1. Editorial and Encoding Rationale and Methodology

1.1.

For a detailed description of the kinds of webpages contained in the archive and their organization and navigation, see Plan of the Archive. The present note discusses the rationale and methodology used in editing and encoding the manuscripts. Past editorial appproaches are reviewed in History of the Bibliography and Editing of the Early Manuscripts.

This note is divided into the following sections:

1.2. Editorial Rationale

1.2.1. Historical Approaches to the Early Ruskin Archive

For a detailed account of this topic, see History of the Bibliography and Editing of Ruskin#s Early Manuscripts. In the present note, precedents and problems in past approaches are summarized as a foundation for the rationale governing the editorial approach adopted in *ERM*. Past practices include separating genres and disciplines that Ruskin, in his youth, did not necessarily perceive as divided; isolating works from larger corpuses in which Ruskin experimented with anthologizing and recontexualizing those works; and imposing editorial policies with misguided aims of suppressing texts that editors deemed incomplete, while intrusively regularizing and even substantively revising texts that did get selected for publication.

1.2.1.1. The Editorial Division of Poetry from Prose

The first editors of Ruskin#s early manuscripts divided the archive by genre, poetry from prose. The precedent for this division was set by Ruskin#s father and his friend, W. H. Harrison (ca. 1792–1878), when they collected a

selection of Ruskin#s early verse compositions in the anthology *Poems (1850)* by "J.R." For them, the anthology commemorated Ruskin#s erstwhile vocation as a poet, an ambition that they had devotedly supported as editors and promoters, but that Ruskin himself had decisively abandoned. Nearly a half#century later than this first project, the decision to separate the poetry from the prose was maintained by W. G. Collingwood (1854–1932) in his edition, *Poems (1891)*. His choice arguably was driven or at least intensified by the cachet that, by the end of the century, had come to surround *Poems (1850)* as a scarce collector#s item. The heated rare#book market surrounding the 1850 volume had already resulted in a pirated American edition of Ruskin#s poems—one of several piracies that threatened Ruskin#s income from his books (see *Poems (1891)*: The Provocation of American Literary Piracy). Animating all this interest in the poems was the charm of Ruskin#s autobiographical narrative in *Praeterita* about his youthful career as a poet manqué.

Collingwood planned a complementary edition of prose, documenting Ruskin#s turn from poetry to criticism. This edition was never realized under Collingwood#s editorship. Ultimately, the project was hurriedly and inadequately compiled as the first volume, *Early Prose*, of the *Library Edition*, under the supervision of E. T. Cook (1857–1919) and Alexander Wedderburn (1854–1931). To a significant extent, that volume merely collected recent editions of early prose works that George Allen (1832–1907) had revived, more with a view to producing handsome volumes for the collectors# market and thwarting sales of American piracies, than with a serious scholarly purpose (see Collecting of Modern Authors in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries).

While these editorial decisions were influenced by the market, the editions did not entirely lack scholarly merit, but their bibliographical underpinnings were flawed by the foundational decision to segregate poetry from prose. Collingwood, who had access to Ruskin#s study in his home, Brantwood, was the first to undertake a descriptive and analytic bibliography of the early verse *manuscripts* (earlier bibliographers had described only the youthful *publications*) and he published his findings as the *"Preliminary Note on the Original MSS. of the Poems"*, appended to volume 1 of the *Poems (1891)* (*Poems [4^{O}, 1891]*,1:261–67; *Poems [8^{O}, 1891]*, 1:262–68). Whatever bibliographical attention Collingwood may have given to the prose manuscripts in his preparations, the *"Preliminary Note"* was rendered incomplete and lacking in evidence, owing to arbitrarily omitting entire manuscripts that contain solely prose. Even on its own terms as a bibliography of the poetry manuscripts, the *"Preliminary Note"* is problematic in neglecting to describe or explain prose works present in several of the manuscripts that the note does describe—or even to describe prose included *as part of* works composed primarily in verse.

In the *Library Edition*, Cook and Wedderburn addressed the problems raised by this division only imperfectly. The editors maintained Collingwood#s scheme of housing works separately by genre in the volumes, *Early Prose* and *Poems* (volumes 1 and 2, respectively), but in the prose volume they did not attempt to match Collingwood#s *"Preliminary Note"* for the poetry with a corresponding bibliographical description of the prose manuscripts. Rather, in *Early Prose* they hastily repackaged existing republications of early prose writings made in the 1890s by George Allen along with their scanty bibliograpical notes. In *Poems*, volume 2 of the *Library Edition*, the editors reprinted Collingwood#s *"Preliminary Note"*, expanding it only with brief descriptions of some additional verse manuscripts, and with lists by title of the individual verse works contained in the manuscripts—a useful enough enhancement, so far as it went, but failing to question the fundamental logic or serviceability of separating the poetry manuscripts from the prose in the first place (Ruskin, *Works*, 2:529–41).

As Cook and Wedderburn organized the manuscripts that they found at Brantwood during preparation of the *Library Edition*, their curatorship of the early manuscripts was based on the same arbitrary distinction. They separately bound some that contained texts of early prose exclusively, while gathering stray poems (including, inconsistently, some early prose) in *MS IA*. They relegated description of the prose manuscripts (or some of them) to volume 38, the *Bibliography* volume of the *Library Edition*, classifying these descriptions as "Juvenilia"—leaving open the question of what should be comprised under that term, if not also the early poetry manuscripts listed separately in the *"Preliminary Note"*. Thus, Collingwood#s editorial scheme—which, if flawed in its logic, had at least beeen carried out consistently and reasonably accurately—was now also confused by inconsistency and unevenness of bibliographical description and editorial procedure in the *Library Edition*.

In *ERM*, rather than perpetuating the late nineteenth#century conceptualization of the early manuscripts in terms of a vocational watershed between poetry and prose, our ambition is to organize the archive around a creatively dynamic tension perceivable throughout the early writing—a tension, less between poetry and prose than between a unitary work, whether in verse or prose, and its potential to join and alter a larger anthology or collection, and also a dynamism between traditional genres and their potential to join with others to form a composite. In the manuscripts of the 1820s known to the Ruskin family as the Red Books, Ruskin projected his prose compositions as "volumes" of *"Harry and Lucy Concluded"*, intended as an ongoing multi#volume series, while filling out each of these "volumes" with poems collected into small anthologies. Later, he advanced beyond volumes that compiled multiple genres to design unitary works as multi#genre anthologies in themselves, as in the Account of a Tour on the Continent (1833–34)—a work initially composed as a travelogue solely in verse, and then re#conceived as a composite#genre travelogue in verse, prose, and picture. Thus, in his youth, while Ruskin learned to observe conventional generic boundaries in many of his poetic, scientific, and theological manuscripts, he was also constantly intrigued by their dynamic interrelatedness. To represent this dynamism of container and contained, we exploit the #teiCorpus# element of the Text Encoding Initiative (TEI) markup, which can describe Ruskin#s nested structures, albeit somewhat imperfectly (see #teiCorpus# Markup and the Tension between Works and Corpora).

1.2.1.2. The Aesthetic Orientation of Editing the Early Manuscripts

W. G. Collingwood#s editorial procedure in *Poems (1891)* can be characterized as *aesthetic* in method, in the sense described by Peter Shillingsburg in *Scholarly Editing in the Computer Age*: "The choice of copy#text and the emendations made", from this standpoint, "result from an aesthetic preference for forms found in various documents over forms with historical integrity derived from the fact that they are contained in a single document" (as preferred in a documentary orientation) (Shillingsburg, *Scholarly Editing*, 20). In fact, many of Collingwood#s choices appear to have resulted, not from systematic emendation at all, but from the vagaries of his personal taste.

The nineteenth#century editors of the Ruskin juvenilia apparently took for granted that readers would benefit by an editorial approach that was almost the opposite of documenting an artifact. From John James Ruskin and W. H. Harrison to Collingwood, and to Cook and Wedderburn, the first editors of Ruskin#s early writing freely and without acknowledgment regularized punctuation, invented titles, rewrote lines and reorganized stanzas of poetry, and joined fragments that are unrelated in the manuscripts to form texts that Ruskin never wrote (see History of the Bibliography and Editing of the Early Ruskin Manuscripts). In *ERM*, these heavily edited texts are themselves treated diplomatically as witnesses to this aesthetic and biographical conception of editing Ruskin#s youthful writing, bearing evidentiary value for how editors of the 1830s believed the boy should be "brought forward" as an author, and for how editors of the 1880s and 1890s perpetuated the mythology of boyhood that, by that time, Ruskin had formed in his autobiographical writing.

1.2.2. The Scope of ERM

For a descriptive survey of the manuscripts planned for inclusion in *ERM*, see Overview of the Manuscripts.

1.2.2.1. The Relation of ERM to Previous Editorial Projects Involving the Early Manuscripts

The archive aims to include all extant works and manuscripts dateable from 1826 through 1842, exclusive of letters edited by Van Akin Burd, *The Ruskin Family Letters* but inclusive of letters that contain poems.

Professor Burd generously granted permission for this edition to be incorporated into *ERM*, so long as his edition#s format was maintained in exact integrity (*Burd to David C. Hanson, 28 August 2008*). Since this condition mandates page images of *The Ruskin Family Letters*, which remains widely available in book form, and since the outstanding quality of Burd#s editing would not justify a new transcription and annotation of the letters, there is no call at present to join the *Letters* with *ERM*. The digital archive does, however, make available manuscript facsimiles of letters containing works (such as poems or parts of poems), since these witnesses are necessary to the editing of these works in *ERM*. Facsimiles of some other family letters are also included as evidence of material aspects of handwriting, media, and so on.

ERM re#edits works that Burd included in *The Ruskin Family Letters* on the grounds of their epistolary presentation. Such works include Ruskin#s presentation copies of New Year#s Poems and birthday odes for his father. Burd edited only the presentation versions of those works, without attempting comparison or collation with drafts and other fair copies.

Another previously published edition of an early Ruskin manuscript is *A Tour to the Lakes in Cumberland*, the account of the joint travel diary by Ruskin and his cousin, Mary Richardson, edited by James S. Dearden and Van Akin Burd. Burd and Dearden stipulate that any use of their editorial work is to be copied "as it stands, introducing comments or variants as an addendum" (*Van Akin Burd to David C. Hanson, 14 August 2003*; *James S. Dearden to David C. Hanson, 3 September 2003)*. Since this 1830 manuscript provides important evidence about such matters as collaborative writing in the Ruskin family, and the developing relation for Ruskin between travel and writing, this edition, like Burd#s *Ruskin Family Letters*, will be gratefully referenced and discussed throughout *ERM*, while it is hoped that the diary can be re#edited in keeping with *ERM*#s editorial method.

James Dearden#s 1969 edition of Ruskin#s 1830 Lake District tour poem, *Iteriad, or Three Weeks among the Lakes*, relies for its copytext on the transcript of Ruskin#s fair copy that Cook and Wedderburn prepared for use in the Library Edition. Although adequate for Dearden#s audience at the time, intended as nonspecialist readers interested in the history of tourism in the Lake District, the transcript taken for the *Library Edition* has limited scholarly interest. Dearden has given permission, however, to quote with attribution from his lively and informed notes for the edition.

ERM references Helen Gill Viljoen#s unpublished scholarly attention to the juvenilia, which she incoporated into notes for her unfinished biography of Ruskin and for her unpublished edition of the so#called *"Sermons on the Pentateuch"*, which are found among the *Helen Gill Viljoen Papers* at the Pierpont Morgan Library. For the biography, see the account by James L. Spates in *"John Ruskin#s Dark Star"*); and for the edition of the sermons, see the summary by Van Akin Burd in *"Ruskin#s Testament of His Boyhood Faith"*. While working in archives, Viljoen transcribed numerous early texts by Ruskin; and at an early stage of research for *ERM*, the editor benefited from consulting these typescript transcriptions, whether as entrusted to him directly by Van Akin Burd or as later deposited at the Pierpont Morgan Library. None of these transcriptions are used as copytext in *ERM*, since they are limited in their usefulness owing to mistranscriptions arising from the speed with which Viljoen had to cover an extensive territory. Viljoen#s unpublished critical papers on the early writing do remain helpful, however, and are cited in *ERM*#s commentary as appropriate.

1.2.2.2. The Scope of Works Included in ERM

Chronologically, a starting point for the scope of works edited in *ERM* would appear easily determined by the earliest available manuscripts in Ruskin#s hand. However, the elusiveness of determining beginnings of a Ruskin archive is suggested by the decisions of Helen Gill Viljoen, whose interest in Ruskin#s early writings drove her

farther back in time to his "Scottish heritage" in order to understand Ruskin#s parents. The personalities and influence of John James Ruskin and Margaret Ruskin, Viljoen believed, were foundational to an understanding of Ruskin as a writer (see Viljoen, *Ruskin#s Scottish Heritage*). Similarly, Van Akin Burd#s *Ruskin Family Letters* begins with the courtship correspondence between Ruskin#s parents, along with their exchanges with their parents. While the present editor is entirely sympathetic to researching Ruskin#s juvenilia in context of his parents# writing (see, e.g., Hanson, *"Materiality in John Ruskin#s Early Letters and Dialogues"*), *ERM* is not meant to duplicate either Viljoen#s bibliographical research or Van Akin Burd#s annotation of the family correspondence, but rather to complement these resources, gratefully referencing them through commentary. *ERM* seeks also to contribute a standard of documentary editing in digital format for Ruskin#s boyhood and youthful writing. Accordingly, the logical terminus a quo for the chronological inclusion of manuscripts lies with Ruskin#s earliest extant poem, which we argue to be *"The Needless Alarm"*, fair#copied in 1826. Possibly earlier markings by Ruskin that survive inside of printed books owned by the family are discussed in Books Used by Ruskin in His Youth: Physical Descriptions).

As a terminus ad quem for Ruskin#s early writing, the editors of the *Library Edition* chose the publication of *Modern Painters I*, since the emerging biographical consensus followed Ruskin#s autobiography in perceiving 1843 as the debut of his destined professional role as a critic. Van Akin Burd likewise chose to close *The Ruskin Family Letters* in June 1843, when *the first volume of Modern Painters* appeared. *ERM* follows suit, but the aim respecting questions of scope should not be settled by precedent without also interrogating the basis of those precedents.

1.2.2.3. The Scope of ERM and the Study of Literary Juvenilia

Christine Alexander and Juliet McMaster refer to nineteenth#century juvenilia by major British writers as "almost a genre" (Alexander and McMaster, "Introduction", 3). The scope of the contents of *ERM* should advance an understanding of how this is so—how the manuscript corpus of Ruskin#s early writing suggests a putative genre shared by other child writers of the period. Paradoxically, in the case of juvenilia, attempts to define and circumscribe the scope of a body of early writing can undermine the perceived value of the editorial project. As Alexander and McMaster comment, establishing an end#point of an author#s "apprentice" work tends to reflect backward on the early writing in negative terms, owing to pejorative connotations of the terms used to characterize the writing, including the term *juvenilia* itself. For example, the separation between the Brontë sisters# early writing and the novels has often been approached as a "problem" in a derogatory sense, with the *juvenile* understood to persist as a kind of lingering debilitation into the later work. Branwell Brontë (1817–48) has been held up as exemplifying what happens if the juvenile as a source of weakness is never rejected by the author, leading critics to categorize the entirety of his creative work as "juvenilia", despite his having produced creative writing continuously until his death at age thirty#one (Alexander and McMaster,*"Introduction"*, 2; Alexander, *"Defining and Representing Literary Juvenilia"*, 71–72).

Participants in the conferences of the International Society of Literary Juvenilia (ISLJ) have been steadily building the case for defining and studying the genre of juvenilia, and Laurie Langbauer in *The Juvenile Tradition* has traced child writing as a literary historical phenomenon from the eighteenth through the early nineteenth centuries. Although nineteenth#century writers may seem themselves to have sanctioned a moralistic and negative assessment of their early writing, characterizing their transition away from juvenilia as a righteous rite of passage, Kate E. Brown, among others, has revealed considerable complexity in this imaginary, by re#examining how Charlotte Brontë (1816–55) thought about her transition from *juvenilia* to the novel, *The Professor* (composed ca. 1844–46; published 1857). By characterizing this novel in its preface as a "little book", Brontë emphasized its material form (she contended for a single#volume publication, contrary to publishers# three#volume standard). By dwelling on the novel#s smallness, Brontë#s preface works to connect *The Professor* with the juvenilia—distinctively, a collection of little books in their material form—more than the preface disassociates the novel from early writing. As Brontë writes: "A first attempt it [the novel] certainly was *not*, as the pen which wrote it had been previously worn a good deal in a practice of some years"—an assertion of the continuity of the writing life that is again figured in terms of material associations, the worn pen. At the same time, Brontë falls into the defensive reflex of denigrating the value of the juvenilia, by erasing its existence as quickly as she invokes it, claiming to have "destroyed almost as soon as" she created these earlier "crude effort[s]". (That claim was false, but at the time of the ca. 1851 preface, the miniature Brontë juvenilia were unknown outside the family; and as Brown remarks, Charlotte had grown secretive about the little books and the sagas they contained, wary even of mentioning them to close friends. The miniature manuscripts came to light publicly after Charlotte#s death, when her husband briefly entrusted a "packet" of the manuscripts to Elizabeth Gaskell, who then described them in her 1857 *Life of Charlotte Brontë*.) Brown links the secrecy with which Charlotte enshrouded the juvenile manuscripts, along with their distinctive materiality, with the episode in *Villette* (1853) in which Lucy Snowe preserves letters from John Bretton by sealing and burying them beneath the roots of the "nun#s tree". Such actions invest the written artifacts with significance as "beloved objects", which, Brown argues, are not repudiated but disavowed. "Repudiation seeks to obviate a loss by claiming it as one#s own desire, rejecting the lost object of love in an effort to restore self#esteem. . . . [D]isavowal offers more contradictory satisfactions: it both denies and accedes to loss so as to perpetuate grief", allowing "for two mutually exclusive responses to coexist"—namely, responding to loss by "at once memorializing a lost love" in the beloved object and by "denying its loss" (Brontë, *The Professor*, ed. Smith and Rosengarten, 3 [preface]; Brown, *"Beloved Objects"*, 397–98, 417 n. 11; Gaskell, *Life of Charlotte Brontë*, ed. Jay, 62 [chap. 5]).

This interpretation highlights one of doubtless many ways in which self#declared rites of passage in a writer#s life erect divisions that can be both evaluative and ambivalent, making "almost a genre" of the writer#s youthful

creations. In 1845, when Ruskin distanced himself from his poetry—during his first study#trip to Italy on his own, without his parents as fellow travellers, allowing him confidence to sever poetry publication in the literary annuals—disavowal in Brown#s sense contested repudiation. Repeatedly invoking Wordsworth#s *"Intimations Ode"*, Ruskin granted himself authority to accept alleged loss (of his feeling for the picturesque) and to welcome compensatory gain (of his newfound critical mission). Buried within his newly urgent critical mission to preserve the monuments of Italy, however, lay an ambivalent disavowal of what that poetry had represented and contained, a disavowal that manifested in fetishization of the stone effigy of a child in Lucca Cathedral, *Ilaria del Carretto* by Jacopo della Quercia (see Hanson, *"Ruskin in the 1830s"*, 151–54).

1.2.2.4. The Scope of Commentary in ERM: Apparatuses, Notes, and Annotation

For the kinds and arrangement of editorial commentary in *ERM*, see Plan of the Archive. The archive follows a tradition, which has prevailed in Ruskin studies since publication of the *Library Edition*, of supplying generous editorial commentary. The guiding principle is to inform professional scholars and advanced students who are knowledegable about Britain in the nineteenth century, but who are not necessarily specialists in Ruskin studies. The archive takes for granted a common ground with its audience of professional interest in the culture and century, and enters this critical conversation by helping to situate the reader in Ruskin#s youthful engagement with his times.

Unless specified otherwise, all commentary is authored by the editor.

1.2.3. ERM#s Documentary Editorial Orientation in Editing Juvenilia and Youthful Writing

Juvenilia and youthful writing as a field of study privileges a documentary editorial methodology over an eclectic approach. The aim of documentary editing, as summarized by Mary#Jo Kline and Susan Holbrook Perdue, is to represent "artifacts inscribed on paper or a similar medium . . . whose unique physical characteristics and original nature give them special evidentiary value" (*Guide to Documentary Editing*, 3). In the mid#1980s, writing in the first edition of the *Guide to Documentary Editing*, Kline could still generalize about a contrast between the documentary approach of historians and the "literary editing" theorized and practiced by textual critics and editors in English departments. In that same decade, however, such scholars as Donald McKenzie and Jerome McGann began to sway literary scholars toward a more sociological approach focused on study of the textual artifact in its cultural moment. Historians came meanwhile to recognize that, in their allegedly purist views of documentary editing, they had tended to overlook their own interventionist and "literary" practices (Kline and Perdue, *Guide to Documentary Editing*, 4–25; Tanselle, *"Historicism and Critical Editing"*). The study of juvenilia foregrounds the merits that historians have traditionally claimed for diplomatic editing of manuscript documents while also highlighting the difficulties of achieving purity in a diplomatic method.

Even before the advent of sociological approaches to literary editing, twentieth#century editing of Ruskin swung to a documentary method, prompted in part by Helen Gill Viljoen#s scorn for the inconsistencies and haphazard methods of E. T. Cook and Alexander Wedderburn in the *Library Edition*. Viljoen was less willing to point out similar faults in W. G. Collingwood#s practices, whereas arguably the *Library Edition* can be credited with favoring a more consistently historical approach than Collingwood#s, given Cook and Wedderburn#s policy of printing unpublished materials, albeit selectively and in heavily edited versions. In any case, a diplomatic approach to transcribing Ruskin manuscripts became the norm with the editorial labors of Van Akin Burd. Victorian studies was influenced by Burd#s 1973 edition, *The Ruskin Family Letters*, which comprehensively collected the entire family#s historical papers—the *family* letters—as requisite to scholarship, rather than limiting the published correspondence to Ruskin#s side, narrowly viewed as a literary accomplishment. Burd also attempted faithfully to reproduce the idiosyncrasies of the Ruskins# punctuation, recognizing how the pulse of thought can be revealed in the hand. The reader is treated as a confidante, comprehending the fullness of the family conversation, and brought closer to the young Ruskin#s responsive thought and feeling. As Sheila Emerson observes, the frequent lack of punctuation in Ruskin#s early writing provides reflects how he "bound his phrases each to each" and allowed "their movement [to jam] back and forth in the mind" (Emerson, *Genesis of Invention*, 27). This view was shared even by Ruskin#s mother, Margaret, who "let Johns letters come just as he writes them", as she explained to John James Ruskin when enclosing their son#s letters inside her own, in order "that you may not be misled in your judgment as to his hopes and feelings" (*letter of 4 March 1829*, in Burd, ed., *Ruskin Family Letters*, 1:185).

Perhaps Burd#s most passionate statement of this approach occurs in his edition of the *The Winnington Letters*, Ruskin#s letters to the schoolmistress, Margaret Alexis Bell, and the girls at Winnington Hall. Burd urges that no edited substitute ultimately can capture the experience of reading Ruskin in manuscript, where syntax and punctuation "convey clearly the flow of his ideas and spirit at the moment of writing. His punctuation, while unconventional, is logical and expressive of the pause, pitch, and stress of his sentences". Burd admits doubt "that print can reproduce the individuality of Ruskin#s punctuation"; and after a long paragraph entrancingly describing the meaning of every eccentric stroke, his regret is palpable that any endeavor by an editor "to make the transcription of . . . [Ruskin#s] punctuation as accurate as printing will permit" can result only in a pale reflection of the experience of reading a Ruskin letter in manuscript. The most exacting documentary transcription, Burd declares, can "never record the story told by his handwriting, which often reflects his moods", and he defies the "printed page [to] convey the pleasure of opening . . . [Ruskin#s] 4½ by 2½ inch envelopes, or unfolding his 4½ by 7 inch (often double) sheets of blue, grey, or cream stationery" (Burd, *introduction to The Winnington Letters*, 84–87).

In his edition of the Ruskin family letters, which followed four years later, Burd maintained his practice of a documentary system of transcription, but with a justification that was advanced in more historicized terms than

the hope, as expressed in the *introduction to The Winnington Letters*, of bringing the reader "close to the flat table on which Ruskin wrote"; rather, Burd more laconically proposed "to preserve for the reader the pleasure of discovering . . . [the] original flavor" of the Ruskins# correspondence, by resisting the editorial impulse to impose "a formality [of regularization] which the writers never intended—and to which some of them were never educated" (Burd, *introduction to The Winnington Letters*, 88; Burd, *introduction to The Ruskin Family Letters*, 1:xlv).

In the evolution of Burd#s justification of a diplomatic approach to manuscript transcription—first appealing to re#creation of an intimacy with a writer, and later arguing for a historical rationale—his editions reflect a longer trend in manuscript and book collecting. Late#Victorian collectors sought first editions by "modern" (i.e., nineteenth#century) writers in the belief that the physical book produced closest in time to the author#s composition carried a personal connection with a writer. In manuals on book collecting, this "sentiment" borne by first editions was figuratively expressed, as it later was by Burd in his most enthusiastic writing, as if following the author#s hand on his writing table. Subsequently, the New Bibliographers of the 1930s rejected such sentiment in favor of more "objective" approaches (see Collecting of Modern Authors in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries; and Hanson, "Sentiment and Materiality in Late#Victorian Book Collecting"). In Ruskin studies, a sentiment of intimacy with the author through collecting or manuscript study seems to have persisted longer, perhaps because Ruskin himself sought such immediacy of connection with audiences by commenting on the materiality of writing, whether as dramatized in *Fors Claivigera* as the act of writing thwarted by piercing steam whistles, or as represented in *Praeterita* by a facsimile of his boyhood writing for whatever it might reveal about his youth. Added to this encouragement by Ruskin in his published work to think about his writing as a physical act was the historical accident of manuscripts remaining at Brantwood for discovery by Helen Gill Viljoen prior to their dispersal in the estate sales—an experience that made her suspect of any form of editorial intervention that might operate as a conspiracy against Ruskin#s ideas. Likewise Burd, at least at the start of his career in the *introduction to The Winnington Letters*, jumps quickly from the record of past editors# attempts to regularize Ruskin#s punctuation and grammar to an accusation that what past editors truly sought was to suppress (quoting Charles Eliot Norton) the "'too personal, too intimate, or of too slight interest'" (Burd, *introduction to Winnington Letters*, 85).

In *ERM*, which is able to present electronic facsimiles alongside diplomatic transcriptions of the text, the claim is not to bring the reader even closer to the moment of Ruskin#s production of manuscripts at his writing table. Since the era of the New Bibliographers, the widening access to manuscripts via ever more spectacularly vivid digitization has brought only renewed skepticism about creating the illusion of reproducing the real thing. In *ERM*, our aim is neither to accuse manuscript studies or first#edition collecting of "sentimentality" nor to defend the "aura" of objects; rather, in annotation and markup of transcriptions taken from original materials in almost all cases, and in exhibition of these transcriptions alongside digital facsimiles where possible, our aim is to realize a model that, as Elena Pierazzo urges, proves "useful when it is used for the purpose for which it is built" (Pierazzo, *Digital Scholarly Editing*, 96, and see 93–96). That purpose, among other things, is to facilitate study of how, on the one hand, the Ruskin family *believed* John#s "hopes and feelings" to be inscribed in his physical strokes on paper as well as through his text; and of how, on the other hand, he often meant his punctuation, many orthographic styles, and other aspects of presentation to reflect, less his inner world, than the print and pictorial culture surrounding him, in an era as visually stimulating as our own.

1.2.4. Expressing the Materiality of the Manuscripts

In expressing both his inner and outer worlds, Ruskin thought about text in a manner that included the materiality of its presentation. Like many nineteenth#century young authors, he modeled his textual production on published texts. In the earliest extant extended prose work of juvenilia, "Volume I" of his *"Harry and Lucy Concluded"* (1826–27) *Harry and Lucy Concluded; Being the Last Part of Early Lessons* by Maria Edgeworth (1768–1849), while asserting his agency on the title page as the "little boy" who had "printed and composed" and "also drawn" the work.

Pursuing his physical imitation to small typographical features, Ruskin invented marks that present the digital encoder with odd challenges in markup. For example, in order to fully justify his hand#printed text on the right as well as left margins, as in a printed book, he invented an end#of#line mark that resembles a hyphen, but that varies in length according to what he needed to fill out the measure of a line, where words fell short of the right# justified margin. (Ruskin continued employing this end#of#line mark as late as 1834–35 in his most elaborate and sophisticated imitation of the print culture of illustrated travel literature, the MS IX fair copy of his *Account of a Tour on the Continent*.) To encode this mark as a hyphen would be misleading (particularly since he also used hyphens at the ends of some lines to divide syllables across the break), whereas to ignore the mark altogether would be implicitly to assert that the materiality of text has no bearing on how we study and think about the youthful productions of nineteenth#century authors. In this instance, *ERM* uses the TEI glyph element, #g#, assigning it the @type "justification". This is an interpretation, not a neutrally objective encoding of horizontal strokes occurring at the ends of lines, but documentary editing that is innocent of editorial interpretation is neither possible nor desirable, if the purpose is to understand how Ruskin both appropriated the appearance of print and constrained his invention to obey its rules (see Pierazzo, *Digital Scholarly Editing*, 101). Ruskin#s early manuscripts are already interpretations, in presenting themselves as "printed" works. In cases of punctuation marks too enigmatic to interpret, the recurring pattern is assigned markup and annotated with a provisional explanation, but no definitive interpretation is imposed. Also, no characters or punctuation marks are ignored that can reasonably be inferred as

intentional. Even if we must temporize about how to interpret and encode what we see, we avoid the inefficiency of passing over puzzling transcription to be captured later (see Transcription and Encoding Procedures).

1.2.5. The Private, Confidential, and Public in the Early Manuscripts

In *The Study of Modern Manuscripts*, Donald Reiman recommends that editors "use different procedures for analyzing and editing private and confidential manuscripts from those they employ in presenting public documents" Reiman defines these three categories, not by the depth of intimacy between writer and reader, nor by the intricacy of artfulness in the writing, but by "the nature and extent of the writer#s intended audience. A manuscript is *private* if its author intended it to be read only by one person or a specific small group of people whose identity he knew in advance; *confidential* if it was intended for a predefined but larger audience who may—or may not—be personally known to or interested in the author; and *public* only if it was written to be published or circulated for perusal by a widespread, unspecified audience, including such abstractions as the nation, the reading public, and posterity" (Reiman, *Study of Modern Manuscripts*, 43, 65).

As an example of a problematic editorial procedure that can arise from ignoring these distinctions between the private, confidential, and public, Reiman points to nineteenth#century editions of poems by Percy Bysshe Shelley (1792–1822) that were arranged "primarily by chronology, rather than by the author#s intentions". This organization resulted in indiscriminate mixing of Shelley#s "false starts and rejected fragments", which "Mary Shelley (1797–1851) had so assiduously rescued from his draft notebooks", with his "highly polished completed poems (with a few fragments) that [the poet had] released for publication". As a consequence, readers of these chronologically ordered editions inadvertently developed "a less positive picture of Shelley#s intelligence" (Reiman, *Study of Modern Manuscripts*, 43, 53–54).

Which of these categories of *private*, *confidential*, or *public* applies to juvenilia and youthful writing? Juvenilia often imitate public forms by mimicking the appearance of published documents, yet the audience is normally confined to the family circle. Reiman considers a case of manuscript juvenilia, Jane Austen#s (1775–1817) *Volume the First* (begun ca. 1786–87), and proposes a special subcategory, "*polished* private and confidential manuscripts", which takes into account the conditions of authorship that developed during the nineteenth#century "age of printing". Professional authors in the nineteenth century came to realize "that their final manuscripts were way stations on the road to a perfected text, rather than the thing itself"; accordingly, "the manuscript no longer carried the same textual authority that it once had, even when it represented the author#s final involvement in such matters as the orthography and punctuation of most of the text". Authors in the age of print sent "their work to press . . . anticipating—and in many cases hoping—that changes in the text or its presentation [would] be introduced by the printers or the publishers". Not so, manuscript "poems or other compositions that were intended for the perusal of a few specific individuals—in short, *private* or *confidential* documents"—that the author fair#copied for limited distribution, but did not intend for publication. These kinds of artifacts, which include nineteenth#century juvenilia, bear authority comparable to that of scribal copies of pre#modern manuscripts, which "the writer never expected . . . to be superseded by a more authoritative printed text. Such a manuscript had to be more carefully prepared than a press copy, because it would neither be vetted by publisher#s readers and compositors nor corrected in proof" (Reiman, *Study of Modern Manuscripts*, 92, 93, 94–95).

1.2.5.1. The Consequences of Private and/or Confidential Classification for Encoding the Materiality of the Text

Compared to the conditional status of the literary manuscript in the modern age of print, the "polish" of the manuscript prepared for confidential circulation confers the status of copytext, thus calling for a Documentary Editorial Orientation in Editing Juvenilia and Youthful Writing. Authority is assured by limiting the intended audience to the private and confidential, signs of which Reiman discovers in the text of Austen#s *Volume the First*: "since some neighbors and acquaintances whom [Austen] disliked seem to have been targets of her satirical thrusts, the manuscript was clearly not intended to circulate beyond Jane Austen#s circle of like#minded intimates, who alone could understand the point of these barbs and share the humor of them" (Reiman, *Study of Modern Manuscripts*, 94). Reiman emphasizes the circumscribed confidentiality of audience as bolstering the authority required for satire, whereas from the standpoint of the child author, the model of nineteenth#century print culture empowered the writer by taking into oneself the structures of editorial authority and bookmaking. The materiality—the polish—of nineteenth#century juvenilia is as significant as the rhetorical and textual relation between author and a private or confidential audience, because, as Christine Alexander remarks about the embodiment by child authors of the specifically nineteenth#century phenomenon of magazine culture, the serious play of appropriating this material world of print prevented the writer from "simply being colonized by the teaching adult", and instead enabled the writer and maker to "coloniz[e] the adult world itself by remaking it in the image of the self; and it is by this process that the child discovers the self" (Alexander, *"Play and Apprenticeship: The Culture of Family Magazines"*, 31).

To understand how the nineteenth#century child writer embodies the self in the materiality of the polished confidential manuscript, the markup routine should so far as possible capture physical as well as textual features. As remarked in Expressing the Materiality of the Manuscripts, this routine necessarily involves the encoder in interpreting and not just mechanically capturing such marks, if only to be able to classify marks of which the purpose may not as yet be entirely understood (see Transcription and Encoding Procedures). Moreover, the scope of the archive must comprise the entirety of known manuscripts, even when multiple copies of a text present few substantive variants, since the various draft and fair copies may represent varying occasions of audience (see The Scope of *ERM*).

1.2.5.2. Classifying the Private and/or Confidential Manuscripts

The boundaries of the private or confidential status of Ruskin#s manuscripts appear to have been negotiable owing to his parents# involvement, unlike the Brontës# miniature play world of print imitation, which was illegible to Patrick Brontë. We know that John James Ruskin carried some of his son#s manuscripts with him on his travels, but we know little about which manuscripts he chose or to whom (if anybody) he exhibited them. In the family letters, we get a glimpse of the parents negotiating the boundaries of audience between them, while John James was on the fly in his travels, as Margaret extended the confidential audience to include their friends, Richard and Mary Gray, who had recently resettled in Glasgow: "I should like Mr. & Mrs. Gray to see Johns letters", Margaret wrote to her husband, suggesting that he "make up a small parcel and send also [the poems] *the fairies—the lines on* Jessy these on Lord Nelson[.] I do not know exactly what you have but any you might wish to send I could let you have—*Weep for the Dead—O to My Heart* I should like them to see" (*letter of 5 March 1831*, in *Ruskin Family Letters*, ed. Burd, 1:232). The episode complicates Reiman#s example drawn from Austen, which suggests that the child author has solitary control over who is included in a confidential audience, the boundaries of which are implicit in the text. Here, Ruskin#s parents not only can decide who is privy to their son#s manuscripts but they also evidently exercise their own ideas about which poems are appropriate to be shared. If the parcel contained fair copies in Ruskin#s hand, then the authority implicit in the polish of the manuscripts also became transferable. Unfortunately, it is not clear whether Margaret intended "Johns letters" to be shared as holograph originals, whether her term *letters* refers to epistles and/or presentation copies of poems, or whether she proposed that she and John James themselves make fair copies for the Grays. (Margaret#s list of poems probably refers, respectively, to *"The Fairies"*, *"On the Death of My Cousin Jessy"*, either *"Trafalgar"* and/or *"A Dirge for Nelson"*, *"Weep for the Dead"*, and *"To My Heart"*, all poems of 1830–31.)

What does this classification indicate for the "different procedures" that, according to Reiman, should be observed in editing and analyzing private or confidential manuscripts as compared with public? First, the class of manuscripts that derive authority from both their polished presentation and their confidential status suggests that readers perceived authority in the material artifact itself, which bore direct witness to the authority of the writer—or of something about the writer. "I let Johns letters come just as he writes them", Margaret explained to John James when enclosing their son#s letters inside her own, "that you may not be misled in your judgment as to his hopes and feelings" (*letter of 4 March 1829*, in *Ruskin Family Letters*, ed. Burd, 1:185]). Margaret assumes a Romantic idea about writing as an open window to the writer#s expression, which if copied in her own hand would not only lose authority, but even potentially mislead the reader. There do survive manuscript copies of Ruskin#s works in his parents# and others# hands, but these are far less common than Ruskin#s own fair copies; and it seems unlikely that what Margaret wanted the Grays to "see"—not just read—would have been a fair copy in her own hand, which derived authority from her adult sophistication of punctuation, spelling, orthography, and the like. Rather, "judgment as to [the child writer#s] hopes and feelings" derived from an intimate experience and knowledge that were available only through the authoritative original artifact; and by virtue of the artifact#s materiality, this experience could be extended to a trusted confidential circle.

Evidence suggests that Ruskin shared this sense of an intended confidential audience that, in Reiman#s defintion, was most likely "personally known to or interested in the author". Ruskin#s understanding of these conditions is indicated by his inclusion of a letter to the Grays# relation, Mrs. Robert Monro, as part of *MS II*, a manuscript that he entitled "vol 1" of his "Works". By including a letter to Mrs. Monro as part of the handsewn pamphlet, which consists otherwise entirely of poems, Ruskin appears implicitly to invite Mrs. Monro to form part his confidential audience beyond the immediate family circle. The designation "Works", moreover, attests to the significance of this production, both as a physical thing, a "volume", and as an abstract promise of more to come.

It follows that, as an editorial procedure appropriate to a manuscript#s classification as a polished confidential production, an edition of nineteenth#century juvenilia should include manuscript images, as does *ERM*; diplomatic, and not eclectic or otherwise "corrected" transcriptions of texts; and a thorough physical description of the manuscript. In *fin de siècle* editions of Ruskin#s early poems and prose, some interest in the physical manuscripts was attested by facsimiles of selected manuscript pages, although the basis of selection was rarely made evident, and the sparseness of such examples, which was doubtless legislated in part by cost, was probably limited also by a perception that such images satisfied curiosity rather than providing essential scholarly information. Manuscript facsimiles in these editions, like reproductions of Ruskin#s drawings, were printed on heavier paper stock and bound only into the large#paper, quarto collector#s edition of the *Poems (1891)*, and not in the inexpensive octavo editions. In the *Library Edition*, manuscript facsimiles seem to gain scholarly purpose, but in fact the manuscripts selected for reproduction tend to be as random and lacking in context as those in George Allen#s collector#s editions of the youthful writing, which he published in the 1890s. The early editors did supply descriptive bibliographies of the manuscripts, but the descriptions were limited in detail; and as argued above in Defining *Works* and *Manuscripts*, lost even more coherence and consistency in the transition from *Poems (1891)* to the *Library Edition*.

While there was a perception among late#Victorian editors, then, that the confidentiality of early writing needed to be represented through its artifactual status—allowing a child#s manuscripts to "come just as he writes them", as Margaret Ruskin suggested, in order that the reader may form a "judgment as to [the child#s] hopes and feelings"—editors apparently believed that they met such a need by supplying a few facsimiles in "large#paper" editions as curiosities for specialized collectors. Once the readership was widened beyond collectors to include the anonymous, public consumption of a "common" edition, such curiosities were dropped, while the editor#s duty remained only (in both common and collectors# editions) to intervene heavily in the texts in order to "improve" them

according to a public standard of uniform punctuation and formal decorum. As Christine Alexander comments, in late#Victorian editions of nineteenth#century authors# juvenilia, heavy#handed "improvement" of texts was typical of editorial approaches to what were condescendingly termed an author#s juvenile "effusions". Alexander contends that these "poorly transcribed, bowdlerized and 'improved'" texts wholely "reinforce the attitude of inferiority towards early works and show the kind of disrespect for childhood that was common well into the twentieth century"—perhaps a somewhat overstated claim, given that this attitude was tempered by editors# acknowledgement of the special artifactual status that juvenile manuscripts held for their original, confidential readership (Alexander, *"Defining and Representing Literary Juvenilia"*, 84, and see 81–84). Nonetheless this materiality retained its value primarily among collectors and did not affect the the editor#s mission to "improve" the texts for a modern, anonymous audience.

1.2.6. Defining Works and Manuscripts

The archive contains, at the most fundamental level, two sets of edited primary materials: *works* and *manuscripts*.

1. A *work* in this edition consists of a discrete text by Ruskin (e.g., a poem, an essay, a sermon, a mathematical proof), including all available witnesses of that text (each of these edited and annotated), and accompanied by the work#s explanatory apparatus and available facsimiles.
2. A *manuscript* is a physical document manifesting Ruskin#s texts. A given work may be confined, so far as presently known, to a single text witness found in a single manuscript; or a work may be made up of multiple text witnesses found in more than one manuscript.

In the archive, a work is represented by diplomatic transcriptions of all available witnesses, from its manuscript through its nineteenth#century published instantiations, the range typically terminating in a version published in the *Library Edition* of Ruskin#s *Works*, which launched in 1903 with editions of the *Early Prose* and *Poems*. All transcriptions are annotated with glosses, both textual and contextual, and each work is introduced by a descriptive and critical apparatus.

Traditionally in Ruskin studies, major manuscripts, which were originally bound notebooks or bound later by Ruskin#s editors, were numbered by the editors; and the manuscripts# nomenclature and physical arrangement were retained when distributed among various repositories. In *ERM*, these major manuscripts are each represented by a critical apparatus; and facsimiles of the major manuscripts are presented both in whole and in part, divided into pages associated with each of the discreet *works* that make up the contents of the manuscripts.

Besides the commentary attached to specific works and manuscripts (the apparatuses and glosses), other commentary, which is hyperlinked throughout the archive, includes notes summarizing biographical, bibliographical, geographical, and contextual information. For illustrating the Ruskin family journeys, maps with timelines are under development (see Plan of the Archive).

As translated into Web pages, these two sets of materials form, respectively, a given work#s Work Pages, and a given manuscript#s Manuscript Pages. This design was initially based on the organization of *Poems (1891)* by its editor, W. G. Collingwood; and on the similar organization of the *Library Edition* by its editors E. T. Cook and Alexander Wedderburn. Similarly, these earlier patterns of organization were reflected in the approaches to bibliographical description by Helen Viljoen. The present editor, David Hanson, absorbed Viljoen#s notes on the early manuscripts through the generosity of Van Akin Burd, when Viljoen#s papers remained in his keeping, and later when Burd deposited her papers at the Pierpont Morgan Library.

While building on these past approaches, Hanson came to recognize how the organization of the archive into separate *works* with their respective bodies of commentary—poems, essays, sermons, and so on—lent necessary bibliographic commentary but concealed a dynamic tension that interested Ruskin—a tension between a given textual work and the material manuscript containing it, the container often presenting possibilities for expansion that Ruskin exploited and explored. From the earliest juvenilia, he was evidently fascinated by the dynamic potential of a work to contain or be contained by something else. If *ERM* carried on in the path of earlier editions, routinely separating "lexical codes" from "bibliographical codes" according to historical precedent, we would achieve apparent clarity on the archive but at the expense of a characteristically Ruskinian feature.

1.2.7. #teiCorpus# Markup and the Tension between Works and Corpora

Editing the early Ruskin manuscripts calls for representing both the integrity of a unitary work and what Neil Fraistat terms its *contexture*—the work#s potential to contribute to some grander stage of organization (Fraistat, *The Poem and the Book*, 4). Ruskin used his manuscripts to build contexture among the works they contain, sometimes exploring loose associations among rapidly drafted, successive fragments in the rough#draft notebooks, *MS VI* and *MS VIII*, and sometimes treating manuscripts as "volumes" or miscellanies in an expanding corpus—the individual volumes themselves often made up partly of anthologies, as found in several of the Red Books and in *MS V*, *MS VII*, and *MS IX* (see Overview of Manuscripts). To represent both the contexture of the unitary work and the integrity of the unitary work in itself, *ERM* uses the TEI element, #teiCorpus#, combined with standoff markup using *XInclude*. Since #teiCorpus# can both contain and be contained by other #teiCorpus# documents, we have found that the element serves as the most available means to represent Ruskin#s double centeredness in both work and manuscript, text and contexture.

A simplified schematization of the #teiCorpus# markup representing *MS I* appears as follows.

1.
#teiCorpus xmlns="http://www.tei-c.org/ns/1.0" xmlns:xi="http://www.w3.org/2001/XInclude"#
#teiHeader type="manuscript"#
#fileDesc xml:id="msi"#
. . .
#/teiHeader#
#xi:include href="harry_and_lucy_vol1_msi.xml"#
#/xi:include#
#xi:include href="poetry_anthology/msi_poetry_anthology.xml"#
#/xi:include#
#/teiCorpus#

Typically, the highest#level entity described as a *corpus* in *ERM* is the bound *manuscript*, which W. G. Collingwood likewise recognized as the chief entity of the archive, and which he numbered according to a rough chronological sequence by roman numeral in his *"Preliminary Note"*. In the *Library Edition*, Cook and Wedderburn expanded on Collingwood#s *"Preliminary Note"* by listing all of the titles of works contained in each of these bound manuscripts, listing the titles in the sequence in which they occur (which is not necessarily an indication of their order of composition). They did the same for collections that were not originally bound, rather that they had gathered and bound themselves (usually in red buckram), entitled with a roman numeral, and inserted into their expanded version of Collingwood#s *"Preliminary Note"*. This attention to the bound manuscript as a container did not fundamentally affect editorial practice in either Collingwood#s or Cook and Wedderburn#s case: their practices still centered on the discrete text, presented chronologically. In *ERM* likewise, we transcribe and annotate discrete works (using a documentary approach, not the earlier editors# eclectic and aesthetic approaches), but we also seek to describe Ruskin#s strategies for contexture. The results are expressed as what the user finds listed on the Index Page as *manuscripts* and *corpora*.

Manuscripts that were bound when Ruskin first used them (e.g., the Red Books, ledgers, and other half# or quarter#calf notebooks) presented a space defined by the parameters of their covers, which he conceptualized filling (at least initially) in some cases as "volumes" in a series, such as the volumes of the "Harry and Lucy" lessons, along with their complementary poetry anthologies (e.g., *MS I*, *MS II*, *MS III*, *MS IIIA*); and which he formed in other cases as miscellanies, such as the *"Battle of Waterloo, A Play, in Two Acts, with Other Small Poems, Dedicated to His Father"*, and *MS V*, entitled "Miscellaneous Poetry". The term *corpora* is reserved in *ERM* for those collections showing particularly strong contexture, because Ruskin developed them as a unified project, often (but not necessarily) assigning an encompassing title. Corpora include the separate poetry anthologies found in the Red Books; the serialized works, each of which may be viewed separately as discrete texts, but which Ruskin explicitly linked together as a common project, such as the "Harry and Lucy" lessons; and most interestingly, works that Ruskin evolved as composite, multi#genre compilations, such as the Account of a Tour on the Continent.

A schematization of the #teiCorpus# markup representing a portion of *"Poetry" [MS I Poetry Anthology]* looks like this:

1.
#teiCorpus xmlns="http://www.tei-c.org/ns/1.0" xmlns:xi="http://www.w3.org/2001/XInclude"#
#teiHeader type="anthology"#
#fileDesc xml:id="msi_poetry_anthology"#
. . .
#/teiHeader#
#xi:include href="msi_poetry_anthology_title.xml"#
#/xi:include#
#xi:include href="the_steam_engine_msi.xml"#
#/xi:include#
#xi:include href="on_scotland_msi.xml"#
#/xi:include#
. . .
#xi:include href="mr_gloss_dating_msi.xml"#
#/xi:include#
. . .
#teiCorpus#

The distinction between corpora and major manuscripts admittedly is ambiguous, with the contexture of corpora elevated by only a degree of intentionality above that of major manuscripts—the latter exhibiting looser but still definable contexture, such as *MS V*, which Ruskin compiled incrementally, open#endedly, and apparently somewhat randomly, one fair#copy poem after another, yet still definably as "Miscellaneous Poetry". In terms of TEI markup, both corpora and manuscripts are enclosed by the same #teiCorpus# element. The slippage of one category into the other reflects Ruskin#s own dynamic process of containment and expansion. He was even apt at times, like Wordsworth, to think of the entirety of his "works" as a single corpus, as suggested by his annotation on *MS II*.

A more conventional way of representing anthologies in TEI markup is to enclose multiple, related texts with the #group# element. Since this element can nest only within a #TEI# document, and unlike #teiCorpus# cannot itself contain a #TEI# document, the #group# element is too inflexible to accommodate *ERM*#s design for both

single works and corpora or manuscripts. Single works are represented by multiple #TEI# documents—typically, an apparatus, multiple witnesses and facsimiles, and glosses—while corpora and manuscripts are also represented by multiple #TEI# documents, including an apparatus plus the sequence of works comprised by the collection (each work again consisting of its multiple #TEI# documents). An advantage that the #group# element holds over #teiCorpus# is that the former is designed to accommodate a #head# element, which would more satisfyingly encode a title, such as *"Poetry" [MS I Poetry Anthology]*, as compared with what is shown in the sample markup above. Instead, using #teiCorpus#, either one must attach the anthology title as a #head# to the germane witness of the first item in the anthology, which is badly formed markup; or, as we have done above, one must insert the title as a separate TEI document. Arguably, however, the latter procedure is as well#formed as it is valid in the frequent cases in which Ruskin#s titles and title pages refuse to conform to the structures that the #group# element was designed to describe. The #teiCorpus# element more flexibly accounts for Ruskin#s dynamic play with the relation between container and contained.

For example, in the originally blank, pre#bound notebook that Collingwood named *MS I*, and that the Ruskin family knew as one of the Red Books, Ruskin used the inside front endboard to make a title page for a text, *"Harry and Lucy . . . Vol I"*, possibly intending the work, at least initially, to be coextensive with the entirety of the physical notebook (see *"Harry and Lucy Concluded"*: Title, and MS I: Title). Whatever his initial plan was, Ruskin completed *"Volume I"* of this prose work without filling the notebook—a terminus that he declared by inscribing "end of Harry and Lucy", and carrying on by adding an anthology, *"Poetry" [MS I Poetry Anthology]*. This, too, reached a terminus, which he declared with a colophon:

1.
The end
hernhill
fountain street
~~end of the poems~~
juvenile library fountain street

This colophon reflects the play of closure by declaring a second ending—the "end of the poems"—specifying the end of the poetry anthology. This declaration was erased by somebody, using a rough pencil scratchout, perhaps in order to shift the emphasis to the end of a larger entity comprising *volume 1 of "Harry and Lucy"* plus the poetry anthology, *"Poetry"*. The colophon had perceptibly altered the usage of "volume" on the original title page of *MS I*, which was clearly meant to apply only to the prose work. Were we instead to use the #group# element, which calls for a #front# element to contain frontmatter, we could not represent a title page that is in flux. We may not have described Ruskin#s dynamically developing ideas much more vividly using #teiCorpus#, but at least we have not misrepresented his ideas.

Our usage of #teiCorpus# also permits description of Ruskin#s manuscripts and corpora as collaborative or mediated documents, which were sometimes glossed by his parents. We do not know who scored through "end of the poems" in the colophon of *MS I*, but it was certainly Ruskin#s mother who inserted a gloss amid the poems making up *"Poetry" [MS I Poetry Anthology]*. She wanted to date precisely her son#s beginning and completion of the manuscript. The determinacy of Margaret Ruskin#s gloss, with its definite "this book begun" and "finished", competes with the ambivalent play of John#s closure (see *Margaret Ruskin#s Gloss on the Dating of MS I*). While not necessarily intended to impose her will on the manuscript, Margaret#s gloss proved as ambiguous as Ruskin#s own colophon, since both were followed by a new work entered on the inside back endboard—an emblematical drawing, "Heights of Wisdom, Depth of Fools", which Ruskin dated a few months later than his mother#s gloss. Such play, whether including an edge of competitiveness or joy of collaboration, cannot be fully described in terms of an *XML* structure; the dynamics of play can be interpreted and discussed only in the archive#s commentary. However, the contributions of Ruskin#s parents are very often convincingly encoded as glosses, which are not in the same class as the editor#s explanatory and textual glosses that hang from and refer only to specific texts, but which form stand#alone TEI documents (including their own apparatuses and transcriptions) referring to and forming part of the corpus as a whole.

Finally, the #teiCorpus# markup also easily allows for reordering corpora athwart manuscripts. In the case of *Account of a Tour on the Continent*, an eclectic editorial approach was adopted both by W. G. Collingwood and by E. T. Cook and Alexander Wedderburn on the grounds that Ruskin left extensive writing for the work in draft along with an ambitious outline for arranging and completing the work; however, prior to realizing that plan, he abandoned the fair copy, requiring copytext to be drawn from both the fair copy and the draft. Collingwood justified his approach in 1891 as follows: "[A]s I find from a list at the end of . . . [MS] VIII" (i.e., the Plan for Continuation of the Account of a Tour on the Continent), Ruskin "intended this volume [i.e., the MS IX fair copy] to contain about 150 pieces of prose and poetry, and at least as many drawings! And in saying [in *Praeterita*] that he did not follow his tour beyond the Rhine, Mr. Ruskin refers only to this volume, No. IX", and not to what he had in fact composed. "I am pretty certain that he was not aware of the amount of material existing in rough copies at the back of his book#shelves" (*Poems* [4^{o}, 1891], 1:266; *Poems* [8^{o}, 1891], 1:267). In *ERM*, #teiCorpus# is used to compile the respective edited corpora that conjecturally reconstruct Ruskin#s work: Collingwood#s, which includes only poems; Cook and Wedderburn#s, which includes both poems and prose sections; and Ruskin#s multiple versions of the *"Account"*, whereby he evolved the work from a poetic travelogue in collaboration with his father into a composite work of poetry, prose, and illustration.

Other compelling candidates for separately and eclectically edited corpora witnessing a composite work include a compilation of the "volumes" making up the uncompleted "Harry and Lucy" narrative, drawn from *MS I*, *MS II MS III*, and *MS IIIA*; and the *Sermons on the Pentateuch*, in which the bonds between the sermon texts are stronger than their ties to the manuscripts in which the texts are found. While arguably the five handsewn booklets containing the fair copies of the sermons can be treated as a single corpus, the various Red Books containing rough drafts of the sermons present a particularly attenuated claim on the texts as composing a portion of their corpora considered as manuscripts. By the time Ruskin entered the sermon drafts in the Red Books, these notebooks had been demoted to providing leftover, unused space for miscellaneous draft, and the sermon texts run reverso and upside#down to what was once a vital corpus.

Yet another candidate for #teiCorpus# markup to describe multiple and conjectural corpora are those that were compiled neither by Ruskin nor his editors, but by members of his circle who were interested in creating anthologies for some special purpose. For example, as previously mentioned, in 1831 Ruskin#s mother proposed that John James make a small "parcel" of letters and poems to be shared with their intimate friends, the Grays. Such anthologies reveal assumptions about the intended audience of youthful writing in the nineteenth century (see The Private, Confidential, and Public in the Early Manuscripts).

1.3. Documentary Editorial Practices and Encoding

1.3.1. Transcription and Markup Protocol

In our transcription policy, we strive to abide by the definition of textual transcription proposed by David Vander Meulen and G. Thomas Tanselle: "the transcriber#s goal is to make an informed decision about what is actually inscribed at each point" in a manuscript, although of course editorial "judgment is necessarily involved in deciding what is in fact present", "as when an ambiguously formed character resembles two different letters". Despite these calls on editorial judgment, which must be notated, in a documentary editorial procedure the resulting "text cannot simultaneously be unemended and emended" since "no single text" can be both a transcription and a critical text; these "are mutually exclusive genres" of editing, although the same *edition* might contain both transcriptions and emended, critical texts (Vander Meulen and Tanselle, *"System of Manuscript Transcription"*, 201, 203).

For most works in *ERM*, the editor supplies documentary transcriptions of witnesses paired with facsimiles (if available) of those witnesses. The archive also provides, as it were, documentary transcriptions of past critical texts of the works, because we believe that researchers will benefit by being able to study, in close proximity with accurate transcriptions of manuscript witnesses, how Ruskin#s first editors saw fit to represent those manuscripts to readers.

The editor is responsible for the accuracy of all transcriptions of witnesses in *ERM*, having taken most of them himself over several years from the original manuscripts in the Beinecke Library, Yale University; the Berg Collection, New York Public Library; the Huntington Library; the Pierpont Morgan Library; Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library; the Ruskin Museum, Coniston; and The Ruskin, Lancaster University. Later, the project acquired facsimiles in the form of high#resolution tiff files from the the Beinecke Library, which have helped to confirm and improve on the editor#s original transcriptions, and which are exhibited in *ERM*. The editor is also responsible for final decisions about the interpretation of doubtful readings of manuscripts and for notating these decisions with textual glosses. In scattered instances, mostly involving manuscripts used to supplement annotation of the works contained in *ERM*, the editor initially had time in the physical archives only to describe a manuscript and gather information for a critical apparatus, and not to transcribe its contents completely; in those cases, we have sometimes been able to capture a transcription based on a high#resolution facsimile. This procedure is noted where it occurs, with the expectation of later revisiting the physical manuscript.

For support of archival research as well as imaging of the manuscripts, the editor and the Digital Humanities program at Southeastern Louisiana University are indebted to the agencies listed on the Staff and Support page. Without the travel grants and fellowships awarded by these agencies, the research underpinning *ERM* would not have been possible. The editor is also grateful to the staffs of these libraries and archives, who shared their expertise and supported our research.

In the earliest stage of developing the digital archive beyond the research and writing, Roger Garside, formerly senior lecturer in the Department of Computing, Lancaster University, devised a helpful program for translating the editor#s word processing files into lightly TEI#encoded *XML*, and for generating transformations in the form of *HTML* pages. This program was subsequently replaced as we elaborated our ideas about describing the early Ruskin manuscripts with TEI markup, and also as we pursued a pedagogy for introducing students to TEI encoding and to the craft of designing and building online scholarly resources. Garside#s program, however, was foundational for helping us to envision the architecture of the archive. Meanwhile, to advance the Digital Humanities program at Southeastern Louisiana University, we benefited from consultation by Syd Bauman, Matthew Christy, Julia Flanders, Laura Mandell, Dot Porter, Lawrence Woof, and the staff of the 2005 NINES Summer Workshop in Digital Scholarship at the University of Viriginia. *ERM* is indebted to these individuals and their institutions for their generosity and good will, which has persisted long beyond their respective workshops or consultations that got us started.

In the ongoing addition of new files to the archive, the following routines are observed by the encoding team. First, using the SyncRO Soft Oxygen XML editor, encoders pull the word#processed files of the Editor#s original transcript(s) of a work, along with files of his apparatus and other annotation, into appropriate templates built for

the varying document types included in *ERM*. In a first pass, encoders mark up the Editor#s original transcription and commentary according to the *TEI P5* standard; and the encoder checks the editor#s original transcript against its manuscript facsimile, querying any possible inaccuracies. Team members are instructed to confirm transcription of every deliberate mark on a manuscript, in whatever hand. The Editor then reviews the transcription and encoding against the facsimile, and he revises and extends the commentary.

As Vander Meulen and Tanselle comment: "Obviously a transcription cannot exactly reproduce the relative precision or carelessness with which handwritten letters are formed, or their relative sizes, or the amount of space between words and lines; but it can aim to record every ink or pencil marking of textual significance on the manuscript—all letters, punctuation, superscripts, canceled matter, lines linking or excising passages, and so on" ("System of Manuscript Transcription", 201). We consider this aim, and nothing less, as defining the standard for first# pass conversion of the editor#s original files, and for checking or completing transcription against its facsimile at this first stage, because it is impractical and an invitation to oversight to reserve some portion of transcription for a later stage. One can and should review the accuracy and thoroughness of transcription as often as one likes, but no systematic procedure for dividing a thorough transcription into stages would be practical, since one would have to redefine the procedure constantly in order to address the peculiarities of each manuscript.

To maintain consistency of markup in this process, the encoding team references an internal Encoding Guide, compiled by the supervising encoder, which lists every element, attribute, and value so far employed in the archive, and which is continually updated, as additional *TEI* elements and attributes or *ERM* values are discussed and added by the team. The team also constantly references and updates a project#based Regularization Crib, which is a *Microsoft Excel* spreadsheet listing every *XML* file name by category—the names, that is, of files in the document#type categories of apparatuses, manuscripts, witnesses, anthologies, drawings, essays, notes, and glosses. The Regularization Crib also lists all standardized editorial titles for these entities; and it serves as the encoders# crib for hex#codes for special characters, *ERM*#s xml:ids for all proper names, titles, and bibliography entries used in the archive, the names used to identify hands, and dates and date ranges used to mark historical events. The team (mainly, in this case, the editor and supervising encoder) continually updates the Regularization Cri as new works, manuscripts, and commentary are added to the archive.

To manage workflow, , encoders add their name and responsibility to the header of each *TEI* file they edit. When ready for review, the *XML* file is moved (not copied) from the encoder#s folder and into a reviewer#s folder, in order to guard against accidental confusion and overwriting of files. The Editor examines first#pass encoding for accuracy, consulting both his notes from on#site archival research and the facsimile. After the Editor has reviewed a file for accuracy of transcription and markup, along with consistency with the *ERM* Encoding Guide and Regularization Crib, it is uploaded for transformation by *XSLT* and the resulting HTML checked for errors.

The team steadily adds new works and manuscripts to the archive, and the Editor constantly researches and develops the commentary in apparatuses, notes, and glosses in order to increase the usefulness of the archive for researchers. At any given time, hyperlinks to notes are embedded in the *XML* files that are presently inactive because the source notes are unfinished. When a source note is completed and added to the archive, any pre#existing links to it should become active. All files are subject to revision and reloading with an appropriately updated version number.

1.3.2. Element, Attribute, and Value Usage

See the Encoding Guide for lists of all elements and attributes used in *ERM* along with their assigned values.

Because editing in *ERM* is documentary, we transcribe without correction Ruskin#s (remarkably rare) misspellings and grammatical errors. Also, we retain his capitalizations, ampersands, and unhyphenated spaces in such words such as *to day*, *every day*, *every one*, and so on. If Ruskin omits letters from words, he usually does so to serve poetic meter. Since the reader can in most cases compare the edited transcript against the facsimile, the cause of an apparent anomaly will be evident (e.g., doubled letters arising from dividing a word between lines, or doubled words occurring before and after page breaks); nonetheless, potentially confusing anomalies and other distinctive manuscript features receive discussion in a textual gloss. Some of the most anomalous and challenging markup decisions are presented by the earliest juvenilia, in which Ruskin invented his own solutions for representing the print sources surrounding him.

1.3.2.1. Handwriting and Special Characters

Ruskin#s handwriting, like that of any youth, developed over the course of time in terms of manual skill; and because he was interested in the material presentation of his manuscripts, he adopted a range of copybook scripts from handwriting manuals, and he imitated various print typefaces, which he found in favorite books printed between the 1820s and 1830s. These developments are surveyed and contextualized in The Ruskin Family Handwriting, while discussion of the hand and other material qualities of specific manuscripts are discussed in the apparatuses for both works and manuscripts.

In the #handNote# of the TEI header for each holograph witness of a work, hands are classified by scribe (i.e., the member of the Ruskin family ressponsible), and assigned an xml:id, which, in the case of John Ruskin#s hands, identifies a date range (usually a calendar year) along with any broad strokes that may be used to classify the holograph among a group of manuscripts sharing a peculiarity of hand. In the case of John James Ruskin#s and Margaret Ruskin#s hands, no attempt is made to use the xml:id to refine the classification of their hands, which retain a stable script throughout the holographs contained in *ERM*.

Within the #text# of the TEI document for each holograph witness, which may contain more than one hand, #handShift# is used to select the xml:id from #handNote# that identifies the hand responsible for a given range of text, until a different hand intervenes, at which point #handShift# toggles to identify the change with the appropriate xml:id. The #handShift# element also carries attributes of @script and @medium, which are assigned broad values—for @script, typically "print", "cursive", or an easily classifiable cursive such as "copperplate"; and for @medium, typically "pencil" and "ink". These broad classifications are described in The Ruskin Family Handwriting, while the eccentricities of the hand used for any given manuscript are relegated to discussion in the apparatus for the work in question, rather than burdening markup values for @script and @medium with excessive refinements. However, where clusters of manuscripts manifest peculiarities of hand, which may be used to help date works and otherwise flag relationships among projects, these classes of handwriting are captured in the values assigned to @script and @medium and may also be coded along with the date range as part of the xml:id given in #handNote#.

Where Ruskin imitates a special character in the style of a typeface, we highlight these using the #hi# element, with the @rend value keyed to such special usages as "doubleletter" and "doubleletter#fill".

1.3.2.2. Justification, Runover, and Word Division

As discussed in Expressing the Materiality of the Manuscripts, Ruskin invented a mark to justify right and left margins in fair#copy prose, which saved him from having to adjust space between words in a line of text. To fill the gap to the margin, he inserted a horizontal mark of variable length (and sometimes of variable appearance, shaped like an equal sign or a tilde). Since it would misrepresent the mark#s purpose to encode it according to its appearance in length as a hyphen, en#dash, or em#dash, or some other symbol, we use a glyph element, assigning it a @type "justification" as follows:

#g type="justification"#-#/g#.

Ruskin often indicated paragraph breaks as minimally as possible. Whether because he meant to use space on a page efficiently, or because he liked the appearance of a more solid block of text, he often failed to indent a word beginning a new paragraph. The intention of a paragraph break can be signaled, despite the lack of indentation, by a significant gap between the end of a preceding line and the right margin, with no justification mark used to take up the slack. Sometimes, however, he fills such spaces with stars, like asterisks, and the following line still seems meant as a new paragraph. Signals become especially confusing when Ruskin ends a block of text with a dash, which serves some rhetorical purpose such as an excited pause, and which would be indistinguishable from a justification mark apart from white space following it. In *ERM*, therefore, we insert paragraph breaks in a text when both sense and some definite scribal feature—such as significant space at the end of a preceding line, and/or a rare indentation at the start of the next line—seem to call for a new paragraph. If the manuscript evidence is ambiguous, the editorial decision is marked by a textual gloss.

We encode where line breaks fall in prose manuscripts, and we render these as breaks in the *XSLT* transformation, so that prose witnesses match their facsimiles. In poetry, if Ruskin wrote an extension of a line as a runover, the line#break element #lb/# is inserted at the start of the runover text within the transcribed line, and the element is assigned a @type "runover", thus:

#lb type="runover"/##space quantity="00" unit="chars"/#.

Here the #space# element quantifies the number of characters that the runover is indented from the left text margin. (In *XSLT* transformation, the runover also renders as an interlineation.)

In some cases of line runover in poetry, Ruskin also signaled the runover with a mark that, in some places, resembles an opening square bracket and, in others, a vertical bar. Usually, he placed this mark at the start of the indented runover line. One can find such a symbol in early nineteenth#century periodicals using narrow columns, thus causing multiple runovers in printing of poetry; however, printers appear to have reserved this punctuation to identify a runover that they were obliged to set *above* its line, and therefore needed to punctuate in order to distinguish from other runovers in the same poem set as usual below the line, and without such a mark. Several examples can be found in the *London Literary Gazette, and Journal of Belles Lettres, Arts, Sciences, &c.*, which uses the opening square bracket to mark a runover set above its line—typically, a line that simultaneously carries a runover appearing below the preceding line of verse, and therefore set without the mark (see, e.g., A.L., *"A Mother#s Morning Kiss to Her Child")*. Ruskin does not necessarily reserve use of the mark for this specialized class of runovers, but may apply it indiscriminately to any runover. As an example, see the opening line of *"The Defiance of War"*, which is encoded as follows:

#l#War war thou art beating thy#lb type="runover"/##space quantity="28" unit="chars"/##g type="runover"#[#/g#drum#l/#.

Ruskin sometimes used a mark to indicate word division at the end of a line. Like his justification mark, he varied the word#division sign in length from a mere dot to an em#dash, and in appearance from a horizontal line to something resembling an equal sign. All of these marks are interpreted without comment and encoded as a hyphen, since the intention is obvious in both facsimile and transcript. Sometimes he divided a word without using any mark at all, if his justified right margin did allow the space; in these cases, no mark is encoded and the line break is represented without comment—the intention again being obvious in facsimile and transcript.

One word division mark does call for special treatment, since it appears confusingly redundant. In some cases, Ruskin uses not only a mark at the right justified margin to denote a break but also at the left justified margin on the line below. Typically, the latter takes a form resembling an equal sign. When this mark appears at the left margin and is clearly functioning to signal word division, we tag it as a glyph element, @type "word_division":

#g type="word_division"#=#/g#.
As an example of a runover using this mark, see the opening line of *"Ehrenbreitstein" [prose]*

1.3.2.3. Italic Letttering

1.3.2.4. Commas, Periods, and Other Punctuation
In the earliest juvenilia, those dating from 1826–27, Ruskin had trouble writing commas and periods on the baseline, with the result that these marks float as if they were apostrophes or quotation marks. In some cases, Ruskin anchors these with an insertion caret (see Deletion and Addition), as in *"On the Rainbow"*. In transcription, these floating marks are interpreted as conventional punctuation on the baseline.

In another idiosyncracy of punctuation, occurring throughout the early manuscripts and perhaps related to what Van Akin Burd has identified in Ruskin#s mature hand as a *half#comma*, Ruskin inscribed what look like periods in the middle of sentences, where syntax calls for commas; and conversely, he wrote what look like commas as terminal punctuation at the end of sentences. This reversal, while not consistent, occurs regularly enough that the marks can be treated as glyphs. Thus, the mark is transcribed as the period or comma that its scribal appearance suggests, but the mark is tagged as a glyph, @type "terminal#comma" for what appears intended as terminal punctuation, and @type "pause#period" for what appears meant to indicate a pause, not a terminus.

As found likewise in letters written by all three members of the family, Ruskin sometimes omits terminal punctuation and instead allows extra space between the end of one sentence and the start of the next. In these instances, the gap is encoded using the #space# element. However, if terminal punctuation is lacking, and no extra space is evident, we do not supply extra space where it does not exist, as Burd does in *Ruskin Family Letters* in order to aid the reader#s eye.

If random flourishes and other marks in a manuscript appear to serve only decorative or doodling purposes, and no purpose of punctuation can be discerned, they are ignored in transcription and markup, apart from a textual note atesting to their presence.

1.3.2.5. Deletion and Addition
In the *ERM*#s Showcase display, deletions and additions are rendered as an approximation of a genetic text, such as that marked up (using typographical symbols) in Melville, *Billy Budd, Sailor*, ed. Hayford and Sealts (pp. 270#425), albeit limited to the genetic development of a single witness. (A genetic reconstruction of a work#s development using all available draft and fair#copy witnesses is presented discursively in the work#s apparatus.) In *ERM* Showcase, using the Transcription Toggle on the toolbar (the curved arrow), the reader can view at stage one (indicated on the toggle arrow by its first third being highlighted) the earliest textual state of a given witness, with text that Ruskin later deleted appearing gray. At stage two (indicated on the toggle arrow by two#thirds being highlighted), the reader views the second state of text, with the added text replacing the deletion. In stage three (indicated by the toggle arrow being fully highlighted), the reader views deletions and additions simultaneously—that is, the final state of the manuscript witness, as it presently appears—with additions appearing above, below, or overlapping with the (grayed#out) deletions, as the case may be.

In *ERM*, addition and deletion is not marked up as a single act, using the substitution element (#subst#), except in cases of overwriting, which cannot be otherwise interpreted. In many instances of deletion followed immediately by a word that makes sense of the passage, or with such a word placed above or below the line, no other scenario than an immediate substitution seems probable—particularly if the change is reflected in a subsequent fair copy. But we leave these inferences to the reader, relegating our own interpretations to a textual gloss or the apparatus.

In the earliest extant juvenilia, a form of erasure and substitution is to allow a mistaken character to stand (or to be erased imperfectly), but to follow that character with a heavily inscribed character, as if the latter were in boldface, in order to emphasize the substitution.

1.3.2.6. Metamarks
In 1833–34, in *"Lille"*, one of the poems for the MS IA, g.1, version of Account of a Tour on the Continent, Ruskin uses marginal symbols to instruct the transposition of two lines from one place in the draft to another place—a meaning for the symbols that is confirmed by his carrying out the transposition in a later fair copy of the poem. We encode Ruskin#s symbol for the point of insertion, an asterisk, with the element #metamark#, with its @function designated in this case as "insertion"; and we encode the lines to be transposed, which Ruskin brackets in the margin, as a span of text. This is a striking, early instance of Ruskin using symbols that function in the way defined by *TEI P5* for #metamark# —to encode a scribal feature in a manuscript that does not form a part of the work, but that functions as a direction for how to read the text.

All metamarks require an editorial gloss to confirm or speculate about their meaning. In general, it seems, the earlier a possible metamark, the more ambiguous its intention, and Ruskin is more likely to use a word rather than a symbol. In 1827, in *"The storm"*, Ruskin inscribed a word, *bad*, which might be tagged as a #metamark#, but its @function and @target could not be specified with certainty. That Ruskin intended the word as metadiscourse seems evident in its isolation, placed on the same line as a runover text without its forming a part of that runover in sense or grammar. We can speculate that he intended this negative judgment as a directive to reject the poem's strophe and replace it with another that follows; however, in this and any such ambiguous instance, we can only encode the word or symbol as a #metamark# without confidently supplying a @function or @target. Rather, we can only discuss a possible function and target in a textual gloss and/or (as in the case of *"The storm"*) propose a meaning that is worked out in the apparatus for the poem. Any such apparent metadiscursive interjection in a

work, the function of which is unclear—such as the ejaculations, “Play” and “arretez Oh arretez,” in *“On Skiddaw and Derwent Water”*—is is encoded with #metamark# and its @function assigned the value “unclear”; speculation about function and target is reserved for a textual gloss and/or apparatus.

1.3.2.7. Manuscript Damage and Supplying Illegible or Missing Writing

The most widespread damage to Ruskin#s manuscripts is scorching, caused by the fire in the house of Charles Goodspeed (1867–1950) (see also Sotheby#s Sale of Ruskin Manuscripts and Library, 1930; and Sotheby#s Sale of Ruskin Manuscripts and Library, 1931)

An affected area of the manuscript is encoded in transcript using the #damage# element with an @agent ascribed to fire or some other cause. If text in this area is legible but partially unclear, it is additionally tagged as #unclear#; if visible but completely illegible, and able to be inferred from another source, text can be inserted and tagged as #supplied#; and if completely illegible, and unable to be inferred confidently from another source, then the element #gap# is used, typically with the @extent given as “several characters”.

1.3.3. Glosses

Glosses fall into two categories:

- Encoded as a @type of #div#, a gloss is a kind of work (see Defining *Works* and *Manuscripts*), which is typically a commentary on another work or a corpus, inscribed directly on the manuscript witness of that work or corpus, and often written by some agent other than the author of the original work or corpus. As works, these sorts of glosses are represented by their own apparatus and witness. An example is Margaret Ruskin#s Gloss on the Dating of *MS I*
- – explanatory;
  – textual.

The editor's explanatory and textual glosses are localized to annotating transcripts of specific works, as compared with the form of commentary called *notes*, which are free#standing and hyperlinked throughout the archive. (see Plan of the Archive). As the term implies, explanatory glosses contextualize specific passages in a work—too specific to be annotated with a #note# that would be accessible by hyperlink througout the edition. A textual gloss draws attention a specific textual or bibliographical feature of a witness.

Explanatory and textual glosses are accessed through clickable callouts embedded directly in the text. The call-outs appear in a different color than that of the surrounding text; and explanatory gloss callouts are sequenced in arabic numerals, while textual gloss callouts are sequenced by lowercase letters.

While it is typically recommended in print editions that such annotations be referenced by line number in order to maintain a clear text, without the clutter of note callouts (see, e.g., Kline and Perdue, *Guide to Documentary Editing*, 117), two factors render embedded callouts more practical in *ERM*. First, because the archive preserves the separate integrity of multiple witnesses of a work, a gloss must be capable of hyperlinking to the same or similar string of characters found in more than one witness, without regard to differences between witnesses in line numbering. Second, because the archive preserves the evidence of Ruskin#s own line numbering, which he applied to some witnesses, annotation callouts need to work independently that numbering, which is often confused or erroneous.