

Stefanie Affeldt

## Nicole Hoffmann, Wiebke Waburg (eds.): Eine Naturforscherin zwischen Fake, Fakt und Fiktion. Multidisziplinäre Perspektiven zu Werk und Rezeption von Amalie Dietrich.

Wiesbaden: Springer VS 2021. 250 pp. ISBN: 978-3-658-34143-5. EUR 49,99; also ebook.

Born in May 1821, Amalie Dietrich reached particular fame through her exploration of the ‘untapped wilderness’ of Queensland onto which she embarked in the 1860s. She was the only female ‘scientific explorer’ her employer, a well-known merchant from Hamburg, sent to Oceania to ‘collect’ specimens from the flora and fauna of Queensland – an endeavour that was soon extended to anthropological and ethnological specimens. While, during her ten-year stay, she amassed a respectable number of botanical and zoological objects,<sup>1</sup> not many authentic documents regarding the life and activities of Dietrich seem to have survived the passage of time, nor has she published or left anything in writing. The foundation of almost all biographical texts and reports, fictitious stories and books, and other cultural outpourings (e.g. comics, poems, and even a play and an opera) that inform a broad audience of Dietrich’s life are based (more or less loosely) on the ‘Bischoff biography’, published by Charitas Bischoff almost two decades after her mother’s passing.<sup>2</sup> In it, Dietrich’s stay in Queensland is mediated via the reproduction of letters between her and her daughter as well as the correspondence with a few other people. However – as contemporaries of Dietrich dunned, Ray Sumner credibly and meticulously proved,<sup>3</sup> and the present volume reiterates numerous times – the truth content of these letters is low; they seem to have been conceived by her daughter based on her memories (undoubtedly), while also drawing on the Australia literature of the time.

Amalie Dietrich’s endeavours in Australia were challenged in the light of discussions about colonialism and its reverberations today, when, in the early 1990s, an Australian newspaper referred to her as the ‘Angel of Black Death’ and implied that she had encouraged murder in the name of science. Almost exactly twenty years later, this accusation was taken up in the context of an emerging German dispute over the handling of ‘human remains’ in German museums

- 1 The here mentioned “Hunderte von Amalie Dietrich gefundene und präparierte Stücke” (1) not only underexposes the context of procurement but also underrepresents the actual number of material sent to Hamburg. Her botanical collection alone comprises “20,000” specimen, making her collection the “largest [...] of zoological and botanical material that was ever created by a single individual”, Birgit Scheps: Amalie Dietrich (1821-1891) and Queensland. In: Andrew G. Bonnell, Rebecca Vonhoff (eds.): Germans in Queensland. 150 Years, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang 201, pp. 47-60, p. 47.
- 2 See Charitas Bischoff: Amalie Dietrich. Berlin: Grote 1909.
- 3 See Ray Sumner: A Woman in the Wilderness. The Story of Amalie Dietrich in Australia. Kensington: NSW University Press 1993.

and institutions as well as their colonial context. These debates are only marginally (if at all) addressed in a publication that – published in the year of Amalie Dietrich's 200<sup>th</sup> birthday by the editors Nicole Hoffmann and Wiebke Warburg – locates her “zwischen Fake, Fakt und Fiktion” (1) and assembles ten essays that seek to take up (some of) the manifold, multifaceted publications on Dietrich and explore the “Multiperspektivität und das Oszillieren in der Wahrnehmung Amalie Dietrichs” (2) by shining a light on rules of authenticity-creating processes of ascription and discussing her position against the background of *biography* and *popular science* as well as *science history*.

The first contribution dealing with Amalie Dietrich under the perspective of *biography science*, Uta Schaffers' ‘Ein Leben erzählen: Literarische Verfahren und narrative Muster in “Amalie Dietrich. Ein Leben” (1909)’, analyses the ‘Dietrich biography’ as fundamental to the her image. Given the doubted facticity of Bischoff's writing, Schaffers rather treats the opus as novelistic and thus discusses Dietrich as a textual construction in the context of an “Erzähltextanalyse” (11), as a series of “Reiseerzählungen” (16). The ‘Bischoff biography’ conveys her stay in Queensland in thirty-one letters; for Schaffers, these letters (mostly addressed to her daughter) are a prime example of “Reiseschreiben” (23) and are meant to invoke both overall authenticity as well as mother-daughter-intimacy. They impart first-hand knowledge about Dietrich's stint in Australia and intimate knowledge of her surroundings, thus solidifying her importance as a scientist. Further, Schaffer examines the narratives ‘reading’ and ‘travelling’ – with the former being replaced by the latter over the course of Dietrich's life – and discusses these against her educational and class background and the restraints of the time for a woman entering the “tradierte männliche Raum” of science (22).

Thorsten Fuchs' ‘Amalie Dietrich – Modellage einer Biografie in Annette Duttons “Das Geheimnis jenes Tages”. Literarische Reflektionen über lebensgeschichtliches Lernen’ takes Amalie Dietrich as an example for “pädagogische Romanlektüren” (34) and “biografisches Lernen” (53). Paradoxically, he does so not by looking at any of the pedagogic works about Dietrich that address girls or young women but by seeking intertextual connections between Dutton's relatively recent novel and the ‘Bischoff biography’. Comparing both authors' descriptions of the respective protagonists and their Australia sojourns, he analyses the differing constructions of Bischoff's and Dutton's ‘Amalie’, her life story, and her endeavours in Queensland. Unfortunately, even though he sees the subject of ‘human remains’ as central to Dutton's novel and even briefly mentions two other novels focused on Dietrich's life, he relinquishes the chance of discussing a specific intertextual nodal point: both Gertrud Enderlein's ‘Die Frau aus Siebenlehn’ (1959) and Renate Goedecke ‘Als Forscherin nach Australien’ (1951) take a position on the circumstances under which Dietrich acquired indigenous human remains.<sup>4</sup> Instead, Fuchs resorts to merely reiterating the fictitious murder

4 This is not the only instance of sloppy (research) work in this volume: the novel by Enderlein that Fuchs refers to as “Gertrud Enderlein (1959 [1937])” was originally published in 1955, four years later the 3<sup>rd</sup> edition was published (This original date is honoured by another contributor to the volume but likewise misstated as being a republication of Enderlein's 1937 book). But more importantly, except for the protagonist (and her story being based on

of six Indigenous Australians committed by an equally fictitious German scientific assistant through which Dutton, as Fuchs claims, “rehabilitiert” (52) Dietrich from the real-life allegations of encouraging or even committing murder. He concludes his contribution with a meticulously prepared table comparing the dates and locations of the letters in Dutton’s story to those from the ‘Bischoff biography’ – the reason for this remain unclear.

Last in this segment, Sigrid Nolda engages in questions about ‘Image editing and image building. Zur Rolle der Bearbeitung von Bildporträts bei der Vermittlung biografischen Wissens am Beispiel von Darstellungen zu Leben und Werk der Amalie Dietrich’ and the extent to which the different versions of Dietrich’s photographic likeness, and derivatives thereof, have shaped her life story and its reception. First, Nolda focuses on the most renowned portrait of her, “eine Atelier-Fotografie im Stil der Zeit (um 1872)” (72).<sup>5</sup> Depending on the creative manipulation – cutting, softening, or outright retouching – the differing versions of the portrait emphasize attractiveness or deterrence, while the textual and visual representations mutually reinforce or contradict each other in their respective depiction of Dietrich. On the quiet (i.e. without addressing it), she identifies a ‘visual turn’: portraits accompanying relatively recent articles, which discuss the allegations waged against her, are identified as rendering Dietrich a “dämonische Frau” (78).<sup>6</sup> However, she merely sees this change as a “Modernisierung” (78); therefore, she forgoes a discussion under this perspective and rather turns to the description and interpretation of another portrait by the same photographer as well as a drawing by a renowned Hamburg painter,<sup>7</sup> an action portrait from a biographical text, and a reference to a recent (portraitless) art installation. The essay concludes with the claim that Dietrich has “(bisher)” not been depicted in “familiäre, berufliche und politische Zusammenhänge” (95) – could this have been assuaged by an expansion of the research frame to comic depictions, which, again, are merely mentioned without being addressed?

The first to explore Amalie Dietrich against the background of the *history of science*, Eberhard Fischer’s ‘Amalie Dietrich und ihre Bedeutung für die Erforschung der Flora von Australien’ provides a detailed register of the plants collected by her and gives an insight into her contribution to the botanical exploitation of the continent. Though he justly addresses the gender imbalance in

Bischoff’s biography), it is a completely different book from the 1937 one, which bears the title ‘Eine Frau aus Siebenlehn. Die Geschichte einer großen Liebe’ and is exactly that. In the same year, Enderlein also published a more factual yet national-chauvinist article on Amalie Dietrich in Australia.

- 5 This time estimate is almost spot on, though with a bit of research the exact year, location, and photographer could have been identified.
- 6 By the way, the portrait of Dietrich which reminds Nolda of the style of the opening credits of a German police procedural television series had been published two years prior in its entirety in another text by the same author. The earlier article was a major contributor to the German discussion about Dietrich’s connection to colonialism and the trade of human remains. Five years later, the very same topic had been taken up by a Hamburg newspaper which staged a kind of identity parade involving a male Indigenous Australian. This would have made for a nice discussion of a picture story.
- 7 Both are mentioned – Allers by name, the photographer remains anonymous – without any historical or other contextualizing introduction, an ‘approach’ that (with few exceptions) runs like a red thread through this edited volume.

botanical ‘collecting’ by referring to a compendium of short biographies that lists “neben 206 Männern gerade einmal 10 Frauen” as “Sammler[ ] und Botaniker[ ]” (103) and states that the “sorgfältige Pflanzensammlerin” “niemals etwas selbst publizierte oder benannte” (113), he does not further pursue this perspective of epistemologic problematization, e.g. the gendered power relations in the evaluating, documenting, and naming of the specimen.<sup>8</sup> Instead, he provides a detailed source exegesis to evidence the reception of Dietrich’s collections and the further (but yet unfinished) exploitation of them by (male) botanists.<sup>9</sup>

‘Amalie Dietrich und die Konstruktion von Wissenschaft in der Portraitliteratur’ by Ursula Engelfried-Rave investigates ways in which Dietrich is constructed as a scientist and how ‘science’ is conceived in four popular-scientific publications of the mid-1990s and early 2000s.<sup>10</sup> As a field explorer in Australia, her regular shippings of botanical and zoological specimens and artefacts<sup>11</sup> reached the Godeffroy Museum in Hamburg; she thus amassed a considerable collection of objects from the colonial frontier. For this, Dietrich is lauded as a “Naturforscherin, Entdeckerin, Botanikerin und Zoologin”, her activities are interpreted “als wissenschaftlich” (125). Based on the theories of Alois Hahn, Engelfried-Rave discusses the meaning of ‘collecting’ in science; employing Max Weber, Dietrich is promoted to the rank of “Wissenschaftler” (141). However, she does so without problematizing connections between botanical ‘collecting’, other activities in the name of science, and colonialism/imperialism – though she seemingly found such in the discussed literature. She concludes that, as a “Belegexemplar” of female contributions to science and a “Vorbild” for women, the portrait literature discussed makes Dietrich a “Lehrstück emanzipatorischen Aufbruchstrebens” (142).

Hannah Rosenberg is ‘Auf den Spuren des Falls Amalie Dietrich vor dem Hintergrund einer Heuristik im Anschluss an Ludwik Fleck’ with a multilayered approach to the central figure. Taking Fleck’s deliberations on natural science as a social activity and science as sociologically and culturally shaped phenomena as well as his identification of “Denkgemeinschaften” (148) and their professional activities as a heuristic, she addresses the multi-perspectivity of Dietrich in popular publications. In the field of botany, only a “klein[er ...] Kreis an Expert\*innen” (152) acknowledges Dietrich and her endeavours;<sup>12</sup> in popular

8 Overall (another red thread), Fischer seems to invoke an ‘Unschuld der Erkenntnis’ – otherwise only represented by the Vatican – which in discussions of both the history and sociology of science can at most pass as a curiosity: a naïve representation of ‘discovery’ and ‘collection’ of plants indigenous to other continents as a process happening in a space both free of ideology and interests and entirely untouched by social and political questions.

9 Without further addressing it, Fischer, too, stumbles across a source that evidences the conceptual conflation of botanical and anthropological ‘ambitions’: a necrology that refers to her botanical collection while praising her “belle collection de squelettes australiens”.

10 Commendably, she not only mentions the authors but introduces them regarding their respective professional and publicist backgrounds.

11 In yet another instance of the ‘innocence of cognition’, these are referred to as “aufgefundene Artefakte” (124).

12 Rosenberg, however, refrains from actually looking at both quality and quantity of what experts of botany write about Dietrich; instead she quotes sources (mainly two – the afterword by a graduate philosopher and party functionary and the historian that wrote the central study about Dietrich in the nineteen-nineties) that claim how small her degree of

circles, a larger audience was reached by the 'Bischoff biography'. She concludes that the "unscharfe[ ], sich vielfach überlagende[ ] Bild der Amalie Dietrich" is utilised in popular circles for various purposes,<sup>13</sup> but it has to remain a "Bild über Amalie Dietrich", the nuances of which are shaped by the respective creators and perspectives (158).

It is in the *popular-science* segment, not the section on the history of science, that Amalie Dietrich's connections to colonialism and debates on human remains are (almost) addressed. Wiebke Waburg's "'The Body-Snatcher'. Eine Filmanalyse zu Amalie Dietrich im Kontext der Human-Remains-Debatte' aims at doing exactly this by introducing the readers very briefly to an issue that is in actuality conversely discussed on the global level.<sup>14</sup> She then proceeds to a likewise abridged locating of Dietrich within the debate and touches on a narrative that had already been voiced twenty years prior in Australia.<sup>15</sup> In 2011, a German television documentary introduced its German audience to the question "was genau sie sich im Auftrag der Wissenschaft zuschulden kommen lassen hat" (167). In the following, Waburg meticulously dissected Dietrich's representation in the documentary, which obtained a semblance and authenticity through the appearance of experts. Taking into account means of dramaturgy, re-enactments, technical realization, and visual symbolisms, she sees the documentary's construction of Dietrich as oscillating between her as "willfähige Grab- und Leichenschänderin im Auftrag Godeffroys, deutscher Anthropologen und somit des europäischen Kolonialismus" and "fachkundige und geschätzte Sammlerin" (182).<sup>16</sup> While the documentary produces no evidence of the means through which she procured the human remains, both visual and auditory messages communicate that "Dietrich

'fame' was. Yet Fischer, in the volume at hand, talks about her significance for the faunal exploration of Australia, quoting not only several scientific sources discussing her 'collections' but also listing a number of plants named after Dietrich.

- 13 Her listing the several 'roles' of Dietrich but – despite having mentioned the connections – generously skipping the 'agent of colonialism' testifies, again, to the general underexposure of this topic.
- 14 Conservatively, the origins of the debate date back to the very early 1990s – actually, indignant people have voiced demands of repatriation beforehand (see Paul Turnbull's work), but this is the point in time where "eye of the storm" (see Colin Pardoe) is chronologically located – Waburg's introductory words on the 'human remains debate', however, make it seem that the debate unfolded this side of the 2010s.
- 15 This is not the only segment that contains factual errors: on no account has the cited Australian journalist come up with the term "Body-Snatcher" [sic] "für Amalie Dietrich und andere Sammler"; likewise the German evolution biologist is *not* the source of the "angel of black death" (167) – this is one of the downsides of a research based on the explanations of an art installation that misspells the name of the central figure and resorts to artistic auto-da-fés. One of the recent extensive publications on the repatriation of human remains that fathoms the concomitant nuanced debate can be found in the reference section of this article; seemingly, only the short segment explicitly mentioning 'Amalie Dietrich' has received Waburg's attention.
- 16 This is an often-diagnosed dichotomy that finds expression in the image of a Janus-faced Dietrich – either she is praised as a heroine of science due to her contributions to the botanical and zoological exploration of northeastern Australia, or she is discredited as a graverobber or even a murder instigator. Usually, this does not lead to a discussion that sees both the 'collection' of human remains and botanical as well as zoological specimens as parts of the larger systematology of colonialism – rather, it commonly leads to exculpatory statements that set off the reprehensible (but in keeping with the alleged zeitgeist) activities against the supposedly purely scientific aspirations.

Leichenfelder und Grabstätten schändete" (183) – it does so not least to cater to central aspects of the 'human remains debate', like the uncovering of corrupt scientists' past injustices and their assuagements by repatriation in the present.

Christine Eickboom's "[D]ie Australneger sind nämlich von finsterem Aberglauben besessen." Zur Fortschreibung von Rassismen im deutschsprachigen Australiendiskurs des 20. und 21. Jahrhunderts am Beispiel von Veröffentlichungen zu Amalie Dietrich' investigates the perpetuation of an early German discourse on Australia in the literature of the last sixty years. Then, the continent was seen as a "dunkle[r] und gefährliche[r] Ort" where peculiarities of flora and fauna evidenced a "Stillstand in der evolutionären Entwicklung" (191) and whose inhabitants were identified and demarcated through the "Konzept der Anthropophargie" (193). This 19<sup>th</sup>-century image of a dark and dangerous, hostile and inhospitable continent inhabited by Stone Age people – who are purportedly alien, uncultivated, childlike, and suspected of cannibalism – is reiterated in numerous works that take Dietrich as an example to introduce the continent down under to a German audience.<sup>17</sup> According to Eickboom, the examined modern texts provide the very same information about Australia that had already been accessible during Dietrich's lifetime. She concludes that, without seizing the opportunity for a "historisch-kritische[n] Bewertung der europäischen Expansion", 19<sup>th</sup>-century "Rassismus [wird] unverändert dargestellt und weitergegeben" (208).

In "'mindestens Kleopatra"? Amalie Dietrich als Rollenmodell in Mädchenlektüren aus der Zeit der jungen BRD', Nicole Hoffmann investigates selected young girls' books published in the early Federal Republic of Germany under the perspective of gender roles. She explores two "Jungmädchenbücher" with regard to their depiction of Dietrich as a "weibliches Rollenreflexionsmodell" (215) and their contribution to the societal memory of the culturally remarkable. Hoffmann suggests that further exploration of such text sources could not only contribute to investigations of 'doing gender' and 'doing biography' but also be extended to perspectives of science, literature, and history – with the source-poor 'Dietrich case' challenging the boundary between fiction and non-fiction and the means through which authenticity is created.

Jens Oliver Krüger's "'Die war doch son' Kräuterweiberl." Populärkulturelle Bezugnahmen auf Amalie Dietrich. Ein Reisebericht' considers her as an 'Erinnerungsort'. Taking 'place of remembrance' literally and into account only a few select sites, this journey in the footsteps of Dietrich remains a local stroll through south-eastern Germany (Grassi-Museum, Leipzig – Siebenlehn – Wilthen – Dresden-Görsitz). While explicitly mentioning *not* having gone to the (no longer existent) Amalie-Dietrich-Straße in Germering, he also did *not* visit, for instance, Hamburg as her place of professional action (neither the Speicherstadt, nor her

17 Authors of the discussed texts are merely mentioned but not thoroughly introduced, this is a definite analytical shortcoming. Taking the statement "Der Zoologe Hans Petzsch veröffentlichte 1948 in der in der ehemaligen DDR erscheinenden Zeitschrift" (193), for instance: Petzsch was a Nazi, whose ideological learning was certainly still in process when the German Democratic Republic was established in October 1949 and whose professional career after the war was temporarily hindered due to this very past.

biological collections)<sup>18</sup> or Rendsburg, as her last abode and final resting place (the ultimate place of remembrance featuring the often-quoted ‘Efeu auf dem Grab’) – this certainly enables him to conclude that the “lokale Bezugnahme” also constructs a “Bedeutsamkeit dieser Lokalitäten” (249).

Altogether, it is, of course, possible to investigate and discuss Amalie Dietrich and her various ways of reception from several perspectives. However, it is an *inexcusable omission* to leave underexposed, or even bypass, the central issue associated with her name – and this includes historicizing the political and academic environment in which she acted.

That the exploitation of colonies and knowledge about them mutually defined and affected each other is undeniable.<sup>19</sup> In their introductory words, the editors of the volume at hand list Dietrich as a “Beispiel für die Gräueltaten des europäischen Kolonialismus” (2). Over the last decades, this perspective has become a focal topic in the light of debates concerning the repatriation of human remains and cultural objects and has led to an apologetic relativisation in the course of which Dietrich’s ‘bone theft’ is enclosed in the ‘zeitgeist’ and additionally charged up against contribution to the natural sciences. In the present volume, ‘colonialism’ remains a buzzword that is mentioned sparsely throughout the volume<sup>20</sup> – albeit without ever actually making it a central point of discussion. Here, botany and zoology are not seen as colonizing endeavours,<sup>21</sup> nor is the ‘collecting’ of indigenous artefacts. A discussion of Amalie Dietrich should neither consider the various subject areas separated from each other nor set them off against each other, but rather develop a critical overall view of Dietrich and the reproduction of her various images in relation to the respective temporal, socio-cultural and political backgrounds.<sup>22</sup>

Some contributions briefly mention connections to colonialism or the ‘human remains debate’ without any attempt at historicizing or contextualizing the

18 For this concept, Amalie Dietrich offers a multitude of linkages that transcend the literal “Ort” of remembrance, see Stefanie Affeldt: ‘Kein Mensch setzt meinem Sammeleifer Schranken’. Amalie Dietrich zwischen Herbarium und Leichenraub. In: Jürgen Zimmerer, Kim Sebastian Todzi (eds.): Hamburg: Tor zur kolonialen Welt. Erinnerungsorte der (post-)kolonialen Globalisierung, Göttingen: Wallstein 2021, pp. 213-228.

19 See Regine Sarreiter: “Ich glaube, dass die Hälfte Ihres Museums gestohlen ist”. In: Annette Hoffmann, Britta Lange, Regina Sarreiter (eds.): Was wir sehen: Bilder, Stimmen, Rauschen. Zur Kritik anthropometrischen Sammelns, Basel: Basler Afrika Bibliographien 2012, pp. 43-58.

20 For instance: “In den zeitlichen Horizont ist zudem der europäische Kolonialismus einzubeziehen”; this is followed by two sentences consisting of the quotation of a statement on the “politisch-soziale Spannungsfeld, auf das das singuläre Schicksal Amalie Dietrichs bezogen war” and another of the claim that the “Pflanzenjagd war im 19. Jahrhundert ‘zu einem organisierten Unternehmen geworden’” (all on page 157).

21 Though the “Exotismus als Wunsch nach ausgefallenen Pflanzen” and “Kolonialismus” are mentioned as going hand in hand as parties involved in the “Versklavung der Ureinwohner\*innen und dem Raubbau an der Natur” (137), subject areas like ‘ecological imperialism’ (Alfred W. Crosby: *Ecological Imperialism. The Biological Expansion of Europe, 900-1900*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2009) and ‘colonial bioprospecting’ (Londa Schiebinger: *Plants and Empire. Colonial Bioprospecting in the Atlantic World*. Cambridge, Mass., London: Harvard University Press 2007) that have been debated for more than a decade remain completely untapped.

22 For an argument in favour of a critical biography, see Stefanie Affeldt, Wulf D. Hund: From ‘Plant Hunter’ to ‘Tomb Raider’. The Changing Image of Amalie Dietrich. In: *Zeitschrift für Australienstudien | Australian Studies Journal*, 33-34, 2019-2020, pp. 89-124.

differing constructions of Dietrich against this background. Occasions were numerous: one essay foregoes examining intertextual connections under this perspective; another leaves out any localisation of Dietrich's 'collecting' within the topic of imperialism (botanizing as 'discovering') and sexism (botanical naming policies). There is only one essay that directly addresses the repatriation discourse and almost embarks on an examination of her activities in the light of 'colonialism'. However, it gives a mere three-page, very abbreviated insight into the "Human-Remains Debate" (164) and a locating of Dietrich within said debate before shifting the discussion to the minute reproduction of a television show concerned with discussing human remains in German museums in general and depicting Dietrich as a graverobber in particular.

While the diverse literature on Amalie Dietrich reiterates her 'collecting endeavours', and a number even address her anthropological endeavours, her alleged benevolence expressed towards Indigenous Australians and her desecration of corpses were never mutually exclusive nor did these lead to ruptures in the respective narratives. Her daughter's biography describes a woman who was appreciative of the Indigenous' support and kindness – but who, nonetheless, not only send human remains to Hamburg but was also aware of the associated violation of both the peace of the dead Indigenous people and their memory for their kindred and acquaintances. At the time when Dietrich worked in Queensland, bone material from Indigenous Australians were desiderata in German scientific circles, and though his findings were only posthumously published, Rudolf Virchow ascertained his rights to examine the human remains acquired by Dietrich. The display of human remains was an everyday occurrence and one of the elements of a racialized political economy of anthropological othering in Germany and other colonial and imperialist countries. Thus, it is not surprising that even though the 'legend' of Dietrich's murder-for-hire was circulated in Germany already before the letters came to the attention of a broader audience in 1909, there never seems to have been recorded any protest or problematization of these possible circumstances of procurement. Due to meticulous research into the massacres of the colonial period,<sup>23</sup> the full extent of violence at the colonial frontier as the background to her Queensland stint comes to light.

Raymond Evans thus argues that to procure the bones of Indigenous Australians it was "not necessary in Dietrich's colonial Queensland to find sacred locations where Aboriginal peoples had been 'ceremoniously buried' and 'ritually remembered'" since "[m]assacres were commonplace" and bodies piled at their sites;<sup>24</sup> this is a circumstance that, like the colonial frontier violence she must have thus encountered – seems to have remained unmentioned by Dietrich. Was she an accomplice to the 'conspiracy of silence'?<sup>25</sup> Paul Turnbull, too, discusses 'collecting' at the colonial frontier in Dietrich's times and the involvement of

23 See, as a visually impressive example, the 'Colonial Frontier Massacres, Australia, 1788 to 1930' map, <https://c21ch.newcastle.edu.au/colonialmassacres/map.php>.

24 Raymond Evans: Picking Over the Bones. Amalie Dietrich and Colonial Queensland, comment on Affeldt, Hund: From 'Plant Hunter' to 'Tomb Raider', doi: 10.35515/zfa/asj.3334/201920.14, p. 7.

25 For the background, see Timothy Bott, Raymond Evans: Conspiracy of Silence. Queensland's Frontier Killing Times. Sydney: Allen & Unwin 2013.



the Native Police. He reasons that “her sense of her humanity and that of Birra Gubba and other peoples of coastal Queensland did not go so far as to quench her desire to secure their bones for science” and that there is a need to “explain the complexity of the connections between scientific collecting of the Indigenous dead and settler colonialism”.<sup>26</sup>

The authors of the edited volume, in contrast, abstained from engaging in such debates. Surprisingly, in many cases, the authors have not even looked at the pertinent discourse or the primary sources (though numerous are even available online) but have resorted to citing or paraphrasing the secondary literature – so to say, a prime example of “Materialfundus” (159), so to say. For instance, doubts uttered by Dietrich’s German contemporaries regarding the veracity of the ‘Australian letters’ are indirectly referenced through an article by an Australian historian rather than the original German source (2); then there are ‘quotation-daisy-chains’ in the course of which an early 20<sup>th</sup>-century gentleman (with a name but without a context) is quoted from a book published in the GDR that is quoted in a recent biographical publication (104). In the case of the phrase ‘Angel of Black Death’, the reluctance to consult primary sources leads to the impression that the phrase originates from the German debate on Dietrich in the colonial context in 2013 (167); elsewhere, the phrase dates from somewhere “im Lauf des 20. Jahrhundert” (41).

But there are other instances of irritation for the attentive readers of this volume: problematic terms as well as textual and factual errors that speak to a disparity in academic rigour and editorship. These are supplemented by annoyances – that are not least blameable on today’s publication culture, which favours individually downloadable, mechanically readable, and internationally portable articles – create a hodgepodge of eyesores that start with an unsightly partitioning of each contribution’s first page, continue with superfluous translations of the title, abstract, and keywords, and do not stop at blue publication dates and links.<sup>27</sup> Redundancy as a mannerism and the folly of doubled titles and keywords culminate vicariously in one contribution that lists “Schlüsselbegriffe: Populärkultur – Inszenierung – Gedenken – Popular Culture – Representation – Commemoration”, only to be followed up by “Keywords: Popular Culture – Representation – Commemoration” (240). Redundantly, every article seems to mention in more or less detail, either that the number of sources on Amalie Dietrich is sparse or that the veracity of the ‘Australia letters’ has been called into question but (like the rest of the ‘Bischoff biography’) are the main source for publications on her or all of the above. The fact that the same publications on Dietrich are mentioned over and over again definitely calls for an intertextual analysis of its own.

26 Paul Turnbull: Amalie Dietrich and Collecting the Indigenous Dead in Colonial Queensland, comment on Affeldt, Hund: From ‘Plant Hunter’ to ‘Tomb Raider’, doi: 0.35515/zfa/asj.3334/201920.15, pp. 10, 12.

27 The individual contributions – all written in German – are irritatingly preceded by a title, a summary, and keywords in English. Why? This is as inaesthetic (at several instances ruining the book design) as inconsequential (the introductory contribution and the section titles all omit this translational convention). This is outdone only by the vacuous habit of pretending that each contribution could be individually decoupled in their digital form.

There is a problematic usage of terms and names in this volume. One of the editors rightfully states that the term ‘Aborigines’ is regarded as “derogatory”; hence, her contribution employs the “politisch korrekten Bezeichnungen Aboriginal People und Aboriginal Australians” (165). Nonetheless, this term is used throughout the volume. It is even used by one contributor who justly debunks ‘Papua’ as “subsuming” people of diverse backgrounds “under one umbrella term” (195) but promptly fails to realize the singularity-producing characteristic of its historical replacement. Another contributor carries this issue to its conflictual peak by unnecessarily yet explicitly citing that the fictitious professor “das Wort ‘Aborigines’ [...] strikt ab[lehnt]” (43) and thus seemingly attempting to ‘excuse’ his usage of ‘indigenous population’ when speaking about the “Stammesälteste[ ] der indigenen Bevölkerung”; this is immediately followed by the surfacing of a “Stammesführer” (45) and “Eingeborene” (61). In another contribution the passé “Ayers Rock” (184) makes an appearance.

Lastly, textual errors are as diverse as numerous in this volume and include misspelt names as “Peiffer” (28) instead of Pfeiffer and “Johann Cesar Godefroy” (twice 103, 124, 139) instead of Johan<sup>28</sup> or “Bromme” (165) instead of Broome and “Germaring” (166) instead of Germering; missing characters as in “eine zusätzlich ‘Korrektur’” (77), “sicht und erfahrbar” (95); typing errors like “dir Ostküste” (166), “Landschaftsaufnahmen” plus “Volkerkunde” (both 176), and “Scienece” (185); in addition, one finds absent blank spaces as well as superfluous punctuation marks.

It remains to be noted that, overall, the volume contributes but little to the current discussion regarding colonialism, ‘human remains’, and the dealing with ‘dark’ cultural heritage – though, especially for the latter, Dietrich would have been a prime case study on multiple levels. While it does not actually promote research on Amalie Dietrich, this collection of essays also does not harm it or set it back.

28 This very misspelling of Godeffroy’s forename is of particular irony: in what leads to an ‘orthographic boomerang effect’, one contribution discredits one of its discussed text as “giving the impression of poor research” based on the “consistent misspelling” of the name Godeffroy (205).