

MS VIII Draft	MSS IA,' VII	Ruskin's Line Num- bering, MSS IA, VIII	MS IX Fair Copy	MS VIII Endpaper List of Proposed Topics	Library Edition	Actual Tour Itinerary
			Blank verso; drawing (<i>Works</i> , 2:364 n. 1 [no. 4])			
			Blank verso; two drawings (<i>Works</i> , 2:364 n. 1 [nos. 5a-b])			
			Blank verso; drawing (<i>Works</i> , 2:364 n. 1 [no. 6])			
			Blank verso; drawing (<i>Works</i> , 2:364 n. 1 [no. 7])			
["Oh are there spirits, can there be"] (po- em)		506-19			["Oh, are there spirits, can there be"] (po- em; <i>Works</i> , 2:384 n. 1)	
"The Source of the Arveron" (prose)		Unnum- bered			[The Source of the Arveron, incorrectly in- dicated to be an editorial title] (prose; <i>Works</i> , 2:386-87)	
[The Arve at Chamouni] (poem)		520-64			[The Arve at Chamouni] (poem; <i>Works</i> , 2:384-85)	

THE DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN'S THOUGHT

The compound curves that would result for each of these cases are illustrated in Figure 31d-f.

MODELING THE PROCESS OF GROWTH IN A HIERARCHICAL SYSTEM WHERE THE LINKAGE BETWEEN GENERAL AND SPECIFIC VARIABLES IS RECIPROCAL

The final situation that must be considered is one where the general curve (G) makes a reciprocal contribution to each of the specific curves (S_1, \dots, S_5). To represent this reciprocal relation, the equation for each specific curve must be rewritten as well. For the case of simple compounding, with a constant and externally fixed carrying capacity, the full set of equations would be as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Q(G)_{t+1} = & Q(G)_t + Q(G)_t \times GR(G) - [Q(G)_t \times GR(G)] \times Q(G)_t / K \\ & + Q(S_1)_t \times k_{S_1 > G} - [Q(S_1)_t \times k_{S_1 > G}] \times Q(G)_t / K \\ & + Q(S_2)_t \times k_{S_2 > G} - [Q(S_2)_t \times k_{S_2 > G}] \times Q(G)_t / K \\ & + Q(S_3)_t \times k_{S_3 > G} - [Q(S_3)_t \times k_{S_3 > G}] \times Q(G)_t / K \\ & + Q(S_4)_t \times k_{S_4 > G} - [Q(S_4)_t \times k_{S_4 > G}] \times Q(G)_t / K \\ & + Q(S_5)_t \times k_{S_5 > G} - [Q(S_5)_t \times k_{S_5 > G}] \times Q(G)_t / K, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Q(S_1)_{t+1} = & Q(S_1)_t + Q(S_1)_t \times GR(S_1) - [Q(S_1)_t \times GR(S_1)] \times Q(S_1)_t / K \\ & + Q(G)_t \times k_{G > S_1} - [Q(G)_t \times k_{G > S_1}] \times Q(S_1)_t / K, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Q(S_2)_{t+1} = & Q(S_2)_t + Q(S_2)_t \times GR(S_2) - [Q(S_2)_t \times GR(S_2)] \times Q(S_2)_t / K \\ & + Q(G)_t \times k_{G > S_2} - [Q(G)_t \times k_{G > S_2}] \times Q(S_2)_t / K, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Q(S_3)_{t+1} = & Q(S_3)_t + Q(S_3)_t \times GR(S_3) - [Q(S_3)_t \times GR(S_3)] \times Q(S_3)_t / K \\ & + Q(G)_t \times k_{G > S_3} - [Q(G)_t \times k_{G > S_3}] \times Q(S_3)_t / K, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Q(S_4)_{t+1} = & Q(S_4)_t + Q(S_4)_t \times GR(S_4) - [Q(S_4)_t \times GR(S_4)] \times Q(S_4)_t / K \\ & + Q(G)_t \times k_{G > S_4} - [Q(G)_t \times k_{G > S_4}] \times Q(S_4)_t / K, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Q(S_5)_{t+1} = & Q(S_5)_t + Q(S_5)_t \times GR(S_5) - [Q(S_5)_t \times GR(S_5)] \times Q(S_5)_t / K \\ & + Q(G)_t \times k_{G > S_5} - [Q(G)_t \times k_{G > S_5}] \times Q(S_5)_t / K. \end{aligned}$$

REVISED PROOF

CASE, OKAMOTO, ET AL.

constant. Figure 31c shows the pattern of growth that would be expected for this model.

The Floating Capacity Model: Conjoint Compounding

The same basic set of equations could also be used to model the case of conjoint compounding, the only difference being that the term $Q(H)_t$ would have to be inserted as a multiplier in each additional term. For the case of the floating capacity model, the new equation would be

$$\begin{aligned}
 Q(G)_{t+1} = & Q(G)_t + Q(G)_t \times GR(G) - [Q(G)_t \times GR(G)] \times Q(G)_t/K \\
 & + [Q(S_1)_t \times k_{S_1>G}] \times Q(G)_t \\
 & + [Q(S_2)_t \times k_{S_2>G}] \times Q(G)_t \\
 & + [Q(S_3)_t \times k_{S_3>G}] \times Q(G)_t \\
 & + [Q(S_4)_t \times k_{S_4>G}] \times Q(G)_t \\
 & + [Q(S_5)_t \times k_{S_5>G}] \times Q(G)_t.
 \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

The Fixed Capacity Model: Conjoint Compounding

For the case of the externally determined carrying capacity, a damping term would be added to each additional term; thus, the equation for the general curve would be

$$\begin{aligned}
 Q(G)_{t+1} = & Q(G)_t + Q(G)_t \times GR(G) - [Q(G)_t \times GR(G)] \times Q(G)_t/K \\
 & + Q(S_1)_t \times Q(G)_t \times k_{S_1>G} - [Q(S_1)_t \times Q(G)_t \times k_{S_1>G}] \times Q(G)_t/K \\
 & + Q(S_2)_t \times Q(G)_t \times k_{S_2>G} - [Q(S_2)_t \times Q(G)_t \times k_{S_2>G}] \times Q(G)_t/K \\
 & + Q(S_3)_t \times Q(G)_t \times k_{S_3>G} - [Q(S_3)_t \times Q(G)_t \times k_{S_3>G}] \times Q(G)_t/K \\
 & + Q(S_4)_t \times Q(G)_t \times k_{S_4>G} - [Q(S_4)_t \times Q(G)_t \times k_{S_4>G}] \times Q(G)_t/K \\
 & + Q(S_5)_t \times Q(G)_t \times k_{S_5>G} - [Q(S_5)_t \times Q(G)_t \times k_{S_5>G}] \times Q(G)_t/K.
 \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

The Growing Capacity Model: Conjoint Compounding

Finally, for the growing capacity model, the equation would remain the same, but K would be a logistically growing variable rather than a constant.

NOTE.—Quotation marks indicate Ruskin's title in manuscript. Square brackets indicate that a piece is untitled in manuscript and/or that the title is editorial. Square brackets enclosing first lines in quotation marks indicate that a piece is untitled either in manuscript or in the Library Edition. For details, consult part 1, MSS IA, VII, VIII, and IX, "Content."

' Only the columns for the MS IX fair copy and for the MS VIII endpaper list sections in the sequence they appear in those manuscripts. The sequences of sections in MSS IA, VII, and VIII (draft) can be inferred from Ruskin's line numbering, listed in column three. As cautioned in part 1, MS VIII, "Content," b, Ruskin's line numbering reflects the sections' manuscript sequence but may or may not reflect their *compositional* sequence.

' See part 1, MS IA, "Content," g, for the order of sections within the three separate sheets contained in MS IA. Those respective orderings are not distinguished in this table.

' Certain gaps in MS IX suggest either that Ruskin intended to paste in a drawing or that a drawing has been removed; these gaps are described as "blank space for drawing." A phrase such as "no drawing at end of poem" means that, in my judgment, no drawing was intended, since the space is too small. All these assertions, however, are more or less conjectural.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN'S THOUGHT

tion would be a good deal more complex and would include either five or 10 additional terms depending on whether each term that was added also had its own damping terms.

For the floating capacity model with simple compounding, the equation for the general curve would be the most straightforward, namely,

$$\begin{aligned}
 Q(G)_{t+1} = & Q(G)_t + Q(G)_t \times GR(G) - [Q(G)_t \times GR(G)] \times Q(G)_t/K \\
 & + Q(S_1)_t \times k_{S_1>G} \\
 & + Q(S_2)_t \times k_{S_2>G} \\
 & + Q(S_3)_t \times k_{S_3>G} \\
 & + Q(S_4)_t \times k_{S_4>G} \\
 & + Q(S_5)_t \times k_{S_5>G}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

This curve is illustrated in Figure 31a. The growth rates of the specific curves have been set at 4%, 5%, 6%, 7%, and 8%. The growth rate of the general curve has been set at 0% (i.e., it gets all its growth from the specific curves).

The Fixed Capacity Model: Simple Compounding

For the fixed capacity model, equation (9) would have to have a damping parameter added to each of the terms, thus:

$$\begin{aligned}
 Q(G)_{t+1} = & Q(G)_t + Q(G)_t \times GR(G) - [Q(G)_t \times GR(G)] \times Q(G)_t/K \\
 & + Q(S_1)_t \times k_{S_1>G} - [Q(S_1)_t \times k_{S_1>G}] \times Q(G)_t/K \\
 & + Q(S_2)_t \times k_{S_2>G} - [Q(S_2)_t \times k_{S_2>G}] \times Q(G)_t/K \\
 & + Q(S_3)_t \times k_{S_3>G} - [Q(S_3)_t \times k_{S_3>G}] \times Q(G)_t/K \\
 & + Q(S_4)_t \times k_{S_4>G} - [Q(S_4)_t \times k_{S_4>G}] \times Q(G)_t/K \\
 & + Q(S_5)_t \times k_{S_5>G} - [Q(S_5)_t \times k_{S_5>G}] \times Q(G)_t/K.
 \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

This curve is illustrated in Figure 31b.

The Growing Capacity Model: Simple Compounding

For the growing capacity model, the equation would be the same as equation (10), except that K would itself be a logistic variable rather than a

Return-path: <jhayman@uvaix2e1.comp.UVic.CA>
Date: Wed, 19 Nov 1997 10:02:13 -0800 (PST)
From: "J. G. Hayman" <jhayman@UVic.CA>
Subject: Ruskin
To: dhanson@selu.edu

Dear David Hanson: I am e-mailing, since we are on the brink of a mail strike.

I found your queries quite intriguing. I must admit that my account in Ruskin and Switzerland seems now rather off-hand. I can't recall if I was aware of complications at the time. I'm not altogether able to resolve them now. However, a few points:

1. Your question: "Why, according to C and W., would they have gone from Maggiore all the way west to Geneva, then down to Turin?" I suspect "Geneva" is a slip for "Genoa." (If you've dipped into the typed transcripts in the Bodleian which were prepared for Works, you'll recognize how such slips could occur!) With this adjustment, placing of poem on Genoa after Maggiore makes sense.
 2. The basis for C & W correction of itinerary. I wonder if this could be a diary of John James Ruskin. I quote from this diary on p. 15 but can't find my notes on it. I think diary itself is in Bembridge Collection. But I'm so far out of Ruskin studies that I don't know if this collection has by now gone to University of Lancaster. I suggest you write to James S. Dearden, Curator at Bembridge. (Address: Bembridge School, Isle of Wight, UK, PO35 5PH). Do you know Dearden's John Ruskin e Le Alpi (1990), the catalogue of a travelling exhibition?
 3. Ruskin's list of proposed sections for "Account" (MSVIII). You note that according to this, "they reenter through the St. Bernard, not the Simplon." There is mention of "The Great St Bernard (37), but isn't this an aside or extra? Earlier sections--"(34) Domodossola...(37) Brieg"--indicate a crossing by the Simplon Pass.
 4. Drawings. "Balstall" seems clearly to be noted in MSVIII. "Oberhofen" not so clearly. But below "Thun," I notice "View on lake of L?" A possible reference?
 5. An illustrated book or video? It's not illustrated, but Murray's Handbook for Travellers in Switzerland (1838) is invaluable for its descriptions of routes. There is a 1970 reprint: NY Humanities Press/Leicester UP. Intro Jack Simmons.
 6. I have slipped around the main issue: when did they do the circuit of Swiss towns? Praeterita's account seems logical. Again, I wonder if JJR's diary indicates otherwise.
- Hope the above is of some help. Shall be interested to learn of your findings! John Hayman

October 31, 1997

Dear Professor Hayman:

I'm working on a new descriptive bibliography and chronology of all the early Ruskin manuscripts, which will replace the Collingwood, Cook and Wedderburn, and unpublished Viljoen contributions. At present, I'm revising the section on 1833/34, especially the "Account" (which Ruskin himself never titled, so far as I can discover). I wonder if you could help me clarify the Ruskins' itinerary for the Continental journey of 1833. I'm baffled by the competing accounts—those in *Praeterita* and the second volume of the Library Edition and yours in *John Ruskin and Switzerland*.

First, I must confess to one of my failings as a Ruskinian, my ignorance of Alpine country. I've never had the opportunity to trace any of Ruskin's beloved routes through Switzerland, and I'm never certain I understand them adequately. Bear with me, then, while I stumble through this, and I'd be very grateful if you'd correct me. I'm interested even in the rationale of Cook and Wedderburn's version, which I presume to be the least reliable, but which must have guided their reconstruction of the "Account."

All accounts seem to agree on the first stage, from Calais through the Rhine journey. From Strasbourg, they dropped southeast through the Black Forest to Schaffhausen, and on to Konstanz and Bodensee to the east.

Now begin the disagreements. First, do you know where Cook and Wedderburn obtained their correction of the itinerary Ruskin gives in *Praeterita* (see 2:340n)? Collingwood in the *Life* follows *Praeterita*.

According to C. and W.'s note, from Constance they followed the Rhine down to Chur (Coire). The Splügen Pass is farther south, with the Via Mala along the way. Coming down from the Splügen Pass, they entered Chiavenna, and from there they approached the top of Lake Como. From the bottom of Como it's not much farther south to Milan, where they went next; and Lago Maggiore is back up north and west again. But I don't understand their progress after Maggiore at all. Why, according to C. and W., would they have gone from Maggiore all the way west to Geneva, then down to Turin? From Turin, it's said, they went through the St. Bernard to Vevey, on the eastern end of Lake Geneva. But then to Interlaken?! Then back to Chamouni?! Wouldn't this be a waste of money? Also, this account omits to mention Genoa: C. and W. place the *poem* on Genoa *after* Maggiore, but surely that doesn't make sense.

According to *Praeterita*, before following the Rhine from Constance to Chur, the family made a circle from Basle to Berne to Interlaken to Lucerne to Zurich to Constance. In Italy, Genoa followed Milan. Geneva was approached through the Simplon, not the St. Bernard. Ruskin agrees that Chamouni was the last stop before leaving the mountain country.

You put the northern Swiss cities *after* the reentry (through the Simplon) to Switzerland, with Chamouni along the way, not at the end. They reentered France near Neuchatel, not farther south at Lyon, as Ruskin remembered.

Complicating matters still more is Ruskin's list of proposed sections for the "Account" at the back of MS VIII, which is close to yours, but the list places Geneva at the end of the northern towns, not the beginning. And they reenter through the St. Bernard, not the Simplon. I enclose a copy of the endpapers, as a friend transcribed them for me as I was frantically copying something else during my last visit to the Beinecke. Note that he continued the left-hand list on the backside of his sheet, so your two xeroxes should be positioned one on top of the other.

Do you know of an illustrated book or video that can help me armchair travel these routes?

Another kind of question. The notebook containing the "Account" is 20.5 x 16.5 cm. Of the 1833 drawings you reproduce in *J.R. and Switzerland*, I guess it's just possible that the Thun drawing could have been intended to be pasted broadside in the notebook. The fortress drawing could have fit easily (with the bottom vignette cut off).

Thanks very much for any help you can provide.

Sincerely,

David Hanson