

Research and Computational Practices: an Interdisciplinary Encounter. *Technology ancilla philosophiae?*

Cristina Marras

Institute for European Intellectual Lexicon and History of Ideas, National Research Council, Rome
cristina.marras@cnr.it

Michela Tardella

Institute for European Intellectual Lexicon and History of Ideas, National Research Council, Rome
michela.tardella@gmail.com

Digital devices and technologies are currently largely used to access and share knowledge in Humanities and Social Sciences. Researchers contribute to create (open access) digital archives of primary and secondary sources; lexica, databases, and text encoding have been developed to formalize texts, to extract concepts, to make concordances, and different vocabularies and applications have been designed both for contents' modelling and representation, such as ontologies, graphs and conceptual maps (Schreibman et alii 2014). Nowadays, philosophical research became part of this scenario, although not a lot has been made in order to thematize the heuristic embedded in the relation between philosophical theory and computational practices.

Notwithstanding, despite innovative projects, such as 'The InPho Project' (<https://inpho.cogs.indiana.edu/>), 'Philpapers' (<http://philpapers.org/>), 'Wittgenstein Source' (<http://www.wittgensteinsource.org/>), and 'Nietzsche Source' (<http://www.nietzschesource.org/>), Agora (<http://www.project-agera.eu/>), some of the dynamics of the integration between the two fields need further reflections and investigations: in fact, in the field of philosophy, scholars seem to use technology as a mere support for their research.

In order to address this issue we would like to discuss two points: the theory (a) and the practices (b) of philosophy *vis à vis* those of digital humanities.

(a) We will first discuss the following statement: "the practice of philosophy is somehow more bound to traditional text-based approaches than other humanities" (Spiro 2013). This perspective implies that the use of technologies for reading/writing simply facilitates access and search in archives and repositories and in publishing and disseminating philosophical research. Instead, we will argue that the relation is more complex and generates a mutual change in methodologies and interpretations. The point, therefore, is how to conceptualize the entire process of interchange between digital and philosophical research (Marras 2014).

(b) We will thus shortly present the experience done at the Institute for the European Intellectual

Lexicon and History of Ideas (ILIESI-CNR) in Rome: for about 50 years researchers and technicians of the Institute have been working together to raise common achievements (<http://www.iliesi.cnr.it/>). When technological devices were not largely applied in humanities research, ILIESI started to digitalize and lemmatize (manually) philosophical texts. That process implied the encoding (which at the time was not standard) and the analysis of multilingual philosophical texts (Greek, Latin, French, German, English, and Italian), a process of knowledge modelling based on lexicographical and philosophical expertise.

Recently, due to the involvement in several international research projects this work has been developed and updated. Standard encoding (XML-Tei), open access, open peer-review, and semantic web tools and applications have been adopted in order to increase the digital archives and to renew the methodologies and interpretative approaches of philosophical research (Tardella-Marras 2014). Researchers are currently building a multilingual philosophical thesaurus (pilot project "TheofPhilo"), which is finalized to information retrieval and semantic enrichment of primary and secondary sources and to terminological research (Lamarra-Tardella 2014), and a critical reflection concerning languages and forms of modelling in philosophical text involving an international research group recently started (Eide et alii 2015). The interplay of all these different components represents a critical test for a community of philosophers and technicians in order to manage and reflect both on interdisciplinarity and cross-border fertilization.

The aim of our paper is not only to select possible paths that could be taken in order to overcome some of the existing barriers for an effective dialectic between philosophical and digital research, but also to stress their intersections and osmosis. Therefore, with our discussion we would like to engage on these issues a serious intellectual inquiry about inter and trans disciplinarity.

References

- Lamarra, A. and Tardella, M. (2014) 'TheofPhilo. A prototype for a Thesaurus of Philosophy', DH 2014, Lausanne, 7-11, 2014 = <http://dharchive.org/paper/DH2014/Paper-636.xml>
- Marras, C. (2014) 'Exploring Digital Environments for Research in Philosophy: Metaphorical Models of Sustainability', *Proceedings of the Third AIUCD Annual Conference on Humanities and Their Methods in the Digital Ecosystem* (AIUCD '14), Francesca Tomasi, Roberto Rosselli Del Turco, and Anna Maria Tammaro (Eds.), ACM, New York, NY, USA, Article 14, 4 pages. DOI=<http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2802612.2802639>
- Spiro, L. (2013) <https://digitalscholarship.wordpress.com/2013/02/26/exploring-the-significance-of-digital-humanities-for-philosophy/>
- Schreibman, S., Siemens, R. and Unsworth J. (eds.) (2014) *Companion to Digital Humanities*, Oxford: Blackwell
- Tardella, M. and Marras, C. (2014) 'Nuovi scenari per la ricerca in filosofia: i testi e gli strumenti del portale Daphnet', AIUCD 2013, Padova: Cleup, pp. 39-54.
- Eide, Ø., Ciula, A., Marras, C., and Sahle, P. (2015) *Project: Modelling between digital and humanities: thinking in practice*, <http://portal.volkswagenstiftung.de/search/projectPDF.do?projectId=5288>