\_books-authors-book-collections-david-markson](http://articles.boston.com/2010-09-19/bostonglobe/29314795_1_books-authors-book-collections-david-markson)

*Forster's library and music collection*. (2012). Retrieved from:  
<http://janus.lib.cam.ac.uk/db/node.xsp?id=EAD%2FGBR%2F0272%2FPPP%2FEMF%2F31>

Gardner, J. (2006, October 20). *Collecting Modern Literary Manuscripts*. Paper presented at the 2006 UK Literary Heritage Group conference, Manuscripts Matter. Retrieved from <http://www.literary.org.uk/conference/>

Gekoski, R. (2011, January 21). *Why literary archives are like monkfish*. Retrieved from the Guardian website:  
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/books/booksblog/2011/jan/21/literary-archives?INTCMP=SRCH>

Hill, J. and Slocombe, W. (2010). *No Larkin around: The challenges of contemporary literary archives*. *Archives*, 35 (122), 1-10.

Hobbs, C. (2003). *Reading in: Alice's Munro's archives*. *Archivaria*, 55, 164-168.

Hobbs, C. (2001). *The character of personal archives: Reflections on the value of records of individuals*. *Archivaria*, 52, 126-135.

*Hop-Picking diary: About*. (2012). Retrieved from:  
<http://hoppicking.wordpress.com/about/>

*Jane Austen*. (2012). Retrieved from the University of Cambridge website:  
<http://janus.lib.cam.ac.uk/db/node.xsp?id=EAD%2FGBR%2F0272%2FPP%2FNM%2FAustenJ>

Kelliher, H. and Brown, S. (1986). *English literary manuscripts*. London: British Library.

*Lady Chatterley's Lover trial papers*. (2012). Retrieved from the University of Bristol website:  
<http://www.bris.ac.uk/library/resources/specialcollections/archives/penguin/chatterley.html>

Larkin, P. (1983). A neglected responsibility: Literary manuscripts. In *Required writing: miscellaneous pieces, 1955-1982* (pp. 98-109). London: Faber and Faber.

Larkin, Philip Arthur. (2012). Retrieved from the National Archives website:  
<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/nra/searches/subjectView.asp?ID=P16782>

*Listening to poetry*. (2012). Retrieved from the Poetry Archive website:  
<http://www.poetryarchive.org/poetryarchive/listenPoetry.do>

*Literary manuscripts and printed books*. (2012). Retrieved from the British Library website:  
<http://www.bl.uk/whatson/permgall/treasures/literary.html>

*Literary papers and correspondence of Geoffrey Hill*. (2012). Retrieved from the University of Leeds website:  
<http://cheshire.leeds.ac.uk/poetry/html/lp-hill-p1.shtml#hill>

McCrum, R. (April 4, 2011). *What writers leave behind in a digital age*. Retrieved from the Guardian website:  
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/books/booksblog/2011/apr/04/writers-digital-age-archive>

Motion, A. (1993). *Philip Larkin: A writer's life*. London: Faber and Faber.

*MS561*. (2012). Retrieved from the University of Birmingham website:  
<http://calmview.bham.ac.uk/Record.aspx?src=DServe.Catalog&id=XMS561>

*Muriel Spark Archive*. (2012). Retrieved from the National Library of Scotland website:  
<http://digital.nls.uk/murielspark/archive.html>

Overbeck, L.M. (1993). *Researching literary manuscripts: A scholar's perspective*. *American Archivist*, 56, 62-69.

*Orwell.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=7>

*Orwell/A.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/A%22%29>

*Orwell/A/1/M.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=20>

*Orwell/A/1/U.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/A/1/U%22%29>

*Orwell/A/1/Y.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/A/1/Y%22%29>

*Orwell/A/2/A.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=34>

*Orwell/A/3/A.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/A/3/A%22%29>

*Orwell/A/4/B.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/A/4/B%22%29>

*Orwell/A/4/E.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=49>

*Orwell/A/4/F.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=50>

*Orwell/A/5/B.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=53>

*Orwell/A/5/D.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=55>

*Orwell/A/6.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo=%22ORWELL/A/6%22%29>

*Orwell/A/6/A.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=58>

*Orwell/A/7.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo=%22ORWELL/A/7%22%29>

*Orwell/A/9.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=66>

*Orwell/B.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo=%22ORWELL/B%22%29>

*Orwell/B/1.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=68>

*Orwell/B/2.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/B/2%22%29>

*Orwell/B/3.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/B/3%22%29>

*Orwell/C.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/C%22%29>

*Orwell/C/5/A.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=98>

*Orwell/C/5/F.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=103>

*Orwell/D.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/D%22%29>

*Orwell/D/1.* (2012). Retrieved from the University of College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/D/1%22%29>

*Orwell/D/3.* (2012). Retrieved from the University of College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/D/3%22%29>

*Orwell/D/4.* (2012). Retrieved from the University of College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/D/4%22%29>

*Orwell diaries 1938-1942: About.* (2012). Retrieved from:  
<http://orwelldiaries.wordpress.com/about/>

*Orwell diaries 1938-1942: Image gallery.* (2012). Retrieved from:  
<http://orwelldiaries.wordpress.com/image-gallery/>

*Orwell/E.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%20ORWELL/E%22%29>

*Orwell/E/1.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=112>

*Orwell/E/2.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=113>

*Orwell/E/3/A.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=115>

*Orwell/E/3/B.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=116>

*Orwell/E/4.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=118>

*Orwell/F.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%20ORWELL/F%22%29>

*Orwell/G.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%20ORWELL/G%22%29>

*Orwell/G/1.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=126>

*Orwell/G/2.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=127>

Orwell, G. (1979). *Why I Write*. In *Decline of the English murder and other essays* (pp. 180-188). London: Penguin.

*Orwell/H.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo=%22ORWELL/H%22%29>

*Orwell/H/1.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo=%22ORWELL/H/1%22%29>

*Orwell/H/2.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=130>

*Orwell/I.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo=%22ORWELL/I%22%29>

*Orwell/I/2/C.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo=%22ORWELL/I/2/C%22%29>

*Orwell/I/2/E.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo=%22ORWELL/I/2/E%22%29>

*Orwell/J.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo=%22ORWELL/J%22%29>

*Orwell/J/1.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/J/1%22%29>

*Orwell/J/4.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/J/4%22%29>

*Orwell/J/11.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/J/11%22%29>

*Orwell/J/26.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=191>

*Orwell/J/40.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/J/40%22%29>

*Orwell/K.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/K%22%29>

*Orwell/K/4/A.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=223>

*Orwell/L.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/L%22%29>

*Orwell/L/1.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/L/1%22%29>

*Orwell/L/2.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/L/2%22%29>

*Orwell/L/5.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/L/5%22%29>

*Orwell/M.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/M%22%29>

*Orwell/M/4/C.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=278>

*Orwell/M/4/D.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=279>

*Orwell/M/14.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/M/14%22%29>

*Orwell/M/20.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/M/20%22%29>

*Orwell/M/23.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/M/23%22%29>

*Orwell/M/24.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/M/24%22%29>

*Orwell/N.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/N%22%29>

*Orwell/N/1.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/N/1%22%29>

*Orwell/N/8.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=322>

*Orwell/N/9.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=323>

*Orwell/N/10.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=324>

*Orwell/N/11.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=325>

*Orwell/N/12.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=326>

*Orwell/N/13.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=327>

*Orwell/N/14/A.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=329>

*Orwell/O.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/O%22%29>

*Orwell/O/2.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=335>

*Orwell/O/3.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=336>

*Orwell/O/4.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=337>

*Orwell/O/5.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo=%22ORWELL/O/5%22%29>

*Orwell/O/6.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=339>

*Orwell/P.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo=%22ORWELL/P%22%29>

*Orwell/P/1.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=341>

*Orwell/P/2.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=342>

*Orwell/P/3.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=343>

*Orwell/P/4.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=344>

*Orwell/P/5.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=345>

*Orwell/P/6.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=346>

*Orwell/P/7.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=347>

*Orwell/P/8.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=348>

*Orwell papers: Associated papers.* (2012). Retrieved from the AIM25 website:  
[http://www.aim25.ac.uk/cgi-bin/vcdf/detail?coll\\_id=5077&inst\\_id=13&nv1=browse&nv2=repos](http://www.aim25.ac.uk/cgi-bin/vcdf/detail?coll_id=5077&inst_id=13&nv1=browse&nv2=repos)

*Orwell/Q.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/Q%22%29>

*Orwell/Q/1.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=350>

*Orwell/Q/13.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServer/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=362>

*Orwell/Q/15.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=364>

*Orwell/Q/16.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=365>

*Orwell/R.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/R%22%29>

*Orwell/R/1.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=368>

*Orwell/R/4.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=371>

*Orwell/R/7.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=374>

*Orwell/R/8.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqCmd=Show.tcl&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqSearch=%28%28text%29=%27orwell%27%29&dsqPos=375>

*Orwell/S.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%22ORWELL/S%22%29>

Orwell, S. & Angus, I. (Eds.). (1982). *The collected essays, journalism and letters of George Orwell. Volume 1: An age like this, 1920-1940.* London: Penguin.

Orwell, S. & Angus, I. (Eds.). (1982). *The collected essays, journalism and letters of George Orwell. Volume 3: As I please, 1943-1945.* London: Penguin.

Orwell, S. & Angus, I. (Eds.). (1982). *The collected essays, journalism and letters of George Orwell. Volume 4: In front of your nose, 1945-1950*. London: Penguin.

Orwell, S. & Angus, I. (Eds.). (1982). *The collected essays, journalism and letters of George Orwell. Volume 2: My country right or left, 1940-1943*. London: Penguin.

*Orwell/T*. (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://archives.ucl.ac.uk/Dserve/dserve.exe?dsqServer=localhost&dsqIni=Dserve.ini&dsqApp=Archive&dsqDb=Catalog&dsqCmd=show.tcl&dsqSearch=%28RefNo==%20ORWELL/T%22%29>

Overbeck, L.M. (1993). *Researching literary manuscripts: A scholar's perspective*. *American Archivist*, 56, 62-69.

*Papers from the Norman Nicholson book collection*. (2011). Retrieved from the University of Manchester website:  
<http://archives.li.man.ac.uk/ead/search?operation=summary&rsid=9985&firstrec=1&numreq=20&highlight=1&hitposition=1#rightcol>

*Papers of Harold Blundell*. (2011). Retrieved from the University of Manchester website:  
<http://archives.li.man.ac.uk/ead/search/eadSearchHandler?operation=full&recid=gb133blu>

*Papers of Siegfried Sassoon*. (2012). Retrieved from the University of Cambridge website:  
<http://www.lib.cam.ac.uk/deptserv/manuscripts/sassoon.html>

Pavelich, D. (2010). Lighting fires in creative minds. *College and Research Libraries News*. Retrieved from:  
<http://crln.acrl.org/content/71/6/295.full>

*Peake papers*. (2012). Retrieved from the AIM25 website:  
[http://www.aim25.ac.uk/cgi-bin/vcdf/detail?coll\\_id=1601&inst\\_id=13&nv1=search&nv2=advanced](http://www.aim25.ac.uk/cgi-bin/vcdf/detail?coll_id=1601&inst_id=13&nv1=search&nv2=advanced)

*Penguin book collection*. (2012). Retrieved from the University of Bristol website:  
<http://www.bris.ac.uk/library/resources/specialcollections/archives/penguin/penguinbooks.html>

*Penguin editorial files*. (2012). Retrieved from the University of Bristol website:  
<http://www.bris.ac.uk/library/resources/specialcollections/archives/penguin/penguineditorial.html>

*Philip Arthur Larkin*. (2012). Retrieved from the University of Hull website:  
<http://www.hull.ac.uk/arc/collection/literarymanuscripts/larkin.html>

*Philip Larkin subject guide*. (2012). Retrieved from the University of Hull website:  
<http://www.hull.ac.uk/arc/collection/philiplarkin/colls.html>

*Sassoon project blog*. (2012). Retrieved from the University of Cambridge website:  
<http://www.lib.cam.ac.uk/deptserv/manuscripts/sassoonblog/>

*Shakespeare: The return of the first folio*. (2012). Retrieved from the Durham University website:  
<http://www.dur.ac.uk/whatson/calendar/?eventno=10383>

*Shaw, George Bernard*. (2012). Retrieved from the National Archives website:  
<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/nra/searches/subjectView.asp?ID=P25908>

*Shelley manuscript*. (2012). Retrieved from the AIM25 website:  
[http://www.aim25.ac.uk/cgi-bin/vcdf/detail?coll\\_id=3659&inst\\_id=13&nv1=search&nv2=advanced](http://www.aim25.ac.uk/cgi-bin/vcdf/detail?coll_id=3659&inst_id=13&nv1=search&nv2=advanced)

*Shelley's ghost: Reshaping the image of a literary family*. (2012). Retrieved from the University of Oxford website:  
<http://shelleysghost.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/home-page>

Sheppard, C. (2006, October 20). *Findings of the GLAM survey*. Paper presented at the 2006 UK Literary Heritage Group conference, Manuscripts Matter. Retrieved from:  
<http://www.literary.org.uk/conference/>

*Short story by David Lodge*. (2012). Retrieved from the University of Birmingham website:  
<http://calmview.bham.ac.uk/Record.aspx?src=DServe.Catalog&id=XMS303>

Skelton, R. (1984). *The acquisition of literary archives*. *Archivaria*, 18, 214-219.

*Special Collections*. (2012). Retrieved from the Swansea University website:  
[http://www.swan.ac.uk/lis/historicalcollections/special\\_collections/](http://www.swan.ac.uk/lis/historicalcollections/special_collections/)

*Stevie Smith*. (2012). Retrieved from the University of Hull website:  
<http://www.hull.ac.uk/arc/collection/literarymanuscripts/smith.html>

*Survey of collecting policy and practice*. (2012). Retrieved from the Group for Literary Archives and Manuscripts website:  
[http://glam-archives.org.uk/?page\\_id=204](http://glam-archives.org.uk/?page_id=204)

Taylor, D.J. (2008). *Orwell's poetry*. Retrieved from:  
<http://www.finlay-publisher.com/archive.htm>

Tener, J. (1984). *Problems of literary archives: A commentary*. *Archivaria*, 18, 228-231.

*Tennyson resources*. (2012). Retrieved from the Lincs to the past website:  
<http://www.lincstothePast.com/home/tennyson-resources/309.article>

*The David Lodge papers.* (2012). Retrieved from the University of Birmingham website:  
<http://calmview.bham.ac.uk/Record.aspx?src=DServe.Catalog&id=XDL>

*The J.B. Priestley archive.* (2012). Retrieved from the University of Bradford website:  
<http://www.brad.ac.uk/library/special/priestley.php>

*The George Orwell archive.* (2012). Retrieved from the University College London website:  
<http://www.ucl.ac.uk/library/special-coll/orwell.shtml>

*The papers of Brian Patten.* (2012). Retrieved from the University of Liverpool website:  
<http://sca.lib.liv.ac.uk/collections/colldescs/patten.html>

*The papers of Edward Morgan Forster.* (2012). Retrieved from:  
<http://janus.lib.cam.ac.uk/db/node.xsp?id=EAD/GBR/0272/PP/EMF>

*The papers of John Cowper Powys.* (2012). Retrieved from:  
<http://janus.lib.cam.ac.uk/db/node.xsp?id=EAD%2FGBR%2F0014%2FJCPS>

*The papers of Julian Heward Bell.* (2012). Retrieved from:  
<http://janus.lib.cam.ac.uk/db/node.xsp?id=EAD%2FGBR%2F0272%2FPF%2FJHB>

*The papers of Roger McGough.* (2012). Retrieved from the University of Liverpool website:  
<http://sca.lib.liv.ac.uk/collections/colldescs/mcgough.html>

*The poets.* (2012). Retrieved from the Poetry Archive website:  
<http://www.poetryarchive.org/poetryarchive/poetsHome.do>

*The Road to Wigan Pier: About.* (2012). Retrieved from:  
<http://theroadtowiganpier.wordpress.com/about/>

*The worlds of Mervyn Peake.* (2012). Retrieved from the British Library website:  
<http://www.bl.uk/whatson/exhibitions/peakeexhibition/peake.html>

Thorpe, J. (1974). *The use of manuscripts in literary research.* New York: Modern Language Association of America.

Tschan, R. (2002). *A comparison of Jenkinson and Schellenberg on appraisal.* *American Archivist*, 65, 176-195.

*University of Bristol library and theatre archive.* (2012). Retrieved from the Group for Literary Archives and Manuscripts website:  
[http://glam-archives.org.uk/?page\\_id=218](http://glam-archives.org.uk/?page_id=218)

*Welcome.* (2012). Retrieved from the Archives Hub website:  
<http://archiveshub.ac.uk/>

