

The Impact of the Manuscript Market on British Libraries and Archives

Graeme Powell

This article discusses some of the difficulties faced by British libraries and record offices in participating in the long-established and flourishing market in manuscripts and personal papers. Rising prices have led to a high degree of co-operation between repositories, some questioning of traditional methods of acquisition, and a greater reliance on external sources, both public and private, for assistance with manuscript purchases.

In 1976 the archivist of Winchester College resigned in protest against the proposed sale of the most famous document in his archives, the 15th century manuscript of Sir Thomas Malory's *Morte d'Arthur*. The governors of the college, who intended to use the money to create scholarships, were unmoved by his noble gesture and proceeded to sell the manuscript to the British Library for £150,000.¹ In 1980 a learned society followed the Winchester example, with even more spectacular results. Faced with serious financial problems, the Royal Asiatic Society decided to part with a 14th century manuscript, the World History of Rashid al-Din, which had been bequeathed to the society in 1841. Again there were protests, again to no avail. At a Sotheby auction the manuscript was bought by a Swiss dealer for the remarkable price of £935,000.

These two incidents illustrate the tendency of individuals, families and private institutions in Britain to alleviate their financial difficulties by selling manuscripts and personal papers. In recent years there have been a large number of sales, by both public auction and private treaty, in which manuscripts or personal archives have been sold for sums exceeding £50,000. The sales have often been well-publicised and have encouraged owners to adopt a much more mercenary attitude towards their family papers, including papers deposited in local record offices. The sales have also provoked a vigorous and at times acrimonious debate about the disposal and dispersal of historical records. At meetings of historians and archivists, in articles and letters in newspapers, and even in the House of Commons, arguments and counter-arguments have been advanced about the preservation of the national heritage, the needs of historians, the rights

of private owners, and the responsibilities and the competence of libraries and record offices.

Notwithstanding the current controversy, a market for manuscripts has existed in Britain for centuries. As early as 1806 the British Museum purchased the political papers and other manuscripts collected by Lord Lansdowne for £5,000 (equivalent to £70,000 in 1983). The Bodleian Library at Oxford paid an even larger sum in 1817 for the great collection of Greek, Latin, Italian and oriental manuscripts of Matheo Canonici. In the mid-19th century the keeper of manuscripts at the British Museum, Sir Frederic Madden, often spent £5,000 per annum on manuscript purchases. His diaries show that he spent a considerable proportion of his time in valuing manuscripts, visiting auction rooms, and bargaining with owners and collectors.² His successors in the 20th century ensured that the British Museum remained pre-eminent among institutional buyers of manuscripts. Thus in 1930-33, during the great depression, the Museum was able to acquire the Luttrell Psalter (£31,500), The Bedford Book of Hours (£33,000), and the Codex Sinaiticus, a 4th century Greek Bible (£100,000).

Yet, until World War II, libraries and archives were generally minor participants in the British manuscript market. They could seldom compete successfully with wealthy and obsessive private collectors, such as Sir Thomas Phillips, Lord Ashburnham and Lord Crawford, who spent fabulous sums on manuscripts. In fact, most libraries made no attempt to compete with private collectors. In the early 1900s the Bodleian Library usually spent as little as £100 per annum on manuscripts and only after 1927 did it set it aside £400 for manuscript purchases.³ Cambridge University Library was equally reluctant to spend money on manuscripts. The great university and college collections were based entirely or largely on gifts and bequests. Similarly, the county and city record offices, which were mostly established after 1930, depended on gifts and deposits. With little opposition from libraries and archives, private collectors were sometimes able to secure amazing bargains. For instance, in 1939 a collector bought at auction the entire papers of Lord Brougham, the 19th century statesman, lawyer and writer, for a mere £205.

In the period 1800-1950 the prices for many categories of manuscripts hardly rose.⁴ Since 1950 the situation has completely changed. In the last few years the prices of both manuscripts and collections of personal and family papers have frequently approached the levels which prevail in the art market. The changes in the manuscript market were particularly evident in a succession of sales in the three years 1979-81:

- (i) March 1979. The National Library of Scotland purchased at auction (in 61 lots) the papers of the African explorer James Grant for about £105,000.

- (ii) June 1979. A 15th century manuscript anthology of English verse was bought at auction by a dealer for £90,000.
- (iii) April 1980. The British Library acquired the manuscripts of the composer Sir Michael Tippett for 'at least £100,000'.
- (iv) June 1980. The Gilbert White Museum at Selborne bought at auction the final draft of White's *Natural history of Selborne* for £100,000.
- (v) July 1980. The manuscript of Lord Tennyson's poem 'In memoriam' was purchased at auction by the Tennyson Research Centre at Lincoln for £100,000.
- (vi) September 1980. The papers of the philosopher G.E. Moore were sold to Cambridge University Library for £61,545.
- (vii) December 1980. The Codex Leicester, comprising illustrated notes on cosmology, water and geology by Leonardo da Vinci, which had been owned by the Coke family (Earls of Leicester) since 1717, was sold at auction to an American oil millionaire for £2.45 million.
- (viii) May 1981. An American dealer bought at auction for £700,000 the Ottobeuren Gradual, a German romanesque manuscript.
- (ix) August 1981. The National Maritime Museum purchased the papers of Admiral Lord Beatty for £72,000.
- (x) 1981. The Vyner Papers, including medieval records of Fountains Abbey and papers of the Robinson Family (Marquises of Ripon), were acquired by the Leeds City Archives for £82,190.

These sales give some idea of the scope and value of the British manuscript market. Although medieval, renaissance and oriental manuscripts continue to fetch the highest prices, modern manuscripts and family archives have proved to be valuable assets for their owners. The sales have included the papers of a wide range of individuals — politicians, soldiers, explorers, scientists, writers, artists, feminists — and also a variety of records — literary manuscripts, letters, diaries, estate records and photographs. It is impossible to estimate the total size of the market, for many sales are carried out privately and prices are seldom disclosed. It is certainly an active market. Sales of manuscripts and letters take place regularly at Sotheby's, while Christie's and the other leading London auctioneers often include manuscripts in their book auctions. Some of the antiquarian booksellers also take a strong interest in the buying and selling of manuscripts. The widespread dispersal of collections of personal papers by sale was highlighted by an Historical Manuscripts Commission survey. It found that, of 425 collections in private ownership recorded by the Commission between 1869 and 1914, 174 collections had since been sold.⁵

The examples of recent sales also indicate that it is foreign collectors and

institutions which now provide the main competition for British libraries and record offices. Despite restrictions, the export trade in manuscripts continues to flourish: in 1977-81 export licences were granted for manuscripts valued at about £8 million. The local opposition to American universities and Arab oil magnates is led by the British Library, which in the last few years has had to purchase about 60 per cent of its manuscript accessions. It has been joined by a small group of national libraries, national museums, and university libraries which have large acquisition budgets, in a few cases exceeding £100,000 per annum, and are prepared to purchase a significant proportion of their acquisitions. None of these institutions are 'pure' archival repositories. It is obviously easier for a 'mixed' repository, which spends considerable sums on books, paintings or museum objects as a matter of course, to find £100,000 or so for manuscript purchases.

In contrast to the small number of plutocratic institutions, the great majority of British record offices have no tradition of purchasing records and little hope of obtaining generous grants from their governing authorities. Local record offices occasionally buy manorial deeds, maps and similar documents. However, as one county archivist said in 1979, 'there are precious few local repositories in this country which have an annual purchasing budget of more than a thousand pounds, and most have considerably less'.⁶ British record offices have generally acquired their private records not by gift or purchase but rather by deposit (a term that covers long-term loans, indefinite loans, and so-called permanent loans). For various reasons archivists have regarded the deposited collection as the norm and they have made little effort to persuade the owners of personal papers to transfer the ownership to the record offices. It may well be that the owners of major family archives have always been aware of their potential monetary value and would not have surrendered the ownership. Nevertheless, at a time when the rising prices of manuscripts have been well publicised, archivists have been placed in a very awkward position by their inability to prevent collections being reclaimed by the depositors.

In 1978 Lord Cobham, faced with a large tax bill, withdrew the archives of the Lyttelton family from the Hereford and Worcester Record Office, where they had been on deposit for more than ten years. The outstanding political and family correspondence and charters, covering eight centuries, were divided by Sotheby's into 181 lots and fetched a total of £147,000. The Record Office which had housed and cared for the papers was only able to buy, by private treaty, a few items. In 1980 there was a similar incident, when Sir Simon Codrington withdrew his family archives from the Gloucestershire Record Office, where they had been deposited in 1959. The huge collection of letters, maps and deeds, covering 300 years, was one of the finest sources on the history of West Indies plantation society. It was

sold by Sotheby's and all the lots were purchased by an anonymous buyer for £106,000. Both the Lyttelton and Codrington families suffered a good deal of criticism and even abuse for exploiting the record offices, risking the breakup and dispersal of their archives, and implicitly for making a lot of money from historical records which they had merely inherited. But the precedents had been created.

The controversy surrounding the sale of the Lyttelton and Codrington papers has led many archivists to revise their attitudes to acquisition by deposit. Few repositories are in a position to emulate the British Library, which simply declines to accept manuscripts on deposit. Nevertheless, there is now much more support for the view that deposits should be covered by written agreements and that, wherever possible, archivists should urge that deposits be converted into gifts. D.G. Vaisey of the Bodleian Library has argued that archivists who provide expensive storage space, skilled cataloguing and free conservation services for deposited records are being left with a disproportionate share of the responsibilities. Deposit agreements should specify a minimum period, with financial penalties for early withdrawals, and they should cover such matters as payment for repairs, insurance, access conditions, copyright and exhibitions.⁷ Most of his suggestions have been incorporated in a model deposit agreement which has been drafted by the Association of County Archivists. The agreement stipulates that records are deposited for a minimum of twenty years.

Deposit agreements may ease the problem, but libraries and archives increasingly have to find large amounts of money if they wish to acquire outstanding manuscripts or collections of family and personal papers. Fortunately, there are several means by which institutions can be assisted, either directly or indirectly, to acquire costly collections.

The British government provides funds directly to the three national libraries and a number of national museums and galleries which regularly purchase manuscripts. It also helps university libraries and local libraries and record offices to buy collections through the Purchase Grant Fund administered by the Victoria and Albert Museum. The fund is extremely venerable, dating back to 1881. Originally, most of the grants were allocated to galleries, but in 1973 a separate fund was set aside for manuscripts, which at present receives £40,000 per annum. If necessary, grants can also be drawn from the main fund. In 1981/82 there were 54 manuscript grants, totalling £113,700. Most of the grants have been for less than £500, but occasionally they have been substantial: £40,000 to the Warwick County Record Office in 1978 and £37,500 to the Leeds City Archives in 1981.⁸ The Science Museum administers a similar but much smaller fund for the purchase of scientific records.

Repositories hoping to purchase expensive manuscripts of outstanding

historical interest can, in the last resort, appeal for grants or loans from a second public fund, the National Heritage Memorial Fund. This fund was set up in 1980 and in its first two years its grants to libraries, galleries, museums, archives and other public institutions totalled near £7 million. Its first grant enabled the Gilbert White Museum to buy the manuscript of *The natural history of Selborne*. Other grants for manuscripts have been quite considerable: for instance, £50,769 to the Lincolnshire County Libraries for the papers of Lord Tennyson, £50,000 to the Wordsworth Museum at Grasmere for manuscripts of William Wordsworth, £30,000 to the National Maritime Museum for the Beatty Papers, and £14,375 to the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge for a 10th century French codex. In their first report the trustees of the fund expressed surprise at the large number of requests that they had received for help with manuscript purchases.⁹

There is a third public fund which is devoted to a special category of manuscripts: the papers of contemporary writers. It is in this field that American university libraries have been most predatory; so much so, that Philip Larkin has likened a meeting of British librarians discussing modern literary papers to 'an annual convention of stable-door lockers.'¹⁰ American competition led the Arts Council of Great Britain in 1961 to start buying the manuscripts of writers in order to sell them at discount to British libraries. In 1974 the discount was increased to 50 per cent. The British Library is no longer a participant in the scheme and virtually all the grants from the National Manuscript Collection of Contemporary Writers Fund have been made to university libraries. Although the grants are not usually large, they have helped libraries to purchase the papers of such prominent writers as Walter De La Mare, L.P. Hartley, Gavin Ewart, William Plomer and Donald Davie.

In addition to direct grants, the British government assists libraries and archives to acquire expensive manuscripts in indirect ways, by fiscal inducements and export controls. The owners of manuscripts or large family archives tend to have extensive assets and have consequently been greatly affected by the various capital taxes which both Labour and Conservative governments have introduced in the last twenty years. Of particular importance has been capital transfer tax, a cumulative charge on transfers made both during a person's lifetime and on death which exceed a value of £15,000. Since 1956 the government has been able to accept works of art in lieu of capital taxes and in 1973 this provision was extended to cover historical manuscripts.¹¹ The scheme, which is now administered by the Office of Arts and Libraries, has led to a few medieval and renaissance manuscripts being lodged with the British Library, Bodleian Library, and other institutions. In recent years, with prices rising rapidly, some major collections of personal papers have also been offered to the government in lieu of tax. They have included the papers of the Duke

of Marlborough (the Blenheim Archive, valued at £342,300), the Duke of Wellington (£372,600), Admiral Lord Fisher (£10,615), and the composer Benjamin Britten (£190,000). It has been claimed that if works of art and manuscripts could be accepted as tax credits far more would be forthcoming.¹²

Manuscripts or papers that are sold, bequeathed or donated to institutions recognised by the Treasury are exempt from both capital transfer tax and capital gains tax.¹³ The Minister for the Arts and other government spokesmen have often urged owners to obtain this exemption by selling manuscripts by private treaty rather than by auction or through dealers.¹⁴ The Treasury has drawn up a somewhat complex formula for valuing works of art or archives, based on the estimated market value with the tax subtracted and a bonus ('the *douceur*') added. Under this arrangement repositories escape the competition of private collectors and other institutions and, moreover, acquire the material for less than the probable market price. Unfortunately, it appears that owners have been slow to take advantage of the scheme.¹⁵ Despite the taxes that they incur, owners are still attracted to auctions, which are usually speedier and more straightforward than private sales and which hold out the possibility of an unexpectedly high price. Sometimes the gamble succeeds. The Codrington Papers sold for £106,000, compared with the estimate of £42,300. On the other hand, Lord Coke, who probably had to pay a tax of 75 per cent on the sale of the Codex Leicester, would almost certainly have gained more by selling the manuscript directly to the government or a library.

In the period 1974-79 those families and individuals with assets worth more than £100,000 lived in fear that an annual wealth tax would be introduced. There was considerable debate as to whether works of art, including manuscripts, should be treated as taxable assets. Librarians and archivists were unanimous that they should be exempt. They believed that otherwise the market would be flooded with art works, British institutions would have insufficient funds to purchase or even house them, and much of the national heritage would vanish overseas. In 1979 the Chancellor of the Exchequer eventually accepted the validity of their arguments. A few weeks later a Conservative government came to power and the threat of a wealth tax quickly receded.¹⁶

The regulation of the export of works of art, which originated in 1939, has been an additional means of helping British repositories to acquire manuscripts. The export of public records, manorial records and tithe documents is in practice completely prohibited. Other manuscripts, if they are over 50 years old, require export licences. A licence may be withheld if it is decided that an object is closely connected with British history, is of outstanding aesthetic value, or is of major significance for the study of a branch of art, learning or history. The system has serious weaknesses. It is difficult to police; manuscripts that have been illegally exported can

seldom be retrieved. Moreover, the provision that a British institution must be willing to purchase the object at the market price favours the determined overseas collector who pays for his licence by forcing the price beyond the reach of any institution. Very few licences have in fact been refused. Nevertheless, the possibility that a licence will not be granted, and also the requirement that photographic copies be retained in the British Library, does deter some foreign buyers.¹⁷ Above all, the temporary withholding of licences has often given British libraries and archives the time they needed to find the purchase money. As a result of temporary export restrictions, the foundation charter of Westminster Abbey, manuscripts and letters of William Wordsworth, and the papers of G.E. Moore were secured for British repositories.

Grants from public sources such as the Victoria and Albert Museum Purchase Grant Fund cannot exceed 50 per cent of the cost of a manuscript. A library or record office which has a small budget must therefore turn to private sources if it wishes to buy a costly item or collection. Some repositories, such as the Bodleian Library and the John Rylands Library at Manchester, have active and generous Friends, who regularly provide the money for rare books and manuscripts. The aid of local businesses has sometimes been enlisted, although business sponsorship of the arts is a recent development in Britain and is mainly limited to support for orchestras and ballets rather than libraries and archives. Similarly, most charitable trusts have shown little interest in manuscripts. The ancient Radcliffe Trust, which was responsible for many of the buildings of Oxford University, has occasionally made contributions for manuscript purchases. The Pilgrim Trust, founded in 1930 by the American philanthropist Edward Harkness, provides grants totalling £400,000 per annum for the preservation of buildings, social welfare, art and learning. Not surprisingly, only a small proportion of the grants have been devoted to manuscript purchases. Nevertheless, such institutions as the British Library, the National Library of Scotland, the Warwick County Record Office, the Public Record Office of Northern Ireland, and the Gilbert White Museum have benefited from grants of up to £10,000 from the Pilgrim Trust.

Finally, libraries and record offices can seek help from a national organisation which exists solely to raise money for the purchase of rare books and manuscripts. The Friends of the National Libraries was founded in 1931 and made a promising start. It soon enlisted 500 members and in its early years made some useful grants, such as £1,500 to the British Museum for the Paxton Papers and £471 to the Imperial College of Science and Technology for the T.H. Huxley Papers. However, its progress faltered badly during World War II and it has remained a rather feeble body. Its membership has never exceeded 1,000 and, although it now derives income from investments, it seldom receives more than £5,000

per annum from subscriptions and donations. The Friends of the National Libraries can rarely contribute more than £500 for a particular purchase. Consequently, it is no longer the national institutions but rather local record offices and museums which usually appeal for its support. Even a modest grant can be helpful in convincing a local authority that assistance for a repository would be justified.¹⁸

The Friends of the National Libraries was modelled on the National Art Collections Fund, yet the differences between the two organisations are considerable. The Fund has a much larger membership and its grants to galleries and museums total at least £200,000 per annum. Sadly, manuscripts are never likely to have the popular appeal of paintings and other art works. As Philip Howard has written:

The trouble is that manuscripts are not as sexy as other parts of the national heritage. You can hang the Gainsborough you have saved for the nation on a gallery wall, and purr with gratification to look at it. Members of the National Art Collections Fund can go on jubilant jaunts together to galleries and stately homes. To look at a historic document, you usually need a reader's ticket.¹⁹

For the same reason, private owners often have few qualms about parting with valuable manuscripts. Lord Coke stated that he would much prefer to sell the Codex Leicester, which was difficult to display, than a painting by Rubens or Van Dyck.²⁰ Thus librarians and archivists are faced with a dilemma. If they wish to acquire important manuscripts or collections of personal papers, they will often be forced to devote a lot of time to the search for money. They will be aware that there is far more public interest in works of art than in manuscripts, yet they will have to press ahead with appeals to trustees, committees and Friends, to local philanthropists and businesses, and to the various public funds. They may need to organise exhibitions or other fund-raising events. (In its efforts to obtain money for the Wordsworth letters, the Grasmere Museum even resorted to the un-Wordsworthian device of a rock concert.) The money will usually have to be found in a very short time and, in the case of auctions, there will still be no guarantee that all the work will not have been wasted.²¹

Faced with limited budgets and the unpredictable competition of wealthy private collectors and overseas institutions, British libraries and archives are generally forced to co-operate with each other. High prices eliminate many potential competitors. In a country with hundreds of manuscript repositories, no institution can attempt to monopolise any particular field of collecting. There is, in fact, a good deal of consultation before major sales take place. There may sometimes be disagreements, especially between national and local repositories, but, if one has a strong claim to a manuscript or collection and has adequate financial resources, the others will stand aside. The market can play havoc with the principle of *respect des fonds* and archivists sometimes have to accept that, for

financial reasons, the papers of an individual or family must be divided between two or more institutions. For instance, in 1978 both the Bodleian Library and the British Library purchased papers of Benjamin Disraeli. The greatest threat to the integrity of collections is posed by auctioneers, and both archivists and dealers have agitated against the common saleroom practice of splitting up collections into numerous lots.²² Auctioneers have made some concessions, but on this question the financial interests of owners and the principles of archivists are often in direct conflict.

Co-operation between libraries and archives is greatly assisted by the existence of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts. The commission has always been primarily concerned with the discovery, listing and publishing of manuscripts, but in the last twenty years it has increasingly assumed an advisory and co-ordinating role. It advises both the National Heritage Memorial Fund and the Victoria and Albert Museum Fund on the allocation of grants for manuscript purchases, makes recommendations to the Minister for the Arts on the disposal of manuscripts and archives accepted in lieu of tax, and assists the Reviewing Committee on the Export of Works of Art. In addition, it notifies local record offices of forthcoming sales which might be of interest and gives advice to owners who are planning to part with their papers, whether by gift, loan or sale. The growth of the manuscript market has placed the commission in an influential position and occasionally it has found itself in the centre of controversy. In 1978 it was denounced by Churchill College, Cambridge, by the Churchill family, and by some historians for advising the government to place the Blenheim Archive in the British Library. Such disputes have been rare and it is generally agreed that a body which itself has no collecting interests, but which has a unique knowledge of the resources of British manuscript repositories, can best promote co-operation between libraries, record offices, government agencies, historians and owners.

Australian archivists have occasionally expressed alarm that the high prices and other features of the British manuscript market may soon be evident in Australia.²³ Their concern is understandable. Such developments as the withdrawal and dispersal of deposited collections, the breakup of organic collections at auctions, the large-scale export of manuscripts, and the inflation of prices due to the intrusion of auctioneers, dealers, speculative buyers and other middlemen are deplored by British archivists. Many of them view with distaste the necessity to undertake fund-raising and lengthy negotiations with hard-headed dealers and manuscript owners. They are particularly worried that, at a time of recession, with heavy cuts in public spending, many of the smaller record offices may simply have to forego acquiring manuscripts or large

collections of personal papers. The position could even worsen, with other classes of private records being sold rather than deposited. (Already libraries have had to buy the records of some publishing firms.) Yet the growth of the manuscript market was probably inevitable. It would be hard to convince owners or dealers that manuscripts are essentially different from books, paintings, sculpture, ceramics or furniture, and in some ways manuscript repositories are simply meeting problems which galleries and museums have lived with for decades.

British libraries and archives have in fact participated in the manuscript market with considerable success. Archivists have frequently referred to the failures, such as the Cobham sale, but the many successful acquisitions tend to be overlooked. Prices have become very high, but the national institutions have substantial financial resources and even such local repositories as the Birmingham Reference Library and the Warwick County Record Office have on occasion raised £100,000 or more for manuscript purchases. Surveys by the Historical Manuscripts Commission have shown that far fewer major collections have been exported or broken up than had once been assumed.²⁴ Instead, the publicity that has been given to manuscript sales has encouraged private owners to offer their collections for sale to public institutions and, at the very least, has reduced the risk of valuable papers being carelessly lost or destroyed. Sir Thomas Phillips, the greatest of the British manuscript collectors, once wrote, 'Nothing tends to the preservation of anything so much as asking it to bear a high price'.²⁵ Australian manuscript librarians, who have so often found that papers were lost through ignorance of their historical value, will acknowledge that there is some force in this argument.

FOOTNOTES

1. In view of fluctuating exchange rates, I have not attempted to convert English prices into Australian currency. In May 1983 the exchange rate was roughly c1.00 (stg) = \$1.80 (Aust).
2. Bell, Alan. 'The journal of Sir Frederic Madden, 1852'. *The Library*, 5th series, vol 29, Dec 1974, pp.405-21.
3. Craster, Sir Edmund. *History of the Bodleian Library, 1845-1945*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1952, pp.197, 289.
4. Munby, A.N.L. 'The acquisition of manuscripts by institutional libraries'. In A.N.L. Munby. *Essays and papers*, edited by N. Barker. London, Scolar Press, 1977, pp.72-73.
5. Great Britain. Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts. *Secretary's report to the Commissioners, 1978-79*, pp.9-10.
6. Gray, V.W. 'Ownership and archives: the way forward'. *Archives*, vol 14, Spring 1980, p.190.
7. Vaisey, D.G. 'Conditions of deposit'. Paper given to Society of Archivists Annual Conference, Leicester, 19 April 1979.

8. Coachworth, David. 'The Victoria and Albert Museum Purchase Grant Fund'. *Archives*, vol 15, April 1982, pp.143-47. A parallel fund in Scotland is administered by the Royal Scottish Museum.
9. National Heritage Memorial Fund. *First annual report, 1980/81* (HC 394), p.5. See also Brian Lang. 'The National Heritage Memorial Fund'. *Archives*, vol 15, April 1982, pp.139-43; Michael Robinson. 'The National Heritage Memorial Fund' *Listener*, 6 Jan 1983, p.9.
10. Larkin, Philip. 'A neglected responsibility; contemporary literary mss'. *Encounter*, vol 53, July 1979, pp.33-41.
11. Finance Act 1973, s.46.
12. The Callaghan Government had planned to bring to an end the scheme whereby art works may be accepted in lieu of tax, but the Thatcher Government decided to retain it. See White Paper. 'A National Heritage Fund'. Cmnd.7428, Feb 1979.
13. Finance Act 1976, ss.76-78; Capital Gains Tax Act 1979, s.147.
14. Stone, Rodney. 'Preservation of the heritage; central funding and support'. *Archives*, vol 15, April 1982, pp.131-39.
15. A survey in 1981 found that libraries and museums had acquired between 50 and 60 items or collections in three years by private sales on the basis of the *donation* arrangement. See House of Commons. Education, Science and Arts Committee. *Public and private funding of the arts; minutes of evidence*. HC 106-i, 19 Jan 1981, pp.80-82.
16. See House of Commons. Select Committee on a Wealth Tax. *Report and minutes of evidence*, HC 696, 11 Nov, 1975.
17. See letter from Humanities Research Centre, Texas University. *Times* (London), 9 Aug 1980, p.13.
18. Day, A. 'Friends of the National Libraries'. *New Library World*, vol 77, Nov 1976, pp.219-21; F. Strong. 'The Friends of the National Libraries'. *Archives*, vol 13, Autumn 1978, pp.180-89.
19. Howard, Philip. 'Saving the literary heritage from the market's blasts'. *Times* (London), 2 June 1981, p.11.
20. *Times* (London), 18 Sept, 1980, p.2.
21. For a discussion of the problems of fund-raising, from the viewpoint of the National Library of Scotland, see T.I. Rae. 'Ownership and archives: the way forward'. *Archives*, vol 14 Spring 1980, pp.182-88.
22. Rota, Anthony. 'Selling literary manuscripts'. *The Author*, vol 91, Spring 1980, pp.16-19.
23. Nathan, Elizabeth. 'Submission to the Interdepartmental Working Group on Cultural Property prepared by the Australian Society of Archivists'. *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol 10, May 1982, pp.47-48.
24. Great Britain. Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts. *Guide to the location of collections described in the Reports and Calendars Series 1870-1980*. London, HMSO, 1982, p.iv.
25. Quoted in Jane Lancellotti. 'Autographed letters'. *Antique Collector*, vol 48, Aug 1977, p.91.

I wish to thank the various librarians and archivists who have explained to me some of the mysteries of the manuscript market, especially Mr B.S. Smith, Mr D.G. Vaisey, Mr A.E.B. Owen and Miss Amanda Arrowsmith.