Foreword for *Digital Humanities, Libraries, and Partnerships*
Amy Murray Twyning

A faculty member of the English department at the University of Pittsburgh, my office is in the Cathedral of Learning, the humanities hub of the campus. Sitting catty-corner across the intersection of two major traffic arteries is Hillman Library, our main humanities and social sciences library. Each of these buildings commands its respective corner and has the aura of a small institution unto itself, each with a cafe and study areas further giving it the air of self-sufficiency. Thus the spatial disposition of these two buildings makes a physical argument about a separateness of purpose—a non-relationship between the library and the professoriate. These physical divisions likewise make an argument about divisions of labor that, as some chapters in this work discuss, can tend to affirm a hierarchical distribution of respect and intellectual value. For instance, there are no designated classroom spaces in our library (though this is changing as I write). At the same time, these edifices and their separation reflect an older set of disciplinary expectations: an older notion of where the vital work of the university takes place, an older assumption about professional and academic monadism, and an older model of teaching. These chapters detail exciting projects and thoughtfully engage the challenges of collaboration across disciplines and across institutional centers that, collectively, open a new space of possibility for academic and intellectual work that responds positively to changes in higher education.

I am a Victorianist and literary scholar and not a digital humanist by training. And yet, thanks to a partnership with Robin Kear and other Pitt librarians, I have taught three iterations of an advanced research seminar that trains undergraduates to develop and complete original research projects, use traditional literary-critical and digital analytic tools, and work together to produce a class 'virtual library'. The course breaks down approximately into thirds. The first month is devoted to reading canonical or at least well-known examples of Victorian mystery and detective fiction. Class discussion of these texts is oriented toward the development of hypotheses about the historical energies that fuel the representations of the supernatural or the occult in fiction and devise plans for original research to test these hypotheses. Students spend the second month combing search results and mining digital databases for forgotten or little known examples of

Victorian fiction or other cultural explorations of 'the mysterious'. During this period, students assign their peers specific texts and run class discussions. Over the last month, students design and create the class virtual library, deciding what will be housed on the 'shelves' of this library, how the shelves should be arranged and interlinked, and how the material should be presented.

I should say, however, that this description of the course is one possible only in retrospect. The strucuture I have outlined emerged out of the partnership between myself, Robin Kear (co-editor of this book), and Aaron Brenner (head of Digital Scholarship Services in Pitt's Hillman Library). The basic remit for the course was that students should learn how to use primary sources, build researcher profiles, present their findings in something other than the dead letter exercise of the term paper, and engage digital humanist methodologies. With this otherwise open structure, the three of us built a variety of assignments and an overall course plan. Robin's deep thinking about the constructedness of information and the ethical questions regarding evidence became a central part of the class discourse; students not only cultivated the habit of skepticism regarding conclusions they were tempted to draw about material that represented only a small portion of the historical record available; they also folded that skepticism into strategies for further discovery. At the same time, Aaron's illuminating reflections on what is often called "inquiry-based learning" became the pedagogical spirit that underwrote the course. Indeed, among the many successful outcomes of the course was the students' adoption of a robust disposition toward the various detours and dead ends that attend research where their peers in more traditional classes might shrink their inquiries to fit the readily available material.

I offer these details because it is otherwise difficult to capture the experience. The shape of the course and our partnership does not have a recognized institutional place. Because the course was one of my teaching assignments and also because I have a forward-thinking and bold program head, I had room within the terms of my contract to do this work. Yet it is also the case, that there was no official way to credit my partners, let alone mark what we were doing as an important [instance of undergraduate teaching] rather than a side or 'pet' project. This is particularly disturbing because the course was highly successful by subjective and objective measures, and roughly half of the students got fellowship money to further their research projects, something

that has traditionally been the privilege of undergraduate science students. So one of the highly productive happenings in undergraduate education at least in my program is being generated from our collaboration, but that collaboration is institutonally invisible. This is a story with which the reader of these chapters will become familiar, and these authors recount inspired arrangements, work-arounds, and triumphs. Each individual piece is illuminating. The true value of the book goes beyond these individual accounts by putting on the map a whole new territory of vital intellectual and professional work that should have and that I trust one day will have a recognized place in the university.

One of the most important ideas that circulates in this collection is the idea that librarians are and should be treated as intellectuals and peers rather than as support staff or assistants who execute tasks designed by professors. To me, this is an obvious point, but I also recognize why it may not seem so apparent to others. Many academics and most tenure and promotion systems still designate the monograph as the single gauge of professional achievement. Digital humanist projects require collective work in which each person contributes according to their expertise. Digital humanist projects also come into being in such a way that there is not always a clear distinction between technical work, so-called support work, and original intellectual contributions. For instance, the work of designing research discovery methods or of giving research form, things we might think of as 'technical' matters, can impact interpretative methodologies. The work is truly collective, collaborative, cooperative. Even though, as one of the chapters in this book puts it, "scholarship is often a collaborative practice masquerading as solitary achievement" (Chesner et al.), most academics have developed ways of thinking about their work that are consistent with the monograph model. What these chapters reveal is how many opportunities there are for valuable work in the university (and in the world) once we begin to think beyond the strictures of individual scholarship. At the same time, these chapters demonstrate the need for structural changes in the university to accomodate such a shift in thinking.

The familiar image of the 'bridge' presents itself as a way to understand just how these chapters stand in relationship to outdated institutional divisions, but a bridge leaves the edifices it links intact. This book stakes a claim to the spaces in between. The reader of *Digital Humanities,*

Libraries, and Partnerships will come away energized by the exciting work that is happening in those spaces.