


INF 2159H: Historical & Analytical Bibliography

Time: Thursdays, 9:00 am - 12:00 pm
Location: McLean-Hunter Room, Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library
Instructor: Alan Galey, Faculty of Information
Email: alan.galey@utoronto.ca
Response time: usually by end of next business day, Monday-Friday
Office: Bissell 646
Office hours: Thurs. 12:00 am - 1:00 pm (after class); Wed. 1:30-2:30
Website: portal.utoronto.ca



The Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library under construction ca. 1968.

Overview

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

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

Upon the successful completion of the course, students should be able:

1. to trace the development of analytical/descriptive bibliography and to evaluate the role of the discipline in current research;
2. to introduce the basic principles of bibliographical description;
3. to extend traditional bibliographical methods and theories into new areas of study, especially born-digital texts and artifacts.

The class will be taught principally by lecture, with illustrated slides and handouts, and hands-on examination of printed materials in the collections of the Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library. The syllabus, reading list, handouts and printed slides will be available on Blackboard. All announcements will be sent through Blackboard.

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

Note that the final date to drop Winter session half (S) courses without academic penalty is Feb. 27, 2017.

Course materials

This course has one required textbook, currently available in the U of T campus bookstore at College and St George:

Philip Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll Press, 1995

All other assigned readings, and most recommended readings, will be made available via Blackboard.

Some assignments will require students to make use of Fredson Bowers's *Principles of Bibliographical Description* (1949, 1962, 1994), which has been reprinted several times, and is available in numerous copies throughout the U of T Library system (best to search by author/title), and among the reference collection in Fisher (Z1001 .B78 1962). Essential parts of this work will be made available on Blackboard, but students are encouraged to familiarize themselves with this resource as a whole, via their assignments.

The following resources are useful general introductions to different aspects of the course topic:

The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain. 6 vols. Cambridge University Press, 2002-2011. [online: <http://go.utlib.ca/cat/8112873>; this link will take you to vol 1., but on the Cambridge Books Online page there should be a link on the right-hand side to the series as a whole]

The Cambridge Companion to Textual Scholarship, edited by Neil Fraistat and Julia Flanders. Cambridge University Press, 2013. [<http://go.utlib.ca/cat/8944587>]

The Cambridge Companion to the History of the Book, edited by Leslie Howsam. Cambridge University Press, 2015. [<http://go.utlib.ca/cat/9936632>]

David Greetham, *Textual Scholarship: An Introduction*, New York: Garland, 1994. [<http://go.utlib.ca/cat/561627>]

A Companion to the History of the Book, edited by Simon Eliot and Jonathan Rose. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009. [<http://go.utlib.ca/cat/7875444>]

The principal journals in the field include *Studies in Bibliography*, *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of Canada*, *The Library*, *Book History*, *Text*, *Textual Cultures*, and *Variants*.

Academic integrity

Please consult the University's site on Academic Integrity (<http://academicintegrity.utoronto.ca/>). The iSchool 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://www.writing.utoronto.ca/advice/using-sources/how-not-to-plagiarize>). Cite it Right covers relevant parts of the U of T *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters (1995)*. It is expected that all iSchool 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. To review and complete the workshop, visit the orientation portion of the iSkills site: uoft.me/iskills

Remember: plagiarism through negligence, as distinct from deliberate intent, is still plagiarism in the eyes of the University. Take notes carefully, use quotation marks religiously when copying and pasting from digital sources (so that no one, including you, mistakes someone else's words for your own), and document your research process. And always, when in doubt, ask.

Writing support

As stated in the iSchool'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 Office of English Language and Writing Support (<http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/currentstudents/Pages/English-Language-and-Writing-Support.aspx>). The services are designed to target the needs of both native and non-native speakers and all programs are free. Please consult the current workshop schedule (<http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/currentstudents/Pages/Current-Years-Courses.aspx>) for more information.

Special needs

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 me 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 them and I know your needs, the quicker we can assist you in achieving your learning goals in this course.

Evaluation

15% Participation
 10% Quasi-facsimile title page exercise
 15% Collation exercise
 25% Evaluation of a descriptive bibliography
 35% Group presentation on born-digital bibliography (15% presentation + 20% written report)

The two short exercises must be submitted in class on the day they are due. The descriptive bibliography evaluation and written report for the final presentation should be submitted as a single PDF files via Blackboard **by noon on the due date**. (The reason this deadline is set at noon, not midnight, is so that the instructor has time to help students with any technical problems with the submission system.)

Extensions will only be granted in the event of illness or emergency, and then only with appropriate documentation. Late assignments (defined here as an assignment submitted after the deadline) will be penalized by one full letter grade per week (e.g. from A to A-), for a maximum of two weeks. After that point, late assignments will no longer be accepted. Furthermore, late assignments will not receive detailed feedback. Written assignments that do not meet a minimum standard (in terms of legibility, formatting and proofreading) will be returned for re-submission, with late penalties in full effect.

All assignments are evaluated in accordance with the University of Toronto Governing Council's Graduate Grading and Evaluation Practices Policy (<http://current.ischool.utoronto.ca/grade-interpretation>) and the Faculty of Information's Guidelines to Grade Interpretation (<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/grading.pdf>).

Assignments

Participation

This mark is determined by the quality of your contributions to class discussion. This means reading all of the week's primary assigned materials, doing further reading (based on suggestions from the reading list, references from the assigned readings, or your own initiative), allowing yourself enough time to think about the readings, and coming to class with things to say. Participation depends just as much on listening, so you should listen carefully to everyone's contributions, consider the effects of your own comments, and respect all members of the class. Participation on the course's Blackboard discussion list will count toward the participation grade.

Quasi-facsimile title page transcription exercise

Due in class, Thursday, Feb. 9

This short exercise requires students to prepare a quasi-facsimile of title pages from a hand-press book. The grade is based on how accurately the exercise follows the rules of descriptive bibliography (primarily as laid out in Bowers's *Principles of Bibliographical Description*), and how accurately the quasi-facsimile represents its material. Bonus grades will be awarded for accurate transcriptions of title pages that are somehow interesting and challenging. Our Week 3 class on title pages will focus on preparation for this assignment, and the instructor will provide additional details in class and via Blackboard as needed.

To prepare for this assignment you should read the section on quasi-facsimile transcription in Gaskell's *New Introduction to Bibliography* (pp. 321-8), and well as supplementary sources such as Greetham's *Textual Scholarship* (pp. 155-61), and the articles linked as recommended reading for Week 3. The ultimate reference work for the rules of quasi-facsimile transcription is Bowers's *Principles of Bibliographic Description* (ch. 4). Copies of this book are available in the Fisher reference collection and the Inforum's course reserves, and a digital version of the relevant part of the book may be downloaded here: [Bowers - Principles - title page transcription.pdf](#)

Your title-page transcription must be from a book printed prior to 1800 that is held in the Fisher Library teaching collection (located on the shelves to the left as you enter the reading room; just ask the staff). If you have previously done a title-page transcription exercise in another course (e.g. BKS 1001H: Introduction to Book History), you must select a new book for this assignment.

Beyond that, the choice of book is up to you. Online resources like [Early English Books Online \(EEBO\)](#) and [Eighteenth Century Collections Online \(ECCO\)](#) may be used for previewing books, and you may take digital images of your book using the Fisher's scanner, but the book itself be used as

a basis for your transcription, not digital images. Your transcription must be accompanied by the call number, copy number, and any other information I would need to find the original book (which I'll be doing as I mark your assignments). Feel free to add notes about anything that makes the copy particularly interesting, like readers' marginalia.

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

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

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

Collation/contents description exercise

Due in class, Thursday, March 2

This short exercise requires students to provide a complete collation formula and contents description for a hand-press book. Books will be randomly assigned to students from the Fisher's teaching collection.

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

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

The grade is based on how accurately the exercise follows the rules of descriptive bibliography (primarily as laid out in Bowers's *Principles of Bibliographical Description*), and how accurately the description matches the material. Several of the classes prior to the assignment deadline will focus on the skills required for this assignment.

Evaluation of a descriptive bibliography or digital project

Due via Blackboard by noon, Wednesday, March 29

1,500-2,000 words, excluding notes and bibliography

Option 1. Choose a published descriptive bibliography--one which contains all the elements we have examined to date in the term--i.e., title-page quasi-facsimile transcription, format and collation, and so forth, and evaluate it, keeping in mind concepts we are learning in class. Reviews can contain many different elements, depending on the topic covered, but items to be considered should contain the following:

- What is the topic covered; why did the author of the bibliography consider it important to produce a bibliography on that particular subject? If the topic is an author bibliography, who is the author—do not presume your reader will know.
- What does the bibliography include, and is excluded?
- Are basic bibliographical principles set out in the text? If so, what are those principles and are they followed?
- Has the author presented and described his method of analytical and descriptive bibliography. How does it follow or depart from what you have been learning so far?
- Does she/he discuss (and even more importantly understand) the concepts of edition, impression, issue and state, and follow through on these concepts?

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

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

- What is the topic covered; why did the makers of the project consider it worthwhile?
- What materials and resources does the project include, and what is excluded?
- Are basic bibliographical principles followed in the project? If so, what are those principles and are they followed?
- How granular is the bibliographical information given by the project; does it deal with edition, impression, issue and state? Is copy-specific information included?
- How well does the project take advantage of the digital medium to represent bibliographical information? What kinds of analysis does the project enable, and how might the resource be used in conjunction with a visit by a researcher to the digitized materials themselves?

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

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

An appropriate case study for this assignment might be:

1. a rare book exhibition website
(ex.: <http://hcl.harvard.edu/libraries/houghton/exhibits/alice/>);
2. a clearly defined subset of a larger project (ex.: the "Published Works" section at the [Walt Whitman Archive](#));
3. a specific tool or interface that enables access to a larger collection (ex.: the Folger Shakespeare Library's *Luna* interface: <http://luna.folger.edu>).

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

Referencing and format. The evaluation should be printed in a 12-point serif font with double-spaced lines. Please be sure to use footnotes, not endnotes. 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, you will be expected to use Chicago's notes + bibliography format, as it is the referencing system most suited to the course topic. The Chicago Manual of Style Online is an excellent writing reference for our course on matters of grammar, usage, and other writing conventions apart from citation. You can find it here: <http://go.utlib.ca/cat/6662347>

Images. Reproduced images are a staple of bibliographical scholarship, and students are encouraged to make liberal use of images in the final two assignments. When it comes to out-of-copyright books, the Fisher is a remarkably hospitable library in terms of its image use policy and the scanner it provides to readers. Students can include copyrighted images in their assignments 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 given in the source).

To make the best use of the Fisher's personal scanning equipment, students should bring their own USB key and make use of image editing software. For a good cross-platform freeware image editor, download *Gimp* (<http://www.gimp.org/>).

Group presentation on born-digital bibliography

Presentation: 15 minutes, followed by 10-15 minutes of class discussion

Written report: 2,500-3,000 words, excluding bibliography, notes, and images; due via Blackboard by noon on the next Friday after your presentation (i.e. eight days after your presentation)

Students will work in groups of 2 or 3 on this assignment. (Note: for logistical reasons, I cannot consider groups of 1 or more than 3.) All students in the group will receive the same grade, and the presentation and written report will be graded separately. All students in the group must be involved in the presentation. The presentation grade will include how well the group field questions from the rest of the class. (Asking good questions on presentation day will, in turn, be reflected in students' participation grade.) Time will be enforced strictly, and presentations that go overtime will be penalized. For the sake of a good discussion, and not treading on the time of other presenters', please make extra sure that your presentation doesn't exceed the 15 minute limit.

The written report may build upon the presentation, including lessons learned from the presentation experience and questions, and may incorporate additional material omitted from the presentation for the sake of time—though this is not required.

In simple terms, this assignment requires research teams to:

1. identify a particular born-digital text, artifact, or other form of media that could be usefully studied from a bibliographical perspective;
2. research the history and nature of your example, applying or adapting bibliographical principles and methods learned in class, and where appropriate combining them with methods borrowed from other disciplines (see the Kirschenbaum readings for an example of how textual scholars do this);
3. present the results of your research to the class, giving particular attention to:
 - why this material is of potential value for bibliographical research (incl. how it exemplifies or complicates ideas we've encountered in our readings);
 - what insights into the nature of bibliographical research you gained along the way.

This assignment is essentially a form of bibliographical field-work: it requires you to go exploring, and to practice textual scholarship in the wild. This may require research into the ways various online communities (including and especially non-professional ones) have dealt with various kinds of textual problems with digital artifacts -- even though those communities may be completely unaware of bibliography as a field.

Guidelines for referencing, format, and images are the same as for the descriptive bibliography evaluation, detailed above. This assignment will also require you to cite various kinds of websites and objects that don't fit easily into the Chicago Manual of Style format. In those cases, you should emulate the emerging conventions of fields like critical code studies (again, see the Kirschenbaum readings), and overall, do your best to apply the general principles of bibliographical citation as embodied by the Chicago Manual. When in doubt, the ultimate guideline is that another researcher should be able to use your citation to find the same materials.

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

Schedule and Readings

All required readings, and most recommended readings, will be accessible via links from the online version of this schedule. Please email me if you have any difficulty accessing a reading.

Week 1 Introduction
12 Jan

- assigned reading
 - Trevor Howard-Hill, "Why Bibliography Matters," in Eliot and Rose, 9-20 [go.utlib.ca/cat/7875444]
 - W.W. Greg, "Bibliography - An Apologia" [1932], in *Sir Walter Wilson Greg: a Collection of His Writings*, ed. Joseph Rosenblum (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 1998), 135-57 [[Greg - Apologia .ed. Rosenblum .pdf](#)]
 - D.F. McKenzie, "The Book as Expressive Form" [1985], in *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (Cambridge University Press, 1999), 9-30 [go.utlib.ca/cat/8357833]
- recommended reading
 - Matthew G. Kirschenbaum and Sarah Werner, "Digital Scholarship and Digital Studies: the State of the Discipline," *Book History* 17 (2014): 406-58 [go.utlib.ca/cat/7690636]

Week 2 Field Trip: Massey College Bibliography Room

19 Jan

- guest speakers: Nelson Adams, Julia King & Joel Vaughan (Massey College)
- assigned reading
 - Robert Darnton, "The Importance of Being Bibliographical" in *The Case for Books: Past, Present, and Future* (New York: PublicAffairs, 2009), 131–48 [[Darnton - being bibliographical.pdf](#)]
 - Philip Gaskell, *New Introduction to Bibliography*, "Composition" (40–56) and "Presswork" (118–41); skim-read "Imposition" (78–117), but don't worry if you can't read all of it, since we'll return to it in a couple of weeks

Week 3 Title Pages and Bibliographical Description

26 Jan

- assigned reading
 - Philip Gaskell, *New Introduction to Bibliography*, "Bibliographical Description" (321-35)
 - Eleanor F. Shevlin, "'To Reconcile Book and Title, and Make 'em Kin to One Another': the Evolution of the Title's Contractual Functions," *Book History* 2 (1999): 42-77 [[go.utlib.ca/cat/7690636](#)]
 - skim-read Fredson Bowers, excerpt from chapter 4 of *Principles of Bibliographical Description* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1949) [[Bowers - Principles - title pages.pdf](#)]
- recommended reading
 - G. Thomas Tanselle, "The Arrangement of Descriptive Bibliographies," *Studies in Bibliography* 37 (1984): 1-38 [[go.utlib.ca/cat/7757661](#)]
 - G. Thomas Tanselle, "A Description of Descriptive Bibliography," *Studies in Bibliography* 45 (1992): 1-30 [[go.utlib.ca/cat/7757661](#)]
 - Alan Galey, "Encoding as Editing as Reading," in *Shakespeare and Textual Studies*, ed. Margaret Jane Kidnie and Sonia Massai (Cambridge University Press, 2015), 177–95 [[go.utlib.ca/cat/10302015](#)]

Week 4 Imposition, Format, and Collation

2 Feb

- assigned reading
 - Gaskell, "Imposition" (78-117)
 - spend some time playing with *Impositor*, designed by Mike Poston of the Folger Shakespeare Library ([titania.folger.edu/impositor](#))
- recommended reading
 - G. Thomas Tanselle, "The Concept of Format," *Studies in Bibliography* 53 (2000): 67-115 [[go.utlib.ca/cat/7757661](#)] (N.B. the critique of Gaskell, esp. on pp. 94-5)

Week 5
9 Feb

Edition, Impression, Issue, and State

- assigned reading
 - Gaskell, "Identification" (314-20)
 - G. Thomas Tanselle, "The Concept of 'Ideal Copy,'" *Studies in Bibliography* 33 (1980): 18-53 [go.utlib.ca/cat/7757661]
 - Joseph Dane, "'Ideal Copy' vs. 'Ideal Texts': the Application of Bibliographical Description to Facsimiles," in *Abstractions of Evidence in the Study of Manuscripts and Early Printed Books* (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2009), 77-94 [[Dane - ideal copy.pdf](#)]
- recommended reading
 - D.F. McKenzie, "Printers of the Mind: Some Notes on Bibliographical Theories and Printing-House Practices," in *Making Meaning: "Printers of the Mind" and Other Essays*, ed. Peter D. McDonald and Michael F. Suarez (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002), 13-85

Week 6
16 Feb

Paper and Type

- assigned reading
 - Gaskell, "Paper" (57-77), "Paper in the Machine-Press Period" (214-30)
 - Gaskell, "Printing Type" (9-39), "Type 1800-1875" (207-213), "Mechanical Composition and Type 1875-1950" (274-88)
- recommended reading
 - Joshua Calhoun, "The World Made Flax: Cheap Bibles, Textual Corruption, and the Poetics of Paper," *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 126, no. 2 (2011), 327-44 [go.utlib.ca/cat/7744793]
 - David McKitterick, "Old Faces and New Acquaintances: Bibliography and the Association of Ideas," *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 87 (1993): 163-86 [go.utlib.ca/cat/7742800]
 - Megan L. Benton, "Typography and Gender: Remasculating the Modern Book," in *Illuminating Letters: Typography and Literary Interpretation*, ed. Paul C. Gutjahr and Megan L. Benton (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2001), 71-93 [[Benton - typography and gender.pdf](#)]
 - David Norton, ch. 3 of *A Textual History of the King James Bible* (Cambridge University Press, 2005) [[Norton - ch3 of Textual History of the KJB.pdf](#)]
 - D.F. McKenzie, "Typography and Meaning: the Case of William Congreve," in *Making Meaning: "Printers of the Mind" and Other Essays*, ed. Peter D. McDonald and Michael F. Suarez (Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002), 198-36 [[McKenzie - typography and meaning.pdf](#)]
 - Dave Addey, "Alien," *Typeset in the Future* (blog), December 1, 2014, typesetinthefuture.com/2014/12/01/alien/

23 Feb

Reading week (no class)

Week 7
2 March

Illustration

- guest speaker: Philip Oldfield (Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, ret.)
- assigned reading
 - Gaskell, "Decoration and Illustration" (154-9), "Processes of Reproduction" (266-73)
 - Kari Krauss, "Picture Criticism: Textual Studies and the Image," in *The Cambridge Companion to Textual Scholarship*, ed. Neil Fraistat and Julia Flanders (Cambridge University Press, 2013), 236–56

Week 8
9 March

The War on error: Corruption, Correction, and Forgery

- assigned reading
 - David McKitterick, "Perfect and Imperfect," in *Print, Manuscript and the Search for Order, 1450–1830* (Cambridge University Press, 2003), 139–65 [[McKitterick - perfect and imperfect.pdf](#)]
 - Random Clod [a.k.a. Randall McLeod], "Information on Information," *Text: Transactions of the Society for Textual Scholarship* 5 (1991): 241–81 [[go.utlib.ca/cat/7759499](#)] (N.B. when printing this article or reading it online, try to keep the proper pages facing each other, as the article would have been printed. You'll see why once you download the article...)
- recommended reading
 - Lee Israel, *Can You Ever Forgive Me?: Memoirs of a Literary Forger* (New York: Simon & Shuster, 2008)
 - Jeffrey Masten, "Pressing Subjects; or, the Secret Lives of Shakespeare's Compositors," in *Language Machines: Technologies of Literary and Cultural Production*, ed. Masten, Peter Stallybrass, and Nancy J. Vickers (New York: Routledge, 1997), 75–106
 - Seth Lerer, *Error and the Academic Self: the Scholarly Imagination, Medieval to Modern* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002)
 - posts on the subject of error at *The Collation*, the Folger Shakespeare Library's blog: [collation.folger.edu/tag/errors/](#)

Week 9
16 March

The Struggle for the Text: Analytical Bibliography in Practice

- guest speakers: Randall McLeod (Department of English) and Meaghan Uyede (Faculty of Information)
- assigned reading
 - Random Cloud [a.k.a. Randall McLeod] "Fearful Asymmetry" [offprint: [Cloud - Fearful Asymmetry.pdf](#); note that this is a 20 MB download]
 - Peter Kornicki, "Japan, Korea, and Vietnam," in *A Companion to the History of the Book*, ed. Simon Eliot and Jonathan Rose (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 111–25 [[go.utlib.ca/cat/7875444](#)]
- recommended reading
 - Ana Mary Armygram [a.k.a. Randall McLeod] "The Triumph of King James and His August Descendants," *Shakespeare Studies* 28 (2000): 184-8 [[go.utlib.ca/cat/7754103](#)]
 - Peter Kornicki, *The Book in Japan: a Cultural History from the Beginnings to the Nineteenth Century* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2001)

Week 10 Born-digital Bibliography 1: E-Books
23 March

- presentation groups
 1. Kathy David & Laura Marchiori
 2. Katherine Salgo & Katelyn Stoddart
 3. Hannah Johnston, Hadas Binyamini & Jefferson Sporn
- assigned reading
 - Matthew G. Kirschenbaum, "Editing the Interface: Textual Studies and First Generation Electronic Objects," *Text* 14 (2002): 15-51 [go.utlib.ca/cat/7759499]
 - Alan Galey, "The Enkindling Reciter: E-Books in the Bibliographical Imagination," *Book History* 15 (2012): 210-47 [go.utlib.ca/cat/7690636]
- recommended reading
 - for a recent overview of digital book studies generally, see the Kirschenbaum and Werner reading from week 1
 - David Vander Meulen, "Thoughts on the Future of Bibliographical Analysis," *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of Canada* 46 (2008): 17-34 [jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/bsc]
 - Adrian van der Weel, "Bibliography for the New Media," *Quarendo* 35, no. 1-2 (2005): 96-108 [[van der Weel - bibliography for new media.pdf](http://van.der.Weel-bibliography-for-new-media.pdf)]
 - Whitney Trettien, "A Deep History of Electronic Textuality: the Case of *English Reprints Jhon Milton Aereopagitica*," *Digital Humanities Quarterly* 7, no. 1 (2013), [digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/7/1/000150/000150.html]
 - Simon Rowberry, "Ebookness," *Convergence: the International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies* [no vol/no assigned yet; see the journal's "OnlineFirst" section] (2015): 1-18 [go.utlib.ca/cat/7699073]

Week 11 Born-Digital Bibliography 2: Video Games and Other Software
30 March

- presentation groups
 1. Eleni Kontogiannis & Holly Forsythe
 2. Kimberly Unruh & Tessie Riggs
 3. Erlind Sulko, Lauren Maxine & Eleanor Howell
- assigned reading
 - Chris J. Young, "The Bibliographical Variants Between *The Last of Us* and *The Last of Us Remastered*," *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 110, no. 3 (2016): 459-84 [go.utlib.ca/cat/7742800]
 - Matthew G. Kirschenbaum, "Operating Systems of the Mind: Bibliography After Word Processing (The Example of John Updike)," *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 108, no. 4 (2014): 381-412 [go.utlib.ca/cat/7742800]
 - Nathan Altice, "Appendix A: Famicom/NES Bibliographic Descriptions," *I Am Error: the Nintendo Family Computer / Entertainment System Platform* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2015), 333-43 [[Altice - I am Error - appendix on bibliographic description.pdf](http://Altice-IamError-appendix-on-bibliographic-description.pdf)]
- recommended reading
 - Matthew G. Kirschenbaum, *Mechanisms: New Media and the Forensic Imagination* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2008) [go.utlib.ca/cat/6363088]

- Steven Jones, *The Meaning of Video Games: Gaming and Textual Strategies* (New York: Routledge, 2008) [go.utlib.ca/cat/8771052]
- Margaret Hedstrom, "Electronic Incunabula: a Framework for Research on Electronic Records," *American Archivist* 54, no. 3 (1991): 334-54 [go.utlib.ca/cat/7683672]

Week 12 Born-Digital Bibliography 3: Digitized Music and Sound Recording
6 April

- presentation groups
 1. Katie Holmes, Danielle Van Wagner & Sarah Walcz
 2. Olena Karbach, Rotem Diamant & Tamara Rosenthal
 3. Aaron Gideon & Maria Ruiz
- assigned reading
 - Thomas Wilmeth, "Textual Problems within the Canon of Hank Williams," *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 93, no. 3 (1999): 379-406 [go.utlib.ca/cat/7742800]
 - Jonathan Sterne, "The Death and Life of Digital Audio," *Interdisciplinary Science Reviews* 31, no. 4 (2006): 338-48 [go.utlib.ca/cat/7717954]
- recommended reading
 - Jonathan Sterne, *MP3: the Meaning of a Format* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2012) [go.utlib.ca/cat/8715131]
 - Kenneth Womack, "Editing the Beatles: Addressing the Roles of Authority and Editorial Theory in the Creation of Popular Music's Most Valuable Canon," *Text* 11 (1998): 189-205 [go.utlib.ca/cat/7759499]

Colophon

This course is an adaptation of Sandra Alston's earlier version of it, which was in turn based on Patricia Fleming's version.
I am grateful to them both for their help.
Nihil biblicum a me alienum puto.