INF 2159H: Analytical and Historical Bibliography

Fall 2023

Location: McLean-Hunter Room, Fisher Library

Time: Wednesdays, 12:30 to 3:00 pm

Instructor: Alan Galey

Contact: Please use regular email (alan.galey@utoronto.ca) rather than Quercus's messaging system. I will normally respond by the end of the next business day. I don't read or respond to email during evenings, weekends, and stat holidays, and don't expect students to do so either.

Office hours: Wednesdays 3:30 - 4:30 in the Fisher reading room, or by appointment

Photo taken by AG in the Bibliography Room at Massey College during a summer printing project in 2023. The typeface is Wren 18pt italic.

Course Description

This course examines books and other textual artifacts as material objects, focusing on methods of production and manufacture, and how they affect the transmission of texts. Students are introduced to theories and methods of bibliographical description and analysis, and to their application across a range of media. Classes cover the history of textual production, from hand-press to digital books, and its relevance to disciplines such as librarianship, digital curation, and digital humanities.

Course Objectives

Upon completion of the course students will understand the technology behind, and the various practices followed, in the printing, publishing, illustrating and binding of books in both the hand- press and machine-press periods, as well as some emerging digital publication technologies. Through description assignments and in-class exercises, students will have examined all aspects of the material objects studied, will know how to analyze their component parts and will learn how to present detailed descriptions following recognized standards. They will learn about the classification of books and will have an understanding of the concepts of edition, impression, issue and state. They will become familiar with the literature in the field and with standard reference sources. Through the final group presentation on born-digital bibliography, they will learn how to extend bibliographical principles beyond traditional books, and how to communicate the results of this kind of exploration to peers and colleagues.

Course Learning Outcomes

Students who have successfully completed this course should be able to:

1. trace the development of bibliography and its subdisciplines and to understand the role of bibliographical approaches in current research and professional practice (assessed mainly through in-class participation and the descriptive bibliography/digital project profile);
2. apply principles and methods of bibliographical description and analysis to complex examples (assessed through the various bibliographical description assignments);
3. extend traditional bibliographical methods and theories into new areas of study, especially born-digital texts and artifacts (assessed mainly through in-class participation and the group presentation on born-digital bibliography).

Relationship between Course Learning Outcomes and MI Program Learning Outcomes: Bibliography is a topic that requires students to be able to apply a range of concepts, theories, and practices derived from a range of information-related disciplines (Program Outcome 1). The book's historical centrality to the preservation and dissemination of human knowledge means that the evolving forms of books are a core concern for information professionals, especially those who work to ensure access to knowledge (Program Outcome 2). Understanding the changing forms of the book, from manuscript to print to digital text, requires a synthesis of theoretical and practical knowledge, linking theories of interpretation to specific encoding and digitization technologies (Program Outcomes 4 & 5).

Evaluation Structure and Grading Policies

10% Participation
10% Assignment 1: Quasi-facsimile title page transcription
20% Assignment 2: Collation and bibliographical description
25% Assignment 3: Evaluation of a descriptive bibliography/digital project
35% Assignment 4: Group presentation on born-digital bibliography (= 15% presentation + 20% written report)

Any assignment that does not meet a minimum level of legibility (i.e. the instructor cannot read it because of grammatical errors or other writing problems) may be returned for revision and resubmission with the late penalty in effect (see below). All assignments are evaluated in accordance with (1) the University of Toronto Governing Council's University Assessment and Grading Practices Policy and (2) the Faculty of Information/s Guidelines to Grade Interpretation. The Governing Council policy is available at
http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/grading.pdf.
The Faculty of Information's Guidelines to Grade Interpretation supplement that policy and are available at
https://www.ischool.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/grade_interpretation_revised_August2020.pdf.
See also the guidelines on the Use of INC, SDF, & WDR: https://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/policies-guidelines/inc-sdf-wdr/

Late penalty:

Extensions will only be granted in the event of illness or emergency, and then only with appropriate documentation. Late assignments (defined here as an assignment submitted after the deadline) will be penalized by one full letter grade per week (e.g. from A to A-), for a maximum of two weeks. Written assignments that do not meet a minimum standard (in terms of legibility, formatting and proofreading) will be returned for re-submission, with late penalties in full effect. Assignments that are more than two weeks late without an extension will not be accepted, and will receive a grade of zero. Late assignments may not receive written feedback.

If you are missing a test/assignment or submitting an assignment late due to **accessibility challenges**, please make an appointment to discuss your accommodation needs with your Accessibility Advisor. Your Accessibility Advisor can write directly to your academic advisor with the appropriate supporting information.

See the section below on declaring an absence in ACORN.

Grade appeals:

If students feel any assignment grade is unfair, or simply have questions about it, I am happy to discuss it with them. However, students should not email me about their grade until at least 24 hours have passed, to ensure that no emails are sent in the heat of the moment. Also, before I will discuss any grade appeals I expect you to do **four** things: 1) re-read the Faculty of Information's Grade Interpretation Guidelines; 2) re-read the assignment instructions in full; 3) re-read your own submitted assignment in full; and 4) re-read my feedback, which may include marginal notes on your returned assignment document. These steps are to ensure that discussions about grades are based on evidence, not just expectations or initial reactions.

Accommodations

Students with diverse learning styles and/or accessibility needs are welcome in this course. In particular, if you have a disability/health consideration that may require accommodations, please feel free to approach me, student services and/or the Accessibility Services Office as soon as possible. Students who believe they require accommodations and are unsure where to begin can speak to an academic advisor in student services for guidance and referrals.

Accessibility Services staff are available by appointment to assess specific needs, provide referrals to supportive services and arrange appropriate accommodations. The sooner you let us know your needs, the quicker we can assist you in achieving your learning goals in this course. Once you have obtained an accommodation plan from Accessibility Services, please share your accommodation letter with your instructor and student services.

Students who have already obtained accommodations from the Accessibility Services Office are encouraged to share their letter with their instructor and with student services in the first week of class. Students should discuss potential accommodations in consultation with their Accessibility Advisor and instructor to understand what may be possible and how the instructor wishes to be informed when an accommodation needs to be actioned. It is the student's responsibility to discuss any extension requests, where possible, in advance of course deadlines.

To book an appointment with an Accessibility Advisor, please connect with the Accessibility Services front desk via email at *accessibility.services@utoronto.ca* or call (416) 978-8060. Consultation appointments are available to discuss any questions about the Accessibility Services registration process and/or potential accommodation support. The on-location Accessibility Advisor at the Faculty of Information is Michael Mercer.

Weekly drop-in appointments are available with Michael for registered students. For more information, visit Accessibility Services and find his name under the Contacts section.

Writing Support

As stated in the Faculty of Information's Grade Interpretation Guidelines, "work that is not well written and grammatically correct will not generally be considered eligible for a grade in the A range, regardless of its quality in other respects." With this in mind, please make use of the writing support provided to graduate students by the SGS Graduate Centre for Academic Communication. The services are designed to target the needs of both native and non-native speakers and all programs are free. Please consult the current SGS Workshops Schedule for more information.

The Faculty of Information Learning Hub can support your learning in this course in a range of ways. They offer programs, workshops, and services to support your learning, as well as a physical place – on the 4th floor of Bissell – for gathering, seeking help, finding resources, studying, creative making, relaxing, playing and collaborating. Below is a partial list of their services:

Cite it Right: All incoming students must complete the Cite it Right online workshop and quiz within the month of September. Cite it Right, with its focus on academic integrity, was designed to familiarize students with the University's *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters* and, more generally, help them build confidence as they work with sources. Both the workshop and quiz are located in the Virtual Learning Hub. Please note that the Dean's Office monitors the completion of these modules, as well as quiz scores.

iSkills Workshops: The iSkills co-curricular workshop series is an expansive program that addresses scholarly, professional, and technical competencies aligned with Faculty of Information academic programs. Rosters are built every term to reflect students' current needs along with trends in the information and heritage professional worlds. View the current roster of workshops and learn more about the program on our iSkills site.

Tutors: The Learning Hub offers one-on-one tutoring services to support writing, research, and technical skills. You can learn more about our tutors' specific areas of expertise, how they can support you, and sign up for individual tutoring on our Writing, Research & Technical Skills Support page. They can help you with assignments for this course at any stage – conceptualizing and planning, drafting, refining, and even after you have received your mark, to help you understand your instructor's comments and plan for your next assignment.

Library Support: The University of Toronto Libraries (UTL) provides a liaison to the Faculty of Information, who is familiar with the specific needs of our students. Yoonhee Lee can connect you to UTL resources, services, and tools, as well as support you with research projects, citation management, and other research-related tasks.

 Academic Integrity

Please consult the University's site on Academic Integrity. The Faculty of Information has a zero-tolerance policy on plagiarism as defined in section B.I.1.(d) of the University's Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters (PDF). You should acquaint yourself with the Code. Please review the material in Cite it Right and if you require further clarification, consult the resource How Not to Plagiarize (PDF).

Cite it Right covers relevant parts of the U of T Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters (1995). It is expected that all Faculty of Information students complete the Cite it Right module and the online quiz prior to the second week of classes of their first term.

As a general rule, **students may not copy or paraphrase from any generative artificial intelligence applications**, including ChatGPT and other AI writing and coding assistants, for the purpose of completing assignments in this course. There are other potentially helpful ways to use generative AI, and we'll discuss these in the course, but the writing you submit in assignments must be your own.

As an anti-plagiarism measure, prior to returning a grade on an assignment the instructor may require the student to meet with them to discuss the submitted work. The purpose of the meeting is to determine whether the student actually wrote the work they submitted. Submitting academic work as one's own when it was actually written by someone else—or some*thing* else, including a generative AI platform such as ChatGPT—is a type of fraud, and will be subject to the plagiarism policies linked above. However, please note that being asked to discuss your submitted assignment is not an accusation of plagiarism; it is simply due diligence on the part of your instructors, who are responsible for ensuring fairness to all students in the course.

Declaring an Absence in Acorn

Students who miss an academic obligation and wish to seek academic consideration in a course may declare an absence using the ACORN Absence Declaration Tool. Students who declare an absence in ACORN should expect to receive reasonable academic consideration from their instructor without the need to present additional supporting documentation. Students can only use the ACORN Absence Declaration Tool once per academic term (e.g., the fall term) for a maximum period of 7 consecutive calendar days.

The ACORN Absence Declaration Tool requires students to select the course(s) they wish to have academic consideration granted, as well as provide the email address(es) to whom their course syllabus identifies as the contact (e.g., instructor, advisor). A record of the absence is sent to the self-provided email(s) at the time of submission, and a receipt of the absence declaration is also sent to the student's University of Toronto email address.

Submitting an absence declaration does not initiate the process of academic consideration. It is the student's responsibility to arrange for academic consideration by contacting the course instructor using the contact information provided in the syllabus.

Students who have already used one absence declaration in a term will be restricted from declaring any further absences using the ACORN Absence Declaration Tool. Students are required to arrange any further academic consideration directly with their instructor and / or student services advisor. Students may be asked to provide supporting documentation as evidence of their absences such as the University approved verification of illness form (VOI).

Academic Dates and Deadlines

See the iSchool's page on Academic Dates & Deadlines. Conflicts with religious observances should be brought to the attention of the course instructor and the Office of the Registrar and Student Services no later than the second week of classes. For more information, please see the Policy on Scheduling of Classes and Examinations and Other Accommodations for Religious Observances.

General Assignment Guidelines

Please make sure to review these guidelines before you begin work on each assignment. The grade will be lowered for assignments that don't follow these guidelines.

Your Descriptive Bibliography/Digital Project Evaluation and Group Presentation report must be written in formal academic English, and submitted in 12-point serif font (such as Times New Roman) with 1-inch margins. A-level assignments will be almost entirely free of writing errors. Be sure to proofread your work carefully before submitting, and consult the writing resources mentioned in the syllabus for extra help.

The American Psychological Association (APA) citation style is the most commonly used one in academic writing in the social sciences, while Chicago and MLA (Modern Language Association) are the most common in the humanities (at least in North America). **For this course, all formal written assignments must use Chicago's notes + bibliography format** , as it is the referencing system most suited to disciplines that work with non-standard sources like the digital artifacts we study in this course. Be aware that the Chicago Style guide also includes an author-date system, but the notes + bibliography system is different, and is the one you should use for this course. It is documented in the *Chicago Manual of Style Online*, which is also an excellent reference for grammar, usage, and other writing conventions in addition to citation. A quick reference can be found here:

www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools_citationguide/citation-guide-1.html. I recommend bookmarking both links in your browser's toolbar.

If it helps to have a model to follow for Chicago Style, I recommend the Cordell article from our course readings (but please use footnotes, not endnotes).

Students are welcome and encouraged to make use of images, including screenshots, in their written assignments within the following guidelines:

1. Images may be included as appendixes or integrated into the body of the text, whichever you prefer; all images must be accompanied by a caption that includes the image's source. It's a good idea to number your images (e.g. "Figure 1") for ease of reference in your text.

2. All but the first two assignments will be read digitally, not printed, so students are welcome to use colour images. However, please be sure to use an image editing program such as *Gimp* (www.gimp.org) or Preview for macOS (Tools -> Adjust size...) to reduce the image file sizes so that the PDF files you submit **don't exceed 10MB**.

If you are unfamiliar with taking screenshots, a brief guide for Windows and PC can be found here: https://lifehacker.com/how-to-take-a-screenshot-or-picture-of-whats-on-your-co-5825771

Participation

This mark is determined by the quality of your contributions to class discussion. This means reading all of the week's primary assigned materials, doing further reading (based on suggestions from the reading list, references from the assigned readings, or your own initiative), allowing yourself enough time to think about the readings, and coming to class with things to say. Participation depends just as much on listening, so you should listen carefully to everyone's contributions, consider the effects of your own comments, and respect all members of the class. Participation on the course's Quercus discussion list will count toward the participation grade. Finally, please remember that participation and attendance are not the same thing. It is possible to attend every single class and still receive a low or failing participation grade if you don't contribute to discussion.

Assignment 1: Quasi-facsimile title page transcription

Due in class, on paper, Wednesday, October 4

This short exercise requires students to prepare a quasi-facsimile transcription of the title page of a hand-press book. The grade is based on how accurately the transcription follows the rules of descriptive bibliography (primarily as laid out in Fredson Bowers's *Principles of Bibliographical Description*), and how accurately the quasi-facsimile represents its material. Our Week 2 class will focus on preparation for this assignment.

For Assignment #1 and #2 you will select a book from a list of the Fisher's holdings, and work on the same book for both assignments. If you have done a similar assignment for another course, you must select a different book for this one. All of the eligible books will be held in the Fisher's main reading room, so you don't have to call them up in advance, as you would with other items in the Fisher's main collection. The reading room attendant can help you locate the book if you're having difficulty.

Each student will sign up for only one book, and each book will have only one student working on it. There will be a paper signup sheet at the reading room attendant's desk -- just ask them when you're ready to sign up for your book.

Books for Assignment #1 and #2:

Books marked "teaching collection" on the list below will be on two shelves immediately on your left as you enter the reading room. Each will have a small paper tab that has the teaching collection number on it (e.g. 18). Please make sure to replace the correct tab in the correct book when you reshelve it!

1. teaching collection no. 18, Cabala, mysteries of state, 1654
2. teaching collection no. 13, The history of the puritans, 1755
3. teaching collection no. 33, Leicester's common-wealth, 1641
4. teaching collection no. 10, Advancement of learning
5. teaching collection no. 26, A dictionary of chemistry
6. teaching collection no. 3, The history of the popes
7. teaching collection no. 28, Quindici tragedie di Vittorio Alfiere, 1808
8. teaching collection no. 41, The lucubrations of Isaac Bickerstaff, 1752
9. teaching collection no. 36, La nouvelle Heloise, 1764
10. teaching collection no. 4, Petri Andreae Matthioli Senensis, 1563
11. teaching collection no. 7, lettres philosophiques et politiques, 1786
12. teaching collection no. 1, Moliere [book 1], 1773
13. teaching collection no. 20, Elemens de Medecine-pratique, 1785
14. teaching collection no. 44, Poetical works of John Dryden [vol. 3],   1784
15. teaching collection no. 30, Ouevres diverses de Pope, 1754
16. teaching collection no. 38, The invader of his country, 1720
17. teaching collection no. 45, Hudibras, 1788
18. teaching collection no. 47, The History of the Rebellion, 1745

The books listed below are also stored in the reading room, but on a different shelf. They'll be on a shelf at the far end of the attendant's desk marked with our course number. The reading room attendant can help you find the right one. Like the books listed above, these will also be permanently shelved in the reading room during our course, so you don't need to call them up in advance. Very important: when returning the book to the attendant, please make sure to tell them it should go back on the INF 2159 shelf, not back into the main collection! That will ensure it will be waiting for you next time.

19. The Holy State, 1663
20. Reliquiæ Wottonianæ, 1654
21. The historie of the holy warre, 1651
22. Plays, never before printed, 1668
23. A discourse concerning the divine providence, 1694
24. Parthenissa, a romance, Part 3, 1655
25. [Ralph Brooke's catalogue, printed by William Stansby], 1622

To prepare for this assignment you should read the section on quasi-facsimile transcription in Gaskell's *New Introduction to Bibliography* (pp. 321-8), as well as supplementary sources such as Greetham's *Textual Scholarship* (pp. 155-61). The ultimate reference work for the rules of quasi-facsimile transcription is Bowers's *Principles of Bibliographic Description* (ch. 4). Copies of these books are available in the Fisher reference collection.

As Greetham notes in his book *Textual Scholarship*, the rules for quasi-facsimile transcription aren't absolutely consistent (pp. 159-60). For the purposes of this assignment, **please follow Gaskell's policy of indicating ligatures**; you can add them to your transcription in pen or pencil if necessary. Also, as Gaskell notes, transcribers sometimes have to choose between approximating the typography of the original or representing it with other forms of visual markup, like underlining (pp. 323-7). This choice is usually determined by the flexibility of the means of reproduction available to the transcriber. For the purposes of this assignment the choice is up to you, and either method is acceptable as long as it is accurate and consistent.

It is also essential to note the distinction between quasi-facsimile transcription and simplified transcription, since this assignment requires you to follow the quasi-facsimile rules, not the simplified rules. Bowers describes the distinction on pp. 180-4. Be aware that some of the transcription examples you may find follow the simplified rules, and shouldn't be used as models for your assignment. Also, you don't need to attempt to reproduce the book's typefaces in your transcription, as some of Gaskell's and Bowers's examples do.

I will accept transcriptions that are a hybrid of print and your own handwriting. For example, you may be able to complete most of the transcription in a word processor and then print it, but you may have to draw the ligature marks by hand afterward. Please note that even if your word processor font automatically simulates ligatures (as some sans-serif fonts do), you'll still need to indicate ligatures in the original using Gaskell's method of drawing a curved line over the connected letters (as shown in the middle example on p. 325), to avoid ambiguity in the encoding system. You should also indicate the long-s in your transcriptions. If you don't know how to make your word processor generate this character, I suggest copying and pasting it from the first sentence of the Wikipedia entry on the character: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Long_s

Assignment 2: Collation and bibliographical description

Due in class, on paper, Wednesday, October 18

This short exercise requires students to provide a complete collation formula, statement of pagination, and contents description for the same book you worked on for the title-page transcription.

The most useful reference for this exercise will be Gaskell's chapter on bibliographical description from *A New Introduction to Bibliography*.

Note that the work you'll need to submit for this exercise isn't nearly as detailed as the examples of full descriptions he gives in Appendix B. For this exercise you need to submit only a collation, pagination statement, and contents description.

For details on the writing of collation formulas, see Gaskell, pp. 328-32, and Chapter 5 of Bowers's *Principles*. Note that your formula should include the format at the beginning (ex. "4o" for a quarto) and, if possible, a description of the paper (ex. "foolscap 4o"). It should also include a statement of signatures, as described in Gaskell, pp. 331-2, and Bowers, pp. 269-71 (include in the collation line, not a separate paragraph; see Bowers on the distinction).

For details on how to write a contents description, see Gaskell, p. 335 and the examples he provides in Appendix B, and Bowers, pp. 289-99. Note Bowers's point on p. 289 that the rules for contents description are not absolute (which I will take into account when grading). You will need to make intelligent decisions about how to adapt the examples that Gaskell and Bowers provide to your specific book.

The grade is based on how accurately the exercise follows the rules of descriptive bibliography (primarily as laid out in Bowers's *Principles of Bibliographical Description*), and how accurately the description matches the material. We will spend much of our week 3 class on the skills required for this assignment, and the field trip to the Massey College Bibliography Room in week 4 will be valuable hands-on preparation, too.

Assignment 3: Evaluation of a descriptive bibliography or digital project

Due as PDF submitted to Quercus, Thursday, November 23 by 5:00 pm
Initial idea for this assignment due via email by Wednesday, November 1

You can complete this assignment in one of two ways.

Option 1. Choose a published descriptive bibliography — one which contains all the elements we have examined to date in the term, i.e., title-page quasi-facsimile transcription, format and collation, and so forth — and write an evaluative essay about it, keeping in mind concepts we are learning in class. Your evaluation should consider the following:

- What is the topic, and why did the author of the bibliography consider it important to produce a bibliography on that particular subject? If the topic is an author bibliography, who is the author? (Don't assume your reader will know.)

- What does the bibliography include and exclude? The latter part of the question may be harder to answer, but this may be the most important part.

- Are basic bibliographical principles set out in the text? If so, what are those principles, are they appropriate for the material, and how effectively does the rest of the work follow them?
- Has the author described their method of analytical and descriptive bibliography? How does it follow or depart from what you have been learning so far?

- Do they discuss — and, even more importantly, understand — the concepts of edition, impression, issue, and state, and follow through on these concepts?

An A-level paper will make good use of secondary sources in its analysis, which may include course readings or other scholarly source relevant to the topic. If you have any questions as to whether your chosen example is suitable or not, please consult with me well in advance of the deadline. If the book is a circulating copy, please hand it in with the assignment. If you are using a non-circulating title, please make sure it is back on the shelf where I can find it.

Option 2. Choose a scholarly digital project that provides access to books or other bibliographical materials, and write an evaluative essay about it, keeping in mind concepts we are learning in class. Reviews may contain many different elements, depending on the topic covered, but items to be considered should consider the following:

- What is the topic, and why did the makers of the project consider it worthwhile?

- What does the project include and exclude? The latter part of the question may be harder to answer, but this may be the most important part.

- Does the project's design and execution reflect an understanding of bibliographic principles? (If the answer is a straight-up _no_, you might need to choose a different digital project.) What are those principles, are they appropriate for the material, and how effectively does the rest of the work follow them?

- How granular is the bibliographical information given by the project? Does it deal with classifications like edition, impression, issue and state, or other categories at a comparable level of detail? Is copy-specific information included?

- How well does the project take advantage of digital media to represent bibliographical phenomena and analysis? What kinds of analysis does the project enable, and how might the resource be used in conjunction with a visit by a researcher to the digitized materials themselves?

An A-level essay will make good use of secondary sources in its analysis, which may include course readings or other scholarly source relevant to the topic. Digital projects frequently have scholarly publications and blogs associated with them, so be sure to check for secondary sources that are specifically about the project you're dealing with.

You will need to think carefully about the scope of your chosen project in relation to the scope of this assignment — indeed, you may need to avoid taking on too big a project. *Early English Books Online*, for example, is ineligible because of its size and complexity, and I'm specifically disqualifying that project because so much has been written about it already. Also, a blog such as *[The Collation](#)* or a learning resource such as *[Quill: Books Before Print](#)*, though they are excellent resources in their own right, would be inappropriate because they weren't created specifically to give access to a particular book or collection.

An appropriate case study for option 2 might be:

1. a rare book exhibition website (ex.: https://library.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/static/onlineexhibits/alice/index.html)

2. a clearly defined subset of a larger project (e.g. the "Published Works" section at the *[Walt Whitman Archive](#)*);

3. a specific tool or interface that enables access to a larger collection (e.g. the Folger Shakespeare Library's Luna interface: http://luna.folger.edu).

Avoid choosing a project with little bibliographical value, such as Project Gutenberg, or one that trades bibliographical rigor for mass digitization, such as the Internet Archive or Google Book Search. It would be possible to write a highly critical review of a digitization project that ignores bibliography entirely, but you will learn more by selecting a project that makes some attempt to represent material books in the ways bibliographers understand them. In other words, don't just settle for an easy target; find an example that prompts you to think intelligently and critically about the aims of bibliography and digitization alike. If you have any questions as to whether the digitization project chosen is suitable or not, please consult with me well in advance of the deadline.

Assignment 4: Group presentation on born-digital bibliography

Presentation: 15 minutes, followed by 10-15 minutes of class discussion
Written report: 2,500-3,000 words, excluding bibliography, notes, and images; due via Quercus by 5:00 pm on the Wednesday following your group's presentation

Students will work in groups of 3 on this assignment (with one group of 4). (Note: for logistical reasons, I cannot consider groups smaller than 3; we won't have enough presentation timeslots.) All students in the group will receive the same grade, and the presentation and written report will be graded separately. All students in the group must be involved in the presentation. The presentation grade will include how well the group field questions from the rest of the class. (Asking good questions on presentation day will, in turn, be reflected in students' participation grade.) Time will be enforced strictly, and presentations that go overtime will be penalized. For the sake of a good discussion, and not treading on the time of other presenters', please make extra sure that your presentation doesn't exceed the 15-minute limit. The written report may build upon the presentation, including lessons learned from the presentation experience and questions, and may incorporate additional material omitted from the presentation for the sake of time.

In simple terms, this assignment requires research teams to:

1. identify a particular born-digital text, artifact, or other form of media that could be usefully studied from a bibliographical perspective;

2. research the history and nature of your example, applying or adapting bibliographical principles and methods learned in class, and, where appropriate, combining them with methods borrowed from other disciplines (see the Kirschenbaum readings for an example of how textual scholars do this);

3. present the results of your research to the class, giving particular attention to:

    o   why this material is of potential value for bibliographical research, incl. how it exemplifies or complicates ideas we've encountered in our readings and lectures;

    o   what insights into the nature of bibliographical research you gained along the way.

This assignment is essentially a form of bibliographical field-work: it requires you to go exploring, and to practice textual scholarship in the wild. This may require research into the ways various online communities (including and especially non-professional ones) have dealt with various kinds of textual problems with digital artifacts -- even though those communities may be completely unaware of bibliography as a field.
Guidelines for referencing, format, and images are the same as for the descriptive bibliography evaluation, detailed above. This assignment will also require you to cite various kinds of websites and objects that don't fit easily into the Chicago Manual of Style format. In those cases, you should emulate the emerging conventions of fields like critical code studies (again, see the Kirschenbaum readings), and overall, do your best to apply the general principles of bibliographical citation as embodied by the Chicago Manual. When in doubt, the ultimate guideline is that another researcher should be able to use your citation to find the same materials.

As an appendix to the written report (not included in the word count), please include a brief description of each group member's contribution to the project as a whole.

All groups are expected to consult with the instructor about their topic early in the research process, and at least **three weeks** prior to their presentation.

Due Dates at a Glance

See the Assignment Instructions page for details, including how to submit each assignment.

Wednesday, October 4	Assignment #1 due
Wednesday, ~~October 18~~ October 25	Assignment #2 due
Wednesday, November 1	Email me your assignment #3 idea
Thursday, November 23	Assignment #3 due
3 weeks prior to your group's presentation date	Consult with me about presentation topic
1 week after your group's presentation date	Written presentation report due

Weekly class schedule and readings

Sept. 13 **Week 1 — Introduction**

Before class:

- read Trevor Howard-Hill, "Why Bibliography Matters," in *A Companion to the History of the Book*, edited by Simon Eliot and Jonathan Rose (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 9–20

After class:

- review this week's lecture slides: week 1 slides.pdf
- look at the books on the list of teaching collection books eligible for Assignments #1 and #2, and decide on your top 3-4 preferences
- explore the following three readings, each of which answers the questions "why does bibliography matter? what can you do with it?" in different ways, and from three very different points in history:
  - W.W. Greg, "What Is Bibliography?", *Transactions of the Bibliographical Society* 12 (1914): 39–53 [based on an address given to the Bibliographical Society in London in **1912]**
  - D.F. McKenzie, "The Sociology of a Text: Oral Culture, Literacy, and Print in Early New Zealand," in *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (Cambridge University Press, 1999), 77–128 [based on an address given to the Bibliographical Society in London in **1983**]
  - Ryan Cordell, "Towards a Bibliography for AI Systems," RyanCordell.com [paper for Andrew W. Mellon Society of Fellows in Critical Bibliography forum on "Preserving and Analyzing Digital Texts"], posted **April 21, 2023**: https://ryancordell.org/research/aibibliography/

Sept. 20 **Week 2 — Title Pages and Bibliographical Description**

Before class:

- read Sarah Werner, Introduction to *Studying Early Printed Books* (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, 2019), 1–7
- read Margaret M. Smith, "The Role of Mass Production," in The Title Page: Its Early Development, 1460–1510 (London: The British Library; New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll Press, 2000), 11–23 [Smith - the title page - intro.pdf]
- read David Greetham, "Describing the Text: Descriptive Bibliography," in *Textual Scholarship: An Introduction* (New York: Garland, 1994), 153–168

After class:

- this week's lecture slides are included in the PDF file for the week 1 slides, linked above
- further reading:
    - o (required for Assignments #1 and #2) Philip Gaskell, "Bibliographical Description," in *A New Introduction to Bibliography (*New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll Press, 1995), 321–35 [Gaskell - bibliographical description.pdf]
    - o (required for Assignments #1 and #2) Fredson Bowers, excerpt from chapter 4 of *Principles of Bibliographical Description* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1949) [Bowers - Principles - title pages.pdf]
    - o Eleanor F. Shevlin, "'To Reconcile Book and Title, and Make 'em Kin to One Another': the Evolution of the Title's Contractual Functions," *Book History* 2 (1999): 42-77

Sept. 27 **Week 3 – Imposition, Format, and Collation**

This week our class will take place in the Bissell Building, Room 507

Before class:

- read Sarah Werner, Part 1 ("Overview") in *Studying Early Printed Books,* 8–25
- in Part 2 ("Step By Step"), read the subsections "Format" and "Printing," 42–65
- if you haven't already, read Gaskell from the previous week and skim-read Bowers

After class:

- further reading:
    - o G. Thomas Tanselle, "The Concept of Format," *Studies in Bibliography* 53 (2000): 67-115 (N.B. the critique of Gaskell, esp. on pp. 94-5)
    - o Jonathan Sterne, "Format Theory," in *MP3: the Meaning of a Format* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2012), 1–31; this introduction to Sterne's book is fairly long, and much of it is specific to the history of the MP3 format; feel free to read this piece selectively, but pay special attention to Sterne's discussion of format theory from p. 7 onward

Oct. 4   **Week 4 — Field Trip to the Bibliography Room, Massey College**

Class will begin at 12:00 this week. For logistical details, please see the announcements section.

Assignment 1 due in class today

Before class:

- check out some of the videos on the Massey College Bibliography Room's YouTube channel
- explore these three articles:
   o Jacqueline Goldsby and Meredith McGill, "What is 'Black' about Black Bibliography?", *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 116, no. 2 (2022): 161–341
   o Kate Ozment, "Rationale for Feminist Bibliography," *Textual Cultures* 13, no. 1 (2020): 149–178
   o Jeffrey Masten, "On Q: an Introduction to Queer Philology," in *Queer Philologies: Sex, Language, and Affect in Shakespeare's Time* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016), 1–38

After class:

- explore the website for the Black Bibliography Project at Yale ,led by Jacqueline Goldsby and Meredith McGill; n.b. their page devoted to the importance of descriptive bibliography to this project's goals
- further reading:
   o articles by Christopher Adams and Eve Houghton in *PBSA* vol. 116, no. 4 (2022)
   o Elizabeth McHenry, "'Out of the business once established could grow various enterprises': W.E.B. Du Bois and the Ed. L. Simon & Co. Printers," *Book History* 24, no. 2 (2021): 405–450
   o Kinohi Nishikawa, *Street Players: Black Pulp Fiction and the Making of a Literary Underground* (University of Chicago Press, 2019)
   o Jeffrey Masten, "Pressing Subjects; Or, the Secret Lives of Shakespeare's Compositors," in *Language Machines: Technologies of Literary and Cultural Production*, edited by Jeffrey Masten, Peter Stallybrass, and Nancy Vickers (New York: Routledge, 1997), 75–107

Oct. 11   **Week 5 — Edition, Impression, Issue, and State**

Before class:

- read Sarah Werner, Part 3 ("On the Page") in *Studying Early Printed Books*, 79–101
- read Joseph Dane, "'Ideal Copy' vs. 'Ideal Texts': the Application of Bibliographical Description to Facsimiles," in *Abstractions of Evidence in the Study of Manuscripts and Early Printed Books* (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2009), 77-94 [Dane - ideal copy.pdf]

After class:

- review our lecture slides on format and Assignment 2: collation slides.pdf (this version is revised from the slides shown in class)
- further reading:
    - D.F. McKenzie, "Printers of the Mind: Some Notes on Bibliographical Theories and Printing-House Practices," in *Making Meaning: "Printers of the Mind" and Other Essays*, edited by Peter D. McDonald and Michael F. Suarez (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002), 13–85
    - G. Thomas Tanselle, "The Concept of 'Ideal Copy,'" *Studies in Bibliography* 33 (1980): 18-53

Oct. 18   **Week 6 — Paper and Type**

Before class:

- in Part 2 ("Step By Step") of Sarah Werner's *Studying Early Printed Books,* read the subsections "Paper" and "Type" (26–42)
- read Megan L. Benton, "Typography and Gender: Remasculating the Modern Book," in *Illuminating Letters: Typography and Literary Interpretation*, edited by Paul C. Gutjahr and Megan L. Benton (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2001), 71-93 [Benton - typography and gender.pdf]
- read Whitney Trettien, "Substrate, Platform, Interface, Format," *Textual Cultures* 16, no. 1 (2023): 286–312

After class:

- review this week's lecture slides: edition, state etc slides.pdf
- for more on the 1611 King James Bible, read Peter Stallybrass, "Visible and Invisible Letters: Text Versus Image in Renaissance England and Europe," in *Visible Writings: Cultures, Forms, Readings*, edited by Marija Dalbello and Mary Shaw (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2011), 77-99 [Stallybrass - Visible Letters.pdf]

Oct. 25   **Week 7 — The Struggle for tne Text: Error and Correction**

Assignment #2 due in class today

Guest speaker: Randall McLeod, Department of English

Before class:

- read Random Clod, "Information on Information," *Text: Transactions of the Society for Textual Scholarship* 5 (1991): 241–81 [Cloud - Information.pdf] (N.B. when printing this article or reading it online, try to keep the proper pages facing each other, as the article would have been printed. You'll see why once you download the article...)
- read Andie Silva, "Corrections," in *Architectures of the Book* (posted 2015; updated 2019)

After class:

- further reading:
    - David McKitterick, "A House of Errors," in Print, Manuscript and the Serach for Order, 1450–1830 (Cambridge University Press, 2003), 97–138 [McKitterick - house of errors.pdf]
    - David Norton, ch. 3 of *A Textual History of the King James Bible* (Cambridge University Press, 2005), 46-61 [Norton - ch3 of Textual History of the KJB.pdf]
    - Peter Stallybrass, "Visible and Invisible Letters: Text Versus Image in Renaissance England and Europe," in *Visible Writings: Cultures, Forms, Readings*, edited by Marija Dalbello and Mary Shaw (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2011), 77-99 [Stallybrass - Visible Letters.pdf]
    - Vicki Mahaffey, "Intentional Error: The Paradox of Editing James Joyce's *Ulysses,*" in *Representing Modernist Texts: Editing as Interpretation*, edited by George Bornstein (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1991), 171-91 [Mahaffey - Intentional Error.pdf]
    - Sam Slote, *Ulysses in the Plural: the Variable Editions of Joyce's Novel* (Dublin: National Library of Ireland, 2004)

Nov. 1 **Week 8 — Field Trip to the Bibliography Room, Massey College (redux)**

Class will begin at 12:00 this week. For logistical details, please see the announcements section.

Before class:

- in Part 2 ("Step By Step") of Sarah Werner's *Studying Early Printed Books,* read the subsections "Illustrations" and "Binding" (65–78)
- read Kari Krauss, "Picture Criticism: Textual Studies and the Image," in *The Cambridge Companion to Textual Scholarship*, edited by Neil Fraistat and Julia Flanders (Cambridge University Press, 2013), 236–56

After class:

- for an important theoretical discussion of image reproduction technologies, see Walter Benjamin's classic essay "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," in *Illuminations*, trans. Harry Zohn (New York: Schocken Books, 2007), 217–42 [Benjamin - Work of Art.pdf]
- at the end of my station with Katie, we looked briefly at *The Deep*, published by Tara Books in India; they post brilliant short films about their books, and I recommend in particular the first three films on this page (on The Deep, *Creation*, and *Brer Rabbit Retold*)
- as Kit mentioned, the MET Museum in New York has some great web pages with videos showing several of the image-making techniques we discussed on our field trip, from woodcuts to lithography and more
- if you're interested in learning some of the book arts first-hand, check out the courses offered by the Canadian Bookbinders and Book Artists Guild (CBBAG) and the Clark Centre for the Arts

Nov. 8   **Reading Week**

I will hold my office hour as usual this week, and will be working in the Fisher Library reading room and available for informal consultation through much of the week.

Nov. 15   <u>**Week 9 – Born-Digital Bibliography: E-Books**</u>

Two group presentations

Before class:

- read (sorry) Alan Galey, "The Enkindling Reciter: E-Books in the Bibliographical Imagination," *Book History* 15 (2012): 210-47
- read Whitney Anne Trettien, "A Deep History of Electronic Textuality: the Case of *English Reprints Jhon Milton Areopagitica*," *Digital Humanities Quarterly* 7, no. 1 (2013): http://www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/7/1/000150/000150.html

After class:

- review this week's lecture slides [born-digital bibliography and ebooks.pdf] and handout [born-digital bibliograpy quotations handout.pdf]
  - o the lecture slides contain images relevant to my article on *The Sentimentalists* but which I didn't have time to discuss in today's class; hopefully those slides will make sense alongside the article
- further reading:
  - o Simon Rowberry, "Ebookness," *Convergence: the International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies* 23, no. 3 (2017): 289–305
  - o Simon Rowberry, *The Early Development of Project Gutenberg, c. 1970–2000* (Cambridge University Press, 2023)
  - o John W. Maxwell, "E-Book Logic: We Can Do Better," *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of Canada* 51, no. 1 (2013): 29-47
  - o Ellen McCracken, "Expanding Genette's Epitext/Peritext Model for Transitional Electronic Literature: Centrifugal and Centripetal Vectors on Kindles and iPads," *Narrative* 21, no. 1 (2013): 105–124
  - o Simone Murray, "Digital Books," in *Introduction to Contemporary Print Culture: Books as Media* (New York: Routledge, 2021): 201–219

Nov. 22   <u>**Week 10 — Born-Digital Bibliography: Electronic Literature**</u>

Assignment #3 due this week
One group presentation

Before class:

- read Matthew G. Kirschenbaum, "Editing the Interface: Textual Studies and First Generation Electronic Objects," *Text* 14 (2002): 15-51

After class:

- review this week's lecture slides: week 10 slides.pdf

- further reading
    - Matthew G. Kirschenbaum, *Mechanisms: New Media and the Forensic Imagination* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2008)
    - Adam Hammond, *Literature in a Digital Age: a Critical Introduction* (Cambridge University Press, 2016)
    - N. Katherine Hayles, "Print Is Flat, Code Is Deep: the Importance of Media-Specific Analysis," *Poetics Today* 25, no. 1 (2004): 67–90
- references from our class discussion
    - on literacy vs literacies: Patricia Crain, "New Histories of Literacy." In *A Companion to the History of the Book*, edited by Simon Eliot and Jonathan Rose (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 467–479
    - the first born-accessible book: Amanda Leduc, *Disfigured: On Fairy Tales, Disability, and Making Space* (Toronto: Coach House Books, 2020)
    - Jennifer Esmail, *Reading Victorian Deafness: Signs and Sounds in Victorian Literature and Culture* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2013)
    - Oliver Sacks, *Musicophilia: Tales of Music and the Brain* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2007)
    - we ran out of time, but I was planning to show you the printout of what it possibly the first computer-generated poems in Canada, and one of the first anywhere, titled "Space Conquest: Computer Poem" and written/assembled by Earle Birney and some human and machine collaborators in 1968; it's discussed at length in Dean Irvine, "Mission Control: An Operator's Manual for Compulibratories," *Amodern* 4 (March 2015): http://amodern.net/article/mission-control/

Nov. 29 **Week 11 — Born-Digital Bibliography: Music and Streaming**

Two group presentations

Before class:

- Thomas Wilmeth, "Textual Problems within the Canon of Hank Williams," *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 93, no. 3 (1999): 379-406

After class:

- review this week's lecture slides (including some slides I didn't have time to discuss; feel free to ask me about anything in them): week 11 slides.pdf
- consider submitting a proposal for the 2024 Book History & Print Culture student colloquium (due by **December 16**); you don't have to be a BHPC student to take part, and I'm happy to advise students on their proposals
- further reading
    - Lee Marshall, "For and Against the Record Industry: an Introduction to Bootleg Collectors and Tape Traders," *Popular Music* 22, no. 1 (2003): 57–72
    - Maria Eriksson, *et al.*, *Spotify Teardown: Inside the Black Box of Streaming Music* (New York: Routledge, 2019)
    - Margie Borschke, *This Is Not a Remix: Piracy, Authenticity, and Popular Music* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2017)

- o Kenneth Womack, "Editing the Beatles: Addressing the Roles of Authority and Editorial Theory in the Creation of Popular Music's Most Valuable Canon," *Text* 11 (1998): 189-205
- o David A. Wallace, "Co-Creation of the Grateful Dead Sound Archive: Control, Access, and Curation Communities," in *Community Archives: the Shaping of Memory*, ed. Jeanette A. Bastian and Ben Alexander (London: Facet, 2009), 169–93 [Wallace - Grateful Dead archives.pdf]
- o Alan Galey, "Looking for a Place to Happen: Collective Memory, Digital Music Archiving, and the Tragically Hip," *Archivaria* 86 (2018): 6–43
- o (not on music per se, but on musical theatre) Doug Reside, "Last Modified January 1996: the Digital History of *Rent*," *Theatre Survey* 52, no. 2 (2011): 335–340.

Dec. 6   **Week 12 — Born-Digital Bibliography: Video Games**

Two group presentations

Before class:

- read Chris J. Young, "The Bibliographical Variants Between *The Last of Us* and *The Last of Us Remastered*," *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 110, no. 3 (2016): 459–84

After class:

- review this week's lecture slides: week 12 slides.pdf
- check out some of the websites mentioned in class:
  - o https://www.unseen64.net/
  - o https://tcrf.net/The_Cutting_Room_Floor
  - o The Valve Archive: https://valvearchive.com/about/
- further reading
  - o Steven E. Jones, *The Meaning of Video Games: Gaming and Textual Strategies* (New York: Routledge, 2008)
  - o articles in my special issue of *Games and Culture* on "Video Games and Paratextuality"
  - o Nathan Altice, *I Am Error: the Nintendo Family Computer / Entertainment System Platform* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2015)
  - o James Newman, *Best Before: Videogames, Superession, and Obsolescence* (New York: Routledge, 2012)
  - o Part 3, "Games & Interactive Fiction: Collecting for Preservation," in the Preserving Virtual Worlds Project's Final Report (2010), 19–32