

University of Groningen

Safeguarding Written Heritage

Irving, Andrew J.M.

Published in:

The Bloomsbury Handbook of Religion and Heritage in Contemporary Europe

DOI:

[10.5040/9781350251410.ch-025](https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350251410.ch-025)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:

2023

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Irving, A. J. M. (2023). Safeguarding Written Heritage: The Ecosystemic Approach of the Hill Monastic Museum and Library. In T. H. Weir, & L. Wijnia (Eds.), *The Bloomsbury Handbook of Religion and Heritage in Contemporary Europe* (pp. 234-244). Bloomsbury. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350251410.ch-025>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

CASE STUDY

Chapter 25

Safeguarding Written Heritage: The Ecosystemic Approach of the Hill Monastic Museum and Library

ANDREW J. M. IRVING

The very abstraction, compactness, and portability that have made written documentation and the book in various formats particularly adept instruments of cultural memory and of its transmission also contribute to their vulnerability. Whether due to natural environmental factors such as humidity and pests, or the man-made violence of arson, theft, censorship, and vandalism, archives and libraries and the cultural memories they are instituted to retain are as fragile as the materials on which these memories are recorded. The sheer concentration of cultural knowledge within the pages of a book and on the seried shelves of the archive makes them both obvious targets in intercultural and interreligious conflicts: from the gradual destruction of the Library of Alexandria under both Christian and Muslim authorities in late antiquity and the burning of the Talmud and other Jewish holy writings in Paris in 1242, to the destruction of the library of Moctezuma II by Spanish conquistadores in the early decades of the sixteenth century. The recent destruction of libraries in Mosul, the extraordinary efforts undertaken by local librarians to save Timbuktu's manuscripts in 2012, and the salvaging of books and the construction of mini-libraries in Bashar al-Assad's Syria in the early 2020s (Minoui 2021), remind us that such bookish techniques of religious and cultural erasure and resistance are not things of the past.

How can a religious community and memory institution appropriately respond to these threats? And what issues arise when the written heritage the institution and community is attempting to safeguard is not its own? The following case study presents a brief historical sketch of the development of the Hill Monastic Museum and Library (HMML), from its founding in the 1960s by monks of St. John's Abbey in Minnesota, USA, until the present day. The Library is now an internationally renowned heritage institution and center of scholarship that has archived in a single site images of over 300,000 manuscripts, working in close collaboration with over 800 libraries, and repositories around the world. The Library is an American institution, housed at a Benedictine Abbey. It began its work of preservation of written heritage in Europe, however, and, while maintaining this work, it has, as we shall see, gradually extended its work beyond the

boundaries of Europe, following lines of contact, coincidence, and need to work with heritage communities in Africa, the Middle East, and Asia. HMML therefore provides a particularly rich case study in interreligious written heritage preservation extending across religious and geographical boundaries. I will necessarily focus on turning points rather than attempt an in-depth critical account of the history of the Library, which is beyond the scope of this handbook. This chapter will trace some stages in the evolution of HMML's approach to its role as a written heritage institution, which I will characterize as the development of ecosystemic thinking. The chapter concludes with some general tenets that can be distilled from HMML's approach, and a consideration of the role of ecosystemic thinking in heritage discourse and practice.

A Safe Haven, Close to Home

In many ways, the location of HMML's vast collection of images of manuscripts, dedicated especially to the preservation of at-risk manuscript collections, in a monastic and rural setting was not merely coincidental. Christian monasticism has, of course, long been associated both with ascetic withdrawal on the one hand and, on the other, with the careful and often laborious preservation and transmission of written cultures—both those originating within the Christian tradition, and those from outside it. It is not hard to imagine that the Benedictine abbey's location, away from urban centers and amid farmland, forests, and lakes in central Minnesota, also informed Fr. Coleman Barry's idea in 1964, as president of St. John's University, to undertake the microfilming of monastic manuscripts in Europe (Coleman 1990).

The project, known at that time as the Monastic Manuscript Project, was doubtless also inspired by two similar American Catholic initiatives to preserve microfilm copies of the manuscripts of important religious libraries in Western Europe in the wake of the Second World War. As early as 1951, Fr. Lowrie Daly S. J. of St. Louis University initiated negotiations with the *Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*, which would lead to one of the largest microfilming projects of its day and the creation of the Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library at St. Louis University. Daly's project was grounded in a desire to assure preservation of the precious Vatican manuscript collections on the one hand, and, on the other, to facilitate access to manuscripts for North American scholars (Krohn 1957: 317). The rise of microfilming technology had itself received a significant boost during the Second World War by microfilm's use for military correspondence and in projects such as the Rockefeller-funded British Manuscripts Project borne out of concern for preservation and/or access to British manuscript sources for American scholars during the War (Born 1960: 353–4). It afforded unprecedented possibilities for “preservation” through duplication, and, simultaneously, for access to manuscripts for North American scholars.

The St. Louis University initiative also served to foster the Jesuit university's relationship with the Vatican and its own reputation as a center of Catholic learning in the American Midwest. The University of Notre Dame's project to microfilm the collection of the *Veneranda Biblioteca Ambrosiana* in Milan (itself damaged during Allied bombing during the War), was conceived during a visit of the Cardinal Archbishop of Milan, Giovanni Battista Montini (later Paul VI), to the University of Notre Dame in 1960 (Smyth 1994: 221). This project played a significant role in the plans of the then director of Notre Dame's Medieval Institute, Astrik Gabriel, to establish the international reputation of the Institute as a North American center for research on medieval manuscripts and Catholic intellectual tradition. Once funds were secured from the

National Science Foundation, filming of manuscripts began in 1962. Both projects illustrate how European religious heritage was used, through new imaging technologies, to burnish American religious and academic reputations and research.

Fr. Barry's initiative at St. John's University in 1964 should be understood as born out of a like awareness of the devastation wrought by the Second World War to cultural heritage and memory institutions in Europe and genuine concern about the risk of still greater destruction during the Cold War, of a sense of an opportunity to facilitate North American scholarly access to European manuscript sources, and of a friendly reputational rivalry among Midwestern Catholic universities. The St. John's project soon garnered the financial support of the Louis W., and Maud Hill Family Foundation, and the intellectual backing of, among others, the Medieval Academy of America. In contrast to the Vatican and Ambrosiana projects based on the collections of single albeit substantial libraries, from the outset the Monastic Manuscript Project at St. John's Abbey ambitiously aimed to gather in a single repository images of monastic manuscripts from a large number of libraries that are geographically scattered and often difficult to access. It was this gathering in a single site of images of scattered sources of divergent dates, and contents, which shared origins as manuscripts in a common religious tradition (Roman Catholic monasticism in its various forms) that lent this heritage project its unique character.

Working in a Shared Milieu

After meeting with some initial resistance in Italy and Switzerland, the project leaders turned to Austria, a neutral state located between the NATO countries and those of the Warsaw Pact, and one where significant collections of manuscripts were still preserved in situ in monastic libraries, having avoided the relocation of ecclesiastical collections to central repositories that occurred elsewhere in Europe in the wake of nineteenth-century secularization. Convincing Austrian librarians to entrust their collections to be photographed for a new project led by Americans less than twenty years after the end of the Second World War was not, however, going to be an easy matter.

Three things appear to have been key in the project's striking roots in their host country. First, the shared religious and monastic culture of the American guests and the Austrian hosts: this shared culture helped to nurture, or at least provide the ground for a sense of shared endeavor, and, significantly, a feeling of joint ownership of the project that focused initially on monastic written heritage.

Second, the appointment of Fr. Oliver Kapsner as the first field director in Austria in 1964 seems to have been highly significant for the project's initial success (Heintzelmann 2012). Kapsner was born in a German-American farming family in Minnesota, and spoke German fluently: this assisted in the building of trust. Further, as a monk Kapsner was highly trained: he had studied philosophy, theology, and library sciences at numerous institutions including the University of Chicago, the University of Notre Dame, and the Pontifical University of S. Anselmo in Rome, and had served as Advisor to the Library of Congress for Theological Headings. During the Second World War, Kapsner served as a US Army chaplain in Europe, and in its aftermath had attended part of the Nuremberg Trials. In sum, with a German-American background, as a monk, scholar, and librarian of considerable professional experience, and having a personal understanding of the horrors of war, Kapsner shared a good deal in common with the communities with whom he was to negotiate, and later work.

The third key factor in the success of the project, and one which remains characteristic of HMML initiatives around the world to this day, was the decision from the beginning to use and support local technicians and expertise in work in the field in the various local repositories in Austria. The organizational breakthrough would finally come in 1965, when a newly elected abbot of the Abbey of Kremsmünster in Upper Austria welcomed his American confrere forthrightly with the words: “Willkommen ... Sie werden in Kremsmünster anfangen” (“Welcome ... You will begin your work in Kremsmünster”). The openness of this young abbot of the prominent Austrian monastery to the microfilming project unlocked doors to libraries in other monastic houses across Austria: first Benedictine, then Cistercian and Augustinian libraries signed agreements with the project, and soon the team would be at work in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek in Vienna. From there, their work would spread across Europe.

Transplants

Not all growth within a landscape is spurred by the natural connections endogenous to the ecosystem. The next major turning point in the history of what was now known as the Monastic Manuscript Microfilm Library, was to come serendipitously from outside the monastic networks. In the early 1970s, Walter Harrelson, a professor of Old Testament from Vanderbilt University in Tennessee, approached the Library with the idea to microfilm manuscripts in Ethiopia. Obviously, Harrelson’s interests did not lie in a shared Catholic monastic manuscript heritage. Rather, the professor’s research centered on ancient texts that were later deemed non-canonical in Latin and Byzantine religious traditions, but which had been preserved and transmitted in the living heritage of Ethiopian liturgical practice, and manuscript production and use. Working with Harrelson, and the Ethiopian Orthodox Patriarchate, HMML director Julian Plante secured start-up funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities, and in 1973 the Ethiopian Manuscript Microfilm Library was founded; it now contains images of 8,000 Ethiopian manuscripts, the largest collection of its kind in the world. Again, throughout the tumultuous circumstances of the civil war, HMML worked with local technicians and scholars. In 1973, the project involved the philologist Getatchew Haile († 2021), then associate professor at Haile Selassie I University in Addis Ababa. Having been forced into exile for political reasons, Haile was appointed in 1976 to St. John’s University, where he would contribute foundational scholarship on Ethiopic studies, and prepare catalog entries of over 6,000 Ethiopic manuscripts. In so doing, HMML committed not only to preservation-through-duplication, but through research and teaching, fellowships, conferences, and publications, led by Ethiopian scholars, it supported a sustainable environment of on-going learning by African and international scholars of Ethiopic languages, art, and religious thought and practice. If images of Ethiopia’s Christian manuscript culture were transplanted to an American Catholic Midwestern abbey, care was taken to ensure that the indigenous environment of learning in which these manuscripts live was not only supported in the host institution, but also nurtured, despite the not inconsiderable diplomatic tensions that existed between the various political and ecclesiastical parties involved.

Becoming Part of a New Heritage Environment

From this first step outside the original focus on monastic Latin Christianity in western European contexts, has grown HMML’s Eastern Christian Manuscript Collection, built in

collaboration with over seventy diverse religious communities, and containing images from more than 75,000 manuscripts from Africa, Europe, the Middle East, and South Asia. The broadening of the religious scope of the collection in Ethiopia also went beyond the written cultures of Eastern Christianities. Initially less by design than by fortuitous coincidence, the microfilming of manuscripts in Ethiopia led to the inclusion of Islamic manuscripts in the collection for the first time. The actions of the Library for collaborative preservation, and scholarship of the written heritage of non-Western and non-Christian cultures, reflecting both their specificities and their complex exchanges would grow significantly in the ensuing decades.

First, even as work continued in projects in Europe—notably the development from 1973 of the Malta Study Centre focusing on both the preservation and conservation manuscripts in Malta and to foster the study of the manuscripts and archives of this center of Mediterranean cross-cultural exchange—HMML’s attention increasingly turned to at-risk collections in the Middle East, an important focus of Fr. Columba Stewart’s tenure as Executive Director since 2003 (Geary 2019; Peede 2019). As technology shifted to digital reproduction, a digital studio was opened at the Antiochene Greek Orthodox Monastery of Our Lady of Balamand in Lebanon in 2003, in an increasingly tense political situation, just days before the US invasion of Iraq. The Library’s work as a memory institution supporting the work of communities employing written heritage as a means of remembrance and survival, already begun in Ethiopia, was extended with a project to digitize surviving manuscripts of Armenian and Syriac Christian communities devastated by the 1915–22 massacres in Turkey. Since 2009, Fr. Stewart and the Director of Field Operations in the Middle East Walid Mourad have worked extensively on the ground with Iraqi Christians to digitize their community’s manuscript collections. These precious manuscripts were often hidden or spirited away by individuals at considerable personal risk, in order to preserve them, and their community’s heritage from the threat of destruction by Islamist extremists.

Not always have the initiatives to work in and with heritage communities across sometimes tense religious lines been prompted by external threat, however. Indeed, by Fr. Stewart’s account, an important expansion of the scope of the Library’s focus, was prompted in 2013, by a chance conversation between the Middle East Field Director and friends and acquaintances in the Old City of Jerusalem (Stewart 2019). Mourad had been recounting the work of HMML to digitize the collections of the Syrian Orthodox monastery of St. Mark, in Jerusalem. His friends, members of the al-Budeiri family who lived just a few minutes’ walk from the monastery, listened carefully, before replying, “Well, what about us? We have a library too!”

Thus began HMML’s collaboration to digitize and make accessible one of the most important family libraries of Old Jerusalem, the al-Budeiri Library, founded in the eighteenth century by the Jerusalemite sharif, Sheikh Budeir (1747–1805), and containing approximately 900 manuscripts, some as early as the twelfth century, and the first project to preserve, reproduce, and make accessible, Islamic sources set up as such. As was the case among monastic networks in Austria in 1965, earning the trust of one important local written heritage institution led to an expansion of trust within the Muslim communities in Jerusalem. HMML would, in turn, undertake the digitization of the Islamic collections of the Khalidi Library, the Dar Issaf Nashashibi Library, and the library of the Uzbek Cultural Centre in Jerusalem, al-Zāwiyah al-Uzbakīyah, containing manuscripts in Persian and Turkic.

Collaborative Safeguarding

Having gained an international reputation as a trusted partner working across cultures and religious traditions, and with experience in working with at-risk collections, sometimes in active conflict zones, HMML began to be actively approached by organizations and communities facing violent threats to their survival. In 2011, the Library received a substantial grant from the Arcadia Fund, dedicated to the preservation of endangered cultural heritage and ecosystems, and to the promotion of access to knowledge. On the strength of this funding, the Library was able to formalize an agreement to work with the Malian NGO *Sauvegarde et valorisation des manuscrits pour la défense de la culture islamique* (SAVAMA-DCI). Together, they would work to digitize manuscripts that had been evacuated from Timbuktu to Bamako by the librarians of Timbuktu, when Timbuktu briefly fell under the control of Tuareg rebels of the National Movement of Azawad and the Salafi jihadist group Ansar Dine in 2012.

In these, and other projects, in which Library's assistance is sought, HMML continues to depend on and support local expertise and knowledge, as partners and coworkers with the heritage communities to whom the manuscripts belong, whose past and living heritage they represent and preserve. The manuscripts of Timbuktu, for instance, potentially numbering more than 250,000 in total, are being digitized by young Malians, many of whom themselves, like the manuscripts they evacuated, had to flee Timbuktu in order to escape violence and kidnapping during the extremist occupation. Here, and in other danger zones, the digitization project provides equipment, training, and ongoing support, guided by the local field worker, in order to facilitate the communities' own initiatives of preservation of their own written heritage. By means of digital copies of manuscripts, and the generous support of training and scholarship, control of the process is resolutely shared, and access can be preserved to manuscripts that have been destroyed, lost, or sold into private hands, in the turmoil and desperation that attend war and violent political upheaval. Not infrequently, lost manuscripts have been able to be identified on the basis of HMML images, and returned to their former owners; in this way HMML serves not only as a repository of images and point of access for the study of manuscript cultures but also as an instrument for the restoration of the manuscripts to the communities to which they belong.

Seven Tenets for Trust-Building between Religious Written Heritage Communities

Can some general guidelines be distilled from this remarkably successful ongoing collaborative initiative? Leaving aside divine providence, and traditional monastic economic savvy, what has been characteristic of HMML's approach, from the beginning of the project in the 1960s to the working with Muslim heritage communities in Mali, is the establishing of a bedrock of mutual trust between heritage communities. But how exactly is that trust to be built? In an interview I conducted with Fr. Stewart in 2021, the current director shared his knowledge and recollections of the ways in which HMML has developed, and his own insights into the tenets that guide the institution (see also Stewart 2019). What follows are my own paraphrases of what emerged from that conversation: what we might term the heritage principles of HMML, which show the relevance of monastic tradition for the work of the modern global and interreligious heritage institution.

Respect

First, it should always be clear that the parties are entering into conversation on the basis of profound respect, especially when a North American, or European memory institution is approaching a community in another cultural and political context.

Monastic Ecumenism

Religious affiliation need not be seen as a barrier to effective intra- and interreligious collaboration. Quite the contrary. Often, Fr. Stewart notes, the monastic habit, and the monastic foundations of HMML, have been advantageous inasmuch as they have served to communicate wordlessly to the religious community's partners a foundational mutual respect—across religious traditions and often in the midst of and despite the political tensions that lie between the countries in which the heritage institutions are based. Between diverse Christian communities, this may be so because monasticism antedates many of the splinterings that have occurred since late antiquity. In HMML's work with communities that are not Christian, the Christian monastic habit and ethos are often, Stewart notes, perceived as the very personification of “not-for-profit.”

Values beyond Preservation, Extraction, Consumption

In the case of HMML, a strong groundedness in a premodern monastic tradition that places a high value on written heritage has helped to reduce potential fears of foreign exploitative heritage extraction. At the same time, the monastic foundation of HMML's on-going work has suggested to many partners inside and outside Europe both a respect for traditional/premodern ways of knowing, and a native ability to understand the identity-related heritage value of a community's written tradition. This has helped HMML to avoid a preemptive suspicion that an American-funded university-linked project would necessarily benefit only its host institution, a clear danger of some early photographic reproduction projects.

Dependence on Local Networks, Expertise, and Partnerships

Fundamentally, trust is nurtured between heritage communities and institutions by concrete practices. From the earliest days, HMML has worked with and in local networks, and has supported local needs and aims with funding, training, equipment, local expertise, and technicians. Local project managers are, Fr. Stewart underlines, absolutely crucial, not only for the practical matters of ground-knowledge but also to interpret, mediate, and build trust between the heritage partners in both directions. These local managers are the ones who do the real work.

Listening and Hospitality

Fr. Stewart associates the foundational trust-building inherent in HMML's approach to written heritage conservation with the Benedictine disciplines of listening and hospitality. The former is underlined in the first words of the monastic Rule of Benedict—“Listen, o my son!” It fosters a special attentiveness to what the heritage partner is saying (and not saying), and a willingness to allow oneself to be transformed by that communication. The latter, which is embodied in the Benedictine monastic emphasis on welcoming and taking care of guests, is supported at

the Abbey of St. John by the provision of funding, accommodation, training opportunities, learning tools, and support to enable nourish students, scholars, and collaborators from around the world and across religious and cultural traditions to spend time at the Library. These stays inevitably transform the heritage institution itself, and are intended to do so. In the field, however, the monastic discipline of being transformed by one's guests has been inverted, such that the HMML team itself practices being the guest, dependent on the hospitality of its host heritage communities, for whom it must demonstrate respect, and on whom it depends. The approach-as-guest helps to bridge the cultural, linguistic, and religious gaps between memory institutions and across religious boundaries, and serves to establish a relationship of hospitable codependence and collaboration in the interreligious and intercultural heritage project.

Stability: Trusting the Resources of the Local Heritage Community

I would add one further monastic discipline that I believe has led to the strength of the project, and may serve as a model even for those of us in heritage work who are not monks: stability of place. In Benedictine tradition, monks take a vow of stability of place (*stabilitas loci*), by means of which they bind themselves not only to the monastic order but also to the particular monastery where they take their vows. It may seem odd to refer to this very site-constrained discipline for a project that has from the outset entailed monks spending a great deal of time in airplanes, and which has extended from Minnesota to Europe to eventually become truly global in scope. Central to the vow of stability, however, is the trust that a particular community, with all of its limitations and imperfections, is enough: it is in this community, after all, that, for the monk, the divine will be revealed. We may perhaps translate this principle as follows: growth is not premised on constantly looking for some better resource, or in extracting resources to add them to one's own pile. Rather, sustainable growth lies respecting and dealing realistically with the local resources where one is. In this frame of monastic discipline, working with local expertise, becoming part of what we might term the local heritage ecosystem takes on a still deeper significance.

Ecosystemic Thinking about Heritage and Challenges on the Horizon

Two things stand out in Fr. Stewart's account of his own first experience of the Benedictine Abbey of St. John in Collegeville, in the summer of 1980. First, he recalls, he was welcomed by "a community of a common purpose," who accepted him, and could use his talents as a young scholar within it, not least at St. John's University, located on the abbey's grounds. Second, he was struck by the beautiful environment of which the abbey forms a part, with its lakes and trails, its calling loons, and a certain quality of silence, brushed still through the leaves of the surrounding forests and the vast monastery lands in which the abbey is nestled. Given the bucolic and monastic setting of the library, and his own love of the outdoors, it is perhaps not surprising to regularly hear the word "ecosystem" on Fr. Columba's lips when he describes both the work of HMML today, and the complex intellectual and cultural exchanges between religious communities in the past, exchanges expressed in and facilitated by manuscripts.

There is, however, something more radical in Fr. Columba's use of the term "ecosystem" to describe the work of a memory institution than mere situational or recreational allusion would imply. As Françoise Choay has argued, in many respects, the origin and history of heritage as

a concept and practice, is, in fact, directly opposed to such interconnection. Bound up with the identification, imposition, and defense of distance (“la prise de distance”) the heritage object as such was born in fourteenth-century Italy in the moment in which objects of classical antiquity were safely placed on the isolating pedestal of (élite) history, artistic value, or conservational need (Choay 2007: 25–48). Thus elevated and decontextualized, heritage monuments were easily turned into objects to be acquired, and instrumentalized in displays of individual and collective power. With an approach that anticipated foundational aspirations of the 2005 *Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society* (Council of Europe 2005) regarding heritage’s role in social inclusion, HMML has approached its work, from the outset, as a fellow participant in an interdependent heritage ecosystem, thereby breaking with this long and, it must be said, persistent tradition, of isolation, objectification, and instrumentalization of heritage. Its practices favor resourceful connection rather than instrumentalizing distance, and mutually dependent exchange rather than separation, and extraction.

It should be noted that this is not the only approach taken to cultural heritage that employs the notion of “ecosystem” as a guiding principle. The publication of the United Nations’ Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA 2005) has recently stimulated widespread scholarly and policy-maker interest in what has been called “Ecosystem Services” (Hølleland, Skrede, and Holmgaard 2017). The term describes the many services that ecosystems provide for human beings, from supporting services (such as nutrient cycling), to provisioning services (e.g., food and fuel), regulating services (e.g., climate regulation, disease regulation, and water purification), and “cultural services” such as aesthetic, spiritual, educational, and recreational services supplied by the ecosystem.

The term “ecosystem services” was first developed in the 1980s, in part to raise awareness of the need for the protection of ecosystems (Ehrlich and Ehrlich 1981; Ehrlich and Mooney 1983), and to provide a means for developing a framework for the identification, valuation, and management of these “services.” In practice, it has proven challenging, however, to appraise “Cultural [Ecosystem] Services” within this framework. Not only is it often unclear, for instance, how precisely material cultural heritage fits into the ecosystem—in service of it, part of it, or as benefiting from it—but also, this approach implies that cultural systems are derivative of ecological services, whereas ecologies are themselves the products of a long history of cultural modification. Graham Fairclough has advocated for a cultural-systems approach to the environment, in line with the Faro Convention’s emphasis on the social value of heritage (Council of Europe 2005) according to which heritage and landscape are understood “as drivers not receptors, and human beings as a core part of the ecosystem, not as impacts on it” (Fairclough 2012: 10). This approach to heritage ecosystems is, it seems to me, in line with HMML’s own monastic inspired, collaborative approach to sustainable, living, written heritage preservation grounded in mutual interreligious respect.

The adoption of digital technologies, now central to HMML’s work with written heritage communities around the world, both in situ, and at the Research Centre in Minnesota, is raising new possibilities and new ethical questions for the digital ecosystem (Manžuch 2017). On the one hand, local access to images of a heritage community’s own written resources can be facilitated to an unprecedented degree by HMML’s platforms. On the other, the provision of stable access to the internet itself and to the skills to use the resources provided, is unequally distributed within local heritage communities. Secondly, it remains a challenge to involve diverse

community members in the selection of heritage items, the determining of relevant metadata, in the development of information systems and maintenance processes, in such a way as to respect the heritage communities as equal partners in digitization, in what Gilliland and McKemmish have called a “participatory archive” (Gilliland and McKemmish 2014). Michele Pickover has reminded us that, even with good intentions, foreign funders of digitization projects influence the interpretation of the digitized content, in a way that may marginalize the interests and voices of the very heritage communities they are attempting to support (Pickover 2014). HMML will need to continue to face these real challenges. Its ecosystemic thinking will help it to do so.

Acknowledgments

The author wishes to thank the executive director of HMML, Fr. Columba Stewart, for his generous willingness to be interviewed in preparation for this article, on October 4, 2021. The author was recipient of a Heckman Stipend in 2012 and undertook research at HMML in June–July of the same year.

References

- Born, L. K. (1960), “History of Microform Activity,” *Library Trends* 8 (3): 348–58.
- Choay, F. (2007), *L'allégorie du patrimoine*. Paris: Seuil.
- Council of Europe (2005), “Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society.” CETS No. 199. <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/EN/Treaties/Html/199.htm> (accessed June 1, 2022).
- Coleman, B. (ed.) (1990), *A Sense of Place II: The Benedictines of Collegeville*.
Collegeville: Liturgical Press.
- Ehrlich, P. R., and A. H. Ehrlich (1981), *Extinction: The Causes and Consequences of the Disappearances of Species*. New York: Random House.
- Ehrlich, P. R., and H. A. Mooney (1983), “Extinction, Substitution, and Ecosystem Services,” *BioScience* 33 (4): 248–54.
- Fairclough, G. (2012), “The Value of Heritage for the Future,” in D. Ünsal (ed.), *Heritage in Society. Cultural Policy and Management (KPY) Yearbook* 3, 34–41. Istanbul: Bilgi University Press.
- Geary, P. J. (2019), “A Monk of the Secular Age,” *Humanities* 40 (40): 28–31.
- Gilliland, A. J., and S. McKemmish, “The Role of Participatory Archives in Furthering Human Rights, Reconciliation and Recovery,” *Atlanti* 24 (1): 79–88. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/346521tf> (accessed June 1, 2022).
- Heintzelmann, M. (2012), “Father Oliver Kapsner, OSB (1902–1991): A Life in Libraries,” *Theological Librarianship* 5 (1): 4–6.
- Hill Museum and Manuscript Library (n.d.), “History.” <https://hmml.org/about/history/> (accessed April 1, 2022).
- Hølleland, H., J. Skrede, and S. B. Holmgaard (2017), “Cultural Heritage and Ecosystem Services: A Literature Review,” *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites* 19: 210–37.
- Krohn, E. C. (1957), “Music in the Vatican Library at St Louis University,” *Notes* 14 (3): 317–24.
- Manžuch, Z. (2017), “Ethical Issues in the Digitization of Cultural Heritage,” *Journal of Contemporary Archival Studies* 4 (2), article 4. <https://elischolar.library.yale.edu/jcas/vol4/iss2/4> (accessed June 1, 2022).
- MEA (2005), *Ecosystems and Human Well-Being Synthesis*. Washington, DC: Island Press. <http://www.millenniumassessment.org/documents/document.356.aspx.pdf> (accessed June 1, 2022).
- Minoui, D. (2021), “Hunting for Books in the Ruins: How Syria’s Rebel Librarians Found Hope.” *Guardian*, March 16. <https://www.theguardian.com/news/2021/mar/16/words-have-the-power-to-heal-syrias-rebel-librarians> (accessed June 1, 2022).

- Peede, J. P. (2019), "Becoming Columba," *Humanities* 40 (4): 10–13, 49–54.
- Pickover, M. (2014), "Patrimony, Power and Politics: Selecting, Constructing and Preserving Digital Heritage Content in South Africa and Africa," *IFLA Lyon 2014*. <http://library.ifla.org/id/eprint/1023/1/138-pickover-en.pdf> (accessed June 1, 2022).
- Smyth, M. (1994), "The Medieval Institute Library: A Brief History," in M. Gleason and K. J. Blackstead (eds.), *What Is Written Remains: Historical Essays on the Libraries of Notre Dame*, 211–29. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Stewart, C. (2019), "Cultural Heritage Present and Future: A Benedictine Monk's Long View." 2019 Jefferson Lecture in the Humanities, Washington, DC, October 7. <https://www.youtube.com/embed/s-kcZ50nn5M> (accessed June 1, 2022).