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Preface

The last decade has witnessed nothing short of a transformation in the study of religion. Where the printed word was once the field’s stock-in-trade, scholars and journalists now produce and circulate knowledge through a variety of digital media as well. These new genres have, in large part, been made possible by the rise of “digital humanities” within the academy—a methodological turn that, despite its name, has altered disciplines across both the humanities and social sciences—as well as the widespread use of social participatory media.

This report documents the effects that digital modes of research and publication have on the study of religion. Based on the examination of over 150 digital projects that attend to religion as well as interviews with project directors and participants, the report aims not only to map the study of religion’s emergent digital landscape, but also to explain the methods that are shaping this evolving terrain. We attempt to do the latter in part by structuring the report based on the workflows of many of the digital projects we examined. After an introductory section that lays out key terms, section two explores the crowdsourced and commons-based world of idea exchange where many digital projects take shape. Section three then presents a rough typology of new digital work in the study of religion, paying special attention to the tools and methods of production, while section four covers the many issues affecting digital projects after they launch, from peer review to public scholarship. Section five ends the report with a discussion of those technical and institutional issues that affect the sustainability of digital scholarship. In this way, we hope to point the field toward areas that require attention and intentional effort in order to ensure that such work can thrive.

We intend for this report to serve as what might be called a form of documentary advocacy. While our primary goal is to chronicle emerging forms of intellectual production shaping the study of religion, we hope that a greater awareness of this new work will generate more recognition of the high quality and innovative work that already exists.
1. Introduction: Hot Spots

_The Internet has been like a library with all of the books thrown on the floor._
- Heidi Campbell, Texas A&M University

As much as the Internet saturates our daily lives, the full impact of its influence is often only revealed in particular instances or places. Think of the boredom, frustration, or anxiety one might feel when they are unable to get online, and the relief or excitement that comes with finding an open Wi-Fi hotspot. The same is true for the digital turn's impact upon the study of religion. While academics, journalists, and other stakeholders often take the digital age for granted, certain moments often reveal unresolved tensions within the field.

In September 2012, for example, historian Karen King announced that she had discovered a seventeen-hundred year old fragment of the Bible that contained a phrase never before seen in any piece of scripture: “And Jesus said to them, ‘My wife . . .’” Of course, the news that Jesus may have been married became a sensation. It was a perfect blend of academic significance and popular iconoclasm that can turn any work of scholarship into a public spectacle. Harvard, where King taught, seemed ready for the attention. The university timed King's presentation of the fragment at an academic conference to coincide with stories in several major newspapers, while the _Harvard Theological Review_ pre-published a draft of a paper King wrote on the text on its website alongside high-quality scans of what was by then called “The Gospel of Jesus’ Wife.”

It was at this point, however, that this story of a fourth century piece of papyrus took on a decidedly digital turn. Within days, a countervailing network of individuals, writing exclusively online, raised a host of concerns over the fragment’s authenticity. By the end of that week, this virtual community of New Testament scholars, graduate students, and even Christian laypeople had collaboratively discovered that every line in the Gospel of Jesus’ Wife, save the mention of Christ’s wife, also appeared in the Gospel of Thomas—including a grammatical error only found in a digital edition of the Thomas gospel. In response, Harvard initially announced that it would delay the publication of King’s paper pending further research. But in April 2014, the _Harvard Theological Review_ seemed to recommit to the text’s authenticity in a special issue that published King’s paper alongside an analysis from scientists at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology that carbon dated the fragment to sometime around the sixth century. Skeptics again rallied online, publishing their doubts on blogs and through self-published articles hosted on personal websites or Academia.edu. Within two weeks, scholars from the group blog _Evangelical Textual Criticism_ conclusively proved the fragment to be a modern forgery after they found, in the issue’s supplemental PDF files, the scan of a Coptic fragment known to be a forgery, but which had never previously been made public. MIT had only used the fragment’s papyrus as a control for dating the Gospel of Jesus’ Wife, for while the fragment was a forgery, its paper was not. When bloggers at _Evangelical Textual Criticism_ compared the two pieces, they found that the handwriting, ink, and instrumentation were identical. Whoever forged the control fragment had also forged the Gospel of Jesus’ Wife. The discovery amounted to a “smoking gun,” as one scholar put it.²
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¹ Heidi Campbell, interview with Christopher D. Cantwell, September 12, 2014.
The discussion of the Gospel of Jesus’ Wife is indicative of a number of issues that surround the study of religion in the digital age. The first concerns the nature of scholarship. As the debate revealed, a disconnect currently exists between the spaces in which knowledge is produced and those places where scholarship is authorized. Articles in the Harvard Theological Review are now a part of the permanent scholarly record, published, bound and preserved in a number of libraries. The blog posts, videos, and extended Facebook comments that contributed to uncovering the fragment’s forgery, meanwhile, are not only unlikely to count in the tenure portfolios of the scholars who created them, but are also not systematically reviewed or preserved by the institutions in which the production of scholarship traditionally takes place.

In addition to highlighting scholarship’s ongoing digital evolution, the Gospel of Jesus’ Wife debate also reveals how taking the study of religion online also significantly broadens the field’s stakeholders. For example, the digital edition of the Gospel of Thomas that was central in initially discrediting the fragment was not the work of philologists or even academics, but of a computer programmer from Pontiac, Michigan, who hosts encoded editions of scriptural fragments on his personal website. The scholarly blog Evangelical Textual Criticism also had an interest in determining the fragment’s historicity. Many of the blog’s authors are a part of the Green Scholars Initiative, funded by Hobby Lobby president Steve Green, the conservative evangelical businessman currently overseeing the creation of a Bible museum on the National Mall. Of course, communities of faith and ordinary believers have long played a part in shaping the study of religion. But when an IT professional in suburban Detroit becomes a key figure in determining the authenticity of a sixth century piece of papyrus, we have to acknowledge that some kind of qualitative change in the relationship between academics and the wider public has taken place.

More than just the objects or consumers of our work, publics beyond the professional study of religion are rapidly becoming key interlocutors in the online production, evaluation, and dissemination of knowledge about religion. As such, contemporary practices of promotion and evaluation of digital work must take this new collaborative reality into account. The following section covers the history of digital work in the study of religion, concluding with an exploration of the interactive, user-generated, participatory media scholars and journalists increasingly use today.

1.1 What Is Digital Humanities and Why Hasn’t It Been in Religious Studies Departments?

Digital scholarship’s origins are actually found in the study of religion. In 1949, a young Jesuit named Roberto Busa convinced IBM CEO Thomas J. Watson, Sr. to give him access to the company’s punch card technology in order to create a concordance of all of St. Thomas Aquinas’s writings. The priest had been studying Aquinas' writings for decades, and after discovering that the church father’s conception of God’s “Holy Presence” was always preceded by some use of the preposition “in,” Busa wondered what else a searchable catalog of Aquinas’ writing might reveal. By 1960, Busa had a staff of sixty priests and computer programmers working on the Index Thomisticus. First published throughout the 1970s as a fifty-six volume concordance, the project eventually released a CD-ROM in the 1980s before moving online in 2005 with a website that remains accessible today.

Busa’s concordance was the first database of human language, a pioneering achievement that proved central to the development of hypertext some decades later. But it was among literary scholars that Busa’s efforts would have its greatest impact. By the late 1970s, a number of academic teams and centers engaged in what they called “humanities computing,” building similarly machine-readable editions of literary corpora. Professional bodies like the Association for Literary and Linguistic Computing (1973) and the Association of Computers and the Humanities (1978) also emerged to standardize and evaluate these modes of inquiry, eventually culminating in the formation of the Text Encoding Initiative (TEI) in 1987. An international consortium of scholars, librarians, computer scientists, and other professionals, TEI issues recommendations for formatting text into digital forms using Extensible Markup Language (XML). Its published guidelines remain the standard in digitization to this day, and allowed the field of humanities computing to flourish. Projects like the Women’s Writer Project, founded at Brown in 1986, enhanced the accessibility of early modern
female authors through encoding and aggregation, while Tufts University’s *Perseus Project* applied Busa’s methods to other classical Greek and Latin texts.3

The advent of the World Wide Web in the 1990s, however, transformed the humanities computing movement. The ability to incorporate images, audio, video, and other non-textual formats into online repositories expanded the kinds of material scholars could aggregate. Advances in personal computing software and other programs like Geographic Information Systems (GIS) also enhanced the way scholars could manipulate and analyze material. But it was the Web’s rapid integration into the contours of daily life that had the greatest impact upon digital scholarship, expanding the kinds of communities who could create and curate digital content. Librarians, museum professionals, other humanistic and social science disciplines, and, increasingly, the general public soon joined literary scholars as contributors to a new generation of projects that were defined by their interactivity. Early “virtual exhibits” or “digital history” projects like the San Francisco Exploratorium’s 1995 *Remembering Nagasaki*, for example, not only recreated a physical museum installation online, but also invited users to enhance the project by submitting their own memories of the bombing through a web-based form. University College London similarly took advantage of the Web’s proliferation in *Transcribe Bentham*, a 2010 project that asked the general public to transcribe Jeremy Bentham’s unpublished writings by posting high-quality scans of the famed British philosopher’s manuscripts online.4

By the early 2000s, the diversification of digital content and the communities who created it led many scholars to call for a new term could transcend humanities computing’s emphasis upon the encoding of texts. When John Unsworth, founding director of the University of Virginia’s Institute for Advanced Technology in the Humanities, sought a title for an edited collection on the variety of digital scholarship in 2004, he and his collaborators coined the term “digital humanities.”5 The name stuck, and it has come to encompass the majority of the digital work now taking place in disciplines across the humanities and social sciences.

Digital humanities have flourished in the decade since Unsworth first coined the term. The University of Illinois Press publishes a *book series* in what has now been shorthanded to just “DH”; multiple journals serve the field; a number of professional associations hold annual meetings on the subject or offer prizes for innovation in the field; an *Office of Digital Humanities* within the National Endowment exclusively funds digital projects; and universities, even in a time of increased austerity and program closures, are investing resources in cluster hires, digital research centers, and humanities labs intended to increase the presence of digital scholarship on their campuses. Indeed, in less than ten years the field has gone from needing such explanatory pieces like literary scholar Matthew Kirschenbaum’s influential “What Is Digital Humanities and What’s It Doing in English Departments?” to being labeled “The Thing” in higher education today by *Chronicle of Higher Education* columnists William Pannapacker.6

At the same time that digital scholarship became ascendant within the academy, it also became surprisingly absent from the study of religion. While digital humanists pointed to Busa’s theological inquiries as t
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of origin—the Alliance of Digital Humanities Organization’s going so far as to name its annual prize for innovation in his honor—the digital humanities has largely been the domain of those less interested in sacred matters. As Charles Ess lamented in his 2004 appraisal of the digital landscape in the study of religion, “beyond the use of the Web and the Internet by believers and discussants – there appear to be comparatively fewer religiously oriented computing projects.” While a Google search might yield thirteen million hits for the term religion, Ess found, those who study religion neither contributed to nor explored such a massive inventory.

It would only be in the decade following Ess’s writing, the span that this report covers, that digital projects would gain prominence within the study of religion.

1.2 Participatory Media

In accounting for the study of religion’s absence from his survey of digital scholarship, Ess only cited the field’s supposedly marginal status within the academy. Another reason, however, was Ess’s limited purview. If he had expanded his scope beyond text encoding projects to explore the Internet’s other corners, Ess would have found an abundance of blogs, message boards, and other forms of web-based publication devoted to the study of religion. While Ess dismissed these sites as “low-tech uses of computing technology,” that even “believers and discussants” used, they have been vital shared spaces where a growing number of researchers have attempted to understand the Web’s impact upon religious communities by harnessing the technologies these communities used. The Electronic Communications and Cultures Group, for example, began as a late 1990s email listserv of scholars, graduate students, journalists, and other individuals interested in religion’s digital cultures. A self-described techno pagan oversaw group’s online bulletin board, drawing spiritual benefit from the resources the listserv’s researchers shared while simultaneously providing scholars with raw material for their research. In short, the ECCG’s online forums became a space where practitioners became interlocutors in the very process by which researchers defined religion as much as they were object of religious inquiry.

Over the next decade, websites and blogs would become steadily established venues for the production and dissemination of knowledge about religion. Indeed, as the Social Science Research Council found in its report on the religion blogosphere, digital and social media was no longer a “new and emerging phenomenon” for the field by 2010. By that point, the report found, it had become a development that had “already begun to mature and grow settled in certain tendencies and habits.” But as the debate surrounding Gospel of Jesus’ Wife makes clear, blogs and other web-based writing platforms now exist within a broader ecology of what some call “participatory media.”

As a matter of terminology, we favor “participatory media” over “social media.” From one perspective, all media is inherently social, the source of innumerable conversations both spoken and in print. But on

8 Ibid.
9 Heidi Campbell, interview with Christopher D. Cantwell, September 12, 2014.
11 Even societies with limited literacy rates we find “social communicators” who put the printed word into communal contexts through telling stories or reading pieces aloud. Our understanding of media’s inherent sociability comes from Jack Goody, The Interface Between the Written and the Oral (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987); C. A. Bayly, Empire and Information: Intelligence Gathering and Social Communication in India, 1780-1870 (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Walter J. Ong, Orality and Literacy: The Technology of the Word (New York: Routledge, 1991), 136.
another level, participatory media indexes myriad web-based technologies that make the manipulation of content a platform’s primary feature. Blogs, of course, are the preeminent—and earliest—example of this. The ability for users to add comments, crosspost, pingback, and share a particular blog post contributed to the genre’s novelty and widespread adoption. The Web 2.0 technologies that followed similarly incorporated such participatory elements. In addition to allowing comments and sharing, video and song sharing services like YouTube and Spotify enable users to create new communities of interest through curated playlists and restructured formats like the mash up. In every instance, a user not only consumes a piece of culture, but also interacts with and thereby transforms it in fundamental ways. This interaction, moreover, takes place within communities of use that make nearly every form of digital media inescapably participatory.¹²

Digital media’s inherently participatory nature means that to engage with the medium successfully, one must be aware of its characteristics or rules. Communities of print, visual, or audio culture that migrate online simply by creating “e-” versions of themselves not only underutilize the medium, but also risk alienating the communities of use that are rapidly emerging around digital content.

2. Crowdsourcing

“We didn’t know exactly what we were providing. It was all very organic.”

- Brooke Wilensky-Lanford, Killing the Buddha

Though the term crowdsourcing was first coined in 2005, the act of distributing particularly onerous tasks to communities who benefit from the work has a much longer history. One of the earliest instances comes from the late nineteenth century when the Philological Society of London solicited volunteers to help catalog words for the Oxford English Dictionary after it took them five years just to make it to the word “ant.” Despite its history, however, the crowdsourcing of work has become synonymous with the digital age. Amazon now relies on users to rate its products, nonprofits use crowdfunding sites to sustain or launch initiatives, and NASA solicits the public’s help in organizing satellite images.

In addition to characterizing our current moment, crowdsourcing is an apt metaphor to describe the process by which digital humanities and participatory media became integrated into the study of religion. In the decade since Charles Ess first lamented digital scholarship’s absence from the field, a loose network of academics, journalists, and other professionals has emerged that is invested in harnessing technology to study religion as well as technology’s impact upon the category of religion. Dispersed, free form, and eclectic, this network coalesced through digital and in person interactions. This section explores part of this network’s technological and organizational infrastructure, as well as the collaborative ethic that underlies it.

2.1 The Social Web

In 2013, journalist Jason Kottke pronounced the blog dead. Once the information age’s youthful disrupter, the primary outlet for rapid-fire commentary on any current event, Kottke notes that current data reveals how even “40-somethings with kids” use blogs now. Such a demographic, he claims, is the sign of a technology’s end rather than its vitality.

Kottke’s pronouncement was, of course, hyperbole. Not only do blogs continue to thrive, they are becoming the primary platform for much of the web’s content. According to website profiling firm BuiltWith, nearly half of today’s websites were built with the popular blogging software WordPress, while the blogging platform Tumblr alone boasts 255 million sites—far more than the mere 156 million blogs that existed across all platforms in 2010. But Kottke is right that the nature of blogging has changed over the last decade. Once the domain of digital upstarts who sought to comment upon the day’s events from the outside, blogs have since become intimately mainstream. Major traditional publications have begun acquiring blogs, as the Washington Post did in 2013 when it purchased the longstanding political science blog the Monkey Cage, while web-based news outlets like Talking Points Memo, BuzzFeed, or The Huffington Post that began as blogs no longer refer to themselves as such. Perhaps the clearest sign of the blog’s mainstreaming is the end of writer Andrew Sullivan’s Daily Dish. Unlike many writers, Sullivan consistently styled himself as a blogger. But in June of 2015, he opted to close the Dish, citing the short-form, rapid fire commentary he founded the publication on as no longer fulfilling or relevant.

13 Brooke Wilensky-Lanford, interview with Christopher D. Cantwell, February 2, 2015.
Even amongst academics, blogging has become increasingly formalized. Researchers have increasingly found that the majority of scholars who blog do so not to reach new audiences with their research, but to engage in highly formal conversations about research, funding, and academic politics with their peers. Even the vaunted Chicago Manual of Style seemed to recognize the blog’s growing seriousness when its sixteenth edition recommended for the first time that writers italicize blog titles like books and other publications.18

Today the independent, freewheeling conversations blogs once fostered are increasingly found on a variety of new(er) social media platforms. Instead of blogging, people now discuss articles on Facebook (2004), sound off on Reddit (2005), tweet their thoughts on Twitter (2006), post photos on Instagram (2010), or pin items to their Pinterest boards (2010). In a relatively short period of time, these sites, which also developed as native apps for smartphones and tablets, have come to dominate the aggregation and distribution of information online. Where search engines like Google once provided fully seventy percent of website referrals, the use of search engines is now tied with social media at 30 percent as the primary way individuals find content online. Last year, Facebook alone drove nearly a quarter of all web site referrals, a fact that led the digital marketing firm Technorati to rename its renowned “State of the Blogosphere” report as the “Digital Influence Report” in order to account for the new ways individuals increasingly find information online.19

In addition to directing a sizeable portion of web traffic, these platforms have also changed how individuals produce, consume, and share the web’s content. The posts these platforms support, called “microcontent” for the abbreviated form they usually take, often shift the platform’s primary benefit away from content itself and toward the network effects the service produces. A user might read an article or blog post on a particular site, for example, but then enhance the content through conversation or curation by sharing it on Twitter, Pinterest, or Facebook. This secondary benefit has significantly altered online reading practices. Increasingly, readers are more likely to consume articles from a variety of publications as opposed to following specific publications, relying upon their social networks as a kind of news filter that sifts the web’s deluge of information. According to the viral journalism site BuzzFeed, Facebook is now “the Internet’s front page,” the place where the majority of readers get their news. But the reality is that the Internet’s front page has become endlessly customizable as individuals piece together its columns from various feeds and streams.20

The centrality of social networks in distributing content has also made them sites of production and publication. The ability for users to sound off at will about any topic at any time has in some ways diminished the need to rely upon established media outlets in order to obtain or respond to the day’s news. Authors, especially established ones with large followings, might have once turned to an existing publication or even a blog in order to respond to an article either about them or a topic they are engaged in. Increasingly, however, a stream of tweets or an extended Facebook comment suffices, potentially denying existing publications of a piece of the conversation. This is most readily seen in the recent development of platforms that aggregate and republished social media content. Storify, for example, allows users to curate tweets that originally appeared on Twitter and repackage them into a more essay-like form complete with annotation or supplemental
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material. In this way, social media becomes publishing of some order, a legitimate means of public discourse that is as of yet limited in its reliance upon other outlets for more long form discussion.\textsuperscript{21}

For many observers, social media’s growing centrality to the circulation of information threatens the open web. While links once circulated online through a loosely connected network of independent blogs, tightly integrated services like Facebook and Twitter now dominate online news. These third-party, for-profit firms not only claim some measure of ownership over the content published on their platforms, they can also manipulate the algorithms that show content to users via streams and feeds. These conditions, some claim, put the free exchange of knowledge at risk.\textsuperscript{22} But they have also facilitated the exchange of ideas and research at a speed and a degree of granularity we have not seen before.

2.2 Social Research

The common knock against social media is that it has ushered in a new age of digital narcissism. On platforms like Twitter, we become the vainest versions of ourselves, posting the most mundane aspects of existence in order to gain attention. Yet technology has no inherent cultural consequences. Its social impact comes only with use, and communities of use have long determined the standards and practices that define technology’s purpose and impact. An increasing number of scholars, journalists, and other writers, for example, see the social web as an opportunity to make research and reporting a more transparent, collaborative endeavor. For them, the web’s perpetual openness not only enhances access to completed work, but can also promote the advancement of knowledge by expanding the circle of participants who can contribute to works in progress.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{network_maps.png}
\caption{Two network maps of hashtag usage. The figure on the left maps the use of the \#Twitterstorians hashtag, with the lines of connections signaling users who follow, retweet, or reply to each other. The figure on the right is use of the hashtag \#History, which has a much less connected community of users. Source: Vanessa Varin, “Mapping the History Twittersphere,” Perspectives on History (September, 2014), \url{https://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/september-2014/mapping-the-history-twittersphere}.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{21} My thanks to Evan Derkacz for sharing this scenario with me. Evan Derkacz, interview with Christopher D. Cantwell, November 4, 2014.

This is perhaps most clearly seen in the history of the Twitter hashtag. Despite its current ubiquity, the use of the “#” sign before a word or phrase in order to organize or find tweets on a particular topic was not a part of Twitter’s original design. It was only after Google developer Chris Messina suggested the common programming symbol be used to sort conversations that the practice first emerged, eventually becoming an official part of Twitter—and now Facebook and Instagram. The hashtag’s early use consisted primarily of adding punch lines or internal dialogue to a tweet, but users soon found more professional uses for the symbol. In 2007 then graduate student Katrina Gulliver first used #twitterstorians in order to discover other historians currently using Twitter. The tag has since become the cornerstone of a vibrant community of historians on Twitter. As the American Historical Association’s associate editor Vanessa Varin found last year, tweeters who use #twitterstorians are far more likely to follow each other, retweet news a user wishes to share, and respond to requests for advice. In contrast, users of the more generic #History, which includes corporations and advertisers, are far less likely to be in robust contact with one another, simply using the tag to send news into the void and not to engage their peers.23

At the same time that hashtags cultivate the formation of close-knit virtual communities, they also afford opportunities for scholars and journalists to join conversations outside their fields. By harnessing hashtags associated with major events, social movements, and even advertising campaigns, experts cannot only interject their informed opinions on the subject, but can also link to additional resources on a variety of platforms. In instances when major news outlets are reluctant to give specialists airtime, social media can become a platform for sustained public engagement. In some instances, a series of tweets on a subject can actually lead to broader awareness and understanding. In the aftermath of the shooting at Ebenezer Baptist Church in Charleston, South Carolina, when growing numbers called upon the state to remove the Confederate flag from the statehouse lawn, the news site Vox turned historian Edward Baptist’s series of tweets on the flag’s history into an article that provided a larger context for the debate.24

These overlapping interests in outreach and collaboration have been a central feature of academic and journalistic engagement with social media. Far from conceited, the medium’s banality and ephemerality can allow the process that goes into research and writing to be much more transparent. Journalist Jeff Sharlet, for example, has begun using Instagram to share short-form pieces of long-form projects he is working on. Following National Geographic photographer Neil Shea’s practice of adding lengthy, narrative captions to shared photographs, Sharlet began posting photographs while reporting stories along with his reflections. These bits of “snapshot journalism,” as Sharlet calls them, are in part creative acts in their own right, overturning the notion that social media’s word limits stifle creativity. Indeed, the platform’s very openness allows writers to cover stories other outlets might ignore, or to profile individuals whose life some consider less than newsworthy. That said, these posts are also often first stabs at narrating or understanding a story. Sharlet’s New York Times Magazine essay about the people who work night shifts began as a series of Instagram photos on the subject. The photos, discovered with a hashtag, eventually illustrated the piece.25
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Far from supporting vanity, journalistic and academic use of social media can cultivate the best qualities of each discipline. According to historian W. Caleb McDaniel, the digital age affords the unique opportunity not only to narrate and showcase our work online, but also to make the entire research process transparent. In the same way that we regularly draw upon free and open source software like Wikipedia and WordPress, McDaniel claims that scholars can also make their work open source through what he calls “open research notebooks.” Inspired by the practice amongst scientists to post the results of even failed experiments online for the benefit of other researchers, McDaniel used basic wiki software to set up a website for ongoing projects. Notes, archival sources, findings, and even early interpretations of the material all go into the wiki, each filed and tagged by McDaniel. He then shares every update online through Twitter, inviting his peers and the public to add their thoughts through comments. His notebook even has a “wishlist” of archival sources he’d like to find in the hope that readers might be aware of an obscure collection that speaks to his interests.

McDaniel has little concern about getting “scooped” in his work; nor is he worried that publishers will reject a manuscript based on the research he shares. Not only would the archival fragments and errant thoughts spread throughout the site never amount to a coherent piece, but the wiki actually has the opposite effect in terms of intellectual property by documenting the precise moment when a scholar arrived at an idea. McDaniel ultimately sees his open research notebooks as the digital manifestation of a quality humanists and social scientists have long admired: collaboration. Through open research notebooks and other social technologies, individual researchers can not only share works in process, but can also make their peers and even the general public a part of the work itself. “The truth is that we often don’t realize the value of what we have until someone else sees it,” McDaniel writes. “By inviting others to see our work in progress, we also open new avenues of interpretation, uncover new linkages between things we would otherwise have persisted.
in seeing as unconnected, and create new opportunities for collaboration with fellow travelers.”

W. Caleb McDaniel is not alone. The rise of cloud-based citation management software like Zotero and Mendeley fosters a more networked and interactive research practice, allowing users to create shared bibliographies or libraries.

Of course, research and writing has long been a cooperative endeavor. We present works in progress at conferences, share chapter drafts in writing groups, and thank colleagues who contribute to our publications in acknowledgements. Yet the rise of digital scholarship and forms of participatory media has provided both the tools and the impetus to make open collaboration a more central part of our work. Perhaps this is most clearly seen in the ways the digital turn is impacting even the analog venues of journalists and academics.

In 2008 two graduate students at George Mason University’s Roy Rosenzweig Center for History and New Media held an “unconference” for humanists that they called THATCamp—or, The Humanities and Technology Camp. The “unconference” idea itself was not new. First organized by computer programmers and web developers in the 1990s, these events sought to open the traditional conference format by making it more user-generated. In contrast to formal presentations, or even a prearranged program, unconferences feature sessions where participants discuss an issue as a group or collaboratively work on a project or a problem. The first THATCamp followed a similar format. In lieu of a conference program organized months or years in advance, organizers invited attendees to propose sessions on a blog in the month leading up to the camp. Sessions could feature open discussions about a particular issue, hands-on workshops on using a particular piece of software or technology, or even the collaborative building of some new kind of project. Those who attended the camp then set the program on the morning of the event, voting on which sessions seemed the most interesting or fit the needs of those in attendance.

In the years since the first camp, THATCamps have been instrumental in integrating digital scholarship into the academy. Nearly 250 have been held to date, most organized by region, such as “THATCamp Chicago” or “THATCamp Appalachia.” Recently, however, they have also become a part of most major academic conferences in the humanities and social sciences, meeting in conjunction with scholarly associations like the Modern Language Association, the American Historical Association, the Organization of American Historians, the Computer Applications and Qualitative Methods in Archaeology, and, beginning in 2013, the American Academy of Religion and Society for Biblical Literature. At these gatherings, scholars have begun to learn and share new modes of inquiry and analysis, conceiving of and in some instances building projects that are now at the forefront of the field.

A central feature of all of these social research practices is the distribution of authority. In the absence of any official authorizing body determining the use of social media accounts or official hashtags for intellectual exchange, dispersed, yet networked, communities of use determine standards and practices. If a community finds neither need nor relevance in a particular term, tool, or digital practice, its use simply fades, while those that do become woven into the rhythms of exchange.

The study of religion’s life on Twitter, for example, at one point had three separate hashtags sorting its conversations. Recently, a number of scholars attempted to use #Digital Religion to foster a conversation on how the Internet is simultaneously changing today’s religious communities as well as the people who study them. The majority of Twitter exchanges about the study of religion, however, tend to augment themselves around #AmRel for the study of religion in America generally or around #AcRel for the academic study of religion in particular. With practices already in place, and the field finding little use for a new, even more
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specific tag, #DigitalReligion slowly fell into disuse until it became a term used by marketing firms to discuss advertising’s abundant digital future.

That said, #DigitalReligion’s decline is less a moment to lament and more a sign of the new collaborative social practices that govern the production of knowledge and the exchange of ideas; specifically a social practice that is often referred to as the commons.

### 2.3 The Commons

Underlying these formal and informal means of outreach and collaboration lay the idea of the commons. Central to the notion of the commons is what is considered for the public and what is from the public. In the context of sharing with a broader public, we think about how we can contribute to a common pool of knowledge. The idea of a commons as something that all members of a society had access to started in reference to physical land, and only over time did it begin to include cultural production. In the modern period, the commons includes all manner of physical and cultural raw material like music, literature, and research.

The commons’ renaissance in many ways began with Eric S. Raymond, an early advocate for the development of what came to be known as open source software. According to Raymond, software development proceeds by two basic models, the “cathedral” and the “bazaar.” In the cathedral, the production of both software and knowledge is high centralized, based upon the existence of a singular expert or firm who claims both authorship and ownership of the work, which is only shared when it is considered complete and authoritative. The bazaar, by contrast, is a distributive model that recognizes multiple experts as contributors and is iterative, so that no version is ever final. Rather, each version represents the common needs and knowledge of both the contributors and the stakeholders, a collaboratively built product that ostensibly benefits the greatest number.29

These models also describe the way in which academic knowledge in the humanities is currently produced. The cathedral system parallels the history of the academy. Emerging from an ecclesiastic space, the academy staked its claim to authority against religious authority. At the same time, the academy reproduced what it knew, favoring a hierarchal system that makes the university the source of knowledge, instead of the cathedral. Like the religious systems it sought to supplant, the academy positioned itself as a caretaker of a larger, public heritage. For the cathedral, everything was the commons because it belonged to God. For the university, it was common because it belonged to humanity.

In the academy, in practice, there is an increasing pressure to limit access to knowledge. One source of pressure comes from the professionalization of academia, resulting in conversations only amongst other academics, rather than with or for a broader public. The earliest professors functioned more as intellectuals, engaged with a community, as the work of the professor could only be validated by its effect on society. Over time, professors became academics, embedded in a guild structure whose members only to other members of the guild.

Another source of pressure is the extractive nature of academic publishing. Colleges and universities both pay their faculty to research and publish scholarship on a regular basis. Academics then publish this material for free or with very minimal return. In the instances where a press requires a subvention, academics literally pay to have their work published. Yet these initial costs or limited returns matter little to most academics because the institutions in which they work subsidize their research. In return academic publishers then not only extract layers of free labor from the academy in the form of peer review, they also charge the university in
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order to access the work of its own faculty. The material is not in the commons, labor increases with little recompense, and the monetary value of the work flows away from the source of labor.30

The rise of the journal, and the need to limit what got published, did partly emerge out of an actual scarcity of print technology and materials. However, as printing technologies became cheaper and more accessible, the ways in which the academy thought about the journal system did not change. Publishing firms benefited from the system and did not need to change either, becoming virtual monopolies of academic knowledge in certain fields. We seem to be at a point of diminishing returns, however, where journal publishing is seen as more extractive than generative. The recent decline in public funding for many colleges and universities has made increasing access to published research a growing issue. Recent controversies around Elsevier publishing, including a boycott by academics that refused to submit their work to the publisher, demonstrate that there is a growing awareness of the problem with the current system.31

The growing importance of the commons as a model for inquiry amongst journalists and academics can be seen in numerous ways. First is the flourishing collaborative network of publication and exchange that currently exists on social media, as we have discussed. More pointedly, however, a growing number of scholarly and professional associations insist that the academy’s work should also be freely available to the public. These advocates for “open access” to research, as it is called, argue that since a sizeable portion of the academy’s research receives public support—whether in the form of federal grants or the salaries faculty draw from public schools—the public should not be charged again in order to access the results of that research. As the American Library Association and the Association of College and Research Libraries advocated in their 2010 letter to the White House’s Office of Science and Technology Policy calling for the open access of federally-funded research, work that can have an “immediate impact on the public good” should not be embargoed for any stretch of time.32 In 2013, the White House concurred, directing all federal agencies with research and development expenditures over $100 million annual to develop plans that made research they funded open access within a year of publication.33

Open access’s origins date well before the Internet. Some date the movement’s origins to the first publicly accessible research journals in the late nineteenth century. The digital turn, however, has provided the means to increase the percentage of freely available scholarship. Scientists have been uploading preprints of accepted publications into a shared database called arXiv since 1991, while the number of open access journals has exponentially increased as alongside the growth of online publishing platforms. Of the 10,388 journals currently registered with the Directory of Open Access Journals, nearly 8,000 were launched in the last decade.34 Formal academic publications with registered ISSN numbers and editorial boards, these open access journals provide a more commons-based, bazaar-like approach to the production of knowledge. Through the use of an open access copyright policy like a Creative Commons license, an author retains copyright of their work but also grants certain permissions for that work’s use and reuse, and journals continue to recognize and reward the singular contribution of individual authors. But by making this work immediately available, they


also recognize the diverse set of peers, colleagues, and stakeholders that contributed to that work as members of a field.\footnote{For more on Creative Commons licenses see Creative Commons, \url{https://creativecommons.org/}.}

In addition to open access and the sharing of scholarship on the social web, the other indicator of the common’s growing importance to the production of scholarship in general, and to the study of religion in particular, can be seen in the flourishing of collaboratively built and publicly available digital scholarship that exists online. In many ways, these projects offer alternative, more commons-based approaches to the production of knowledge in contrast to the cathedral-like systems that have long governed our fields. But not every project is a manifesto. In most instances, digital projects emerge out of a team of investigators or scholars attempting to explore a particular question. It is to these new forms of digital inquiry that we now turn.
3. User Stories

“It is absolutely necessary to articulate in very precise ways how the digital thing that you are doing will change your argument. . . . What sort argument would constitute success or failure?”

- Lincoln Mullen, George Mason University

In the early stages of designing a website or computer software, developers often compose what they call “user stories.” A simple list of one-sentence narratives that walk through how a hypothetical user would engage with or use a hypothetical computer program, user stories are an essential first step in translating rough ideas into concrete work plans. “As a user,” one might read, “I want to be able to click on a thumbnail of an image and see a high quality scan of the image as well as the image’s full citation information.” As a method of development, user stories give a project scope and help identify in advance the kinds of tools, software, and team members that will be necessary to build the finished product.

Digital projects in the study of religion often go through a similar process of envisioning and team building. Many project directors employ user stories as well. Regardless of their method, however, digital scholarship first takes shape as those involved discuss the kinds of tools or technologies necessary for a project to achieve its stated goals. These conversations have yielded not only the plethora of projects that exist today, but also the broad genres of digital work that have emerged as other projects adapt, refine, or hack their predecessors. This section will explore these new genres of digital work in detail.

Of course, mapping the full breadth and diversity of digital work on religion is as impossible as tracing the four corners of the Internet itself. But, over the last decade, a number of discrete genres, or what Anne Burdick and her colleagues call “knowledge models,” have emerged to give the digital landscape a visible shape. These models are based not only on the particular software or computer program researchers use, but also on the kind of analysis researchers employ. There is more than one way to make a map, for example, but every kind of mapping technology facilitates a kind of spatial thinking. For Burdick et al., this relationship is vital. It reflects the growing need for scholars to be reflexive about the relationship between the form and content of our work. Not only does the technology facilitate research, it also is now central to the very construction of knowledge in the same way that our arguments are dependent upon our prose.

Despite these many knowledge models, however, digital projects all share a number of defining characteristics. In contrast to print-based projects, which tend to be single-authored, text-based, and completed upon publication, digital projects tend to be collaborative, multimodal, and open ended. They are collaborative in that digital projects tend to require multiple skill sets and professions to function. In addition to scholars, editors, or authors, many digital projects often require computer programmers, web developers, librarians, and other professionals in order to succeed. Digital projects are also multimodal in that they may utilize multiple forms of technology, or even multiple platforms, simultaneously. While a book exists only on the printed page, for example, a digital project might use a website to showcase findings or animations built using a particular mapping software that are then communicated through a series of blog posts or even print publications. Without one of these components or tools, the project would be incomplete. Finally, digital projects are open-ended in that launching the project is more often the beginning of the work as opposed to its ending. Amongst web developers, this process is often called “perpetual beta.” Facebook, for example, is never “done,” but is rather always in development, constantly adding new features and services. Similarly, a crowdsourced transcription project is not “completed” once a community encodes a corpus of text. Instead,

36 Lincoln Mullen, interview with Christopher D. Cantwell, August 28, 2014.

Based on a survey of over 150 digital projects, this section explores what we see as the seven most common knowledge models present within the study of religion. It follows those laid out by Burdick et al., but adapts them based on the projects most prevalent today. This rough typology is neither exhaustive nor definitive, and given the border-blurring nature of digital work, many projects could easily fit into multiple categories. Indeed, the most innovative digital projects are often those that creatively combine a number of these models or genres. For every genre, we provide a specific example for illustrations, but only in brief. Readers wishing for greater detail on the logistical and technical building of a project can read the Case Studies in Appendix I. We suggest appropriate case studies for each genre.

### 3.1 Digitization

*Case Studies: Jesuit Libraries Provenance Project, MAVCOR*

Digital scholarship’s origins in the rendering of social and cultural artifacts into machine-readable forms has made the digitization of research materials one of the most foundational, and by far the most common, methodological development of the digital turn. Indeed, the digitization of texts and objects had become such a primary feature of the digital turn by the early 2000s that the scholars who coined the term “digital humanities” did so to set their efforts apart from “simple digitization.”\footnote{Kirschenbaum, “What Is Digital Humanities and What’s It Doing in English Departments?” 2-3.} Yet in an age when Google is the first place students, the public, and even scholars turn to find information, the informed migration of content online remains an important act of research and interpretation.

Digitization primarily takes two forms. First is the translation of analog content into structured digital formats. Much like early digitization efforts, current digitization projects like the *Joseph Smith Papers*, *Jonathan Edwards Papers*, and *Isaac Mayer Wise Digital Archive* continue to encode manuscript sources with markup languages using guidelines set by the Text Encoding Initiative. Advances in user interface software and linked data structures, however, have allowed projects to augment these base level texts with annotations or connections to other sources. Drawing on these techniques, projects like *Digital Mishnah* are able to create dynamic critical editions of a text, linking texts with a plethora of commentary and analysis.

Alongside these traditional forms of encoding print-based material, other efforts have emerged to digitize aspects of contemporary life for preservation and future research purposes. The declining cost and growing proliferation of cameras and audio recorders have made it possible to document social and material aspects of everyday life that would have been impossible or cost prohibitive a decade ago. Projects like *Sounding Islam in China*, for example, seek to create a “soundscape” of the region’s Muslim communities. Run by the University of London’s School of Oriental and African Studies, the project hosts the audio recordings of Western and Chinese researchers that document the aural cultural of one of China’s largest religious minorities. Meanwhile the *Center for the Material and Visual Cultures of Religion (MAVCOR)*, both a research center and a born-digital publication at Yale University, similarly seeks to digitize artwork and other artifacts for future research. Alongside scholarly articles and essays, MAVCOR integrates preservation-quality scans and photographs of the object. These scans then go into the journal’s archival repository as a resource for future researchers and educators.
Shortly after founding the Pluralism Project at Harvard University, Diana Eck began a photography contest that offered an award for the image that best captured America’s religious diversity. The contest was part of a larger effort to chronicle the country’s growing religious diversity where students in her courses set about photographing and recording Boston’s religious communities. According to Eck, documenting today’s religious landscape is a field in which our students can be the pioneers. For her, the digitization of this new religious landscape in text, video, and photographs is a vital research act. Other digitization projects underscore this point.40

3.2 Critical Curation
Case Studies: ISLAMiCommentary, MAVCOR

It is no accident that the first projects to harness computers for the study of human culture were expandable digital archives like the Index Thomisticus. These projects leveraged the qualities of digital media that were particularly beneficial to the humanities and social sciences, such as the ability to place a seemingly limitless quantity of diverse content into a single digital space. With all of Aquinas’s both published and unpublished writings in one database, these previously scattered materials could be subjected to new forms of inquiry and analysis. This kind of critical curation, the intentional aggregation of thematically relevant sources into structured, uniform formats, has been one of the most common, if not the most common, method of digital inquiry and interpretation.

The word “critical” is central here. From the earliest museum’s procurements of cultural artifacts in the third century BCE to the relatively more recent efforts among sociologists to generate social data in the late nineteenth century, curation has long been a part of humanistic and social scientific inquiry. But with the digitization of human knowledge, where information is defined not by its scarcity but by its abundance, the organization, presentation, and preservation of life has become both an interpretive endeavor and an intellectual necessity.

This new form of collecting takes many forms: digital archives that draw on multiple physical repositories; global, collaborative knowledge sites or wikis that aggregate sources, tools, projects, or reference material; augmented publications that support particular texts with other forms of media; virtual new media exhibits that juxtapose visual, audio, and printed material; or the accumulation and preservation of digital cultural artifacts like tweets, hashtags, and other social media posts for critical presentation or analysis. Despite their diversity, however, these projects are all driven by and organized around a particular research question. They also have a tendency to be built collaboratively by multiple stakeholders, making critical digital curation a multi-author, multivocal endeavor.

The American Converts Database, for example, seeks to build a collaborative archive that advances the study of religious change in America. Built by Erin Bartram, a graduate student at the University of Connecticut, and Lincoln Mullen, as assistant professor of history at George Mason University, using the open-source content management system Omeka, the database is an open, searchable catalog of primary sources about religious converts. Visitors can create a profile on the site and contribute their own research finds, adding transcriptions, images, citations, and important demographic data to the database. Scholars, students, and educators can then use the database for their own purposes, either as a way to uncover heretofore unknown research sources or by studying the act of conversion en masse through text mining or targeted searches.

Yet critical curation involves more than just reorganizing digital content or recently digitized material. In an age of information overload, it also involves the informed filtering of the web’s current content for more manageable research and analysis. Islamopedia Online, a project of the Islam in the West Program at Harvard University, is exemplary in this regard. Directed by Jocelyn Cesari, Islamopedia’s project team of student interns

and affiliate scholars collects Western media coverage of Muslim majority countries, enters them into a
database, and then augments these entries with relevant metadata. The project provides a synopsis or excerpt
of each article, a URL to the article’s original source, and then adds a host of subject tags that allow visitors to
sort the site’s broader content by publication, topic, individual, or issue. In addition to culling the Web’s
content, Islamopedia enhances this collection even further with a number of educational resources like
recorded lectures and even profiles of selected nations authored by project staff. These additional resources
are intended to allow readers to understand, contextualize, and perhaps even critique the very coverage the
site originally aggregates.

More than just mere collection, curation has become an important form of intellectual intervention. With one
of the primary features of digital culture being its hyperlinked, non-linear character, the critical curation of
digital content provides a means to provide informed, interpretive order to the Web’s content.

3.3 Data Visualization
Case Study: Jesuit Libraries Project

From their founding as professions in the late nineteenth century, both journalism and academia have
privileged fine-grained analyses of discrete sets of data. Humanists rooted their study in the close readings of
texts; social scientists valued the stability of controlled datasets; and journalists celebrated the revelations that
came from on-the-ground investigations. These methods remain relevant today, but the digital turn also poses
certain challenges to their application. As much as the Internet’s rise has yield qualitative changes in our daily
life, it has also been a distinctly quantitative phenomenon. Google claims to have indexed thirty trillion
websites and scanned fifteen million books, while Facebook users post an average of six billion images during
the holiday season alone. Such scale poses a challenge not only for Facebook’s engineers, but also to those
journalists and scholars for whom this data deluge is the focus of research. To closely read the videos,
photographs, and writings yielded by the user-generated Web would take lifetimes.

Recently, journalists, humanists, and social scientists have turned to the visualization of data to draw insights
from this challenge of scale. Data journalism sites like Vox, FiveThirtyEight, and the New York Times’ new
Upshot now use advanced statistics in order to predict trends; digital humanists use text mining software to
extrapolate themes from millions of texts; and social scientists use network analysis programs to chart the
significance of social relationships amongst millions of individuals. In contrast to the close reading journalists
and academics once prized, each of these computational or algorithmic analyses seeks the signal amidst our
digital noise through what some call “distant reading.” Liz Shayne’s study of the digitized corpus of rabbinic
literature, for example, visualized over 2,000 years of Jewish thought in a single graph. Using the network
analysis program Gephi, Shayne, a graduate student in English at the University of California-Santa Barbara,
mapped the relationships between verses in the Tanakh and the hundreds of thousands of pages of
commentary and religious codes that cite them. The resulting displays revealed important functional
differences between the citation and the quotation of verses, where commentaries were more likely to cite a
verse in their theological reflections while the codes relied upon explicit quotations from the text.41

41 Liz Shayne, “Sefaria in Gephi: Seeing Links in Jewish Literature,” Lucid Analytics (blog), June 14, 2014,
https://ludicanalytics.wordpress.com/2014/06/17/sefaria_in_gephi. This post is the first in a series on using Gephi to
analyze encoded Jewish texts.

As both a method of research and mode of publication, the visualization of data harnesses digital tools to analyze information at the macro level in order to produce graphical representations of results that lend themselves to close reading. But data visualization is more than just a computational shortcut to making an infographic. Rather, it is a part of an even larger “visual turn” within digital scholarship. Data visualizations constitute digitally native productions of knowledge, where data is less the source from which textual stories emerge and more the main character in an intrinsically visual tale. Joshuah Eaton and Ben Piven’s visualization of Tibetan self-immolations for Al Jazeera is exemplary in this regard. Organizing the hundred-plus acts of protest against China on a timeline that animates a map showing their exact location, the display conveys not only the scale of the protests but also the specific regional and seasonal conditions that triggered their emergence. The timeline is then also augmented with photographs and text, building out the story the data already displays with specific information related to Tibet’s longstanding tensions with China.

As any chart, graph, or map from the turn of the twentieth century conveys, the digital turn did not invent the visualization of data. But the scale at which the digital age operates has put a premium on data visualization.

3.4 Thick Mapping
Case Study: Mapping Ararat

Mapping is, at its core, a form of data visualization—and one of its oldest forms as well. As Eaton and Piven’s aforementioned project on Tibet demonstrates, maps can illustrate stories with a power text might not be able to convey. Yet the spatial dimensions of the digital turn have pushed mapping in new, more dynamic directions. Geographic Information Systems (GIS) software can now manipulate, juxtapose, analyze, and display multiple levels information and dissimilar forms of data. The inclusion of global positioning systems (GPS) in most handheld electronic devices like smartphones and tablets has also added a cartographic dimension to nearly every form of data. The confluence of these technological advances has led some to suggest there has been a distinct “spatial turn” within the humanities and social sciences. Such a turn, however, remains dependent upon the digital tools that make it possible.

As a genre of intellectual production, spatial analysis focuses upon the creation of deep, multi-layered maps that either curate data landscapes or recreate the spatial dimensions of lived experience. The Digital Atlas of American Religion, for example, provides dynamic presentations of the changing face of America’s religious
landscape over the last century. Built by Indiana University-Purdue University-Indianapolis’ Polis Center, the project stores and displays data on religious adherence at the county, state, and national level. Using the Atlas, visitors can explore the numerical growth and regional concentrations of America’s religious communities over time. Similar projects like the Salem Witch Trials Documentary Archive and Transcription Project from the University of Virginia seek to transform texts into spatial narratives. By transcribing trial records that resulted from a rash of witchcraft accusations in colonial Massachusetts, the project visually displays the relationship between the lack of security on the New England frontier and the tendency among New Englanders to see evil in their midst.

In addition to these projects of spatial analysis, thick mapping also involves the harnessing of locative technology to create projects of spatial experience. One of the earliest projects in this regard was the Qumran Visualization Project, which built a 3D virtual model of the Khirbet Qumran site where archaeologists uncovered the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947. To project director William Schniedewind of the University of California-Los Angeles’s Department of Near Eastern Languages and Culture, political debates over the Scroll’s importance had hindered more objective archaeological understandings of the site. Schniedewind’s recreation is an attempt to visually recreate Qumran without recourse to the Scrolls in order to see what the site’s structure might say about its usage. Other projects harness our own geo-coordinates to recreate obscured, lost, or even fictional worlds. Mapping Ararat, for example, is a project focused on recreating Mordecai Noah’s failed 1825 attempt to establish an independent Jewish state on Grand Island in New York. The project’s team of scholars, artists, and developers from York University and the University of Toronto in Canada not only simulate Noah’s dreams on contemporary Google Maps in an act of speculative cartography, but they have also built a smartphone app that allows individuals to take an augmented reality tour of a nation that never was, complete with schematics for a capital and archways that were never realized.

In much of the writing on religion, space is presumed. Of course, the subjects we study all, in a literal sense, take place. But that place is often conceived of only as a stage upon which reality plays out. Thick mapping represents a new way to explore the production of space in the human experience, charting not only the actual spaces upon which history played out, but also the imagined communities people create.

3.5 Critical Infrastructure

A large portion of the existing digital work on religion is one of appropriation and transformation. It is an appropriation because, in many instances, individual projects adapt tools built by others for their own digital work. For example, many text-mining projects use software or methods originally designed to find bugs in a software’s code, while network analyses often rely upon programs initially built for the study of bioinformatics. This repurposing raises certain disciplinary challenges. Internal rabbinical citations, after all, are not the same as cellular genetics. But the journalistic or academic use of such software to study the world’s religious diversity also reveals deeper systemic biases built into digital technology. As creations of the industrialized West, most tools for humanistic inquiry are structured by categories and assumptions that may not necessarily translate to non-western traditions and cultures. The Text Encoding Initiative’s markup standards, for example, were derived using classical European languages as the standard, making the encoding of dextrosinistral or bi-directional languages like Arabic, Hebrew, or Chinese difficult.\footnote{For more on the project, see Benjamin P. Murphy, “The Qumran Visualization Project: Prospects for Digital Humanities in Theological Libraries,” Theological Librarianship 4:1 (2011): 29-38; Robert R. Cargill, Qumran through (Real) Time: A Virtual Reconstruction of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2009).} \footnote{On recent efforts to expand TEI guidelines to accommodate non-western languages see Henri Hudrisier, et al., “Promoting the Linguistic Diversity of TEI in the Maghreb and the Arab Region,” paper delivered at The Linked TEI: Text Encoding the Web, 2-5 Oct 2013, http://www.tei-c.org/Vault/MembersMeetings/2013/program/papers/abstracts-paper/; Mohammed Ourabah Soualah and Mohamed Hassoun, “Which Metadata for Ancient Arabic Manuscript Cataloging?” Proceedings of the International Conference on Dublin Core and Metadata Applications (2011): 137-146.}
This dependence has made developing, adapting, or hacking tools that meet needs specific to the study of religion a recent but vital part of the digital turn. The scale of these projects can vary greatly, from a plugin for existing software that allows for the addition of metadata to the fashioning of an entirely new piece of software. Till Grallert, for example, found studying Islamic conceptions of space in the late Ottoman Empire burdensome because the databases available to him only accepted Gregorian dates, while the subjects he studied all used the Hijri calendar. As part of his research, Grallert, now a researcher at the Oriental Institute of Beirut, wrote an XSLT string (Extensible Stylesheet Language Transformation) that automatically converted Hijri dates into a form databases could recognize—a process that would have been prohibitive by hand.44 Similarly University of Connecticut sociologist Bradley Wright sought to overcome the limitations of polling data that only measures religious traits by building a tool that could measure religious states. Working with software developers, Wright developed Soul Pulse, a smartphone app that allows subjects to report upon their spiritual mood or state that could be studied in relation to the events and material realities of their surrounding lives.

Neither of these programs found their way into official publications, with the exception of Grallert’s personal blog and the news coverage Soul Pulse received after it was launched. They were, at their core, tools that facilitated the publication of more traditional scholarship. But they were also important contributions to the study of religion in their own right, supporting and advancing future research in their respective fields. Grallert released his tool over the social coding site GitHub, while Soul Pulse has become a model for future mobile interview programs. The digital study of religion requires such an infrastructure to function, making the development of tools that can make critical interventions into the field an important outlet of intellectual production.

3.6 Digital Religion
Case Studies: Mapping Ararat, ISLAMiCommentary

The National Endowment for the Humanities’ Office of Digital Humanities defines the digital humanities as encompassing not only the use of digital technology to advance humanistic inquiry, but also the “study [of] digital culture from a humanistic perspective.”45 A similar diversity defines the digital study of religion. Alongside those whose work applies digital technology in the study of religious phenomenon are a number of other scholars, journalists, and artists who interrogate digital technology itself as a religious form—or what many call “digital religion.”

The study of digital religion includes not only the impact new media is having on today’s religious communities, but also how religion’s use of the Internet is now central to the digital’s very composition. As communications scholar Heidi Campbell puts it, the term digital religion “describes the technological and cultural space that is evoked when we talk about how online and offline religious spheres have become blended and integrated.”46 In this space, novel and established religious practices merge, yielding new cultural forms marked by the Web’s inherent interactivity as well as religion’s emphasis upon tradition.

A great deal of the work on digital religion involves the ethnographic study of religious activity online e.g. virtual churches, Facebook prayer groups, or YouTube fatwas. While individual scholars or investigators may utilize a number of the research tools or methods mentioned above, much of the work on digital religion takes very traditional forms such as books, monographs, and conference papers. Yet there is also a small

niche of projects that explore how our world’s rapturous engagement with the Internet calls into question the very category of religion. Artists and activists undertake most of these projects, creatively repurposing digital technology to poke holes in the notion that computers and the Internet are an intrinsically secular phenomenon. Ivan Safrin, Will Brand, and Ramsey Nasser’s God.js, for example, explicitly seeks to interrogate digital technology’s religious dimensions. A simple web browser plugin, God.js allows users to input a series of commandments to govern their Internet usage such as “Thou shalt not visit espn.com.” Break this commandment, and your computer screen fills with images of frogs, boils, and other plagues. While God.js might seem like a crass joke, the program’s developers claim to be trading in much deeper stuff. Safrin notes the project’s original inspiration came from the visual similarities between a sheet of programming language and a page of scripture. But the team’s even broader intent is to comment upon the religious power of technological infrastructure, because in this age of information and mass surveillance, there is nothing more omnipresent, more omniscient than the Internet.47

This ability to mock, explore, and interrogate the category of “religion” is, we think, God.js’s most intriguing contribution. It is also the central question of the field of religious studies and speaks to the potential for digital work on religion that is visual, multimodal, and nontextual.

3.7 Scholarly Communication
Case Studies: MAVCOR, ISLAMiCommentary, Mapping Ararat

Of the Internet’s many effects upon the study of religion, none has been greater than its impact upon the ways members of the field converse with each other. Even in his lament over the field’s lag in taking up digital scholarship in 2004, Charles Ess readily acknowledged that students of religion had already harnessed the web to expedite the distribution of pertinent information. Announcements went out over listservs, resources were shared on message boards, and debates were carried out through blogs.48 As we have seen, the decade after Ess first wrote has witnessed even greater changes to the ways scholars publish, share, and evaluate their work.

As a concept, “scholarly communication” is relatively new. The term only gained widespread usage in the 1970s as a comprehensive way of describing the evaluation, publication, and dissemination of research. This includes not only the publication of books and articles, but also the systems of peer review that assess and promote research both before and after publication, from the double blind review systems most academic presses use to the book reviews and awards that go out once a piece is in print.

To some observers, scholarly communication is currently in a state of crisis. The increased cost of academic publishing coupled with the decline in public support for original research threatens the ability of presses, scholars, and libraries to publish, evaluate, and distribute scholarly work. For some, including many of the advocates for open access, the Internet provides the tools necessary to rescue traditional models of scholarly communication. E-books and web-based open access journals significantly reduce the costs associated with academic publishing while maintaining established systems of publication. Yet the digital turn has also contributed to an air of crisis surrounding scholarly communication because many of the new genres associated with digital scholarship are often released outside established systems of publication and peer review. Many, in fact, are often self-published online, born-digital products that reveal the print-based biases of scholarly communication.

The Web was not always a place for the publication of original research and writing. The study of religion’s earliest forays into born-digital publication reveal implicit assumptions about the medium’s nature. The American Academy of Religion’s 2004 Lilly Endowment-funded *Why Study Religion*, for example, offered potential students common definitions of religion as well as resources on the world’s foremost religious traditions. The Religious Studies Department at the University of Alabama’s 2005 *Studying Religion*, meanwhile, walked presumably uninformed readers through approaches to analyzing the category of religion. Contrast these promotional andintroductory uses of websites, however, with a project like *frequencies*. A curated collection of richly-illustrated essays exploring the contours of American spirituality, *frequencies* is more like an anthology of original research whose audience is the study of religion broadly understood. The project called the web home less because it hoped to shape the opinion of a general reader, but more because established outlets of publication were either loathe to take such an eclectic project or would have slowed the project’s release significantly.

The last several years have witnessed only an increase in these types of web-based publications, many of which showcase work using the genres of digital scholarship discussed previously. Generally called “projects” in the absence of more formal language to describe their existence, these endeavors turn to the web as the primary outlet for the work of scholarly communication. News outlets, for example, have partnered with design firms to create dynamic, born-digital stories that incorporate not only multimedia, but also multilinear narratives. *Unmasking the Arzeshi*, for example, is a born-digital publication of the nonprofit Small Media that analyzes Iran’s conservative blogosphere. The report lives at a single URL, uses the dynamism of web-based publication to post interactive data visualization and other kinds of media. The site has a guiding narrative that takes users through the data, but the narrative functions more as an executive summary to a multilinear analysis. At any time, users can click on an item, visualization, or link and they will be taken to more thorough block of information.

In light of the challenges digital projects pose to traditional outlets of scholarly communication as self-published, born digital endeavors, some digital scholarship advocates argue that the solution is to expand the definition of both publication and peer review to include these new forms. In addition to the publication of original research, for example, the digital turn’s new multimedia formats have yielded new venues to evaluate and disseminate research in both digital and print. Podcasts are particularly revealing in this regard, as a relatively new medium that has grown by 25% in the last two years alone. Episodic audio pieces released through services like *iTunes* and *SoundCloud*, podcasts adapt the features of radio topics that radio traditionally does not cover. Academics have turned to podcasts as well, seeing them as a space not only to expand upon the arguments laid out in their books, but also to connect with broader audiences. Marshall Poe, for example, claims he founded the *New Books Network* on the assumption that while the public would never read an academic book, they might want to listen to an academic talk about their book. Allowing individuals to create their own channels so long as they consent to contributing regularly, Poe has helped foster a consortium of nearly a hundred academic podcasts on everything from aging to world music. The premise of the podcasts is simple: a host, usually a specialist in the field, interviews an author about their current book.

In addition to podcasts, blogs, and other outlets for the distribution and assessment of new work on religion, other scholars are harnessing participatory media to create what some call user communities that perform a number of the tasks of scholarly communication. Building user communities is as much an intellectual project as it is a technical one. As a genre, user communities emphasize, and in many instances accentuate, research’s inherently collaborative qualities by designing digital or analog spaces that foster the cooperative exchange of ideas, practices, and resources. The previously mentioned *American Converts Database*, for example, is as much
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a user community as it is a site where others who are interested in the history of religious conversion can gather virtually and share sources. In other instances, however, software facilitates the cooperation. The development of wikis and other web applications that allow websites to be collaboratively composed has allowed projects like the Database of Modern Chinese Buddhism to develop, where users can create and edit pages on major figures, institutions, ideas, and sources on the subject.

But in other instances, user communities can become like a minor social network. The Network for New Media, Religion, and Digital Culture Studies, for example, applies the principles of participatory media to the emergent field of digital religion. Users create profiles on the site, which then allows them to post recent publications, share sources they’ve found valuable, or even contact a like-minded colleague for collaboration. The site regularly posts reviews of new books or articles in the field, maintains a bibliography of existing work, and even works toward building new databases for future research.

These sites and platforms, in short, are instrumental to the evaluation and dissemination of research. But highlighting their contributions to the work of scholarly communication is not the same as granting them the authority of peer review. These are challenges that projects face once they are launched, and this is the focus of the next section.
4. Going Live

“You sort of tap into all of these debates whether you want to or not based on how the community is drawing its boundary line.”
- Laura Liebman, Reed College

When Roberto Busa published the first volume of the *Index Thomisticus*, his work was, in a sense, completed. After decades of encoding the words of St. Thomas Aquinas by hand, he had finally created a searchable index of the saint’s writings. Yet, in another sense, Busa’s work had really just begun. While he had begun the work in part to create the concordance, his real goal was to analyze Aquinas’s language.

This blurred benchmark over when a project is complete often defines digital scholarship. While books or articles are often considered finished once they are published, the work of a digital project often begins with its publication online. It is often only after a project is launched that material is digitized, content is uploaded, and metadata is added.

In the same way, it is often only after a project is launched that issues related to digital work surface. This section explores the characteristics of digital work after it is launched, as well as key issues digital projects currently face. Based primarily on interviews with over two dozen project directors, it explores the challenges digital scholars and journalists face as they attempt to situate their work within the traditional modes of promotion and peer review.

4.1 New Communities

The web, according to sociologist Jonathan VanAntwerpen, is an “interstitial” space. It is a space where once hard and fast borders—between disciplines, between communities, between institutions—begin to overlap and blur as exchanges made possible by digital media constitute new publics. In these spaces, no single mode of inquiry or even object of study dominates, as every participant may have a different conception of what, exactly, the rules and objects of inquiry even are. Interstitial spaces are, in short, defined by debates over the terms of debate.

For VanAntwerpen, the web’s interstitiality is primarily an intellectual phenomenon. It is a space where diverse and even contradictory positions coexist as the formation of that space’s boundaries remain constantly in flux. This is, of course, an accurate description of the kind of discourses that exist online. But the web’s interstitiality is also a professional phenomenon in that digital spaces require multiple skill sets to function. While these contributors may not conceive of themselves as intellectual stakeholders, they are nonetheless essential to the digital study of religion.

This interdependency has made digital projects remarkably collaborative spaces that are in many ways defined by the new communities that flourish around them. On one level, these new communities are technical. Of the nearly two-dozen project directors we interviewed, only two were the primary developers of their projects in addition to the producers of its content. The rest of the digital project directors required external support. In more than a few instances, directors were able to rely upon the assistance of friends, colleagues, or spouses who happened to be web professionals in getting their project off the ground. For most directors, however, their decision to take up a digital project placed them within a new intellectual ecosystem. Web developers, computer programmers, and metadata librarians are all now a central part of most digital project teams. In addition to providing technical support, these new interlocutors shape a project’s broader theoretical interventions through the platforms they build and the schema they create. According to American Converts Database developer Lincoln Mullen, the creation of things like metadata fields for his project not only
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facilitated the aggregation of testimonies for text mining, but also set parameters on how those narratives could be understood. Such fields were not only “a way of representing the relationship between converts and their many conversions,” but also effectively “reduced the irreducible complexity of conversion to rows on a spreadsheet.”\(^{53}\) Such a turn requires care, caution, and technical collaboration.

On another level, these new communities are also educational in that students and the classroom have become important spaces in the building of digital work. This was true for the overwhelming majority of the projects we considered. In many instances, student work came in the form of paid student positions or internships, which directors saw as a way to provide students with practical work experience while also advancing the project. A number of project directors also saw their work as inhabiting an interstitial space between pedagogy and research. Religious studies scholar Isaac Weiner’s sound map of the religious communities of Columbus, Ohio, titled *Listening for Religion*, for example, made recording the city’s sacred soundscape an assignment in his course on studying religion. The assignment not only served as a means to teach students the skills of fieldwork, but also made the students valued contributors to the research process.

This blending of teaching and research—often considered separate spheres within the academy—is indicative of an even broader blending of the boundary between the academy and the general public. A number of the project directors we spoke to specifically cited enhancing the study of religion’s imprint among communities outside the academy. “As long as I was going places and taking photographs for my research,” literary scholar Laura Liebman recounted on starting the *Jewish Atlantic World* digital archive to showcase her fieldwork, “I wanted people to have access to those materials.”\(^{54}\)

In addition to facilitating access, a number of digital project directors also concerned themselves with increasing the field’s reach and impact. This is particularly seen in the growing community of academics and journalists who collaborate online. Indeed, a number of project directors declared facilitating more productive and intentional exchanges between these two fields was their project’s primary purpose. The reasons project directors gave for wanting to build these relationships varied. Some suggested journalists needed a more academic understanding of religion in order to report on stories accurately, while others claimed scholars of religion had done a poor job communicating the importance of their work to the general public. Regardless of emphasis, however, most directors claimed their projects were sites of mutually beneficial exchange.

Project directors generally took one of three approaches in attempting to build stronger ties between academics and journalists. By far, the most common was using their project to facilitate conversation. Web magazines like *The Revealer*, *Killing the Buddha*, *Religion & Politics*, and *Cosmologics* have become sites that consider journalists and academics as primary, and co-equal contributors, who are building conversations difficult to sustain in print. For *Religion & Politics*’ managing editor Tiffany Stanley, facilitating an engaged, sophisticated, and uniquely accessible conversation between the various communities that study religion is the journal’s primary goal. According to Stanley, the kinds of pieces *Religion & Politics* runs are either longform articles of original reporting that traditional magazines would have difficulty using or reflective pieces from scholars that an academic journal would not find original enough. In this way, the site promotes a third kind of discursive key that emphasizes the overlap between popular and academic tones that expands the impact of both.

The second digital method for fostering greater collaboration between journalists and academics comes from what might be called “knowledge sites,” or digital projects that act as repositories for relevant and helpful information. Nausheen Hussain’s *Islam for Reporters* site, for example, takes advantage of common Google search terms in order to provide a resource for journalists looking to learn about major ideas, people, and places in contemporary Islam. Similarly, *Religion Watch*, built by the University of Missouri’s Center on Religion and the Professions, curates a weekly newsletter of current stories for academics wishing to stay
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informed about ongoing issues and provides a collection of scholarly resources for journalists looking for reputable information.

The final way digital projects attempt to foster relationships between journalists and academics is by using the web to create virtual communities. In the absence of direct institutional collaboration between these professions, projects like religion and new media scholar Heidi Campbell’s Network for New Media, Religion, and Digital Culture studies allow individuals to create a profile on the site and follow the work of others. The Network also established a formal relationship with the Religion Newswriters Association that allows members to issue press releases about new research on the site that then gets picked up by the RNA’s larger press release outreach. Other projects have sought to facilitate greater cooperation between journalists and academics by providing spaces for inquiry and conversation. The Transcultural Islam Research Network, for example, not only maintains a database of scholars willing to work with journalists or policy makers, but also allows for the creation of online forums, or “TIRN Groups,” where researchers and writers can meet over conversations about work in their field.

For many of these projects, the general public is generally an amorphous entity. An increasing number, however, look to take advantage of the web’s openness to mine the interstitial spaces between researchers, writers, and their audiences. Where the general public might once have been the object or consumers of journalistic and academic work, diverse publics and constituencies have grown to become necessary contributors, valued interlocutors, and even the originators of content. Liebman’s Jewish Atlantic World archive asked Jewish communities to submit their content for analysis, for example, and the Jesuit Libraries Provenance Project asks users to transcribe the marginalia of scanned books. But in addition to contributing content to digital projects, an increasing number of digital publications are turning to the public to author original content as well. In a blog post at the web magazine Killing the Buddha, contributing editor Mary Valle wrote a post asking readers to share a mystical experience they themselves had experienced using the hashtag #Mystex. The overwhelming response ended up serving as the basis for a series of pieces at the site, including a curated article of the tweets built using Storify. Titled “Are you Mystically Experienced?,” the piece had nearly a hundred “authors,” each of whom tweeted their own mystical experiences and reflections.

Where journalists, scholars, and the public were once discrete spheres of discourse and exchange, digital projects are promoting the formation of new intellectual communities that defy traditional categorization. In these communities, researchers and subjects enter into increasingly interdependent exchanges that are dispersing traditional lines of authority in the production of knowledge. The Sefaria project, for example, which aims to encode every major rabbinical text, relies upon a network of Rabbis, Hebrew students, and dedicated laypeople to transcribe much of the site’s content. Once encoded, text can be searched, manipulated, and arranged in order to build study guides for student, rabbis, and synagogue groups. Yet as the project’s collection of digitized content grew, the site increasingly became of interest to scholars who wished to use the corpus for text mining. Sefaria’s directors now give access to scholars wishing to explore the text in full, while the scholars who use the material send back their visualizations and findings to the project for the benefit of the community who study these texts for other reasons. In this way the project involves scholars, journalists, and religious leaders in a symbiotic intellectual relationship.

How the products of this more distributive model inquiry, analysis, and exchange will fit within established professional and academic disciplines, however, remains a contentious issue.

4.2 Does this Count?

For academics who choose to undertake a digital project, the question of whether their project will “count” for promotion and tenure is a vital one. According to the project directors we interviewed for this report, the answer they got from their department chairs or university administrators was a resounding “no.” There were, of course, variations on this answer. Some informed project directors to classify their digital work as teaching or service, while one project director relayed that her dean conceived of her digital work as a “complete waste
of time.” Regardless, it is clear that most senior administrators do not see digital projects as innovative, original contributions to the field.

Many of the academics we interviewed bristled at the outright dismissal digital scholarship often received. But when we asked whether their digital work should count as scholarship, their answers were far from uniform. Some made an emphatic plea that the kind of public engagement that can occur in digital work should absolutely be counted as a form of scholarship. These scholars would often point to the public charge academics have in benefitting society to justify their point. “On one hand I do believe that scholars have an obligation to speak to issues of contemporary import,” R. Marie Griffith notes in reflecting upon the academics who write for the Religion & Politics journal she publishes as director of the John C. Danforth Center on Religion and Politics at Washington University in St. Louis. But as Griffith’s reserved opening suggests, she was hesitant to classify the work of many digital projects as on par with more traditional scholarly products.

Many scholars agreed, noting that digital projects are rarely the equivalent of an original monograph or journal article. Some highlighted that digital work is often either a tool that facilitates traditional research or a distilled presentation of findings. The kind of work that happens online, they highlight, is simply different. “I do believe there is an integrity about scholarship that reflects digging down deep and really putting a lot of time, effort, and reflection into a subject,” notes Diane Winston, the Knight Chair in Media and Religion at the University of Southern California and publisher of Religion Dispatches. Some of that happens in the kind of work published on Religion Dispatches, she continued, “but at a different level.” At the same time, others pointed to the ways in which digital projects often enter the field outside traditional lines of scholarly communication. Often self-published, digital projects can lack the traditional model of scholarly production where a scholar submits a work to a journal or press for evaluation before it is published. “The fact that it was not peer reviewed before it launched,” historian Edward J. Blum noted of the digital teaching resources that accompanied his book The Color of Christ, “means to me that it couldn’t be counted amongst my scholarly work. But there is no reason it couldn’t have been.”

This sense that digital projects are currently not scholarship as it has been traditionally defined but could be classified, and thereby “counted,” as some kind of scholarly product ran through nearly all of our interviews. A number of interviewees suggested that while the kind of writing and publication that happens online may not be original scholarship, it should be seen as a vital part of a “scholarly profile” the academy has long valued. Others, however, suggested that the proliferation of digital work demands a redefinition of scholarship that encompasses these new genres that now facilitate, disseminate, and contribute to the production of scholarship. “I started out by thinking that what matters is the data I’ll get at the end and the papers I’ll publish with it,” sociologist Bradley R. E. Wright recalled of his work to build the smartphone application SoulPulse that collected data on participant’s spiritual states. But in light of all of the intellectual, theoretical, and technical choices he made in developing the app, Wright has begun to think about scholarship and research as more of a process with a variety of measurable outcomes and products. “And that process is changing how we think about research.”

4.3 The Salaita Affair

Yet as much as the project directors we interviewed suggested that their home institutions do not classify their digital work as scholarship, the academy has sent a number of mixed messages on this topic. In October of 2013, Steven Salaita, an English professor at Virginia Tech, was offered a tenured associate professorship at the University of Illinois - Urbana-Champaign (UIUC). He was to start in Fall 2014, and according to the
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criteria of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) had met the functional criteria of being hired and was an employee of the UIUC. In the summer of 2014, he was told that he was no longer being hired because of tweets he issued regarding Israeli bombardment of Gaza.

Salaita has since sued the university to have his job reinstated, and the case has yet to be fully litigated. Regardless of the outcome, however, the Salaita affair raises a number of questions about what counts as a “publication” in the digital age. Cary Nelson, a past president of the AAUP said that he doubted “if the search committee felt equipped to deal with the implications [of academic publishing overlapping with a “foul-mouthed… social media presence”].” Nelson’s statement demonstrates the incoherence of the ways in which the academy approaches non-peer reviewed, non-restricted work. For Nelson, Salaita’s tweets are enough of a publication to count against a tenure decision, but not enough of a publication to count for a tenure decision. The objection to Salaita’s tone and content disappears. It is, for Nelson, simply the vehicle that matters, and the vehicle should not be public.

For adjunct faculty, the situation is more delicate. That we cannot easily find a similar cause célèbre amongst adjuncts makes us question whether publications like the Chronicle do not consider the travails of adjuncts worth discussing, or if adjuncts are so overworked and/or precariously positioned that they do not produce public scholarship. The professoriate is composed of more than 75% adjuncts, contingent, or part-time labor. At the same time, many of these faculty are most conversant with the tools and methods of digital work, and therefore the most vulnerable.

Such distinctions between publication and public engagement go against the collaborative, open-access nature of digital work and thereby limit its growth and advancement. In the final section, we consider ways institutions and disciplines can support digital work.
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5. Backing Up

“There simply aren’t established models yet for how to proceed.”
- Bradley Wright, University of Connecticut

Logistical issues are often lost in the social, intellectual, and professional challenges of digital work. In February of 2015, for example, those who visited to the SSRC’s experimental collection of essays on spirituality frequencies instead found they had landed in a portal for “Mejores webs de porno en español”—“the best porn sites in Spanish.” According to the site’s curators, the site had fallen into the hands of a self-described “growth hacker” who squatted on the site to fill it with spam links for cash. In the end, however, the site’s sudden change in focus was far less dramatic. The project team’s ownership of the URL “http://freq.uenci.es” had simply lapsed. In the absence of renewal, the site became available for public purchase and was quickly snatched up by a domain reseller who used the site to traffic in spam. The new site was in Spanish because the frequencies team had chosen to register the site in Spain in order to get the top-level domain that cleverly spelled the project’s name. The site was less hacked than a victim of the short-term planning that occasionally affects digital projects.

The frequencies error ended up being only a minor hiccup. The site was easily reconstituted at a new URL in a matter of days and remains functional to this day. But its temporary disappearance does point to the need for long term planning if digital projects are to be sustained and maintained. This involves more than a domain renewal plan. It also requires a host of other considerations from disciplinary forms of recognition to institutional repositories. This section concludes the report by surveying the major issues that affect not only the sustainability of existing digital work, but also its future growth and development.

5.1 Who Owns the Data?

The presumption IT professionals bear responsibility for backend issues like domain registration is a sensible one given how large institutions like universities and media companies function. For a field driven by robust conversations happening over a network of digital projects, however, clear data management plans and institutional support for the preservation of data is vital for sustaining the field’s growth.

Funding, for example, is a particularly troublesome issue for the sustainability of digital work. While the costs associated with starting a digital project are often relatively minimal, there are a substantial number of hidden costs involved with maintaining and updating that project. And while funders often have an interest in providing support for launching a new project, there is often less fanfare in funding software upgrades or bug fixes. In light of this difficulty, the not-for-profit research firm Ithaka S+R recently released a report of potential funding models for digital projects and resources. Author Nancy L. Maron identified eleven separate funding models for sustainability, from traditional advertising revenue to philanthropic support. In between these poles, Maron identifies various models of financial sustainability, the majority of which encourage digital project directors to integrate revenue generation into a project’s development either through membership fees, seeking costs from contributors, or licensing a project’s content or its members’ expertise.

According to some of the project directors we interviewed, this search for legacy funding has led to certain structural inequalities within the digital work in the study of religion. Researchers or writers at smaller institutions are often forced into collaborating with larger institutions in order to illustrate that a project will

---

62 Bradley Wright, interview with Christopher D. Cantwell, November 17, 2014.
have access to in-house sustainability funding. Smaller institutions like theological libraries, liberal arts colleges, and independent organizations could therefore benefit from the development of targeted sustainability grants that ensure a project remains of use to the field.

Part of this pressure surrounding maintenance and preservation can actually be met through the traditional mechanisms of scholarly communication. For much of the last century, academic presses and university libraries facilitated the production of print-based scholarship. Presses oversaw scholarship’s publication process while libraries ensured the preservation of published work. These institutions can, and have begun to, continue carrying out this role. The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, for example, recently awarded Stanford University Press a major grant to explore how they might publish and host interactive, non-textual, born-digital scholarship. Many universities have also begun investing in what are called digital or institutional repositories. A part of the movement for open access, these repositories make an institution’s scholarly output available to the wider public through an open digital archive of material. In addition to hosting PDF files of articles, manuscripts, and theses, these repositories can host a variety of digital assets from datasets to web data.65

As much as established institutions could support the preservation of digital projects, however, many have been slow to catch up. What is more, the expense in setting up an institutional repository makes them unattainable for many smaller institutions. In light of these challenges, a number of organizations and associations have stepped in to fill the gap. The recently organized Anvil Academic, for example, aims to fill the gap that exists between the growth of digital scholarship and lack of publishing outlets. Founded by the National Institute for Technology in Liberal Education and the Council for Library and Information Resources, Anvil provides the peer review, publication, and preservation of born digital work.66 The Modern Language Association has also stepped in to support the flourishing of digital work within literary studies. Recognizing that a growing number of humanities and social science Ph.Ds. are employed outside the tenure track and often not at research universities, the MLA partnered with Columbia University’s Center for Digital Research and Scholarship to launch its Commons Open Repository Exchange, or CORE. A digital repository available to members of the MLA, CORE allows users to create profiles and upload multiple forms of scholarship, thereby allowing individuals to share and assert authorship over their work. According to the MLA’s Director of Scholarly Communication, Kathleen Fitzpatrick, such initiatives are vital for scholarly associations. They not only serve the variety of career paths researchers are now on, but also advance knowledge in the field. “By giving our members a way to instantly share their syllabi, conference papers, blog posts, and research, we hope to eliminate some of the barriers to collaboration and discoverability in the humanities and foster the work of our community.”67

In addition to such technical issues, however, the maintenance and sustainability of digital projects also raise of host of ethical considerations. While open research notebooks might evoke the spirit of the commons, this commitment to collaboration must also be tempered by a respect for the privacy of those involved. Requiring students to blog or utilize tools developed by the private sector, for example, exposes their identities to third party corporations who claim ownership to the data generated on their platforms. Similarly, sharing field notes or interviews on open research notebooks might expose information our subjects might not wish

---


revealed. But even more important, we must be clear about the ownership and use of the data our interlocutors and subjects contribute. The *Soul Pulse* app, for example, assures its users in its privacy policy that the information they provide the research team will be anonymous and studied in aggregate. Yet according to *Soul Pulse*’s project director, the app individuals use to input their data remains the proprietary software of the developer, meaning that this private for-profit entity retains access over the spiritual data users input.68

The *Soul Pulse* team is in no way misusing the data its subjects contribute. But the unintentional gap in the chain of ownership over the data of private individuals points to the fact that, in addition to technical and logistical assistance, digital work also requires the development of standards and best practices in the maintenance of data.

5.2 Graduate Education

In light of the rapidly evolving nature of digital publishing and scholarly communication, how the training of future journalists and academics should change remains an open question. A number of scholarly associations and journalism schools have already undertaken projects around rethinking the career paths of recent Ph.D.s., driven largely by the declining number of tenure track positions at most universities. The American Historical Association’s Career diversity for Historians initiative, for example, has provided pilot funding to Ph.D. programs to rethink graduate training in light of the need for historians to look for positions off the tenure track.69

When it comes to changing graduate education to prepare students to produce more born-digital projects, however, the conversation is much more divided. Both journalists and academics we talked to were evenly split on this question. Editor-in-chief of the online publication *Faith Street*, Patton Dodd, for example, claimed that digital publishing has become so entrenched and established that students will not be marketable to many digital media firms and publications unless they have some kind of training in new media. “Most digital media companies were startups when I got my first job and there was still an entrepreneurial spirit that brought in a lot of people,” Dodd recalled. Such conditions, however, are now gone, and Dodd suggests aspiring journalists could benefit from training in analytics and digital storytelling.70 On the other hand, however, a number of journalists we spoke to noted that since mediums change so rapidly, programs would do well to re-emphasize the importance of research and writing. Tiffany Stanley recalled the many newspaper and magazine layout courses she took as a journalism undergraduate that no longer apply to her work as managing editor at *Religion & Politics*. “But any program that teaches you how to think and how to write is going to beneficial,” she concluded.71

Among academics, the central question is often whether graduate students should learn computer coding alongside historiography or critical theory. But here, too, the scholars we interviewed were divided over the degree to which graduate education should integrate digital methods into their curriculum. According to historian Lincoln Mullen, an individual’s research questions should point them to a particular tool rather than the other way around. There should be “less and less digital additives,” Mullen noted, “and more seeing how digital work is helping you think through your scholarship,” which means individual scholars might need to take the initiative in learning about the tools that advance their work. Others cautioned that since digital work is likely not going to count in a scholar’s tenure file, it is not worth training students in skills the academy
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does not value. “Make sure it’s a digital part of your regular research,” new media scholar Heidi Campbell advised, “because it’s not going to be counted.”

At the same time, however, all of the academics we spoke to acknowledge that the importance of digital work in the field does demand that programs ensure their students have some kind of baseline digital literacy. One young scholar we spoke to noted that while graduate programs should not sacrifice training students in the long-standing practices of their disciplines in favor of making everything born-digital, graduate student access to training in using digital humanities tools and methods should not be so “ad hoc.” Other scholars agreed, noting departments, programs, and scholarly associations need to do a better job of informing students of the available digital tools and ways to gain training in them. Additionally, a number of scholars we spoke to note that while digital work might not yet supplant traditional publications in making scholarly careers, having a robust digital profile is a vital part of academia today and departments should stop actively dissuading students from engaging in digital work or writing for the plethora of digital publications. “It would be great if graduate students could take advantage of online opportunities to publish works in progress and get feedback on them,” the University of Southern California’s Knight Chair of Religion and Media Diane Winston notes. “I think their dissertations would be enriched. You find more sources, get new ideas, be in conversation with other people, get comfortable writing.”

As Winston’s answer suggests, the stigma against digital projects or contributing to digital publication would significantly diminish if they were understood as part of a scholarly research process and not separate or distinct from it. Central to this broader understanding of scholarship and scholarly communication is a more robust peer review of digital work.

5.3 Peer Review

As suggested by our previous discussion on whether digital projects or contributions to digital publications “count” for academics on the tenure track, the absence of peer review for such work is a significant issue facing the digital study of religion. Expanding our practices of peer review to evaluate, and thereby recognize, such work is therefore a central need for the field.

As an ideal, peer review should be able to evaluate the quality of any form of scholarly work. Our most common peer review practices, however, typically cannot account for the inherent qualities of digital scholarship and thereby exclude it. Traditional lines of scholarly communication, for example, typically involve an author submitting a manuscript to a journal or university press for publication. The press then sends that work out to peers for evaluation before overseeing its publication. By evaluating completed or nearly-completed work and ceding control over scholarship’s production to university presses, this process excludes digital projects that, as we discuss in the introduction to Section 2, tend to be open ended and self-published. This process is also built entirely around the production of printed texts with a limited number of authors, which also excludes digital projects that either employ multiple platforms or involve multiple communities of users. In light of this gap between existing means of scholarly communication and emerging modes of scholarly production, a growing number of associations and independent organizations have formed in order to assess digital scholarship.

By and large, these attempts to expand contemporary peer review practices take three separate but interlocking approaches. The first involves incorporating digital projects into existing outlets for peer review and scholarly communication. As we discussed in Section 5.1, for example, established academic presses like Stanford and new initiatives like Anvil Academic have emerged to incorporate digital projects into traditional publication models, where the press oversees the peer review process. But there have also been changes within the broader ecology of scholarly communication that recognizes digital work. Beginning in 2001, for instance, the Organization of American Historian’s Journal of American History, the premier journal for
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American historians, began featuring “web site reviews” in its pages, asking invited scholars to assess new online teaching resources or digital archives. In 2013, the journal expanded this section to become “Digital History Reviews” and incorporated the evaluation of multiple forms of digital work. The journal provides reviewers with specific guidelines on how to evaluate digital scholarship and publishes these reviews alongside the journal’s book reviews in order to emphasize their equivalency.73 Similarly, the American Historical Association now awards an annual prize specifically for Innovation in Digital History. Jointly sponsored by the AHA and the Roy Rosenzweig Center for History and New Media at George Mason University, the prize seeks “to honor and support work on an innovative and freely available new media project, and in particular for work that reflects thoughtful, critical, and rigorous engagement with technology and the practice of history.”74 In lieu a specific prize for digital projects, the Modern Language Association has expanded the scope of existing awards to incorporate born-digital work.75

In addition to integrating the evaluation of digital work into existing institutions, scholars have also established a number of new consortia or organizations devoted to the evaluation of digital scholarship. In June of 2015, for example, the American Historical Association created a permanent Digital History Working Group to assist departments in assessing the digital work of their faculty or in drawing up their own guidelines for evaluating digital scholarship. Long before established associations began creating these organizations, however, digital humanists and other digitally inclined scholars formed their own communities of assessment. In 2001, for instance, University of Virginia literary scholar Jerome McGann oversaw the organization of the NINES, or the Networked Infrastructure for Nineteenth-century Electronic Scholarship. Founded explicitly as a “peer reviewing body,” the NINES aims to promote excellence in digital scholarship on nineteenth-century British and American culture. Through the NINES’s website, project directors can submit their work to a community of peers for review. The NINES then finds two scholars—an expert in the subject matter and an individual competent in the digital methods the project uses—to review the site’s content as well as its technical infrastructure. If the reviewers recommend changes or upgrades in order to bring the project in line with the standards and best practices other projects employ, project directors can then make edits and changes to their work before submitting it to the NINES’s open database of digital scholarship. Indeed, through the NINES’s open source content management system software, members can actually remix and juxtapose the digital objects from multiple projects (such as essays, images, encoded texts, etc.) for their own use, thereby making the NINES’s repository a true commons that facilitates new interpretations of aggregated data. As of this writing, the NINES has reviewed 141 digital projects that have contributed nearly 900,000 digital objects to the field.76

As the NINES’s commitment to shared best practices suggests, a foundational effort to define accepted standards for the evaluation of digital work underlies these attempts to integrate digital work into established institutions of peer review or to create new outlets for their assessment. Crafting these guidelines constitutes the third effort to expand contemporary peer review practices, and is by far the most diverse of the three. Both the American Historical Association and the Modern Language Association have adopted their own standards for evaluating digital scholarship, while a number of individual academics have offered up their own perspectives on how to assess the quality of digital work. Indeed, the current conversation on how to assess digital scholarship is both so needed and so robust that the Journal of Digital Humanities recently devoted an entire issue to the topic.77

Within this diversity, however, several of the proposed or accepted guidelines share a number of common thresholds or benchmarks. Most, for example, place a significant burden upon digital scholars to justify the significance and contribution of their work. The Modern Language Association’s guidelines instruct project directors to draw up a document that makes explicit “the results, theoretical underpinnings, and intellectual rigor of their work,” which can then be handed to colleagues, funders, tenure and promotion committees, and peer reviewers. Other guidelines note that in light of the collaborative nature of digital work, it is incumbent upon digital scholars to clearly delineate the scope of their contribution and the amount of time they committed to a project in order to convey the project’s magnitude. The American Historical Association goes a step further, recommending that scholars frame the time and effort they put into their digital work in terms of its print equivalent—such as a research note, journal article, monograph, etc.

These recommendations for scholars to be proactive in describing the nature of their work illustrates how incorporating digital projects into the peer review process will necessarily be a collaborative endeavor. In addition to having digital scholars describe their work, most proposed or accepted guidelines also demand that established scholarly bodies become more familiar with digital scholarship’s unique characteristics as it determines what is or is not scholarly. The Journal of American History’s guidelines for digital history reviews, for example, requires reviewers to focus on four discrete categories when evaluating projects that reflect some of the inherent qualities of digital work: the content, form, intended audience or use, and digital creativity of a project.

In terms of Content, scholars have long been committed to the rigorous evaluation of the substances of each other’s work. Indeed, evaluating the content of a scholarly work—the quality of its argument, the relevance of its sources, and the significance of its contribution—has long been the primary function of peer review. The evaluation of digital projects should be no different, attending to the intellectual rigor and originality of a project. But in addition to considering a project’s argument, sources, and contribution, the evaluation of digital scholarship must also take into account the Form that digital work takes. This means assessing the design and usability of a project, whether the interface advances or hinders the argument a project wishes to make. This attention to form is also an attention to the open-ended nature of digital work, evaluating a project in light of its current phase of development. Such considerations are often not a part of the evaluation of print scholarship, for the form is always established or presumed. But in digital scholarship, a clear and compelling design or functionality is a necessary component of a clear and compelling argument.

In order to evaluate the quality of a project’s form, however, one must also take into account a digital project’s Intended Audience or Use. While the audience for scholarly monographs is largely predetermined—other scholars—digital projects have the ability to involve or incorporate multiple communities into its work simultaneously. Evaluating a digital project, then, involves attending to the communities digital projects seek to either serve or create. Is the project a tool intended for scholarly use? Is it a teaching resource meant for the classroom? Or is it a forum intended either to facilitate existing conversations or generate new ones? While the Web is always said to be a “public” space, publics are in fact always created or invoked. Evaluating digital work thereby involves assessing its content and form in light of the community it envisions.

---

Finally, according to the *Journal of American History*’s guidelines for evaluating digital projects, reviewers should consider whether a project makes effective or creative use of the Digital medium in which it works. This requires a certain familiarity with the knowledge model a project employs, asking whether the project follows the best practices and standards common to that genre of digital work. If the project seeks to encode a corpus of texts, does it follow the guidelines established by the Text Encoding Initiative? Does a mapping project employ the appropriate GIS software for its stated aims? In light of these preexisting standards, does a project make a particularly innovative use of these best practices or contribute significantly to the field’s ability to adopt them?80

Assessing this significance and creativity can sometimes be a challenging task. Not everyone is well versed in the software a project might use, and the rapidity with which technology changes almost ensures knowledge about new tools or approaches will be uneven. Given these challenges, several proposals on evaluating digital scholarship recommend considering a variety of sources in determining a project’s impact, or what are called “alternative metrics.” Digital historian Sheila Brennan, for example, has advised scholars to “let the grant do the talking” in conveying the quality of their work. Given that most digital projects require some kind of external funding, the very fact that a project received funding is often a sign of its quality. Brennan also highlights that grants also have a number of evalutative apparatuses such as regular reports, white papers, and funder’s recommendations that can serve as evidence of a project’s significance.81 In addition to grant reports, other scholars have called for the inclusion of other kinds of data in assessing the significance of digital work, such as page views, blog comments, the number of times a data set is downloaded, shares on social media, or the number of repositories a project draws upon or curates.82

While attending to alternative metrics might entail incorporating new kinds of data into the assessment of digital work, the impetus behind its inclusion is more than technical. The movement for alternative metrics, or “altmetrics” as it is sometimes called—the movement even has its own hashtag, #Altmetrics—began in the sciences. According to its advocates, even if established institutions of peer review incorporate digital scholarship into their work, peer review as a process remains broken so long as we continue to expect the enormity of our work to funnel through just a handful of institutions. The submission of completed scholarly works to established institutions for promotion and evaluation continues to mirror the filter-then-publish model that defined print scholarship. But the ability for scholars to now post their thoughts on blogs and share their research in the cloud for the first time allows us to conceptualize peer review as a publish, then filter process; a process that places the evaluation of impact not in the hands of a few peer reviewers but in the fields’ collective use. Technology might facilitate this process, but as we discussed in Section 2.3 on “The Commons,” a commitment to the collaborative production of knowledge is entirely a social phenomenon.83

The Press Forward initiative at the Roy Rosenzweig Center for History and New Media at George Mason University provides a particularly illustrative example of this post-publication peer review process for the humanities and social sciences. Utilizing plugins used by the widely popular blogging and web development platform WordPress, Press Forward allows teams of researchers to aggregate, filter, and then share scholarly works in any form using common RSS feeds that serialize and automatically distribute the publication of content on blogs or websites.84 The comprehensive, peer-reviewed, and open-access *Journal for Digital Humanities* uses Press Forward’s software, for example. More importantly, it bases its peer review model on the kind of open ended, multimodal, collaborative, and digital work that now takes place online.

80 McClurken, “Digital History Reviews.”
The journal’s content originates from an initial publication Digital Humanities Now that uses Press Forward software to aggregate a number of RSS feeds from blog posts and other born-digital content across the digital humanities community. This list is in part created by the Digital Humanities Now’s editorial board, and is in part created by individual authors who submit their blog’s RSS feed to the publication. Individuals can choose to subscribe to Digital Humanities Now’s full RSS feed, which shows them all the content the publication takes in. But Digital Humanities Now also curates this content by inviting volunteer “editors-at-large” from the field to spend a week reviewing all of the content that comes through the site and flagging particularly innovative or important pieces as “Editor’s Choice” pieces. These can be blog posts, new digital projects, statements posted on organizational websites, or even a storified collection of tweets. The Journal of Digital Humanities’ editorial board then monitors these “Editor’s Choices” pieces to see which ones particularly resonant with the field through page views or blog comments. The Journal of Digital Humanities then approaches authors of particularly important or heavily viewed Editor’s Choice items and asks if they would like to revise their initial pieces based on peer feedback for inclusion in the journal’s next issue. After another round of peer review and editing, the journal then publishes the piece in one of its quarterly issue along with a link back to the original publication so readers can see how the piece evolved over time.85

It is no stretch of the imagination to envision the study of religion adopting a number of the practices discussed. One can easily imagine a journal of new work based on the conversations happening on the field’s many digital publications, or a prize for digital innovation in the field. But it would require the scholarly associations and other governing bodies that oversee the study of religion to initiate committees, organize working groups, commission guidelines, and offer prizes that attend to the digital work in our field. We think such work is needed and vital. Not only does it address one of the most vibrant corners of the field today, as the listing of work in Appendix II suggests, but it also stands as to advance knowledge within the field.

5.4 The Digital Futures of Religious Studies

This distributive way of thinking forces us to consider questions of authority and authorization. Authority is the ability to make statements, a question of expertise or power, whereas authorization is about allowing someone to speak. The question of authorization, then, is also about control.86 The controlling aspect of authorization is a feature, not a bug, of the way higher education is structured, and of the study of religion in particular. It is the college that sees itself as the site for the production of knowledge. Yet, communities outside of the academy are constantly producing their own knowledge and experts, which is, in fact, the material academics study. The field of the study of religion emerged from a need to classify, and thus control non-Christian religions, a natural result of Enlightenment thinking around progress and supremacy. An open, collaborative model does not operate only within the academy, but engages communities outside of the academy as well.87

The authorization-authority divide is not about who is “right,” but about what powers are exercised and how they are deployed. The default setting at the authorizing agency is the college. The response is not to turn to any voice that claims authority, but to navigate that tension. Thus, one can imagine publications that are multidisciplinary and multi-layered, such as the living history of a particular site like Touba, Senegal. Built around a vision of Ahmadou Bamba, and ultimately his burying place, one can construct a presentation of the city through digital scholarship that covers architecture, urban design, history, hagiography, music, clothing, dance, etc. The core only needs to be built out by a small group, which then invites other contributors to

86 We take inspiration for this point from Edward W. Said, Orientalism (New York: Vintage, 1979), 3.
87 See for example Mahmood Mamdani, Good Muslim, Bad Muslim: America, the Cold War, and the Roots of Terror (New York: Pantheon Books, 2004); Tomoko Masuzawa, The Invention of World Religions, or, How European Universalism Was Preserved in the Language of Pluralism (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005);
build on the site, thus making it a multivocal, multilinear study of religion that more closely approximates how religion functions in the world.\textsuperscript{88}

By focusing on a multi-sensory approach to faith, the limits of the original construction of study of religion become clear. Based in an Enlightenment notion of progress, which sees Protestant Christianity as the pinnacle of that progress, other traditions are fit into a model of what “true” religion should be. The result includes the idea that anything that does not fit this model is deviant. There is an emphasis on text as a primary source of authority, resulting in the reification of texts that may not traditionally hold the meaning within the community that is ascribed to it, and the idea of scripturalism, or that text controls the believer and is predictive.\textsuperscript{89}

While the discipline has generally moved on from this narrow start, it is still informed by it. The rise of digital humanities scholarship in the study of religion is an opportunity to rethink sources of research and how we structure the study of religion. Some potential directions involve thinking about religious practice, particularly when it has not or cannot be recorded; religious literacy; civilizational webs; non-linear temporal thinking; and spatial thinking.\textsuperscript{90} By moving away from text-centric approach, not only can academics supplement scriptural bases with aspects of lived religion, but can also structure ways of capturing non-text religions, where an oral tradition dominates, or itineracy limits the ability to preserve artifacts.

Despite the difficulties we have identified with digital humanities, we are optimistic about the future. This is a transitional period, from multiple perspectives, for the study of religion, the humanities, and higher education. We see digital work not in a panglossian mode of offering solutions to all these problems, but as a vehicle for rethinking in substantial ways how to build something new that speaks to the ethos of the humanities and the purposes of higher education. The organizations that govern the study of religion might have been slow to officially integrate digital work, but the opportunity stands for us to intentionally address where the future of our field lies.

\textsuperscript{88}See for example, Eric Ross, \textit{Sufi City: Urban Design and Archetypes in Touba} (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2006).
\textsuperscript{89}Carl W. Ernst, \textit{Following Muhammad: Rethinking Islam in the Contemporary World} (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 55.
Appendix I: Case Studies

Center for the Study of Material and Visual Cultures of Religion (MAVCOR)
http://mavcor.yale.edu/

Genres
Scholarly Communication, Digitization, Critical Curation, User Community, Digital Religion, Publication

Project Director
● Sally M. Promey, Professor of American Studies and Religious Studies, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Yale University; Deputy Director and Professor of Religion and Visual Culture, Yale Institute of Sacred Music

Editor and Curator
● Emily C. Floyd, Ph.D. candidate, Art History and Latin American Studies, Tulane University

Project Affiliates
● Editorial Board of 25 scholars and professionals
● Advisory Network of 48 scholars
● Initiative/Center Fellows cohort of 22 scholars in first project cycle; 40 Fellows plus 12 Graduate Fellows in second project cycle (now in planning stages)
● Research Affiliate network of 59 scholars and professionals

Description
The study of religion and the study of visual/material cultures have begun to intersect in significant ways only over the past couple of decades. While those who study religion often consider the role of material culture, most interpret these objects primarily for their religious meanings, infrequently drawing upon the methods or frameworks of art history. Meanwhile, curators and art historians, especially when dealing with art and artifacts produced in Western modernity, typically separate objects from their contexts of religious practice. The Center for the Study of Material and Visual Cultures of Religion (MAVCOR) seeks to bridge this divide by fostering new intellectual communities, curating new source material, and publishing high quality scholarship that is also available to stakeholders outside the academy.

As a project, the MAVCOR website is a portal within a much larger scholarly endeavor based at Yale University that is deliberately directed outward to other institutions, national and international, and to wider publics. In 2008, the project received major funding from campus and external sources to launch the Initiative (now Center) for the Study of Material and Visual Cultures of Religion. The Initiative sponsored a number of campus programs and exhibitions, a group of 22 Initiative Fellows, and a national conference over a four year project cycle, titled Sensational Religion, that culminated in the publication of an edited collection, titled Sensational Religion: Sensory Cultures in Material Practice (Yale, 2014). The Center is currently organizing the second project cycle, a five-year, multi-institutional collaboration titled Material Economies of Religion in the Americas: Arts, Objects, Spaces, Mediations, that will support an international and interdisciplinary group of 40 Fellows at multiple ranks, representing both public and private education. A cohort of 12 Graduate Student Fellows, selected by competitive application, will increase the overall number of Fellows in this cycle to 52.
The new project cycle will begin in 2016 and is directed by Sally Promey and Sarah Rivett (Princeton). During the first cycle, the MAVCOR website primarily served as the Initiative’s homepage and news outlet. Built using the web development platform Drupal, the site’s “Happenings” page announced events supported by the Initiative, including film series, symposia, conferences, and visiting artists.

From the beginning, the site was imagined with a much broader scope, however, and late in 2013 MAVCOR entered a second, born-digital phase that was to serve as the website’s centerpiece. Under the heading of Conversations, MAVCOR began publishing original works of inquiry and analysis. Categorized by the type of writing or focus, these Conversations could take the form of “Object Narratives” that analyze or reflect upon a particular object; “Interviews” with scholars, professionals, or practitioners in the fields of art, art history, or religious studies; “Medium Studies” that focus on the qualities and uses of particular substances or material; curated exhibits called “Constellations” that analyze a collection of objects; and original, somewhat longer pieces of scholarship or argumentation under the heading “Essays.” Project staff put every contribution through blind peer review before publication, drawing upon the assistance of a distinguished Editorial Board organized in advance of the site’s launch.

In order to facilitate the generation of new scholarship and the production of knowledge, the MAVCOR site dedicates considerable energy to the creation of its collaboratively built archive (the Material Objects Archive). This archive is, in some ways, the heart of the site, an ever-expanding and expansible searchable collection of digitized images (of art and artifacts, monuments and buildings) aiming to represent an inclusive expanse of religious traditions, times, and places. The archive grows in two principal ways: first, the project editor/curator and director regularly add materials to the site from their own collections and site visits and also from collecting institutions willing to share digital files and information with such scholarly endeavors as this one. Materials added in this fashion already carry permissions, and contributing scholars may add to the interpretation of these objects without securing additional permissions. Second, whenever MAVCOR publishes an Object Narrative, Essay, or Medium Study on objects or images not already included in the archive, the project team requests that authors submit preservation-quality images of the objects they discuss to illustrate their contribution. Authors are responsible for acquiring these images, which could come either from the author’s fieldwork or personal collection, or from a museum, gallery, or archive. In these latter cases, the author is responsible for working with the institution to secure both the image and permission. The images serve a purpose beyond illustration. Taking advantage of a digital repository’s ability to host seemingly limitless quantities of diverse materials, these images are then saved in the searchable database. The project team uploads these images to the site and adds relevant metadata using Drupal’s content management features, which allows users to discover new material along the themes MAVCOR establishes in its publication, including medium, religious tradition, place of origin, time period, and other subject tags. This archive then becomes a generative space for new kinds of writing, research, and curation including the Constellations hosted on the site or some other use in the classroom.

As a major node of dissemination for the broader Center for the Study of Material and Visual Cultures of Religion, the MAVCOR website also helps demonstrate the project’s sustainability and was a factor in the former Initiative’s recent promotion to Center status at Yale University. With this new designation, the project has acquired additional funding in the form of a generous discretionary grant from the Henry Luce Foundation to redesign and update the site, particularly the Material Objects Archive, in order to incorporate a robust Digital Asset Management system more reflective of the needs of this emerging field of inquiry. Project staff members are now assembling a committee of experts in Religious Studies and Art History to
consult on search terms for materials representing a wide range of traditions, periods, and places. The redesign will also incorporate new *Conversations* types, a streamlined and more dynamic interface for site visitors, and a new Fellows Portal for use by Center Fellows during the upcoming and subsequent project cycles.

**Workplan**

**Phase I:**
- Grant writing and application
- Convening scholars in the field through conferences and symposia to identify new research
- Working with web developers to build and design the *MAV/COR* site
- Organizing the Editorial Board and Advisory Network
- Launching the site

**Phase II (ongoing):**
- Soliciting, peer reviewing, editing, and publishing *MAV/COR*’s five forms of “Conversations”
- Working with authors, museums, libraries, and archives to secure images of selected items
- Uploading images into database
- Adding relevant metadata to these images

**Dissemination**

Presentations at academic conferences. Citations in academic publications. Listing on author's curriculum vitae.

**Evaluation**

Editorial Board, Advisory Network, and Fellows are periodically consulted for advice and feedback on *MAV/COR* initiatives. Grant evaluation and reporting.
**ISLAMiCommentary and Transcultural Islam Research Network**

http://islamicommentary.org/
http://tirn学者.org/scholars-experts-database/

**Genres**
Critical Curation, Scholarly Communication, Digital Religion

**Project Manager**
- Julie Poucher Harbin, Communications Specialist, Carnegie Transcultural Islam Project at the Duke Islamic Studies Center (DISC), Editor and Editor/Writer for the project’s affiliated web sites ISLAMiCommentary and TIRN.

**Project Affiliates**
- Faculty from the Duke Islamic Studies Center at Duke University
- Faculty from the Carolina Center for the Study of the Middle East and Muslim Civilizations at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
- Occasional part-time paid graduate student positions
- Multimedia specialist from Duke's John Hope Franklin Center
- Duke University Office of News & Communications

**Description**
The decade after the attacks of 9/11 has seen both an interest in and a need for more informed and reasoned comment on Islam throughout the world. Democratic movements in Egypt and Iran, intensifying violence in Syria and Iraq, and representations of Sharia law as a supposed threat to the American judicial system have all drawn diplomats, policy makers, and even ordinary citizens into a series of conversations about the Muslim experience. These conversations, however, have often been marred either by misunderstandings or the intentional spread of misinformation. How might the knowledge of journalists and academics be integrated into these conversations?

ISLAMiCommentary and its attendant Transcultural Islam Research Network (TIRN) aim to inform and promote public knowledge about the diversity of thought and culture within Muslim communities by critically curating and offering expert analysis on the circulation of knowledge about Islam online. Launched in 2012 with major funding from the Carnegie Corporation of New York, ISLAMiCommentary and TIRN form the Transcultural Islam Project (TIP), which is run out of the Duke Islamic Studies Center (DISC) of Duke University in partnership with the Carolina Center for the Study of the Middle East and Muslim Civilizations at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill. Together, the projects of TIP seek not only “to deepen understanding of and inform public discourse and policy,” but also to advance “Islamic studies (broadly defined) scholarship and research . . .”

ISLAMiCommentary advances TIP’s first aim by collecting, creating, and disseminating knowledge about Islam and Muslim communities. Built by Duke’s web services department using WordPress and its suite of available plugins, the site’s main strength lies in the behind the scenes work of the project’s manager and occasional student assistants. The site contains pages of resources about particular topics, including publicly-available polling data, open-access publications, and recorded lectures or events from reliable sources.

ISLAMiCommentary’s primary strength and function, however, is its aggregation of the media’s coverage of Islam and Muslim communities throughout the world. Using WordPress’s blogging capabilities, project members post excerpts of an article into a blog post along with a full citation of and link to the original piece. ISLAMiCommentary staff then augments this filtered content with additional metadata like subject tags that allow users to sort ISLAMiCommentary’s archive of online information by topic, region, or some other social or cultural classification. Users visiting the site could therefore not only read the latest news on the Muslim
experience at home and abroad, but could also follow ISLAMiCommentary's subject tags to relevant backstories and contextual information that puts the day’s news in a broader context.

In addition to curating the content of others, however, ISLAMiCommentary also generates its own material. Branded separately as “i-Comment” on the site, the bulk of this new material is the work of the project manager and can take many forms, including print and videotaped interviews with scholars in the field, write-ups and video excerpts of academic conferences, reviews of new books or author “Q&As” about them, and video of lectures, symposia, or events sponsored by DISC and departments across the university. Alongside this regular material, a network of ISLAMiCommentary contributors, drawn primarily from faculty at Duke and UNC, also regularly author reflections upon the material gathered at the site or publish original pieces of journalism and analysis. Photo essays and documentaries made by Duke and UNC students also find a home on the site, as well as other material by scholars outside of Duke and UNC that is submitted to or solicited by the site.

This commitment not only to promote but also advance new knowledge about Islam in the world is also supported by the Transcultural Islam Research Network (TIRN), which is a companion site to ISLAMiCommentary and the other component of the Transcultural Islam Project. Much like ISLAMiCommentary, TIRN is built on WordPress where project staff aggregate and share trusted resources in Islamic studies, but with a focus upon professional associations and academic networks. TIRN’s major feature, however, is a public directory of scholars and experts in the field. The directory is relatively new and has yet to be widely advertised, but it aims to be a resource for both academics and the general public. By registering with the site and having a profile approved by project staff, individuals with advanced knowledge on a topic can submit their credentials to have their name, contact information, and areas of expertise posted in a public, searchable database. Journalists and policy makers can utilize the list to connect with scholars in the field for interviews or consultations, while scholars can search the directory to find new colleagues in the field. The site promotes this latter effort through a page called “MyTIRN,” where scholars can publish working papers, lecture texts, reflections on conferences, or essays for feedback and public peer review.

Utilizing WordPress’s messaging board features, TIRN also hosts what they call “TIRN Groups” where scholars can create their own forums or spaces for conversation, debate, and professional networking. While the project manager notes that this portion of the project remains underutilized as the directory continues to grow, the presence of TIRN Groups on the site suggest the ways TIRN in particular and TIP in general is not only a resource that promotes existing scholarship, but is also a site where new work takes form.

Though only a few years old, TIP’s digital spaces and virtual communities are already having an impact. This is in part seen in the expanding list of i-Comment contributors from new institutions, as well as the repurposing of ISLAMiCommentary’s content elsewhere. Faculty from nearly sixty universities have contributed some form of content to the site, while major news outlets like The Huffington Post, World Religion News, The Muslim Observer, Tikkun, and Juan Cole’s Informed Comment blog, among others, have mirrored or republished entire ISLAMiCommentary pieces. Additionally, the project manager has connected a number of scholars to journalists for pieces that appeared in The Wall Street Journal, Voice of America, National Public Radio, Fox News, and Nightline. Through DISC, TIRN has also become the institutional affiliation of the New Books in Islamic Studies podcast of the New Books Network, further cementing TIRN’s role as a platform for the study of Islam throughout the world.

**Workplan**

**Phase I:**
- Grant application to Carnegie Corporation
- Building of ISLAMiCommentary and TIRN site
- Organizing network of scholars and contributors
- Aggregation of resources for publication
- Launching both sites
Phase II (*ISLAMiCommentary*, ongoing):
- Regular publicity, mainly through social media, to raise awareness of site
- Curation of news media for relevant articles
- Inputting these articles into the site with relevant metadata
- Soliciting, editing, and publishing new material

Phase III (*TIRN*, ongoing)
- Regular publicity, through social media and listservs to raise awareness of site
- Evaluating, approving, or rejecting applications for inclusion in the directory
- Monitoring the posts, comments, and conversations on the *TIRN* groups
- Reading, evaluating, approving, and publishing announcements and working papers on MyTIRN

**Dissemination**
Mirroring or reposting of content in other news outlets. Citations and references in other articles. Presentations at academic conferences. Sponsorship of the *New Books in Islamic Studies* podcast. Listing of contributor status or publication on an author’s resume or curriculum vitae.

**Evaluation**
Carnegie Corporation grant evaluation and reporting. Regular meetings with and presentations to DISC and UNC faculty for input and evaluation.
Loyola University’s history is tied closely to the history of Catholic Chicago. Founded in 1870 by Belgian, German, and Dutch Jesuit priests as St. Ignatius College, the university’s initial student body was, like much of Chicago, overwhelmingly working-class Irish immigrants. Yet by 1878, St. Ignatius’ library boasted over 5,000 titles comprising 8,000 volumes. What might these acquisitions reveal about the history of Catholic higher education? What might these holdings and their use say about American Catholicism more broadly? And how did a university of such limited means amass a library of this size so quickly?

The Jesuit Libraries (JLP) and Provenance Projects (JLPP) seek to answer these questions through digitizing, critically curating, and visualizing the data from the university’s first c. 1878 library catalog and surviving books. With modest funding from Loyola’s Hank Center for the Catholic Intellectual Heritage and support from the university’s Center for Textual Studies and Digital Humanities, the project began with undergraduate interns digitizing the original catalog in the fall of 2012. In spring 2013, project director Roberts, an assistant professor of public history and new media, used the catalog in a course on American Catholicism. As part of the class, students transcribed the catalog into an spreadsheet following the Machine Readable Catalog (MARC) record scheme and then attempted to connect as many titles as possible to the library’s current catalog.

The project digitally remediated the manuscript catalog through the use of an Integrated Library System cataloging software called Koha. Koha is an open-source, web-based database for MARC records that allows for the creation of a searchable library catalog that can also track usage and circulation information. Using Koha, the JLP created a Virtual Library System (VLS) out of the original catalog that not only reconstituted the original catalog in digital form, but also allowed for the analysis and visualization of holdings data. This data, viewable in aggregate for the first time, revealed the negotiation between the European-born Jesuit’s pedagogical concerns and the pragmatic needs of their American-born students.

Rather than serve as the project’s conclusion, the catalog’s remediation into digital form actually opened a number of new research questions and facilitated the launching of a complementary project, the Jesuit Libraries Provenance Project. Through the VLS, it became possible to search the original catalog and cross reference it.
with the library’s contemporary catalog to see what texts from the original library remain in circulation. What might the physical texts reveal? Would their conditions speak to the history of Catholic reading practices over the last century? Or might their inscriptions shed light on how the college acquired the books in the first place?

In March 2014 the JLPP was launched. Undergraduate and graduate interns searched the Loyola University Libraries’ contemporary holdings for the university’s first texts. They found that nearly 1,750 of the library’s 5,000 original titles remained. Pulling these titles from the stacks—many of which, they discovered, were in need of preservation and conservation—the students then set about digitizing a text’s inscriptions and marginalia. They uploaded these scans to the social media image sharing site Flickr (http://blogs.lib.luc.edu/archives/). The interns then began blogging, tweeting, and posting about their findings on social media, asking the public to help identify provenance marks and transcribe marginalia and other notes in the texts.

The results have been as amusing as they are enlightening. A text bearing the stamp “A PROTESTANT BOOK: Not for Circulation,” revealed the faculty’s early fears about doctrinal purity. In other instances, inscriptions revealed that many of Loyola’s original texts were donated by lay Catholics. Of these, a few were actually stolen from southern parishes during the American Civil War by Irish Catholics serving in the Union Army. After posting this finding on the project’s blog, the project team then received an email from a descendant of one of the soldiers in question who was able to provide the project with excerpts from the soldier’s diary detailing how, when, and why the text was confiscated.

With the JLP and JLPP now launched and gaining international attention, the project is entering yet another phase of development. Discussions are currently ongoing with other North American Jesuit colleges and universities about replicating the project. The project director’s second monograph will also draw upon the project’s findings and focus on Catholic libraries, book history, and reading practices.

Workplan
Phase I:
- Obtain rights and permissions to digitize catalog manuscript
- Interns digitize original catalog manuscript
- Create MARC record schema for translation of the manuscript into a searchable database
- Graduate students transcribe catalog into a database as part of a digital humanities course, associating the original catalog’s entries with contemporary library records
- Transcribed catalog entered into the Koha VLS
- VLS analyzed for usage and reception history

Phase II:
- Undergraduate and Graduate students, in consultation with library staff, identify texts from the original catalog that remain in circulation as part of a digital humanities class
- Texts analyzed for history of provenance, reception, and use
- Library staff remove original texts for conservation and preservation
- Obtain rights and permissions to digitize original texts
- Graduate interns digitize surviving texts with the help of library staff
- Marginalia, inscriptions, and other usage notes transcribed
Transcriptions analyzed

Dissemination
Marketing and outreach through social media (Twitter, Facebook, Flickr, and blogging) invited the public to complete the transcription of the library’s marginalia. The project has 80 Facebook likes and 95 Twitter followers. Initial results were published immediately on the project blog. The project and its findings have also been the subject of conference papers, poster sessions, and invited keynote lectures. Select texts identified by the projects, along with results of the project, have been featured in museum exhibit on the restitution of the Jesuits. A catalog of the exhibit is forthcoming. The Catholic Libraries Association also commissioned the project’s director to edit a special issue of its official journal, Catholic Library World.

Evaluation
Library staff and History faculty oversaw the implementation of best practices in digitization and MARC record design. The project also went through periodic self-initiated peer review through invited consultations.
Mapping Ararat
http://www.mappingararat.com/

Genres
Thick Mapping, Digitization, Digital Religion

Project Directors
- Melissa Shiff, Research Associate at Sensorium: Centre for Digital Arts and Technology at York University
- Louis Kaplan, Professor of History and Theory of Photography and New Media, University of Toronto
- John Craig Freeman, Professor of New Media Art, Emerson College Boston

Project Affiliates
- Sarah James, Graphic Design
- Reena Katz, Soundscape
- Elizabeth Hirst, 3D Modelling
- Ultan Byrne, 3D modelling
- Niki Sehmbi, Photoshop
- Stev’n Hall, After Effects
- Matthew Pereira, Web Design

Description
In September 1825, Mordecai Manuel Noah established a small town on Grand Island near Niagara Falls in upstate New York. He called the community Ararat after the mountain where Noah’s ark was said to have rested once the Biblical flood recorded in Genesis receded. The reference both to his namesake and a place of refuge was important to Noah. An American-born Jew of Portuguese descent, Noah had once held several posts as a U.S. diplomat. By the time of Ararat’s founding, however, Noah was largely known as a playwright and newspaper publisher, having been deposed of his post because of his religion. Knowing the sting of antisemitism, Noah claimed he founded Ararat as “a city of refuge for the Jews,” a new homeland for a people scattered across the globe. Thousands attended the community’s founding, where Noah unveiled the cornerstone that would anchor the city’s first structure. The cornerstone, however, is all that remains of Ararat. Like so many nineteenth-century utopian communities, Ararat never took permanent root.

Ararat’s absence from the physical landscape, however, does not diminish the experiment’s historical importance as one of the first attempts to establish a Jewish homeland in the modern world. Mapping Ararat: An Imaginary Jewish Homelands Project seeks to reconsider the community’s significance by combining original works of art with locative technology like global positioning systems (GPS) in order to virtually envision Noah’s plans in physical space. Overseen by a historian and two visual artists, the project began in 2011 with major funding from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. In the first phase, the project directors worked with students employed by the grant to conduct extensive research into Ararat’s brief history. From this archive, the artists on the team either selected or imagined a number of sites, objects, or structures that would serve as Ararat’s potential built environment. These objects could have once existed, like the monument that displayed Ararat’s cornerstone, or were imagined, like a synagogue or port of entry.
Virtual artists and computer animators created 3D representations, contracted by the grant to render the directors’ visions into digital form. The project team then connected these renderings to physical locations on Grand Island using contemporary geocoordinates and a historic map of the region that showed Ararat’s location. All of this information was then inputted into an augmented reality software and mobile application called Layar. Through the mobile app, individuals who are on Grand Island can look through their smartphone or tablet and see Ararat as imagined by the project team.

Formally launched in 2012, Mapping Ararat now exists as an augmented reality walking tour and a website of videos and primary documents. With Layar and a guide published on the project’s website, groups or individuals can traverse the eastern coast of Grand Island and view the project’s 24 items. As visitors tap the image of an augment on their screen, an audio file recorded by the project plays on the Layar app and narrates the object before them. For those unable to visit the virtual sites at Grand Island, the project’s website hosts all of this material, additional primary sources, and video clips of a tour in process. Vernacular cultural artifacts have also been created including stamps, money and postcards that function as simulations of statehood. To date, project members have led a number of directed walking tours and have installed videos in two exhibitions.

As a project, Mapping Ararat is more than just the creative commemoration of a failed utopia. In combining the work of imaginative artists and historical research, the project explores the imagined nature of homelands for diasporic communities more generally. The ability of visitors to see themselves, and even take a selfie, next to absent historic sites such as Ararat’s cornerstone on the walking tour highlights the importance of heritage tourism in constructing social identities. The presence of hypothetical contemporary sites like a movie theatre showing one of Noah’s plays, or, in keeping with the landscape of modern upstate New York, a Native American casino forces visitors to consider what would and would not be a part of a Jewish homeland. They suggest that a modern Ararat, like any community or nation state, would have been the result of contests of power and local histories, and not a universal given.

Since its launch, Mapping Ararat has witnessed a great deal of success. In addition to the aforementioned tours and exhibits, the project has also helped shaped a number of conversations in Jewish studies. It has been referenced in numerous scholarly monographs and book chapters, the subject of a journal article, and has been the subject of panels or roundtables at several academic conferences. The project also recently received a second round of funding from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. With this new grant, the project intends to research and recreate other failed Jewish homelands. In this way, the project will continue to advance its central argument that the past always haunts the present, even if that past lacks a physical presence.

Workplan
Phase I:
- Grant writing and application
- Archival research into Ararat history
- Selecting sites and objects to recreate
- Designing 3D representations of these sites and objects
- Georeferencing these sites on Grand Island
- Uploading the objects and coordinates onto Layar
- Creating cinematic representations of the Layar tour
Phase II (ongoing):
- Building project website
- Uploading research, documentation, and created objects onto site
- Leading walking tours of virtual Ararat
- Presenting the project in art gallery exhibitions and academic conferences
- Continuing to design objects and site for the tour that take Ararat into the present

Dissemination
Citation, reference, and analysis in book chapters in edited collections, scholarly monographs, and journal articles. One of the project directors also published an article about the project in a peer-reviewed journal. Invited talks, lectures, and presentations at universities, art galleries, and academic conferences. The 2013 meeting of the Association for Jewish Studies and the 2013 meeting of Duke University’s Humanities, Arts, Science, and Technology Alliance and Collaborator conference held special roundtables on the project where scholars offered critiques, reflections, and feedback. Walking tours with University of Buffalo students and classes.

Evaluation
Grant evaluation and reporting. Peer review of scholarly articles written about the project.
**Appendix II: Digital Projects in the Study of Religion**

*Note:* This table excludes the 519 open access journals that list religion as one of their subject headings. As born-digital or now fully digital publications, we consider these journals to very much be a part of the new digital work on religion. In the interest of brevity and because the Directory of Open Access Journals already collects this information, we have left them off the below list. For more information, visit [http://doaj.org/](http://doaj.org/).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14th Century Oxford Theology Online <a href="http://theology.unl.edu/">http://theology.unl.edu/</a></td>
<td>Digitization, Critical Curation</td>
<td>A project that seeks to digitize and encode the lesser-known works of medieval English philosopher John Wykliif as well as some of his contemporaries; built by faculty at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>Altafisr</em> <a href="http://www.altafsir.com/">http://www.altafsir.com/</a></td>
<td>Digitization, Critical Curation</td>
<td>A project commissioned by the Royal Aal al-Bayt Institute for Islamic Thought that seeks to digitize, encode, and make available commentaries on the Quran.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>America's Interfaith Infrastructure</em> <a href="http://pluralism.org/interfaith/">http://pluralism.org/interfaith/</a></td>
<td>Thick Mapping, Critical Curation, Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>A map of every known interfaith organization and center in America, along with reports on their activities and link to further resources; built by faculty and staff affiliated with Harvard University’s Pluralism Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>American Converts Database</em> <a href="http://americanconverts.org/">http://americanconverts.org/</a></td>
<td>Digitization, Critical Curation</td>
<td>A crowdsourced collection of conversion narratives in nineteenth century America, along with citation information and occasionally text of the testimony; built by two historians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC) Archive</em> <a href="http://archives.jdc.org/archives-search/?s=archivestopnav">http://archives.jdc.org/archives-search/?s=archivestopnav</a></td>
<td>Digitization</td>
<td>A project to digitize and make available the entire archive of the Joint Distribution Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>The Aramaic Language of the Zohar</em> <a href="http://aramaiczohar.wordpress.com/">http://aramaiczohar.wordpress.com/</a></td>
<td>Digitization, Scholarly Communication, Critical Curation</td>
<td>A project built by scholar Justin Jaron Lewis that collects resources on reading and analyzing key texts in Jewish mysticism in their original language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8   | *Art in the Christian Tradition* | Digitization, Critical Curation | An open database of art from the Christian tradition in the
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **9** | **Association of Religious Data Archives**  
[http://www.thearda.com/](http://www.thearda.com/) | Digitization, Data Visualization, Thick Mapping, Critical Curation | A collection of freely available polling and demographic data related to religion, as well as an association of scholars committed to making data on religion more open access. |
| **10** | **Belief Blog-CNN**  
[http://www.cnn.com/specials/belief](http://www.cnn.com/specials/belief) | Scholarly Communication | A CNN blog that explores the religious angles of the day’s major events from the blog’s editors and CNN’s contributors. Offers both opinion pieces and breaking news. |
| **11** | **Belief: A GlobalPost Blog**  
[http://www.globalpost.com/globalpost-blogs/belief](http://www.globalpost.com/globalpost-blogs/belief) | Scholarly Communication | A channel on the independent media site Global Post, this site showcases the work of the media company’s journalists as well as writers connected with the Post’s affiliated programs such as Ground Truth. |
| **12** | **Ben-Yehuda Project**  
[http://benyehuda.org/](http://benyehuda.org/) | Digitization, Critical Curation | A project devoted to the crowdsourced translation and transcription of Hebrew texts; built by scholars affiliated with the Computing Hebrew Literature association. |
| **13** | **Biblical Humanities**  
[http://biblicalhumanities.org/](http://biblicalhumanities.org/) | Scholarly Communication | Built by a network of Biblical studies scholars, this forum uses open source message board software to facilitate discussion about the application of digital humanities methods to biblical studies. |
| **14** | **Bishop Accountability**  
[http://www.bishop-accountbility.org/](http://www.bishop-accountbility.org/) | Digitization, Critical Curation | The web presence of the nonprofit organization devoted to holding the Catholic Church accountable for the abuse of its members, the site hosts sources and documents that shed light on incidents of abuse within the Church and efforts by the church to cover up that abuse. |
| **15** | **Braginsky Collection**  
| **16** | **Brick and Mortar: Pieces of Catholic Chicago**  
[http://catholic.las.uic.edu/catholic-studies/courses/cst-150](http://catholic.las.uic.edu/catholic-studies/courses/cst-150) | Critical Curation, Scholarly Communication | A digital exhibit built by students and scholars on Chicago’s Catholic history using sources from the archive of the University of Illinois at Chicago. |
| **17** | **British Evangelical Networks**  
[https://evangelicalnetworks.wordpress.com/](https://evangelicalnetworks.wordpress.com/) | Data Visualization, Scholarly Communication | A project that uses network visualization software to explore the social network of evangelical activists in England; built by historian Peter Webster. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Buddhist Studies.Net</td>
<td><a href="http://www.buddhiststudies.net/">http://www.buddhiststudies.net/</a></td>
<td>Critical Curation, Scholarly Communication, User Community</td>
<td>An open source wiki of resources, topics, and news related to the study of Buddhist history and culture; built by scholar Gregory Adam Scott.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Building Islam in Detroit</td>
<td><a href="http://biid.lsa.umich.edu/">http://biid.lsa.umich.edu/</a></td>
<td>Digitization, Critical Curation</td>
<td>An interdisciplinary research project devoted to documenting Detroit’s contemporary and historic Muslim communities; built by scholars and students at the University of Michigan-Dearborn’s Center for Arab American Studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Center for the Study of Material and Visual Cultures of Religion</td>
<td><a href="http://mavcor.yale.edu/">http://mavcor.yale.edu/</a></td>
<td>Scholarly Communication, Digitization, Critical Curation</td>
<td>The web presence of Yale University’s center of the same name, the site publishes new scholarship on the material and visual cultures of religious traditions and hosts a database of newly digitized material that supports the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Centropa</td>
<td><a href="http://www.centropa.org/?nID=1">http://www.centropa.org/?nID=1</a></td>
<td>Digitization, Critical Curation</td>
<td>Centropa is the web presence of the Hungarian historical institute of the same name that connects digitized photographs on the history of Jews in Central Europe to the audio of oral histories that explain them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>The Church in the Southern Black Community</td>
<td><a href="http://docsouth.unc.edu/church/">http://docsouth.unc.edu/church/</a></td>
<td>Critical Curation, Digitization, Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>A digital exhibit based on sources found in the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill's Documenting the American South digital archive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 27| Clergy of the Church of England Database                              | http://theclergydatabase.org.uk/            | Digitization, Data Visualization         | A searchable database of ministers affiliated with the Church of England in the early modern period; built by scholars from
|   | **Commandments**  
http://www.arthackday.net/projects/quin-kennedy-commandments | Digital Religion | A project of artist Quin Kennedy that prints out every tweets where someone uses the phrase “Thou Shalt.” |
|---|---|---|---|
| 29 | **Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project**  
http://call1.cn.huc.edu/index.html | Digitization | A searchable database of Aramaic terms; built by the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati. |
| 30 | **Coptic Scriptorium**  
http://www.copticscriptorium.org/ | Digitization, Critical Curation, Scholarly Communication | A forum and social network built by scholars and programmers at multiple American universities that facilitates the collaborative transcription, encoding, and analysis of Coptic texts. |
| 31 | **Cosmologies**  
| 32 | **Crowdmap the Crusade**  
http://dhcrowdscribe.com/crowdmap-the-crusades/ | Thick Mapping, Critical Curation, Digitization | A crowdsourced transcription projects that maps the place names referenced in a text on the First Crusade; built by a graduate student and a developer. |
| 33 | **Confucius: Images of the Temple of Culture**  
http://www.dhinitiative.org/projects/confucius | Thick Mapping, Data Visualization | A 3D, virtual reality recreation of an early temple to Confucius; built by faculty, students, and developers at Hamilton College. |
| 34 | **Culture on the Edge: Studies in Identity Formation**  
http://edge.ua.edu/ | Scholarly Communication | The blog of the religious studies department at the University of Alabama, which regularly features new work by faculty and students. |
| 35 | **Deily**  
https://www.deily.org/ | Scholarly Communication, Critical Curation | A for-profit digital start up that seeks to build a Wikipedia-like repository of sources, entries, and information about the world’s religious traditions. |
| 36 | **Database of Modern Chinese Buddhism**  
http://buddhistinformatics.ddbc.edu.tw/dmcb/Main_Page | Critical Curation, Scholarly Communication | An encyclopedia of events, people, topics and resources; collaboratively built by an international network of scholars and students using open source Wiki software. |
| 37 | **Die Damaszener Familienbibliothek Refaiya**  
http://www.refaiya.uni-leipzig.de/content/below/ | Digitization | A searchable database of the historic private library of a scholar of Islam; built by faculty and students at the University of Leipzig. |
| 38 | **Digibaeck**  
| 39 | Digital Atlas of American Religion  
http://www.religionatlas.org/ | Data Visualization, Thick Mapping, Critical Curation | Presents historic and contemporary demographic data on religious communities; built by the Polis Center at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis. |
| 40 | Digital Islam  
http://www.digitalsoislam.eu/ | Scholarly Communication, Digital Religion | Built by scholars at the University of Prague, the project collects and shares resources documenting Islam’s digital presence in modern Europe. |
| 41 | Digital Mishnah  
http://www.digitalmishnah.org/ | Digitization, Critical Curation | A critical digital edition of the Mishnah; built by faculty and staff at the University of Maryland’s Maryland Institute for Technology in the Humanities. |
| 42 | Digital Persian Archive  
http://www.asnad.org/en/ | Digitization | A database of scanned documents on the history of Iran and Central Asia; built by the Iranian Studies Division at the Centre of Near and Middle Eastern Studies, Philipps University in Marburg. |
| 43 | Directions in the Study of Religion  
| 44 | Dissenting Academies Online  
http://www.english.qmul.ac.uk/drwilliams/portal.html | Data Visualization, Digitization | A virtual recreation of the library catalogs at early modern dissenting academics in England; built by faculty and postdoctoral fellows at Dr. Williams Center for Dissenting Studies at Queen Mary College University of London. |
| 45 | Egypt in Turmoil  
http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/timeline-egypt-inturmoil0.html | Data Visualization, Scholarly Communication | A multimedia timeline built by *Al Jazeera America* on the uprising in Egypt. |
| 46 | Epigraphical Database  
http://steinheim-institut.de/cgi-bin/epidat | Digitization, Critical Curation | A database of files, text, and metadata Jewish epigraphy; built by the Steinheim Institute at the University of Duissburg-Essen. |
| 47 | Euro-Islam.info  
http://www.euro-islam.info/ | Critical Curation, Scholarly Communication | Built by CNRS France and Harvard University, this project critically curates Western media coverage of Islam in Europe and publishes informed commentary from scholars as well as resources about issues and topics. |
| 48 | European Holocaust Research Infrastructure  
http://www.ehri-project.eu/ | Critical Curation, Scholarly Communication | Built by a consortium of scholars and universities in Europe, this project gathers digital projects and resources to support |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 49| *Eye of Providence*  
| 50| *Feminism & Religion*  
[http://feminismandreligion.com/](http://feminismandreligion.com/) | Scholarly Communication | The blog of Claremont University’s Women’s Studies and Religion program that provides a platform for early ideas and works in progress.                                                                     |
| 51| *Fihrist*  
[http://www.fihrist.org.uk/](http://www.fihrist.org.uk/) | Digitization, Critical Curation | A collaborative project built by scholars and librarians from universities across the United Kingdom, this project seeks to bring together into a single database the records of every encoded Arabic text in England in order to facilitate scholarship. |
| 52| *First Impressions*  
| 53| *Free Press Bible*  
[http://freepressbible.net/](http://freepressbible.net/) | Digital Religion   | Built by developer David Janca, this art project seeks to crowdsource the creation of a contemporary scriptural canon by allowing users to submit and vote on scripture.                                           |
| 54| *French and Spanish Missions in North America*  
| 55| *freq.uenci.es: a collaborative genealogy of spirituality*  
[http://freq.uenci.es](http://freq.uenci.es) | Scholarly Communication | A collection of essays from scholars and journalists on the contours of spirituality in modern America; edited by two academics and hosted by the Social Science Research Council.                                 |
| 56| *Friedberg Genizah Project*  
[http://www.jewishmanuscripts.org/](http://www.jewishmanuscripts.org/) | Digitization, Critical Curation | A joint project between two Jewish manuscript societies in Toronto, the project brings six discreet manuscript sources into one database.                                                                       |
| 57| *God Mode: Art Hack Day 2013*  
[http://www.arthackday.net/events/god-mode](http://www.arthackday.net/events/god-mode) | Digital Religion   | A collaborative digital art installation built by participants of the 2013 Art Hack Day that explore the sacred power society ascribes to technology.                                                                  |
| 58| *God of Hands*  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 59 | God.js  
http://www.arthackday.net/projects/ivan-safrin-will-brand-ramsey-nasser-god-js | Digital Religion                      | An experimental web browser extension built by artists that interrogates the relationship between religious texts and computer code by allowing users to create religious rules for Internet usage.                        |
| 60 | Greek-Arabic New Testament Interlinear Project (GrArNTI)  
http://greekarabicnt.org/ | Digitization, Scholarly Communication | A blog and transcription project built by graduate students Kamal Abou Mikhael that hosts interlinear transcriptions of Greek and Arabic texts alongside tutorials and teaching resources.                |
| 61 | The Hand of God  
| 62 | Hijir-Gregorian Calendar Converter  
https://github.com/tillgrallert/xslt-calendar-conversion | Critical Infrastructure               | A computer program built by historian Trill Gallert that translates dates from the Islamic Hijri calendar into dates that fit within the Gregorian calendar.                                                        |
| 63 | Historical Jewish Press Project  
http://web.nli.org.il/sites/JPress/English/Pages/default.aspx | Digitization, Critical Curation       | A database of digitized Jewish newspapers; built by Tel Aviv University and the National Library of Israel.                                                                                                    |
| 64 | Houses of Worship  
https://housesofworship.umn.edu/ | Thick Mapping, Digitization, Data Visualization | Using archival sources and GIS software, this project maps the location of every church, synagogue, or mosque in the Minneapolis-Saint Paul area at the turn of the twentieth century; built by faculty and staff at the University of Minnesota. |
| 65 | How the Islamic State is Carving out a New Country  
| 66 | HuffPo Religion  
http://www.huffingtonpost.com/religion/ | Scholarly Communication               | A channel of the media company Huffington Post that features original reporting as well as commissioned and contributed commentary on contemporary religious issues.                                            |
| 67 | The Immanent Frame  
http://blogs.ssrc.org/tif/ | Scholarly Communication               | A blog of the Social Science Research Council’s Religion in Public Life Program, which is moderated by editors.                                                                                           |
| 68 | Index Thomisticus  
http://www.corpusthomisticum.org/it/index.age | Digitization, Critical Curation       | A searchable database of St. Thomas Aquinas’s encoded writings; built by Roberto Busa and maintained CAEL Society.                                                                                      |
<p>| 69 | Indian Converts Collection | Digitization, Critical Curation       | Built by faculty, staff, and students at Reed College, this project                                                                                                                                         |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Data Visualization</td>
<td>Data Visualization</td>
<td>maps the events referenced in a colonial text on Native American converts to Christianity, and it provides teacher resources for using the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Instagodit</td>
<td>Digital Religion</td>
<td>Built by a number of artists and hacktivists, this project automates the projection a user's Instagram photos alongside publicly available information about them as a way to interrogate the web’s omniscience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Isaac Mayer Wise Digital Archive</td>
<td>Digitization</td>
<td>The digital archives of the papers of Rabbi Isaac Mayer Wise; built by librarians and staff at the American Jewish Archives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>ISIS’s Road to Baghdad</td>
<td>Thick Mapping, Scholarly</td>
<td>A multimedia, spatial narrative of the ISIS’s movement through Iraq; built by the journal Foreign Policy using the StoryMap.js plugin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Islam For Reporters</td>
<td>Data Visualization, Critical</td>
<td>A project built by report Nausheen Hussain that provides basic information on Islam for reporters who cover the religion, and also collects information on instances of anti-Muslim violence throughout the US.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Islamic History Commons</td>
<td>Scholarly Communication,</td>
<td>Built by a senior scholar and a graduate student and hosted by the City University of New York, this social network allows individuals interested in medieval Islamic history to create profiles and share resources and ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Islamic Seals Database Project</td>
<td>Digitization, Critical</td>
<td>A database of recently digitized seals found on Islamic texts; built by staff at the Chester Beatty Library in Ireland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>IslamiCommentary</td>
<td>Scholarly Communication,</td>
<td>A forum built by faculty, students, and staff at Duke University and the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill that collects the media’s coverage of Islam and offers informed commentary on contemporary issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Islamopedia Online</td>
<td>Scholarly Communication,</td>
<td>A forum built by faculty, students, and staff at multiple universities that provides news and background analysis on contemporary issues in the Islamic world by building a comprehensive database of information on topics, figures, and places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Jesuit Libraries Project</td>
<td>Digitization, Data Visualization</td>
<td>A digital recreation of Loyola University, Chicago’s original library.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

60
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library/Project Name</th>
<th>Website/URL</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Atlantic World</td>
<td><a href="http://cdm.reed.edu/cdm4/jewishatlanticworld/">http://cdm.reed.edu/cdm4/jewishatlanticworld/</a></td>
<td>Digitization, Critical Curation, Data Visualization</td>
<td>A public archive of material collected by literary historian Lauren Liebman in the process of research, built with the help of students and staff at Reed College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews in America: Portal to American Jewish History</td>
<td><a href="http://www.jewsinamerica.org">www.jewsinamerica.org</a></td>
<td>Critical Curation</td>
<td>A curated database that searches other databases for sources on American Jewish history; built by a larger consortium of several institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Edwards Center</td>
<td><a href="http://edwards.yale.edu/">http://edwards.yale.edu/</a></td>
<td>Digitization, Critical Curation</td>
<td>The digitized archives of Jonathan Edwards that also facilitates the crowdsourced transcription of Edward's papers; built by Yale University's Jonathan Edwards Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judaica Europeana</td>
<td><a href="http://www.judaica-europeana.eu">http://www.judaica-europeana.eu</a></td>
<td>Critical Curation</td>
<td>An integrated database that facilitates access to digital collections held libraries and museums throughout Europe; built by the European Union in consultation with an international board of scholars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Latin Works of John Wycliff</td>
<td></td>
<td>Digitization</td>
<td>An encoded database of the major works of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://wyclif.library.fordham.edu/works/">http://wyclif.library.fordham.edu/works/</a></td>
<td>Critical Curation, Digitization, Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>philosopher John Wycliff; built by faculty and staff at Georgetown University.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Religious Archives Network</td>
<td><a href="http://www.lgbtran.org/">http://www.lgbtran.org/</a></td>
<td>Critical Curation, Digitization, Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>An integrated database providing access to archival sources related to the LGBT community’s religious history; built by the LGBT Religious Archives Network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Logarithms: Finding Meaning in Sermons</td>
<td><a href="http://disc.library.emory.edu/lincoln/">http://disc.library.emory.edu/lincoln/</a></td>
<td>Data Visualization</td>
<td>A project built by graduate students affiliated with Emory University’s Digital Scholarship Laboratory that text mines a digitized collection of eulogies on Abraham Lincoln.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening for Religion</td>
<td><a href="https://cfs.osu.edu/archives/collections/L4R">https://cfs.osu.edu/archives/collections/L4R</a></td>
<td>Digitization, Critical Curation</td>
<td>Built by Ohio State University religious studies scholar Isaac Weiner in collaboration with other university staff and students, this project records the religious soundscapes of Columbus, Ohio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locating Lutheranism: Nineteenth Century Norwegian-American Congregations in the United States</td>
<td><a href="http://locatinglutheranism.omeka.net/">http://locatinglutheranism.omeka.net/</a></td>
<td>Digitization, Critical Curation, Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>An online exhibit of digitized items related to Norwegian-American Lutheran churches in America; built by faculty, students, and staff at St. Olaf College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping Ararat: An Imaginary Jewish Homeland Project</td>
<td><a href="http://www.mappingararat.com/">http://www.mappingararat.com/</a></td>
<td>Thick Mapping, Digitization, Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>A digital art project that explores the alternative histories of a failed attempt to found a Jewish homeland in the US using geolocative technology; built by faculty, students, and staff at the University of Toronto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping Ottoman Damascus</td>
<td><a href="http://sitzextase.de/dh/mapping-ottoman-damascus/">http://sitzextase.de/dh/mapping-ottoman-damascus/</a></td>
<td>Thick Mapping, Data Visualization</td>
<td>Built by historian Trill Gallert, this project uses GIS software to map Islamic understanding of space in Damascus during the Ottoman Empire by placing historical sources and data on top of contemporary maps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginalia Review of Books</td>
<td><a href="http://marginalia.lareviewofbooks.org/">http://marginalia.lareviewofbooks.org/</a></td>
<td>Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>A channel of the Los Angeles Review of Books that while supported by the LARB is editorially independent. Marginalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Domain</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Materializing the Bible</td>
<td>Scholarly Communication, Digitization, Critical Curation</td>
<td>Built by anthropologist James Bielo along with students, this project documents and analyzes public presentations of scripture in American life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Messenger of God</td>
<td>Digital Religion</td>
<td>A digital art project that explores the omniscience of digital surveillance; built by artists Jonathan Dahan and Dan Moore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Network for New Media, Religion, and Digital Culture Studies</td>
<td>Scholarly Communication, Digital Religion, User Community</td>
<td>A social network for scholars and journalists interested in the impact digital media is having upon today’s religious communities; built by new media scholar Heidi Campbell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>New Books in Biblical Studies</td>
<td>Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>A podcast where scholars interview one another about their new books; affiliated with the New Books Network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>New Books in Buddhist Studies</td>
<td>Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>A podcast where scholar interview one another about their new books; affiliated with the New Books Network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>New Books in Christian Studies</td>
<td>Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>A podcast where scholars interview one another about their new books; affiliated with the New Books Network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>New Books in Islamic Studies</td>
<td>Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>A podcast where scholars interview one another about their new books; affiliated with the New Books Network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>New Books in Jewish Studies</td>
<td>Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>A podcast where scholars interview one another about their new books; affiliated with the New Books Network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>New Books in Religion.</td>
<td>Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>A podcast where scholars interview one another about their new books; affiliated with the New Books Network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>New Books in Secularism Studies</td>
<td>Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>A podcast where scholars interview one another about their new books; affiliated with the New Books Network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>New Books in Spiritual Practice and Mindfulness</td>
<td>Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>A podcast where scholar interview one another about their new books; affiliated with the New Books Network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>On Being</td>
<td>Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>The official site of the radio program by the same name, which also serves a platform for stories written or visual solicited by the editors or contributed by listeners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>On Common Ground</td>
<td>Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>A web-based version of the Harvard University Pluralism Project’s digital textbook on America’s religious diversity. This web version is fully updated with new multimedia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>On Faith</td>
<td>Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>The blog/web magazine of the tithing start up FaithStreet that uses the options and reporting published on the site to generate revenue and leads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Out of Many: Religious Pluralism in America</td>
<td>Digitization, Critical Curation</td>
<td>A collaboratively-built digital exhibit of sources, essays, and discussion questions that allow educators to integrate the study of America’s religious history into their classroom; built by staff at the Newberry Library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Patheos</td>
<td>Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>An online media company that also hosts a network of 450 blogs based around various religious topics and themes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Jewish Newspaper Project</td>
<td>Digitization</td>
<td>Built by staff at Carnegie Mellon University’s libraries, this project scans and encodes extant copies of Pittsburgh’s Jewish newspapers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Practical Matters</td>
<td>Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>A digital journal of Emory University’s Candler School of Theology that publishes both text and multimedia explorations of religious studies and theological reflection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Prosop</td>
<td>Critical Infrastructure</td>
<td>An open research tool built by historian Will Hanley at Florida State University that provides an open database of research topics that facilitates unforeseen connections between figures and ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Qumran Visualization Project</td>
<td>Thick Mapping, Data Visualization</td>
<td>A virtual recreation of the Qumran archaeological site; built by scholars at the University of California Los Angeles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Quranic Arabic Corpus</td>
<td>Digitization, Critical Curation</td>
<td>An annotated linguistic resource that shows the grammar, syntax, and linked morphology of every word in the Quran; built by scholars at the University of Leeds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Rabat Genizah Project</td>
<td>Digitization, Critical Curation</td>
<td>The transcribed, encoded, and digitized archive of material related to Morocco’s Jewish community; built by Oren Kosansky at Lewis and Clark College and maintained by a team of faculty and students at other institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Religion and Incarceration</td>
<td>Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>The official blog of the Religion and Incarceration working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Religion &amp; Politics</td>
<td>Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>A web magazine that features the work of scholars and journalists on contemporary and historical issues in American politics; published by the John C. Danforth Center on Religion and Politics and Washington University in St. Louis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Religion Dispatches</td>
<td>Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>An online magazine of religion, culture, and commentary founded at Emory University and now published by the University of Southern California’s Annenberg School of Journalism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Religion in Kansas Project</td>
<td>Digitization, Critical Curation, Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>A digital archive and sources and field work completed by faculty and students at the University of Kansas documenting religious communities in the state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Religion in North Carolina Digital Collection</td>
<td>Digitization, Critical Curation, Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>Overseen by Duke University’s libraries in partnership with libraries throughout North Carolina, this project digitizes archival material and facilitates access to extant digital sources through its database.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Religion News Service</td>
<td>Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>A digital media company owned by the Religion Newswriters Association that publishes original reporting and commentary through a network of blogs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Religion Watch</td>
<td>Critical Curation</td>
<td>&lt;ADD TEXT HERE&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>ReligionLink</td>
<td>Scholarly Communication, Critical Curation</td>
<td>Commissioned by the Religion Newswriters Association, this site collects resources and information today’s religious communities meant to aid journalists in their work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>The Religious Studies Project</td>
<td>Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>Launched by two graduate students, this project is now supported by the British Association for the Study of Religion and publishes a weekly podcast of interviews with scholars in the field, alongside original essays.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | Research on Religion  
http://www.researchonreligion.org/ | Scholarly Communication | This podcast is hosted political scientist Tony Gill and features interviews with scholars about their work. Baylor University’s Institute for the Study of Religion supports the podcast. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 66 | The Revealer  
http://therevealer.org/ | Scholarly Communication | A web magazine of original reporting and opinion pieces on religion in the world today; hosted at New York University’s Center for Religion and Media. |
| 70 | Reverberations: New Directions in the Study of Prayer  
http://forums.ssrc.org/ndsp/ | Scholarly Communication | A digital forum of original essays from scholars and journalists supported by the Social Science Research Council’s New Directions in the Study of Prayer initiative. |
| 74 | Revolution Decoded: Iran’s Digital Media Landscape  
http://smallmedia.org.uk/revolutiondecoded/ | Data Visualization, Scholarly Communication | A digital media project of Small Media and the Arab Media Report that collects a series of investigative reports, many of them using data visualization, to explore Iran’s digital culture. |
| 78 | Sacred Centers in India  
http://sci.dhinitiative.org/ | Digitization, Scholarly Communication | Built by a team at Hamilton College led by religious studies scholar Abhishek Amar, this project uses 3D modeling to reconstruct lost Buddhist and Hindu temples in India. |
| 82 | Sacred Matters  
https://scholarblogs.emory.edu/sacredmatters/ | Scholarly Communication | A web magazine hosted by Emory University’s Department of Religion that explores religious themes in culture. |
| 86 | Salem Witchcraft GIS Project  
http://salem.lib.virginia.edu/libsites/salem/index.html | Thick Mapping, Digitization, Critical Curation | An early digital project from the University of Virginia’s Institute for Advanced Technologies in the Humanities that encoded records from the Salem Witch Trials and mapped their location. |
| 90 | Sefaria  
http://www.sefaria.org/ | Digitization, Critical Curation | A platform built by a startup firm that crowdsources the transcription of key texts in the Rabbinical tradition. The site also supports the manipulation of these texts for analysis or study. |
| 94 | SeNeReKo  
http://senereko.ceres.rub.de/en/ | Digitization, Data Visualization, Scholarly Communication | A joint research project of the Center for Religious Studies at Ruhr University Bochum and the Trier Center for Digital Humanities, this project explores shared religious ideas by text mining digitized religious sources. |
| 98 | SHEBANQ: System for HEBrew Text: ANnotations for Queries and Markup  
http://shebanq.ancient-data.org/ | Digitization, Critical Infrastructure | Built by the Eep Talstra Centre for Bible and Computer in collaboration with the German and Netherlands Bible Society, this project designs structured query languages for adding |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Soul Pulse</td>
<td><a href="http://www.soulpulse.org/">http://www.soulpulse.org/</a></td>
<td>Critical Infrastructure, Digital Religion</td>
<td>A smartphone and tablet application built by pastors, scholars at multiple universities, and private developers that asks users to answer questions about their current spiritual state. The app supports a team of sociologists who analyze this data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>State of Formation</td>
<td><a href="http://www.stateofformation.org/">http://www.stateofformation.org/</a></td>
<td>Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>The blog of the <em>Journal of Inter-Religious Dialogue</em> which seeks to foster conversations on topics and from authors who might not submit to the journal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Studying Religion</td>
<td><a href="http://rel.as.ua.edu/studyingreligion.html">http://rel.as.ua.edu/studyingreligion.html</a></td>
<td>Scholarly Communication, Critical Curation</td>
<td>A website of introductory essays on theoretical terms and key approaches in the study of religion; built by faculty at the University of Alabama’s Department of Religious Studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Syriaca</td>
<td><a href="http://syriaca.org/">http://syriaca.org/</a></td>
<td>Critical Curation, Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>A collaborative project from an international team of scholars hosted at Vanderbilt and Princeton Universities, this project will publish digital reference works related the study of Syriac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Terms of Mt. Sinai</td>
<td><a href="http://www.arthackday.net/projects/ivan-safrin-terms-of-mt-sinai">http://www.arthackday.net/projects/ivan-safrin-terms-of-mt-sinai</a></td>
<td>Digital Religion</td>
<td>An art piece built by Ivan Safrin that explores the authoritative power of terms and conditions agreements by digitally reading out loud Facebook’s policies in a voice akin to God.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 151 | Transcultural Islam Research Network  
http://tirnscholars.org/ | Scholarly Communication, Critical Curation | A social network for journalists, scholars, and policymakers who engage with Islam in the modern world. |
| 152 | Unmasking the Arzeshi  
http://unmaskthezarzeshi.com/#home | Data Visualization, Scholarly Communication | A multimedia publication of investigative reporting built by the advocacy group Small Media that uses analytics to explore Iran’s conservative blogosphere. |
| 153 | Shoah Foundation Institute Visual History Archive Online  
http://vhaoonline.usc.edu/login.aspx | Digitization | The digital archive of the USC Shoah Foundation, committed to making audio-visual interviews with Holocaust survivors available online. |
| 154 | Virtual Paul’s Cross Project  
http://vpcp.chass.ncsu.edu/ | Thick Mapping, Data Visualization | A project that uses virtual reality technology to experience what it was like to hear a sermon in a church in 1622; built by scholars at North Carolina State University. |
| 155 | The Wandering Jew’s Chronicle  
http://wjc.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/ | Digitization, Critical Curation | A critical digital edition of an early modern historical ballad of the same name; built by Oxford University. |
| 156 | Who Were the Nuns? A Prosopographical Study of the English Convents in exile 1600-1800  
http://wwtn.history.qmul.ac.uk/ | Digitization, Critical Curation, Data Visualization | Hosted by Queen Mary University London, this project works with other institutions to build a database of women who entered English convents in the early modern period. |
| 157 | World Religions in Greater Boston  
http://pluralism.org/wrgb | Thick Mapping, Digitization, Scholarly Communication | A project built by students and faculty affiliated with Harvard University’s Pluralism Project that documents Boston’s religious diversity through essays placed on a map. |
| 158 | Writer’s Block: A Story of Censorship in Iran  
http://www.smallmedia.org.uk/writersblock/ | Scholarly Communication, Data Visualization | A multimedia piece of investigative reporting built by researchers and developers at Small Media that analyzes the history of censorship in Iran. |
| 159 | YIVO Encyclopedia of Jews in Eastern Europe  
| 160 | Zsinagógák: Magyarországon [Synagogues in Hungary]  
http://synagogues.hu/ | Digitization, Critical Curation, Thick Mapping | A project built by the Virtual Jewish Museum Association that seeks to build a virtual museum of Hungary’s historic synagogues by collecting, digitizing, mapping, and then making available historic and contemporary sources. |
Appendix III
Selected Bibliography

Interviews
Cantwell conducted the following interviews over the course of 2014. They were done either in person, over the phone, or through a preliminary questionnaire.

Michael J. Altman, University of Alabama
Edward J. Blum, San Diego State University
Kelly J. Baker, Freelance Writer
Heidi Campbell, Texas A&M University
Evan Derkacz, Religion Dispatches
Patton Dodd, On Faith / Faith Street
Emily Ford, Tulane University
Trent Gillis, On Being
R. Marie Griffith, Washington University St. Louis
Kali Handelman, The Revealer
Julie Poucher Harbin, Duke University
Louis Kaplan, University of Toronto
Laura Liebman, Reed College
Brett Lockspeiser, Sefaria.org
Kathryn Lofton, Yale University
Lincoln Mullen, George Mason University
Kristian Petersen, University of Nebraska-Omaha
Marshall Poe, New Books in Religion
Sally Promey, Yale University
Kyle Roberts, Loyola University Chicago
Melissa Schiff, University of Toronto
Carrie Schroeder, University of the Pacific
Liz Shayne, University of California-Santa Barbara
Tiffany Stanley, Religion & Politics
Krista Tippet, On Being
Isaac Weiner, Ohio State University
Brook Wilensky-Lanford, Killing the Buddha
Diane Winston, University of Southern California
Bradley Wright, University of Connecticut

Published Sources


Other Resources


Creative Commons. https://creativecommons.org/
MLA Commons Open Repository Exchange (MLA Core). https://commons.mla.org/core/
Roy Rosenzweig Center for History and New Media. https://chnm.gmu.edu/
The Humanities and Technology Camp (THATCamp). http://thatcamp.org/