

The Digital Humanities Disconnect

Drs. Joris J. van Zundert (presenter)

Huygens Institute for the History of the Netherlands

Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences

Prins Willem-Alexanderhof 5, 2595 BE, The Hague, The Netherlands

+31 70 33 15 800

joris.van.zundert@huygens.knaw.nl

Prof. Dr. Karina van Dalen-Oskam

Huygens Institute for the History of the Netherlands

Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences /

University of Amsterdam

karina.van.dalen@huygens.knaw.nl

On face value a most recent development in the history of the humanities—the advent of digital humanities—should represent an significant impetus for connecting disciplines to and from the field of humanities. The very nature of digital humanities as an inter- and multidisciplinary domain (Svenson 2010) should warrant the emergence of methodological connections and interplay between for instance computer science and various humanities domains. However, despite a history spanning at least six decades—if the computerized concordancing work of Father Busa is taken as a starting point (Hockey 2004)—and notwithstanding the high expectations about its potential for transforming and revolutionizing the humanities from both policy makers (Courant 2006) and humanists (McGann 2010), the connection of digital humanities to other scholarly disciplines is hardly without friction and far from seamless. Rather in contrast digital humanities are often vigorously and passionately attacked from the ranks of conventional humanists. Thus digital humanities has been portrayed as a scholarly empty answer to a presumed valorization crisis in the humanities (Fish 2010), as a managerial fad (Allington 2013), a big data ideology (cf. Kirschenbaum 2014), and many other ugly things (Kirsch 2014, cf. Worthey 2014).

As an exercise in the historiography of current humanities this paper compares the observed disconnect between conventional and digital humanities that is manifest in the Anglo-American dominated (cf. Prescott 2014) international digital humanities community to the development of digital humanities in the Netherlands in the last three decades. We focus most prominently on the differences between the rationales underpinning the various typologies that have been proposed for the major developments in digital humanities in the last three decades—i.e. first and second wave digital humanities (Presner 2009, Hayles 2012), digital humanities types I and II (Ramsay 2013), and humanities 1.0 and 2.0 (Bod 2013). From this comparison we are able to identify three key issues that will prove pivotal in answering the question whether digital humanities will establish itself successfully as a connective methodological trading zone and middle ground between humanities and computer science, or as an academic discipline in its own right. These key issues that we will highlight are: 1) the definition of scholarly questions beyond the conventional realms of humanities and computer science; 2) the status of mathematics & logic, code, and interfaces as viable means of scholarship; 3) the ability to define a hermeneutic frame and critical theory for digital scholarship.

--

References

- Allington, D., 2013. The managerial humanities; or, Why the digital humanities don't exist. Daniel Allington — Cultural sociologist, book historian, and applied linguist. Available at: <http://www.danielallington.net/2013/03/the-managerial-humanities-or-why-the-digital-humanities-dont-exist/#sthash.MdpKuZmu.dpbs> [Accessed May 8, 2014].
- Bod, R., 2013. *Het Einde van de Geesteswetenschappen 1.0*. Available at: <http://staff.science.uva.nl/~rens/OratieRens.pdf> [Accessed February 26, 2013].
- Courant, P.N. et al., 2006. *Our Cultural Commonwealth: The report of the American Council of Learned Societies' Commission on Cyberinfrastructure for Humanities and Social Sciences*. University of Southern California.
- Fish, S., 2010. The Crisis of the Humanities Officially Arrives. *New York Times*. Available at: <http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/10/11/the-crisis-of-the-humanities-officially-arrives> [Accessed May 8, 2014].
- Hayles, K.N., 2012. *How We Think: Digital Media and Contemporary Technogenesis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hockey, S., 2004. The History of Humanities Computing. In S. Schreibman, Siemens, Ray, & J. Unsworth, eds. *A Companion to Digital Humanities*. Oxford: Blackwell. Available at: <http://www.digitalhumanities.org/companion/>.
- Kirsch, A., 2014. Technology Is Taking Over English Departments: The false promise of the digital humanities. *New Republic*. Available at: <http://www.newrepublic.com/article/117428/limits-digital-humanities-adam-kirsch> [Accessed May 8, 2014].
- Kirschenbaum, M., 2014. What is 'Digital Humanities,' and Why Are They Saying Such Terrible Things about It? *Differences* 25(1), pp. 46–63.
- McGann, J., 2010. *Online Humanities Scholarship: The Shape of Things to Come*. Available at: <http://cnx.org/content/col11199/latest/> [Accessed January 10, 2011].
- Prescott, A., 2013. Small Worlds and Big Tents. Digital Riffs: extemporisations, excursions, and explorations in the digital humanities. Available at: <http://digitalriffs.blogspot.com/2013/05/small-worlds-and-big-tents.html> [Accessed May 8, 2014].
- Presner, T., 2009. Digital Humanities Manifesto 2.0 Launched. Todd Presner. Available at: <http://www.toddpresner.com/?p=7> [Accessed May 8, 2014].
- Ramsay, S., 2013. DH Types One and Two. Stephen Ramsay — Blog. Available at: <http://stephenramsay.us/2013/05/03/dh-one-and-two/> [Accessed May 8, 2014].
- Svensson, P., 2010. The Landscape of Digital Humanities. *DHQ: Digital Humanities Quarterly* 4(1). Available at: <http://digitalhumanities.org:8080/dhq/vol/4/1/000080/000080.html> [Accessed May 28, 2014].
- Worthey, G., 2014. Why are such terrible things written about DH? Kirsch v. Kirschenbaum. Stanford | Digital Humanities. Available at: <https://digitalhumanities.stanford.edu/why-are-such-terrible-things-written-about-dh-kirsch-v-kirschenbaum> [Accessed May 8, 2014].