



VIA
PANORAMICA

Revista de Estudos Anglo-Americanos
A Journal of Anglo-American Studies

TOWARDS THE MAELSTROM THE DIGITAL HUMANITIES IN ACTION

1ST CETAPS MEETING ON
DIGITAL HUMANITIES
DOSSIER

THEMATIC SECTION
EXTRA

The Digital Humanities: A Common Ground for Experimentation

Carlos Ceia, Fátima Vieira, Federico Boschetti, Nils Geißler, Joana Pinela,
Luciano Moreira, Raquel Souza, Hanna Pięta,
Liam Benison & Joel Ramos Faustino

LUCIANO MOREIRA: Good afternoon. Thank you all for being here. Some of us have been here for two days; some are here for the first time. Thank you for coming. Now, we have more representation of academia, which shows interest in Digital Humanities. Interestingly, we are in the English department because the English departments pioneered Digital Humanities.¹ And it's very hard to define what it is about. It's one of the most challenging things that we face in the field, precisely to say what it is about. Some people even question if we can define Digital Humanities or even attest to its existence.² We think we can define it as an approach, that's the way we see it. An approach where we are united by a set of values that we share, and those values create, in the end, a community that has shared interests.³ We can also say, as we dig for the next volume of VIA PANORAMICA,⁴ that it's quite a stormy place, to put it this way. A place that shakes things up. And I think that this roundtable will show a little bit how exciting the field is. So, without further delay, we would like to introduce you to the panel.

RAQUEL SOUZA: The first introduction is Professor Carlos Ceia. For those who don't know him, he is a Full Professor of English Studies at the Faculty of Human and Social Sciences, NOVA University of Lisbon, in Portugal. He is a member of the NOVA FCSH Council, and he currently holds The International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies Chair on Digital Humanities in Education. He is the director of the Centre for English, Translation and

Anglo-Portuguese Studies in Lisbon, where he coordinates the research area on Teacher Education and Applied Language Studies. And as well, we have Professor Fátima Vieira. For those who don't know her, she is Vice Director for Culture at the University of Porto. She is a full professor of English at the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, where she started teaching in 1986. She got her Doctoral degree with a thesis about William Morris and the British Utopian Literary tradition. She was the chair of the Utopian Studies Society in Europe from 2006 to 2016. She is the coordinator of the University of Porto's branch of CETAPS, where she is the leader of the Mapping Utopianisms research area and, of course, the leader of our Digital Lab.

LUCIANO MOREIRA: And with us, we also have two invited guests. Federico Boschetti holds a PhD in Classical Philology and a PhD in Brain and Cognitive Sciences. He is a researcher at the CNR, the Institute of Computational Linguistics, and a member of the Venice Research Center for Digital Humanities and Public Humanities. He coordinates the CoPhiLab and the CNR-ILC research unit hosted at the DPH at the Department of Humanities in Venice. He also co-leads the CLARIN knowledge center for Digital and Public Humanities and has taught Digital Humanities courses in Pisa and Venice. Also with us is Nils Geißler, who has studied Information Processing and Philosophy at the University of Cologne, with participation in an arts research master's program and has been working as a student research assistant at the CCeH, which stands for Cologne Center for eHumanities, and in various projects since 2014, including Pessoa Digital, which also includes the NOVA University Lisbon. Currently, he is working in specialized information service philosophy as a developer and in data domain editions in the consortium of Text+ of the national research data infrastructure. So, thank you all for being here and for these two exciting days of experience that we shared together. Our first question is precisely what led you to Digital Humanities and what makes your research center unique?

CARLOS CEIA: OK, shall I start? Thank you so much. Thank you for asking me the biggest question possible. CETAPS has been involved in Digital Humanities for some years now, especially because Professor Fátima started showing it all to us, persuading us to pursue this path. We are very happy that now it is something that we all know—those of us inside this

room—we all know that this is definitely our future, our next future, and our biggest investment is exactly in Digital Humanities because it is something to which we can all contribute from our expertise. We can add something to introduce new knowledge from our backgrounds. Since I started as a teacher many decades ago, I remember being a high school teacher when we first received a computer in my hometown. So, I've worked with computers since the beginning of my career, and I am not afraid of technological developments. However, the biggest issue in Digital Humanities is exactly what's going on right now. I'm not worried about people in this room; I'm worried about people who are not in this room and who have never entered a room full of people who work in this area. Right now, we are somehow divided. Those of us in the humanities believe this is already here, we have to do something about it, we have to learn how to use it in our daily academic routine. And there are all those people, all those colleagues and students who do not believe it, who think that this is a fashion, it's temporary, and somehow, they won't be touched by Digital Humanities; they will keep doing the same thing, using the same methods for the rest of their lives. So, this is, I believe, our biggest challenge: to persuade students, teachers, and researchers that Digital Humanities can help us do our job better and faster. At least these two adjectives, for me, are very important. To the best of my knowledge so far, that's what I've learned: I can do it better and faster. And another characteristic that I really like is that we do not have to do it alone. It makes no sense to do this alone. So, the old days of the lonely researcher in the library, to me, those days are over. And I really like this spirit of working together, always in an interdisciplinary mode, which I really like. We are always learning with colleagues, students, and researchers from other fields. We are never alone when we are working within Digital Humanities. We can learn from each other. And what I do these days is so different from what I've done ten or twenty years ago. Now I'm learning with my colleagues from the hard sciences. I teach in a PhD in Education where we have teachers from the Faculty of Sciences and Technology (NOVA FCT), experts in Mathematics and Sciences, and I have colleagues from Psychology (ISPA). So, we are always working together, and we are always trying to see what we can learn from each other using the most recent technologies and trying to help us change a little bit of what we usually do. Especially in academic writing and research as well. These two areas are changing so fast that I'm amazed every day... I'm teaching and learning at the

same time right now. That's why I just realized that I cannot cope with the daily advances of technology; I'm learning and teaching at the same time. That's why I tell my students: I'm teaching what I've just learned yesterday. So, that's basically my current status as a teacher. And I like it. It's a big challenge.

FÁTIMA VIEIRA: So, in my case, I would say that my curiosity for Digital Humanities was first sparked by a project which is called, I believe, Republic of Letters. When I was shown that you could look at Voltaire... So, the project is all about Voltaire. There's another one also about Rousseau. But I was shown the results of that project concerning Voltaire. So, you could see Voltaire, during all his life, sent out letters and received letters from people from, I don't know, how many... Well, from three continents, I believe. And so, of course, if I am a specialist, for instance, in Voltaire, I will never ever be able to read all the letters. Well, I may be able to read the letters that he wrote and that he sent out to the other people. But what the project did was to show, well, Voltaire sent this letter to the United States and that person sent out, spread the ideas, Voltaire's ideas, by sending out the letters to other people. Or perhaps some of the ideas that we think that were Voltaire's, in fact, they came from other people. And in fact, when I was shown this network of collaboration, I realized that the Digital Humanities or Computing Humanities, which was its first label, was more than what we were doing at CETAPS, because we have many archives, but which were just used as archives. Then I realized, well, this is all about collaboration, because you need people from other disciplines, and you need many people doing the same thing. So, it's all about collaboration. And it's all about research, new research methods, and all about having the sort of information that opens up new avenues by offering us information that makes us formulate other questions. So why do I think that the work that we are doing here at CETAPS is unique? It's because after we realized that, we started a Digital Lab. Jacqueline Pierazzo, it's a pity that she's not here, but she was fundamental, she was then starting her PhD, and it was also in Digital Humanities, so the amount of information that she brought was impressive, also for our meetings. And then Joana Caetano, she used Digital Humanities. Of course, Luciano Moreira, I mentioned his name several times, was crucial. Why do I believe we are unique, at least as regards to the other centres that I know? It's because we are really offering training, we are providing training

to young researchers. And this morning, we had presentations by our JRAAS - Junior Researchers in Anglo-American Studies. We're talking about six students that are now in their second year of their Master's, and after six months of training, it's really impressive the amount of intuition, I would say, that they already have. Joel was sitting next to me, and I was asking him, what do I have to do? And, of course, for him, it was already natural and intuitive, and this is important. I would say we are unique also because we are discussing important topics, and I would just take two. The first is, what sort of training do we need to provide our students if we want them to be the next generation of Digital Humanists? We discussed that yesterday, and I believe that we all agreed that they still need to have, at least I would say, at BA and MA level, training in the Humanities, in our case, in Anglo-American Studies, and then we'll just have six months, a year, two semesters, three semesters, for instance, of Computing Sciences, or perhaps Brain and Cognitive Science, because that's your training as well. Will it be enough so that we can have the future humanists trained? And the second has to do with public humanities. CETAPS is now preparing an MA in Public Humanities, and this will for sure be the future. So, what sort of training do we have to provide our students with, so that they can also work in that field as well? For the moment... What I have to say is that I'm excited, and for me, I really felt that I needed something new. I have to say that I always feel that I learn much more when I attend conferences, when speakers are from geography, I'm sure that everyone feels the same... When I there is a philosopher speaking, a geographer, or even a biologist, I attend, and I learn so much. So now I'm really excited because this is completely unknown territory for me, and it's like starting again.

CARLOS CEIA: Yeah, all the time, every day.

FEDERICO BOSCHETTI: From my point of view, the term *Digital Humanities* is somewhat misleading because it detracts from the essential emphasis on collaboration and cooperation, which I believe are the most significant aspects of the field. Let me clarify: while collaboration can occur in a traditional context, cooperation in its truest sense is challenging to achieve without the support of a digital infrastructure. These terms—*collaboration* and *cooperation*—are borrowed from pedagogical studies, where collaboration typically refers to the

organization of a group working toward a unified, monolithic goal. Cooperation, on the other hand, involves dividing a project into subtasks that can be tackled independently, with the results recombined in novel ways, often exceeding the original intentions of the creators. This ability to produce something that serves third-party needs is crucial for ensuring the scalability of projects. In this framework, digital infrastructures enable researchers to address questions spanning multiple levels—micro, meso, and macro. For example, a new methodology can be tested not only on isolated samples but also applied to entire archives or corpora. This scalability aligns closely with FAIR data principles—findability, accessibility, interoperability, and reusability—where interoperability, in particular, has deep implications. It not only enhances the preservation and conservation of digital artefacts but also significantly advances the scientific paradigm itself, fostering new possibilities for research and discovery.

NILS GEIBLER: I think the Digital Humanities is a chance, a place to come together for different humanities disciplines to work on common standards, maybe, in the digital part, to not work on standards each, or inform each discipline on its own, but work together on standards, so you don't have to do things again and again. And also, if you just... (pulling a smartphone out of his pocket and holding it up) I mean, USB-C is really a nice thing, because before that you had a lot of different cables to power your cell phone, and now you just have a USB-C cable. There's Apple still, but you can use USB-C and some of those cables are only for powering devices, and some are also for transferring data. So, we can use common standards in different fields and come together and discuss those standards and what is needed for certain things. In Linked Open Data, if we speak about a person, what is essential for a person, what birth date, death date, what I just showed you yesterday. For me, it's quite essential if we talk about a historical person, because if we want to know if we are talking about the same person, then we can just look at when that person lived, and we have a good measure to disambiguate if we are talking about the same person. So, if we only talk about names, we have a lot of names that are the same, but if we have a certain identifier and we add some more data, some more context, we know what we are talking about. And then, this means if we use the same standards, we can be more sure and exchange data faster and more... What is the other term? Faster and better. So, we can all use that.

LUCIANO MOREIRA: Thank you. We go now to a second round of presentations. I'm Luciano Moreira, I should have said that at the beginning, for those who don't know me. Between us, we also have Raquel Souza, who is with me, co-moderating this roundtable, and we have Joana Pinela. Joana Pinela is also in this panel because she is a member of JRAAS. JRAAS stands for our Junior Researchers in Anglo-American Studies. Her voice is, in a way, the voice of the group. So, it's precisely to Joana that I would like to ask a question. So, Sophia de Mello Breyner, we went yesterday to the Botanic Garden. She has a beautiful poem where she says "*Navegavam sem o mapa que faziam*" - they sailed without the map they were making. I would like to ask Joana, how many times did you feel lost?

JOANA PINELA: Quite a few. I have to be honest, when I was going into Digital Humanities, my curiosity and my interest started as a matter of opportunity. I didn't really know anything about Digital Humanities. So, right from the start, I was lost. I just saw the proposal and the call for the scholarships. And even though I didn't know anything about the area, it was for my Master's, because I'm an Anglo-American Master's student, so, I went for it lost, sort of. I've always thought of myself as a sort of the preconceived, stereotypical notion of a humanities student: doesn't like numbers, can't work numbers, let alone code or even organize events. I've never done anything like this. So, doing this has been somewhat challenging, because it does seem like we have so many new things coming at us that sometimes it is intimidating to work through them, but we are a team. And so, it does help to navigate those things together. In fact, in our newsletter last month, the editorial was precisely about this. I used the Moby Dick quote: "I try everything, I achieve what I can".⁵ And that is precisely what we do here. Even though sometimes it feels intimidating and daunting, we try.

RAQUEL SOUZA: As you can see, we are all involved in Digital Humanities in a certain way, but based on the workshops you conducted here and the brief description you gave about your research centers, I would like to ask you how the Digital Humanities take part in your own research and your practice, because I can see, each one of you, has a very different approach on the Digital Humanities.

CARLOS CEIA: Ok, I can start. At the beginning of this century, I tried to publish a dictionary of literary terms. It started initially with some dozen entries. I contacted a publisher in Lisbon, and as the dictionary grew larger and larger, he told me, "Well, this will be very expensive; we give up, we won't publish the dictionary". We don't have many editions of literary terms in Portuguese. We have two, totally out of date. The idea was that I needed to update this dictionary in several editions because Literary Studies are not static; they are evolving all the time, and we need to have new terms all the time. I didn't persuade the publisher to publish the book. Ok, you don't want to publish it, my response was: I will make it online, with free access for everyone, and I can update it anytime I want. It will be available for free for everyone in the Portuguese-speaking world. Today, it has more than 20 million visits, many from Brazil. It's open access, with 1,500 entries so far, more than 180 collaborators from Portugal and Brazil, and it is not finished. I will finish one day, maybe when I'm retired, but one of the good things is the fact that it is a triumph of Digital Humanities, even before I knew that I was doing something for Digital Humanities or reading about Digital Humanities. But it's a good example of what the future holds, in the first place. It is open access, which is great; nobody has to buy this dictionary. I know it's used in all schools; I keep being informed that everyone around this country and in Brazil is using it, which is good. It's free, and I can update it at any time. Any reader, any user, can leave a comment and help improve any entry, so it's not just a book of one publisher or one editor; it's a book of all writers and all readers, which is how I conceive of a dictionary. If your dictionary wants to be updated all the time, it has to include the reader's opinion, when it's a good one. I've received a lot of spam as well; you've got the spam, you've got the good comments, and I feel that the readers are part of the dictionary. It's not just my dictionary; it's everyone's dictionary, and everyone is using it, which is what we want. So, this is just a practical example of something that is collaborative work in Digital Humanities; it's always updated, it's free, and anyone can collaborate. I've been asking my students over the years to write new entries. Right now, I've got a scholarship for one of our master's students; he's helping me reorganize it and write a couple more entries. So, it's the work of a lifetime. I haven't made any money from it, which is a good thing because it does not belong to me; it's

true public service. So, this is one practical example I can provide that proves that Digital Humanities changes the whole game.

FÁTIMA VIEIRA: Well, my first experience was with the Portuguese vegetarians, so we had this project which was funded by FCT, on food utopias actually, and we studied a journal, which was published here in Porto, from 1909 to 1935, that is for 36 years. We had a team, and we described – but we did not use AI, of course, because we were not familiar with the AI tools then –, we fully described every article, every letter, because there were letters also being published in the journal, and every image, and we constructed an Excel. And this is the sort of raw data that we in the humanities just keep for ourselves. So, if you ask me, could you please write a paper on what sort of recipes vegetarian women would publish in that journal? It will be very easy for me, because I go to my Excel, and I just use that information. And then, actually, someone from the Faculty of Engineering paid me a visit, and he told me about raw data, and about this project that has raw data shared with everyone, and then I said, well, this means that anyone can use it, and this is a product of very much effort. But then, finally, we decided, yes, we want to share the data. And so we did it, and there's a master's thesis that has just been published and its author resorted to this data. So, this was the first thing. The second thing we did for the same project has to do with citizen science. We thought that perhaps we could have a citizen science project by inviting people to share the readings that they had of utopias, they would have to read literary utopias and insert into the database information about those texts, and answer a few questions. Where do people have their meals? Where do people live? Do they have meals together, or do they have meals at home? What sort of food do they have? And so, we invited people, and we had, I don't know how many entries we have now, but we had quite a few entries. And so, for instance, if I want to see, to know, how many vegetarian communities we have in literary utopias, I can go to the database and get an accurate answer. And that was the first proof that it really worked. My experience also went through the supervision of Jacqueline's thesis and also Joana's thesis. I learned a lot from them. And now I'd just like to say that I'm really interested in social reading. So, this idea, I have already told Luciano what I would like to do, what I really want to do is experiment with publishing a text, and then invite people to make comments so that they can read other

people's comments and see what comes out of it. So, we'll see, we'll try to use utopia, of course, because that's my field.

FEDERICO BOSCHETTI: I work at the CNR-ILC and I collaborate extensively with universities, particularly with scholars whose research centers on intertextuality. When working in the realm of intertextuality, the first requirement is to have corpora — consistent corpora that can, in turn, comprise multiple sub-corpora. The consistency of corpora —where identical phenomena are described in a uniform manner and distinct phenomena are distinctly categorized — is a crucial factor in enhancing research methodologies. This consistency facilitates a shift of paradigm from merely selecting individual samples to support a specific theoretic position, often from a rhetorical standpoint, to a broader and more comprehensive study of phenomena within their full context. By examining phenomena holistically, researchers can move beyond isolated examples to uncover patterns and relationships that provide a more nuanced and robust understanding of their subject matter. From this perspective, a rigorous scientific approach involves systematically identifying phenomena and evaluating them using metrics such as counting false positives, false negatives, true positives, and true negatives. Researchers cannot simply identify a phenomenon and illustrate it with a few prominent examples; instead, they must provide a systematic account, such as demonstrating that five cases support one direction while 25 cases might point to alternative interpretations. This systematic approach requires establishing frameworks — or systems — for organizing and analyzing digital resources, which is why interoperability becomes crucial. Interoperability facilitates connections between literary and linguistic resources and enables their integration into digital analysis tools. As we saw during the workshop, linguistic analysis of data requires robust infrastructures: training sets, linguistic resources, annotated corpora, and so forth. Another critical topic is the annotation process itself, which involves the creation of descriptors by scholars. It is important to emphasize that researchers should not be constrained by existing standards, as scholarly inquiry must often move beyond predefined frameworks. Standards, while essential at both the starting and concluding stages of a project, should not limit the process of discovery and exploration in the middle. This presents a key challenge: researchers must delineate boundaries while simultaneously innovating beyond

conventional cognitive schemes. Standardization, particularly of input data, remains indispensable. However, researchers should actively contribute to shaping the standardization process to ensure that their specific needs are recognized and incorporated into broader community practices. For example, within CLARIN, we are currently advocating for the specific requirements of philologists to be acknowledged and integrated into the broader framework used by linguists. Standards cannot remain static; they must accommodate residual or evolving aspects that can be formalized and standardized in subsequent stages. This iterative approach ensures that standards remain dynamic and responsive to the needs of the research community.

NILS GEIBLER: And you will always have someone or need somebody who is going to translate into those standards, right? And have some common place where everyone meets. For me, I have that example from my BA thesis. I made a model of some sort of a pet project that gathered dust in the last few years. It was a model of martial arts and how to practice martial arts, how it is practiced. So, it's immaterial, and it's intangible, but it's some sort of cultural object. A cultural practice. And I tried to model it and use that model to annotate videos of people doing martial arts. And I created a small database, a graph database, in RDF. Using CIDOC CRM. I had that running on my institute's server running. The way I showed you yesterday, using SPARQL, I could query the stuff and get things out again. So, this was working but at some time the server was shut off because it wasn't used anymore and there were no other projects in that area of that certain use case. But I still had the data in my online repository, GitHub, you might know that. And now, I was quite alone with that because there are very few people looking at it from that perspective: martial arts as a cultural practice. But now I met a guy who is doing some very similar stuff for Kung Fu. Kung Fu is more well known and it has a lot more different techniques. Anyway, I was now able to just take my RDF data and just give it to him. And now we can do stuff with it, and we can just reuse it, and for me, it's a great example of how using such standards is effective. We can reuse it and just pull it out again and do things with it.

RAQUEL SOUZA: Now this is to Joana. Can you explain what we do, representing all the JRAAS and our relation with Digital Humanities?

JOANA PINELA: One of the very first projects that I worked on was *O Vegetariano*. I worked on the database that you mentioned, and most recently, I created a database with a compiled list of names from all the subscribers. There were 1027 and the goal was to be able to retrieve as much information as possible.⁶ So birth date, death date, the place where they were at the time of the subscription, the country, of course, and also the occupation. I wouldn't have been able to create the database if I hadn't already had the information that the team from the Foodways Project curated. Because we are talking about people born in the early 19th century, so retrieving this information is very difficult, and I already had a difficult time finding more information, but it would have been a lot harder if I didn't have some of their occupations for example. If I didn't know someone was a doctor, I wouldn't have been able to know whether or not it was them, so that was really helpful. The database is now also available on the repository. Most of what we do is we create databases so we make them as complete as possible, we keep working on them, and then we put them in an open access platform where people can go and check the information as much as they like. With this database, I also created a map, which is still a work in progress, and it should be available soon on the new Alimentopia website⁷ that the team has developed, which will act as an archive where you will be able to access the map. It's what we have been working on and it's been very fulfilling to do that.

LUCIANO MOREIRA: Thank you. There is a comment that I would like to make about what Federico said about the standards because it reminds me of what Latour said about the science of metrology, the science of measurement, and he says it's the last of the sciences so we work always ahead and we rely on it to move and to push research further, so we depend on standards in a way to challenge the standards to make the standards evolve.⁸ That's quite fascinating. It puts us in this idea of what is our direction. I remember a quote by Henry David Thoreau, I think, in *Walden*, and he puts there a question that always puzzled me, and I think

that it's quite a good question to put to the panel. He says we have now railroads, I'm quoting by heart, so it's not exactly like this, but he says we now have railroads that take us to Tennessee. The question is who among us wants to go to Tennessee? We now have wires that put us in contact with London but what do we have to say to London? So, no matter what the direction is, why do we want to run this path? What pushes us?

CARLOS CEIA: That's a good question. I feel the same way when I see how AI is evolving and how it can be applied to Literary Studies and educational studies in the many areas I work with. I'm always thinking, what can I do with this? Now that I know these tools, how can I use them? Why are they changing my own practices within these two main fields? I think we will find answers. We will find that we can do new things with the tools that AI is offering us right now. Here are two examples. One of the improvements we have made in Literary Studies is the creation of web pages for authors. Take a look at, for instance, the official web page for Charles Dickens or James Joyce. It's amazing the kind of extensive information we have access to now that we didn't have 20, 30, or 50 years ago. Now, we have their whole lives available for everyone to research, explore, and read their works. These web pages are not just for classical writers; they are for any writer. The work done with Pessoa, for instance, with Pessoa Digital, is amazing. For major writers, at least, we have access to their entire written and published works and more. This is something that we, within Literary Studies, can take immense advantage of, allowing us to do new things with the accessible information. In the past, I had to travel extensively just to check a couple of documents, but now we have digital libraries available to us; we just need a computer. This kind of information is absolutely amazing for those of us working in Literary Studies and is changing our practices. Now, let me talk about education. We are changing everything again. Maybe sometimes we are not using the best practices, but we are trying to change our educational practices using digital resources. There is a big project that our government, not exactly this government but the previous one, started. It's called RED in Portuguese, which stands for Recursos Educacionais Digitais (Digital Educational Resources). This project is funded by the European Commission for all countries in Europe, and the resources they are producing are amazing. We are helping the Ministry of Education to produce these resources. The point is that we have this responsibility to produce

new digital resources for all schools, private and public, for all students. It doesn't matter if they have a computer or not, or if they have good or bad internet access; we are producing educational resources for all disciplines, not just for the humanities. This is a new responsibility from our point of view, so we must be aware of this. We must participate and collaborate because this is a new world. The issue is that our public schools, at least, are not using these resources. They are available to all, but they are not being used. There might be some prejudice here, some bias there. They don't believe this is the new world. They might say, "I don't have good internet access," but you can use it. Ask your students to check on their phones or at home, wherever they can, but use it. We have produced the digital resources, but they are not being used as we would like. I've seen beautiful things done for all disciplines, especially within our Portuguese and English disciplines. I was a counsellor for one of them, and it was an amazing start. We at the university are working with publishers because we have to engage with them as well. They are following this path. Right now, we have at least two very big platforms, Escola Virtual and Aula Digital, offering lots of very good digital resources for all teachers and students to use. The next step is persuading all teachers to use these digital resources in primary and secondary schools. Hopefully, this will improve because the resources are already there. We've been producing for publishers, but the digital resources are already there. So, if our teachers want to use them, they cannot complain. There are so many things available right now. There are no excuses not to use digital resources. They are not meant to substitute teachers; they are meant to complement what they are doing. Some colleagues think this is a threat to their teaching, but it is not. A good video presentation of any difficult, complex content can always be a great help for any teacher. Fortunately, we have lots of digital resources available right now. Now we have to persuade our colleagues to use them and create good conditions in schools. They need good internet access. They already have their computers. As you know, every single student in Portugal has a computer. Every single teacher in Portugal has a computer, provided by the state. Some of them are not very good, but it doesn't matter. They have computers, they have the internet. There are no excuses for not introducing digital education alongside formal education. Let's see what happens.

FÁTIMA VIEIRA: I tried to list all the things that were mentioned, or most of the things that

were mentioned over these days. So, I'm talking about approaches or Digital Humanities approaches, sentiment analysis, network analysis, spatial analysis, digital mapping, data visualization, social reading, digital preservation, authorship, and attribution. These already point out so many new avenues of research that, of course, I would say that this is why I'm so excited about it. But Carlos mentioned that people feel threatened by the digital. It is true, some people are. But what we have to remind them is that we are still, first and foremost, scholars of humanities. So, we have to make people understand that the sort of work and the sort of questions that we are formulating, although we may now be resorting to different methodologies and approaches, are still pertinent to our human condition. They are still the same sort of interrogations about our world. And this is the message that we really need to convey. We have to say this is not a threat. No, you are going to know more. But, of course, what I also believe is that we do need to foster discussion on the subject, not only within CETAPS, but also with colleagues from other areas, those who work mostly in the humanities – and also social sciences, but I would say that the problem is mostly with the humanities. We need this sort of discussion to be fostered so that people do not feel threatened, I would say. But I must confess I forgot the question you asked me.

LUCIANO MOREIRA: What drives you?

FÁTIMA VIEIRA: So what drives me is really all the things that were mentioned here, and I was so excited yesterday and today, this morning, and of course what drives me is, for instance, what happened today with the JRAAS, when I saw you all talking already like that – and of course I know that you are standing for your colleagues, so it's the same – when I saw you, I thought that you are already talking as a digital humanist. And this is what really drives me as well.

FEDERICO BOSCHETTI: At the beginning, you raised an important question: while we may have the means to reach Tennessee, why should we go there? I believe this question is crucial for understanding the relationship between Digital Humanities and Public Humanities. We might consider Digital Humanities as the humanities *in potentia*, whereas Public Humanities

can be seen as the humanities *in actu*, borrowing these concepts directly from an Aristotelian-Thomistic framework. When we create corpora, we often treat them as treasures, carefully assembled and stored as though they are safeguarded for posterity. However, history has shown us examples where such treasures were lost — take the case of ancient literary works that were preserved in secondary collections but ultimately forgotten because no one engaged with them. This raises a critical issue: instead of merely preserving resources created in Digital Humanities, we need to ensure their active use. Not all resources will be used exhaustively, but they should be leveraged to create purpose-driven applications and foster networks of interest. This, I believe, is the central role of public humanists: to promote and facilitate the meaningful use of digital resources, transforming their potential into active contributions to society and scholarship.

NILS GEIBLER: In two parts what drives me is, first, it's quite simple. I really like to look into different projects. In Digital Humanities, if you work on projects, you always have insights into new projects and new research, and it's always like a visit to a museum. For me, personally, it's really nice to see something and get it from the experts. And the other part is, I like structuring things and giving structure to things, and it's maybe, in a way, being lazy, so after you structure things, you can use that structure. Yeah, I'm still advocating for the standard things and stuff. So, you are able to, I mean, why do we have that road to Tennessee? We can now send an autonomously driving car down that road, and let it fetch something for us. And if we have the numbers of houses, the addresses, we can send it to a certain address and so on, and things come together, kind of, and we can use what we have structured before. And this is really nice.

JOANA PINELA: Talking about education, earlier this year, our team conducted a workshop with students from the seventh grade to the twelfth grade, and for that workshop, we used digital tools, so they were to use their phones, they filled out Google forms, and they were receptive to it, the teacher was receptive to it. Later on, we wrote a paper on this activity, and based on Doctor Luciano's research, we also know that teachers in Portugal are not trained enough in digital tools.⁹ So it's not just a matter of persuading them – because they're not

trained, they fear it. And because they don't understand it, there's a fear that it may substitute their work. And there's also a sort of misunderstanding of the students themselves because teachers think of students as phone and internet-addled, and they're not. They used their phones, but it didn't overrun the workshop; they didn't go on social media during the workshop; they did use their phones, and they used digital media, but they were restricted, and it worked really well. So that was one of the experiences that we had that was really exciting for us, and we had a lot of fun. We had a lot of fun writing the paper, which we already presented at a conference. It's going to be published later this year, and it was one of those experiences that really told us that going forward, Digital Humanities can be really incredible in terms of improvement.

RAQUEL SOUZA: Professor Carlos Ceia said something very interesting, that for many people, Digital Humanities is just fashion. It's going to be something that's going to disappear. I would like to know, in your opinion, how Digital Humanities is going to evolve and how these new researchers, like Joana and I, can help with this evolution. Because I believe each of you has new researchers, as we have JRAAS at CETAPS, or maybe you also have goals for the new generations of researchers to learn Digital Humanities. So, how do you think this combination can evolve with Digital Humanities?

CARLOS CEIA: That's a huge question. I cannot see the future, but I can see that the present is sometimes frightening because of the things we've just witnessed. We've just launched a preview of the new language model by OpenAI, which is a thousand times more powerful than ChatGPT. I've been trying this out, even with my students, and it's amazing. I thought it wouldn't be able to understand what we do, but I recently had an experience in class with my future teachers. I gathered all of them in an auditorium for teacher training and demonstrated this technology. It's not available on the internet right now; you must buy a bundle, like monica.im or you.com. These are the two that I know. I bought monica.im, which is absolutely incredible. It costs just nine dollars a month, so it's perfect. It includes ChatGPT-4o, Claude 3.5 Sonnet V2, Gemini 1.5 pro, DALL-E 3, Llama 3.1 405B, and access to o-1-preview, the most advanced language model invented by humankind so far. It's absolutely crazy what it can

do. This is both frightening and exciting at the same time due to its capabilities. From now on, I told my students, let's see what it can do. I asked this new model to do something that I was certain it couldn't understand. I asked it to prepare the organization of a report for our teaching practicum, which is unique to Portuguese education. We are the only ones who have this kind of practicum report. So, I asked it to create this type of report for our teaching practice, with a structure that is very restricted and rigid in our educational environment. To my surprise, it built the most perfect structure I've ever seen for a practicum report. I've never seen anything so complete and sound. One of the students, a future philosophy teacher, asked, "What am I doing here?" while we were sitting for a course on methodology. That's the right question. I told them they are here because they are human, and we need them to work from their own words. These developments in AI put us all at a new starting point. I have to change the way I begin my research, my teaching, and my assessment techniques. I cannot start by telling them to pair a good index with an introduction and a review, as we know for a scientific report, because they can all do this perfectly now. This is the new starting point. Now, they must have their own point of view. They cannot simply repeat the same thing, or we will all be producing identical reports. The human factor will make the difference from now on, and that will be more relevant than ever. We have to start working much further ahead than where we used to start with our students, colleagues, and even our research. We can conduct research faster and find things more easily, but we should not trust 100% of what we get. There are still many mistakes, even with this super new language model. For example, I asked it for information about one of Gil Vicente's plays, and it invented new characters and details that are not part of the real plays. So, don't trust any language model completely, no matter how powerful it is. However, you can start much further ahead than before. The human factor, the human reading, and the organization of information will never be lost. We don't have to feel threatened because the human factor—our thinking, creativity, human touch, and emotion—will always be needed. Emotion is important for academic writing as well, as long as you don't overuse adjectives and subjectivity. You will have to find your own voice more than ever because finding a personal start for academic writing will be the next challenge. We all need to find our own voice when writing academic papers because AI can do it for us, and it can do

it in the same style for everyone. Finding your own voice in academic writing is the next big challenge, as that's what differentiates us, humans, from text generated by computers.

FÁTIMA VIEIRA: As a research centre, what we have to do is to offer research infrastructure to our members. And this is what I believe that we should go on doing. All sorts of research tools, including digital tools, of course. So, I would say that in the future, the way I see it, we need to go on training better digital humanists, always with this idea in mind that we are training people with a solid humanities background, in English and American studies, who learn how to use tools. And I do believe that we'll be training people that will have jobs, because we know there are many reports on the jobs of the future. And at first, we thought that the jobs that will be extinct would be manual jobs. Now we know that manual jobs will go on, but there are many technical jobs that are going to disappear. For instance, we already know that some courts in the United States do not have lawyers anymore. They have already replaced, or they are making experiments, by replacing lawyers with AI. They just ask AI to analyse, for instance, a situation and to see if there are any precedents or similar previous situations. And then they just try to solve it by referring to previous cases. The same with engineers. One of these days I attended a meeting with engineers and architects. AI, in ten years, will be able to give us a plan for a new building.

CARLOS CEIA: And learn a new profession, “prompter engineering”. This will be the future.

FÁTIMA VIEIRA: Yeah, someone who knows how to give the prompts, the prompts we'll need to be given, we still need prompter in the future. That's what I was going to say. We still need people to give the prompts. Because, of course, AI is not creative, as you were saying, just to put different points together, different dots together. The human being is still the one who is really able to be creative. And, of course, we need critical thinking. AI, I believe, will never be able to have critical thinking. So, I would say that by training digital humanists, we'll be training people who will have jobs, I hope.

Nils Geißler: I would ask the question, what is the difference between prompting and “prompting a book”, or books, or a library? So, checking books, doing your research, and so on and so on. Where's the big difference in that? I mean, yeah, it's obvious what the difference is, but in some way, it's still a method to go into a library, get answers, and get data input, and then can be processed. Yeah, AI may process that already, and give us some text, but we still have to validate that right now and do something with that.

FÁTIMA VIEIRA: Can I just say something about these prompts? We had Mark Amerika, I don't know if you attended his session, we had Mark Amerika here, I don't know, last year, at Casa Comum Reitoria, and he was here and he was selling his book. And this book had been entirely written by AI, and then he said: “Well, it has not been written by AI, it was by me, because I gave the prompts.” It cost about \$40, something like that. And then he said: “I'm just delighted now, because I discovered Pessoa and the *Book of Disquiet*. So, my next project will be to write a book in Pessoa style, sort of imitating the *Book of Disquiet*.” And I said: “But this is not you, so who's going to have the copyright? And he said: “No, it's me.” Even the prompt thing raises this issue: who has the copyright of a book? Is it just because I give a prompt, like I say, well, could you please write a story about something, in someone's style – can I say that I'm the author? So also, the question of authorship is very important. One of these days I made an experiment. I have a subscription to ChatGPT; I'm trying all sorts of things so that I understand what it can be and what it can do. And I asked ChatGPT: could you please write a story about a little girl who looks at a tree, and then says, well, how beautiful life is? Something like that. Could you please write that story in Lídia Jorge's style, in Valter Hugo Mãe's style? And it was perfect.

CARLOS CEIA: Even in Shakespeare's style.

FÁTIMA VIEIRA: Even in Shakespeare's style. And I was like this, and I said, what? So, there's really... drama, you know, I have to say, but yeah, there's a new world. But the question of prompting... it is all about giving prompts and confirming, so, of course, the human being is

still needed... but the idea of “prompter engineers”, I don’t know, I found it quite strange when I first heard about it.

CARLOS CEIA: We are organizing a prompt conference, a prompt workshop.

FEDERICO BOSCHETTI: I believe that the future of Digital Humanities may paradoxically involve their transformation to the point of “disappearing” as we currently understand them. This disappearance could unfold in several ways, one of which is through advancements in quantum computing that might redefine the technological foundations of what we now call the “digital”. Quantum computing, based on principles such as superposition and entanglement, operates fundamentally differently from the binary logic of classical digital systems. However, rather than entirely eliminating discreteness, it introduces a paradigm that combines discrete states with probabilistic models, offering new ways to process and conceptualize information. From this perspective, quantum technologies could be seen as a step toward a partial “return to the continuum”, as they challenge the rigid segmentation characteristic of traditional digital architectures.

CARLOS CEIA: Does that make sense, talking about quantum humanities in the future? Does that make sense?

FEDERICO BOSCHETTI: Yes, I believe it does make sense to talk about quantum humanities in the future. That said, this idea invites us to reflect on the current technologies employed in Digital Humanities and their evolution. These technologies are often associated with deterministic models, governed by algorithms and predictable processes. However, AI introduces a new dimension, as it is, in many respects, non-deterministic and not directly controllable—at least in its current state. While we are studying how it operates, much remains unclear, particularly because knowledge of AI systems is distributed across networks. This opacity is one reason these technologies, as currently used in Digital Humanities, may eventually “disappear” or evolve beyond their present frameworks.

Another reason for this potential disappearance, or transformation, is the hope for full integration of Digital Humanities into the humanities as a whole. In fact, the greater risk of extinction lies with traditional humanities, not Digital Humanities. The latter is, in a way, more accessible to scientists in other fields, including STEM disciplines, which is evident in how European funding is often contingent on incorporating aspects of Digital Humanities. This reflects the challenge of fostering dialogue between humanists and scientists, a gap that Digital Humanities can help bridge. By enabling interdisciplinary collaboration, Digital Humanities can support the survival and evolution of traditional humanities, making them more relatable and comprehensible to other scientific domains. Returning to Aristotle, we see that science often focuses on the general — the study of categories, genera, and species — rather than the particular. In contrast, humanists must engage deeply with the specific: the individual manuscript, the singular author, or the unique cultural artefact. The challenge, then, is to find coherence between these two levels of inquiry. On the one hand, we have descriptive work, rooted in historical and contextual particularity; on the other, a scientific drive toward generalization. Neither approach is sufficient on its own. We must maintain a balance that respects the specificity of the individual while situating it within broader, generative frameworks.

FÁTIMA VIEIRA: Can I just jump in, just to say, when you mentioned that Digital Humanities are going to disappear, I thought that you were going to say they are going to disappear because we are not going to think any more of the digital component because it will be so natural. So, from my point of view, it will still be the humanities. And if you think of the digital, this is the way I think of it, as a means, then it's still humanities resorting to the digital. But I remember that I read about the history of publishing and writing and so on, and apparently, in Greece, there were people against the invention of writing because they thought, well, even our philosophy, critical thinking, would be disturbed by the paper and the act of publishing. And so perhaps, in fact, what we discover is that the paper and the pen, whatever, they are meant. So, it's a way to do something. So, don't you think that they are going to disappear because they are going to be so natural that we will just say, what do you do? I'm doing humanities research, full stop, because the digital will be natural.

JOANA PINELA: I guess in terms of AI, I think the biggest concern right now, is people doing their work fully with AI. Because I know, for example, there are more and more cases of plagiarism, not only at university but also in public schools at a lower level, which you wouldn't necessarily expect, and it was never like this. So, students are becoming more and more stunted in a way that they weren't before. They're losing their creativity and their imagination, which are two of their biggest tools in anything they'll ever do. And so, if they lose that, they can't write. And if every time they try to write, they resort to AI, I guess that's also a teacher's concern. They fear having their students overuse it, or use it at all, because they see its repercussions directly in their tests, in their exams, and then at university. So, I understand those fears, but I guess it's also our job to show that we can use these digital tools responsibly, and we can create fun activities with them, like the workshop that we did, which was really interesting and it was fun, and to do that in an exhibition would be incredible as well, as a responsible, intuitive, and a fun way to use ChatGPT, that I think any teacher taking their students to an exhibition would appreciate.

LUCIANO MOREIRA: Thank you. I think that now we can give the true meaning of a round table and be open to questions or comments from the other people in the room, if anyone wants to jump in.

LIAM BENISON: I was interested in how this perhaps makes us question the notion of the author. Maybe we need to focus on the role of the prompter. What does prompting mean? What does prompting involve? What did Mark Amerika do? Did he just simply publish what the AI produced? Or did he actually intervene?

FÁTIMA VIEIRA: His conversation with AI. So, it was just a book of him asking questions, you know, and then the answer. It was just like that. It was published by Power Wave or something like that, because it was quite innovative. First, I was thinking of how we can translate it into Portuguese. Prompting. So, Hanna? Zulmira, Prompter? Because it will be a future job. One of the jobs of the future.

HANNA PIĘTA: We will probably only know the name when we get there, and when it is a consolidated profession.

CARLOS CEIA: It's already a speciality in engineering, you know. I was told by engineers. And they are preparing courses in Portuguese.

FÁTIMA VIEIRA: Prompting engineer.

CARLOS CEIA: Prompting engineer. In Portuguese it's awful. It's an awful name. It makes no sense at all.

FÁTIMA VIEIRA: Seria instrução de engenharia.

HANNA PIĘTA: I wonder if we should be using the term “engineering”. This term is associated with hard sciences. “Language engineering” might be better. Maybe a language engineer is better.

FÁTIMA VIEIRA: The same could happen with designers. We don't have a word for designers. We have prompters.

CARLOS CEIA: *Engenharia de Prompt.*

FÁTIMA VIEIRA: But in Portuguese we'll probably say “prompteiro”. Okay, what else? Prompter. That's very popular. With the Porto accent. So prompter.

HANNA PIĘTA: I have a question. It's a tricky one. But you're off the hook. Because I honestly don't have an answer to this. I don't think anyone has. Typically, when we're talking about Digital Humanities and AI at a certain point we're talking about biases too, right? My first question is, is this one of the major concerns that you're having right now in your initiatives? Are you trying to mitigate any potential bias? And I'm not thinking only about gender bias or

race bias, but any type of bias that you might see in your initiatives. How are you approaching this and trying to mitigate that?

FÁTIMA VIEIRA: Can I just say, well perhaps Luciano, your question reminds me... I'm sure that Luciano will be able to also explain how one of our missions is also to preserve information so that it can be used in the future. But your question reminded me of *1984* by Orwell. And, of course, what happens is that Winston was a curator of information. And the government, of course, wanted him to make available only the information that it wanted to be offered. So, my main concern is also the curators of the information: who decides what information is going to be passed on to the future or not? Now, what we do is just Google, and then, of course, we know that the first hits will be those who paid. Okay? But we know the rules. These are the rules. So, I don't know in the future who's going to decide what sort of information is going to be preserved. But now I'll leave it to others...

NILS GEIBLER: And then again, I have to ask that question. Didn't we have that before? I mean if you came into a library and there's that table with those curated books...

FÁTIMA VIEIRA: Those are the things.

NILS GEIBLER: So, we already had that in some way before. I mean, now we have it on a larger scale and maybe with fewer questions.

FÁTIMA VIEIRA: We even had Bloom who told us what the canonical works are. And all the others were forgotten just because Bloom said, Harold Bloom said: these are the canonical works.

HANNA PIĘTA: You're not worried about bias, then.

NILS GEIBLER: I'm worried about bias. Totally. But I would say we had that in some way before. And now maybe we still have other means to go around that. In a project we're working

on with the FID philosophy, we thought about making our own word embeddings. Which is kind of one of the foundations of all those large language models. Kind of make our own embeddings and provide them to the researchers. So, if somebody is interested in philosophy and wants to do something with his own large language model. Or in that way, a RAG or whatever you would use. A RAG being something that is built upon a model and a specialized model. Kind of a large language model. So, the idea was that we would pick different philosophical works or books, texts with different backgrounds. For example, if you look into literature from the DDR, the German Democratic Republic. You had a certain influence in there, a certain bias. And so, you have a certain, let's call it "flavor" in there. And then you could provide different flavors of corpora. Or corpora with different flavors each. And then people could know about the bias they would use there. So, you could kind of maybe pick what bias you want to use. And maybe compare. And so, you would have some means to get around those biases. Or kind of work with that. What you actually do if you try to read about something. You don't read only one source, right? You read different sources.

FÁTIMA VIEIRA: When the first five sources tell you the same, then perhaps you don't go on to write, you know, reading more. So, who decides what goes first? Because we can read, well, the first page of hints. And then we normally repeat.

NILS GEIBLER: And then it's a nice chance for the digital stuff. You can read not only five things, but you can read...

FÁTIMA VIEIRA: So, it starts reading more.

LUCIANO MOREIRA: I think that when we started this collaboration, we usually started with a text by Johanna Drucker.¹⁰ And then even balance for the Digital Humanities, they spotlight these when they talk about the FAIR principles.¹¹ And she says, we should stop talking about data. That which is given to us. And we should instead talk about Capta. So that is taken by us. So, the idea that we build data. And I think the best example is perhaps the one that Joana and Joel, who worked on a paper about it, can give. And how they, in the paper, address the

bias. I don't know, Joel, if you want to share a little bit of that perspective about our Utopian mindset.

JOEL FAUSTINO: Well, we've analyzed the data set. The goal of analyzing it was to sort of, through the information that we have there, try to find the state of the utopian project. It depends on the collaboration of many people. So analyzing that which is taken here, Capta, because we needed to isolate this information within itself so we could understand that field of the utopian thought, is that by analyzing what sort of people they would put in a database dedicated to utopians, where they came from, what they worked on, we could sort of find what people's current perception of what constitutes utopia and utopia thinking and utopia work is. So, yeah, analyzing numbers and percentages to try to find out what the field looks like there. One of the most impressive insights is that we asked people to give an example of a utopian thinker, and we got the man.

FÁTIMA VIEIRA: Can I say something? You don't have to go far. At the faculty, all the departments were asked to just give an example of someone who's a reference for that department. And I was part of this department, and I also agreed that it should be Hemingway. So, if you go downstairs, you can see that we have eight departments here, so we have eight men, no women at all. So, at the time, I didn't know that all the departments would mention a man. So, you go downstairs just before the Amphitheatre, if you go there just before the hall, past our canteen or bar, you just have men. When I saw it, I went to the director and said: "Who did it?" And she said: "It was the director of the library". The director is a woman. So, I went to her and said: "Isabel, how can it be? We only have men". And she hadn't realized. So, sorry, I had to tell you this story. And I've already said several times that we should replace those men, at least a few of those men – because I'm not, like, in *Herland*, where all men were extinct.

HANNA PIĘTA: It's like this was a collective, right? I wouldn't blame the lady.

FÁTIMA VIEIRA: No, no, of course not, but she could have noticed. Because the thing is that

someone suggested Hemingway, okay, Hemingway, I didn't make any comments, I could have done it, Hemingway, okay. And someone else, in another department... but in the end, we have eight men. This is something that still troubles me, and this happened over ten years ago. And they haven't been replaced.

LUCIANO MOREIRA: I think that we really must close.

HANNA PIĘTA: That's a very pessimistic note to end on.

LUCIANO MOREIRA: We still have the closing session, which is right now. Let's try to end it optimistically. Thank you so much to our invitees. But before we close, I would just ask Carlos Ceia and Fátima Vieira a very brief statement about these two days here, and what is, in your view, the biggest achievement of these days. And this will be our very formal closing session before we deliver some gifts to our invitees to whom we are grateful.

CARLOS CEIA: OK, let me start. First of all, I want to thank our keynote speakers and our colleagues, because this is the way we should do it: in a collaborative way, with many different viewpoints from different areas. I feel that we have a greater responsibility right now. I was talking about biased people around us. I'm surrounded by biased people—not my students, but mainly my colleagues. This is our greater responsibility from now on—not just to persuade them, but to help at all educational levels. We need to help our colleagues, especially teachers. I work with teachers all the time, and I know most of them have biases about the humanities. It is our greater responsibility now to provide courses, workshops, and training to help our colleagues understand that they can do their work better and faster. These are our most significant responsibilities as research units, including the responsibility to provide quality training. I'm also concerned about the type of training we are providing to our teachers, particularly our in-service teachers, not just the pre-service ones. This is an area where we need to improve. It is our responsibility as research units and universities to provide quality training in this area and many others, but this area is already at stake. In the future, hopefully, we will provide better, quality training for everyone in the country. Thanks to Digital Humanities, we

can reach anyone in any school, from the Algarve to Trás-os-Montes. This is a great advantage of Digital Humanities—we can reach anyone, anywhere. It is our responsibility to provide quality training in Digital Humanities from now on. Thank you so much for what I have learned over these two days. I have a stronger feeling that we have a greater responsibility to provide quality research here. Let's take this quality research to the rest of the world and the rest of the country.

FÁTIMA VIEIRA: I know that we are running late, so I will subscribe to everything that was said. And my words will be of gratitude. First of all, to our speakers, and also to our colleagues who came from Lisbon. Thank you so much, because I believe that we now have, I would say, a Digital Humanities community. And I believe that we really need to repeat this kind of activity, to have more sessions, so that we can discuss all these important topics. My gratitude goes to Luciano Moreira, of course, and many, many special thanks to our JRAAS, our junior researchers in Anglo-American studies, who talked about the future. You are the future, because this generation, my generation, will be retiring soon. So, I have hope, and what I feel is that we are lucky to be able to trust the future of the centre to your most capable hands. Thank you very much.

LUCIANO MOREIRA: One support that we received to organize this event was coordination that was with us all along to the colleagues that came from Lisbon. And I think that it's really important to stress that we are two branches of the same tree. So, I think these two days also proved that. A very special thank you to those who joined us today, and allow us to show that the community is not a closed one. To our invitees who agreed to travel, to spend two days with us, working from half past eight in the morning. Thank you very much. And thank you to Inês Silva, also who helped us organize the event, and to the JRAAS. It's a very special honor to work with them. And this kind of horizontality, I think it's also something that we look forward to having in academia. Thank you very much. And now we have a small gift. So we now have a small gift for our invitees. Thank you very much. Thank you.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are grateful to Lizi Kolbaia, Raquel Souza and Thaís Barbedo Vagas who transcribed the roundtable.

END NOTES

¹ Kirschenbaum, M. (2012). What Is Digital Humanities and What's It Doing in English Departments? In M. K. Gold (Ed.), *Debates in the Digital Humanities* (NED-New edition, pp. 3–11). University of Minnesota Press; JSTOR. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/j.ctttv8hq.4>

² Dinsman, M. (2016, February 3). The Digital in the Humanities: An Interview with Franco Moretti. *The Digital in the Humanities: An Interview with Franco Moretti*. <https://lareviewofbooks.org/article/the-digital-in-the-humanities-an-interview-with-franco-moretti>

³ Spiro, L. (2012). “This Is Why We Fight”: Defining the Values of the Digital Humanities. In M. K. Gold (Ed.), *Debates in the Digital Humanities* (NED-New edition, pp. 16–35). University of Minnesota Press; JSTOR. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/j.ctttv8hq.6>

⁴ This thematic issue, edited by Jaqueline Pierazzo and Luciano Moreira.

⁵ The proper quote is as follows “I try all things, I achieve what I can”. Herman, Melville. *Moby Dick*. Strelbytskyy Multimedia Publishing, 2020, page 527.

⁶ <https://cetapsrepository.letras.up.pt/id/cetaps/129169>

⁷ See the repository collection at <https://cetapsrepository.letras.up.pt/id/cetaps/114158>; and the website at <https://id.letras.up.pt/alimentopia/>.

⁸ Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the Social – An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford University Press.

⁹ Souza, R., Faustino, J., Pinela, J., Kobaliani, L., & Moreira, L. (2024). Create your own utopia: A case study on integrating the Internet, language and utopia. Work presented at techLING 2024.

¹⁰ Drucker, J. (2011). Humanities approaches to graphical display. *Digital Humanities Quarterly*, 5(1), 1–21.

¹¹ ALLEA. (2020). *Sustainable and FAIR Data Sharing in the Humanities: Recommendations of the ALLEA Working Group E-Humanities*. <https://doi.org/10.7486/DRI.tq582c863>

HOW TO CITE



VIA
PANORAMICA
Revista de Estudos Anglo-Americanos
A Journal of Anglo-American Studies

Ceia, Carlos, Fátima Vieira, Federico Boschetti, Nils Geißler, Joana Pinela, Luciano Moreira, Raquel Souza, Hanna Pięta, Liam Benison, and Joel Ramos Faustino (2024). "Roundtable The Digital Humanities: A Common Ground for Experimentation". *VIA PANORAMICA: Revista de Estudos Anglo-Americanos*, vol. 13, n.º 2, 2024, pp. 111-140. Web: <http://ojs.letras.up.pt/>.

DOI: 10.21747/2182-9934/via13_2t1