INF 2331:
The Future of the Book

Winter 2022

Instructor: Alan Galey

Teaching Assistant: Anna Kalinowski

Technical & Accessibility Support Assistant: Andrew Sedrak

A [Little Free Library](#) in the Christie Pits neighbourhood of Toronto, photographed around the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic. The handwritten note taped to the shelf reads "no textbooks please."

Important Details for the Winter 2022 term

Delivery mode: As of March 1st, classes will be held in person in Bissell 538, beginning at 1:30 as usual. Please note that there is no hybrid option for this course.

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. Please note that we will not be recording in-person classes, but I will make lecture slides available afterward.

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).

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.

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 artifact 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 artifact 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 5:00 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 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.

To book an appointment with the Faculty's on-location Accessibility Advisor, Alexa Quach, email accessibility.services@utoronto.ca or call (416) 978-8060 and state that you would like to book a meeting with Alexa Quach at the Faculty of Information.

Equity, Diversity and Inclusion

The University of Toronto is committed to equity, human rights and respect for diversity. All members of the learning environment in this course should strive to create an atmosphere of mutual respect where all members of our community can express themselves, engage with each other, and respect one another's differences. U of T does not condone discrimination or harassment against any persons or communities.

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.

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 site 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 e-Workshops on the Virtual Inforum.

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 Artifact 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 from our class on
digitization in Week 4 (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 10MB**.

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://lifehacker.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. 17 Jan. 20, Jan. 31, Feb. 14 (first assessment after this post), Feb. 28, March 14, March 28, April 11 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.

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, 2022) 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 **Thursday, February 17** (i.e. three days after post #3 is due). Similarly, we will begin the second assessment after **Thursday, April 14**, 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 Artifact Profile

1,000-1,200 words, excluding notes, bibliography, and images
Due as PDF submitted to Quercus by 5:00 pm EST on Wednesday, February 9

Students must are advised to email the instructor with at least one idea for their digital artifact by 5:00 pm EST on Monday, January 24 Friday, January 29 (late penalty will apply)

Grading rubric: Assignment 1 rubric.pdf

This lecture video (60 min.) should also help you understand the assignment. I made this video last year for a different course which used the same assignment, and the video occasionally refers to other assignments or classes that aren't relevant to INF 2331, but everything in the video that's about the Digital Artifact Profile assignment applies for our course.

For this report, you will choose a specific bookish born-digital artifact, and imagine that you are an archivist who will need to preserve it for the future. However, this assignment is not primarily about the technical challenges of digital preservation, but about what digital curation specialists call the significant properties of a record or artifact. We will discuss the concept of significant properties in classes leading up to this assignment, and our primary reading for this

assignment will be Geoffrey Yeo's article ["'Nothing Is the Same as Something Else' Significant Properties and Notions of Identity and Originality"](#) (*Archival Science* 10, 2010) and Margaret Hedstrom et al.'s article ["'The Old Version Flickers More': Digital Preservation from the User's Perspective"](#) (*American Archivist* 69, 2006; [Hedstrom et al.pdf](#)). For an example of this kind of thinking applied effectively to specific examples of born-digital artifacts, students should also read closely another of our course readings, Matthew Kirschenbaum's article ["Editing the Interface: Textual Studies and First-Generation Electronic Objects"](#) (*Text* 14, 2002).

What does *bookish* mean in the description above? The short answer is something that's either a digital book or book-like enough to be relevant to our course. As we will consider in the course, there are many kinds of experimental forms that play with the form of the book without replicating it. Even the term *born-digital* is fuzzy around the edges, as we will discuss in our classes. We will spend time in class on what types of examples might be eligible for the assignment, and you are welcome and encouraged to consult with the instructor. The best way to know what the quality of *bookishness* means in the context of this assignment is to keep up with the class discussions and readings.

Some examples of bookish digital artifacts might include:

- an ebook (though I'd recommend one that's somehow interesting or unusual in its form);
- a specific work from the Electronic Literature Organization's archives ([www.eliterature.org/electronic-literature-archives/](#));
- a literary app such as *Bottom of the Ninth* ([ryanwoodwardart.com/my-works/bottom-of-the-ninth/](#));
- a multimedia artwork such as *The Wilderness Downtown* ([www.thewildernessdowntown.com](#));
- or something else that fits the assignment requirements, with approval of the instructor.
-

In preparation for this assignment, you should carefully read the articles mentioned above, but also spend time close-reading your chosen artifact. You should draw upon and cite some of all of the Yeo, Hedstrom et al., and Kirschenbaum articles, but no additional secondary sources are required. You are welcome to bring in other primary and secondary sources, but your focus should remain on your chosen artifact.

Your profile should begin by giving a bibliography-style entry for your object, including as much descriptive information as you believe is necessary for a future researcher to know which version of your artifact you're discussing in your report. For this part of your assignment, you should begin by trying to find your type of artifact in the online Chicago Manual of Style (specifically, in [this part](#)). If your specific kind of artifact isn't listed in the Chicago Manual, look for something similar that is listed, and try to extend the same descriptive principles to your artifact. Either way, you may need to think critically about the level of detail that the Chicago Manual calls for, and you may need to adapt or invent a more detailed form of description,

depending on what details you think are important in a citation. The point, overall, is to provide an appropriately detailed description that's as systematic as possible, like a bibliography entry.

A strong assignment will also answer some or all of the following questions:

- Why is your chosen artifact worth preserving for the future? Why should future historians be interested in it? (This question will weigh less than the others in the grading, and you shouldn't spend more than 2-3 sentences on it.)
- If your artifact were preserved in some form, what are the significant properties that should be retained or at least accounted for? In other words, what are the details about this artifact that you believe are vital to understanding its cultural meaning(s)?
- Which of those significant properties could easily be overlooked, especially by an archivist who isn't familiar with its history, genre, or present social context? (The Kirschenbaum article is an excellent example of this kind of thinking.)
- Which significant properties might be especially vulnerable to technological or media changes in the future, and why?
- Which of the terms in Kirschenbaum's appendix ("Towards Some Principles of Computational Description") are applicable to your artifact? Does your artifact require us to rethink any of Kirschenbaum's terms (which, as he emphasizes, should be matters for debate)?

Twine Project

Twine component: minimum 20 nodes
Critical reflection: 1,000 words, not including notes, bibliography, and any images
Due Wednesday, April 6 by 5:00 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 14**. *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 use Twine 2 and SugarCube (not Harlowe).

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. See also this handout to help get you started with the first steps: Twine Handout.pdf.

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)

In our Twine workshop class, we also looked at examples of other CSS resources, including this one (from W3Schools on CSS selectors) and this one (from the Mozilla developer site, on the CSS "font" property).

How to submit your Twine assignment

Groups should designate a single member to submit assignment materials on behalf of the group.

For the critical reflection component, please submit a single PDF file via the "Assignments" link on Quercus. Feel free to incorporate images in your PDF file, but we'd appreciate it if you could keep the total filesize to 10 MB maximum. (The free image editor Gimp is useful for reducing image file sizes.)

If your Twine project is a single standalone HTML file, please submit it via the link in the "Assignments" section. If your project includes other media, such as images or audio files, you won't be able to submit it via Quercus. In that case, please send us a link by email, or include the link in your critical response document (ideally somewhere at the beginning where we can find it easily).

The bottom line: don't worry too much about how to submit your Twine project, and don't let that limit what you try to do; we'll find way to make it work.

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?

Some helpful examples and resources

- An online collection of student made games for ENG279 at UTM.
- This is mental health resource Twine. It incorporates a lot of secondary information and outside links for further information to access resources. Shows how information and sources can be integrated beyond the Twine itself.
- my father's long, long legs - a classic horror twine. It doesn't include secondary sources and is very simple/linear at first glance, but develops in a unique way to show off the strengths in subtlety achieved with Twine.
- You Will Select a Decision overtly integrates and showcases the "choose your own adventure" format. Good to look at to see how branching paths can work and for those who don't have familiarity with Twine but do have experience with the paper based adventure texts.
- Anna's little twine that shows how images can be integrated to depict different decisions and choices (for those who feel adventurous and want to incorporate visuals!)
- for groups who are trying to work around Twine's limitations for real-time online collaboration, consider trying the shared whiteboard platform Miro

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 5:00 pm EST on the due date.

Monday, January 17	Discussion post #1
Monday, January 31	Discussion post #2
Wednesday, February 9	Digital artifact profile
Monday, February 14	Discussion post #3
Monday, February 28	Discussion post #4
Monday, March 14	Discussion post #5
Monday, March 28	Discussion post #6
Wednesday, April 6	Twine project
Wednesday, April 13	Discussion post #7

Jan. 11   **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

After class:

- check the Discussions section and make a note of your discussion group number
- post a note introducing yourself in your group's discussion board
- start thinking about your response to discussion question #1
- read the syllabus and assignment instructions, start thinking ahead to the Digital Artifact Profile

Jan. 18   **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. 25   **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:

- to work through the concept of significant properties, we'll use the Sherlock Holmes story "A Case of Identity," originally published in the *Strand* magazine in September 1891, as our main example; you don't need to read the story, but we'll look at it in a few different digitized forms:
  - ProQuest: https://www.proquest.com/docview/4157051/fulltext/8928E11A414E43C4PQ/1?accountid=14771&imgSeq=1
  - Internet Archive (scroll to p. 32 using the slider at the bottom): https://archive.org/details/StrandMagazine9/page/n31/mode/2up
  - the full text on Wikisource (https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/A_Case_of_Identity) linked from the story's Wikipedia page (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/A_Case_of_Identity)

After class:

- explore Kirschenbaum's follow-up to the article above, *Mechanisms: New Media and the Forensic Imagination* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2007)

Feb. 1   **Week 4 — Digitization and the Prehistory of Digital Books**

Before class:

- read 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]

    ☞ 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

After class:

- if you'd like to learn more about the two png files we looked at in class (which show different images depending on which operating system you're using), this *Gizmodo* post does a reasonably good job of explaining them, and links to the original post by their creator, David Buchanan: https://gizmodo.com/hello-world-vs-hello-apple-what-do-you-see-when-you-l-1848233730

Feb. 8   **Week 5 — 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.

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 interested in getting under the hood with ebooks, as we did in class today, 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
  - Alan Galey, "Imagining Marshall McLuhan as a Digital Reader: an Experiment in Applied Joyce," in "Reading McLuhan Reading," ed. Paula McDowell, special issue, *Textual Practice* 35, no. 9 (2021): 1525–49
  - 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/

Feb. 15 **Week — Book Design, Artists' Books, and Experiments with Form**

Guest speaker: Kit MacNeil, College Printer, Tours & Educational Programming, Massey College

Before class:

- read Johanna Drucker, "Artists' Books and Picturebooks: Generative Dialogues," in *The Routledge Companion to Picturebooks*, ed. Bettina Kümmerling-Meibauer (London: Routledge, 2017), 291–301
- read Johanna Drucker, "The Self-Conscious Codex: Artists' Books and Electronic Media," *SubStance* 26, no. 1 (1997): 93–112
- check out Drucker's project Artists' Books Online (www.artistsbooksonline.org)

After class:

- further reading on (or in the spirit of) today's topics:
  - Anthony Dunne & Fiona Raby, *Speculative Everything: Design, Reading, and Social Dreaming* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2013)
  - Random Cloud, (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)

Feb. 22 **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.

Mar. 1   **Week 7 — 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)

Mar. 8   **Week 8 — Reading Interfaces / Creating Digital Narratives with Twine**

Guest speaker: Anna Kalinowski, Faculty of Information

Before class:

- review the Drucker reading from last week; we'll return to it in the first part of this week's class
- read Adam Hammond's Twine tutorial
- review Anna's Twine handout: Twine Handout.pdf

Mar. 15   **Week 9 — 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
- 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

Mar. 22   **Week 10 — Books and Games, Part 2: *Gone Home***

Before class:

- read Adam Hammond, "Books in Videogames," in *The Unfinished Book*, ed. Alexandra Gillespie and Deidre Lynch (Oxford University Press, 2021), 332–44
- 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 *Gone Home* (Fullbright, 2013); 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

Mar. 29   **Week 11 — Field Trip to the Fisher Rare Book Library**

Before class:

- we'll be splitting into two groups for our visit(1:00 - 2:30 and 2:30 - 4:00); please sign up for one of the groups using this Doodle poll
- read William Uricchio, "Interactivity and the Modalities of Textual Hacking: From the Bible to Algorithmically Generated Stories," in *The Politics of Ephemeral Digital Media: Permanence and Obsolescence in Paratexts*, ed. Sara Pesce and Paolo Noto (New York: Routledge, 2016), 155–69

April 5   **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