

BookLab: Print to Programming

- Course Number: IS583 BL / ENGL583 BL
- Spring 2022
- Classroom: School of Library and Information Sciences, 501 East Daniel Street, Room 46. **Please check the syllabus each week, however, as we are often on location elsewhere on campus.**
- Class Time: Mondays 1-3:50pm
- Credit hours: 4

Instructor Info

- Ryan Cordell
- Office: 614 Daniel St., Room 5147
- Office Hours: TBD
- Phone: 217-333-2622
- Email: <mailto:rcordell@illinois.edu>
- Preferred contact:

Course Description

“BookLab: Print to Programming” offers an applied, comparative history of new media from the hand-press period to the present. Our approach will draw on scholarship in book history, bibliography, information science, media studies, and digital humanities, an intersection described by N. Katherine Hayles and Jessica Pressman as “comparative textual media.” We will take this comparative, interdisciplinary approach first to better understand machines of reading (from the printed book to computer code) as material, historical, and cultural objects. We will examine how practices of reading, writing, and publishing have interacted—thematically and materially—with contemporaneous technological innovations over the past 250 years. This cross-historical examination will open new modes of materially-engaged critique for our technological present.

We will complement our readings with praxis, gaining hands-on experience through critical making experiments using textual technologies from letterpress to zines to computer programming, as well as with archival materials from UIUC’s Rare Books and Manuscript Library. Together, weekly “book labs” and course discussions will help us consider relationships among modes of textual production, reception, and interpretation: including in our purview both “intellectual work,” such as writing, and “manual labor,” such as setting.

Through our discussions we will develop greater capacities to critically read machines, analyzing the political, cultural, and social forces that shape—and are shaped by—textual technologies. We will raise urgent questions around privacy, algorithmic bias, intellectual property, information overload, and textual authority, asking how a rich new media history

might inform our technological present and contribute to a richer construction of the digital humanities and information sciences fields.

Acknowledgements

In developing this course I learned from many people, but I particularly thank [Whitney Trettien](#), [Matthew Kirschenbaum](#), and [Kari Kraus](#) for graduate syllabi from which I drew particular inspiration. I thank Matthew and Kari, in particular, for the [Book Lab moniker](#), which they graciously agreed to share.

Pre- and Co-requisites

BookLab presumes no prior experience and thus is well suited for all students interested in book history, digital humanities, or adjacent fields.

Course Materials

The majority of our readings will be available online. You will need to acquire the *The Book*, however, which is available through the campus bookstore. I also recommend you buy a copy of Sarah Werner's book *Studying Early Printed Books, 1450-1800* if you can. There is an electronic version available through the library, but it seems only one reader at a time can access it, which could become complicated.

- Amaranth Borsuk, *The Book* (MIT Press, 2018)
- Sarah Werner, *Studying Early Printed Books, 1450-1800: A Practical Guide* (Wiley, 2019)

Assignments

Your work in BookLab will happen through two major assignments:

1. Leading Class Discussion

Once during the semester you will work with a partner to lead our class discussion. This means a few things:

1. You should read all the core **and** penumbral readings for your chosen week. You and your partner can choose to split the penumbral readings if you wish.
2. Optionally, you may adjust our readings for your week by adding one additional article and possibly moving one required reading into the penumbral category. You should speak with me well in advance about either, as I might see something essential in a piece that would not be apparent to you. Any decision to change the reading schedule should be made at least one week prior to your assigned session, so that your colleagues have time to adjust their preparations.

3. You should come to your assigned class ready with a few questions or points you that will help get our conversation started. Your prompts should incorporate ideas from the penumbral readings that your colleagues may not have encountered. You are not expected to lead discussion for the entire class period: I only expect you to take the lead for the first 20-30 minutes.

We will sign up for discussion-leading slots on the first day of class.

2. BookLab Fieldbook

BookLab is an experiential course that moves between discussion of readings and applied book labs each week. A central goal of the class will be to bring its two facets into conversation: to use our readings and discussions to contextualize our applied work in laboratories, and to use our applied work in laboratories to enrich our understanding of concepts from our readings.

To help accomplish this goal, you will maintain a fieldbook, which will constitute your central scholarly activity throughout this semester. I call this assignment a “fieldbook” rather than a “journal” to convey its hybridity: week by week, your entries will include a mix of description, analysis, code, figures, or images. This ongoing assignment will give you the chance to organize the diverse tasks of the class’ experiential work, practice the skills introduced in the labs, bring your experiential work into conversation with class readings and personal research, and experiment with ideas that will be further developed in experiments you will conduct and write up.

There will be three types of entries in your fieldbooks: **bibliographic annotation**, **lab report**, and **experiment**.

1. Bibliographic Annotation Entries

In order to help you attend closely to our course texts and prepare for each class, you should prepare a few paragraphs responding to the core readings and your chosen penumbral text. I mean a few paragraphs **in total**, *NOT* a few paragraphs per text. Your entries should synthesize and bring readings into conversation, and should focus on a few ideas you want to highlight rather than attempting to summarize everything in the readings. These entries should be prepared, roughly, in the style of the annotated bibliography. It will be easiest to complete this assignment if you jot down notes and ideas while reading.

You should draft each bibliographic annotation fieldbook entry in its own .md file, following the naming convention outlined above, and commit it to your fieldbook repository prior to the pertinent class period. *To emphasize: each class preparation entry should be saved as a separate file in your Github repository.*

2. Lab Report Entries

Your lab report entries will vary quite a bit from lab to lab. I may post a prompt for a lab to help start your thinking, in which case you should begin your reports from these prompts.

In each lab report entry, I will expect to find a brief description of the lab activities completed and any outcomes (code, a material product, etc.). For coding labs, you will likely integrate code snippets directly into your Markdown file (more on this as those labs approach), while for other labs you may instead reference external proof of your work, such as photos. I will also expect prose that reflects analytically on the work of the lab, putting it into conversation with *one or two* readings *from the same week of class* as the lab, as well as readings drawn from the larger class or beyond where appropriate. This prose need not be as formal as a research paper, but it should demonstrate careful thought and preparation. You should integrate the readings explicitly, if possible through direct quotation. Use this writing to experiment with intellectual pairings you think might be generative to your larger thinking and help you prepare for the class' Unessay projects.

3. Experimental Entries

Unlike many graduate seminars, BookLab will not ask you to produce a final seminar paper. In some ways, your lab report entries will constitute an ongoing analysis akin to what happens in many seminar papers.

In addition, twice during the semester, you will conduct your own experiment with textual technologies or media. In brief, you will either extend your work with one of our lab technologies, bring together multiple modalities from our labs, or even introduce a textual technology or medium we were unable to explore in class. Your goal will be to delve more deeply into a particular book technology or medium than we can in 90 minutes, gain a more robust understanding of the scholarly literature touching on that technology or medium, and produce a materially-engaged analysis. Your experiments should, like our labs, bring together theory and praxis and be engaged with material texts, capaciously construed.

As with your lab report entries, your experimental fieldbook entries will pair description and analysis, but with more emphasis on academic argument, and your own theoretical or scholarly approaches. We will discuss these assignments more in class in the first few weeks, so that we have a shared understanding of what is expected and what is possible, but I encourage enthusiasm and risk taking in these experiments.

You may choose your topics and technologies at your own discretion, and complete your experiments on your own calendar, though I would not recommend putting both off until the end of the semester. You might think of the effort asked in these assignments as, roughly, half what you would contribute to a more traditional seminar paper assignment.

Organizing Your Fieldbook

Your fieldbook will be a collection of Markdown or .md files collected in a [Github Repository](#). We will learn how to write in Markdown and contribute to a Github repository

during our first class. You will share the address of your repository with me so that I can check your progress. I may also ask to repost stellar fieldbook entries on our class website, either under your name or anonymously as you prefer.

You should name your files following the following convention:

For bibliographic annotation entries:

YYYY-MM-DD-bibliographic-WHAT-WORDS-YOU-WANT.md

For lab report entries:

YYYY-MM-DD-labreport-WHAT-WORDS-YOU-WANT.md

For Experimental entries:

YYYY-MM-DD-experimental-WHAT-WORDS-YOU-WANT.md

Flexibility

BookLab is a challenging and full class. The semester will include fourteen weeks of readings and eleven or twelve humanities laboratories. To give you some flexibility, you may choose to forgo bibliographic annotation entries twice during the semester, and you should plan to complete seven lab report entries. I strongly recommend you not delay starting this work, but instead begin early and work steadily so that you can use this flexibility as the inevitable stresses of the semester emerge. Your bibliographic annotation entries are due prior to the pertinent class, while lab report entries are due within two weeks of the pertinent lab session.

Incomplete grades

Students must initiate an incomplete request by **contacting the instructor. The instructor and student must agree on a due date for completion of coursework.** The student must fill out the Incomplete Form and get it signed by the student, the instructor, and the student's academic adviser.

An request for an incomplete grade is most often granted to students encountering a medical emergency or other extraordinary circumstances beyond their control. Students must request an incomplete grade from the instructor. The instructor and student will agree on a due date for completion of coursework. The student must submit an Incomplete Form signed by the student, the instructor, and the student's academic advisor to the front office:
<https://uofi.app.box.com/s/sx7arobhrogfw12teaetmp1qq32ifdrd>

Please see the Student Code for full details:
<http://studentcode.illinois.edu/article3/part1/3-104/>

Method of Assessment

The Trouble with Grading

As you no doubt know, grading can be a contentious issue in college courses, particularly in writing- and discussion-based courses, where grades can seem arbitrary and contestable. Grading in school does not much resemble the way you will be evaluated in your lives or careers, where you will define many of your own goals and be measured by how responsibly and effectively you achieve them. For these reasons, **in my undergraduate classes** I have moved toward contract grading. To quote Cathy Davidson, a professor at CUNY from whom most of my ideas about contract grading are adapted:

The advantage of contract grading is that you, the student, decide how much work you wish to do this semester; if you complete that work on time and satisfactorily, you will receive the grade for which you contracted. This means planning ahead, thinking about all of your obligations and responsibilities this semester and also determining what grade you want or need in this course. The advantage of contract grading to the professor is no whining, no special pleading, on the students part. If you complete the work you contracted for, you get the grade. Done. I respect the student who only needs a C, who has other obligations that preclude doing all of the requirements to earn an A in the course, and who contracts for the C and carries out the contract perfectly. (This is another one of those major life skills: taking responsibility for your own workflow.)

In graduate courses, however, these issues are even more acute, as you professionalize away from away a system in which you are assigned letter grades and toward a system where you must take ownership of your own work, ensuring it meets the standards of professional performance, service, research, and writing. Your professors will give you feedback and guidance—and will at points decide whether your work is sufficient to move to the next stage—but your theses, comprehensive exam papers, or dissertation chapters will likely not be given A's or B's. In your work experiences, you will certainly not be given letter grades, but instead be evaluated in other ways, often with your own participation.

In addition, BookLab is an experimental course in which I want you to feel empowered to experiment and even sometimes to fail. I want to create an environment in which intellectual risk-taking and creative scholarship can be rewarded, even when it does not pan out as hoped.

Consultative Grading

Ultimately, the university will require me to assign a grade to your work this semester. In order to address the concerns outlined above and create space for experimentation, you will assess your own work in this class in dialogue with me, as mentor rather than judge. You will ultimately grade your own work based by assessing your effort and performance across the course assignments as they relate to the goals you set for yourself, your work to meet those goals, and your intellectual growth during the class.

Formally, this means that I will ask you to draft self-evaluations a few times during the semester, including a final self-evaluation through which you will assign yourself a grade. Barring extreme circumstances (see the Adjustment Caveat below) this self assessment will determine your grade for the semester. Ideally, knowing this process in advance will free you to do more ambitious work from the beginning of the semester.

My Commitments

In order to foster your progress this semester, I commit myself to:

1. Providing substantive and timely commentary on your assignments aimed at cultivating your research skills, analytical abilities, and scholarly voice.
2. Making myself available for in-person consultation and practical help during office hours and at other scheduled times, including virtual meetings if we cannot find a mutually-agreeable time to meet on campus.
3. Assuming no technical expertise from students going into any of our laboratories. We will begin at the beginning, so that no one feels left behind. In order to ensure this happens, I will listen carefully to students if they feel lost and adjust a given lab plan as necessary to keep everyone together.
4. Allowing students with expertise in particular technologies to challenge themselves and craft their own laboratory experiences beyond our work in class.
5. Working with you to understand your goals and methods when you take intellectual risks in assignments, even if the final product does not turn out as expected.
6. Respecting your identity, perspectives, and intellectual commitments in class discussions and assignments. I may push you to consider other perspectives, but I will not dismiss your thoughts or take them lightly. If you feel I am doing either of those things, I will listen and adjust my responses as necessary. See our class code of conduct for more details.

Your Commitments

This system will only work, however, if you also commit to:

1. Holding yourself to the highest standards. You should work to the best of your abilities throughout the semester in your reading, class-room conversation, and assignments.
2. Taking intellectual risks when possible, pushing yourself to think, write, and create in new modes and grown as a scholar and teacher. This may prompt anxiety, which you can work through by doing and with my help (see above).
3. Experimenting with new tools and learning new technical skills with enthusiasm and an open mind.
4. Assisting your colleagues with our laboratories when you have prior expertise, or if you acquire it more quickly during the lab itself.
5. Clearly articulating your goals and methods when you take intellectual risks in assignments so that I can understand what you are seeking to do, even if the final product does not turn out as expected.
6. Respecting your colleagues' identity, perspectives, and intellectual commitments in class discussions and assignments. You may push them to consider other perspectives, but you should not dismiss their thoughts or take them lightly. If

someone feels you are doing either of those things, you should listen and adjust your responses as necessary. See our class code of conduct for more details.

7. Meeting with me, in person or via Skype, at least two times during the semester to discuss your work and ensure you are meeting expectations (my own and yours) for work in the class.

Adjustment Caveat

I do reserve the right to adjust grades as appropriate, if a student takes undue advantage of the consultative grading paradigm. However, I have never needed, and do not anticipate needing, to exercise this right.

Course Policies

Caveat Emptor

This class may be a bit different from most of your graduate classes. I hope you will see these differences as exciting and intellectually stimulating, but you should be aware of the following caveats as we begin (and thanks to Miriam Posner for **writing the first draft** of these caveats for her DH grad course). If you can face these challenges with persistence, verve, and (reasonably) good humor—and abide by the code of conduct outlined below—we should have an intellectually enlivening semester. If you have any concerns about these caveats, please come talk to me. I am confident we can find a way forward if we work together.

1. The course will itself be an experiment.

The concepts and structure of BookLab emerged from my experiences teaching experiential book and media history to undergraduates; my own experiences—alongside faculty, librarians, and graduate students—with hands-on archival work and instruction through organizations such as the **Rare Book School** and the **Digital Humanities Summer Institute**; and my growing conviction that theory and praxis must be intertwined in scholarly discussions of historical and contemporary textual technologies. This course will focus on inscription technologies from the hand press period to the internet, which we will come to understand through a range of readings *and* hands-on book labs in class.

An experiential course such as this opens itself up to many quirks: the syllabus may shift; a given tool might not work as expected; an experiment might veer off track or fail altogether. In other words, this course will require both an inventive spirit and patience from its students.

2. You may not produce a final seminar paper.

You will likely produce a final, (potentially) collaborative project that will ask you to be conscious about relationships among media and messages. Likely this project will require substantial writing, but it will not look like a 20 page seminar paper at semester's end. Instead, your projects will require sustained work and will be multimodal, comprising text and other elements (e.g. digital images, maps, network graphs). Your projects may be fully digital, fully analog, or some hybrid of the two. These projects may well lead into more established forms of writing or publication, but we will not begin there.

3. You will collaborate (not just do group work).

Digital humanities projects often require collaboration among scholars who bring different intellectual and technical skills to expansive projects. This class will require you to work together both in class and for some of your assignments, distributing responsibilities and sharing credit.

4. You will be required to acquire some technical skills (old and new).

I do not require or assume any particular technical experience as we begin this course, but I will expect you to be willing to experiment with new tools and learn new technical skills throughout the semester. In this course, those skills will run the gamut from the historical—such as letterpress printing—to the contemporary—such as computer programming. “I’m not very technical” will not excuse you from the hands-on portions of the course any more than “I’m not poetic” would excuse you from reading Dickinson in a survey of American literature. Some of the tools we test you may find useful for your research program; some you will not. But I expect you to try them with enthusiasm and an open mind.

Code of Conduct

The code of conduct for this course borrows directly from the stellar model outlined by Northeastern’s [Feminist Coding Collective](#). Their Code of Conduct and Community Guidelines are well worth consulting in full, but I have copied and lightly adapted those items most pertinent to the work we will do in our class.

- **It’s okay not to know:** Assume that no one inherently knows what we’re learning. We all come to this class with different backgrounds and abilities; none of us (including the instructor) will know everything and that is okay! Encourage a space where it’s okay to ask questions.
- **Be respectful:** Do not use harmful language or stereotypes that target people of all different gender, abilities, races, ages, ethnicities, languages, socioeconomic classes, body s, sexualities, and other aspects of identity.
- **Online spaces:** Respect each other in both physical and digital spaces.
- **Collaborative and inclusive interactions:** Avoid speaking over each other. Instead, we want to practice listening to each other and speaking with each other, not at each other.

- **Use “I” statements:** focusing on your own interpretation of a situation, rather than placing blame or critiquing someone else.
- **Harassment clause:** The following behaviors are considered harassment and unacceptable in this community (these are borrowed from the [Django Code of Conduct](#)):
 - Violent threats or language directed against another person.
 - Discriminatory jokes and language.
 - Posting sexually explicit or violent material.
 - Posting (or threatening to post) other people’s personally identifying information (“doxing”).
 - Personal insults, especially those using racist or sexist terms.
 - Unwelcome sexual attention.
 - Advocating for, or encouraging, any of the above behavior.
 - Repeated harassment of others. In general, if someone asks you to stop, then stop.

COVID Caveat

I have adapted much of the prose on this page and the linked syllabus pages from other courses offered in very different semesters. I have tried to adjust the course policies and expectations to account for the strangeness of the times. I am certain, however, that I have not imagined every situation that might arise, or fully accounted for the full range or extremity of situations you might find yourselves in this term. Frankly, I will rely on your understanding and grace as I teach this course in entirely new ways. I hope to extend the same understanding and grace to you.

Consider this caveat an *override switch* for everything—yes, literally everything—else on the syllabus. I mean this sincerely: everything on this syllabus and in this class is subject to this one clause. We’re all doing our best to learn together during an unprecedentedly difficult time. We’re working in new ways and in unusual environments. We are caring for others while trying to keep ourselves healthy, sheltered, fed, and sane. We are worried all the time, and some of us are dealing with fear and loss. Among all these challenges, I still want to come together and talk about data and digital methods in the humanities because I find these topics fascinating and—dare I say it, given this world we find ourselves in—important. I believe we can learn a lot from each other and even have some fun together in the next months. I will operate from the base assumption that each of you is here in good faith: that you are curious, engaged, and eager to do the best work you can.

Taking all that as given, I also want you to **know** that your health—both physical and mental—is always more important to me than this class. Your family and friends’ health is always more important to me than this class. You don’t have to apologize to me if attempting to learn *during a pandemic* forces you to work at a different pace from what’s outlined on this syllabus, or if we need to find an alternative path for you through this class. My primary role as a teacher is to support you however I can. Let me know how I can do

that better. I mean all of this, sincerely. Let's work together to meet the challenges and find the joys of this strange semester.

Academic Integrity

The iSchool has the responsibility for maintaining academic integrity so as to protect the quality of education and research in our school and to protect those who depend on our integrity. Consequences of academic integrity infractions may be serious, ranging from a written warning to a failing grade for the course or dismissal from the University.

See the student code for academic integrity requirements:
<http://studentcode.illinois.edu/article1/part4/1-401/>

Statement of Inclusion

<https://diversity.illinois.edu/about/senate-diversity-resolution/>

As the state's premier public university, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign's core mission is to serve the interests of the diverse people of the state of Illinois and beyond. The institution thus values inclusion and a pluralistic learning and research environment, one which we respect the varied perspectives and lived experiences of a diverse community and global workforce. We support diversity of worldviews, histories, and cultural knowledge across a range of social groups including race, ethnicity, gender identity, sexual orientation, abilities, economic class, religion, and their intersections.

Religious Observances

In keeping with our Statement of Inclusion and Illinois law, the University is required to reasonably accommodate its students' religious beliefs, observances, and practices in regard to admissions, class attendance, and the scheduling of examinations and work requirements.

Religious Observance Accommodation Request form:
https://cm.maxient.com/reportingform.php?UnivofIllinois&layout_id=19

Other accommodations may be available.

Accessibility Statement

To insure disability-related concerns are properly addressed from the beginning of the semester, I request that *students with disabilities who require assistance to participate in this class contact me as soon as possible* to discuss your needs and any concerns you may have. The University of Illinois may be able to provide additional resources to assist you in your studies through the office of Disability Resources and Educational Services (DRES). This office can assist you with disability-related academic adjustments and/or auxiliary

aids. Please contact them as soon as possible by visiting the office in person: 1207 S. Oak St., Champaign; visiting the website: <http://disability.illinois.edu>; calling (217) 333-4603 (V/TTY); or via e-mail disability@illinois.edu. *NOTE: I do not require a letter from DRES in order to discuss your requested accommodations.*

Land Acknowledgment

Suggested by Native American House:

I recognize and acknowledge that we are on the lands of the Peoria, Kaskaskia, Piankashaw, Wea, Miami, Mascoutin, Odawa, Sauk, Mesquaki, Kickapoo, Potawatomi, Ojibwe, and Chickasaw Nations. These lands were the traditional territory of these Native Nations prior to their forced removal; these lands continue to carry the stories of these Nations and their struggles for survival and identity.

As a land-grant institution, the University of Illinois has a particular responsibility to acknowledge the peoples of these lands, as well as the histories of dispossession that have allowed for the growth of this institution for the past 150 years. We are also obligated to reflect on and actively address these histories and the role that this university has played in shaping them. This acknowledgment and the centering of Native peoples is a start as we move forward for the next 150 years.

Graduate Academic Support & Tutoring:

The iSchool Writing Resources is the in-house writing support team for graduate students at the iSchool. They are here to help you with your writing and help you feel more comfortable and confident in your skills. The writing consultants are not professors or evaluators. They simply know the struggles of graduate and undergraduate-level writing and want to help you learn how to succeed and improve your writing skills. The iSchool writing consultants can help you with every step of the writing process. For detailed information on our services please visit our website:

<https://publish.illinois.edu/ischoolwritingresources/>

Schedule of Weekly Readings

A Note on the Schedule

Each week there are readings listed under *Core* and *Penumbra*. The core readings are just that: central to the week's discussion and lab. Everyone should read these closely and prepare to discuss them. The penumbral readings include some of the many brilliant, pertinent readings I could not require because time is, sadly, finite. Each week you should choose (at least) one of the penumbral readings, based on your own interests, to read and be prepared to discuss in class.

In the week you lead class you and your partners should prepare all of the core and penumbral readings, and if you choose to dig into one of these topics for an assignment the penumbral readings are the first place you can start expanding your thinking.

Week 1 | January 24 | Medium

Core

- Marshall McLuhan, “The Medium is the Message” (1964), [library link](#)
- Ursula K. Le Guin, “A Rant about ‘Technology’” (2004), [external link](#)
- Ken Liu, “[The Bookmaking Habits of Select Species](#)” (2012)
- Alan Liu, “Imagining the New Media Encounter” (2008), [external link](#)

Penumbra

- Lisa Gitelman, “Introduction: Media as Historical Subjects,” from *Always Already New: Media, History, and the Data of Culture* (MIT Press, 2006), [library link](#)
- Tara Brabazon, “Dead Media: Obsolescence and Redundancy in Media History” (2013), [external link](#)
- N. Katherine Hayles and Jessica Pressman, “Making, Critique: A Media Framework,” introduction to *Comparative Textual Media* (2013), [library link](#)
- Mark Alan Mattes, “Media” (2018), [library link](#)

Book Lab 1: Well That Was Illuminating

Week 2 | January 31 | Book

On Location: Meet at Rare Books and Manuscripts in the Main Library

Core

- Hannah Alpert-Abrams, “Archaeology of a Book: An Experimental Approach to Reading Rare books in Archival Contexts” (2016), [external link](#)
- Sarah Werner, “Part 1: Overview” and “Part 3: On the Page” from *Studying Early Printed Books, 1450-1800 : A Practical Guide* (2019), [library link 1](#) & [library link 2](#)
- Linc Kesler, “Indigenous People and the Written Word” from *The Unfinished Book* (2021), [external link](#)

Penumbra

- Robert Darnton, “What is the History of Books?” (1982), [GET LINK](#) and “What is the History of Books? Revisited” (2007), [library link](#)
- Matthew and Sarah Werner, “Digital Scholarship and Digital Studies: the State of the Discipline” (2014), [library link](#)

- Leah Price, “Introduction” and “Reading Over Shoulders” from *What We Talk About When We Talk About Books* (2019), [GET LINK](#)
- Johanna Drucker, “[Preliminary 1. Histories of the Book and Literacy Technologies](#)” and “[Preliminary 2. Bibliographical Alterities](#)”
- Browse [Kit Davey’s Instagram](#)

Book Lab 2: Rarely Reading

Week 3 | February 7 | Page

Core

- Bonnie Mak, “Architectures of the Page” from *How the Page Matters* (2012), [library link](#)
- Amaranth Borsuk, “The Book as Object” from *The Book* (2018)
- Jonathan Senchyne, “Introduction” and “Conclusion: Reading Into Surfaces” from *The Intimacy of Paper in Early and Nineteenth-Century American Literature* (2019), [library link](#)
- Lisa Gitelman, “Near Print and Beyond Paper: Knowing by *.pdf” from *Paper Knowledge: Toward a Media History of Documents* (2014), [GET LINK](#)

Penumbra

- Herman Melville, “The Paradise of Bachelors and the Tartarus of Maids” (1855), [external link](#)
- Jonathan Senchyne, “The Whiteness of the Page: Racial Legibility and Authenticity” from *The Intimacy of Paper in Early and Nineteenth-Century American Literature* (2019), [library link](#)
- Sarah Werner, “Paper” from *Studying Early Printed Books, 1450-1800 : A Practical Guide* (2019), [library link](#)

Book Lab 3: The Old Time Rag

Due to materials, space, and time constraints, we cannot conduct Book Lab during class. Instead, students will sign up for one of two sessions during the week held at [Fresh Press Paper](#). We will end class early this week in recognition of the additional time ask of the lab. If the available time slots present an insurmountable barrier, please send me an email.

Week 4 | February 14 (Valentines!) | Print

On Location: Meet in the Books Arts Space, West Room, CU Community FabLab (1301 S. Goodwin Ave., Urbana)

Core

- Elyse Graham, “The Printing Press as Metaphor” (2016), [external link](#)
- Amaranth Borsuk, “The Book as Content” from *The Book* (2018)
- Sarah Werner, “Type” from *Studying Early Printed Books, 1450-1800 : A Practical Guide* (2019), [library link](#)
- Kandice Sharren, Kate Ozment, and Michelle Levy, “Gendering Digital Bibliography with the *Women’s Print History Project*” (2021), [library link](#)

Penumbra

- Benjamin Franklin, *The Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin*, Chapters 2-7 (mostly skim, but focus on the sections describing the print shop), [external link](#)
- “**Printing**” vocational film (1947) and “**Learning to Set Type**” vocational film (1940s)
- Stuart McKee, “How Print Culture Became Indigenous” (2010), [external link](#)
- Lisa Gitelman, “Print Culture (Other Than Codex): Job Printing and Its Importance” from *Comparative Textual Media* (2013), [library link](#)
- Marcy J. Dinius, “Press” (2018), [library link](#)
- Corinna Zeltsman, “Defining Responsibility: Printers, Politics, and the Law in Early Republican Mexico City” (2018), [library link](#)

Book Lab 4: Compose Yourself

Week 5 | February 21 | Type

On Location: Meet in the Books Arts Space, West Room, CU Community FabLab (1301 S. Goodwin Ave., Urbana)

Core

- Charles W. Chesnutt, “Baxter’s Procustes” (1904), [external link](#)
- Marcy J. Dinius, “Look!! Look!!! at This!!!!: The Radical Typography of David Walker’s Appeal” (2011), [library link](#)
- Thomas S. Mullaney, “Introduction: There is No Alphabet Here” from *The Chinese Typewriter: A History* (2017), [library link](#)
- choose 2 entries from the **Kern Your Enthusiasm** series and/or the *Font Review Journal* you would like to discuss in class.

Penumbra

- Donald F. McKenzie, “Printers of the Mind: Some Notes on Bibliographical Theories and Printing-House Practices” (1969), [library link](#)
- Nick Montfort, Patsy Baudoin, John Bell, Ian Bogost, Jeremy Douglass, Mark C. Marino, Michael Mateas, Casey Reas, Mark Sample, and Noah Vawter, “Introduction” to *10 PRINT CHR\$(205.5+RND(1)); : GOTO 10* (2013), [external link](#)

- Lisa Gitelman, A Short History of _____” from *Paper Knowledge: Toward a Media History of Documents* (2014), [GET LINK](#)
- Matthew P. Brown, “Blanks: Data, Method, and the British American Print Shop” (2017), [GET LINK](#)
- Miranda Marraccini, “‘True Home Spirit’: Paper Homes from the Victoria Press” (2018), [library link](#)
- Sarah Werner, “Printing” from *Studying Early Printed Books, 1450-1800 : A Practical Guide* (2019), [library link](#)

Book Lab 5: A Welcome Imposition

Week 6 | February 28 | Text

On Location: Meet in the Books Arts Space, West Room, CU Community FabLab (1301 S. Goodwin Ave., Urbana)

Core

- (Watch, ~30 minutes) Carl Schlesinger and David Loeb Weiss, “Farewell etaoinshrdlu” (1978), [external link](#)
- David C. Zentgraf, “What Every Programmer Absolutely, Positively Needs To Know About Encodings And Character Sets To Work With Text” (2015), [external link](#)
- Ryan Cordell, “‘Q i-jtb the Raven’: Taking Dirty OCR Seriously” (2017), [external link](#)
- Tyler Shoemaker, “Error Aligned” (2019), [external link](#)

Penumbra

- Donald F. McKenzie, “The Book as an Expressive Form” from *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (orig. 1986), [library link](#)
- Jerome McGann, “The Textual Condition” (1991), [GET LINK](#)
- Michael Whitmore, “Text: A Massively Addressable Object,” from *Debates in the Digital Humanities* (2012), [external link](#)
- Martin Paul Eve, “‘You have to keep track of your changes’: The Version Variants and Publishing History of David Mitchell’s Cloud Atlas” (2016), [external link](#)
- Denis Tenen, “Computational Poetics: An Introduction” and “Metaphor Machines” from *Plain Text: The Poetics of Computation* (2018), [GET LINK](#)
- (browse) David A. Smith and Ryan Cordell, “A Research Agenda for Historical and Multilingual Optical Character Recognition” (2019), [external link](#)

Book Lab 6: Pressing On

Week 7 | March 7 | Format

Core

- Octave Uzanne, “The End of Books” (1894), [external link](#)
- Meredith L. McGill, “Format” (2018), [library link](#)
- Élika Ortega, “The Many Books of the Future: Print-Digital Literatures” (2020), [external link](#)
- Dennis Yi Tenen, “Reading Platforms: A Concise History of the Electronic Book” from *The Unfinished Book* (2021), [library link](#)

Penumbra

- Nick Montfort and Ian Bogost, “Afterword on Platform Studies” from *Racing the Beam: The Atari Video Computer System* (2009), [library link](#)
- Jonathan Sterne, “Format Theory” from *MP3: The Meaning of a Format* (2012), [external link](#)
- James N. Green, “Bound/Unbound” (2018), [library link](#)
- Leah Price, “Interleaf: Please Lay Flat,” from *What We Talk About When We Talk About Books* (2019), [GET LINK](#)
- Sarah Werner, “Format” and “Binding” from *Studying Early Printed Books, 1450-1800 : A Practical Guide* (2019), [library link 1](#) & [library link 2](#)
- Meredith L. McGill, “Books on the Loose” from *The Unfinished Book* (2021), [library link](#)

Book Lab 7: A Real Bind

Spring Break!

Week 8 | March 21 | Image

On Location: Meet at Rare Books and Manuscripts in the Main Library

Core

- Sarah Werner, “Illustration” and “Part 4: Looking at Books” from *Studying Early Printed Books, 1450-1800 : A Practical Guide* (2019), [library link 1](#) & [library link 2](#)
- Andrew Piper, Chad Wellmon, and Mohamed Cheriet, “The Page Image: Towards a Visual History of Digital Documents” (2020), [library link](#)
- Jacqueline Goldsby, “Book Faces” (2021) from *The Unfinished Book*, [library link](#)
- Caroline Wigginton, “An Indigenous Pipe Bibliography” from *The Unfinished Book* [library link](#)

Penumbra

- Sydney Shep, “‘Smiley, you’re on candid camera’: Emoticons & Pre-Digital Networks” (2010), [external link](#)

- Aaron Kashtan, “Introduction: Comics, Materiality, and the Future of the Book” from *Between Pen and Pixel: Comics, Materiality, and the Book of the Future* (2018), [library link](#)
- Élika Ortega, “Not a Case of Words: Textual Environments and Multimateriality in Between Page and Screen (2017), [external link](#)
- Juliet S. Sperling, “Image” (2018), [library link](#)
- Joseph Viscomi, “Illuminated Printing” exhibit from the *William Blake Archive*, [external link](#)

Book Lab 8: It'll Last Longer

Week 9 | March 28 | Remediation

Core

- Ellen Gruber Garvey, “Introduction” from *Writing with Scissors* (2012), [GET LINK](#)
- Catherine Coker, “The Margins of Print? Fan Fiction as Book History” (2017), [\[external link\]](#)
(<https://journal.transformativeworks.org/index.php/twc/article/view/1053>)
- Amaranth Borsuk, “The Book as Idea” from *The Book* (2018)
- Browse the [Queer Zine Archive Project](#) blog and its [zine archive](#)

Penumbra

- Lara Langer Cohen, “Notes from the State of Saint Domingue: The Practice of Citation in Clotel,” from *Early African American Print Culture* (2012), [library link](#)
- Zine Librarians’ Code of Ethics (2015), [external link](#)
- Emily C. Friedman, “Amateur Manuscript Fiction in the Archives: An Introduction” (2020), [GET LINK](#)
- Adam Hammond, “Books in Videogames” from *The Unfinished Book* (2021), [library link](#)

Book Lab 9: I Feel Zine

Week 10 | April 4 | Network

Core

- browse the “Love Letter” to *Viral Texts* (2016), [external link](#)
- Scott Weingart, “The Route of a Text Message” (2019), [external link](#)
- browse the [Electronic Literature Collection: Bots](#)
- Rachel Sagner Buurma, “Indexed” from *The Unfinished Book* (2021), [library link](#)

Penumbra

- Jim Ridolfo and Dànienne Nicole DeVoss, “Composing for Recomposition: Rhetorical Velocity and Delivery” (2009), [external link](#) *Note: make sure to read each of the sections in the table of contents at the top*
- Meredith McGill, “A Matter of the Text” from *American Literature and the Culture of Reprinting, 1834-1853* (2007), [GET LINK](#)
- Molly O’Hagan Hardy, “‘Black Printers’ on White Cards: Information Architecture in the Data Structures of the Early American Book Trades,” from *Debates in the Digital Humanities 2016*, [external link](#)
- Ryan Cordell and Abby Mullen, “‘Fugitive Verses’: The Circulation of Poems in Nineteenth-Century American Newspapers (2017), [library link](#)

Book Lab 10: Aye, Robot

Week 11 | April 11 | Infrastructure

On Location: Meet in the Books Arts Space, West Room, CU Community FabLab (1301 S. Goodwin Ave., Urbana)

Core

- Melissa Terras and Julianne Nyhan, “Father Busa’s Female Punch Card Operatives,” from *Debates in the Digital Humanities 2016*, [external link](#)
- Jessica Marie Johnson, “Markup Bodies: Black [Life] Studies and Slavery [Death] Studies at the Digital Crossroads” (2018), [library link](#)
- Kate Crawford and Vladan Joler, “Anatomy of an AI System: The Amazon Echo As An Anatomical Map of Human Labor” (2018), [external link](#)
- James A. Hodges, “Forensic Approaches to Evaluating Primary Sources in Internet History Research: Reconstructing Early Web-Based Archival Work (1989–1996)” (2021), [library link](#)

Penumbra

- Steven Lubar, “‘Do Not Fold, Spindle or Mutilate’: A Cultural History of the Punch Card” (1992), [library link](#)
- Charity Hancock, Clifford Hichar, Carlea Holl-Jensen, Kari Kraus, Cameron Mozafari, and Kathryn Skutlin, “Bibliocircuitry and the Design of the Alien Everyday” (2013)
- Lisa Nakamura, “Indigenous Circuits: Navajo Women and the Racialization of Early Electronic Manufacture” (2014), [library link](#)
- Sydney J. Shep, “Digital Materiality,” from *A New Companion to Digital Humanities* (2016), [library link](#)
- Barnard, Megan and Gabriela Redwine. “Collecting Digital Manuscripts and Archives” (2016), [external link](#)
- Matthew G. Kirschenbaum, “Archives Without Dust” from *Bitstreams* (2021), [GET LINK](#)

Book Lab 11: Totally Fabricated

Week 12 | April 18 | Code

Core

- Benjamin M. Schmidt, “Do Humanists Need to Understand Algorithms?” from *Debates in Digital Humanities 2016*, [external link](#)
- Katie Rawson and Trevor Muñoz, “Against Cleaning” (2016), [external link](#)
- Annette Vee, “Introduction: Computer Programming as Literacy” from *Coding Literacy: How Computer Programming is Changing Writing* (2018), [library link](#)
- Rachael Scarborough King, “The Scale of Genre” (2021), [library link](#)

Penumbra

- Roberto Busa, “Why Can a Computer Do So Little?” (1976), [GET LINK](#)
- Stephen Ramsay, “An Algorithmic Criticism” and “Potential Readings” from *Reading Machines: Toward an Algorithmic Criticism* (2011), [library link](#)
- Hannah Alpert-Abrams, “Machine Reading the *Primeros Libros*” (2016), [external link](#)
- Matthew Lavin, “Why Digital Humanists Should Emphasize Situated Data over Capta” (2021), [external link](#)

Book Lab 12: From a Distance

Week 13 | April 25 | Interface

Core

- Craig Mod, “Future Reading” (2015), [external link](#)
- Jon Bois, “[What Football Will Look Like in the Future](#)” (2017) *Note: this is a longer read so be prepared*
- Amaranth Borsuk, “The Book as Interface” from *The Book* (2018)
- (read or listen), 99% Invisible, “The Universal Page” (2019), [external link](#)

Penumbra

- learn about “Agrippa” (1992) at “[The Agrippa Files](#)”
- Alan Galey, “The Enkindling Reciter: E-Books in the Bibliographical Imagination” (2012), [library link](#)
- Lori Emerson, “Indistinguishable from Magic: Invisible Interfaces and Digital Literature as Demystifier” from *Reading Writing Interfaces: From the Digital to the Bookbound* (2014), [library link](#)
- Allie Alvis, “Volvellies: Moveable Book Machines!” (2020), [external link](#)

Book Lab 13: Thoroughly Entwined

Week 14 | May 2 | Memory

Core

- Lauren J. Young, Daniel Peterschmidt, and Cat Frazier, “File Not Found Series” (2017)
 - “Ghosts in The Reels”
 - “The Librarians Saving the Internet”
 - “Data Reawakening”
- Bethany Nowviskie, “Change Us, Too” (2019)
- Matthew Kirschenbaum, “Bibliologistics: The Nature of Books Now, or A Memorable Fancy” (2020), [external link](#)

Book Lab 14: Book Reports