A Review of Patrik Svensson, *Big Digital Humanities: Imagining a Meeting Place for the Humanities and the Digital*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2016, 279 pages,
ISBN 978-0-472-07306-1 (hardcover);
ISBN 978-0-472-05306-3 (paper);
ISBN 978-0-472-12174-8 (e-book)

Cheng Li[1] and Fekede Menuta[2]

Shanghai Jiao Tong University[1]; Hawassa University[2]
E-mails: cheng_li@sjtu.edu.cn; mnutafekede2012@gmail.com

Patrik Svensson's book on *Big Digital Humanities: Imagining a Meeting Place for the Humanities and the Digital* is a scholarly work that questions several concepts in the state of the art and proposes alternatives while, at the same time, creating a splendid academic dialogue. The author focuses on the Big scope of the Digital Humanities so that the field can accommodate the diverse scholars from the different disciplines.

Patrik Svensson is a name in Digital Humanities, Professor of Humanities and Information Technology at Umeå University and Visiting Professor of Digital Humanities at UCLA (2016-2020). His intellectual interests mainly cover Digital Humanities and Conditions for Knowledge Production. His publications include *Big Digital Humanities* (University of Michigan Press, 2016), *Between Humanities and the Digital* (co-edited with David Theo Goldberg, MIT Press, 2015), and numerous book chapters and journal articles. Some of the chapters in the book were previously published in *Digital Humanities Quarterly* between 2009 and 2012, where they were well-received, and hence the author felt the need to revise them, homogenize them and add more ideas in a coherent monograph whose aim is to offer 'a comprehensive model of digital humanities' that the author hopes to 'help the field move forward.' (xvi)

The adjective 'big' has generally been used in Digital Humanities with two different meanings: Big Tent (meaning diversity) and Big Data (a vast number of perspectives and richness of material). As the title of Svensson's book suggests, he perceives 'the bigness of big data in the humanities' as referring to both 'the number of perspectives inherent in the material and the richness of critical inflection rather than the sheer quantity of data' (viii). The notion of the 'Big Tent' of Digital Humanities was the title of an important conference from Stanford University in 2011.[1] The notion has been otherwise contested by a number of scholars, among whom Melissa Terras, a professor of Digital Humanities at University College London, who recognizes the necessity to

---

[1] In the welcome speech, the hosts expressed a hope to include 'the many different varieties of DH practice' in 'a broad and diverse and vibrant DH field'. See Matthew Jockers, and Glen Worthey, 'Welcome to the Big Tent', in *Digital Humanities 2011 Conference Abstracts* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Library, 2011), vi-vii; available at
https://dh2011.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/DH2011_BookOfAbs.pdf [accessed 20 October 2020], vi.

concentrate on some defining features of Digital Humanities 'if the field is all encompassing'.[2] Svensson himself subscribed to this criticism. Although his title might make us think that he is an enthusiast of the 'big tent' notion, he actually starts from the 'big tent' discourse and explores further incorporation of the field beyond it, emphasizing the benefits of a 'no tent' approach.[3] He envisions a model being 'open' and moves 'beyond the big-tent framework' of the Digital Humanities and 'some of [its] territorial struggles'(xi), thus substituting 'big Digital Humanities' for the Big Tent, whereby highlighting the idea of a 'meeting place' (see also 78-80).

As the Digital Humanities develop at the interface between the digital and the humanities, its boundaries have always been contested, with 'disciplinary and epistemic tensions', yet Svensson states that his aim is to engage with 'the ideational and practical shaping of that field, not in a dogmatic or exclusionary way but rather in an exploratory and inclusive fashion.' (vii) His declared intentions are also to propose 'a comprehensive model of Digital Humanities', with the hope that such a model helps the field move forward (xvi-xvii). Moreover, what is challenging about this book is that the author regards the Digital Humanities as 'a place of hope, open debate, and progressive energy, with strong critical potential' (viii), a reason why he brings in it his own personal experience as a linguist in the department of English at Umeå University, an experience that is the result of the courses he has taught, of the research in Corpus linguistics, his HUMlab projects, encounters at various conferences and academic events; he also uses his readings from different books, journals, and blogs reflectively to substantiate his arguments and exemplify descriptions vividly. His book is thus concerned with 'engagement' by which he understands 'a critical component of making big Digital Humanities happen' and which he structures in the form of 'eight personal interludes interspersed throughout the book' (xvii).

The book consists of five chapters: the first two explore the intersection of the humanities and the digital through probing into the challenges of technology and provide a profound understanding within a wider context of history and current development. The third chapter continues this thinking beyond big-tent Digital Humanities and presents the foundation of big Digital Humanities through three basic premises, seeing the Digital Humanities as an open 'site of engagement for all of the humanities' (xvii). The fourth chapter ponders on the role of academic infrastructure not just to facilitate and support humanities, but to be re-conceptualized in return, and the last chapter proceeds with the experience in his HUMlab to envision the 'making' of Digital Humanities through 'building institutions, curating the Digital Humanities, empowering the humanities, and making spaces' (xviii).

---

[2] See Melissa Terras, 'Peering Inside the Big Tent: Digital Humanities and the Crisis of Inclusion'. On Melissa Terras Blogspot, 2011; available at
http://melissaterras.blogspot.com/2011/07/peering-inside-big-tent-digital.html [accessed 20 October 2020]. See also the published version as Melissa Terras, 'Peering inside the Big Tent', in *Defining Digital Humanities: A Reader*, eds. Melissa Terras, Julianne Nyhan, and Edward Vanhoutte (London and New York: Routledge, 2016 [2013]), 263-70.
[3] See not only the book reviewed here, but also his chapter in Matthew Gold's book. Patrik Svensson, 'Beyond the Big Tent', in *Debates in the Digital Humanities* ed. Matthew K. Gold (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012); available at
https://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/read/untitled-88c11800-9446-469b-a3be-3fdb36bfbd1e/section/38531431-5bd6-4eb1-95f5-fa49c025322d#ch04. [accessed 15 October 2020].

The book is impressive in its broad vision of the current landscape in the field, its open-mindedness and an optimistic, as well as ambitious, outlook on the Digital Humanities. The eight interludes in the book, otherwise a very creative and challenging part of his work, substantiate Svensson's illustrations. Similar to those in the theatrical realm where the best interludes may provide a moment to reflect on the previous performances and even a chance to converse with them, the eight interludes in Svensson's way of telling, offers us his opinion on different events through lively experience mingled with personalized emotional reactions. The blend of more subjective reflections with logical arguments testifies to the uniqueness of his viewpoints and adds value to the rationale of his analysis.

In Chapter 1, 'Introducing the Digital Humanities', Svensson argues that scholars from the humanities were already using media before the 'digital' age and that we should not envisage 'the Digital Humanities as a way of curing technophobia in the humanities' (1). Leaving aside the discussion of the resistance to technology, he reminds that when they do, humanists engage with the digital critically and materially. Such engagements have historically been there as most of the research output in the humanities and teaching materials 'are increasingly available in digital formats.' (2) These are what we may call the retro-engineered digital material. In addition, Svensson finds 'digitally born material' (from archived e-mails, websites, online fan fiction, old games, surveillance data, online video, dance performance sensor data, and live data feeds) 'useful for humanistic inquiry.' (2) The new academia of our century is the world of open access policies, 'alternative types of academic production' that are impossible to handle with the traditional tools of the 20th century. Engaging with the work of great names in the field of posthumanism, from Fred Turner, the author of *From Counterculture to Cyberculture*,[4] to N. Katherine Hayles, who made a clear division between 'human' and 'posthuman' as constructions emerging from historically embedded understandings of technology, culture and embodiment,[5] Svensson argues that the interconnection and material production between the digital and humanities vary in the many disciplines within humanities, with media studies, English, and comparative literature being more 'directly affected by digital media, expressions, and inflections' than other disciplines of humanities (3).

Acknowledging the difficult task of defining the field of Digital Humanities, the 'uncertainties and reliance on binary oppositions such as individual-collaborative and methodological-critical' (4), Svensson attempts to better define and describe the interrelation between the humanities and the digital via three possible 'modes of engagement' which he sees as coming from different epistemic traditions: 'technology as a tool', 'technology as an object of analysis and as an expressive medium' (5).

He discusses the relevance of the digital to the field of the humanities, following the prevailing criticism that 'there is not enough humanities in the Digital Humanities' (10), since very important fields of the new humanities, such as gender, ethnic, queer, or environmental perspectives, otherwise very dynamic fields, as well as visual studies interacted less well with Digital Humanities – even if this affirmation has to be largely evaluated in the light of the evolutions of the field since the publication of Svensson's book. At the same time, Digital Humanities became a competitor for resources within

---

[4] Fred Turner, *From Counterculture to Cyberculture* (Chicago: The University of Chicago University Press, 2010).

[5] N. Katherine Hayles, *How We Became Posthuman: Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature and Informatics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999).

the field of the humanities, with digital humanist scholars getting significant grants even when there were budget cuts in American universities. Svensson also discusses research challenges emerging at the intersection of other disciplines and the Digital Humanities with the help of scholars such as Kaci Nash or Cameron Blevins who provided different answers.

In his discussions included in two interludes, the author delineates his personal experience in the process of launching HUMlab at Umeå University and his pondering on the identity of a Digital Humanist, which have changed his viewpoint to the recognition of 'a very strong idea about an open meeting place for the humanities, culture and technology' (6) that performs as the basis for his arguments. Seeing a shift of position 'educational in itself,' he believes it 'inspirational and productive' (7) to embrace a more open future in the development of Digital Humanities.

In search for the potential development of Digital Humanities, Svensson also examines the state of the field, critically scanning its history. He selects three books published in 2012: Matthew Gold's *Debates in the Digital Humanities*,[6] which he sees as somewhat falling short in 'not question[ing] the existence of Digital Humanities as a field' (27), David M. Berry's edited book *Understanding Digital Humanities*,[7] which made the difference 'between databases and narratives' (29), and N. Katherine Hayles's *How We Think: Digital Media and Contemporary Technogenesis.*[8]

Acknowledging that all the three books 'point to the transformative potential of the Digital Humanities in relation to the development of the humanities and the liberal arts' (30), Svensson offers three possible directions into which the Digital Humanities can evolve: to emerge as 'a relatively self-sufficient discipline of Digital Humanities'; to continue occupying 'an in-between position rather than moving toward a more distinct disciplinary position', or to get absorbed by the humanities' (31-3). Without taking a definitive stance about any of these three possibilities, Svensson clearly finds multiple advantages to the second potential model and his books is clearly driven by such a vision.

The second chapter of the book, 'Digital Humanities as a Field,' is mainly devoted to the history of Digital Humanities. Having been reconfigured in the last ten years, Digital Humanities undergo different critical moves amongst which the 'renaming of the field from *humanities computing* to *Digital Humanities*' (36). The epistemic tradition of the humanities computing was kept intact in the Digital Humanities by the 'scholarly associations connected with humanities computing in terms of doing institutional work, hosting conferences, supporting journals, and providing a platform' (36). As a response to these, the name 'big-tent Digital Humanities' was proposed to accommodate newcomers, although the big-tent later on seemed still somewhat exclusive rather than inclusive. The author therefore suggests an elimination of the notion and a positioning of Digital Humanities 'as an intersectional and liminal field with multiple genealogies' (37). Svensson invites the Digital Humanists to stay open to the newcomers, in spite of the challenges they may bring to

---

[6] Matthew K. Gold, ed., *Debates in the Digital Humanities* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012); also available in digital format at
https://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/projects/debates-in-the-digital-humanities [accessed 20 October 2020].
[7] David M. Berry, *Understanding Digital Humanities* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).
[8] N. Katherine Hayles, *How We Think: Digital Media and Contemporary Technogenesis* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012).

pre-existing core values and epistemic traditions. He believes that if Digital Humanities stay inclusive and intersectional with its 'dynamic character' (39), they could accommodate new ideas, epistemic traditions as well as the newcomers.

As to the question if Digital Humanities is a field or discipline, the author compares three terms, 'discipline', 'field', and 'area'. He prefers to regard the Digital Humanities as a 'field' through demonstrating its dynamic nature, with a third Interlude in which he renders his pondering on the 'Academic Road Trips and Textured Visitors' as evidence to the dynamicity of the field as well as diverse institutional engagements. Scholarly associations of the Digital Humanities that provide formal network possibilities through conferences and journal publications are also considered important in the dynamism of Digital Humanities, especially the way in which such associations and publications shape the field in terms of institutionalization, epistemology, and scope. For instance, the association 'Alliance of Digital Humanities Organizations (ADHO), an international umbrella organization founded in 2005' is said to 'control the annual Digital Humanities Conferences as well as journals such as Digital Humanities Quarterly' (51), and has members from areas including 'textual analysis, electronic publication, document encoding, textual studies and theory, new media studies and multimedia, digital libraries, applied augmented reality, interactive gaming, and beyond' (52).

Svensson covers in his discussion the typologies of Digital Humanities in terms of history and evolution. The first typology draws a distinction between maximalist and minimalist Digital Humanities which 'points to the difference between a strong investment in the technology used for traditional scholarly work and a wish to change the humanities at its core' though 'it lacks nuance in tracing these traditions and overlapping layers' (56). Another model is 'moving beyond print' Digital Humanities, proposed by Hayles, and articulated around humanists 'engag[ing] on the level of text encoding, digital editions, 3-D models, archives, and spatial representations' (56). The third typology proposed in 2009 by Tara McPherson who worked on the relation between Digital Humanities and media studies[9] 'emphasizes production and design' (57). McPherson differentiates computing humanities, by which she understood 'building tools, infrastructure, standards, and collections', blogging humanities, 'concerned with the production of networked media', and peer-to-peer writing and multimodal humanities which 'brings together scholarly tools, databases, networked writing, and peer-to-peer commentary while leveraging the potential of the visual and aural media that are part of contemporary life' (57). The fourth typology of Digital Humanities which was proposed by Stephen Ramsay[10] has two components: Type-I which refers to humanities computing and Type-II Digital Humanities which subsumes other recent activities of Digital Humanities that are outside the communal effort of the Humanities computing.

The author presents these different typologies to demonstrate 'a complex landscape with several concurrent epistemic traditions, associated visions, and possible trajectories' (59). He believes such complexity 'could feed fruitfully into the Digital Humanities as a meeting place' (60). Just as the renaming from Humanities Computing to Digital Humanities, the shift of focus in terms of study area and territorial ambition

---

[9] Tara McPherson, 'Introduction: Media Studies and the Digital Humanities', *Cinema Journal* 48. 2 (Winter 2009): 119-23.

[10] Stephen Ramsay, 'DH Types One and Two', *Stephen Ramsay's Blog*; available at http://stephenramsay.us/ [accessed 20 October 2020].

may take time to be digested. As stated by the author, 'humanities computing leaders strategically appropriated Digital Humanities, their actions have increased the difficulty of maintaining the epistemic tradition of humanities computing in the light of external pressure and the field's much more heterogeneous configuration' (66).

In terms of focus, humanities computing was committed primarily to digitized texts as well as 'the instrumental focus of the tradition, a methodological orientation, the privileging of text, and the tradition's engagement with digitized cultural heritage as opposed to other study objects and materials' (65-6). More recently, Digital Humanities started to engage with digitally created material, ranging from computer games, blogs, Twitter feeds, Facebook data, email collections, websites, surveillance footage, YouTube films, and the digital art requiring different kinds of new media settings. In terms of territorial ambition, the organizations associated with humanities computing and these epistemic commitments play an important role concerning an expansive notion of Digital Humanities (70). For instance, the successive addition of a number of associations in ADHO, amongst which the Canadian Society for Digital Humanities (created in 2007), the National Initiative for Networked Cultural Heritage and the Text Encoding Initiative Consortium, then centerNet and the Australasian Association for Digital Humanities (set up in 2012), and the Japanese Association for Digital Humanities (created in 2013) which originally consisted of two member associations, ALLC and the ACH, has played a significant role in expanding and reshaping Digital Humanities through bringing in specific perspectives and disciplinary traditions into the field (77).

Chapter three, 'Three Premises of Big Digital Humanities', proposes 'Big Digital Humanities' as the best candidate phrase to replace Big-tent Digital Humanities on three basic premises: the 'benefit from engaging broadly with the digital,' the need for the Digital Humanities 'to be a meeting place with broad humanistic and deep academic investment,' and the need for the Digital Humanities 'to be a site of engagement for all of the humanities' (85).

As an actual demonstration of these premises in an academic setting, the author provides in Interlude 4 the theme of a possible 'virtual wedding' in which students from traditionally separated fields, namely, linguistics, literary studies, and cultural studies, were brought together to work on it. The aim of the project was to explore 'how technology could help […] tackle challenges, inspire students, and challenge traditions' (85). The students worked in small groups virtually and developed contents out of the provided theme each semester. Team-work enabled students to open better intellectual discussions and cooperation. Svensson concludes that technologies were both enabling and constraining, and that their work was simultaneously practical, experimental, and critical. In short, the virtual wedding project has been quite a successful 'meeting place' for joint efforts and engagements from various disciplines.

As Svensson points out, the Digital Humanities as a project requires simultaneous engagement with the digital as a tool, a study object, and a medium. The modes of engagement should be multimodal and nontrivial.

Digital technologies as tools are found to facilitate the management and analysis of huge data in humanities. Svensson sees 'methodologies and toolsets such as culturomics, topic modeling, and timeline tools' as bringing their own 'worldviews and assumptions' that need to be approached 'both instrumentally and critically' (90). The author points towards a shift of Digital Humanities away from toolsets and platforms that were more specific and, in some cases, restricted. Nowadays, the World Wide Web

and web-technologies offer means to collect and store data through providing huge archives, databases, and online materials. Underlying the use of these tools is 'an ideology of cognition and functionalism' (91).

More profound ideological changes relate to the engagement with the digital as a study object for humanities. He exemplifies this with an example of a possible shift of interest in 'the details of taking turns in a specific digital platform or across communication media' (97) in linguistics. In the same vein, scholars in humanities may be able to probe various academic problems in different types of digital environments, focusing on variegated 'study objects [that] can be phenomena, cultural artifacts, and processes that are digitally inflected in various ways' (101).

As to the engagement with the digital as a medium, Svensson compares the traditional scholarly formats that were followed in print media and those one finds in online environments. In both cases, expressive situations vary in different academic ladders and contexts. For instance, many digital experimentations are part of undergraduate programs rather than graduate programs, such as MA and PhD, since 'there is more epistemic and social control', for example, at PhD level, where there is 'also typically less focus on employability and digital literacy.' (106).

The opportunities and challenges of the Digital Humanities being a meeting place on various levels are the focus of Svensson's outlook. He is quite optimistic that 'the Digital Humanities requires an institutional position, a breadth of epistemic traditions, methodological competence, and material resources, and that seeing the field as a meeting place can help meet these requirements' (109). Even when considering the Digital Humanities as a trading zone or a boundary object, the author's view is that they should 'have its integrity and appropriate organizational status, but the idea would be to work with the rest of the humanities and what is outside' (116).

Discussions on possible challenges of living in-between or being at a meeting place are presented in Interlude 5. Despite the prospected advantages 'in terms of visibility, the ability to present visions and ongoing work, and channeling energy,' it is challenging 'to make a meeting place work in an institutional context where […] the traditional institutional structures are very strong' (119). Besides, the intellectual middleware is also part of the difficulty. Big Digital Humanities require inclusive involvement from many scholars, as the field involves big data and dedicated material to answer research questions in the field. Yet, intellectuals in the area may not be well involved. For example, 'practices such as prototyping and user testing are underutilized' (126). Since some projects being initiated by a 'very limited group of people', there looms 'little need to tailor interfaces to a large constituency' (126). At the same time, as 'this propensity is not just a matter of technology or design but is also part of the field's epistemic tradition' (126), the intellectual middleware is considered to be the missing element, since it would become the space where 'different levels, competencies, and intellectual drive [should] come together' (126-7).

Recognition of such difficulties does not prevent Svensson from being confident in the future of Digital Humanities. He believes that the liminality in the position of big Digital Humanities can handle them with its very nature of flexibility in offering 'strong connections to the rest of the humanities, the academy, and the outside world' (130).

Based on the substantial probing into Digital Humanities in the previous parts, Chapter 4, 'Humanities Infrastructure,' addresses more practically the particular types of infrastructure required for Big Digital Humanities. Proposing a 'shared, humanistic infrastructure' that 'can support the three premises of Digital Humanities: the Digital

Humanities as a meeting place, multiple modes of engagement, and the field as a place to engage with the situation and future of the humanities' (131), Svensson contemplates on how to approach them. He draws from his own experience as the ex-director of HUMlab involved in constructing material environment in his Interlude 6 and constructively looks on infrastructure as an 'instrumental way' with 'intersectional capacity' of bringing together people from different fields (136).

At the same time, being aware that humanists do not get enough funds required for infrastructure when compared to scientists or engineers, the author sees this as 'the result of institutional, cultural, political, and conceptual processes' (135) and urges that the humanities should argue in favour of humanities' infrastructure and that infrastructure should be shared.

He follows such an urge with a proper effort of defining research infrastructure, an exercise that humanists perform less well than scientists. From this point of view, Svensson's findings from this chapter might be a useful guide to any humanist who would like to set up a laboratory with proper research infrastructure. Despite variables such as social, institutional, and political contexts, he generalizes research infrastructure as 'the resources' (personnel, buildings, or equipment) required for an activity as well as 'the underlying foundation or basic framework (of a system or organization)' (138).

Acknowledging that in the digital age, the humanities are pressingly pushed towards using digital objects, Svensson further delineates possible risks, strategies, and models of infrastructures for the humanities. Risks include a danger of existing humanities infrastructure being disregarded; a science-based and data-driven model being imposed on the humanities (sometimes by humanists themselves); infrastructural agendas most compatible with a largely science-based model being inappropriately prioritized; and even new humanities infrastructure being uncritically based on existing infrastructure, such as libraries, and associated epistemic commitments, all of which call for the maintaining of 'a critical stance and advocating a truly humanities-based approach' as the main strategy' (143). Models are provided by the author to demonstrate his strategies that either extend the already existing infrastructures to meet new demands or a STEM notion of transforming technological infrastructure into humanities, typically with an example of his HUMlab. He states that 'a meeting place' 'is central to HUMlab as an idea and space and was clearly articulated in early vision documents as well as in practice' (155).

Design principles as 'translucence (encouraging contact and having a sense of what other people are working on), flexibility (supporting many different kinds of meetings and technological platforms), and intensity (space and endeavor that attracts engagement and interest)' (155-6) are vital to the exercise. The very flexibility and multiplicity go in line with the very nature of the humanities as 'richly engaged with a multi-perspective, complex, and multilevel subject matter' (161).

The last chapter, 'Making Digital Humanities', outlines in particular 'the strategies and parameters relevant to implementing big Digital Humanities' (172), including building infrastructure at the local level and connecting it with national and international institutions, organizations, and scholarship. Just because of the position of Digital Humanities in-between disciplines, departments, competencies, ideas, and technologies, it is necessary to create best fit institutional leadership for the Big Digital Humanities.

Aiming at building Big Digital Humanities to empower researchers, Svensson ponders on various forms of collaboration on thematic research projects. Such

empowering function can range from events and activities to an all-round form in support as long as it can enable people to 'develop and test their ideas' (196). He even suggests making and collaborating space for Digital Humanities both physically and digitally by referring to his experience of screen-using in HUMlab for participating activities of all kinds, which ensures that the Digital Humanities can benefit from 'a strong spatial presence' (207). In Interlude 8, 'Operating on the Radar', Svensson discusses a proposal challenging the institutional tradition of the humanities, and highlights the epistemic importance of Digital Humanities. Svensson views Digital Humanities as 'a Site for Learning' (172 and 212), starting 'from a conceptual foundation' to building 'competent institutions and curat[ing] the Digital Humanities and empower[ing] humanities' (212) in an overall effort which could initiate the recognition of learning in every way. Actually this is the very reason why Svensson sees Digital Humanities as a 'meeting place', as 'learning across epistemic traditions and intersectional junctions can be facilitated' (212) as long as the field provides a contact zone.

The books's Epilogue, entitled 'Making December Events', discusses scholarly events in Umeå that help to strengthen networks through encouraging both physical and online participation via Skype. Svensson seems to draw the optimistic conclusion that such events not only bring people together, but also provide an opportunity for 'intellectual and technological exploration', and 'channel considerable amounts of energy into specific endeavors' (222). Looking at how important such technologies proved to be during the 2020 pandemic year, when all teachers from all over the world relied almost exclusively on Skype, Zoom, Canvas, Google Meet and other means of connecting live with their students, we can see how right Svensson was in 2016 when he published his book. Furthermore, organizing large-scale events can motivate many other accomplishments, ranging from installation of infrastructure, accomplishing projects and upgrading of labs, which proves to be constructive in all senses.

In summary, *Big Digital Humanities: Imagining a Meeting Place for the Humanities and the Digital* presents the historical development of Digital Humanities, the diversity of scholars in the field, and the ways to be all-inclusive in accommodating stakeholders, different views, and epistemologies. The imagined meeting place should be big enough for such inclusion. The author stresses the advantages of the liminal position of Big Digital Humanities, and points out at how to solve the challenges that may be faced due to this special position. He makes quests for adequate funds the Digital Humanities, directed to building an appropriate infrastructure for the field.

The book is written not only for scholars in the Digital Humanities but also researchers and students having a potential interest in the field or those involved in the academic circle at large. Without shunning difficulties and challenges Digital Humanities face, the author presents an encouraging outlook with a set of constructive instructions and advices based on his broad vision of and insightful contemplations in the field as well as his first-hand experience, with both theoretical and practical values. Enhancing further recognition of Digital Humanities on both academic and institutional levels, the book may also prove to be of help to various decision-makers in higher education and institutional organizations, or even to policymakers in the realm.

Bibliography

1. Berry, David M., *Understanding Digital Humanities.* Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
2. Gold, Matthew K. Editor. *Debates in the Digital Humanities.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012. Available in digital format at https://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/projects/debates-in-the-digital-humanities. Accessed 20 October 2020.
3. Hayles, N. Katherine. *How We Think: Digital Media and Contemporary Technogenesis.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012.
4. Hayles, N. Katherine. *How We Became Posthuman: Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature and Informatics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.
5. Jockers, Matthew, and Glen Worthey. 'Welcome to the Big Tent'. In *Digital Humanities 2011 Conference Abstracts*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Library, 2011. vi-vii. Available at https://dh2011.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/DH2011_BookOfAbs.pdf. Accessed 20 October 2020.
6. McPherson, Tara. 'Introduction: Media Studies and the Digital Humanities'. *Cinema Journal* 48. 2 (Winter 2009): 119-23.
7. Ramsay, Stephen. 'DH Types One and Two'. *Stephen Ramsay's Blog.* Available at http://stephenramsay.us/. Accessed 20 October 2020.
8. Svensson, Patrik. 'Beyond the Big Tent'. In *Debates in the Digital Humanities.* Edited by Matthew K. Gold. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012. Available at https://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/read/untitled-88c11800-9446-469b-a3be-3fdb36bfbd1e/section/38531431-5bd6-4eb1-95f5-fa49c025322d#ch04. Accessed 15 October 2020.
9. Terras, Melissa. 'Peering Inside the Big Tent: Digital Humanities and the Crisis of Inclusion'. On Melissa Terras Blogspot, 2011. Available at http://melissaterras.blogspot.com/2011/07/peering-inside-big-tent-digital.html. Accessed 20 October 2020.
10. Terras, Melissa. 'Peering inside the Big Tent'. In *Defining Digital Humanities: A Reader*. Edited by Melissa Terras, Julianne Nyhan, and Edward Vanhoutte. London and New York, 2016 [2013]. 263-70.
11. Turner, Fred. *From Counterculture to Cyberculture.* Chicago: The University of Chicago University Press, 2010.