

INF 2331: The Future of the Book

Winter 2021

Instructor: Alan Galey

Teaching Assistant: Anna Kalinowski

Tech Support Assistant: Akriti Kaur



A smartphone held in a printer's composing stick. Photo by Leora Bromberg, taken in the Massey College Bibliography Room.

Important Details for the Winter 2021 term

Given the new challenges we are all facing during the COVID-19 pandemic, I have restructured not only the course's delivery mode, but also some of its assignments, deadlines, course policies, and content. However, the learning outcomes remain the same. This section covers the essential logistical details.

Delivery mode: Our course will take place entirely online, with synchronous classes that you are expected to attend. Each week we will meet via Zoom on Tuesday at 1:00 EST. We will not use the full three hours allocated for class, but you are still expected to keep 1:00 - 4:00 EST free in your schedule. When the formal part of class ends, you are free to leave but I'll remain on Zoom to chat with students and consult about assignments until 4:00.

Contact details: The best way to reach me is by email at alan.galey@utoronto.ca. Our TA, Anna Kalinowski, can be reached at annamaria.kalinowski@mail.utoronto.ca. Please use regular email rather than Quercus's built-in messaging system. I normally respond to messages by the end of the next business day (Monday to Friday) at the latest. I take a break from email during evenings (EST), weekends, and university holidays—and I don't expect students to read or answer messages during these times either—but otherwise during regular business hours I always answer student emails first.

Office hours: In addition to informal, drop-in office hours on Zoom after our Tuesday class, I will hold an office hour on Wednesdays from 3:30 to 4:30 pm EST. Students can sign up for individual 20-minute Zoom appointments via the course calendar in Quercus (the calendar link should appear in the menu on the left). Anna will also be holding office hours prior to assignment deadlines, and we will announce the times and signup methods via Quercus.

Course policy on recordings and privacy

From the University of Toronto's Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FIPP) office:

This course, including your participation, will be recorded on video and will be available to students in the course for viewing remotely and after each session.

Course videos and materials belong to your instructor, the University, and/or other sources depending on the specific facts of each situation, and are protected by copyright. Do not download, copy, or share any course or student materials or videos without the explicit permission of the instructor.

For questions about recording and use of videos in which you appear please contact your instructor.

Each week I will make available on MS Stream the video recording of our Zoom class. (Breakout rooms and post-class conversations on Zoom won't be included in these videos.) Class recordings will be available for two weeks after the class takes place, and then I will take them down. Please don't treat these videos as a substitute for attending class. If you miss the in-class group exercises, you will be missing a substantial part of the course and preparation for the assignments.

In our Zoom classes and meetings outside of class, you are welcome and encouraged to turn on your video, but no one will be required to turn their video on at any point in course. There are many reasons for this, including privacy, and no one needs to explain if they choose to leave their video off. Students are welcome to use one of Zoom's virtual backgrounds, but please avoid anything with animation or other distracting elements (e.g. the one with waves rolling onto a tropical beach).

Advisory for students taking this course from outside of Canada

From the University of Toronto's Information Security Council:

If you are a citizen of another country, and/or accessing your courses at the University of Toronto from a jurisdiction outside of Canada, please note that you may be subject to the laws of the country in which you are residing, or any country of which you have citizenship. The University of Toronto has a long-established commitment to freedom of expression, with this right enabled by an environment valuing respect, diversity, and inclusion. In your classes, you may be assigned readings, or discuss topics that are against the law in other jurisdictions. I encourage you to become familiar with any local laws that may apply to you and any potential impact on you if course content and information could be considered illegal, controversial, or politically sensitive. If you have any concerns about these issues, please contact your instructor directly to discuss with them.

Course Description

This course considers the history and possible futures of books in a digital world. In this course "the book" is interpreted broadly, meaning not just an object with covers and pages, but also an evolving metaphor for conceptual frameworks for knowledge, and a metonym that brings together many different technologies, institutions, and cultural practices. The course introduces students to interdisciplinary approaches such as book history, textual studies, history of reading, and digital humanities, with an emphasis on balancing theoretical speculation with practical implementation. Readings will survey topics such as the ontology of born-digital artifacts, critical assessment of digitization projects, collaborative knowledge work, reading devices (old and new), e-book interface design, text/image/multimedia relationships, theories and practices of markup, the gendering of technologies, the politics of digital archiving, the materiality of texts, and the epistemology of digital tools. Students will also receive a practical introduction to XML markup and visualization tools.

Student Learning Outcomes

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

- use different disciplinary and theoretical frameworks to understand the changing form of the book from a range of perspectives (assessed through discussion posts);
- understand how specific technologies, such as XML and the EPUB format, affect the design possibilities, implementation choices, and preservation challenges inherent in various forms of digital text (assessed through discussion posts and the digital archive profile);
- situate changes in authorship, publishing, and reading within historical, social, and cultural contexts (assessed through discussion posts);
- apply theoretical and practical knowledge gained in the course to current debates regarding the digitization of print books, the dissemination of e-books, and experimentation with new forms of the book (assessed through discussion posts and the Twine project).

Relationship between Course Learning Outcomes and [MI Program Learning Outcomes](#)

The future of the book 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 digital 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

- 15% Discussion posts (first assessment)
- 25% Discussion posts (second assessment)
- 25% Digital archive profile
- 35% Twine project and report (group assignment)

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. 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

Late assignments will be penalized 3% per day (including weekends) for up to two weeks, starting at 6:00 pm EST on the due date. Extensions will only be granted in cases of illness or personal disruptions. Assignments that are more than two weeks late without an extension will not be accepted, and will receive a grade of zero. Late assignments, with or without an extension, may not receive written feedback.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, the University is temporarily suspending the need for a doctor's note or medical certificate for absences from academic participation; students should use the [Absence Declaration tool on ACORN](#) to declare an absence if they require consideration for missed academic work; students are responsible for contacting instructors to request the academic consideration they are seeking; students should record each day of their absence as soon as it begins, up until the day before they return to classes or other academic activities.

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.

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 or the TA about their grade until at least 24 hours have passed, to ensure that no emails are sent in the heat of the moment, so to speak. Also, before Anna or I meet with students to discuss their grades, we expect them to do three things: 1) re-read the assignment instructions in full; 2) re-read their own submitted assignment in full; and 3) re-read the feedback, which may include marginal notes on the assignment document itself. 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 needs are welcome in this course. If you have a disability or a health consideration that may require accommodations, please feel free to approach Student Services and/or the Accessibility Services Office <http://www.studentlife.utoronto.ca/as> as soon as possible. The Accessibility Services staff are available by appointment to assess needs, provide referrals 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.

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.

Academic Integrity

Please consult the University's site on Academic Integrity <http://academicintegrity.utoronto.ca/>. 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 <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/ppjun011995.pdf>. You should acquaint yourself with the Code. Please review the material

in Cite it Right and if you require further clarification, consult the site How Not to Plagiarize <http://advice.writing.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/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 take the Cite it Right workshop and the online quiz. Completion of the online Cite it Right quiz should be made prior to the second week of classes as the workshop is now interactive. To review and complete the workshop, visit the Orientation Workshop portion of the Inforum site: <https://inforum.library.utoronto.ca/workshops/orientation>

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 Digital Archive Profile and Twine Project 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](#) that's also required reading for the Digital Archive Profile (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. 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 20MB**.
3. Students may include copyrighted images in their assignments and discussion board posts without acquiring permission as long as they follow the Canadian Copyright Act's current exceptions for fair dealing, in that the images must only be used for the purposes of criticism or review, and each image must be accompanied by: 1) the source; and 2) the name of the creator.

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

Discussion Group Assignment

Due dates for 7 required posts throughout the term: Jan. 20, Feb. 2, Feb. 16 (first assessment after this post), March 2, March 16, March 30, April 13

Required posts in response to assigned questions should be 500-800 words

Discussion with other students is an important part of this course. For the duration of the course, students will be part of a discussion group of about five people. Your group membership is pre-assigned, and you can find your group in the "People" section, linked in the left-hand menu, and under the "Groups" tab. Within these group discussion spaces, you will contribute original posts approximately every two weeks in response to questions set by the professor for the whole class (for a total of seven required posts). The questions will be shared well ahead of the due dates for posts, and designed to let you explore the topic and draw in your own interests, responses to class material, and research for your assignments. (You can see some examples of previous questions here, and some of these might show up again in our course.)

Group members are expected to interact with each other, commenting or replying to each other's contributions to create an ongoing dialogue about different aspects of the course topic. Also, to help you get to know your group members, you'll also be working with them whenever we have in-class exercises in breakout rooms on Zoom. Students are welcome to go beyond the assigned questions and use their group blogs to generate new lines of discussion, provided they're somehow related to the course topic.

In your discussion board posts, links, media, and block quotations are welcome, but these should never stand alone; they should always be accompanied by discussion of contents and an explanation of why they are included. Quotations and references should be indicated either with a link or more formal citation, depending on the material. (The test of any citation is that another reader should be able to follow your trail back to the same point in your source.) If Chicago Notes + Bibliography proves awkward for this medium, you can use an author-date format like APA, but in that case please avoid dropped-in citations (Galey, 2021) that don't actually engage with the cited material in a specific way. For discussion posts, quality of engagement with secondary sources from the course (and beyond) matters more than quantity.

The writing can be informal and conversational (like a blog), and your posts will not be graded as though they were mini-essays—though grammatical or other writing errors that affect clarity will lower the grade.

Your discussion group posts will be reviewed and graded twice over the course of the term, once during the first half of the semester (with grade and feedback returned prior to the drop date), and once during the second half. For the first assessment, we will be grading your answers to the first three discussion questions and any comments you've posted until the end of the day on **Friday, February 19** (i.e. three days after post #3 is due). Similarly, we will begin the second assessment after **Friday, April 15**, giving you three days after the last post's due date to add any comments.

Your grade for this assignment will be based on the consistency and relevance of your individual contributions to the discussion group. Here, "consistency" means that contributions—both original posts and comments—reflect a timely, ongoing engagement with weekly readings, materials, research, etc. "Relevance" means that the contribution contains one or more of the following: familiarity with course readings and other materials (lectures, class discussions, etc.), as demonstrated through the use of specific examples, author names or theoretical concepts; inclusion of themes and points that have a clear and direct relevance to the course topic; discussion of literature, problems, ideas, examples and current events that pertain directly to your assignments, which includes consideration of the course readings and themes. Commenting on other group members' posts is also expected, and the frequency and quality of your engagement with others' posts will be taken into consideration in the grading. Students who only post and do not comment on other posts will not receive a grade in the A range on this assignment.

Digital Archive Profile

*1,200-1,400 words, excluding notes, bibliography, and images
Due as PDF submitted to Quercus by 6:00 pm on Friday, Feb. 26*

This [lecture video](#) (60 min.) expands on the instructions below, with examples, and you can also look at the key slides as a standalone file: [archives profile video slides.pdf](#). Please keep in mind that the video isn't a substitute for reading the assignment instructions carefully (including the general guidelines above). I recommend reading the written instructions and the Cordell article first, and then watching the video.

This assignment is based on an article that supplements our weekly class reading:

Ryan Cordell, "'Q i-jtb the Raven': Taking Dirty OCR Seriously," *Book History* 20 (2017): 188–225
[<https://muse-jhu-edu.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/article/674968>]

As preparation for this assignment, students are advised to begin by reading this article carefully. For this assignment, you will select a specific digital archive related to our course topic and profile the ways it presents its materials, as well as the audiences and communities that provide its broader social contexts. Although Cordell's article focuses on the digitization of specific 19th-century American newspapers, he offers four questions that could be adapted to nearly any kind of digital archive:

1. *What metadata does the archive's interface provide about the historical originals of its materials, its digitized edition(s), or both? (p. 202)*
2. *What information about this archive's historical originals and their digitization can be gleaned from the metadata encoded across the image and text files it provides? (p. 204)*
3. *What can be learned about the material and sociological processes of this digitization through paratexts such as grant applications, digitization guidelines, or project reports? (p. 208)*
4. *What can be learned about a given digitization through paratexts about previous remediations? (p. 212)*

Cordell's article goes on to provide detailed answers to each of these questions in the context of his case study. Your assignment should address each of these four questions in a similar manner—albeit in much less detail, given the smaller scope, and you may need to adapt the questions to suit the digital archive that you choose to study. If any of the questions isn't applicable to your example, explain why. (But if more than one question seems inapplicable, you might need to find a different example.)

In terms of materials, we will take a broad approach to what qualifies as a "digital archive" for this assignment—though your chosen archive must be demonstrably related to the course topic. Like Cordell in his article, you might choose to study a digital archive that fits the more traditional definitions of the term, and preserves digital records of cultural heritage materials that were originally non-digital, offered through a traditional institutional context like a library, museum, archives, or university-based digital humanities project. Examples of eligible digital archives that fall into this category include:

- [The Rossetti Archive](#)
- [The Martin Luther King, Jr. Papers Project](#)
- [The SpokenWeb project](#)
- [The British Library's online manuscripts and archives](#)
- [The Story Nations project](#)
- [Early English Books Online](#)
- [The Charles Harpur Critical Archive](#)
- almost any of the digitization projects associated with the U of T-based [LGBTQ Oral History Digital Collaboratory](#)
- [The Electronic Literature Archives](#)

However, some of the most interesting digital archives fall into the category of what Abigail DeKosnik has called "rogue archives" (*Rogue Archives: Digital Cultural Memory and Internet Fandom*, MIT Press, 2016), though the less dramatic term *community archives* may be more helpful. These are archives operated outside of institutional or corporate contexts by online communities, fans, and dedicated amateurs. The boundary between this category and the preceding one can get blurry, but examples that fall into these categories category might include:

- [Archive of Our Own](#) and similar fan-fiction archives
- [First Screening: Computer Poems](#) by bpNicol
- Genius.com (in its [song lyrics](#) sections)
- [A Museum After Dark](#) (a site dedicated to lyrical references in the music of The Tragically Hip)

The defining quality of an eligible digital archive for this assignment is that it needs to take an active role in the preservation of digitized or born-digital cultural materials, and does so according to some identifiable logic and sense of mission. Ideally, your digital archive should have an "About Us" page or the equivalent, which is an example of the kinds of paratexts that Cordell mentions in his 3rd and 4th questions. If your chosen digital archive is a mass digitization project (e.g. Early English Books Online), or even just a large critical digitization project (like the Charles Harpur Critical Archive), you may need to arbitrarily narrow the scope of your profile to part of the project that can serve as an example—even just an individual record or two, provided they are representative of the project overall.

Your submitted profile should follow the assignment formatting and referencing guidelines laid out in the General Assignment Guidelines section. It should be structured as a set of answers to Cordell's four questions, plus a brief descriptive overview of your chosen digital archive at the beginning. Although this is a descriptive report, not an essay, effective use of secondary sources related to the course will be reflected in the grade. You should also look for relevant secondary sources related to your chosen project.

The instructor can advise on your choice of project, but given the size of the class, students are asked to post their query on the Quercus discussion board for this assignment rather than emailing the instructor or TA directly. The questions and answers on the discussion board will help other students, and you might even find your question answered there in advance.

Twine Project

Twine component: minimum 20 nodes

Critical reflection: 1,000 words, not including notes, bibliography, and any images

Due Wednesday, April 14 by 6:00 pm EST

*Students may work individually or in groups, ideally composed of 3-4 people drawn from the same discussion group. Groups of 2 are also welcome. We are willing to consider groups larger than 4, but prospective large groups must email a brief rationale and outline of roles to us no later than March 10 (ideally sooner). All groups, regardless of size, must designate someone to email us with their finalized group membership **by Monday, March 15**. Students who are not part of a group by this point will complete the project individually.*

Twine Component

For this project, your task is to perform a **creative intervention** in a particular critical or creative work we've discussed in the course, or in another work that's clearly related to the course topics. This involves identifying a particular missed opportunity, or blind spot, or wrong turn, or other flaw in a work and correcting it in your own version, using the affordances of the Twine platform.

For example, with a fictional works we've discussed in class, such as *Little Women* (the novel or the 2019 film, or both) or Octave Uzanne's story "The End of Books," you might:

- rewrite an important scene;
- reimagine a scene from a different character's perspective;
- add a new scene;
- make a non-interactive scene interactive by adding choices;
- change the interactivity of an existing scene by altering or removing existing choices.

The same approach could be extended to real-world performances of new reading technologies, such as Steve Jobs's iBooks presentation during the 2010 iPad rollout event (which in our Week 6 class we analyzed as though it were a one-actor stage play); with an example like this or other reading-oriented tech demo, you might:

- rewrite it to introduce some fun and illuminating glitches in the tech demo;
- reframe it from the perspective of someone from the Darnton circuit or Murray and Squire's digital version;
- reimagine it in the near or distant future, with Tony-Stark-style holograms, or set in Margaret Atwood's Gilead.

For a thematically related videogame like *What Remains of Edith Finch* or *Gone Home*, you might:

- reimagine a particular scene or episode as hypertext fiction;
- add a new object to the gameworld (a diary, a letter, a piece of hypertext fiction);
- add a new gameplay mechanic (e.g. Edith Finch doesn't just recover her family history, but can revise it like an author with a manuscript).

If you'd rather perform a creative intervention in a critical work, such as Whitney Trettien's article or Darnton's and others' depictions of communications circuits, you might:

- write accompanying blog post(s), branching subreddit-style comments, or other social media responses (maybe McLuhan initiates a Tweetstorm from the great beyond, or an imaginary self-aware AI authoring-bot has something to say?);
- add new arguments or examples to an existing text;
- alter the interactive affordances of an existing text (i.e., introduce hyperlinks or otherwise remix a critical discussion);
- make your own communications circuit for digitized or born-digital books, in the spirit of Murray and Squires's revision of Darnton, but use Twine somehow instead of a static diagram.

Critical Reflection

The Twine component should be accompanied by a critical reflection on the project, in the form of a short essay. The critical reflection should explain your goals, contextualize your influences and the sources you've drawn upon, and think through any significant insights and/or challenges that emerged in the course of your work. Overall, the purpose of the critical reflection is not simply to describe or summarize your project, but to step back from it and consider what you've learned from the experience. What do you know at the end of the process that you didn't know at the beginning? How do you regard any of our course readings/lectures or other secondary sources differently now that you've worked on the Twine project?

For group projects, the critical reflection must include an appendix with a very brief summary of each group member's contribution to the project as a whole.

It may be pragmatic to write up the critical reflection toward the end of the project, but also to keep running notes in a group document as you undertake the Twine portion. Groups may decide to designate one member as the lead writer for the critical reflection, but we advise against too rigid a division of labour, given that the reflection depends on the insights of those directly involved in the making of the Twine project.

Technical Requirements and Resources

Twine may be accessed through your web-browser or by downloading the program to your computer here: Twinery.org

Your story must have a minimum of 20 “nodes” (we may set that minimum higher for any groups larger than 4).

The first node must be a title page that states that name of the group members (or individual creator) and contains a link to a node with any necessary citations. Both the nodes and the title page will only require you to know how to use Twine’s linking features. The linking process is the central feature you will be using to build your Twine. The video here is recommended to get you started in learning about this linking process: [Getting Started With Twine 2.1](#)

You are more than welcome to create a more elaborate Twine (e.g., with visuals, sound and more extensive node connections), but this is not a requirement. If you do want to explore those options, however, the following resources may help with that:

- Adam Hammond’s [Total Beginner's Guide to Twine](#)
- Adam Hammond’s lecture [video on Microsoft Streams](#) (can also be accessed [here](#))
- These lists of [CSS colours](#) and [web-friendly font families](#)
- [Image Baby](#) (for uploading images to import into your Twine)

Grading Criteria

We are not looking for virtuoso Twine coding -- this assignment doesn't assume any prior knowledge of Twine or of coding generally -- but we are looking for a strong fit between the intellectual and technical sides of your project. In other words, your Twine component doesn't need to be perfect; rather, we'll be looking for evidence that you've used Twine to work through a creative intervention which **couldn't have been made in a traditional linear essay**.

Assignments will be graded on their identification of a worthwhile creative intervention, how well their intervention is carried out using Twine's capabilities, the clarity and insight of the critical reflection, and the effective use of relevant scholarly sources from the course readings and beyond.

When grading, we'll be asking the following questions:

- Does your project clearly identify a perceived flaw or shortcoming in the work you've chosen to alter? Do you cite the text in outlining this shortcoming? Does your critical reflection provide compelling reasons for regarding this as a flaw or shortcoming?
- Do you develop an original and insightful manner of correcting this flaw or shortcoming in your creative intervention? Does your critical reflection provide a lucid and persuasive account of how you correct this flaw or shortcoming?
- Does your project meet the technical requirements outlined above? Does it follow the general assignment guidelines for things like writing and citations?

Acknowledgement: thanks to [Adam Hammond](#) for sharing his Twine assignment, which Alan Galey and Anna Kalinowski adapted for this version.

Class Schedule & Readings

Due Dates at a Glance

All assignments are due via Quercus by 6:00 pm EST on the due date.

Wednesday, Jan. 20	Discussion post #1
Tuesday, Feb. 2	Discussion post #2
Tuesday, Feb. 16	Discussion post #3
Friday, Feb. 26	Digital archive profile
Tuesday, March 2	Discussion post #4
Tuesday, March 16	Discussion post #5
Tuesday, March 30	Discussion post #6
Tuesday, April 13	Discussion post #7
Wednesday, April 14	Twine project

Jan. 14 **Week 1 — Introduction**

Before class:

- read Simon Gikandi, “The Work of the Book in the Age of Electronic Reproduction,” *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 127, no. 2 (2012): 201-211
- check the Discussions section and make a note of your discussion group number

After class:

- post a note introducing yourself in your group's discussion board
- start thinking about your response to discussion question #1

Jan. 21 **Week 2 — Disciplinary and Theoretical Contexts**

Before class:

- read Simone Murray, "Introduction: What Is 'Print Culture'?", in [Introduction to Contemporary Print Culture: Books as Media](#) (New York: Routledge, 2021): 1–13
- read Matthew G. Kirschenbaum and Sarah Werner, "Digital Scholarship and Digital Studies: the State of the Discipline," *Book History* 17 (2014): 406–58

After class:

- I created a follow-up lecture video which covers the material we didn't have time for in class, specifically a summary of four fields that will be important disciplinary contexts for this course: book history, bibliography, media archaeology, and digital humanities; you can find the video on MS Streams [here](#) (where it will remain available for the duration of the course)
- one of the articles mentioned in the video is Random Cloud's (Randall McLeod's) "Information on Information," *Text* 5 (1991): 241–281; it's hard to find online, but it's a fun read (make sure to set your PDF reader to show facing pages, like you'd see in the printed version)
- if you were interested by the book wheel image, you can read more about it and its cousins in my book chapter ["Reading the Book of Mozilla: Web Browsers and the Materiality of Digital Texts"](#)

Jan. 28 **Week 3 — Bibliography Beyond Books: Files, Formats, and Significant Properties**

Before class:

- read Matthew G. Kirschenbaum, "Editing the Interface: Textual Studies and First Generation Electronic Objects," *Text* 14 (2002): 15-51
- read Christoph Becker, "Metaphors We Work By: Reframing Digital Objects, Significant Properties, and the Design of Digital Preservation Systems," *Archivaria* 85 (2018): 6–37

During class:

- we'll be working with this article: Jens Dittrich and Patrick Bender, ["Janiform Intra-Document Analytics for Reproducible Research,"](#) *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 8, no. 12 (2015): 1972–5; specifically, we'll be working with the article *file* itself, so don't worry about reading it before class (though the

abstract is worth a quick read); all you need to do is download the file and put it in its own empty folder on your computer


After class:

- explore Kirschenbaum's follow-up to the article above, [*Mechanisms: New Media and the Forensic Imagination*](#) (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2007)
- read the Digital Archive Profile assignment instructions and start thinking ahead to your choice of topic (the next two classes will help, too)

Feb. 4 **Week 4 — Digitization and the Prehistory of Digital Books**

Before class:

- read Mats Dahlström, Joacim Hansson, and Ulrika Kjellman, "'As We May Digitize'—Institutions and Documents Reconfigured," *Liber Quarterly* 21, no. 3–4 (2012): 455–74 [<https://www.liberquarterly.eu/471/volume/21/issue/3-4/>]

 With this article, we'll begin a class experiment in comparative annotation. If you have access to a printer, please print this article, and read **and annotate it** on paper.

- 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>

During class:

- for our in-class exercise, in the spirit of Trettien's and Cordell's scrambled titles, we'll be working with this enigmatic image: [koob_spnies.jpg](#)

After class:

- if you haven't already, start preparing for the Digital Archive Profile assignment by reading Ryan Cordell, "'Q i-jtb the Raven': Taking Dirty OCR Seriously," *Book History* 20 (2017): 188–225
- check out one of the best published articles on digitization, written as both a practical case-study and a theoretical exploration: Bonnie Mak, "[Archaeology of a Digitization](#)," *Journal of the American Society of Information Science and Technology* 65, no. 8 (2014): 1515–26

Feb. 11 **Week 5 — Digital Editions and Digital Archives**

Before class:

- read Julia Flanders, "The Body Encoded: Questions of Gender and the Electronic Text," in *Electronic Text: Investigations in Method and Theory*, ed. Kathryn Sutherland (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 127-144 [[link](#)]
- skim my blog post, "[Five Ways to Improve the Conversation About Digital Scholarly Editing](#)" (feel free to skip the opening paragraphs), and explore some of the readings linked from it, including "[Considering the Scholarly Edition in the Digital Age](#)"

During class:

- We'll be looking briefly at these two examples digitized books:
 - <https://archive.org/details/cassellsmagazine00lond/page/n7/mode/2up>
 - https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/CW0116263490/ECCO?u=utoronto_main&sid=ECCO&xid=8068cc67&pg=1
- In the second half, we'll work through an activity on digital archives to help you prepare for Assignment 2. Please download this worksheet file to record your notes during the activity: [digital archives worksheet.docx](#) (No need to submit your file once class is finished; this is just for your own notes.) For the activity, you'll work with your discussion group in your usual breakout room, and your group will be asked to work through **one** of Cordell's four questions by applying them to **two** different digital archives:
 - **Groups 1 and 4** will apply Cordell's first question (on item-level metadata) to:
 - The Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library's [digitized manuscript collections](#)
 - [Archive of Our Own](#)
 - **Group 2 (incl. the former group 3)** will apply Cordell's second question (on metadata encoded in the files themselves) to:
 - [The William Blake Archive](#)
 - The Electronic Literature Organization's [online archives](#)
 - **Groups 5, 6 and 7** will apply Cordell's third question (on paratexts about material and sociological processes of digitization) to:
 - [The Martin Luther King, Jr. Papers Project](#)
 - [The SpokenWeb project](#)
 - Genius.com (in its [song lyrics](#) sections)


- **Groups 8 and 9** will apply Cordell's fourth question (on paratexts about previous remediations) to their choice of examples from:
 - [Early English Books Online](#)
 - [First Screening: Computer Poems](#) by bpNicol

After class:

- the Prezi presentation of the Electronic New Variorum Shakespeare interface is available [here](#), with several slides I didn't show in class (I created this presentation for a conference presentation a few years ago)

Feb. 16 **Reading Week**

No class this week, but to prepare for the next segment of the course, read Matthew Kirschenbaum, et al., [Books.Files:Preservation of Digital Assets in the Contemporary Publishing Industry](#) (College Park, MD, and New York, NY: University of Maryland and the Book Industry Study Group, 2020). It's about 50 pages, but hopefully not too dense.

 As part of our running class experiment on annotation, try reading this piece entirely on screen, and use the annotation features of your PDF reading software to make your own digital annotations. If you're reading in a web browser, you might need to switch a PDF reader like Preview or Adobe Reader, or look for plugins that let you annotate PDF documents in your browser.

I will hold my Wednesday office hour as usual this week.

Feb. 25 **Week 6 — Ebooks and the EPUB Format**

Before class:

- read Simone Murray, "Digital Books," in [Introduction to Contemporary Print Culture: Books as Media](#) (New York: Routledge, 2021): 201–219
- read John W. Maxwell, "E-Book Logic: We Can Do Better," [Papers of the Bibliographical Society of Canada](#) 51, no. 1 (2013): 29-47.

During class:

- For our in-class activity, you'll need the following items:
 - [in-class exercise instructions.pdf](#)

- the segment from the 2019 film version of *Little Women* (dir. Greta Gerwig) showing the printing of Jo's novel:
- the iBooks segment from the original launch event for the Apple iPad in 2010 (beginning at about 48 min., 30 sec.):
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zZtWISDvb_k
- If there's time we'll also take a look under the hood of an EPUB ebook version of James Joyce's *Ulysses* from Project Gutenberg:
<http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/4300>

After class:

- Further reading on ebooks:
 - Simon Rowberry, "[Ebookness](#)," *Convergence: the International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies* 23, no. 3 (2017): 289–305
 - Daniel Punday, "Ebooks, Libraries, and Feelies," in [Computing as Writing](#) (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015), 76–97
 - if you're particularly interested in getting under the hood with ebooks, as we did only in the final few minutes of today's class, check out the [Calibre](#) software and these articles which deal with bibliographic case-studies of ebooks:
 - Alan Galey, "[The Enkindling Reciter: E-Books in the Bibliographical Imagination](#)," *Book History* 15 (2012): 210-247
 - Martin Paul Eve, "'You Have to Keep Track of Your Changes': the Version Variants and Publishing History of David Mitchell's *Cloud Atlas*," *Open Library of the Humanities* 2, no. 2 (2016):
<https://olh.openlibhums.org/articles/10.16995/olh.82/>
- Check out the program for the upcoming Book History & Print Culture program's annual student colloquium, which will be held via Zoom on Friday and Saturday, March 5-6: <https://bhpcolloquium2021.wordpress.com/>; registration is required but at no cost, and all Future of the Book students are welcome!

Mar. 4 **Week 7 — Coach House Books and Publishing Today**

Before class:

- read Maxwell, John. "[Coach House Press in the 'Early Digital' Period: a Celebration](#)," *The Devil's Artisan: a Journal of the Printing Arts* 77 (2015): 9-20
- explore the Coach House Books website (chbooks.com)

Guests:

- [Alana Wilcox](#), Editorial Director at Coach House Books
- [Ellen Michelle](#), iSchool PhD student, currently researching CHB's publication of Amanda Leduc's [Disfigured](#) as a born-accessible book
- [Sarah Pelletier](#), BHPC alum and current student in Carleton's PhD program in English, and former printer and binder at Coach House Books

After class:

- check out this video from Coach House Book's 2020 virtual wayzgoose (what's a wayzgoose, you ask? watch the video to find out):
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vaaS63ZSNpU>
- to put some images and words to our discussions of Coach House Books spaces, check out Jessica Duffin Woolfe's description and photos in this Quill & Quire piece: <https://quillandquire.com/book-culture/2016/01/13/spaces-coach-house-books/>
- the book about libraries Alana recommended during class is [The Dark Library](#), by Cyrille Martinez

Mar. 11 **Week 8 — Literary Apps, Audiobooks, and Multimodality**

Before class:

- read Johanna Drucker, "Modeling Functionality: From Codex to E-book," in [SpecLab: Digital Aesthetics and Projects in Speculative Computing](#) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009), 165-75
- read (or listen to) Matthew Rubery, "Caedmon's Third Dimension," in [The Untold Story of the Talking Book](#) (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016), 185–216; this title is, of course, also available as an audiobook, which you can access on [Audible](#) if you sign up for a 30-day free trial (just make sure to cancel in time if you don't want to pay for the service)

During class:

- we looked at this digital facsimile of the first page of Genesis from the 1611 King James Bible, from the Schoenberg Center for Text and Image at the University of Pennsylvania:
<http://sceti.library.upenn.edu/sceti/printedbooksNew/index.cfm?TextID=kjbi&PagePosition=77>

After class:

- Consider taking time to complete the [MISC student experience survey](#) (5-15 min.)

- If you found the Drucker reading interesting, check out this digital project: [Architectures of the Book](#). Some collaborators and I created it a few years ago to explore the aspects of historical book design that could inform the design of digital books and reading interfaces. We also published this article, which Draws on the work of Drucker and other design-oriented book historians: Alan Galey, Jon Bath, Rebecca Niles, and Richard Cunningham, "[Imagining the Architectures of the Book: Textual Scholarship and the Digital Book Arts](#)" *Textual Cultures* 7, no. 2 (2012): 20-42.

Mar. 18 **Week 9 — Creating Digital Narratives with Twine**

Before class:

- read [Adam Hammond's Twine tutorial](#)


During class:

- we'll be looking briefly at a book called *The Deep*, published by Tara Books, as shown in [this video](#)
- we'll also look very briefly at one of my own projects, called [Visualizing Variation](#), which uses some of the same underlying web technologies as Twine
- during the Twine workshop portion, the two CSS reference pages I showed on the screen briefly were [this one](#) (from W3Schools on CSS selectors) and [this one](#) (from the Mozilla developer site); both are examples of the kinds of reference resources you can find on the web for common technologies like CSS, and it can be helpful to look at different reference sources to see which ones are most helpful for you

Mar. 25 **Week 10 — Books and Games, Part 1: Text and Paratext**

Before class:

- read Steven E. Jones, Introduction to [The Meaning of Video Games: Gaming and Textual Strategies](#) (New York: Routledge, 2008), 1-18

 As part of our running class experiment on annotation, let's try annotating this reading together, as a class, using the social annotation platform Hypothes.is. This is optional, but if you'd like to try it out, you just need to create a [Hypothes.is](#) account (it's free, and they aren't predatory about your data) and then join the annotation group.

- read Jerome McDonough, *et al.*, "Twisty Little Passages Almost All Alike: Applying the FRBR Model to a Classic Computer Game," *Digital Humanities Quarterly* 4, no. 2 (2010): <http://www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/4/2/000089/000089.html>

April 1 **Week 11 — Books and Games, Part 2: *What Remains of Edith Finch***

Guest lecture: Anna Kalinowski, Faculty of Information

Before class:

- read Janet Murray, "Introduction: A Book Lover Longs for Cyberdrama," *Hamlet on the Holodeck: the Future of Narrative in Cyberspace* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1997), 1–10 [[Murray - Hamlet on the Holodeck intro.pdf](#)]
- read N. Katherine Hayles, "[Print Is Flat, Code Is Deep: the Importance of Media-Specific Analysis](#)," *Poetics Today* 25, no. 1 (2004): 67–90
- (optional) play [What Remains of Edith Finch](#) (Annapurna Interactive, 2017); the game takes 2-3 hours to complete, and doesn't require any prior knowledge of videogames, but if you have any difficulty you can opt to watch gameplay videos instead
 - Content advisory: *What Remains of Edith Finch* is not a violent game in the tradition of, say, *Call of Duty* or other shooters—indeed, it couldn't be more different in tone and pacing—but death and mortality are its central themes, and it depicts a family history which includes teen suicide and the accidental death of a child. These events are not depicted directly, and tonally the game is mostly like a Wes Anderson film (think *Moonrise Kingdom*), but the gameplay is designed to provoke reflection on grief, memory, and living with mortality. Students who might find these topics difficult to experience in a game are free to skip it, and doing so will have no effect on their grade. Another option is to play (or watch) up to the end of the "Calvin's story" segment, and then assess your comfort level. Our class discussion may refer to the darker parts of the game, but these parts will not appear as images or videos in the lecture.

After class:

- further reading/listening on the connections between books, *What Remains of Edith Finch*, and other video games:
 - Caleb J. Ross's blog post on "[The Books of *What Remains of Edith Finch*](#)," which includes a list of identifiable books in the game
 - Caleb J. Ross's [interview](#) with *Edith Finch* creative director, Ian Dallas

- Melissa Kagen, "[Archival Adventuring](#)," *Convergence: the International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies* 26, no. 4 (2020): 1007–1020
- Mona Bozdog and Dayna Galloway, "[Worlds at Our Fingertips: Reading \(in\) What Remains of Edith Finch](#)," *Games and Culture* 15, no. 7 (2019): 789–808
- Ian Bogost, "[Video Games Are Better Without Stories](#)," *The Atlantic* (April 25, 2017)
- Adam Hammond, "Books in Videogames," in *The Unfinished Book*, ed. Alexandra Gillespie and Deidre Lynch (Oxford University Press, 2020), 332–344; this chapter discusses *Gone Home*, an environmental storytelling game which thematizes various aspects of print culture (like *Edith Finch*), but if you haven't played *Gone Home* and think you might like to, I strongly recommend playing the game before doing any reading about it—like *Edith Finch* it's a game best played without too much foreknowledge

April 8 **Week 12 — Books of Futures Past**

Before class:

- read Robert Coupland Harding, "A Hundred Years Hence," *Typo* 8 (27 January 1894): 1. [<http://nzetc.victoria.ac.nz/tm/scholarly/tei-corpus-typo.html>]
- read Octave Uzanne, "The End of Books." *Scribner's Magazine* 26 (July-December 1894): 221-31



This syllabus is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>