"Form and Computation"
Anupam Basu, Washington University

"[V]olumes that / I prize above my dukedom": The Archive, Digital Projects, and the Democratization of Knowledge Creation

Emily Isaacson, Heidelberg University

In this position paper, I will consider the problems of the physical archive and the possibilities of the digitization of those archives in relation to access for students at small liberal arts institutions, particularly those that are underfunded. Studies by the Council of Independent Colleges have shown that small independent colleges educate a large portion of first generation students and students from working class backgrounds. By overemphasizing the physical archive's role in the creation of knowledge, we put students at underfunded schools at a significant disadvantage: this potentially deprives students of ways of knowing should they wish to pursue graduate study and maintains an elitism based on physical access. Further, if we believe that looking at texts in their original form helps students develop valuable critical thinking skills, we must consider how we can expand opportunities to all students. A recent collaboration between the Stanford University Library and Stanford faculty is giving students opportunities to work with primary documents, as historians ought to; this is an excellent program, but it is not necessarily replicable at institutions without research libraries.*

Most of us as faculty understand that it is essential for undergraduates to look at materials in some approximation of their original form: contemporary editions of work will not fully suffice when it comes to teaching early modern literature (or medieval, or eighteenth century literature). While facsimile versions would be helpful, those too can prove cost-prohibitive. Thus, the project of digitization opens up important avenues of access for faculty at small institutions without significant research support, and, most importantly, opens up potential for access for undergraduates. If we agree with projects like the current initiative at Stanford to get students into the rare books room, we must find ways to help all students move into those spaces, even if they're digital and not physical spaces: this is a matter of access and democratization of knowledge. Students attend institutions like mine not because they're incapable of doing the work that students at Stanford do, but primarily because they are first generation and working class students, coming from substantially less privileged backgrounds.

Finally, I want to ask questions about what we can do at institutions like mine with the resources out there: while we do not have the infrastructure to do much in terms of digital humanities work ourselves, being limited primarily to open source software and Google for Education, we can and should make use of the digitization projects that are available to us. The question, for me, then is whether we will open up the ways of knowing or the ways of creating knowledge to all, or if we will limit liberal arts education to the elite.

*Link to article about Stanford's current project: http://news.stanford.edu/2017/01/06/new-teaching-approach-brings-students-archives/

"The Recipe and the Yeast: Multimedia Shakespeare Apps as Performance/Performing Texts"

Noam Lior, University of Toronto

Multimedia Shakespeare apps are digital editions of Shakespeare which incorporate Shakespeare text alongside performance recordings – audio and/or video – on a digital platform, most often a touchscreen-based smartphone or tablet. The design of these projects presents text and performance as parallel streams, suggesting both parity and equivalence by placing them contiguously but separately within a shared mise-en-screen. My aim is to draw out some of the analogies between this structure and the incorporation of facsimile images alongside modernized text in digital editions. Hans Walter Gabler suggests that such "document visualizations" should be treated as more than "mere illustrative add-ons to editions," becoming instead "a core element of our editorial objects themselves" (Gabler 50). For Gabler, incorporating such visualizations in a dynamic way is a step toward making a scholarly edition which functions as a "web of discourses…interrelated and of equal standing" rather than a core text festooned with editorial appendices (Gabler 45).

The current crop of multimedia Shakespeare editions (I'm looking at seven: Folger's Luminary apps, Cambridge's ExploreShakespeare apps, Stratford Ontario's PerformancePlus webpage, our own Shakespeare at Play app, TouchPress' Sonnets app, the Heuristic Shakespeare app, and The New Book Press' WordPlay Shakespeare iBooks) all present the Shakespeare text with a set of glosses, essays, comments, and other paratexts, while presenting the performance materials to speak for themselves. The marketing and media for these projects tend to discuss the performance materials as innately accessible, and engaging in ways which 'mere' reading is not. The performance thus becomes a kind of gloss on the text, rather than a document in itself, inviting (or even requiring) critical and analytical study.

If the inclusion of multimedia materials is to be an ongoing practice in digital editions of Shakespeare (and beyond), then there is both an opportunity and an imperative to think about the discursive tissues that digital editions place around such materials. Of particular interest to me is the possibility for this format to conceive, present, and enact dynamic relationships between text and performance, emphasizing the multiple nature of play-texts (and other documents which notate orality – poems, sermons, speeches) as recordings, blueprints, and catalysts.

Gabler, Hans Walter. "Theorizing the Digital Scholarly Edition." *Literature Compass* 7.2 (2010): 43–56. *Wiley Online Library*. Web.

"Some Reflections on Digital Reading, or Digital Reading and the Early Modern Archive"

Elizabeth Pentland, York University

"In Use: Evoking Movement in/of Early Modern Books on Screen"

Scott Schofield, Huron University College

The last two decades has seen a steady increase in the digitization of early modern rare books and manuscripts online. If early initiatives focused on making large datasets available, e.g. the digitizing of the UMI microfilms to form Early English Books Online (EEBO), many recent initiatives have turned to the materiality of specific copies (e.g. readers' notes, ownership marks etc.). This move from the digitization of a representative imprint (e.g. STC 3832) on EEBO to a specific institution's colored copy of Ralph Brooke's *A Catalogue and Succession of the Kings* (London: W. Jaggard, 1619), for example, has come with a series of benefits. Digitizing individual copies has typically resulted in the ability to view the most granular of book features at higher resolution; it has also led to new ways of classifying and representing the materiality of early modern books. We now have sites devoted to specific titles (e.g. Shakespeare Quartos Archive), provenance (e.g. UPenn's Provenance Online Project), and binding (British Armorial Bindings), just to name three. The move from a representative imprint to a specific copy also coincides with an attempt to negotiate the goals of bibliography with those of book history. Indeed, one could suggest that these projects begin to realize some of the calls made by D.F. McKenzie in his seminal *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*. However, despite the important work on capturing the human traces in books, we are still left with variations of the book-as-object on screen.

How might a focus on various spaces—from the architectures of the page to the study to the library—shape our understanding of how books were navigated, stored and circulated? How might the ms. notes and annotations found in early modern books allow us to rethink the book-in-use? Finally, how might these questions enable new approaches to how we digitize the contexts of early modern books? This paper will explore the importance of tactile engagement with rare books and how we might evoke such sensory experience in digital environments. Over a series of case studies of different copies of primarily STC titles, I will explore the possibilities for representing what we might call *the movement* of the book by considering how early modern subjects used their books and the different spaces they inhabited when reading, annotating, excerpting and more. The proposed paper, then, is both argument and conceptual prototype.

"A Literary Studies Approach to Digital Modelling"

Margaret Simon, North Carolina State University

This paper argues that with the increasing prominence of 3D scanning for cultural heritage purposes, scholars of book history and of literary studies more generally need to attend to the valuative and interpretive assumptions inherent in technologies developed for industry and adapted to scholarly inquiry. Undoubtedly conversations about object scanning are more prolific and long-standing in fields like art history for which the primary objects of inquiry are more frequently engaged for their dimensionality.[1] Nonetheless, books, inscribed objects, and early modern epigraphy are just three possible aspects of literary culture that might also be productively approached through dimensional modeling. To help identify the questions central to digital modelling for literary studies, this paper will consider how early moderns themselves represented and conveyed information about three-dimensional objects. I will then put these historical concepts about materiality and the remediation of objects into conversation with current efforts to make objects available in the digital realm. While there might be a range of potential objects to consider, I will focus on scanning projects of early modern books and artefacts at the British Library. While contrasts between paper-based and digital versions are familiar to scholars, this paper seeks to expand on claims about remediating objects that have weight, volume, texture and color, among other dimensional features. The paper will use Gervase Markham's *Farewell to Husbandry* (1620) as a case study for thinking about how early moderns theorized and represented objects in the technology of the book—and how those concepts might inform digital dimensionality in the present. Markham's lesser known agricultural treatise comes interestingly on the heels of his own printing scandal in which he was brought to account for publishing similar treatises on animal husbandry under five different titles. The text's use of illustration and its position as an endpoint to Markham's own experiments in re-packaged content is especially useful in thematizing how early moderns considered form and content and how books displayed other objects on their pages. For example, how do the illustrations of various tools in Markham's text relate to its verbal exposition on their structure, fabrication, and use? What constraints does woodcut technology place on the text's communicative or illustrative capacity? How do the images manage the work's themes? What arguments about representing objects are implicit in the text's procedures? As a window into early modern theories of dimensional representation, Markham's text opens a conversation about our own emerging presuppositions and practices in digital modelling of books and other cultural heritage objects.

---

[1] Consider, for example, Stanford's turn-of-the-century digital Michelangelo project or, more recently, scanning of Matisse's "Back" sculptures.