Research Paper

21 Century: Ultimate age of Digital Humanities blending with comparative literature

Bappy Shariar Shajib
Department of Bangla Language and Literature, Khulna University

Farhana Khan
Lecturer, Department of English, City University
Corresponding Author: Bappy Shariar Shajib
Department of Bangla Language and Literature, Khulna University

Abstract
The discipline of digital humanities has arisen as a vibrant and interdisciplinary domain that combines technology with study and scholarship in the humanities. There has been an increasing interest in combining digital humanities techniques with the examination of literature and culture in recent years. This collaboration improves our comprehension of literary works and broadens the scope for investigation and interpretation. The digital humanities are currently at a crucial moment in their evolution, moving from being an emerging field to being a fully established community with shared methodologies, sources of proof, and infrastructure. These elements are key for obtaining academic credibility. The experiences of the sciences in their endeavors for cyberinfrastructure and eScience provide useful insights. This research paper examines the convergence of digital humanities and literature, investigating how technology is transforming the analysis of literary texts, generating fresh viewpoints, and involving scholars and readers in new approaches. This paper also finds out similarities and differences between science and comparative literature with digital humanities. How humanities have been shifted into digitalized version in recent years. The future of the digital humanities also shown in this paper. This paper offers a comparative analysis of the current or potential challenges and the corresponding practical solutions in the theoretical development of comparative literature and the digital humanities.
KEYWORDS: Digital Humanities, Science, Technology, Comparative Literature

I.   INTRODUCTION

A new era that involves the blend of technology and humanistic inquiry has been ushered in by the digital age, which has completely changed the field of literary studies. With a broad spectrum of technological and analytical techniques, digital humanities provide academics with exceptional chances to interact with literature in fresh ways. This paper looks at how digital humanities are influencing research methods and enhancing the study of literary works by merging with the area of literature.

Achieving academic legitimacy requires the digital humanities to evolve from a specialized field to a full-fledged community with shared methodologies, evidence sources, and infrastructure. This transformation is happening at a key juncture. For the digital humanities, this is a critical time. A foundation of research techniques, theory, practice, and academic conferences and journals has been established by the community. Is this our chance to turn digital scholarship into a major player in humanities research? Or will the community become just one more of the multiple casualties of the ongoing economic crisis's enormous reductions to higher education? The community's potential to raise awareness of the importance of digital humanities research and to gather all the resources required for advancing the discipline from "emergent" to "established" is crucial. Over the years, there have been several ways in which the humanities, sciences, and arts blended and diverged. Many

---

interests are shared among researchers in the field of digital academic discourse. What's distinctive is the acceptance rate of respiration.

In the humanities, digital research is still in its infancy, while in the sciences, eScience is now accepted as the standard. The humanities can benefit from examining the accomplishments (and shortcomings) of eScience and cyberinfrastructure projects, without having to imitate the sciences.

Although the reader has the option to determine "the humanities," two contrasting definitions of "digital humanities" offer an informative breakdown of the field. Frischer's definition (2009, p. 15) is "the application of information technology as an aid to fulfill the humanities' basic tasks of preserving, reconstructing, transmitting, and interpreting the human record." One resulting from the UCLA Mellon seminar claims that "Digital humanities are not a unified field but an array of convergent practices that explore a universe in which print is no longer the exclusive or the normative medium in which knowledge is produced and/or disseminated" (Digital Humanities Manifesto, 2009). When blended, the digital humanities provide a literary work approach to addressing the discipline's research issues by utilizing cutting-edge technology. 2009's Amy Friedlander offers a noteworthy exception. She named four academic disciplines where technology researchers, humanists, and other academics have similar interests. Scale, language and communication, time and place, and social networking are these.

The humanities' main fields of language and communication are of greater importance for issues like pattern identification and cross-language indexing and retrieval. The terms "space" and "time" refer to the expanded capacity for temporal comparisons, geotagged documents and photographs, and new study methodologies made feasible by these technologies. Such cross-cutting objectives have the potential to have a significant impact on the overall infrastructure design. When decisions about basic infrastructure are being made, humanities academics should be present at the table.

II.   SCIENCE [AND, OR, VERSUS] THE HUMANITIES

Both the sciences and the humanities cover large areas of study with a great deal of internal variation. While these two groups differ greatly, they also share a great deal in common. The six comparative variables listed above were chosen for their potential impact on the direction of digital academia in the humanities, and they are publication practices, data, research techniques, incentives, and learning. The first five of these are drawn from longer analyses published elsewhere (Borgman, 2007); the last is drawn from the *NSF Task Force on Cyberlearning* (Borgman et al., 2008). The ideas are presented in an accumulative order to show how the lines between the humanities and sciences are becoming less distinct.

Publication practices

Digital versions are rapidly developing into the standard for scholarly journal publication, particularly in the sciences. While some journals have dropped print publishing entirely, others say that the online version—which is typically published weeks to months ahead of the printed edition—is the journal's official version. Under pressure from authors, the majority of scholarly journals now appear to allow online posting of some form of pre-print or post print (SHERPA/RoMEO: Publisher copyright policies & self-archiving, 2009).

Despite innovative efforts like the 1990 launch of the Journal of Post Modern Culture as an electronic-only journal and the 2005 launch of Vectors as an online-only multi-media journal (Journal of Post Modern Culture, 2000; Vectors: Journal of Culture and Technology in a Dynamic Vernacular, 2009; Hamma, 2009; King et al., 2006; Whalen, 2009), neither journal publishing nor book publishing in the humanities has quickly shifted toward online publication. A few prominent humanities journals have started publishing digitally enabled online editions. Beginning in March 2010, for example, the *JSAH* (Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians, 2009) will publish an online version that will support "zoomable images, video, GIS map integration, Adobe Flash VR, 3-D models, and online reference linking" – while continuing to publish its static print version.

III.   Participation and Benefits: Overcoming Disciplinary Barriers

In the digital humanities as well as in comparative literature, communication is essential. Scholars from different fields engage to address challenging research issues and provide multidisciplinary solutions in the digital humanities. The collaborative models of the sciences, in which multidisciplinary teams coordinate to accomplish shared objectives, offer valuable insights for the humanities. Benefits are also essential for encouraging teamwork and multidisciplinary research. By offering academic acknowledgment and credit for research in the digital humanities, academics will be encouraged to work together on projects and push the limits of their research.

IV. Pedagogy and Learning

Revolutionizing Education One objective that both digital humanities and comparative literature share is the change of education. New pedagogical techniques are developing in the digital era, challenging established educational structures. The digital humanities provide chances to improve education by using digital resources, tools, and approaches. Digital humanities techniques may be integrated into the curriculum to give students useful views and abilities for navigating the digital world. In addition to encouraging a more varied and inclusive approach to education, the digital humanities also foster international understanding and global involvement.

V. Obstacles and Prospects: Accepting Modification

In their respective domains, digital humanities and comparative literature both confront difficulties and uncertainty. Concerns including academic boundaries, institutionalization, and the use of technology into research and teaching must be addressed as the digital humanities develop. By embracing change and drawing on the experiences of comparative literature, the digital humanities may promote innovation, teamwork, and interdisciplinary study. In the ever-changing world of higher education, the digital humanities may establish themselves as a reputable and established field by continuing to be flexible and receptive to new ideas.

Instead of looking up in the sky, humanities researchers are more likely to discover their data sources in the library, which serves as their conventional laboratory. Though the role of the library in humanities studies remains more fundamental than in other areas, the nature of that connection is evolving.

Since university library funds have been stagnant or decreasing for the past 20 years, there has been a significant shift in how physical space and library staff are used. Consolidation of campus libraries is an attempt to reduce the number of public service locations that require staffing. Physical resources such as books and journals have been relocated to distant locations and retrieved from the stacks upon request.

Professional librarians, who make up a smaller percentage of library staffs, are focusing more on making the most use of the items they already have rather than expanding their collections in light of the financial difficulties. Because of the decline in demand from the sciences, university libraries are able to reorganize their physical areas to better serve teachers and students studying the humanities. Now that card catalogs, notebooks, and book stacks have taken up prime floor space, groups may collaborate using both digital and physical resources.

Compared to scientists, librarians are more likely to have backgrounds in the humanities, and many of them are keen to collaborate with humanities researchers to develop improved resources and methods for locating, analyzing, and utilizing scholarly literature. The primary audience for tangible books, journals, and records at the majority of universities nowadays consists of humanities academics and students. Additionally, this community makes the best distinctions between printings, editions, and other variations—differences that are occasionally lost in the conversion from print to digital form. Any edition may be sufficient for general reading, and access to vast collections of books and periodicals may be worth a little loss in visual quality. Researchers rely far more on information to locate and contrast variations, and they might need physical copies to inspect printing and paper properties, annotations, and other features.

Projects in the field of digital humanities have not yet reached the same level of engagement, audience, or data as the Sloan Digital Sky Survey. Nonetheless, a number of enduring digital humanities initiatives have significantly improved research techniques and data excellence. Perseus is usually considered the first digital library in the humanities, with planning begun in 1985 and services available by 1987 (Perseus Digital Library, 2009; Crane et al., 2001; Marchionini & Crane, 1994). The initial collections of Perseus cover the history, literature, and culture of the Greco-Roman world. They have since expanded into other areas, and conducted significant research on the classification, management, and use of visual and textual materials (Crane, 2006; Mahoney, 2002; Smith, Mahoney & Crane, 2002). Rome Reborn, begun in 1997 at UCLA, was first concerned with digital library problems such as metadata, organization of historical and architectural periods, and representing relationships between textual sources and visual models (Rome Reborn, 2009; Frischer, 2004; 2009). Now the system exists in multiple manifestations, supports three-dimensional "fly-throughs," audio typical of the time period (including spoken Latin), and gladiator fights in the amphitheater using the latest computer graphics technology. Perseus, Rome Reborn, and newer projects such as HyperCities integrate map layers from Google Earth and other sources, which broadens their scope, audience, and interoperability with other components of the scholarly information infrastructure (HyperCities, 2009; Presner, 2010, forthcoming).

VI. Digital humanities social studies: where are they?

Why, in contrast to how scientists have been researched for the past few decades, is no one tracking digital humanities researchers about to learn about their practices? This corpus of work is essential to cyberinfrastructure and eScience programs, and it has influenced the development of academic infrastructure for

*Corresponding Author: Bappy Shariar Shajib
Department of Bangla Language and Literature, Khulna University

the sciences. Research on behavior is thriving in the humanities because of how quickly knowledge is developing in these fields. More social scientists ought to be invited by the humanities community to collaborate on research projects and offer themselves as study subjects. By doing this, the community will get a better understanding of itself and be able to apply those lessons to the creation of tools, services, rules, and infrastructure.

VII.   What does the 21st-century humanities experiment look like?

Scholars in the humanities as well as research libraries are very concerned about this issue. The humanities are still being studied in laboratories, not only the library. Humanities academics manage computer labs and may do research and study in dispersed virtual settings. Humanists should collaborate with university information technology planning and policy committees as well as librarians. It is imperative that these communities "think together" on the shared issues they are facing at a time when funding for digital services, staffing, collections, and physical space is being cut.

The digital humanities are currently flourishing in the higher education system and are a popular issue in academia, thanks to the forces of globalization and the rise of digitalization. Given the many similarities between digital humanities and comparative literature, we should investigate additional common ground between these two fields of study.

VIII.   Comparative literature and the digital humanities have similarities.

First, from the standpoint of discipline histories, digital humanities and comparative literature emerged during a period of profound transformation that was transforming mankind and even the way in which new modes of transportation and communication were promoting human existence. In light of these conditions, some fundamental components of comparative literature and the digital humanities—such as their global vision, systematic cognition, cross-cultural approach, and interdisciplinary method—inherently require that these two fields adopt an open mode, a multiculturalist ideal, a worldwide perspective, and a systematic approach.

Second, we discover that digital humanities and comparative literature are both compound disciplines—that is, compositive disciplines built upon the framework of "research method(s)" + "research object(s)"—from the standpoint of disciplinary structures. Both of these fields can, and ought to, rise beyond a pure and straightforward approach, maintain their uniqueness and locality, and develop into a form of highly developed, elevated theory that is both universally sound and ethical. Beyond just combining method and theory, both of these disciplines should be organically integrated. This means that theory should contribute deeper understanding through method, and the former should absorb the potential meaning and academic value of the latter. Together, these two disciplines can achieve the disciplinary ideal.

Third, because of their nature and scope, comparative literature and the digital humanities both have a strong internal inclusivity and external openness from the standpoint of disciplinary ideals. In order to investigate the cognitive mechanism and cultural spirit of all of humanity from the perspective of human ontology, both of these disciplines can retain their uniqueness while attempting to achieve a certain level of universality and summarize the similarities and particularities of human experiences. The goal of both cosmopolitanism and Cosmo localism, despite their dialectical unity, divergence, and dynamic nature, is to create a sublimated, pluralistic integrity that is grounded in their respective particularities.

Fourth, both digital humanities and comparative literature satisfy the requirements of disciplinary prospects. With the use of several multidisciplinary approaches and a broad, cross-temporal, macro viewpoint, these two fields aim to find specific answers to current cultural issues and foster reciprocal gains across various civilizations on a worldwide basis. As the disciplines advance, they might run across a number of obstacles, including survival crises, as well as a variety of questions and criticisms. Thus, to eliminate critical flaws, resolve current issues, and generate new theories, a theoretical, positive construction mode is required in order to transform disciplinary crises into possibilities.
Comparative literature: a mirror for the digital humanities the digital humanities can be perfectly mirrored by comparative literature. To become an independent and well-institutionalized discipline, the digital humanities must first address four fundamental issues: developing a distinct mission, a unique methodology, a mature institutional system, and a clear scope.

*Corresponding Author: Bappy Shariar Shajib   81 | Page
Department of Bangla Language and Literature, Khulna University

IX. CONCLUSION

In the past, academic committees at universities may have found it relatively simple to identify the field in which a scholar's publications were published or, based on predetermined research fields or paradigms, to identify the field in which a scholar was working in order to categorize that person as a scholar. However, it could be more difficult to identify the discipline or subject to which these publications belong at the moment due to the blurring of the lines between interdisciplinary studies and the humanities. The difficulty surrounding academic categorization brought about by "excessive interdisciplinary studies" is a valuable lesson for the digital humanities in the creation of comparative literature.

References

[1]. Friedlander, A. (2008). Head in the Clouds and Boots on the Ground: Science,
[2]. Cyberinfrastructure and CLIR. Kanazawa Institute of Technology Library
[3]. Roundtable. Retrieved from http://www.clir.org/pubs/resources/articles.html on 15 August 2008.
[4]. Borgman, C. L. (2007). Scholarship in the Digital Age: Information, Infrastructure, and the Internet. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
[5]. Borgman, C. L., Abelson, H., Dirks, L., Johnson, R., Koedinger, K. R., Linn, M. C., Lynch, C. A., Oblinger, D. G., Pea, R. D., Salen, K., Smith, M. S. & Szalay, A.
[6]. Borgman DHQ Article Final revision, January 2, 2010, page 24 of 30 (2008). Fostering Learning in the Networked World: The Cyberlearning Opportunity and Challenge. A 21st Century Agenda for the National Science Foundation. Report of the NSF Task Force on Cyberlearning. Office of Cyberinfrastructure and Directorate for Education and Human Resources. National Science Foundation. Retrieved from http://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=nsf08204 on 12 August 2008.
scholarship. In. Working Together or Apart: Promoting the Next Generation of Digital Scholarship. Washington, DC, Council on Library and Information Resources. CLIR Publication No. 145: 1-15. Retrieved from http://www.clir.org on 15 June 2009.
[7]. Culler J (2006) Comparative literature, at last. In: Saussy H (ed.) Comparative
[8]. Cyberinfrastructure and CLIR. Kanazawa Institute of Technology Library
[9]. Digital Humanities Manifesto (2009). UCLA. Retrieved from Digital Scholarship. Washington, DC, Council on Library and Information driving force. Digit Humanit Q 10(3):39–53 During S (1993) Introduction. In: During S (ed.) The cultural studies reader.
[10]. Frischer, B. (2009). Art and Science in the Age of Digital Reproduction: From Mimetic globalization. Neohelicon 28(1):13–24 Journal of Post-Modern Culture. (2000). Retrieved from http://pmc.iath.virginia.edu/ on 2 September 2009.
[11]. Vectors: Journal of Culture and Technology in a Dynamic Vernacular. (2009). Retrieved from http://www.vectorsjournal.org/ on 8 September 2009.
[12]. Hamma, K. (2009). Professionally indisposed to change. EDUCAUSE Review, 44(2): 8-9.
[13]. Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians. (2009). Retrieved from http://www.sah.org/index.php?src=gendocs&ref=JSAH&category=Publications on 2 September 2009.

Perseus Digital Library. (2009). Tufts University. Retrieved

*Corresponding Author: Bappy Shariar Shajib
Department of Bangla Language and Literature, Khulna University*