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Background

The Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection of the Berlin Society for Anthropology, Ethnology and Prehistory (BSAEP) in Berlin, Germany, currently holds nineteen (19) human remains (skulls) identified as being of Australian origin. An initial overview of these remains was published in 2014 by Nils Seethaler, who compiled it on the basis of inscriptions on the skulls themselves, together with associated documentation (e.g. catalogue cards) and further information held in the archive of the BSAEP.\(^1\) A table of basic provenance information supplied to Seethaler by Ulrich Creutz, the long-term curator of the Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection, is reproduced in English translation in Appendix A of the current report.

In this report I draw on research conducted in German archival collections to expand on Seethaler’s conclusions. Funding for this research was generously provided by the Australian German Association Inc. through their AGA-Goethe Fellowship Program. A list of institutions and individuals consulted in the compilation of this report can be found in Appendix B.

The suggestion that I undertake provenance research into Australian Indigenous ancestral remains in the BSAEP’s collections was first made by the Australian Government Ministry for the Arts (now the Department of Communications and the Arts) in mid-2014. At that time I was employed as Executive Assistant to the Ambassador at the Australian Embassy in Berlin, and had already been involved for several years in facilitating repatriations of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander ancestral remains from German collecting institutions to their Traditional Owners. However, as Seethaler’s initial overview was then nearing publication, it was decided to postpone my research until after his report had appeared in print.

Importantly, the BSAEP has worked with the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation in the intervening period to formulate a position paper on the care of human remains in the collections of the National Museums in Berlin, including the Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection. It is also currently engaged in undertaking initial provenance research.\(^2\)

My repatriation recommendations for the remains in question are based on an analysis of documentary sources only. I have not examined the remains themselves, nor would I have the necessary expertise to do so. I therefore recommend that an expert in forensic or physical anthropology be commissioned to examine these nineteen skulls, both to confirm the nature of any information inscribed on them, and to identify any features (e.g. sex, approximate age, visible damage or deformities) which might assist in ascertaining their provenance.

---

\(^1\) Seethaler 2014.  
\(^2\) Fuhr & Seewald 2015; Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz 2015a, 2015b.
## Recommendations matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection No.</th>
<th>Collector / Donor</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Archival provenance</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v1050 (732)</td>
<td>Pressler; C.W.F. Uhde</td>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>Contextual evidence supports probable Aboriginal ancestry of this skull</td>
<td>Repatriation recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v1090 (770)</td>
<td>Ferdinand von Mueller</td>
<td>North Queensland</td>
<td>Contextual evidence supports probable Aboriginal ancestry of this skull</td>
<td>Repatriation recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v1091 (771)</td>
<td>Ferdinand von Mueller</td>
<td>North Queensland</td>
<td>Contextual evidence supports probable Aboriginal ancestry of this skull</td>
<td>Repatriation recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v1428 (950)</td>
<td>Ferdinand von Mueller</td>
<td>King George’s Sound</td>
<td>Contextual evidence supports probable Aboriginal ancestry of this skull</td>
<td>Repatriation recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v1429 (951)</td>
<td>Ferdinand von Mueller</td>
<td>King George’s Sound</td>
<td>Contextual evidence supports probable Aboriginal ancestry of this skull</td>
<td>Repatriation recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v1430 (952)</td>
<td>Ferdinand von Mueller</td>
<td>King George’s Sound</td>
<td>Contextual evidence supports probable Aboriginal ancestry of this skull</td>
<td>Repatriation recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v1431 (953)</td>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>King George’s Sound</td>
<td>Insufficient documentary evidence</td>
<td>Further archival research advised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v1432 (954)</td>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>King George’s Sound</td>
<td>Insufficient documentary evidence</td>
<td>Further archival research advised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v1433 (955)</td>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>King George’s Sound</td>
<td>Insufficient documentary evidence</td>
<td>Further archival research advised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v1434 (956)</td>
<td>Ferdinand von Mueller</td>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>Contextual evidence supports probable Aboriginal ancestry of this skull</td>
<td>Repatriation recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v1435 (957)</td>
<td>Richard Schomburgk</td>
<td>Australia (South Australia?)</td>
<td>Contextual evidence supports probable Aboriginal ancestry of this skull</td>
<td>Repatriation recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v1445 (967)</td>
<td>Emanuel von Korff (?)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Available documentary evidence suggests that this skull is not of Aboriginal ancestry</td>
<td>Repatriation not recommended at this stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v1493</td>
<td>Georg von Neumayer; Nikolaus Friedreich</td>
<td>Port Adelaide</td>
<td>Contextual evidence supports probable Aboriginal ancestry of this skull</td>
<td>Repatriation recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v1494</td>
<td>John Riddoch (?); Richard Schomburgk</td>
<td>Australia (South Australia?)</td>
<td>Contextual evidence supports probable Aboriginal ancestry of this skull</td>
<td>Repatriation recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Name(s)</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v1495</td>
<td>Georg von Neumayer; Nikolaus Friedrich</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Contextual evidence supports probable Aboriginal ancestry of this skull</td>
<td>Repatriation recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v1518</td>
<td>G.C. (or G.E.) Erbsloh (or Erbsloeh); Robert Jannasch</td>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>Contextual evidence supports probable Aboriginal ancestry of this skull</td>
<td>Repatriation recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v1893 (221)</td>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>Insufficient documentary evidence</td>
<td>Further archival research advised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v1894 (222)</td>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>Insufficient documentary evidence</td>
<td>Further archival research advised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v4017 (191)</td>
<td>Emanuel von Korff</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Contextual evidence supports probable Aboriginal ancestry of this skull</td>
<td>Repatriation recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview: The Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection

The Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection of the Berlin Society for Anthropology, Ethnology and Prehistory (BSAEP) is named after Rudolf Ludwig Karl Virchow (1821-1902), the celebrated German cellular pathologist, left-liberal politician and public health reformer. He co-founded the Berlin Society for Anthropology, the forerunner of the BSAEP, in 1869 and served repeatedly as its president over the following years.

The holdings of the Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection currently number around 4500 items. The majority of these are human skulls; however, the collection also includes other human skeletal remains, skulls and skeletons of primates, and so-called ‘anthropologica’ (e.g. hair samples, soft tissue samples, plaster casts of bones and body parts). In its current form, the Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection is drawn from three separate collections, depending on whether the objects in question were donated to Virchow personally, donated to the BSAEP, or acquired by means of funding made available through the ‘Rudolf Virchow Foundation’. In practice, however, Virchow ‘owned’ all three collections. Although objects continued to enter the Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection after Virchow’s death in 1902, the vast majority were acquired during his lifetime and as a result of his personal direction and guidance of potential collectors.

Some general information on Australian Indigenous ancestral remains in Virchow’s possession can be gleaned from his publications. In March 1873, during an address to the BSAEP on skulls from New Guinea and surrounding regions, he exhibited to his audience the skull of ‘an Austral Negro’, adding that he ‘also possess[ed] a second skull from a different region of Australia’. On this occasion he did not supply any further information about the provenance of these two skulls. In January 1875, during an address on ‘cranial characteristics of the lower human races’ to the Royal Academy of Sciences in Berlin, he again mentioned ‘two Australian Aboriginal skulls in my possession’, specifying that one was that of a ‘man from New South Wales’, the other that of a ‘woman from Port Adelaide’.

According to Virchow’s detailed description, the skull from New South Wales ‘display[ed], on the left-hand side, a complete discontinuity, [and] on the right-hand [side] a considerable decrease in size of the space between the temporal squama and the frontal bone; the ‘alae were] moderately curved inwards, [the] temporal squamae high and steep, [and the] coronal and sphenoparietal sutures in alignment’. The skull from Port Adelaide showed ‘a very small space [between the temporal squama and the frontal bone] on both sides, but no discontinuity’; the ‘alae temporales [were] strongly curved inwards, [the] temporal squamae very high, [and the] parietal angle short’. Possibly an experienced forensic or physical anthropologist might be able to match elements of these descriptions with the corresponding skulls in the Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection. The published version of Virchow’s address also included an illustration of the skull from New South Wales, reproduced in Appendix C of this report.

In 1880 Virchow again addressed the topic of ‘cranial characteristics of the lower human races’. He mentioned that he had ‘acquired another 4 new skulls’ of Australian Aborigines ‘since the time of [his] first communication’ on the topic in 1875, but did not provide any further information on their

---

3 Pagel 1903; Schultz 2008.
5 Virchow 1873: 66.
6 Although the German term Australierschädel translates literally as ‘Australian skulls’, the noun Australier (‘Australian’) was used during this period to refer specifically to Aboriginal Australians.
7 Virchow 1876a: 12. The address was delivered in 1875, but the published version did not appear until 1876.
8 Virchow 1876a: 28-29.
provenance. Later references to Australian Indigenous ancestral remains in Virchow’s works are generally brief and inconclusive. In 1895, during a discussion of the recently-discovered skull of *Pithecantropus erectus* (‘Java Man’), Virchow compared it with the skulls of ‘an Australian Aborigine ... a gorilla and a chimpanzee’, declaring that the former, which ‘originate[d] from a native of Cape York’, could ‘be considered the most bestial in our collections’. An excerpt from this discussion is reproduced in Appendix D of this report. Probably the skull in question was one of several collected in Cape York in 1881 by the German traveller-naturalist Otto Finsch (1839-1917) and given to the Royal Ethnological Museum in Berlin on his return. Virchow, who had advised Finsch on his anthropological responsibilities prior to his departure, evidently had access to Finsch’s collections of skeletal material; this is demonstrated by an 1898 discussion of ‘red-painted human bones’ in which Virchow explicitly referred to ‘a skull from Cape York, brought back by Dr. Finsch in 1881’. These ancestral remains, together with those collected by Finsch in Torres Strait, were transferred to the custody of the Medical History Museum at Berlin’s Charité University Hospital in 2005, and in 2013-14 were returned to their Traditional Owners.

The best-documented Australian Indigenous ancestral remains acquired by Virchow do not appear to be held in the Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection at present. These were the remains of Johnny Campbell (c. 1846-1880), a Gubbi Gubbi/Kabi Kabi man whose Aboriginal name is variously recorded as Kagariu, Ubelah or Umbelah. A feared and successful bushranger, he was convicted of rape and hanged at Brisbane Gaol on 16 August 1880. The Russian traveller-naturalist Nikolai Miklouho-Maclay (1846-1882), who had previously obtained permission from the Australian ‘authorities and the Colonial Secretary, as well as the Chief Superintendent of Prisons, to remove and examine the brain for scientific purposes in the event of a native dying in prison’, photographed and dissected Campbell’s corpse, removing the brain and other internal organs for his own studies. He then preserved the remainder in fluid and sent it to Virchow, who confirmed receipt at the BSAEP’s monthly meeting in March 1881. Several scholars have discussed this incident, but none has succeeded in pinpointing the current location of Campbell’s remains, if indeed they still exist. Publications on the history of the Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection are unclear on the extent and nature of losses sustained during the First and Second World Wars, as well as in the course of numerous relocations.

By comparing the above details with information contained in Creutz’s table of provenance information (Appendix A), it is possible to conclude that the ‘two Australian Aboriginal skulls in [Virchow’s] possession’ by March 1873 were most likely (i) ancestral remain v1050 (732) from New South Wales, and (ii) ancestral remain v1493 from Port Adelaide. The ‘4 new skulls’ Virchow had acquired by 1880 almost certainly included v1434 (956) from Western Australia, as well as v1435 (957), probably from South Australia. However, uncertainties regarding the accession dates of several of the Australian Indigenous ancestral remains in the Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection make it difficult to be precise on this point.

---

9 Virchow 1880c: 39.
10 Virchow 1895: 436.
11 Letter from Otto Finsch to Hans Virchow, 7 March 1909, NL Virchow, No. 607, BBAS.
15 Miklouho-Maclay 1882; Virchow 1881a, 1881b: 397.
Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection – v1050 (732)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection No. (1)</th>
<th>Collection No. (2)</th>
<th>Collector (1)</th>
<th>Collector (2)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v1050</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>Pressler</td>
<td>Uhde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New South Wales</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

I concur with Seethaler’s suggestion that the ‘Uhde’ associated with ancestral remain v1050 (732) was the German surgeon and anatomist Carl (or Karl) Wilhelm Ferdinand Uhde (1813-1885). Born in Hohegeiss in Germany’s Harz Mountains, Uhde studied first in Göttingen – where his teachers included Johann Friedrich Blumenbach (1752-1840), the ‘father of comparative anatomy’ and founder of Germany’s oldest craniological collection – then in Halle, Zurich, Freiburg im Breisgau, and Vienna. In 1843 he was offered a position as Director of the Surgical Division of the Ducal Hospital and Lecturer in Surgery at the Anatomical and Surgical College in Braunschweig, Germany, but delayed accepting it until the following year in order to undertake a study voyage through Europe (Belgium, England, France, Italy, Germany, Netherlands, Switzerland). During this voyage he met several times with the Dutch anatomist Jacobus Schroeder van der Kolk (1797-1862) in Utrecht and viewed his anatomical collections; as a result of this experience, Uhde later recalled, he became determined to ‘contribute everything [possible] to the completion of the collections here’.

Uhde spent the remainder of his career in Braunschweig, accepting progressively more senior positions. Although his primary focus was surgery, he retained an interest in comparative anatomy. In 1854 he published a catalogue of the surgical and anatomical collections in Braunschweig, and in 1861 a description of four skulls from the Sandwich Islands (Hawai‘i). These skulls, he noted, had been collected at his request by a Mr Bielitz, a ship’s doctor employed by the Hanseatic League. Possibly Uhde made a similar arrangement with ‘Pressler’, presumably the collector of ancestral remain v1050 (732); one or both of them could have been his students. As there is no evidence to suggest that Uhde ever visited Australia, or indeed travelled outside western Europe, it is highly unlikely that he collected ancestral remain v1050 (732) himself.

The identity of ‘Pressler’ is uncertain. Seethaler suggests the German forestry scientist and engineer Max Pressler (1815-1886), but offers no supporting reasons for this suggestion, and I have found no evidence of any connections between Max Pressler and either Uhde or Virchow. A few references to individuals with the surname ‘Pressler’ or ‘Presler’ can be found in nineteenth-century Australian newspapers (available in digitised form on the National Library of Australia’s TROVE database, trove.nla.gov.au). One whose name appears repeatedly is a certain Heinrich (or Henry) Gottlieb Pressler (c. 1823-1887), who in April 1851 was listed amongst the foreigners naturalised in South Australia over 25 years, and there is a ‘Heinrick G. Pressler’, 64 years of age at his death in 1887.

---

18 Seethaler 2014: 85-86.  
20 Blasius 1887: 24-25; Maas 1885; Zimmermann 1895.  
21 Uhde 1854, 1861.  
22 Uhde 1861: 3-4.  
23 Seethaler 2014: 86.  
24 Sturt 1851.
interred in Adelaide’s West Terrace Cemetery. There are also two references to a ‘Peter Pressler’ in relation to an insolvency case in Sydney, but I have not been able to locate any additional information about this person. A further possibility is that ‘Pressler’, like Bielitz, was a ship’s doctor, perhaps a former student of Uhde’s, and merely made a brief visit to Australia rather than settling there.

No accession date is recorded for ancestral remain v1050 (732). However, Uhde was in direct contact with Virchow as early as 1860, and may have known him through medical networks before this. Given that ancestral remain v1050 (732) is one of only two in the BSAEP’s collection with a specific provenance of ‘New South Wales’, and that the other, ancestral remain v1518, has an accession date of 1880, I consider it likely that ancestral remain v1050 (732) is identical with the skull of a ‘man from New South Wales’ (see Overview) acquired by Virchow prior to March 1873 and described in detail in 1875.

Recommendation

Repatriation of ancestral remain v1050 (732) is recommended.

---

25 Adelaide Cemeteries Authority 2015; Anon 1873, 1875b; Fisher et al. 1866; Torrens 1860.
26 Anon 1867, 1871.
27 Letter from C.W.F. Uhde to Rudolf Virchow, 18 July 1860, NL Virchow, No. 2204, BBAS.
Ancestral remains v1090 (770) and v1091 (771) will be discussed together.

Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection – v1090 (770)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection No. (1)</th>
<th>Collection No. (2)</th>
<th>Collector (1)</th>
<th>Collector (2)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v1090</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>Müller v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>North Queensland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection – v1091 (771)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection No. (1)</th>
<th>Collection No. (2)</th>
<th>Collector (1)</th>
<th>Collector (2)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v1091</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>Müller v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>North Queensland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Six of the nineteen Australian ancestral remains in the Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection (v1090 (770), v1091 (771), v1428 (950), v1429 (951), v1430 (952), v1434 (956)) can be linked definitively to the German-Australian botanist Ferdinand Jakob Heinrich von Mueller (1825-1896). Another three (v1431 (953), v1432 (954), v1433 (955)) may also be connected to him.

Mueller, also spelt ‘Müller’, was born in Rostock and studied at the University of Kiel. Health concerns prompted him and two of his sisters to emigrate to a warmer climate; they arrived in Adelaide in 1847, where Mueller worked intermittently as a pharmacist while devoting much of his time to investigations of South Australia’s native vegetation. In 1852 he moved to Melbourne, and in 1853 was appointed government botanist. In this role he undertook expeditions to many areas of Victoria and New South Wales, including the alpine regions, Gippsland, and the Grampians. In 1855-56, as botanist to the North Australian Exploring Expedition, Mueller accompanied expedition leader Augustus Gregory (1819-1905) from Joseph Bonaparte Gulf in the Northern Territory to Lake Gregory in the Kimberley Region of Western Australia, then overland via Albert River (now Burdekin) on the Gulf of Carpentaria, Croydon and Charters Towers (Burdekin Valley), and the Dawson River (near Rockhampton) to Moreton Bay in south-east Queensland, a total distance of 8000 km.28

In 1857 Mueller was appointed Director of the Botanic Garden (now the Royal Botanic Gardens) in Melbourne, a position he held until 1873. He cultivated an extensive network of collectors throughout Australia, exchanged seeds and plants with botanists in Australia and overseas, published widely on botanical and related topics, and was actively involved in Victoria’s scientific and German communities. Although there is no clear evidence that he collected Aboriginal human remains himself, he certainly sourced them for contacts overseas. Home et al. note that, ‘[I]ike most other white Australians of his day, Mueller showed little sensitivity towards the Australian Aborigines, whom he seems to have regarded as … barbaric people in need of the civilizing

28 Cohn 1996; Home et al. 1998: 30-32; Morris 1974; Parkin 1996. The latter includes a map of the route taken by the North Australian Exploring Expedition.
influence of Europeans. He also saw them as legitimate objects of scientific study and so did not hesitate to send aboriginal skeletons, almost certainly of recent origin, to European museums.’

The extent of Mueller’s activities in this regard can be seen from a paragraph in one of his numerous letters to the Munich-based botanist Carl Friedrich Philipp von Martius (1794-1868):

> I shall not neglect the great Carus’ wishes to obtain skeletons and especially skulls of our savages. Rudolph Wagner, Quatrefages and other anatomists have received such [remains] from my hand; and only recently I asked the Governor of Tasmania to have skeletal remains of the original inhabitants of that small island exhumed on Flinders Island. The tribes themselves are extinct!30

Mueller was referring here to the physician and comparative anatomist Carl Gustav Carus (1789-1869), whose collection of skulls later formed the basis of the Anthropological Cabinet at the Museum of Natural History in Dresden; the naturalist and physiologist Rudolf (or Rudolph) Wagner (1805-1864), curator of the Blumenbach Skull Collection in Göttingen; and the anthropologist Armand de Quatrefages (1810-1892), Chair of Anthropology and Ethnography at the National Museum of Natural History in Paris.31 Mueller’s correspondence reveals that in 1862 he forwarded two ‘skeletons of aboriginal Australians’ to Wagner, and ‘a skeleton of an Australian aboriginal (not quite but nearly complete)’ to Quatrefages.32 In 1866 he dispatched ‘2 complete skeletons of a man and a woman from the tribe inhabiting the Murray desert, and several other separated bones of the black natives of these parts’, to the Imperial Society of Naturalists in Moscow; in 1868 ‘several skulls and other bones of the natives of the Richmond River’ to Ferdinand Krauss (1812-1890), Chair of the Natural History Collection in Stuttgart; and in 1869 ‘[t]he skeleton of [a] native ... from Western Australia’, again to Krauss.33 A letter written in 1864 to the physician Adolphus Berndt in New Zealand shows Mueller actively attempting to source ancestral remains:

> Prof. Ecker in Freiberg [sic] has asked me for some skulls of New Zealand natives. Is it possible to buy such things there. If so I ask you to purchase a couple for me and the expense will be reimbursed immediately ... Skeletons of the Apterix [kiwi] and bones of Moa etc. would also be welcome.34

Ancestral remains v1090 (770) and v1091 (771) are both provenanced to ‘North Queensland’, with an accession date of 1881. Seethaler suggests that Mueller might have acquired these two skulls in the course of the North Australian Exploring Expedition of 1855-56, but concedes that the period of time between this expedition and the skulls’ accession date in Berlin is ‘too large to be able to postulate a connection of this kind conclusively’.35 I also consider it unlikely that Mueller, if he had acquired two skulls in 1855-56, would have waited for over twenty years before transferring them to Virchow. Mueller himself does not appear to have had any personal interest in anatomy or physical

---

32 Chisholm 1911; Jacobi 1925: 14-15; Knauß 1957; Pagel 1896; Wustmann 1990.
34 Anon 1866a; letters from Ferdinand von Mueller to Ferdinand Krauss, 7 October 1868 and 1 February 1869, access courtesy of Sara Maroske, Correspondence of Ferdinand von Mueller Project.
35 Letter from Ferdinand von Mueller to Adolphus Berndt, 29 September 1864, access courtesy of Sara Maroske, Correspondence of Ferdinand von Mueller Project. The reference is to the physician and anatomist Alexander Ecker (1816-1887) in Freiburg im Breisgau (Ortolf & Wittwer-Backofen n.d.).
36 Seethaler 2014: 84.
anthropology, and, as outlined above, was in contact from at least 1862 with a number of scientists eager to take ancestral remains off his hands.

Sara Maroske, co-editor of the Ferdinand von Mueller Correspondence Project, notes that by 1860 Mueller had virtually ceased collecting in person; instead, he relied increasingly on his extensive network of collectors and correspondents to supply him with specimens.36 One who was particularly active in north Queensland was John Dallachy, a former curator of the Botanic Garden in Melbourne, who "[supplied] Mueller with large numbers of well-chosen specimens of Australian tropical plants, many previously unknown to science".37 However, Dallachy died in 1871, a full ten years earlier than the accession date recorded for ancestral remains v1090 (770) and v1091 (771). Closer to 1881, other correspondents of Mueller’s active in north Queensland included W. Anthony Persieh, a Belgian-born pharmacist and surveyor who collected botanical and zoological specimens in the Endeavour River and Cooktown areas from around 1878, and the pastoralist Charles Weldon de Burgh Birch, who sent plant specimens to Mueller from north-central Queensland for a period of twenty years (1870s-1890s).38

Recommendation

Repatriation of ancestral remains v1090 (770) and v1091 (771) is recommended.

---

37 Home et al. 2002: 11.
Ancestral remains v1428 (950), v1429 (951), v1430 (952), v1431 (953), v1432 (954) and v1433 (955) will be discussed together.

### Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection – v1428 (950)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection No. (1)</th>
<th>Collection No. (2)</th>
<th>Collector (1)</th>
<th>Collector (2)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v1428</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>Müller v donor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>King George's Sound</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection – v1429 (951)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection No. (1)</th>
<th>Collection No. (2)</th>
<th>Collector (1)</th>
<th>Collector (2)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v1429</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>Müller v donor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>King George's Sound</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection – v1430 (952)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection No. (1)</th>
<th>Collection No. (2)</th>
<th>Collector (1)</th>
<th>Collector (2)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v1430</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>Müller v donor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>King George's Sound</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection – v1431 (953)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection No. (1)</th>
<th>Collection No. (2)</th>
<th>Collector (1)</th>
<th>Collector (2)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v1431</td>
<td>953</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King George's Sound</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection – v1432 (954)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection No. (1)</th>
<th>Collection No. (2)</th>
<th>Collector (1)</th>
<th>Collector (2)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v1432</td>
<td>954</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King George's Sound</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection – v1433 (955)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection No. (1)</th>
<th>Collection No. (2)</th>
<th>Collector (1)</th>
<th>Collector (2)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v1433</td>
<td>955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King George’s Sound</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

King George’s Sound was the name given to the British settlement established as a military garrison in 1826 at what is now Albany, south-west Western Australia. Although today King George Sound refers only to ‘the large outer harbour’, the name King George’s Sound was applied to ‘the whole region, including the settlement and the harbour’, in its early years.39

The *Proceedings* for the BSAEP’s monthly meeting in July 1883 record the arrival of ancestral remains v1428 (950), v1429 (951) and v1430 (952), noting: ‘Baron Ferd. v. Müller in Melbourne sends three skulls of Western Australian natives from the vicinity of King George’s Sound, together with a letter of 17 May and several publications’. Virchow, who was chairing the meeting, took the opportunity to thank the BSAEP’s ‘meritorious corresponding member for his tireless participation’ and indicated that he would discuss these ‘most interesting donations’ in more detail on a later occasion.40 To date, however, I have found no evidence of such a discussion.

Mueller made three separate visits to Western Australia during his career. The first, as mentioned above, was with the North Australian Exploring Expedition in 1855-56. The second, in 1867, took him to ‘the Stirling range and surrounding country, and the vicinity of King George’s Sound’, where he spent a holiday ‘botanizing enthusiastically’.41 On his third visit in 1877, his ‘last major period of field-work’, he ‘spent several weeks travelling through the settled districts of the south-west of Western Australia after being commissioned by that colony’s government to survey the forest resources of the region’.42 Although this visit was closest in time to the accession date recorded for ancestral remains v1428 (950), v1429 (951) and v1430 (952), none of the areas he traversed – ‘the country from Champion Bay [Geraldton] to Shark Bay, and also from Swan River to Geograph[e] Bay, and thence to the Shannon and Gordon rivers’ – is within 100 km of King George’s Sound.43 On the other hand, it seems improbable that he would have gone to the trouble of obtaining ancestral remains during his 1867 holiday in ‘the vicinity of King George’s Sound’, only to wait for over a decade before forwarding them to Virchow.

I consider it more likely that ancestral remains v1428 (950), v1429 (951) and v1430 (952) were obtained at Mueller’s request by one of his collectors in the field. As already mentioned, Mueller relied increasingly on his extensive network of collectors and correspondents in his later years. He had several collectors working for him in and around King George’s Sound in the late 1870s and early 1880s, including Ann Augusta Knight (née McKail), Catherine Louisa Taylor, and the married couple William Heaton Webb and Lucy Webb (née Mew). Webb, who lived in Albany from his arrival as a convict in 1862 to his death in 1897, is known to have collected animal and bird skins for

---

40 Müller 1883.
41 Mueller 1879: 2; Home et al. 2002: 46-47.
42 Home et al. 2006: 30.
43 Mueller 1879: 2.
Mueller, as well as seeds and plants, and may have had access to local Aboriginal communities through his ‘part-Aboriginal’ wife Lucy.44

The situation with regard to ancestral remains v1431 (953), v1432 (954) and v1433 (955) is unclear. On the one hand, they are numbered consecutively to ancestral remains v1428 (950), v1429 (951) and v1430 (952), and the same region of origin, ‘King George’s Sound’, is recorded for all six. On the other hand, the numbering of ancestral remains in the Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection does not appear to be strictly chronological: the six remains from King George’s Sound are followed immediately by ancestral remain v1434 (956), which, as discussed below, was already in Virchow’s possession by 1876. In addition, if Mueller was the donor of all six ancestral remains from King George’s Sound, it seems odd that his name would be recorded for only three of them.

Recommendation

Repatriation of ancestral remains v1428 (950), v1429 (951) and v1430 (952) is recommended.

Prior to recommending repatriation of ancestral remains v1431 (953), v1432 (954) and v1433 (955), I recommend further archival research into the circumstances of their acquisition.

---

Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection – v1434 (956)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection No. (1)</th>
<th>Collection No. (2)</th>
<th>Collector (1)</th>
<th>Collector (2)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v1434</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>Müller v</td>
<td>donor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Western</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

The impending delivery of ancestral remain v1434 (956) was reported at the BSAEP's monthly gathering in June 1874. Dr Klefeker, a naval staff surgeon, had advised in a letter from Sydney, dated 8 April 1874, ‘that he was bringing with him the skull of a Western Australian Aborigine, as well as various weapons, on behalf of Mr v. Müller in Melbourne’. A year and a half later, at the BSAEP's monthly meeting in January 1876, Virchow confirmed the arrival of these items:

> H.M. Frigate Arkona has brought with it for the Society a number of anthropological and ethnological objects which were consigned to the special care of Staff Surgeon Dr Boehr following the death of Naval Staff Surgeon Dr Klefeker. Amongst them are a Western Australian skull and a number of Western Australian weapons from Baron von Müller in Melbourne.

Virchow took this opportunity to express ‘the Society's particular thanks’, noting that these gifts were ‘all the more welcome as Western Australian objects and skulls have until now been very under-represented’ in the Society’s collections.

The Arkona (or Arcona) arrived in Melbourne in mid-March 1874, departing again for Sydney in early April. According to a contemporary newspaper report, the ship had already stopped at Rio and the Kerguelen and McDonald Islands, and was calling at Melbourne and Sydney ‘on her way to the South Pacific, where she will visit the Fiji Islands and other groups’, followed by stops at Japan and China on the homeward route. Other reports reveal that the ship was first visited by local dignitaries, then opened to the public for a small fee, and that the captain and crew participated in various local entertainments, including the laying of the foundation stone of the new German Lutheran church in East Melbourne, a performance of the opera Faust, and a day trip to Ballarat. Although there is no explicit mention of the ship’s band performing in the Botanic Garden in Melbourne, as they subsequently did in Sydney, there were nevertheless numerous opportunities for contact between Mueller and members of the Arcona’s crew, and a number of gifts exchanged hands. Mueller’s correspondence reveals that the Arcona arrived with a ‘collection of seeds of alpine plants from Tyrol’ for him on board, ‘with the request to sow them in the alps in our south here; prior to its departure, he ‘gave some of the [Arcona’s] scientific men ... letters’ for the geologist and Anglican clergyman William Branwhite Clarke, a correspondent of his in Sydney.

Information about Mueller’s visits to Western Australia is included in the discussion of ancestral remains v1428 (950) through v1433 (955) above. His second visit in 1867 is closest in time to the

---

45 Virchow 1874.
46 Virchow 1876b.
47 Virchow 1876b.
48 Anon 1874c.
49 Anon 1874a, 1874b, 1874d, 1874e, 1874f, 1874g, 1874h, 1874i.
50 Anon 1874j.
51 Letters from Ferdinand von Mueller to Julius Haast, 1 November 1874, and to William Clarke, 25 April 1874, access courtesy of Sara Maroske, Correspondence of Ferdinand von Mueller Project; Home et al. 1998: 525.
collection date (no later than 1874) of ancestral remain v1434 (956); however, I consider it more likely that one of his many contacts acquired this ancestral remain for him. Possible candidates include the surveyor John Sherlock Brooking, resident in Western Australia from 1863, and Oliver Llewellyn Jones, a member of the West Australian Police Force from 1872 to 1884, who accompanied Mueller on his travels in Western Australia.

Recommendation

Repatriation of ancestral remain v1434 (956) is recommended.

---

52 Home et al. 2006: 783, 804.
Ancestral remains v1435 (957) and v1494 will be discussed together.

Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection – v1435 (957)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection No. (1)</th>
<th>Collection No. (2)</th>
<th>Collector (1)</th>
<th>Collector (2)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v1435</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>Schombergk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection – v1494

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection No. (1)</th>
<th>Collection No. (2)</th>
<th>Collector (1)</th>
<th>Collector (2)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v1494</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schomburgk</td>
<td>Biddock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Seethaler states that the BSAEP’s catalogue card for ancestral remain v1494 describes it as that of an ‘Australian from Mr John Biddock via Dr. Schomburgk’. He notes that the surname of the collector associated with ancestral remain v1435 (957) is spelt ‘Schombergk’, but assumes the reference in both cases is to the botanist Moritz Richard Schomburgk (1811-1891). I agree, though I have found no evidence to support Seethaler’s assertion that Schomburgk himself used this variant spelling. However, it does occur occasionally in German-language sources and relatively frequently in English-language ones.

Schomburgk was born in Freyburg in the state of Saxony. In 1831 he relocated to Berlin, where he undertook military service with the Royal Guard and subsequently worked as a gardener at Sanssouci, the palace of King Friedrich Wilhelm III in Potsdam. From 1840 to 1844 he accompanied his eldest brother Robert on an expedition to British Guiana (now Guyana) in South America. Robert had been appointed Boundary Commissioner for the British Crown, and Schomburgk accompanied him in the service of the Prussian government to make collections for the Royal Prussian Museum and the Botanical Gardens in Berlin. Both men collected human remains of indigenous peoples during their travels. Robert supplied an ‘Arrowak [Arawak] skull’ to the Royal College of Surgeons in London; Schomburgk, disregarding ‘the holy awe that the Indians cherish for their dead’, exhumed three skeletons near the village of Pirara, one of which was later exhibited ‘in the Anatomy Museum at Berlin’.

In 1849, together with his older brother Otto, Schomburgk emigrated to South Australia. The brothers settled at Buchfelde, near Gawler, shortly after their arrival, where they established a farm, an orchard and a vineyard. Both were appointed to the local magistracy and became involved with local government, though Otto’s involvement ended with his untimely death in 1857. While based

---

53 Seethaler 2014: 83.
54 Anon 1849, 1875a, 1876a, 1876b, 1883c, 1891.
55 Payne 2007: 55; Schomburgk 1848a: 305-307, 1848b: 242-244; Virchow 1886a: 110. Presumably Schomburgk was referring to the anatomical collection established by Johann Gottlieb Walter (1734-1818) during the second half of the eighteenth century. It was sold to the Prussian State in 1803 and taken over by the University of Berlin (now the Humboldt University) following its establishment in 1830 (Weber 2013).
in Buchfelde, Schomburgk also collected specimens of South Australian reptiles and amphibians for the zoologist Wilhelm Peters (1815-1883) in Berlin.\(^56\)

In 1865 Schomburgk applied successfully for the position of director of the Adelaide Botanic Gardens. He relocated to Adelaide the same year, remaining there until his death in 1891. As director, Schomburgk assiduously cultivated a global network of contact and exchange with private individuals, learned societies and institutions, including the BSAEP. He was elected a corresponding member in July 1879, and his name appears in the BSAEP’s *Proceedings* in association with various gifts: copies of George Taplin’s *Australian Aboriginal Folklore* and William Wyatt’s *Some Account of the Manners and Superstitions of the Adelaide and Encounter Bay Aboriginal Tribes*, as well as several of his own publications on botanical and ethnobotanical topics.\(^57\)

Further gifts, including ‘a newly-published work on *The Native Tribe of South Australia*, ‘a stone knife and seven magical boards from South Australia’,\(^58\) and a report compiled by an unnamed ‘friend’ on ‘manners and customs of the tribes living deep in the interior of South Australia’, were presented to the BSAEP on Schomburgk’s behalf by Andreas Fedor Jagor (1816-1900), the Berlin-born son of a wealthy Russian restaurateur and hotelier.\(^59\) Jagor travelled widely in South and Southeast Asia during the second half of the nineteenth century, assembling extensive collections of anthropological and ethnographic material for the BSAEP and for Berlin’s Royal Ethnological Museum.\(^60\) His letters to Virchow suggest that he was well connected within Europe’s scientific circles and very effective in recruiting others as donors and collectors. As I have found no evidence of direct correspondence between Virchow and any of the Schomburgk brothers, I suspect that Schomburgk’s connection with the BSAEP may have been facilitated by Jagor, though I have not been able to establish exactly how or when contact was initiated.

In addition to collecting in the field, Jagor brokered transactions (purchases, gifts and exchanges) of anthropological and ethnographic items at major exhibitions. In 1878, for example, he obtained ‘a very valuable collection of South Australian weapons, tools etc.’ from Josiah Boothby (1837-1916), Executive Commissioner for South Australia at the Paris International Exhibition.\(^61\) Schomburgk directly facilitated this transaction, writing to Jagor in February 1878: ‘Our Government has sent a complete collection [of weapons etc.] to the Paris Exhibition, and I have arranged with our Executive Commissioner … to let you have a set … Now, *sein Sie klug und weise* [be clever and wise] and you will get a fine collection for your Society’.\(^62\)

In view of this close contact between Schomburgk and Jagor, which evidently preceded Schomburgk’s formal association with the BSAEP, I consider it likely that Jagor was involved in the acquisition of ancestral remain v1435 (957), ancestral remain v1494, or both. Possibly ancestral remain v1435 (957), which has an accession date of 1874, was acquired in the context of the Vienna International Exhibition in 1873; Jagor wrote to Virchow describing his ‘negotiations’ with ‘representatives from Japan, China, [and] Australia’ at this exhibition, although I have not been able
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\(^56\) Middelmann 1976; Payne 2007: 74-79; Peters 1864a, 1864b, 1875.
\(^57\) Beyrich 1884; Virchow 1879a, 1879b, 1880b, 1891: 867.
\(^58\) According to Schomburgk, he had been sent these ‘magical boards’ by an unnamed finder, who had discovered a total of 30 such artefacts ‘in a cave, hidden under dried grass’. Judging by the finder’s description, they were secret/sacred men’s objects (Jagor 1879b: 105-106; cf. Kaus 2008). A later communication reveals that Schomburgk also kept some of the 30 ‘magical boards’ himself (Jagor 1879c).
\(^59\) Jagor 1879a, 1879b, 1879c; Schomburgk 1879.
\(^60\) Virchow 1900.
\(^61\) Hawker 1969.
\(^62\) Letter from Richard Schomburgk to Fedor Jagor, 12 February 1878, Slg Darmstaedter Australien 1852 Müller, Ferdinand von, SL-Berlin. Note that this letter has erroneously been filed with Ferdinand von Mueller’s correspondence. Apart from the phrase ‘sein[...] Sie klug und weise’, it is written in English.
to establish the object of these negotiations or whether they were successful.\(^1\) No items likely to have been of interest to Jagor were listed in South Australia’s official contribution to the Vienna International Exhibition, though the inclusion of an album containing views of Adelaide’s Botanic Gardens, presumably contributed by Schomburgk, is noteworthy. Queensland and Victoria also participated in the exhibition, but only Victoria’s contribution included anthropological and ethnographic items, namely models of Aboriginal weapons, photographic portraits, ‘[c]asts of the skulls of the aboriginal natives of Victoria’, and charts of Aboriginal languages.\(^4\)

As mentioned above, the BSAEP’s catalogue card for ancestral remain v1494 describes it as that of an ‘Australian from Mr John Biddock via Dr. Schomburgk’. My searches of digitised Australian newspapers available through the National Library of Australia’s TROVE database found no references to a ‘John Biddock’; however, there are numerous references to a ‘John Riddoch’ or (correctly) ‘John Riddoch’ (1827-1901), a significant figure in South Australia’s political, economic and social life during the second half of the nineteenth century. Riddoch’s parents migrated with him from Scotland to Victoria in 1851-52; after stints as a carter, gold digger and buyer on the Ovens River goldfields, and as a shopkeeper and wine merchant in Geelong, he purchased Yallum Park, near Penola, south-east South Australia, in 1861. ‘Here he built an Italianate mansion, surrounded with exotic trees and a forty-acre ... deer park’, and was known as ‘a genial host’. By 1893, Riddoch and his brother George ‘held the freehold to over 75,000 acres’ of land in South Australia, extending ‘from the Coonawarra fruit colony ... in the north, [to] Glencoe in the west and almost to Mount Gambier in the south’. In addition to their activities as experimental farmers and graziers, both brothers sat in the South Australian parliament.\(^5\)

John Riddoch’s political and social influence, together with his evident interest in exotic plant and animal species,\(^6\) would undoubtedly have brought him into contact with Schomburgk. The two men clearly moved in similar circles: both were exhibitors at the 1886 Indian and Colonial Exhibition in London, and both sat on organisational committees for the 1887 Adelaide Jubilee International Exhibition of the Arts, Agriculture and Manufactures.\(^7\)

It is difficult to narrow down the likely provenance of ancestral remains v1435 (957) and v1494 further on the basis of the evidence available. Both can be assigned with reasonable certainty to South Australia, given Schomburgk’s and Riddoch’s long-term connections to the state. Ancestral remain v1435 (957) entered the Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection in 1874, well after Schomburgk had moved to Adelaide; his biographer Pauline Payne notes that he ‘travelled comparatively little in Australia’, and ‘very little in South Australia’ specifically, but he may well have been given ancestral remain v1435 (957) by one of his more mobile contacts, rather than collecting it himself.\(^8\) This certainly appears to have been the case with ancestral remain v1494, collected by ‘John Biddock’ (probably John Riddoch) under unclear circumstances at an unspecified date; it also applies to the ethnographic items and reports sent by Schomburgk to the BSAEP.

Recommendation

Repatriation of ancestral remains v1435 (957) and v1494 is recommended.

\(^{61}\) Letter from Fedor Jagor to Rudolf Virchow, 27 September 1878, NL Virchow, No. 1009, BBAS.

\(^{64}\) Great Britain, Royal Commission for the Vienna Universal Exhibition 1874: 10, 17, 343-342, 361.

\(^{65}\) MacGillivray 1988.

\(^{66}\) Riddoch sent several gifts of native plant seeds and other natural history specimens to the Botanical Gardens at his former home in Geelong (Anon 1864a, 1864b, 1864c).

\(^{67}\) Anon 1883a, 1883b, 1886a, 1887; Elton n.d.

\(^{68}\) Payne 2007: 155.
Ancestral remains v1445 (967) and v4017 (191) will be discussed together.

Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection – v1445 (967)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection No. (1)</th>
<th>Collection No. (2)</th>
<th>Collector (1)</th>
<th>Collector (2)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v1445</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>Korff?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Australia, not Aboriginal!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection – v4017 (191)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection No. (1)</th>
<th>Collection No. (2)</th>
<th>Collector (1)</th>
<th>Collector (2)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v4017</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>Korff</td>
<td></td>
<td>1897</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

The accession of ancestral remain v4017 (191) was briefly reported at the BSAEP's monthly meeting in February 1897, as follows:

Baron v. Korff donates photographic images of Port Darwin, Australia, and an Australian Aboriginal skull.69

According to Seethaler, the BSAEP’s photographic collections, currently held in the Ethnological Museum in Berlin, include three photographs of Aboriginal Australians 'taken in 1896 in the Bay of Carpentaria (Port Darwin)' and given by 'General Baron Korff' to 'Privy Councillor Virchow', 'together with the skull of an Austral Negro'. As Seethaler points out, the phrasing here suggests, but does not explicitly state, that ancestral remain v4017 (191) was also obtained in Darwin.70

Seethaler also notes that a 'Baron von Korff, Colonel (retired), Berlin' was an ordinary member of the BSAEP from 1879 to 1890.71 He suggests that the man in question might be Karl Christoph Julius Viktor von Korff (1867-?), who studied medicine in Freiburg, Berlin and Kiel in the years 1890-1895 and was then briefly employed as a ship's doctor on an 1897 voyage to China and Japan.72 However, there is no evidence that this man ever held the title of Baron or the rank of General, both of which are associated with the Korff who donated ancestral remain v4017 (191). Moreover, Karl von Korff would have been only twelve years old in 1879, and it seems unlikely that the BSAEP would have accepted someone so young as a member.

I believe a more likely candidate is the Prussian military officer Emanuel Freiherr (Baron) von Schmysingk (1826-1903), also known as Emanuel von Korff.73 Following his retirement from active service, the already well-travelled Korff undertook a series of voyages to various parts of the world over the years 1893-1901, publishing an account of his experiences in ten volumes under the title

---

69 Korff 1897.
70 Seethaler 2014: 83. Seethaler gives the numbers of these photographs as P2153, P2154, and P3524.
71 Seethaler 2014: 85. 'Baron von Korff, Colonel (retired), Berlin' is listed amongst the BSAEP’s new members in May 1879 (Koner 1879), his name then appears in the list of ordinary members every year until 1890, with the exception of 1884.
72 Seethaler 2014: 85; Mörike 1988: 77-78.
73 Anon n.d. Rüß (1988: 12) states that Korff was awarded the title of Generalmajor (Major-General) in 1894.
Korff’s Weltreise (‘Korff’s World Tour’). Volumes 1-4 and 5-8 are listed amongst the BSAEP’s recently received publications in 1894 and 1896 respectively, in each case with the remark: ‘Gift of the author’. In addition, the archive of the BBAS holds two items of correspondence addressed to Virchow from ‘Colonel Baron Korff’; both date from 1880 and relate to Korff’s eyewitness observations of tomb inscriptions at the Beni Hasan cemetery site in Egypt.

The seventh of Korff’s ten world tours in 1895-96 took him to Australia, New Zealand and South America. According to his published account of this voyage, he travelled by ship from the port of Aden (now in Yemen) to Albany, WA, then onward to Adelaide, Melbourne, Sydney, back to Melbourne, then briefly to Tasmania, his last stop before departing for New Zealand. He travelled by rail between Melbourne and Sydney, by ship between all other locations. There is no indication that he visited Darwin, or even that he travelled any further north than Sydney. This suggests that the photographs ‘taken in 1896 in the Bay of Carpentaria (Port Darwin)’ were not taken by Korff himself.

Korff’s published account of his travels in Australia sheds little light on how he obtained ancestral remain v4017 (191). He writes in general terms about relationships between Aboriginal Australians and settlers on the mainland and in Tasmania; although he condemns the casual violence inflicted on Australia’s original inhabitants, he has nothing positive to say about them, maligning ‘the native Austral Negro’ as ‘the most unpleasant of all creatures ... stupid, treacherous, cowardly and cruel’. However, he describes only one first-hand encounter with Aboriginal Australians, and this took place not in Australia but in India:

> When I was in Bombay two years ago, an Australian entrepreneur brought 400 horses for the government. Amongst the carriers were 80 Austral Negroes. Out of curiosity, I stayed in their camp for two days, in order to be able to observe this human variety, previously unknown to me. Without exception, everything disgusted me, the dirt in which they lived, their laziness, their quarrelling, the brutality with which they handled the horses, and finally the blows with which they themselves were kept in order.

There is no suggestion in Korff’s description that he obtained ancestral remain v1445 (96?) on this occasion. I consider it more likely that he acquired it from a third party, possibly a dealer in natural history specimens and ethnographica. He was certainly aware of the existence of such establishments in Australia, mentioning in the course of his description of Albany that ‘[o]ne sees in the shop windows of the naturalists stuffed flying foxes with a wingspan of up to 1 ½ metres’.

The situation with regard to ancestral remain v1445 (96?) is unclear. No accession date is recorded, Korff’s involvement in its acquisition is uncertain, and the provenance information associated with it includes the explicit statement that it is ‘not Aboriginal’.

---
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Recommendation

Repatriation of ancestral remain v4017 (191) is recommended.

Given that available documentary evidence suggests that ancestral remain v1445 (967) is not of Aboriginal ancestry, I do not recommend its repatriation at this stage. Ideally, further archival research should be undertaken into the circumstances of its acquisition.
Ancestral remains v1493 and v1495 will be discussed together.

Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection – v1493

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection No. (1)</th>
<th>Collection No. (2)</th>
<th>Collector (1)</th>
<th>Collector (2)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v1493</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neumeyer</td>
<td>Friedrich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pt. Adelaide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection – v1495

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection No. (1)</th>
<th>Collection No. (2)</th>
<th>Collector (1)</th>
<th>Collector (2)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v1495</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neumeyer</td>
<td>Friedrich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

According to Seethaler, the BSAEP’s catalogue card for ancestral remain v1493 describes it as the skull of a ‘female Aborigine’ from ‘Pt. Adelaide, Victoria, obtained by Prof. Neumeyer, received from Prof. Friedrich’. The same catalogue card refers to damage caused to the skull by a blow from a ‘waddie’ (club). Seethaler notes correctly that Port Adelaide (now a suburb of Adelaide) is in fact located in South Australia, not Victoria.82

I concur with Seethaler’s assessment that the ‘Neumeyer’ listed as the collector of these two skulls is almost certainly the hydrographer, oceanographer and meteorologist Georg Balthasar von Neumayer (1826-1909).83 He visited Australia on two separate occasions, spending a total of nine years there (1852-54 and 1857-64). Following his return to Germany, he maintained a professional association with the BSAEP for many years; he was elected an ordinary member in 1871 and an honorary member in 1906, and delivered several lectures at the BSAEP’s monthly gatherings, two of them dealing specifically with Australian Aborigines.84 He concluded the first of these lectures by declaring that he had been glad to speak on behalf of ‘a race which on many occasions has shown itself to me to be useful and loyal, and about which I have … only good things to report’.85 Neumayer also had direct contact with Virchow from at least 1871, mostly regarding Virchow’s contributions to Neumayer’s edited volume Anleitungen zu wissenschaftlichen Beobachtungen auf Reisen (‘Instructions for Scientific Observations while Travelling’, 1875).

Neumayer’s correspondence with Virchow, held in the archive of the BBAS, contains no reference to human remains, nor have I been able to find any reference to skulls collected or donated by Neumayer in the BSAEP’s publications. Failing this, I have outlined below Neumayer’s activities in Australia during his two visits, including the only two references I have found in his publications to Australian Indigenous human remains.

82 Seethaler 2014: 83.
83 Neumayer’s surname is generally spelt correctly in the BSAEP’s publications; however, on at least two occasions it is given as ‘Neumeyer’, although the reference is clearly to the same person (Anon 1877a: 7; Schadenberg 1880: 145).
84 Lissauer 1906; Neumayer 1871, 1872; Virchow 1872a.
85 Neumayer 1871: 80. Plans to print Neumayer’s second lecture, delivered in May 1872, in the Zeitschrift für Ethnologie seemingly did not eventuate (Neumayer 1872; cf. letter from Georg von Neumayer to Rudolf Virchow, 3 August 1872, NL Virchow, No. 2546, BBAS).
Neumayer was born in Kirchheimbolanden, now in the German state of Rhineland-Palatinate. After studying science in Munich and navigation science in Hamburg, he signed on to a ship's crew to gain practical experience, arriving in Sydney in August 1852. He remained for some months in the employment of various freight and passenger ships servicing Australia's east coast, then obtained a dismissal in Melbourne and set out for the Bendigo diggings (now Castlemaine) in May 1853. Here he joined a group of German gold seekers, remaining until August 1853. He then returned briefly to Melbourne and took ship to Port Adelaide, where he visited a number of German settlers. Presumably it was on this occasion that he acquired ancestral remain v1493, although his description of his visit to Port Adelaide offers no further insights into the circumstances of its acquisition.86 While in South Australia, he also undertook an inland journey along the Murray River, then returned by ship to Hobson's Bay and departed Port Phillip for Germany in January 1854.87

In January 1857 Neumayer returned to Australia and succeeded in establishing the Flagstaff Observatory on Melbourne's Flagstaff Hill. Over the years 1858-64, he also conducted a magnetic survey of the colony of Victoria, a major undertaking involving ten separate excursions to various parts of Victoria and surrounding states. Magnetic mapping was understood at the time to assist in establishing the value of land for agricultural and mining purposes.88 In April 1864, at the invitation of Sir Edward Sabine, then President of the Royal Society, he visited Tasmania (Launceston and Hobart, now Hobart) to carry out further magnetic measurements. He then returned to Melbourne, departing for Europe in June 1864.89

Neumayer had fairly frequent contact with Aboriginal people during his magnetic survey excursions, both as hired guides and through chance encounters. On several occasions he benefited from Aboriginal assistance to navigate areas unfamiliar to him, locate food and water, and ford rivers.90 He was interested in Aboriginal languages and customs, recording the meanings of Aboriginal placenames, and noting during a stop near the Prungle Hills in south-west New South Wales: 'I was very much pleased by some of the Blacks showing considerable intelligence while explaining to me their way of living and giving me an idea of their language'.91 A little later in his report, he added 'a few remarks respecting some customs of the natives of this part of the country [between the Murrumbidgee and Wakool rivers]', including the comment that '[t]hey seem to have a great affection for their relatives; and women have to carry their dead babies on their backs until another baby of their tribe dies'.92 However, unless ancestral remain v1495 is found on closer examination to have belonged to a child, this remark is unlikely to be of significance for provenance purposes. Later again, Neumayer visited the 'Bone-Caves of Mt. Burr' in south-east South Australia, where he observed 'large quantities of fine bones cemented together into a very hard mass', including 'many sharks' teeth'; however, he did not mention finding any human remains here.93

The fourth of Neumayer's ten magnetic survey excursions took him 'through the West of the colony of Victoria and the East of South Australia'.94 He was accompanied on this trip by an assistant, presumably either S. Sahner or Edward Brinkmann, both of whom he acknowledged in general
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86 Neumayer 1907: 26-30.
87 Neumayer 1907; Quilty 2011; Schlechter 2009: 46-47.
88 Morrison 2011; Neumayer 1869.
90 Neumayer 1869: 14, 18-19, 38, 40-42, 45-47, 93-94.
92 Neumayer 1869: 15.
93 Neumayer 1869: 48. Presumably Neumayer was referring to the Mt Burr rock shelter. Archaeological excavations of this site in the 1960s found stone implements, faunal remains and charcoal, indicating Aboriginal occupation dating back to over 8000 years, but seemingly no human remains (Anon 1968: 11; South Australian Museum Archives 2014). Earlier descriptions of the 'Mount Burr Cave' or 'Mount Burr Caves' also emphasised faunal remains, including 'bones of animals of gigantic size' and 'animals that have now no representatives' (Anon 1866b; Tenison-Woods 1862: 356-357).
94 Neumayer 1869: 3; for a map of his route, see Morrison 2011: 54.
terms for the ‘services [they had] rendered’ him as ‘travelling companions and assistants’. In addition, two ‘private guests’ travelled with him: Hermann Beckler, a German-born doctor who had briefly accompanied the Victorian Exploring Expedition (Burke and Wills Expedition) in 1860 as medical officer and botanist, and ‘a young gentleman of the name of Irvine’. Possibly this was James Hamilton Irvine, co-owner of Dunmore Station in Victoria’s Western District.

On 14 December 1861 Neumayer and his companions set up camp ‘about three quarters of a mile’ from the settlement of Wellington in South Australia. The following morning ‘[t]he gale was so strong that we could scarcely make any head [sic] against the fury of the wind; the covering of sand was carried away by it from the graves of the Blacks, and we had occasionally to step over skulls and bones’. Apart from his description of dead babies being carried on their mothers’ backs, this is the only mention of Australian Indigenous human remains I have been able to find in Neumayer’s publications. As an opportunistic, rather than systematic, collector of natural history specimens, it seems likely that Neumayer took this opportunity to obtain ancestral remain v1495.

As mentioned above, the BSAEP’s catalogue card for ancestral remain v1493 notes that it was ‘obtained by Prof. Neumeyer, received from Prof. Friedrich’. Seethaler suggests that ‘Prof. Friedrich’ was Paul Leopold Friedrich (1864-1916), a medical doctor active in Leipzig, Greifswald, Marburg and Königsberg. However, I have been unable to establish any connection between Paul Leopold Friedrich and either Neumayer or Virchow. I believe a more likely candidate is the pathologist Nikolaus Friedreich (1826-1882), after whom Friedreich’s ataxia, a degenerative neuromuscular disorder, is named.

Born in Würzburg, Friedreich studied medicine there from 1844 to 1850; his teachers included Virchow, and in 1856 he succeeded Virchow as Chair of Pathological Anatomy in Würzburg. In 1858 he was appointed Director of the Medical Clinic and Professor of Pathology and Therapy in Heidelberg, remaining there until his death in 1882. Over the years 1856-82, Friedreich corresponded regularly with Virchow, whom he evidently considered a mentor and friend; his letters, held in the archive of the BBAS, include both professional observations and personal information. These letters reveal that Friedreich sent ‘Virchow pathological specimens from patients treated in his Heidelberg clinic, and that in 1871 he was instrumental in supplying Virchow with a human skull obtained from ‘a guaca [Indigenous burial site] in Chiriqui’ by A. de Zeltner, former French Consul in Panama. Friedreich’s letters to Virchow do not mention any human remains from Australia; however, the two met in person on several occasions, so possibly ancestral remains v1493 and v1495 exchanged hands directly, without accomplishing correspondence.

In addition to his longstanding friendship with Virchow, Friedreich undoubtedly knew Neumayer. Both men were members of the Pollichia, an association dedicated to the natural history of the Rhenish Palatinate region in south-western Germany. Neumayer was elected an honorary member while still based at the Flagstaff Observatory in Melbourne; shortly after his return to Germany, he spoke on the development of the sciences in Australia at the Pollichia’s 25th anniversary celebrations in September 1865, ’emphasising the achievements of the Germans, the bearers of science to the
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whole world’.\textsuperscript{103} Friedreich, who had joined the Pollichia as an ordinary member in 1863/64, may well have been present on this occasion.\textsuperscript{104} Virchow also had a direct association with the Pollichia: although not present for Neumayer’s September 1865 address, he had been elected an honorary member in 1859/61, and had spoken at the general meeting in November 1861.\textsuperscript{105}

In September 1868 Neumayer was elected President of the Pollichia, a position he held until 1872, when he relocated to Hamburg to become hydrographer to the German Admiralty.\textsuperscript{106} However, his involvement in the Pollichia continued well after this date; in September 1876 he was elected Chair of its Physical and Geographical Division, and in 1896 took up the position of Honorary President.\textsuperscript{107} He also established a foundation to support young scientists, still administered today by the Pollichia as the Georg von Neumayer Foundation.\textsuperscript{108}

From its establishment in 1840, the Pollichia maintained a series of natural history collections, initially encompassing zoological, botanical, mineralogical and fossil specimens.\textsuperscript{109} Over the years 1863-71, Neumayer contributed ‘a New Holland cassowary (emu)’ and a further 22 species of Australian birds to the Pollichia’s zoological collections.\textsuperscript{110} It might therefore seem logical to expect that he would also have donated to them the human skulls he had obtained in Australia. However, the Pollichia did not establish an anthropological collection until 1878, well after Neumayer had relocated to Hamburg, and this appears to have been focused principally on human remains and ethnographic objects from the Rhenish Palatinate region.\textsuperscript{111}

As outlined in the Overview, ancestral remain v1493 is almost certainly the skull of a ‘woman from Port Adelaide’ described by Virchow in 1875. It is possible that ancestral remain v1495 is the skull of a ‘man from New South Wales’ described by Virchow on the same occasion. However, I consider it more likely that the skull from New South Wales was ancestral remain v1050 (732), collected by Pressler and donated to Virchow by C.W.F. Uhde, and that ancestral remain v1495 was given to Virchow at a later date than ancestral remain v1493.

Recommendation

Repatriation of ancestral remains v1493 and v1495 is recommended.
Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection – v1518

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection No. (1)</th>
<th>Collection No. (2)</th>
<th>Collector (1)</th>
<th>Collector (2)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v1518</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jannasch</td>
<td>Erbslöhn</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New South Wales</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

I concur with Seethaler’s suggestion that ‘Jannasch’, the donor of ancestral remain v1518, was the German economist and statistician Robert Jannasch (1845-1919). As founder (in 1878) and president of the Central Association for Trade Geography, Jannasch was actively involved in promoting German trade and colonial policy; his obituary in the BSAEP’s *Proceedings* largely credited him with ‘the great development of the German export trade to Australia, Mexico and South America’. The Central Association for Trade Geography published a weekly journal, titled *Export*, and Jannasch himself wrote a number of books on related topics, including *Kolonien, Kolonialpolitik und Auswanderung* (‘Colonies, Colonial Policy and Emigration’, 1885), co-authored with fellow economist Wilhelm Roscher. He also travelled to Portugal, Morocco and the Mediterranean (1886) and southern Brazil (1904) for the purpose of expanding German trade relationships, and published several maps.

Jannasch had strong connections to the BSAEP. He was an ordinary member from 1882 to 1893 and again from 1896 to 1919, and delivered an address to his fellow members on at least one occasion; from time to time, the BSAEP and the Central Association for Trade Geography also reported on each other’s activities in their respective journals. In addition, Jannasch is mentioned in the BSAEP’s *Proceedings* as having facilitated contact between Virchow and two collectors of human remains, one active in Brazil, the other in Morocco.

I have found no evidence to support Seethaler’s suggestion that Jannasch might have visited Australia, possibly in connection with the Melbourne International Exhibition of 1880-81. However, Jannasch was certainly closely involved in preparations for Germany’s participation in both the Sydney (1879-10) and Melbourne International Exhibitions. It is also true, as Seethaler suggests, that the accession date of 1880 for skull v1518 would match a connection of some kind to one of these exhibitions (most likely the Sydney International Exhibition, in view of the fact that a provenance of ‘New South Wales’ is recorded for this skull).

In any case, Jannasch is explicitly listed as the donor of skull v1518. A separate name, Erbslöhn, is recorded for the collector. Seethaler suggests that this may be a reference to Carl Emil Erbslöhn, father of the German balloon and airship pioneer Oskar Erbslöhn, but offers no supporting reasons for this suggestion, nor have I found any evidence of connections between Carl Emil Erbslöhn and either Jannasch or Virchow. I believe a more likely candidate is a G.C. (or G.E.) Erbslöhn (or Erbsloeh), co-owner of a firm by the name of Schmedes, Erbsloeh (or Erbsloeh), & Co., which went into
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voluntary liquidation in 1893. Prior to this time, it appears to have had offices in London, Melbourne, and (perhaps temporarily) Sydney.\(^{120}\) The earliest reference I have been able to find to this firm in an Australian newspaper is an advertisement of September 1877 in the *Argus*, which describes the proprietors as ‘general agents and indenters [for] continental goods’, as well as buyers of ‘leather and tallow ... for various foreign manufacturers’.\(^{121}\) Further newspaper reports confirm that Schmedes, Erbslö, & Co. were heavily involved in both the Sydney and Melbourne International Exhibitions.\(^{122}\) A report on the Sydney International Exhibition of 1879-80 lists them as ‘the sole agents for Great Britain, the Australian Colonies, and New Zealand’ of a significant number of German and Austrian exhibitors, including producers of hand-painted china, leather, musical instruments, bent-wood furniture, glassware, and soap.\(^{123}\) The same report credits the firm with being ‘almost the first to bring the largest Austrian and German manufacturers into direct relation with the wholesale houses of Australia and New Zealand’.\(^{124}\)

It is not difficult to imagine that Jannasch and Erbslö could have come into contact with one another over the period 1879-81 as a result of their close involvement in the Sydney and Melbourne International Exhibitions. Potentially a further connection existed through a product known as Jannasch’s Patent Conserve Salt, designed to preserve meat for export; its use was demonstrated in March 1880 at the Sydney International Exhibition and elsewhere by a Mr Herbert Kaeppel (or Koeppel), the Sydney representative of Schmedes, Erbslö, & Co.\(^{125}\) However, I have not been able to establish whether the inventor of this product, Hugo Jannasch, was related or otherwise connected to Robert Jannasch.\(^{126}\)

**Recommendation**

Repatriation of ancestral remain v1518 is recommended.

---
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Ancestral remains v1893 (221) and v1894 (222) will be discussed together.

**Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection – v1893 (221)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection No. (1)</th>
<th>Collection No. (2)</th>
<th>Collector (1)</th>
<th>Collector (2)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v1893</td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Queensland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection – v1894 (222)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection No. (1)</th>
<th>Collection No. (2)</th>
<th>Collector (1)</th>
<th>Collector (2)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v1894</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Queensland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Apart from the location 'Queensland', no provenance information is recorded for ancestral remains v1893 (221) and v1894 (222). The fact that they are numbered consecutively suggests, but does not confirm, that they entered the collection at around the same time; they may also have been donated by the same individual.

Apart from the references detailed in the Overview to (i) the corpse of Johnny Campbell, and (ii) a skull from Cape York, I have not found any reference to ancestral remains from Queensland in Virchow’s publications. As already stated, I believe the skull from Cape York was most likely collected in 1881 by Otto Finsch, incorporated into the collections of the Royal Ethnological Museum in Berlin, and repatriated to its Traditional Owners by the Charité University Hospital in 2013. It is possible that Johnny Campbell's skull was later detached from the remainder of his body and incorporated into the Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection as either ancestral remain v1893 (221) or ancestral remain v1894 (222). However, I consider this unlikely, given the stark contrast between the lack of provenance information recorded for these ancestral remains and the highly detailed provenance information which accompanied Johnny Campbell’s corpse to Berlin. In any case, Johnny Campbell’s skull, if found, would be easily recognisable by its damaged condition. In the course of his report on the condition of Johnny Campbell’s preserved corpse, Virchow remarked:

> Mr Maclay had opened the skull and removed the brain for the purpose of comparative investigation. Unfortunately, despite all our searching, the skullcap [calvaria] could not be found ...

**Recommendation**

Prior to recommending repatriation of ancestral remains v1893 (221) and v1894 (222), I recommend further archival research into the circumstances of their acquisition.

---
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Appendix A. Overview of holdings of human remains from Australia (compiled by Ulrich Creutz)\(^{128}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KG</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Collector</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Serial Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>Pressler Uhde</td>
<td></td>
<td>v1050</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>North Queensland</td>
<td>Müller v</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>v1090</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>North Queensland</td>
<td>Müller v</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>v1091</td>
<td>771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>King George’s Sound</td>
<td>Müller v ded</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>v1428</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>King George’s Sound</td>
<td>Müller v ded</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>v1429</td>
<td>951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>King George’s Sound</td>
<td>Müller v ded</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>v1430</td>
<td>952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>King George’s Sound</td>
<td>Müller v ded</td>
<td></td>
<td>v1431</td>
<td>953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>King George’s Sound</td>
<td>Müller v ded</td>
<td></td>
<td>v1432</td>
<td>954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>King George’s Sound</td>
<td>Müller v ded</td>
<td></td>
<td>v1433</td>
<td>955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>Müller v ded</td>
<td></td>
<td>v1434</td>
<td>956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Schombergk</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>v1435</td>
<td>957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Australia, not Aboriginal!</td>
<td>Korff?</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>v1445</td>
<td>967</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>Aboriginal, Pt. Adelaide</td>
<td>Neumeyer Friedrich ded</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>v1493</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td>Schomburgk ded Biddock</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>v1494</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td>Neumeyer Friedrich ded</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>v1495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>Jannasch ded Erbslöh leg</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>v1518</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>v1893</td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>v1894</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Korff</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>v4017</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note on abbreviations

- KG 4a is the identification code assigned to remains from Australia held in the Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection, where KG (German *Kennung*) = identifier, 4 = Pacific, a = Australia;\(^{129}\)
- *ded* (Latin *dedit*, ‘he gave’) indicates a donor;
- *leg* (Latin *legit*, ‘he gathered’) indicates a collector.

\(^{128}\) Translation of table originally published in Seethaler 2014: 89.

\(^{129}\) Nils Seethaler, pers. comm., 11 November 2016.
### Appendix B. Institutions and individuals contacted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Contact details</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide Botanic Garden and Botanic Park</td>
<td>Lorrae West, Librarian</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lorrae.west@sa.gov.au">lorrae.west@sa.gov.au</a></td>
<td>Schomburgk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences (BBAS)</td>
<td>Wiebke Witzel, Deputy Head of Archives</td>
<td><a href="mailto:witzel@bbaw.de">witzel@bbaw.de</a></td>
<td>Friedreich, Jagor, Mueller, Neumayer, Virchow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin Central and Regional Library</td>
<td>Volker Scharnefsky, Deputy Head, Historical Collections Division</td>
<td><a href="mailto:volker.scharnefsky@zlb.de">volker.scharnefsky@zlb.de</a></td>
<td>Friedreich, Jagor, Virchow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin Society for Anthropology, Ethnology and Prehistory (BSAEP)</td>
<td>Professor Wolfram Schier, President</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wolfram.schier@fu-berlin.de">wolfram.schier@fu-berlin.de</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSAEP</td>
<td>Nils Seethaler, Deputy Treasurer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:n.seethaler@smb.spk-berlin.de">n.seethaler@smb.spk-berlin.de</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSAEP</td>
<td>Barbara Tessmann, Curator, Anthropological Rudolf Virchow Collection</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sammlung@bgaeu.de">sammlung@bgaeu.de</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke &amp; Wills Historical Society</td>
<td>David Dodd, Committee Member</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neumayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Museum, Munich</td>
<td>Marlinde Schwarzenau, Manuscripts, Corporate and Institutional Archives</td>
<td><a href="mailto:archiv@deutsches-museum.de">archiv@deutsches-museum.de</a></td>
<td>Mueller, Neumayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leipzig Municipal History Museum</td>
<td>Marko Kuhn, Librarian in Chief</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marko.kuhn@leipzig.de">marko.kuhn@leipzig.de</a></td>
<td>Schomburgk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leipzig University Archive</td>
<td>Beate Rebner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:archiv@uni-leipzig.de">archiv@uni-leipzig.de</a></td>
<td>Friedrich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leipzig University Library</td>
<td>Cornelia Bathke, Special Collections</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bathke@ub.uni-leipzig.de">bathke@ub.uni-leipzig.de</a></td>
<td>Friedrich, Jannasch, Schomburgk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palatinate Regional Library, Speyer</td>
<td>Dr Armin Schlechter, Collections Manager</td>
<td><a href="mailto:schlechter@lbz-rlp.de">schlechter@lbz-rlp.de</a></td>
<td>Friedrich, Neumayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Botanic Gardens Melbourne</td>
<td>Dr Sara Maroske, Editor, Correspondence of Ferdinand von Mueller Project</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mueller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Society of South Australia</td>
<td>Kim Critchley, Secretary</td>
<td><a href="mailto:roysocsa@gmail.com">roysocsa@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Schomburgk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Library of Bavaria, Munich</td>
<td>Nino Nodia, Papers and Manuscripts Division</td>
<td><a href="mailto:information@bsb-muenchen.de">information@bsb-muenchen.de</a></td>
<td>Friedreich, Mueller, Neumayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Library of Bavaria, Munich</td>
<td>Sophie Schrader, Manuscripts and Old Prints</td>
<td><a href="mailto:handschriften@bsb-muenchen.de">handschriften@bsb-muenchen.de</a></td>
<td>Friedreich, Mueller, Neumayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Library of South Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:slsainfo@sa.gov.au">slsainfo@sa.gov.au</a></td>
<td>Schomburgk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tasmania</td>
<td>Professor Paul Turnbull, Cultural Historian</td>
<td><a href="mailto:paul.turnbull@utas.edu.au">paul.turnbull@utas.edu.au</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C. Excerpts from Virchow (1876) Ueber einige Merkmale niederer Menschenrassen am Schädel

pp. 28-29

I. Australian Aboriginal skulls.
1. Man from New South Wales. Own collection.
2. Woman from Port Adelaide. Own collection.\(^\text{130}\)

p. 128

Explanation of figures.
Table I. Fig. 1. Australian Aborigine from New South Wales. Left: frontal process [processus frontalis], right: stenocrotaphy [narrowness of the skull in the temporal region].

Table I

[see ‘Explanation of figures’ on p. 128 above]

\(^{130}\) Skulls 3-12 in this table were collected in Queensland (Bowen and Rockhampton) between 1864 and 1872 by the German traveller-naturalist Amalie Dietrich for the Museum Godeffroy in Hamburg, Germany. Following the collapse of the trading firm Johann Cesar Godeffroy and Son in 1879, the Museum Godeffroy was disbanded and its ethnographic collection purchased by the Ethnological Museum in Leipzig, Germany. In December 1943 the Ethnological Museum was struck by an Allied bomb and a substantial proportion of its collections destroyed, including Dietrich's collection of Australian Indigenous ancestral remains (Penny 2000; Scheps 2013; Virchow 1902).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mann von Neu-Süd-Wales</td>
<td>Eigene Sammlung</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>70,0</td>
<td>71,6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Weib von Port Adelaide</td>
<td>desgl.</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>72,3</td>
<td>71,2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mann von Bowen, Nr. 9800</td>
<td>Museum Goedeoffroy, Hamburg</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>73,1</td>
<td>74,1</td>
<td>Proc. front. compl. von 11 Mm. Länge</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Weib von Bowen, Nr. 9804</td>
<td>desgl.</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>71,5</td>
<td>71,0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Weib von Bowen, Nr. 9807</td>
<td>desgl.</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>74,5</td>
<td>77,4</td>
<td>Proc. front. compl. von 6 Mm. Breite</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mann von Rockhampton, Nr. 9775</td>
<td>desgl.</td>
<td>1314</td>
<td>75,5</td>
<td>81,8</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>kurz</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mann von Bowen, Nr. 9801</td>
<td>desgl.</td>
<td>1372</td>
<td>72,2</td>
<td>76,1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>kurz</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>schmal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Weib von Bowen, Nr. 9805</td>
<td>desgl.</td>
<td>1262</td>
<td>72,5</td>
<td>71,8</td>
<td>Proc. front. compl.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Zwei kleinere trennende Schaltkn.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>schmal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mann von Gladstone, Nr. 3651</td>
<td>desgl.</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>74,8</td>
<td>78,1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>sehr kurz</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>schmal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mann von Bowen, Nr. 9802</td>
<td>desgl.</td>
<td>1523</td>
<td>68,9</td>
<td>72,1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>schmal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mann von Bowen, Nr. 9803</td>
<td>desgl.</td>
<td>1371</td>
<td>71,5</td>
<td>73,6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mann von Bowen, Nr. 9806</td>
<td>desgl.</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>75,5</td>
<td>75,2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>kurz</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Australier-
### Über einige Merkmale niederer Menschenrassen am Schädel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L i n k s</th>
<th>Länge der Sut. sphenoparietal.</th>
<th>Schaltknochen der Schläfenfontanelle.</th>
<th>Breite der Ala magna oss. sph.</th>
<th>B e m e r k u n g e n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proc. front, squam. temp.</td>
<td>6,5 Mm.</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 Mm.</td>
<td>Taf. I. Fig. 1. Alae mäßig eingebogen. Squam. temp. hoch und steil. Sut. coron. u. sphenoparietal. in einer Flucht.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beginnende seitliche Synostose der Kranznaht. Alae sphen. 10 Mm. breit, stark eingebogen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Trennender Schaltknochen</td>
<td>schmal</td>
<td>Untere seitliche Synostose beider Kranznaht. Alae 12—15 Mm. Squam. steil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kurz</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>breit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>sehr kurz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>kurz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Schädel.**

5. Beginnende seitliche Synostose der Kranznaht. Alae sphen. 10 Mm. breit, stark eingebogen. 
Erklärung der Abbildungen.

Taf. I—III. Zur Erläuterung des Stirnfortsatzes der Schlafenschuppe, der temporalen Schaltknochen und der Stenokrotaphie.

Taf. I—II stellen den Stirnfortsatz und die Stenokrotaphie, Fig. III die verschiedenen Formen der temporalen Schaltknochen dar. Auf Taf. I und II ist jedesmal die linke und rechte Seite desselben Schädels nebeneinander gegeben.


Taf. I. Fig. 1. Australier von Neu-Süd-Wales. Links Stirnfortsatz, rechts Stenokrotaphie. S. 12 und 28.

Fig. 2. Moderner Philippinen-Schädel von Manila. Doppelter Stirnfortsatz. S. 19, 30, 53.


Taf. II. Fig. 1. Magyarin. Links Stenokrotaphie, rechts Stirnfortsatz. S. 24 und 36.

Fig. 2. Schädel von S. Remo. Doppelter Stirnfortsatz. S. 26 und 38.

Fig. 3. Schädel von S. Remo. Links Stenokrotaphie, rechts Stirnfortsatz. S. 26 und 38.

Taf. III. Fig. 1. Estnischer Schädel. Großer temporaler Fontanellknochen ohne vollständige Abschließung der Ala sphenoidalis vom Angulus parietalis. Der Schaltknochen ist hauptsächlich auf Kosten des Angulus parietalis entwickelt; dafür hat sich letzterer auf Kosten des Stirnbeins compensatorisch vergrößert. Außer dem findet sich ein Schaltknochen im Angulus mastoideus der Schuppennaht. Linke Seite. S. 45.
Appendix D. Excerpts from Virchow (1895) *Pithecanthropus erectus*

pp. 435-436

For the purpose of more convenient comparison, I have had my draughtsman, Mr Eyrich, prepare geometrical depictions of the skull of an Australian Aborigine and of the skulls of a gorilla and a chimpanzee. These are reproduced in Table VI at a 1/3 reduction in size: Fig. 1 the Australian Aborigine, Fig. 2 the gorilla and Fig. 3 the chimpanzee in horizontal position (Frankfurt Horizontal) ... I note that the Australian Aboriginal skull originates from a native of Cape York and may be considered the most bestial in our collections.

Table VI

[See explanation of figures on p. 436 above]
d. i. das Verhältniss der Tageszahl des sexagesimalen Rundjahrs (360) zu der des periodischen Monats (27), bezw. das Verhältniss der scheinbaren Umläufe der Sonne (Gold) und des Mondes (Silber). Eine solche Anlehnung erscheint um so erklärlicher, wenn man bedenkt, dass die altbabylonischen Priester in ihrer Person oder wenigstens in ihrer Körperschaft die Funktionen des Astronomen, des Astrologen, der obersten Aichungsbehörde, des Finanzministeriums, des Banquiers, des Kaufmanns, des Notars u. s. w. in sich vereinigten.

(20) Hr. Rud. Virchow kommt nach neuen Erfahrungen zurück auf die in früheren Sitzungen (S. 78 und 336) behandelte Frage von dem

Pithecanthropus erectus.

(Hierzuf Tafel VI und VII.)

Die größte Differenz in der Deutung der von Hrn. Dubois in Java aufgefundenen Skelettheile betrifft die Schädeldecke. Während sie von ihm selbst als eine mehr affenähnliche, der Calvaria des Gibbon am nächsten stehende betrachtet wurde und auch mehrere von uns dieser Auffassung beitraten, haben andere Anatomien, und unter ihnen sind in erster Linie Sir William Turner und Cunningham zu nennen, sie für entschieden menschlich erklärt. Ihnen hat sich Hr. Rudolf Martin (Globus 1895, LXVII, Nr. 11) in einer ausführlichen Motivierung angeschlossen.


1) Unter Nichteinrechnung der Epagomenen.

Zum Zwecke der bequemeren Vergleichung habe ich von dem Schädel eines Australier's und von den Schädeln je eines Gorilla und eines Chimpanse durch meinen Zeichner, Hrn. Eyrich, geometrische Abbildungen anfertigen lassen, welche auf Taf. VI in \( \frac{1}{5} \) Verkleinerung wiedergegeben sind: Fig. 1 der Australier, Fig. 2 der Gorilla und Fig. 3 der Chimpanse in Horizontalstellung (Frankfurter Horizontale). Fig. 2a ist eine Abbildung desselben Gorillaschädels, bei dem nur das Gesicht stark gesenkt ist, um die gewaltige Grösse des Orbitaltheils zu voller Erscheinung zu bringen. Ich bemerke dabei, dass der Australier-Schädel von einem Eingeborenen von Cap York herstammt und in unseren Sammlungen als der am meisten bestiale gelten darf. Man wird sofort die grosse Verschiedenheit bemerken, welche zwischen Mensch und Affen hervortritt. Bei dem Australier hat die Stirn, und zwar in ihrem cerebralen Antheil, eine beträchtliche Breite und die Schläfengegend ist gefüllt, während bei den Affen der Gehirnschädel sich nach vorn verjüngt und die Verbreiterung der Stirn allein dem Orbitaltheil zufällt. Der Schädelform entspricht auch die Gehirnform: das Vorderhirn ist bei den Affen schmal und fast zugespiitzt, bei den Menschen breit und stumpf.


Vergleicht man nun die Abbildungen, welche Hr. Dubois von dem javanischen Schädelmache geliefert hat (S. 3, Fig. 1, P. und Taf. I, Fig. 1), so ergiebt sich sofort, dass dasselbe in seinem Vordertheil nach Affenart gebildet ist. Es würde das noch deutlicher hervortreten, wenn die Jochbogenansätze nicht abgebrochen und der vordere Rand über Nase und Augenhöhlen nicht mehrfach zertrümmert wäre. Ich habe in Rücksicht auf das erstere, besonders wichtige Verhältniss für meine Abbildungen einen Chimpanesschädel, bei dem beide Jochbögen zerbrochen und der rechte ganz dicht am Stirnbein verloren gegangen ist, und einen Australier-Schädel, bei dem gleichfalls aus dem rechten Jochbogen ein grüsseres Stück ausgebrochen ist, gewählt. Gerade diese Defekte lehren augenfällig, dass die Schädelform trotzdem leicht erkennbar ist, und dass die des Chimpanse mit dem javanischen Schädelmache durchaus übereinstimmt, während die des Australier's gänzlich verschieden ist.

Es ist schwer verständlich, wie Hr. Martin in der Beurtheilung des javanischen Schädelmaches zu einem gerade entgegengesetzten Resultat gelangt ist. Er beruft sich auf die Textfigur 1 (S. 3) bei Dubois, „in welcher die Scheitelansicht des Hylobates und des fossilen Schädel's in einander gezeichnet sind;“ daran soll man sich überzeugen, „dass beim Menschen und den Anthropoiden die seitlich und hinter den Augenbrauenbogen gelegenen Schädeltheile ganz verschieden geformt sind.“ Aber ein menschliches Schädelmache ist an der bezeichneten Stelle überhaupt nicht abgebildet, und die Scheitelansicht des Hylobates und des fossilen Schädel's sind nicht