

Possessing an “Inner History”

Curators, Donors, and Affective Stewardship



Amy Hildreth Chen

*Special Collections Instruction Librarian, University of Iowa Libraries,
Amy-Chen@uiowa.edu*

Abstract Acquisition histories reveal how relationships between repository curators and collection donors shape an institution’s holdings as well as the direction of future scholarship. However, researchers often overlook the significance of acquisition histories, as cultural heritage organizations do not make this information readily available, for accession information either is considered private or is not presumed to be valuable. Therefore, tracing acquisition histories requires analyzing evidence across critical, artistic, and institutional records to see how curators recruit donors and then support the processing and promotion of their collections. The case study of curator Kevin Young and Lucille Clifton at Emory University’s Stuart A. Rose Manuscripts, Archives, and Rare Book Library provides an example of the merit of acquisition histories. While Clifton had no previous institutional connection to Emory, she chose Rose Library because she knew Young personally and trusted him, as both belonged to the same community of African American poets. I argue that Young advocated for Clifton’s papers out of respect for her legacy, which included her mentorship of his early career. This “inner history” between writer and curator, mentor and protégé, demonstrates the value of affective stewardship, or when a curator’s emotional connection to a writer generates a level of collection advocacy surpassing standard promotional practices.

Acquisition histories reveal how relationships between repository curators and collection donors shape an institution’s holdings as well as the direction of future scholarship. However, researchers often overlook the significance of acquisition histories, as cultural heritage organizations do not make this information readily available, for accession information either is considered private or is not presumed to be valuable. Therefore, tracing acquisition histories requires analyzing evidence across critical, artistic, and institutional records to see how curators recruit donors

and then support the processing and promotion of their collections. The case study of curator Kevin Young and Lucille Clifton provides an example of the merit of acquisition histories. Clifton placed her literary collection at Emory University's Stuart A. Rose Manuscripts, Archives, and Rare Book Library (Rose Library) rather than Duke University's David R. Rubenstein Rare Book and Manuscript Library (Rubenstein Library) in 2006. Young currently is the curator for literary collections at Rose Library. While Clifton briefly taught at Duke and had no previous institutional connection to Emory, she chose Rose Library because she knew Young personally and trusted him, as both belonged to the same community of African American poets. I argue that Young advocated for Clifton's papers out of respect for her legacy. The empathetic attention paid in her poetry to overlooked histories expanded the reach of the Black Arts Movement and heavily influenced Young and his post-soul peers. Her mentorship, seen through her membership in *Cave Canem*—an organization dedicated to supporting African American writers—and her selections as a poetry judge reinforced her connection to these succeeding generations. This "inner history"¹ between curator and writer, mentor and protégé, demonstrates the value of affective stewardship, or when a curator's emotional connection to a writer generates a level of collection advocacy surpassing standard promotional practices.²

Acquisition history generally is an understudied field across galleries, libraries, archives, and museums, but it is particularly ignored within scholarship-dedicated literary collections within libraries and archives. This lack of attention to acquisition histories is partially structural: notes about how literary collections come into the archive make up brief entries within finding aids, if they are included at all.³ While basic fields such as biographical notes and content lists can be found in all finding aids, the inclusion of acquisition details varies according to the policies of the repository. Acquisition details may not be included if repositories keep donor information classified or if institutions lost accession information as record keeping shifted between personnel or over time. Additionally, humanities researchers infrequently perceive the importance of acquisition histories, for they typically focus on the content of a collection and not its context. As a result, details regarding acquisition may be omitted by tradition rather than by policy. To learn more thoroughly about acquisition histories, a researcher often needs a personal connection to the curator or donor or access either to a repository that allows more information on its finding aids or to one that will respond to inquiries on this topic.⁴

While obtaining acquisition histories can be difficult, learning the acquisition history of literary collections can be even more challenging. Writers' papers differ from other common genres of records in special collections; literary collections focus on individuals who have obtained a high reputation in their field rather than in communities or in organizations.⁵ Because these writers are not relying on their posthumous reputation, they are able to sell their papers when they are still living and thus can enjoy the financial benefit themselves.⁶ Few writers of signifi-

cance donate their collections outright. Thus, the circumstances of how a repository acquires a literary collection more closely resembles how museums purchase collections rather than how libraries accept donations.⁷

Curators are the most important variable to consider when evaluating literary collection acquisition histories. No matter what type of cultural heritage organization they represent, curators designate which collections they are interested in by deciding which collections to pursue for their repositories. Their preferences control which agents/dealers and appraisers they will consult. In the field of museum studies, researchers are beginning to recognize how curators are pivotal to their institutions, for curators' individual backgrounds and personalities influence their professional activities.⁸ Although many contemporary curators in special collections, a field that includes both archives and libraries, may have qualified for their role only through a combination of experience and a traditional master of library and information science or master of library science degree, those who belong to the community they represent enjoy their donor's trust, which gives them a competitive advantage in the marketplace.⁹ Michael Basinski, a poet and the curator of the poetry collection at the University at Buffalo State University of New York, goes so far as to call this relationship one of intimacy.¹⁰ In these cases, the institution that a curator represents is often ancillary to who the curator is, for a donor will select the repository based on the significance of his or her connection to the curator, not the repository. A curator whose behavior shows extensive support for a collection beyond the amount given to other collections under their subject area highlights his or her affective connection to a donor. For this reason, curators who engage in affective stewardship are those who are connected to the donor by belonging to their community and who are inspired by this connection to advocate for the donor's collection.¹¹

A case study of the acquisition history of Lucille Clifton's literary collection reveals that curator Kevin Young's affective stewardship is driven by Young's identification as Clifton's protégé. From acquisition to arrangement, description to promotion, each of Young's curatorial steps reveals an emotional connection to Clifton. Young's holistic approach to preserving her legacy is supported by his connection and gratitude rather than by an objective appreciation of her career. However, Clifton's value as a writer would be unmistakable to any curator: she is the only writer to have been nominated for the Pulitzer Prize for poetry for two books at the same time.¹² She spent eleven years as the poet laureate of Maryland and won the National Book Award in 2000. Clifton also is notable in that her career evolved alongside the Black Arts Movement. The Black Arts Movement generated a campaign for black aesthetics that took its political momentum from the Black Power Movement's drive to detach African Americans from the white majority culture in order to properly recognize, represent, and advocate for black constituents. As Clifton is a writer invested in women's perspectives as well as the insights of African Americans, politically charged identities, she became a mentor

to post-soul poets, the generation that followed her. How Kevin Young took his place within a tradition she helped create and how that led to his future curatorial decisions can be more fully understood by first understanding Clifton's significance in 20th-century American literature.

Clifton's affiliation with the Black Arts Movement encourages one to read her work alongside the larger scope of 20th-century African American literature, making her collection an invaluable contribution to this field. Black Arts, the aesthetic sibling to the Black Power Movement, followed the impetus of Marcus Garvey and Malcolm X by advocating for a black aesthetic with a "separate symbolism, mythology, critique, and iconology" asserting the "equality, differentness—and sometimes superiority—of black and black American ways of doing and perceiving things."¹³ Officially, the Black Arts Movement began in 1965 with the founding of the Black Arts Repertory Theater School (BARTS) in Harlem, New York. Amiri Baraka, the most well known member of the movement, first became prominent due to his affiliation with Allen Ginsberg and other Beat poets before becoming an outspoken Black Nationalist. Baraka described how BARTS sent "five trucks out across Harlem" six days a week under the auspices of a Black Arts flag. Each truck contained writers, artists, and musicians who visited the "vacant lots, playgrounds, [and] parks" of Harlem to enrich the lives of local residents.¹⁴ The movement eventually spread beyond Harlem to include a generation of black writers over the next decade. And, among these authors, Clifton is one of the most significant due to her connections as well as the most distinct in terms of her achievements.

While Lucille Clifton did not participate in the early activities of the Black Arts Movement, her writing can be read within this larger community of black authors and artists, which in turn situates her papers among a constellation of other significant, similar literary collections. At the time of Amiri Baraka's activities in Harlem, Clifton was pregnant, living in Maryland, and "didn't even know what that [the Black Arts Movement] was."¹⁵ She remained connected to the movement through Amiri Baraka, whom she met in 1953 when both attended Howard University.¹⁶ Even though she did not participate directly in the intellectual ferment of the era, Clifton created art that was black in "form & content" as well as "mass-oriented."¹⁷ Because, as she said, as "a black person . . . everything I write is a black thing."¹⁸ Indeed, race shaped Clifton's aesthetics.¹⁹ She employed indicators of Black Arts, such as "the small letter 'I,' and the omission of capital letters and certain punctuation marks,"²⁰ traits that would become hallmarks of her aesthetic style. Both can be seen in the poem "apology," where Clifton writes,

i remember again the wise one
old and telling of suicides
refusing to be slaves.²¹

Another example from “1994” demonstrates how Clifton continues to use lowercase letters while also omitting punctuation marks:

you know how dangerous it is
to be born with breasts
you know how dangerous it is
to wear dark skin²²

In these selections, Clifton combines Black Arts political awareness and aesthetics with her own feminist perspective. While life as an African American is dangerous, so, she would have us believe, is life as a woman. While slavery cruelly dehumanized African Americans, patriarchy continues to disempower women. Clifton asserted black women are doubly marked by their race and their sex. Therefore, Clifton deployed the markers of Black Arts aesthetics not only to write against white experience and literature but also to illuminate her black feminist perspective.

Clifton’s writing expanded the community of those who could see their experiences and art belonging to the Black Arts Movement, one powerful reason for Young to seek to acquire her collection. While Black Arts mobilized artists to represent political agendas associated with Black Power, the perspective that emerged from both Black Arts and Black Power was by and large male. By way of illustration, Amiri Baraka’s poem “Black Art” confronts readers from its first phrase—“poems are bullshit”—and continues on to declare, “We want poems / like fists beating niggers out of Jocks” or “Poems that wrestle cops into alleys / and take their weapons leaving them dead / with tongues pulled out and sent to Ireland.” Baraka redeploys poetry as an actor that can recalibrate the world to provide justice, intoning in his final stanza, “Let the world be a Black Poem.”²³ Baraka’s language and depiction of violence highlight the masculine aesthetic he brings to the Black Arts Movement. However, it is his casual use of the plural first-person pronoun “we” that allows him to represent all African Americans and demonstrates how he believes he can assume responsibility for defining what black poetry is and can do. Baraka believes he speaks on behalf of his entire community as a protest poet. In contrast, Clifton’s poems speak to a more intimate audience. As seen in “apology” or “1994,” Clifton writes in first-person singular or second person, the register more commonly found in lyric poetry. While Baraka’s “we” generates a more powerful voice of protest, in retrospect, participants in the Black Arts Movement recognized that this singular focus on generating a challenging rhetoric weakened their popular reach. The value of Clifton’s lyric mode is that it generated empathy without compromising the message—a tactic that would be carried forward by poets such as Kevin Young.²⁴

After all, the lyric does not prevent Black Arts objectives from being espoused; rather, it allows for greater diversity in how its politics and aesthetics can be represented.²⁵ In further contrast to Amiri Baraka’s protest poem “Black Art,”

which represents the quintessential Black Arts Movement poem, Clifton's personal lyric "miss rosie" depicts a woman who is old, poor, and unable to sort out her own mind let alone influence others. Far from the ideal activist espoused by both the Black Arts or the Black Power Movement, miss rosie is significant only because she "used to be the best looking gal in Georgia." Clifton highlights her looks by making her title, the Georgia Rose, the only phrase or word capitalized in the poem. However, in the intervening years, the former Georgia Rose has turned into "a wet brown bag of a woman." Clifton directs the pathos of the poem not to miss rosie's actions but to Clifton's self-conscious recognition of her own voyeurism by repeating the phrase "i watch you" three times. Clifton justifies her voyeurism by expressing solidarity with miss rosie. She states, "I stand up / through your destruction / I stand up." By standing up, Clifton witnesses the myriad ways in which racism slowly destroyed miss rosie's life, demonstrating how empathy can bridge the divide between poet and subject while highlighting her own responsibility to share miss rosie's suffering with a public inclined to ignore her pain and downplay her value.²⁶ After all, diversity leads poets to find a broader array of subjects, and these subjects in turn generate empathy, a key feature of post-soul poetics. While Clifton made the radical choice of valuing the experience of an older, black woman who succumbed to the racism of her time rather than using her poetry to advocate for change through activism and violence, her successors would turn their eyes to unexpected or unnamed black experience.

Lucille Clifton described this empathy as a wild blessing—the painful gift of understanding suffering.²⁷ Through her inclination to generate a poetics that "mix[ed] the personal with the public,"²⁸ verifying public art with the experience of private life, Clifton provided a much-needed corrective to the Black Arts Movement²⁹ even as she celebrated the need for those "mannish days."³⁰ Her emphasis on expanding the field of who belonged to Black Arts made her a welcome mentor for African American poets whose aesthetics and subjects built on her lyric approach to black life by continuing to focus on overlooked people and forgotten histories. In the future, this impact would make her papers a valuable acquisition for Rose Library.

Clifton's mentorship came through formal means as well as through her informal example as a poetic predecessor. Clifton mentored writers through Cave Canem, a nonprofit organization for writers founded in 1996 by poets Cornelius Eady and Toi Derricotte. Eady and Derricotte, poets born after Clifton's Black Arts generation but before the vanguard of the post-soul peers, created Cave Canem as a community for black authors away from master of fine arts programs that continued to espouse white canonical authors and white aesthetics—a place "where you didn't have to apologize" and "didn't have to explain."³¹ In Cave Canem, Clifton became a role model to a new crop of writers. "Raised on the rhythms and harmonies of 1970's soul,"³² they collectively became known as the post-soul generation. Their ranks include Elizabeth Alexander, who read her poem "Praise Song

for the Day” at Barack Obama’s inauguration in 2009;³³ Natasha Trethewey, 2007 Pulitzer Prize winner and 2012–2014 U.S. poet laureate; and Kevin Young, Emory University’s professor and curator. Clifton also supported the next generation of authors by judging poetry awards. These prestigious prizes gave the winner the book contract that could begin their career. While Clifton did not value awards and she joked at the way in which people perceived judges as using prizes to propagate more poets like themselves,³⁴ she nevertheless participated in this aspect of awards culture when she chose Young’s manuscript *Most Way Home* as the winner of the 1993 National Poetry Series. Although she selected the recipient of the award blindly, basing her decisions on the merit of the material, Clifton justified her selection by noting Young’s “gift of storytelling and understanding of the music inherent in the oral tradition of language” as the means by which he “recreates for us an inner history which is compelling and authentic and American.”³⁵ Clifton’s assessment that Young created an “inner history” acknowledges how Young described people and events that otherwise did not have a place in the dominant narratives of American history, a project similar to her own. Clifton’s recognition of Young’s talent also became a personal connection—Young next appears as the “young poet” in Clifton’s address book.³⁶

Young’s writing, like Clifton’s, used empathy to allow the personal lyric of one narrator’s experience to stand in for a broader array of African American life. Reading Young’s poetry demonstrates how Clifton built a place for a succeeding generation of black poets to explore the history of African American resistance that foregrounded the actions of everyday life rather than overt political action. In “The Preserving,” the poem whose concluding line provides the volume’s name, Young uses the mundane tasks of food preparation—peeling peaches, boiling tomatoes, and shelling peas—to illustrate the seasonal cycle of domestic chores within a household. These routines also show how carefully prepared food and liquor, proudly shared, become a support for lives that are otherwise disadvantaged. After all, brandy warms when the “handed down handme- / downs” fail; in the cold, the industrious family must pray “those homemade spirits / would warm most way home.”³⁷ *Most Way Home*, an expression of hopeful realism, thus depicts the bitter transition from slavery to freedom. African Americans are “most way” to achieving equality in the United States but are prevented from fully realizing this ideal through ongoing systematic discrimination. The products of self-sufficiency and love, symbolized by the brandy, keep the family alive and hopeful in an otherwise hostile environment. Young’s “The Preserving” showed how family and community support inspired resilience, similar to how Clifton’s “miss rosie” highlighted that even basic survival can be a political act. Both perspectives are marked by their theme of empathy, whether the lives they portray are contemporary or historical. Additionally, both Young and Clifton use the perspective of an outside observer to bear witness rhetorically to the ongoing courage required to live within a hostile country.

Kevin Young was not the only post-soul poet to use empathy to create counter-narratives within American history that insert women's lives, domestic details, and other unrecorded aspects of the past into the national narrative. By revisiting the past, authors such as Natasha Trethewey and Elizabeth Alexander reiterate the significance of those who have been overlooked, in the process endowing them—and the details of their days—with dignity and consequence. While the Black Arts Movement sought to issue a direct challenge to white supremacy by generating alternative aesthetics, forms, and subjects that focused on the present, post-soul writers reclaimed the right to use both black and traditionally European forms to narrate the experience of African Americans, generating an aesthetic that drew equally and confidently from both traditions that can be seen in volumes such as Trethewey's *Bellocq's Ophelia* (2002) and Alexander's *Antebellum Dream Book* (2001). Liberated from the Black Arts Movement's immediate need to ground their work in racial pride following the advances of the civil rights movement, the post-soul authors could afford to embrace a more expansive and empathetic view of black history, one that acknowledged underrepresented voices within African American communities, appreciated the past as well as the present, and used any poetic means available. Therefore, lyrics that witnessed and provided testimonials grounded in empathy characterized Clifton's work as unique within the Black Arts Movement; it also made her work an especially rich influence for post-soul poets, a topic ripe for discovery in the pages of future literary collections that might, like Trethewey's, eventually reside at Rose Library.³⁸

African American literary history thus unfolded through the Black Arts Movement, the aesthetic and political perspectives of which Lucille Clifton helped to shape. Clifton's wider understanding of the literary manifestation of political actions and the value of alternative histories heavily influenced Kevin Young, and, by extension, Young's actions as a curator emerge from his respect for Clifton's legacy. His respect can be seen through his commitment, for Young dedicated a significant portion of his career to Clifton. She remained a fixture in his work between 2006, when he acquired her collection, through 2013, when a show he developed was displayed first at Emory University and then at Poets House.

While emotion can be displayed in statements that show affective content, emotion can also be seen—and is more frequently seen—in a scholar's drive to pursue a single topic over a number of years and/or through a number of projects. This trait is because, in scholarly work, emotion is often either overlooked or repressed; professional norms associate emotion with compromised objectivity and rigor.³⁹ Both scholars and curators have the flexibility to choose what projects to pursue. Although curators focus their projects on the collections they curate, the number of collections under a curator's domain highlight the range of their available options. After all, Young cares for more than 300 collections relating to literature.⁴⁰ As Clifton's protégé, Young engaged in affective stewardship not only by acquiring Clifton's collection for Rose Library and supporting their arrangement

and description but also by committing to promote these papers in particular and advocate for them more widely as an editor, exhibition designer, and poet. The number of projects Young took on regarding Clifton—and their variety—demonstrates his emotional connection to her. While respect can grow from scholarly objectivity, Young’s respect is deeper and more personal, the kind that grows out of mentorship. As a result, his affective stewardship expanded the number of projects he took on supporting Clifton’s papers.

Young successfully acquired Lucille Clifton’s collection for Rose Library at Emory University, a coup that allowed Emory to capture a leading voice not only of the greater Black Arts Movement but also of 20th-century American literature. However, Young was not the first curator to seek Clifton’s papers—Rubenstein Library at Duke University made the initial offer.⁴¹ That Duke would contact Clifton first was not unexpected. Clifton had no prior history at Emory, but she taught at Duke as the William Blackburn Distinguished Visiting Professor during the 1998–1999 academic year.⁴² Information regarding the acquisition history of literary collections usually is difficult to obtain, but Clifton’s papers contain a hint of the negotiations that unfolded when she began to seek a place to house her materials.

Two letters, one from each university, remain in Clifton’s papers as evidence of the acquisition process. These notes offer a rare insight into Clifton’s options and priorities as well as Young’s skill as a negotiator. On April 6, 2001, Walter C. West, Duke’s director of collections management, wrote to Clifton to discuss his prior conversation with her regarding Duke’s interest in her papers. West wrote that he would like to visit Clifton to see “just what you have and would be interested in possibly placing here” and asserted,

I do think your materials—personal and family papers, literary papers, books, and other things—would fit well here, and I can tell you that we would be honored to care for them and make them available to scholars, students, and your friends and relatives.

West also reflected,

although we like to make materials as openly available as possible, we could discuss limiting access to some materials if you wish. I also might mention that you and your descendants could retain copyright even as physical ownership is transferred.⁴³

This offer, combined with the reassurance that “we will deal fairly with you as far as payment is concerned,” which is due to the fact that West must have given “the impression that we would pay more readily for the papers of Richard Bausch or anyone else,” intended to suggest to Clifton that Duke’s bid was serious and that she would be treated fairly and respectfully in the ensuing negotiations.⁴⁴ Clifton’s collection

does not offer any documents that describe later conversations with Duke, nor does it show how Emory began to compete with Duke to solicit Clifton's papers. The only other clue of the acquisition process can be found in an e-mail from Keith Nash, a Rose Library specialist, that was sent on September 13, 2006, and tipped into Clifton's 2006 date book. The e-mail reveals that Clifton committed to housing her papers at Emory around this date, a turn of affairs that highlights how Young successfully persuaded Clifton to reconsider where her papers should reside. Nash reports that in the ensuing excitement, "your name has become a 'household word' at the archive."⁴⁵ These two letters are a remnant from what was a much more complex process: both Duke and Emory would have a much larger collection of correspondence relating to their interest in Clifton's collection. However, these internal documents are a part of donor relations and are not available to be viewed by researchers. So while Clifton found the placement of her papers an important step in her career and personal life for the financial stability it brought, the details of this significant negotiation and how Young managed to convince Clifton to go with Emory over Duke are largely hidden.

Young's skill as a curator can be seen by how quickly he was able to obtain Clifton's papers after he became a faculty member at Emory, a role he gained after his swift rise through academia. Only a year prior to his acquisition of Clifton's papers, Young joined Emory's faculty in 2005 as both a creative writing professor in the English department and a curator of the Raymond Danowski Poetry Library at Rose Library.⁴⁶ Young's roles at Emory represented his dual background as a poet and an expert in the rare book and manuscript trade. After studying creative writing as an undergraduate with Seamus Heaney and Lucie Brock-Broido at Harvard University, Young completed a Stegner Fellowship at Stanford University. At Stanford between 1992 and 1994, Young continued to write while developing his interest in rare books, particularly those from the era of modernism and the Black Arts Movement.⁴⁷ Following his graduation from Brown University with a master of fine arts degree, Young became a book collector, authored one poetry collection, and edited three anthologies while moving between faculty roles at the University of Georgia and Indiana University, where he was the Ruth Lilly Professor of Poetry.⁴⁸ Young's rapid academic advancement positioned him not only to become a curator but also to be able to acquire his mentor's collection shortly after taking his new role.

Despite Young's speed, his career still bears the hallmarks of a standard academic career trajectory. His focus on Clifton shortly after arriving at Emory indicates not only that his work with her collection is a timely coincidence but also that preserving and promoting her papers became a project of deep personal significance. After all, Young's start at Emory—and his acquisition of Clifton's collection shortly thereafter—occurs at the beginning of what Anna Neumann describes as his academic mid-career, a period Neumann found in a study of research faculty as the most productive era of a scholar's life. The early mid-career is fruitful because researchers and artists working in higher education can enjoy the benefits of

tenure, which secures their status, giving them the freedom to indulge the projects they find most personally inspiring. Neumann describes the choices made at this career juncture as driven by passionate thought, outlining that this state of mind can be seen in the decisions a professor makes regarding research topics and creative endeavors.⁴⁹ Young's behavior follows Neumann's pattern. In his first three years at Emory, he produced four books, only one of which was an anthology, in contrast to the three anthologies and one poetry volume he generated in the entire previous decade.⁵⁰ The switch in emphasis from editing anthologies to producing his own writing highlights a growing confidence and ability to speak on his own behalf rather than out of the traditions set by others. In one important way, Young's experience differs from those that Neumann studies: unlike others in their early academic mid-career, Young came to Emory as a full professor with a named chair rather than as an associate professor. While Young's quick rise through the academic hierarchy might make him more senior in rank than those that Neumann studied, his publishing pace and the amount of time elapsing since the conferral of his terminal degree make him a peer to the professors she describes. Young's decision to focus also on securing Clifton's legacy during this significant period in his own career is revealing, for he could have restricted his interest in Clifton's collection to his role at Rose. Instead, he elected to combine his curatorial work with his editing, exhibitions, and writing, demonstrating Neumann's insight that academics at this point in their career choose paths revealing of their "inner life" and "inner experience."⁵¹

Young's initial task as a curator was to secure the ability to prioritize Clifton's materials over other unprocessed collections at Rose so that her papers would be available to researchers sooner. This step from acquisition to arrangement and description may be too easily taken for granted, for it would seem that after a library invests a sizable amount in acquiring a collection, this commitment would extend to timely processing. However, many repositories acquire collections yet lack the funds—or the time—to arrange and describe them.⁵² Additionally, during the processing of Clifton's papers, Young guided her collection through three conservation quandaries. Nondescript folders containing her significant and unpublished early and final poems needed identification, date books combining a variety of different media into overstuffed spiral coil planners posed preservation concerns, and her born digital archive (her records originally created [born] in digital media rather than on paper) required a range of preservation techniques. Young stewarded Clifton's papers at each of these intersections in a way that honored her larger creative and spiritual endeavors.

First, Young's unveiling of Clifton's unpublished writing granted future scholars access to a poet's intellectual development in a manner more holistic than the standard examination of published work. In Clifton's early writing from the late 1960s, found in folders titled "Old Poems and Ones that May Not Be Poems at all and Maybe should be thrown away One Day" and "Bad Poems," readers could

see what writing she elected not to include in her published volumes. However, these two folders do not necessarily represent poor writing; Young notes in his afterword to Clifton's *Collected Poems* that while "Old Poems" retain less artistic merit, "Bad Poems" show significant improvement.⁵³ While published poems grant readers awareness of her fully realized abilities, these two folders enrich understandings of how Clifton initially developed her characteristic aesthetics, subjects, and tone. Young also recognized that Clifton's late writing, represented by her unpublished final volume, *Book of Days*, formed perhaps the most vulnerable and valuable portion of her collection. Michael Glaser, who later edited Clifton's *Collected Poems* alongside Young, discovered this manuscript discarded in the trash of Clifton's St. Mary's office.⁵⁴ Young comments that while the poems did not contain "any editorial markings or even her name," they proved to be immensely valuable and beautiful once rescued. In a piquant turn, Clifton's poems foreshadow their own rescue. Because "each day / something that loves us / tries to save us,"⁵⁵ Clifton's future editor and curator demonstrated that he understood Clifton's writing "as something / more than a common occurrence."⁵⁶ The typescript is now included as a "proposed compilation" under Clifton's series of collected works of poetry.⁵⁷

Second, Young faced the question of conserving Clifton's annual planners, which he calls "daybooks," by lobbying to keep them intact as they were during Clifton's lifetime. These planners "serve[d] as a kind of portable desk," as they included travel reservations, invitations, poem drafts, and other paperwork stuffed in between the pages of the calendar.⁵⁸ While an intriguing combination of media for prospective researchers to consider, archivists processing Clifton's papers found the planners challenging because best practices dictate that different types of items should be separated into different folders. For example, letters containing photographs would be divided between a correspondence and a photographs series; a slip would be placed in the letter's folder to tell a researcher where in the photographs the missing item resided. This procedure ensures that each item is preserved according to archival standards, for when similar types of material are grouped, it is easier to observe the needs of each item and isolate potential problems. Stacking an assortment of papers together, as Clifton did in her daybooks, causes inconsistent fading over time. But dividing up Clifton's planners by media type would dismantle the physical environment Clifton created, hiding the rich network of associations these materials have when placed in their original order.

Clifton's born digital archive supplements her paper records, but these electronic records posed a third challenge. Born digital records often come in a variety of forms, and Clifton's collection was no different: it contained a personal computer, an HP Tower Pavilion Elite M9040N, a Videowriter and four Magnavox Videowriter diskettes, and personal e-mail.⁵⁹ Rose Library digital archivist Dorothy Waugh noted that the complexity of Clifton's collection meant that the majority

of her time was spent on problem solving rather than processing.⁶⁰ Emory classifies its born digital collections on a scale of 1 to 3 in terms of complexity, 1 being the simplest to arrange and 3 the most complex. Complexity is itself defined by whether a collection has quality and authenticity⁶¹ as well as what copyright or restrictions come into play and what the collection's level of use is projected to be. Although Clifton's digital files did not have much restriction, the fact that she had content from three sources in different formats and shared her computer, and Young's knowledge that her files were likely to attract a high level of use, made her collection qualify as tier 3 in complexity.

Young knew that Clifton's personal computer ideally would be emulated so that researchers could access the original computer through contemporary technology in order to understand the computer's context (its operating system, applications, and software) as well as its content (individual files). Digital humanists especially are invested in contextual evidence as they analyze and interpret the materiality of technology. However, emulation is a time- and resource-intensive project that few repositories are able to commit the necessary funds and expertise to provide. Even when they can, emulations are special projects rather than a routine methodology. While Emory does create emulations, it was not able to commit the resources to do so for Clifton's collection.⁶² Waugh deduced that the best way to provide access to Clifton's diskettes was to print their content through the Videowriter and then to scan these documents to create PDFs that would then be placed into a searchable database similar to the database created to provide access to Clifton's personal computer files. Migration is a less demanding, more common preservation option for born digital materials. In Clifton's case, Emory presented her migrated files in three different methods: the first preserved her original order, the second mimicked the papers' organizational structure, and the third sorted files according to their file format.⁶³ These options allow researchers to browse her files in the way most amenable to their research question, promoting access to the widest possible audience of users.

Young saw how Clifton's Videowriter, a word processing machine that replaced electronic typewriters when it was first released in 1985, demonstrated how she adapted to new technology. Like typewriters, Videowriters do not contain memory, so they cannot control the composition process. While Videowriters can preserve a record of their use like computers do, these records can be found only on their diskettes. Waugh deduced that the best way to provide access to Clifton's diskettes was to print their content through the Videowriter and then to scan these documents in order to create a PDF database similar to the database created to provide access to Clifton's personal computer files. By accessing three of the diskettes, researchers can better understand how early computing technology shaped Clifton's composition.⁶⁴ However, the fourth diskette, "Selected Poems, Spirit Series," was not readable. Its presence indicates the difficulties of digital preservation, including the likelihood of data loss within electronic file formats.

Young also understood how Clifton's composition methods adapted as technology advanced in order for her to maintain her unique aesthetic sensibilities. Much of Clifton's later composition took place within the framework of empty e-mails in order to avoid the auto-correction programmed into Microsoft Word, which changed her lowercase letters and standardized her spacing. While Clifton wrote in e-mail for extrinsic reasons, her practice also illuminates how often the epistolary mode is found in her work.⁶⁵ The correlation between word processing and poetic structure suggest the rich possibilities implicit in interpreting the use of technology.

Young stewarded Lucille Clifton's collection through acquisition as well as arrangement and description in order to make her papers accessible to researchers. However, only select audiences would know about the acquisition and would be interested in working with her papers without the benefit of outreach. In order to bring her poetry—and her collection—to a wider public, Young advocated for Clifton's significance within American letters through his work as an editor and exhibition designer as well as in his poetry. These myriad roles demonstrate how affective stewardship does not limit a curator's work to his or her duties within a repository; rather, such curators must act holistically across different platforms and for a variety of publics in order to generate an audience for their collection. As this type of integrated perspective requires a high level of time and energy, it represents a commitment beyond simply what can be construed as professional duty.

Young's afterword for Clifton's *Collected Poems* established Clifton's posthumous reputation by combining superlative rhetoric associated with editors, scholars, and curators. As an editor, Young included Clifton's early poems and occasional poems alongside her published work to provide readers with a comprehensive account of her oeuvre and discussed how she standardized her aesthetic, such as using only lowercase letters, over the course of her career. As a scholar, Young connected Clifton to other 20th-century writers as well as poets from the 19th century. While he nodded to Clifton's context within the Black Arts Movement, he spent more time emphasizing unexpected links, such as how her writing can be seen in parallel to the work of mid-century confessional poet Denise Levertov and Victorian Gerald Manly Hopkins, how she can be read as an eco-poet, or how she could be found within the tradition of spirit writing, which includes poets such as James Merrill, Robert Duncan, and W. B. Yeats. As a curator, Young discussed Clifton's composition habits, her juvenilia, and her activity within the poetry community.⁶⁶ Using the rhetoric of the editor, scholar, and curator allowed Young to deepen the public's appreciation for Clifton's writing and expand the conversation around her work, in turn ensuring her impact value as an author worthy of literary research.⁶⁷

Furthermore, Young brought an emotional resonance to his rhetoric by employing superlatives. Clifton is a "national treasure," "our Neruda"; her poetry "leaps and soars," "embraces its multitude," and is "as much music as polemic." Individual poems are "breakthrough[s]," "showstoppers," and in her voice, Young hears Bessie Smith, Billie Holiday, and John Coltrane. Young concludes she is "extraordinary in what she calls and makes ordinary."⁶⁸ His language demonstrates that his invest-

ment in Clifton emerged from a deep, personal respect that places her as personally significant not only to him or to students and scholars of American literature but also to all those interested in poetry internationally. In Young's mind, Clifton becomes a representation of America. His estimation that Clifton's writing "embraces its multitude" suggests that Clifton belongs alongside Walt Whitman, who famously wrote, "I am large, I contain multitudes,"⁶⁹ and who represents American poetics and its uniquely democratic ethos abroad. Likewise, as Bessie Smith, Billie Holiday, and John Coltrane represent the pinnacle of the American genres of blues and jazz, by comparing Clifton to them, Young elevates Clifton's voice to iconic status. Thus, Young's rhetoric celebrating Clifton's career combines the full professional weight of all three of his roles as well as all the cultural authority he can conjure through comparing Clifton to great American artists.

Young also dedicated three exhibitions to Lucille Clifton, a number that represents his commitment to her as an author. Between 2005 and 2013, Young created, cocurated, or oversaw the development of only six exhibitions in total.⁷⁰ *Democratic Vistas*, shown in 2008, highlighted the strengths of the Raymond Danowski Poetry Collection. While the show's theme ranged the entire history of American poetry and poetics, Young took the opportunity to include seven of Lucille Clifton's books and three of her broadsides.⁷¹ *Do You Remember?: Children's Books by Poets*, which ran from the fall of 2008 to February 2009, featured Clifton's book *Do You Remember?* (1973) as the exhibition's title and title image.⁷² Then, in 2012, arranged to coincide with the fall release of Clifton's *Collected Poems* and the Decatur Book Festival, Clifton received an exhibition dedicated solely to her work: *come celebrate with me: The Work of Lucille Clifton*. On show at Emory's Robert W. Woodruff Library through the summer of 2013, the exhibition then traveled to Poet's House in New York City during the fall of 2013. *come celebrate with me* highlighted the range of Clifton's writing, beginning with her earliest work and ending with *Book of Days*. Not to be overlooked, Young gave Clifton's children's books, ignored so far in the critical literature, the opportunity to be shown in their own space.⁷³ These exhibitions are significant to Clifton's legacy because they allow broader publics to see a variety of her papers. Exhibitions highlight cultural heritage institutions' priorities because dedicating a show to a topic demonstrates how much time an organization is willing to allot to the collection(s) on display. This amount of exhibition time Young gave to Clifton's papers demonstrates his interest in promoting Clifton's collection compared to the many other collections under his stewardship.⁷⁴

As Rose Library, like many special collections repositories, is housed in an academic library building that includes the general circulating collection and other divisions, the time and space commitment for each show is even more significant because exhibitions can and are developed by other internal divisions. Of the three galleries scattered across Emory's Robert W. Woodruff Library, two are shared spaces. The Schatten Gallery on level 2 is used for the most significant exhibitions, while smaller shows are placed either at the main entrance (also on level 2) or at the entrance to Rose (on level 10). Only the Rose entry space is limited to special

collections exhibitions. The fact that Clifton's writing was featured in half of Young's shows—and in every available university space—highlights the depth of Young's support of Clifton's legacy. Young advocated exhibiting Clifton's work over other writers' collections but also insisted on her significance within broader library-wide conversations on who should be able to use these shared spaces and for what reason.

Finally, Young demonstrated his affective stewardship by continuing to cite Clifton as an influence on his own poetry. He even specifically highlights the role that her papers, rather than her published books, had on his composition.⁷⁵ During an interview for *Guernica Magazine*, Young described the genre of his book *Dear Darkness* by comparing it to a book of hours, which he explained is "a medieval daybook of prayer." Likewise, *Dear Darkness* "is a kind of daybook of grief," a recording of loss as it unfolds across time and space. But what is indicative is that Young incorporates a word referring to Clifton—the "daybook" is how Young describes Clifton's planners, one of the major arrangement challenges he faced with her papers—into the vocabulary he uses to categorize both his work as a curator and his poetry. Therefore, Clifton—and specifically the physical properties of Clifton's literary collection—shaped Young's conception of himself.

Young found Clifton's book of hours/daybook principle an especially rich topic while he completed *Book of Hours* (2014), his most recent volume. After all, the amount of time required to create an exhibition, shepherd the arrangement and description of her papers, and edit her collected writing made Clifton an omnipresent author in Young's mind during this era of his career. As a result, the titular sequence to *Book of Hours* strikingly parallels Clifton's *Book of Days* (2006). In *Book of Days*, time is conceptualized on a cosmic scale rather than on a daily level, as medieval books of hours would guide users through their daily worship by moving them through the sacred time of the spiritual calendar year, thereby providing a rhythm to a reader's spiritual life. Likewise, Young uses this concept of spiritual time to illuminate deeper truths hiding in everyday life. The thematic overlap between *Book of Hours* and *Book of Days* indicates that what Young found most enriching as a curator would be transformed into a significant influence on his poetry.

One of the ways in which the similarity between Clifton and Young's sequences is most evident is when both poets reserve the use of first- and second-person singular for a voice that speaks on the behalf of the universal rather than the particular. In Clifton, this universal presence is God; in Young, it remains undefined. Consider, from Clifton, "angelspeak" in its entirety:

god keeps himself in a place now
 so far above the mortal and immortal worlds
 that in order for us to abandon him again
 we'd have to hurl ourselves
 from such a height that
 to survive another fall would be impossible.⁷⁶

In comparison, Young's "the light here leaves you" includes in its final lines

The brightest
blue beneath the clouds—
We guess at what's next

unlike the mountain

who knows it
in the bones, a music

too high
to scale.⁷⁷

Here, wisdom resides at such a height as to be unreachable. In Clifton's poem, God removes himself from the realms of his angelic and human followers in order to protect himself. His withdrawal is a bid for love—he hopes humanity will stay with him out of fear because further abandonment is not survivable. In the fragment from Young's poem, the vantage point is again high: the blue is beneath the clouds rather than above them. And, again, wisdom is kept so lofty that it resides above any possible summit: Clifton's "far above the mortal and immortal worlds" becomes Young's "too high/to scale."⁷⁸

Representations of the universal in both Clifton's and Young's poem sequences highlight how both authors desire to gain perspective over the events they witness in daily life. Clifton finds this perspective after a lifetime, while Young discovers his not only through the nature walk that frames the narrative of *Book of Hours* but also through his time working intimately with Clifton's papers. Traces of Clifton's themes continue to appear in Young's writing, for as both poem sequences continue, the poets compel readers to understand humanity's failings so that we can accept the beauty of God's—or nature's—original intent. Clifton's God asks,

little ones,
small and treacherous,
why would you believe that i punish you
who punish each other relentlessly
and with such enthusiasm?⁷⁹

On the other hand, Young's judgment comes from the stars "finding/ us wanting."⁸⁰ However, both books close on a suggestion of hope. Clifton's version is grimmer; "godspeak: kingdom come" asks,

what if i told you
this is all there ever was
this earth, this garden, this woman,
this one precious, perishable kingdom.⁸¹

On the other hand, Young's "it's death there" invites,

Welcome
the moon's squinting

into space.
The trees

bow like priests.

The storm lifts
up the leaves.

Why not sing.⁸²

Comparing "godspeak: kingdom come" and "it's death here" demonstrates that Young adopts similar composition strategies to Clifton: both questions are rhetorical, unmarked by punctuation, and open the book up to the reader at the moment it concludes. Clifton's poetry reminds readers that this valuable earth and life is all humanity can claim, while Young's narrator surveys the landscape, imagining the need to honor human's ecological inheritance. While formal elements differ between Clifton's writing and Young's—Clifton prefers lowercase letters, while Young follows traditional capitalization; Clifton's poems are short, while Young's run much longer; and Young is more likely than Clifton to employ stanzas—they conjure parallel aesthetic impressions because both poets build room for reflection into the page. Furthermore, both poets make use of ample white space. Individual poems have short lines, and the sequences solicit readers to engage in introspection between poems. The amount of space surrounding the poems generates the impression that God—or a type of wisdom—is flickering, emerging and hiding, speaking aloud or through silence to remind those living to appreciate where and to whom they belong: to their landscapes, families, and, ultimately, to themselves.

Young's vision, like Clifton's, does not depend on a particular racial consciousness. Poetry and poets transcend their confines, recognizing their ability and right to speak on behalf of all humanity without losing their unique attributes. While the history of late 20th-century African American verse began alongside the Black Arts Movement's struggle to discuss segregated experience and developed into the post-soul poets' attention to overlooked and underappreciated lives and histories, Clifton and Young came together to generate an African American poetry that is liberated, with subjects and aesthetics freely drawn from all traditions. Clifton achieves this effect not by using the representative "we" that Amiri Baraka employs but rather by retaining an intimacy generated by the use of the first or second person. Using a narrower scope paradoxically allows Clifton to enlarge the scale of her message. Young notices this characteristic when he draws connections between Clifton's visionary mode and the work of W. B. Yeats in his

afterword to her *Collected Poems* as well as to more expected writers, such as Amiri Baraka. Young believes that Clifton does not need to be defined prescriptively only as a black poet within an African American tradition, for while her writing grows within this field, its range exceeds its limiting focus. Clifton's writing liberates itself from the confines of historical categorization, allowing later authors, including Young himself, to claim black traditions while simultaneously releasing themselves from strict definitions of what it entails. Ultimately, by adapting Clifton's lessons into his own verse, Young's poetry joins Clifton's in celebration.⁸³

Likewise, by acquiring Clifton's literary collection for Rose Library, Young empowers Clifton's poetry to speak to a diverse audience of students and scholars, unlimited by definitions that would pigeonhole her influence as belonging to a particular time, place, or demographic. Young's advocacy emerges from his respect for Clifton. In her, he found a foremother who shaped his writing as well as his vision for the future of Rose Library. In turn, Clifton found a curator whose affective stewardship would give her papers a home and her legacy an advocate. As a result, the acquisition history of Clifton's papers is a narrative of interdependence between predecessor and successor as well as author and curator.

Acquisition histories demonstrate how the relationship between curators and donors shapes an institution's holdings while generating new angles for researchers to investigate within the donor's collection. However, since acquisition histories are not easily accessible, it is necessary to outline these negotiations through a combination of administrative, critical, and artistic records. Here, the connection between Kevin Young and Lucille Clifton forms a case study illuminating how a protégé used affective stewardship to establish Rose Library as a space of belonging for his mentor, for black writers in general, and for researchers interested in the history of African American poetics. Rather than creating a separate space, such as Cave Canem, Young enforces that the academic library (and its special collections) is a place constructed by their inner history, their belonging.

Notes

1. Lucille Clifton, quoted in Kevin Young, *Most Way Home* (New York: Penguin Random House, 1998), <http://www.penguinrandomhouse.com/books/195167/most-way-home-by-kevin-young>.
2. Between March 2010 and May 2013, I served as Kevin Young's research assistant while completing my doctoral studies in English at Emory University.
3. Finding aids are guides to collections that allow researchers to locate what type of documents they need, similar to how books provide a table of contents to allow readers to go directly to particular chapters.
4. Consider how Zachary Leader discussed the acquisition of English literary collections with Huntington Library manuscripts curator Sara S. Hodson in an interview and then used this information in his article "Curatorial Nationalism and Modern Manuscripts: Kingsley Amis, Saul Bellow, and Franz Kafka," *Critical Inquiry* 40, no. 1 (Autumn 2013): 160–193. Leader likely obtained the right to discuss the Bellow acquisition with Hodson on the basis of his status as Bellow's official biographer, not because he happened to be a researcher interested in acquisition histories.

5. Observe the difference between single-author literary collections and the Washington Writers' Archive, founded and held by the Special Collections Research Center at George Washington University, which documents the writers of the Washington, D.C., metro area. See Jennifer King, "Let Me Recount the Ways: Documenting the Poetry Community in Washington D.C. A Case Study," *Archival Issues* 33, no. 1 (2011): 57–67.
6. Literary agents and booksellers represent writers in this competitive market, a process that also requires working with appraisers to set a value on the collection. Agents (and, to a lesser extent, sellers) follow professional norms separate from either the writing world or the world of universities and academic special collections repositories, as they must prioritize profit over the best practices of archival administration. A full discussion of this topic falls outside the bounds of my article. However, a good introduction to this topic is Rachel Donadio, "The Papers Chase," *New York Times*, March 25, 2007, http://www.nytimes.com/2007/03/25/books/review/Donadio.t.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0. Also, Stephen Enniss gave a significant talk on the role of literary agents' role in the marketplace for literary collections at the 2014 meeting of the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section preconference of the American Library Association. Listen to the audio of his talk in the second section of the Marketplace Plenary Session here: <http://rbms.info/conferences/2014docs>.
7. For this reason, I refer to donors in general when speaking about collections within cultural heritage organizations (galleries, libraries, archives, and museums). But when I refer to literary collections and/or Lucille Clifton, I simply call her a writer since she sold, rather than donated, her collection to Emory.
8. Sarah Byrne, "Trials and Traces: A. C. Haddon's Agency as Museum Curator," in *Unpacking the Collection: Networks of Material and Social Agency in the Museum*, ed. Sarah Byrne, Anne Clarke, Rodney Harrison, and Robin Torrence (London: Springer, 2011), 307–325, <http://link.springer.com/book/10.1007%2F978-1-4419-8222-3>. An additional compilation of studies on this general topic is Viv Goulding and Wayne Modest, eds., *Museums and Communities: Curators, Collections, and Collaboration* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013). This book concentrates more on curators' relationships to communities rather than to individuals, but the volume usefully outlines issues surrounding the relationships between each party.
9. Another way to think of belonging is the term "in group," a more commonly used term in the social sciences.
10. Michael Basinski is credited with using this term to describe his own role as a curator in Jennifer King's "Let Me Recount the Ways," 63. Read more about Michael Basinski's poetry career on the Poetry Foundation website: <http://www.poetryfoundation.org/bio/michael-basinski>.
11. Those interested in this topic and how it connects to theories of business might enjoy the outline of agency theory versus stewardship theory, or the theories behind when employees act independently (as agents) or for the common good (as stewards). See the key study on this topic by James H. Davis, F. David Schoorman, and Lex Donaldson in "Toward a Stewardship Theory of Management," *Academy of Management Review* 22, no. 1 (1997): 20–47. My theory uses the word "steward" for mixed motivations. On the one hand, curators are stewards of their collections as they collect for repositories that have a service model to the public as a type of cultural heritage institution. On the other hand, curators act according to their own preferences as agents. My point is that this is especially true for curators who were hired for their insider status in a certain field. However, I chose the term "affective stewardship" because I want to emphasize the connection between emotional relationships held by curators who share a background with their donors, the curator's responsibility as a steward of that donor's collection, and the idea that stewards are still driven by the need for responsibility and autonomy. The social sciences would call my description of curators' actions prosocial behavior based on in group identification.

12. In 1988, Clifton was nominated for the Pulitzer Prize in poetry for *Next: New Poems and Good Woman: Poems and a Memoir 1969–1980*.
13. Reginald Martin, *Ishmael Reed and the New Black Aesthetic Critics* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988), 3.
14. Amiri Baraka, "BLACK FIRE: A New Introduction," in *Black Fire: An Anthology of Afro-American Writing*, ed. Leroi Jones and Larry Neal (Baltimore: Black Classic Press, 2007), xviii–xix.
15. Hilary Holladay, *Wild Blessings: The Poetry of Lucille Clifton* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2004), 11; Lucille Clifton and Charles H. Rowell, "An Interview with Lucille Clifton," *Callaloo* 22, no. 1 (Winter 1999): 65–66.
16. After completing one academic year, Clifton had to drop out of Howard in 1954 because she ran out of money. In contrast, Baraka completed his degree in English that same year. Lucille Clifton and Chard deNiord, "Her Last Interview, with Chard deNiord," *American Poetry Review* 39, no. 3 (May/June 2010): 6.
17. Baraka, "BLACK FIRE," xviii–xix.
18. Clifton and Rowell, "An Interview with Lucille Clifton," 66.
19. R. Roderick Palmer, "The Poetry of Three Revolutionists: Don L. Lee, Sonia Sanchez, and Nikki Giovanni," in *Modern Black Poets: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Donald B. Gibson (New York: Prentice Hall, 1973), 146.
20. *Ibid.*
21. Lucille Clifton, "apology," in *The Collected Poems of Lucille Clifton 1965–2010*, ed. Kevin Young (Rochester, NY: BOA Editions Ltd, 2012), 82, lines 9–11.
22. Lucille Clifton, "1994," in *the terrible stories* (Rochester, NY: BOA Editions, Ltd, 1996), 24, lines 9–12.
23. Amiri Baraka, "Black Art," in *Black Magic: Collected Poetry, 1961–1967* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1969), 116–117, lines 1, 12–13, 21–23, 52. Not to be confused with the article by the same name by Amiri Baraka, "Black Art," *The Black Scholar* 18, no. 1 (January/February 1987): 23–30.
24. Cheryl Clark, *After Mecca: Women Poets and the Black Arts Movement* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2005), 21.
25. In his afterword to *Black Fire*, the era's anthology, Larry Neal acknowledged that the Black Arts Movement "failed to evolve a workable ideology . . . which can encompass many of the diverse ideological tendencies existent in the black community." Larry Neal, "An Afterword: And the Shine Swam On," in *Black Fire: An Anthology of Afro-American Writing*, ed. Amiri Baraka and Larry Neal (Baltimore: Black Classic Press, 2007), 638–656.
26. Lucille Clifton, "miss rosie," in *The Collected Poems*, 39, lines 1, 6, 12.
27. Clifton and deNiord, "Her Last Interview, with Chard deNiord," 6.
28. Terrance Hayes and Charles H. Rowell, "The Poet in the Enchanted Shoe Factory: An Interview with Terrance Hayes," *Callaloo* 27, no. 4 (Autumn 2004): 1078–1079.
29. Other writers who served a similar function within public and literary discourse included Toni Morrison and Audre Lorde.
30. Clifton, "apology," 82, line 8.
31. Elizabeth Alexander, "Introduction," in *Gathering Ground: A Reader: Celebrating Cave Canem's First Decade*, ed. Toi Derricotte and Cornelius Eady (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2006), 1–2.
32. Brian Reed, "The Dark Room Collective and Post-Soul Poetics," *African American Review* 41, no. 4 (Winter 2007): 729.
33. Elizabeth Alexander, considered a teacher at Cave Canem, noted Clifton's ability to make "room for widely divergent spokes of black aesthetics, poetics, and identity," indicating that Clifton's poetry expanded the Black Arts Movement's simplistic point of view by predicating her art

- not in what Alexander calls "either/or" but rather through the wider perspective of "and/but." Alexander, "Introduction," 6.
34. Clifton and deNiord, "Her Last Interview, with Chard deNiord," 8.
 35. Lucille Clifton, quoted in Young, *Most Way Home*.
 36. Address book, Series 6: Personal papers, 1953–2010, Collection of Lucille Clifton, Manuscript, Archives and Rare Book Library, Emory University.
 37. Kevin Young, "The Preserving," in *Most Way Home* (New York: William Morrow, 1995), 78–79, lines 37–38, 41.
 38. Elaine Justice, "Former U.S. Poet Laureate Trethewey Places Her Archive at Emory," Emory News Center, August 26, 2014, http://news.emory.edu/stories/2014/08/upress_trethewey_papers/campus.html.
 39. Anna Neumann, "Professing Passion: Emotion in the Scholarship of Professors at Research Universities," *American Educational Research Journal* 43, no. 3 (Autumn 2006): 381–382.
 40. I counted 303 collections by typing "Literature" into the search box for Emory's finding aids, <http://findingaids.library.emory.edu/search/?keywords=literature&page=1>, on November 24, 2015. While the exact number of collections can be debated, as a few of the ones listed here may not exactly fit under Young's purview as the curator; the vast majority of those listed here do.
 41. Walter C. West, Letter, April 6, 2011, Lucille Clifton Papers, Manuscript, Archives and Rare Book Library, Emory University.
 42. Kevin Young, "About Lucille Clifton," *The Collected Poems of Lucille Clifton 1965–2010*, ed. Kevin Young (Rochester, NY: BOA Editions Ltd, 2012), 765.
 43. West, Letter.
 44. Ibid.
 45. Keith Nash, September 13, 2006, Lucille Clifton Papers, Manuscript, Archives and Rare Book Library, Emory University.
 46. At the time, Young curated literary collections, but this role was not yet a part of his official title, and it would not be given to him formally until 2008. "Kevin Young Named Curator of Literary Collections at Emory," Emory University News Releases for Manuscript, Archives and Rare Book Library, December 18, 2008, <http://shared.web.emory.edu/emory/news/releases/2008/12/kevin-young-named-curator.html#.VcS1VflVhBc>.
 47. Kevin Young, "Introduction," in *John Berryman: Selected Poems*, ed. Kevin Young (New York: Library of America, 2004), 50–51.
 48. Young attended Harvard from 1988 to 1992, Stanford from 1992 to 1994, and Brown from 1994 to 1996 and then served as a professor at the University of Georgia from 1996 to 2001 and Indiana University from 2001 to 2004. During the period when he taught at Georgia and Indiana, Young wrote *Jelly Roll* (2003) and edited the anthologies *Giant Steps: The New Generation of African-American Writers* (2000), *Blues Poems* (2003), and *John Berryman: Selected Poems* (2004). Read more about Young's time at Indiana in "Kevin Young," Honoree, Guggenheim Fellow, University Honors and Awards, 2003, <https://honorsandawards.iu.edu/search-awards/honoree.shtml?honoreeID=3894>.
 49. Neumann, "Professing Passion," 383–384. Neumann also cites Antonio Damasio and Susan Krieger on this point, but I suggest perusing her bibliography, which contains many more names of those whose work dovetails with hers and supports the significance of personal feeling driving research programs. See Antonio Damasio, *The Feeling of What Happens: Body and Emotion in the Making of Consciousness* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1999) and Susan Krieger, *Social Science and the Self: Personal Essays on an Art Form* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press), 1991.
 50. Young's publications between 2005 and 2007 include *To Repel Ghosts* (2005), *Black Maria* (2006), *Jazz Poems* (2006), and *For the Confederate Dead* (2007).
 51. Neumann, "Professing Passion," 383.

52. Take, for example, the case of the Saul Bellow papers at the Regenstein Library, University of Chicago, which remained unprocessed between 2006 and 2015. Bellow's papers are discussed in Zachary Leader's "Cultural Nationalism," *Critical Inquiry* 40, no. 1 (Autumn 2013): 182. Compare the library's announcement of the Bellow papers' acquisition and their announcement of the Bellow papers' processing: "Saul Bellow Papers Complete Bellow Archive at University of Chicago Library," University of Chicago News Office, June 8, 2006, <http://www-news.uchicago.edu/releases/06/060608.bellow.shtml> and "Saul Bellow Papers Being Processed, Temporarily Closed for Research Starting August 1, 2015," Special Collections News, University of Chicago Library News, July 6, 2015, <http://news.lib.uchicago.edu/blog/2015/07/06/saul-bellow-papers-being-processed-temporarily-closed-for-research-starting-august-1-2015>.
53. Kevin Young, "won't you come celebrate with me: the poetry of Lucille Clifton," in *The Collected Poems*, 731–732.
54. *Ibid.*, 746–747.
55. Lucille Clifton, "mother-tongue: the land of nod," in *The Collected Poems*, 694, lines 9–11.
56. Lucille Clifton, "mother-kind: to mankind," in *The Collected Poems*, 700, lines 2–3.
57. Collected Works, Poetry, Writings by Clifton, Lucille Clifton Papers, <http://findingaids.library.emory.edu/documents/clifton1054/series2/subseries2.2/subseries2.2a>.
58. Young, "won't you come celebrate with me," 747.
59. Lucille Clifton Papers, "Administrative Information," Table of Contents, <http://findingaids.library.emory.edu/documents/clifton1054>.
60. Clifton's born digital collection did not take the full four years to be processed that elapsed between the arrangement and description of her papers and the preservation of her digital content; digital archivist Dorothy Waugh recalled that it "probably took me eighteen months to do everything, but I wasn't working on Clifton full time." Dorothy Waugh, interview with the author, September 4, 2015.
61. Waugh cautions readers that the terms "quality" and "authenticity" are defined differently when assessing born digital content. Quality means "talking about the collection in terms of completeness and the amount of context it provides," while authenticity "is not saying that something is not authentic" but rather ensuring that "the digital collections that we take stewardship of shows a robust chain of custody and that documents were just as they were when they were created by the donor."
62. For example, while Emory completed emulations of Salman Rushdie's computer, to date Rose Library still considers the method too demanding to be used on all born digital material in its holdings. The library did not consider it for Clifton's machines.
63. Lucille Clifton Papers, "Processing Note," Series 11, Born Digital Materials, 1988–2011, <http://findingaids.library.emory.edu/documents/clifton1054/series11>.
64. One potential research question is why Clifton used the Videowriter to create *Quilting: Poems 1987–1990* (1991) and *The Book of Light* (1992) when one would imagine that she would have used it to write *Good Woman: Poems and a Memoir, 1969–1980* (1987) or *Next: New Poems* (1987), as Videowriters were more common in those years than they were in the early 1990s.
65. Not only does Clifton write many poems as addresses to individuals or groups, but whole sections of her poetry are messages sent to her. In particular, see the poem sequence "the message from The Ones" from *Mercy* (2004) and *Voices* (2008).
66. Young, "won't you come celebrate with me," 729–749. Read more about Clifton at Squaw Valley here: <http://photos.squawvalleywriters.org/Historical-Photos/Memorials/Lucille-Clifton>.
67. Sande Cohen, "Publication, Knowledge, Merit: On Some Politics of Editing," *Cultural Critique* 75 (Spring 2010): 119.
68. Young, "won't you come celebrate with me," 729–740.
69. Walt Whitman, *Song of Myself*, 50, http://www.english.illinois.edu/maps/poets/s_z/whitman/song.htm.

70. In 2008, he curated *Democratic Vistas*, oversaw *My Dreams, My Works: Selections from the Library of Gwendolyn Brooks*, and cocurated *Don't You Remember?: Children's Books by Poets*. In 2011, he cocurated *The Art of Losing*, an exhibition timed to coincide with his anthology of the same name and released as *Shadows of the Sun: The Crosbys, The Black Sun Press, and the Lost Generation*. In 2012, he launched *come celebrate with me: The Work of Lucille Clifton*. Kevin Young, "Curating," <http://www.kevinyoungpoetry.com/curating.html>.
71. The broadsides Kevin Young included were "All of Us Are All of Us" (1974), "At the Cemetery, Walnut Grove Plantation, South Carolina, 1989" (1998), and "Aunt Jemima" (2006). Kevin Young, *Democratic Vistas: Exploring the Raymond Danowski Poetry Library* (Atlanta: Emory Libraries, 2008), 70–71, and Kevin Young, "Democratic Vistas," Schatten Gallery, Robert W. Woodruff Library, Emory Libraries, <http://old.web.library.emory.edu/libraries/schatten-gallery/previous-exhibits/democratic-vistas>.
72. Young, "Curating."
73. I created this exhibition while serving as a research assistant to Kevin Young. Amy Hildreth Chen, "she sang so sweet: Lucille Clifton's Children's Literature," *Goings On*, Robert W. Woodruff Library, Emory Libraries and Information Technology, October 24, 2012, <https://scholarblogs.emory.edu/woodruff/goings-on/she-sang-so-sweet-lucille-cliftons-childrens-literature>.
74. On average, exhibitions can take anywhere from six months to more than a year to prepare and then may remain up for approximately the same duration of time. Every exhibition forecloses the opportunity to show other material or can push alternative projects several years into the future.
75. Kevin Young and Parul Kapur Hinzen, "The Everyday Extraordinary: Parul Kapur Hinzen Interviews Kevin Young," *Guernica: A Magazine of Art & Politics*, December 1, 2014, <https://www.guernicamag.com/interviews/the-everyday-extraordinary>.
76. Lucille Clifton, "angelspeak," in *The Collected Poems*, 693, lines 1–6.
77. Kevin Young, "the light here leaves you," in *Book of Hours* (New York: Knopf, 2014), 159–160, lines 17–25.
78. These lines suggest that wisdom exceeds the limits of both musicality and mountaineering.
79. Lucille Clifton, "godspeak," in *The Collected Poems*, 702, lines 1–5.
80. Kevin Young, "How to Listen," in *Book of Hours*, 172–173, lines 23–24.
81. Lucille Clifton, "godspeak: kingdom come," in *The Collected Poems*, 711, lines 2–5.
82. Kevin Young, "It's death there," in *Book of Hours*, 180–181, lines 19–26.
83. Reference to Lucille Clifton, "won't you celebrate with me," in *The Collected Poems*, 427, line 1.

Bibliography

- Baraka, Amiri. 1969. "Black Art." In *Black Magic: Collected Poetry, 1961–1967*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- . 2007. "BLACK FIRE: A New Introduction." In *Black Fire: An Anthology of Afro-American Writing*, edited by Leroi Jones and Larry Neal, xvii–xx. Baltimore: Black Classic Press.
- Carroll, Laura, Sarah Prince, and Cristopher Sawula. "Finding Aid to the Lucille Clifton Papers." <http://findingaids.library.emory.edu/documents/clifton1054>.
- Clark, Cheryl. 2005. *After Mecca: Women Poets and the Black Arts Movement*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Clifton, Lucille. 1996. *the terrible stories*. Rochester, NY: BOA Editions, Ltd.
- . 2012. *The Collected Poems of Lucille Clifton 1965–2010*. Edited by Kevin Young. Rochester, NY: BOA Editions Ltd.
- . Lucille Clifton Papers. Manuscript, Archives and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

- Clifton, Lucille, and Chard deNiord. 2010. "Her Last Interview, with Chard deNiord." *American Poetry Review* 39, no. 3 (May/June): 5–13.
- Clifton, Lucille, and Charles H. Rowell. 1999. "An Interview with Lucille Clifton." *Callaloo* 22, no. 1 (Winter): 56–72.
- Cohen, Sande. 2010. "Publication, Knowledge, Merit: On Some Politics of Editing." *Cultural Critique* 75 (Spring): 114–147.
- Derricotte, Toi, and Cornelius Eady, eds. 2006. *Gathering Ground: A Reader: Celebrating Cave Canem's First Decade*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Hayes, Terrance, and Charles H. Rowell. 2004. "The Poet in the Enchanted Shoe Factory: An Interview with Terrance Hayes." *Callaloo* 27, no. 4 (Autumn): 1068–1081.
- Holladay, Hilary. 2002. "Black Names in White Space: Lucille Clifton's South." *Southern Literary Journal* 34, no. 2 (Spring): 120–133.
- . 2004. *Wild Blessings: The Poetry of Lucille Clifton*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Justice, Elaine. 2014. "Former U.S. Poet Laureate Trethewey Places Her Archive at Emory." Emory News Center, August 26. http://news.emory.edu/stories/2014/08/upress_trethewey_papers/campus.html.
- "Kevin Young Named Curator of Literary Collections at Emory." 2008. Emory University News Releases for Manuscript, Archives and Rare Book Library, December 18. <http://shared.web.emory.edu/emory/news/releases/2008/12/kevin-young-named-curator.html#.VcS1VflVhBc>.
- King, Jennifer. 2011. "Let Me Recount the Ways: Documenting the Poetry Community in Washington D.C. A Case Study." *Archival Issues* 33, no. 1: 57–67.
- Martin, Reginald. 1988. *Ishmael Reed and the New Black Aesthetic Critics*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Neal, Larry. 2007. "An Afterword: And the Shine Swam On." In *Black Fire: An Anthology of Afro-American Writing*, edited by Amiri Baraka and Larry Neal. Baltimore: Black Classic Press.
- Neumann, Anna. 2006. "Professing Passion: Emotion in the Scholarship of Professors at Research Universities." *American Educational Research Journal* 43, no. 3 (Autumn): 381–424.
- Palmer, R. Roderick. 1973. "The Poetry of Three Revolutionists: Don L. Lee, Sonia Sanchez, and Nikki Giovanni." In *Modern Black Poets: A Collection of Critical Essays*, edited by Donald B. Gibson. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Reed, Brian. 2007. "The Dark Room Collective and Post-Soul Poetics." *African American Review* 41, no. 4 (Winter): 727–747.
- Whitman, Walt. *Song of Myself*. http://www.english.illinois.edu/maps/poets/s_z/whitman/song.htm.
- Young, Kevin. 1995. *Most Way Home*. Cambridge, MA: Zoland Books.
- . 2004. "Introduction." In *John Berryman: Selected Poems*. New York: Library of America.
- . 2008. *Democratic Vistas: Exploring the Raymond Danowski Poetry Library*. Atlanta: Emory Libraries.
- . 2014. *Book of Hours*. New York: Knopf.
- . "Curating." <http://www.kevinyoungpoetry.com/curating.html>.
- . "Democratic Vistas." Schatten Gallery, Robert W. Woodruff Library, Emory Libraries. <http://old.web.library.emory.edu/libraries/schatten-gallery/previous-exhibits/democratic-vistas>.
- Young, Kevin, and Parul Kapur Hinzen. 2014. "The Everyday Extraordinary: Parul Kapur Hinzen Interviews Kevin Young." *Guernica: A Magazine of Art & Politics*. Last modified December 1, 2014. <https://www.guernicamag.com/interviews/the-everyday-extraordinary>.