

## 1: The (Digital) Library of Babel

*"Eternal September" is a notion that comes from Usenet culture – the early peer-to-peer newsgroups and alt.\* discussions that were, for many of us, an introduction to networked discourse and digital identity.*

What humanities arguments does digital humanities make? Concern over the apparent lack of argument in digital humanities comes not only from outside our young discipline. Many practicing digital humanists are concerned about it as well. Does digital humanities have to help answer questions and make arguments? Is it answering lots of questions currently? Hence the reason for worry. But this suggests another, more difficult, more nuanced question: When does digital humanities have to produce new arguments? Does it have to produce new arguments now? Does it have to answer questions yet? In the great instrument maker, mathematician, and experimenter, Robert Hooke died, vacating the suggestively named position he occupied for more than forty years, Curator of Experiments to the Royal Society. Part research, part ice breaker, and part theater, one important function of these performances was to entertain the wealthier Fellows of the Society, many of whom were chosen for election more for their patronage than their scientific achievements. Invented some years earlier, Hauksbee greatly improved the device to produce ever greater charges. Perhaps his most important improvement was the addition to the globe of a small amount of mercury, which produced a glow when the machine was fired up. In an age of candlelight and on a continent of long, dark winters, the creation of a new source of artificial light was sensational and became a popular learned entertainment, not only in meetings of early scientific societies but in aristocratic parlors across Europe. And yet not until later in the 18th century and early in the 19th century did Franklin, Coulomb, Volta, and ultimately Faraday provide adequate theoretical and mathematical answers to the questions of electricity raised by the electrical machine and the phenomena it produced. Only after decades of tool building, experimentation, and description were the tools sufficiently articulated and phenomena sufficiently described for theoretical arguments to be fruitfully made. One of the things digital humanities shares with the sciences is a heavy reliance on instruments, on tools. Sometimes new tools are built to answer pre-existing questions. Sometimes it takes a while, in which meantime tools themselves and the whiz-bang effects they produce must be the focus of scholarly attention. Eventually digital humanities must make arguments. It has to answer questions. Like 18th century natural philosophers confronted with a deluge of strange new tools like microscopes, air pumps, and electrical machines, maybe we need time to articulate our digital apparatus, to produce new phenomena that we can neither anticipate nor explain immediately. At the very least, we need to make room for both kinds of digital humanities, the kind that seeks to make arguments and answer questions now and the kind that builds tools and resources with questions in mind, but only in the back of its mind and only for later. We need time to experiment and even – as we discussed recently with Bill Turkel and Kevin Kee on Digital Campus – time to play. The 18th century electrical machine was a parlor trick. For Hauksbee and the electrical machine see W. Hackmann, *Electricity from glass*:

## 2: Doing Digital Humanities at the Community College by

*the eternal September of the digital humanities. If, on the local scene, I strive to give a habitation and a name to the administrator (yes, 15 even 16 that 17) as driven intellectual partner, for outreach and service to the.*

But coursework and publications related to DH project management tend to focus heavily on the difficulties of planning and launching a new project rather than the challenges of maintaining an established one. Together these phenomena downplay the professional skills needed to successfully manage a project while suggesting that project management is necessary only in the beginning stages of an endeavor. They may even give the impression that scholarship in the digital humanities is inherently ephemeral. Through a case study of project management practices at the William Blake Archive, which began publishing electronic scholarly editions in , this essay details the challenges and rewards of managing an established digital humanities project. Managers of mature projects may be called upon to oversee expansions in scope and mission, research and recommend new features and tools, grow or shrink the number of project staff, seek out alternate sources of support when early grants run out, maintain continuity as collaborators join and leave the project, and develop new workflows and procedures to reflect these and other changes. But funding agencies that support digital humanities scholarship appear to be moving away from models based on project proliferation and ephemerality and toward an emphasis on preservation and permanence “at least of data, if not of entire projects. It does so through a case study of project management activities at the William Blake Archive, one of the longest-running digital humanities projects in existence. These challenges differ significantly from those of launching a new project but should nevertheless be considered by scholars just beginning their DH endeavors. I begin with a discussion of the important but sometimes hidden role that project management skills play in successful DH projects, and then follow with a set of general observations about managing mature projects, illustrated with specific examples from recent activities at the Blake Archive. Making the Implicit Explicit: There is no such thing as a manage-a-thon. On an immediate level, these actions can be thought of as a nodal network of bodies and machines in which machines combine with humans to perform tasks”. In addition, we have the even wider infrastructural support necessary for producing such media objects: The importance of project management for digital humanities scholarship thus risks demotion on several fronts: Making explicit the tasks and aptitudes required for good project management can help to reduce the frustration felt by principal investigators or developers who find themselves unexpectedly occupied with organizational tasks and stakeholder relationships that seemingly have little to do with researching content or writing code. Once these implicit tasks and expectations are made explicit, it becomes easier to recognize how indispensable they are, whether a team has one member or Managing an Established DH Project: Observations from the William Blake Archive 8 In the following subsections I offer some general principles, gleaned from my work at the William Blake Archive, that demonstrate how the management of a mature and ongoing project differs from that of a newly established one. While these principles may not apply to all established projects “there is considerable difference, for instance, between maintaining a static project that is still in existence but no longer being actively developed and one that, like the Archive, is still growing and changing “I believe they can provide guidance to project managers as well as content providers, developers, and other collaborators who have moved beyond the planning stage and are anticipating a long relationship with their ongoing project. Questions of Ontology and Epistemology Never Go Away 9 Good digital scholarship, like good analog scholarship, will never be finished. This does not simply mean that digital projects will always need upgrading though that will certainly be the case. At a roundtable on digital humanities and digital pedagogy at the conference for C The Marriage of Heaven and Hell , for instance, is a work by Blake that we, as editors and readers, recognize only by virtue of the nine complete and individually printed copies in existence. Each of these copies is made up of twenty-seven objects printed on paper from a set of copper plates and arranged in an order that need not remain consistent among copies. There are also three additional copies of the Marriage consisting of only three or four objects each. The texts and images that make up each of these objects can also vary greatly depending on whether and how Blake inked each of the copper plates, what colors he used, and

whether he added or altered the objects with pen or wash after printing. In other words, there is no definitive copy or edition of the work known as *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*. Under such conditions, issues of classification and organization must be perpetually renegotiated: Is this a typographic edition or a manuscript? In the case of the Blake Archive, links between Related Works represent technologically the collective knowledge of Archive editors and staff, who decide before each publication which works are related to the new publication and in what way they are related. But the Related Works feature is meant to supplement rather than to replace the user-generated connections enabled by other tools in the Archive. The Archive is designed such that a publication process that works flawlessly for an illuminated book will require tweaking for a manuscript or watercolor. Thus, scholars reading Eugenie R. The incorporation of BIQ represents scope change of the best kind: Like the Archive itself, these issues will be highly searchable and require no subscription fees. In the image below, for instance, objects from *The Small Book of Designs* a series of separate plates appear alongside corresponding images from *The Book of Urizen Visions of the Daughters of Albion* both illuminated books. Like the integration of BIQ though on a much smaller scale, this change reflected the logical development of an existing tool rather than feature creep run amok. Compare feature windows showing images printed from the same copper plates but appearing in different works. The top row shows an object, far left, from *A Small Book of Designs* alongside objects from. At the Archive, the danger of feature creep is that every tool will be expected to do everything: Revision Gets Harder Rather than Easier 23 In the planning stages of a digital humanities project collaborators must constantly be sibyls: At the low-consequence end of the spectrum is our book of image search terms: Since there are scores of digital editions already published and hundreds left to publish, at the Archive we find ourselves perpetually looking forward as well as backward, pondering the possible consequences of our actions for future staffers. The Longer a Project Lasts, the More Diffuse Its Collective Knowledge Becomes 26 One of the most exciting and frightening aspects of digital humanities projects is their reliance on distributed expertise. This need is present from the beginning of nearly every project; rare though not unheard of is the digital humanist who can single-handedly write code, mark up data, build a database, design web interfaces, write grants, manage a staff, and provide expert content. Rarer still is the scholar who can do all of these things while teaching, publishing, and serving on numerous committees. The longer a project exists, the greater the number of collaborators or, to use the private-sector term, stakeholders “ principal investigators, editors, project managers, grant administrators, developers, deans, graduate students, undergraduate assistants “ who will pass through the project and contribute their particular strengths. But in addition to its geographic dispersal, Archive expertise has become more temporally diffuse as well, as graduate and undergraduate staff members join and then leave the project, contributing their analytical and practical skills to publications that take years to move through the transcription and markup process.

## 3: Project MUSE - Debates in the Digital Humanities

*For more about the dangers of DH projects falling into the "Eternal September" see Bethany Nowiskie's blog post, "Eternal September of Digital Humanities," in Debates in Digital Humanities ed. Matthew K. Gold (Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, ),*

I understand the impulse, and to some degree admire the rough-and-tumble attitude of those in digital humanities whose first priority is getting things done. Hell, I like getting things done. But I cannot agree with the distinction between theory little-t and practice that this sets up, nor the zero-sum logic that it impliesâ€”i. DuBois and Jessie Fauset. Consequent upon all of these are new burdens on the experienced digital humanists who have built the field. And one of those burdensâ€”or perhaps I should say, responsibilitiesâ€”is theoretical. Given that digital humanists are now tasked with initiating much broader numbers of colleagues and graduate students into the field, how is that field to be represented? And what are the limits of a slogan in that pedagogy? Often, the new digital humanist is imagined as a fully formed humanities scholar who must now add some technical skills; thus, THATCamp workshops are usually dominated by computer-science-based technical skills or tools. And again I turn to Hughes for a metaphor for teasing out the implications of that move. It also, however, comes with some costs. In taking up digital tools, it sometimes seems, we are asked to lay down our theoretical tools: To be clear, I do not mean to caricature, much less insult, digital scholarship as it is currently practiced. The best digital humanities work is already implicitly or explicitly theoretical, and in any case, there are times when you have to let a concept remain a black box if you are to do anything with it. Is it not precisely in those moments of institutional incarnation that theory matters the most? Eternal September means that the theoretical commitments of digital humanities are more consequential than ever. And what are those commitments? Or, to put it more bluntly, can such a representation ever be other than anti-intellectual? To my mind, the best articulations of a digital humanities epistemology that rises above the shorthand have been offered by Stephen Ramsay, Geoffrey Rockwell, and Tom Scheinfeldt. This is persuasive, and fair enough as far as it goes. And indeed, it entirely makes sense that these critics should attempt to isolate a form of knowledge that is not reducible to discourse, in order to investigate its status. But to then insist on its untranslatability seems to me to confuse the issue. Is it indeed necessary to strictly demarcate the construction of knowledge through writing i. The questions that the roundtable poses get at what we stand to lose when we fail to theorize practice, or when we insist on the tacitness of our theorizing: In an era of widespread budget cuts at universities across the United States, scholars in the digital humanities are gaining recognition in the institution through significant grants, awards, new departments and cluster hires. At the same time, ethnic studies departments are losing ground, facing deep cuts and even disbandment. Though the apparent rise of one and retrenchment of the other may be the result of anti-affirmative action, post-racial, and neoliberal rhetoric of recent decades and not related to any effect of one field on the other, digital humanities discussions do often elide the difficult and complex work of talking about racial, gendered, and economic materialities, which are at the forefront of ethnic and gender studies. Suddenly, the raceless, sexless, genderless technological seems the only aspect of the humanities that has a viable future. And so far, despite the best of intentions, digital humanities has not done a good job of theorizing either that disciplinary shift or its political implications. Have we not arrived? But the way that the comparison breaks down is perhaps as important as the ways in which it holds. To note the internal tensions that the Harlem Renaissance and digital humanities share is to raise the question: What is the moral and political force of digital humanitiesâ€”what are its cultural and institutional consequences? Are we content to suppose that it has no such force, or ought we not inquire? Langston Hughes is right. Originally published by Natalia Cecire on October 11, I am also grateful to Ted Underwood and Sarah Melton for thoughtful comments on the blog post where this essay first appeared. See Hughes, *The Big Sea*, introd. Arnold Rampersad ; New York: University of Minnesota Press, , Notably, as with the arguments made for digital humanities, this marginalization is understood as a matter of linguistic particularity. See Yu, *Race and the Avant-Garde: Experimental and Asian American Poetry since* Stanford: Stanford University Press, ,

4: Table of Contents: Debates in the digital humanities /

*Eternal September of the Digital Humanities BETHANY NOWVISKIE; Back. Part IV. Practicing the Digital Humanities. Canons, Close Reading, and the Evolution of Method.*

This research note narrates existing and continuing potential crossover between the digital humanities and writing studies. I bring recent work in the two fields together under these common labels, with the goal of building strategic alliances between them rather than to delimit or be comprehensive. I offer the valences as one heuristic for establishing connections and distinctions between two fields engaged in complementary work without firm or definitive discursive borders. Writing analytics might provide a disciplinary ground that incorporates and coheres work from these different domains. I further hope to locate the areas in which my current research in digital humanities, grounded in archival studies, might most shape writing analytics. Digital humanities and writing studies are two fields in which scholars are performing massive data analysis research projects, including those in which data are writing or metadata that accompanies writing. There is an emerging environment in the Modern Language Association friendly to crossover between the humanities and writing studies, especially in work that involves digital methods and media. Writing analytics accordingly hopes to find common disciplinary ground with digital humanities, with the goal of benefitting from and contributing to conversations about the ethical application of digital methods to its research questions. I provide a more detailed explanation, drawing from my categorization of this work, of the conversations in digital humanities surrounding the digital archives that enable data analysis. A review of past and current research in digital humanities and writing studies reveals shared attention to techniques for tokenizing texts at different scales for analysis, which is made possible by the curation of large corpora. Both fields are writing new genres to compose this analysis. In these genres, both fields emphasize process in their provisional work, which is sociocognitively repurposed in different rhetorical contexts. Finally, both fields recognize that the analytical methods they employ are themselves modes of composition and argumentation. An ethics of data transformation present in digital humanities, however, is largely absent from writing studies. This ethics comes to digital humanities from the influence of textual studies and archival studies. This is especially true for analyses of text, which in particular foreground writing and analysis of writing as acts of transformation. Directions for Further Research: I recommend that future efforts to find crossover between digital humanities and writing studies do so by identifying their common values rather than trying to co-opt language and spaces or engaging in broad definitional work. I further provide a set of guiding principles that writing analytics might follow in order to pursue research that draws upon and contributes to both digital humanities and writing studies. Keywords archives; definitions; digital humanities; methodologies; text analysis; transformation; writing analytics; writing studies Full Text: References About the archive: The William Blake archive. Neoliberal tools and archives: A political history of digital humanities. Los Angeles Review of Books. Rhetoric in American anthropology: Gender, genre, and science 1st edition. University of Pittsburgh Press. Threshold concepts of writing studies pp. University Press of Colorado. A corpus-based study with implications for pedagogy 1st ed. In Proceedings of the Balisage: The Markup Conference Systems of genres and the enactment of social intentions. Open access book publishing in writing studies: First Monday, 13 1. The rise of writing: A theory of revision and editing for book and screen. University of Michigan Press. Why can a computer do so little? Association for Literary and Linguistic Computing Bulletin, 4 1 , University of Chicago Press. Empiricism Is not a four-letter word. College Composition and Communication, 47 4 , 116-127 The dark side of the digital humanities. The development of Walden: ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. Large-scale assessment, locally-developed measures, and automated scoring of essays: Fishing for red herrings? Assessing Writing, 18 1 , 1-10 Taking dirty OCR seriously. Generic, referential, and functional. Historical and contemporary studies of writing in professional communities pp. U of Wisconsin Press. Humanities approaches to interface theory. Humanities approaches to graphical display, 5 1. Performative materiality and theoretical approaches to interface, 7 1. Sociocognitive domains of reader-response theory: Open Library of Humanities, 2 2 , 1. Ends, futures, and transforming the academy. Detailism, digital texts, and

the problem of pedantry. *TEXT Technology*, 2, 41â€” The women writers project: Strategies for stability and change. An archaeology of Victorian newspapers. *Victorian Periodicals Review*, 49 4, â€” How a prototype argues. *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 25 4, â€” A conversation with data: Prospecting Victorian Words and Ideas. *Victorian Studies*, 54 1, 69â€” Strategies for stability and change pp. What we share and what we miss when we share. Facts, patterns, methods, meaning: Public knowledge building in the digital humanities. R for data science. How to do things with texts. Research and recommendations for computers and composition. The history of humanities computing. Examining student revisions at scale. Toward a labor economy of literacy: Writing and research after literacy in American lives pp. These flames and generousities of the heart: Emily Dickinson and the illogic of sumptuary values. Some notes on visual intentionality in Emily Dickinson. *HOW ever*, 3 4, Toward a new rhetoric of difference. National Council of Teachers of English. Univ Of Minnesota Press. *Differences*, 25 1, 46â€” The image of absence: Archival silence, data visualization, and James Hemings. *American Literature*, 85 4, â€” The *Computer Journal*, 27 2, 97â€” *College Composition and Communication*, 64 1, The New York Times. A theory of writing assessment 1st edition. Utah State University Press. The erasure of language.

## 5: » Introduction: Theory and the Virtues of Digital Humanities Journal of Digital Humanities

*Eternal September means that the theoretical commitments of digital humanities are more consequential than ever. And what are those commitments? "More hack, less yack" functions as a pedagogical shorthand because it really does capture something about the epistemological and ethical underpinnings of digital humanities.*

Builders , Collaboration , Digital Humanities , Eternal September , Tortoises A well-known scientist some say it was Bertrand Russell once gave a public lecture on astronomy. He described how the earth orbits around the sun and how the sun, in turn, orbits around the center of a vast collection of stars called our galaxy. At the end of the lecture, a little old lady at the back of the room got up and said: The world is really a flat plate supported on the back of a giant tortoise. A premise invariably breaks down into things that support it and the cycle repeats. The challenge is not getting stuck in the loop, or counting the tortoises to torture the metaphor a little further. Since our group started working on a digital primer for Old English I have been giving a lot of thought to the tortoises and the depth to which the tortoises of the primer go common consensus seems to be all the way down. Structuring a primer means starting with a wide range pedagogical goal for the text, a fair point, but to get there you need to think about the best tools to achieve that goal. An example, our project seeks to create an interactive means of engaging high-school graduates or college students in the basics of Old English grammar, following a theoretical model of language acquisition by Kenneth Scott Morrell. We also need a platform that is flexible enough to allow for a system of radial learning, rather than forced linear paths, and accommodating enough to allow for self directed interests later on. So where to start? Well this is where one of the first problems of infinite regress comes in, how much coding background to we have on our team? Some, but not much. Ok, so that limits the choices to what platform we can build on, namely we will have to work with some other platform that operates with a certain level of accessibility. Do we need server space for the tools we wish to access? Yes, so how long with that take to acquire? Can it be done in the time-line of a semester? Do we like what one platform can do, but not how it looks? Are there issues of licensing? And on and on it goes! tortoises all the way down. While much of the spirit of DH seems to involve bringing new people under the big-tent and acclimating them to the tools and projects at their disposal, someone has to be there to make that happen, or perhaps even let go of the reins depending on the ambition of the project. This is speculation at the moment but a practical possibility worth thinking about. There are quite a few resources out there for finding something accessible to build with, sites such as Bamboo DiRT, but trying to get off the ground involves a lot of preliminary work on hashing out what can be moved forward with practically and what needs to be tabled until we have more practical solutions. This particular path of musing, in it of itself, might very well be a misdirected approach. Perhaps these musings, mixing and twining with anxieties, are natural to any part of any collaborative project; however this seems to be a place and forum for discussing some of them as they come up. It may not be the place of theoretical articles to engage with specifics or to explore the recursive nature of collaboration. At the end of the day someone has to keep track of the tortoises. Teaching Beginning Greek and Latin, Oxford: Oxford University Press, , University of Minnesota Press, ,

## 6: Debates in the Digital Humanities – University of Minnesota Press

*perpetual newness*—what Bethany Nowviskie () has called the "eternal September" of the digital humanities. The field has gained particular prominence in the past decade with the founding of the NEH's Office of Digital Humanities.

I came to theory because I was hurting—the pain within me was so intense I could not go on living. It therefore seems appropriately inappropriate to introduce a special section on digital humanities and theory with poetry, a kind of utterance in which language, it is still conceded, may do as well as say. Not in the days of Adam and Eve but when Adam was alone; when there was no smoke and color was fine, not with the fineness of early civilization art but by virtue of its originality; with nothing to modify it but the mist that went up, obliqueness was a variation of the perpendicular, plain to see and to account for. Gradually resemblance, discourse, and logical argumentation ceded epistemological authority to a factual register established through experimentation, witnessing, and testimony. Knowledge, once established through discursive proof, became a matter of the physical. We seem still to be in this modern moment. I am proposing, then, that the question of theory is a question about the place of digital humanities in a set of disciplines that have continually wrestled with the status of the word in the production of knowledge. Gestures that consolidate professional legitimacy also name those actors who are and are not to be regarded as legitimate, with consequences that propagate unevenly across race, class, gender, sexuality, disability, and institutional status. Epistemologies of doing What, then, are the options for a postlapsarian humanities? By and large, however, digital humanities has taken another tack. Digital humanities does not so much contest the modern division between saying and doing as attempt to dilate the critical power of doing. From the earliest hackers working at large research universities on the first networks to anyone who deserves the term today, a hacker is a person who looks at systemic knowledge structures and learns about them from making or doing. It is undertheorized the way carpentry or computer science are. Epistemological claims are ethical claims. Suspending for a moment the question of whether this is necessarily the case—a question that Tom Scheinfeldt, Ryan Shaw, Trevor Owens, and Mark Sample take up in this volume—I wish to point out the ways in which these epistemological debates are implicitly ethical ones as well. We can already see the ethical dimensions of method in the rhetoric by which experimentalism came to be legitimated in the early modern period, as Shapin has detailed: The rhetoric that presented new scientists like Boyle as craftsmenlike practical doers has been immensely effective. This reversal was understood as an ethical good: Both rhetorics—of manual labor and of its ethical concomitants—are almost uncannily echoed in the disciplinary discussions around digital humanities today. Why should a focus on method make us nice? Because methodological debates are often more easily resolved than theoretical ones. Critics approaching an issue with sharply opposed theories may argue endlessly over evidence and interpretation. Practitioners facing a methodological problem may likewise argue over which tool or method to use. Yet at some point in most methodological debates one of two things happens: Hacking is more than a method; it is an ethos. And yet this ethos plays out in uneven ways, often with unintended consequences. It is no wonder that alt-ac jobs, which require specialized skills and can be as difficult to attain as tenure-track jobs—or more—have come to be represented in the profession as shovel-ready projects just waiting to put our Ph. Yet in its best version, digital humanities is also the subdiscipline best positioned to critique and effect change in that social form—not merely to replicate it. Above all, I hope that the pieces we have included that suggest existing or imagined theoretical engagements for digital humanities will not be thought sufficient. The aim of this special section is not complacency but instigation. As the quarterly journal stemming from the ongoing work of Digital Humanities Now, the Journal of Digital Humanities selects online work in part on the basis of metrics that have shown that the work in question has already given rise to new thought and discussion within the field. This represents a response to recent calls for new, postpublication models of peer review. There are, of course, flaws in the system: Yet some of their most significant contributions have taken the form of face-to-face discussions, including at sessions at THATCamp SoCal and a roundtable at the American Studies Association conference. The online activity generated by these formats is incommensurable with that generated by blog posts, and difficult to

track. Such examples show that as we work toward realizing a new model for peer review, structural gaps continually require our attention and correction. And yet, as the contributions to this special section attest, the methods and metaphors of digital humanities are far from settled. What is needed is not self-flagellation much less defensiveness but attempts to develop the discipline within which we wish to work. This special section is offered to that end. Acknowledgments Many thanks to Joan Fragaszy Troyano, Dan Cohen, and the staff at PressForward for inviting me to work on this special section, and for their thoughtful collaboration throughout the editing process. Lauren Klein and Miriam Posner offered valuable feedback on this introduction as well.

Education as the Practice of Freedom New York: Routledge, , The Reinvention of Nature London: The Early Poems, , ed. University of California Press, Hobbes, Boyle, and the Experimental Life ; Princeton: Princeton University Press, , See Ramsay, Reading Machines: Toward an Algorithmic Criticism Urbana: University of Illinois Press, , 2. In an important message to the Humanist list in October , Alan Liu argued that digital humanities was in a privileged position to undertake that defense because its aims and methods were congenial to a broad popular understanding of productivity. Advocating for the Humanities, accessed February 10, , <http://> Because Usenet activity centered around colleges and universities, a large influx of new students each September had disruptive effects on its established, internal standards of conduct, or netiquette. About thirty days in, newbies had either acclimatized to Usenet or they had dropped away, and the regular roiling of September could be left behind for another eleven months. As the mids approached, Internet access became more common and less metered by the academic calendar. Harvard University Press, See Fish, Professional Correctness: Emphasis in the original. University of Minnesota Press, , U of Minnesota P, , Essays and Speeches by Audre Lorde Berkeley: Crossing Press, , Duke University Press, , Knowledge Work and the Culture of Information Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Lisa Nakamura and Peter A. It is important to observe that hooks is deeply critical of theoretical work that, through elitist vocabulary and deference to the writings of white men, reproduce the structures of domination that they are meant to undo. Hence, they collude with those whom they would oppose. By internalizing the false assumption that theory is not a social practice, they promote the formation within feminist circles of a potentially oppressive hierarchy where all concrete action is viewed as more important than any theory written or spoken.

## 7: Eternal September | Old English Collaborative Education Online (OECEO)

*Continue reading "eternal september of the digital humanities" Posted in higher ed, twittering Tagged collaboration, digital humanities, libraries, scholarly-communication 21 Comments on eternal september of the digital humanities.*

It was a bittersweet delivery because I had to miss the first day of our Open Syllabus Project conference at Columbia U. I dedicate these attempts to say something useful to my guides, Bethany and Jerry. In that congress, Alejandro Ferri remembers for us, about 20 Argentineans would gather on Saturdays at the house of another Alejandro, the red bearded, wealthy landowner Alejandro Glencoe. Sic on the men. Their vast mission, combined with their small numbers, led them to come up with very clever solutions: Glencoe for example could represent landowners as well as men with red beards, or men sitting on a couch. Naturally, they needed a library of congress. They started small, with a few encyclopedias. Soon enough the classics followed. On the day the bankrupted Glencoe ordered the books to be burned, he invited all to take a carriage ride through the night streets of Buenos Aires, declaring with great authority that the real congress of the world was the world itself. All accepted and exited clearheaded unto that largest of tents. But whose documentary past are we talking about? This is not the first time we build a republic of letters. We memorists have built countless already, each bound to specific mnemotechnics, labor arrangements and ideological charges. For the first time, though, we have within our reach the means for both the production and dissemination of our own scholarly work at a massive scale. Provided the bloodstained cables, circuits and energy sources that support our digital mirrors clean up their act and survive our politics and commerce, we have an unprecedented opportunity to rebuild our collective memories on a different key. A humanities gone digital brings not the future, but a new past. Canons built on top of nationalist and regional agendas; material traces of the past languishing in the libraries of former and current empires; brittle others crumbling under the pressure of the politicians and booklice of former colonies. In our diligent present, authors upon theorists sign over their Microsoft Word documents to the serviceable folks of the publishing industry, who will surely PDF them, perhaps stain and bind some paper, then ship the product by donkey or cable off to select corners of the earth. The industrial indexers and bundlers never lag far behind, chock-full of DRM cufflinks. Eventually we end up with an accumulation of our scholarship in large metropolitan or wealthy academic libraries—mostly north, to be clear. On the margins of our inherited republic of letters, the provinces make do with hungry local productions and dark libraries crawling with all kinds of strange critters—trackers, leechers, seeders—as the global wars rage on. By this point, centerNet had already made enormous strides in connecting centers across the constituent members of the Alliance of Digital Humanities Organizations ADHO, but they had found some difficulties connecting outside of that tent. With this backdrop, GO:: Many in this room now were there. I joined the conversation around that time. During our fortuitous debates in Havana, though, GO:: DH started molding its current ethos for transnational collaboration based on a different gambit: In doing so, we transformed the we. Our we is now a function of our intersections around the world, and WE are now entering our second year. So far, so good. DH consists of a mailing list, which anyone can join, a website, around members worldwide, a series of working groups and an executive board. We are just getting started, of course. While our online forum is the soul of our special interest group, our hands are the working groups. Each of the groups has their own coordinating executive, which reports back to the GO:: Working groups are strategic, in the sense that they help us carry out our larger mission in one way or another. Cuba, for example, continued the work we started during the INKE meeting; the Translation Commons group embodied our distributed and collaborative approach to language diversity; the Rewriting Wikipedia project provided us with a model of groups working together in different geographies and connecting by telepresence as groups an alternative to controversial anonymous, individual-centered models of crowdsourcing; our most recent addition, the Minimal Computing group is setting out to imagine a digital humanities conscious of global accessibility questions bandwidth, hardware, electricity, etc. Starting June 21 and running for 80 days, the site will take us to different parts of the world to highlight a different digital humanities project every day. Not only can arounddh allow us to get a sense of the rich diversity of scholarly engagement with digital environments

around the world, it can also provide a piecemeal entry for beginners to the digital humanities, refracted now through a broader lens. The first stage of the project consisted of compiling a master list on a Google Doc spreadsheet of digital humanities projects around the world. The creation of the master list was itself instrumental in making connections between individual scholars, many of whom became more involved in the activities of GO:: Ryan approached us as collaborator with an understanding that the project would be a great pedagogical tool for introducing graduate students to digital humanities around the globe. Students in the class began work on the project using the Scalar platform, and were able to create a prototype of the project that included mapping and descriptions of the project. Students also made their selection process transparent. Their well-documented experience served as a foundation for the continued development of the project. The next stage of the process consisted of gathering an editorial board of scholars from around the world to make the selection of the final 80 projects based on the master list. As of this moment, the final website is being designed using Jekyll, a static website generator, and using minimal design, like the SVG map you see in the slide, in order to make the project more easily accessible in areas with low bandwidths. In the strongest sense, though, this project has been more about the process than the actual product. We have built many important relationships throughout the development stage, and expect to build more; we have also had an opportunity to see the pedagogical benefits of the anthological approach to the Introduction to Digital Humanities course, which is becoming a staple of our collective practices. More importantly the project has helped us broaden our network and put to test many of the ideas discussed in the forum. The exercise proved that we are still long ways from sorting out how to foster a true babel. I personally have a longstanding love affair with the English language, but it does not blind me to the home court advantage of native speakers in large numbers. Undoubtedly, many of these problems lie outside of the scope of what we can accomplish as scholars, but we can certainly tend to our own tents. DH we have approached these issues by foregrounding the role of translation, allowing all languages free reign. While for the most part the community reverts to globish as a lingua franca, our policies promise to be a model for other groups seeking a global outlook. For our essay contest, we decided to accept submissions in any language, with the plucky suspicion that we would be able to find a translator regardless what participants threw at us. Our gambit paid off. We received 53 submissions in seven languages, five of which the panel could easily read ourselves, two of which, Polish and Korean, we had no problems finding readers for. Instead of requiring a lingua franca or official languages, we open language to the community, where a translation of the website or any forum post depends on the community itself. By allowing speakers to write in the language of their choice, we hope to chip away at perhaps one of the most daunting obstacles facing the global community of scholars to come. And because English speakers are all encouraged to speak in careful globish, we place the burden on the hegemon. Perhaps I can send you off in good cheer. Do not confuse the dancer for the dancehall. With *In The World Interior of Capital*, German philosopher Peter Sloterdijk reminds us that our obsession with dwelling within spheres and canopies is as old as dust, and like dust those celestial figures eventually must return to the ground. The rush for big data and massive surveillance, inevitably reduced to forms, continues an ancient search that could tame, and perhaps generate, the asymmetrical granularities of the real. Our new humanities must not refuse this dance, but we should dance it with our feet on the ground. Our task as memorists requires us to return always to a science of exceptions, to the punctum. Each produces an effect without being subordinate to the other. As we begin our global collaborations, we must do likewise. We must certainly have choreographies in place, do the dance, but remain open to wondrous new forms in the process. Listen to the experienced dancers. As we invent new dances and write new histories of dance, listen to those who have been dancing for years. The arts we preach are rigorous and demand years of dedication, perhaps lifetimes. The eternal September of the digital humanities is only bound to increase in intensity in the years to come. Let us welcome our students with patience and remind them gradually, but firmly of our disciplinary memories. Finally, and this one is personal, Let us be excellent dancers to one another. The world is a messy place, covered under the big tent of a capitalism flirting with authoritarianism, plagued by AKs and countless lunacies; but also agency and promise, the dance halls of communities. We are a small, if albeit visible, band of hackers and pirates charged with an impossible, but ever so crucial mandate. To reach the promised land, we must not fall into facile Us vs.

Thems, especially those of us who are wrestling with the tough questions of race, gender and other charged differences. I see many tents, and tents within tents, big ones and small ones, and clearings too; I walk among many of them and so can you. Let us count beyond twos and threes as we do so, and always err on the side of grace. Our students and publics are watching us; they have their fingers crossed. Not to disappoint them, let us continue to be excellent dancers to one another as we exit unto the world.

### 8: Staff View: Debates in the digital humanities /

*moment" [Gold ], the field often re-encounters the growing pains of the "eternal September of the digital humanities" [Nowviskie ]. As a result, recurring questions insist on the need for cultural critique in the field: "Where is cultural.*

This review of Linda K. Hughes and Sarah R. We are more comfortable aligning ourselves with discussions that take up literary exchanges from all sides of the Atlantic rather than adhering to the nationalist "either British or American" coherent, tightly sealed literary canons. Boundary-crossing and open geographic exchange can become a challenge, however, when setting out to plan a course on early transatlantic literature, or even to fulfill institutional and departmental requirements for what counts as literary studies. Robbins take up this challenge in their edited collection, *Teaching Transatlanticism*. *Teaching Transatlanticism* aims to reposition the way literary scholars teach nineteenth century transatlantic literature. The anthology offers a selection of essays from literary scholars who cross genre, discipline, and national boundaries in their pedagogical methods. Though *Teaching Transatlanticism* is not a text primarily devoted to digital humanities DH scholarship, Hughes and Robbins encourage readers to look towards DH for pedagogical methodologies. However, what *Teaching Transatlanticism* offers DH scholarship is insight into the ways literary scholars are crossing the bridge into DH work, and withal how literary scholars more versed in DH are welcoming new participants. From this perspective, pedagogy is an accessible passageway into DH methodology for literary scholars. While DH pedagogy is certainly not a new field, Hughes and Robbins recognize that many of their readers may be new to DH scholarship, and may also be unsure of how to become acquainted with the field. As a relative newcomer to the field myself, I am interested in pedagogical methods that aid new scholars in joining the conversation, and in the tension that arises when transitioning from DH novice to DH expert. Chapman thus theorizes the benefits of digital pedagogy in a transatlantic literature course as twofold: Simpson credits his students both in his chapter as well as within each entry in *The Transatlantic s* database. Hughes and Robbins present *Teaching Transatlanticism* alongside a website of the same name "teachingtransatlanticism". The WordPress site includes two components that solicit user participation: Currently, the teaching resource contributors and forum participants are mostly individuals associated with the *Teaching Transatlanticism* anthology. The authors in this volume help us understand the connections between transatlanticism, mediation, and the digital, and their work demonstrates an opening for further conversation. It seems that users are more drawn to online communities where they can annotate texts and collaborate on projects, rather than the model of the often neglected static forum or comment box. Edinburgh University Press,

### 9: Resistance to Digital Humanities - Minnesota Scholarship

*Debates in the digital humanities / " Encompassing new technologies, research methods, and opportunities for collaborative scholarship and open-source peer review, as well as innovative ways of sharing knowledge and teaching, the digital humanities promises to transform the liberal arts--and perhaps the university itself.*

*Best practice inventory management The Cross and the River My Unfair Lady by Guy Cullingford Principles and Techniques of Electromagnetic Compatibility, Second Edition Discovering Gods promises Story of the earth in past ages Mixed-Effects Models with Incomplete Data (Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability) Corporal Politics Molecular genetics of hypothalamic-pituitary axis development Phu V. Tran . [et al.] Little brown essential handbook 7th edition Cambridge legal studies preliminary Dr. Quicksolve Mysteries Mechanical engineering google drive Informatics practices class 11 sumita arora Synthetic application of diels alder reaction The Fourth Wiseman Introduction to managerial economics Behavior, development, and training of the dog Women and Theatre In the Hollow of Gods Hand The Kuhnian revolution Discrete choice methods with simulation The bikini diaries lacey alexander The Neapolitan chord Psychic Detectives (Readers Digest) Blessed are the cynical Principles and methods of teaching book Principles of data management facilitating information sharing Growth and development, with special reference to developing economies Start it, sell it and make a mint The end of the Renaissance and the crisis of humanism : the disintegration of the human image The rest Ill whistle. When governance is tested. Calcium transport and intracellular calcium homeostasis An introduction to radio frequency engineering by christopher coleman Journey to wisdom Human and social biology past papers 2016 Traffic engineering and control The Frangipani Garden Players guide to the high clans*