

Christopher D. Cantwell and Kristian Petersen

Digital Humanities and Religious Studies: A “Why” To Guide

In 2018, the American Academy of Religion hosted a special “wildcard” panel on digital research and teaching projects that encourage students to engage with their local communities. Titled “Teaching Local Religion with Digital Humanities: Objects, Methods, Pedagogies,” the session featured ten educators who contributed to eight different projects. Some of the projects were based at major research universities and worked with communities across the country. Others were housed at small liberal arts colleges and focused on one place of worship. But almost all of the projects connected with the scholars’ research agenda and employed the tools and methods of digital humanities (DH) in order to benefit from the work of student collaborators.¹

Despite the panel’s explicit focus on teaching, the question and answer session that followed forayed into other matters. The very first question from the audience asked how—or even if—such projects counted in tenure and promotion portfolios. Another wondered how the projects’ directors received credit for their work. Finally, one audience members seemed to question the entire premise of the panel altogether, asking whether the time spent developing these projects would be better spent producing journal articles or monographs.

Such questions are important ones. They get at some of the tensions around integrating digital scholarship into the academic study of religion. But they also missed the point of the session. While the presenters were eager to talk about the pedagogical and intellectual benefits they had gained by employing digital methods, the audience was concerned with the professional issues that surround digital work.

¹ “Teaching Local Religion with Digital Humanities: Objects, Methods, Pedagogies,” American Academy of Religion Annual Meeting, Denver, Colorado, 19 Nov. 2018. The projects featured at the roundtable were Emily Suzanne Clark, “Jesuit Missions on the Columbia Plateau”; Shana Sippy and Michael McNally, “Religious Diversity in Minnesota Initiative,” <https://religionsmn.carleton.edu/>; Gale Kenny, “Religion in the Archive”; Rachel McBride Lindsey, “Arch City Religion,” <https://www.archcityreligion.org/>; Christopher D. Cantwell, “Gathering Places: Religion and Community in Milwaukee,” <https://uwm.edu/gatheringplaces>; Rachel Kranson, “Pittsburgh Torah Scrolls Project,” <https://pittsburghtorahscrolls.wordpress.com/>; Amy DeRogatis and Isaac Weiner, “American Religious Sounds Project,” <https://religioussounds.osu.edu/>; Jennifer S. Leath, “Black Religious Denver”; Cara Lea Burndige, “American Religion and Refugees in the Heartland.”

It is a disconnect that also often defines conversations about digital humanities more broadly. From the moment scholars first took up the term “DH” in the early 2000s to describe work that either harnessed new technology for humanistic inquiry or studied new technologies humanistically, debates about DH tend to circulate around “how” questions. How is digital scholarship going to count? How is it going to be peer reviewed? How is it made?² Though, again, important, what can get lost in these more practical discussions is a sustained reflection on why one might want to take up digital methods in the first place. Why are an increasing number of scholars and educators finding digital humanities relevant to their work? What advantages have these methods presented to them? How have they benefited? And why might digital scholarship be vital for the study of religion’s future?

This collection aims to take up this later set of questions. Rather than add to the already robust literature on best practices in the production, evaluation, and promotion of digital scholarship, it aims to focus on the ways scholars have found that digital methods enhance their research, teaching, and service to the profession. Gathering together the lead investigators of more than a dozen projects, the collection covers a wide swath of the digital work now being done in the study of religion. It considers why podcasting and social media platforms might be the future in promoting the public understanding of religion. It showcases why digital projects might be an invaluable resource in helping our students become critical producers of knowledge about religion. And it dwells upon why twenty-first century technology might be the most productive avenue for answering some of the questions that have animated our fields for almost a century. Though by no means a comprehensive survey of the ever-growing body of digital work taking place, the collection does hope to serve as a snapshot of the inspirations and revelations that have propelled digital scholarship’s growth of late. In assembling the volume, we asked contributors to outline the journey of their inquiries and the logic behind the approaches they used. We hope that by

2 On the history of digital humanities and the perennial debates that have defined the field, see Susan Hockey, “The History of Humanities Computing,” in *A Companion to Digital Humanities*, Susan Schreibman, Ray Siemens, John Unsworth, eds. (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004), http://digitalhumanities.org:3030/companion/view?docId=blackwell/9781405103213/9781405103213.xml&chunk.id=ss1-2-1&toc.depth=1&toc.id=ss1-2-1&brand=9781405103213_brand; Matthew Kirschenbaum, “What Is Digital Humanities and What’s It Doing in English Departments?” *ADE Bulletin* 150 (2010): 2–3; Matthew K. Gold, “The Digital Humanities Moment,” in *Debates in Digital Humanities*, Gold, ed. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012), <http://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/debates>; Christopher D. Cantwell and Hussein Rashid, *Religion, Media, and the Digital Turn* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 2015).

mapping the terrain in such a way—showcasing why digital tools aided in producing, managing, or teaching religious studies—the reader might come away with an alternative perspective on researching their own subjects or be inspired to try new methods that resonate with their materials.

Why Digital Humanities?

As the case studies presented here hopefully will demonstrate, there are as many reasons for drawing upon digital methods as there are digital projects. Scholars often find themselves drawn to digital methods because they help grapple with a question peculiar to their field, or because they open up new avenues for addressing perennial issues related to teaching, research, or service. But taken as a whole, the essays collected here do point to a series of overlapping inspirations that have propelled the field. For instance, several of the authors collected here turned to digital tools because analyzing a body of source material by traditional methods proved impractical. Lincoln Mullen’s interest in documenting the most widely quoted passages of scripture throughout American history would have required him to read hundreds of millions of newspaper articles. Similarly, Frederick Elwert’s research on the frequency with which certain characters or ideas appear in sacred texts across time, space, and tradition would have necessitated a lifetime of close reading and cataloging. These are issues that confront scholars across the academy today as the sheer volume of material or data related to our work grows exponentially. And by using textual and network analysis software, both Mullen and Elwert were able to process colossal quantities of data over a reasonable amount of time in order to contribute to debates in their field in new and vital ways.

The ability of digital research methods to facilitate the interpretation of data goes beyond just computational analysis, however. A number of the projects featured here have turned toward digital platforms in order to foster collaboration or consolidate resources around a particular kind of source material. Rebecca Krawiec and Caroline T. Schroeder’s work on the Coptic *SCRIPTORIUM*, for example, not only uses text analysis software to analyze Coptic texts. It also takes advantage of open-source text encoding methods to create a shared database of Coptic items from multiple institutions across the globe. James Bielo and Claire Vaughan’s piece on the *Materializing the Bible* project, meanwhile, similarly curates a collection of texts, images, and multimedia related to those instances when Christian communities across North America attempted to make Bible stories “real” through art, sculptures, plays, and other public performances. What’s more, the expanse of Bielo and Vaughn’s work is also made possible

by the ability of many digital asset management systems, which allow them to host a variety of kinds of media in one place. Through their intentional curation, juxtaposition, and organization, Bielo and Vaughn, like Krawiec and Schroeder, open new avenues of inquiry and analysis.

In addition to creating new collections of source material, moreover, digital methods also allow scholars to reach and constitute new publics as well. Wendi Bellar and Heidi A. Campbell, for instance, argue in their contribution that social network platforms can actually facilitate the kind of interdisciplinarity the study of religion claims to foster. On the Network for New Media, Religion, and Digital Culture Studies they run, scholars from any discipline can create a profile in order to find a potential research partner or learn about new work that might have been published in another field. Christopher R. Cotter and David G. Robertson take this argument even further, claiming that new media outlets like podcasting not only connect scholars with each other, but can also connect scholars with the wider public. As founding contributors of the Religious Studies Project, Cotter and Robertson hope that their work will impact the public understanding of religion. The episodes and essays they host on their site are aimed at both scholars across the academy and lay readers who take an interest in the field.

As Cotter and Robertson's work suggests, one of the central promises of digital research methods are their ability to blur boundaries between previously separate categories or spheres of work. For the Religious Studies Project, this means collapsing the distance that exists between the academy and the wider public. With Coptic SCRIPTORIUM, the line where Krawiec and Schroeder's research begins and their service to the profession ends is blurred. Digital scholarship's multimodal nature is often what makes it incredibly difficult to fit into existing themes of promotion, peer review, and tenure. But for many of the contributors here, digital scholarship's genre-busting potential is also its greatest promise. Caleb Elfenbein's project documenting instances of anti-Muslim hostility in the U.S., for instance, is a class assignment, research project, and public resource all at once. Students scour the media for reports of Islamophobic or anti-Muslim hate crimes that official outlets fail to collect. This material then gets posted on an interactive map that journalists, activists, and policy makers can refer to. Abhishek Amar's work in developing virtual recreations of lost or inaccessible Hindu temples in India similarly builds upon the digital inclinations of twenty-first century students in order to make them partners in the research process. In a different vein, however, Louis Kaplan and Melissa Shiff's project blurs the boundaries between scholarship and art, fact and speculation. Their work developing speculative recreations of failed efforts to create a Jewish homeland through virtual reality and other map-based software both documents these overlooked endeavors and interrogates the impulses that tie them together.

Each of these projects, in short, drew upon digital tools, platforms, or methods for a multitude of reasons. It is important to note, however, that despite this diversity all of the efforts documented here share a common understanding about the nature of DH work. Every project in its own way turned to new technologies because they allowed them to advance the study of religion’s longstanding commitment to research, teaching, and public service. Emily Floyd and Sally Promey’s essay on the Material and Visual Cultures of Religion (MAVCOR) perhaps documents this most clearly. MAVCOR began in part as an archive of sources related to religion’s material and visual manifestations. But those connected with MAVCOR intended the archive to serve as a resource that could promote greater collaboration between art historians, visual studies scholars, and the study of religion. As part of its efforts, MAVCOR’s team published an edited volume and established a new journal. Though it is published online in order to take advantage of the web’s ability to publish images and other material at a lower cost than print publications, MAVCOR’s journal functions, at its core, as an exemplar of best practices in scholarly publication.

The same is true for the other projects showcased here. The turn to the digital is in many ways a means to augment and enhance the work we do in analog. Quality digital work should never exist solely of its own accord. It should contribute to the study of religion’s ongoing efforts in print, in the classroom, and in the public. The works gathered here exemplify this commitment to the field. Our hope is that their work can inspire others in their efforts as well.

What to Consider

While the reasons why scholars turn to digital work are diverse, the process by which projects came together, developed, and then launched is more uniform. The growth in digital scholarship in the last decades has provided a roadmap that many projects follow, and the contributions collected here are no different. From the essays readers may glean several themes that arise when using digital methods or producing digital scholarship. Taken together they draw attention to several things to consider when embarking on a digital humanities project. They include:

- *Do your homework.* Before starting a project do some exploratory research on the “how to” of DH. There is a growing body of resources, many of them open source and freely accessible, on how to employ certain methods, do certain

types of analysis, and use specific tools.³ As you learn about new methods and tools some of what you'll encounter may seem beyond your abilities or patience. Don't get discouraged. Keep moving forward in your DH discovery and see where it brings you. Often you will not need to master lots of technical tools or languages in order to produce results that can advance your research. But it is important that you select the right tool for your project, and consulting the plethora of DH "how to" guides will help in that selection.

- *Collaboration is key.* Many projects will require the labor of several contributors, often those with very different skill sets. As with traditional research, collaboration may benefit from including various disciplinary specializations (i.e. different regional foci, expertise in varied traditions, or methodological approach, etc.). Digital projects, however, also often require collaboration with individuals from other fields altogether, including programmers, archivists, librarians, and students. Finding the right collaborators is key, and there are many outlets to do so. If you lack access to digital scholarship networks at the institution where you work, there are a number of DH blogs and professional associations you can connect with. Of particular interest will be the The Humanities and Technologies Camp (THAT Camp), which the American Academy of Religion and the Society for Biblical Literature sponsor at the start of their joint annual meetings.⁴

³ The literature and resources here are immense. For resources in the field see, The Digital Humanities Literacy Guidebook, (Cleveland: Carnegie Mellon University, 2018), <https://cmu-lib.gi.thub.io/dhlg>; Doing Digital Scholarship (New York: Social Science Research Council, 2018), <https://labs.ssrc.org/dds/>; Digital Humanities Now (Fairfax, VA: George Mason University, 2009), <http://digitalhumanitiesnow.org/>. Commonly cited introductory texts in the digital humanities also include Gold, ed., *Debates in Digital Humanities*; Daniel J. Cohen and Roy Rosenzweig, *Doing Digital History: A Guide to Gathering, Preserving, and Presenting the Past on the Web* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press and Fairfax, VA: Center for History and New Media, 2005), <http://chnm.gmu.edu/digitalhistory/>; Anne Burdick, et al., *Digital Humanities* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2016); Elieen Gardiner, *The Digital Humanities* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015); Claire Battershill and Shawna Ross, *Using Digital Humanities in the Classroom: A Practical Introduction for Teachers, Lecturers, and Students* (New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2017); D. Berry, ed., *Understanding Digital Humanities* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012); Geoffrey Rockwell and Stefan Sinclair, *Hermeneutica: Computer-Assisted Interpretation in the Humanities* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2016); Jentery Sayers, *Making Things and Drawing Boundaries: Experiments in the Digital Humanities* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2018); Cantwell and Rashid, *Religion, Media, and the Digital Turn*.

⁴ Other resources include the Alliance of Digital Humanities Organizations, <http://adho.org/>; MLA Commons, <https://mla.hcommons.org/core/>; Network Infrastructure for Nineteenth-Century

- *Think iteratively.* Traditional models of scholarly production based around print typically presume a project is finished upon publication. The appearance of a monograph or journal article represents years of labor. Digital scholarships, however, can—and often should—work in reverse. The launch of a digital project marks the beginning of the work to be done rather than its end. The projects featured here are growing and changing, not finished. What this means is that project directors have the ability to think about their work in phases or stages, allowing for both the project and the project team to grow and learn over time. If a project seems too daunting, consider breaking it into a series of phases that provide a set of benchmarks that can be set. The publics you envision or engage with can then provide multiple moments of connection and benefit. This iterative thinking also relates to scale, allowing a project to grow in scope over time.
- *Audience(s) is key.* A given project may address a number of constituencies. Who your intended audience is will shape the types of choices you make regarding the tools you employ, the user interface, privacy, accessibility, and phases. Projects might simultaneously be used by academic and general audiences, with their findings being used for scholarly research, activist outreach, and educational purposes all at the same time. These various components might develop over time but it is key to think about how your project will take shape as it moves beyond your computer and is taken up by others.
- *Is this ethical?* While digital tools and analysis may make new approaches available to researchers we should always think about the implications and social consequences of our research. Some projects may put religious actors, especially those from vulnerable communities, at risk. When designing projects one should consider: Am I endangering anyone by making this information available publicly? How can I protect my subjects? How might my data be used in the future? The ethical issues related to data and privacy may force you to imagine your project’s objectives or methods in necessary ways.
- *Does this “count?”* For many scholars the question of institutional expectations may shape the types of scholarship they can pursue, especially in relation to tenure and promotion requirements. If one is not hired specifically to do digital humanities work, then a DH project may not fulfill narrow definitions of “scholarship.” In these cases, academics often take an approach that places digital scholarship as an extra outcome in addition to more tra-

ditional publishing methods, such as peer-reviewed journals and books. Part of the reason institutions don't recognize digital projects as fully as they might is because they may not be legible to reviewers using longstanding departmental standards. The American Academy of Religion (along with organizations such as the American Historical Association, Modern Language Association, and others) has produced "Guidelines for Evaluating Digital Scholarship," which are intended to aid evaluating committees in assessing digital scholarship. Part of the effort can be done by recognizing more traditional criterion for scholarship, such as grants, academic reviews, citations, or classroom use.

- *Think about sustainability.* While the ability to grow and evolve digital projects over time is one of the medium's benefits, this feature also raises the spectre of a lifetime of upkeep and maintenance. Therefore, it is incumbent to think about the lifetime of your project early on in order to identify both the kind and amount of resources you will need to maintain it. Not every project needs to involve a decade-long commitment to build a colossal archive that can call forth a new field of inquiry. Smaller scale projects can be completed in either a year or a semester's time and then left up with little change. Keeping projects online, however, often requires regular hosting and registration fees. So, accounting for when a project will sunset, and considering where the data from a project will live after the interface might break, are topics worthy of consideration early on.

While there are many issues to keep in mind when developing a digital project, the most important, perhaps, is managing expectations and keeping open the opportunity for surprise. Results derived from a DH project may not align with the initial expectations one may have going into a project. Alignment between the two shouldn't be the sole standard for measuring success. There are many unexpected elements that will arise when doing digital work but often these surprises will result in new opportunities. Unanticipated issues may be raised through the accumulation of valuable data, which may require learning how to use a new digital tool in order to analyze this data. Even grave challenges or out-right failures can lead to the next productive stage of a particular project. Luck (good or bad) can often be a factor in how a project takes shape or in the results it garners. What matters is that you thoughtfully and intentionally engage with these tools as you would any research method. And like other forms of inquiry and analysis, the best way to engage with them thoughtfully is by considering other examples. This is what we hope these essays provide.

A Guide to the Volume

As there are an infinite number of reasons scholars turn to DH and numerous ways these projects take shape, there are many ways to structure this volume as well. One version could have structured the collection by research method, dividing the essays by the kind of software or tool that they use. Another could have arranged the volume by activity type, grouping together those essays focused on research, teaching, or public engagement. We chose, however, to arrange the volume by source type, with sections on texts, images, places, and issues. Such an arrangement is in service of the fact that the kinds of sources scholars work with often dictate the tools or techniques used. Part I on “Texts,” for instance, includes pieces on four projects whose data is primarily textual in nature. Marcus Bingenheimer’s contribution focuses on the ways digitization and text encoding are changing the nature of research within Buddhist studies. The advent of computational methods have made the creation of encoded corpora valuable scholarly contributions to the field. Lincoln Mullen’s essay, meanwhile, showcases the kind of public scholarship that can emerge from employing textual analysis. His America’s Public Bible Project mined a massive collection of digitized American newspapers to pull out the frequencies of specific Bible quotes. In addition to advancing Mullen’s own scholarship on the topic, the application of digital methods also resulted in the creation of a public-facing resource that allows anyone to chart the use of a particular passage of scripture over time. Similarly, Frederik Elwert’s contribution documents how the digitization of textual material allows for the application of methods commonly associated with the study of institutions, organizations, or relationships. By tagging keywords, character, and parts of speech, Elwert’s SeNeReKo project was able to chart the history of religious contact by the appearance of certain themes in ancient Egyptian and Buddhist texts. Like Bingenheimer, Mullen, and Elwert, Rebecca Krawiec and Caroline T. Schroeder’s essay on the Coptic SCRIPTORIUM project underscores how the digitization and encoding of texts are vital scholarly contributions.

Building upon Part I’s focus on texts, Part II on “Images” considers the digitization and interpretation of sources beyond the written word. Andrew Quintman and Kurtis R. Schaeffer’s essay, for example, illustrates how digital methods can help bring textual and visual material in conversation with each other. The Life of the Buddha project they discuss annotates large Tibetan murals with both scholarly commentary as well as passages from the texts that inspired the work of art. Similarly, Erin Walcek Averett and Derek B. Counts’ contribution highlight how a suite of digital tools have brought fresh insights to archaeological remains

from Cyprus. Beyond rich, 3D modeling of artifacts that allow for levels of scrutiny beyond the human eye, digital methods also allow archaeologists to link this data to provenance, geographical information, and scholarly commentary. James Bielo and Claire Vaughn's contribution, meanwhile, demonstrates how the web's ability to keep multiple kinds of data from myriad locations in a single site allows for the creation of specialized research archives. The Materializing the Bible project they discuss has, to date, collected material related to nearly five hundred attractions that made Bible stories real and manifest in some way. Finally, Emily Floyd and Sally Promey's piece on the Material and Visual Cultures of Religion project demonstrates the kind of scholarly outcomes that can come from this kind of critical curation. As previously mentioned, the MAVCOR project includes both a digital archive as well as a peer-reviewed journal that draws upon that archive as a source of reflection and analysis.

In contrast to Parts I and II, Part III on "Places" focuses less on a particular kind of source and more on a mode of thought encouraged by the digital turn. Focusing on questions of space, or using geographic information systems as a means of analyzing material has become such a prominent part of DH work that some have argued that it constitutes its own field.⁵ Abhishek S. Amar's essay on the 3D modeling of historic Hindu and Buddhist sites of pilgrimage, for instance, explicitly grapples with the kind of transformative work scholars must do to their data in order to make it machine readable. But the final renderings of these sites, Amar claims, would allow for the study of these sites across time, combining textual, archaeological, and art-historical analysis. Spatial thinking also allowed J. E. E. Pettit, Fenggang Yang, and Yuqian Huang to shed light on territories devoid of other kinds of source material. In creating a database of 72,000 temples, mosques, and churches in China, they were able to approximate the relative size of these religious communities in a country that refuses to release such data. This ability of space to make real that which may seem absent also defines Louis Kaplan and Melissa Shiff's essay on Mapping Ararat. They use augmented and virtual reality software to project failed attempts at establishing a Jewish homeland onto the landscape. In this way, they call forth the religious imaginaries that often animate communities or individuals, instantiating the visions that have motivated people. Finally, where Kaplan and Shiff build speculative topographies, Caleb Elfenbein, Farah Omer, and Julia

5 On the importance of "spatial humanities" see Richard White, "What is Spatial History?" *Stanford Spatial History Lab: Working Paper*, February, 2010, <http://www.stanford.edu/group/spatialhistory/cgi-bin/site/pub.php?id=29>; David J. Bodenhamer, John Corrigan, and Trevor M. Harris, *The Spatial Humanities: GIS and the Future of Humanities Scholarship* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2010).

Shafer discuss how they also make invisible landscapes visible. By geo-referencing hate crimes against Muslims and other instances of anti-Muslim hostility, Elfenbein, Omer, Shafer, and others demonstrate both the pervasiveness and the regional specificities of American Islamophobia.

Where the collection's first three sections focus on particular types of data or sources, the final section, Part IV, focuses on how scholars are using DH tools and methods to address issues that impact the study of religion more broadly. Christopher R. Cotter and David G. Robertson's essay documents their ambitious plan to create a social media strategy for the academic study of religion. The Religious Studies Project they discuss hosts rigorous debates about theory, method, and interpretation. But it presents this material in genres accessible to wider audience such as blogs and podcasts. S. Brent Plate, meanwhile, reflects upon his experience teaching a Massive Open Online Course, or MOOC. While debates in DH might have moved beyond MOOCs to discuss more practical concerns related to online education, Plate's essay offers a great deal of insight related to how scholars can, and cannot, reach broader audiences online. Wendi Bellar and Heidi A. Campbell's essay, meanwhile, explores how digital platforms can reach new audiences within the academy. Like Floyd and Promey's essay on MAVCOR, Bellar and Campbell's discussion of the Network for New Media, Religion, and Digital Culture Studies site documents how the web has become a place for new subfields to form. In the absence of support from or cooperation between different professional organizations, Bellar and Campbell have created a space online where interlocutors can converse and collaborate. Finally, the collection concludes with a vital, but surprisingly overlooked discussion: the impact digital tools or platforms are having on religious studies departments. An essay by Russell T. McCutcheon discusses one of the oldest attempts to harness new technology to promote the study of religion at the university level. Through blogging, podcasting, and other new media outlets, the University of Alabama's Department of Religious Studies has made the work of generating majors a site of vibrant disciplinary discourse in the field as well.

While the above outline structures the volume, it is, as we mentioned, not the only way to approach the text. We encourage you to engage with the collection in ways that will inform and inspire your own work, diving into those essays that are relevant to you. Those who are interested in the use of digital tools for what might be called “pure” academic research, we recommend you look at the essays by Bingenheimer; Mullen; Elwert; Krawiec and Schroeder; Averett and Counts; Amaral; and Pettit, Yange, and Huang. For those who are interested in how digital platforms can help academic research reach broader audiences can consult Mullen; Floyd and Promey; Averett and Counts; Kaplan and Shiff; Elfenbein, Omer, and Shafer; Cotter and Robertson; Plate; and Bellar and Camp-

bell. Those interested in DH pedagogy, meanwhile, should see Bielo and Vaugh; Amar; Elfenbein, Omer, and Shafer; and McCutcheon.

But we hope you will engage with all of the essays, and draw from them the inspiration necessary to develop your own digital work. Because as each of the essays collected here demonstrates, the digital work happening now in the study of religion has built upon the work done in other disciplines across the academy. If the study of religion is to continue to grow, it will need to take up this kind of work and make it its own.

Selected References

- Battershill, Claire and Shawna Ross. *Using Digital Humanities in the Classroom: A Practical Introduction for Teachers, Lecturers, and Students*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2017.
- Berry, D., editor. *Understanding Digital Humanities*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Bodenhamer, David J., John Corrigan, and Trevor M. Harris. *The Spatial Humanities: GIS and the Future of Humanities Scholarship*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2010.
- Burdick, Anne, et al. *Digital_Humanities*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2016.
- Cantwell, Christopher D. and Hussein Rashid. *Religion, Media, and the Digital Turn*. New York: Social Science Research Council, 2015.
- Carnegie Mellon University. *The Digital Humanities Literacy Guidebook*. <https://cmu-lib.gitlab.io/dhlg>.
- Cohen, Daniel J. and Roy Rosenzweig. *Doing Digital History: A Guide to Gathering, Preserving, and Presenting the Past on the Web*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005.
- Gardiner, Elieen. *The Digital Humanities*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Gold, Matthew K. "The Digital Humanities Moment." In *Debates in Digital Humanities*, edited by Matthew K. Gold, <http://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/debates>. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012.
- Hockey, Susan. "The History of Humanities Computing." In *A Companion to Digital Humanities*, edited by Susan Schreibman, Ray Siemens, John Unsworth, http://digitalhumanities.org:3030/companion/view?docId=blackwell/9781405103213/9781405103213.xml&chunk.id=ss1-2-1&toc.depth=1&toc.id=ss1-2-1&brand=9781405103213_brand. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004.
- Kirschenbaum, Matthew. "What Is Digital Humanities and What's It Doing in English Departments?" *ADE Bulletin* 150 (2010): 2–3.
- Rockwell, Geoffrey, and Stefan Sinclair. *Hermeneutica: Computer-Assisted Interpretation in the Humanities*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2016.
- Roy Rosenzweig Center for History and New Media, George Mason University. *Digital Humanities Now*. <http://digitalhumanitiesnow.org/>.
- Sayers, Jentery. *Making Things and Drawing Boundaries: Experiments in the Digital Humanities*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2018.
- Social Science Research Council. *Doing Digital Scholarship*. <https://labs.ssrc.org/dds/>.

White, Richard. “*What is Spatial History?*” *Stanford Spatial History Lab: Working Paper*,
<http://www.stanford.edu/group/spatialhistory/cgi-bin/site/pub.php?id=29>.

