

## Emma Tsoglin

---

8:55 PM I was struck by the obvious excitement present in both articles—the confidence that the field, amidst the dubious future of the humanities as a whole, will thrive in our contemporary scholastic environment. There seems to be a solid foundation for this sense. Kirschenbaum's article dedicates almost half of its page-count recounting the development of the methodologies into a widely embraced movement with genuine underlying support. Burdick et al., meanwhile, envisions a movement that both fully applies the accessibility, collaborative potential, and intertextuality of digital media to traditional subjects of humanistic research, and uses traditional values and techniques of the humanities in order to preserve and analyze digital artifacts. Both articles made me consider the benefits of applying some of these concepts to older technologies, such as printing processes and even writing itself. I particularly found Burdick et al.'s brief overview of the development of the humanities as a recognizable discipline to be informative, and it helped me reflect on how a field predicated on reflecting 'the human experience' will inevitably prioritize human creations in media widely available to members of that field (these being text for the majority of the humanities' existence). As the internet has made it relatively simple to access images, audio, 3D models, and video, it is now possible to analyze works and have them be received by an audience as easily as if they were text. As a result, I wonder if the digital humanities will result in the expansion of the humanistic canon to further center non-digital but non-text results of creation, as well as directly confronting and preserving digital artifacts.

## Simone Kirkevold

---

9:45 PM Across the three sources that we engaged with this week, it became increasingly clear through the authors' passions, as well as the hundreds of definitions that are available to us, that Digital Humanities is a new form of scholarship that is drastically changing academics and

how scholars are engaging with their sources, as well as with each other. Despite the quantity of definitions, they all seemed to be describing the same thing, and the two articles also had overlap in their description of what Digital Humanities is, as well as the importance it has on the distribution of information across mediums; it can be used as a tool to expand knowledge, creating new companions to the knowledge acquired through the process of digitizing humanities, as well as a tool to consolidate information to make it more readily available. The benefits of Digital Humanities were discussed to a great extent, but I would appreciate hearing the other side of the argument against the expansion of digital humanities. The articles made it feel necessary in our current day and age of technology, but I'm sure there are people who will argue against it, and hearing their opinions in contrast to these positive articles would interest me, as I can see how Digital Humanities may be viewed negatively in academic circles and by people who are more of "purists" within their relationship to academic collection, expansion, and dissemination of knowledge.

## Nathalia Allenza

---

10:14 PM Authors with different backgrounds define digital humanities in various contexts and real-life situations where humanities and technology intersect, and their perceptions provide a holistic perspective of how individuals apply technological advances and how humans can create and modify old societal patterns through technology. Many commonalities intersect with humanistic perceptions, emphasizing human beings and the importance of an individual's technological contributions. However, how can we measure these experts' contributions to digital humanities? These contributions to technology lead to changes in social structures and technology culture. The differences delve into how we can apply digital technology in society, innovating and creating. Experts in digital humanity contribute to a broad spectrum of technology and human studies, as well as the development and creation of digital tools to advance society. The readings highlight the continuous transformation and adaptation of the meaning of digital humanities into different social schemes and fields. The role of technology is a double-edged sword. Positive outcomes can lead to a positive contribution to humanity, for example, learning

technology and online learning, or situations where technology would not precisely help someone, such as the misuse of ChatGPT. Technology is a tool that fundamentally reshapes humanity, either positively or negatively. The question is, how is the foundation of digital studies forming new paradigms among societies?

## Abby Bacall

---

10:56 PM From the sources we read, I've gotten a better understanding of what the digital humanities are—although every scholar defines the subject in a slightly different way, they all seem to agree that it focuses on the intersection between technology and the humanities, however broad that may be. I enjoyed that both Kirschenbaum and Burdick et al. discussed how the growth of the internet and social media (Twitter, for example) has increased the breadth of dissemination of the humanities, and it seems like these have made the materials more accessible to a much wider audience. Burdick et al. compared this process to the introduction of the printing press to society, and I would be interested in learning more about the comparison between these two major events. In what ways have they had similar effects? How have they produced differing repercussions on the production and distribution of art, music, literature, etc.? Part of the study of the humanities involves thinking about the overlap between the past and the present and putting those two eras in conversation with each other, so I think it would be fascinating to delve deeper into the overlap between the printing press and the digitization of the humanities. Furthermore, the pace of the digital humanities is contingent upon the advancements made in the world, and it seems like there is no limit to what that can encompass; from YouTube videos to artificial intelligence to copies of ancient texts, the digital humanities truly are, as Burdick et al. describes, an additive pedagogy. It evolves with the evolution of human imagination, and that field appears to be ever-growing.

## Todd Ferry

---

11:01 PM I found it fascinating how digital humanities as a discipline has become something more than itself, a synecdoche for an entire era of humanity trying to find its footing in a new emerging age. The question

of identity is paramount in the growth of digital humanities as a discipline attempting to break away from a traditional view of academia and become something new, a way to dive deeper and surpass the limitations of current research methods. In the beginning of the digital humanities 'movement,' researchers forged a sense of community and "common purpose manifested, for example, in events such as the Day of Digital Humanities" (Kirschenbaum). Digital humanities became their way of self-validating their own human drive for knowledge and understanding. Conversely, the potential prospects of digital humanities have muddled the identity of other researchers in the humanities disciplines. Suppose we are to assume that part of humanity is human understanding. In that case, the notion that human observation can be replicated and optimized through digital means can be quite unnerving for those who have spent their entire careers engaging in scholarship: "the construction of 'digital humanities'... increasingly serves to focus the anxiety and even outrage of individual scholars over their own lack of agency amid the turmoil in their institutions and profession" (Kirschenbaum). Possessiveness of knowledge has followed, opening debates about ownership and copyright, acknowledgment of digital assistance, etc., to 'preserve' the humanness of scholarship. Therefore, digital humanities tread a fine line of trying to enhance human capabilities without devaluing the facets that make the capabilities human in the first place.

## Zoe Rhodes

---

11:29 PM I think that these articles gave me a great introduction into the birthplace and some scholarship surrounding digital humanities. I was surprised that the field started as such a small movement. But as we move forward I am excited to see what generations with increased technology usage and connections will push the field further. Already in the Kirschenbaum article I started to see the implications of social media for the field. Discussions happening at conferences on twitter or a trending article seemed novel in this article. But now I find myself interacting with new articles or scholarly debates across numerous social media platforms. I was inspired by the positivity of the articles we read. Digital humanities from their perspectives seems like the next best step that we are taking as scholars. While I agree with these

sentiments I also have some apprehension. The internet has connected us but I find that not everyone who sounds like they know what they're talking about is correct. Even the best intentioned and well informed scholars make mistakes. This is not the problem but rather the "mob mentality" that can happen on the internet when something (wrong or not!) gains popularity. A lot of what I like about digital humanities is the important role that disseminating information to a wide audience takes. But I want to ensure that this information is critical and engaging rather than misinforming and outright erroneous.

## Catherine Di

---

11:54 PM "As a profession, we are just learning how to live with computers, just beginning to integrate these machines effectively into writing- and reading-intensive courses, just starting to consider the implications of the multilayered literacy associated with computers." (Kirschenbaum, P1) Both readings this week helped me develop a more holistic understanding of what digital humanities is, both from the aspect of what it entails/encompasses and the aspect of how/why it came into being. I guess something I had been thinking about since reading these works is just how we are just beginning to learn (humans and also specifically scholars) how to incorporate technology into our humanities teachings and practices (like the quote above suggests), and yet backlash has never ceased and has perhaps in fact grown? Whilst a lot of classrooms around the world, starting from kindergarten, are trying to bring technology into students' lives, in recent news, the NYC governor has been campaigning about banning smartphones in schools, and even going back to things like computer labs in an effort to prevent students from bringing personal technologies into the classroom. I wonder what stance the DH community would take on this ban? I reflected a lot about this in my comments (in the papers) - I also wonder how we can reconcile with the ethical considerations that arise when we try to switch traditional methodologies with newer technological approaches? Whether it be the amount of distraction and bullying that arose due to smartphones in elementary and middle school, to replacing practices and work that traditionally needed years of rigorous training, it does indeed seem like our battle with technology is very much ongoing and uncertain. We want our children to become

familiar with technology, computers, coding, etc. so that they can excel in this technological era - yet we protest about smartphone usage in schools and there still exists many conventional scholars (and even institutions) who refuse to "catch up" and adopt technology. What is the solution here? How do we find the balance? Is this perhaps also a responsibility that DHers also possess, as our readings suggested that DH did, in fact, contribute to this modernization (and the "loss of tradition")? PS. I also thought the ever-increasing importance of "design" as DH became more popular was very interesting. In addition to this, I also picked up on a point in the Burdick et al. reading - it is true that modern content is becoming more and more concise due to our shortening attention span AND the gaining popularity of AI summaries. A summary by default means nuances are lost - people no longer appreciate the original language, or writing style, or deeper context; but summaries also save us time. I wonder what is lost when DHers ultimately try to appeal to this modern audience in shorter words and perhaps more visuals? Or is the entire point of DH to make humanities more accessible - hence appealing to this rising trend of shorter content is exactly what it needs to do? (edited)

## Cora LeCates

---

12:19 AM The readings for this week gave me a much greater understanding of—and enthusiasm for—the Digital Humanities. In particular, the Burdick et al. article highlighted a generative potential for DH which I had not considered (as a student of the humanities during an AI revolution, there is a sense of pessimism amongst some academics and young professionals which can sometimes feel pervasive). Indeed, my own personal conception of “the humanities” seems out of date in light of our ever-expanding potential to use technology as a tool for humanistic inquiry—the “what is digital humanities” website quotes made this clear to me. While no two definitions seemed in perfect agreement, all hit upon the propulsive power of the field. For instance, Gideon Burton stressed “new questions...modes of creativity...connections among people and ideas,” and Charles Travis called it a “protean discipline.” Claire Ross’ definition of DH as a means of “understand[ing] how and why” our world has adopted an “increasingly digital...way of life,” in particular, resonated



with me; I am drawn to DH for its capacity to add to our existing understanding of linguistics, language, and foundational texts, but also for the unique perspective it provides upon the massive transformation of media and culture (in form, length, language, etc.) which has resulted from the popularization of new technologies in the past century.

## Theo Wells-Spackman

---

1:50 AM I've been struck by the broadness of definitions, even after we discussed the "big tent" idea in class, that folks have been using to describe this field. Posner's idea on the website we looked at that DH can be simply (for example) the act of building a digital archive seems to signal that DH might sometimes be less a subfield than a new direction. This seems especially true when considering Kirschenbaum's perspective of DH in an English department. It would not be appropriate to lump it in with what at a different university might be called the film and media studies department, because, as he says, it is "akin to a methodological outlook" rather than a narrowing-down to any kind of content. Something that has also kept resurfacing for me is the idea of reach. There seems to be a lot of discussion of audience by way of discussing effective ways to process and disseminate information. Kirschenbaum's emphasis on design, for example, would seem to include product design strategies at legacy media companies. Burdick likens the digitization of humanistic thought to the advent of the printing press in renaissance Europe, which among other affects widely democratized literature and religious texts. And both talk about a growing community of increasingly connected researchers, for whom the material is intended. But if success in the new humanities means reaching people, there seem to be indications that new audiences beyond the academy must be considered. These authors don't deal much with this point, but I'd love to discuss it more in seminar.

## Carl Zielinski

---

10:00 AM From what I can tell, Digital Humanities as a whole seems to encompass a wide variety of digital techniques and methodologies that get applied to various parts of humanities research. What actually counts as digital humanities though is very much debated. I found it

pretty funny that the Wikipedia article mentioned in Kirschenbaum's piece now mentions that "The definition of the digital humanities is being continually formulated by scholars and practitioners. Since the field is constantly growing and changing, specific definitions can quickly become outdated or unnecessarily limit future potential." I personally liked the definition by Rehberger that says "digital humanities is quilt making." I think it summarizes what a lot of the definitions are saying - digital humanities is a hugely interdisciplinary study of humanities that weaves together large communities of contributors with various skill sets. Like the Burdick et al. piece mentions, we're moving past auteur-based studies of the humanities, and instead different folks have different roles to play in applying digital, multi-modal approaches to the study. In this last century, we've experienced an information revolution with the advent of big data, computing, and the World Wide Web. It makes sense to apply these advances - such as the fact that communication and collaboration with a global audience is easily possible - to various human-focused fields of study.