Matthew K. Gold and Lauren F. Klein, eds. *Debates in the Digital Humanities 2016*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2016. 579 pp. 978-0-8166-9954-4.

Reviewed by
Mauricio Espinoza
University of Cincinnati

To say that *Debates in the Digital Humanities 2016*, edited by Matthew K. Gold and Lauren F. Klein, is a comprehensive and multidimensional attempt to catalog and flesh out the growing field of the digital humanities would be an understatement. At 579 pages, 50 articles organized in six different sections, and over 60 contributors, the size of this volume alone is a clear indication of the diversity of voices and practices that have fallen and continue to fall under the umbrella of this multi- and interdisciplinary field. The voluminous collection also represents a conscious effort to chart the future course of the digital humanities as one of inclusion and dialogue rather than clearly delimited disciplinary lines—at a time in history when our polarized societal debates tend to fluctuate between the drive to build walls and the need, instead, to extend bridges.

To provide a bit of background, the first *Debates in the Digital Humanities* anthology was published in 2012 to seize and mark the "moment" the new discipline was having at the time. In this second volume, Gold and Klein proclaim that over the past few years since the inaugural publication, the digital humanities have, as a field, finally "arrived." In fact, the editors offer the 2016 anthology—with its variety of approaches, disciplines, and practitioners—as proof of this momentous progress. In an afterword to this volume, they also announce the launching of a new book series from the University of Minnesota Press, equally called (and this may lead to confusion later on) *Debates in the Digital Humanities*. Thanks to this series, the collection being reviewed here will become an annual publication highlighting the most important developments in the field in that particular year. Additionally, the series will publish book-length volumes focused on specific topics that require more attention and depth. All the books will be published in both traditional print form and interactive online format. The 2012 and 2016 editions, as well as the call for proposals for future publications, are available at http://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/.

And now, back to the 2016 anthology. It is clear from the volume's introduction by Gold and Klein that the main issue facing the digital humanities field at this moment of significant growth is its "definitional dilemma." What are digital humanities exactly?

What kind of work do they entail? What can be considered part of this field and what should not? The editors use terms such as "big tent," "motley of effort," "infinitely malleable," and "free-floating signifier" to refer to the way in which the digital humanities have from the beginning embrace openness and elasticity. And while other scholars (including art historian Rosalind Krauss when reflecting on the definition of "sculpture" in the past few decades) have warned about the dangers of definitional imprecision and trying to embrace too much, Gold and Klein believe that having an expanded field will bring about "differently structured possibilities" to the discipline— and that such advantage outstrips the potential risks. In the end, they claim, the digital humanities' expanded field will be defined not so much by who's in and who's out but by "relationships among key concepts"—in other words, they see the digital humanities as a field that operates through relation instead of definition.

This answer to the digital humanities' definitional dilemma has been articulated to address one of the field's toughest challenges over the past few years: legitimacy within academia. One thing is for digital humanities practitioners to sit in the "big tent" that the field has built for them, where their diverse backgrounds and interests are welcome. Another completely different is practicing digital humanities at "a field-specific level," as Gold and Klein put it, where practitioners have to confront disciplinary habits as well as structures and colleagues/administrators that might not be quite sure what to make of their work. The editors point out that this conversation has shifted from the tensions experienced by practitioners as they argued their tenure and promotion cases "before colleagues who had trouble even conceiving of DH work as scholarship" to "grappling with DH at the disciplinary level, most often by scholars from the disciplines who have looked in vain to see their concerns represented in DH" (xi). This may be a good problem to have, as it is an indication that the field has in some respects transcended the question of whether it is an academic discipline at all and it is now dealing with growing pains—which takes us back to the discussion about the steady expansion of the digital humanities with which this book opens.

Gold and Klein's insightful report on the state of the field is followed by six sections that reflect the multifaceted nature of the digital humanities today. Each section includes several "traditional" academic essays on specific issues as well as a few blog posts and short essays that illustrate interesting debates taking place on the field's interactive trenches. This combination of writing styles and article lengths makes each section of the mammoth book a little easier to digest for the reader. Part I deals with the histories and futures of the digital humanities, attempting to chart a chronology of the developments and upcoming possibilities of a field whose name was first coined in 2004. Part II focuses on the methods used by digital humanities practitioners, while Part III details popular practices such as text mining and digitization. Meanwhile, Part IV tackles the relationship between digital humanities and the disciplines it works with and within, with a particular emphasis on shifting disciplinary borders. Part V takes on the criticisms often lobbed at the digital humanities, including whether the field is utopian

and whether, at this point in the digitalization of our culture, the word "digital" should be dropped from the field's name. Finally, Part VI is a forum about text analysis at scale.

As mentioned before, the wealth of topics and disciplines represented in this collection is commendable. And yet, there's very little representation from the world of romance languages and literatures or even modern languages in general. Along the same lines, there isn't much representation from Latin American or Latino studies. These are notable holes that future anthologies and series monographs should address. In Chapter 13, "Why We Must Read the Code: The Science Wars, Episode IV" by Mark C. Marino, there's mention of a provocative work of media art called the Transborder Immigrant Tool. Created by the Electronic Disturbance Theater, the tool is a phone application that uses GPS technology to help undocumented U.S.-Mexico border crossers find caches of waters in the desert. The app also plays poetry that includes, among other topics, instructions for helping migrants survive in unhospitable terrains. Falling under the category of Critical Code Studies, the Transborder Immigrant Tool is a good example of how activism, art, academia, and the digital humanities can come together when dialoguing with one of the most pressing social, political, and humanitarian issues of our day.

Readers interested in Latin American studies and the challenges to ethnic/racial diversity in the digital humanities field should read Chapter 16, Alex Gil's interview with Ernesto Oroza. A designer, architect, and theorist, Oroza has been working as an ethnographer of Cuba's DIY culture and advancing concepts such as "architecture of necessity" and "the technology of disobedience." While not related directly to romance languages and literatures or Latin American/Latino studies, Kim Gallon's article "Making a Case for the Black Digital Humanities" offers several points of confluence when thinking globally of race/ethnic studies. As Gallon indicates, trying to articulate a relationship between the digital humanities and a field like Black studies can "highlight how technology, employed in this underexamined context, can further expose humanity as a racialized social construction" (42). This approach may prove to be helpful for our fields as well.

My final thought about *Debates in the Digital Humanities 2016* and future offerings from this series is: Should these publications discard paper editions and focus solely on e-books and interactive online format that allow for searchability and dialogue? After all, the "digital" in the digital humanities is there for a reason. And 579 pages is a whole lot of non-digital trees.