RSA Procedures for Evaluation of Proposals & Submissions to the Library of Digital Latin Texts (LDLT)

1. Introduction

Editions of early modern Latin texts in the LDLT will appear under the aegis of the RSA, after review and approval in accordance with the following guidelines. It is to be noted that editions of ancient Latin texts will be reviewed by the Society for Classical Studies and those of Medieval Latin texts by the Medieval Academy of America, each in accordance with its own policies and procedures.

The RSA will recognise two types of publications in this series:

A "Peer Reviewed Critical Edition" will meet the standards of a critical edition commonly accepted in the field of early modern studies. Acceptance by the editorial board will be evidence that the work is judged by the RSA to be equal in quality to the kinds of editions that appear in RSA print publications or scholarly articles that appear in the RSA journal *Renaissance Quarterly*.

A "Peer Reviewed Working Edition" will be a high quality edition that should be regarded by scholars as useful and reliable. While lacking certain features that are expected of a full critical edition (such as a collation of certain manuscripts, an *apparatus fontium*, etc.), it is free from errors, and offers a text that is a genuine improvement over what has heretofore been available.

2. Editorial Board

The RSA Editorial Committee for the Digital Latin Library shall serve as the initial editorial board for this series, with the chair of the committee serving as chair of the board.

The responsibilities of the editorial board include:

(1) Communication with prospective editors about proposals.
(2) Approval of proposals.
(3) Maintenance of a record of ongoing projects.
(4) Coordination with the leadership, executive and technical, of the LDLT where necessary.
(5) Identification and communication with external reviewers.
(6) Approval of digital publications as working or finished editions.
(7) Coordination with the Digital and Multimedia Committee and Chair of Publications, if necessary.

3. Preproposal

Scholars contemplating working on an edition for this venue should consult the Guidelines for LDLT Editions provided by the Digital Latin Library, particularly section "3. Definition of an LDLT Edition" and consult with the RSA Editorial Committee for the Digital Latin Library as to the appropriateness of the project for the series and whether the proposed text is already in development by someone else.

The Editorial Board may be approached with projects in three different states of development:

(1) An already encoded draft digital edition.
(2) A draft text edition, not yet encoded.
(3) A simple plan for a digital edition.

In all three cases, editors should be referred to the technical requirements described in the Guidelines for LDLT editions. In the case of (1), it will be a matter of making sure that the coding matches the LDLT schema, if it does not already do so. In the case of (2), it will be a matter of making clear to the editor that they are responsible for encoding the text, with guidance from Digital Latin Library (DLL) staff. In the case of (3), it will be a matter of encouraging the editor to keep these requirements in mind in preparing the proposal.

4. Proposal

A. Editors should submit to any member of the RSA Editorial Committee for the Digital Latin Library a proposal including the following items:

(1) Author and title of the text to be edited.
(2) Brief survey of existing editions.
(3) Justification of a new working or critical edition, explaining how it will improve upon earlier editions, if any.
(4) Description of the editor's qualifications.
(5) Description of the work completed to date.
(6) Plan for implementing features of the LDLT's encoding guidelines.
(7) Sample of the encoded text.

Item (6) should address whether or not the edition will include a textual commentary, *apparatus fontium et testium*, tags for analysis, and/or any of the advanced semantic encoding techniques mentioned in the guidelines.

B. The RSA Editorial Committee for the Digital Latin Library will review the proposal and determine whether or not to give it provisional acceptance. The Editorial Board may choose to consult informally outside scholars at this point (on an anonymous basis) as to the merits of the proposal. If they decide to pursue the project, the chair

will inform the author of the proposal and the director of the DLL that the project should proceed to the next stage. Approval at this stage does not guarantee acceptance. Rather, approval means that the proposed project is likely to meet the standards of the RSA and is deemed worth pursuing.

5. Development

The editor will interact with the DLL staff during development to do the following:

(1) Set up a repository for version control and storage of the edition's files and data.
(2) Set up a Zotero collection for bibliography related to the edition.
(3) Establish a plan for representing the edition's data according to the LDLT guidelines.

During development, a number of mechanisms will be in place to encourage compliance with the LDLT's encoding guidelines. The schema for LDLT texts will provide warnings when the XML is not valid and well formed. Instructions will also be available to enable an editor to prepare material in plain text files and spreadsheets so that much of the edition can be encoded automatically by scripts prepared by the DLL. The editor will also have access to a testing version of the DLL's "reading room" viewer to verify that the data is behaving as expected. DLL staff will also be available for consultation.

6. Submission of Final Draft

A. When the final draft of the edition has been completed, the editor will send the following materials to the Chair of the RSA Editorial Committee for the DLL:

(1) A description of the project.
(2) A copy of an email from the technical director of the DLL certifying that the edition adheres to the LDLT encoding guidelines.
(3) Directions for access to the edition on the DLL's testing site, the Zotero bibliography, and the repository for the edition's files and data.
(4) A .pdf version of the file appropriate for "paper" review.

B. The RSA Editorial Committee for the DLL will select two expert referees to assess these materials and to write reports on the same. A qualified member of the Editorial Committee may serve as one of the referees. The review will be carried out on a double-blind basis.

C. The RSA Editorial Committee for the DLL will review the referees' reports and, after discussion, formulate the appropriate response. Generally, the possibilities will be:

(1) Accept unconditionally (the author may of course make minor revisions in response to any suggestions of the referees or the Editorial Committee).

(2) Accept with the expectation that the author will revise in the light of specific suggestions made by the referees or the Editorial Committee, with the chair of the Editorial Committee being charged to verify that the author's final version takes account of the suggestions.

(3) Ask the author to revise and resubmit, with the resubmission to be evaluated by one or two referees (not necessarily the same as used previously), who will be provided copies of the previous reports and response. The choice between one or two referees will be at the discretion of the Editorial Committee, and use of the same referee(s) will be at the discretion of the board and subject to the availability and willingness of the referee.

(4) If the edition does not meet the expectations of the reviewers, it may be rejected, in which case all materials revert to the editor who may choose to pursue publication elsewhere.